

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

General Requirements			
Page #	Line #	Question #	Question
21	94	GR 01	Is a written Leafy Greens Compliance Plan which specifically addresses the Best Practices of the LGMA available for review?
21	95	GR 02	Does it specifically address best practices for water, soil amendments and crop inputs, environmental factors, work practices, and field sanitation?
21	97	GR 03	Is an up to date producers list with contact and location information available for review?
21	98	GR 04	Does the Shipper have a traceability process?
21		GR 04a	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter source?
21		GR 04b	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter subsequent recipient?
21	101	GR 05	Has the Shipper designated someone to implement and oversee the food safety program?
21		GR 05a	Is the name of the individual available?
21		GR 05b	Is 24/7 contact information for the individual available?
Records			
21	126	RE 01	Were all records required by the Leafy Greens Compliance Plan readily available and accessible for inspection during the audit? (e.g. Logs, Checklist, Spreadsheets, etc.)
21			Do they include (as applicable):
21	111	RE 01a	Farm name and location
21	113	RE 01b	Actual values and observations obtained during monitoring
21	114	RE 01c	An adequate description of the leafy green product
21	116	RE 01d	Growing area location (i.e. production location including block and/or lot)
21	117	RE 01e	Date and time of the activity being documented
22	119	RE 02	Do records indicate they were created at the time the activity was performed?
22	121	RE 03	Were the records signed and dated by the person performing the documented activity?
22	123	RE 04	Did the Shipper assign/designate and document the supervisor/responsible party for records review and sign off?
			Have the following records been reviewed, signed and dated by a supervisor or responsible party:
27	284	RE 04a	Water records must be reviewed and signed within a week (Records include: ag water microbiological test results, ag water assessments, water treatment monitoring records and records of corrective actions for test that do not meet the water quality criteria)
64	Table 3	RE 04b	On-Farm Soil Amendments within a week (Records include: process control monitoring for on-farm produced soil amendments)
23	188	RE 04c	Training documentation for required training must be reviewed and signed within a reasonable timeframe per SOP.
73	833	RE 04d	Harvest equipment, tools, containers, packing material, buildings (if applicable packing facilities) cleaning and sanitation records in a reasonable timeframe per SOP (i.e. keep a record of the date and method of cleaning and sanitizing equipment)
22	142	RE 05	Do SOPs require documentation and records to be kept for 2 years?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Personnel Qualifications and Training			
22	156	PE 01	Did personnel receive training at hire and at least annually thereafter?
			Does the training provided to all personnel who work with leafy greens or supervise those who do include:
23	167	PE 01a	The principles of food hygiene and safety, including recognition of employee health conditions for illness?
23	169	PE 01b	Training and education on infectious illnesses that can be asymptomatic (e.g. cyclosporiasis, hepatitis, salmonellosis, norovirus).
23	168	PE 01c	The importance of health and personal hygiene?
23	172	PE 01d	The standards established in these best practices that are applicable to the employee's job responsibilities?
			Do all harvest personnel receive additional training in:
23	176	PE 01e	Recognizing leafy greens that may be contaminated and therefore not be harvested? (This includes the potential of cut product to contact the ground/soil.)
23	178	PE 01f	Inspecting product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials to ensure they are working properly and do not pose a product contamination risk?
23	181	PE 01g	How to correct problems with product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials or report problems to supervisors?
23	184	PE 02	Has a food safety professional / representative for each farm completed the Produce Safety Alliance, "Grower Training" or a standard curriculum recognized by the FDA?
		PE 02a	Grower
		PE 02b	Harvester
		PE 02c	Cooler/Holder
23	187	PE 03	Are there records of training events that include the training date, topics covered, and trainee's name?
Environmental Assessments			
Pre-Season Assessment			
Animal Activity			
23	198	EA 01	Was a Pre-Season Assessment conducted prior to the first seasonal planting?
85-87	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 02	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion?
85-87			If EA 02 is answered "NO" then EA 03 - EA 05 will drop down.
85-87	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 03	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by Food Safety professional?
85-87		EA 04	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
85-87		EA 04a	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
85-87	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 05	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
85-87		EA 05a	If "YES" were corrective actions formulated?
85-87		EA 05b	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
85-87		EA 05c	If "YES" are you periodically monitoring the effectiveness of any corrective actions?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Adjacent and Nearby Land Use			
82	1168	EA 06	Was a detailed risk assessment conducted for adjacent and nearby land use?
			If present, were the risk factors for the following evaluated for risk level:
25-26	Table 0	EA 07	Animal operations (i.e. AFO, CAFO, Grazing Lands, and Domestic Animals/Hobby Farms)
Pre-Season Assessment			
25-26	Table 0	EA 07a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
25-26	Table 0	EA 07b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 08	Compost / Soil Amendments Operations
25-26	Table 0	EA 08a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
25-26	Table 0	EA 08b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 09	Non-leafy greens crops - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
25-26	Table 0	EA 09a	If "Yes" were Table 0 risk factors evaluated?
25-26	Table 0	EA 09b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10	Water Source and Systems - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10a	Wellhead proximate to Untreated Manure?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10c	Surface Water proximate to Untreated Manure?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10d	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10e	Water Storage and conveyance systems proximate to conditions that pose a food safety risk?
25-26	Table 0	EA 10f	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 11	Urban Settings
25-26	Table 0	EA 11a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
25-26	Table 0	EA 11b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
25-26	Table 0	EA 12	Other environmental considerations - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
25-26	Table 0	EA 12a	Were Table 0 risk factors evaluated?
25-26	Table 0	EA 12b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
24	220-223	EA 13	Were there adjacent and nearby land use activities that occurred after the initial pre-season assessment that required an additional risk assessment?
24	220-223	EA 13a	If "Yes" were mitigation factors implemented and documented?
Assessment of CAFO's			
24	224	EA 14	Is the adjacent and nearby land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations(CAFO)?
			If EA 14 is answered "NO" then EA 15 will drop down.
24	224	EA 15	Was the adjacent and nearby land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO) within 1200' of the crop edge?
24	224	EA 15a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 1200' recommendation should be increased or modified?
24	224	EA 15b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
24	224	EA 15c	If "NO" was a rigorous pre-season assessment completed to address the impact of the CAFO?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Assessment of CAFO's			
			Did it address the following:
24	224	EA 15d	Information on the CAFO's Best Management Practices?
24	224	EA 15e	Number of animals within the CAFO?
24	224	EA 15f	Water source and distribution system for the production location proximate to the CAFO? (e.g. Appendix A)
Assessment of Historical Land use and Flooding			
24	239-245	EA 16	Are production blocks free from all of the following:
		EA 16a	History of flooding within the last 60 days
		EA 16b	History of grazing on the crop land within the last year
		EA 16c	History of hazardous activity including but not limited to CAFO, municipal waste, toxic waste, landfill, etc.?
		EA 16a - EA 16c if any of these are answered "NO" then EA 16c (1) will drop down	
EA 16c (1)	Were specific actions implemented and documented to mitigate the issue(s)?		
Pre-Harvest Assessment			
23	192	EA 17	Was a Pre-Harvest Assessment conducted within 7 days for each harvested lot?
			Did the assessment address the following:
24-26 & 85-87	Table 0, Table 6, Figure 9 & 207-210	EA 17a	Intrusion by animals
		EA 17b	Flooding
		EA 17c	Potential contamination materials
		EA 17d	Condition of water source and distribution system
		EA 17e	Worker hygiene and sanitary facilities
		EA 17f	Weather condition or weather events (e.g. severe wind, hail, freeze, excessive rain, or consecutive weather events) that could impact the original pre-season risk assessment (See Appendix F)
		EA 17g	Did the food safety status of the adjacent and nearby land use remain unchanged since the pre-season assessment was conducted?
Pre-Harvest Assessment - Animal Intrusion			
85-87	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 18	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion?
		If EA 18 is answered "NO" then EA 18a - EA 18f will drop down.	
		EA 18a	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?
		EA 18b	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
		EA 18c	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
		EA 18d	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
		EA 18e	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?
		EA 18f	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
Preharvest Assessment - Unusual or Other Events			
25-26 & 80	Table 0 & Table 5	EA19	Did the pre-harvest ranch assessment indicate that fields were flooded during the crop cycle?
		If EA 19 is answered "YES" then EA 19a - EA 19d will drop down	
25-26 & 80		EA19a	If production blocks were flooded is there documentation to indicate the extent of the flooding and the area of the crop impacted?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Preharvest Assessment - Unusual or Other Events			
25-26 & 80	Table 0 & Table 5	EA19b	Was the product left un-harvested?
25-26 & 80		EA19c	If product was harvested, was a 30' (min) "no harvest" buffer from the high water mark established?
25-26 & 80		EA19d	Are these remedial activities documented?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20	Does the preharvest assessment indicate the production area was free from any other type of potential contamination? (i.e. potential contamination materials, condition of water source and distribution system, unexpected adjacent land activity that will pose a risk to food safety, worker hygiene and sanitary facilities)?
86-87	Table 6		If EA 20 is answered "NO" then EA 20a - EA 20h will drop down
86-87	Table 6	EA 20a	Was a food safety assessment completed?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20b	Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20c	Is the date of the assessment documented?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20d	Were remedial actions formulated?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20e	Was the field harvested?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20f	Is there documentation to show the remedial actions were followed?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20g	Did the remedial action include creation of "no harvest" buffer or separation zones around the potentially contaminated area(s)?
86-87	Table 6	EA 20h	Is documentation which fully delineates the potential contamination available for review?
Assessment of Produce Field			
24	234-238	EA21	If the preharvest assessment indicates the production area had a changes in weather condition or weather events during the production period are the following addressed:
24	234-238	EA 21a	Potential impact on the crop or operations?
24	234-238	EA 21b	If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out and documented according to Company SOP?
24	234-238	EA 21c	Was the production area evaluated for any discharge events or other potential impact on the crop or operations from a CAFO?
24	234-238	EA 21d	If the crop or operations were impacted by a discharge event were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP?
Water Use			
General Agricultural Water Management			
27	267	WU 01	Was an Agricultural Water Assessment completed prior to use for each agricultural water system?
27	268	WU 01a	Is an agricultural water system description (or other documentation) indicating the source(s) of water and distribution system(s) available for review?
27			For irrigation systems:
27	269	WU 01a (1)	Does the description (or other documentation) identify permanent above ground fixtures such that they can be located in the field?
27	269	WU 01a (2)	Does the map (or other documentation) identify the flow of the water system(s) and production blocks that may be served by the water source(s)?
27	282	WU 01a (3)	Are effluent systems that convey untreated human or animal wastes separated from irrigation water systems?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

General Agricultural Water Management			
			For All Water Systems and Uses:
28	294	WU 01b	Was the system, including water source, water storage and water conveyance, evaluated to determine the system type(s) (Type A or Type B)?
29	358-363	WU 01c	Has the operation established how and when water will be suitably applied for specific uses? (e.g. irrigation, chemical/nutrient application, dust abatement, equipment cleaning, etc.)
Managing Agricultural Water Storage and Conveyance Systems			
32	431	WU 02	Has an SOP been created for maintenance of ancillary equipment, water storage and conveyance?
			Does the SOP include the following:
32	433	WU 02a	Regularly scheduled visual inspections to ensure that it is in good working order and does not pose a contamination risk to the water system?
32	436	WU 02b	Does the SOP include maintaining water quality by removal of debris, weeds, algae, tulle, trash, and sediment within the producer's control?
32	440	WU 02c	Controls for pest access in place and corrective actions outlined if pest infestation occurs?
32	442	WU 02d	Controls identified for the prevention of run-off into water storage and conveyance systems?
32	444	WU 02e	Procedures to ensure standing water does not pose a contamination in place?
Managing Agricultural Water Storage and Conveyance Systems			
32	445	WU 02f	Management of agricultural water system components used to prepare and apply crop inputs to ensure these activities and equipment used are not a source of contamination?
32	447	WU 02g	Practices to ensure water used in aerial applications within the 21 days-to-scheduled harvest are Type A or B → A water systems?
32	449	WU 02g (1)	Holding tanks and equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
32	451	WU 02g (2)	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?
32	453	WU 02h	Establish corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios (e.g. contaminated source water, animal intrusion, contaminated run-off, flooding)?
32	458	WU 03	Were corrective measures, cleaning activities, and maintenance documented?
Overhead Chemical Applications prior to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
34	521	WU 04	Were Overhead Chemical Applications utilized prior to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
30	377	Wu 04a	If "yes", did the water used for the applications meet the Baseline Microbial Assessment for Type A source water quality criteria?
30	380	Wu 04b	If "yes", did the water used for the applications meet irrigation Type B water quality criteria as outlined in Table 2E (Routine Verification of Microbial Water Quality)?
Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
33	501	WU 05	Has an SOP been created for all of the parts of the agricultural water system used in overhead chemical application?
			The SOP for overhead applications must address the following:
33	503	WU 05a	Water used within 21 days requirement to meet Type A and/or B → A water quality criteria

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
33	505	WU 05b	Holding tanks, equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
33	508	WU 05c	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?
33	510	WU 05d	Control pest access to equipment during storage and staging
33	513	WU 05e	Corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios, includes treatment failure, contaminated source water, pest concerns, chemical incompatibility, equipment sanitation concerns)?
34	519	WU 06	Was there documentation of corrective measures, including cleaning activities and maintenance ?
34	520	WU 07	Is there an SOP to address each unique application process to treat water?
			The SOP must address the following:
34	522	WU 07a	Use initial water treatment assessment to establish treatment parameters, monitoring to ensure consistent delivery and effectiveness (Note: You must reestablish treatment parameters if a material change to the system occurs)
34	526	WU 07b	Step-by- step instructions to ensure the water treatment is correctly implemented
34	527	WU 07c	Location of water sources
34	528	WU 07d	Name, and suggested supplies needed
34	529	WU 07e	Sanitizer used and quantity used
34	530	WU 07f	Critical limits and operational limits
34	531	WU 07g	Water sampling location
34	532	WU 07h	Corrective actions if critical limits are not met
34	533	WU 07i	Required records
35	563	WU 08	If Type A water is used, are records available that demonstrate the water used for chemical application meets the Baseline Microbial Assessment Criteria for Type A source water quality criteria?
33	504	WU 09	Was Type B→A water used for Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
34	535	WU 09a	Was a baseline for treated water done for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?
34	535	WU 09a (1)	Were there a minimum of three 100 mL samples taken for each overhead application process from different treated water batches.
34	539	WU 09a (2)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli?
34	541	WU 09b	Was a minimum of one 100 mL sample taken for routine testing done monthly from a representative ag water system or at the next application event?
34	543	WU 09b (1)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria of non-detectable generic E. coli?
			WU 09b (1) answered "NO" then WU 09b (2) - WU 09b (4) will drop down for Corrective Action
34	547	WU 09b (2)	Was your grower/producer notified?
34	546	WU 09b (3)	Was a root cause analysis done to correct the concern?
34	548	WU 09b (4)	If water used within 21 days exceeds the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
34	551	WU 09c	Was ongoing monitoring of the treated water performed at each application event to verify treatment parameters established during the initial set up were being followed ?
34	553	WU 09c (1)	Do records show the water treatment parameters were met?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
WU 09c (1) answered "NO" then WU 09c (2) - WU 09c (5) will drop down for Corrective Action			
35	555	WU 09c (2)	Was a corrective action performed to ensure the water treatment was effective before using the water?
35	557	WU 09c (3)	Was a microbiological sample taken to verify the treatment was effective and was documented for the corrective action?
35	559	WU 09c (4)	If the microbiological sample did not meet the acceptance criteria of non-detectable generic E. coli was root cause analysis performed to correct the treatment process? (Note: It is suggested that the grower/producer is notified)
35	561	WU 09c (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
Irrigation Water from TYPE B Agricultural Water (before and after 21 Days to scheduled harvest)			
36	Table 2A	WU 10a	Was a source water test conducted, for each source of water, within 60 days of first use?
			<i>Note: Reclaimed water sample results and analysis provided by the water district or provider may be utilized as records of water source testing for verification and validation audits.</i>
36	Table 2A	WU 10a	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples have been collected on a monthly basis, or at the next irrigation event if greater than monthly?
36	Table 2A	WU 10b	Do records show that the water samples are taken no less than 18 hours apart?
36	Table 2A	WU 10c	Is the geometric mean less than or equal to 126 MPN/100 mL?
36 & 53	Table 2A & Table 2E	WU 10d	Are all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 mL for overhead application/irrigation 21 days prior to scheduled harvest or 576 MPN/100m ml for any type of water application, except overhead?
WU 10c or WU10d answered "NO" then WU 10d (1) - WU 10d (8) will drop down			
37	Figure 1	WU 10d (1)	Was the water distribution system use discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?
36	Table 2A	WU 10d (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
37	Figure 1	WU 10d (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken to eliminate the contamination sources?
36-37	Table 2A & Figure 1	WU 10d (4)	Was the system retested - five samples (taken no less than 18 hours apart) at the previous sampling point?
		WU 10d (5)	Did the five samples meet the acceptance criteria - average less than 126 MPN/100 mL (based on rolling geometric mean=5) and all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 mL for overhead application/irrigation 21 days prior to scheduled harvest or 576 MPN/100 mL for any type of water application, except overhead?
		WU 10d (6)	Do records show the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate?
		WU 10d (7)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
		WU 10d (8)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella, do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
		WU 11	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
		WU 12	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?
38-40	Table 2B	WU 13	Is the TYPE A Irrigation water sourced from a public or private provider?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers				
38-40	Table 2B	WU 14	Was the public or private provider's most current COA available for review (e.g. may be provided by municipalities, irrigation districts, or other water providers)?	
38-41	Table 2B & Figure 2A	WU 15	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment performed at least one-time seasonally for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?	
		WU 15a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment, and at least one taken from the end of the delivery system?	
		WU 15b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?	
		If WU 15b answered "NO" then WU 15b (1) - WU 15b (4) will drop down		
		WU 15b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?	
		WU 15b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?	
		WU 15b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?	
		WU 15b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?	
		WU 16	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?	
		WU 16a	Were three 100 mL samples with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?	
		WU 16b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?	
38-41	Table 2B & Figure 2A	If WU 16b answered "NO" then WU 16b (1) - WU 16b (4) will drop down		
		WU 16b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?	
		WU 16b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?	
		WU 16b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL ?	
		WU 16b (4)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system)?	
38-42	Table 2B & Figure 2B	WU 17	Was a routine verification of microbial water quality performed on each distinct irrigation system at least once during the season?	
		WU 17a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during the routine verification with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system used to evaluate acceptance criteria?	
		WU 17b	Did the three samples meet acceptance criterion - two must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?	
		If WU 17b answered "NO" then WU 17b (1) - WU 17b (2) will drop down		
		WU 17b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?	
		WU 17b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system)?	

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers			
38-42	Table 2B & Figure 2B		If WU 17b (2) answered "NO" then WU 17b (3) - WU 17b (5) will drop down
		WU 17b (3)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
		WU 17b (4)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
		WU 17b (5)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
38-42	Table 2B & Figure 2B	WU 18	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
		WU 19	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies			
43-46	Table 2C & Figure 3A	WU 20	For the purpose of baseline microbial assessment are records of analysis of source water available - historical water test data?
		WU 20a	Is a self-certification with historical water test data available that states the acceptance criteria has been met with at least one test taken within the last 6 months?
		WU 20b	If "NO" was the system tested two times, three 100 mL samples at the source, no less than seven days apart prior to using the water in the 21 days-to-scheduled harvest window?
		WU 20c	Did the sampling meet the acceptance criteria - five of the six total samples have no detectable generic E. coli and the remaining sample has no greater than 10 MPN in 100 mL?
			If WU 20c answered "NO" then WU 20c (1) - WU 20c (2) will drop down
		WU 20c (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed?
		WU 20c (2)	Was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
43-45 & 47	Table 2C & Figure 3B	WU 21	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment performed at least one-time seasonally for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?
		WU 21a	Were three 100 mL samples from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?
		WU 21b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples from end of delivery system with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of three 100 mL samples and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
			If WU 21b answered "NO" then WU 21b (1) - WU 21b (4) will drop down
		WU 21b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 21b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 21b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
		WU 21b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies			
43-45 & 47	Table 2C & Figure 3B	WU 22	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?
		WU 22a	Were three 100 mL samples with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?
		WU 22b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples from end of delivery system with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
			If WU 22b answered "NO" then WU 22b (1) - WU 22b (4) will drop down
		WU 22b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 22b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 22b (3)	Did sampling meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four of the five total samples must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
		WU 22b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies			
43-45 & 48	Table 2C & Figure 3C	WU 23	Was routine verification performed on each distinct irrigation system sampled and tested for generic E. coli at least once during the season with three 100 mL samples at the end of the delivery system?
		WU 23a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during the routine verification from the end of the delivery system to evaluate acceptance criteria?
		WU 23b	Did the three samples meet acceptance criteria - two must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
			If WU 23b answered "NO" then WU 23b (1) - WU 23b (3) will drop down
		WU 23b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 23b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 23b (3)	Did the five samples for the level one assessment meet acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
			If WU 23b (3) answered "NO" then WU 23b (4) - WU 23b (6) will drop down
		WU 23b (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
		WU 23b (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
WU 23b (6)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?		
43-45	Table 2C	WU 24	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
		WU 24a	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli and total coliforms?
Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B->A Agricultural Water Systems			
33	484	WU 25	Was an SOP established outlining irrigation treatment and process parameters for irrigation treatment systems based on the Initial Irrigation water Treatment Assessment?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B→A Agricultural Water Systems			
33	479	WU 26	Was an Initial Irrigation Water Treatment Assessment performed to establish treatment process parameters prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest?
33	479	WU 26a	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment conducted prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest?
33	482	WU 26b	Was the assessment repeated if material changes occurred?
49	Table 2D (D1)	WU 27	Was routine verification of microbial water quality for each distinct system performed?
49	Table 2D	WU 27a	If the system is used within the 21 days to harvest window is sampling (three 100 mL samples) conducted monthly?
49	Table 2D	WU 27b	If the system is used within the 21 days to harvest window, was the irrigation treatment system tested on at least two occasions separated by at least three days?
49	Table 2D	WU 27c	Was at least one sample taken from the end of the delivery system?
49	Table 2D	WU 27d	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B→A Agricultural Water Systems			
			If WU 27c or WU 27d answered "NO" then WU 27d (1) - WU 27d (3) will drop down
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (3)	Did the five samples for the level one assessment meet acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
			If WU 27d (3) answered "NO" then WU 27d (4) - WU 27d (6) will drop down
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
56	Table 2F	WU 27d (6)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
50	Table 2D (D1)	WU 28	Did all samples meet the data monitoring criteria for Total Coliform - maximum level of no greater than 99 MPN per 100 mL?
50	Table 2D (D1)	WU 29	Was there an adequate log reduction (as outlined in Appendix A) in Total Coliforms, based on the untreated water's baseline levels?
			<i>Note: If "NO" to WU28 or WU29 then continue to monitor for total coliforms and continue to evaluate your irrigation treatment system to identify and correct any failures.</i>
50	Table 2D (D2)	WU 30	Is the water treatment system being monitored when in use for flow rates and treatment related parameters per the SOP (routine water treatment monitoring)?
50	Table 2D (D2)	WU 31	During every irrigation event, treatment-related parameter values such as residual antimicrobial levels, pH, dose settings, UVT, etc. must be documented to demonstrate the system is working as intended?
50	Table 2D (D2)	WU 32	Is the system tested for microbial water quality if the monitoring parameters fall outside the acceptable criteria?
50	Table 2D (D2)	WU 33	Are USEPA antimicrobial water treatments being used, per the label instructions?
50	Table 2D (D2)	WU 34	Was the crop nutrients and/or crop protection materials window not invoked within 21 days to scheduled harvest for overhead irrigation?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B → Agricultural Water Systems			
			If WU 34 answered "NO" then WU 34a - WU 34c (3) will drop down
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34a	Was it followed by antimicrobial water treatment?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b	Was Option 1 selected?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b (1)	Was the crop pre-harvest tested for pathogens from all affected lots for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella after the last irrigation event?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b (2)	If no, or the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c	Was Option 2 selected?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (1)	Was one sample collected pre-treatment as close to the point of use during the irrigation event when crop nutrition/protection chemicals were applied?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (2)	Was microbial water quality acceptance criteria and action as described in Table X taken?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (3)	If no, or the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 35	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production within 21 days to scheduled harvest was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
51	Table 2D (D3)	WU 35a	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
50	Table 2D (D1)	WU 36	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
50	Table 2D (D1)	WU 37	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli and total coliforms?
Harvest Direct Produce Contact, Harvest Food Contact Surfaces and Hand Wash Water (On-Farm Practices Only)			
57-58	Table 2G	WU 38	Is the water that directly contacts edible portions of harvested crop, hand wash water or used on food-contact surfaces (i.e. equipment or utensils) from a source that meets the U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) for E. coli.?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 38a	If "NO" has the water received sufficient disinfection to meet the USEPA MCLG for microbial quality?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 39	Was a source water test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use?
57-58 & 59	Table 2G & Figure 6	WU 40	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples or monitoring results have been collected from each water distribution system within the last month?
57-58 & 59		WU 40a	Were the microbial acceptance criteria met?
57-58 & 59		WU 40b	Is there a corrective action SOP for harvest direct produce contact, harvest food contact surfaces and hand wash water that does not meet acceptance criteria?
57-58 & 59			If WU 40a is answered "NO" then WU 40b (1) - WU 40b (8) will drop down
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (1)	Was use of the water discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Harvest Direct Produce Contact, Harvest Food Contact Surfaces and Hand Wash Water (On-Farm Practices Only)			
57-58 & 59	Table 2G & Figure 6	WU 40b (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken per SOP to eliminate the contamination sources?
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (4)	Was the water retested at the same sampling point?
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (5)	Did the retest results meet the acceptance criteria - non-detectable per U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) for E. coli. (e.g. less than 2.2 MPN/100 mL)?
57-58 & 59		WU 40bb (6)	Do records show the water was not used while the water quality was inadequate? (e.g. records for a change in the water source)
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (7)	If water exceeding acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, and Salmonella?
57-58 & 59		WU 40b (8)	Records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella?
57-58		Table 2G	WU 41
57-58	Table 2G	WU 42	If disinfectant is used during re-hydration or product coring in the field (single-pass) does the water have breakpoint disinfectant present at point of entry and does the operation monitor and test for disinfectant levels?
Municipal & Well Exemptions			
57-58	Table 2G	WU 43	Is the source water from a municipal supply or well?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 43a	Does this source qualify for the 5 consecutive monthly samples below the generic E. coli detection limit on record exemption?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 43b	Is the last sample recorded within 180 days of the audit date?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 44	Show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
57-58	Table 2G	WU 45	The generic E. coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Soil Amendments and Crop Inputs			
61	693	SA 01	Are there SOP's that address the implementation of storage and application controls that establish management controls that significantly reduce the likelihood that soil amendments being used may contain human pathogens.
			Does the SOP address the following:
61	696	SA 01a	Supplier Approval (e.g. Supplier and/or on-farm SOP to prevent cross contamination and written sampling procedures)
61	697	SA 01b	Source and Quality of the amendment
61	698	SA 01c	Delivery and transport
61	699	SA 01d	Surplus/unconsumed inventory
61	700	SA 01e	Length of Storage and storage location prior to crop application
61	701	SA 01f	Timing of application in the crop cycle and processes used for application.
61	702	SA 01g	Weather events (wind, rain and water runoff)
61	703	SA 01h	Potential for animal intrusion while on farm
61	704	SA 01i	Visitor and employee movements
61	705	SA 01j	Vehicle traffic
63	776	SA 02	Are there SOP's that address the implementation of storage and application controls that establish management controls that significantly reduce the likelihood that crop inputs being used may contain human pathogens.
			Does the SOP address the following:
63	779	SA 02a	Supplier Approval (e.g. Supplier and/or on-farm SOP to prevent cross contamination and written sampling procedures)
63	780	SA 02b	Source and Quality of the amendment
63	781	SA 02c	Delivery and transport
63	782	SA 02d	Surplus/unconsumed inventory
63	783	SA 02e	Length of Storage and storage location prior to crop application
63	784	SA 02f	Timing of application in the crop cycle and processes used for application.
63	785	SA 02g	Weather events (wind, rain and water runoff)
63	786	SA 02h	Potential for animal intrusion while on farm
63	787	SA 02i	Visitor and employee movements
63	788	SA 02j	Vehicle traffic
61 & 63	690 & 803	SA 03	Do you use any materials that are not verified to be safe for food production as soil amendment or crop input?
60 & 63	686 & 771	SA 04	Do you use soil amendments or crop inputs made from mortality composting processes? If yes, answer the following question.
60 & 63	686 & 771	SA 04a	Did the process follow all local, state, and federal regulations?
61 & 62	692 & 763	SA 05	Do you use soil amendments or crop inputs made from post-consumer waste materials? If yes, answer the following
61 & 62	692 & 763	SA 05a	Were the materials used according to all local, state, and federal regulations?
61	706	SA 06	If any soil amendments and/or crop inputs became contaminated, was the product segregated and not used until determined safe for food production?
61	706	SA 07	Are <u>on-farm</u> produced soil amendments and/or crop inputs used? If yes, answer the following question.
61	706	SA 07a	Are soil amendments and/or crop inputs suspected of being contaminated? If yes, answer the following question.

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Soil Amendments and Crop Inputs			
61	707	SA 07a(1)	Are soil amendments and/or crop inputs segregated and kept from use until it is determined to be safe for food production? (Proof of reconditioning, verification it is free of pathogens - COA)
Raw manure, untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure-containing <u>soil amendments</u> (see composted)			
60	681	SA 08	Was raw manure and/or other soil amendments containing untreated animal by-products, uncomposted or incompletely composted animal manure, or non-thermally treated animal manure applied to lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA 08a	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA 08b	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer the following questions.
64	Table 3	SA 08b (1)	Was soil testing conducted?
64	Table 3	SA 08b (2)	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?
64	Table 3	SA 09	Have <u>Type A biosolids</u> been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA 09a	Were leafy greens planted within one year from application?
64	Table 3	SA 10	Have <u>Type B biosolids</u> been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA10a	Were leafy greens planted within 38 months from application?
7A- Composted Soil Amendments (contain animal manure or animal products)			
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 11	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 11a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 12	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 12a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 12b	Was the active compost maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 13	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 13a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 13b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 13c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 13d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7A- Composted Soil Amendments (contain animal manure or animal products)			
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 14	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 15	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following question.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16a	Fecal coliforms : < 1000 MPN / gram
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16h	Was a representative and random composite sample obtained as described in the California State regulations?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 16j(1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7A?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 17	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 18	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7B[1] Composted Soil Amendments Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (Green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 20	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a (1)	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7B[1] Composted Soil Amendments Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (Green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a (2)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (1)	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (2)	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 23	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 24	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 25	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26h	Was a representative and random composite sample obtained as described in the California State regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[1]?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 27	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 28	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7B[2] - Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid Soil Amendments Not Containing products of Animal origin (fungal/bacterial extracts, green/plant waste, plant extracts, vegetative material, algae, yeast extract, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 29	Were any non-composted soil amendments of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 29a	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30	Has each lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA30b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA30c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30e	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30f	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30g	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30h	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30i	If no, is an application time interval used?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30j	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30k	Were there products suspected of contamination or was bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
		SA 30k (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[2]?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 31	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 32	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7C Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33	Has a soil amendment been applied that has gone through a heat validated treatment process? If yes, answer the following questions.
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33a	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33b	If a Certificate of Process Validity is not available and COA that meets acceptance criteria is available, was the amendment applied no less than 45 days from harvest?
7C Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
			Have acceptance criteria been met for each of the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33c	Fecal coliforms: Negative or less than Detection Limit per gram
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33d	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33e	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33f	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected of Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7C Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33g	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33h	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33i	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33j	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33k	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33l	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33m	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33n	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33o	Was each lot tested before application to production fields?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33p	Was the lot suspected of contamination and reconditioned/re-processed?
		SA 33p (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7C?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 34	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 35	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7D Synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments			
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 36	Have synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments been applied?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 37	Is documentation available that shows the soil amendment is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 38	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 39	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
7E Soil Amendments with Combined Components			
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40	Has a soil amendment that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year? If yes, answer the following question.
			Does the combined soil amendment include:
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 45c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, not containing products of animal origin
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40d	Biological material that has gone through a Validated Treatment Process
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40f	Have the acceptance criteria been met the requirement of its respective class of materials? (See above for appropriate criteria.)
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40g	Has the sampling plan followed the criteria for the requirement of its respective class of materials?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7E Soil Amendments with Combined Components			
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 41	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the requirement of its respective class of materials per the most stringent limits been followed?
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 42	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?
Raw manure, untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure-containing <u>crop inputs</u> (see composted)			
60	681	SA 43	Were raw manure and/or other Crop Inputs containing untreated animal by-products, uncomposted or incompletely composted animal manure, or non-thermally treated animal manure applied to lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA 43a	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer the following question.
64	Table 3	SA 43b	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer the following questions.
64	Table 3	SA 43b (1)	Was soil testing conducted?
64	Table 3	SA 43b (2)	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?
64	Table 3	SA 44	Have <u>Type A biosolids</u> been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?
64	Table 3	SA 44a	Were leafy greens planted within one year from application?
64	Table 3	SA 45	Have <u>Type B biosolids</u> been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?
64	Table 3	SA 45a	Were leafy greens planted within 38 months from application?
7A- Composted Crop Inputs (contain animal manure or animal products)			
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 46	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the crop within the last year? If yes, answer the following questions.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 46a	Are <u>Process Validation</u> records available for review?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 47	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 47a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 47b	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 48	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 48a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 48b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7A- Composted Crop Inputs (contain animal manure or animal products)			
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 48c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 48d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 49	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 50	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following questions.
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51h	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 51j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
		SA 51j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7A?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 52	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
65-66	Table 3-7A	SA 53	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7B[1] Composted Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7B[1] Composted Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (4)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55b	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55c	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop inputs is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile Composting</u> method? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56e	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 57	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 58	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59a	Fecal coliforms : < 1000 MPN / gram
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59h	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7B[1] Composted Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[1]?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 60	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 61	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7B[2] - Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid Crop Inputs Not Containing products of Animal origin (fungal/bacterial extracts, green/plant waste, plant extracts, vegetative material, algae, yeast extract, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 62	Were any non-composted Crop Inputs of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 62a	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63	Has each lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63e	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used as appropriate?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63f	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63g	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63h	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63i	If no, is an application time interval used?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63j	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63k	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
		SA 63k (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[2]?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 64	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
69-70	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 65	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7C- Biological Crop Inputs that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66	Has a crop input been applied that has gone through a validated treatment process? If yes, answer the following questions.
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66a	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7C– Biological Crop Inputs that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66b	If a Certificate of Process Validity is not available and COA that meets acceptance criteria is available, was the amendment applied no less than 45 days from harvest?
70-72	Table 3-7C		Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66c	Fecal coliforms: Negative or less than Detection Limit per gram
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66d	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66e	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66f	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected or less than Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)
			Have the recommended test methods been used for the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66g	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66h	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66i	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66j	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66k	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
70-72	Table 3-7C		Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66l	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66m	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66n	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process
70-72	Table 3-7C		Has the testing frequency been used:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66o	Was each lot tested before application to production fields?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66p	Was the lot suspected of contamination and reconditioned/re-processed?
		SA 66p(1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7C?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 67	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 68	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
7D - Synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs			
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 69	Have synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs been applied to the crop?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 70	Is documentation available that shows the crop input is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 71	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
72	Table 3 - 7D	SA 72	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
7E – Combined Crop Input Components			
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73	Has a crop input that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Does the combined crop input include:
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, Not Containing products of animal origin

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

7E – Combined Crop Input Components			
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73d	Biological material that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73f	Have the acceptance criteria been met for the highest risk ingredient? (See previous sections for appropriate criteria.)
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73g	Has the sampling plan followed the criteria for the highest risk ingredient?
72	Table 3 - 7E	SA 74	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the requirement of its respective class of materials per the most stringent limits been followed?
		SA 75	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?
Worker Practices			
General Requirements			
76 & 77	950 & 969	WP 01	Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors to the field location which describes the required hygiene rules?
			Does the Policy address the following:
77	992	WP 01a	Sanitary Facilities
76	950	WP 01b	Field Worker Practices (GMP's, GHP's, etc.)
77	979	WP 01c	Worker Health Practices
Sanitary Facilities			
77	992	WP 02	Is there a documented field sanitary facility program? (i.e. SOP)
77			Does the program address the following:
77	999	WP 02a	The number, condition, and placement of field sanitation units complies with applicable state and/or federal regulations.
77	1002	WP 02b	Sanitary facilities are readily accessible (proximate) to the work area.
77	1003	WP 02c	Sanitary facilities are regularly maintained, cleaned and serviced according to schedule.
77	1004	WP 02d	Sanitary facilities have sufficient consumable supplies (i.e. hand soap, water that meets the hand wash acceptance criteria in Table 2G, paper towels, toilet paper, etc.).
78	1006	WP 02e	Readily understandable signs are posted (e.g. to instruct employees to wash their hands after using the facility)
78	1007	WP 02f	Field sanitation facilities are cleaned and serviced with waste disposed of on a scheduled basis and at a location that minimizes the potential risk for product contamination. (i.e. grey water, black water, overspray/drift or runoff)
78	1025	WP 02g	Address the placement and transport of the sanitary facility in order to minimize any impact on the crop in the field including:
78	1011	WP 02h	Minimize the impact on the crop from leaks and/or spills
78	1012	WP 02i	Ability to access the unit for maintenance and cleaning service
78	1008	WP 02j	Response plan in the event of a leak and/or spill. (e.g. an SOP and a documented corrective action)
Field Worker Practices (GMPs, GHPs, etc.)			
76	950	WP 03	Is there a written worker practices program that establishes employee work rules?
			Does the program address the following:

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Field Worker Practices (GMPs, GHPs, etc.)			
76	957	WP 03a	Requirement for workers to wash their hands with soap and water before beginning or returning to work, and any other time when hands may have become contaminated.
77	967	WP 03b	Confine smoking, eating and drinking (except water) to designated areas.
77	978	WP 03c	Storage requirements for personal items in/or adjacent to the field?
76	963	WP 03d	The appropriate use and sanitation of gloves, this includes prohibiting the use of personal gloves and taking gloves home.
77	966	WP 03e	Avoid contact with animals
77	968	WP 03f	Prohibitions on spitting, urinating or defecating in the field.
76	961	WP 03g	Requirement for workers' clothing to be clean at the start of the day.
77	972	WP 04	For materials targeted for further processing, is there a written physical hazard prevention program?
			Does the program address the following:
77	974	WP 04a	The proper wearing of head and facial hair restraints.
77	974	WP 04b	The proper wearing of apron and other food safety apparel.
77	975	WP 04c	Removal of visible jewelry (rings, bracelets, necklaces, body piercings, etc.) or covering of hand jewelry prior to the start of work.
77	977	WP 04d	Removal of all objects from upper pockets.
Worker Health Practices			
77	979	WP 05	Is there a written worker health practices program that establishes employee work rules?
77			Does the program address the following:
77	980	WP 05a	Workers with diarrheal disease or symptoms of other infectious disease are prohibited from being in the field or handling fresh produce or food-contact surfaces?
77	984	WP 05b	Workers with open cuts or lesions are prohibited from handling fresh produce.
77	986	WP 05c	Instruct personnel to notify supervisors if they may have a health condition that may result in contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces (e.g. injury or illness).
77	990	WP 05d	A policy describing procedures for handling/disposition of produce or food contact surfaces that have come into contact with blood or other body fluids.
Field Sanitation			
General Requirements			
76	950-952	FS 01	Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors in the field location which describes the required field sanitation SOPs?
Field and Harvest Activities SOP's			
		FS 02	Is there a written field and harvest activity SOP?
			Does the SOP address the following:
75	924	FS 02a	Prohibit ground/soil contact of cut surfaces.
73	837	FS 02b	Cross contamination by farming equipment and tools that comes into contact with raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, animal hazards or other potential sources.
73	831	FS 02c	If "YES" does it appropriately restrict the use or require a documented cleaning and sanitation program of the equipment?
73	833	FS 02d	If cleaning and sanitation is required, are records of the cleaning/sanitation available for review.

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Field and Harvest Activities SOP's			
86	Table 6	FS 02e	Is there a written SOP for corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?
82	1148	FS 02f	Is there a written SOP for production locations that have environmental source of pathogens (i.e. CAFO, dairy, hobby farm and manure or livestock compost facility) and the potential for contamination during weather conditions and events?
76	936	FS 02g	Is there an SOP that addresses waste, trash, and other debris that protects product and production area from contamination?
76	953	FS 02h	Is a specific individual designated as responsible for food safety compliance with the best practices of the LGMA for growing operations?
76	953	FS 02i	Is a specific individual designated as responsible for food safety compliance with the best practices of the LGMA for harvesting?
Daily Harvest Assessment			
		FS 03	Is a documented daily food safety harvest assessment available for review?
22	121	FS 03a	Is the assessment dated?
22	121	FS03b	Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?
21	116	FS 03c	Are the specific growing blocks associated with the assessment clearly identified?
21	117	FS03d	Is the Harvester name and contact information documented?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or potential risk of intrusion?
If FS 03e is answered "NO" then FS 03e (1) - FS 03e (6) will drop down.			
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (1)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (2)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (3)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (4)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (5)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?
86-87	Table 6	FS 03e (6)	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
24	207	FS 03f	Did the daily harvest assessment address changes in weather condition or weather events (e.g. severe wind, hail, freeze, excessive rain, or consecutive weather events) since the last assessment?
			If the assessment indicates the production area had a changes in weather condition or weather event during the production period are the following addressed:
24	208	FS 03f (1)	Potential impact on the crop or operations?
		FS 03f (2)	If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP?
Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings			
74	883	FS 04	Is there an SSOP for food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment, tools, and utensils?
			Does the SSOP address the following:
73-75	837-892	FS 04a	Equipment specific cleaning instructions
73-75	837-892	FS 04b	Method and frequency of cleaning and sanitation
73-75	837-892	FS 04b (1)	Food contact surfaces on harvest equipment, tools and utensils are cleaned and sanitized at the end of each daily harvest

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings			
73-75	837-892	FS 04b (2)	Food contact surfaces on harvest equipment and tools are cleaned and sanitized before moving to the next commodity and/or field
73-75	837-892	FS 04c	Daily inspection of food contact surfaces on equipment
73-75	837-892	FS 04c (1)	Did the Daily inspection of harvest equipment, tools and utensils that was completed prior to beginning harvest address cleaning and sanitation or change in conditions since prior sanitation?
73-75	837-892	FS 04c (2)	Did the inspection indicate the equipment do not need to be rinsed and sanitized prior to beginning daily harvest?
73-75	837-892	FS 04c (3)	If no, was the equipment rinsed and sanitized prior to beginning daily harvest?
76	955	FS 04d	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer, etc.)
74	853	FS 04e	Sanitation Procedures Verification
73	839	FS 04f	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc.)
74	883	FS 05	Is there an SOP for non-food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment and tools?
			Does the SOP address the following:
73-75	837-892	FS 05a	Equipment-specific cleaning instructions
73-75	837-892	FS 05b	Method and frequency of cleaning
76	955	FS 05c	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, etc.)
74	854	FS 05d	Cleaning verification
73	839	FS 05e	Daily inspection of non-food contact surfaces and equipment
74	860	FS 06	Is there an SOP for sanitary operation of harvest equipment?
			Does the SOP address the following:
74	861	FS 06a	Are spills and leaks addressed
74	855	FS 06b	Harvest equipment protection
74	855	FS 06c	Overnight equipment and tool storage
74	860	FS 06d	Does the SOP for Sanitary Operation of Harvest Equipment, address remedial actions?
74	864	FS 07	Is there an SOP for water tanks and equipment used for hydration?
74	851	FS 08	Is there an SOP/SSOP for product containers?
			Does the SOP address the following:
74	855	FS 08a	Over night storage
75	896	FS 08b	<u>Prohibit contact with the ground or soil</u>
74	857	FS 08c	Container assembly (RPC, fiber bin, plastic bin, etc.)
74	858	FS 08d	Damaged containers
74	859	FS 08e	Use of containers only as intended
73-75	837-892	FS 08f	Method and frequency of routine cleaning and sanitation
76	955	FS 08g	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, etc.)
74	852	FS 08h	Daily inspection of containers

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings			
74	853	FS 08i	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc..)
75	895	FS 09	Are packing materials or containers cleanable or designed for single use?
75	898	FS 10	Are reusable packing materials or containers cleaned and sanitized or fitted with a clean liner?
76	955	FS 11	Is there an SOP for chemical storage and chemical content labeling
74	870	FS 12	Are instruments or controls used to measure, regulate, or record temperature, hydrogen ion concentration, pH, sanitizer concentration or other conditions:
74	872	FS 12a	Accurate and precise as necessary and appropriate for their intended use?
74	873	FS 12b	Adequately maintained?
74	874	FS 12c	Adequate in number for their intended use?
75	905	FS 13	Are there any buildings used to store packing material?
75	912	FS 13a	Does the building have proper drainage and protection from condensate or drips to keep food-contact surfaces from getting wet?
75	909	FS 13b	Are packaging materials and other food-contact surfaces kept separate from contamination sources by partition, time, location, enclosed system, or other effective means?
Transportation			
88	1225	TR 01	Is there an inspection program for equipment and shipping containers used to transport leafy greens from the farm and on the farm?
88	1225	TR 01a	Are shipping units and equipment used to transport leafy greens on the farm or from the farm to a cooling, packing, or processing facility part of an inspection program?
88	1227	TR 01b	Is the condition of shipping units and equipment checked for cleanliness before being used to ship leafy greens?
Field Observations			
Water Use			
		FO WU 01	Are all active and/or inactive water sources and distribution system recorded in the agricultural water assessment?
		FO WU 02	From visual inspection, there is no evidence that the water sources and distribution systems may pose a contamination risk (damage, inadequately maintained, evidence of animal activity, environmental sources of contamination, connection with effluent systems)?
		FO WU 03	No other observations of improper use of water
Soil Amendments			
		FO SA 01	No evidence of undocumented use of soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 02	No evidence of improperly applied soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 03	No evidence of improperly stored soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 04	No other observations of improper use of soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
Environmental Factors			
		FO EA 01	No evidence of fecal contamination in the production area?
		FO EA 02	No evidence of animal intrusion or potential risk of intrusion in the production area?
		FO EA 03	No evidence of non-compliance with distances as outlined in the Environmental Assessment?

Arizona LGMA - 2021/2022 Audit Checklist

Environmental Factors			
		FO EA 04	No evidence that remedial actions have not been implemented?
		FO EA 05	No other observations of environmental risk factors.
Work Practices			
		FO WP 01	No employees eating, drinking (except water), chewing tobacco or smoking in crop production actively harvested areas or outside of designated area outlined in the SOP?
		FO WP 02	No evidence that sanitary facilities are not routinely clean and operational?
		FO WP 03	No evidence that sanitary facilities are not adequately stocked with disposable supplies?
		FO WP 04	All employees observed to have washed their hands after; restroom usage, work breaks or any returning to work occasion?
		FO WP 05	No evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated?
		FO WP 06	No improperly stored personal items observed in the field?
		FO WP 07	No evidence that workers practices for further processing have been violated?
		FO WP 08	No employees with uncovered wounds, boils or cuts?
		FO WP 09	No employees with symptoms of infection or contagious disease?
		FO WP 10	No other observations of improper work practices.
Field Sanitation			
		FO FS 01	Are there visitor policies/procedures in place?
		FO FS 02	No evidence of excessive non-vegetative debris in the field?
		FO FS 03	Are chemical containers labeled as to its contents?
		FO FS 04	Are chemicals stored per SOP?
		FO FS 05	No evidence of leaks and spills on equipment in the field?
		FO FS 06	No evidence of equipment is not maintained and operational?
		FO FS 07	No evidence of the use of farm equipment that may have come in contact with potential contaminants (e.g. uncovered products as outlined in the PSR, raw manure, partially treated compost, waters of unknown quality, wildlife or domestic animals)?
		FO FS 08	No evidence of potential cross-contamination of product? (i.e. cut surface of product and contact with the ground/soil)
		FO FS 09	No evidence of other potential cross-contamination of food contact surfaces on harvest equipment or tools
		FO FS 10	No evidence of potential cross-contamination of containers and packing materials
		FO FS 11	No other evidence of improper field sanitation.