

Audit Checklist

General Requirements		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Page 13, Lines 274-276	GR 01 - Is a written Leafy Greens Compliance Plan which specifically addresses the LGMA metrics available for review?	
	GR 02 - Does it specifically address the following subjects consistent with the LGMA metrics: GR 02a - Water GR 02b - Soil Amendments GR 02c - Environmental Factors GR 02d - Worker Practices GR 02e - Field Sanitation	
Page 13, Lines 277-278	GR 03 - Is an up-to-date growers list with contact and location information available for review?	
Page 13, Lines 279-281	GR 04 - Is the handler in compliance with the registration requirement of The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002?	
	GR 05 - Does the Handler have a traceability process? GR 05a - Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter source? GR 05b - Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter subsequent recipient?	
Page 13, Lines 282-284	GR 06 - Has the Handler (or if applicable, the grower) designated someone to implement and oversee the food safety program? GR 06a - Is the name of the individual available? GR 06b - Is 24/7 contact information for the individual available?	

Environmental Assessments		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Pre-Season Assessment		
Page 12, lines 319-322	Animal Activity	
Page 14, Lines 300-302	EA -1 - Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion? <i>If EA -1 is answered "NO" then EA 001 - EA 003d will drop down.</i>	
Page 46, Table 5	EA 001 - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by a Food Safety Professional? EA 002 - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"? EA 002a - If "YES," were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP? EA 003 - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"? EA 003a - If "YES," were corrective actions formulated? EA 003b - If "YES," were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements? EA 003c - If "YES," is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?? EA 003d - If "YES," are you periodically monitoring the effectiveness of any corrective actions?	

Audit Checklist

Environmental Assessments (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Page 13, Line 326 - 335	Adjacent Land Use	
Page 48, Table 6	EA 02 - Was the adjacent land area free from compost operations within 400' of the crop edge? EA 02a - If "No," are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 400' recommendation should be modified? EA 02b - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Page 48, Table 6	EA 03 - Was the adjacent land area free from confined animal feeding operations (CAFO) within 400' of the crop edge? EA 03a - If "No," are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 400' recommendation should be modified? EA 03b - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Pages 48-49, Table 6	EA 04 - Is the adjacent land area free from non-synthetic soil amendments stored within 400' of the edge of the crop? EA 04a - If "No," has the non-synthetic crop treatment been treated using a validated process and no closer than 30' from the edge of the crop? EA 04b - If "No," are there mitigation measures or topographical features that indicate that the 400' recommendation should be modified? EA 04c - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Page 49, Table 6	EA 05 - Is the adjacent land area free from grazing lands/domestic animals within 30' from the edge of the crop? EA 05a - If "No," are there topographical or climate features that indicate that the 30' recommendation should be modified? EA 05b - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Page 49, Table 6	EA 06 - Is the adjacent land area free from any septic leach fields (home or other building) within 30' of the edge of the crop? EA 06a - If "No," are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 30' recommendation should be modified or is too short a distance? EA 06b - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Page 49, Table 6	EA 07 - Are all well heads at least 200' from untreated manure? EA 07a - If "No," are there topographical or climate features that indicate that 200' is too short a distance? EA 07b - If "No," are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Page 50, Table 6	EA 08 - Does documentation justify the buffer zone distance for all surface water sources on the ranch and their separation from untreated manure (raw manure and partially composted manure) as follows? EA 08a - 100' for sandy soil with a slope <6% EA 08b - 200' for loamy or clay soil with a slope <6% EA 08c - 300' for all slopes >6%	
Page 44, Lines 968-970	EA 09 - Is the adjacent land free from uses or conditions that pose a food safety risk to crops? EA 09a - If "No," has a risk assessment been conducted to evaluate the risk? EA 09b - If "No," have corrective measures been put in place and documented?	

Audit Checklist

Environmental Assessments (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Recent Field History		
	EA 10 - Are production blocks free from all of the following:	
Page 14, Lines 315-317	EA 10a - History of flooding within the last 60 days	
Page 14, Lines 305-307	EA 10b - History of grazing on the crop land within the last 1 year	
Page 14, Lines 308-310	EA 10c - History of hazardous activity including but not limited to CAFO, municipal waste, toxic waste, landfill, etc?	
EA10a - EA10c if any of these are answered "NO" then EA10d will drop down		
	EA 10d - If "NO," were specific actions implemented and documented to mitigate the issue(s)?	
Soil Fertility		
Page 14, Lines 321-324	EA 11- Does the handler harvest/process spinach?	
Pre-Harvest Assessment		
Page 13, Lines 293-317; Page 42, Lines 887-889; Page 46, Table 5	EA 12 - Was a Pre-Harvest Assessment conducted within 7 days for each harvested lot? EA 12a - Did it address the following areas? EA 12b - Intrusion by animals EA 12c - Flooding EA 12d - Potential contamination materials EA 12e - Condition of water source and distribution system EA 12f - Unexpected adjacent land activity that poses a risk to food safety EA 12g - Worker hygiene and sanitary facilities	
Animal Intrusion		
Page 46, Table 5	EA 13 - Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion? If EA 13 is answered "NO" then EA 13a - EA 13f will drop down. EA 13a - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by a food safety professional or food safety personnel? EA 13b - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"? EA 13c - If "YES," were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP? EA 13d - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"? EA 13e - If "YES," were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements? EA 13f - If "YES," is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?	

Audit Checklist

Environmental Assessments (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Unusual Events		
Page 14, Lines 315-317	EA 14 - Does the pre-season ranch assessment include an evaluation of potential flooding and a conclusion that there is insignificant potential for flooding of the production blocks?	
	If EA14 is answered "NO" then EA13a - EA13e will drop down	
	EA 14a - If "No," do the records indicate that no fields were flooded at any time during the crop cycle?	
	EA 14b - If production blocks were flooded, is there documentation to indicate the extent of flooding and the area of crop impacted?	
	EA 14c - Was the product left unharvested?	
	EA 14d - If product was harvested, was a 30' (min) "no harvest" buffer from the high water mark established?	
	EA 14e - Are these remedial activities documented?	
Page 14, Lines 308-310	EA 15 - Is the pre-harvest lot free from all evidence of any other type of potential source of human pathogen contamination, AND has the food safety status of the adjacent land remained unchanged since the pre-season assessment was conducted?	
	If EA 15 is answered "NO" then EA 15a - EA 15h will drop down	
	EA 15a - If "No," was a food safety assessment completed?	
	EA 15b - Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?	
	EA 15c - Is the date of the assessment documented?	
	EA 15d - Were remedial actions formulated?	
	EA 15e - If "No," was the field harvested?	
	EA 15f - If "No," is there documentation to show the remedial actions were followed?	
Page 43, Lines 928-931	EA 15g - Did the remedial action include creation of "no harvest" buffer or separation zones around the potentially contaminated area(s)?	
Page 47, Table 5	EA 15h - Is documentation which fully delineates the potential contamination available for review?	

Water Use		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Page 14, Lines 339-345	WU 01 - Is a ranch map (or other documentation) indicating the sources of water and distribution systems available for review?	
	WU 01a - Does the map (or other documentation) identify permanent above ground fixtures such that they can be located in the field?	
Page 14, Lines 339-345	WU 01b - Does the map or other documentation identify the production blocks that may be served by each water source?	
Page 15, Lines 351-353	WU 01c - Was a sanitary survey completed prior to the use of each water source?	
Page 15, Line 346-347	WU 01d - Are effluent systems (that convey untreated human or animal wastes) separated from irrigation water systems?	

Audit Checklist

Water Use (continued)			
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments	
Pre-Harvest Foliar and non-Foliar Water Applications			
Table 1 & Figure 1A & 1B			
Page 17, Table 1	<p>WU 02 - Was a source water test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use on post germinated fields?</p> <p>WU 02a - Are records available to demonstrate that water samples have been collected from each water distribution system on a monthly basis (N/A if a system has qualified for an exemption)?</p> <p>WU 02b - Do records show that the water samples were taken no less than 18 hours apart?</p>		
Page 18, Table 1	<p>WU 02c - Is the geometric mean less than or equal to 126 MPN/100 ml?</p> <p>WU 02d - Are all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 ml (foliar) or 576 MPN/100m ml (non-Foliar)?</p>		
Page 17, Table 1	<p>WU 02e - Do records show the location where the sample was taken?</p> <p>WU 02f - Do records show the name of the test laboratory?</p> <p>WU 02g - Is the generic E.coli testing methodology specified on the test report, and does it meet the 15 tube MPN (FDA BAM) or other U.S. EPA, AOAC, or other method accredited for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?</p>		
If WU02c or WU02d answered "NO" then WU02h-WU02p will drop down			
Page 17, Table 1	<p>WU 02h - Was the water system discontinued after tests indicated that the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?</p> <p>WU 02i - Was a sanitary survey completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?</p> <p>WU 02j - Do records show that corrective actions were taken to eliminate the contamination sources?</p> <p>WU 02k - Were samples for the required water retesting taken at the previous sampling point?</p> <p>WU 02l - Was one water test was taken daily (not less than 18 hours apart) for 5 days?</p> <p>WU 02m - Did these 5 test results met the acceptance criteria: average less than 126 MPN/100ml (based on rolling geometric mean=5) and no sample exceeded greater than 235 MPN/100 ml (foliar) or 576 MPN/100 ml (non-foliar)?</p> <p>WU 02n - Do records show that the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate?</p> <p>WU 02o - Was product sampled for E coli 157:H7 and Salmonella? OR</p> <p>WU 02p - Do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when the water tests were positive for E coli O157:H7 or Salmonella?</p>		
Municipal Supply or Well Exemption			
Page 17, Table 1	<p>WU 03 - Is the source water from a municipal supply or well?</p> <p>WU 03a - Does this source qualify for the 5 consecutive monthly samples below the generic E. coli detection limit on record (2.2 MPN) exemption?</p> <p>WU 03b - Is the last sample recorded within 180 days of the audit date?</p>		

Audit Checklist

Water Use (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Post Harvest- Direct Produce Contact or Food Contact Surfaces		
	Table 1 & Figure 1C	
Page 18, Table 1	WU 04 - Is the water from a source that meets the USEPA MCLG for microbial quality (Negative per 100ml (<2.2 MPN/100ml))? WU 04a - If "No," has the water received sufficient disinfection to meet the USEPA MCLG for microbial quality?	
Page 19, Table 1	WU 04b - If the water is reused, is sufficient disinfectant added and monitored to prevent possible cross-contamination? (Chlorine-more than 1ppm free chlorine and PH 6.5-7.5 or ORP-more than 650mV or other approved treatment per product EPA label for human pathogen reduction in water)	
Page 18, Table 1	WU 04c - Was a source water test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use? WU 04d - Are records available to demonstrate that water samples or monitoring results have been collected from each water distribution system within the last month? <div style="background-color: #cccccc; text-align: center; padding: 2px;">If WU04 and WU04a are answered "NO" then WU04e - WU04n will drop down</div> WU 04e - Was use of the water system discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements? WU 04f - Was a sanitary survey completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination? WU 04g - Do records show that corrective actions were taken to eliminate the contamination sources? WU 04h - Were samples for the required water retesting taken at the previous sampling point? WU 04i - Was one water test taken daily (not less than 18 hours apart) for 5 days at the point closest to use? WU 04j - Did these 5 test results meet the acceptance criteria: less than 2.2 MPN/100ml? WU 04k - Do records show that the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate? WU 04l - Was product sampled for E coli 157:H7 and Salmonella? WU 04m - Do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when tests were positive for E coli O157:H7 or Salmonella? WU 04n - Do the records show that the product was not harvested?	

Audit Checklist

Water Use (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Page 18, Table 1	WU 05 - Do records show that all water used in equipment cleaning processes (Tables, belts, bins, etc.) was tested for generic E. coli or that sufficient disinfectant was used?	
Page 19, Table 1	<p>WU 05a - Do the records document all of the following:</p> <p>WU 05b - The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets the 15 tube MPN (FDA BAM) or other U.S. EPA, AOAC, or other method accredited for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli.</p> <p>WU 05c - The records indicate that the operation monitors disinfectant levels during re-hydration, product coring in the field, and product cooling.</p> <p>WU 05d - The records indicate the testing procedure/equipment that was used for monitoring the disinfectant levels [Indicate the procedure/equipment type.]</p> <p>WU 05e - Records indicate the location where the sample was taken.</p> <p>WU 05f - Records show the name of the test laboratory (if applicable).</p>	

Soil Amendments		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
All soil amendments are free from raw or partially composted animal manure and biosolids.		
Page 23; Lines 490-492	SA 01 - Raw or partially composted animal manure or biosolids have not been applied in the last 1 year? SA 01a - If "No" to the above, were any of these fields used in the production of leafy greens?	
Soil amendments contain composted manure		
	SA 02 - No soil amendment containing fully composted animal manure has been applied to the field within the last year?	
Page 24, Lines 526-536	If SA02 is answered "NO" then SA02a-SA02u will drop down SA 02a - Are Process Validation records available for review?	
Pages 25-26, Table 2	<p>SA 02b - If the Enclosed or Within-Vessel Composting method is used, do the records show:</p> <p>SA 02c - ...that the active compost maintained a minimum of 131oF for 3 days?</p> <p>SA 02d - If the Windrow Composting method is used do the records show:</p> <p>SA 02e - ...that the active compost maintained aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?</p> <p>SA 02f - ...a minimum of five turnings?</p> <p>SA 02g - If the Aerated Static Pile Composting method is used do the records show that:</p> <p>SA 02h - ...the active compost was covered with 6 to 12 inches of insulating materials?</p> <p>SA 02i - ...maintain a minimum of 131oF for 3 days?</p> <p>SA 02j - Has each lot of composted material that is equal to or less than 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?</p> <p>SA 02k - Has each lot of composted material been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?</p>	
	Records must be available to document that the following criteria have been meet for each utilized lot of compost containing animal material.	
Pages 25-26, Table 2	<p>a. Acceptance criteria</p> <p>SA 02l - Fecal coliforms: <1000 MPN/gram</p> <p>SA 02m - Salmonella: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test</p> <p>SA 02n - E. coli O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test</p>	

Audit Checklist		
Soil Amendments (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Soil amendments contain composted manure		
Pages 25-26, Table 2	b. Recommended test methods SA 02o - Fecal coliforms: 9 tube MPN SA 02p - Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682 SA 02q - E. coli O157:H7: Any laboratory validated method for compost SA 02r - Other U.S. EPA, FDA, or AOAC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate.	
Pages 25-26, Table 2	c. Sampling plan SA 02s - A composite sample is representative and random and obtained as described in the California state regulations SA 02t - Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by any testing laboratory or state authority SA 02u - Laboratory must be certified/accredited	
Page 23, Lines 497-507	SA 03 - Is a Letter of Guarantee or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, bag label, etc) available that shows that the soil amendment does not contain animal manure or is composed of a single ingredient? SA 03a - Is the name of the authority issuing the Letter of Guarantee or other comparable document shown?	
Page 26, Table 2		
Soil amendments that contain animal manure that are physically heat treated or processed by other equivalent methods		
	SA 04 - No soil amendment containing animal manure that has been physically heat treated or processed by other equivalent methods has been applied in the field within the last year? If SA04 is answered "NO" then SA04a-SA04m will drop down	
Pages 27-28, Table 2	SA 04a - Are process records or other comparable documentation available that show the lethality of the process? SA 04b - Is the name of the process authority issuing the Letter of Guarantee or other comparable document shown?	
	Records must be available to document that the following criteria have been met for each utilized lot of physically heat treated (or processed by other equivalent method) compost containing animal material.	
Pages 27-28, Table 2	a. Acceptance criteria SA 04c - Fecal coliforms: Negative MPN/gram SA 04d - Salmonella: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test SA 04e - E. coli O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test	
Pages 27-28, Table 2	b. Recommended test methods SA 04f - Fecal coliforms: 9 tube MPN SA 04g - Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682 SA 04h - E. coli O157:H7: Any laboratory validated method for compost SA 04i - Other U.S. EPA, FDA, or AOAC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate.	
Pages 27-28, Table 2	c. Sampling plan SA 04j - Take at least 12 equivolume samples from 12 or more separate locations or 12 samples from 12 individual bags, if bagged SA 04k - Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by any testing laboratory or state authority SA 04l - Laboratory must be certified/accredited	

Audit Checklist

Soil Amendments (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Pages 27-28, Table 2	SA 04m - If testing records are NOT available, is a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" available for review?	
Soil amendments that are Non-Synthetic Crop Treatments (compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc) Table 3 & Figure 3).		
Page 31; Line 581-589	SA 05 - No non-synthetic crop treatment has been applied to the crop?	
If SA05 if answered "NO" then SA05a - SA05v will drop down		
Pages 32-33, Table 3	SA 05a - If "No" to the above, the product (non-synthetic soil amendment) was not applied to the edible portion of the crop?	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	SA 05b - Is a letter of compliance or comparable document outlining the actual conditions of use and conformance to standards available for review (including presence of animal products or manure)?	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	Records must be available to document that the following criteria have been met for each lot of non-synthetic crop treatment used. SA 05c - Did each lot/batch used meet the microbial criteria identified below? <i>SA 05d - Salmonella: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test</i> <i>SA 05e - E. coli O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test</i> SA 05f - If this treatment is applied as a liquid, does the solution meet the microbial criteria set forth for pre-harvest water application? (5-sample geometric mean of 126 MPN/100 ml and no sample >235 MPN/100ml (Foliar) or 576 MPN/100 ml (non-foliar))	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	Application intervals were met: SA 05g - Was this non-synthetic crop treatment produced using a validated process for pathogen control? SA 05h - If "No" to above, was the treatment applied at least 45 days before harvest? SA 05i - If "Yes", are process validation records and documentation available to show that the process is capable of reducing pathogens of human health significance to acceptable levels.	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	Acceptable testing methods were followed: SA 05j - Salmonella spp: U.S. E.P.A. Method 1682 SA 05k - E. coli O157:H7: Any laboratory validated method for compost sampling SA 05l - Other U.S. EPA, FDA, or AOAC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate.	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	The proper sampling plan was followed: SA 05m - Solid: 12 point sampling plan composite sample SA 05n - Liquid: Single well-mixed sample per lot SA 05o - Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by the testing laboratory SA 05p - Laboratory must be certified/accredited by annual review of laboratory protocols based on GLPs by recognized NGO.	
Pages 32-33, Table 3	Testing Frequency SA 05q - Test each lot before application to production fields. Records should: SA 05r - Identify the crop treatment. SA 05s - Show the name of the laboratory completing the testing. SA 05t - Show date of application. SA 05u - Show the date of harvest SA 05v - Show the supplier name.	

Audit Checklist

Worker Practices		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
General Requirements		
Page 37; Lines 737-742	WP 01 - Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors to the field location which describes the required hygiene rules?	
	WP 01a - Does the Policy address the following:	
Page 38, Lines 766-781	WP 01b - Sanitary Facilities	
Page 37; Lines 743-751	WP 01c - Field Worker Practices (GMP's, GHP's, etc.)	
Page 37; Lines 758-765	WP 01d - Worker Health Practices	
Sanitary Facilities		
Page 38; Lines 766-781	WP 02 - Is there a documented field sanitary facility program?	
	WP 02a - Does the Field Sanitary Facility Program address the following:	
	WP 02b - The number, condition, and placement of field sanitation units complies with applicable state and/or federal regulations.	
	WP 02c - Are sanitary facilities readily accessible (proximate) to the work area.	
	WP 02d - Are sanitary facilities are regularly maintained according to schedule.	
	WP 02e - Do sanitary facilities have sufficient consumable supplies (i.e.: hand soap, water, paper towels, toilet paper, etc).	
	WP 02f - Are readily understandable signs are posted to instruct employees to wash their hands before beginning or returning to work.	
	WP 02g - Are field sanitation facilities cleaned and serviced on a scheduled basis, and at a location that minimizes the risk of product contamination?	
	WP 02h - Does the field sanitary facility program address the placement of the sanitary facility in order to minimize any impact on the crop in the field including:	
	WP 02i - Minimizing the impact on the crop from leaks and/or spills	
	WP 02j - The ability to access the unit for service	
	WP 02k - A documented response plan in the event of a major leak and/or spill.	
Field Worker Practices (GMPs, GHPs, etc.)		
Page 37, Lines 758-765	WP 03 - Is there a written worker practices program?	
	WP 03a - Does the program establish employee work rules which address the following:	
	WP 03b - Training on proper sanitation and hygiene practices?	
	WP 03c - The requirement that workers wash their hands before beginning or returning to work?	
	WP 03d - Confining smoking, eating and drinking (except water) to designated areas?	
	WP 03e - Storage requirements for personal items in or adjacent to the field?	
Page 37; Lines 754-755	WP 03f - The appropriate use and sanitation of gloves?	
Page 35; Line 665-666	WP 03g - Proper cleaning, sanitation and storage of hand harvest equipment (knives, scythes, etc)?	

Audit Checklist

Worker Practices (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Pages 37, Lines 752-757	<p>WP 03h - For materials targeted for further processing, is there a written physical hazard prevention program which includes the following?</p> <p>WP 03i - The proper wearing of head and facial hair restraints.</p> <p>WP 03j - The proper wearing of apron and other food safety apparel.</p> <p>WP 03k - Removal of visible jewelry (rings, bracelets, necklaces, body piercings, etc.) prior to the start of work.</p> <p>WP 03l - Removal of all objects from upper pockets.</p>	
Worker Health Practices		
Page 37, Lines 758-765	<p>WP 04 - Is there a written worker health practices program?</p> <p>WP 04a - Are employee work rules established which address the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">WP 04b - Workers with diarrheal disease or symptoms of other infectious disease are prohibited from handling fresh produce.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">WP 04c - Workers with open cuts or lesions are prohibited from handling fresh produce.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">WP 04d - Actions for employee to take in the event of injury or illness.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">WP 04e - A policy describing procedures for disposal/handling of produce or food contact surfaces that have come into contact with blood or other body fluids.</p>	
Page 37, Lines 758-765		
Field Sanitation		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
General Requirements		
Page 37, Lines 739-742	<p>FS 01 - Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors in the field location which describes the required field sanitation SOPs?</p>	
Field Activities		
Page 38, Lines 792-795	<p>FS 02 - Does the written field activity SOP address the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 02a - Cross contamination by farming equipment that comes into contact with raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, animals hazards or other potential sources.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 02b - If "yes", does it appropriately restrict the use or require a documented cleaning and sanitation program of the equipment?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 02c - If cleaning and sanitation are required, are records of the cleaning/sanitation available for review.</p>	
Harvest Activities		
Page 37, Line 743-744	<p>FS 03 - Does the written harvest activity SOP address the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 03a - Is a specific individual assigned the food safety responsibility for harvesting?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 03b - Is a documented daily food safety harvest assessment available for review?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 03c - Is the assessment dated?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">FS 03d - Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?</p>	

Audit Checklist

Field Sanitation (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
	FS 03e - Are the specific growing blocks associated with the assessment clearly identified? FS 03f - Is the Harvester name and contact information documented? FS 03g - Did the assessment indicate that the production are was free from evidence of animal intrusion? If FS 03g is answered "NO" then FS 03gg 0 FS 03i2 will drop down	
Pages 46-47, Table 5	FS 03gg - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by a food safety professional or food safety personnel? FS 03h - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"? FS 03h1 - If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP? FS 03i - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"? FS 03i1 - If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements" FS 03i2 - If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented" FS 03j - Is there an SSOP of harvest equipment that addresses the following:	
Page 36, Lines 698-700	FS 03k - Frequency of cleaning and sanitation	
Page 37, Line 745	FS 03l - Chemical usage and record keeping	
Page 36, Lines 695-697	FS 03m - Equipment-specific cleaning instructions	
Page 36, Lines 681-682	FS 03n - Chemical storage	
Page 35, Line 663	FS 03o - Appropriate labeling of chemical storage containers.	
Page 35, Line 664	FS 03p - Sanitation verification	
	FS 03q - Daily inspection	
	FS 03r - Question deleted per LGMA Board action on 07/10/2009	
Page 35, Lines 670-671	FS 03s - Is there an SOP for handling and storage of product containers that addresses the following:	
Page 35, Line 672	FS 03t - Overnight storage	
Page 35, Line 673	FS 03u - Contact with the ground	
Page 35, Line 674	FS 03v - Container assembly (RPC, fiber bin, plastic bin, etc)	
Page 35, Line 675	FS 03w - Damaged containers	
Page 35, Line 676	FS 03x - Use of containers only as intended	
Page 35, Line 677	FS 03y - Is there an SOP for sanitary operation of equipment that addresses the following:	
Page 35, Line 678	FS 03z - Spills and leaks	
	FS 03za - Harvest equipment protection	
Page 36, Lines 703-712	FS 03zb - Overnight equipment storage	
	FS 03zc - As per the SOP for Sanitary Operation of Equipment, were the appropriate remedial actions taken as necessary?	
Page 46, Table 5	FS 04 - Is there a written SOP which addresses corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?	

Audit Checklist

Field Observation		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Water Use		
	<p>FO 01 - Are all active and inactive water sources recorded in the Water Use Audit?</p> <p>FO 01a - 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, connection with effluent systems)?</p> <p>FO 01b - No other observations of improper use of water</p>	
Soil Amendments		
	<p>FO 02 - No evidence of undocumented use of soil amendments?</p> <p>FO 02a - No evidence of improperly applied soil amendments?</p> <p>FO 02b - No evidence of improperly stored soil amendments?</p> <p>FO 02c - No other observations of improper use of soil amendments</p>	
Environmental Factors		
	<p>FO 03 - No evidence of fecal contamination in the field?</p> <p>FO 03a - No evidence of animals hazards in the field?</p> <p>FO 03b - No evidence of non-compliance with distances as outlined in the Environmental Assessment?</p> <p>FO 03c - No evidence that remedial actions such as animal barriers (fences, gates, grates, etc) are not in good repair and operational?</p> <p>FO 03d - No evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated during the crop cycle?</p> <p>FO 03e - No other observations of environmental risk factors.</p>	
Worker Practices		
	<p>FO 04 - No employees eating, drinking (except water), chewing tobacco or smoking in crop production actively harvested areas?</p> <p>FO 04a - All employees observed to have washed their hands after; restroom usage, work breaks, or any returning to work occasion?</p> <p>FO 04b - No evidence that sanitary facilities are not routinely clean and operational?</p> <p>FO 04c - No evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated during the crop cycle?</p> <p>FO 04d - No evidence that sanitary facilities are not adequately stocked with disposable supplies?</p> <p>FO 04e - No improperly stored personal items observed in the field?</p> <p>FO 04f - No evidence or observations that employees are not using the restrooms?</p> <p>FO 04g - No employees with uncovered wounds, boils or cuts?</p> <p>FO 04h - No employees with symptoms of infection or contagious disease?</p> <p>FO 04i - No other observations of improper work practices.</p>	

Audit Checklist

Field Observation (continued)		
Page & Line #s	Question	Comments
Field Sanitation		
	<p>FO 05 - No evidence of excessive non-vegetative debris in the field?</p> <p>FO 05a - No evidence of open and/or unsupervised chemicals in the field?</p> <p>FO 05b - No evidence of leaks and spills on equipment in the field?</p> <p>FO 05c - No evidence of the use of non-sanitized farm equipment that may have come in contact with raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, wildlife or domestic animals?</p> <p>FO 05d - No evidence of other cross-contamination potential of product and/or product contact surfaces?</p> <p>FO 05e - No other evidence of improper field sanitation.</p>	
Soil Fertility		
Page 51, Lines 995-999	SF 01: Have all production blocks intended for spinach been evaluated for the presence of Cadmium?	
Page 51, Lines 1000-1007	SF 02: Has a soil fertility program been developed?	