

General Requirements			
Page & Line #s	#	Question	
Page 18, Lines 99-101	GR 01	Is a written Leafy Greens Compliance Plan which specifically addresses the Best Practices of the LGMA available for review?	
	GR 02	Does it specifically address best practices for water, soil amendments, environmental factors, work practices, and field sanitation?	
Page 18, Line 102	GR 03	Is an up to date producers list with contact and location information available for review?	
Page 18, Line 103-105	GR 04	Does the Shipper have a traceability process?	
	GR 04a	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter source?	
	GR 04b	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter subsequent recipient?	
Page 18, Lines 106-108	GR 05	Has the Shipper designated someone to implement and oversee the food safety program?	
	GR 05a	Is the name of the individual available?	
	GR 05b	Is 24/7 contact information for the individual available?	
Records			
Page 18, Lines 112-119	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.)	
		Do they include (as applicable):	
	RE 01a	Farm name and location	
	RE 01b	Actual values and observations obtained during monitoring	
	RE 01c	An adequate description of the leafy green product	
	RE 01d	Growing area location (i.e. production location including block and/or lot)	
	RE 01e	Date and time of the activity being documented	
Page 18, Line 121	RE 02	Do records indicate they were created at the time the activity was performed?	
Page 18, Lines 123-124	RE 03	Were the records signed and dated by the person performing the documented activity?	
Page 22, Lines 271-272		Have the following records been reviewed, signed and dated by a supervisor or responsible party?	
Page 58, Table 3 Documentation Requirement		RE 03a	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)
Page 20, Lines 186-188		RE 03b	On-Farm Soil Amendments within a week (Records include: process control monitoring for on-farm produced soil amendments)
Page 67, Lines 779-782		RE 03c	Training documentation for required training must be reviewed and signed within a week
	RE 03d	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)	
Page 18, Line 144	RE 04	Do SOPs require documentation and records to be kept for 2 years?	
Personnel Qualifications and Training			
Page 19, Line 155-156	PE 01	Did personnel receive training at hire and at least annually thereafter?	
Pages 19-20, Lines 163-172		Does the training provided to all personnel who work with leafy greens or supervise those who do include:	
		PE 01a	The principles of food hygiene and safety, including recognition of employee health conditions for illness?
		PE 01b	Training and education on infectious illnesses that can be asymptomatic (e.g. cyclosporiasis, hepatitis, salmonellosis, norovirus).
		PE 01c	The importance of health and personal hygiene?
Page 20, Lines 173-182		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:	
		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.)
		PE 01f	Inspecting product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials to ensure they are working properly and do not pose a product contamination risk?
		PE 01g	How to correct problems with product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials or report problems to supervisors?
Page 20, Lines 183-188	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	
	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		
Page 20, Lines 202-204	EA 01	<p>Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion?</p> <p>If EA 01 is answered "NO" then EA 02 - EA 04 will drop down.</p>
Page 77-81 Table 6 Figure 9	EA 02	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by Food Safety professional?
	EA 03	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
	EA 03a	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
	EA 04	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
	EA 04a	If "YES" were corrective actions formulated?
	EA 04b	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
	EA 04c	If "YES" are you periodically monitoring the effectiveness of any corrective actions?
Adjacent Land Use		
Page 77, Lines 1114-1117 Table 7	EA 05	Was the adjacent land area free from compost operations within 400' of the crop edge?
	EA 05a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 400' recommendation should be modified?
	EA 05b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
Page 20-21, Lines 209-214	EA 06	Is the adjacent land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO)?
Page 77, 82-83 Lines 1114-1117 Table 7		If EA 06 is answered "NO" then EA 07 will drop down.
	EA 07	Was the adjacent land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO) with more than 1000 head/animals within 1200' of the crop edge?
	EA 07a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 1200' recommendation should be increased or modified?
	EA 07b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
	EA 07c	If "NO" was a rigorous pre-season assessment completed to address the impact of the CAFO?
		Did it address the following:
	EA 07c (1)	Information on the CAFO's Best Management Practices?
	EA 07c (2)	Number of animals within the CAFO?
	EA 07c (3)	Water source and distribution system for the production location proximate to the CAFO? (e.g. Appendix A)
	EA 08	Is the adjacent land area free from non-synthetic soil amendments stored within 400' of the edge of the crop?
	EA 08a	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 08b	If "NO" are there mitigation measures or topographical features that indicate that the 400' recommendation should be modified?
	EA 08c	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
	EA 09	Is the adjacent land area free from grazing lands/domestic animals within 30' from the edge of the crop?
EA 09a	If "NO" are there topographical or climate features that indicate that 30' recommendation should be modified?	
EA 09b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
EA 10	Is the adjacent land area free from any septic leach fields (home or other building) within 30' of the edge of the crop?	
EA 10a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that 30' should be modified and is too short of a distance?	
EA 10b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
EA 11	Are all well heads at least 200' from untreated manure?	
EA 11a	If "NO" are there topographical or climate features that indicate that 200' is too short of a distance?	
EA 11b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?	
Adjacent Land Use		
Page 82-84 Table 7	EA 12	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 12a	100' for sandy soil with a slope <6%
	EA 12b	200' for loamy or clay soil with a slope <6%
	EA 12c	300' for all slopes >6%
Page 20-21, Lines 209-214	EA 13	Is the adjacent land free from uses or conditions that pose a food safety risk to crops?
	EA 13a	If "NO" has a risk assessment been conducted to evaluate the risk?
	EA 13b	If "NO" have corrective measures been put in place and documented?

Environmental Assessments (continued)		
Recent Field History		
Page 75, Lines 1058-1059 Page 57, Table 3 Raw manure Page 21, Lines 231-233	EA 14 EA 14a EA 14b EA 14c	Are production blocks free from all of the following: History of flooding within the last 60 days History of grazing on the crop land within the last year History of hazardous activity including but not limited to CAFO, municipal waste, toxic waste, landfill, etc.?
Page 21, Lines 231-233	EA 14c (1)	EA 14a - EA 14c if any of these are answered "NO" then EA 14c (1) will drop down Were specific actions implemented and documented to mitigate the issue(s)?
Pre-Harvest Assessment		
Page 20, Lines 196-200	EA 15	Was a Pre-Harvest Assessment conducted within 7 days for each harvested lot?
Page 20, Lines 201-236	EA 15a EA 15b EA 15c EA 15d EA 15e EA 15f	Did the assessment address the following: Intrusion by animals Flooding 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
Page 20, Lines 205-208	EA 15g	Routine monitoring of changes in weather condition or weather events (e.g. severe wind, hail, freeze, excessive rain, or consecutive weather events) during the production period? (See Appendix F)
Page 20, Lines 225-227	EA 15h	Did the food safety status of the adjacent land remain unchanged since the pre-season assessment was conducted?
Preharvest Assessment - Animal Intrusion		
Page 79 Decision Tree Pages 80-81, Table 6	EA 16 EA 16a EA 16b EA 16c EA 16d EA 16e EA 16f	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion? If EA 16 is answered "NO" then EA 16a - EA 16f will drop down. Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel? Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"? If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP? Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"? If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements? If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
Preharvest Assessment - Unusual or Other Events		
Pages 73-76, Lines 1048-1075 Pages 74-75 Table 5	EA 17 EA 17a EA 17b EA 17c EA 17d EA 17e	If pre-harvest ranch assessment indicates that flooding has occurred are the following addressed: Do the records indicate that no fields were flooded at any time during the crop cycle? If production blocks were flooded is there documentation to indicate the extent of the flooding and the area of the crop impacted? Was the product left un-harvested? If product was harvested, was a 30' (min) "no harvest" buffer from the high water mark established? Are these remedial activities documented?
Page 20-21, Lines 209-214	EA 18 EA 18a EA 18b EA 18c EA 18d EA 18e EA 18f EA 18g EA 18h	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)? If EA 18 is answered "NO" then EA 18a - EA 18h will drop down Was a food safety assessment completed? Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified? Is the date of the assessment documented? Were remedial actions formulated? Was the field harvested? Is there documentation to show the remedial actions were followed? Did the remedial action include creation of "no harvest" buffer or separation zones around the potentially contaminated area(s)? Is documentation which fully delineates the potential contamination available for review?
Assessment of Produce Field		
Page 76, Lines 1094-1096	EA 19 EA 19a EA 19b EA 19c EA 19d EA 19e	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: Potential impact on the crop or operations? If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP? Are there environmental sources of contamination (i.e. CAFO, dairy, hobby farm and manure or livestock compost facility) proximate the production location? If there are environmental sources of contamination proximate the production location was the production area evaluated for any discharge events or other potential impact on the crop or operations? If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP?

Water Use		
General Agricultural Water Management		
Page 22, Lines 254-261	WU 01	Was an Agricultural Water Assessment completed prior to use for each water system?
	WU 01a	Is an agricultural water system description (or other documentation) indicating the source(s) of water and distribution system(s) available for review? For irrigation systems:
	WU 01a (1)	Does the description (or other documentation) identify permanent above ground fixtures such that they can be located in the field?
	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)?
Page 22, Lines 269-270	WU 01a (3)	Are effluent systems that convey untreated human or animal wastes separated from irrigation water systems?
Page 22, Lines 274-279	WU 01b	Was the system, including water source, water storage and water conveyance, evaluated to determined the system type(s) (Type A or Type B)?
Page 24, Line 347	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 Storage and Conveyance Systems (i.e. Irrigation Water Treatment)		
Page 27, Lines 442-447	WU 02	Has an SOP been created for maintenance of ancillary equipment, water storage and conveyance? Does the SOP include the following:
	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?
	WU 02b	Does the SOP include maintaining water quality by removal of debris, weeds, algae, tule, trash, and sediment within the producer's control?
	WU 02c	Controls for pest access in place and corrective actions outlined if pest infestation occurs?
	WU 02d	Controls identified for the prevention of run-off into water storage and conveyance systems?
	WU 02e	Procedures to ensure standing water does not pose a contamination in place?
Page 27, Lines 436-441	WU 02f	Management of agricultural water system components used to prepare crop amendments to ensure these activities and equipment used are not a source of contamination?
	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?
	WU 02g (1)	Holding tanks, equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
Pages 27, Lines 442-447	WU 02g (2)	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?
	WU 02h	Establish corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios (e.g. contaminated source water, animal intrusion, contaminated run-off, flooding)?
	WU 02i	Does the SOP require corrective measures be documented (e.g. cleaning and maintenance activities)?
Overhead Chemical Applications prior to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest		
Page 24, Lines 363-364	WU 03	Were Overhead Chemical Applications not utilized prior to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
	WU 03a	If "no", did the water used for the applications meet irrigation Type A water quality criteria?
	WU 03b	If "no", 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		
Page 28, Lines 490-491	WU 04	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:
Pages 28-29, Lines 492-508	WU 04a	Water used within 21 days requirement to meet Type A and/or B->A water quality criteria
	WU 04b	Holding tanks, equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
	WU 04c	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?
	WU 04d	Control pest access to equipment during storage and staging
	WU 04e	Corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios, includes treatment failure, contaminated source water, pest concerns, chemical incompatibility, equipment sanitation concerns)?
	WU 04f	Was there documentation of corrective measures, including cleaning activities and maintenance?

Water Use (continued)		
Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest		
Page 29, Lines 509-522	WU 05	Is there an SOP to address each unique application process to treat water? The SOP must address the following:
	WU 05a	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)
	WU 05b	Step-by- step instructions to ensure the water treatment is correctly implemented
	WU 05c	Location of water sources
	WU 05d	Name, and suggested supplies needed
	WU 05e	Sanitizer used and quantity used
	WU 05f	Critical limits and operational limits
	WU 05g	Water sampling location
	WU 05h	Corrective actions if critical limits are not met
	WU 05i	Required records
Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest		
Page 30, Lines 552-554	WU 06	If Type A water is used, are records available that demonstrate the water used for chemical application meets Type A source water requirements?
Page 29, Lines 523-528	WU 07	Was Type B→A water used for Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
	WU 07a	Was a baseline for treated water done for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?
	WU 07a (1)	Were there a minimum of three 100 mL samples taken for each overhead application process from different treated water batches.
Page 29, Lines 529-532	WU 07a (2)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli?
	WU 07b	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?
	WU 07b (1)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria of non-detectable generic E. coli?
Page 30, Lines 533-538	WU 07b (1) answered "NO" then WU 07b (2) -WU 07b (4) will drop down for Corrective Action	
	WU 07b (2)	Was your grower/producer notified?
	WU 07b (3)	Was a root cause analysis done to correct the concern?
	WU 07b (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?
	WU 07c	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 ?
Pages 29-30, Lines 539-551	WU 07c (1)	Do records show the water treatment parameters were met?
	WU 07c (1) answered "NO" then WU 07c (2) -WU 07c (5) will drop down for Corrective Action	
	WU 07c (2)	Was a corrective action performed to ensure the water treatment was effective before using the water?
	WU 07c (3)	Was a microbiological sample taken to verify the treatment was effective and was documented for the corrective action?
	WU 07c (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)
	WU 07c (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)		
Pages 30-32, Table 2A/Figure 1 Pages 51-53, Table 2E/Figure 5	WU 08	Was a source water test conducted, for each source of water, within 60 days of first use? 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.
	WU 08a	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples have been collected from each water distribution system on a monthly basis, or at the next irrigation event if greater than monthly?
	WU 08b	Do records show that the water samples are taken no less than 18 hours apart?
	WU 08c	Is the geometric mean less than or equal to 126 MPN/100 mL?
	WU 08d	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 8c or WU 8d answered "NO" then WU 8d (1) - WU 8d (8) will drop down	
	WU 08d (1)	Was the water distribution system use discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?
	WU 08d (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
	WU 08d (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken to eliminate the contamination sources?

Water Use (continued)		
Irrigation Water from TYPE B Agricultural Water (before and after 21 Days to scheduled harvest)		
Pages 31-32, Table 2A Figure 1	WU 08d (4)	Was the system retested - five samples (taken no less than 18 hours apart) at the previous sampling point?
	WU 08d (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 08d (6)	Do records show the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate?
Pages 31-32, Table 2A Figure 1	WU 08d (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 08d (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 09	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 10	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 Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers		
Pages 33-35, Table 2B	WU 11	Is the TYPE A Irrigation water sourced from a public or private providers?
	WU 12	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)?
Page 34, Table 2B Page 36 Figure 2A	WU 13	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 13a	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 13b	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 13b answered "NO" then WU 13b (1) - WU 13b (4) will drop down	
	WU 13b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
	WU 13b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
	WU 13b (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 13b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
	WU 14	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?
	WU 14a	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?
Page 34, Table 2B Page 36 Figure 2A	WU 14b	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 14b answered "NO" then WU 14b (1) - WU 14b (4) will drop down	
	WU 14b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
	WU 14b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
	WU 14b (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 14b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
Page 35, Table 2B	WU 15	Was a routine verification of microbial water quality performed on each distinct irrigation system at least once during the season?
	WU 15a	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 15b	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 15b answered "NO" then WU 15b (1) - WU 15b (3) will drop down	
	WU 15b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
	WU 15b (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)?
	WU 15b (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 15b (3) answered "NO" then WU 15b (4) - WU 15b (6) will drop down	
	WU 15b (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
	WU 15b (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 15b (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?

Water Use (continued)		
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers		
	WU 16	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 17	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		
Page 38, Table 2C Page 41, Figure 3A	WU 18	For the purpose of baseline microbial assessment are records of analysis of source water available - historical water test data?
	WU 18a	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 18b	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 18c	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 18c answered "NO" then WU 18c (1) - WU 18c (2) will drop down	
	WU 18c (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed?
	WU 18c (2)	Was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
Pages 39-40, Table 2C Page 41, Figure 3A	WU 19	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 19a	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 19b	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 19b answered "NO" then WU 19b (1) - WU 19b (4) will drop down	
	WU 19b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
	WU 19b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
	WU 19b (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 19b (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		
Pages 39-40, Table 2C Page 41, Figure 3A	WU 20	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?
	WU 20a	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 20b	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 20b answered "NO" then WU 20b (1) - WU 20b (4) will drop down	
	WU 20b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
	WU 20b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
	WU 20b (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 20b (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		
Page 40, Table 2C Page 43, Figure 3C	WU 21	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 21a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during the routine verification from the end of the delivery system to evaluate acceptance criteria?
	WU 21b	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 21b answered "NO" then WU 21b (1) - WU 21b (3) will drop down	
	WU 21b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment 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 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 21b (3) answered "NO" then WU 21b (4) - WU 21b (6) will drop down	
	WU 21b (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
	WU 21b (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 21b (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?

Water Use (continued)		
Page 40, Table 2C Page 43, Figure 3C	WU 22 WU 22a	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? 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		
Page 28, Lines 473-475	WU 23	Was an SOP established outlining irrigation treatment and process parameters for irrigation treatment systems based on the Initial Irrigation water Treatment Assessment?
Page 28, Lines 468-470 Appendix A	WU 24 WU 24a WU 24b	Was an Initial Irrigation Water Treatment Assessment performed to establish treatment process parameters prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest? Was an initial microbial water quality assessment conducted prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest? Was the assessment repeated if material changes occurred?
Page 44, Table 2D Page 28, Lines 476-481	WU 25 WU 25a	Was routine verification of microbial water quality for each distinct system performed? If the system is used prior to the 21 days to harvest window is sampling (three 100 mL samples) conducted monthly?
Page 44 Table 2D (D1.) Figure 4	WU 25b WU 25c WU 25d	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? Was at least one sample taken from the end of the delivery system? 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?
Page 45 Table 2D (D1.) Figure 4	WU 25d (1) WU 25d (2) WU 25d (3)	If WU 25c or WU 25d answered "NO" then WU 25d (1) - WU 25d (3) will drop down Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event? Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)? 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?
	WU 25d (4) WU 25d (5) WU 25d (6)	If WU 25d (3) answered "NO" then WU 25d (4) - WU 25d (6) will drop down Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use? 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? 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 26	Did all samples meet the data monitoring criteria for Total Coliform - maximum level of no greater than 99 MPN per 100 mL?
	WU 27	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 WU26 or WU27 then continue to monitor for total coliforms and continue to evaluate your irrigation treatment system to identify and correct any failures.</i>
	WU 28	Is the water treatment system being monitored when in use for flow rates and treatment related parameters per the SOP (routine water treatment monitoring)?
	WU 29	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?
	WU 30	Is the system tested for microbial water quality if the monitoring parameters fall outside the acceptable criteria?
	WU 31	Are USEPA antimicrobial water treatments being used, per the label instructions?
Page 45 Table 2D (D2.)	WU 32	Was the crop nutrients and/or crop protection materials window not invoked within 21 days to scheduled harvest for overhead irrigation? If WU 32 answered "NO" then WU 32a - WU 32c (3) will drop down
	WU 32a	Was it followed by antimicrobial water treatment?
	WU 32b	Was Option 1 selected? If "no" to WU32.
	WU 32b (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?
	WU 32b (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?
	WU 32c	Was Option 2 selected?
	WU 32c (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?
	WU 32c (2)	Was microbial water quality acceptance criteria and action as described in Table X taken?
	WU 32c (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?

Water Use (continued)		
Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B->A Agricultural Water Systems		
	WU 33	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?
	WU 33a	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 34	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 35	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)		
Page 52 Table 2G	WU 36	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.?
	WU 36a	If "NO" has the water received sufficient disinfection to meet the USEPA MCLG for microbial quality?
	WU 37	Was a source water test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use?
Page 52-53 Table 2G Figure 6	WU 38	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples or monitoring results have been collected from each water distribution system within the last month?
	WU 38a	Were the microbial acceptance criteria met?
	WU 38b	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?
		If WU 38a is answered "NO" then WU 38b (1) - WU 38b (8) will drop down
	WU 38b (1)	Was use of the water discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?
	WU 38b (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
	WU 38b (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken per SOP to eliminate the contamination sources?
	WU 38b (4)	Was the water retested at the same sampling point?
	WU 38b (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)?
	WU 38b (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)
	WU 38b (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?
	WU 38b (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?
Page 52-53 Table 2G	WU 39	If the water is reused (multi-pass), is sufficient disinfection added and monitored at routine intervals to prevent possible cross-contamination? (e.g. Chlorine-more than 1ppm free chlorine and pH 5.5-7.5 or other approved treatment per product EPA label for human pathogen reduction in water)
Page 52 Table 2G	WU 40	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		
Page 38 Table 2C (C1.)	WU 41	Is the source water from a municipal supply or well?
	WU 41a	Does this source qualify for the 5 consecutive monthly samples below the generic E. coli detection limit on record exemption?
	WU 41b	Is the last sample recorded within 180 days of the audit date?
Page 39 Table 2C (C1.)	WU 42	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 43	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?

Soil Amendments		
All soil amendments are free from raw or partially composted animal manure and biosolids.		
Page 55, Lines 658-661	SA 01	Raw or partially composted animal manure, animal by-products or biosolids have not been applied in the last year? If "NO" to the above were any of these fields used in the production of leafy greens?
Soil amendments contain composted manure		
Pages 57-60, Table 3	SA 02	No soil amendment containing fully composted animal manure has been applied to the field within the last year?
		If SA 02 is answered "NO" then SA 02a - SA 02u will drop down
	SA 02a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
	SA 02b	If the Enclosed or Within-Vessel Composting method is used, do the records show:
	SA 02c	...that the active compost maintained a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
	SA 02c (1)	...Is a Letter of Guarantee or other comparable documentation available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
	SA 02d	If the Windrow Composting method is used do the records show:
	SA 02e	...that the active compost maintained aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
	SA 02f	...a minimum of five turnings during this period?
	SA 02f (1)	...Is a Letter of Guarantee or other comparable documentation available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
	SA 02g	If the Aerated Static Pile Composting method is used do the records show that:
	SA 02h	...the active compost was covered with 6 to 12 inches of insulating materials?
	SA 02i	...maintain a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
	SA 02i (1)	...Is a Letter of Guarantee or other comparable documentation available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
	SA 02j	Has each lot of composted material that is equal to or less than 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?
SA 02k	Has each lot of composted material been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?	
All soil amendments are free from raw or partially composted animal manure and biosolids.		
Pages 57-60, Table 3		Records must be available to document the following criteria have been met for each lot of compost containing animal material used.
		a. Acceptance criteria
	SA 02l	Fecal coliforms: <1000 MPN/gram
	SA 02m	Salmonella: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 02n	E. coli O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
		b. Recommended test methods
	SA 02o	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-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, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate.
		c. Sampling plan
SA 02s	A composite sample shall be representative and random and obtained as described in the California state regulations.1	
SA 02t	Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by a testing laboratory or state authority.	
SA 02u	Laboratory must be certified/accredited for microbial testing by a certification or accreditation body.	
Soil amendments that do not contain animal manure		
Page 56, Lines 690-699	SA 03	Is a Letter of Guarantee or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, bag label, etc.) available that shows 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?
Soil amendments that contain animal manure that are heat treated or processed by other equivalent methods		
Page 57-60, Table 3 Page 62, Figure 7B Decision Tree	SA 04	No soil amendment containing animal manure that has been heat treated or processed by other equivalent methods have been applied in the field within the last year?
		If SA 04 is answered "NO" then SA 04a-SA 04b (16) will drop down
	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 the following criteria have been met for each lot of heat treated or processed by other equivalent method compost containing animal material used.
		a. Acceptance criteria
	SA 04b (1)	Fecal coliforms: Negative MPN/gram
	SA 04b (2)	Salmonella: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 04b (3)	E. coli O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 04b (4)	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	b. Recommended test methods	
SA 04b (5)	Fecal coliforms: 9 tube MPN	
SA 04b (6)	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	

Soil Amendments		
Soil amendments that contain animal manure that are heat treated or processed by other equivalent methods		
Page 57-60, Table 3 Page 62, Figure 7B Decision Tree	SA 04b (7) SA 04b (8) SA 04b (9) SA 04b (10) SA 04b (11) SA 04b (12) SA 04b (13)	E. coli O157:H7: Any laboratory validated method for compost Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate. <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for testing soil amendments c. Sampling plan Take at least 12 equivolume samples from 12 or more separate locations or 12 samples from 12 individual bags, if bagged individually. Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by a testing laboratory or state authority. Laboratory must be certified/accredited by a certification or accreditation body. If testing records are NOT available is a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" available for review?
Page 58, Table 3	SA 04b (14) SA 04b (15)	Application intervals were met: Was this heat treated or processed crop treatment produced using a validated process for pathogen control? If "NO" to above, was the treatment applied at least 45 days before harvest?
Page 57, Table 3	SA 04b (16)	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.
Soil amendments that are Non-Synthetic Crop Treatments (compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc.) Table 4 & Figure 8).		
Page 63	SA 05	No non-synthetic crop treatment has been applied to the crop?
Pages 64-65 Table 4 Figure 8 Decision Tree	If SA 05 if answered "NO" then SA 05a - SA 05c (24) will drop down	
	SA 05a	If "NO" to the above, the product (non-synthetic soil amendment) was not applied to the edible portion of the crop?
	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)?
	SA 05c	If compost / treated ag tea containing nutrients intended to increase microbial biomass (e.g. molasses, yeast extract, algal powder) is applied to edible portion of the crop, do records indicate that the nutrients were added prior to treatment?
	Records must be available to document the following criteria have been met for each lot of non-synthetic crop treatment used.	
	SA 05c (1)	Did each lot/batch used meet the microbial criteria identified below?
	SA 05c (2)	<i>Fecal coliforms</i> : Negative MPN/gram
	SA 05c (3)	<i>Salmonella</i> : Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 05c (4)	<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7: Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 05c (5)	<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
Pages 64-65 Table 4 Figure 8 Decision Tree	SA 05c (6)	If this treatment is applied as a liquid was the solution made with water that meets the quality standards for post-harvest water (Table 2G)?
	SA 05c (7)	Application intervals were met:
	SA 05c (8)	Was this non-synthetic crop treatment produced using a validated process for pathogen control?
	SA 05c (9)	If "NO" to above, was the treatment applied at least 45 days before harvest?
		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.
		Acceptable testing methods were followed:
	SA 05c (10)	Fecal coliforms: Negative MPN/gram
	SA 05c (11)	Salmonella spp: U.S. E.P.A. Method 1682
	SA 05c (12)	E. coli O157:H7: Any laboratory validated method for compost sampling
	SA 05c (13)	<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Negative per sample size of the prescribed test
	SA 05c (14)	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods may be used as appropriate.
		The proper sampling plan was followed:
	SA 05c (15)	Solid: 12 point sampling plan composite sample
	SA 05c (16)	Liquid: Single well-mixed sample per lot
	SA 05c (17)	Sample may be taken by the supplier if trained by the testing laboratory
	SA 05c (18)	Laboratory must be certified/accredited by annual review of laboratory protocols based on GLPs by a certification or accreditation body.
		Testing Frequency:
	SA 05c (19)	Each lot before application to production fields.
	SA 05c (20)	Identify the crop treatment.
	SA 05c (21)	Show the name of the laboratory completing the testing.
	SA 05c (22)	Show date of application ?
	SA 05c (23)	Does it show the date of harvest?
	SA 05c (24)	Show the supplier name.
Page 55, Lines 665-666	SA 06	Is there a written policy implementing management plans (e.g. timing of applications, storage location, source and quality, transport, etc.) that significantly reduce the likelihood that soil amendments being used contain human pathogens and assure to the greatest degree practicable that the use of crop treatments does not pose a significant pathogen contamination hazard?

Worker Practices		
General Requirements		
Pages 70-71, Lines 893 - 934 Lines 912-914	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:
	WP 01a	Sanitary Facilities
	WP 01b	Field Worker Practices (GMP's, GHP's, etc.)
	WP 01c	Worker Health Practices
Sanitary Facilities		
Pages 71-72, Lines 935-951	WP 02	Is there a documented field sanitary facility program? (i.e. SOP) Does the program address the following:
	WP 02a	The number, condition, and placement of field sanitation units complies with applicable state and/or federal regulations.
	WP 02b	Sanitary facilities are readily accessible (proximate) to the work area.
	WP 02c	Sanitary facilities are regularly maintained, cleaned and serviced according to schedule.
	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.).
	WP 02e	Readily understandable signs are posted (e.g. to instruct employees to wash their hands after using the facility)
	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)
	WP 02g	Address the placement and transport of the sanitary facility in order to minimize any impact on the crop in the field including:
	WP 02h	Minimize the impact on the crop from leaks and/or spills
	WP 02i	Ability to access the unit for maintenance and cleaning service
	WP 02j	Response plan in the event of a leak and/or spill. (e.g. an SOP and a documented corrective action)
Worker Practices		
Field Worker Practices (GMPs, GHPs, etc.)		
Pages 70-71, Lines 893-921	WP 03	Is there a written worker practices program that establishes employee work rules? Does the program address the following:
	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.
	WP 03b	Confine smoking, eating and drinking (except water) to designated areas.
	WP 03c	Storage requirements for personal items in/or adjacent to the field?
	WP 03d	The appropriate use and sanitation of gloves, this includes prohibiting the use of personal gloves and taking gloves home.
	WP 03e	Avoid contact with animals
	WP 03f	Prohibitions on spitting, urinating or defecating in the field.
	WP 03g	Requirement for workers' clothing to be clean at the start of the day.
	WP 04	For materials targeted for further processing, is there a written physical hazard prevention program? Does the program address the following:
	WP 04a	The proper wearing of head and facial hair restraints.
	WP 04b	The proper wearing of apron and other food safety apparel.
	WP 04c	Removal of visible jewelry (rings, bracelets, necklaces, body piercings, etc.) or covering of hand jewelry prior to the start of work.
	WP 04d	Removal of all objects from upper pockets.
Worker Health Practices		
Page 71, Lines 922-934	WP 05	Is there a written worker health practices program that establishes employee work rules? Does the program address the following:
	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?
	WP 05b	Workers with open cuts or lesions are prohibited from handling fresh produce.
	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).
	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		
Page 70, Lines 893-895	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:
Page 70, Lines 870-871	FS 02a	Prohibit ground/soil contact of cut surfaces.
Page 67, Lines 783	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.
Page 67, Lines 783-796	FS 02c	If "YES" does it appropriately restrict the use or require a documented cleaning and sanitation program of the equipment?
Page 67, Lines 777-778	FS 02d	If cleaning and sanitation is required, are records of the cleaning/sanitation available for review.
Page 80, Table 6	FS 02e	Is there a written SOP for corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?
Page 76, Lines 1094-1096	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?
Page 69, Lines 823-824	FS 02g	Is there an SOP that addresses waste, trash, and other debris that protects product and production area from contamination?
Page 18, Lines 106-108	FS 02h	Is a specific individual designated as responsible for food safety compliance with the best practices of the LGMA for growing operations?
Page 70, Lines 896-897	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		
Page 80, Table 6	FS 03	Is a documented daily food safety harvest assessment available for review?
	FS 03a	Is the assessment dated?
	FS 03b	Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?
	FS 03c	Are the specific growing blocks associated with the assessment clearly identified?
	FS 03d	Is the Harvester name and contact information documented?
	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.	
	FS 03e (1)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?
	FS 03e (2)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
	FS 03e (3)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
Page 80, Table 6	FS 03e (4)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
	FS 03e (5)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?
	FS 03e (6)	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
Pages 67-68, Lines 783-796 Page 21, Lines 225-227	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:
	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		
Pages 67-68, Lines 783-812	FS 04	Is there an SSOP for food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment, tools, and utensils? Does the SSOP address the following:
	FS 04a	Equipment specific cleaning instructions
	FS 04b	Method and frequency of cleaning and sanitation
	FS 04b (1)	Food contact surfaces on harvest equipment, tools and utensils are cleaned and sanitized at the end of each daily harvest
	FS 04b (2)	Food contact surfaces on harvest equipment and tools are cleaned and sanitized before moving to the next commodity and/or field
	FS 04c	Daily inspection of food contact surfaces on equipment
	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?
	FS 04c (2)	Did the inspection indicate the equipment do not need to be rinsed and sanitized prior to beginning daily harvest?
	FS 04c (3)	If no, was the equipment rinsed and sanitized prior to beginning daily harvest?
	FS 04d	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer, etc.)
	FS 04e	Sanitation Procedures Verification
	FS 04f	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc.)

Field Sanitation		
Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings		
Pages 67-68, Lines 783-812	FS 05	Is there an SOP for non-food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment and tools? Does the SOP address the following:
	FS 05a	Equipment-specific cleaning instructions
	FS 05b	Method and frequency of cleaning
	FS 05c	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, etc.)
	FS 05d	Cleaning verification
	FS 05e	Daily inspection of non-food contact surfaces and equipment
	FS 06	Is there an SOP for sanitary operation of harvest equipment? Does the SOP address the following:
	FS 06a	Are spills and leaks addressed
	FS 06b	Harvest equipment protection
	FS 06c	Overnight equipment and tool storage
	FS 06d	Does the SOP for Sanitary Operation of Harvest Equipment, address remedial actions?
	FS 07	Is there an SOP for water tanks and equipment used for hydration?
	FS 08	Is there an SOP/SSOP for product containers? Does the SOP address the following:
	FS 08a	Over night storage
	FS 08b	Prohibit contact with the ground
	FS 08c	Container assembly (RPC, fiber bin, plastic bin, etc.)
	FS 08d	Damaged containers
	FS 08e	Use of containers only as intended
	FS 08f	Method and frequency of routine cleaning and sanitation
	FS 08g	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, etc.)
	FS 08h	Daily inspection of containers
	FS 08i	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc..)
Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings		
Page 69, Line 841	FS 09	Are packing materials or containers cleanable or designed for single use?
Page 69, Line 844	FS 10	Are reusable packing materials or containers cleaned and sanitized or fitted with a clean liner?
Page 71, Line 898	FS 11	Is there an SOP for chemical storage and chemical content labeling
Page 68, Lines 816-820	FS 12	Are instruments or controls used to measure, regulate, or record temperature, hydrogen ion concentration, pH, sanitizer concentration or other conditions:
	FS 12a	Accurate and precise as necessary and appropriate for their intended use?
	FS 12b	Adequately maintained?
	FS 12c	Adequate in number for their intended use?
Page 69 Lines 851-861	FS 13	Are there any buildings used to store packing material?
	FS 13a	Does the building have proper drainage and protection from condensate or drips to keep food-contact surfaces from getting wet?
	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		
Page 86 Lines 1177-1181	TR 01	Is there an inspection program for equipment and shipping containers used to transport leafy greens from the farm and on the farm?
	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?
	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?
	FO SA 02	No evidence of improperly applied soil amendments?
	FO SA 03	No evidence of improperly stored soil amendments?
	FO SA 04	No other observations of improper use of soil amendments
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?
	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.