



Journal of Agromedicine

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wagr20>

Aging and Disabled Workers Education and Outreach Heat Related Illness Language, Literacy and Cultural Barriers Livestock Handling Musculoskeletal Disorders Pesticide Exposure Respiratory Issues Safe Tractor Operation Zoonotic Influenza Other

Published online: 27 Jul 2010.

To cite this article: (2010) Aging and Disabled Workers Education and Outreach Heat Related Illness Language, Literacy and Cultural Barriers Livestock Handling Musculoskeletal Disorders Pesticide Exposure Respiratory Issues Safe Tractor Operation Zoonotic Influenza Other , Journal of Agromedicine, 15:3, 307-327, DOI: [10.1080/1059924X.2010.504470](https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2010.504470)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2010.504470>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

pesticide; 77 percent felt confident that they knew how to identify a pesticide exposure; and 38 percent had run diagnostic tests to identify type of exposure. These data, while limited, indicate that providers in Texas are not aware that disinfectants are considered pesticides or that pesticide exposure is a reportable condition. DSHS PEST conducts educational campaigns in at hospitals and in the community, but these data suggest that alternative forms of interaction and education may be necessary to inform providers of pesticide exposure reporting requirements in Texas.

Correspondence: Brienne Diebolt-Brown, Brienne.brown@dshs.state.tx.us

Violations of Federal and State Pesticide & Pesticide-Related Personal Protective Equipment Standards among Agricultural Employers in Oregon

Kimberly A. Faulkner,¹ PhD, MPH; Maryann M. D'Alessandro,¹ PhD; John Mendeloff,² PhD; Garnet R. Cooke,³ BS

¹National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, National Personal Protective Technology Laboratory, Pittsburgh, PA

²RAND Center for Health and Safety in the Workplace, Pittsburgh, PA

³Oregon OSHA, Salem, OR

The objectives of this study are to quantify and characterize violations of federal and state pesticide-related personal protective equipment (PPE) standards among randomly selected Agricultural workplaces in Oregon from 1999 to 2008. We analyzed data from the Oregon OSHA Pesticide Emphasis Program in over 500 pesticide-related inspections in Oregon from 1999–2008. All inspections were conducted randomly within major groups of the industry as targeted by the Pesticide Emphasis Program. Violations included non-compliance with specific standards of both the EPA Worker Protection Standard (WPS), including respiratory and non-respiratory PPE requirements, and the Oregon OSHA PPE standards. The following items will be analyzed and reported: 1) trends in the number and rate of EPA WPS violations and separately in Oregon OSHA PPE violations over time, controlling for the types of Agricultural Industry included which varies from year to year-violation rates will be calculated as the number of violations divided by the number of inspections; 2) a description of the types of violations and their seriousness and any changes in their prevalence over time; and 3) rates of violation recurrence within a workplace. All analyses will be presented in the poster. By addressing the study objectives, we will better understand the extent to which Agricultural workplaces in Oregon comply with state and federal pesticide-related PPE standards and the types of non-compliance that occur. The study addresses the Personal Protective Technology Program's PPE Surveillance in Agriculture effort to characterize PPE use among agricultural workers in order to better address their occupational safety and health needs.

Correspondence: Kimberly A. Faulkner, kcf3@cdc.gov.

Practical Solutions for Minimizing Agricultural Worker and Family Exposure to Pesticides

Richard A. Fenske, PhD; Jennifer Krenz; and Kit Galvin, CIH, MS

Pacific Northwest Agricultural Safety and Health Center, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

The purpose of this study is to promote practical and proven solutions for minimizing pesticide exposure in agriculture. The objectives are to identify, document, and evaluate unique solutions for pesticide safety measures developed and used in Washington tree fruit orchards. These orchard-developed interventions are relevant to the user and encourage adoption by other orchards. This project is part of a larger investigation that is developing, evaluating, and distributing pesticide safety measures that will minimize agricultural worker and family exposure to pesticides. Key to the overall project is collaboration of the research team with the Expert Working Group (EWG). This group, comprised of orchard managers, pesticide handlers, and specialists in agricultural safety, brings the knowledge of orchard practices and production to the project. Potential practical solutions were identified by contacting: orchards recommended by the EWG and colleagues in the agricultural community; as well as recipients of agricultural safety awards. The solutions were documented by observation, photographs, and interviews with managers and pesticide handlers. The solutions are being evaluated for uniqueness (not in common use); practicality (compatible with work practices, affordable, and convenient); and safety (does not create another hazard or increase pesticide exposure). Summaries of each solution are being evaluated by pesticide handlers and crew foreman, the EWG, orchard managers, and agricultural safety professionals. The pesticide handler and crew foreman evaluation takes place through an interactive presentation/survey in Spanish language sections of agricultural conferences. Proposed solutions are presented in Power Point and participants respond to the questions using a direct audience response system. The other target groups are completing an evaluation survey. Twenty-two practical solutions have been documented. Results from crew manager and pesticide handler evaluation are presented. Evaluation results are used to inform the selection of practical solutions and safety measures to be included in a manual and website.

Correspondence: Richard A. Fenske, rfenske@u.washington.edu.

Pesticide Interactions and Risk to Agricultural Workers

Ernest Hodgson, PhD and Andrew D. Wallace, PhD

Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

Human health risk assessment and the subsequent risk communication to end users are based largely on studies on surrogate animals. With regard to worker protection in agriculture such studies are deficient in several respects.