The focus of this year’s advisory board meeting was to discuss the most recent developments in agricultural health and safety from several of HICAHS’ grant award recipients. Each year HICAHS awards grants to agricultural organizations and members of Extension to conduct health and safety projects of their choice through the HICAHS Pilot Program and the HICAHS Community-Initiated Small Grants Program.

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) received funding to survey pesticide applicators in Colorado on exposure to pesticides. An important finding is that 75% of those exposed to pesticides did not seek medical care. CDPHE just began a pesticide surveillance program that evaluates incidence and severity of pesticide exposures through data collected at medical centers, but this finding indicates that the majority of pesticide exposure cases would not be found in medical records. This study was important for understanding the limitations of their current pesticide surveillance practices.

Thia Walker and Delphine Farmer presented plans for a study on the effectiveness of cleanout methods for pesticide equipment. Pesticide residues in spray tanks can lead to unintentional worker exposures and unintended application of pesticides to agricultural areas. Thia Walker will be surveying pesticide applicators on their cleanout methods and Delphine Farmer will be improving analytical methods for quantifying pesticide residues in spray tanks and determining methods for improving tank clean-out. This project is in progress.

John Pfister shared how Montana Extension Agents are working on reducing fatalities involving ATVs on ranches. Agriculture represents 20% of ATV use but 65% of fatalities. Through a series of four HICAHS funded projects Extension agents identified the primary ways that ATVs are used on ranches. Professional educational posters and flyers have been developed on ATV safety while herding/handling animals, mending fences, spraying
pesticides, or general riding. Extension agents have been certified through the ATV Safety Institute and are educating Montana ranchers on safe riding practices.

Peter Kolb describes chain saws as the most dangerous piece of equipment that can be purchased without a license. Equipment safety is determined by the technology of the equipment, the operator handling the equipment, and the maintenance of the equipment. In his forestry safety class, he is teaching Montana loggers how to properly fell trees and use their equipment.

Michael Pate shared the results from his survey of farmers and ranchers on their perceptions of confined spaces. Grain bins were the most common confined space on agricultural operations in Utah. Survey respondents said that the greatest training need with confined spaces is on rescue procedures, followed by working safely with grain storage systems, using respirators, and assessing hazards.

HICAHS strives to meet the health and safety needs for all agriculture production throughout its six-state region. To this end, we are planning on conduct a broad needs-assessment related to emerging trends and concerns. During the afternoon session HICAHS asked for help from the advisory board members with identifying key members of the agricultural community for the assessment.

The HICAHS Evaluation Team collected feedback on each of the projects presented during the advisory board meeting. We appreciate the time and effort each of the attendees provided to complete the feedback forms. Results and analysis of the feedback forms can be provided upon request.

Action Items:

- **For Board Members:** If you have not done so already, we would appreciate your suggestions on whom to contact for an agricultural health and safety assessment.
- **For HICAHS:** Board members suggested that HICAHS increase its engagement and communication with board members. We have listened to your suggestions and will be developing a newsletter and considering other ways to increase engagement. We will also be reviewing and revising the list of advisory board responsibilities. We might be asking for feedback from the advisory board members during this process.
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## AGENDA

**HICAHS Advisory Board Meeting**  
*January 28, 2013*  
9 AM – 2:30 PM  
Colorado State University  
Lory Student Center, Grey Rock Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Discussion Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:15</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-10:00</td>
<td><em>Projects from HICAHS Grant Recipients</em></td>
<td>Michael Pate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing Injuries Associated with Confined Spaces in Agriculture*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute Pesticide Poisoning Experiences of Certified Applicators in Colorado</td>
<td>Amy Warner &amp; Meredith Towle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Improving pesticide tank clean-out*</td>
<td>Thia Walker &amp; Delphine Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Forest Landowner Forest Operations Safety Training †</td>
<td>Peter Kolb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATV Safety Training for Ag Producers in Montana*</td>
<td>John Pfister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Discussion: Regional Needs Assessment for Occupational Health and Safety*</td>
<td>Vicky Buchan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 2:30</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendices for Presentation  
† Presentation available upon request
Agricultural Confined Space Hazard Perceptions of Utah Farm Owner Operators

Michael L. Pate
Utah State University

Geographic Regions of Utah

• Semi-arid West versus High Moisture Midwest

• Production practices affecting grain conditions and manure handling

• Training approach may need evaluation

Predictors of Perceived Hazard Risks

• Adoption of safety practices (Jenkins et al., 2012; Kingman et al., 2004)

• Liability concerns (Mosher et al., 2012)
  – Death
  – Injury

• Confined Space Exposure (Payne et al., 2012; Roberts & Field, 2010)
  – Entries
  – Number of confined spaces on-site
  – Experience
  – Production type

• Demographic variables (Payne et al., 2012; Wadud et al., 1995)
  – Age
  – Gender
  – Education

Appendix A:
Michael Pate's Presentation
Hazard Risk Score

- Hazards identified by NCERA-197 Agricultural Safety and Health Research and Extension Committee Confined Spaces in Agriculture White Paper
- 16 work tasks were selected (Riedel & Field, 2011)
  - Reviewed by a panel of 4 members of the NCERA-197 committee
- Owner/operators were asked to rate agricultural confined space work tasks as either not a risk, low risk, moderate risk, or high risk for a potential fatal injury
- Coding of the ratings
  - 4 = high risk to 1 = not a risk
  - Possible score range was 16 up to 64

Methods

- Utah Agricultural Statistics Office
  - Sampling frame (399)
  - Mailing and telephone calls
- A $5 gift card to farm or ranch supply store was offered as an incentive for participating
- Of the 328 respondents (82% response rate) only 17 respondents were female.

Variables of interest

- Injury concern while working alone in a confined space
  - 4-point rating scale
  - Not at concerned to very concerned
- Death concern while working alone in a confined space
  - 4-point rating scale
  - Not at concerned to very concerned
- Experienced a close call while working in confined space
  - Yes/No
Variables of interest

- Knowledge of anyone injured or killed due to confined space working.
  - Yes/No
- Farmers safe behaviors
  - Yes/No (Kingman et. al, 2004)
  - Higher score given for unsafe behavior practices
- Demographics
  - Age
  - Education
  - Production type
  - Mode of response

Distribution of responding farmer and ranch owner/operators

Demographics

- Age of participants
  - <40 years old 6.7%
  - 40-59 years old 51.1%
  - 60+ years old 42.2%
- Education
  - High school completion 23.3%
  - <4 yrs higher education 43.4%
  - 4+ yrs higher education 33.2%
- Majority of participants were male 94.8%
Respondent Age and Education

• Owner/operators farmers reporting between the ages of 20-39 consisted of only a small portion (7%) of the respondents.
• Most farmers (76.6%) reported being between 50 to 70 years of age.
• Reported education level of the respondents differed by regions.
  — Approximately half of the owner/operators in the southwest (55.4%) and central (50%) regions reported having at least two or more years of college education.
• 34.1% of the farmers in the north region reported having two or more years of college education.

Top Three Reported Confined Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain Bin</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Truck</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Feed Bin</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety Practices

- 49.8% entries without an outside observer watching
- 58.1% of sites not assessed for confined spaces/develop a response plan
- 90.5% of operations did not have a written response plan
- 52.7% did not train employees on hazards of confined spaces
- 96% of operations had not had local emergency first responders visit for training
- 74.3% of operations indicated that confined spaces were not labeled with safety alerts
Safety Equipment and Training Needs

- Respirators were the most common piece of safety equipment that farm owner/operators ($n = 128, 37.5\%$) had access to, yet only 86 of those individuals indicated using them.

Top 4 Training Needs as Indicated by Respondents

- Rescue Procedure: 157
- Working safely with grain storage systems: 151
- Use of respiratory protection equipment: 147
- Hazard Assessment: 139

Average hazard risk score in each region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Hazard score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences between regions on hazard risk score ($p > 0.20$)

Lower scores would indicate they do not perceive high risk for a fatal injury associated with work tasks.
### Response Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Production Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animal $f$ (%)</th>
<th>Grains $f$ (%)</th>
<th>Others $f$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>17 (4.1)</td>
<td>8 (3.5)</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17 (3.2)</td>
<td>12 (3.7)</td>
<td>8 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>86 (4.7)</td>
<td>50 (3.5)</td>
<td>21 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>51 (3.5)</td>
<td>7 (1.9)</td>
<td>22 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $N = 303$  

### Central Region Issues

- **Response by mail**
  - 17.6% had experienced a close call while working in a confined space.
  - Average hazard score for owner/operators responding by mail was 2.0 points higher than those responding by telephone. However it is not statistically significant ($p=0.226$).

- **Response by telephone**
  - 36.4% had experienced a close call while working in a confined space.
Eastern Region Issues

• In East region, grain production has the highest hazard scores 55.7, which is significantly higher than animal production (p=0.031).

Northern Region Issues

• For those responding by mail, there perception of hazard risk score was on average 2.4 points higher. This difference was not statistically significant (p=0.315).
  – Hazard score is highest in grain production at 44.9 points but not significantly different from animal and other production.

Southwest Region Issue

• Hazard risk score is significantly lower in grain production than other types of production.
General Conclusions

• The four studied regions are different in their types of production, farmers’ age and education and level of hazard concerns and safe behavior.

General Conclusions

• There is more “other” production in the southwest region than in the other three regions.
• In all regions, animal production is more prominent followed by grain production.
• North and Southwest regions have more young farmers (20-39 years old) than Central and East regions.
• The farmers’ education level is highest in Southwest and lowest in the North.

General Conclusions

• Owner/operators who replied by telephone seem to have less injury and death concerns.
• Injury and death concern while working alone in confined spaces are higher for farmers with higher hazard score.
• Safe behavior negatively affected farmers’ hazard scores.
  – Increasing SAFE behavior leads to increase in perception of fatal injury risks.
General Conclusions

• 48.7% operations were grain and dairy
• Training needs reflected the lack of safety practices for operations
• Few site assessments for confined space hazards
• Personal proximity may be a possible link to promote change in behavior with regards to high risk task associated with confined spaces.

Lessons learned...

• We concluded a need for outreach and educational efforts to increase safety behaviors regarding confined space work
• This needs to be strategically targeted for each region based on predicting factors.
• Targeting agricultural producers social networks to address human factors such as worker’s attitude and/or lack of skill or knowledge that effect hazard perceptions of confined spaces in agriculture.
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# Survey & Effectiveness of Pesticide Application Equipment Cleanout Methods

## HICAHS Research Project

**Thia Walker – CSU Extension Specialist**  
**Dr. Delphine Farmer – CSU, Department of Chemistry**

## 2011 S.A.F.E. Fly-In Tank Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Ex. labeled products</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>Atrax, Guardian Maxx</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azauxathrin</td>
<td>Quelt, Quadris</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aflatoxins</td>
<td>Capture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalon</td>
<td>Dicard</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyhalothrin Lambda Vienna</td>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofloxacin</td>
<td>Cruiser Maxx, Quadris Top</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinethane</td>
<td>Dinethane Insecticide</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>Roundup</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imazapyr</td>
<td>Arsenal, Lightening, Mojave</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malathion</td>
<td>Malathion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metconazole</td>
<td>Caramba, Headlin AMP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methomyl</td>
<td>Lannate, Nudrin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permethrin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td>Tordon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telosynonazole</td>
<td>Folicur</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymol</td>
<td>antibacterial disinfectant</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part 1: Survey

- Demographic info & opinions on cleaning equipment
- Info about the sprayer you use
- Info on your tank cleaning procedure

Would like to collect some information from everyone here today, even if you decide NOT to fill out the survey!
Your participation is important... but voluntary!

**ALL RESPONSES ARE ANONYMOUS!**

Using an Audience Response System
- Push button corresponding to answer
- You can change your answer until poll closes by pushing desired button
- Should display a green light when transmitting
- **Please** don’t take receivers home!

**What type of applicator are you?**

1. Private Applicator
2. Commercial Applicator
3. Not licensed

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)

- Private Applicator: 13%
- Commercial Applicator: 79%
- Not licensed: 8%

410 Respondents

**What best describes the location where you make applications**

1. Farm: 31%
2. Rural (<10,000 people): 6%
3. Town (10,000-50,000 people): 18%
4. Suburb (>50,000 people): 15%
5. City (>50,000 people): 38%

403 Respondents
How many years of experience do you have making pesticide applications since obtaining your pesticide applicator license?

1. Less than 1 year
2. 1-3 years
3. More than 3 years

408 Respondents

• Part 1: Survey
  • Demographic info & opinions on cleaning equipment
  • Info about the sprayer you use
  • Info on your tank cleaning procedure
• Part 2: Collect samples during normal cleanout (1 time)
  • Volunteer to participate - ‘contact survey’
  • What you get/ What we get

If you need more information...

About the survey and/or collecting samples:
Thia Walker (719) 691-9118 or thia.walker@colostate.edu

About your rights as a volunteer:
Janell Barker, CSU Human Research Administrator
(970) 491-1655
**Part 1: Results**  
*as of January 17, 2013*

**46 Completed Contact Surveys**  
**219 Completed Equipment Cleanout Surveys**

**Private Applicators**
- 90% Weed Control  
- 72% Insect Control

**Commercial Applicators**
- 52% Ag Weed Control  
- 48% T/O Weed Control  
- 44% Ag Insect Control  
- 36% T/O Insect Control

---

**How many years of experience do you have making pesticide applications since obtaining your license?**

A. Less than 1 year  
B. 1-3 years  
C. More than 3 years

---

**What type of applications do you normally make?**

A. Aerial  
B. Ground
In your opinion, how important is cleaning your application spray tank to your operation?

A. Very important  
B. Somewhat important  
C. Not important at all

At any time in the last 5 years, have you ever experienced left over residues in the spray tank causing symptoms to off-target plants?

A. Yes  
B. No

Very important factors which limit your ability to clean out your spray equipment

A. No suitable place to clean sprayer  
B. Limited availability of clean water  
C. Limited place to put tank rinsates
Factors which are NOT important in limiting abilities to clean out spray equipment

A. Too time consuming
B. Too much ‘downtime’ for equipment
C. Cost of tank cleaner additives

Do you wear Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) when cleaning the sprayer?

A. Yes
B. No

How often do you clean your application sprayer? (check all that apply)

A. At the end of each days use
B. When switching sites
C. When switching type of pesticides
D. At the end of the season
Future Survey Sites
Private Applicator Workshops – 7
CO Association of Landscape Professionals
Tri-River Area Pest Management Workshop

Questions on Part 1?

Part 2: Sample Collection
Described by Dr. Delphine Farmer
Department of Chemistry

Thank you!

Thia Walker – CSU Extension Specialist
Dr. Delphine Farmer – CSU, Department of Chemistry
ATV Safety In Montana

John Pfister, MT Extension Agent
January 27, 2013 - Update

Session Objectives:

- Provide a brief history of projects supporting ATV safety in MT
- Outline future directions toward improved ATV safety in Agriculture

ATVs Overview

- 1970 – 2012
- 16 million vehicles
- 10.5 million ATVs users
- Ag 20% users
- Ag 65% of fatalities
- MT has a problem!

(Jim Helmkamp)
Dave Gilkey contacted Doug Steele at MSU
Doug Steele connected Dave to me
ATV Use and Animal Handling
Aims:
1. Identify ATV uses
2. Develop H&S information
3. Craft dissemination plan
4. Enhance risk awareness

Methods: (Executed 2011)
3 focus groups in MT Ag communities
I hosted the first focus group in my kitchen
Roundup had been flooded out
Survey about ATV knowledge, experiences, S & H training, Ag applications
ATV Training is not for Ag!

Major tasks in Ag

Community Project 2
ATV Safety Training for Ag Producers in MT (2012)

John Pfister, MSU Ag Extension Agent

Primary Objectives:
1. Ag Extension Agents ATVSI Certified
2. Train Ag Producers Using ATVSI Curriculum
Community Project 2

- Ag Extension Agent to AZ
- Train 8 Ag Producers (5 hours)
  - Pre/Post Survey
  - 90 Day follow-up
- Focus Group (3 hours)
  - Assess Applicability to Ag Operations

Community Project 2

- Montana ranchers 5 male; 3 female ages of 23-63 yrs.
- The ranch sizes ≈3000-≈10,000 acres
- 5 out of 7 reported using ATVs 1-3 times per day
- 12-19% improvement on pre/post testing
- 50% of the respondents reported beneficial
- 88% said it definitely increased their awareness of ATV safety issues and will change their behavior
- Additionally, 7 of 8 stated they would attend hands-on training in the future

Community Project 2

Products:
- Successful Certification of 2 Ag Extension Agents (John Pfister and Ken Nelson)
- Successful Training of 8 Ag Producers
- Newsletter Article in development
  - MT State Fund, MT Farm Bureau, other
    - Galia and Daniel
- ATV Safety Demonstration
  - John Pfister
Community Project 3

ATV Safety Tip Sheets for Producers in MT

- Ken Nelson, MSU Extension Agent

- Primary Objectives:
  - 1) To develop and refine ATV Safety Tip Sheets for Ag operators,
  - 2) Pilot test the Tip Sheets in the Circle, MT community and region, and
  - 3) Evaluate operator’s perceptions, impression and impacts to Tip Sheets.

- Methods:
  - 2 focus groups with 5-7 Ag producers to further develop and refine tip sheets for the three primary ATV job tasks: 1) animal handling, 2) fence building and mending, and 3) weed control/spraying.
  - Obtain ATSI review and in-put (no NIOSH)
  - Pilot to MacCone County residents
  - Assess impact of tip sheets
Products

ATV and Animal Handling
- Approach at low speeds to avoid frightening or startle the animals.
- Be patient—if animals are causing you frustration, don’t let it show. If you do, you’ll only make the situation worse for you and the animals.
- Use caution when making sharp turns at higher speeds. Animals can be easily startled and run off the road.
- Never overtake animals that are moving faster than you.
- If an animal gets off the road, stop the ATV, reverse, and allow the animal to pass before proceeding.

Communication with others on ATVs or horses. Use hand signals, voices, or other equipment to communicate.

Spraying with ATVs
- Don’t use an aluminum or aluminum spray system.
- Keep the nozzle head fixed to avoid damaging the ATV and make sure to turn off the water when you’re not using it.
- Use a spray tank that has a long enough hose to reach up to the ground.
- Choose nozzles that are easy to handle and are adjustable.
- Always be sure to wear appropriate protective clothing when using a spray system.

ATV Safety

All-terrain vehicles (ATVs) can be great tools for the time or work, but using them improperly can greatly increase the risk of accidents and injury to the job.

Combine with others on ATVs or horses. Use hand signals, voices, or something similar.

Don’t ride and spray when using a wind or water pipe. If you’re using a blower, make sure the ATV is fast enough while you’re spraying.

Don’t drop your hose near the root—this can increase your risk of losing control of the ATV.

Only use the speed that you need—the optimal speed for good spray distribution is probably slower than you’d think. High speeds mean higher chances of missing your target, and wind can真的 resist control of the ATV.

Cleaning with ATVs
- Use a blower to disassemble parts and tools.
- Use a blower to clear the top and sides of the ATV.
- Keep the nozzle head fixed to avoid damaging the ATV and make sure to turn off the water when you’re not using it.
- Choose nozzles that are easy to handle and are adjustable.
- Always be sure to wear appropriate protective clothing when using a spray system.
Project 4 – Underway!

ATV Safety Training Tool Kit for Agricultural County Extension Agents in Montana

- Doug Steele, PH.D., PI taken over by John Pfister

Primary Objectives

1. Develop and refine tool kit materials
2. ATVSI certify 2 additional Extension Agents
3. Pilot the ATV Safety Training Kit with the four ATVSI Certified Ag Extension Agents
4. A training of “trainers” in MT (AG Extension Agents)
Project 4

- 2 additional Extension Agents ASI Certified as “Trainers”
- Virginia Knerr and Jodie Pauley
- 8 additional MSU Extension Agents ASI Trained
- ATV Safety Kit developed and soon to be deployed
  - Flash drive
  - Posters
  - Power Point Presentation
  - Education Script
  - Evaluation Surveys

Two counties have requested training of Search and Rescue To weed departments made requests.

One trained producer using helmet
Like face shield better
All grandkids now have helmets.
Future Directions

- Collaborate with other partners
  *MT Farm Bureau, MT State Fund, NCBA, Others*
- Obtain ASI Certification to train and certify
- Grow the numbers of Certified Ag Extension Agents
- Grow the number of Ag producers ASI trained
- Increase the acceptance of ASI training in AG
- Track the outcomes
- Save lives in MT

Ag producer quote: “Danger is a perception and Ag producers have interesting ways of preserving things.”
Thank You

Questions And Comments Please
References


Upcoming Needs Assessment
HICAHS Evaluation Project Team

Purpose

- Conduct a broad based needs assessment related to emerging trends and concerns in Public Health Region VIII
  - Health and safety related to all types of agricultural production found in the intermountain-high plains regions.
- Add greater depth of understanding of regional needs
- Include multiple sources and different perspectives
- Identifying emerging trends in the region
- Identify new areas for Health and Safety Research, Translation, Education and Outreach

Why is this important?
Recognition that change is occurring

- Add greater depth of understanding of regional needs
- Include multiple sources and different perspectives
- Identifying emerging trends in the region
- Identify new areas for Health and Safety Research, Translation, Education and Outreach
What is your task?

- Identify from your area organizations and entities that we should contact
- Are there individuals from your area that are not on the list that we should contact?
- Are there organizations from your area that we should add?
- Identify which, if any, national organizations we should seek to include?

Caveat: we are only interested in individuals and organizations that can speak to concerns that impact our region.

Thank you so much!