

Training

Actions to be taken at a HAZMAT spill

Some basic concepts should be used to guide the actions of spill response personnel at accident sites. The specific actions required to mitigate the effects of a hazardous materials spill will vary depending on the nature of the material spilled, the area affected, and the extent of the spill. The following recommendations are general in nature and for information purposes only.

rial spill response plan.

Aspects of or all of this generic hazardous materials response plan are appropriate for use by turfgrass and landscape managers for all but the most serious of hazardous materials spills. It can be effective for a broken bag of granular pesticide spilled on a concrete surface or a vehicular accident involving a 2500 gallon

Action areas for managers

Initial response -	control access to spill site and personnel movement on site tend to the medical needs of anyone injured determine the substance and form involved determine area involved notify authorities if spill meets minimum reporting standards
Setup command-	senior trained responder on site should take control establish an incident command system (ICS) or command structure establish both, on site, and outside lines of communication senior responder is sole decision maker in control of site and personnel analyze situation and determine course of action determine additional equipment or personnel required to contain spill
Confine spill-	senior responder designates trained responders to initiate containment initiate containment activities senior responder must continually evaluate success of activities document each stage of planned activities, their initiation and success cease activities if planned activities are not working reformulate action plan and initiate new plan withdraw from site if there is any question about personnel safety re-evaluate total site plans if withdrawal is necessary successfully finish action plan
Cleanup-	once contained, inspect site determine best course of action to clean up site clean up plan should not be more hazardous than spill site remediation should not pose any off-site safety problems monitor clean up activities reevaluate and reformulate clean up plans as needed complete clean up decontaminate all personnel and equipment withdraw

Turfgrass managers should contact their local and state HAZMAT representatives for detailed instructions.

The list below is generic in nature and may or may not be appropriate for the materials and the circumstances involved, but it highlights most of the action areas that managers should be concerned with when formulation a specific plan for a given spill or when designing a company wide emergency hazardous mate-

spray truck. The nature of the material spilled, the extent of the spill, and the level of the danger that the spill poses to surrounding people, buildings or the environment are the determining factors as to how much of this plan should be instituted on site.

Turfgrass and landscape managers should contact their suppliers or the manufacturers of the products that they use to formulate a company or organiza-

-continued on page 14

E.P.A. acts on worker protection standards

The Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.) has taken civil actions against two of the nation's largest pesticide manufacturers for alleged violations of the labeling requirements of the new Worker Protection Standards.

Dupont and Rhone-Poulenc were notified that the E.P.A. determined that they were in violation of the worker protection standards of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and that the E.P.A. was seeking fines that would total \$2.125 million. Dupont was cited for 379 counts of the prohibited sale of four of its triazine-based agriculture herbicides and Rhone-Poulenc was cited for 46 counts of the

prohibited sale of Chico Ronstar 50 WP. The alleged violations occurred when the products were sold, after the E.P.A. had notified the two manufacturers that their proposed new labels for these products contained serious flaws posing significant danger to application workers, and did not meet the new WPS labeling requirements.

Normally, when a manufacturer is issued a "Notice of Serious Error" the notified manufacturer works with the E.P.A. to correct the violations. In both of these cases, the companies did not choose to cooperate with the E.P.A. and ignored the notice by continuing to sell the products with the flawed labels. The proposed fines were \$1.895 million for Dupont and \$230,000 for Rhone-Poulenc.

Clemson University study

Dollar value put on landscaping

A study conducted at Clemson University found that researchers were able to isolate and verify the increase in dollar value that is added to the sale price of a house as a result of improving the quality of landscaping at the house from fair to good or from good to excellent.

The study, confirming previously held best industry estimates, found that, in addition to shortening the amount of time a property takes to sell, improving the quality of landscaping of a house for sale from fair to good raised selling prices from 8% to 10%, and raising landscape quality from good to excellent raised prices an additional 4% to 8%. Improving the landscaping from fair to good on the nationwide average \$117,000 house

could add almost \$12,000 to its sale value, while upgrading a \$200,000 home from good to excellent could add an additional \$10,000.

TGT's view: This analysis, published in the "Journal of Environmental Horticulture" in the June, 1994 issue on the dollar value effect of quality landscaping on the sale prices of houses has finally given landscape and lawn care professionals specific numbers that can be given to their customers when they ask. Additionally, green industry companies should use the results of the study to promote their services, just as the various members of the household remodeling industry have effectively done. —CS

Mistake found in EPA WPS publication

Page 33 of the EPA publication on the Worker Protection Standards contains an error that could be of considerable consequence. In the pamphlet entitled "Protect Yourself From Pesticides - A Guide for Agricultural Workers" a passage improperly identifies mouth-to-mouth resuscitation as CPR (cardiopulmonary resuscitation). The passage states "If someone gets sick from breathing a pesticide... 1. Get them to fresh air right away. 2. Loosen their clothing. 3. If not breathing, give mouth-to-mouth (CPR)."

Mouth-to-mouth resuscitation is performed when someone has stopped breathing for a period of time. This procedure is done to either restart the individual breathing, or, lacking sustained breathing provide oxygen during the period. CPR is a complex resuscitation technique of both mouth-to-mouth and heart compressions done when an individual's heart stops beating.

The EPA is rewriting the passage and suggests that holders of the uncorrected pamphlet strike the term CPR from their current copies.

TGT View - Although the newly implemented Worker Protection Standards do not specifically apply to turf or landscape management, some managers use WPS. Check to see if you are using the publication, and if so make the appropriate changes. —CS

Actions continued from page 13

tional response action plan before a spill occurs. The manufacturer should supply managers with all of the appropriate response information concerning each product and this information should play a prominent part in establishing response policy. Also manufacturers may be a valuable source of on site information or other resources. —CS