

Evaluation of methods for controlling silica dust exposures on roof bolters

G.V.R. Goodman and J.A. Organiscak

Mining engineers, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health,
Pittsburgh Research Laboratory, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Abstract

This paper examines methods for limiting occupational silica exposures for roof-bolting personnel in underground coal mining. A canopy air curtain and an air tube were evaluated as means to provide filtered air over the breathing zone of these personnel. Laboratory testing showed that dust reductions beneath the air curtain and air tube approached 60% and 40%, respectively, with low interference air velocities. The data also showed that dust reductions were highest for positions closest to the device and that these levels decreased with distance. This paper also evaluates a metal rake, a flexible insert and a rigid insert for cleaning the roof-bolter dust collector box. Less dust was produced when using the rigid insert. Surprisingly, the flexible insert was sometimes no better than scraping or raking the dust onto the mine floor. However, little dust got on the workers coveralls when using either of the inserts.

Introduction

The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act limits respirable dust exposures of mine workers to a time weighted average of 2.0 mg/m³ for a working shift (US Government Printing Office, 1999). If the respirable dust sample contains more than 5% silica (by weight), the dust standard is reduced according to the formula $10 \div (\text{percent silica})$. Compliance with the 2.0 mg/m³ standard or a reduced standard maintains silica dust levels at or below 100 µg/m³.

Data from the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) revealed that more than 3,400 respirable dust samples were collected at underground coal roof-bolter occupations in 1999. Of these, nearly 70% exceeded 5% silica content on the dust samples, while nearly one-quarter of the samples exceeded 100 µg/m³ (Mine Safety and Health Administration, 1999). Clearly, roof-bolter occupations exhibit a continued risk for overexposure to respirable silica dust. These high levels of noncompliance could result from operation of the roof bolter downwind of the continuous-mining machine or from inadequate maintenance of the vacuum dust-collection system.

Data collected by NIOSH researchers showed that silica dust levels in the roof-bolter intake increased when working downwind of the continuous-mining machine. These dust levels were measured by placing four gravimetric samplers in the bolter intake. Two samplers were used when bolting upwind of the mining machine and the other two used when bolting downwind. Comparing dust levels from each sampling set showed the effects of bolting downwind of the mining machine.

The samplers consisted of constant-flow sampling pumps pulling dust-laden air through a 10-mm nylon cyclone at a rate

of 2 L/min to deposit the respirable fraction onto preweighed 37-mm PVC filters. All filters were subsequently weighed and dust levels calculated. The filters were sent to an independent laboratory for analysis of crystalline silica using the infrared P-7 Method (Mine Safety and Health Administration, 1973).

The results show that silica dust levels in the intake airway of the roof bolter increased by nearly 70 µg/m³ when operating downwind of the mining machine. At another operation, silica dust levels measured in the bolter intake increased by nearly 40 µg/m³ when operating downwind of the mining machine. Similar results were found in Colinet et al. (1985), Kok et al. (1985) and Taylor et al. (1986). To limit these silica exposures, many MSHA dust-control plans limit the time that the roof bolter works downwind of the mining machine.

Improper cleaning of the dust-collector box and dust filters is another dust source for roof-bolter personnel. Although the cleaning process has the potential to produce high silica dust levels, durations for these exposures are typically low (Colinet et al., 1985). However, bolter headings can be poorly ventilated so that any dust generated by dust-collector box cleaning may linger near the bolter operators, increasing the duration of their exposure (Kok et al., 1985). Miners also can get dust on their clothing when cleaning the collector boxes and filters. Future movement by these workers may generate additional dust until the clothing is cleaned. Furthermore, dust from the collector boxes is generally dumped into tramways where it can be entrained into the mine atmosphere by movement of men and equipment.

NIOSH studies also revealed that dust boxes and filters were not frequently cleaned during the shift causing dust to accumulate in the collector boxes and to eventually bypass the

Preprint number 02-163, presented at the SME Annual Meeting, Feb. 25-27, 2002, Phoenix, Arizona. Original manuscript accepted for publication October 2002. Discussion of this peer-reviewed and approved paper is invited and must be submitted to SME Publications Dept. prior to Sept. 31, 2003. Copyright 2002, Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Inc.




Figure 1 — Dust levels before and after cleaning dust boxes and/or filters.




Figure 2 — Test setup for filtered air suppliers.




Figure 3 — Canopy air curtain construction and testing.

filters. Dust flowed from the mufflers of the bolter and formed a white haze around the machines, suggesting that immediate corrective action (cleaning collector box, changing filters) should be taken.

Eventual cleaning of the dust collector boxes and filter reduced dust levels by 10% to nearly 80% at two surveyed operations (Fig. 1). The values in this figure are averages for bolting an entire cut before and then after cleaning the collec-

tor boxes or filters. The mini-RAM units used in this figure are outputs from this light-scattering device and are representative of a dust concentration. Little differences were evident between cleaning the collector boxes or cleaning just the filters. Although cleaning the collectors and filters reduced instantaneous dust readings, some dust continued to flow from the mufflers, suggesting that fine dust particles were present throughout much of the vacuum system downstream of the filters. According to a bolter manufacturer, only a thorough cleaning and purging of the dust collection system may clear this dust.

Infrequent cleaning and subsequent contamination of the vacuum dust-collection system led to high silica dust levels at the roof-bolter operator's sampling location. During the two studies mentioned above, dust levels were measured by placing gravimetric samplers on the frame of the roof bolter approximately 1.0 to 1.2 m (3.3 to 3.9 ft) outby the controls of the return side-bolter operator.

Silica dust concentrations and percentages at these surveyed operations ranged from 103 to 327 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 9.1% to 13.7%. Levels were measured when operating upwind of the continuous-mining machine and in clean intake air. Therefore, silica exposures arose from dust generated by the bolter and not by the mining machine.

This paper describes methods for controlling occupational silica exposures for roof-bolting personnel in underground coal mines. A canopy air curtain and an air-tube system are tested as a means to limit exposures by supplying filtered air over the breathing zone of these personnel. Finally, dust levels are given for various methods of cleaning the roof-bolter dust box.

Testing of filtered air suppliers

Two filtered air suppliers, the canopy air curtain and the air tube, were tested separately in a full-scale facility at the Pittsburgh Research Laboratory. This facility simulated a 1.9-m- (6.2-ft-) high, 5.5-m- (18-ft-) wide, 12.2-m- (40-ft-) deep bolter heading. This heading was ventilated by an exhausting line curtain hung 0.9 m (3 ft) from the left side of the simulated heading. Each device was mounted 1.6 m (5.2 ft) above the floor on a wooden test rig placed 1.0 m (3.3 ft) from the return curtain and 0.9 m (3 ft) from the curtain mouth (Fig. 2).

Three gravimetric samplers each were placed 305 and 610 mm (12 and 24 in.) beneath the filtered air supplier, while three samplers were placed around the device to measure environmental dust levels. One was placed 1.5 m (5 ft) in front of the test rig and one sampler 0.9 m (3 ft) to the left and right sides of the test rig. These three samplers were positioned 1.1 m (3.6 ft) above the floor. All sampling equipment was sized and calibrated similarly to that used in the underground studies.

A $13.0 \pm 0.9\%$ mixture of silica dust in coal dust was used for this testing. This dust was introduced into the gallery 12.2 m (40 ft) upwind of the air curtain or air tube to simulate dust flow from a mining machine working upwind of a roof bolter. Reductions in dust levels were calculated by comparing dust levels beneath the filtered air supplier to dust levels surrounding the device. Selected filters were analyzed for silica content using the MSHA P-7 Method.

Canopy air curtain testing. The canopy air curtain is constructed of a 432-mm (17-in.) wide, 432-mm (17-in.) long, 76-mm (3-in.) thick square steel frame. Air enters this device at one side of the frame and passes along an intake plenum and through a series of aluminum honeycomb flow straighteners

(Fig. 3). The airflow then enters another honeycomb flow straightener before exiting through a perforated steel plate. The perforations are 2.38-mm- (0.009-in.-) diam holes drilled on 6.35-mm (0.25-in.) centers. The perforated plate is roughly 406 by 406 mm (16 by 16 in.).

The tested system consisted of the canopy air curtain connected to a 5.6-kW (7.5-hp) centrifugal fan (American Fan Co., Ohio) by 203-mm (8-in.) diam metal tubing. A Donaldson Co. (Minneapolis, Minnesota) ECG11-2501 Konepac filter was mounted on the inlet side of the fan to filter dust from the air supplied to the air curtain (Goodman and Organiscak, 2001).

Tests were run with air quantities of 0.094 and 0.283 m³/s (200 and 600 cfm) supplied to the air curtain and with interference air velocities of 0.32 and 0.64 m/s (60 and 120 fpm). Interference airflow is the ventilation airflow moving in the bolter heading and, at higher velocities, may distort air patterns emanating from the canopy air curtain. The lower value of 0.32 m/s represents the lowest velocity permitted in bolter headings. Five tests were made at each set of canopy flow and interference air velocity to assess errors in dust reduction potentials. Test durations were 50 minutes.

Figure 4 gives mean dust reductions and 95% confidence levels for distances of 305 and 610 mm (12 and 24 in.) beneath the canopy. Positive reductions signify protection from environmental dust concentrations, whereas negative reductions show increases in dust concentrations.

The data shows that efficiencies always were highest when sampling close to the canopy and that these efficiencies decreased with distance. Also, reductions were highest when interference air velocity was lowest. This suggests that dust reductions approaching 60% were possible in headings with low interference air velocities, a likely occurrence in many bolter headings. Increases in interference air velocity adversely affected the performance of the canopy air curtain. Detailed statistical analyses of test parameters and their interactions are given in Goodman and Organiscak (2001).

Silica contents averaged 6.10 ± 0.40% for samples 305 mm (12 in.) beneath the air curtain, 5.95 ± 0.56% for samples 610 mm (24 in.) beneath the canopy and 6.13 ± 0.35% for samples outside the canopy. Statistical analyses showed that respirable silica contents beneath the canopy were not significantly affected by changes in either air curtain quantity or interference air velocity. Subsequent pair wise comparisons revealed no significant differences between silica contents measured under the canopy and those contents outside the canopy suggesting that the canopy air curtain was equally effective on both coal and silica particles.

Air tubing testing. Although the canopy air curtain provided adequate dust reductions, its 76-mm (3-in.) thickness could detract from its usefulness in lower seam operations. To provide more headroom for the roof-bolter operator, an air tube was placed on the edge of the canopy and tested for its efficiency in reducing concentrations of respirable coal and silica dusts. The air tube was a 457-mm (18-in.) length of 63.5-mm (2.5-in.) internal diameter PVC tubing. A 90° section of the tubing was removed over a 406-mm (16-in.) length and covered with a perforated steel plate. The perforations were 2.4-mm (0.095-in.) diam holes drilled on 6.4-mm (0.25-in.)




Figure 4 — Canopy air curtain performance.




Figure 5 — Air tube construction and testing.

centers. Polycarbonate hexagonal flow straighteners with 3.2-mm (0.125-in.) openings redirected the tubing airflow to exit from the 90° section through the perforated plate (Fig. 5). Airflow was distributed over the tube length by means of an internal baffle.

The air tube was connected to an American Fan Co. 0.6-kW (0.75-hp) centrifugal fan using 127-mm- (5-in.-) diam rigid tubing and 102-mm- (4-in.-) diam flexible tubing. A Donaldson Co. G11-0120 Radial Seal dust filter was mounted on the intake side of the fan. This device was mounted on the underside of a surface representing the bolter operator canopy. Initial testing revealed that placing the tube on the upwind side of the canopy and angling it 45° downward delivered more air over the operator's breathing zone.

Air quantities of 0.057 and 0.103 m³/s (120 and 220 cfm) and interference air velocities of 0.32 and 0.64 m/s (60 and 120 fpm) were evaluated in this testing. Again, five tests of 50 min duration were run with each combination.

At a distance of 305 mm (12-in.) from the air tube, dust reductions approached 40% with low interference velocity in the bolter heading (Fig. 6). Increasing interference air velocity adversely affected air tube performance, especially at the low tubing flow where negative dust reductions occurred at both




Figure 6 — Air tube performance.

Table 1 — Sieve analyses of drill dust and rock dust.

Sieve size, No.	Opening, μm	Cumulative percent finer than size	
		Drill dust, %	Rock dust, %
4	4,750	100	100
7	2,800	98.4	100
16	1,180	85.0	100
30	600	64.4	100
40	425	53.6	100
60	250	38.2	99.9
100	150	26.9	61.0
200	75	16.8	25.8
Fines	<75	0	0

305 and 610 mm (12 and 24 in.) from the tubing. Like the canopy air curtain, dust reductions decreased as distance from the air tube increased.

Silica dust content averaged $6.75 \pm 0.51\%$ for those filters 305 mm (12 in.) beneath the air tube and $7.00 \pm 0.37\%$ for samples taken from the environment surrounding the air tube. Statistical analyses showed that at 95% confidence no significant differences in silica contents existed between samples surrounding the air tube and samples beneath the air tube. Furthermore, changes in silica contents were not significantly affected by changes in tubing air quantity or interference air velocity. As with the canopy air curtain, the air tube was equally effective on both coal and silica particles.

The air tube produced dust reductions approaching 40% in tests with low airflow. Although the air tube was more adversely affected by higher interference airflows than the canopy air curtain, the air tube offers certain advantages. This device is less obtrusive than the air curtain because it is mounted at the edge of the operator's canopy. Air tube operation also may require a smaller fan that will produce less heat and noise.

Cleaning the roof-bolter dust box

Roof-bolter personnel can reduce their occupational exposure to respirable silica dust by maintaining the vacuum dust-collection system on the machine. This includes proper clean-

ing of the dust collector box by removing drill cuttings and placing them in the return or against the rib.

This study examined three methods of cleaning the dust collector box. These include an unacceptable, but very common, method of using a metal rake to scrape dust from the collector box onto the mine floor. Dust likely falls on the worker's clothing. A second method inserts a rigid box with open top into the largest compartment of the bolter's dust collector box. This rigid box measures approximately 380-mm (15-in.) wide by 280-mm (11-in.) high by 320-mm (12.6-in.) deep and is constructed of 16-gauge steel with recessed handles welded on the front and top sides. When full of dust, the rigid box is carried to the rib and carefully

dumped to control the dust cloud. A final method inserts a lightweight, flexible bag in the largest dust collector box compartment. This bag is sized similarly to the rigid box and is constructed of lightweight brattice-type material with handles sewn on the top. This bag also is carried to the rib and dumped when full of dust.

The different methods were evaluated on an EIMCO 300-10 (EIMCO, LLC; Bluefield, West Virginia) single-boom roof bolter. This machine uses a permissible four-compartment Donaldson vacuum dust collector with a single canister-type filter. The bolting machine was placed in a heading ventilated by an exhausting line curtain hung 0.9 m (3 ft) from the right rib. Ventilation problems limited face airflow to 0.5 to 1.0 m^3/s (1,000 to 2,000 cfm) behind the curtain. The dust collector box was located on the right side of the bolter chassis.

To avoid potential health risks of working with silica dust, limestone rock dust was used instead. Sieve analyses of rock dust and drill dust from this drill showed that the rock dust had a finer composition (Table 1). Two 22.7-kg (50-lb) bags of rock dust were opened and set on the mine bottom near the drill chuck. The vacuum hose running to the drill chuck was disconnected and, after energizing the bolter, was used to vacuum-up the rock dust pile. After de-energizing the machine, the dust collector box was cleaned using one of the methods described earlier. New rock dust was used every five tests to avoid altering the size fraction of the dust. The filter was cleaned every three tests.

Because of the short test durations, gravimetric sampling at 2 L/min did not collect sufficient mass on the filters to permit accurate analyses. Instead, all samples were collected at 4.2 L/min. Use of this higher flow rate required a change in the cyclone preseparator from a 10-mm nylon cyclone to a Gk-2.69 metal cyclone (BGI, Inc., Waltham, Massachusetts). Constant flow pumps pulled dust-laden air through BGI cyclones at 4.2 L/min. The respirable fraction was then deposited onto preweighed 37-mm PVC filters. These filters were weighed following each test and dust levels calculated.

Accurate measurement of the respirable size fraction was not compromised by changing sampling rate and cyclone design. Work conducted by Kinney and Gussman (1997) showed that a d_{50} of 4.2 μm was obtained with the BGI cyclone sampling at 4.2 L/min. This was similar to the value obtained when sampling at 2 L/min with the 10-mm nylon cyclone (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 1995).

For each test, only the largest compartment of the dust collector box was cleaned, and this kept test durations to one minute. Five replicates of each cleaning method were made and were split between Researcher A and Researcher B. The five tests were averaged to establish an average dust concentration for each cleaning method. Dust levels were measured with two BGI gravimetric samplers in the breathing zone of the researcher cleaning the dust collector box. Separate samplers were used for each cleaning method to note any differences in dust levels.

The test results in Fig. 7 show that cleaning the dust-collector box using the rigid box insert produced minimum dust levels compared to those measured when using the brattice bag and rake. Not only were dust levels less, but little dust was observed on the coveralls of the researchers.

Surprisingly, the brattice bag insert was not very effective and sometimes was less effective than raking the dust onto the mine floor. This was attributed to dust “puffing” off the bag as it flexed and bent while being pulled out of the dust collector box and while being carried to the rib. It is possible that the “puffing” problem will be smaller when used with coarser drill dust. Like the rigid box, cleaning the dust collector box with the brattice bag insert did not get much dust on the researcher’s coveralls.

The rake produced much dust as the dust mass fell from the collector box onto the mine floor. In the process, dust got on the coveralls of the researchers. Furthermore, there was no way to get the dust to the rib without rehandling the dust. When cleaning the dust collector box using either the rigid box or the flexible bag, carefully rolling the box or bag at the rib successfully limited the size of the dust cloud.

Summary

Recent field work by NIOSH researchers showed that high silica dust levels around a roof-bolting machine arose when working downwind of the continuous-mining machine. One means to limit exposure is the use a canopy air curtain or an air tube to provide a constant flow of filtered air over the breathing zone of roof-bolter personnel. This laboratory work evaluated the effectiveness of each device for limiting exposures to respirable coal and silica dust.

The results showed that dust reductions were highest when sampling close to each device and that efficiencies decreased rapidly with distance. Furthermore, reductions with both devices tended to decrease rapidly when interference air velocities increased, although the air tube was most affected by such increases. Increases in airflow supplied to the canopy air curtain and air tube generally led to increased dust reductions. The canopy air curtain provided dust reductions approaching 60% in headings with a low interference air velocity, a likely condition in many bolter headings. Reductions approached 40% when using the air tube under similar conditions.

Silica dust contents were not affected by changes in flow quantity or interference air velocity when using the canopy air curtain or the air tube. Generally, silica contents measured under the air curtain and air tube were not significantly different from those measured outside.

Roof-bolter personnel can control their exposures to respirable silica dust through proper cleaning of the dust-collector




Figure 7 — Results of dust box cleanings.

box by removing drill cuttings and placing them against the rib. Three methods were examined for cleaning this box. The first used a metal rake to scrape the cuttings onto the mine floor. The other two methods used a rigid metal box or a flexible bag inserted in the largest compartment of the dust collector box to hold the drill cuttings. When full of dust, the rigid box or flexible bag was carried to the rib and carefully dumped.

Less dust was produced when using the rigid box insert. Not only was less dust generated when dumping the rigid box, but the authors observed less dust on the clothing. The flexible bag did not do as well as the rigid box and sometimes did no better than scraping the dust onto the mine floor. This was attributed to “puffing” of dust as the bag flexed and bent while being carried to the rib. As with the rigid box, little dust got on the clothing. Much dust was present on the clothing when scraping the dust onto the mine floor. Also, there was no way to get this dust against the rib without rehandling it.

References

- Colinet, J.F., Shirey, G.A., and Kost, J.A., 1985, “Control of Respirable Quartz on Continuous Mining Sections,” Contract Report No. J0338033, US Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Goodman, G.V.R., and Organiscak, J.A., 2001, “Laboratory evaluation of a canopy air curtain for controlling occupational exposures of roof bolters,” *Proceedings, 7th International Mine Vent. Congress*, Krakow, Poland, June, pp. 299-305.
- Kok, E.G., Adam, R.F.J., and Pimentel, R.A., 1985, “Control of Respirable Quartz on Continuous Mining Sections,” Contract Report No. J0338078, US Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Kinney, L.C., and Gussman, R.A., 1997, “Characterisation and modelling of a family of cyclone aerosol preseparator,” *J. of Aerosol Science*, Vol. 28, No. 4, April, pp. 677-688.
- Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), 1973, “Standard Method No P-7, Infrared Determination of Respirable Quartz in Respirable Coal Mine Dust,” Internal Document, US Dept. of Labor, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), 1999, “Respirable Coal Mine Quartz Dust Data,” available from the MSHA Technology Center, Dust Division, Pittsburgh, PA 15236.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), 1995, “Occupational Exposure to Respirable Coal Mine Dust — Criteria for a Recommended Standard,” US Dept. of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 336 pp.
- Taylor, L.D., Thakur, P.C., and Riester, J.B., 1986, “Control of Respirable Quartz on Continuous Mining Section,” Contract Report No. J0338077, US Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA.
- US Government Printing Office, 1999, *Mineral Resources Code of Federal Regulations Title 30, Parts 70 and 75*.

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date
2/19/2003

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. GEORGE BOCKOSH, OD		
2. ROB TUCHMAN, OD		
3.		
4.		
5.		

X	Action	File	Note and Return
	Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
	As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
	Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
	Comment	Investigation	Initial
	Coordination	Justify	

RE: PUBLICATION DISTRIBUTION

ATTACHED ARE 3 COPIES OF THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATION:

DATABASE RECORD NO: 2154

TITLE OF PAPER: Evaluation of methods for controlling silica dust exposures on roof bolters

PUBLISHED IN: SME Transactions 2002, Vol. 312, Preprint 01-163

AUTHORS: Gerrit Goodman and John Organiscak

REPORTED IN MONTHLY REPORT: _____
Reference #1596 (month) (year)

FILLED IN PUBL. AVAILABILITY DATE
IN PUBL. DATABASE: 2 / 18 / 03
mo / day / year

SUBMITTED ORIGINAL TO DIANE FELICE
FOR POSTING IN CISS: 2 / 19 / 03
mo / day / year

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No. — Bldg. 03
Jill Raufus, Health Branch	Phone No. 412-386-6868 Fax No. 412-386-4917