

## TECHNICAL PAPERS

# Deep cut: ground control and worker safety in coal mines

### Introduction

In the underground coal-mining industry in the United States, the use of extended cuts has been steadily increasing. From 1988 to 1995, the number of mines approved to mine extended cuts increased by 108% (Bauer, 1998). According to the US Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), in 1995, approximately 45% of the producing underground bituminous coal mines had approval to mine extended cuts.

Extended cuts are taken during room-and-pillar mining, retreat mining and for longwall gate-road development. The popularity of extended-cut mining assures that mines will continue to request approvals for the use of this coal-extraction system.

There are safety concerns associated with the mining of extended cuts, including ground control and remote-control operation. The safety and health issues of remote-control mining include operator positioning during extended cutting and human factors analysis of remotely operated mining systems. These have been presented by King and Frantz (1977), Love and Randolph (1991), Steiner et al. (1994) and Bauer et al. (1995). These authors suggest that the safety of workers engaged in extended-cut mining can be enhanced through a systems approach to ergonomic design of equipment, tasks and work processes. Much of the research on the ground-control aspects of extended-cut mining was conducted in recent years (Bauer et al., 1993; Bauer et al., 1995; Bauer et al., 1997; Grau and Bauer, 1997; Bauer, 1998). These authors reported on the roof-fall hazard potential of employing extended cuts. Preliminary conclusions, based only on whether a mine had an extended-cut approval, indicate that extended-cut mining was no more hazardous than the mining of 6-m (20-ft) deep cuts.

In addition, all MSHA coal

E.R. BAUER AND C.J. BISE

E.R. Bauer, member SME, is a mining engineer with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Pittsburgh Research Laboratory, Pittsburgh, PA; C.J. Bise, member SME, is chairman Mining Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. Preprint number 99-109, presented at the SME Annual Meeting, March 1-3, 1999, Denver, CO. Revised manuscript accepted for publication December 1999. Discussion of this peer-reviewed and approved paper is invited and must be submitted to SME prior to Sept. 30, 2000.

mine roof-fall fatality reports for 1988 through 1996 were analyzed to determine how often extended cutting was a contributing factor. Extended-cut mining was considered a contributing factor if the fatality occurred at the active mining face and the depth exceeded 6 m (20 ft). This nine-year period was examined because all fatality reports were available and because the mines with extended-cut approval were known with a fair degree of certainty.

From 1988 through 1996, 106 roof-fall fatalities occurred in underground bituminous coal mines in the United States. Extended cutting was a possible contributing factor in 26 (24.5%) of the fatalities. To determine if extended-cut mining causes more roof-fall fatalities, the percent of extended-cut fatalities was compared to the percent of mines approved to mine extended cuts. For the period 1988-1996, the average percentage of extended-cut, roof-fall fatalities (24.5%) is slightly higher than the percentage of mines with extended-cut approval (23.2%).

It is important to note that this is comparable to the nine-year average and that, currently, nearly 50% of all mines are approved to use extended cuts.

For example, in 1995, 47% of the mines were approved to use extended-cut mining, while only 37% of the fatalities involved extended cutting. In addition, because mines with an extended-cut approval do not mine all cuts deeper than 6 m (20 ft), the percentage attributed to deep cuts could actually be lower. This comparison suggests that extended-cut mining is no more hazardous to mine workers from a roof-fall perspective than is the mining of a nonextended cut.

### Roof-fall fatality characteristics

Fatality characteristics extracted from the reports included geologic influences, fall location,

### Abstract

*The trend in underground room-and-pillar coal mining is to employ remote-controlled, continuous-mining machines and extended cuts to depths of 12 m (40 ft) or more. This system of coal extraction, adopted by more than 435 mines, can create additional worker safety hazards. To address the ground-control-related safety hazards, a combination of statistical analysis and numerical modeling was used. Initially, the reported roof-fall incidents and fatalities were reviewed to delineate the ground-control hazards. Then, the application of the coal mine roof rating (CMRR) for estimating safe extended-cut depths was evaluated. Finally, computer modeling was completed to predict roof displacements during extended-cut mining. This paper describes the results of these studies and their impacts on the safety of extended-cut mining.*

victim location and action of the victim. Many of the roof-fall fatalities occurred because of illegal actions on the part of the victim. For instance, 42% of the extended-cut fatalities occurred when the MSHA-approved depth of cut was being exceeded. In addition, 61% of the victims in extended-cut and nearly 34% of the victims in nonextended-cut, roof-fall fatalities were inby permanent supports when fatally injured (Bauer, 1998).

Visibility during extended cutting could be a problem for continuous mining machine (CM) operators because the added depth may restrict their ability to recognize changing roof and geologic conditions, causing them to travel inby permanent supports for better visibility. Geology was reported as a contributing factor in 81% of the extended-cut and 76% of the nonextended-cut roof-fall fatalities. The geologic anomalies cited included slickensided slips, laminated and unconsolidated shale roof, fractures, cutter roof, cap coal, draw rock, horsebacks, hillseams and highly jointed rock. The CM operator's ability to detect changing geology was only slightly reduced. This was because the reports stated that the geologic influences went undetected in 29% of the extended-cut and 21% of the nonextended-cut fatalities (Bauer, 1998).


Another concern of extended cutting is that, by exposing a larger unsupported area, the falls will be more likely to run out of the unsupported area and ride over the bolted areas. The reports indicated that, in more than 62% of the nonextended-cut and in only 46% of the extended-cut fatalities, the fall rode over or in between the roof bolts.

For extended cuts and nonextended cuts, where a distance was reported, the falls rode past the bolts an average of 1.7 m (5.6 ft) and 3.8 m (12.4 ft), respectively. A contributing factor to the lower incidence of falls running over the bolts for the extended-cut fatalities is the occasional use of extra, and more substantial, supports installed at the last row of bolts when extended cuts are mined.

Finally, the fatality-report analysis was used to evaluate whether mine workers performing certain job tasks were more likely to be fatally injured by a roof fall during extended-cut mining than during the mining of nonextended cuts. During the remote-control mining of extended cuts, workers either operating or helping on the CM were over three times more likely to be involved in a roof-fall fatality than they would when mining a nonextended cut (46% vs. 15%). Workers involved with support operations were only slightly more likely to be a victim of a fatal roof-fall incident during ex-

**FIGURE 1**

**Staged model (Bauer, 1998).**



tended cutting than during nonextended cutting (31% vs. 29%) (Bauer, 1998).

### Reported roof-fall accidents

The reported roof-fall accidents were analyzed to estimate the roof-fall potential of extended cutting. Mine operators are required to report any fall of roof if certain criteria are met, as specified in 30 CFR 75.223 (US Code of Federal Regulations, 1994a). These roof falls are termed "accidents" by MSHA and are reported by mine operators on MSHA Mine Accident, Injury and Illness Report Form 7000-1 (30 CFR 50.20) (US Code of Federal Regulations, 1994b). All reported roof-fall accidents for 1989 through 1991, 1993 and 1995 were extracted from MSHA's Health and Safety Analysis Center (HSAC) Accident Database. This is a compilation of all the Form 7000-1 reports received by MSHA from mine operators.

Data from these years were used because they represent the years that an accurate list of mines with extended-cut approval was available. The data were categorized and compared by whether the mine had an extended-cut approval. Then, incidence rates, normalized with respect to employee-hours worked underground, were calculated. Table 1 lists the reported roof-fall accident incidence rates for extended- and nonextended-cut mines. It also shows that the incidence rate of reported roof-fall accidents for extended-cut mines is less than


**TABLE 1**

**Accident incidence rates based on underground employee-hours worked, 1989-1991, 1993 and 1995.**

Mine category	Total roof-fall accidents	Total underground hours worked	Incidence rate <sup>1</sup>
All <sup>2</sup>	13,666	571,701,998	4.78
Extended cut	7,479	314,250,741	4.76
Nonextended cut	6,187	257,451,257	4.81

<sup>1</sup>Incidence rate =  $\frac{\text{Number of roof-fall accidents}}{\text{Total underground hours worked}} \times 200,000$

<sup>2</sup>Includes only data for underground bituminous coal mines.

**FIGURE 2****Joint-element model (Bauer, 1998).**

the rate for nonextended-cut mines and all underground coal mines. This suggests that there is no significant difference in potential for worker injury from roof-falls between the two mine types.

### Depth determination using CMRR

Although the maximum depth of cut is specified in a mines' approved roof-control plan, determination of the safe depth of cut, on a cut-by-cut basis, is usually the responsibility of the CM operator or section foreman. Their decisions are based on experience, how they perceive the roof is behaving and the visual signs of roof instability if present. Because this decision process is subjective in nature, there is some inherent error that could prove disastrous if an unsafe depth is selected and a roof failure occurs. To improve the depth-decision process, the coal mine roof rating (CMRR) was evaluated as a possible depth-determination alternative.

CMRR was selected because it estimates the struc-

tural competence of coal mine roof and considers bedding most important (Mark et al., 1994). CMRR addresses the lithologic factors that weaken bedded coal-measure rocks, such as discontinuities, moisture sensitivity and rock strength rather than just the geologic characteristics of the rock. CMRR also includes a strongbed adjustment, a moisture sensitivity factor, a surcharge adjustment when weaker rocks overlay the bolted interval and an adjustment for structurally weak contact surfaces rather than just for lithologic changes (Molina and Mark, 1994).

Other mine-specific information that was used in the analyses included entry width, average safe/successful cut depth, extended-cut status and overburden. This infor-

mation was collected during underground mine visits in approximately 40 mines. An example of the mine-specific data is listed in Table 2. Entry width was included because research has shown that the entry width, width-to-height ratio and opening shape can influence the stability of the mine roof (Obert et al., 1960; Stefanko, 1983). Combined with the overburden thickness, the stresses around an opening will influence the stability of the mine roof. The average cut depth and extended-cut status are two parameters that are determined after the mining of extended cuts has commenced. Extended-cut status is an estimate of a mine's ability to extract extended cuts based on the percentage of cuts mined that are extended cuts. The scale is listed as a footnote to Table 2. The average cut depth is either the depth of a majority of the cuts mined or the extended-cut depth when extended cuts are routinely mined.

Regression analysis using the statistical software package MINITAB, Release 10Xtra, was completed to

**TABLE 2**

Example of mine-specific information used for estimating safe extended-cut depths (Mark, 1998).

Coal seam	State	CMRR	Entry width, m (ft)	Average cut depth m (ft)	Extended cut status <sup>1</sup>	Overburden m (ft)
Blue Creek	AL	50	6.2 (20.3)	7.6 (25)	2	549 (1,800)
Wadge	CO	55	6.1 (20.0)	12.2 (40)	1	549 (1,800)
Herrin No. 6	IL	72	5.5 (18.0)	12.2 (40)	1	305 (1,000)
Springfield No. 5	IL	50	5.9 (19.5)	12.2 (40)	1	183 (600)
Springfield No. 5	IN	29	5.7 (18.8)	4.6 (15)	3	76 (250)
Harlan	KY	63	5.5 (18.0)	12.2 (40)	1	549 (1,800)
Lower Freeport	OH	68	5.9 (19.5)	12.2 (40)	1	183 (600)
Pittsburgh	PA	40	5.2 (17.0)	9.1 (30)	2	46 (150)
Hiawatha	UT	70	6.1 (20.0)	12.2 (40)	1	457 (1,500)
Powellton	WV	34	5.6 (18.3)	5.2 (17)	3	122 (400)
Hanna	WY	43	5.6 (18.3)	12.2 (40)	1	213 (700)

<sup>1</sup>Status 1 = always extended cuts (approximately 75% to 100% of the time).

Status 2 = sometimes extended cuts (approximately 25% to 75% of the time).

Status 3 = almost never extended cuts (under 25% of the time).

**TABLE 3**

Best-fit equations for estimating safe depths of cut (Bauer, 1998).

Mining stage	Best fit equation (using English units of measure)	Standard deviation ± ft (m)	Coefficient of determination R <sup>2</sup>
Design	Cut depth = 10.1 + 0.442(CMRR)	7 (2.1)	0.455
Preapproval	Cut depth = 10.1 + 0.442(CMRR)	7 (2.1)	0.455
Postapproval	Cut depth = 35.4 + 0.164(CMRR) – 6.64(Status) or Cut depth = 47.0 – 18.56(Status)	5.5-6 (1.7-1.8)	0.641 0.609

evaluate the relationship between depth of cut and one or all of the five variables listed in Table 2. Regression analysis determines which of the five variables best predicts the cut depth and provides the best-fit equation for estimating safe cut depths. The equation for the simple linear regression model that was used to represent this statistical relationship is

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_i X_i \quad (1)$$

where

$Y_i$  is the response (dependent) variable, depth-of-cut;

$\beta_0$  is the y-intercept of the regression line;

$\beta_i$  is the slope of the regression line; and

$X_i$  is the predictor (independent) variable.

The independent variables ( $X_i$ ) were CMRR, entry width, average cut depth, extended-cut status and overburden. The regression models were completed using the independent variables that were available for three different mining situations:

- During the design stage (prior to opening a mine).
- Pre-extended-cut approval (after mining has commenced but before applying for an extended-cut approval).
- Post-approval (after mining extended cuts when a change in the approved depth is desired).

Table 3 provides the best-fit equations, as determined by the regression analyses for the three mining stages. In all three situations, CMRR was the best predictor of cut depth, while, in the postapproval stage, extended-cut status was also a significant predictor of the depth of cut. The coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ) for the best-fit equations range from 0.455 to 0.641. These  $R^2$  values are considered low by standard statistical methods. But they are reasonable for a mining-based analysis, where the environment is highly variable, uncontrollable and unpredictable. Ultimately, these equations are not "design" equa-


tions and cannot be used to determine an exact, safe depth of cut. They can be used as a starting point for mine operators and regulatory agencies to estimate a range of cut depths that could possibly be safely mined (Bauer, 1998).

### Numerical modeling

Two-dimensional, finite-element numerical modeling of roof-and-pillar reactions during extended-cut mining was completed using the computer program Phase<sup>2</sup> (Rock Engineering Group, 1997). Roof displacement was predicted as the depth of cut increased from 6 to 12 m (20 to 40 ft) to evaluate where maximum displacement would be expected and to determine if the area where the remote operator is most likely to be positioned is safe. The effect of discontinuities on mine roof stability was modeled using joint elements to simulate geologic discontinuities in the mine roof. Awareness of how discontinuities affect mine roof stability can lead to an


**FIGURE 3**

Premining staged model output of plastic total displacement (Bauer, 1998).



**FIGURE 4**

**Plastic total displacement for 12-m (40-ft) cut, staged model (Bauer, 1998).**



increased level of safety during extended-cut mining.

To analyze strata displacements as the depth of cut increases, a side-elevation-view staged model was constructed (Fig. 1). The staged model represented the extraction sequence of a typical 6-m- (20-ft-) deep, 1.5-m- (5-ft-) high cut of coal that was extended to 12 m (40 ft) in successive 3-m- (10-ft-) deep cuts. Strata displacements were predicted along the centerline of the entry. The effect of geologic discontinuities was investigated by adding joint elements in the roof and overburden to the original model (Fig. 2). For both models, the material properties for the coal seam, immediate roof and floor,

stage, which included a bolted roof area, the plastic modeling predicted a maximum displacement in the immediate roof of 2 mm (0.07 in.) (Fig. 3). As the depth of cut increased, the predicted displacement also increased, finally reaching 2.5 mm (0.098 in.) at a cut depth of 12 m (40 ft) (Fig. 4).

Once an understanding of how "solid" mine roof strata reacts during the mining of extended cuts was obtained, the effects of geologic discontinuities on the stability of the roof during extended-cut mining could be studied. This analysis was important because the review of the roof-fall fatality reports revealed that geology was

main roof and main floor were from an actual mine site (when available) and from representative values extracted from the literature (Table 4). The bolt parameters used are listed in Table 5. Initially, linear elastic material properties were used to estimate the strength factors of the roof, coal and floor and to predict where elements were failing. Then, plastic material properties were used to evaluate strata displacements as the cut was extended from 6 to 12 m (20 to 40 ft) deep. The field stresses used were gravitational, based on an overburden of 152.4 m (500 ft), and unit weight of overburden of 0.022 MN/m<sup>3</sup> (175 pcf). This resulted in a vertical stress of approximately 3.85 MPa (550 psi) using the relationship that  $\sigma_v = 1.1 \times$  overburden depth in m (ft). In addition, studies at the mine in question indicated a higher-than-normal horizontal stress (Campoli et al., 1996). Thus, the vertical and horizontal stresses were assumed equal. The horizontal stress ( $\sigma_H$ ) was also 3.85 MPa (550 psi).

The plastic modeling followed the elastic modeling and was used to predict the location of the maximum displacement. For the premining

**TABLE 4**

**Failure criteria for Phase<sup>2</sup> modeling (Bauer, 1998).**

Location	Rock type	Thickness m (ft)	Unit weight MN/m <sup>3</sup> (pcf)	Young's modulus MPa (psi)	Poisson's ratio	Mohr-Coulomb		
						c, MPa (psi)	phi, degree	Tensile MPa (psi)
Main roof	sandstone	12 (40)	0.022 (175)	28,000 (4.0 x 10 <sup>6</sup> )	0.18	2.8 (400)	25	20.0 (2,857)
Imm. roof	sandy shale	3 (10)	0.0214 (170)	25,375 (3.6 x 10 <sup>6</sup> )	0.19	0.75 (107)	20	14.9 (2,133)
Coal	L. Kitt.	1.5 (5)	0.01 (80)	3,250 (4.6 x 10 <sup>6</sup> )	0.37	0.20 (28.57)	35	2.8 (400)
Floor	shale	2.75 (9)	0.0214 (170)	28,420 (4.1 x 10 <sup>6</sup> )	0.14	1.5 (215)	19	37.4 (5,335)
Main floor	sandstone	12 (40)	0.022 (175)	28,000 (4.0 x 10 <sup>6</sup> )	0.18	2.8 (400)	25	20.0 (2,847)

a contributing factor in 76% of the nonextended-cut roof-fall fatalities and in 81% of the extended-cut roof-fall fatalities. Joint elements were used to simulate geologic discontinuities such as clay veins, slickensided surfaces, cracks or fractures, fault planes, jointing, and cutter roof and horizontal stress effects. These discontinuities affect the roof similarly by severing the strata into discontinuous beams. The joint-element models used the same material properties as before. The joints were given properties that would simulate the worst-case scenario. This included a joint aperture of 6.9 mm (0.027 in.). Normal and shear stiffness, joint tensile strength and cohesion were all equal to 0.0 MPa (0.0 psi).

Slip along the joint was allowed, and the joint was permitted to deform from both the far field stresses and the induced stresses due to the excavation. A vertical joint was placed approximately at the midpoint of each stage, trending perpendicular to the direction of mining. The joint-element staged models were completed using the effects of the excavation and jointing as inputs to each subsequent model. Figure 5 presents the initial premining displacements.

As in the previous displacement models, the displacement of the roof, floor and coal ribs into the excavation, as represented by the deformed mesh, were exaggerated for illustrative purposes. The result of placing joints in the mine roof is an initial displacement (slip along the joint) of 3.4 mm (0.13 in.), located along the first joint just ahead of the face. The maximum displacement in the bolted roof was 2.5 mm (0.1 in.), nearly 43% more than what was predicted by the premining, "solid" roof model.

As the subsequent stages were modeled, the maximum displacement continued to increase until finally, after Stage 3 at a cut depth of 12 m (40 ft), the predicted maximum displacement was 9.1 mm (0.36 in.) (Fig. 6).

The models predicted that only the first joint had a significant impact on roof displacement, while the depth of cut and remaining two joints had only a minimal influence.

### Summary and conclusions

This research was conducted to address the ground-control and worker-safety concerns of extended-cut mining. Safer extended-cut mining will reduce mine-worker injuries associated with this extraction system. The research efforts included the following investigations: roof-fall fatality and accident analysis, determination of improved methods of estimating safe depths-of-cut and numerical modeling.

The review of the roof-fall fatality reports from 1988 through 1996 indicated that extended-cut mining was a possible contributing factor in 24.5% of the roof-fall fatalities. For the same years, the average percent of mines approved to extract ex-

**TABLE 5**

Bolt properties for phase<sup>2</sup> modeling (Bauer, 1998).

Bolt characteristic	Value
Type	Full-column resin
Length, m (ft)	1.52 (5)
Diameter, mm (in)	15.875 (0.625)
Modulus, MPa (psi)	205,800 (2.9 x 10 <sup>4</sup> )
Peak capacity, MN (lbs)	0.2 (60,000)
Residual capacity, MN (lbs)	0.02 (6,000)
Pretensioning, MN (lbs)	0.0 (0.0)
In-plane spacing, m (ft)	11.22 (4)
Out-of-plane spacing, m (ft)	1.22 (4)


tended cuts was only 23%. A more reliable estimate of the safety of extended cuts was obtained by calculating roof-fall incidence rates.

From an industry-wide perspective, the incidence rate of reported roof-fall accidents was slightly less for extended-cut mines (4.76) than for nonextended-cut mines (4.81). These results could be partially attributed to the presumption that mines approved to extract extended cuts would likely have stronger, more stable roof conditions. In addition, the safety of extended cuts could be more reliably estimated by taking into consideration the number of working sections at each mine type and converting this to an incidence rate based on production or cuts mined.

In addition, it was demonstrated that the coal mine roof rating (CMRR) and extended-cut status could be


**FIGURE 5**

Initial premining displacements, joint-element staged model (Bauer, 1998).



**FIGURE 6**

Stage 3 output, joint-element staged model, 12-m (40-ft) cut (Bauer, 1998).



used to estimate safe depths of cut on a mine-wide basis. The best-fit equation determined for cut depth during the design stage and preapproval stage was

$$\text{Cut depth} = 10.1 + 0.442 (\text{CMRR})$$

For the postapproval stage, either of the following best-fit equations applies

$$\text{Cut depth} = 35.4 + 0.164 (\text{CMRR}) - 6.64 (\text{Status})$$

or

$$\text{Cut depth} = 47.0 - 8.56 (\text{Status})$$

No method other than the experience of the CM operator or section foreman was found to accurately predict the safe cut depth on a cut-by-cut basis. Finally, numerical modeling of roof-and-pillar reactions during extended-cut mining predicted that a maximum roof displacement of 2.5 mm (0.1 in.) would occur in the center of the entry at the last row of bolts. In addition, when a joint (geologic discontinuity) was present, nearly four times the displacement would occur. The modeling indicated that the area encompassing the second row of bolts outby should remain stable, and the area should be a safe place for the remote operator to be positioned while mining an extended cut. ■

## References

- Bauer, E.R., 1998, "The impact of extended depth-of-cut mining on coal mine ground control and worker safety," PhD thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 287 pp.
- Bauer, E.R., Chekan, G.J., and Steiner, L.J., 1997, "Stability evaluation of extended cut mining in underground coal mines," NYRocks '97, 36th US Rock Mechanics Symposium, Linking Science to Rock Engineering, June 29 - July 2, New York, NY, *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mineral Science*, 34:3-4, Paper No. 302, 10 pp.
- Bauer, E.R., Pappas, D.M., and Listak, J.M., 1993, "Ground control safety analysis of extended cut mining," US Bureau of Mines IC 9372, 24 pp.
- Bauer, E.R., Steiner, L.J., and Hamrick, C.A., 1995, "Extended cut mining and worker safety in underground coal mines," SME preprint 95-60, 7 pp.
- Campoli, A.A., et al., 1996, "State-of-the-art room-and-pillar mining in the Kittanning coalbed," *Proceedings of the 15th International Conf. On Ground Control in Mining*, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO, August 13-15, pp. 269-285.
- Grau, R.H., III, and Bauer, E.R., 1997, "Ground control worker safety during extended cut mining," *Proceedings, 16th International Conference On Ground Control in Mining*, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, August 5-7, pp. 283-288.
- King, R.H., and Frantz, R.L., 1977, "Health and safety aspects of automated, remote controlled, continuous underground coal mining in the USA," *International Conference on Remote Control and Monitoring in Mining*, Birmingham, England, Oct. 11-13, 17 pp.
- Love, A.C., and Randolph, R.F., 1991, "Visibility and task demands for remote control continuous mining machine operators," *Proceedings, 35th Annual Meeting of the Human Factors Society*, San Francisco, CA, Vol. 1, Sept. 2-6, pp. 872-879.
- Mark, C., 1998, "Application of the coal mine roof rating (CMRR) to extended cuts," SME preprint No. 98-100, 6 pp.
- Mark, C., et al., 1994, "Evaluating roof control in underground coal mines with the coal mine roof rating," *Proceedings, 13th International Conference on Ground Control in Mining*, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, Aug. 2-4, pp. 252-260.
- Molinda, G.M., and Mark, C., 1994, "Coal mine roof rating (CMRR): a practical rock mass classification for coal mines," US Bureau of Mines IC 9387, 83 pp.
- Obert, L., Duvall, W.I., and Merrill, R.H., 1960, "Design of underground openings in competent rock," US Bureau of Mines Bulletin 587, 36 pp.
- Rock Engineering Group, University of Toronto, 1997, *Phase<sup>2</sup> Reference Manual*, J.H. Curran and B.T. Corkum, eds., 174 pp.
- Stefanko, R., 1983, *Coal Mining Technology, Theory and Practice*, Society of Mining Engineers of AIME, New York, NY, pp. 82-85.
- Steiner, L.J., Turin, F.C., and Hamrick, C.A., 1994, "An ergonomic and statistical assessment of safety in deep cut mining," Chapter in US Bureau of Mines Special Publication SP 18-94, pp. 124-132.
- US Code of Federal Regulations, 1994a, "Title 30 - Mineral Resources; Chapter I - Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor; Subchapter O - Coal Mine Safety and Health; Part 75 - Mandatory Safety Standards - Underground Coal Mines; Subpart C - Roof Support," July 1, pp. 511-520.
- US Code of Federal Regulations, 1994b, "Title 30 - Mineral Resources; Chapter I - Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor; Subchapter - Accidents, Injuries, Illnesses, Employment, and Production in Mines; Part 50 - Notification, Investigation, Reports, and Records of Accidents, Injuries, Illnesses, Employment, and Coal Production in Mines; Subpart C - Reporting of Accidents, Injuries, Illnesses," July 1, pp. 307-313.