UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH

REVIEW COMMISSION

* * * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

* * * * * * *

Before: PATRICIA SILVEY

Hearing: Thursday, October 25, 2007

1:04 p.m.

Four Points by Sheraton Hotel

1938 Stanton Way

Lexington, KY 40511

Speakers: Pearl Farler, Lewis McCoy,

Randy Duncan

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency.

			2
1	INDEX		
2			
3	OPENING REMARKS		
4	By Ms. Silvey	4 - 14	
5	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	14 - 46	
6	CERTIFICATE	47	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

			3
1		EXHIBIT PAGE	:
2			
3			PAGE
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	<u>IDENTIFIED</u>
5			
6		NONE OFFERED	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

MS. SILVEY:

Good afternoon. My name is

Patricia W. Silvey. I'm the director of the

Mine Safety and Health Administration's Office

of Standards, Regulations and Variances. I

will be the moderator of this public hearing

on MSHA's proposal for mine rescue team

equipment. On behalf of Assistant Secretary of

Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Richard E.

Stickler, I want to welcome all of you here.

The MSHA members of the panel are on my left, William Bill Wilson, who is with MSHA's metal, non-metal Mine Safety and Health Office. To his left, Jeffrey Kravitz and he is with our office of technical support. And to his left Mike Kalich who is with MSHA's office of coal Mine Health and Safety. To my right Cherie Hutchison and Cherie is in my office. Matthew Ward, our attorney on the project and Mr. Phan, who is our economist on the project. Before we start this hearing this afternoon --- and I know most of you were here

with us this morning, but I would like to ask you to join me in a moment of silence in memory of all miners and rescuers who have lost their lives in mine accidents and including those as a result of the tragic and unfortunate events at Crandall Canyon. right now if you would please join me in a moment of silence.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SILVEY:

Thank you. This is the second of four public hearings on this proposal. held the first hearing in Salt Lake on Tuesday. The other hearings will be in Charleston and Birmingham, Alabama on next Tuesday and Thursday respectively. We are holding the two hearings each day, one in the morning, as you know from this morning, and this one in the afternoon so that persons interested in both rules can attend the hearings. The mine --- significantly, the mine rescue team equipment proposal applies to all underground mines, metal, non-metal and coal. In the back of the room we have copies of the Federal Register that contains the

proposed rule.

2.

2.4

The comment period for the proposal ends on November 9th, and specifically that will be midnight eastern standard time on November 9th. As of October 19th we have received three comments on the proposed rule, which is not unusual because historically most people wait until the end of the rulemaking to submit their comments. You can view any comments on the agency's website at www.msha.gov under the section entitled rules and regulations.

The proposed rule addresses mine rescue team equipment at mine rescue stations serving underground coal and metal and nonmetal mines. The Agency proposes to amend the existing standards to reflect advances in mine rescue team equipment technology. It is critical that mine rescue team members be provided with the latest in protective equipment so that they can safely and effectively carry out their mission. The purpose of these hearings is to receive information from the public that will help us evaluate the requirements in the proposal and

produce a final rule that enhances teams' safety and effectiveness.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

The preamble to the proposal to the proposal discusses the provisions in the rule and includes a number of specific requests for information. MSHA requests comments on all of the provisions and on the validity of the assumptions that the Agency used in deriving its costs estimates. As you address these provisions either in your testimony today or in comments please be as specific as possible about how the changes will affect miner safety and mine rescue team members and mine rescue teams, composition of MSHA also requests detailed teams. information on --- and data on the costs and feasibility of implementing these proposed provisions.

At this point I want to summarize the substantive changes in the proposal. The proposal upgrades and enhances certain types of equipment required for mine rescue stations and increases the amount of critical supplies that must be available.

The proposal would upgrade

requirements for self-contained breathing apparatus, SCBA, from two hours to four hour devices. And I believe that at this time all mine rescue stations in the U.S. currently have the four hour breathing apparatus.

2.

2.1

The proposal would increase the required number of extra oxygen bottles from one additional to two additional bottles to provide an added measure of safety for mine rescue teams during time sensitive operations.

The proposal would increase the amount of liquid air, liquid oxygen, pressurized oxygen or oxygen generated chemicals and carbon dioxide absorbent chemicals to maintain self-contained breathing apparatus for eight hours rather than six hours as it is under the existing rule, because industry practice is to stock these supplies in bulk. MSHA estimated that there are no costs associated with this requirement, but we specifically ask for comment on that.

The proposal would require mine rescue stations to be equipped with four gas detectors appropriate for each gas, which may be encountered at the mine served. If

methane, oxygen or carbon monoxide may be encountered the gas detector must measure concentrations of methane from 0 to 100 percent volume, oxygen from 0 to at least 20 percent volume.

BRIEF INTERRUPTION

2.

2.1

2.4

MS. SILVEY:

Excuse me. I stopped at oxygen from 0 to at least 20 percent of volume, and carbon monoxide from 0 parts per million to at least 10,000 parts per million. MSHA is particularly interested in comments on the Agency's assumption that all mine rescue stations including those serving non-gassy metal and non-metal mines would choose to purchase four multi-gas detectors with multiple sensor heads rather than four single gas detectors for each gas likely to be encountered.

The proposal would delete the existing requirements for flame safety lamps and oxygen indicators due to advances in gas detector technology. These outdated devices could still be used as a back up.

Mine rescue teams have relied in

the past on self-contained, self rescue 1 devices or self-contained breathing apparatus 2. to revive or help survivors breathe during 3 4 rescue operations. These devices are heavy, and may not be appropriate for unconscious 5 persons or those who have stopped breathing. 6 7 Lightweight oxygen resuscitators weighing 8 about six pounds with the oxygen bottle are 9 now available through at least one manufacturer. MSHA requests comments on 10 11 whether an oxygen resuscitator should be required at the mine rescue station for use by 12 mine rescue teams. 13 MSHA's estimated costs for 14 15 compliance with this proposal are contained in the preamble. There is no separate 16 17 preliminary regulatory economic analysts for the proposal. The Agency estimated total 18 19 annual compliance cost of \$237,000 for 20 underground coal mines and \$131,000 for underground metal and non-metal mines. 2.1

assumptions and data used in arriving at the

cost estimate supports the Agency's finding

that the proposal is economically feasible.

The Agency requests comments on all of the

22

23

2.4

estimates.

2.

2.1

As I stated this morning and for those of you who participated in prior MSHA hearings the hearing will be conducted in an informal manner, formal rules of evidence do not apply. The panel may ask questions of the witnesses, the witnesses may ask questions of the panel. Cross Examination, however, is not allowed. MSHA will make a transcript of the hearing and post it on the Agency's website within one or two weeks after the conclusion of today's hearing.

If you wish to present written statements or information clearly identify your material and give it to one of the panel members, and as stated earlier you may also submit any comments following this hearing as long as the Agency receives the comments by November 9th.

We ask that everyone in attendance this afternoon sign the attendance sheet. Now, I know you probably signed an attendance sheet this morning, but that was for a separate hearing. So if you don't mind, if you haven't signed we have an attendance

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

sheet out there for mine rescue team equipment. And if you would be so patient and sign that one because the two rulemakings will comprise separate records, so that attendance sheet will go with the record for this morning's rulemaking and a separate attendance sheet will go for the record for this hearing. So for those of you who haven't done that, we appreciate it. If you have a hard copy or an electronic version of your presentation provide it to the court reporter. We will now hear from those who signed up to speak and if you would clearly state your name and spell it for the reporter we would appreciate it. our first speaker is, I believe, Mr. Charles. Is he here? He's not here; is he? OFF RECORD DISCUSSION

MS. SILVEY:

Is there anybody else who wishes to speak. Somebody was going to speak because they told me that this morning. I won't call any names. Does anybody else wish to speak? Well, I have a few questions. Somebody's got to answer them. Whoever wants to volunteer can come forward. Mr. Farler? One of the ---

are there any metal, non-metal operators in 1 Well, I can't ask you to speak for 2. here? That's kind of unfortunate. 3 them. We did hear a lot of comments from metal, non-metal 4 operators out in Salt Lake, but I did have a 5 few questions that --- and maybe some of my 6 7 panel members do, that I wanted to ask on the 8 gas detectors. And specifically as I noted in 9 the opening statement we did ask some 10 questions in the proposal about the gas 11 detectors that we are requiring, and we are 12 requiring the gas detectors. I have a tendency to misspeak sometimes on that myself, 13 and we're requiring that they measure specific 14 15 concentrations of oxygen, methane and CO and the higher range. So basically we're 16 17 requiring high range. Actually I say high 18 range and low range I guess one could say, but 19 what we did is we assumed for the purposes of 20 deriving our costs that all mine rescue stations would be equipped with the multi-gas 21 22 detector as opposed to --- we just assumed that they would purchase that type as opposed 23 24 to the single gas detectors. And I wanted to 25 hear from several --- you know, maybe more

than one person about what do you think about 1 that assumption. First of all, do you all use 2. What is your usual practice and would 3 them? you think you would opt to do the purchase of 4 multi-gas as opposed to the single gas? 5 to some extent I recognize that in terms of 6 some of the conditions with respect 7 8 --- especially non-gas, metal and non-metal 9 mines, not the gassy ones but the non-gassy ones are ---. You know, some have, what, 10 11 different conditions than underground coal 12 mine, so ---.

MR. FARLER:

We do use multi-gas detectors.

We use a three gas for our mine rescue team,
methane, oxygen and carbon monoxide. They are
limited. The methane is limited to five
percent. Okay. Anything over that is over
range is what you read.

MS. SILVEY:

So to do what we require in this proposal would mean that you would have to buy the higher range ---

MR. FARLER:

25 Right.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

MS. SILVEY:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.4

--- different detector; right?

MR. FARLER:

Right. We would have to purchase four detectors that will read that range. right now as far as I know the industrial scientific ATX 620 is the state of the art machine that does that right now because it's got an internal pump that actually pulls the sample through and it's an infrared reader now. It's gone away from the Wheatstone Bridge and all that stuff where they actually had to burn the methane. It is state of the art. reads from 0 to 100 percent methane. It reads from 0 to 20,000 parts per million CO with its own display out that reads from 0 to 23 --- I believe it's 23 percent oxygen. It has a high It's a state of the art alarm, a low alarm. equipment there. I think you miscalculated the costs on it a little bit though.

MS. SILVEY:

Okay. That's the next thing I

23 was going to ask you, if you ---

MR. FARLER:

Okay.

MS. SILVEY: 1 --- how much does it cost? 2. 3 MR. FARLER: The detector itself is around 4 \$2,500. That does not include the carrying 5 case, the carrying strap and also a 6 calibration kit that goes with that equipment. 7 8 Then you also have to have --- you can't have 9 just that on hand, you have to have additional parts, replacement filters, things like that. 10 11 So if you buy four of the detectors you have 12 to have additional parts for each one of those machines, and plus you have to have the 13 calibration kit. The calibration kit is a one 14 15 time cost, but the detectors you have to have enough parts. Around \$3,800, \$4,200 per 16 17 detector with parts and everything that you have to have plus the costs of calibration 18 19 kit. 20 MS. SILVEY: Well, what about training? 21 22 MR. FARLER: 23 Well, training --- you have to go 24 through the training of course, and that takes 25 time.

		17
1		MS. SILVEY:
2		Is that an additional cost or
3		MR. FARLER:
4		That's additional.
5		MS. SILVEY:
6		is that in with the
7	package	
8		MR. FARLER:
9		No.
10		MS. SILVEY:
11		that a manufacturer sells
12	to?	
13		MR. FARLER:
14		No, that's additional.
15		MS. SILVEY:
16		That's additional costs?
17		MR. FARLER:
18		Yes.
19		MS. SILVEY:
20		Right. Okay. How long is the
21	training?	
22		MR. FARLER:
23		It's a pretty good machine. It's
24	kind of self	explanatory.
25		MS. SILVEY:

Okay. So ---? 1 MR. FARLER: 2 You just --- 30 minutes to an 3 4 hour ---MS. SILVEY: 5 The training ---. 6 7 MR. FARLER: --- would be sufficient on that 8 9 piece of equipment. 10 MS. SILVEY: 11 Okay. 12 MR. WILSON: 13 Does the manufacturer come out and train you for --- and charge ---? If you 14 15 have five people to be trained, does the manufacturer come out and train you and give 16 17 you a certificate and then charge you per person or do you do that in house? 18 19 MR. FARLER: No, we --- the manufacturer will 20 They usually don't charge for that. 21 come out. 22 I guess they absorb that cost the first time. 23 They will come out and give you training on 24 it. What we usually do is try to have 25 everybody there. If we can't have everybody

there, of course, we train the people that was

not present at the time of the training. 2 3 MR. WILSON: 4 Is that training good? 5 MR. FARLER: There is no certification on it. 6 7 MR. WILSON: 8 Okay. So it's not like every two 9 years you have to have ---10 MR. FARLER: 11 No. 12 MR. WILSON: 13

--- it or whatever?

MR. FARLER:

No.

MR. WILSON: 16

> You talked about going from the low range to the high range, so your current detectors you can't take the sensor head out, put a new sensor in for the high range and use it. You would have to buy a whole new

22 machine?

1

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

2.4

25

MR. FARLER:

That's correct.

MS. SILVEY:

1 All right. So you'd have to ---? MR. FARLER: 2 They would have to get it totally 3 redone, a new version put in on the 4 5 electronics. MR. WILSON: 6 7 So \$4,200 roughly, \$3,800, \$4,200 plus whatever time is lost for the training? 8 9 MR. FARLER: Right. 10 11 MR. WILSON: 12 It depends on how many people you 13 train at a time? 14 MR. FARLER: 15 Right. Yeah. MS. SILVEY: 16 17 Times four. 18 MR. FARLER: 19 Times four, yeah. MS. SILVEY: 20 21 Right. 22 MR. FARLER: 23 Yeah, except for the calibration 24 kit. Of course, you could use the calibration --- one calibration kit per the four 25

1 detectors. 2 MR. WILSON: Right. 3 4 MR. FARLER: 5 So you'd have to have the four detectors plus a calibration kit, one 6 7 calibration kit. So that would be --- and the calibration kit has to be calibrated itself. 8 9 You know, you have to send the calibrator for calibration, so that's a cost also. That's a 10 11 yearly cost. 12 MR. WILSON: 13 \$3,800 to \$4,200, plus the calibrator? 14 15 MR. FARLER: Plus the calibrator. 16 17 MR. WILSON: What's the calibrator run 18 19 roughly? 20 MR. FARLER: 21 Lewis? 22 MR. MCCOY: 23 What's that? 24 MR. FARLER: 25 Calibration kit?

1 MR. MCCOY: For what, brand X or 19? 2 3 MR. FARLER: Brand X. 4 MS. SILVEY: 5 6 So you are with whom? 7 MR. MCCOY: 8 I work for CSE Corporation. 9 MR. FARLER: Yeah. 10 11 MS. SILVEY: 12 Oh, well, I forgot. I saw 13 something. Well, you can come up here That's all right. We had --- I 14 separate. 15 won't call any names, but we had a manufacturer in Salt Lake who ---. He didn't 16 17 volunteer, but he was drafted to come up and provide some information. So you can look on 18 19 the record and see who it was from Salt Lake, 20 and he answered some useful questions for us. 21 MR. FARLER: 22 We pay \$1,400 for our calibration kit. 23 24 MR. WILSON: 25 Okay. So ---?

1 MR. FARLER: 2 And it's a new calibration kit. It's not a --- you don't turn the bottle ---3 the regulator on. It does it itself. I mean, 4 it's state of the art. 5 MR. FARLER: 6 7 So \$3,800 to \$4,200 times four, 8 plus \$1,400 roughly? 9 MR. FARLER: If you can get it for \$1,400, 10 11 yeah. 12 MR. WILSON: 13 Roughly? 14 MR. FARLER: 15 Right. Roughly. MR. WILSON: 16 17 And the training you said a half hour to an hour? 18 19 MR. FARLER: 20 Per person. 21 MR. WILSON: 22 Per person. So if they're all 23 sitting in a room you have ten people an hour 24 later ---? 25 MR. FARLER:

That's fine. 1 MR. WILSON: 2 Yeah. 3 4 MR. FARLER: Yeah. 5 MR. WILSON: 6 7 Got you. 8 MR. FARLER: 9 But if you don't then you ---. 10 MR. WILSON: 11 Right. 12 MR. FARLER: 13 Right. And you can't plan on all of them being there. 14 15 MS. SILVEY: So you tell me right now you all 16 17 don't have these devices as of now or do you have them right now? 18 19 MR. FARLER: We do not have them. 20 I have one at our rescue --- in our rescue station. We 21 22 do have them at the coal mines, because we 23 have 24 --- we're required to pull samples from behind 25 That is the unit to do that. seals.

MS. SILVEY: 1 Okav. I know --- and I know most 2 of you all know that in an emergency mining 3 4 evacuation we require the multi-gas detectors for groups of miners. If miners were working 5 in groups they had to just have one or miners 6 7 working alone they had to have one. If you 8 were working alone you had to have separate to have one. The difference is they're not the 9 high range, they're not specific to the 10 11 concentrations of the gas to be measured? 12 MR. FARLER: 13 And they don't have the internal 14 pump, the internal permissible pump, this one 15 does. MS. SILVEY: 16 17 Okay. I'm trying to think if there's anything else. 18 19 MR. FARLER: 20 I have one question. 21 MS. SILVEY: 22 Do we need anything? Phan, do you need any more information on that? 23

I assume that you only need

MR. PHAN:

Yes.

2.4

25

one calibration kit for four? 1 MR. FARLER: 2 Yes. 3 4 MR. PHAN: What about the maintenance costs? 5 Could you give us an estimate on how ---? 6 7 MR. FARLER: 8 On the calibrator or the ---? 9 MR. PHAN: 10 Well, the maintenance like, you 11 know, ---. 12 MR. FARLER: 13 On the detectors themselves? MS. SILVEY: 14 On the detectors. 15 16 MR. FARLER: 17 The filters --- you go through filters pretty quick. The filters are \$12 18 19 each. We have ten of them on hand, and the filters are about the size of a dime. But 20 they are --- you are required to have those. 21 22 MS. SILVEY: 23 But the filters are \$12 each? 24 MR. FARLER: 25 Each.

MS. SILVEY: 1 Okay. 2 3 MR. WILSON: 4 What's the, in your 5 guesstimate ---? MS. SILVEY: 6 7 How long do you have ---? 8 MR. WILSON: 9 Yeah. MR. FARLER: 10 11 Well, it's according to what you 12 do. 13 MS. SILVEY: How much ---? 14 15 MR. FARLER: It's according to what you --- if 16 17 you pour a little bit of water through it, it's done. 18 19 MR. WILSON: On average, say, per detector 20 time and effort, parts and all that, on an 21 22 annual basis how much does it cost to maintain 23 each detector if you were guessing, if you 24 were having to budget for it? \$100, \$200? 25 MR. FARLER:

The problem is you have to have a 1 back up detector if one of them goes bad. 2 You have to send it off, you have to have another 3 detector or you really --- if you mandate 4 four, you have to have a minimum of five. 5 MR. WILSON: 6 7 I understand and I understand 8 that there's some repairs you can do in-house. 9 MR. FARLER: That's right, yeah. 10 Right. 11 MR. WILSON: But if were having to quesstimate 12 maintenance, repair costs per unit assuming 13 you don't have to send it off? 14 15 MR. FARLER: Assuming you don't have to send 16 17 it off? MR. WILSON: 18 19 Right. 20 MR. FARLER: 21 Sensors you go through pretty 22 quick. If the methane portion of that particular detector goes bad you have to send 23 24 it back. You cannot work on the infrared

portion of it. The manufacturer has to.

25

Okay? The other sensors --- I can change a sensor out in probably 15 minutes, 20 minutes, but the cost of the sensor is about \$300 per sensor.

MR. WILSON:

Given your experience what would you say you spend on average per device?

MR. FARLER:

Oxygen sensors you go through probably a year. You'd probably go through three or four. Methane sensors you --- of course you have to send that off. We haven't had any problem with the methane sensor yet. The CO sensors, we've put in one and we've had them for a little bit over a year. So I would estimate probably \$2,000.

MR. WILSON:

Per detector?

MR. FARLER:

Per detector.

MR. WILSON:

Time, labor, parts?

MR. FARLER:

Not counting that. Yeah, parts,

25 labor. Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WILSON:

Okay. That's on the current

3 detectors you have, ---

MR. FARLER:

Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILSON:

--- not the new models?

MR. FARLER:

No. No, that's the new model.

MR. WILSON:

Oh, that's the new one?

MR. FARLER:

That's my experience with the new

14 model, yeah.

MS. SILVEY:

about the increased oxygen, do you think we were pretty accurate in what we said about that, you know, to increase the back up oxygen that operators --- stocking the liquid oxygen and pressurize oxygen or oxygen generated chemicals we want to increase that from --- to maintain the breathing apparatus for eight hours rather than six hours, and we didn't

include any increased costs for that because

we said we thought operators stock that in bulk.

MR. FARLER:

We do stock that in bulk. The problem is is with the eight hour you have to move your time to reorder up. You can't wait another three weeks to order. You have to make sure that you've got the eight-hour quantity on hand. Okay. So normally what we do is we wait, you know, until we're probably three to four or five weeks away from getting down below the six hours that we have now and then we reorder everything. And it puts us back in compliance, but the eight hour you couldn't wait that long. You would have to order more often.

MS. SILVEY:

Yeah, so what you are saying ---.

MR. FARLER:

You probably would not increase

21 your costs ---

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

MS. SILVEY:

I see what you're saying.

MR. FARLER:

25 --- you just have to keep it on

hand. You have to order more often. The costs probably wouldn't increase because we keep that much basically anyhow.

MS. SILVEY:

2.

2.1

We asked a question about whether --- we did not propose this. I know people who were following along with me, but we asked about whether an oxygen resuscitator should be required. What's your thought on that? And I don't want to put you on the spot. If you weren't prepared to address it here then you can provide it in your written comments because I'm not intending to put anybody on the spot.

MR. FARLER:

I understand.

MS. SILVEY:

But I'm just --- I'm more on this one, trying to get information that would help us make the right decision.

MR. FARLER:

Uh-huh (yes). I was going to ask you where that was. I didn't see that in the proposed regulations.

MS. SILVEY:

It's in the --- it's not in the regulations.

MR. FARLER:

It's not in the regulations.

MS. SILVEY:

It's not in the regulations.

MR. FARLER:

Okay.

MS. SILVEY:

That's why I said we did not

11 require ---

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FARLER:

13 Okay. I didn't see it in the

14 preamble.

MS. SILVEY:

agencies do that as opposed to requiring something. We ask the question in the preamble like if you're not quite sure of which way you ought to go. Being thus said, you were thinking about something and you tell us what your thoughts are. But the fact that we required it in the preamble, if we did the requirement in a specific enough manner, then

the law allows that with a proper comment and

rationale, you can then go on and require it 1 in the final rule because you would have given 2. the public prior notice so I was just trying 3 4 to figure out or anybody else in the audience, 5 what were your thoughts on that, whether that should be required. 6 7 MR. FARLER: 8 Well our rescue team has one. 9 purchased one. 10 MS. SILVEY: 11 And how much was that? 12 MR. FARLER: 13 It was \$3200. That hurts. It's 14 \$3200, no face piece, no oxygen bottle. It's just a hose with a regulator. It's \$3200. 15 MS. SILVEY: 16 17 You have another one. You have a state of the art one. 18 19 MR. FARLER: 20 Yes. 21 MS. SILVEY: 22 Yeah. 23 MR. FARLER: 24 Yes. 25 MS. SILVEY:

Excuse me. And so with the 1 additional for the requirements what would you 2 say then of total cost when you're talking 3 about training and additional ---. 4 MR. FARLER: 5 Now, that takes a little bit more 6 7 training. 8 MS. SILVEY: 9 Right. 10 MR. FARLER: 11 It's a CPR type training. 12 MS. SILVEY: 13 Yeah, probably retraining. MR. FARLER: 14 Yes, it does. And that is an in-15 depth training on that. That's a CPR type 16 17 training, plus the mechanisms on the timing 18 ---. 19 MS. SILVEY: 20 How long have you had it? 21 MR. FARLER: 22 We've had it for a year. 23 MS. SILVEY: 24 A year. 25 MR. FARLER:

About a year, yes. 1 MS. SILVEY: 2 Okay. 3 4 MR. WILSON: 5 How much did the extra parts and training and all that, what do you figure that 6 7 to the \$3200? 8 MR. FARLER: Well the \$3200 for the valve and 9 the hose, and oxygen bottle. 10 11 MR. MCCOY: 12 About \$900. 13 MR. FARLER: 14 \$900 for the oxygen bottle, face 15 piece? 16 MR. MCCOY: 17 \$350 for a face piece. 18 MR. FARLER: 19 How much? 20 MR. MCCOY: \$350. 21 22 MR. FARLER: 23 \$350? \$350 for the face piece 24 and then the training, it takes about two 25 hours per person.

	37
1	MR. WILSON:
2	Is that free?
3	MR. FARLER:
4	No.
5	MR. WILSON:
6	How much do you have to pay for
7	that?
8	MR. FARLER:
9	Well, we had to pay for the first
10	training.
11	MS. SILVEY:
12	The manufacturer does?
13	MR. FARLER:
14	The manufacturer will do that.
15	MS. SILVEY:
16	Right. Right. Okay.
17	MR WILSON:
18	For free?
19	MR. FARLER:
20	Well, I don't know if it's free
21	or not. Is it free, Lewis?
22	MR. MCCOY:
23	You don't see it on a
24	MR. FARLER:
25	Okay. That's what I thought. He

hides it. 1 2. MS. SILVEY: Yeah, but I was going to ask them 3 I was going to say but what about 4 separately. like we just said, it's retrained, you have to 5 do retraining? 6 7 MR. FARLER: 8 Yes, you have to do retraining on it. 9 10 MR. WILSON: 11 Annually? 12 MR. FARLER: Well, we try to do it at least 13 every six months just to make sure everybody 14 remembers how to do it. 15 MR. WILSON: 16 17 Okay. 18 MR. KRAVITZ: 19 And the oxygen and the face piece are the same as you use for your breathing 20 21 apparatus. 22 MR. FARLER: 23 Yes, but you can't use the face 24 piece and the oxygen bottle from your

25

machines.

MR. KRAVITZ: 1 No, you have to have spares. 2 3 MR. FARLER: You have to have extra. 4 MS. SILVEY: 5 Okay. I think those are sort of 6 7 the questions that I have. Has anybody else 8 got any more? We appreciate very much you 9 providing us with this being here. MR. FARLER: 10 11 Rethinking this keeping the eight hours, if you have to order more often, seems 12 13 like you'd have to spend some more money somewhere. 14 15 MS. SILVEY: No, you don't know, I'm sitting 16 17 here thinking about this assumption that they're stocking supplies but if you have to 18 19 reorder soon, then you got to replenish your supplies. 20 21 MR. FARLER: 22 You got to spend money somewhere. 23 MS. SILVEY: 24 So I don't know if you want to 25 give us any comments, any additional comments

before the record closes but that will be on 1 the estimate of how much you would have to 2. reorder during the run of a year, you know, 3 will it make you have to reorder two more 4 I mean, I'm just making this up ---. 5 times? MR. FARLER: 6 7 Right, I understand. 8 MS. SILVEY: I'd have to work it out on a 9 chart, you know, three more times. 10 11 MR. FARLER: 12 That's right. 13 MS. SILVEY: Yeah, I think you're probably 14 15 right there. MR. FARLER: 16 17 Yeah. 18 MS. SILVEY: 19 Some amount. Maybe not an 20 enormous amount but some amount. MR. FARLER: 21 22 Right. 23 MS. SILVEY: 24 Yeah. Thank you very much. 25 think you're right there. Okay. Actually,

the Mr. CSE back there, I think the --- he sort of answered, I think probably most of our questions, but if you don't mind, I think I have just a few questions.

MR. MCCOY:

2.

I do have to decline. Thank you.

MS. SILVEY:

I probably can figure out why but I'll talk to you afterwards.

MR. MCCOY:

It will be the same answer.

MS. SILVEY:

No, I know that. I know I'm sure I will but I know. I'm not saying that part of why, I'm just saying that we had --- it's a public record. We had Draven in Salt Lake City and we asked some questions because like I said, we had posed certain questions in the preamble on the gas detectors as well as --- a number of questions quite honestly, but specifically on the gas detectors and on the oxygen resuscitator which we did not require in the rule and we just posed the questions in the preamble. So this information is useful to us to help us determine what is the most

appropriate and effective way that the agency 1 should go in the final ruling. And a lot of 2. times, you know, when people have criticism of 3 an agency's regulations, you know, and it's 4 sort of easy to generally criticize but to 5 criticize and then provide specifics and back 6 7 up that with specifics and then if you don't 8 like something like we talked this morning 9 about the training and alternatives to doing it at each mine, then to follow that up with 10 11 certain specifics, that is much better at 12 helping an agency craft --- that type of information is very useful and will be a lot 13 more helpful and so that's kind of where we 14 15 Is there anybody else who were trying to go. Anybody else who wishes to 16 wishes to comment? 17 comment on the agency's equipment regulation? Do any members of the panel have anything? 18 19 Well if nobody else wishes to comment, I'm going to break for about 15 minutes just 20 because I don't think it's two o'clock. 2.1 22 I'm going to break for about 15 minutes and then we will reconvene at about two o'clock or 23 2.4 a little after 2:00. Thank you. SHORT BREAK TAKEN 25

MS. SILVEY:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We'll continue with the Mine Safety and Health Administration's public hearing on the Proposed Mine Rescue Team Equipment rule and at this time, we will continue and --- excuse me. If there's any discussion on the specific requirements that we included in the proposal relative to the specific measurements by the gas detectors, specifically CO, methane and oxygen. believe that we have, I have heard several comments up to this point about detectors being able to measure 9,999 CO if I'm not Yes, from 0 parts per million to mistaken. 9,999. We propose that they measure from 0 parts per million to at least 10,000 and I would like to hear from anybody. I heard earlier and I'm not sure I appreciated the magnitude of the comment from anybody who have current detectors now that measure up to 9,999 parts per million. SHORT BREAK TAKEN

MR. DUNCAN:

24 My name is Randy Duncan,

25 D-U-N-C-A-N with the Patriot Coal Company.

There's a new instrument coming out that 1 replaced the 620, which is a smaller version 2. and a whole lot easier to carry. It would be 3 more feasible for the mine rescue teams but 4 it's MX6. It would only read up to 9,999 5 parts per million. 6 7 MR. WILSON: 8 CO. 9 MR. DUNCAN: CO, right. Everything else would 10 11 read the limits. 12 MS. SILVEY: 13 Excuse me. Is this a part of a multigas detector? 14 15 MR. DUNCAN: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. 16 It's 17 just like the 620 but a smaller version. 18 MS. SILVEY: 19 And who makes that? 20 MR. DUNCAN: 21 The same company. It's an 22 industrial science. 23 MS. SILVEY: 2.4 Okay. 25 MR. DUNCAN:

And what I was worried about then 1 if I purchase this then I'll have a MSHA come 2. in and says this is not made to requirements 3 because lack of more parts per million. 4 I'm worried about getting a citation on this. 5 That's the part I'd be worried about. So I 6 7 would like, you know, for you to take this 8 into consideration. 9 MS. SILVEY: We appreciate --- I'll be honest, 10 I didn't fully appreciate that when I heard it 11 12 the first time. 13 MR. DUNCAN: Pearl mentioned something about 14 it in his comments. 15 MS. SILVEY: 16 17 He did, exactly. And until we were just talking on the break, I didn't fully 18 understand so sometimes, you know, the talking 19 on the break can help you better understand 20 21 things. 22 MR.DUNCAN: 23 Yes, ma'am. 2.4 MR. WILSON:

So if the regulations said at

25

least 9,999 parts per million or more then that would satisfy that new instrument coming out?

MR. DUNCAN:

Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON:

Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SILVEY:

Okay. Well that does clarify Yeah, thank you very much. Okay. that issue. Is there anybody else at this point who wishes Anybody else who wishes to speak? to speak? If nobody else wishes to speak then, at this time, I will conclude the Mine Safety and Health Administration's Public Hearing on Mine Rescue Team Equipment. And as I do so, I want to say that MSHA appreciates very much your participation in this rulemaking. For those of you that participating in prior MSHA rulemaking, we appreciate that and we appreciate your continued interest and helping to improve mine safety and health. members of mine rescue teams that we heard today and we heard those, we want to say that we appreciate your service and hope that you

1	will feel so honored to continue that service.
2	For those who did not speak here today but
3	who came and attending the hearing, we
4	appreciate your interest in the rule making.
5	As I stated before, for those of you who we
6	asked to provide us specific information, more
7	specific information, we would appreciate if
8	you would do so before November 9th, 12
9	o'clock midnight eastern standard time. And
10	the next two hearings are in Charleston on
11	next Tuesday, Birmingham on next Thursday and
12	we may see some of you at those hearings. And
13	so thank you very much.
14	

HEARING CONCLUDED AT 2:13 P.M.