### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

+ + + + +

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING RE:
INTERIM FINAL RULE FOR HAZARD COMMUNICATION
IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2001

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing was held at the National Mine Health and Safety Academy Auditorium, 1301 Airport Road, Beaver, West Virginia, at 9:00 a.m., Ernest Teaster, Moderator, presiding.

### PANELISTS:

ERNIE TEASTER, MODERATOR, Administrator, Metal and Nonmetal Mine Safety and Health RICHARD FEEHAN, Educational Policy Development DEBORAH GREEN, Solicitor's Office CAROL JONES, Metal and Nonmetal Mine Safety

and

Health

ROBERT SNASHALL, Solicitor's Office CHERIE HUTCHISON, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances PHAN PHUC, Office of Standards, Regulations,

and

Variances

## I-N-D-E-X

Opening Statements - Moderator Teaster	4
Testimony of Gary Trout	2
Testimony of Timothy Miller	8
Testimony of Larry Lee	2
Testimony of Donald Keith 4 United Mine Workers	:0
Testimony of Larry Huestis 5 United Mine Workers	0
Testimony of Andrew Laferty	3
Testimony of Wayne Conaway 8 United Mine Workers	3
Testimony of Terry Richardson 8 United Mine Workers	9
Testimony of Bob Morris 9 United Mine Workers	1
Testimony of Charles Miller	.3
Testimony of Scott Irwin	2
Testimony of John Ely	1
Testimony of Dwayne Barton 14	2
Testimony of Danny Smith	:5
Testimony of David Bradley	9

# I-N-D-E-X (Cont.)

Testimony of Samuel Johnson . United Mine Workers	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	151
Testimony of Tom Baker United Mine Workers	•						•	162
Testimony of Mike Browning . United Mine Workers	•	•		•			•	168
Testimony of Edward Yevincy . United Mine Workers	•			•			•	178
Testimony of Tim Baker United Mine Workers	•	•		•	•		•	181
Testimony of Stan Stemkowski	•	•						205

### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1 2 (8:44 a.m.) 3 MODERATOR TEASTER: Good morning, and 4 welcome to MSHA's public hearing on the Interim Final 5 Rule for hazard communications in the mining industry. I'm Ernie Teaster, administrator for metal 6 and non-metal, and I will be your moderator here 7 today. The members of today's panel are Bob Snashall 8 from the Solicitor's Office, Richard Feehan, from our 9 10 office of standards, regulations, and variances, 11 Cherie Hutchison, who is from our office of standards, 12 regulations, and variances; Carol Jones from metal, 13 non-metal, and Phan Phuc, from the office 14 standards, regulations, and variances. 15 We are here to listen to your comments on the hazard communications Interim Final Rule, which we 16 17 published on October 3rd last year. We are holding 18 this Hearing in accordance with section 101 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. 19 20 As is our practice, we will conduct the 21 Hearing in an informal manner. During the proceeding 22 panel members may ask questions of the presenters. Although formal rules of evidence will not 23 apply, we will be taking a verbatim transcript of the 24

Hearing, and we will make it a part of the official

rulemaking record.

The Hearing transcript will be made available for public, review by the public, along with all comments and data that MSHA has received to date.

The entire rulemaking record, of course, is available at our office in Arlington, Virginia. If you wish a personal copy of the Hearing transcript, please make your own arrangements with the Court Reporter.

Now let me briefly give you some of the background on the Interim Final Rule, and highlight its major provisions. Following that I will share with you some of our reaction to some of the comments received thus far.

On November 2nd, 1987, the United Mine Workers of America, and the United Steel Workers of America jointly petitioned MSHA to adapt OSHA's health communication standard, hazard communication standard to both coal and metal, and non-metal mines, and propose it for the mining industry.

They based their petition on the need for miners to be better informed about chemical hazards, and that miners working at both surface and underground coal and metal, and non-metal mines, are exposed to a variety of hazardous chemicals.

1 On March 30, 1988, in response to this 2 petition, MSHA published an advance notice to proposed 3 rulemaking on hazard communication for the mining 4 industry. In this notice we indicated that we would use the OSHA hazard communication standard as a basis 6 for our standard, and requested specific comments on 7 a number of related issues. 8 9 published а notice of We proposed 10 rulemaking on hazard communication on November 2nd, 11 1990, and held three public Hearings in October 1991. 12 The record closed January 31st, 1992. Interim comments on our advance notice of 13 14 proposed rulemaking and proposed rule, commenters 15 represented both small and large mining companies, individual miners, a variety of trade associations, 16 17 state mining associations, chemical and equipment 18 manufacturers, national and local unions, members of 19 Congress, and other federal agencies. 2.0 We reopened the rulemaking record on March 21 30th, 1999, requesting comments on the impact of the 22 proposed rule on the environment, small mines, state, local, and tribal governments, and health and safety 23 24 of children.

The National Environmental Policy Act, and

most recent statutes, and Executive Orders, included requirements for us to evaluate the impact of a regulatory action in these areas.

At that time we also requested comments on the information collection, and paperwork requirements of certain provisions of the proposal, now considered as an informational collection burden under the expanded definition of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

We received seven comments to the limited reopening of the rulemaking record, primarily from trade associations, and labor organizations. The rulemaking record closed June 1, 1999.

On June 3rd, 2000, we published an Interim Final Rule on hazard communication, with an effective date of October 3, 2001. October 3rd, 2001.

We gave commenters until November the 17th, 2000, to submit comments. The Interim Final Rule specifically requested comments on the plain language format, and the content of the Interim Final Rule.

Non-operators experience under OSHA's hazard communications standards, and any changes in the mining industry since the publication of the proposed rule.

2.0

1 On December 7th, 2000, we personally spoke 2 with, or emailed all commenters, and other interested 3 persons, telling them of our decision to hold a public 4 Hearing in Washington, D.C., on December 14th, 2000. The Public Notice of the Hearing appeared in the Federal Register on December 11th, 2000. 6 received 22 written comments on the Interim Final Rule 7 and heard testimony from six persons at the Public 8 9 Hearing on December 14th, 2000. 10 Commenters objected what they 11 considered to be an inadequate comment period, and an 12 inadequate notice of a Hearing. These commenters 13 stated that they did not have sufficient time to fully 14 analyze the impact of the Interim Final Rule, which 15 affected their ability develop and submit to meaningful comments. 16 17 They also stated that many operators were unable to testify at the Hearing, because they did not 18 19 have enough time to prepare testimony, and make plans 2.0 to attend the Hearing. 21 Members of the mining community have also 22 stated that because this is the first time MSHA 23 promulgated an Interim Final Rule, there is some confusion about their compliance obligations. 24

The National Miners Association, and the

National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association, have asked for a delay in the effective date of the Interim Final Rule until we respond to their previous comments submitted on it.

A number of mine operators and trade associations challenged the hazard communication Interim Final Rule in the US Court of Appeals, and the United Mine Workers of America, and the United Steel Workers of America have intervened in that litigation.

Now I will briefly highlight the six major provisions of the Rule. Hazard determination. The hazard communication Interim Final Rule requires mine operators to identify the chemicals at their mines, and determine if they present a physical, or a health hazard to the miners, based on the chemical's label and material safety data sheet referred to as MSDS sheet, or on a review of the scientific evidence.

Under the Interim Final Rule for the purpose of hazard communication, MSHA considers a chemical hazard, and subject to the hazard communication rule, if it is listed at any one of the following four recognized authorities or sources.

Title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, chapter 1. The American Conference on Government and Industrial Hygienist, threshold limit values, and

biological exposure indices.

The National Toxicology program annual report on carcinogens, and both of those would have been the latest edition under the Interim Final Rule.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer, mammograms, or supplements.

The hazard communications program. The hazard communication Interim Final Rule requires mine operators to develop, implement, and maintain a written program to establish a hazard communication program.

The program must include procedures for implementing hazard communication through labeling, MSDSs, and training of miners. A list of hazardous chemicals known to be present at the mine, and a description of how mine operators will inform miners of the chemical hazards present in non-routine tasks, or of chemicals in unlabeled pipes and containers.

If the mine has more than one operator, or has an independent contractor on-site, the hazard communication program also would have to describe how the mine operator would inform other operators about the chemical hazards and protective measures needed.

Container labeling. A label is an immediate warning about a chemical's most serious

1 hazards. The hazard communication Interim Final Rule 2 requires mine operators to ensure that containers of 3 hazardous chemicals are marked, tagged, or labeled 4 with the identity of the hazardous chemical, and 5 appropriate hazard warning. The label must be in english and prominently displayed. 6 I would like to clarify one point about 7 the labeling requirements. Practically speaking very 8 little labeling is required. You only have to label 9 10 stationery process containers, and temporary portable 11 containers, and then only under some circumstances. 12 Chemicals coming onto mine property are almost always labeled. They would not have to relabel 13 14 them unless the existing label becomes unreadable. 15 You would not have to label containers of raw material being mined or milled by their own mine 16 property. You would not have to label mine products 17 18 that go off a mine property. 19 You would have to provide the labeling 2.0 information to downstream users upon request. 21 Material safety data sheets. A chemical's 22 material safety data sheet provides comprehensive 23 technical and emergency information. Ιt is 24 reference document for mine operators, exposed miners,

health professionals, and firefighters, or

public safety workers.

The Hazard Communication Interim Final Rule requires mine operators to have an MSDS for each hazardous chemical at the mine. Mine operators should already have MSDSs provided by the supplier for those chemicals brought to the mine.

The MSDSs must be accessible in the work area where the chemical is present or in a central location immediately accessible to miners in an emergency.

Interim Final Rule requires mine operators to establish a training program to ensure that miners understand the hazards of each chemical in their work area, the information on MSDSs, and labels, and how to access this information when needed, and what measures they can take to protect themselves from harmful exposure.

Under the Interim Final Rule mine operators have the flexibility of combining the training requirements for the hazard communication with existing part 46 and part 48 training.

The Interim Final Rule does not require mine operators to have an independent training program separate from part 46 and part 48 training.

1 Mine operators already cover some of the 2 above information in their current training program. 3 If so they do not have to retrain miners about the 4 same information. We designed the hazard communication training requirements to be integrated into the 6 7 existing training program for miners. Making HAZCOM information available. 8 HAZCOM, the Hazard Communication Interim Final Rule 9 10 requires mine operators to provide miners, their 11 designated representative, MSHA, and NIOSH, with 12 access to the materials that are part of the hazard 13 communication program. 14 These include the program itself, the list 15 of hazardous chemicals, labeling information, MSDSs, training materials, and any other material associated 16 17 with the program. 18 Mine operators do not have to provide 19 copies of the training materials purchased for use in 20 training sessions, such as videos. Also mine 21 operators do not have to disclose the identity of a 22 trade secret chemical, except where there is 23 compelling medical or occupational health need. 24 I will now share with you our thoughts on

some of the comments we've received on the Interim

1 Final Rule. 2 Commenters representing the aggregate argued Hazard 3 industry strenuously that the 4 Communication Rule is unnecessary, and that the 5 aggregate industry should be exempt from the Rule. The HAZCOM Rule does not duplicate other 6 it 7 MSHA standards, augments, supplements, and complements these existing standards. 8 The Rule 9 specifically deals with chemicals and chemical 10 exposure. 11 Chemicals may be used in any mine, 12 including those in the aggregate industry. There have been hundreds of chemical burns in the aggregate 13 14 industry. Chemical burns can occur on any part of the 15 body. Skin burns may require multiple skin 16 17 grafts, and require repeated hospitalization. Еуе 18 burns can be serious and result in permanent loss of 19 eyesight. We believe the burden of small mines is 20 21 less than some commenters stated. First, small mines 22 typically use far fewer chemicals than large mines. 23 And in many cases no new chemicals. 24 Second, small mines typically

chemicals in small quantities, and for shorter periods

of time, similar to household use.

Third, many of the chemicals used at small mines are not covered by the Rule. For example, soaps used for washing hands are cosmetic, and are exempt.

A can of spray paint is a consumer product, and exempt when used in small quantities, intermittently.

The length of exposure, as well as the amount, is really the determining factor. A can of spray paint only lasts a short time. Glue, or adhesive, when used intermittently in small quantities, are exempt.

Again, the length of exposure, as well as the amount, is the determining factor in whether or not a consumer product is exempt. We recognize, however, that not all mines are likely to use a wide range of chemicals.

Although we cannot exempt the aggregate industry from hazard communication, as we said, there are steps we can take to minimize the burden of the Rule.

For example, we intend to make extensive compliance assistance visits, and conduct extensive outreach. We also will be finalizing a compliance guide to help operators and miners understand the application of the HAZCOM final rule.

1 We are developing a variety of compliance 2 aides, such as a model HAZCOM program, a training 3 video for mine operators about determining chemical 4 hazards, and a training video for miners about 5 chemical hazards reading the MSDS. A draft of MSHA's Compliance Guide has 6 7 been on the MSHA website for months. If you refer to the Compliance Guide, many of these issues 8 9 explained. 10 If you have any question in these areas, 11 send them by email to comments@msha.gov, or the Office 12 of Standards at the address listed in the Hearing 13 Notice. 14 We will use these questions to clarify 15 your responsibilities and include additional or better examples in the compliance guide. 16 17 As a rule of thumb, however, if you are in 18 compliance with OSHA's Rule, you will be in compliance 19 with MSHA's Rule. In the same vein, mine operators may 20 21 obtain help from organizations that have developed 22 generic guides to help OSHA's health communication standard, because HAZCOM contains the same basic 23 24 requirements.

We will provide links, on our website, to

some organizations which have developed a variety of generic HAZCOM material. While it will remain the responsibility of each operator to develop and implement a HAZCOM program, and to have MSDSs, to the extent possible we will help you establish a hazard communication program, if requested.

We have already taken other steps in revising our Interim Final Rule to make it easier for mine operators to comply, without reducing the projections afforded by the Rule.

We are considering the final substantive changes to the Interim Final Rule in response to commenters concerns. We are also considering several non-substantive changes to clarify our intent and correct errors based on the commenters perspectives and questions.

Under hazard determination we may revise reference the American Conference of to Government/Industrial Hygienist, the Toxicology Program, and the International Agency of Cancer, from those considered in Research on determining if a chemical is a hazard, and if a chemical is carcinogenic.

One option we are considering, in determining whether a chemical is a hazard, is to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 refer to the 2001 editions of the American Conference 2 of Governmental/Industrial Hygienists, TLV booklet, 3 and the International Agency for Research of Cancer, 4 and the National Toxicology Program. 5 In determining whether a chemical carcinogenic, we are considering referring only to the 6 2001 editions of the National Toxicology Program and 7 the International Agency for Research of Cancer. 8 9 We had expected the use of the American 10 Conference of Government/Industrial Hygienist, the 11 National Toxicology Program, and the International 12 Agency for Research on Cancer list, to reduce the 13 burden on the mine operator, because the miners use 14 relatively few hazardous chemicals for which they 15 would have to develop an MSDS and label. Commenters objected to the use of these 16 listings, 17 stating that the organizations which 18 them, offer no opportunity for public compiled 19 They impose unknown future requirements by comment. 20 latest edition, they citing the and violate 21 regulations governing incorporation by reference. 22 We are hoping to consider alternatives, 23

We are hoping to consider alternatives, where the impact of the alternative would not reduce protection afforded miners by the Interim Final Rule.

Concerning labels and MSDSs, commenters

24

requested additional language to clarify that the designated responsible person mentioned on the labels and MSDSs, can be the mine operator.

Accordingly we are considering changing these provisions to read the name, address, and telephone number of the operator, or a responsible person who can provide that information.

Concerning the availability of the MSDSs, commenters asked that we increase compliance flexibility, and recognize that MSDSs may be stored in a computer.

In response we are considering modifying the requirement to have MSDSs available for each hazardous chemical before using it, requiring the operator have an MSDS available for each hazardous chemical which they use.

MSHA is also considering accepting a list of OSHA PELs on MSDS as an alternative to listing the MSHA PEL. This would facilitate the use of widespread existing MSDSs, and reduce costs by eliminating the need to develop additional MSDSs.

In response to comments concerning hazard communication training, we are considering changing the language from requiring the operator to train the miner whenever introducing a new hazardous chemical

into the miner's work area, to requiring training when the operator introduces a new chemical hazard into the miner's work area.

This change would clarify MSHA's intent that when a new chemical is introduced, additional training is required, only if the hazards change. This is the intent, as discussed in the preamble of the Interim Final Rule.

Also, in response to comments, we are considering revising the definition of health hazards. The Interim Final Rule defines health hazard to include chemicals that damage the nervous system, including psychological, or behavioral problems.

We are considering deleting the phrase psychological or behavioral problems. We are also considering adding the criteria toxic, or highly toxic, to more closely conform to the language to that in OSHA's hazard communication standard.

The Hazard Communication Interim Final Rule is an information and training standard that requires mine operators to know about the chemicals at their mines, and to inform miners about the risk associated with exposure to hazardous chemicals, the safety measures implemented at the mine to control exposures, and safe work practice.

1 The Hazard Communication Interim Final Rule does 2 not restrict chemical use, require control, or set 3 exposure limits. 4 We will publish our response to the 5 written comments, including those comments received today at this Hearing, in the preamble to the Hazard 6 Communication Final Rule. 7 We will consider all comments contained in 8 the rulemaking record from the publication of the 9 10 advanced notice of proposed rulemaking on March 30th, 11 1998, through the close of the record on October 17th, 12 2001, in a development of this final rule. 13 You may submit written comments to me 14 during the Hearing, or send them to the address listed 15 in the Hearing Notice. We will also accept additional written comments, and other appropriate data, on this 16 17 Final Rulemaking from any interested parties, 18 including those who do not present oral statements. All comments and data submitted to MSHA, 19 20 including that submitted to me, today, will be 21 included in the rulemaking record. The record will 22 remain open until October 17th, 2001, for the 23 submission of post-hearing comments. 24 We ask that you please sign the attendance

sheet at the back, where you enter the room.

1 have not done so, we ask you to do that during the 2 first break. 3 And if there is anyone that wants to speak 4 we have our sign-up sheet at the back of the room, we 5 would ask you to please sign up. We will begin with the folks that have 6 7 signed up in advance, to speak. If there is time, and we will make time, at the end of that any one in the 8 9 audience who wants to come up and make a statement 10 will be able to do so. 11 We will ask that anyone that has a 12 statement, or a comment, that they come to the podium We will continue the Hearing until all 13 to speak. 14 speakers have the opportunity to address the panel. 15 Should it be necessary to be extended beyond 5 o'clock we will stay as long as we need to, 16 17 so that all that choose to do so, will have 18 opportunity to speak. 19 This concludes my opening statement. 20 will now start with the speakers. Our first speaker 21 of the day is Gary Trout, from the United Mine Workers 22 District 29. 23 MR. TROUT: Good morning. My name is Gary Trout, I'm from the United Mine Workers 24 25 America Local Union 1335.

1 On October 3rd of 2000, after years of delay, MSHA finally issued an Interim Final Rule, 2 3 which would provide safeguards for miners against 4 harmful chemicals in the workplace. This rule would have went into effect October of 2001. On August 28th, 2001 MSHA stopped 6 7 this HAZCOM rule from going into effect. By doing 8 this MSHA has thrown the entire HAZCOM Rule wide open for comments, and to date, soliciting comments on any 9 10 issue relevant to the rulemaking. 11 In our opinion, or in my opinion I should 12 say, this severely weakens the rule that was out there for adoption, that should have went into effect. 13 14 You know, as I looked at the Rule, and 15 looked at what OSHA already has, and OSHA has had a HAZCOM Rule for years, I think it is a shame that our 16 miners, myself, my brothers and sisters, have to work 17 in chemicals, or around chemicals that could cause 18 various health effects. 19 20 Joe Carter and I just recently was asked 21 to come down to a doctor's office and visit some of 22 our miners that are his patients. And those folks had 23 worked at preparation plants, and those folks had 24 severe health, damage to their health.

They had anything from Parkinson's-like

1 disease, to various other nerve disorders. And it was 2 real -- an awakening experience for myself, and Joe, to see these folks in that condition. 3 4 And, you know, some folks would make the 5 argument that these folks might have gotten these diseases from elsewhere, but two of those folks, one 6 7 individual had worked at a preparation plant handling various chemicals. 8 And when he got disabled to where he 9 10 couldn't work any more, another individual took his 11 place, and both of those individuals have the same 12 symptoms after working the job now, at same 13 occupation. 14 And, you know, it is just a shame that we 15 can't provide the miners, I should say our miners, with the same protection that OSHA has for their 16 17 workers. 18 It is my understanding that MSHA, in their 19 opening statement, announced that they were going to 20 look really hard at a lot of the objections posed by 21 the mine operators. 22 Myself, my brothers and my sisters, you 23 know, we have objections too. And those objections 24 are that every day we are exposed to various types of

And some of those chemicals could cause

chemicals.

cancer.

And, ladies and gentlemen of the panel, I don't know whether any of you all have ever seen anyone who has died from cancer, but it is not a real pretty sight.

My father in law, who has over 35 years' experience around the mines, and around preparation plants, just recently, about a year and a half ago, died of cancer. And that was very long suffering, and it just wasn't a very pretty sight.

And, you know, we've got a lot of miners up there that are exposed to these chemicals. And, you know, I would just ask that each one of you look around and consider some of these individuals who have had serious injuries, and some who have possibly even died from chemical exposures.

And here today you are going to hear other testimony from individuals who has actually gotten burnt by chemicals working around preparation plants.

And if you could just put yourself in their place, would you like to give up the job that you have and trade places with those folks, and be exposed to those chemicals that you know, that there is data out there, that some of these chemicals can cause cancer, and would expose your own self to

1 cancer.

You know, it is my opinion that the HAZCOM rule should be put into effect, should have been put into effect on October 3rd of 2001, and I think that this rule, even though it is not perfect, it might very well have protected, and give our members protection from various types of chemicals.

You know, I think that the access, that MSHA is there to protect miners, I think that MSHA should be enforcing the laws, and not delaying the implementation of these rules so that it could protect our miners.

In closing I would just ask each one of you, I would like to leave you with this question in mind. As you contemplate this rule, how many miners must be injured or die before we can get a chemical exposure, of chemical exposure, before we can get a HAZMAT rule implemented. Thank you.

MODERATOR TEASTER: Gary, if I might, when you and Mr. Carter visited the doctor, do you know what chemicals that these miners were supposedly exposed to?

MR. TROUT: I can have Dr. Kasincko probably get that information to you, Ernie.

MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay.

1 MR. TROUT: It was flocculent, but I don't 2 know the specific chemicals. 3 MODERATOR TEASTER: Gary you, I know, get 4 around to a lot of different mines. Are you familiar 5 with to what extent Part 48 training is provided to the miners under the annual refresher training that 6 7 deal specifically with hazards, chemical hazards at their operations? 8 I know the retraining that I 9 MR. TROUT: 10 attend at various operations, you know, normally there 11 is very little, if any, given. At the ones that I 12 have attended. You know, it is kind of a hush hush 13 14 situation that, you know, nobody wants to get into. 15 The only way that any of our members can get any information is basically trying to force the issue to 16 17 get any type of MSDS sheets, or anything of that 18 It is real hard to do, Ernie, real hard. 19 MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay, thanks. Some of 20 the mine operators currently get MSDSs. Are you aware 21 of that? 22 MR. TROUT: Yes. 23 MODERATOR TEASTER: And do you know if 24 there is a request, do the miners normally request to 25 see those, and whether or not those are made available

1 to the miners? 2 MR. I don't think it is made TROUT: 3 available to the miners, straightforward. I think 4 that normally they have to make a request. 5 experience has been, when they make a request, a lot of times they don't get a sufficient MSDS sheet. 6 7 A lot of times they will have like maybe half of it there, and some of it be gone, it doesn't 8 9 go into any details toward the chemicals that might be 10 involved in there, about the reactions that may occur 11 if you are overexposed to it. 12 Any type of treatment that might 13 necessary if you are overexposed, it doesn't go into 14 any of that kind of detail. 15 MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay, thank you. next speaker will be Timothy Miller, United Mine 16 17 Workers Local 9177. 18 Good morning, Panel. MR. MILLER: 19 Timothy Miller, I have worked in the mines for 26 years, I'm presently employed with Peabody Coal at 20 21 their Rocklake preparation plant. 22 And at our plant alone there is probably 23 in excess of 12 chemicals that not everyone comes in

contact, but is used on the job site, each and every

Sheets are available on some, but they are not

day.

24

1 very extensive into what we can do after we've been 2 exposed, or anything of that nature. I would like to read some notes, 3 4 something I wrote down. We need to have the right to 5 know what we are working with, at all times. We need to be able to force our employers to use a chemical 6 7 that is after if it is available, even if our employer 8 has to pay more for it. We need more training on each chemical, 9 10 and all dangers involved with using it. I would like 11 to see a law put into effect that would force 12 employers to have a data sheet that would be sent with 13 an employee to the emergency room, or doctor's office, 14 in the event one comes in contact with the hazardous 15 chemical. We need some training for our employees to 16 17 be able to administer proper first aid to coworkers 18 who have been exposed to hazardous chemicals before 19 being sent for medical assistance. 20 MODERATOR TEASTER: Tim, are the 21 chemicals, you said there are probably 12 used at your 22 operation? 23 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. 24 MODERATOR TEASTER: Has the company made 25 the miners aware of what those 12 chemicals are?

MR. MILLER: Only if you ask, and then what we are given out is like the chemical makeup, not exactly what it is, what the long-term effect is, to look out for signs, like if a skin irritation starts, that it is an exposure, and that you need medical attention, or something.

And even our employers, I don't really feel that they are aware of what dangers are involved with each of the chemicals.

MODERATOR TEASTER: The information that you get related to the hazards associated with these chemicals, and the type of chemicals, does that come as part of your part 48 training, or is that something that is passed on to you as you perform various tasks?

MR. MILLER: It is passed on to you, if you ask. It is not automatically, before you start a new task, or a new job, you are not enlightened as to, you know, they just say this is what you use this for, they don't inform you, unless you ask, or you research it yourself, as to what that it can do to you, and what that it can do if it is mixed with something else incorrectly.

Or what the long term effect is if you are exposed to it on a daily basis. Or when we change from one chemical company to the other, you know, you

1 might be getting basically the same thing, but they 2 make it up in a different process, and use some other 3 chemical in making that. 4 And that if we change our data sheets, are 5 sort of slow about getting revitalized, and stuff. 6 MODERATOR TEASTER: Do you have 7 knowledge of any injuries that has occurred at the 8 preparation plant where you work? MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. I've seen chemical 9 burns on skin, I've seen people suffer with watery 10 11 eyes, or burn in their throat from being around 12 different things, and cleaning. 13 MODERATOR TEASTER: Do you think these 14 injuries were a result of the lack of knowledge of 15 what exposures they were --MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. And I think that 16 17 the employers have a lack of knowledge, too. I feel 18 that they really need to research what they are 19 bringing on the job, prior to bringing it. 20 And if there is something out there, 21 better and cheaper, for the employer, even though that 22 it is not as available as what they are getting, or 23 maybe not from the supplier they have a contract with, we need to try to get a hold of that, and put that 24

into effect.

1 MR. SNASHALL: In your experience do 2 miners commonly use MSDSs? 3 MR. MILLER: Yes, sir. Some do, some 4 Where I'm at we have quite a bit of people 5 that have worked underground, went into the preparation plant, they are not familiar with a lot of 6 7 things. And a lot of people are proud and are 8 ashamed to ask. And, you know, unless someone forces 9 10 the employer to sort of school them in this, even 11 though they might not come in contact with it but once 12 at least give them a week, or something, 13 knowledge and be more informative about what they are 14 using. 15 I've got a buddy that is a doctor. A lot of times he gets people in, they tell him, I've been 16 17 exposed to this. Well, he doesn't know what that is. 18 And then it is a big bunch of red tape to try to find 19 out what exactly that is, that he was exposed to. 20 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Tim. 21 MR. MILLER: Thank you. 22 MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is 23 Larry Lee of United Mine Workers Local 1332. 24 MR. LEE: Hello, good morning. My name is 25 Larry Lee, I work for Pittsburgh and Midway, out in

New Mexico and Arizona, we are on the Navajo reservation, and we are a surface mine.

Out there we deal with a lot of dust, we

have haul roads, and we have dump trucks and haul trucks that haul coal, and there is a lot of dust out there, and that is what we deal with every day.

And our Local is 1332, and the reason I came up before you guys, is we should make this HAZCOM a rule, a policy, let's make it a policy for the mines, either underground, surface, or aggregate.

And after all these years I think it should be made a policy. So miners will know what they are dealing with, and mine operators, they will give us information on what we use out there, as HAZCOM.

And I know we deal with a lot of hazmat products out there, and some of these products we don't know what it is, but we use them every day, and we ask the management what it is, but they don't tell us, because it is not a rule, and we don't go through training for that.

We go through training but they just give us a little overview of what it is, and I would like them to make it a full training process, that way we know what is in there, what the contents are in the

MSDS sheets, and all that stuff.

Because the other places where I worked before they have a training program that they give these chemicals about, and all that, because they have a rule. But in the mining area they don't have that rule.

So I guess it is up to you guys to make it a rule, and all that. That is why we came up here testifying before here, and giving an overview of what we think it is, and what we think should be done.

And over there at the mine, where I work, we have a chemical that is called penzzupress, we use it to mix it with water, and spray it on the haul road. And we don't know what is in there, they don't tell us, there is no MSDS sheet about what the chemical is.

We tried talking to the management for the full page on there, or a full chart, but they don't do that, because they say it is not harmful, they won't do anything. But we use it anyway. Our people are exposed to it, our truck drivers.

They get it on their skin, and their clothes, and they come up to me and say, how come you are not doing anything about that? Because over there I'm the safety chairman, so I try to work with the

management.

I ask them and it seems like they don't know, either, it is not a rule, and they don't have to worry about it. And we use that stuff like three times a night for our haul roads. We spray it on the haul road, and we mix it with water like 20 to 1, or whatever they tell us.

They might say 5 to 1 or 10 to 1. We try to mix it that way, and that stuff is dirty, it is sticky, it looks like tar. And these guys are exposed to it almost daily.

And we don't know what is in that stuff.

All they tell us is that it is safe, and unharmful,

and all that. But then we put it on the road and the

dust comes around, it blows it off, and we have people

around the area, and they don't know what it is.

And we have people that have livestock around the area, and I think they should be made aware of what we use out there, what kind of harmful or harm that that stuff we use out there, I think they should be made aware of.

Because we have had people around there that live, that have animals, and livestock. So I think this should be made a rule, and I think the mine operators should be aware of what they use out there,

1 and let their miners know what is harmful, and what 2 can kill them, or what can -- all the stuff that goes 3 on. 4 I've heard miners that are commenting and I think it should be made into a 5 about that, policy, and all that. That is why we are up here, in 6 7 front of you guys, trying to testify and after all 8 these years, and also the chemicals we use, solvents, 9 whatever we use out there, hazmat, that they should 10 all be labeled, instead of just saying chemical 11 distillants. 12 We don't know what it is. It can be 13 I think it should be labeled, this is what 14 it can do to you, or if you get it on yourself, or on 15 your clothes. So I guess all I'm saying is let's make it 16 17 a rule and go from there. 18 MODERATOR TEASTER: Larry, you said that 19 you asked for the information on this chemical that 20 you used to spray the water, and the company wouldn't 21 share any information with you, or they didn't have 22 any information? They had the information, but 23 MR. LEE: 24 they don't want to go deep into it and say, this is

what it will do to you, or what --

1	MODERATOR TEASTER: So they do have the
2	information, but don't share it with you. Do you know
3	if there is any other incidents where that type of
4	chemical, or other types of chemicals that they had
5	the information, and the miners requested it, and were
6	not allowed to get that information?
7	MR. LEE: I tried to talk to the
8	management, put MSDS sheets out there where people can
9	read it, they don't do it. And all they say is it is
10	down in the warehouse, but we don't have time to go
11	down there and read it.
12	MODERATOR TEASTER: You also mentioned
13	some other close by workers that maybe were covered
14	under OSHA, where they had this information.
15	Do you know if the miners regularly
16	requested to review that information?
17	MR. LEE: I don't think so, not to my
18	knowledge.
19	MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay.
20	MR. LEE: And that penzzupress, we will
21	use that on the haul roads, and then there is another
22	chemical, mat chloride, we use that too. And that
23	stuff we don't have information on it too. All they
24	have is MSDS sheets, and that is all they can tell us.
25	MS. HUTCHISON: The dust suppressant that

1	you mix with water, to use on the haul roads, does it
2	come from a container that is labeled?
3	MR. LEE: No, that stuff is like a big
4	water tank, the truck comes in and just pumps it in
5	there. There is no label or anything on it. The only
6	thing it says on there is penzzupress, that is all.
7	MS. HUTCHISON: It says what?
8	MR. LEE: Penzzupress, P-E-N-Z-Z-U-P-R-E-
9	S-S.
10	MS. HUTCHISON: And so there is no you
11	have no information as to what this stuff contains?
12	MR. LEE: No, as miners working there, we
13	don't have any information.
14	MS. HUTCHISON: It is brought in, in bulk,
15	pumped just verifying. It is brought in, in bulk,
16	pumped into a tank. The only thing the tank says is
17	the name of the product?
18	MR. LEE: Uh hum.
19	MS. HUTCHISON: And you use the
20	suppressant out at the tank, and mix it with water,
21	and
22	MR. LEE: Yes.
23	MS. HUTCHISON: spray it
24	MR. LEE: Spray it on the haul roads.
25	MS. HUTCHISON: on the roads?

1	MR. SNASHALL: Larry, you said that you
2	don't get much training except a little review of what
3	it is. That little review you get, could you say
4	something more about that, what little do they give
5	you?
6	MR. LEE: We have an annual retraining, we
7	call that. That is the only place they give it to us.
8	MR. SNASHALL: Not on task, when you are
9	assigned a new job?
10	MR. LEE: During that retraining we might
11	not even have that stuff, and we don't know it,
12	because the retraining is usually in the winter, and
13	we don't use that in the winter.
14	MR. SNASHALL: And in your retraining what
15	is the nature of the training, what is the information
16	that they give you?
17	MR. LEE: It is like first aid, then
18	annual retraining, like haul roads, and equipment
19	operation.
20	MR. SNASHALL: On the chemicals, on your
21	annual retraining, do they get into chemical hazards
22	in your annual retraining?
23	MR. LEE: Not that much.
24	MR. SNASHALL: Okay, thank you.
25	MODERATOR TEASTER: Larry, could you come

1	back? We have one other question.
2	MR. PHUC: How much time do the operator
3	take to do annual refresher training?
4	MR. LEE: Usually it is a full shift.
5	MR. PHUC: Full shift is 8 hours?
6	MR. LEE: Yes.
7	MR. PHUC: And HAZCOM is not part of the
8	training?
9	MR. LEE: It is part of the training, but
10	it is just a little bit.
11	MS. HUTCHISON: About how much?
12	MR. LEE: Maybe half an hour.
13	MODERATOR TEASTER: Sorry, Larry, thanks.
14	Our next speaker is Donald Keith, from
15	United Mine Workers Local 1620.
16	MR. KEITH: Hello. My name is Donald
17	Keith, and I'm from the Arizona Navajo Reservation,
18	and as you can see I'm a Native American, just like
19	Larry is.
20	And there is four or five of us that is
21	here today, and we are all gone into mining business,
22	and I work for Peabody Coal Energy, Local 1620, in
23	Arizona.
24	The way I'm concerned about this is if I
25	may elaborate a little bit into the things that my

Native American people are experiencing out there in the West.

As we all know that Native American people has been neglected quite a bit, going into anything that has been brought into the United States, what we consider United States, and we call it our Native American States.

Going back to the time of the wars, of the big wars, World War II in that sense, you know, people were -- a lot of my people were in need of jobs, so they went underground to become uranium miners.

And we all found out about, what, 20, 30 years how harmful, how dangerous this is to human body, and because the nature that these people were illiterate in english, and not knowing what was all in those chemicals at the time, now people are out there suffering with cancer, and the dangerous amount of things that they've experienced.

And a lot of my people are, again, without medical facilities, or diagnosed with cancer. And to continue with that, during the Vietnam War a lot of us had gone into Vietnam, and exposed to Agent Orange.

Here, again, no knowledge of what was we were involved in. I have a brother in law, my nieces, they have been exposed to this, because their father

was in contact with agent orange. Now my niece, I see her hands and they are all swollen up, sores, because people that supposed to have this knowledge, they are not bringing out to the people the amount of dangers they are being exposed to.

I've seen some of my people, again, like Larry and me, safety committee chairman, and I have some rank and file members come up to me and ask me the things that they are exposed to.

You know, I have some people that are doing blastings, and shootings, and we call them shooters, and they have been in contact with different type of chemicals, and you can see that their hands have gotten sores, and they have been given time out to have their hands heal.

They have been to, again, bad medical facilities, and they don't know what is causing it. But they say they have handled those shooters, and things that they use to explode, for explosive.

They have been in contact, they are given a different type of gloves. But here, again, we don't know that the gloves is doing them any good. But I know of three or four different cases now that a lot of these old miners because, here again, they didn't have the opportunity to have gone to school, and they

don't know what they were in contact with, with management bringing all these type of different types of chemicals onto the mine property, and people are getting into it, being exposed to it.

And now they are suffering from hands they can hardly use any more. And without the knowledge, you know, had this chemical that is being brought on to the mine site, had they been labeled, and having a history of what it could cause, what it could do further down the road, and had these guys been taught, even if the management, I don't think the management —— I don't think they even have the knowledge of what these things are, when they bring these chemicals on to the mine site.

So that the management doesn't have the knowledge, how are they going to relate to their, to us miners about what dangerous effect it can cause us.

Yes, we do have these training courses, but all it is, is just numbers, statistics about things, and an 8 hour annual retraining, you don't have the time to get these out to people.

You have so many other things that is involved in your 8 hour annual retraining, so that stuff usually doesn't come up to surface.

So, you know, I'm thinking about, my mouth

is getting dry. But I don't know why these people are giving these type of things, and it is not required to have these people given the knowledge to -- thank you, I appreciate that.

But we should be informed of these things, and you know, we have a history where we have to get our people educated and into a society. Back then, a long time ago, our people were taken off the reservation to be educated into a society where we all could speak a common language.

And now that some of us have been educated, now there is this type of chemicals that has been brought out, and they don't even have it labeled to let us know what it can do to us.

I don't know where the problem is, but had MSHA brought this on long before, I think we could have been, us educated people could have in turn told -- we would have had the knowledge to tell our people what is going on, and they would have a different point of view about things right now.

Things are just so much into just making production, making more money for everybody, and the Native Americans are getting kicked around and without knowledge of these type of things, I don't know how it is going to affect us down the road.

I spent, all these excuses, we have heard all different kinds of excuses, just to procrastinate things, instead of preventing of these types of things, which has been prolonged.

And the economic factor there, that is the total loss, and so to be trained, and to have the knowledge, and also the management to have the knowledge to make these things available to us to help us with our health more effective.

I don't understand why this is being brought up and then shut down, and continue to let it sit there without any kind of effort being made to a law.

I think that we really do need to bring these concerns out to the people. And not only am I talk about the miners, I'm also talking about people, like Larry said, we use these different types of chemicals on our roads.

And when we have all these different types of miners being exposed to, say on these big drag lines machines, the welders are -- when they heat up different type of toxic, and they are being exposed to different types of toxins, and they don't know what that is. Some of these people get nauseated so they have to be relieved of their job for three or four

1 hours before they can continue again. 2 And, here again, there is no knowledge of 3 what we are all involved in, here. So I've always --4 I went up to my management and asked them what they 5 are going to do about that? Again, they don't have the knowledge either. 6 7 And the people that are building these different type of chemicals and bringing them on the 8 mine sites, I think they should be made aware to what 9 10 they are doing, what they are bringing out. 11 So in terms, they, my management can have 12 the knowledge to where they can let us know what we are involved in. 13 14 So basically I guess what we are saying 15 is, why is it taking this long of a time to put a label on a barrel. You know, it is simple, people 16 make these things, they know what they are putting in 17 18 all that stuff. 19 All they've got to do is write down what 20 is in there, what the long-term effects are going to 21 be, how it is going to hurt you. You know, us Native 22 Americans, we don't have the very thing -- we don't have the basic things, like running waters, stuff like 23

And so all these chemicals that are left

that.

24

on-site, you know, we have a rain, and it gets on to different atmospheric, it is airborne, some of them are run into different type of water that is being where our livestocks are using up, drinking this water, eating these plants.

So in an essence what I'm saying here is that whether it is the miners, or the people that are living around there, that are exposed to it. Because they use their livestocks for food, and those livestocks drink out of that same water that is contaminated from these different type of chemicals, you know?

And we have no knowledge of what is all out there. A long time ago we were -- you know, people took our land and our water away from us, and they took our mountains away. Now they are coming back and taking our rocks, and using all this kind of different type of chemicals.

I don't know whether there is an excuse for it, not label these things, or why we have to go through this type of course again. And, you know, I'm very concerned about it, and my people are concerned about it.

And I think that this stuff needs to be labeled, it needs to be brought up, and it needs to be

1 informed all the people what it is about. And I think 2 as long as we are -- have an excuse to procrastinate, 3 and to prolong these type of accidents, it needs to be 4 stopped, simple as that. 5 You know, all you have to do is people that make these things, they just need to put it in 6 7 writing and say, these are the dangerous effects. Ιt could help a lot of people's lives later on down the 8 9 road. 10 And I am concerned about this thing. And, 11 again, I say that yes, we do need to have these things 12 labeled so we have an understanding of what we are all 13 doing. And I thank you. 14 MODERATOR TEASTER: One thing, Donald, on 15 the -- you mentioned the miners that were exposed to the chemicals associated with the explosives. 16 Did you say that the operator did not have 17 the knowledge as to what chemicals were in there that 18 19 may --20 No, they do not have the MR. KEITH: 21 knowledge, because we did ask what is in that. The 22 guys that have these sores in their hands, are asking 23 me to talk to them, and I ask why are these people 24 getting those sores on their hand? And they had no

knowledge.

1 And with poor medical facilities 2 there, and these people are, they don't have education, so they are just living with it now. 3 4 MODERATOR TEASTER: So prior to this 5 occurring, did the company require gloves to be worn? MR. KEITH: No, no. 6 7 MODERATOR TEASTER: Just after this? Yes, people started getting 8 MR. KEITH: 9 sores, so then they started providing different type 10 of gloves. But we don't know if that glove is going 11 to protect their hands, because they already got sores 12 in their hands, it is probably entered their immune system, and it is probably too late, you know? 13 14 So whether you provide them with gloves 15 after the fact, what good is it, you know? Did they, did the 16 MODERATOR TEASTER: 17 company -- do you have knowledge of whether the 18 company had changed types of explosives that they 19 used? 20 The company is always trying MR. KEITH: 21 to change different things to make it more efficient 22 for their means of production. It is not -- they are not looking at the health and the welfare of the 23 24 people, they are looking at production. 25 MODERATOR TEASTER: The OSHA rule which

1	applies to most of the, other than mining, and they
2	are required to provide labels. So we have
3	anticipated, under the drafting of our rule, that most
4	of the labeling will be done by the manufacturer, and
5	it will be there, in place, when it arrives on mine
6	property.
7	Are you telling me that this is coming to
8	the property with no labels, most of this stuff?
9	MR. KEITH: Probably, because we have no
10	knowledge of, and the mine managers don't even know
11	what they are bringing in. But my problem here, my
12	I don't understand why it is taking this long.
13	I mean, if OSHA had this into law 12 years
14	ago, and here we are still trying to implement
15	something that has been out there for years and years,
16	and here we are just having prolonging.
17	I don't know what type of excuse it is,
18	but it is not on the law yet.
19	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Donald.
20	MR. KEITH: I think you guys.
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
22	Larry Huestis, the United Mine Workers.
23	MR. HUESTIS: Good morning panel. I'm
24	Larry Huestis, I do the surface inspections for the
25	United Mine Workers International in the western

1 United States. I'm also a past member, or current 2 member of Local 1972 out of Sheridan, Wyoming, that is 3 my home. 4 I have some personal experiences with some 5 different chemicals that I was going to talk to you But I have heard quite a few different 6 7 questions, and I guess I would like to get into some of your questions you've asked some of the other 8 speakers, from my experience going down to the Navajo 9 10 Nation, for instance, doing safety inspections. 11 Also, I guess maybe the Panel, I would ask 12 them to really try to put themselves in a miner's 13 shoes. And I'm going to ask you to think about, for 14 instance, I was hired at Decker Coal as a mechanic in 15 1978. And about 1983, '84, in that time frame, 16 17 as a mechanic I was asked to, you know, repair things 18 like brakes on Euclid 170s. so I would take the wheel 19 motors off the 170s. 20 And it became a very common practice. The electricians, we seen they had some chemicals that 21 22 really worked good for electrical cleaning. Boy, that took the grease off, it evaporated, so they didn't 23 24 have dirt, grease, and stuff on their contacts.

the

mechanics,

and

Well,

25

the

with

knowledge and the blessing of management, we started getting this stuff in, in 55 gallon barrels. So if you were working on a brake system, you would go get a five gallon bucket, you would get your air hose hooked up, you had to basically a suction device set up in -- and it wasn't good enough, the ones you could buy, you had to use the three quarter inch pipe, so you could suck that five gallon bucket out in about three minutes, and you could put a lot of this chemical to get the grease off the brakes if you had a bad wheel seal, or if you were trying to get to even the nuts and the bolts to take something apart.

And there was enough of this chemical in the air that if you used it for a minute and a half, you wouldn't be able to see the other end of this auditorium. And we didn't know what this stuff was. It was nice and cool, you could put your hands in it, but boy it would clean things.

And I guess my point being, there is a chemical, and if that chemical is produced, or brought on to the mine site for a situation, that may not be what it is only used for. That, if I remember right, was carbon tetrachloride.

I have used that in six by six areas, contained area, in the back of these trucks, that

today if I had to try to even get in that hole I couldn't make it. But to get in there, and then take a five gallon bucket of this stuff and clean the contacts, clean out the brake areas, to get those wheel motors off so that you could get in and take the pinion and the sun gear out of there, so you could take the rest of the wheel motor apart, that was a common practice.

I rolled out of that hole too many times and getting sick to my stomach, light-headed, and I just decided, myself, I have to find out more about it. So I went and started asking the electricians, what really is this stuff? It is good stuff, but what the heck is it?

Well, we start digging. And yes, it is a cancer causer. They no longer have it out there. But what my point being is, again, it was not put out on that mine site to be used to the type of a situation we were using it.

So when there is a chemical brought out to a property, there is going to be, and I'm sure in a lot of cases it is definitely abused. So the warnings, and the labels for a can of what we would call, and you could probably go to Wal-Mart and buy contact cleaner. Well, that is a little spray can,

but I have seen it being used and put in the air over 20 gallons of it, in probably less than 15, 20 minutes.

And not just exposing the person that was using it, but 25 other people working in the area. It was a very big-time practice. I don't know the long term effects of this. I know it is -- it wasn't very smart on my part, and it definitely wasn't very smart on Decker Coal's management part to see this practice and to continue to let it go.

So there are a couple of points here. Is there going to be abuse, or a possibility of abuse of chemicals? Yes. If somebody can find some chemical that will do something, and they don't really have the knowledge of how harmful this can be.

At the same time we, as workers, a lot of time depend on our management people to know what is good or bad for us, or they should have been told from their supervisor, or whoever purchased this, that it should be safe.

So there is a sort of a blind trust put in here to the system. Now, I guess since I grew up a little bit, and hopefully got a little smarter, I find out from digging into this, there is sometimes people out there, that are in management, that do know these

1 things. 2 But then it becomes a portion of what is 3 best for the bottom line, do they always look out for 4 the betterment and the health and safety of their 5 employees? (Whereupon, above-entitled matter 6 the 7 went off the record at 10:20 a.m. and went back on the record at 11:40 a.m.) 8 9 MODERATOR TEASTER: We are now set up to 10 continue the Hearing on HAZCOM. For those that are 11 here, who would like to sit in on it, we would like to 12 start back. We have everything set up on a temporary 13 basis. 14 We will go back on the record now. Wе 15 have had a power failure, we will try to get through with the speaker that was speaking at the time of the 16 17 power failure. 18 And if that works we will continue to take 19 testimony, if not we will delay, after this speaker, we will return to the auditorium. 2.0 21 But we do want to try this and see how it 22 Larry Huestis will continue on with his works. 23 testimony. He was testifying at the time of the power failure. 24

MR. HUESTIS:

25

I was testifying on using

the carbon tetrachloride as a solvent degreaser.

One of the points I wanted to make sure that the Panel understood is that once the company, or once somebody came to have the knowledge that this isn't good stuff, that we had been abusing it, and to even take it out in a bulk form, you know, there is no more MSDS sheets left at Decker Coal.

Once the chemical is gone, the MSDS sheets are gone. And another thing on the use of, and I guess I would say some possibilities of abuse of, these different chemicals, is that the management people at Decker Coal, the foremen, and even the safety people that, and purchasing agents, I think it was very well known what kind of abuse was being used with this chemical.

And, you know, they didn't have the training to recognize that hazard. I don't blame them, I believe they were lacking the knowledge that it could be that hazardous and cancerous.

But that is my own personal experience with, I guess I would say, the chemicals, the lack of knowledge on them, the abuse of them, and those -- that chemical was used like that. It was mixed with solvents at the same time.

So when you get solvents mixed with that,

1 you know, what other kind of forms of hazards have you 2 created? The other things I would like to testify 3 4 on, and I maybe ask the Panel to ask some of the 5 questions to me that were asked of other members that 6 were up here. 7 Because, again, I work for the Mine Workers, I do safety inspections to the surface mines 8 in the west. And I just wanted to go over a couple of 9 10 things that I've experienced doing those types of 11 inspections. 12 a question asked about how There was 13 available MSDS sheets are. And I will give you a 14 couple of examples. Peabody Coal, the Big Sky mine, 15 I was doing an inspection there. And as I was inspecting the shop, they had 16 17 just received a 55 gallon barrel of antifreeze. 18 it was marked caterpillar. And then it had the, it 19 was called coolant, and then it had the trade, or the 20 numbers, Caterpillar numbers. They just received it in, and they told me 21 22 that Caterpillar went to their own type coolants, a 23 new coolant. And I said, do you have the MSDS sheets 24 on it? And they said yes. 25 I said, I would like to look at it.

1 had to leave the shop, go over to the safety 2 supervisor's office. He had about four books of MSDS 3 sheets, three ring binders, some of them up to six 4 inches thick. And he said, it should be in here 5 somewhere. So we start looking. We can't find it. 6 7 We can find some antifreeze, but it wasn't, the it 8 numbers didn't match. wasn't Caterpillar 9 antifreeze, it might have been Prestone. 10 So he says, well, let's just forget about 11 looking in the books. I will get on my computer. 12 he gets on his computer, he gets into the Peabody data He can't seem to find it. 13 14 So we go to a different place on the 15 internet, looking for the information, Caterpillar. Finally he says, well, if we don't have it here, we 16 17 should have it in the warehouse. 18 We go to the warehouse, we can't find it. 19 So we end up calling a Caterpillar dealership, and 20 they faxed it to us. So I started asking questions 21 and concerns for our members, come on company, this is 22 a little bit ridiculous. 23 If we just had somebody get a bunch of 24 this splashed in their face, their eyes, how are they

going to get to your office way over here, another

building up two flights of steps?

2.0

And I said, when we were talking, you mentioned this room gets locked up at 4:30 in the afternoon. And he says, yes, I guess I never thought about the other shifts not being able to get that. But he says, they do have that access, or the information in the warehouse.

I says, we didn't find it. And so I said, are they going to be able to get a hold of Caterpillar, run through the same process as we did, and if Caterpillar is closed, what are these people supposed to do?

You know, it is -- I think there is a misconception out there that when you say the companies have the MSDS sheets, they do? In probably most cases try to find that information, there is not a company that sets their books up the same, whether it is getting alphabetized by the trade name, the chemical names, that is not the total answer on how these chemicals are being treated at the job site.

So once you go out and really ask, and push, you have to push to get this information from the company. You have to be consistent. That we got faxed to us, and it probably took two and a half hours.

Another incident was with PNM Coal. We heard, my union brother Larry Lee talking about, and I can't remember the chemical name, but the dust control chemical.

He was -- I can't remember on their bulk tank if it just said danger, or if it had the actual chemical in it. But it is, that tank was probably at least a 3,000 gallon tank that they brought in from the bulk trucks, pumped into the tank, put into the water trucks, mixed with the water.

Well, as I started asking questions about that, and some of our members, that they had been using these chemicals for a couple of years. They had a favorite little fishing pond. All the fish are dead.

And they are telling our members this stuff is safe. So I started pushing again. Well, let's see the MSDS sheets on these different chemicals. We left that place four hours later, I still did not get that information.

So when you think, and when you are asking our members, have you asked for MSDS sheet, a lot of times they ask and then they will get it for you, and we went all the way around to four different offices that day at PNM, and still did not receive that

information.

And I have a lot of papers thrown at me and says, I think this is it. I says, why doesn't it say exactly the chemical? You know, are we talking the same thing, or is it one that you used three weeks ago?

Nobody could answer those questions. So it is -- the system that is in place right now, it is not working very well. So don't hinge your decisions on that we've got a good system.

You've got a system, to me, that is not enforced. It is a system that does not work. And I think that you hear from industry, as we've got them here, all they have to do is ask.

I have been with members when they have asked. And I have heard foremen say, it is around here somewhere, you are just trying to screw around and not go to work, you are trying to use this information, to know if it is safe, so you don't do it.

And then at the same time the other response is, damn it, it has been safe, we have been using this stuff for the last two years. Well, you have new people coming in that may be from a truck driver into the shop as a laborer, and then he is

1 being exposed to these chemicals that he doesn't know 2 what has been there for two years, what came in last 3 week, what is good, what is bad, how much stuff, 4 protective clothing he has to use. I mean, I've seen it from battery acid. And then do a safety inspection, seeing the way 6 7 different people use bulk battery acid to 8 batteries. No eye protection, no clothing protection, 9 nothing. 10 And doing the safety inspection, with the 11 safety company people, maybe the shop foreman will 12 come around the corner see this. I say, hey buddy, we've got to have some better protection gear. 13 14 you understand how you should be handling this stuff? 15 Then right away the foreman will say, And I've got the individual and I 16 we've told them. 17 say, what kind of training you've got? Well, I've just been in here for two weeks, I didn't know that 18 19 this wasn't anything more than water. 20 So there is the loopholes in the training. 21 When you get hazardous training in your annual 22 refresher course, they show you some films on chemical 23

burns, different things like that, what kind of, what can your lungs look like.

But what is taking place here, they are

24

not saying this chemical that we use at this mine can do this. They give the chemical name, people don't connect it. Whether it is this cleaning solvent, or anything.

So there is a big gap in the annual refresher. These are the things you've got on the books now. They are not working the way I believe a lot of people in MSHA, I mean, it is different from what you guys are believing in the action, and what is taking place in the field.

Everybody knows what starting fluid is, what its purpose is. But I don't know how many cans of starting fluid I found in vehicles in the summertime, in the cab, on the back of a truck, by the cases.

Well, it doesn't take a genius to figure out they are not using this starting fluid to start a piece of equipment in July. You ask the foreman, you ask the company safety person, why are you guys even letting this out of the warehouse? You know it is being abused for a cleaner.

And I get the response, oh no, it isn't.

Well, before I leave there I found two or three

mechanics using it for a cleaner. It is things that

are, I think, some companies will tell you we are

1 doing our best to get that under control. 2 I tell you what, if a company wants that 3 under control they can control it. They don't need to 4 check that stuff out. They can give training. I go to the mechanics and say, have you ever seen this stuff blow up? Do you know what is 6 7 going to happen if this is in your cab and it blows? You are going to die. Didn't know that. 8 9 So there is a -- even now it is training, 10 training, training, and the companies will hide behind 11 that. That true message is not getting out because 12 the company doesn't feel that it is to their best 13 betterment to get it out. 14 So that in the Navajo Nation, Peabody 15 Coal, Black Mesa, not Black Mesa, I'm sorry, the Consol Mine, we talk about these chemicals being used 16 17 on the roads. 18 Now, if you go to Cante Mine, it is a total different situation because this is the only 19 mine I've ever been out where the haul road is a 20 21 county road. You can be going down the haul road, 22 following a 200 ton truck, and it is following a one 23 ton pickup with a bunch of hay on it, and four kids

And here is the dust coming off of these

riding on top of the haystack.

24

1 trucks. If they just watered it now we've got a 2 liquid mud that is splashing upside the truck, the hay, and the kids. 3 4 I mean, we don't know what is in all these 5 chemicals. But I know it killed fish over in, and even management said yes, it killed the fish over at 6 PNM, outside of Window Rock, Arizona. 7 So there is chemicals out there that are 8 9 being abused, the companies are not furnishing the 10 MSDS sheets so that they do what the law is intended 11 it. 12 So if I get some of this stuff in my eyes 13 I can turn around and find a quick remedy of how I'm 14 supposed to take care of it. If I've got to look for 15 three hours, whatever damage is done, is done. And if my co-workers, and this is not --16 17 really, I think you need to talk to some of your 18 agents, and I think they will tell you that when they 19 go to look for the MSDS sheets, look and see how much 20 dust are on the cover of those. They are not being 21 used. 22 The foreman, the company people, and this is who our members rely on, is this stuff safe? 23 24 if you push it then you are labeled as a troublemaker.

And these are union mines, guys.

1 Now, I know what kind of intimidation is 2 used in the non-union operations. You can multiply it by a lot of numbers. 3 4 And this is, again, you are doing laws for 5 union, non-union people. We want the non-union people protected. But I know that the fear and intimidation 6 7 for standing up for your safety rights, I've talked to 8 too many non-union people. 9 They are told, I open my mouth, I can look That intimidation, even though there is 10 for a job. 11 laws against it, it takes place day, after day, after 12 day. In the big city of Gillette, Wyoming, 13 14 where there is a lot of them. And a lot of big name 15 These companies know how to run a safe companies. I'm telling you, they have chose not to, 16 operation. They will cut the corners. 17 in a lot of cases. 18 And I quess I will stop my testimony 19 there, and be more than glad to answer any questions. 20 MODERATOR TEASTER: Larry, just 21 clarify, it is not our intent, and hopefully we are 22 not doing that, that what we have out there in place 23 is acceptable. 24 What we are trying, get some 25 information from those that have had some experience,

some commenters are making the statements that miners would not use these MSDSs, if they were available.

And what we are trying to do is to get some information as to whether or not that is the case. It may be accurate in some cases, it may not be in others. But that is why we are asking the question, is that in the fact the way it is, or is it partially right, or never right? That kind of stuff.

It is not in any way justify what we are doing as being acceptable. Now, these voluminous MSDSs that you identified, and couldn't locate the one you were looking for, do you know if there was more MSDSs for chemicals that were not at the mine, or was all of those chemicals at that mine?

MR. HUESTIS: No, at the particular one that I'm thinking about, the Peabody Mine at Big Sky, in that incident we found, and I even asked that question, how many of these MSDS sheets are representing chemicals that are no longer even on the mine site?

He said, they are scattered in and out of here. So this particular safety department they said, we will go through this every once in a while and clean them out. But to my knowledge, and from how he answered that question to me is, yes, there were MSDS

sheets that were there, that were chemicals that were probably more likely not on the mine site.

And I guess my point being, in talking to you about the MSDS sheets, and the members, our members trying to get those MSDS sheets, again you know, I think with the Rule coming, if we can get the Rule in, I think we can finally get some -- a little bit more serious to the coal companies, and treat this better, and the training that will be available, that our members and other miners will turn around and not be intimidated, but to really understand the true dangers of misusing, abusing, or grabbing a spray can of something that they don't know what it is, and spraying it on a piece of hot metal to cool it down, instead of a glass of water.

It is -- their training, hopefully the training will raise in quality so that they will bring it to what these chemicals really, and the harm that are being used today, but the training will start to connect the dots, connecting it with this can can produce this.

And at the same time, hopefully, we will bring up the knowledge of the safety departments within the coal companies, and their purchasing agents, that they will get safer chemicals, and what

1 their knowledge, it will come down so that everybody 2 starts paying a lot closer attention to it. 3 So I'm hoping that my testimony here 4 pertains to some of the things that are wrong in the 5 past, and where decisions to try to improve things, is that we've got some problems over here that still 6 7 have, need a lot of improvement. But the Rule, itself, will hopefully cure 8 some of that, and the need for the Rule. You know, it 9 10 is way past due, way past due. 11 MODERATOR TEASTER: Larry, in your 12 experience and training with Part 48, are you aware of 13 any training that took place where the MSDSs were used 14 as part of the training? 15 Yes, personally for me I MR. HUESTIS: can't remember years ago at Decker they did. And they 16 17 said you can find them at the warehouse. That is 18 about the training, right there. Here they are, this 19 is what they look like, you can find them in the triple ring binder, and they should be over in the 20 21 north corner. That is your training. 22 MODERATOR TEASTER: No discussion on the 23 specific hazards? MR. HUESTIS: No, no discussion from this 24 25 is an MSDS sheet of a can of WD40, her is what you can

1 experience if you abuse it, if you are using it too 2 much. You should not use it for this, this is what it is bought for, intended to use as. 3 4 That sort of training for this type of 5 chemical, no. It is, here is the MSDS sheet for a can of WD-40. It just happened to be the one the safety 6 7 guy brought out of a book. But they didn't get into the hazards of 8 You know, that particular sheet they probably 9 it. read it over, said, this is what it can do. 10 11 MS. JONES: And you feel that they were 12 meeting the requirements of Part 48 by what they were doing? 13 14 MR. HUESTIS: I think they were meeting 15 the minimum requirements. 16 MS. JONES: And it was too general, is 17 that what you are saying? 18 MR. HUESTIS: Very much too general. And at the same time, like I mentioned, showing a video. 19 That is a generic video. And it didn't tie it to the 20 21 particular different chemicals that were used at that 22 mine site. 23 So, yes, it is a general meeting the 24 minimum requirement of the law. And at the same time 25 I think part of the problem is, and has been, that the

1 safety people of these companies are not educated 2 about the seriousness of these chemicals. JONES: 3 MS. Wе heard a number of 4 arguments, primarily earlier this week, that this was 5 just redundant to what was already on the books, as far as regulations. 6 7 Would you care to comment on that? 8 MR. HUESTIS: I don't think it is It is -- I think it needs to be 9 redundant at all. 10 There is, I'm thinking with the HAZCOM Rule, 11 and how to communicate these hazards as a part of 12 itself, will get these coal companies, and 13 industry as a whole, to understand how serious it is. 14 Until that gets through, they are going to 15 skirt by the minimum, the very bottom minimum, on your training. So part of the whole rulemaking process, 16 the content of the process, you know, and I'm not 17 18 pleased with everything I read in it, because I don't 19 believe it has enough penalties to it for these 20 companies. 21 They can skate by too easy, yet. But at 22 the Rule itself, will bring least bv up the 23 seriousness of the chemicals for everybody. 24 MR. SNASHALL: Larry, you mentioned that, 25 about annual refresher training, and deficiencies, in your view, of annual refresher training.

Would those remarks also extend to task training when miners get task training in particular jobs, they are supposed to be trained on the health and safety aspects of those jobs; have the companies included, in relation to the health and safety aspect training, have they included hazard chemical training as well?

MR. HUESTIS: From my own personal experience, and again working at Decker Coal for ten years as a mechanic, I have never been given a task training on how to use solvent, or when I'm working on something, how to use starting fluids, what to do with these cans of things that you could probably buy at Wal-Mart at the job site.

Any other -- I cannot think of any chemical that we had come in there that I was told this is how you use this chemical. Now, Caterpillar uses a lot of different types of epoxies for seals, and stuff like that. I have never received training on that.

And those, you know, all I can say, speaking from my experience, as far as my own personal task training, the answer is if there has been, it has been so very little, I can't remember it.

1	MR. SNASHALL: Thank you.
2	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Larry.
3	MR. HUESTIS: Thank you.
4	MODERATOR TEASTER: Can we go off for just
5	a minute?
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7	went off the record at 12:06 p.m. and
8	went back on the record at 12:07 p.m.)
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: Back on. Our next
10	speaker is going to be Andrew Laferty.
11	MR. LAFERTY: My name is Andrew Laferty,
12	I work for Bluestone Industries at a prep plant in
13	Keystone, West Virginia. I'm a union safety
14	committeeman. I have 33 years of experience of being
15	underground, the rest at the plant.
16	I've been, since I've been at the plant I
17	have worked with every chemical that is around the
18	plant. I was a filter operator for roughly seven
19	years. When I first started, nobody told me these
20	chemicals are going to hurt you. All I was told was
21	how to mix them into the system.
22	I asked one of my foremen one time, I
23	said, well this hurt you if you get it on you? He
24	said, it is not supposed to. We had another chemical
25	there that we used, you mixed with water, it had an

odor to it, or it would burn you, burn your eyes if you breathe it very long.

He said it was basically potato starch, it shouldn't hurt you. We have absolutely no training on these chemicals, at all. They just -- anybody that goes into these jobs, all you are told is how to mix them.

We run different grades of coal, sometimes two or three times each shift. The man that is in charge of this has to go change these chemicals back and forth, add or subtract whatever he needs.

They never trained, and the eight hour refresher we have each year, they show you a little bit about chemical burns, but most of it is nothing that we actually work with. They just -- nobody is told what is going to happen if you put too much of this in.

They just say if you don't put enough our coal is not going to be right. Don't worry if you put too much, if it spills, because we have -- below our cleaning plant that catch all of our water, our runoff.

Sometimes there is a lot of rainwater, and this goes into a stream, a public stream. They don't -- one time we had a -- we had this large coal pile,

1 and the dust went right in this little town. The coal 2 dust was bad, so they brought a chemical in, in a It had a corrosive sticker on it, it 3 black barrel. 4 had some numbers stamped on it. They said put four, put 20 gallons of this into 2,400 gallons of water, and we will spray it on 6 7 the coal pile. The machine we used was broken, it 8 didn't work right. Nobody said it would hurt you, or 9 wouldn't hurt you. 10 We had to wear, well all we had were rags, 11 we didn't even have a mask, we had to wear this over 12 And when we finished we were our face. all, everybody, anybody that used this machine was soaking 13 14 wet. You had to go change your clothes. 15 It would dry and it would become very sticky. We had people, right now, that on these jobs, 16 they don't know -- well, they abuse it, I guess would 17 18 be the word. They put too many chemicals in. 19 Sometimes, I've moved now, I'm a dryer 20 attendant, and supposedly we have been told this is an 21 alcohol diesel fuel mixture that we use to float our 22 coal. 23 Sometimes when I do my dryer checks, we 24 have a heat dryer, I'm afraid to open the little

inspection door for fear that there might be an

explosion, because there are so many of these chemicals in the system.

You can smell them just out walking around anywhere. We definitely need some kind of a law, or something, that would enforce some training. None of us are trained, we have never been trained on any of these.

I'm really surprised that somebody hasn't gotten seriously hurt with it. I, one time myself, got something on me at work. I don't know what it was, it caused a rash on the upper part of my body. I was in -- I have been in two different states to three different skin specialists, and they just give me whatever they've got. Sometimes it takes care of it, sometimes it doesn't. It goes away, it comes back.

But a couple of years ago we have two large storage containers. Well, we actually have three. But sometimes somebody fails to keep records, and they run out.

So the chemical company will bring in two or three barrels, whatever is needed, probably, to do until the next day. We get chemicals in chlorine buckets. They are not chlorine, it is some form of a liquid.

The barrels come in and they have a flammable sticker on them, or a corrosive sticker on them. You open the barrel, if it smells like what you used yesterday, go ahead and put some in the system.

Another guy and myself had to move a couple of these barrels one evening. And somebody had opened one, and hadn't closed it, which we were at fault for not checking it. But when we moved it some of this liquid came out and got on us.

Well, it had a terrible odor, and both of us got it on our hands, and we got rash, and burning. The other guy asked the superintendent for a data sheet, and he says, it is around here somewhere, I will find it for you.

Well, the next day he gave me this data sheet, he gave me four papers supposedly on this particular chemical that we got on us. And it was four pages of the same page. And it told us nothing about what to do about it. If we were chemists or something we could have probably understood what that paper read.

But we had no idea of what we were even looking at. And if the laws don't pass, they need to be enforced real well. I don't know, but as far as I've been told, you know, you can request these sheets

1 from where we work. 2 But like the one I requested, I got it the next day, and it still didn't tell me anything we 3 4 needed to know about it. And we need a good law, and 5 we need to get enforcement of that law to keep people, make things a little bit safer for people. 6 7 Because I, myself, have had chemicals on 8 just about every part of my body. And some of them 9 are okay, some of them cause problems, some of them 10 don't. 11 But we just do our jobs, and I've had 12 comments made to me, personally, that I brought it to the attention of some of our inspectors, and a couple 13 14 of days later I have had comments made to me, you need 15 to learn to appreciate your job a little more. 16 So most people that we work with don't say 17 much, you just go on and do what you are doing, and not worry about it. There is no enforcement at all 18 19 with our chemicals at the place that I work, at all. 20 MODERATOR TEASTER: Some of the barrels 21 were identified as flammable. Was there not any label 22 identifying what the --23 MR. LAFERTY: It had something stamped on 24 it, but --MODERATOR TEASTER: But I'm talking about 25

1 information that would identify what the chemicals 2 were. 3 MR. LAFERTY: When they bring us chemicals 4 they have, I think some of them Saturday, as a matter 5 of fact, they have some ten gallon plastic buckets, and the only thing on the outside of this buckets is 6 7 chlorine tablets. Well, I took the top off of one of these, 8 and it has this chemical in it. I assume it was what 9 10 we call flocculent, but as far --MODERATOR TEASTER: It was different than 11 12 what was identified on the label? Oh, yes, it said chlorine 13 MR. LAFERTY: 14 tablets, but it was a liquid, a white thick looking 15 liquid. We also -- we use muriatic acid to clean some cables on our aerial tram that we have. 16 Well, when we get ready to do this, if you 17 -- I quess if you wanted a pair of safety glasses they 18 19 would probably give you those. But nobody says, they 20 just say be careful. 21 We put this acid in a five gallon bucket, 22 we put this cable down in the acid, the end of the 23 cable that we are going to use, and we take a cutting torch and stick down in this acid, and aerate it to 24 25 clean this steel cable.

Well, when we are done with that one we put it in another bucket with vinegar and soda to neutralize the acid. And nobody really says, they just say be careful. I guess that is enough. So far it has been.

But we take -- when they finish with them, they carry them back in this one little location that they store, and just stick the lid on them, and they are probably there today. We used them three or four weeks ago. Next time we need them they will still be there. It is just a plain white bucket. And muriatic acid is really dangerous.

MODERATOR TEASTER: How many miners --

MR. LAFERTY: There were 31. Two weeks ago they had a small cut-off, laid off six of us, six of the younger men. I had -- when I signed off of that job, and took a new one, the boy that got the floater job was 24 years old.

A week or two into the job he came to me one night, in the bathhouse, and he said I got that, he said I got that alcohol on my face and hands tonight, it burnt me. But will it hurt me? And I had to look at him and say, Scott, I don't know. They told me it wouldn't hurt me. That is all I could tell him.

1 MODERATOR TEASTER: You have any idea of 2 how many injuries that have occurred at the mine, say, 3 in the last two or three years, as far as reportable 4 injuries? 5 MR. LAFERTY: Most people it is usually their hands or their face. Most people put something 6 7 on it, go on about your business. Nothing is ever 8 really said about it. We've -- I can't really -- we have several 9 10 men that have to wear gloves when they work, latex 11 gloves. As a matter of fact I used to wear them 12 myself when I done this job, because there is so much 13 that we are around, your hands stay irritated. 14 Some of the guys their hands bleed, they 15 peel, and they are just -- they are in really bad shape. But it is just that nobody really says it is 16 17 an accident on the job, they just don't -- I've got 18 severe dermatitis, or something, you know? 19 Nobody really ever tried to collect any, 20 to my knowledge, the safety committee job, I've only 21 been on it a couple of years. Prior to that I just 22 done my job and don't make waves, do your thing. 23 MR. PHUC: You mentioned intimidation by 24 the mine operators. Can you comment on the number of 25 injuries that went unreported, that people just didn't

1	report it because of the fear of their
2	MR. LAFERTY: I would imagine every man
3	that has done that job has had a chemical on his
4	person. And these guys, you just you know, you
5	just do your job and go on. I mean, that is it. You
6	might talk about it in the bathhouse to some of your
7	buddies, or something. I got something on me today,
8	my hands are all itchy and burning.
9	We, you know, we are a union job, but we
10	are still really restricted, I guess you would call
11	it, to what we can speak out about. I'm sure I will
12	be in trouble over this when I get home. That is
13	okay, that is fine with me.
14	MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay, Andrew, thank
15	you very much.
16	MR. LAFERTY: You are welcome.
17	MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
18	Wayne Conaway, from United Mine Workers.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
20	went off the record at 12:22 and went
21	back on the record at 1:00 p.m.)
22	MODERATOR TEASTER: We will now continue
23	with the afternoon session.
24	Our first speaker is Wayne Conaway, with
25	United Mine Workers.

MR. CONAWAY: My name is Wayne Conaway, I've been an underground miner for 25 years, local 9909, safety committee person, Consol employee.

Half of my working career, so far, has been trying to get something on this hazard communication. And that is a long time. Congress required MSHA that our health and safety be first priority. They said that 25 years ago.

So I think 14 years doesn't, in my mind, constitute first priority. I've had a friend pass away, just as recently as six months ago, 46 years old, he told me within a couple weeks of his passing away, he said there is no question in my mind what is killing me.

He says, from all the times I had to work on the long wall in that emulsion. He said, of course it is not there now, because they did finally find out it was bad. 46 years old, it is a little bit too late.

And I'm kind of glad that I was able to hear a few other testimonies before I was able to speak, because after listening to some of the questions you've been asking, as far as Part 48, and after viewing the video yesterday, it seems to me that you've already pretty much come up with something that

1 all mine operators can do as a minimum is show this 2 video, in your Part 48, and that is going to apply 3 with the law. 4 Gentlemen, ladies, that is not going to be 5 There are way too many things that we have to look at when it comes to hazard communication. 6 7 You have disposals, clean-up, spill containment, evacuations. 8 The MSDS, first handling that type of thing, PPE, and there is just 9 10 not enough time in the Part 48s. 11 And I don't know if you really know for 12 sure, or not, because I -- ever since I've been in 13 Part 48 classes I've never, ever seen an 14 inspector monitoring it to see if everything is 15 actually in that criteria, in general. Because I think if you had actually had 16 17 anyone -- and I've talked to a few people, and no one 18 has ever seen an inspector at a Part 48 course. 19 that would probably also be changed, you know, if it was really looked at hard, let alone trying to put 20 21 this in on top of it. 22 The people that are, that you are relying on to feed us information and training, they do not 23 24 have it. Just to give you a good example, last

February we got a new safety supervisor.

He was 25 years old, he had worked two years underground with the engineering department as a surveyor. In February they contacted him and said you are the new safety supervisor. He has absolutely no idea about general safety, let alone hazard communication.

Just on general safety matters he has to come to me, or to someone else. So I can only imagine what it is going to be like when he has to deal with any type of chemicals.

We've talked a lot about MSDS sheets. They are on the mine site, usually inaccessible. Day shift people, you know, if you want to go in and find them yes, they are there, but you are going to have to find them on your own.

The door is locked on the other two shifts. The majority, and I strongly say majority of the people, have no idea what an MSDS sheet is, or how to actually obtain the information that is on it. They have to regurgitate it, it is just not there.

Luckily I have an education in that, to where I kind of oversee some things, you know, that are top priority. Because this has been kind of a passion with me for quite a few years. Because I actually worked underground for 20 years before I went

1 degree in safety and environmental to get 2 engineering. So I know that this is a problem. We have 3 4 people, another very good example that upset me 5 greatly, I was laid off for a period of about a year. I come back, I notice these small containers of foam 6 7 sealant that they use to seal stoppings, and what not. 8 Well, if you've all read the back of the 9 box, it told you right then and there exactly, you 10 11 must use a respirator, without question. Because all 12 the cancer causing agents in it. I asked the company, I said, do you have 13 14 respirators for these people that have been using 15 these things? Well, no. I said, I suggest you get some before anything else has been used. 16 17 okay, we will get some. 18 About three days later they said we got 19 the respirators, we are going to start using that 20 I said, I would like to see the respirator. again. 21 They brought out charcoal filters for respirable dust, 22 instead of an organic filter for that mask. 23 If they can't handle something that small, and you guys don't enforce it, do the job that they 24

actually required you to do, the companies are going

1 to do just as normal, very minimal. 2 Because what really upsets me is Wal-Mart 3 employees understand HAZCOM much more than coal 4 miners. And it is embarrassing to me, and it should 5 be embarrassing to you. It seems like every year things keep 6 7 getting easier for the coal companies, by regulations, but it is always at our expense. We need to get back 8 9 to basics. Treat us as your first priority. 10 And I think if you do that you will find 11 out that we have to get this thing through, because 12 there is too many people dying and we don't need it. 13 Are there any questions? 14 MODERATOR TEASTER: What. kind of 15 background and/or training do you think an individual would need to present chemical hazard training at a 16 17 mine? 18 MR. far CONAWAY: As overall as 19 background, each person, as a rule, will have to work 20 with a specific chemical or maybe chemicals in one 21 Because it is usually not that diversified area. 22 where your chemicals are spread all over. 23 You know, you use one chemical for one 24 application. The people that is using 25 applicated chemicals for that area, they need to know,

1 like I said, as far as if they spill it how to clean 2 it up, how it should be disposed of. There is going be first aid which will be accountable 3 4 different types of situations. 5 You know, you just can't treat each chemical burn, or whatever, the same way. Putting a 6 7 fire out with a chemical spill, you cannot put it out the same way. You are going to have a certain way of 8 9 emergency response, do we have to get fire trucks. 10 You know, just a general program. 11 need to enforce an actual program, not just say I want 12 you guys to be able to do -- each operator to do this, 13 They need to come up with a specific 14 program. 15 Because, like I said, just a few odds and ends is not going to work, not going to get it. 16 17 we really need to make the coal companies 18 accountable. 19 Because it seems like, to me, every time 20 we are giving them such a minimal obligation to do 21 anything, that that is exactly what they are sliding 22 And no one is really backing it up, 23 checking on it, to see if they are actually doing what

MODERATOR TEASTER: Do you have a feel for

they say they are doing.

24

the number of chemicals that is used at your
operation?
MR. CONAWAY: Being as I work underground,
no. Because the bulk of the chemicals are at the prep
plant. But I have a person that will be speaking,
that works at my mine, that does work outside, and he
may be able to give you more information on that.
MODERATOR TEASTER: Do you have a feel for
the number of, and kinds of injuries that is occurring
at your operation?
MR. CONAWAY: Sadly to say more so tumors,
cancers, than injuries. A gentleman, probably, could
have passed away today, I'm not sure. I spoke to him
a week ago, he cannot even get out of his bed now.
They all seem to be in a field
mechanically, as a rule, where they are around
petroleum products.
MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Wayne.
Our next speaker is Terry Richardson, from
United Mine Workers.
MR. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon. I'm a
representative from District 2, local 1998, do mostly
surface construction.
I'm here on behalf of my union brothers

1 that allows operators to classify only those chemicals 2 used under normal circumstances, or foreseeable 3 emergencies, as hazardous. 4 The fact is most situations could be 5 construed to fall under two categories, abnormal conditions, and unforeseen emergencies. 6 7 Understanding that basic premise operators could effectively claim the Rule did not apply to any 8 9 given situation. Taking this necessary action will 10 greatly enhance the Rule's ability to effectively 11 protect miners. 12 The lack of prescriptive language will allow operators to avoid notifying workers of the 13 14 presence of a hazard, and still be in compliance. 15 Also the reference to non-routine tasks must be eliminated in the Rule. 16 17 Miners need, and have the right to be made 18 more aware of the presence of chemicals at the mine, 19 regardless of the frequency of their use. 20 currently serving as safety committeeman for our local 21 union, and for the employees of the company that I 22 work for. 23 I'm also grievance man for these men. 24 Frankly I feel we as minors have been grieved. Ladies

and gentlemen, I have been working around chemicals,

1 and chemical plants for quite a while, and dealt with 2 OSHA's HAZCOM standards. And I can't understand why in 14 years you 3 4 haven't implemented a plan of your own. We all have 5 a responsibility to these miners to ensure a safe and healthy environment for them to work in. 6 7 So I think we ought to quit with the bureaucratic bias, and get this Rule into effect now. 8 9 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Terry. 10 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. 11 MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is 12 Bob Morris, United Mine Workers. 13 MR. Good MORRIS: afternoon, 14 Moderator, and Panel members. My name is Bob Morris, 15 I'm currently serving as a mine safety committeeman at 31, 16 Leverage Mine, District Consolidation 17 Company. 18 I have 27 years working in the mine. 19 last 12 years I've been employed in the surface in the 20 leverage preparation plant. Wayne Conaway alluded to 21 me speaking about certain chemicals, and I will do 22 that later on in the presentation. Since 1989, I will just preface my remarks 23 with some background, we have been debating the Rule 24 25 based upon the standard that OSHA currently uses.

92 On October 3rd, 2000, MSHA was supposed to issue their Interim Final Rule, and it was supposed to go into force by October 3rd, 2001. On August 28th, 2001, MSHA stayed the issuance of the Rule, this would have implemented the Final Rule effective June 2002. By staying this Interim Final Rule MSHA opened the door to more needless comment and We have had 14 years to debate this issue. And it seems like they've opened the door strictly to hear the operator's side of the question, to talk about a Rule to protect the working miner. If in the past 14 years the operators couldn't have come up with questions, and presented their side, there is something really wrong, they don't have a side, here. MSHA failed to implement the Rule to

MSHA failed to implement the Rule to provide the miners with basic protection. The Interim Final Rule was scheduled to be placed into full force by August 3rd, 2001, it did not go far enough in my opinion, to protect the working miners, but at least it was a step in the right direction.

It had several shortcomings, and I'm going to try to outline them, briefly. First, it failed to notify and identify miners exposed to carcinogenic chemicals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Operators were not required, secondly, to satisfy the miners that they were being exposed to certain hazards, they did not have to notify them.

MSDS labels are available on some chemicals, some chemicals are not. We use a myriad of chemicals on the preparation plant, and you can ask me about each one, I will go over some of them, the major ones used.

We've -- the new Rule did not require the mine operator to be the responsible party for training and compliance with the Rule. By reopening the Rule to debate, it is my opinion that the Agency announced plans to address a list of the mine operator's objections.

The mine operators have had 14 years to list their objections, and if they haven't done so, that is their problem. Mine operators, fourth, another point I wanted to make, the mine operators cannot be the party allowed to make the determination on what is or is not a hazard. That is the same as asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

Because most of the people that I have worked for in the 27 years, especially on the last 12 years on the preparation plant, have no more idea how to read an MSDS label, or how to interpret it, or how

1 to train anybody in the proper use of the chemical 2 that they are using. 3 MSHA was mandated by Congress, under the 4 Act, as a regulatory agency, and in my opinion we are 5 becoming an advisory agency to the mining industry. MSHA's has abdicated its primary role, and 6 7 that was protecting the most precious resource in the mining industry, and that being the miner. 8 9 I will give you several examples. 10 alluded to some individuals that had become sick as a 11 result of working with chemicals, I'm going to give 12 you specific names. First was Mike Renick. Mike passed away 13 14 about six months ago. He left a wife and two 15 children. Mike worked on the long wall system back when the long walls were first being brought on the 16 17 site by Consolidation Coal Company at Four States 18 Mine. 19 They used an oil that was called solcenic 20 I don't know if any of you are familiar with it. 21 Initially when we started using solcenic oil on the 22 long wall sections, there was no warning labels on the 23 cans, they came in five gallon cans, it had an ID 24 number on the can, and the people that worked

maintenance routinely would use it to wash grease off

their hands at the end of the shift.

And after five or six years of using this chemical on the property, the warning labels appeared on it that it was a cancer causing agent, and it was absorbed through the skin.

Mike died approximately six months ago from a brain tumor. His oncologist stated, categorically, that Mike was exposed to some chemical that was commonly used in the oil fields. And I don't know what the exact use in the oil fields would be.

Secondly, the other individual, he is currently, he is a real good friend of mine, his name is Chuck Sommers. Chuck got sick approximately 18 months ago, he had a brain tumor, exactly the same type of tumor that Mike had.

His doctor, he had the same oncologist, and he told Chuck that it was highly unusual to see this type of tumor. He said, again, he cited that this was a tumor that they only see among people who work in oil fields.

And Chuck has worked for the past 15 years on the preparation plant. And I will cite three other instances. One was Leonard Myers. Leonard was working one day, we use a, it is called stone hard. It is a powder chemical that you mix, and it is used

as a liner in chutes, and various other things on the preparation plants.

Leonard had to get down inside of what is called a three way jig distributor. It is a small type vessel, to do the work that he was doing. He was in there approximately 8 hours. When he came out his eyes were almost swollen completely shut from the fumes off of it.

A lot of the work that we do in the plant is typically in confined spaces, and where you can't get away from the fumes, specially the chemical that you are using is producing any kind of fumes, you cannot get away from it, you can't escape it.

Another friend of mine worked underground,

John Sliger. We had -- he passed away in 1986. John
was a bigger man than me, weighed probably 260. When
he died he weighed 89 pounds.

He was exposed to a chemical that we used on the coarse coal slurry system that we had underground at Leverage at the time, it was called chromate. Chromate was used to increase the wearing properties of the inside, on the inside of the pipes in the slurry system.

This chromate came in 55 gallon drums, and what you had to do, you had to add it into a hopper

that fed into the piping, into the slurry. And you always end up getting it on you.

The big barrels never carried a warning label on them anywhere. After about four or five years of using it, then the labels started to appear, that it was absorbed, it was a chemical that was, that you could not have on your skin, you were supposed to wear protective clothing to even handle it. John died in 1986, like I said, he was down to 89 pounds.

Last I will refer to my own self. I have worked as an electrician on the plant for the last almost 12 years now. And just before we shut down here recently, I was working as a plant operator.

Well, I had several occasions, one as an electrician, my electrical foreman had sent me, we had a train load-out station, and where the conduit came down through the metal floor of the building, it was rusting and deteriorating. And to try to buy us some more time for having to completely redo it, one morning I went to work, he gave me a gallon can of paint, and a paintbrush, and he said, I want you to go down and sand, brush that off as good as you can, to get the dirt from around it, and then I want you to paint this on it.

Well, this building was approximately 20

feet by 20 feet. And there was no way, there was one door that you could open on it, that was the only ventilation I could get in the building.

I used it for about two hours, to complete the job that I was supposed to do. By the time that I finished, I started getting real light-headed, dizzy, went outside to sit down in the fresh air, it was wintertime.

I got back up to the plant, and for a week after that it was just like I had a chemical cold. And so the foreman, I asked him, what was that stuff that I was using, Barry? And he said it is PVC paint. He said there is nothing wrong with using it.

I said, you know, I told him what had happened to me, and everything, and he said there is another can of it. This can had no warning label on it, brand new can. They had another can in our storage area. I went and got it, and it said minimal exposure to this chemical, to only be used in well ventilated areas, minimal exposure could cause severe brain damage.

And this, like I said, this is just one other example. Then another time they had, I don't know if any of you have any prep plant background. We had what they call a densitometer. And they are

1 mounted on the outside of the pipes, in the plant, coming off the heavy media pumps, which in turn pump 2 to heavy media vessels. 3 4 And essentially what it does, it measures 5 the density of the material going through the pipe. There are signs up that say, caution radioactive 6 7 material. The foreman sent me and another mechanic 8 9 to help two gentlemen who came down there from a firm 10 in Pittsburgh, to work on this pipe. And there were 11 chemical, and it says radioactive element. 12 Here I am, I am wearing a t-shirt, and a pair of bib overalls, my buddy is dressed just about 13 14 like me. These two guys, I noticed they didn't have 15 any tools, and I asked the foreman, don't they need Well, he told us what we 16 any tools to work with? 17 needed to get. 18 He said, meet them up on the second floor, 19 and you will have to give them a hand for a couple of 20 hours. And the quy, when they come walking in, they 21 had on suits with hoods on them, and it looked like a 22 visor that they could see through. And I asked the quy, I said, what are 23 24 those suits for? He said, because we are working

around this material. And I said, those aren't lead

1 lined suits, are they? And he said, yes, they are. And I said, me and my buddy, are we at any risk here? 2 3 And I said, he told me, he said, no we do it every 4 day. This is not that much exposure for you. And I asked him, I said, how do you measure what amount of exposure level we have here? 6 7 I said, do you have a geiger counter? He said, yes. 8 He pulled out, it pegged the geiger counter. And so 9 this is another example, this is a chemical, a 10 radioactive chemical. 11 Then just mechanics routinely used, like 12 I used the PVC paint as an electrician. I will go over some of the chemicals that we use in the plant. 13 14 We use an antifreeze at the train load out 15 station. And what they do, they put it in suspension, spray it into the rail cars before they load the coal 16 in the wintertime, and they call that freeze release 17 treating the cars. 18 19 And this chemical, I mean, it is 20 antifreeze, probably a methyl alcohol based, and I'm 21 not sure what it is. I've never seen a data sheet on 22 it. 23 a reagent in the fine coal 24 processing part of our plant. It is called a frother, 25 it is used in conjunction with diesel fuel, and pumped in by pumps, into large tanks. And what it basically does, it recovers the fine coal particles, puts them in a suspension, and then goes through a filtering system, and on to the belt line. It is also toxic.

We no longer use the chromate, but it was used at our mine in times past. We use an agent called flocculent. And it is used in the water system, it goes to our thickener. And I don't even know what the properties are on it, I've never seen a data sheet on it.

Then underground, from time to time, they use a substance called rock lock. And they drill in the top, and inject this to bind the coal strata together when they are having problems with the coal at the top.

It is called a methyl sico cyanate. I'm sure most of you have heard of it. And I've never, ever heard anybody tell the people when it was being used in a section, or long wall panel, that they shouldn't be downwind from this. It does go into a suspension in the air.

Wayne spoke about the foam sealant that we use. Leverage mine had a fire in 1999, and we went back into the mine, we did a lot of temporary stoppings, where we sprayed this foam material on the

1 stoppings as a sealant. 2 And, like he said, they did not provide 3 the people with the proper respirators, they used it 4 with open faced, with nothing on. 5 And Wayne spoke about the Part 48. I have been through Part 48 training approximately, due to 6 the number of layoffs that we have had at Leverage 7 8 Mine, probably 32 times. I have never yet heard any mention of 9 10 hazardous materials, or hazardous chemicals in the 11 workplace, not one time. 12 Another problem too, that you encounter, is that chemical suppliers, even if you had an MSDS 13 14 sheet on the chemical. Consol is just like any other 15 company, the bottom line is what drives this country, and everybody knows that. 16 17 They have to try to stay as competitive as 18 possible. So from time to time they shift suppliers. 19 The chemicals may be similar, but not the same. So you couldn't go by what the data sheet 20 21 that you had on that particular chemical when they 22 changed it to another supplier. 23 Leverage Mine, we have a thermal dryer. We use a number of chemicals there, that aren't 24 25 We use a caustic system. I don't know if -common.

1 if any of you have any knowledge of this, what I'm talking about. 2 3 And it is to dry, we had a problem with 4 the Clean Air Act, with the quality of what was coming out of the thermal dryer. It is a coal-fired dryer. 5 And they went to a caustic system there, and they use 6 7 another chemical that they spray on the coal once it 8 comes through the dryer, and goes onto the belt line. And there is a data sheet, it is on a tank 9 about 60 feet tall, and it is about 20 feet up. 10 11 can't see it, I can barely see the paper here, without 12 glasses. Lastly we routinely use a substance called 13 14 Electro Clean. And it is used, mostly it is the 15 electricians are the ones that use it. A lot of mechanics will get a hold of it, and they will use it 16 17 as a degreaser. And for a year, at Leverage Mine it was 18 19 banned, it wasn't allowed on the property. And when 20 we came back to work this time, we came back July 21st 21 of 1990, I take that back, July 21st of the year 2000, 22 we came back, it was back again and being used on a 23 regular basis. 24 And it clearly states on the can that it

is a carcinogenic. I will conclude with that, I will

1	answer any questions that you have.
2	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Bob. Bob,
3	this PVC paint that you used, how long ago was that?
4	MR. MORRIS: Two years.
5	MODERATOR TEASTER: Two years. And that
6	container had no label identify any
7	MR. MORRIS: The first one that they gave
8	me had no label at all on it.
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: The
10	MR. MORRIS: They just buy it in bulk.
11	They might ship in 20 gallons of it, if they are
12	anticipating a lot of work.
13	MODERATOR TEASTER: So they took that from
14	a bigger container and put it in a small one?
15	MR. MORRIS: No, it comes in a gallon can.
16	That particular can had no label on it, that is what
17	I'm saying.
18	MODERATOR TEASTER: The miners that you
19	referenced, the one that passed away in '86, was he
20	actively employed at the time of his death?
21	MR. MORRIS: Yes.
22	MODERATOR TEASTER: Do you know whether
23	that was reported as a
24	MR. MORRIS: There was a lawsuit filed.
25	I don't know what the disposition of the litigation

1 It was filed by his wife against Consolidation was. 2 Coal Company, against the manufacturer that made the 3 chromate. 4 MODERATOR TEASTER: What I'm trying to get 5 at here is, the operator is required to file a Part 50 report of an occupational illness, or injury, if they 6 7 were employed at the time, in case of an occupational 8 illness, if it was diagnosed, or an award compensation was made, they have to file a report 9 10 under Part 50, to the Agency. 11 And I was just wanting to know if there is 12 any way that maybe, if they did file that information, that information would be available to us, and would 13 14 be quite useful for us if we could back and review it. 15 I don't know if there was a MR. MORRIS: Part 50 form filed. John's wife filed the lawsuit 16 17 following his death. I don't think they had started 18 anything on it prior to that. 19 MODERATOR TEASTER: The other two miners 20 that you referenced, were they actively employed just 21 immediately prior to the --Mike Renick had been off 22 MR. MORRIS: 23 approximately two years, after he became ill. And I think he lived maybe two and a half years total. 24 25 it was -- I have never talked to his wife.

1 Mike came by my home one morning, we were 2 close friends, we worked together as electricians, 3 underground, before I went outside. He came by my 4 home one morning, rang the doorbell, I just go out of 5 bed. I went to answer the door, and I heard a 6 7 voice, I didn't even know who it was. His head was 8 swollen so large, you know, from the -- he had 9 undergone chemotherapy three or four times. 10 needed me to fill out some paperwork so that he could 11 try to get his pension. 12 And Chuck Summers, I saw Chuck about three weeks ago, he has been sick probably close to two 13 14 years right now. And he has no use of the left side 15 of his body. He is blind on the left side, he lost his sight on the left side. 16 17 And then, let me see, who else was it? 18 There is another one in there, I think that I missed, 19 John Vincent. John is off, John was a person that never drank alcohol in his life. Right now he is on 20 21 a liver transplant list.

> John was a mechanic, worked on the long wall, was one of these guys that worked with solcenic oil. And I'm sure there are others out there that we don't even know about.

22

23

24

1 I know that Robinson Ruaon Mine, I think 2 they had 20 plus people off, right now, that are dying 3 with cancer. In fact we had asked NIOSH to do a study 4 at our mine and at Robinson Roan. Dennis O'Dell, the international safety rep in district 31 was taking care of that. I don't 6 7 know where that ended up at. And I know several of 8 those people have passed away. I don't know any of these individuals by 9 they work at a different mine. 10 Ιt is 11 Consolidation Coal Company, also. And I'm not citing 12 Consol, you know, any more than any other operator. I mean, it is a business. And, you know, 13 14 and I'm not -- I would be the last one to say that I 15 want to do something punitive to the employer that I work for, because that is my livelihood. 16 But what I'm saying is that MSHA needs to 17 take a hard look, you know, before they promulgate 18 19 another Act, here, this is a serious issue, and it has been for a long time. 2.0 21 And the sad part is, you know, from the 22 time that somebody might be exposed to the chemical 23 hazard, and to the time the symptoms show up, it might be ten years, you know? 24 25 A cancer doesn't just form and grow in a

1 matter of a couple of days after an exposure to a 2 chemical agent. And these people, I would say that 3 there are a lot of people that have died, through the 4 years, that have been exposed to chemicals, and we've 5 basically had no protection in the workplace. For some odd reason the coal industry in 6 7 West Virginia, I will cite West Virginia because I'm The coal industry in West Virginia was 8 from here. exempt from the standards. All the other industries 9 10 in the states were covered but us. 11 And all we are asking MSHA to do is to 12 give us some protection. Give us at least what OSHA 13 does for the rest of the workers in this country. 14 MS. JONES: I would like to ask just one 15 more little detail. You were talking about the use of methyl iso cyanate. Could you describe, in a little 16 17 more detail, how that is used, and how the exposures 18 happen there, with that? 19 MR. MORRIS: It is injected, they drill 20 the top strata, inject it into the top, 21 It is almost like a resin, and it is 22 injected under pressure. And what it does, it goes 23 out into the various layers of the strata, they will 24 all come together.

Hence, I quess, that is where they got the

109 1 name rock lock. But in doing that it also, I don't 2 know what the word is that I'm looking for here, it becomes airborne. The fumes off of it. 3 4 Alabama had a severe problem with it 5 several years back, where they had some miners -- one exposure, they had to cease working, their lungs were 6 7 And I'm saying if we are using chemicals like 8 this, then we need to make the people that are doing 9 the work aware of it. 10 You can't, you know, most miners aren't 11 going to go into the superintendent's office, that is 12 where they keep all the things at the prep plant, and say, I want to see an MSDS data sheet, I want to know 13 14 what I'm working with here. They are just not going 15 to do it. The mine operator is going to have to make 16 17 it a part of our training that we have a right to know 18 what we are using, and we have a right to ask to be 19

protected.

MODERATOR TEASTER: I think you may have alluded to this earlier, and just didn't by name. But is West Virginia miners covered under Right to Know? MR. MORRIS: We are not covered like the other industries in the state. I mean, I worked on a plant for two or three years, and I handled various

20

21

22

23

24

1	chemicals, you know, even diesel fuel is dangerous
2	when it is absorbed through the skin into the blood
3	stream.
4	MR. SNASHALL: We have had some comment to
5	the effect that miners, if they are working with
6	chemical solvents, they should wear gloves, and if
7	something has fumes, that they should have
8	ventilation, and there is a generic instruction, based
9	on common sense, that people should operate on.
10	Do you have any reaction to that?
11	MR. MORRIS: You are saying that
12	MR. SNASHALL: In other words that
13	MR. MORRIS: the miners should
14	MR. SNASHALL: there is common sense.
15	MR. MORRIS: Just common sense that I
16	should know that I'm working with a chemical, and I
17	should I don't know, that is putting it back on the
18	miner to provide his own protection.
19	You know, I mean, that is not something
20	that we have the leeway to do.
21	MR. SNASHALL: Do you have any sense that
22	people, if they are, for example if you are painting,
23	and I was a painter at one point, okay?
24	MR. MORRIS: Okay.
25	MR. SNASHALL: So you, one of the things

1 is you have, you don't paint in a confined space, 2 generally. Or you look for some ventilation. The point of the, I guess of the comment 3 4 we've had before, is that a lot of this stuff can be 5 picked up by common sense precautions, it doesn't need a lot of detail. 6 7 Do you have any reaction to that? Or is a significant amount of exposure subtle, and really is 8 beyond what people can reasonably expect to know 9 10 quickly, that something may be wrong, or could happen 11 to them? 12 Well, I think a lot of the MR. MORRIS: 13 time, you know, just like a mechanic on a plant may 14 use that PVC paint. He may use it today, and may 15 never use it again for a year. Then somebody like an 16 electrician may use it every day. 17 I mean, I've painted for years, and I 18 would have never dreamed, I've never used a paint that 19 would have done what that did to me. I would have had 20 no reason. 21 You know, there is an implied feeling on 22 the part of the workers that, you know, my employers 23 shouldn't be exposing me to something that is going to 24 kill me. I think that is a reasonable assumption. 25 Maybe not in the legal sense, but in a

1 moral sense. You know, I should reasonably be able to 2 expect to go home at the end of the day, to my family, 3 and not have to worry about what I may have been 4 exposed to, either through my skin, through breathing 5 it. You know, we deal in an atmosphere where 6 7 we deal with a lot of dust, anyway. A miner is 8 exposed, at best, to a dust hazard, and to silica 9 And why should you have to assume that when hazard. you go on a job site, that something that is done 10 11 maybe two or three times in your whole mining career, 12 could potentially cause, you know, fatal consequence 13 20 years down the road. 14 I mean, I never -- I think I have an 15 obligation, I'm not bashful when it comes to using 16 something now. But I learned the hard way. 17 MR. FEEHAN: Do you know of, or can you tell us, the percentage of unreported injuries that 18 19 are chemically related, do you have a sense of that, 20 Bob? 21 MR. MORRIS: No. And I will tell you for 22 one reason why. At our mine, and I'm sure it is the 23 same at other Consol operations, at Peabody, or PNM, 24 or wherever, they do not want -- they discourage you

even turning in a normal accident. I mean browbeat

1	you.
2	If somebody gets hurt at our mine, the
3	superintendent will be calling them in the next hour.
4	You know, it is your fault, you were the employee, you
5	were doing something wrong, or you wouldn't have been
6	hurt. It is no different with a chemical.
7	I think just about anybody in the room
8	here, I can't speak for every company, and I wouldn't
9	try to, but I would say that, you know, they are
LO	basically the same, they operate the same.
L1	MODERATOR TEASTER: Bob, we appreciate you
L2	sharing your testimony, and your story. And we do
L3	sympathize with the families that lost their loved
L4	ones, and we appreciate you coming forward.
L5	MR. MORRIS: All right, thank you.
L6	MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
L7	Charles Miller, United Mine Workers.
L8	MR. MILLER: I'm Charles Miller, I work
L9	for Consol, I'm a union member, and I have been for 32
20	years, and I'm a safety committeeman at that local.
21	There are a few comments I would like to
22	make, and then if you have any questions, you could
23	ask me.
24	I would like to see MSHA make a rule on

this HAZCOM, so that it is actually made for

1 everybody. The people who work there, the people who 2 know what is going on, and no grey areas. 3 I find that through all these years of 4 seeing what happened to people, and hearing all these 5 things, that something has to be done, and not ten years from now, because of all these exposures we've 6 7 had now. And I think to eliminate these operators 8 from making all these determinations, this rule has to 9 10 be done now, as soon as possible. It is a shame that 11 it has taken so many years now to resolve this 12 problem. And I don't think we should have to wait 13 14 any longer for other people to get sick and say, I 15 can't work today, or I can't go tomorrow, because I've got cancer now, or I got burnt too bad. 16 I don't think any of this should happen to 17 us, or you, or anybody else, just from the chemicals 18 19 that actually I don't think, in my opinion, should 20 even be there. 21 If that stuff is going to hurt our people, 22 we shouldn't be using it. They should find some way 23 to train, or whatever, to eliminate all that kind of stuff. 24 25 I mean, they were trying to do that with dust control, and with noise, things like that, that people are trying to get control of. I mean, it shouldn't take all these years, back in the '40s and killed a lot of people, well I think we should have done this, I think we should have made some changes in this law.

I mean, I don't want to go home and tell my kids, I'm so sick I can't work no more. You know, I don't want to do that. And I don't want other people to have to go through that, or some of the stories you hear.

As MSHA has, for a long time now, turned its back on us, through Congressional mandates to protect all these miners, I think that MSHA is on the back road for that. I think you should have been out on a bandwagon and told these companies, this is what we are going to do, and this is the law, and this is how it has to be. No loopholes, no grey areas, nothing.

Then I have a few other things I want to talk about. The reasons why I'm talking about this for our miners' sake, is that under your Federal Register you had stated, and expressed concern that you had not had sufficient time to fully analyze the Interim Final Rule, to develop and submit meaningful

1 comments, and you cannot -- and it cannot compare to 2 the thousands of miners who continue to suffer the 3 effects of exposure to hazardous substances. 4 And then by your own admission there have 5 been, from 1990, through 1999, there have been an excess of 2,000 chemical burns, about half of which 6 7 were lost time injuries. And in some other things, there were 400 8 9 poisonings among this all these chemicals. And then 10 MSHA has decided to turn a deaf ear on the miners of 11 the nation. I believe that MSHA has given the operators plenty of time to ensure compliance with 12 these rules. 13 14 The miners believe that MSHA has caved in 15 to the pressures of the operators involving the 16 administration at the expense of these miners. It is time that MSHA has given the miners the benefits of 17 18 HAZCOM. 19 And I personally think that when all this 20 is done, and you try to do the right thing, that you 21 22 MODERATOR TEASTER: Charles, just for a point of clarification, in my opening statement I said 23 that the industry had made allegations that they had 24

not had time to analyze the Interim Final Rule, and

1	have enough time to analyze it so they could submit
2	meaningful comments.
3	It wasn't that we said that, that they
4	didn't have time to do it. That was something that
5	the operators had submitted in their comments, as far
6	as going forward with
7	MR. MILLER: But they are the ones that
8	use the chemicals, not you or I.
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: Right.
LO	MR. MILLER: I mean, they know what they
L1	are using, and what they want to use.
L2	Then I heard other comments about, people
L3	are saying that these companies know what is in these
L4	chemicals, and they are not affording the information.
L5	Then I heard you brought up Part 48.
L6	If you sat through one of those classes,
L7	in an 8 hour period, for all the things that is in
L8	that mandate now, under Part 48, you don't get to all
L9	the things that could hurt you.
20	They will give you some warnings and tell
21	you, or give you a little short film, and tell you
22	that is what that is.
23	In the 32 years of all these trainings
24	that I've had, on different things, they never ever
25	hit at all these different things that can happen to

1	you, that don't go under an unsupported roof, or if it
2	gets too dusty, get some water, things like that.
3	But you are talking about something else
4	that you can get through your skin, you know, what is
5	the proper stuff, what do you use to make this stuff
6	not hurt you.
7	MODERATOR TEASTER: Well, the intent of
8	the Interim Final Rule is so the operator can identify
9	what hazards that you could potentially be exposed to,
10	and then share that information to you, through some
11	training program, and make this information available
12	through labeling, and through the MSDSs, as well as
13	the training.
14	So the whole thing, that is the purpose so
15	they would be able to do that.
16	MR. PHUC: Would you be able to provide a
17	data, the injury data that you just mentioned?
18	MR. MILLER: On the accidents?
19	MR. PHUC: Yes.
20	MR. MILLER: I didn't write that down, I
21	think
22	MODERATOR TEASTER: I think he just took
23	their own data.
24	MR. PHUC: Okay.
25	MR. MILLER: I read that through the MSHA

1	register, it had that.
2	MR. PHUC: Okay, I was just wondering
3	where you got that data from.
4	MR. FEEHAN: Do you have an idea of how
5	many injuries are unreported?
6	MR. MILLER: At my mine?
7	MR. FEEHAN: Chemically related injuries.
8	MR. MILLER: I had one.
9	MR. FEEHAN: Did you?
10	MR. MILLER: Yes. I have a burn on my
11	back. Actually it looks like a skin rash, but it is
12	a burn. And it burnt for a while, now it is just a
13	big scar.
14	I know a person that hasn't been working,
15	he got solcenic oil in his blood system, and he is
16	ruined, he hasn't worked for two years now.
17	MR. FEEHAN: That has not been reported?
18	MR. MILLER: I don't think it has.
19	MODERATOR TEASTER: Why would you not
20	report that, if it was an injury that
21	MR. MILLER: Well, it didn't come on until
22	like four or five days afterwards, this rash that I
23	have. I mean I couldn't say that happened at work.
24	Do you know what I mean? Because they wouldn't accept
25	that as an accident, then. But it come on me

1 afterwards. 2 MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay. Would you come to the podium and identify yourself for the record, 3 4 and we can get you in? 5 MR. MORRIS: I am Bob Morris, I was up here previously. Probably one of the reasons why, you 6 7 know you asked him why he wouldn't report an accident like that, you only have like 24 hours to report an 8 accident before you leave mine property. 9 10 So a lot of people they will get hurt, 11 burned or whatever, and they will say, it is not going 12 to amount to anything. Two or three days later it may 13 come as a problem, but you can't go back and back date 14 it, and claim that it is a loss time injury, or 15 whatever. It happens constantly, believe me. 16 17 We have a lot of people MR. MILLER: 18 complain about itching, and they will use rubber gloves, and some of the things that they have, and 19 20 still get the stuff on their skin, they itch and 21 everything else. 22 MS. JONES: I just wanted to go back to a 23 point that you made early on about trying to eliminate hazards in mining, and perhaps substituting less 24

hazardous chemicals for -- making a substitution.

1 Do you feel, or are you of the opinion 2 that the hazard communication standard, which would 3 provide the knowledge to both the mine operator, and 4 the miner, might lead to substitutions like that? MR. MILLER: I think if they could find something else that would be better, that would be 6 7 less harmful to you, yes I think it would be a good 8 idea. You mentioned annual 9 MR. SNASHALL: refresher, and this I've asked before, with another 10 11 Have you been task trained in the health speaker. 12 aspects of the task which would include exposure to 13 chemicals? 14 MR. MILLER: The only thing that they 15 showed us in the last few years was a little film for about eight minutes, ten minutes, on some of the 16 17 things you do. 18 But, you know, it is not like if you 19 looked at the film, and you didn't know anything about 20 it, you wouldn't know what to do. That is the kind of 21 films that they show you, because they don't have 22 enough time in an 8 hour period to teach all the 23 things they have to teach. MR. SNASHALL: But before, if you were to 24 25 be assigned a new task, there is, separate from the

1	eight hours?
2	MR. MILLER: I've already asked questions,
3	and they don't know, they don't know what to tell you.
4	That is the kind of answer they will tell you, I don't
5	know. Then they will make a call and try to find out
6	from somebody else. That is what happens.
7	MODERATOR TEASTER: Charles, do you know
8	what kind of chemical you got on your back? Did you
9	know when you got a chemical?
10	MR. MILLER: I didn't realize anything
11	that it was, until afterward. It was, like I said, a
12	week.
13	MODERATOR TEASTER: And you have no idea
14	what chemical you were working with?
15	MR. MILLER: They have this milk oil, they
16	call it. It is fire resistant oil, it is a white oil
17	that I think is 80 or 90 percent water, and ten
18	percent some kind of petroleum product.
19	MODERATOR TEASTER: Water emulsion?
20	MR. MILLER: Yes.
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you Charles,
22	appreciate it.
23	Our next speaker is Craig Irwin from
24	United Mine Workers, Local 93.
25	MR. IRWIN: How are you doing, my name is

Scott Irwin, Local 93, I'm on development of mining. I have been working in the mining industry for 21 years, started out with a truck dump operator, grease truck, grader, dozers, went up to the slate for 13 years, now I'm back on the strip on a dozer.

I have various experience with all these things, with the chemicals that we have, when I was at the Temple, not very much, but the men that we work with, my buddy back there gave me a few notes on a few of the chemicals, I didn't know what they was.

You say you take the common sense approach to these things. All of us have common sense. But when we are being led to believe that there is no danger, we believe there is no danger.

When we are told by the authority, or the people that we work for, that there is no danger, we assume there is no danger. I am here today to say this HAZCOM rule needs to be effective, it needs to be implemented immediately, and enforced just as rigorously as you possibly can.

The film we seen yesterday, my experience since we've been union, we went union in '93, I never had any of this training. You talk about Part 48 training, I see in the Code where it doesn't have any hazmat training in it.

1 You've got four hours of first aid, you've 2 ground control plans, you've got the 3 operation of trucks and haulage. You get your 4 definition of where you are going in the mine, and 5 stuff. And I notice this year we had a fatality, 6 7 one of our foremen, and that took up most of our annual retraining. I think training is an important 8 9 part. 10 Before I ever came up here to the Academy, 11 there is a lot of things that I did, that I didn't 12 know that I was supposed to not do. The Academy has helped me really well, and I think training is a 13 14 continuous thing that we need to learn, and to improve 15 upon. Because, as you said, your experience with 16 17 your painting career, yes, you are aware of these 18 things. But I'm not aware of that. I buy something 19 at the store I assume that it is safe for me to use. 20 Sometimes I read the thing, sometimes I don't. But we've had four, three people that has died 21 22 in our plant, and as far as I know it has not been 23 reported as job related. 24 I think that some of our widows are trying 25 to prove that it was job related. But we've had two

1 with cancer, they are dead, one with leukemia, dead. 2 We have another one that is not working out with a 3 brain tumor. 4 That is four people out of approximately 5 42 people that has got these things. The 13 years experience I had up on the slate dump, they call it 6 7 magnetite, the slurry impoundment. 8 And these are some of the things that go 9 into the slurry impoundment. The perk, the ionic, 10 ammonia, caustic soda, soda ashes, and cationic. What 11 kind of chemical is in there mixed together, is 12 creating in that sediment pond? And that sediment pond, we pump it into 13 14 the front, the slurry drop out, the water go back to 15 the back, they pump it off, it goes into the other sediment ponds, then they treat it with something. 16 don't know what it is, it is another chemical. 17 And also when it come back down, they pump 18 19 it back to the temple to reuse that water, they 20 rehandle that water. We are washing floors down, we 21 are washing the ceilings down, and also it is treated 22 for us to take our showers in. 23 A lot of the guys down at work, another 24 man that is retired experienced great rashes on his

And several times the health department has

body.

1 came and give us a water advisory when they came to 2 check the water, that it was not up to standard. 3 So we has to stay on top of these things. 4 If you don't have a law, or a rule in effect, that 5 says specifically that you are going to train your men, my company is not going to train me. 6 7 And I am a firm believer, and I am so glad 8 that I have had opportunity with the UMWA, to be in 9 classes, to be trained. And when you go back to your 10 men, and you try to explain the things that we learn 11 here at the Academy, they think that you are just 12 carrying on. I don't know what it is, I guess it is the 13 14 human factor. That they think, well you just think 15 you've got a little knowledge, and we don't need to do 16 this. A lot of people go in with masks. I know 17 one incident one time, we had an ammonia tank to 18 19 burst, rupture, whatever it was. Some of our men 20 almost didn't get out of the tipple. 21 And my understanding of this, right now, 22 this is second-hand, I don't know if you are going to 23 take it or not, but I'm going to tell it to you 24 anyway, the two masks we got is our floc man, is our 25 chemical men, the ones that mixes stuff up to put it

1 out to the tanks to do the sediment, this, that, and 2 the other. 3 Well, you have two masks. When 4 ammonia came in, they provided two masks, and them two 5 guys got it locked up in their locker. I mean, what good is that going to do me if something or another, 6 7 if my piece of equipment tore up, they have the right 8 to temporary assignment to do any job that I'm capable 9 of doing. 10 But do they give me everything? 11 said, yes, this control puts it up, this control puts 12 But what else -- sometimes we don't look it down. 13 beyond ourselves, we look for something down the road 14 that is going to hurt us. 15 But that thing is right beside of us is going to hurt. I heard one testimony talked about the 16 17 starting fluid. That is bad stuff. And when I get in 18 my cab I make sure it is out of my cab. But it is 19 back in the next day. You tell the men but somehow or another it 20 21 is not getting done. Me, personally, I don't direct 22 that workforce. If you give a regulation and a rule 23 for the company to enforce these things, I think it 24 would go a whole lot better.

And this is human.

25

I had a lot of

1 inspectors tell me, and I find it to be true, I am my 2 own worst enemy. I say, well, I can get in there and 3 I can paint that in a couple of minutes, and I won't 4 be exposed long. Well, I can make one more trip, I have a hydraulic leak, but I can make one trip, it would be 6 7 good enough to do another. So that is where we need continuous training, eight hour annual refresher is 8 not enough, my friend. 9 10 Because it is short, it is sweet, 11 sometimes, like I said, with the seriousness of the 12 accident, we had a foreman killed, sometimes a topic like that will take over the annual retraining. 13 14 And I'm sure they try to do the best they 15 but I think that the thing is continuous can, education is what we need, and I sort of like one of 16 the things that MSHA did a few years ago, it was 17 18 called CAPs, compliance assistance program. 19 He showed our operators a lot of things 20 they were doing wrong. They was filling out books 21 wrong, they was doing a lot of things that they wasn't 22 supposed to be doing, a lot of things was corrected. But somehow or another it don't trickle 23 24 down to the workforce, some way or another. And like

I said, I'm finished, I don't know what else to say.

1	I say let's implement the Rule, let's get it on there.
2	You are protecting other people, other
3	industry, protect me, I'm my own worst enemy. Help
4	me, I need help.
5	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Craig.
б	Just a clarification. The existing Part 46 and Part
7	48, part 46 for those of you that may not know, is a
8	training requirement for the aggregate industry. It
9	is a separate training regulation just for that
10	segment of the industry.
11	But both of them have a requirement that
12	just says that they will train the miners in the
13	hazards to which they are exposed. And we get some
14	comments that says that that training is where they
15	cover this chemical hazards training, is where the
16	hazards that the miners are exposed to.
17	I just say that to clarify, because there
18	is no specific requirement in there that says that you
19	have to do this or that. But just the general
20	subject of hazards. At least that is my understanding
21	of it.
22	MR. IRWIN: It is not happening.
23	MODERATOR TEASTER: I think we are
24	starting to get that picture.
25	MS. JONES: I just want to clarify one

1 thing. When you were going through the components of 2 the material that is used in your settlement ponds, 3 what was the first component that you mentioned? 4 MR. IRWIN: Perk, P-E-R-K, perk. 5 Magnetite was what -- I tell you, that is another little story, too. 6 7 Three of us worked up there 13 year. I'm glad you reminded me of that. Phil Opana has had 8 9 about 18 inches of his guts took out because he had 10 chrones disease, and colitis. Gary Munsy is busted. 11 These are all the guys I worked with for 13 years. I 12 have been diagnosed with arthritis colitis. And I don't know if that is industry or 13 14 not, but three out of four working in the same area, 15 I don't know what that is. And, like I said, all that stuff is gathered together at one time. 16 And when I was at the tipple, it wasn't 17 nothing, if a vessel got stopped up the boss said get 18 19 it cleaned out, it wasn't nothing for me to jump in, 20 up to my waist, getting that cleaned out. 21 Did I asses all the hazard? Maybe I 22 didn't, maybe I don't have common sense like a regular 23 man does. But I assumed there was no danger there. 24 And I guess you know what that made me, when I 25 assumed, don't you?

1	I'm finished. You get me started on
2	something else I will talk all day.
3	MR. FEEHAN: The perk, do you know what
4	the, what that actually is, is it perchlorethylene, is
5	that what you are
6	MS. JONES: That is what I was wondering,
7	is that what it is?
8	MR. IRWIN: Yes.
9	MR. FEEHAN: Yes. Do you know of
10	unreported injuries, chemically related injuries?
11	MR. IRWIN: Myself personally, no. That
12	is why I tell my people to report everything that
13	comes to. I even instruct them to go out if they have
14	to. That way you have a record.
15	Because these guys going home, like they
16	said earlier, we think we are doing the company a
17	favor, but we are just hurting ourselves. And we need
18	MSHA to help us, we need training.
19	MODERATOR TEASTER: Craig, we thank you.
20	Our next speaker is John, and I can't make
21	this out real clearly, but it looks like Early, it is
22	from UMAW local 2300.
23	MR. ELY: My name is John Ely, United Mine
24	Workers of America, health and safety committee, Local
25	2.300. Cumberland Mine. Pennsylvania.

1 I have 25 years working underground. 2 guess I will just start out reading what I've written here, and then I will take some questions, and maybe 3 4 elaborate a little bit. 5 Common sense is something that is important, and should have already been put into 6 7 place. Many people are currently being exposed to, due to the lack of urgency to get this Rule into 8 9 place. 10 To me a hazardous chemical is a hazardous 11 chemical. They are dangerous by their very nature. 12 is very important, just as a drug dose important to be taken in its proper dose. 13 14 As we all know, an overdose of anything 15 In our particular mine we use a can be fatal. particular chemical which contains carcinogenics, 16 17 which they spoke about earlier, which is the glue into 18 the roof. I think that is a common thing in the mine 19 20 industry today. Our employees are exposed to this on 21 a regular basis, not only when pumping it into the 22 roof, but during the handling of the 55 gallon drums, that could be from the folks outside when they are 23 loaded, to the men underground, as it is taken to the 24

section.

1 We requested MSHA to come in and do a test 2 in an airborne state. They used dust pumps, they 3 didn't really even have the proper equipment to test 4 that for us. And that is one other issue, I think, 5 that MSHA needs to beef up on, is maybe some testing So they really couldn't give us 6 equipment. 7 accurate statement as to what was in the air. On this training issue, I say training is 8 9 done only to appease the law. If additional training 10 is needed, let's force the operator to do so. 11 little, if any, hazard training is done in our annual 12 retraining. suggestions would 13 One of mу 14 standardize the MSDS sheets. I don't think that was 15 in your film that you had, that actually mentioned that the MSDS sheets were not a standardized type of 16 a format, you know? 17 18 And much like the papers we fill out, like 19 if we fire a boss, or whatever type sheets you might have, it would make it much easier to look down there 20 21 and see exactly what the hazards were, maybe what the 22 treatment for a burn, or something like that. 23 Ι think important that is very 24 standardize those sheets. And like I talked to a

gentleman, in one of our many breaks, we were talking

1 about as far as the training, we didn't even know what 2 these gentlemen were talking about. It has become so redundant over the years, 3 4 I've had like probably 25 to 26 classes of this 5 retraining, and I really believe in my own heart that the company does the minimum to say that they've done 6 7 it. 8 And there are some cases where you 9 actually need more. Right now we've got the diesel 10 regulations in Pennsylvania, which are the best in the 11 country. And even at that, we don't like them. 12 We are forcing our people, we have to 13 actually force the company to train people to run the 14 diesels. I mean, we can't even get them to do it. 15 And everything is done to the minimum. And I have oftentimes thought that. 16 And training, 17 I've often time used our mind at work, we are not the 18 dummer work force, but we are more ignorant than we 19 were in the past, because we are not being exposed to 20 training. New equipment coming in, hazards, this 21 22 type of thing. I mean, it kind of give you a blanket 23 statement, yes you have hazards in the mine. But we 24 need to have more specifics. We are not really as

dumb as some people might think we are.

1	Actually the mining industry is a proud
2	industry, and United Mine Workers is a proud group of
3	men that really just want what is fair for all of us.
4	And someone mentioned earlier, I mean,
5	what we do directly affects the non-union miners, too.
6	I mean, they are still human. We still have to look
7	out for everyone's best interest.
8	So actually we are kind of like the sacred
9	lamb, I think, for a lot of them at times, to bring
10	these issues to light.
11	As Mr. Trout asked you earlier, please put
12	yourselves in our shoes, and make a decision based on
13	the facts, they are very evident. I'm sure some of
14	these things are maybe new to you folks, that you've
15	heard today, and I would hope that you would take
16	those in consideration.
17	And one last comment, as I heard you say
18	in the opening remarks, several times, that the Rule
19	could put a burden on the operator, at some point in
20	time. You did say that, right?
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: That is what the
22	operators are saying.
23	MR. ELY: Right. I know you didn't say
24	it, but you are saying what the operator said.
25	MODERATOR TEASTER: Correct.

1	MR. ELY: Well, I would like to go on the
2	record and make the comment that I will guarantee you,
3	without a good rule put in place, our miners and our
4	families will have a greater burden than the operator
5	ever dreamed of. Thank you.
6	MODERATOR TEASTER: Any questions?
7	MR. PHUC: You mentioned that we should
8	standardize the MSDS sheets?
9	MR. ELY: Yes, sir.
10	MR. PHUC: And what is the reasoning
11	behind that?
12	MR. ELY: Well, you know, usually when
13	someone gets hurt, or they are exposed, it is like an
14	emergency type situation. And I could add that maybe
15	making them readily available.
16	Because someone mentioned before, maybe
17	after the midnight shift the doors might be locked,
18	that type of thing.
19	You need to go in where you can open up,
20	and on the first line it is going to say the chemical,
21	the second line is going to say the reaction, the
22	third line is going to say the treatment, maybe the
23	emergency phone numbers.
24	I'm sure you've dealt with a lot of
25	paperwork, and it is much easier to be able to go down

1 and read, and have an idea of what is on the first 2 page, second page, or third page. 3 I have read a lot of them, and every one 4 of them is different. 5 MR. PHUC: Right. MR. ELY: I mean, it is just a suggestion. 6 7 But I think that anything is standardized that is that 8 important. MR. PHUC: But the few that you have seen, 9 are they -- I mean, how is the language, is it easily 10 11 understandable? 12 Yes, you can read it, but you MR. ELY: 13 have to search through it to find out what exactly you 14 are looking for, and was it easily understandable. I 15 would say yes, but at the same time I think it needs to be put in layman's terms. 16 17 I mean, I'm not a chemist, I'm pretty 18 impressed with some of these guys the way they can say 19 these things. I don't even attempt to do that. 20 But, you know, I need to know exactly what 21 it is going to do to me, you know? But I think, when 22 I say standardized, I basically mean the format, you know, one through ten, this, this, and this type of a 23 thing. That way you can look at it and -- do you know 24 25 what I'm saying?

1	MR. PHUC: Okay.
2	MODERATOR TEASTER: John, does the mine
3	operator has MSDSs at the mine?
4	MR. ELY: Yes, sir, they do, for the
5	biggest part.
6	MODERATOR TEASTER: And have you reviewed
7	any of those?
8	MR. ELY: Yes, we have.
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: Are they in a
10	relatively sequential order of some kind, that you can
11	go find what you want with relative ease?
12	MR. ELY: I don't know if they would be in
13	a sequential order. However, they are available in a
14	binder type book, it is in the safety department.
15	But, once again, they are primarily going
16	to be locked up in the afternoon to midnight shift.
17	I think they do need to be made really accessible,
18	more so.
19	And, like I said, when you look through
20	it, it is not like a Cabellos book, where you have the
21	bows, and the rifles, and the clothing in the back.
22	Do you know what I'm saying? It is like, you've got
23	everything all over the place.
24	Like you might have one chemical here for
25	the prep plant, and you might have one over here for

1	aerosol cans. It is just real unorganized. And, like
2	you said, if someone got burnt, and you are trying to
3	find something real quick, it is going to add to the
4	mess, you know, trying to find it.
5	I think you know what I'm trying to say.
6	I'm not exactly sure how to do it.
7	MODERATOR TEASTER: Under what
8	circumstances do you go look at the MSDSs?
9	MR. ELY: We had a situation a while back
10	where they are adding a chemical to our water supply,
11	I believe it is called Polo, it smells like orange.
12	It is a wetting agent that they put in our water.
13	We looked over it for that. And, once
14	again, the information was sketchy, at best. And we
15	have been trying to get more information on that.
16	That was the last instance I can remember looking at
17	it.
18	And we do use the foam to spray over
19	casks, and seals underground. And we are constantly
20	fighting for respirators for the folks for that, and
21	the right type of respirator.
22	Once again we have the same problem, they
23	want to buy the cheapest thing on the market. Once
24	again, they are going to appease the law and say yes,
25	we have respirators. It is an age old fight.

1 But that is the last time I can recall looking at them. 2 3 MODERATOR TEASTER: The chemicals that you 4 use, and this goes specifically to this chemical that 5 has this orange, or citric type ingredient, does it have a label on it? 6 7 MR. ELY: Yes, it does. But it is hard to 8 get, because they put that in outside, up above our 9 prep plant, in our yard. And it comes in huge 10 barrels. And it is very --11 MODERATOR TEASTER: So it just goes into 12 the water system, as it goes underground? MR. ELY: The entire water system, yes. 13 14 Not directly handled. And it is diluted drastically. 15 I don't know what it is. It is a very, very small 16 amount. But you can smell it. And we've looked at it, and it does --17 like I said, it is sketchy, at best. And, once again, 18 19 you are not dealing with a brain surgeon here, you 2.0 know? 21 I mean, I try to do my best, but I can't 22 read some of that stuff. And that is another thing. 23 I think it needs to be written so the average guy can 24 read it. I'm doing my best but sometimes it is hard. 25 We are doing it in our best interest, you

know, but it is hard to keep up with.
MODERATOR TEASTER: Based on your
knowledge does the miners themselves request to look
at those MSDSs?
MR. ELY: Yes, they do. In this
particular case they have, and they continue to do so.
I have yet to convince them that it is not going to
kill them somewhere down the line, to be honest with
you.
I mean, it is still a concern in our mind.
And we have to get that under control. I mean, it is
still an issue, I will put it that way.
MR. FEEHAN: I am going to ask the same
question.
MR. ELY: Okay, I will give you the same
answer.
MR. FEEHAN: Do you know of unreported
chemically reported injuries, and can you quantify it?
MR. ELY: I can't really say of any
unreported chemically related injuries, I can't. I
would like to think that we have none, because I just
don't think we do at this point.
MODERATOR TEASTER: John, we appreciate
it.
MR. ELY: Sure, thank you for your time.

1 MODERATOR TEASTER: Let's go off the 2 record, Ed. 3 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 4 went off the record at 2:14 p.m. 5 went back on the record at 2:38 p.m.) MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is 6 7 Dwayne Barton, he is a coal miner. 8 MR. BARTON: Thank you. In opening I would like to thank the Panel for allowing me the time 9 to speak here to you today. 10 11 My name is Dwayne Barton, and I work for 12 New Brunswick Coal Limited. I come from the East 13 Coast of Canada. There I serve on the safety 14 committee, and I'm a recording secretary for the local 15 I've been a mine worker for 24 years. union. I've just recently been reelected to my 16 17 second term on Village Council. I've had the 18 opportunity and the honor to come down here for the 19 past ten years, to learn in this great facility that you have here in the United States of America. 20 21 And behind me all these Americans are my 22 friends, they have been my friends for a long time. 23 The other night at supper there was a discussion going on about a Hearing here today, the 24 25 one that you are having here today. And I said to

1 someone, what is the Hearing about? They said, 2 hazmat. 3 I said, what is hazmat? They said, that 4 is a system that they are trying to put into place for -- to deal with hazardous chemicals in the worksite. 5 I said, you are pulling my leg. They said, no, no. 6 I said, you don't have that in place yet? 7 In Canada we have been under the WHMIS 8 9 program for the past 20 years. WHMIS, which is 10 W-H-M-I-S, spelled is the workplace hazardous 11 materials information system. 12 It is a system that deals with everything 13 that is made in Canada, and shipped out to companies. 14 The company is responsible for providing --15 responsible for manufacturer is providing the companies with the information on everything they ship 16 17 us. 18 They have to tell us, first of all, what is in the product, what the name of the product is; 19 what are the possible harmful effects from the 20 product; what protective safety equipment do we need 21 22 to use this product, and what could we do if an accident happens while using this product. Plus a 1-23 800 number that we can get information that we are not 24

sure of.

1 I hope what I'm saying here this afternoon 2 will help you in making your decision to protect the 3 coal miners of the United States. And I hope the 4 United States government does catch up to Canada in 5 their program to protect them from chemicals. I don't know what kind of a cost you can 6 7 put on human life. I would like to say this, I hope 8 I don't offend anybody. But on September 11th you guys suffered a terrible, terrible thing here in the 9 10 United States. Six thousand people lost their lives 11 in the blink of an eye. 12 That is a terrible thing. And because it 13 all happened at once it received world-wide news, and 14 should have. We should be aware that there are 15 terrorists out there. But in the 20 years that the Canadians 16 17 have been protected by WHMIS, there is а 18 possibility that 6,000 Americans died from using chemicals on the work site. And I think it is time 19 2.0 that the United States government put their program 21 into place, and protected the lives of the miners here 22 in the United States of America. Thank you. 23 (Applause.) 24 MODERATOR TEASTER: No questions. 25 MR. BARTON: Thank you.

MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is 1 Danny Smith, United Mine Workers of America. 2 3 MR. SMITH: My name is Danny Smith, I've 4 been a United Mine Workers of America member as an 5 employee of U.S. Steel, number 50 mine, for 25 years. I have seen much new technology come to 6 7 the coal mines during those years, including the widespread use of chemicals. Today I'm here to speak 8 9 hazard communication rule on the that so 10 desperately need in our industry today. 11 In today's business world the right to 12 information is at a premium. However, in our 13 industry, this obviously does not apply. 14 We, as a workforce, have been trying to 15 obtain a fair hazard communication rule since November 2nd, 1987. Thus far this struggle has been very one-16 17 sided. 18 MSHA has had numerous opportunities to put this rule into effect. I would very much like to 19 20 express my concern about just some of the language in 21 our proposed rule, such as operator, or chemical 22 manufacturers being held responsible not 23 inaccurate labeling and material safety data sheets. We are being exposed to chemicals that we 24 25 are not familiar with, nor do we know what toxic

1 effects they may have on our health, or on the 2 environment. 3 We also need to know specifically what 4 first aid treatment to administer to ourselves, or our 5 coworkers, in case of exposure to these chemicals. problem not 6 This of knowing 7 chemicals, or their ill effects, will only grow as technology advances, and we are introduced to new 8 chemicals regularly in our workplace. 9 10 I have been in two information gathering 11 type meetings with MSHA in the past three months. I 12 have been quoted some of Mr. Lorenski's, the assistant secretary's goals for our industry for the next four 13 14 years. 15 He would like to have a 15 percent decrease in accidents and fatalities in each year, 16 17 during this time frame. We need this rule in order to 18 eliminate, or greatly reduce, the risk of injuries or 19 deaths relating to chemical exposure. 20 I have seen my employer apply for, and 21 receive, changes to MSHA regulations and plans, very 22 routinely. MSHA representatives always seem very 23 receptive to the employer's ideas. 24 It concerns me greatly that employees 25 cannot receive needed information about the hazards

1	that we are exposed to daily.
2	In closing, I would like to say that ours
3	is the only industry in West Virginia that this
4	crucial information is being withheld from. This has
5	been a hot and cold issue for almost 14 years, and
6	continues to be so.
7	If we aren't truly working to prevent
8	injuries and deaths, by enacting this rule, once and
9	for all, then I feel the matter should be completely
10	dropped, without the pretense of later consideration,
11	and being shoved back on a back shelf, as has been the
12	practice thus far.
13	Thank you for your time and patience in
14	hearing my concerns.
15	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Danny.
16	Danny, are you aware of any injuries that resulted
17	from chemical
18	MR. BARTON: No, sir, honestly I can't say
19	I've I can't honestly say that I have ever heard of
20	any at our mines.
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: How many miners do you
22	have?
23	MR. BARTON: Close to 500.
24	MODERATOR TEASTER: 500.
25	MR. BARTON: I'm an underground employee

and I've considered for years moving into our preparation plant. But after hearing what my union brothers and sisters are telling me about the chemicals there, you know, I'm kind of hesitant to go there now.

And I've been a safety committeeman for only three months, and I've already experienced one opportunity to deal with hazardous chemicals in that we were at our plant, on a different problem one day, and one of the mechanics come up to me and ask me about a particular chemical that they used. And I think it was the one that somebody said it was Floc, and he said he had asked for an MSDS sheet for it.

And it had been three days and the employee had not afforded him that sheet. So myself as a safety committeeman, and another safety committeeman, went to the company's safety person and asked for this. And they said they did not have it on the premises, but they would afford him one.

So two days later they came up with the sheet, the fellow called us and told us he had received the sheet on it. But, you know, I can relate to a lot of the chemicals that they are talking about using underground, as I don't know the exact name of the chemicals, but the type that they glue the top

1	with.
2	And we have sealed part of our mines off,
3	and they use a chemical similar to this when they
4	build the seals to put around it, to stop any leakage
5	through our seals, when we seal part of the mines off.
б	And as far as the Part 48 training, I've
7	had it for 24 years, and I can't remember any
8	relations, you know, referring to the hazardous
9	chemicals.
10	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Danny.
11	MR. BARTON: Thank you.
12	MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
13	Daniel Bradley, United Mine Workers.
14	MR. BRADLEY: That is David Bradley. My
15	name is David Bradley, and I work for Peabody Coal
16	Company in Boone County, West Virginia, and I'm a prep
17	plant utility man on the day shift.
18	In our prep plant we have stationary tanks
19	that we have floc, frother, kerosene, and other
20	chemicals I'm really not sure of, to be honest.
21	These are marked as hazardous chemicals,
22	but as far as any kind of data sheets, the data sheets
23	and MSDS sheets are over our heads to really get
24	anything out of.

I mean, you can look at it, and I'm not a

chemist like everybody else. They will use big words that we don't know what they are. Most of the people that use it, the fine coal circuit operators, know what they do, and what they are used for.

But to me they are not labeled right, and they need to be labeled in a safer manner. And I think everybody should be trained on exactly what we have, and what it will do.

Besides that I have a little story to tell about our supervisor asked me, like I said I'm a utility man, which I'm all over the plant, do different things. And he asked me to take the bobcat with the forks and go up and remove a 55 gallon drum, he said it is the only drum sitting there, behind the coal lab, and take it up to an old haul road that we use, where we have abandoned equipment, a junkyard basically.

So I got the bobcat and took it up there, and he said be real careful with it. It had never been opened, it wasn't labeled, nothing on it. And I noticed the bottom of the drum, it was on a wooden pallet, I noticed the bottom of the drum was rusted, it wasn't leaking, I made sure of that, because I didn't know what it was.

And I took it up to the haul road, and set

1 it out in the middle of a field, and I brought it 2 And when I came back I was curious, it was 3 quite a trip. So I went up and asked the coal lab man 4 what it was, and he said he thought it was perc, which 5 I didn't have any idea at the time what perc was. So he started explaining to me exaCtly 6 7 what perc was. And I went to my supervisor and asked him for MSDS sheet on it, and he pulled it out, which 8 I didn't look at it, he didn't hand it to me to look 9 He pulled it out, and he pronounced a name this 10 11 long, you know? And he said it is used to float coal. 12 after today, and I've talked to several people that is 13 14 more knowledgeable on this than what I am, it is 15 pretty bad stuff. And I've handled it several times like that. 16 And about a week or two after I had moved 17 18 that we had a state mine inspector come on the 19 property. So somehow he found out about the 55 gallon 20 I can't tell you where from. 21 But he managed to go up there and look at 22 it, and ordered it to be taken to the warehouse, in a 23 fenced off area that we have there, that we store 24 different things.

So it was there, never was labeled, and

1 probably a week later, I'm in the warehouse various 2 times during the day, and about a week later it 3 disappeared, never saw it again. I don't know where it went. 4 But something like that needs to be, you know, taken care of. If there is a hazardous chemical 6 7 on the property I think everybody should be aware of what it does, aware of what chemicals are involved in 8 9 all the processes of the plants. 10 Not one person, not the person that is 11 handling the chemicals, per se, is the fine coal 12 But I have to handle the chemicals circuit man. because of my job as a utility man. 13 And everyone 14 should know about them, because they are all around 15 it, every day, 24 hours a day. 16 And that is pretty much it. MODERATOR TEASTER: David, how long ago 17 was this? 18 19 BRADLEY: This was, I would say, 20 probably six months ago, six to eight months ago. 21 MODERATOR TEASTER: And there was no label 22 on that drum? MR. BRADLEY: No, no label. There was a 23 24 label that was on the drum, and it was probably four 25 inches square, that was paper, that was stuck on

1 there. And through the weather it had deteriorated, 2 and you couldn't read it to see what it was, or 3 whatever. 4 MODERATOR TEASTER: And do you have any 5 idea how long it had been there? MR. BRADLEY: No, not exactly. The man at 6 7 the coal lab that actually uses it, after I spoke with him, he told me it had been there a while. 8 9 doesn't use it on a regular basis. But it was there. And, of course, the bottom was rusted, it wasn't 10 11 leaking, but it showed signs of deterioration on the 12 metal. And he explained to me that since he used 13 14 it, and he was probably the most knowledgeable person 15 of it, I asked him what he did with it, and he said it was used to float coal. 16 And he said whenever he used it, he would 17 use an apron that was made out of a rubber material 18 19 with the arms, and they were just like a doctor's 20 jacket, or whatever, that you slip your arms through, 21 and ties up behind the neck, rubber gloves, and the 22 apron comes down here to cover him there. And he handles the material. And he said 23 24 at one time, and it didn't happen at that particular

site, that he had spilled some on his boot.

1 said he immediately went and washed it off of his work And through the day, as he went on, he didn't 2 3 change shoes, and didn't change socks. And when he 4 got home in the evening, that the top layer of skin 5 had been burned off of his foot like a blister, and he had ended up missing work. 6 7 But our coal samplers, our contractors, which I'm sure that, you know, like it didn't happen 8 9 on that site, but it was just something that happened, and it was something I thought that should have been, 10 11 you know, if it happened any time it is a terrible 12 thing. And a chemical like that is -- it doesn't need to be around the mines and not labeled. 13 14 And set aside, you know, out beside a road 15 where if you get it in the water table, it could get on anyone, and especially with the drum in that 16 condition. 17 MS. JONES: Excuse me, did the fellow who 18 19 had the rubber apron on, also have a respirator on? 20 MR. BRADLEY: Yes, yes, ma'am, he did. 21 And in our 8 hour retraining classes that we have, we 22 always take, they try to break it up to accommodate 23 everyone on the job. 24 We have deep mines, prep plant, and we

small strip job. And they try to cover

have a

1 everything. The safety department does a real fine 2 job there. And if you need any information they will 3 give it to you. 4 And, to be honest with you, I didn't 5 really know that the situation with the chemical, the laws and stuff, wasn't in effect, and wasn't covered 6 7 by MSHA. But I'm sure that anything that I need, 8 9 that would be in a reasonable manner, they would probably do to help, you know? 10 11 But it is just like any other thing, 12 companies aren't going to, and my company included, 13 they are not going to do anything to spend a whole lot 14 of money, I mean, in great amounts of money, to do 15 anything unless there is a real hazard, which there is a long-term hazard, I'm sure, after listening to 16 everyone today, there is a long-term hazard. 17 18 And the way we look at MSHA is when we see 19 an MSHA mine inspector pull on-site it is like a 20 knight in shining armor coming up. I mean, we really look up to MSHA. And if we have a problem that we 21 22 can't get fixed, we can always go to that man, and if 23 writes if it is a violation, it up, he 24 recommendation, that is one thing we can count on.

They are mostly stand-up people, and we

1 are hoping you all are going to be stand-up people on 2 You know, we hope you are. 3 MR. PHUC: Excuse me, I have a question. 4 Who usually conducts the part 48 training in your 5 mine? MR. BRADLEY: The safety department. 6 7 MR. PHUC: The safety department. So there is not like a contractor coming in? 8 9 MR. BRADLEY: No. As a matter of fact all the safety, the department, in our division they 10 11 usually get together, and they have a real, it is a 12 real informative 8 hour retraining. Like I said, they try to break it down, and try to cover the 13 14 things. 15 But we usually on the hazard materials, it is usually a 45 minute to an hour, to each class, and 16 17 it is covered, like for truck haulages an hour, hazard 18 materials is an hour. 19 But as far as the hazard materials go, I 20 have been there for 25 years, and the only thing that 21 I can remember covered in an hour's time, is always 22 wear rubber gloves, glasses, respirators. And a lot of times, you know, just like 23 24 everybody else, you can go to the supply house and 25 they say, well, we don't have that kind of respirator,

1	you are going to have to use this one.
2	And I know it is not, you might not be
3	exposed to it for about 15 or 20 minutes, but it is 15
4	or 20 minutes I don't want to be exposed to it. And
5	I will remove myself from the job if it comes to that,
6	now.
7	And I'm sure that anybody with a little
8	bit of common sense, I'm sure they will too, now. And
9	should before.
10	MR. PHUC: And how big is your mine?
11	MR. BRADLEY: At the prep plant we
12	probably have 30 people. And I know at the deep
13	mines, altogether, probably over 100.
14	MR. PHUC: Okay, thanks.
15	MS. HUTCHISON: In your annual refresher
16	training do they cover dust and noise?
17	MR. BRADLEY: Yes, ma'am.
18	MS. HUTCHISON: Okay, so they do cover
19	that?
20	MR. BRADLEY: Yes, ma'am.
21	MS. HUTCHISON: And they cover hazardous
22	materials in general, just not specific ones?
23	MR. BRADLEY: Right. They will cover
24	stuff like WD-40, stuff that, you know, that people
25	use every day, spray cans of paint, minor stuff like

1	that. And most of the people that are teaching the
2	class, and this is one thing that concerns me more
3	than anything, is the instructors at the class, I
4	mean, are college educated people, they are well
5	informed people.
6	But they don't have any idea what the
7	chemicals at our prep plant are, and what they are
8	used for. And to be honest, the people that actually
9	use it, don't really know what it is, and what it is
10	used for.
11	They know the names, and they have a, just
12	a real small idea of what it is. But as far as being
13	in-depth, they are just like everyone else. I think
14	that is one of the reasons that the company, I think
15	it is I don't want to say they are stupid.
16	But ignorance is the type of thing where
17	you are not informed about it, and if it doesn't
18	concern you, you don't worry about it. So nobody has
19	ever brought it up.
20	MS. HUTCHISON: How do you train new
21	miners about the chemical hazards, say you have a new
22	employee come to your prep plant?
23	MR. BRADLEY: We haven't had a new
24	employee there forever.
25	MS. HUTCHISON: Really?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, as a matter of fact we
have lost several. It is like everywhere else, there
has been reduction in work force, and cut back. And
unless they are actually put specifically on that job,
as far as being task trained on hazardous materials,
they are done a general task training job on the job
itself.
But as far as the chemicals go, like I
said, I don't think the supervisors even know, you
know, exactly what is going on. And it is a sad thing
that they don't.
I mean, if I was on a job like that, I
would want to know. And now that I know what I know
now, I will find out. I'll find out what it is. If
I do have to go the manufacturer, because I will go to
the safety department and get a list to find out.
MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, David.
MR. BRADLEY: You are welcome.
MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
Samuel Johnson, United Mine Workers.
MR. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Samuel
Johnson, I'm with the 1332 local, and I'm employed
with the United Mine Workers. I'm with Peabody Coal
in New Mexico.

this about what we are talking about everything, you know, the point of view how I see this whole thing. We can be talking, and talking, and even trying to beg you guys to, ask you guys to make a change.

But, you know, it is up to you as a panel to decide what is good for us or not. I'm not well educated, or I'm not a good speaker, or anything like that. But just by reading what I've read, I feel I understand, and I would like to bring it to a point that what are we waiting for?

Like our senators and congressmen are saying, what is -- we are going to have start thinking the unthinkable, and start doing the unthinkable.

And our nation knows, it was brought up that some unlabeled chemicals were going to be used in these air crop spraying machines. It is -- this issue is a big problem, which what do we, what does it take to happen, to make us wonder? These things could happen, a disaster. Are we waiting for a disaster to happen?

I feel if we don't do anything today, or in our time, I wouldn't be able to forgive myself saying that I never did try to make a change. And all I'm asking is we would like to make this change, to prevent any type of disaster from happening, before it

1 is too late. 2 Let's not have this incident happen in our 3 time, that is what I'm asking. That is all. I'm not 4 asking for much of your time, that is just my concern, 5 from my point of view, where this whole thing is a bigger issue than we are asking, unlabeled chemicals 6 7 coming to our nation from overseas, you know? By the time we find out what it is, it is 8 That is all. 9 too late. 10 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Sam. 11 Our next speaker is Tom Baker, United Mine 12 Workers. 13 My name is Tom Baker, I'm --MR. BAKER: 14 I worked 33 years in a surface mine in southeastern 15 I'm on the safety committee, also the mine Ohio. committee. 16 17 A few things I wanted to touch on have 18 already been covered, so I will make it a little short 19 here, to keep things moving. Under the current writing of the Rule mine 20 21 operators are required to prepare labels for any 22 hazardous chemical produced at the mine. However, the 23 Rule should also require the operator to place the 24 label on all containers that are used to store or

transport such material.

1 The UMWA is also very concerned with the 2 Agency's decision to allow a three month delay in 3 updating these labels. Operators must be aware of 4 what substances that they are creating at the time of labels, delaying 5 production. Delaying any labeling update simply places miners at risk. 6 7 A few things. One thing in particular I 8 want to talk about is the AMFO. AMFO was, a man by the name of the late Timothy McVeigh's weapon of 9 10 choice in Oklahoma City. Most οf the surface 11 operations use this product. It is ammonium nitrate 12 and fuel oil. When detonated, or fired in anything but 13 14 a perfect explosion, AMFO creates a hazardous gas, it 15 is an orange cloud of smoke. It spread out wide, no matter where you are at. 16 Where we work at we are surrounding by thousands of acres of reclaimed land. 17 18 This hazardous gas spreads out, it will 19 stop engines from running in vehicles. You just can't 20 hardly breathe it. We have MSDS on fuel oil, and 21 ammonium nitrate, but there has been a lot of talk, 22 even some talk of research on the gas that 23 We have nothing, there is nothing yet. produced.

I've been involved, I was involved with it

of my 33 that I worked out there.

for 22 years

24

1 have a lung fungus myself, I can't directly attribute 2 that to working around ammonium nitrate. 3 People Ι have worked with have 4 chemical burns from handling the nitrate, especially in the summertime when it is hot, their hands and arms 5 burned, have gotten burnt. In some cases they've had 6 7 to take time off. I guess talking about the poisonous gas, 8 we have created a chemical, or a chemical reaction. 9 10 I wanted to talk some about the prep plant, it has 11 been pretty well covered. 12 In my workplace we have three cancer One has passed away, one is on medical leave, 13 14 will never return, and one is now working with daily 15 medication. The recycling of the water, the process of 16 cleaning the sludge, the byproduct of the clean coal, 17 18 those are the different phases, is treated, pumped up 19 on the hill to the impoundment, floats down to our 20 clean pond, so to speak, back to the prep plant, and 21 the water is reused. 22 The only thing we don't do with that 23 water, we don't drink it. That has already been 24 covered. But the solvents we use for cleaning, we mix

and grease, we've created a chemical,

with oil

1 chemical reaction. Used grease is stored in barrels, some of 2 3 them are marked hazardous material, some are not 4 marked at all, they are picked up by an outside 5 contractor. There is nothing on the truck, labeling or anything on the truck that hauls the 6 7 grease away. So short and sweet, that is what I want to 8 9 talk about today. And I hope we can come up with Help us 10 something that everybody can live with. 11 miners working now, help our children, and the people 12 that work in the mines later, if there is mines to work at in years to come. 13 Thank you. 14 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Tom. 15 Tom, the three miners that you mentioned, that had contracted cancer, was there any connection 16 back with those diseases, back to their occupation? 17 No, there wasn't. 18 MR. BAKER: 19 were all three --20 MODERATOR TEASTER: Were they working at 21 the time they were diagnosed with cancer? 22 MR. BAKER: Yes, they were. One is still 23 working, one has passed away, and one --24 MODERATOR TEASTER: One of the speakers 25 earlier made a reference back that the doctor had said

1	that it was as a result of some handling of chemicals.
2	Do you know if that was the case here?
3	MR. BAKER: That has never, I've never
4	heard that with our people. It is the same as the
5	floc, it is a magnetite. But I've never heard that it
6	was directly connected with the chemical.
7	MODERATOR TEASTER: And were these three
8	miners exposed to essentially the same type of
9	chemical?
10	MR. BAKER: Exactly.
11	MODERATOR TEASTER: Over a prolonged
12	period?
13	MR. BAKER: Ten to twenty years.
14	MS. HUTCHISON: The Interim Final Rule
15	required that portable temporary transport containers
16	for hazardous chemicals did not, or it stated that
17	they did not have to be labeled if the person knew
18	what was in them.
19	And I was just wondering, when you were
20	talking about storage and transport containers, if you
21	were talking about these single use, or the small
22	transport containers that miners use when they take
23	chemicals as part of their job, to use?
24	MR. BAKER: Are you talking about the used
25	grease that I was referring to, that was picked up by

1	
2	MS. HUTCHISON: No, I'm not, I'm talking
3	about well, when you were speaking earlier, you
4	were talking about labels, and that storage and
5	transport containers need labels too, any labels that
6	were produced at the mine.
7	And I was wondering about, say, the grease
8	before it is used, unused grease, unlabeled hydraulic
9	fluid, lubricants.
LO	MR. BAKER: They are labeled what they
L1	are. As far as the hazards, no.
L2	MS. HUTCHISON: So in your experience
L3	these chemicals are already labeled when they are
L4	taken to be used by the individual miner?
L5	MR. BAKER: No. On the hazards? They are
L6	labeled hydraulic oil, bearing grease, motor oil. But
L7	they are not the information on the hazards of the
L8	material, no.
L9	MS. HUTCHISON: Okay. So would it be
20	sufficient, or adequate in your estimation, or
21	experience, that if the container said I don't
22	know, grease, or hydraulic fluid, that the miners
23	would know the hazards without them being listed on

MR. BAKER: Not really. It is something

the container?

24

1 you don't drink, or put on your face for makeup. 2 as far as the -- and we do have MSDS sheets on these 3 things. 4 But, like I said, you use a solvent to 5 clean grease, or hydraulic oil, or something like Have we created another chemical, have we 6 7 created a chemical reaction once we've cleaned this, 8 the hydraulic oil or the grease, have we created 9 something new here? That is what I was saying, more. 10 MS. HUTCHISON: Okay. Another question 11 about storage and transport. The Interim Final Rule 12 not require the labeling of also does storage containers for the mineral being mined, or milled, 13 14 while it is on mine property. 15 Were you intending that those be labeled as well? 16 17 MR. BAKER: Yes. MS. HUTCHISON: Like coal, or sand, or --18 19 MR. BAKER: No, not -- I was thinking 20 more, the fellow referred earlier to say that water 21 treatments on the road coming in, stuff like that. 22 What was put on the road, and it is worked into the 23 air, it is airborne. 24 MS. HUTCHISON: So you weren't referring 25 to the raw materials, you were referring to chemicals

1	that are produced by mixing other materials, or
2	reactions?
3	MR. BAKER: Reactions, yes.
4	MS. HUTCHISON: Thank you.
5	MR. BAKER: Thank you.
6	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Tom.
7	Our next speaker is Mike Browning, United
8	Mine Workers.
9	MR. BROWNING: Hello, I'm Mike Browning,
10	I'm from Local 9177.
11	You stand around and think about some of
12	these things these people said. I have sat here and
13	listened to this today. If we reflect back every one
14	of us knows people that has had cancer.
15	A number of us have known people that have
16	had several different diseases. And I have heard
17	questions up here today that several times, how come
18	you have not filled out an accident report out on
19	this?
20	Well, myself, I've experienced this
21	myself. I had an eye problem. Both of my eyes were
22	covering over. It looked like I had pink eye in both
23	eyes. I went to my doctor and he told me, he said,
24	one of his first questions to me were, what work
25	environment are you in?

1 So, to me, that tells me he suspects that 2 some kind of chemical is causing my problem. 3 went on for a three or four month period. 4 know what was causing my problem. He finally sent me to a specialist, and he checked my eyes, and he couldn't figure out what was 6 7 causing the problem. So he sent me back to my doctor, and through time and effort I finally figured out what 8 9 was causing my eye problem. It was a cleaner in an 10 aerosol can. 11 a citrus orange all purpose Ιt was 12 I quit using that cleaner. cleaner. I'm a mobile 13 equipment operator, and I was using it to clean the 14 inside of my vehicle, my truck. When I quit using t 15 product my eye problem went away. And I've had another problem. 16 17 shower at the bathhouse. I broke out in a rash. 18 treat the water there. I can no longer shower at that 19 bathhouse because the water breaks me out, because it is treated with chemicals. 2.0 21 I've heard all my union brothers and 22 sisters say today, they have poured their hearts out 23 here, these are things that -- it is tough teaching

every one of us, and it has made us more aware of our

environment around us.

24

1 We have been led into a false sense of 2 security at our workplaces, that these chemicals will not hurt us. 3 And when we don't fill out accident 4 reports it was because we don't know what has caused 5 the accident. And by the time we figure it out, or find 6 7 out what is causing it, it is too late, we have been 8 exposed to these chemicals. I feel that is why we 9 need these stiff regulations. I have a friend right now that is dying of 10 11 He has probably got three or four months to 12 And he is one of my coworkers. live. All these 13 chemicals that these guys have talked about today, I 14 have been exposed to. 15 What is this going to do to me? When it shows up, what am I going to be able to do about it? 16 17 If I would have had information on these chemicals, 18 and knew the hazards of these chemicals, I could have 19 protected myself. 20 But I didn't know the hazards, I don't 21 know what is going on. That is why we need a new, 22 stiff regulation to stop these chemicals. 23 I do mobile equipment work. Our plant is 24 idle on Mondays, I do maintenance work on Mondays. I

go in, I can't shower at the bathhouse. I go home, my

1	clothes are filthy.
2	My grandbabies come up to me. What am I
3	doing to my babies? We are asking you all for help,
4	and we want you to please help us in this, and get
5	something done. Thank you.
6	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Mike.
7	Mike, if we could, the chemical that you was using,
8	the orange spray that cleaned the inside of your
9	vehicle, did that have any type of label on it?
10	MR. BROWNING: It has labeling. I'm a
11	coal miner, I don't understand the labeling on it.
12	And even if I read it, it has a caution on it. I have
13	a false sense of security, they are not going to hurt
14	me, they are not going to give me something that is
15	going to hurt me. But they are.
16	MODERATOR TEASTER: It only affected your
17	eyes?
18	MR. BROWNING: They thought that I had
19	glaucoma, they thought I was going blind, and it was
20	the chemical.
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: But it only affected
22	your eyes?
23	MR. BROWNING: Just my eyes.
24	MODERATOR TEASTER: Was there anything on
25	there that mentioned about the potential damage or

irritation to the eyes?

MR. BROWNING: It is the same as all aerosol cans, use in a well ventilated area. You can open your doors on your truck, you clean your truck when you have time to clean it. If you are waiting on a load, you may be able to clean that truck.

That is part of our work order every day, clean your equipment. We will provide you with stuff to clean your equipment. Since then I've went to a furniture polish for mine, I won't use that stuff any more.

We use ammonia-based window cleaners in cabs of trucks, enclosed cabs. These cabs are to be sealed and kept sealed because of dust protection. But yet they are still telling us use this product to clean this. They don't care if they put us in a hazardous position, for the simple reason that there is nothing to make them to.

If we don't get a law, or something, we are going to kill ourselves slowly. We've got an opportunity here to do something, to change this. And if we don't change it, like some of the other guys said, we have failed.

I know you all are here working for us. Every one of us are safety committeeman, or mine

1 committeeman. Everyone of us have got people that we 2 are working for. We are here for basically the same 3 goal, to help protect our coworkers, and fellow 4 americans, and anybody else that it might help. And I love my family as much as anybody does. And I hate to think that I was the cause of one 6 7 of them getting a disease because I carried it home 8 from work. 9 MODERATOR TEASTER: Yes, I appreciate 10 that, and understand that, Mike. And we are trying to 11 get as much information as we can to draft this rule, 12 and draft something that is going to be helpful and meaningful. 13 And any questions that we ask is to 14 15 clarify and to expand on. Just like I ask about the 16 reading of this label, not to say it was your fault, 17 I was just trying to find out, are these labels giving us the information that we need to protect ourselves? 18 19 MR. BROWNING: No. 20 MODERATOR TEASTER: I think it may be in concert with the labels, with the MSDS sheets, and the 21 22 collectively, training, that the we can get 23 information that we need. 24 MR. BROWNING: It is so bad that it's got 25 to where if they got an empty container, and they need

1 a chemical, antifreeze is a common thing where we 2 work, they will take a blue ink pen and write 3 antifreeze on top of a can. 4 They will fill those cans up and store it, 5 sometimes on the top of, over our bathhouse, or over the mine office. You go up those steps when you need 6 7 antifreeze. If there is none, if somebody has used all the antifreeze in that area, they will grab one of 8 the white buckets, write in there antifreeze on top of 9 10 it, that is what you get. 11 It is -- it may be our fault because we 12 have let it go for so long. And we are there trying 13 to make a living. We are going to do what we can to 14 support and feed our families. 15 But I don't want to be put in a hazardous situation to support my family, if I can keep from it. 16 MR. PHUC: Was your injury reported? 17 18 MR. BROWNING: No. That is what I thought 19 I just explained. Instead of the company having to 20 pay compensation, which I didn't miss any work with 21 this, but it cost me a lot of my time, and it cost me 22 a lot of my money, and a lot of travel expenses, that 23 I had to pay for a chemical or a situation that they 24 put me in. 25 And if we had a stringent law that would

1 tell me, and I've heard some stuff on these training 2 classes, they try to cram so much into an 8 hour training class, there is no way we can go over this. 3 4 As I hear these other guys talk about 5 they've not had any hazard training, we just hired a new guy where I work. I done the task training for 6 7 some of the equipment he was running. And other 8 employees, coworkers, done some more of his task 9 training. 10 What was done was what I knew. I didn't 11 know that I needed to task train him on hazardous 12 conditions, because I wasn't aware of it. This trip to the Mine Academy, if I don't get nothing else out 13 14 of it, has been worth it, because I have learned a 15 little bit about hazardous materials, and their 16 effects. 17 And I hope that there is no more delay on this, that we can get this law into effect, and get it 18 19 settled, not only for our sakes, but for our kids' 20 sakes, and our family, and our coworkers. 21 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you Mike. 22 MS. HUTCHISON: The hazard communication 23 standard, for the most part, would not cover consumer 24 products such as you described, a window cleaner,

citrus orange, things like that that are used, just

1 like you would, in a normal household. 2 Our supposition was that the label on the 3 container, as required by the consumer product safety 4 commission, would contain enough information to help 5 you protect yourself. And since that does not seem to be the 6 7 case, how would you suggest that we remedy that situation? I want to, first of all, affirm that it is 8 very true that many people think that a consumer 9 10 product is safe just because they sell it in little 11 cans, and it has a label. 12 There are some extremely toxic chemicals in these little consumer products that are all around 13 14 the mines. And -- but this hazard communication 15 standard does not address them unless they are used in greater quantity, or more frequently than a normal 16 17 household use. 18 MR. BROWNING: We work in dusty 19 environment, and these containers are used every 20 shift, by each individual employee that drives that truck. That is a whole lot more than what you do in 21 22 a house. And as far as these chemicals, I think 23

anything that may harm me, or anyone else, should be

listed as hazardous. We talked about glue earlier, I

24

1 think you said that was exempt from this policy. 2 They had made, a couple of Mondays ago, 3 they glued ceramic in ceramic chutes for the coal to 4 keep from wearing the chutes out. We was having a 5 problem at our plant with those chutes stopping up. They had me take a hammer and break the 6 7 ceramic out of there. Then I had to take a cutting torch and cut through the glue, with the torch, and 8 What kind of gas did I create? 9 the metal. 10 know, because we have no sheets on it. 11 And I've heard you say that you want to 12 exempt certain things from this. This is where I say 13 that any chemical that is a potential hazard should be 14 covered under this agreement. 15 This is a common practice, I'm sure many 16 of my coworkers have done the same thing. 17 creating gases, we have no idea. Then after I cut it 18 out, I took a welding rod, and welded over the rest of 19 the area, and it heated the rest of the glue up around 20 that area. And this was all on a 12 hour shift. 21 22 probably spent 10 hours in that chute, welding 23 that, whatever fumes may have come off of there.

want to be able to see what that is going to do to me

before I'm put in that environment.

24

1	That is why I think any hazardous chemical
2	that is used in a mining operation, or anywhere,
3	should be listed as hazard, not exempt anything from
4	it.
5	MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Mike.
6	MR. BROWNING: Thank you all for your
7	patience.
8	MODERATOR TEASTER: Our next speaker is
9	Edward Yevincy of the UMWA.
10	MR. YEVINCY: Good afternoon. My name is
11	Edward Yevincy, local 2470. I have been employed in
12	the mining industry for 22 years. My employer is
13	Peabody Coal Company. The operation is Canton 9
14	preparation plant.
15	My concerns are dealing with MSDS sheets.
16	The company keeps the MSDS sheets on some of the
17	chemicals they use. I'm not sure about all the
18	chemicals they use.
19	This information is kept in the safety
20	supervisor's office, and that is not made readily
21	available to us at certain times of the day. I was
22	informed of this because I'm the chairman of the
23	safety committee.
24	They told me they keep this information
25	here, so they informed me, because I'm the chairman.

1 I don't know if the rest of the employees are aware of 2 where the MSDS sheets are located. 3 The company also changes distributors of 4 the chemicals. Sometimes they can get it through a 5 different company at a cheaper price, so they change distributors. if the 6 Τ don't know composition is made up the same as the previous 7 chemical we had. 8 And they also use the same MSDS sheets 9 chemical that 10 with the new came with the 11 chemicals. 12 problem is that some of Another the 13 employees I work with can't read. And the company has 14 made no effort to read these MSDS sheets to these 15 people that can't read, that have to use them. Myself I think that every new chemical in 16 17 the preparation plant, and every existing chemical 18 that has an MSDS sheet, should be read to the 19 employees, made readily available all and 20 employees. 21 Thank you. 22 MODERATOR TEASTER: Ed, you said that the 23 operators should read these MSDSs to folks that can't read. 24 25 MR. YEVINCY: Yes.

1	MODERATOR TEASTER: Are the other folks,
2	are the other miners reading them?
3	MR. YEVINCY: Some may be, not to my
4	knowledge, very few has. The only reason I'm aware of
5	them, like I said, is because I'm chairman of the
6	safety committee. But I don't know that all of them
7	are reading them.
8	And I know some of them have been set to
9	use these chemicals, or products, and they can't read.
10	So I know that the company people haven't went down
11	there and read these off to them, what this contains,
12	what cautions you are supposed to use.
13	MS. HUTCHISON: Have you personally read
14	any MSDS sheets?
15	MR. YEVINCY: Yes.
16	MS. HUTCHISON: Do you find them difficult
17	to understand?
18	MR. YEVINCY: Yes. Certain chemicals are
19	difficult to understand, terminology I'm not familiar
20	with, certain aspects of them, I don't understand
21	them, you know? I pretty much can.
22	MS. HUTCHISON: Did you see the video that
23	Richard showed yesterday?
24	MR. YEVINCY: No, I did not.
25	(Unmiked participant.)

1	MS. HUTCHISON: I was just wondering if
2	that helped you understand what the terms on the MSDS
3	meant.
4	MR. SNASHALL: Have you received, under
5	part 48, training in hazardous chemicals?
6	MR. YEVINCY: I have been employed 22
7	years with Peabody and to my knowledge never in annual
8	retraining have we went over anything to do with
9	chemical hazards, other than radioactive material that
10	we have located in our preparation plant.
11	MR. SNASHALL: And what about task
12	training, has there been anything in the health
13	aspects?
14	MR. YEVINCY: No, not on hazardous
15	materials, no.
16	MODERATOR TEASTER: Just broaden that to
17	any training. Have you had training in hazards
18	associated with chemicals?
19	MR. YEVINCY: If it is any at all, it was
20	very brief, and I can't recall any myself.
21	MODERATOR TEASTER: Okay. Thank you, Ed.
22	Our next speaker, and the last one that is
23	signed up is Tim Baker, from United Mine Workers.
24	MR. BAKER: I would like to thank you for
25	having the hearing, and allowing the concerns of a

1 whole lot of miners be heard. 2 I think there are some misconceptions And before I get into any major comments I 3 here. 4 would like to make a few brief comments on what I've 5 heard. You know, we have continued, or you've 6 7 continued to say how many times have you become aware of a chemical accident, and we have heard a few of 8 9 those. 10 But I think we are missing the point here. We will deal with a chemical accident, whether it is 11 12 a spill, or whatever it is, and somebody is burnt, is The major point here also is that after 13 one thing. 14 working with this stuff for 20 years, what do I have. 15 Latent effects are not an accident that happened today, they are not an accident that happened 16 17 three times over the course of a career. They are 18 what I breathe for 20 years. 19 They are what my employer brought into a 20 plant, told me I was going to use, and have to use to 21 get a job done. And I have no idea what it is, I 22 really have no idea what it is. So we need to look past this particular 23 24 incident that occurred today, I need to know what 25 happened from the careers of these guys, and for

1 myself.

And I guess before I get too far along, I should introduce myself. I am Tim Baker, I'm the Deputy Administrator of Occupational Health and Safety for the United Mine Workers.

Joe Main sends his apologies, he would have liked to have been here, but obviously other matters took him away.

The other thing I think that we miss is, we talk a lot about common sense. For any of you who have worked in the mining industry, miners generally speaking aren't allowed to have a whole lot of common sense on the job site. Like it or not, it is a fact.

You are told what to do, and when to do it, and how to do it, and there is not a whole lot of leeway here to say, gee, I wonder what effect that is going to have.

You know, a lot of things happen in an 8, or 10, or 12 hour shift that you have to keep that production going. And, you know, we have tried for years to convince operators that they need to hire us from the neck up, as well as the neck down, but a lot of them still don't believe it. And that is a matter of fact.

And I'm glad that we are finally seeing,

after 14 years, I'm glad somebody is finally seeing that we are not getting hazard training, and haven't been getting hazard training. And I have been in the industry 25 years, and I can say, without a doubt, I have never been trained.

In the 16 years I spent underground, I was never trained on the hazards of any chemical. So I don't think it should be a surprise. I don't think it should be a surprise at all.

What I think I want to focus on now, I want to read some comments that I have already prepared, and I will try to make it brief. But I think the issue is extremely important, and I think that when you look at where we are at, from 1987, we are no closer to a rule right now, than we were in 1987.

Because while we have this magic data out there, of June of 2002, something tells me we had a magic date of October 3rd, 2001. And I have to be honest with you. I'm disgusted with this whole process.

This process has been one of delay, and in my opinion, one of some deceit. We were told what we were going to get. We have never hidden the fact that we weren't necessarily happy with the whole package.

1 That we believed that it needed to be stronger. That 2 we building that the Interim Final Rule needed to have 3 more projections. 4 We have never made that a secret. But we 5 are also kind of realist. We said, you know, we will take what we can get at this point, and work for 6 7 something better. And now you jerked the rug out from under 8 us again. Frankly I don't believe MSHA when they tell 9 10 me that in June 2002 there is going to be a rule, I 11 don't believe you. 12 And until that rule is in effect, I find it hard to establish any faith along those lines. 13 14 have guys out here, and if you look, this may be 15 enough guys to run a typical prep plant in a 24 hour 16 period. These guys are handling chemicals day in 17 and day out. With that number, with what we've seen, 18 19 out of those 40 people you are going to have some 20 anomalies that just don't occur in nature. 21 You are going to have people that have 22 neurological damage that we can't explain. 23 going to have an incident rate in Parkinson's disease, 24 or Parkinson's syndrome, that is way past the national

average.

You are going to have cancers that you don't normally see from prep plant workers. That is the only thing they have in common, they don't golf at the same golf course, and drink the same water all the time.

The commonality is where they work. And I think that we have procrastinated long enough, we have played the game long enough. And we, frankly, have appeared the operators long enough. It is time to get a Rule.

The history of HAZCOM does date back to November of 1987 when the President of the UMWA, and the United Steel Workers of America requested MSHA to promulgate a rule to protect miners from hazardous chemicals and compounds.

Presidents Trumka and Williams cited specific instances where miners were exposed to chemical compounds resulting in serious injuries and health effects. And highlighted a series of chemicals found at the mine site that could seriously impact miners health and safety.

In almost every instance miners were never aware of the substances they were handling, or the risk that those substances presented. The Agency did respond four years later -- I'm sorry, three years

1 later, in 1990, when it published a notice of proposed 2 rulemaking. 3 Public hearings were subsequently held at 4 three locations, miners, representatives and miners, 5 operators and interested parties expressed their respective opinion on the need for the rule, and the 6 7 scope. The Agency officially closed the Rule 8 January 31st, 1992. Efforts to promulgate this much 9 10 needed rule remained dormant until 1999, when the 11 Agency reopened. 12 The Agency sought input to the effect that 13 regulatory mandates and executive orders. And I think 14 that it is important to note that that is exactly what 15 you asked for. That is all you asked for in 1999, what impact did these things have in the rule we are 16 17 going to propose. 18 The record closed again, and the record 19 closed in December 19th, 2000. We anticipated a rule in October of 2001. Nearly 14 years after the Agency 20 21 had been petitioned by the Mine Workers, and the Steel 22 Workers, they anticipated a rule would be designed to 23 reduce exposure to hazardous chemicals and compounds. Since that time the union has made efforts 24

to prepare its membership for the application of this

rule. The UMWA was under the impression that while some operators were unhappy with the scope of the rule, they too were preparing to implement it.

Unfortunately that was not the case. Instead of addressing the issues contained in the standard, and adopting plans to protect miners from unnecessary exposures, some operators worked to delay the much needed safeguards.

Sadly MSHA mad no real effort to resolve the issues through litigation. Their failure to make necessary efforts to implement a rule have once again left miners the victim.

Despite the objections of the original petitioning parties, and other interested groups, the Agency has given mine operators what they were unsuccessful in attaining in March of 1999, blocking projections from miners, and reopening the Rule for continued debate.

The Agency's granting of this request is totally contrary to the previous statement of October 3rd, 2000, when the Agency stated, substantive rulemaking issues, and regulatory alternatives have not changed since the close of the record in 1992. And the evidence in the rulemaking record is current. And those were the statements of Marvin Nichols.

Despite that fact the Agency has decided to continue this rulemaking history, instead of making history with a HAZCOM rule. The UMWA has, out of necessity, participated in every aspect of this process to date.

The union will continue to strongly express the need to protect workers from chemical exposures, and at the same time raise our objections to delaying tactics.

The UMWA will continue to seek, through whatever legal means available, to end this history of operator denial. The procrastination concerning this rule, on behalf of the nation's miners, and their health and safety, is intolerable.

We have talked, for some time, and you have heard a lot of people talk about the delays. And I think that there is a lot of frustration in this room. And maybe there is frustration on the Panel, I don't know the feeling of how that works.

But there were two reasons, the Agency gave two reasons for reopening this rule. And I have to be honest with you, they are disingenuous, at best, to suggest that one of the reasons being that operators had not had sufficient time to prepare comments, and review the Interim Final Rule before

1 comments were submitted in 1999, is absolutely 2 ridiculous. I would have thought, and I would have 3 4 hoped it would have been a little bit more creative 5 than that. But to suggest that they were not This thing started in 1987. They had 6 prepared? 7 plenty of time to get their act together. Then to also suggest that the other reason 8 9 for reopening the Rule was to make more clear to the 10 operators what they had to do for compliance purposes. 11 Again, what have they been doing, where have they been 12 at? 13 They know what chemicals they are buying. 14 They know what substances they are bringing to that 15 property. This is a basic a right to know as anything 16 else. 17 These individuals behind me work every day 18 with these substances, and have no clue as to what 19 I mean, we've delayed it long enough. they are. 20 And to open it on those two basis is 21 really something that I look at and I think, you know 22 what? Sometimes I can't read an MSDS sheet, and I 23 will be honest with you, sometimes I don't understand 24 that. But that struck me as we are being played off

as stupid.

Do you honestly expect us to stand here and believe that that is a rational reason for reopening this rule, they didn't know what to do for compliance? Well, in my estimation, if they don't know what to do with compliance, you put the Rule in effect, and you send an inspector out, and you write them enough tickets, they will figure out what to do with compliance in a big hurry.

That is a reality, that is how the system works. I have said it before at hearings, and I will say it again. The reason this industry is not back in 1945, is because MSHA has promulgated rules that won't allow that to happen.

If they could get along without hanging curtains, if they could get along without much ventilation, and if they could get along without controlling methane, because there was no rule, and no inspector, and nobody to write a ticket, they would be doing the same thing today that they did in 1940, or in 1969, when Farmington exploded. They would be doing the same things.

My concern also about the Rule is the fact that I'm afraid that there is not enough teeth in this thing. I'm afraid that an operator has too many loopholes, and too many ways to escape. We have heard

1 people talk about, you know, routine and foreseen 2 emergency, routine tasks, and foreseen emergencies. 3 You know, I can honestly, with very few 4 exceptions, see how we can construe just about 5 anything to be non-routine, and we can construe anything to be kind of an unforeseen emergency that 6 7 occurred. I think that that is a major loophole, I 8 think we need to close that loop. We need to look at 9 10 how we are going to get correct information on MSDS 11 sheets. 12 And I think that is a pretty basic thing that we need to discuss. We have MSDS sheets that 13 14 could arrive on mine property that are incorrect. And 15 the Rule basically alludes to the fact that that could 16 happen. 17 I mean, it says that you won't hold the 18 operator responsible if the MSDS sheet is incorrect. 19 And I just brought, you know, whatever it is onto the 20 site, and now the MSDS sheets -- who are we going to 21 hold responsible here? That is what I want to know. 22 I have 40 miners working at the prep 23 plant, I have 400 of them underground. I have an MSDS sheet that is absolutely worthless. And the operator 24 25 is not liable. And I quess I can basically understand

1 the logic when you say, he bought the product, he 2 didn't create it, right? 3 I can understand that logic. On the other 4 hand somebody has to be held responsible, and MSHA 5 cannot do anything about the guy that manufactured 6 this stuff, you are not going to reach that far to get 7 them. 8 What you have to do, whether it 9 labeling, or MSDS sheets, whether the Agency likes it 10 or not, somebody is going to have to get written up. 11 And the only person that can be is the operator. 12 I guarantee you, you write a ticket, and he is not going to buy chemicals from somebody that 13 14 gives him a bad MSDS sheet. I mean, that is pretty 15 simple logic. So we need to -- we need to look at that. 16 17 Also when we begin to discuss what is hazardous, what isn't hazardous, first of all let's cut the operator 18 19 out of this. I'm not so sure I want my operator, 20 where I used to work at R&P Coal and they are not in 21 business anymore, I'm not sure I want any of those 22 folks determining for me what is a hazard and what is 23 not. 24 I want somebody out there that is with a 25 little bit of objectivity, just somebody that doesn't

1 necessarily have a pony in the race. It is just going 2 to tell me this is the hazard that you are facing. 3 So we need to eliminate that. And we need 4 to be honest about what a hazardous chemical is. And 5 when you are dealing with this stuff, any chemical is I mean, medication, like somebody said 6 a hazard. 7 before, medication is a hazard, chemicals are a It just depends on the dose. 8 9 If you get the right dose you are cured, no problem, it is great. If you get the wrong dose, 10 11 you are just as dead as anybody else would be. 12 So when they bring it in, if it is a 13 chemical, it is a hazard. And it goes to all those 14 things like WD-40, and Windex, and all those other 15 things. Because you know what? At the mine we don't use them the same way, and we don't use them in the 16 17 same quantity. 18 if think know, you about this You 19 logically, when was the last time you went through 20 five gallons of WD-40 in your household? I probably have a couple of cans I've had for a couple of years. 21 22 But you will go through five gallons in that shop, or 23 in that prep plant, or underground, in absolutely no 24 time at all.

It may last a week, if you are lucky.

we are using huge amounts. But Consumer Product Safety Commission doesn't deal with the conditions that I live with. They are not at the mine, they don't understand what that product is being used for.

I'm dumping WD-40 on hot surfaces, I'm creating vapors. We need to have some kind of labeling, we need to have some kind of control over what is going on.

And to be honest with you there is a lot of folks out there that don't see a problem with doing that, they've done it for years. They've never had hazard training tell them not to. We need to look at those things, we need to be realists about how those things occur.

I think enough has been said, I guess, about training the trainers. If I'm going to have somebody train me on the hazards of chemicals, I want to make sure they know what they are talking about.

I would imagine there may be a few health and safety directors out there, for some of these operations, that understand some of these things. But by and large they are coal miners, too. They came from the same place we came from, have a little more training maybe here and there, but they are not going to know what those chemicals are. They are not going

to understand how to explain them to you.

So they need to have training before they give us training. Retraining, 8 hour retraining is a sensitive issue. We need 8 hour retraining, absolutely. I'm thinking maybe when we get all this stuff heaped on top of it, we might look at 16 hours of retraining, because we are dealing with ventilation plans, we are dealing with roof control plans, we are dealing with ground control plans, we are dealing with first aid, we are dealing with all these issues.

And let's be realists about this. You can't fit it in, in 8 hours. So we may need to address those things.

Labeling of any container should be required. I don't care if the 55 gallon drum, or a, you know, two pint bucket you are going to carry things around in. And the Rule says, you know, you can have a portable container that doesn't have to be labeled, provided you keep it with you at all times, or you use it all by the end of the shift.

You have to be at the mine to understand that that guy is not going to necessarily be able to keep track of that, for that entire shift. I mean, if I'm working over here on a dozer, and I have a bucket of whatever chemical it may be, sitting beside me, and

I'm going to use it to wash this thing down, and that drag line goes down, I know where I'm going, and I'm not going to pick that bucket up to get it, because the boss is going to come and get me and tell me, get out there, the drag line is not running, we are not loading coal, the heck with the dozer, okay?

I mean, and we are not going to pick it up. I don't understand the -- and I don't understand this, and maybe somebody can enlighten me. But I don't understand what is the big deal of having a label on a portable container. I don't understand that. You use it for the same thing every time, and instead of maybe having three portable containers that you can switch out for 12 chemicals, buy 12 portable containers, and put a sticker on it, folks. I mean, it is not that tough.

We also believe that any chemicals that leave the property should be labeled, should have an MSDS sheet. Whatever they happen to create. And I'm not talking raw coal, and I'm not talking sand. But if there are chemicals in the soups that they make there, that they have to get off-site, and it doesn't necessarily go through a settling pond, anything that they send out there that is a chemical hazard should be labeled, anything downstream should have a label on

∥ it.

People should understand what we are producing out there, and sending to them. And we need, we truly need to look at that.

Briefly, I guess, we deal with some of the regulations of the EPA because you say that things that are regulated by the EPA aren't necessarily regulated here. And I would, without getting into great detail, I would suggest that somebody look into the application of biosolids on these reclamation projects.

And, you know, biosolids sludge is a big ticket item and Pennsylvania produces, you know, millions of tons, and I think New York produces millions of tons. And now we have our guys spreading this stuff on the fields for growing grass, growing crops, growing whatever they happen to be farming at the time.

There are heavy metals in this stuff, there is bacteria in this stuff. We need to look at what we are putting out there as far as a biohazard is concerned.

I could probably go on longer, but I think, to be honest with you, most of these guys have just about covered every issue. I would like to try

1 to tie things together, and let you know that while I 2 can honestly say that there is nobody on this panel 3 that I have animosity towards. 4 You are doing your job, and I think some of you do it well, and the others that I don't know 5 I'm guessing you do it well. I think the Agency, as 6 7 a whole, has frustrated us, on numerous occasions. And they frustrated us on this rule on more than one 8 occasion, and they've delayed it. 9 10 And, let's be honest, we wouldn't have 11 gotten the thing out in 1999 if we hadn't filed a 12 lawsuit. We are just asking for a little help here. If we could do this on our own, I would be 13 14 honest with you, if we could do this on our own, we 15 would do it. But we don't have that ability. We need something that is out there. 16 And, Lord knows, I deal mostly with coal 17 operators, and I have not had one of them come to me 18 19 and saying, Tim, we are the ones bitching about this. 20 Because they would tell me straight up. 21 Now, I don't know what the aggregate 22 industry is doing, but if it is not the coal industry, 23 it has to be sand and gravel, and somebody else. They need just as much protection as these coal miners 24

sitting behind me, they are going to deal with the

same stuff.

They have to get with the program at some point, and they just need to do that. We just need the Rule, it is as basic as that. We need the Rule. We are not happy with it, I've given suggestions on how to tighten it up.

I would ask you to take those suggestions back, because I would be honest with you, in the opening that you gave, Ernie, I didn't see one suggestion. I did not see one suggestion that the union made the last time it gave comments.

I have seen suggestions that the operator gave, but I didn't see any of ours. And I think that is a little disheartening. I think that it becomes clearer and clearer why the Rule is reopened, and we are disappointed with that fact.

And with that I will entertain any questions. I hope I haven't run on too long. But the issue has a life of its own in some respects.

MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you, Tim. No, you have not run on too long. Just to clarify, my understanding of the Rule is, in the use of WD-40, when you use this thing, as you indicated, that that would clearly fall under the Rule, that that is certainly outside the use of a normal household

consumer type thing.

MR. BAKER: Well, and maybe I can -- and if that is true, that is fine. But maybe we can look at, and what you need to look at is the case for solcenic at this point. And I think somebody mentioned that before. You know it is an antifreeze that they use in the hydraulic jacks.

Now, that is not going to be regulated from the way I understand this rule. But I would suggest that you look at those situations where I have at least 20 cases of cancer, whether it is liver cancer, or kidney cancer.

Whatever those things are, I mean, we have a problem with this. And I'm not sure that it is the solcenic, per se. Now they are telling me that they have done a survey, they don't believe it is solcenic, but they believe it is the fungicide that they put in the solcenic.

To me, you know, you've lost me when you talk about solcenic, generally. But we need to look at those things. We are spilling a million and a half gallons of that stuff, underground every year, at that mine. And I have 20 cases of strange cancer, organ cancer.

Those things need to be regulated, those

1	things need to be tied up. And I could be wrong, but
2	this is an antifreeze. We are talking all they are
3	using it for is an antifreeze. The concentrations may
4	be less than what you would normally use daily in your
5	car, where you would be around if you put it in your
6	car. But we are dumping a bunch of it.
7	So, you know, I just believe there are a
8	lot of loopholes we need to tie up.
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: Tim, one other
10	question. What do you think the qualifications of the
11	person providing the training on the chemical hazards
12	should possess, background training?
13	MR. BAKER: Well, you know, I would like
14	to say I would like to have an engineer or somebody do
15	it, you know, like a Dr. Weeks, or something. But we
16	have to be realists about how we train those folks.
17	
18	But I think that these companies could
19	certainly get their safety inspectors, or trainers, or
20	whoever they are going to have, because usually it is
21	the safety inspector at the mine that runs the
22	training.
23	Send them to a class with a Weeks, or a
	1
24	PhD, or somebody that understands chemicals, and at

with Jim, somebody that can explain it in real basic terms, and real layman's terms, so they understand it, and then bring that information back.

And I'm not faulting the guy at the mine.

I mean, he is doing his best, I'm sure, to get the information out. But he -- listen, maybe he does understand those 26 letter words, but I sure can't. And we just need to get someone that does to explain it to him simply, and we can go on with training.

And I think that could be, you know, if you have a relationship with some of these folks, and you bring a new chemical in, it wouldn't be a problem for you to pick up the phone, as a safety guy, and call the guy over there and say, what is this stuff, and what do I need to know about it? And relay that to your own workers.

MODERATOR TEASTER: Yes. I think it is important, a lot of us have never learned those big words, or exactly what all is contained in them. I think the important things we know is how to use this safely, and what effect that can have on us, what we need to do to protect ourselves, rather than trying to — we may all fail that test if we have to pronounce all them words when we come out of the training.

1 MR. BAKER: Yes, you know, that is 2 certainly a major part of it. And, you know, 3 understanding not only what it is, but being specific. 4 And I think somebody earlier mentioned That is a thousand different 5 petroleum distillates. What is that? That could be any one of a 6 things. 7 thousand different compounds. You know, diesel fuel, what is it? 8 Having something like that on an MSDS 9 10 sheet is generally useless. I mean, what do I do to 11 control that? But having basic information that is 12 easy for them to understand, and what they do if there is a spill, or what they do if there is an accident. 13 14 Basic layman's terms need to be out there, 15 I mean, if it just says call the fire you know? department on the bottom, we know how to do that, you 16 17 know what I mean? Don't touch, call the fire 18 department. Not a long drawn out dissertation, like 19 I'm giving now. 2.0 MODERATOR TEASTER: Thank you Tim. 21 MR. BAKER: I thank you very much. And we 22 do very much appreciate speaking here. We appreciate your indulgence, and hope that you go away with an 23 understanding of just what our level of concern is, 24

thank you.

1	MS. HUTCHISON: Are you going to leave a
2	copy of your statement?
3	MR. BAKER: No, I will submit a copy, and
4	some of it will be contained in there, but this is the
5	working draft, and I'm not going to leave that, okay?
6	MODERATOR TEASTER: That is fine.
7	MR. BAKER: Thank you.
8	(Applause.)
9	MODERATOR TEASTER: Is there anyone else
10	that has not signed up, that would like to speak? You
11	can come forward and identify yourself, we would
12	appreciate it.
13	MR. STEMKOWSKI: Believe me, this is
14	totally I want to apologize to Mr. Baker. I don't
15	know anyone here but Mr. Baker, only by telephone, and
16	a fellow I came from eastern Ohio with.
17	My name is Stan Stemkowski, I'm from Local
18	1506. I have 32 years mining experience with
19	Consolidation Coal Company. I am on the safety
20	committee, probably for the last six or seven years.
21	I wasn't going to say a word here today.
22	I was asked yesterday, this week in class, if I would
23	like to speak, and I was so timid, I said no. Never
24	done this before.
25	But having sat here and listened to these

people, and I have seen that they are not as professional, probably as I am, at least I'm not afraid to get up here. I think they've all done a fantastic job.

But I could not go home without putting two cents' worth in here. If my wife was here, which she is back in the room she would probably say, oh, no.

But Part 48, I heard you talk about that. And I'm not versed at this, and believe me this is not rehearsed. In my 32 years with having gone to the annual retraining, and I have seen you people ask several people about that Part 48.

That annual retraining we've gotten it every year, faithfully, and I believe they've always tried their best. But as far as hazmat, and hazardous chemicals, I'm here to tell you we have gotten very little to none. And I mean that from the bottom of my heart.

And I can't speak for the other mines, but I've got 32 years at Consol, I started as a field mechanic, I worked as a regular mechanic, I've been a truck driver, I've been a certified welder, used a lot of chemicals, WD-40, on the shovel, I work on the silver spade, we probably go through a case of WD-40

a week.

Other spray cans of stuff I don't know the chemical ingredients. There is a cutter solvent that we use to wash off the nozzles of the spray guns that we put dope on the gearing, and stuff, I don't know what the chemical is in there. I have never been told the hazards of it, I've never been told to wear a mask when I use it, I've never even been told to use gloves.

Yes, common sense tells me to use gloves because it is messy, okay? Here is how strong that stuff is. I was wearing a hard hat, we always wear a hard hat, that is standard procedure. You don't go on Consol property without a hard hat, glasses, and gloves, and hard toes.

Those doggone, that can of stuff there is so strong, it gets on your glasses, it cleans it off good. Had a horrible hard hat, couldn't rub it off, couldn't wash it with regular solvent. I thought it cuts that grease off that nozzle, that doggone thing, I'm going to use it on there.

So I sprayed it on my hard hat and it cleaned it beautifully. I said, this is the stuff to clean it with. After one week my hard hat fell totally apart. I'm standing here to tell you that.

Now, it had stress cracks in it, I grant you. But I've cleaned it with a lot of things before, other type cleaners, and I don't know what it did. But after sitting and listening to those people, stuff like this, and I was not forewarned how -- I grant you, there is a label on the can, you know, caution this, caution that. But I never dreamt that it was that strong that it would do something like that. And I'm thinking, if it is going to ruin my hard hat, what is it going to do to me? ever said, Stan be careful with that stuff. think I could add much more, other than what these people put in. Like I've said, they have done their Some of them are just like me, they come up homework. here out of their heart, and that is where I'm speaking to you people, out of my heart. Never heard of this law coming into effect, or this ruling, until I come down here. This is the first year I've been to the Academy. Believe me, I've learned a lot this week, especially about how things work here. And I will say one more thing. Being on the safety committee for the last

six or seven years, every time an MSHA man shows up,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 that is like the police, buddy, we are going to go in, and we are going to inspect this place, and Consol 2 does respect what they have to say, and we get their 3 4 attention. 5 So therefore I respect if you people come down and help us to get some compliance for this sort 6 7 of thing. I don't know what is involved in the 8 procedure, or whatever. 9 And, once again, I want to apologize to 10 What, another speaker? I was supposed to 11 finish here. But I just felt my heart, I had to come 12 up here and put my two cents' worth in. If there is any questions that I could 13 14 answer for you, I don't know what I could, but I will 15 try. 16 MODERATOR TEASTER: We appreciate you 17 coming up. I'm sure Tim don't mind you coming up. We appreciate all the comments that we 18 19 received here today. Hopefully they are going to be 20 all taking into consideration when we draft this final 21 rule, and we are going to come out a rule that is 22 going to do the job that it is intended to do. 23 The record, I will remind you, does close 24 on October 17th of this year. We encourage all of you 25 that would like to submit comments, to submit them to

1 the Agency. They will be included with the comments 2 that we got on the record here today, and they will 3 all be taken into consideration in drafting the final 4 rule. 5 We have five other public Hearings that will be held on this rule. Four of them will be next 6 7 week. One will be in Dallas on Tuesday, and on the 8 same date there will be one in Salt Lake City. then on Thursday of next week there will be two held, 9 10 one in Reno, Nevada, and the other one in Birmingham, 11 Alabama. 12 The following week I think it is on the 13 10th of October, it will be the seventh and final 14 Hearing on this Interim Final Rule. And we welcome 15 you to attend, to participate in any of those Hearings 16 that are remaining. 17 And, again, any comments you've got, please submit them to us, and they will be given due 18 consideration. 19 And with that we will close the record. 20 And thanks, all of you, for coming. 21 22 (Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m. the above-23 entitled matter was concluded.) 24 25