# TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

A PUBLIC HEARING ON REGULATIONS FOR MINER SAFETY AND HEALTH TRAINING

Pages: 1 through 142

Place: College Park, Georgia

Date: January 7, 1999

### HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C.
(202) 628-4888

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

### A PUBLIC HEARING

ON REGULATIONS FOR MINER SAFETY AND HEALTH TRAINING

Biltmore III Room Georgia International Trade & Convention Center 1902 Sullivan Road College Park, Georgia

Thursday, January 7, 1999 8:00 a.m.

MSHA PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

KATHY ALEJANDRO, Presiding ROSYLN FONTAINE, Member RODRIC BRELAND, Member KEVIN BURNS, Member

## $\underline{\text{I}} \ \underline{\text{N}} \ \underline{\text{D}} \ \underline{\text{E}} \ \underline{\text{X}}$

<u>COMMENTS</u> <u>BY</u> :	PAGE
Opening Remarks, Ms. Alejandro	 3
Dick Martin	 8
Charles Machemehl	 39
Ronnie Colson	 62
Ken Stockton	 74
Bobby Rider	 80
Ben Hart	 92
Kenneth Jackman	 107
Frank Ford	 120
Ed Elliott	 130
Closing Remarks, Ms. Alejandro	 137

Page 3

### 

### PROCEEDINGS

MS. ALEJANDRO: Good morning.

My name is Kathy Alejandro, and I am with Metal and Nonmetal Mine Safety and Health with the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

On behalf of the Mine Safety and Health

Administration I would like to welcome you to the last of seven public meetings on regulations for miner safety and health training.

These meetings are intended to give individuals and organizations, including miners and their representatives, and mine operators, both large and small, an opportunity to present their views on the types of requirements that will result in the most effective miner safety and health training.

These regulations would apply at those nonmetal surface mines were MSHA currently cannot enforce existing training requirements.

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the members of the MSHA panel who are here with me this morning.

To my immediate left is Rosyln Fontaine of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances with MSHA;

To my immediate right is Rod Breland who is the Western Operations Manager of the newly-formed Educational

1 | Field Services within MSHA; and

To my far right is Kevin Burns who is also with Metal and Nonmetal Mine Safety and Health with MSHA.

Since 1979, MSHA has been guided by a rider to its appropriations. The restriction currently states that:

...none of the funds appropriated shall be obligated or expended to carry out Section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, or to carry out that portion of Section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

In the omnibus budget passed by Congress on October 21st, 1998, MSHA f directed to:

...work with the affected industries, mine operators, workers, labor organizations, and other affected and interested parties to promulgate final training regulations for the affected industries by September 30, 1999. It is understood that these regulations are to be based on a draft submitted to MSHA by the Coalition for Effective Miner Training no later than February 1, 1999.

MSHA expects to publish a proposed rule in the Federal Register some time in the spring of 1999.

The regulations that MSHA will be developing must

include the minimum requirements in Section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1997, and I will give you a short summary of those requirements.

Section 115 provides that every mine operator shall have a health and safety training program that is approved by the Secretary of Labor, and that complies with certain requirements.

Section 115 specifies that surface miners are to receive no less than 24 hours of new miner training, no less than eight hours of refresher training annually, and task training for new work assignments.

Section 115 also requires that the training cover specific subject areas, provides that the training is to be conducted during normal work hours at normal rates of pay, requires that miners be reimbursed for additional costs they incur incidental to such training, and provides that mine operators must maintain miners' training certificates and furnish such records to the miners.

In addition to these minimum requirements, MSHA is looking for suggestions, MSHA is looking for suggestions and comments as to how best to achieve effective miner safety and health training consistent with the Mine Act, including any additional requirements that should be included in the proposed rule and, most importantly, why.

Public meetings have already been held at six

locations: In North Brook, Illinois; Denver, Colorado; Albany, New York; Portland, Oregon; Ontario, California; and 3 in Dallas, Texas.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These meetings have been intended to give as many individuals and organizations as possible an opportunity to present their views on these issues.

We intend to conduct this meeting in an informal manner. As you can see, a court reporter is making a transcript of the proceedings. Anyone who wishes to speak at this meeting and has not signed up in advance should sign up on the speakers' list which is located currently on this table with me.

We also ask that everyone who is here today, whether or not you wish to speak, sign the attendance sheet which is located in the back of the room on table with the water.

Anyone who wishes may also submit written statements and information to us either during the course of this meeting, or at some point after the meeting, and we will incorporate this information in the record when the proposed rule is developed.

Although there is no formal deadline for the submission of written comments, we are encouraging everyone to submit their comments on or before February 1st of 1999 to ensure that we can give full consideration to your

1 | suggestions and your input.

2.0

Although we are most interested in what you have to say to us, we will also attempt to answer any questions you may have to clarify the process and the purpose of this meeting.

We are specifically interested in comments addressing certain areas, although you are strongly encouraged to comment on any issue related to miner safety and health training at currently-exempt mines. These issues were outlined in the November 3rd Federal Register notice that announced the schedule of public meetings, and I will summarize them:

Should certain terms, including "new miner" and "experienced miner" be defined?

Which subjects should be taught before a new miner is assigned work, even if the work is done under close supervision?

Should training for inexperienced miners be given all at once, or over a period of time, such as several weeks or months?

Should supervisors be subject to the same training requirements as miners?

Should task training be required whenever a miner receives a work assignment that involves new and unfamiliar tasks?

Should specific subject areas be covered during
annual refresher training? If no, what subject areas should
be included?

Can the eight hours of annual refresher training
required by the Mine Act be completed in segments of training

lasting less than thirty minutes?

Should the records of training be kept by the mine operator at the mine site, or can they be kept at other

Should there be minimum qualifications for persons who conduct miner training? If so, what qualifications are appropriate?

I would now like to introduce the first speaker this morning. We ask that all speakers state their name for the court reporter before beginning their presentation, and also spell their names.

And, again, thank you very much for attending this morning.

The first speaker on our list is Dick Martin from Watson Gravel. Mr. Martin.

21 DICK MARTIN, WATSON GRAVEL

locations?

MR. MARTIN: I am Dick Martin with Watson Gravel in Cincinnati, Ohio.

We are a small operator up in that area, and we have been involved in this part of this training area since

1 | 19 -- let's see, it was the first year it was put into effect 2 | -- '78, '77 or '78.

When I came away from that meeting, and there was probably about a dozen people in Vincennes, Indiana at that time at the meeting -- we had like a Sears and Roebuck catalog with us as far as the training and everything, and it scared everybody to death.

I hope that this new thing here that you're putting in won't do that, and I've got some comments, and I have talked to a lot of the operators in the Cincinnati area, the small operators, and also I am a past board member for Ohio Aggregate Association for the small groups of people, and I talked to them, too, and it's almost the consensus of opinion through the whole group that we need something that we can work with there, and we hope that it's a little bit simpler.

I think the first thing here I would like to talk to is here is a copy of an outline for training, and with that it says 24 hours of training before a person can start to work.

Most people I think when they make this thing out is that it's almost like a pie, it's 24 hours, and then they try to work out the segments and different things that's in here as far as statutory rights of miners, first aid, things like that. And they come up with something that's really not workable.

We have people in our area that's got four or five mine operators that work there, and to sit down and talk to them for two or three hours about the statutory rights of miners or, you know, they try to put this in it's just -- but we have inspectors come in, and periodically they will ask somebody "Have you been trained?" "Yeah." "How much training?" and then they will come back to the operator and say "That man says that you didn't talk to him for so many hours."

You know, it's just like on some electrical. We've got people who have -- a front-end loader, they load into a hopper, and it's only got one conveyor, and you can't talk to that person I don't think about the hazards of electricity for six hours when he's only got one thing to do, and that's press a button, you know, to make it run.

So I hope these things are taken into consideration on this thing here.

We don't want anybody to get hurt on the job. When you're a small operator I think you're even closer to your people than you are when you're a large operator, and we're almost like family.

So we want something that we can prove to you that we've done the training, that the people know what's going on, you can talk to them freely. Our doors are always open to inspectors. We just want something workable.

On the 24 hours of training, I think that that shouldn't be set in stone. I just don't think so, because the 24-hour training before you put somebody to work, the way we do it and the training that you do after the fact, after they first get started and things like that, it always adds up to more than 24 hours.

And it's an ongoing thing. Training is an ongoing thing in the gravel industry especially, and I imagine most every place else you just constantly do this.

Some people when it gets down so far you call it refresher training, but mainly, you know -- and I think if we could do this, get the person that's trained on the job and all the things that you're asking for here within thirty to sixty days I think is good, and I think it's workable. I think that would work fine.

We do have some people there that come in. We have a large farming area there, and we have people, a lot of people we hire in, they're the farm boys and things like that. They know a lot of things before they ever get the job, and they might be newly-hired inexperienced people, but they're experienced in heavy equipment and things like this, and electric, and hazards, and so I think you just as a -- I think it's almost a refresher training for them, it's not a new training, and this should be taken into consideration.

On the one thing that they hit on here very hard,

and it's very important, and that is first aid training. To bring a person in off the street and give him seminars on first aid training, CPR, and things like this before you ever take him out and put him in the gravel pit, I just don't think that that's necessary for that whole thing to be done.

I think that you can cover some CPR and control bleeding, pressure points, things like this, and we've got first aid around the gravel company there and things like this, that that should be sufficient for something like that because we -- every year we have open-door policy for first aid training in our company. And just like I say, we're just a small company, we've got two small gravel pits there.

And we've had a lot of other people in the area follow our course on the thing, and that is that we offer first aid training for the people, we give them CPR, the full amount of it every year, and we give them refresher training every year on the thing there. So we've got a constant flow of first aid training going on all the time.

We bring people in, and they do it in the conference room, which we have a conference trailer. I've done it in the small motels there in town that's got a conference room, I bring them in there, and it's workable.

We do it for two reasons. For the employee that he knows what he's doing when he's on the job, and it's also for when he's at home or away from the job there. It's proved

out it's worked real good for that.

On the new hire/experienced miners, I've got -- I think that everybody up there has done the same thing is that after verbal questioning on qualifications for the job they are hired and basic off-the-job hazard training should be completed, and the rest of the health and safety training could be completed on the job there, just like we normally do that now.

And then this information could be put on their certificate. In other words, if a person comes in he might have been running a backhoe for somebody on a construction site for two or three years, or driving a dump truck on the job, and they come in there, they're a new hire, inexperienced miners, but they've got the experience in the thing that they're going to do, and I think that should be taken into consideration, and that can be put on their hiring thing there so that's part of the training there.

Refresher training. We have safety meetings and information meetings where we sit down and talk to the people, and I think that this should tally in on their refresher training as far as their jobs. We have refresher training on first aid. We cover these things.

It might only be maybe ten or fifteen minutes to the meeting, or maybe twenty minutes to the meeting, but I think that should count in on the thing.

And I don't think we should have to have a score card to say, well, ten minutes here, ten minutes there, and then have an inspector come in and say "Well, you only did an hour and five minutes here" because I just -- I don't want to have the score card there.

On employees assigned to the task we'll say, this I think is the -- when you get around a small operation like we have, almost without -- I'll say there's probably only about two or three people there that don't do all the jobs, that haven't been trained on all the jobs, and they're so close, and they work with the people.

And then that gets to another point here is that I feel that the people that are on the jobs know more about the jobs than anybody, and they should be the ones that can train if they want to do the training.

The outline says that if there's a competent person there that can do they training they can do it. That one thing right there, I hope you people take into consideration one thing. We have a lot of good people there. They don't have a lot of schooling and things like that, but they know what they're doing, and they're good instructors. They can teach a person to do their job, and do it safely and things like this. And it gives them a little bit of pride.

I took some of our people to a safety meeting here two years ago in Columbus to just give them some exposure and

let them see what's going on, and there was an MSHA inspector there, and in his talk he told the people there that they could be held responsible if somebody got hurt on the job after they trained them.

I almost lost my trainers, because they didn't want to be held responsible to where they could go to jail or things like that.

And I did have one MSHA inspector tell the personnel on the job, and the man that we work with in the state there is Okie Ritter, and Okie Ritter is a good man. I got back to him and told him what went on and things like that. But these were some inspectors that come in from out of state, they were loaners to him.

So I hope that doesn't happen any more, because we've got too many good people out there that want to do a job, and they have some pride in their job, and I think that when it comes to competent people the person on the job is mostly the one that do it running.

When I asked to come down here for this meeting I didn't know I was going to be a speaker, and I'm not a speaker, but I'm just talking for our company and some of the people around there. I want you to know that I appreciate the opportunity to do this.

I think that the little operator out there just needs to be heard. Just like I say, I'm not a paid

representative of these people, but I've had most of the people --

Let me take a minute or two here to tell you, we're in the -- our gravel operation is in the glacier deposits down in the Great Miami River Valley there, so we're basically strip miners, that's what we -- When it comes to a high wall, if we get thirty feet of gravel we're tickled to death, that's a high wall to us. Most of ours is drag line and things like this, underwater and things like that.

Our inspectors that come around, we have good MSHA inspectors. I don't -- in twenty years we've only had a couple of times where we've had if you want to call it an incident with an inspector, and most of the time it's a little bit of a misunderstanding on their part, because our -- you can talk to Mr. Ritter up in Ohio there -- our doors are always open, people can come in, and we don't hide nothing, we turn them loose.

The only time we get mad is that if finds something that's wrong that we should have corrected, that's when we get mad at ourself. And just like I say, the inspectors do a good job here.

But it's -- I know that if you make laws it's like, you know, you have highway speeds out here, it's 65 and they'll allow you to run seventy, you know, but when it comes to some of these things that come down as laws, if you try to

reason with the inspector, "That's what it says, Dick," you know. There's no gray area there.

I have on several occasions had citations that I talked to them, and reasoned with them, with you people -I'll say you people, and we have had -- I've lost a couple,
I've won a couple.

I cherish the opportunity to do this, because it seems like it makes things a lot easier. I haven't had anything held against me so far.

But the safety training here is something that I think is, it's important. I think most all the gravel operators do it. They do it in different phases on the thing.

And just like I say, I hope that you come up with something here that we can work with, that we can train the people, give them the opportunity to take advantage of other training, both on the job and off the job.

We're nonunion people there, so our people they switch if you want to call it classifications continuously. Absenteeism, vacations, and things like that, a man might run a drag line one day, and a dredge the next. If they need a loader operator, the plant man might run the loader. They switch things around like that.

So we do need training in all the areas, and they do need to be protected in all the areas, and I think that we

can -- I know we can do it, and I know that we can have a simpler outline for safety that will get the job done with competent people on the job.

And I want to thank you very much.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you, Mr. Martin.

I have got a couple of follow-up questions, and other people on the panel may as well.

You stated that you didn't think that the 24 hours of new miner training should be set in stone, and I just want to clarify what your point was.

As you probably know, the 24 hours minimum is in the Mine Act, so in this regulation we really can't do anything to change how much new miner training has got to be given to new miners.

However, one of the issues that we're looking at -and I think that that's maybe where you were coming from -is how much of the new miner training has got to be given to
a miner before he or she begins work, and you may know -- or
maybe you don't know -- but in Part 48 it establishes eight
hours of minimum training before a miner can begin work, and
that's what we're trying to figure out here is in this
regulation do we set a minimum like that and, if so, is it
cast in terms of hours, or in subject areas, or things like
that.

We have gotten comments saying that eight hours is

too much, particularly for smaller operations where there really isn't that much to the operation.

Other people have suggested maybe two hours minimum. Other people have spoken in terms of subject areas that should be covered before a miner begins work.

I think that the thinking is a miner should get something before he or she begins work, and I was just wondering if you had any specific comments on that.

MR. MARTIN: One reason I said the 24 hours is because we've had the inspectors come in, and they have said, you know -- and I, you know, said "Well, you know, it doesn't say it's 24 hours before they ever walk out the door."

MS. ALEJANDRO: Right.

MR. MARTIN: "No, it's 24 hours, Dick," you know, "and I'll get the reg and I'll show it to you," and things like that. That's where our conflict has been on the thing.

The amount of training before a person goes out, I'll tell you what we do, and that is that a new hire comes in, sits down and goes through all of his paperwork that he has to sign and do things like that before, you know, he's hired on type of situation.

He comes in to work -- well, we might start him that day. Before the person ever goes out and does the job that he's hired to do there, the man or woman, we talk to them at least two hours. I've got an outline book and things

1 | like that that we go over.

I've got a large -- we do a flyover of all the gravel operations in Ohio there, and we have a picture on the wall showing our gravel operations, and so we can show them, you know, "This is where you are now, and this is where the gravel operation is here," you know, "and this is the garage area, and this is the escape routes" if you want to call it that, which you can go anywhere in a surface mine to get away.

But the thing of it is is that we cover all the areas of "These are the things that you want to look out for." In the booklet I go over the guarding and things that we do, the safety checks on all the machinery and the equipment before we start every shift.

I have a sheet there that shows them -- there's a check sheet for every piece of equipment, no matter where they're going. Even if they're if you want to call it a laborer around the plant area there, all they do is keep the place clean, it's that "These are the things that you check every time we start out on a job," and go over it with them when we take them out on the job, you know.

So we do a couple of hours, and from then on we get them with a person that is experienced on the job, and then they work with that person until we feel that the man or woman can handle that job, stick with it.

And then we come back to them, and we never leave them, they're never out of eyesight of anybody there. They go to work, and they're free to ask any question. Just like I tell them all, you know, nobody knows everything; ask any question. It might be the dumb question today, but tomorrow it will be the simplest thing.

So I think that a couple of hours is sufficient to get them out there on the job.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you have any opinion as far as how long operators should have to give the new miners the balance of the training? I mean they need to give them 24 hours if they're new miners, but what period of time should that 24 hours be given in?

MR. MARTIN: I think within thirty to sixty days that we ought to be able to cover all aspects of the job there.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: The thing, the only part of it that might all outside of that would be the first aid training because we might not -- we'll just say for instance you might have hired me today and you go over some of the basic things that you normally would for first aid, you know, where the first aid stations are, who handles first aid, and things like that, and tell the person, you know, tell them the first of March we're going to have our first aid training, and you

will be involved in this, it will be paid for, you know, it might be done here, or we might do it down at the Shady Rest Hotel down here, you know, and then have that -- the first aid training would be picked up within at least eight or nine months of the time they get there. I mean that is complete first aid training.

Now, we do also -- on first aid training we have had a problem with a few people that didn't want to do it, and the reason for it was that they didn't want to -- there are some people in life don't want to fail in front of somebody else, and they were afraid that they might not pass it.

But just like I told them, the inspectors pass everybody. they keep working with you time and time again, and here again is where we have some people on the job, competent people on the job that can talk to this person and say, yeah, you know, we have had the training where, you know, they went back and -- especially the CPR. I've had people pull the heads off the dummies and everything else, you know.

They can work with this, and they can get that training in, and then they get the full training out of it, and then they get their certificate from it.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I have one other question. You were raising the issue of what individual

should be considered experienced, I guess meant to decide who
needs to get the 24 hours of training, and you indicated
you've got people who have got experience, and pretty
significant experience on the equipment that you use,
although it might not have been mining experience.

Do you have any suggestions for how we might in the rule address that, I mean as far as I mean somebody coming in with that kind of experience, not clearly mining experience, but obviously relevant experience of then deciding who's an experienced miner and who is a new miner for purposes of the training requirements?

MR. MARTIN: You're talking about somebody we would hire that would be an inexperienced miner, but he's like a truck driver for example?

MS. ALEJANDRO: Yeah, I mean somebody who maybe doesn't have any mining experience, or little mining experience, but is very experienced on the kind of things that he's going to be doing at the site.

MR. MARTIN: Most -- I shouldn't say most -- a lot of our employees come into the gravel operation, and they are truck drivers, and they haul gravel. Say they haul gravel out of our plant, not only our plant, but any of the gravel companies around there, and so they're very familiar with the operations, you know, around even though they're not out of truck running around all over.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Are they your employees, or are they contract?

MR. MARTIN: No, they're some of what we call brokers, people that come in, and they just want to get out of truck driving, and they apply for a job, if we've got an opening there, and we also -- we don't hire from anybody, we don't take people away from anybody. If somebody says yeah, go ahead and hire the person we bring them on.

This just happened about three months ago, a man that had driven a truck out of our plant there for about six years, and he wanted to get out of the truck, and so he hired on, and it just so happened we had a job at the plant there which was a truck driver in the pit area that would haul materials from one end to the other there, which fit right in. We didn't have to give him truck driver training, we didn't have to give him the safety training because he had his CDLs from the truckers.

And so all those qualifications, and I think at that time, you know, you could sit down and say "Well, Dick worked here, you know, and he's driven a truck for so many years" and things like that, and we could cover all that, and that covers a lot of territory there.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Uh-huh.

MR. MARTIN: And so I just think -- and we have some people who are backhoe operators and dozer operators who

- work for contractors that do home building and things like
  that, and we hire them on and, you know, they've got all this
  experience, and they've probably got -- you know, maybe some
  of them have got ten or twelve years. Because the
  construction business is -- they lay off a lot in the winter
- 6 time, we don't a whole lot, and so they want to get off that,
  7 and so here's some experienced people coming in, and that
- 8 should be taken into consideration and written up.
  - MS. ALEJANDRO: People like that you're saying shouldn't be considered to be new miners for purposes of training?
- 12 MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

9

10

11

22

23

- MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you have anything?
- MR. BURNS: Yeah, I have a question concerning the 24 hours training.
- You mentioned that you have a program or a check
  list that you go through for new hires.
- 18 MR. MARTIN: Pardon me?
- MR. BURNS: You mentioned you have a check list or
  a program that you go through for new hires. Would you be
  able to make that available to us?
  - MR. MARTIN: You can get one to you. If you can give me an address, I can send it to you
- MR. BURNS: Okay. I'll give you the address
  afterwards, unless you want to write it -- I don't know if

1 | you have a pen and pencil right now.

MR. MARTIN: We don't have a lot of -- I'll say there's a lot of companies that have got booklets of things, you know, but we have just a basic thing that we do on any new hire as to what we cover as far as, you know, all the way from insurance, talking to them about their insurance and things like that, all the way down, and then it comes down into, you know, pre-hiring just like we're talking about here as to what we talk to them about before we put them out on the job. And that's all -- it will all be one big thing there, so you know that.

MR. BURNS: Okay. I'll give you the address for that where you can send it to me.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. BURNS: The other thing is how many -- I'm looking at your experience with that program, and your experience with the new hires that are trained in that way.

As far as, you know, your accident and injury experience with those miners trained in that way, would you be able to comment on that?

MR. MARTIN: On the -- I'm not following you, I'm sorry.

MR. BURNS: Well, I guess I'm trying to see if you can clarify or explain the effectiveness off training based upon your accident and injury experience with those miners.

MR. MARTIN: Oh, okay. Yeah, we've got a very low accident record there with our mines there.

We have the things where if they hit their finger or something like that, but as far as people for instance getting caught in unguarded pulleys and things like that, no; people having accidents with rubber-tired loaders, trucks, and things like that, no. We have never had anybody run over anybody, we haven't upset any equipment like that.

We have just had if you want to call it the normal things. We've had one incident where a man who was an experienced man on the crusher operation there for about seven or eight years, and he shut the crusher off, and it was a jaw crusher -- and all of you are familiar with how a jaw crusher works like this [indicating] -- and it was jammed, and he went in and pulled the stone out, and it wasn't running, it was locked out and everything, and he pulled the stone out, and as he did the thing cycled one more time and mashed two fingers, and we consider that a severe accident at our place.

But, no, we've been very fortunate, we haven't had any bad accidents.

MR. BURNS: I don't want to overburden you, but if you could go back like for a five-year period and sort of if possible document like over a six-month period the experience with your new miners, and then maybe over a one-year period,

because that's really what's relevant for this training issue 1 is how do they perform within that initial period of their 3 employment, and that would be very helpful to validate --4 MR. MARTIN: If you could do me a favor and write 5 down exactly what you want there, I'll go back and --MR. BURNS: I'll do that. 6 7 MR. MARTIN: -- when I go back I'll get our 8 accident reports, reportable accidents to MSHA, and I'll pull 9 them out, and then I'll --10 MR. BURNS: Yeah, but I'm looking at particularly 11 the new miners, because that would be very helpful to 12 document how this sort of training is effective. 13 MR. MARTIN: When you're talking new miner --14 MR. BURNS: New employees. MR. MARTIN: -- how far after the date of 15 16 employment do you consider a new miner? 17 MR. BURNS: Well, I'm looking at maybe a six-month 18 period and a one-year period to see, because that's really 19 where the new miner training should have its impact during 20 that period of time. 21 MR. MARTIN: Yeah, I can do that very easily. 22 Yeah, I'll give you a copy of it. 23 MR. BURNS: I'll put that down specifically with

I appreciate that.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah. No problem.

24

25

the address.

Page 29

MR. BURNS: The other question I had was on the annual refresher training, and we've had a lot of comments that the ten-, twenty-, thirty-minute safety meeting talks, or tailgate talks, many people feel if they're done properly that continuous type of safety talk throughout the year is very effective.

The other thing you mentioned was that you didn't want to have a score card, but how would you be able to I guess document or square away that there was in fact eight hours done whenever an inspector or someone comes on the property? because the other thing you mentioned was that, you know, an inspector may talk to the miner and they don't remember, you know, getting this many hours. I think if you don't have a score card you're going to have that problem.

MR. MARTIN: I think the minutes of our safety meetings are very sufficient for that.

MR. BURNS: The minutes cover all that?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. BURNS: Okay. So there is some documentation you can point to?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. All our -- in the -- in fact, we have information meetings and safety meetings combined, and just like I say we just -- we like to keep the people informed what's going on.

To give you a for instance, we just went through a

Page 30

situation here in the last year where we traded some 1 properties in order to get a little bit more area to mine in 3 the future, which people were -- you know, they wanted to 4 know what was going on, what their future was, and so in these meetings we would go over things as where we are right 5 now, and then when we do that I always -- either I or the 7 supervisor that I have there, I feed him and the lady over in 8 Air Spare the information as far as ny inspection we might have had by either the State of Ohio or MSHA, the things that was covered and discussed at that time, any citations we 10 11 might get, or anything like that, or any comments and things 12 like that.

6

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

These things all work in there, and it's an ongoing thing there, and that's where the safety keeps -- we just keep feeding the safety back in there on the thing, and it's in the minutes right there what was covered and things like t.hat..

And then we recap every year anything that happened, you know, any injuries, reportable or unreportable injuries. We keep records of all those.

MR. BURNS: Okay. The only other thing is we are going to try to address this prior experience issue, you know, because it is something that keeps coming up in all the meetings. You know, in this particular industry there's a lot of going back and forth between construction and mining

1 of workers. That is an issue we intend to try to address.

MR. MARTIN: It's kind of hard to take somebody with twenty years of bulldozer experience, and you hire him, and you give him all new training, and the guy is sitting there looking at you like, you know, "I know more than you do," you know, and a lot of times they do. Sometimes they don't.

You know, sometimes people bring bad habits with them. You know, I'm not gonna say they're all perfect, we're not perfect. There's only one person perfect, and he's not here today.

MR. BURNS: Okay. That's all the questions I have for you.

I guess I do have one other one.

Are there are sort of materials, or would you view any sort of training materials that MSHA would develop for these short safety talks, would you find that beneficial, something that's timely like on crushers, or on conveyor belt safety, or things like that? Would you welcome that sort of training assistance?

MR. MARTIN: I think that there's -- there's booklets that's available from you people right now on guarding, and these type things that I think are very good, and I will say one thing that when I call for them or ask for them I get them in numbers that I can pass out to people, and

Page 32

they're pretty good documented things.

There is one thing that I think that might be available and maybe I don't know about it, and that is if there are some video type things that you could use that would be available.

I know that there is a safety, Baum Safety, they supply us with a lot of the videos, and they are very, very good, and they're returnable things. We use them and send them back, and sometimes we purchase them and keep them for certain topics that we really want, and I think those would be available.

MR. BURNS: Okay. So if there is a deficiency, we should try to work on more training videos for the sand and gravel people that can be used in short safety meetings?

MR. MARTIN: I'm having an awful time hearing you.

MR. BURNS: So if there is a deficiency, you would recommend that we work on more training videos for sand and gravel operators that they can use in the short safety meetings?

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. BURNS: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: I would say that of the things that I -- I guess you people sort of generalize on a lot of this covering the coal and --

25 MR. BURNS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- and I have had some comments from several of the people. In Kentucky, there's no sand in Kentucky, and we move a lot of sand down there, the coal haulers bring it back, and so we get to talk to the people that run the quarries, because all the limestone quarries are in Kentucky and they haul to the quarries, and so I get to talk to those people there, and I have had some comments from some of those people in the quarry business that they felt that you people could do a lot better if you had some things that were strictly the quarry operations and the stone.

MR. BURNS: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Rod.

MR. BRELAND: Just a couple.

Mr. Martin, you had talked about being a small pit.

I'm not sure that I really understood. How many employees do you have year round, and is it seasonal?

MR. MARTIN: The high side we hit about forty-five.

MR. BRELAND: And is that just like again in the seasonal time of the year? Do you drop down to half that in -- ?

MR. MARTIN: No. We are very lucky. If we have a layoff it's when like it is up home right now when it gets down to about five below zero, and we let anybody who wants to work, because there's always some repairs that can be done, and there's things that we can take inside and work on,

and anybody who wants to work, you know, we'll allow them to work there.

The only problem we have is we do have our own truck drivers, and those people there, there would be a layoff in the year, at the end of the year, and probably that would probably be about five or six people that they usually get laid off right about now because we just don't need that many truck drivers and things like that, but we run about forty-five people most of the time.

MR. BRELAND: Is that for the two plants?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, sir.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. Also you talked about the two-hour kind of indoctrination you did. When you're done with that, do you send them out under some close supervision typically?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, the foremen, they take them from there, and then they take them out, and then they either stay with them -- it's all according to what the job is -- they stay with them, or else they'll put them with somebody who is experienced on the job, and they work with that person there. That person never leaves them until they're -- I'd say probably if you go from loader operator -- See, we don't put people out on the loader operators and make them loader operators because, you know, we've got \$300,000 worth of equipment there, and you just can't afford to have that tore

up or get somebody hurt there.

Most of our people that are inexperienced altogether that come into the mine, they will be laborers around the sifting and classifying area, plant area, or they will go into training as a plant operator because the plant operator is strictly a person that just sits and watches the different screens and pressures, and got a control board there, and they would easily work into that area first.

And then if they want to be loader operators, then that's -- and truck drivers if they haven't had any truck driver experience, then that's when it takes some time there. And you can't have two people riding in the same loader because there's only one seat, and so --

For instance, if we have somebody that wants to be a loader operator we'll take them in an area that's flat, there's no lakes, there's no cliffs that they're going to go over, or anything like that, and we'll give them some instructions on how to run the loader, let them just drive it around for a while, and then we'll let them load our pit truck. If they tear the pit truck up it don't make those people half as mad as it makes the brokers that come in.

And we work them from there, and we just let them do that, and then they work from there to -- they work their way up, and that can take anywhere from two to three weeks to get them to the point where they can safely operate that

thing.

We go through them, and there's a safety check we go through on every piece of equipment. They check off that they have checked the oil, the water, the tires, the fire extinguisher, the glass area, the whole thing, and so we go through that.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. Well, I suspected that you did that, which is like an extension of the training at least initially, even for the laborers if you're watching them, and on-the-job type training is what it sounds like you do after you've gone over some outlines of your expectations I guess and mine awareness initially in that outline that you're going to provide to us.

Also you talked some about the competent people doing the training, and we would agree that a lot of the experienced miners would be the people to do the training, but do you have some method that you use to evaluate the effectiveness of the training? assuming that some of these people are better than others, if you're going to have an equipment operator train you may have a favorite-type person to do that. Is that just based on the results of the new employees' training capabilities maybe?

MR. MARTIN: The first is a loader operator.

Number one, you look at the standpoint of how safe the person is as far as is it somebody that does run in fourth gear,

tries to run over everybody, that you have to talk to all the 1 time; is it somebody that takes care of the equipment and 3 knows how to grease it and oil it, and take care of it, and 4 things like that. 5 You know, we've got one guy that we call him Down Hill Bill because he's a good loader operator, but he 6 7 continuously digs down. You want somebody that doesn't do 8 that, that keeps the pit floor clean and level, things like that. 9 10 And I'll have to say there are some people that are 11 better trainers than they are operators, you know, but we 12 look at the people who do the job efficiently, they take care 13 of the equipment. 14 You know, most of the time the people who work 15 around them will let you know how good they are. 16 MR. BRELAND: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Martin. 17 MS. ALEJANDRO: Do you have anything? 18 MS. FONTAINE: Mr. Martin, the agency is 19 responsible for developing a regulatory flexibility analysis to determine the costs and benefits of the proposed rules. 20 21 You said you have forty-five full-time employees. 22 Could you give me a ballpark estimate of what it costs you to 23 train your employees on an annual basis? 24 MR. MARTIN: No, I couldn't.

MS. FONTAINE: Okay. Could you send some

25

Page 38

```
information in later?
1
               MR. MARTIN: I can send you some information, yeah.
 3
              MS. FONTAINE: Okay.
 4
              MR. MARTIN: Yeah, I can get you something on that.
 5
              MS. FONTAINE: Okay. Thank you.
              MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Martin.
 6
 7
              MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much.
 8
               MS. ALEJANDRO: All right. The next speaker on our
    list is Ronnie Colson from Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Company,
9
10
    who is not here I don't believe.
11
               The next speaker on the list is Ben Hart from the
12
    Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
13
               MR. HART: If I could, I would like to defer to a
    little later.
14
15
              MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
16
               The next speaker is Charles -- and I apologize for
17
    the pronunciation --
18
               MR. MACHEMEHL: Yes, ma'am.
```

- MS. ALEJANDRO: Excuse me?
- 20 MR. MACHEMEHL: I don't want to speak now either,
- 21 | but I will.
- MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I appreciate it.
- 23 And you're from the Georgia Crushed Stone
- 24 Association.
- MR. MACHEMEHL: That's correct.

1 MS. ALEJANDRO: And if you could, spell your name 2 for the court reporter.

MR. MACHEMEHL: I'll try.

MS. ALEJANDRO: All right.

MR. MACHEMEHL: When I was in the second grade everybody could spell their last name but me. I signed mine Charles M. M-a-c-h-e-m-e-h-l, Machemehl.

As you say, I'm executive director of the Georgia Crushed Stone Association. We are a part of the Coalition for Effective Miner Training.

I'm sure you've heard these points before that I want to talk to you about, but I will try to inject some things, and then the people that will speak behind me will go into a little more detail on some of it.

The Coalition for Effective Miner Training -- I guess most people call it CEMT -- believes that effective employee training is an important component of a comprehensive safety program that also includes other equally important ingredients including, but not limited to, management culture, employee involvement, hazardous identification, evaluation and control, program personnel evaluation, feedback, record keeping, and continuous improvement.

The second point is CEMT's commitment to the development of MSHA-enforceable effective training for

1 | employees.

And the third point is the current Part 48 training requirements were designed for other segments of mining, parentheses, coal and underground stone mines, parentheses closed, the needs of which differ from those of exempt industries.

The fourth point, CEMT is committed to meeting both the letter and the spirit of the training requirements set forth in Section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977.

The fifth point, to be effective training must be performance oriented, not prescriptive, and be flexible, recognize current developing innovations in instructional techniques, and fully take into account the unique needs, conditions, and circumstances of exempt industries, including small operators.

And the last point, Number 6, CEMT believes the primary responsibility for training of an operator's employees rests with the operator.

Contractors are responsible for the training of their employees; however, the operators must provide the contractor with site-specific information appropriate to training.

Okay. That's because I'm representing the Coalition for Effective Miner Training, and I wanted to be

1 | sure that I covered all the points.

Now I put on my other hat as head of the Crushed Stone Association, and I will cover some things that might be interesting to you, and probably could be used in other states throughout the United States.

As a way of telling you my background so you'll know where some of the points came from, before I ran the stone association I worked with Vulcan Materials for about thirty years, and I'm very close to the military. I was in the active duty reserve, the guard, and served about thirty years.

So I would probably be a better MSHA inspector than a Vulcan employee or head of the stone association, so that's the way I'm going to comment, but I wanted you to know where I was coming from.

I'm an engineer, I'm registered in about six states; I'm a surveyor in about three states.

Now, what we do in the stone association, we work very close with the mining association and the Georgia Dump Truck Association, and inside our association we have an extensive training and education program.

We've got a management development school that's been going on about three or four years. The biggest part of that school, when somebody comes to work -- and I wish I had had that training thirty years ago -- it takes about a year

to go to school one or two days a month for a year, they're given tests, they graduate those people, and those people are -- we've done about four years now, and they are taking over and becoming the leaders of the industry.

Inside that program a big part of it is safety, and it's put on by people that understand the industry. We use retired people.

Our safety committee -- Ken Stockton will talk after me -- they do a big part of the training, Bobby Rider from Vulcan, and they cover a lot of training, a lot of MSHA requirements in the school, they cover a lot of practical things because you've got a lot of people in there, and so when a person gets through that school he's really going to be a good manager, and he's going to put safety number one.

Another part of the education -- I'll stay on education first -- is skill training, and what we do in skill training we teach people -- the first course we did was in welding, and we've got one we just finished on electrical, and we're starting on plant maintenance.

Now, in those courses, the skilled trade, the most important part and the first part is safety, and it's also put together by our people that understand operations and understand safety.

And then we've got a degree program we're just getting off the ground that will start in the fall of this

year with Southern Tech. A lot of that program will be safety.

So we believe that in order to have effective safety you've got to have training, and over the years I can assure you that we've found at Vulcan Materials Company that the safer we were the more money we made, and I've told many inspectors -- and I'm a material engineer by trade -- that the tougher they were on me the more money I would make, and I think Vulcan is the biggest in the world, and probably the most successful. Marker, Tranes Dezell who runs Marker, so he might argue that he's more successful, but I think any one of those people would tell you that if you do something safe you're going to make more money.

Now, from the military side, and I'll speak to that in just a little bit, you can learn a lot from the military. They probably do a better job of training than anybody else, because in the military you've got to take whoever will be willing to serve, and you've got to train that person to be effective, and you've got to train that person to win.

So you've got to do probably more extensive training than you do any other way, and the way you do that is very simple.

As Mr. Martin was saying, you use a lot of OJT, and you put a person with somebody that understands that position or that job. There's a lot more record-keeping than he would

like, because you've got to have records to show that you've done it, and you give people different levels.

There was a question by one of you all how do you know effective your training is. Well, in the military you've got -- and the Army and the Air Force, everybody uses the same system -- you've got three-level, five-level, and seven-level, and so as the person is trained you reach those particular levels, and that's the way you get promoted, and that's the way you're given responsibility.

Of course, on anything we do, whether it's military, whether it's in Vulcan, or whether it's with the stone association, we have to stand on our record, so if we've a good safety record in Georgia, well, then, we've done a good job.

If we win when we go to war -- I used to tell my troops if you go -- I said "I'm tough as hell on you," and I was, but I said "we're gonna win," and I said "if we go to war you're going to come back alive." And I meant that, and I played football that way, I ran the military that way, I worked at Vulcan that way, I run the stone association that way.

And we work very close, though, with the mining association, and they're outstanding. In many areas they do a better job than we do in the stone association, so we work very close with them.

Ken Jackman is here, he'll talk to you about what they do, and Ken Stockton who will talk behind me is my chairman of the safety committee, and the safety committee does an outstanding job.

To prove that point with you on how we put safety
-- and so you don't just think I'm giving you a lot of words
-- we do these directories every two years, and I'll give you
this, and this was -- Matter of fact, it's got a date right
on here, it was done 6/11/97, and here's the Georgia Crushed
Stone safety mission statement right in the front of the
book, so we put safety number one, we give everybody MSHA
training, and we have internally in the stone association
workshops. Our last work shop, the title of it was Safety
and the Environment. Out of six sessions we had four of them
on safety.

As far as the -- The only advice I would give you -- and I guess I'm older than anybody in the room, so I guess I can give advice -- is make sure that what you come up with as CEMT suggests is flexible, make sure that you allow the people that are putting on the training to select who is going to do the training, and then make sure -- the other problem you've always got, and I'll liken this to the IG, if you get inspectors -- in the military they call them inspector generals -- if they're smart and they know what they're doing and they have experience you'll have a better

outfit, a better unit. If they're not, they can cause a lot of problems.

So MSHA has the challenge of making sure that when these people inspect us and make sure we are complying with the training, which right now we all accomplish. We represent 98 percent of the crushed stone in Georgia, and I'd put our training programs from individual companies against anybody in the United States.

But it's very important that you all have people that are competent as inspectors, because our mission here is to keep people alive, and we don't want anybody hurt, and we want everybody to --

What we fight for in the military, to give you a little bit of, lecture you a little bit on that, we fight so people can have freedom, and everybody in this room has freedom. The reason we're having what we're having today, the public hearing, is people before us fought so we've got freedom. That's the most valuable thing, and that freedom is only good if we're alive.

So we've got to keep our people alive, and that's our mission. We don't want anybody hurt, and that's the mission. But I'll tell you this, you will make more money, and you'll win, and we'll stay the greatest country in the world if we do comply with that mission.

I probably missed some points, but that's -- and

I'll leave this with you, but I'll be glad to try to answer any questions you have on anything.

MS. ALEJANDRO: I just have a couple of questions.

My first question is, our impression has been the people who have been coming to these public meetings generally are giving their employees good, comprehensive safety and health training.

One of the things that we're trying to do is get a sense of what percentage, or what number of the exempt operations may not be giving their employees any, or very little safety training.

Do you have a sense in your area, I mean in the area that you're familiar with, on what that breakdown might be? I don't want to you on the spot.

MR. MACHEMEHL: No, I have no secrets. You know, in our area the only challenge we have, or problem we have, Kathy, is -- and that's why we work so -- we've got a dump truck association, and the fellow that runs it used to work for me, he does an outstanding job on the safety committee, started the safety committee in the dump truck association.

I think our real challenge in our industry is not with the small producer, because I think the small producer by being a part of the association does accomplish the training, and I think Mr. Martin probably accomplishes the training.

I don't think the small producer gets credit for accomplishing the training, and I think the small producer probably may do a better job than the larger producer, because there's a more intimate relationship there.

They probably do a much poorer job keeping the records, and what they've got to do there, though, is just bite the bullet and have somebody carry a card in a pocket and check off their training. I think they can do that.

But we have no problem with any small producer that I'd say does not accomplish training. The real problem you've got is maybe with the contractors and that sort of thing.

This industry is moving like every industry to the point where you're doing more by contract, an what we've got to do is be very sure that we get that accomplished, too.

And we work very closely with your people. We have safety meetings at workshops, we have MSHA people come in and talk to us, and we're very familiar with the problems that we have on the trucking accidents, and the contractor accidents and that.

We know what the challenge is, but as far as to single out and say we've got a small producer that's not accomplishing training, I would say you're in the -- you know, you're talking about one, or two, or three, or four percent.

You've got some very, very small operators here, not more than one or two or three, that may not be in the association, and I think it's gonna work a hardship on them, but I don't think you're gonna be able to do anything about that.

I think you all are going to have to bite the bullet and make sure that those guys comply as well as everybody else, because they get killed -- you can be easy and get along with them, play politics and get that guy killed just as easy as you can kill somebody in Vulcan Materials.

That's my answer, two percent.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. You referred to contractors, though, as maybe a source of a problem.

MR. MACHEMEHL: They are.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Could you maybe expand on what you foresee as the problem in the area of contractors?

MR. MACHEMEHL: Well, the problem is that what we've got to do is be sure there is a clear-cut, there's a clear-cut way that training of contractors' people is accomplished.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. MACHEMEHL: Now, that can best be done, again not by MSHA telling us if you will how to do it, but telling us that it should be done, and then letting us accomplish it.

MS. ALEJANDRO: You mean as far as who's responsible for ensuring that contractor employees have got their training that they're required to have?

MR. MACHEMEHL: Sure.

MS. ALEJANDRO: One of the things that we've been hearing about is we've had a number of commentors indicate that they believe that the contractors, the companies of the contractors should be responsible for ensuring that the contractor employees get the 24 hours of training, or the eight hours of training; that the production operator, I mean the mine site operator should then be responsible for giving those employees site-specific hazard training when they come onto the mine property.

Do you share that view, or do you have any -- MR. MACHEMEHL: Absolutely, a hundred percent.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. MACHEMEHL: In other words, the basic training has to come from the contractor himself, but when you get the contractor to perform the job, then you've got to tell the contractor himself that there is a hazardous line under this area, or you've got to be sure that -- there's a train that runs through here, you have to run over this track. Whatever the local situation is, you've got to be sure he does it.

You're responsible, though, for two things. Being sure his people are trained, and then making sure he's

1 | familiar with the local area. But therein is the challenge.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Is that typically the way that it's happening now, or I mean is that your point that it's not really happening any particular way as far as who's responsible for contractor employee training?

MR. MACHEMEHL: My point is that that is gonna be more and more of the challenge of the industry. I think we're trying to do that now, but the challenge of the industry is you're gonna do more by contractor.

What I foresee in the stone industry, and I don't think it's too far in coming, and Zellnick could tell you this a lot better than I can, he gave an outstanding talk — he's head of Marker, Stu Zellnick — you're gonna have maybe one or two or three people, it's gonna be like our kids running the computer, you're gonna have those people running the plant, you're gonna have maybe one person, two people running the plant, and a lot of that other stuff is gonna be done by contractor. And we're not far from that point in this industry.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. MACHEMEHL: We are very close to that point now. You can computerize -- and I'm quoting Zellnick -- you can computerize a plant right now to the point it will run itself. You can do that right now.

Well, if you do that and then the plant goes down,

you're gonna have to have somebody come on the plant, and that's going to be the challenge of MSHA and the challenge of the industry to make sure that person is trained in safety, and at the same time that he understands the local situation.

But I basically agree with you. We've been in with CEMT, we've got more supports from the state standpoint, from the local standpoint in Georgia than any other state.

In other words, if you look down the list of who's a member of CEMT, the stone association, the mining association, kaolin, you've got more people here than any other state.

So we've worked, you know, we've debated with them, so what they're telling you we basically agree with.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And I just have one additional question.

We are under an obligation, as I indicated in my opening statement, to develop a final rule that will be published on or before September 30th of 1999, and after the date of publication there's some period of time that will be given for the industry and everyone affected by the requirements of the rule to come into compliance.

Do you have any opinion as far as how much time the industry would need after the rule is published to come into compliance? Obviously that's going to depend on what the requirements look like to a degree, but do you have any sense

of how long it is going to take for the industry to comply with these, how much time we should give in the rule for the 3 industry to comply with these requirements?

MR. MACHEMEHL: I would say that you're exactly To comment on that intelligently you'd have to say right. "Well, what is the rule?"

> MS. ALEJANDRO: Right.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MACHEMEHL: But if the rule is what we think it's going to be, I would say we could do that -- you all could do that, and we could do that in six months.

> MS. ALEJANDRO: Okav.

I don't think -- I think most MR. MACHEMEHL: people are complying right now, but I think the problem is going to be -- the other problem could be you want to be very careful that you don't try to make this retroactive, because as you go forward and you say "Okay, here are the rules that we're going to go out and inspect by, " you've got to be very sure that you don't go in there and send the inspector and say "Well, you haven't been doing this, you haven't been doing this so we're gonna write you up and give you citations, et cetera, et cetera, so that there's gonna have to --

What we do with MSHA, and the reason we work very close with them, I'll be very honest with you, if you understand the inspector and he understands you, you don't

- 1 | have any problem. But if you don't, you've got a problem.
- So once you publish that thing you've got to give
  us time for our people to understand it, and then you've got
- 4 to make sure your people understand it.
- 5 MS. ALEJANDRO: Oh, absolutely.
- 6 MR. MACHEMEHL: And then we go forward together,
  7 because ultimately we have the same goal.
- 8 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Thank you.
- 9 Do you have any questions?
- 10 | MR. BURNS: I just have a few.
- You had mentioned that through your association you do quite a bit of training for management people.
- MR. MACHEMEHL: Absolutely. Well, for skilled
- 14 | trades. Not just management, we cover the -- it's a three-
- 15 pronged training program. It's management development, and
- 16 | then it's also skilled trades, and then a degree program, so
- 17 | we try to get young kids into the mining industry. It's
- 18 | three prongs.
- MR. BURNS: As far as the -- I don't know how you
- 20 can -- the management training, that's been going on for
- 21 | about four years?
- MR. MACHEMEHL: Yes, sir.
- MR. BURNS: Have you been able to notice any sort
- 24 of trend or effect from that training as far as how it's
- 25 | impacted safety and health in the operations due to the

Page 55

supervisors being trained? And a lot of this is geared towards miners right now, what we're talking about, but there's also a supervisor aspect to the training that we'd like to hear feedback on.

MR. MACHEMEHL: The supervisors have come to respect the importance of safety much more than they did before, because -- and this will increase as the years go by because the people going through this program are imbued with their responsibility towards safety, and I would differ with Mr. Martin on that point very much on your responsibility.

If you work for me and I train you, and you get hurt, killed, or anything, I feel a personal responsibility for that, and that's the point we try to get across to the people in the management.

And they go through all the MSHA training, and all the rules, and all the legal training, and our safety people are in there with them, and so when a guy comes out of that thing he's scared probably, you know, and he should be, because -- and so what happens over time when these guys are promoted, and they're promoted, but I'll tell you another thing, you can care about a person and he knows sincerely you care about him, he's gonna do a hell of a lot better job for you, and then he's gonna get promoted because he's gonna have the same attitude you do.

That's the kind of thing that comes about by the

supervisors, and the fellow that's gonna talk right after me

-- we're putting together a workshop right now which is in

February, which any of you are welcome to come to in the

audience, or MSHA, or anybody -- the 25th and 26th of

February, and he didn't feel like they had enough safety in

the program -- and I told you that story, Kevin -- and he

went in there and he put all -- and these are the top people

in the company, he said he put all of them in a brace before

it was over, and they did what he wanted.

So I think the respect for safety in Georgia right now is very, very high. I hope we keep it that way, though, because as you know the results are the only thing that really count. That's the only thing that counts.

MR. BURNS: I agree with you. I know when I first started in mining I had forty hours, I worked in underground coal, and I know the first couple of weeks I was pretty scared. I mean I wasn't mortified working underground, but I was cautious. That was part of the training, and I think that's part of effective training is -- I mean someone that's new in the mining industry shouldn't go in there thinking, you know, this is going to be a piece of cake.

MR. MACHEMEHL: I think the point we try to get across is -- and I really don't tolerate this from anyone, and a point we try to get across is the fact that years ago I think what happened, I think MSHA is the greatest thing that

happened to the industry making everybody get safe, because I happen to know how many lives it's saved over the years, but I think years ago people said "Well, hell, that's just something we've got to do." Now what we've got to do is get on with the program.

And I think what we have proven to ourselves over time is if you do something safely you're gonna make more money.

I was chairman of -- Dick back there, we worked together, he's from New Mexico, I'm surprised he came all the way over here, he runs the state association out there -- and we had a fellow talk one time, he was a contractor, at one of our meetings, and this guy gave a whole talk on this. I mean he spent an hour up there proving to you that the safer you were the more money you made, and the guy was a very successful contractor, road builder, and so I think the point -- but it's something you can't relax on.

In other words, if you relax and say "Well, hell, we've got a good safety program, we're doing great," you know, tomorrow you may have somebody get killed.

So to answer your question, I think we're -- I think it's great, and I give the mining association a lot of credit for that in Georgia, because they have a great conference every year, and we work with their committee, and I think they probably have done over the years -- in the past

1 | they have done a better job on safety than we have.

I think we're probably even with them now, but we work with them very, very close, and we're trying to bring the dump truck association to that. Maybe we can do the contractors with the ADC or somebody like that.

I don't know, it's a big challenge.

MR. BURNS: And that's really what we want to do here is we don't want to have a training rule where people feel like they have to do their compliance training, and somewhere else they do their safety training. That's what we really want to avoid.

I appreciate your comments.

MR. MACHEMEHL: Well, I don't know, though, you've got to be -- you know, you've got to be tough if you're an inspector if you're gonna be a good one. Hell, if you're not gonna -- you might as well not have MSHA if you all are not gonna make us comply.

MR. BURNS: I agree with that, but I think they should be the same thing.

MR. MACHEMEHL: Sure.

MR. BURNS: I don't have any more questions. I don't know if Rod does.

MR. BRELAND: Just a couple of follow-up.

On the brochure you're going to give us, that's a safety training --

MR. MACHEMEHL: No, no. This is a Georgia Crushed Stone directory, and what I said is this is the mission statement for safety.

MR. BRELAND: Oh, okay.

MR. MACHEMEHL: Now, we have a -- the fellow that's going to talk after me can cover that in more detail, but they do teach in this management development course for a day safety, which they get MSHA to help them, and, you know, there's a lot more detail in that.

This manual right here, this is a directory, so it covers everything in the industry.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. I see.

MR. MACHEMEHL: The point I was trying to make is we put safety number one, and here it is in the front of the manual, and it's a mission statement. It says the Georgia Crushed Stone Association's safety committee mission statement so, you know, that's the point I was trying to make.

But the detail that you're looking for probably would best come out of the management development course for the day that they talk to the people I would think, and then if you want to go deeper than that, when we write these skilled training manuals we can send you -- the first chapter is always on safety, like welding, and we could send you that, it's got a lot of detail in it, and then we could also

- send you the electrical we just finished, and the first chapter is always safety on those skilled training courses.
- We've got a lot of detail that we can get to you if you desire.
- 5 MR. BRELAND: Yeah, I think that's good information 6 for us to have.
  - Does the association provide an outline for a general training plan that might fit what's in Part 48 now?

    I'm not sure if I understood that.
- MR. MACHEMEHL: No, they do not. To answer that question, we do not.

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. BRELAND: Okay. And then also you talked about the --
  - MR. MACHEMEHL: They leave it up to individual members on that. The fellow that comes behind me is one of the individual members, so he can speak to you from that company's, the way they do it.
  - There's another fellow in the audience here, Bobby Rider from Vulcan, he could speak to the way they do it.
  - They comply, but now that's the point I'm trying to make with you really. You need to give us enough flexibility if you will to let those individual people accomplish that training as they would accomplish it, and I think therein lies the real challenge.
- 25 In other words, how much do you as an inspector,

- 1 | how much detail are you going to go into as an inspector?
- 2 | Are you just gonna say have an hour on first aid? Or are you
- 3 gonna tell me exactly what I do on first aid? And therein
- 4 | lies the real challenge, and there's got to be some
- 5 | confrontation, disagreement there I guess, but the more
- 6 | flexibility you give us probably the better job we're gonna
- 7 do.
- 8 MR. BRELAND: Okay.
- 9 MR. MACHEMEHL: But if you don't think we're doing
- 10 | a good job, then you certainly need to slap us down and make
- 11 | us do it.
- 12 The military does the same thing. In other words,
- 13 | there's more flexibility there than you might realize.
- 14 MR. BRELAND: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.
- 15 MR. MACHEMEHL: Okay.
- MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Machemehl.
- 17 MR. MACHEMEHL: Thank you, ma'am.
- 18 MS. ALEJANDRO: I think we're probably going to
- 19 | take a short, maybe about a ten-minute break here.
- In the break I would ask the people who have come
- 21 | in since the beginning to sign up on the attendance sheet
- 22 | that's in the back of the room on the table, and also if
- 23 | there's anyone here who has not signed up to be a speaker who
- 24 | would like to speak, I have the speakers' list up here on
- 25 | this table, so I ask that you come up and sign the list.

Page 62

1	[A brief recess.]
2	MS. ALEJANDRO: The next speaker actually not
3	the next speaker, but Ronnie Colson from the Kentucky-
4	Tennessee Clay Company has arrived, so I would ask that he
5	come up.
6	MR. COLSON: Do I go over here?
7	MS. ALEJANDRO: Yes, please, and if you could state
8	and spell your name for the court reporter.
9	MR. COLSON: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
10	Ronnie Colson, R-o-n-n-i-e C-o-l-s-o-n, with the
11	Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Company, Safety Director of the
12	Georgia operations.
13	We are a small mining company, 350 employees
14	scattered throughout Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina
15	Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Mexico. I appreciate
16	you giving us this opportunity to be here with you. Glad we
17	could make it.
18	I've been a little bit disturbed, though, about
19	some of the recent publications I've read and gave me the
20	impression that MSHA really thinks that the mining industry
21	is not involved in safety training, and that we don't even
22	have a plan to train our miners safety. It disturbed me a
23	little bit.
24	I can only speak for what I know, and that's the

ball clay, feldspar, and kaolin industry. We are very active

25

Page 63

members in the Ball Clay Mining Association, the Georgia

Mining Association as well, and each of these associations

are very active in the safety of our miners. We have safety

committees, we have paid professional people whose job it is

to promote and protect safety laws and our miners. We're

6 very active through legislative branches, public, and

7 | employee education on safety.

A few comments on the Part 48 training alternate draft. Section 1-1, Definitions, Part B, it states that a competent person designated by the operator. Now, the current law 30 CFR 4823, Part 3, requires that the trainer is to be MSHA approved instructors. I'm kind of concerned about who makes the decision as competent person.

Normally now instructors are required to complete 80 hours of MSHA training and certification.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Colson, if I could interrupt you. Just for the record, the draft that you're referring to I assume is a draft of the Coalition for Effective Miner Training, and what's the date on that? Is there a date? just as far as which --

MR. COLSON: Yes. 11/24/98 -- 10/30/98.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. You've got the coalition's draft from that date. Okay.

MR. COLSON: In Part (f) it talks about newly-hired experienced miners, states "...who has had at least twelve

months' mining experience."

This is much more open-ended than the current laws which requires miners who have acceptable miner MSHA training within the preceding twelve months, or at least twelve months' experience in and underground mine during the past three years, or who has received new miner training the preceding twelve months.

Section 1-2 of the same document talks about training, and the (b) part talks about training requirements for newly-employed inexperienced miners, they must receive eight hours' instruction before being assigned to tasks, unless those tasks are under close supervision.

Now, I don't think the hours, I don't think the quantity is as important as it is quality. If you've got one guy, you can train him four hours in a classroom under all of these things, and then four hours introduction to the work area, and surely that's sufficient. I don't think hours is that important.

I'm concerned about that statement "unless under close supervision." Now, it's been my experience that the guy who can train me adequately is certainly talented and competent to train me to operate a front-end loader, he's usually not the guy who can train me on respirator use and certify me to use say respirator fit testing. So it could be a problem with that statement.

Under (d) it talks about experienced miner, and returning after five years only requires eight hours of training. Now, I think a guy who's been out of the mining industry for five years is certainly inexperienced. I would really feel uncomfortable bringing a guy back who hadn't been around the mining industry for five years, you know, treat him as an experienced miner.

Under (f) it talks about hazard training, and the current law requires hazard training annually. This one doesn't specify how often the training should be done.

Under 1-13(a) it talks about refresher training, and it states appropriate training. Now, this leaves the operator subject to a wrong decision if you will, the statement "appropriate."

Currently the subjects are covered under the 30 CFR 4828, annual refresher training. I'm a little bit concerned about "appropriate" as to who makes that decision.

The (b), it talks about short safety talks being a part of annual refresher training. Now, short safety talks are very effective for the immediate task or the immediate situation. They are very effective as a brain tickler if you will, but they're not -- I don't think in any case should be taking the place of a structured classroom training.

We use it as an addition to your classroom instruction, not as a part of it. I think it needs to be in

addition to.

1-4, Contractors, (b), it talks about contractors shall assure that their contract employees are trained in work practices. Contractors, bless their hearts, we need them and all this, but they're really someone you have to really watch out for. I guess everybody that's a miner knows this; we love them, we need them, we work with them, but you better keep your eyes on them.

We treat them pretty much like miners. If they come onto the plant and they're involved in the milling, and extraction, and the drilling and all that, we treat them just like miners, and we require the eight-hour annual refresher training, and we've got to have the 5023 certification just like we do our own people. Contractors bleed and die just like miners.

In 1-15 it talks about training certification. In the (a) part it states that operators shall certify that required training has been provided.

I'm not quite sure, are we talking about certification for operators' employees, certification for contractors? You know, who is he required to have certification for?

I have been around mines for 29 years. I started out as a laborer in the plants, and the warehouses, and kind of worked my way down into management.

We never had a fatality, knock on wood somewhere.
We worked 1.9 million hours without a lost time accident;
that's a little bit over three and a half years for a little old small company.

I talk to our miners there in the plants and other places, and we talk about MSHA inspecting, safety training files. I have been through the whole thing with them, you know, and they seem to think that this draft is not nearly as stringent as the current federal safety laws, and I haven't been able to convince them that an inspector looking into our safety files is going to keep any of them from getting killed.

They are pointing out, and what they're telling me was that they would like to see MSHA use their vast resources, all the videos, all the pamphlets, all the personnel to come in and do an on-site training, education, that type of stuff, rather than hiring people to come out and inspect and being the bad police and that sort of thing.

They do feel like that MSHA should target without any reservations locations where our miners are getting killed. They fully agree with that, and I do too, that's where we need to be focusing.

But they don't feel like, and I don't either, that MSHA should be an adversary, you know, coming around slapping industry in the head, and certainly they don't feel like we

1 | need any more laws either.

2.4

Basically what they're telling us that we really need to pool our resources together, you know, don't be antithis or that, and train and educate our people, the public and the miners.

I think everyone needs to understand that the mining industry, our main concern and the goal is to protect our most precious resources, and that's our people. I don't have any problem with that statement that the majority of all mining companies are out to protect their miners.

Thank you.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Colson, I've got a couple of follow-up questions, and others on the panel may as well.

You read from the coalition draft, earlier draft, the definition of competent person as far as an individual who can give training.

From your remarks are you saying that you support a definition that's more along the lines of the Part 48 definition? I mean are you saying that MSHA should approve instructors, or are you just saying that competent person is too vague a term?

MR. COLSON: I think competent person is kind of vague, and leaving it open to -- yeah, it's leaving it open to who decides.

Currently we have laws stating what the instructor

1	should do. We certainly don't have any problem, and I don't
2	think the industry has any problem. Most of them I know have
3	the certifications. All our instructors are certified.
4	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. So you're saying you would
5	support a Part 48 type of program for instructors?
6	MR. COLSON: Yeah. We're living under those laws
7	now, we've been living under those for the whole time.
8	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And also as far as
9	definition of new miner, you're saying that the current
10	definition of new miner in Part 48 is the definition that you
11	would support?
12	MR. COLSON: Right. The Part 48 definition of new
13	miner is not an experienced miner. That's what it states.
14	So if he's not an experienced miner, then he's a new miner.
15	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And again annual refresher
16	training, although you say that the safety talks, the short
17	safety talks are good and effective that you don't think that
18	the time spent on those should be counted towards satisfying
19	the eight hours of annual refresher training?
20	MR. COLSON: I think they should be in addition to.
21	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. So you give eight hours of
22	more formal classroom-type instruction for the eight hours of
23	refresher training, and then safety talks on top of that are

MR. COLSON: I don't think it needs to be a law.

24

25

good?

Page 70

1	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
2	MR. COLSON: I think it's in practice.
3	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
4	MR. COLSON: I don't think it needs to be
5	installed; I think it's just a common sense practice.
6	And also I don't think we need to get hung up on
7	hours of training. I know you've got guidelines and all
8	this, but I'm telling you you can train a guy four hours, and
9	you get in there and do a good job one-on-one you can do it r
10	four. But now if you've got a classroom of twenty guys,
11	yeah, it may take you five, six, or seven hours.
12	The quantity of hours I don't think is the issue.
13	I think it's how well you do it and, like I say, if you've
14	got one it's not going to take half as much time.
15	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I just have one other
16	question.
17	You indicated that your operation, I mean the
18	contractors that you have, the ones that are involved
19	directly in the processing or extraction you treat them like
20	miners, and they get the kind of training that the other
21	miners get.
22	Do you have contractors whose ties to your
23	operation are maybe less regular, less close to the actual

process, I mean service people who come onto the property for

short periods of time? And, if so, do you have any views as

24

25

- 1 far as how we should approach training for those kinds of
- 2 | people?
- MR. COLSON: Yes, we have a certified form, and
- 4 | we've had it approved through MSHA, and it's one page, but
- 5 | it's long, and we train all vendors, everybody that comes on
- 6 | the property.
- 7 MS. ALEJANDRO: When you say train, what do you
- 8 | mean?
- 9 MR. COLSON: Hazard training.
- 10 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Site-specific hazard
- 11 training?
- 12 MR. COLSON: Right.
- MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And then they get that?
- MR. COLSON: Yes.
- 15 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. But as far as, you know, the
- 16 | eight hours of annual refresher, the new miner training,
- 17 | those contractors as far as you know, I mean they get it,
- 18 | it's given to them by their employers?
- 19 MR. COLSON: Right. Now, occasionally we do train
- 20 | contractors.
- 21 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
- 22 MR. COLSON: If we let out a bid, and the project
- 23 engineer comes up and says "I've let this to so and so," and
- 24 | I look and I say "Well, gosh, he hasn't got any training.
- 25 | Where's his training?" "I didn't know." I say "Well, okay,

- 1 | yeah, " and under the circumstances I will train contractors,
- 2 but normally they're responsible for their own training and
- 3 | having the certification form.
- 4 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. But you give them site-
- 5 | specific hazard training?
- 6 MR. COLSON: Also, in addition to that.
- 7 MS. ALEJANDRO: All right. That's all I have.
- 8 Kevin or Rod?
- 9 MR. BRELAND: I just have a couple of follow-ups.
- 10 One, I would like to commend the work record.
- 11 That's pretty impressive, that many millions of hours without
- 12 | a lost-time accident.
- But you say you do the Part 48 training now, or
- 14 | comply with that. Is that including the record-keeping and
- 15 | all of that you're doing as well?
- MR. COLSON: Sure.
- MR. BRELAND: So this proposed rule is less
- 18 | stringent than what you're doing, or the coalition is
- 19 offering?
- 20 MR. COLSON: I know this has reduces fatalities.
- 21 | We've got sufficient laws on the books. You know, I don't
- 22 | think we need any more laws.
- 23 MR. BRELAND: Okay. That's all I had. I wondered
- 24 | if you were doing the paperwork as well right now.
- 25 MR. COLSON: All right.

MS. FONTAINE: Mr. Colson, could you give me an 1 2 estimate of what it costs for you to train your employees on 3 an annual basis? 4 MR. COLSON: Gosh. Just in Georgia we're probably spending with all the little gimmicks and the shirts and 5 jackets I'm going to say it's around twenty thousand just in 6 7 Georgia. 8 MS. FONTAINE: Do you usually do your training on site, or do you send your employees -- ? 9 10 MR. COLSON: The majority of our training is on 11 site. 12 MS. FONTAINE: Okay. Do you bring professionals 13 in? 14 MR. COLSON: Occasionally I will bring them in, or 15 I'll send out people. And we also have a -- we have fifty 16 hourly employees, but we also have like sixteen certified 17 instructors. 18 MS. FONTAINE: Thank you. MR. BURNS: I just have a question on the annual 19 20 refresher training. 21 You indicated that that draft is a little bit too vague, it just says they pick whatever subjects are 22 23 appropriate. I guess other people bring the concern that, 24 you know, Part 48 lists all kinds of subjects, and they feel

that perhaps some of those areas don't really need to be

25

addressed, they would rather focus on some of the safety
concerns that they have at their particular property, and
they would like to have more flexibility to pick and choose
those subjects which are relevant, you know, in any given
year. Would you support something along those lines?

MR. COLSON: Sure, yeah. And it states in the draft training, and it works the same way now. Part 48-28 talks about explosives. Well, obviously we don't use explosives and blasting, so, you know, we don't do that, so we're not required.

MR. BURNS: Thank you.

2.0

MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Colson.

The next speaker on our list is Ken Stockton from GCSA/Benchmark.

MR. STOCKTON: My name is Ken Stockton, I'm the safety director for Benchmark Materials, Southeast Region. That's Stockton, S-t-o-c-k-t-o-n.

I am also representing the Georgia Crushed Stone
Association safety committee, and the members of the Georgia
Crushed Stone Association.

Basically what I am here for is to state that the Georgia Crushed Stone Association and its members are behind the efforts of the Coalition for Effective Miner Training, to bring flexible and more specific training to our segment of the industry.

1 And I'll stop there and let you ask questions.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Are you saying you support the draft, the latest coalition draft as far as what the requirements in a proposed rule would be?

MR. STOCKTON: Yes.

6 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you have anything to add 7 to that?

MR. STOCKTON: Not really. The latest draft that I have is 11/19/98.

MS. ALEJANDRO: I think actually there's a later draft, but they're pretty similar.

MR. STOCKTON: They're similar.

MR. STOCKTON: Twenty years.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Well, let me ask you this question: As I said earlier, and as I have asked earlier, we have got to figure out -- once we decide what the requirements in this rule are going to be we've also got to determine how long we're going to give to the affected industries to come up to compliance with these requirements, and obviously as I said earlier how much time is needed is going to depend to a certain extent on what the requirements look like, but assume, you know, hypothetically that the rule looks somewhat like the latest draft that you have seen, in your best guess how long do you think the agency should give the industry to come into compliance with those requirements?

1	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
2	[Laughter.]
3	MR. STOCKTON: I believe it's in the proposal for
4	one year. Is that correct?
5	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. So you think that's a good
6	time?
7	MR. STOCKTON: for the industry to come in line.
8	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you think it ought to be,
9	the requirements ought to be phased in? I mean that's one of
10	the things that we have discussed at some of the other
11	meetings is for example I mean an operator has got to have a
12	training program, would it make sense to have that
13	requirement go into effect sooner than perhaps the
14	requirement that the miners be trained, or do you think that
15	all requirements ought to go into effect at about the same
16	time?
17	Would that, you know, enhance the likelihood that
18	maybe some of the people out there who aren't doing training
19	will be able to come into line with it easier, or do you not
20	think it matters a great deal?
21	MR. STOCKTON: Say that again. You have the
22	training program
23	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I mean operators have got
24	you know, under the Act, I mean under Section 1-15 of the
25	Act, and it's a requirement that we have no choice, I mean

it's got to be included into any rule that we develop, mine
operators have got to develop and implement a training
program for their miners.

MR. STOCKTON: Okay.

MS. ALEJANDRO: And then on top of it they've got to train the miners after they have developed the training program.

For a compliance deadline do you think that it would enhance the ability of some of the operators out there to come into compliance if say hypothetically we made it a requirement that went into effect in six months that the operator develop their plan, and then six months thereafter -- I mean we basically give them a year to actually train their miners under the plan they developed, or do you not -- that's just an example -- or do you not think that that really makes a great deal of difference, we should just give a year for operators to comply with everything?

MR. STOCKTON: I think you ought to give them the same amount of time for everything.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. A year -- I mean if you were going to pick a year then you would give them a year to develop their plan, and also to train their miners?

MR. STOCKTON: Correct.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I don't have any more questions. Do you, Kevin or Rod?

- I guess the -- I'm not sure, but the 1 MR. BRELAND: 2 training of supervisors is an issue that was recently changed 3 in Part 48, and so far I guess basically just getting your 4 opinion on any sort of requirement for training of supervisors in this rule. 5 6
  - MR. STOCKTON: We train all our supervisors. don't know what you -- Do you mean over and above the regular safety training?
  - MR. BRELAND: Or for instance like consider them under the definition of miners so that they require training also.
  - MR. STOCKTON: I can speak for Benchmark.
- 13 MR. BRELAND: Okay.

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

21

- 14 MR. STOCKTON: We train all ours anyway just like 15 they are regular out there pulling the wrenches so to speak, 16 because a lot of them are.
  - And so if you're asking should everybody else do that, is that what you're asking?
- 19 MR. BRELAND: Well, I just wanted to make sure that 20 the training -- the original Part 48 had I guess a loophole where supervisors weren't considered miners, and therefore 22 they weren't necessarily required to have training, and that 23 was recently addressed in soliciting information concerning if they are considered miners should they get the same sort 24 25 of training, or would you recommend additional training or

- additional training or additional subjects for those people?

  MR. STOCKTON: I think they should be trained the

  same way.
- 4 MR. BRELAND: Okay. I don't have any more right now.
- 6 MS. ALEJANDRO: Do you have any, Rod?

MR. BRELAND: Just a couple.

Presently when you do annual refresher at your operations, are you doing that spread out over the year, or are you doing that in what block?

MR. STOCKTON: We spread it out over the year, it's continuous training, and we do it in tailgate meetings, and we do it monthly.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. Do you keep records of that by sign-in sheets, or do you keep some summary of an individual's total training for the year?

MR. STOCKTON: I can tell you what we do as far as Benchmark Materials. We have a form that they sign when they come to the safety meetings. That form has two blocks. One is for tailgate meetings, the other one is for annual refresher training.

Whichever one they go to is the one that's checked off. That form is turned in, and the safety managers keep track of that during the year. They put out a quarterly report telling people which subjects that they need to do for

Page 80

- 1 | the rest of the year.
- 2 If a tailgate meeting for example goes an hour,
- 3 | that's allowed to count toward annual refresher training if
- 4 | it is an annual refresher training subject.
- 5 MR. BRELAND: Okay. That sounds like a good way to
- 6 | track it. I just didn't know, I was curious how you were
- 7 | doing that.
- 8 How many operations do you have that are in the
- 9 | state?
- 10 MR. STOCKTON: We're in North Carolina, South
- 11 | Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama. We have 34
- 12 | locations.
- MR. BRELAND: 34 locations.
- 14 And then about the initial training, if you hire a
- 15 | new inexperienced miner, how do you handle your 24-hour
- 16 | program?
- MR. STOCKTON: We do eight hours first, and then
- 18 | the other sixteen within sixty days.
- 19 MR. BRELAND: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have
- 20 MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Stockton.
- 21 The next speaker on our list is Bobby Rider from
- 22 | Vulcan and the Georgia Mining Association.
- 23 | MR. RIDER: My name is Bobby Rider, it's R-i-d-e-r,
- 24 I'm with Vulcan Materials Company, also a member of the
- 25 | Georgia Mining Association Safety and Health Committee, as

well as the Georgia Crushed Stone Safety and Health
Committee.

I appreciate the opportunity in your letting us come up today and give you our opinions and views on this particular subject.

I think, though, that MSHA needs to look long and hard at a program that is already in effect as far as training is concerned, and that's the state grants program that I know we use in speaking for Vulcan Materials Company quite a bit, as well as other members of the associations that I belong to.

Pickens Tech and the money that is allocated to them is used very wisely, it's used to train miners in the state of Georgia as well as the state of South Carolina which I am also involved in.

I would like to see possibly more money given to the state grants program. If you can help in any way, fine, and it would certainly be appreciated by members of the two associations.

Talking now about Part 48, the changes that you're talking about, I think that one of the problems that I have with it personally -- and I think I can speak from experience, I've been with Vulcan for twenty-five years, been involved in safety dealing especially with OSHA for most of that time, a little bit back in the MESA days, but ever since

MSHA was formed in 1997 I guess, so I've been around a little bit, I've had to personally do the training myself years ago.

Thank goodness our company now has allowed us to expand our training staff and our safety and health staff, and we do most of the new-hire training, at least what we call Day A training is done by us in house.

Going back to the days that I used to do it, and listening to the people that now report to me we're still having the same problem, or they're having the same problem that I had, and it was touched on earlier, and that's the fact that MSHA law says that you must give eight hours of training initially, or 24 hours to inexperienced miners.

To me that's kind of ridiculous. If we can give good quality training without any kind of time limit on it, then we ought to be allowed to do that.

We don't need necessarily 24 hours, or sixty hours, or whatever number you come up with to do good adequate training. I would certainly like to see our business thrown out, the topics that you asked us to, or that's required by the law, I guess I have a problem with that also.

And the reason I say that is training to me almost has to be site-specific. We at Vulcan have very large plants, and we have very small plants, but overall if you look at them we would call them small plants. We might have some plants with eighty people, but most of ours run around

the twenty to thirty range, somewhere in there.

And we know from experience that it takes a different type training at our smaller operations than it does our larger operations, and the reason for that is that in our smaller operations we have to train our new employees to do multiple tasks, that in our larger operations the initial training and the initial hiring that we do does not require that we do multiple training tasks.

For example, in a small plant we might hire a person as a truck driver, but if we have a breakdown then that employee is going to have to certainly participate in doing the repair and maintenance, whereas in some of our larger operations that would not be true. So I would like to see almost a site-specific type training without really telling us what we need to train them.

That carries over into annual refresher training. We are required to cover certain areas. It's difficult for me as -- we're going through annual refresher training as we speak, Pickens Tech is up at one of our quarries in north Georgia, and I've been with them for the last couple of days doing annual refresher training.

As I look at the actual analysis and analyze the actions that we've had in the past year we base our training program for annual refresher training based on that analysis.

We have a lot of hand injuries. This year we're

concentrating heavily in annual refresher training in eliminating those hand injuries. If we're not having any problems in some other area, then I don't think we need to waste our employees' time or our time dealing with those areas where there's not a problem.

For example, lock and tag procedures. Very rigid lock and tag procedures that we have, it's gone over time and time again during annual -- I mean during weekly safety meetings, so during the annual refresher training do we really need to talk about that? I don't really feel that we should.

The other item I want to talk about, and I have scratched some notes down, deals with contractors. I do think contractors are a problem. However, I see us getting a better handle on that problem.

They are required to have training. We don't do the training, we simply in our contract say that they are going to be required to abide by all the MSHA regulations as well as our own safety rules, and they are given Pickens Tech who is the state grants program here in Georgia, we give them their phone number, they contact them, and they do a lot of training of contractors. We personally would like to stay away from that from a liability standpoint.

The only area where we get involved in contractors is really done at a plant level, and that's hazard training

that we make with the contractors before they start to work, and they are invited and do attend our weekly safety meetings at our operations.

Last, but not least, whatever changes are made I hope that MSHA will be consistent in enforcing those particular standards, in fact hopefully a lot better than they are in enforcing the current standards. There seems to be quite a bit of discretion and difference of opinion from almost operation to operation, but in my opinion and what I see is there is such a drastic difference in the way that inspectors inspect our operations compared to other operations. I have a problem with that, and I certainly do not want to see that in part, whatever part comes up.

With that I conclude my remarks, and thank you.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Rider, I just have a couple of questions, and others may as well.

You indicated that you believe that we should get away from the hours requirement for training, that it imposed restrictions on training that were not necessary. As you probably know, there are some hours requirements, we can't get away from them in the Act, specifically it puts a minimum of 24 hours of new miner training and eight hours of annual refresher training.

But having said that, one of the issues we're trying to deal with here is what type of training, or how

much training should a new miner get before he or she begins work at the site.

Now, I gather from your remarks that you don't think we ought to put like two hours minimum training before they start work or, you know, four hours and the balance of the 24 hours to be delivered within whatever period of time.

However, do you think the rule should address minimum training for miners before they begin work in some fashion, I mean either by way of subject areas or something along those lines?

MR. RIDER: No, I really don't think it should be.

I think that we're smart enough that we know what needs to be taught, and how long in that area.

And again it's almost task-specific. Somebody mentioned earlier that most of their new people are haul truck drivers -- well, you know, so are ours -- and before they go do any other work we give them training at that particular time, so I hate to see us try to cover everything in one session.

And let me give you an example of this. Back when I was doing the training we had to bring these new employees in, and we're talking about safety around screens. These people don't know what screens are, they think that's something that goes over a window, and that's not what we're talking about.

I have found it works much better for us, we bring them in, give them some initial training going over safety rules, and what MSHA is, and maybe the statutory rights of miners, and then bring them back in a week or two after they have been under close supervision, they sure do have a lot better questions, they sure do comprehend a lot better what we're trying to teach them.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Uh-huh.

MR. RIDER: So to say that we need to do this in 24 hours or not, I don't know, and if we need to change the law then that certainly needs to be a project, too, of industry as well as MSHA.

MS. ALEJANDRO: But you're saying their exposure to the work site causes them to maybe get a lot more out of whatever training they get after they have been exposed to the work site for some period of time?

MR. RIDER: Absolutely, as long as they're with that competent person as MSHA calls them, yeah.

MS. ALEJANDRO: All right. Kevin?

MR. BRELAND: Just a couple of things.

You have, Vulcan has an awful lot of operations I'm sure, and this issue of the smaller plant versus the larger one, it sounds like you spend more time typically for new employees at the smaller operations because of the multiple jobs they might do.

Are you talking about the task-type training itself rather than say some other introduction in the work environment?

MR. RIDER: We certainly do comply with what is required of us right now.

I guess what I'm asking is the opportunity to make those changes that we need to make in those two areas.

Certainly at a smaller operation we may talk more about repair and maintenance, hand safety, and proper lifting procedures than we would in a larger operation initially in our training.

MR. BRELAND: Well, would you -- then I assume you have like a training plan that you use for each operation now. Would you be proposing to have a more individualized outline that you follow at the mines based on the specific needs of that mine?

MR. RIDER: Yes, sir.

MR. BRELAND: And then that would cover a listing of some kind of what was typically expected for that type of occupation I assume at each of those locations?

MR. RIDER: Yes, sir. I guess what -- The thing I want to try to get you to understand is don't limit me on time on how long I've got to talk about something, or not all -- or a list of subjects that I have to discuss. That's what I'm after. I know that is in the law right now.

MR. BRELAND: Well, I think everybody understands that flexibility needs to be built into anything new that's coming about, but if you were saying that you needed that flexibility because of the mine-specific additional training, certainly any additional training I don't think would ever be a problem with MSHA or anybody else, state organizations either.

MR. BRELAND: Just on the contractor issue, you follow a list of hazard issues for each mine operation that you would cover with a contractor that comes on site, like hazard training.

MR. RIDER: Yes, sir. We have, and it's given to each contractor, a contractor handbook that is given to the contractor and their employees that covers a lot of issues.

A lot of them are our safety rules, and some of them are MSHA requirements.

But site-specific again might be our blasting procedures at that plant, our emergency evacuation, just the hazards they can look for. Does that answer your question?

MR. BRELAND: Yes, it did. Thank you.

That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. BURNS: On the annual refresher training, would you recommend that MSHA put out some sort of data analysis, or accident and injury analysis on a yearly basis for the industry to help them choose the subjects that may be

1 | relevant for annual refresher training?

I mean you do that for your own operations. Would you see that as a benefit to the industry if that was something that MSHA did?

MR. RIDER: Yes. Kevin, if it's specific enough.

If you just send out an analysis that, you know, 68 percent of the people, miners were injured doing repair and maintenance that doesn't tell us anything. Specifically what they were doing, were they using a hammer, or a tool, or whatever, now we can see where we are, was it a hand injury, eye injury, back injury, and get pretty specific with it.

The way we do it it really helps us zero in and see where the problems are, and if you could do that, yes, sir, that would be helpful to us, to me.

MR. BURNS: Okay. I don't have any more questions.

I think everybody else has covered everything I had on my
mind.

MS. ALEJANDRO: I think Rosyln has got a couple of questions.

MS. FONTAINE: Actually I just have one question for you.

Would you be willing to submit some data to us showing the differences in what it costs to train your employees on an annual basis, the twenty employees versus the eighty, so we have a feel?

1 MR. RIDER: Sure. That would be easy to do.

My only problem is I hate to put a number with cost when it comes to safety. I don't know how much money right here sitting today it costs or that we spent on safety training in 1998. I can certainly get that number.

I guess the number I would like to see is how much money did we save by spending that money, and how much we spend as our top executives in our company, our CEO and president have said cost is not an issue when it comes to safety.

We do keep up with those costs, we do need to know how much we're spending, and we'll be glad to submit that to you. If you just want to know what does it cost to train twenty people versus eighty people, yes, I can come up with that, and I'll furnish that.

MS. FONTAINE: Okay. Well, actually we would be interested in that as well, if you could help us to quantify the savings as a result of the training. That would help, too.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Rider, we appreciate your point as far as, you know, the benefits of training, but as far as the regulatory process the agency has got to come up with an estimate of how much it's going to cost the industry to comply with any of the requirements in the rule, so that's why we have to ask these questions. But we appreciate your

1 | point.

That's all. Thank you very much, Mr. Rider.

Mr. Hart, are you ready to go?

MR. HART: Yes.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Ben Hart from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

MR. HART: Thank you. Good morning.

I am Ben Hart, Mine Safety and Health Program

Director, Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

That's H-a-r-t.

It is a pleasure to be here this morning. I would like to start off by saying that I've been conducting MSHA training, Part 48 training through the state program of the State of Florida for a little over ten years now, and I would like to especially acknowledge Mr. Rider's comments about the increase of funding for state grants, and I plan to talk about this, and a couple of my state grant buddies from other states are here, and I think that that definitely is needed, and I will discuss that in a few minutes.

But first of all I'm kind of confused, I don't know if I've got the wrong copy of something, but I've been conducting this training for ten years, and I'm hearing from the industry that it's very difficult to do the training, it imposes a hardship on the companies to do safety and health training under Part 48 for surface aggregate industries.

And I guess I have been living in a dream world or something because I haven't found it that difficult. I have found it difficult to keep the training fresh and new, to talk about the same subjects every year, but it's a dull thing.

You can't put a program together -- we've talked about training programs this morning -- you can't put a program together -- you can't put a training program together today and keep training on that exact same program ten years from now. It needs to be changed every year.

As far as the training plan submitted to MSHA, I think that can be a static plan that is only changed as needs arise, or as the circumstances require.

The reason I wanted to defer to later, I wanted to hear some of the comments because I wasn't sure what all this furor was about. I've had conversations with the stone association members over the years, and I hear people from these companies coming up here talking saying we're complying now. I don't know if that's because MSHA is here and they're not going to say they're not, I don't think it is. I think they are complying now, and I think when this rider is lifted there won't be any problem, business as usual basically with some minor modifications.

But under -- I want to address the questions that were in the Federal Register, which Sections 1-15 subjects

should be taught before assignment of work duties. Right now we have three, we have introduction to work environment, hazard recognition, health and safety aspects and the task force that was assigned, and I would like to recommend from that list that was in the Federal Register adding emergency procedures to that simply because a person the first day on the job and they're assigned to work with an experienced miner, or the first day out in the field let's say, there may be an emergency horn go off, and they don't know what that is, they didn't get that coverage in the introduction to work environment. It should have been, but since it was listed as a separate point I think that would be good to mention.

Should new miner training be given all at once or spread out? That's already addressed in new miner in Part 48.25. You have the right, the mine has the right to request split training, it's up to the district manager to approve it, but it's my understanding that at least in the Southeast which I'm most familiar with we've never had any split training request denied.

It does give the operator flexibility. That word has been used quite a bit, flexibility. I think it gives the operator flexibility. They choose the split training, they say they're going to give them a minimum of eight hours before they go out in the field for their assigned work duty, but they can also give the other sixteen hours in day two and

day three if they want to, so they've got some flexibility, or they can give four hours now, and four hours next week, and four hours next week, as long as they meet the minimum which Section 1-15 specifies a minimum of 24.

I think to change any of the hours to anything less than 24 is going to require changing the Act, and I think that's a big task we don't want to tackle, we don't need to tackle.

Should the operator make the decision about flexibility? Again, it's already there in Part 48-23 under training plans. It gives them that flexibility for split training.

Let's see. Should supervisors be subject to this training. I definitely think so, I think that supervisors are getting killed just like regular miners, nonsupervisory miners at an alarming rate, and I know in particular in Florida we had three supervisors get seriously injured a number of years ago because they weren't familiar with the tasks they were doing.

It was over the Christmas holidays, they were filling in for workers who had taken Christmas vacation, and they should have had more training that they didn't have. As supervisors they were considered they didn't have to have that training.

So should supervisors be included under all Part 48

Page 96

training? Yes, I think definitely.

2.4

Let's see. Mr. Martin mentioned in his presentation a need for more training videos, and MSHA should come up with more training videos, and I agree, but also we would like to mention that the state grants programs in several states have developed video programs, slide programs, handouts, just a number of things that are available through the Minecap or through the individual states themselves, and these should be listed in the MSHA catalog at the academy already under state grants section.

There are a lot of things out there already, but I certainly encourage MSHA as he did to continue to develop training materials.

To go back to say, to concur with Bobby Rider that there needs to be close coordination with the state grants program, there needs to be support of the state grants program from MSHA not only from Section 503 of the Act, but also more coordination, more conversation, and work more closely with it.

There was an instance several years ago where MSHA wanted to do a quick educational sweep about something -- I think it was a rash of fatalities at the end of '96 -- and I felt the state grant should have been more heavily involved in that.

That's all I do is train, develop training

programs. I do not inspect, I don't have that
responsibility, and I don't think most of the state grantees
do, so that's what we're there for, and I think we need to
have more utilization of the state grant program.

Having said that, in order to do more training, and I think when this rider is lifted, or I know when this rider is lifted in the state of Florida I'm going to get a big demand for training right away, and I'm not going to be able to cover it all.

There's just one person covering the whole state, so I'm going to need some help, and the help comes in the form of money to pay somebody.

So I would certainly like to see language in this proposed rule that increases the state grant funding.

Section 503 authorized up to \$10 million, in fact authorized \$10 million after 1970 for the state grant program, and to date we have never gotten more than seven -- I think right now we are at about 6.3 million, 6.34, and that's been static for the last several years.

So we do need some more money in order to do this, but I think it is a doable thing.

The issue with the smaller mine versus the larger mine, that flexibility I think is already in place also in Part 48 because in the training plan each operation, each mine with an ID number, or a plant with an ID number has to

Page 98

have a training plan submitted to MSHA.

The problem is right now under the rider they cannot be either approved or disapproved, they can be accepted or not accepted, but with the smaller mine you can make your training plan more flexible because in addition the courses are already outlined under Part 48 and in Section 115 of the Act.

Under Part 48 it says such other courses as are required by the district manager based on the circumstances at the mine, and I'm not sure about the wording, but required by the district manager, perhaps that could be stricken and just say such other courses as required based on, or as recommended or suggested based on the circumstances and conditions of the mine. So I think there's room for that flexibility already.

Let's see. I think that pretty well covers everything I would like to say. Thank you very much.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Hart, I have a couple of questions.

Do you have any sense -- and I have asked this of others -- in your area, the geographical area that you cover of what percentage or what number of mine operators are not currently giving safety training to their employees?

MR. HART: No, ma'am, I don't have even a guesstimate figure, but of the -- and somebody earlier

mentioned fatalities, and fatalities is certainly a good
measure of how things are going -- the fatalities we've had
in ten years in Florida, none of the people that have died
have been trained by the state grant program.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. HART: They may have been trained by the company.

I do know as somebody mentioned earlier that there is a problem with small operators, they're worried about complying with Part 56, and since MSHA cannot enforce Part 48 they don't worry about Part 48.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Right.

MR. HART: But we are increasingly training greater numbers of people each year through the state grant program because of word of mouth, and also because of the possible removal of the rider.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. HART: And we welcome that.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. It's sort of related, as far as the compliance deadline, you know, we are under an obligation to publish a final rule in September of this year.

What's your best recommendation for how long we ought to give beyond that date for compliance with the requirements and the rule?

MR. HART: I'm glad you asked that. I meant to

1 | address that.

Mr. Stockton mentioned twenty years initially, and that number does ring a bell with me. Twenty years is how long the requirement has been in place; the rider has been there nineteen years.

I think that they should be in compliance now, but granted we've got to give some of them time to get in order.

I think a couple of months, sixty days ought to be plenty of time.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

MR. HART: Particularly because they should at least have a training plan in place. A lot of them may not, but there again their state grant program can help them implement or write their training plan.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. When I ask for your best guess as far as how long it would take, I'm also looking for you to tell me how long it's going to take you maybe to address the needs that are going to be generated by --

MR. HART: As far as training needs, it depends. If we get more resources and can hire the adequate number of trainers we can probably train them in sixty, maybe ninety days, but if --

And what we're trying to do now is train them before this takes place, train them just as if the rider didn't exist --

1	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.
2	MR. HART: all who will let us do the training,
3	and the questions have been directed about how much does it
4	cost to train, and that's another thing that in Florida
5	anyway since I'm the only trainer we use the MSHA grant funds
6	to do the training, and do not charge the companies anything.
7	I believe that's a return of their tax dollars, a
8	good return of their tax dollars.
9	MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Rod, do you have any
LO	questions?
L1	MR. BRELAND: Yes. Ben, in the state of Florida do
L2	you have any feel for like what percent of your exempt
L3	operations are maybe not following Part 48 now?
L4	I know you do a lot of training and you're around
L5	the entire state, and some may do portions of it.
L6	MR. HART: Right. I think all of them are trying
L7	to do some kind of training, health and safety talks, and
L8	they have introductory talks, but if you're looking for a
L9	guess it would be probably forty percent maybe, thirty or
20	forty percent, the small operators.
21	MR. BRELAND: That are not doing any training, any
2.2	training related to Part 48 as it exists under the Act?

that hires somebody who has had no experience in mining is

certainly going to give them a walk-around tour, going to

MR. HART:

23

24

25

I think that anybody, any mining company

1 | give them an introduction to the mining environment.

They're going to give them hazard recognition, they're going to tell them about the alligator that likes to lay out in the sun over there by that pond, watch out for him, things like that.

And they're they're doing some of the Part 48 training, but they're really aware of what they're doing because they may not be -- I hope they are aware of what Part 48 training requires. That's one of the things we have tried to do in Florida is to make sure that we do get the rules out to them, make sure they understand, and make sure we're there to help them.

But, no, I wouldn't say that that percentage is not doing any Part 48 training as far as documentation, Part 48 training as far as documentation, Part 48 training on 5023 they may not be filling those out.

MR. BRELAND: Okay.

MR. HART: But I would really hate to give a guess, because the percentage may be as low as ten percent.

MR. BRELAND: Okay.

MR. HART: But doing some, but not doing a complete program, and not doing it under an approval or accepted plan.

MR. BRELAND: Yeah, we would expect a lot would be doing required training that they didn't even know they were doing --

1 MR. HART: Right.

MR. BRELAND: -- because they would do it as the nature of their work.

MR. HART: Right. I believe, Rob, somebody mentioned common sense training. That's a given. I mean if you're in the mining business and you're making money at all you're doing something right, using common sense, and safety has got to be an integral part of it, safety training.

MR. BRELAND: Now, you also I think mentioned earlier about the eight/sixteen split and -- I think that was discussed anyway -- do you have a sense for what you would consider as a minimum amount of time a new employee inexperienced should have the formalized type training prior go going in the work environment?

MR. HART: Right. Recently I revised my training plan in Florida at the suggestion of MSHA, some people I talked to in Arlington, and I had an eight-hour requirement for newly-employed experienced miner training, and had been recommending that to all the people that called in and asked questions about training class, help them to develop training plans that should be a minimum of eight hours.

I have since changed that, and I believe in that now that the term "as needed" in terms of hours under newly-employed experienced miner, and I think that could possibly be applied here to give some flexibility that the people have

been asking for is without delineating the exact hour, but requiring that records be kept of how many hours they went.

In a small operation take the introduction to work environment for example. In a small mom and pop sand and gravel operation that might take five minutes to see the whole operation. In a large crushed stone operation it may take a half a day, so it depends.

But I think the language as needed could be there, and requiring documentation of what was covered during that course, things which will be outlined in the training plan.

MR. BRELAND: That's all I have. Thanks.

MR. BURNS: As far as the issue of Spanish training, how are you currently addressing that for the work force mainly in southern Florida?

MR. HART: Okay. Well, first of all, I have had several Spanish-speaking, predominantly Hispanic native people taking the instructor class, the MSHA instructor class.

We have a number of videos that we have done through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Department of Education prior to that with the program, and we are currently having those translated into Spanish. In fact, I'm going next week to finalize the Spanish translations of four of the videos. We did a new video this past year, and that also will be translated into Spanish.

Of course, anybody who wants to be an instructor -this is something that was mentioned earlier I would like to
address and I forgot it -- the instructor certification
requirements, there's a move to say a competent person,
whatever that definition may be, can do the training

I believe that a person doing MSHA instruction under Part 48, or whatever part it may be called, should be properly trained, should be adequate and competent to do it, and I think that requires some standardized training.

Right now we've got some people doing one day of training for instructors, some doing three, some doing five, some doing ten. In Florida I do ten. I do not only the instructor training for MSHA, but also the first aid instructor and the Part 48 subject matter.

I've had a lot of opposition on that issue because people feel like that their people already know the subject matter. Well, if they've gone through ten or fifteen or twenty years of annual refresher training, yes, they should know what to teach, but a lot of them don't, and when I was doing a one-week course I kept getting questions from people "Well, what do I use to teach this?" and particularly in the Spanish, "How do we train the Spanish people?"

And so I have a problem with saying that as long as you've got a sign, for example for hazard training you've got a sign posted and it's in Spanish and it's in English that

it's adequate training, because you don't know if that person can read Spanish, or can read English or not, and you don't know if they can even read Spanish.

We have some miners in all states I believe that probably can't functionally read and write at all, but they can do a good job as a miner, but they can't read, and if you're going to train them by posting signs it's not going to be effective training.

If you give them a form to sign that says "I have read and agree to abide by all these rules and understand the hazards," you put an "X" there they know where to sign it, but that doesn't mean they've read it.

But your question as far as Spanish, I know the University of Texas has taken that program in Texas is doing a lot of stuff in Spanish, Spanish translations, and Florida is getting into that, and I think we all need to work together with MSHA on that very issue.

MR. BURNS: That was part of my question, is that something you think that we should focus some more resources on?

MR. HART: Yes.

MR. BURNS: Okay.

MR. HART: I think you should, and I think you should work particularly with the states that have that problem.

MR. BURNS: Are you recommending that we add 1 2 alligator awareness to the requirements? 3 [Laughter.] 4 MR. HART: Whatever it takes. That would be based 5 on circumstances and conditions at the mine. In Florida that is a problem. Any time you've got a body of water you may 6 7 have alligators, probably will. 8 MR. BURNS: Thanks, Ben. 9 MR. HART: Okay. MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Hart. 10 11 The next speaker on our list is Kenneth Jackman 12 from China Clay Producers Association. 13 MR. JACKMAN: Good morning. My name is Ken 14 Jackman, J-a-c-k-m-a-n, and I represent the China Clay 15 Producers Association here in Georgia. 16 The China Clay Producers Association is an 17 association of five kaolin companies, it's the five water-18 washed kaolin companies here in the United States. 19 very small association. We have in total about forty-five 20 hundred employees, and we utilize routinely somewhere between 21 three and four thousand contractors, depending on the 22 workload and what's going on in the kaolin business. 23 I am very pleased to report this morning we have a

very excellent safety record, we have had for years.

expect this year we will complete 1998 with a total case

24

25

incident rate of about 1.6, and that incident rate is not based on lost-time accidents, but is based on recordables, which is an exceptional rate, and probably one of the lowest rates in the country I would suspect.

One of the reasons we have good results is that we support training; we always have, our executives always have made safety training a priority in our industry, in the case of all five companies a number one priority.

We support -- I'm here this morning to support the precepts that are outlined in the Coalition for Effective Miner Training and the work that's been done there. The latest draft I've seen is December 9th, and I think this is basically the points Mr. Machemehl made earlier, the China Clay Producers Association does support those same points.

I would like to talk a little bit about some of the important, what I consider to be the important pieces within those points, and the first two are the ones that talk about effective and pertinent training.

In terms of pertinent training, as I look at the kaolin industry I think that people that are in the best position to be able to determine what is pertinent training are the people that are running the kaolin business. I think we have done that over the years.

Have we done it as perfectly as we could possibly do? Of course not. We have made some mistakes, and every

time we make a mistake we try to correct that and change our training program so that we reflect those mistakes, and sometimes those mistakes end up being accidents, and we try to learn from our accidents and not repeat the accidents.

The fact of the matter is that nobody knows the kaolin business better than we do, and nobody knows I don't believe what it takes to train our miners any better than we do, and we use a variety of different techniques.

Some of our companies train internally, and strongly believe that internal training is the way to go.

Many of our companies use Pickens Tech that we have talked about this morning, and it's been very effective for many of our companies, particularly on refresher training and new miner training.

Regardless of how the training is accomplished, I think the most important point is that the training has got to be effective, and it's got to be absolutely pertinent to the industry that it applies to.

I would also like to talk a little bit about the role I think that MSHA has in terms of enforcing not only training, but anything. I have long been a believer that we are dealing with a finite number of resources, whether we're talking about the resources that exist within our companies, or the resources that exist within the MSHA organization, and that finite body of resources really ought to be allocated in

the direction of need.

We have companies even within our small group of five companies that -- for example last year I had one of my five companies had eight hundred and some-odd employees and had one recordable accident the entire year. Not a lost-time accident, but a recordable accident the entire year.

That company believe should not receive the same level of scrutiny from MSHA as other companies even within the kaolin business that maybe had twenty or twenty-five recordable accidents. There's got to be some discretion that's exercised, or the resources that MSHA has, and the resources that we have in our companies is never going to be adequate.

Contractor philosophy. Many of the speakers this morning have talked about our philosophy or what's required for contractors, and clearly contractors are becoming a more and more important part of the mining business, and that is also the case in the kaolin industry.

I mentioned our numbers, forty-two hundred fulltime employees, and three to four thousand contractors, and I
suspect over the next five to ten years you're going to see
that number shift even higher in the direction of
contractors.

It's absolutely the philosophy of all our companies that every contractor that comes on board needs to be

properly trained, and needs to be certified, and that every contractor that comes on board needs to not only live up to the standards that are imposed by MSHA, but the standards that are generally speaking even more stringent that are imposed by our companies.

The fact of the matter is that many contractors work side by side with our employees, and if you walk into one of our plants sometimes it's virtually impossible to tell who's a contractor and who's an employee, so clearly the standards for the employees have to be the same as they are for the contractors.

Record keeping has not been talked about too much today. I would like to touch on record keeping. The record keeping that comes out of this process I believe has got to be effective record keeping, but it's got to be simple, and I strongly believe in the KISS principle, let's keep it as simple as possible, let's not again stretch our limited corporate resources and our limited MSHA resources in looking at record keeping that's anything more than the very simplest necessary to get the job done.

The last point I would like to make is -- I believe I'm correct when I say that in 1978 when the training was exempted from certain industries our Congress in their wisdom took away some of the money that was in the training budget at that time. In other words, they pared it back based on

the number of miners that were going to be trained.

I strongly believe that that money needs to be -when we make this change in 1999, or I guess it's the year
2000 we'll officially make the change, that money ought to be
restored, and it ought to be restored not in 1978 dollars,
but in 1999 or the year 2000 dollars. It ought to be
ratcheted up to accommodate the changes in the inflation in
that interim period.

So that's kind of a quick and dirty summary of the points I wanted to make this morning. I would be glad to answer any questions you might have, or amplify on those points.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Jackman, I've got a couple of questions, and it concerns the issue of contractors.

The first question is one of the issues that has come up at some of the other meetings is the responsibility for providing training to contractor employees, and I would say one of the positions that we've heard a number of times from some of the speakers is that the contractor should be responsible for providing the 24 hours of new miner training, or eight hours of annual refresher training, and that the mine operator should be responsible then for the site-specific hazard training.

Is that the way that your company handles it? and if not, do you have some other way of approaching it, or

other recommendations you might have for that?

MR. JACKMAN: It's not my company, I'm representing the association, but I think it's the way most of our member companies within the association handle it, that they expect the contractors to do the training, to pay for the training, and to do the training, or to see that it's done for the required, and then for site-specific training I believe that's generally handled on site by our companies.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Then as far as categories of employees, we have heard a lot as we have moved around the country about contractor employees who may be exposed to the same hazards as mine employees, I mean they're either directly engaged in the processes, or close enough that they need to be treated as miners and get the 24 hours, or the eight hours, or whatever is appropriate.

Do you have any views on other categories of employees whose ties to hazard at the mine site might be less close so that maybe they shouldn't be considered miners, maybe they need to get some lesser type of training than that? and, if so, do you have any idea where the line should be drawn for that?

MR. JACKMAN: You know, it's the common sense line I believe. In any one of our companies you've got a whole range of people that could be considered contractors. You have the man that comes in, or the woman that comes in to fix

your Xerox machine, is that person a contractor?

Technically he is, or she is, but certainly the training that's required there is a lot different than the contractor that comes in to drive a truck across your mine property.

There's all shades of gray in between those extremes and, you know, you really have to use good common sense about what kind of training you use.

Even if the person that you're bringing into your facility, all he does is fill your Coca-Cola machine, if he's filling the Coca-Cola machine in an area where he may be exposed to blasting dangers, for example, he has to have some element of training, you know, emergency evacuation or whatever the situation might be that would pertain to that particular hazard.

I don't think there's any prescription that you can write and say that one size fits all, you really have to use common sense. And I know sometimes we get all stumbled up in what we have as common sense and what we have to write for rules and regulations, but I guess it would be my appeal today as we begin writing these final rules is to let's leave common sense have a role in this thing so that we don't end up with things that are just wasting these finite resources that we all have.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Do you have any recommendations for

how we might approach writing those lines in this regulation?

Should we decide what type of training should be given based

on the kinds of hazards that an individual is exposed to, or

the length of time that they spend at the mine site, or a

combination?

MR. JACKMAN: I think it has to go back to the basic concept I have, and that is the people that are in the best positions to really declare what training is required are the people that are running the facility, and I think you just have to give those folks the discretion, you have to give the companies discretion to do that, because I really believe --

You know, many times in these rooms in these public hearings and so forth I always kind of scratch my head because what we end up doing is preaching to the choir a little bit, you know, and the folks in -- you know, I haven't heard a person this morning talk about the fact that training is ridiculous and we don't need it.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Right.

MR. JACKMAN: And that's the difficulty sometimes in these public hearings, but I really believe that when all is said and done here that we have to give our companies the discretion to effectively train their own people, and the responsibility that goes with that discretion.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Thank you. I don't have any

Page 116

1 | more questions. Kevin or Rod?

2.4

MR. BRELAND: Just to follow up on that a little bit, the discussion with the contractors. It seems a little bit of a contradiction when you talk about the industry, like the kaolin industry deciding what needs they might have for training, but then with the contractor you would expect them to have been trained when they come to work for you, outside of maybe some specific hazard.

If we were looking for a rule that would try to address some basic needs, that would be hard for us I guess to come up with something considering all those other industries to have one that's just specific for contractors that work in the kaolin industry for example.

I'm not sure I'm making myself clear.

MR. JACKMAN: No, I'm not suggesting that at all.

I'm suggesting that there is some basic training that we do
in our industry that we do for everyone, contractors,
employees, everyone. And then beyond that there's some
specific training that we do for all our employees, and we
will do for contractors if they come on our payroll. That's
all I was saying with that.

MR. BRELAND: That would be in addition to their expected 24 hours or eight hours annually.

MR. JACKMAN: In addition to, that's right.

MR. BRELAND: Okay.

MR. JACKMAN: For example, every company I believe in our industry has a different way they do lock, tag, and try. However, if you peel those differences out and you look at the fundamentals, the fundamentals are all the same, but 4 there are some unique things that each of the companies feel are necessary within their companies on lock, tag, and try 7 that are unique for their particular situation.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRELAND: Okay. Then on the record keeping, I think everybody agrees it needs to be simple, however flexible it could be, but how would you see like when you get a contractor that comes in would your association expect that they would provide some documentation they've had it? would you ask for in that area?

MR. JACKMAN: The thing I've seen work effectively in the past is if the contractor comes on board for the first time he has to demonstrate that he's trained his people. it's a contractor that's routinely with you day in and day out, then what he needs to do is when he brings new people in he has to demonstrate that those new people have been trained.

Okay. And then if you do some MR. BRELAND: specific training, you provide them back some documentation of that as well?

> MR. JACKMAN: Yes.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. That's all I have, Mr. 1 | Jackman. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BURNS: As far as the contractors, how do they demonstrate that their people have been trained? Do you know?

MR. JACKMAN: Well, they bring in certification basically that they have been trained, which I think in the case of our industry many times has been this Pickens Tech that you've heard about this morning.

MR. BURNS: Do you run into a situation where they maybe present the OSHA training cards to demonstrate their training?

I don't know. I don't think so. MR. JACKMAN: do have some of our companies that have different businesses, and some of the businesses are overseen by OSHA, and some of the businesses are overseen by MSHA, and within those companies sometimes that gets a little confusing because there are some small differences between the MSHA regs and the OSHA regs, but for the most part the -- and of course in our situation in the kaolin industry we're dealing in a very small area, we're dealing in a twenty-mile-wide sixty-mile area, and that's the whole kaolin industry in the United States basically, and so we have different issues than some of our other folks that have -- you know, like the crushed stone people have crushed stone operations across the entire United States, so it is a little different for us, in some

cases a lot simpler for us because of that.

But when our contractors come in, they basically come in with MSHA certification, not OSHA certification.

MR. BURNS: That was really the reason I was asking, because that has been suggested by others at other meetings that there should be something that recognizes training that the contractors, or training that individuals had received safety training under OSHA where it's applicable.

I guess for example if you were bringing somebody in to pave your parking lot, and they're going to be in there for a week, would it do them much good to go get the MSHA training if they already have all the training required by DOT in the state and, you know, they're the biggest paver in the whole state. Would that be efficient use of the finite resources you're talking about?

MR. JACKMAN: It would not be, in my view it would not be. I mean the example you used is another one of those shades of gray between the fellow that's fixing your Xerox machine and the guy that's driving your mine truck.

Here's a contractor that's out in your parking lot paving your parking lot, you know, he's not exposed to mining hazards, he's not exposed to the hazards of your business.

He's exposed to hazards within his particular business, but not your business. I think that's where the common sense

1 | piece of this has to come in.

MR. BURNS: Okay. I appreciate it. That's all the questions I have, unless Roz has any questions.

MS. FONTAINE: No.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Jackman.

MR. JACKMAN: Thank you.

MS. ALEJANDRO: The next and the last speaker on our list is Frank Ford, and I'm afraid I cannot read the organization, so I'm going to rely on you to spell or pronounce.

MR. FORD: My name is Frank Ford, and I'm here today representing Hughey Stock Steel, Incorporated, and the spelling of the last name is F-o-r-d.

First off, I would like to thank you all for giving us this opportunity to express our opinions and concerns.

I too support training, and to give you an example of why I think training works, I've been with the company I'm going into my fourth year. When I first came there they had just been issued a cancellation from the workers' comp carrier, and I received a call from one of the principals of the company asking me to come on board and administrate their training.

I did a lot of different things, of which I can't attribute one thing to being the magic pill for lack of a better word, but implementing safety awards, coming in with

company benefits as far as health considerations, things like that.

When I went there we had a workers' comp premium of \$297,000. This workers' comp carrier put them in a rehabilitation program, and that's when I was hired on. Since then we have lowered our premiums to \$149,000, we've cut it in half, and one of the things that I did upon coming on was I went to Birmingham, Alabama, and I went to a one-week school and got my MSHA instructor's rating.

We do not do Part 48 training right now. Obviously we're fixing to. I've been seeing this coming, I told the principals two years ago with the rash of fatalities with other operators that this was coming down the pike and, sure enough, here it is. So we will be complying.

I would like to give you a little background. We are a small operator, we employ between 165 currently up to the summer months 200 employees.

Of those employees, the company I work for, Hughey Stock Steel, Incorporated, is more or less a parent company. There are three other corporations who kind of fall under that umbrella, of which one is a trucking company, a general contractor, and we do have two sand and gravel mines. We have two sand plants, one in Louisiana and one in Mississippi.

Affected employees are about forty. That would be

the employees who are classified as miners.

I would like to go on record as saying that I do support the Coalition for Effective Miner Training, and also the state grant program. I don't know if Mississippi still has a state grant program; I'm hoping to the good Lord they do because I'm gonna need some serious help here. I know that the year before last they did, but I don't know about '98 or '99. I will be finding out, though.

As far as the compliance time, I would like for it to be as user friendly as possible. I would like to see it a year if possible, because we've got a lot of work to do to play catch-up.

We had two accidents last year -- I'm saying last year, '98 -- and those were third-party accidents in the contracting area of the company, and they were subrogated a hundred percent, so as far as, you know, being safe we are a very safe operator. Our EMOD workers' comp is .99 which says that we're, as an industry as a whole we're 1 percent discounted, so I feel like we're doing an excellent job. I also feel like there's room for improvement; there always is room for improvement.

On the record keeping, there again I would like to keep that simple if possible.

And that's basically all I have to say.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Mr. Ford, you say you're not

- complying with Part 48, but you are giving your employees training; correct?
- MR. FORD: Yes, we are.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

- MS. ALEJANDRO: Could you maybe be a little bit more specific when you say you're not maybe complying with the letter of Part 48, but do you have a long way to go before you get there because of the amount of time spent on training, or the subjects covered?
  - MR. FORD: It's going to be the subjects covered, basically getting it in outline type form. You know, one of our concerns is turnover. We have fourteen-year employees, and we have six-day employees. Certain areas have the higher turnover, of which our sand plant operations where we process the sand for sale, it has an extremely high turnover as far as your baggers, packers, things like that.
    - Does that answer your question?
- 17 MS. ALEJANDRO: Yeah.
- MR. FORD: We are doing safety meetings, we do
  monthly and lunch-box safety meetings currently, and they are
  documented.
  - MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And how long do those usually last?
- MR. FORD: It depends. On average ten or fifteen minutes.
- 25 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. And your position would be

- that the time spent on those safety talks, those informal safety meetings should be applied to the eight hours of annual refresher?
  - MR. FORD: I would like for it to.
- 5 MS. ALEJANDRO: But you do document them?
- 6 MR. FORD: Yes, we do.

4

15

20

21

- 7 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Now, as far as new miner 8 training, one of the issues that we have to deal with is for a new miner coming on site and what kind of training does he 9 10 or she need to get before they can start work. Currently 11 Part 48 requires eight hours. Do you have -- I mean you've 12 got sand and gravel operations, I mean is eight hours 13 realistic, or do you think it should be a shorter period of 14 time, or whether certain subject areas ought to be covered
- MR. FORD: Well, I think they should be type-17 specific to the operation.
- MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. You mean without setting a minimum?
  - MR. FORD: Right. In other words, let us be responsible for --
- 22 MS. ALEJANDRO: Deciding --

before someone can start work?

MR. FORD: -- deciding in what areas. As I guess

Mr. Martin has spoke on, and I believe Mr. Stockton as well,

you know what you need in your mine, you have your statistics

- as far as what type injuries -- are they hand injuries, are
  they back injuries, or where are the injuries, where are they
  happening, and then address those problems.
  - MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you have contractors that come onto your property?
    - MR. FORD: We have one contractor who hauls our product from our sand plants, he's a third-party contractor, and he takes it to an end user.
  - MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. Do you give that individual any kind of site-specific hazard training?
- 11 MR. FORD: Yes, he has hazard training.
- 12 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay.

- MR. FORD: There again, he's got extremely high turnover, as trucking typically does, because he has no benefits to offer, unlike ourselves. Our turnover is low in the trucks, but he has extremely high.
- And I would also like to go on record as saying I think that the contractors should have their own, they should be responsible for their own training.
- MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. But as far as the site-specific hazard training, how do you approach that with the truck driver? Is it just sort of an informal discussion, or do you have a piece of paper that you hand out, or do you handle it with signs on the property, or --?
- 25 MR. FORD: We have signage all over the property

Page 126

- 1 | and, you know, informal also.
- 2 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. But you think it's
- 3 | appropriate that you should be responsible for that with
- 4 regard to contractors who come on?
- 5 MR. FORD: The hazards, that's right.
- 6 MS. ALEJANDRO: Okay. I don't have any more
- 7 | questions. Rod?
- 8 MR. BRELAND: Are you the only person certified
- 9 presently to train with your company?
- 10 MR. FORD: I'm the only safety director, as well as
- 11 | the only certified MSHA instructor, yes, sir.
- 12 MR. BRELAND: Okay. And you have multiple plants
- 13 | in different states, too?
- 14 MR. FORD: Yes, sir. There's four corporations, of
- 15 | which one is a Louisiana corporation, the other three are
- 16 | Mississippi, and probably -- I had it broken down into crews,
- 17 | and roughly ten different crews, and I do training for all of
- 18 them.
- 19 MR. BRELAND: Would those ten crews all be under
- 20 | MSHA jurisdiction as well?
- 21 MR. FORD: No, sir, they wouldn't.
- MR. BRELAND: Okay. So you would see probably a
- 23 | need to have some additional people within your group trained
- 24 | to be trainers?
- 25 MR. FORD: Right.

I didn't mention this initially. We have a lot of mom and pop operators, mine operators in our area. They are not going to be able to do this. Fortunately we are. We are one of, if not the largest in our area, and I would say within a hundred and fifty miles, a two-hundred-mile area.

I don't know if they're gonna do -- we've had some interest, you know, some calls from the other operators asking if I would do the training.

Now, I'm sure I'll be seeing Mr. Hart or Mr. Joe Futch, I will be going back for refresher training before I undertake this.

But I don't think -- well, matter of fact, I know
I'm not gonna train those other guys. If I'm not gonna be
responsible for them, I'm certainly -- and when I say
responsible, I will be responsible legally, and I'm not gonna
train them if I'm not there to, you know, actually make sure
that they're doing the proper thing, if that makes any sense
to you. Since they don't work for us, I cannot control them.

MR. BRELAND: Okay. And then the other thing you mentioned, you had two accidents that were involving contractors. Were those the truck contractors you were talking about?

MR. FORD: General contract -- that's on the general contracting end of the business working on the road construction.

MR. BRELAND: Oh, it wasn't part of MSHA. Okay. 1 MR. FORD: No, it was not. That's what I'm saying, 2 3 as far as MSHA we've had no accidents over the year. 4 MR. BRELAND: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you. 5 MR. BURNS: Well, certainly you have dropped your 6 workers' comp rate down by half, and that's -- I know those 7 people are pretty careful about their money, so I'm sure it's 8 based on merit, so obviously the training you have been doing 9 is pretty effective. 10 MR. FORD: Yes. I will be the first to admit 11 training is effective, and you save money. The bottom line 12 is the company saves money, so I would like to go on record 13 as saying I believe in it wholeheartedly, as well as the 14 principals of the company. I have saved my salary many times 15 over. 16 MR. BURNS: I just wanted to I guess address your 17 comment concerning the Part 48 training. Do you do more than 18 eight hours annual refresher training if you're counting the 19 safety talks? MR. FORD: No, sir. It would probably be right at 20 21 that. 22 MR. BURNS: It would be right about eight? 23 And the reason I haven't been doing it MR. FORD: 24 is because I was not mandated to do it. People are not gonna

do what they're not mandated to do. That's -- you know,

25

humans are lazy in general, and we're gonna do it.

MR. BURNS: In your discussions with the really small operators, the mom and pops, can you recommend anything where you think MSHA should be prepared to assist them?

MR. FORD: We have a community college twelve miles north of town, and I would like to see some type of state-ran programs similar to the Pickens program set up there for training, because they're going to need it, and I don't know where they're gonna get their training from.

MR. BURNS: That's all the questions I have. I compliment you on your success, and I hope you continue on that path.

MR. FORD: Yes, sir. But like I said, it's not really anything that I have done, but it's just a combination of a lot of things that have happened.

The company was formed in the early sixties, and it was a mom and pop operation, and it's grown into what it is today with annual revenues in the 22 to \$25 million range, and they saw their workers' comp going out of sight. Well, when you get canceled there's a problem and so, you know, they enlisted my help, and I came in, and we started doing certain things, and it's just a culmination of all of it, primarily somebody there to oversee, and the employees know that there's gonna be, you know, actions taken and somebody is going to be held responsible when there's a problem.

1 MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Ford.

MR. FORD: Thank you.

MS. ALEJANDRO: We have reached the end of the list of people who have signed up to speak.

I would like to ask now is there anyone here who has not spoken who would like to come up and offer some of their remarks?

Mr. Elliott.

MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

I'm Ed Elliott, E-d E-l-l-i-o-t-t, the safety manager with the Rogers Group, Incorporated.

I would first like to say that if Mr. Ford is going to volunteer to train other companies, if he would come up and see me afterwards he could help me out a lot also.

I'm not going to -- well, I should say I have previously put in comments concerning those specific issues that were in the Federal Register, and I'm not going to repeat those today, but I would like to make just a few other general comments.

First, we must really walk before we run. If the new regulations that come about are too prescriptive the are currently enforcement-exempted industries will once again rebel against this enforcement. But if we have a regulation that is performance oriented, flexible, allowing incorporation of training innovations, then any and all

operators will really have no excuse not to do training.

I have attended three of these sessions which represent three different MSHA districts in which Rogers Group operates. So Rogers Group, we want consistent enforcement in any regulation throughout the area we operate in.

Presently the safety regulations are not equally and consistently enforced throughout these areas. Many operators are not inspected in accordance with the law, and if the Educational Field Services is not able to work with all operators once this rule takes effect, it will not have the impact we really need, and consistency again is what I want to reinforce.

I'm not here representing the Coalition for Effective Miner Training, but I would like to make some comments on CEMT based on my involvement with this group.

The National Stone Association safety committee, of which I am a member, recognized a couple of years ago or so that the enforcement rider would probably be coming off. The leadership of the committee at that time put together a task group to develop some suggested modifications to Part 48 which could be presented to MSHA for their consideration.

The committee as a whole recognized the importance of consensus from within our industry, and the NSA staff made contacts with other associations, and in August of 1998 a

1	coalition at that time of twelve organizations was formed,		
2	and that has grown to seventeen members.		
3	I have attended through the NSA the majority of the		
4	CEMT meetings. I would like to read a current list of the		
5	CEMT membership:		
6	The American Portland Cement Alliance;		
7	China Clay Producers Association;		
8	Dry Branch Kaolin Company;		
9	Georgia Crushed Stone Association;		
10	Georgia Mining Association;		
11	Indiana Mineral Aggregates Association;		
12	National Aggregates Association;		
13	National Industrial Sand Association;		
14	National Lime Association;		
15	National Stone Association;		
16	North Carolina Aggregates Association;		
17	Arizona Rock Products Association;		
18	Construction Material Associates of California;		
19	Indiana Mineral Producers Association;		
20	Sorptive Minerals Institute;		
21	United Metro Materials, Incorporated; and		
22	The Virginia Aggregates Association.		
23	This list represents a large segment of the		
24	affected industry, and the coalition I know is continuing to		
25	look and solicit additional members to develop consensus on		

1 | these regulations.

I would like to also read the mission statement of the coalition:

The Coalition for Effective Miner Training was formed to work with MSHA in developing a viable training document for industrial minerals. We recognize that training and education are critically important in making progress to improve worker safety. In conjunction with MSHA, we want to improve safety performance at every mine with site-specific safety plans, use of modern technological training aids, and training that will truly meet the safety needs of each miner.

And also just to talk, there were two initial objectives, the first to develop by the consensus process an industry-specific, effective miner training program as an alternative to the existing coal-based Part 48 training regulations.

The second was to maintain the rider on the appropriations bill until an appropriate alternative is approved.

This organization has tried to reach out to many in industry. Also they have reached out to labor organizations that we have been able to identify within industry, and have met with these organizations, and are continuing to meet with them to develop consensus on this.

Rogers Group supports the coalition and its efforts

at achieving the objectives and through the mission statement.

If this rule takes into account the circumstances of our industries, it will place an enormous amount of responsibility back upon the industry to make it work.

The CEMT's work will not end with the publishing of a final rule. CEMT and each of the mining associations will need to work at gaining full compliance. This will not be an easy task, because I have seen from my position as a member of the NSA safety committee that there are some NSA members that are skeptical of what MSHA will do if the rider is removed. Some feel that we should be spending our time trying to keep the rider in place rather than developing rules.

Even within our associations we will need to sell the merits of any new regulation, and I know that the NSA along with these other associations are committed to being leaders in safety within the mining community, and support training as an integral part of this.

You do not have to produce the perfect training regulation in this attempt. A problem which is apparent after nineteen or so years is that no matter how noble the regulators of 1978 were, their Part 48 result was too prescriptive and did not take into account the entire mining community.

You are demonstrating the process which should be used in promulgating standards. The operators must see that this is a guide which will add value to their operations, and not unduly restrict them as Part 48 does now.

I would like to make just some off-the-cuff comments. Mr. Hart mentioned about the difficulty with -- people should not really have much difficulty complying with Part 48, and the Rogers Group will not have a problem if the rider is taken off and Part 48 is the standard.

I have just made some calculations. In all the meetings, these seven meetings that you've had, if twenty people representing individual mining companies made comments at each meeting, this would represent only around one percent of the total number of mines covered under these proposed rules.

But probably, I would venture to guess 98 to a hundred percent of the people that attend the meetings do the training, and probably come very close to meeting Part 48. So the idea that is I think vitally important is, and my last formal comment was the first rule that you come out with, these regulations do not have to be all-encompassing.

You have shown, and you are showing that you can come up with an entirely new rule in less than a year. It is not an easy thing to do, but I know that you will do it, and I trust that you will come out with something that is fair

and meets the industry's needs.

We can do the same thing, if we need to add something additional to it in the figure. If the first one doesn't hit everything we need to do, then we can always come back and go through this process in the future and make additions to it, because if you put together a rule, whatever it is, good or bad, it is almost impossible to get that rule or part of it withdrawn or changed without a tremendous amount of problem, but it would be much easier I think to add to it if necessary. And that's what I would hope that will come about with this.

I thank this group very much. I feel like I know you now, I've been to three of the meetings, but it's a lot of hard work, and I think you all have done an outstanding job, and myself and the Rogers Group thank you very much for your efforts in government service.

And that's all I have. Thank you.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much, Mr. Elliott.

I don't have any questions, but thank you for your remarks.

Does anyone else have anything to add?

MR. BRELAND: Thank you, Ed.

MS. ALEJANDRO: Thank you very much.

Again I'll just ask one more time, does anybody else have anything they want to add or contribute?

[No response.]

MS. ALEJANDRO: If not, what I have been doing at the later meetings is give just sort of a real brief overview of the issues that have been raised and some of the comments that we've gotten. You probably heard a lot of the issues addressed today, but I'll just go through very briefly.

As far as contractors, we have had a number of individuals advocate that mine operators be responsible for site-specific hazard training for contractor employees, whereas the contractor should be held responsible for the comprehensive training which includes the 24 hours of new miner training and the eight hours of annual refresher training, and the commentors have supported addressing the issue of responsibility for the different types of training in the rule itself.

Additionally, as I indicated, we need to differentiate between types of employees that come on the mine property. Some of them are exposed very directly to mining hazards; there are other categories of employees, delivery people or types of employees like that who probably it is appropriate to give them some other type of training, or require some other type of training besides the comprehensive training required for miners.

We have had a lot of commentors who advocate not requiring eight hours of initial miner training before a miner could start to work on the property. A number of

commentors have indicated that their sites don't really involve so much that requires eight hours to be covered before the miner can begin work.

On the other hand, we have had some commentors who do support eight hours of initial training out of the 24 hours, so that's an issue that we will to address.

WE have had a number of commentors who advocate allowing annual refresher training to be given in periods of time of less than thirty minutes as you have heard today. As we have heard at a number of the other meetings, these informal safety talks are very common, and a number of commentors believe that it is appropriate for us to give credit and allow that to be applied toward satisfying the eight hours of annual refresher training.

We have had a lot of comments regarding flexibility with record keeping, allowing operators to centralize their record keeping, and perhaps include something in the rule that would require a mine operator to furnish training records within a specific period of time without actually requiring that those records be kept at the mine site.

As far as compliance deadline, we have had all across the map. We have had people who have suggested that we have a twenty-year compliance deadline, that was a suggestion we had today, but more typically we've gotten a number of people who have said that a year is appropriate,

we've had several people indicate that six months would be appropriate, and several other commentors who have advocated shorter periods of time for a compliance deadline.

In general we have gotten a lot of comments advocating flexibility in the rule requirements, and reduction of any kind of administrative burden.

That sort of summarizes the kinds of issues and the kinds of comments that we have gotten.

I would like to also now give you a short summary of what we think our schedule is going to be in the coming months.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, we are planning to publish a proposed rule in the Federal Register some time in the spring of this year -- that's in the next couple of months.

After that proposed rule is published, there will be a comment period which allows for the submission of written comments by commentors, and also we will I would expect have a minimum of two public hearings during that time period which are going to be similar in format to the public meetings we have been having now.

We may have as many as four public hearings, but again that's going to be determined by our time schedule, so we will have to probably wait and figure out what that's going to look like after another month or two.

That comment period typically lasts for several 1 The comment period will close, and then we will sit 2 3 down and develop the final rule which is required to be 4 published in the Federal Register by Congress on or before September 30th of 1999, and then at that point we will also 5 have come to some decision as far as long we're going to 6 7 allow for compliance, and that will be clearly indicated in 8 the final rule itself. Again, I would like to encourage you if you have 9 additional things that you would like to offer to submit them 10 11 to us in writing on or before February 1st of 1999. If you 12 need any information as far as addresses, or phone numbers, 13 or anything, feel free to come up to us at the conclusion of 14 this meeting and we will give you anything that you need. 15 If there is nothing further --16 MR. BURNS: Kathy, I quess Ken would probably want 17 me to clarify, I think he meant the twenty years as a joke. 18 MS. ALEJANDRO: Oh, I know. 19 MR. BURNS: He's got to work on his delivery. 20 [Laughter.] Right. Let the record reflect that 21 MS. ALEJANDRO:

the twenty-year compliance deadline was a joke, and I took it as such. I was just trying a little light humor which maybe didn't succeed.

22

23

24

25

In any case, I would like to thank you all for

## Page 141

1	coming. Particularly I would like to thank the speakers, and		
2	if there is nothing further I will call this meeting to a		
3	close.		
4	Thank you very much.		
5	[At 12:00 noon, Thursday, January 7, 1999, the		
6	meeting was concluded.]		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			

1		REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
2			
3	DOCKET NO.:	N/A	
4	CASE TITLE:	Public Hearing on Regulations for Miner	
5		Safety and Health Training	
6	HEARING DATE:	January 7, 1999	
7	LOCATION:	College Park, Georgia	
8	I hereby	certify that the proceedings and evidence are	
9	contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes		
10	reported by me	e at the hearing in the above case before the	
11	U.S. Department of Labor.		
12			
13			
14		Date: January 7, 1999	
15			
16		L.N. Paiten	
17		Official Reporter	
18		Heritage Reporting Corporation	
19		Suite 600	
20		1220 L Street, N. W.	
21		Washington, D. C. 20005	
22			
23			
24			

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888