# U.S. Department of Labor

Mine Safety and Health Administration 1100 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22209-3939



DEC -6 2014

MEMORANDUM FOR

PATRICIA W. SILVEY

**Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations** Mine Safety and Health Administration

THROUGH:

**NEAL H. MERRIFIELD** 

Administrator for

Metal and Nonmetal Mine Safety and Health

JAY P. MATTOS

Director, Office of Assessments, Accountability,

Special Enforcement and Investigations

FROM:

ALFRED L. CLAYBORNE

Deputy Director, Office of Accountability,

Special Enforcement and Investigations

SUBJECT:

MSHA Office of Accountability Review, MNM Southeastern

District, Knoxville, Tennessee Field Office, and

### Introduction

This memorandum summarizes the Office of Accountability's review of the subject district office, field office, and mine. The review included MSHA field activities; level of enforcement; conditions and practices at the mine; Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs); Office Reviews (ORs): and MSHA supervisory and managerial oversight. The accountability review also included evaluations to determine if there were any deficiencies in areas commonly identified during Agency internal reviews of MSHA's actions following past mine disasters.

Positive findings as well as issues requiring attention are included in this accountability review report.

#### Overview

This review was conducted by Accountability Specialist Jerry Kissell from

accompanied the accountability specialist during this audit.

The review team traveled with the inspection party to the mine on a regular (E-01) inspection. Areas and activities examined included: daily mine crew safety meeting, check in check out board, primary shaft, primary escape and secondary escape routes to the Gann shaft, haulage roads/travelways from the 242 level to the 484 level, air readings throughout areas traveled, ventilation velocity readings, roads and berms, loading and haulage cycles, development face drilling, high scaling/ground control practices, and ventilation practices.

Other areas inspected included the primer and powder storage facilities, inventory/records and housekeeping practices. Also inspected were the 14 lower pod bench, 14 upper – 55 roadway, the 3-AF 2 lower stope level, three Strata refuge chambers, the AW-3 SWICK exploration drilling (contractor) work area, fire extinguishers throughout the mine and mine communication systems.

Mobile equipment inspected included a Caterpillar R 2900 load haul dump (LHD), two Caterpillar 2600 G haul trucks, a Toro 0010 LHD, three Oldenburg Cannon twin boom jumbo rock drills, a Genie 585 man lift scaling rig, a Minetec core drill, a Ford personal utility tractor, a Kubota maintenance tractor, a Kubota lube tractor and two - 75 horse power auxiliary fans.

#### **Review Results**

The accountability review revealed positive findings in several areas, including the following:

- 1. Enforcement personnel conducted themselves in a professional and courteous manner at all times during the audit and during the inspection.
- 2. Inspection procedures observed during the audit appeared in compliance with MSHA policy and procedures.
- 3. Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs) for the Knoxville Field Office were adequately documented.
- 4. Enforcement personnel used appropriate enforcement tools during the mine site visit.
- 5. completed the minimum required Office Reviews (ORs) and Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs) for the second half of FY 2013 and the minimum required OR's for the first half of FY 2014.
- 6. Staff and safety meetings were well documented and included updates and reviews of MSHA initiatives and policy memoranda.

This accountability review revealed one issue that requires a corrective action: (Supporting data for each issue can be found in the OA checklist and attachments)

 Required office reviews were not completed for the first half of FY 2013. The field office was without a supervisor during the period in question and no office reviews were completed for inspectors during this time.

#### Requirement:

B. <u>Office Reviews</u> (M/NM Mine Safety and Health Supervisors Handbook AH09-III-1(1) Item B, pg. 4)

Requirement: "Field office supervisors shall evaluate inspection documentation generated by inspectors assigned to them once every six months during a fiscal year. That review must include at least one recently completed regular (mandated) inspection or investigation for each inspector. Evaluation activities shall include:

All work documentation or products related to a completed regular inspection to determine if enforcement tools available to the inspector were properly used and whether the level of enforcement applied on the inspection was appropriate based on the actions of the mine operator.

Evaluations will be based on a review of the violations cited, inspection notes, possible knowing and willful review forms, special assessment review forms, photographs, mine maps, required plans or documentation, and any other related documents. Related documents shall include the number and type of violations issued, whether multiple violations of the same standard were issued, and whether similar conditions were cited at different locations with different outcomes. Supervisors must also determine whether specific samples or tests required (e.g., Government Performance and Results Act health goals, radon daughter samples) were conducted and properly documented.

Supervisors shall meet with the affected inspector following completion of the review to discuss their findings. Significant accomplishments and deficiencies during the review shall be discussed with the inspector. Emphasis added.

Supervisors shall complete a FAR form, checking "no" for the accompanied inspection block. Once the FAR form is completed, it shall be forwarded to the Assistant District Manager for review within 5 business days of completion.

Assistant District Managers may alter the submission requirement if adequate justification is provided by the field office supervisor.

E. Oversight of Field Office Supervisory Accompanied Reviews and Office Evaluations (M/NM Mine Safety and Health Supervisors Handbook (AH09-III-1(1) Item E. pg. 5-6)

Requirement: "Assistant District managers are required to verify that supervisors conduct the required accompanied inspections and field activity inspection report evaluations. This is accomplished by them completing the following activities each fiscal year.

Reviewing and initialing every FAR form submitted by their field office supervisors. These reviews will assure that the forms are properly completed and that supervisors are conducting the required field activity inspection report evaluations and accompanied inspections. It does not include a review of the inspection files.

Reviewing documentation and signing FAR forms for at least two field activity inspection report evaluations from each field office. This activity will include a review of appropriate inspection files. Assistant Managers must evaluate whether field office supervisors properly conducted, evaluated, and documented their field activity inspection report evaluations....".

# Attachments

- A. Internal Review Summary
- B. Office of Accountability Checklist
- C. Statistics
- D. Citations/Orders issued during this audit
  - 1.

57.20032

- E. Examples of Citations Issued During Previous E01 Inspections (No issues were identified during this review)
- F. District Corrective Action Plan

Tennessee	District	Southeastern	Field Office		Mine ID		Date	
-----------	----------	--------------	--------------	--	---------	--	------	--

# Attachment A – Internal Review Summary

The table below lists the most common internal review findings following mine disasters. The Knoxville, Tennessee Field Office had one of the most commonly identified issues.

	Common Internal Review Findings	Examples of Deficiencies found in this Accountability Review:
	Failure to identify deviations in approved plans.	Not identifying operator departures from requirements in any plan that requires approval, such as training plans, roof control plans, ventilation plans, emergency response plans, etc.
	Incomplete or inadequate inspections.	Not following policy or procedures for conducting/documentation inspections. Failure to cite all violations. Not inspecting all areas and equipment.
	Failure to conduct 103(i) spot	Not conducting spot inspections in a timely manner and at irregular
	inspections according to policy.	intervals.
X	Supervisors did not provide adequate oversight.	No review/lax review of inspection reports. Inadequate review of PKW/SAR forms. Failure to conduct required Field Activity Reviews (Office Reviews) and Accompanied Activities.
	Improper evaluations of gravity, negligence and type of enforcement action.	Inadequate documentation to support citation and evaluation. Failure to consider and document aggravating or mitigating circumstances.
	Inadequate Peer Reviews	Inadequate district level Peer Reviews. Failure to adopt and follow corrective action plans. Failure to follow up or monitor effectiveness of corrective action plans.
	Weakness in the ACR Program	Not following ACR handbook. Inadequate management oversight. Failure to follow the Mine Act, MINER Act, 30 CFR and MSHA policy.
	MSHA data not used or reviewed.	Key Indicators, Mine Profile, Inspection completion reports not being used. Failure to keep MSIS data up to date and accurate.
	Lack of unwarrantable failure tracking system	No or inadequate unwarrantable failure sequence tracking system.
	Conflict of Interest	Inspecting prior employers, employment of relatives
	Failure to comply with Hazard	Improper coding of inspections. Inadequate documentation of
	Complaint Procedures.	inspections/investigations.

Dis	strict	Southeastern	Field Office	Knoxville,	Mine ID		Date		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	].	Tennessee	]	L			
Cor	mmon	Internal Review	Findings	Examples of	Deficiencies	found in this A	.ccountability F	Review	
Investigations of multi-phase plans						e evaluations		(OVICH	
		sugations of mul		1 andre to co					
	Failu	ıre to observe re	treat mining.	Inadequate	periodic eva	luations when	retreat mining	is conducted.	
	Soct	ion 103(a) is viol	ated when an						
		ator gives advan		Citation not issued when advance notice of impending MSHA					
		IA's presence on		inspection					
	Trac	king tool was ne	eded to monitor						
		onnel resources		Not monitorin	a resources	devoted to spe	ecial investiga	tions	
	'	ted to special in			9.4404	шотоков ко ор	out invocaga		
			-						
<u> </u>	NI	J- J 1- : 1-			·				
		ded to improve tr ining of supervis	•	Some super	icore incoc	tors and ana	ialista wara na	t baina vatrainad	
		ning of supervis specialists	ors, mispeciors,	Joine superv	isois, ilispec	auto, and spec	iansis were no	ot being retrained.	

District Southeastern Field Office Knoxville, Mine ID Date Tennessee						
Attachment B – Audit Checklist						
Determine if complete and thorough E01 inspections are being conducted and /or if policy and procedures were properly followed.  Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below						
Determine if documentation for inspections is complete and thorough.						
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below						
Determine if citations and orders issued during previous inspections were properly 3. evaluated for gravity, negligence, level of enforcement, number of persons affected, and supported by documentation.						
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below						
4. Evaluate inspector(s) examination of required records and postings for compliance with applicable standards.						
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below						
5. Evaluate the inspector(s) physical examination of the active working areas of the mine and inspection of all mining cycles.						
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below X						
No blasting or roof bolting took place during the mine visit.						
6. Evaluate the inspector(s) on-site contaminant assessment and documentation.						
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below X						
No health samples were taken during this inspection. A review of previous inspection reports verify the last health survey was conducted in April of 2014.						

District Southeastern Field Office Knoxville, Tennessee Mine ID Date
7. Evaluate inspector(s) examination of electrical equipment, transformer stations, and/or electrical circuits.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below
8. Determine if adequate close-out conferences are being conducted at the end of each inspection.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below X
Field notes reviewed show daily and final close-outs are consistently conducted.
9. Determine if Possible Knowing/Willful (PKW) Forms are documented and processed according to agency policy and procedures.
Adequate Corrective Action Needed Comments Below X
No PKW's were reviewed during this office review.
Evaluate 103(i) spot inspection (E02) reports for the office/district being audited for 10. compliance with agency policies and procedures, including compliance with time frames and separating E02 inspections from other events.
Adequate Corrective Action Needed Comments Below X
No 103(i) mines in this field office.
11. Determine if Hazard Complaint inspections/investigations are being conducted according to policy and procedures.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below
Determine if supervisors are monitoring inspector time and activity to ensure proper use of time, including off-shift and weekend work, by all inspectors.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below

District Southeastern Field Office Knoxville, Tennessee Mine ID Date							
Are required Office Reviews (ORs) and supervisory follow-up reviews being conducted and documented according to agency policy and procedures?  (One E-01/Inspector/every six months/FY –minimum)							
Adequate Corrective Action Needed X Comments Below X							
Required office reviews were not completed for the first half of FY 2013. The field office was without a supervisor during the period in question and no office reviews were completed for inspectors during this time. (See section on Review Results contained in the report for requirements).							
Are Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs) and supervisory follow-up reviews being  14. conducted and documented according to agency policy and procedures?  (one/inspector/year - minimum)							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
Determine if a 104(d) tracking system is in place and being kept current at the office being audited.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
16. Determine if the Mine Files are legible, up to date, and reviewed by supervisors.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
17. Determine if supervisors are visiting active mines.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							

District Southeastern Field Office Knoxville, Tennessee Date Date
18. Review documentation of staff meetings/safety meetings to determine their effectiveness and relevance to current issues and the Agency's mission.  Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below
Determine if Assistant District Manager is conducting the required second level reviews 19. and holding supervisors accountable for oversight of Office Reviews and Field Accompanied Activity Reviews.
Determine if district management personnel are reviewing work products and reports for accuracy and completeness.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below
21. Determine if managers and supervisors are using required standardized reports to review critical data relevant to inspections and investigations.
21. Determine if managers and supervisors are using required standardized reports to review critical data relevant to inspections and investigations.  Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below
review critical data relevant to inspections and investigations.
review critical data relevant to inspections and investigations.
Petermine if Districts are conducting in-depth Peer Reviews in compliance with agency policy and procedures including follow-up to determine the effectiveness of corrective
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below  Determine if Districts are conducting in-depth Peer Reviews in compliance with agency policy and procedures including follow-up to determine the effectiveness of corrective actions.
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below  Determine if Districts are conducting in-depth Peer Reviews in compliance with agency policy and procedures including follow-up to determine the effectiveness of corrective actions.
Petermine if Districts are conducting in-depth Peer Reviews in compliance with agency policy and procedures including follow-up to determine the effectiveness of corrective actions.  Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below  Determine if Districts are conducting in-depth Peer Reviews in compliance with agency policy and procedures including follow-up to determine the effectiveness of corrective actions.  Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below  Is information (mine status, methane liberation, number of employees, etc) being entered into the MSHA Standardized Information System (MSIS) accurately and in a

District Southeastern Field Office Knoxville, Tennessee Date Date							
Determine if inspectors have sufficient equipment and supplies to conduct thorough inspections.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
25. Evaluate the overall condition of the mine relative to the level of enforcement documented in previously completed inspections.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
Determine if inspectors have an understanding of when a violation of Section 103(a) for 26. Advance Notice occurs and whether appropriate citations are issued for Advance Notice.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
Determine if the management resource tracking tool is being used to track resources regarding Special Investigations.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							
28. Determine if retraining of supervisors, inspectors, and specialists is being tracked.							
Adequate X Corrective Action Needed Comments Below							

District	Southeastern	Field Office	Knoxville, Tennessee	Mine ID	Date	

#### Attachment C - Statistics

#### S&S Rate Comparison

During FY 2013, the S&S rates for the Knoxville, Tennessee Field Office are higher than the average for the Southeastern District and national average. Year to date in 2014, the S&S rates for the Knoxville, Tennessee Field Office are lower than the average for the Southeastern District and national average. Citations issued during the review were appropriately issued and consistent with policy and procedures. (See attachment D)

	Fiscal Year	Knoxville Field Office	Southeastern District	National Average
	2013	33%	27%	27%
_	2014*	24%	26%	26%

<sup>\*10/01/2013</sup> thru 06/30/2014

#### Time and Activity Comparison

A comparison of FY 2013 and FY 2014 time distribution for the Knoxville Field Office at all mining operations shows that time in the other category has decreased and on-site enforcement time decreased.

Time Distribution (%) – E01 Inspections										
FY	Area/Office	Travel	*Other	**On- Site Enf. time	Total Enf. Time	Non Enf. time	Total Percent			
2013	FO	12%	11%	49%	72%	28%	100%			
2013	Nat'l Avg	21%	15%	42%	78%	22%	100%			
2014***	FO	11%	7%	42%	60%	40%	100%			
2014	Nat'l Avg	20%	15%	42%	77%	23%	100%			

<sup>\*</sup> Other time includes off site citation/order writing, health equipment calibration, and mailing of samples

<sup>\*\*</sup> Total On-Site time includes citations written on-site

<sup>\*\*\* 10/01/2013</sup> thru 06/30/2014

District	Southeastern	Field Office	Knoxville, Tennessee	Mine ID	Date	

### Attachment D- Citations issued during the Review

Mine Citation/Order	U.S. Department of Labor Mine Safety and Health Administration			
Section I-Violation Data	3. Citation/			
1. Date Mo Da Yr 12. Time (24 Hr. Clock)	Order Number			
4. Served To	5. Operator			
6. Mine	7. Mine ID			
O Constitution of Providence	(Contractor)  8a, Written Notice (103g)			
8. Condition or Practice  The underground mine phone locates	d at bottom of the Gann Escape Shaft did not			
the hoist man when miners have to	page or receive. The phone is used to call escape the mine. To warn miners of hazards d not escape from fires or other hazards			
	See Continuation Form (MSHA Form 7000-3a)			
9. Violation A. Health B. Section of Act Other	C. Part/Section of Title 30 CFR 57,20032			
Section II-Inspector's Evaluation  10. Gravity:				
A Injury or Illness (has) (is): No Likelihood Unlikely	/ ☑ Reasonably Likely ☐ Highly Likely ☐ Occurred ☐			
B. Injury or illness could reasonably be expected to be: No Lost Workdays   Lost Workdays Or Restricted Duty Permanently Disabling Fatal				
C. Significant and Substantial: Yes ☐ No ☑	D. Number of Persons Affected: 001			
11. Negligence (check one) A. None B. Low	C. Moderate  D. High E. Reckless Disregard			
12. Type of Action 104a 13. Type of	of Issuance (check one) Citation 🗹 Order 🗌 Safeguard 🗌 Written Notice 🗍			
14. Initial Action A. Citation B. Order C. Safeguard D. Written Not	E. Citation/ F. Dated Mo Da Yr Order Number			
15. Area or Equipment	·			
16. Termination Due A. Date Mo Da Yr B. Time (24 H	Hr. Clock)			
Section IIITermination Action				
17. Action to Terminate				
18. Terminate A. Date Mo Da Yr B. Time (24 Hr. Clock				
Section IVAutomated System Data				

MSHA Form 7000-3, Apr 08 (revised) In accordance with the provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, the Small Business Administration has established a National Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Ombudsman and 10 Regional Fairness Boards to receive comments from small businesses about federal agency enforcement actions. The Ombudsman annually evaluates enforcement activities and rates each agency's responsiveness to small business. If you wish to comment on the enforcement actions of MSHA, you may call 1-888-REG-FAIR (1-888-734-3247), or write the Ombudsman at Small Business Administration, Office of the National Ombudsman, 409 3rd Street, SW MC 2120, Washington, DC 20415. Please note, however, that your right to file a comment with the Ombudsman is in addition to any other rights you may have, including the right to contest citations and proposed penalties and obtain a hearing before the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

19. Type of Inspection (activity code)

22. AR Name

20. Event Number

E01

21. Primary or Mill

23. AR Number

Tennessee	District	Southeastern	Field Office		Mine ID		Date	
-----------	----------	--------------	--------------	--	---------	--	------	--

Attachment E – Examples of Citations Issued During Previous E01 Inspections No issues were identified during this review

District	Southeastern	Field Office	Knoxville, Tennessee	Mine ID	Date	
		•				

# Attachment F - Southeastern District Corrective Action Plan

October 2, 2014

MEMORANDUM FOR

**TED SMITH** 

Supervisor, Office of accumtability

FROM:

Sam Pierce

District Manager Southeast District,

MSHA, Metal Nonmetal

SUBJECT:

**Proposed Corrective Actions** 

This is a response to the review conducted by the Office of Accountability from at the Knoxville Field Office and the

I he results of your review identified one deficiency, which is required to be addressed by this district.

District	Southeastern	Field Office	Knoxville, Tennessee	Mine ID	Date	
Issue N	lo. 1					

The required Office Reviews (ORs) for the first half of FY 2013 and supervisory follow-up reviews were not being conducted and documented according to agency policy and procedures.

- -

Root Cause:

The Knoxville field office was without	during the period in question, and no
office reviews were completed for insi	pectors during this time

### PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION:

Re-training will be given to all ADMs and Supervisors on the requirements listed in the MNM Mine Safety and Health Supervisor's Handbook for the items specifically identified during the OA Review conducted from

- The ADMs and Supervisors will be re-trained to according to the MNM Mine Safety and Health Supervisor's Handbook (AH09-111-1(1) Item E, pg. 4-6)
- The ADMs and Supervisors will be re-trained to fully document the completion of both the accompanied FAR (field activity review) and unaccompanied office reviews (ORs) according to pg. 4 of the MNM Mine Safety and Health Supervisor's Handbook (AH09-111-1(1) Item E.
- Supervisors will be re-trained to forward the ORs/FAR's to the ADM for review within 5 business days of completion.
- The ADMs will be re-trained to verify that supervisors conduct the required unaccompanied and accompanied inspections and office reviews/field activity inspection report evaluations. This is accomplished by completing the following activities each year:
  - Reviewing and initialing every OR/FAR form submitted by their field office supervisors.

The re-training will be conducted during a field office staff conference call utilizing the MNM Mine Safety and Health Supervisor's Handbook (AH09-111-1(1) Item E. All supervisors will be required to participate and a record of the training will be kept with the corrective actions for this review.