MEMORANDUM FOR PATRICIA W. SILVEY  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations  
Mine Safety and Health

THROUGH:  NEAL H. MÉRRIFIELD  
Administrator for  
Metal Nonmetal Mine Safety and Health

THOMAS W. CHARBONEAU  
Acting 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, Metal and Nonmetal  
Rocky Mountain District, Mesa, AZ Field Office (South), and

Introduction

This memorandum summarizes the Office of Accountability’s review of the subject district office, field office, and mine. The review consisted of an evaluation of 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.

You can now file your MSHA forms online at www.MSHA.gov. It’s easy, it’s fast, and it saves you money!
Overview

The review of the Rocky Mountain District and Mesa, Arizona Field Office (South) was conducted by Accountability Specialists Jerry Kissell and Mark Odum from [redacted]. The review focused on inspection activities during FY 2014 (October 2013 through September 2014) and specifically involved the review of the regular E01 inspection conducted by the Mesa Field Office of the Office of Accountability during the fourth quarter of FY 2014. The Office of Accountability selected the Mesa Field Office due to the field office having a higher S&S rate and higher Violations Per Inspection Hour (VPIH) rate, lower elevated enforcement actions at the mine as compared to district and national levels, as well as the field office not having been previously reviewed by the Office of Accountability. During FY 2014, the VPIH for the Mesa Field Office was 0.29 as compared to the National average VPIH of 0.23 for all MNM. The S&S rate during FY 2014 for the [redacted] was 36 percent as compared to the National average of 26 percent for all MNM. The review team conducted a mine visit as part of this review focusing on general mine conditions; whether conditions at the mine appeared to correspond with enforcement levels; and to observe work practices at the mine site.

Mine Visit

The [redacted] is located in [redacted], and mines [redacted] from a surface open pit. The run-of-mine material is milled or leached, processed on-site, and made ready for commerce. The mine employs approximately [redacted] persons.

The Accountability review team accompanied the field office supervisors and two mine inspectors to the [redacted] as part of a regular safety and health inspection (E01). The team traveled in two inspection groups to separate areas of the mine site. The observations of inspection activities included: equipment inspections of the P&H 2800 shovels, numbers 16 and 17 and the P&H 4100 Shovel number 02; Caterpillar 834B rubber-tired blade; Caterpillar 834 H rubber-tired blade; Atlas Copco Pit Viper 351 bench drills, number 04 and number 06; Liebherr 400 ton haul truck, number 23; the Blue Bird fuel station; monitoring dispatch control; the 1700 level bench and the 1850 level bench. Inspection observations included blast loading procedures, blast area security, and a bench blast. Other observations on the inspection included roadways, berms, warning signage, and highwalls. Additionally, the on-site review included citation reviews, closeout discussions, and safety and best practice discussions.
Review Results

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

1. Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs) and Office Reviews (ORs) for the Mesa Field Office were adequately documented.
2. Second level reviews documented detailed feedback to field office supervisors.
3. Supervisors documented staff meetings and safety meetings which included updates and reviews of MSHA initiatives and policy memoranda and use of manufacturer materials as training guides.
4. Inspectors were descriptive of equipment safety features inspected, included good documentation of blasting practices and blasting security procedures, and documented safety discussions and best practices discussions in their inspection notes.
5. Inspectors documented inspection and evaluation of a petition for modification regarding use of man-trip buses.
6. The [redacted] developed and uses an E01 inspection report check sheet for review of all required items for a complete inspection and is developing a checklist for use in inspections of mobile equipment.
7. Enforcement personnel conducted themselves in a professional and courteous manner at all times during the review and during the inspection.

This accountability review of the Rocky Mountain District and Mesa, Arizona Field Office revealed no material weaknesses or systemic issues requiring corrective actions.
Attachments

A. Office of Accountability Checklist

B. Citations/Orders issued during this review

1. 56.14206b
2. 56.3200
3. 56.12005
4. 56.4011

C. Examples of Citations Issued During Previous E01 Inspections
   (No issues were identified during this review)

D. District Corrective Action Plan
   (No corrective action required)
## Attachment A - Office of Accountability Checklist

1. 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 [ ]

2. Determine if documentation for inspections is complete and thorough.
   - Adequate [X]
   - Corrective Action Needed [ ]
   - Comments Below [ ]

3. Determine if citations and orders issued during previous inspections were properly 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 [ ]
   - Drilling and blasting practices were observed.

6. Evaluate the inspector(s) on-site contaminant assessment and documentation.
   - Adequate [X]
   - Corrective Action Needed [ ]
   - Comments Below [ ]
   - No health samples were taken during this inspection.
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 PKWs were reviewed during this office review.

10. Evaluate 103(i) spot inspection (EO2) reports for the office/district being audited for compliance with agency policies and procedures, including compliance with time frames and separating EO2 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 □

12. 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 □
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13. 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 [X] Corrective Action Needed [ ] Comments Below [ ]

14. Are Field Accompanied Reviews (FARs) and supervisory follow-up reviews being conducted and documented according to agency policy and procedures?
(one/inspector/year - minimum)
Adequate [X] Corrective Action Needed [ ] Comments Below [ ]

15. 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 [ ]

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 and holding supervisors accountable for oversight of Office Reviews and Field Accompanied Activity Reviews.

20. Determine if district management personnel are reviewing work products and reports for accuracy and completeness.
   Adequate ✗ 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.
   Adequate ✗ Corrective Action Needed ☐ Comments Below ☐

22. 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 ✗ Corrective Action Needed ☐ Comments Below ☐

23. Is information (mine status, methane liberation, number of employees, etc.) being entered into the MHSA Standardized Information System (MSIS) accurately and in a timely manner?
   Adequate ✗ Corrective Action Needed ☐ Comments Below ☐

24. Determine if inspectors have sufficient equipment and supplies to conduct thorough inspections.
   Adequate ✗ Corrective Action Needed ☐ Comments Below ☐
25. Evaluate the overall condition of the mine relative to the level of enforcement documented in previously completed inspections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Corrective Action Needed</th>
<th>Comments Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Determine if inspectors have an understanding of when a violation of Section 103(a) for Advance Notice occurs and whether appropriate citations are issued for Advance Notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Corrective Action Needed</th>
<th>Comments Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Determine if the management resource tracking tool is being used to track resources regarding Special Investigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Corrective Action Needed</th>
<th>Comments Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Determine if retraining of supervisors, inspectors, and specialists is being tracked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Corrective Action Needed</th>
<th>Comments Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B - Citations/Orders issued during the Review

Mine Citation/Order

U.S. Department of Labor
Mine Safety and Health Administration

1. Violation Date
   1. Date: [Redacted]
   2. Time (24 Hour Clock): [Redacted]

2. Violation
   3. Location: [Redacted]
   4. Operation: Operator
   5. Mine: [Redacted]
   6. Citation/Order Number: [Redacted]
   7. Mine ID: [Redacted]

8. Condition or Practice
   8a. Written Notice (103p)
   [Redacted]

The Caterpillar 450E backhoe, Cat. #BH922 was left unattended with the unit's wheels off the ground and was not mechanically secured. The hydraulic bucket cylinder and outriggers were extended to keep it off the ground. This unit was located at the bottom area of the Bluebird ramp. A serious injury could occur if the cylinders failed causing the unit to strike someone that would be near it.

Standard 56.14206b was cited.

9. Violation
   9a. Health Safety Other: [Redacted]
   9b. Section of Act: [Redacted]
   9c. Part/Section of Title 30 CFR: 56.14206b

10. Classification/Evaluation
    10a. Gravity
        A. Injury or illness (injuries) No Likely
        B. Injury or illness could reasonably be expected to be Lost Workdays
        C. Significant and Substantial Yes
        D. Number of Persons Affected 1

11. Negligence (check one)
    11a. None
    11b. Low
    11c. Moderate
    11d. High
    11e. Reckless Disregard

12. Type of Action
    12a. Citation
    12b. Order
    12c. Safeguard
    12d. Written Notice

13. Type of Issuance
    13a. Citation
    13b. Order
    13c. Safeguard
    13d. Written Notice

14. Initial Action
    14a. Citation
    14b. Order
    14c. Safeguard
    14d. Written Notice

15. Area of Equipment

16. Action
    16a. Date: [Redacted]
    16b. Time (24 Hour Clock): [Redacted]

17. Action to Terminate
    The backhoe was lowered to the ground and wheels were checked.

18. Terminate
    18a. Date: [Redacted]
    18b. Time (24 Hour Clock): [Redacted]

19. Type of Inspection (activity code)
    19a. Event Number: [Redacted]
    19b. Primary or MFR: P

20. AR Name
    [Redacted]

MSHA Form 7022 - 5th Apr 96 (Rev.)
In accordance with the provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, the Small Business Administration has designated a National Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Observation (Ombudsman) and to Regional Fairness Boards to receive comments from small businesses about federal agencies' enforcement actions. The Ombudsman is authorized to evaluate enforcement activities and take such actions as may be necessary to ensure small business. If you want to comment on the enforcement actions of MSHA, you may call 1-888-REGS-FRM (1-888-734-3273), or write the Ombudsman at Small Business Administration, Office of the National Ombudsman, 409 4th Street SW, MC 2112, Washington, DC 20410. Please note, however, that your right to file a complaint with the Ombudsman is in addition to any other rights you may have, including the right to contest citations and appeal penalties and obtain a hearing before the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

10
There is loose and unconsolidated material observed on the north wall of the upper Hercules ramp. The wall is about 75 feet in height with a span of about 500 feet of the upper Hercules ramp of loose material. This ramp is heavily traveled with haul trucks and a variety of light vehicles. The travel roadway extends near the foot of the wall. No warning signs or barriers were provided to prevent travel near the high wall. This condition exposed persons traveling near the high wall to a serious injury should the material fall onto the vehicle.

Note: Termination due time is for the operator to place an earthen barrier and warning signs. In the meantime cones have been placed in the affected area.
United States Department of Labor  
Mine Safety and Health Administration  
Office of Accountability

Mine Citation/Order  
Continuation

U.S. Department of Labor  
Mine Safety and Health Administration

Section I - Subsequent Action/Continuation Data

1. Subsequent Action 4. Seved To
- Action  
- Date

2. Dated
- (Original Issue)
- Mo  
- Da  
- Yr

3. Citation/Order Number

4. Seved To

5. Mine

6. Mine 
-(Contractor)

7. Mine 

Section II - Justification for Action

Continuation of 8. Condition of Practice

Standard 56.3200 was cited.
An earthen barrier and warning signs were placed at the upper portion of the Hercules ramp. This citation is terminated.
The 4160 volt power cable feeding the #16 shovel had been run over by a large piece of mobile equipment, subjecting the power conductors to damage. Continued normal mining operations expose miners to 4160 volt phase to phase electrocution hazard. The cable was megged at 10,000 volts and there was no damage detected making the chances of an accident occurring unlikely.
At the #16 shovel 120 VAC load center were three circuit breakers, #17, 18 and 22, that were marked spare and energized. The circuits were determined to be abandoned and terminated with electrical tape and/or wire nuts, making the chances of an accident occurring unlikely. Continued normal mining operations expose miners to lost workdays/restricted duty shock/flash burn hazard while working on a circuit thought to be de-energized. Abandoned electric circuits shall be de-energized and isolated so that they cannot become energized inadvertently.
Attachment C - Examples of Citations Issued During Previous E01 Inspections
(No issues were identified during this review)
Attachment D - District Corrective Action Plan
(No corrective action plan required)