### Development of a Canopy Air Curtain to Reduce Roof Bolters' Dust Exposure

Jeffrey M. Listak and Timothy W. Beck

February 20, 2012 SME Annual Meeting





### Problem

Roof bolter operators' rate of over-exposure to respirable dust is second only to the continuous miner operator.

The main source of this over-exposure is working downwind of the continuous mining machine.



## **Operational Facts**

- Roof bolter operators continue to work downwind of the CM.
- MSHA is requiring more CM machines to operate without scrubbers, even though scrubbers greatly reduce respirable dust in the return.
- The impending dust rule will reduce respirable dust exposure lower than the current 2 mg/m<sup>3</sup> standard.



# **Addressing the Problem**

Develop a retrofit system to deliver a curtain of clean air over operators when performing drilling activities beneath the canopy.





# **Air Curtain Development**

- 1975 The Donaldson Co. Inc., under contract from the USBM, demonstrates that air curtain technology can protect CM operators from respirable dust while working in onboard cabs.
- 1982 USBM report shows respirable dust reductions on gatheringarm loaders operators fitted with air curtain system.
- 1987 The Donaldson Co. Inc. improves original air curtain design. Newer design improved airflow, decreased thickness, and decreased noise levels.





## **Design Changes for Bolters**

- Plenum geometry dimensions based on typical canopy size and shape.
- Inlet port located parallel to length of plenum length.
- Blower powered by a dedicated hydraulic motor and reservoir.



Box closed on all sides except this side



# **Laboratory Test Apparatus**

### Air Curtain Test Setup



#### **Fan-Filter Assembly**



#### **Plenum Test Stand**





## **Plenum Design Objective**

### Achieve even airflow distribution beneath the plenum





### **Plenum Testing**

### **Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) Analysis**



39.2



### **Plenum Testing**

### Airflow visualization using smoke





# **Preliminary Field Trials**

- Identified region of unneeded coverage
  - Canopy overlaps operator's tool tray
- Demonstrated feasibility of design
  - Acceptable impact on overhead clearance
  - Hydraulic fan provides adequate air quantity



### **Plenum Testing**

### **Final Plenum Design**

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Air Distribution**

### **Post-CFD Design**

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Final Design**

![](_page_12_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Full-Scale Testing**

![](_page_13_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **Sampling for Dust Reduction**

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **Test Methods**

- Full-scale testing conducted in the continuous mining simulation gallery at the OMSHR laboratory.
- Respirable dust sampled at entry velocities of 0.03 (10), 0.30 (60), and 0.61 (120) m/s (fpm).
- Respirable dust concentration held constant for all test velocities (average of 6.0 mg/m<sup>3</sup>).
- Respirable dust concentrations measured with gravimetric samplers and Personal Data Ram.
- Six test replicates for each velocity.
- Sample in open entry and beneath the plenum.

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **Sampling Locations**

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Dust Reduction Across Tests

		7.00 -	.00 -						
	Dust Concentration, mg/m <sup>3</sup>		6.00 -						I
Test	Plenum	Entry	ູ 5.00 - ອ			I		I	
1	1.62	4.48	/ <sup>3</sup> m (1.00 - u						
2	1.41	4.57	tratio						
3	1.70	5.13	oncen	т		Т	Т		
4	1.63	4.78	2.00 -						
5	1.36	4.56	1.00 -	_ 1		_1			
6	2.42	6.52	0.00 -						
				1	2	3	4	5	6
				Test number					

■ plenum ■ entry

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **Dust Reduction** Across Entry Velocities

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

## **Laboratory Results**

- Final design provides filtered air coverage over 70% of plenum area: velocity > 0.51 m/s (100 fpm).
- Plenum provides area of confirmed dust reductions at entry velocities up to 0.61 m/s (120 fpm).
- No significant difference in dust exposure reductions in the three entry velocities tested.
- Dust reductions of 67% to 75% was achieved beneath the plenum at each of the test velocities.

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Field Testing**

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

## **Field Testing Results**

- Based on time studies, bolter operators spent about 66% of a complete bolting cycle beneath the plenum (tram in to tram out of place).
- Integrating the blower into the machine's hydraulic system proved to be problematic.
- Limited PDM (194 min) data showed a reduction of 34% between the dual boom bolter operators (left side vs right side) during sampling.

![](_page_21_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Alternate Design**

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_3.jpeg)

OFFICE OF MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH RESEARCH

### **Questions?**

Jeffrey M. Listak 412-386-5082 Email: jlistak@cdc.gov

### Timothy W. Beck 412-386-4776 Email: tbeck@cdc.gov

Disclaimer: Mention of any company or product does not constitute endorsement by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). The findings and conclusions in this presentation are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of NIOSH.

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)