

Controlling Blast Related Fume with Modified Explosives



J. Rock – Technical Specialist, Hanwha Mining Services

K. Bambrook – Drill & Blast Engineer, Glencore Coal Assets Australia, Clermont Mine





- Glencore proactively seeking alternatives to lower the risk of blast generated fume
- As with many sites, Clermont Coal Mine has weathered tertiary material that has a high risk of fume
- Increase in industry focus on fume from blasting
- Conventional Bulk Products impose restrictions to reduce risk of fume
- > This in turn impacts on downstream processes





GLEN

- Caused by fuel deficiency or low order detonation
- Can be caused by individual or multiple factors:
 - Explosive formulation & quality control
 - Geology
 - Blast Design
 - Product selection & Implementation

In certain conditions, blast fume could cause minor visual impact through to serious health issues and negative media

Blast Fume





AIR QUALITY: The plume of dust created by a mine blast at MTW last Wednesday near Putty Road.

NOTE: These articles and Facebook posts do NOT refer to Clermont Coal Mine

GLENCORE



- Blasts are managed to reduce both the risk and possible impacts
- Key considerations:
 - Blast design & Product selection
 - Geology & Ground conditions
 - Blast Implementation and Changes
 - Preceding & Prevailing weather conditions
- Possible impacts considered before blast fired with "worst case" scenario adopted



Clermont Coal Mine approach







- Absence of any NOx fume
- Zero incidents
- Fragmentation & Heave Profile suitable for excavating equipment
- Excavator productivity to match or exceed benchmark
- Equivalent blasting cost (\$/bcm)





- A blend of emulsion, ANFO and polystyrene beads
- Emulsion is a high density, low water content dual salt emulsion (1.48g/cc)
- Emulsion provides high waterresistance
- Polystyrene provides ability to alter product density without chemical gassing



GLENCC

Density range 0.9 to 1.2 g/cc

Trial Process



GLENCO

- 5 Blasts in total; 2 benchmark blasts & 3 trial blasts
- Alternate blasts to ensure unbiased comparison
- Total product trial of 600 tonnes



Trial Process



- Both benchmark blasts used the standard site blast design parameters & products
- > 1st Trial Blast adopted conservative approach:
 - 10% reduction in powder factor
- > 2nd Trial Blast same pattern as Benchmark:
 - 20% reduction in powder factor
- 3rd Trial Blast further reduction in powder factor to provide cost neutral comparison





1st Benchmark blast

- Loaded with 40% emulsion heavy ANFO
- Slept for up maximum of 48 hours
- Level 1 fume event observed

2nd Benchmark blast

- Loaded with gassed 70% emulsion blend
- Slept for 5 days
- Level 1 fume event observed





All trial blasts loaded with XLOAD at density of 1.0 g/cc

1st Trial blast

- Slept for up to 3 days
- 2nd Trial blast
 - Slept for 16 days
- **3rd Trial blast**
 - Slept for up to 5 days

NO Fume observed for any trial blasts



Results



Dig face comparison between Trial product and benchmark product





Results



Instantaneous Dig Rates:

Benchmark Blasts Vs Trial blasts

(6% improvement in dig rate)





GLENCORE

Velocity of Detonation – XLOAD 100







- No fume observed from the three trial blasts
- 6 % increase in productivity from shovel for trial blasts over benchmark blasts
- No operational or environmental incidents
- Cost neutral against benchmark product





- The Management of Glencore and Clermont Coal Mine
- The Management of Hanwha Mining Services
- The Operational personnel from both Clermont Coal Mine and Hanwha in particular the site Drill & Blast Team





Controlling Blast Related Fume with Modified Explosives



J. Rock – Technical Specialist, Hanwha Mining Services

K. Bambrook – Drill & Blast Engineer, Glencore Coal Assets Australia, Clermont Mine

