Original Research Article

Occupational noise and vibration assessments in forest harvesting equipment in north-eastern Brazil

.

ABSTRACT

Occupational hazards arising from physical agents present in wood harvesting equipment may cause irreversible damage to the health of exposed operators. Thus, the objective of this study was to quantify the noise and vibration levels emitted by three types of wood harvesting equipment (Feller-buncher, Harvester and Forwarder) in a forestry company in north-eastern Brazil during a workday. Noise measurements were performed with an equivalent noise level meter (audiodosimeter) at the workstation and compared with the limits set in NR-15. To evaluate the vibration was used a full cup gauge, which has a sensor called triaxial accelerometer (directions X, Y and Z), installed on the operator's seat. As a result, the average noise dose of all activities in the operation studied did not exceed the maximum allowable limit of 85 dB (A) for 8 hours of continuous work. The whole body vibration in all equipment was below the exposure level, however, some equipment obtained indexes slightly higher than the alert level, a fact that shows a higher accuracy in the equipment.

Keywords: Health; Physical agents; Operators; Forestry.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Brazilian forest sector occupies the sixth place among the forest producing countries with an estimated area of about 7.78 million hectares representing 6.2% of the GDP of the Brazilian industrial production [1]. This sector is a wood producer to manufacture a huge list of products needed by the population. However, there is a need to seek technological and operational advances in this field, with the objective of increasing productivity and global competitiveness, based on a model of environmental and social sustainability, since wood production is, in its essence, a costly and impactful activity [2].

One of the most important stages of the production chain is the harvesting of wood, which can represent up to 60% of the final product cost. The harvest has undergone major advances in recent years by the introduction of new equipment. These forestry equipment consist of a set consisting of a tire or track tractor and a coupled front implement (head), which is responsible for cutting trees [3].

The equipment used for harvesting wood can be Harvester, Forwarder and Feller-buncher, among others. These equipments are, in general, imported from European countries, having their design characteristics different from the Brazilian reality [4].

In this sense, there is a concern in investigating aspects related to workers' safety, since their activities are carried out inside the cabins with equipment in forest areas subject to sloping and eroded reliefs. In addition, forestry operators are known to be exposed to a variety of fatigue-causing factors such as cab vibration, shrill movement due to uneven terrain, uncomfortable working positions and the constant twisting and turning of the head, neck and cervical regions [5]. In this context it is necessary to assess the environmental risks present in the workplace [6], given that many forestry companies are more concerned with production than with ergonomics and work organization [7].

Environmental hazards are characterized as existing elements in the workplace that, in relation to their concentration, intensity, nature and exposure time can cause damage to workers' health. The risks may come from chemical, physical, biological, ergonomic and accident agents, depending on the type of activity [8].

It is noted, therefore, that forest harvesting requires special attention from companies due to the high representativeness in production costs, high risk and high demand for skilled labor, often even outsourced [9]. The elements that require this attention in the analysis are variations in risk agents, where we highlight the physical agent. This agent is characterized as the various forms of energy to which the worker may be exposed, examples are noise; the vibrations; abnormal pressures; extreme temperatures; ionizing radiation; non-ionizing radiation, among others [10].

Thus, it must be ensured that the concentration and the exposure time of the worker to the risk agent are in accordance with Brazilian law. Therefore, this determines that the ideal conditions for the development of activities compatible with the occupational health of the operators are assured [11].

Given this scenario, the objective of this study is to evaluate the occupational hazards arising from physical agents noise and vibration in equipment used for harvesting wood in north-eastern Brazil.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Study area and work system

The research was carried out in a forest company located in the northeast region of Brazil from May 2017 to July 2018. In an area of *Eucalyptus* spp. approximately six years old, in a region of low slope and good drainage, already in the wood harvesting phase.

The evaluations were performed in the two harvesting systems employed by the company. System 1 consists of: Feller-buncher slaughter + Harvester processing + Forwarder extraction. System 2 consists of: Harvester slaughter and processing + Forwarder extraction. Both systems used are considered Cut-to-length.

Comment [E961]: Please enter the machine types (for all) and a list of important parameters in the table, including engine type and power, which are related to noise and vibration.

2.2 Rated equipment

The following are the crawler Feller-buncher equipment without leveling device - FB1; crawler Feller-buncher with leveling device - FB2 (Fig. 1). This equipment is used to cut down and accumulate trees in rows.

Forwarder-type equipment has a load capacity of 1400 kg, cab suspension system and 6 x 6 - FW1 and 8 x 8 - FW2 and FW3 traction tire wheels (Fig. 2). This equipment is used for logging and its main function is to take the wood to the edge of the area.

Comment [E962]: Is this value too small? What is it about? Forwarder load capacity or loader capacity?

And finally Harvester-type equipment, with crawler and appropriate head - HV1 and HV2; Harvester with tires and appropriate head - HV3 and adapted tire agricultural machinery with

Harvester head - HV4 (Fig. 3). This equipment simultaneously performs felling, delimbing, tracing, and wood stacking operations.



FIG. 1 Crawler Feller-buncher without leveling device – FB1; Crawler Feller-buncher with leveling device – FB2

FIG. 2 Tire Forwarder with 6x6 cab suspension system – FW1; Tire Forwarder with 8x8 cab suspension system – FW2 and FW3



FIG. 3 Crawler Harvester– HV1 and HV2; Tire Havester – HV3; Adapted tire agricultural machinery with Harvester head – HV4

2.3 Occupational noise assessment

The assessment was performed using an equivalent noise level meter (audiometer). The instrument microphone was installed close to the operator's ear. The values obtained were compared with the maximum exposure limits determined by Regulatory Standard NR-15 that deals with unhealthy activities and operations, of the former Ministry of Labor [12]. In addition, the following were considered: a) noise interference in conversation and listening to acoustic warning signals; b) presence of undesirable noises due to lack of equipment maintenance.

Comment [E963]: Please enter type, supplier and measurement accuracy.

Comment [E964]: This is not very precise. The measurement method should be accurate enough to be able to repeat the measurement and compare the test results. How exactly was the microphone installed? Which measuring scale was chosen. How many measurements were made, at what engine speed, at which machine operations? What was the background noise? Was the cabin closed? These are scientific studies and precision of description is needed, not generalities.

Noise was individually assessed for the analyzed machines, following Occupational Hygiene Standard NHO-01 which establishes the Normalized Exposure Level (NEL), ie the noise exposure level converted to an 8-hour workday [13].

The criteria adopted for decision making on forest machinery were those present in NHO-01, described in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1 Criteria for noise analysis by Normalized Exposure Level (NEL)

NEL dB(A)	Daily dose %	Technical Consideration	Recommendation
Up to 82	0 to 50	Acceptable	At a minimum maintaining existing condition
82 to 84	50 to 80	Above action level	Adopt preventive measures
84 to 85	80 to 100	Region of uncertainty	Adopt preventive and corrective measures to reduce daily dose
Over 85	Over 100	Over exposure limit	Immediate adoption of corrective measures

Fundacentro (2001).

2.4 Occupational vibration assessment

In the vibration evaluation was used a full cup meter, which has a sensor called triaxial accelerometer (X, Y and Z directions). The device was installed on the operator's seat, recording the acceleration values in m.s^{-2}.

Comment [E965]: Please enter type, supplier and measurement accuracy.

Comment [E966]: Why no vibration measurements were made on the controls; handles, steering wheel? The operator not only sits, but constantly operates the controls and vibrations are transmitted through his hands. This is basic research, and where is science?

Comment [E967]: Same comments as for noise measurement. How many repetitions were made for each machine and for what operating conditions?

The measurement results were compared to the values recommended by Occupational Hygiene Standard NHO-09 [14], expressed as Accelerated Resulting from Normalized Exposure (AREN) obtained using equation 1 below:

$$AREN = \text{ARE}\sqrt{\frac{T}{To}} \qquad (1)$$

where: ARE= acceleration resulting from exposure;
T= time of daily workday expressed in hours or minutes;
To= 8 hours or 480 minutes.

The standard reference values are: threshold for action level, AREN = 0.5 m.s^{-2} and daily occupational exposure limit (8 hours), AREN = 1.1 m.s^{-2}.

Comment [E968]: Why is there no statistical analysis?

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The parameters set for adopting the noise compliance level for an 8-hour work shift per day was the Action Limit of 80 dB(A) and Maximum Permitted Exposure Limit of 85 dB(A). For whole body vibration, the parameters established for adopting the compliance level are as follows: below alert level (0.5 $m.s^{-2}$) and below exposure level (1.1 $m.s^{-2}$). Table 2 presents the analysis of forest equipment with the corresponding noise and vibration levels.

TABLE 2 Criteria for noise analysis by Normalized Exposure Level (NEL) and vibration by Acceleration Resulting from Normalized Exposure (AREN)

Forestry Equipment	NEL dB(A)	AREN $m.s^{-2}$
FB1	84.5	0.45
FB2	84.5	0.60
FW1	82.6	0.38
FW2	75.0	0.70
FW3	75.0	0.70
HV1	78.9	0.27
HV2	76.2	0.37
HV3	77.4	0.33
HV4	78.6	0.37
Average	79.19	0.46

Comment [E969]: Are these individual measurements? Please refer to the measurement requirements. Very important conditions must be met that are not described in the article. This is not a scientific article, but some research report.

Comment [E9610]: Are these results statistically significantly different? For all.

3.1 Occupational noise assessment

Noise analysis has shown the need for all operators to wear the recommended hearing protector since, on average, all forestry equipment is close to the 80 dB(A) action limit set by NR-15 [14]. The source of the intense noise may be in the field, as there are several plots and forestry machines working in an integrated manner, so, at times, the noise of one can interfere with the other [15]. Allied to this, the results indicate some insulation failure of the machine cabs, which is a relevant problem. Since, one of the main functions and safety differential of other methods is the presence of cabs on tractors to protect operators from adverse environmental influences [16].

The discomfort generated by loud noise tends to impair mental concentration when performing certain tasks that require attention, speed or precision of movement [17].

For the work on Feller-bunchers (FB1 and FB2), the level of attention should be increased, as they presented very high noise levels and very close to exceeding the maximum allowable exposure limit of 85 dB (A). If exposure above the limit may occur, a new adjustment should be proposed. In this case, for every 5 dB(A) above the limit, the operator will have a 50% reduction in their working hours [18]. However, there are no productivity targets to be adjusted in any of the evaluated equipment due to noise.

3.2 Occupational vibration assessment

Whole body vibration in all equipment was below 1.1 $m.s^{-2}$ exposure level. However, the overall average remained close to the 0.5 $m.s^{-2}$ alert level. The FB2, FW2 and FW3 equipment had indices slightly higher than the alert level, a fact that needs greater accuracy in machinery, although it remains in a normalized classification, against Annex VIII of NR-15 [10]. In this case, there are no productivity targets to adjust for vibration.

Other authors have found similar results for vibration indices [19], however, even though Brazilian standards are acceptable, they are considered to be in disagreement with Directive 2002/44/CE of the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union.

Exposure to vibration is determined by the intensity and time of exposure of the operator, as well as the body parts used to perform such activities [20]. Due to the fact that it is considered harmful and represents a major risk to the health, comfort and safety of people involved in activities with high motion emission equipment, it is important to have readjusted goals when the vibration exceeds the proposed tolerable limit.

It is noteworthy that, in addition to the type of activity performed, machinery speed, tire calibration, terrain type, among other variables considerably interfere with the vibration and noise indices transmitted to the operator [21, 22].

3.3 Overall result

For the forestry equipment studied, the results, even with some warning, none are exceeding the compliance limit, which shows promising improvements in the forest machinery and working environment. Since, in this scenario, the noise and vibration levels of the forest machines were commonly above the safety limits established by the NR-15 standard, to which workers were exposed during their working hours.

The results of this study corroborate those of other authors [23], who highlight the technological advances and improvements in the workplace of high performance forestry equipment in recent years, but point out that the equipment still exposes the operator to some degree of risk. and mainly influences your occupational health. From this comes the importance of studies on the ergonomic quality of forest harvesting machinery in order to improve the working conditions of national operators. Several authors [24, 25, 26] performed evaluations on different types of forest harvesting machines on various ergonomic aspects of the machines, mainly addressing anthropometric issues, work area visibility and operator exposure to physical agents.

Comment [E9611]: There is a lack of interpretation of research results and in-depth scientific analysis. These are general statements. Please complete the description.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present study demonstrate a new behavior of the forestry machinery and equipment industries, which have been intensifying the development and application of new technologies, in order to provide greater comfort and safety to their operators.

Despite all the technology involved in each machine evaluated, the results of the occupational exposure of the operators to mechanical vibration and noise were at levels that suggest more effective actions, including the reduction of working hours.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brazil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001.

REFERENCES

1. IBÁ. Indústria Brasileira de Árvores. Relatório Anual dos Indicadores de desempenho nacional do setor de árvores plantadas referentes ao ano de 2017. São Paulo: IBÁ, 2018. Portuguese.

2. Machado CC. Forest harvest. 3st ed. Viçosa: UFV; 2014. English.
3. Malinovski JR, Malinovski RA. Evolution of pine harvesting systems in southern Brazil. Curitiba: FUPEF, 1998. English.
4. Carmo FCDA, Fiedler NC, Minette LJ, Souza AP. Optimization of the use of forestry Forwarder based on productivity, costs and load capacity. Revista Árvore. 2015; 39 (3): 561-566. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0100-67622015000300017
5. Gellerstedt S. A Self-Leveling and Swiveling Forestry Machine Cab. Journal of Forest Engineering. 1998; 9(1): 7-16. English.
6. Schettino S, Minette LJ, Santos, VP. Work safety in the forest sector. 1st ed. Curitiba: Brazil Publishing, 2019. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.31012/978-65-5016-110-1
7. Hanse JJ, Winkel J. Work organisation constructs and ergonomic outcomes among European forest machine operators. Ergonomics. 2008; 51(7): 968-981. English. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130801961893
8. Mauro MYC, Muzi CD, Guimarães RM, Mauro CCC. Occupational health risks. Revista de Enfermagem da UERJ. 2004; 12 (3): 338-345. English.
9. Lacerda LC, Fiedler NC, Chichorro JF, Minette LJ, Carmo FCDA. Analysis of the production capacity from a *Harvester* in the forest in own and outsourced modules. Revista Árvore. 2017; 41 (1): e410120. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1806-90882017000100020
10. Brazil. Ministry of Labour. Regulatory Standard 9: environmental risk prevention program. Brasília: Official Gazette. 2014.
11. Guedes IL, Amaral EJ, Leite ES, Fernandes HC, Sant'anna CM. Performance and cost evaluation of two cable yarder systems in the extration of eucalyptus wood. Ciência Florestal. 2017; 27 (2): 571-580. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.5902/1980509827737
12. Brazil. Ministry of Labour. Regulatory Standard 15: unhealthy activities and operations. Brasília: Official Gazette. 2014.
13. FUNDACENTRO. Jorge Duprat e Figueiredo Foundation for Safety and Occupational Medicine. Occupation Hygiene Standard: NHO 01: assessment of occupational noise exposure. São Paulo: Fundacentro; 2001.
14. FUNDACENTRO. Jorge Duprat e Figueiredo Foundation for Safety and Occupational Medicine. Occupation Hygiene Standard: NHO 09: assessment of occupational exposure to full body vibration. São Paulo: Fundacentro; 2013.
15. Baesso MM, Gazzola M, Bernardes S, Brandelero E, Modolo A. Noise level evaluation, items security and ergonomic in agricultural tractors. Brazilian Journal of Biosystems Engineering. 2015. 9(4): 368-380. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.18011/bioeng2015v9n4p368-380
16. Gerasimov Y, Sokolov A. Ergonomic evaluation and comparison of wood harvesting systems in Northwest Russia. Applied Ergonomics. 2014. 45(2): 318–338. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2013.04.018
17. Minetti LJ, Souza AP, Machado CC, Baeta FC, Fiedler NC. Análise da influência de fatores climáticos no corte florestal com motosserra. Revista Árvore. 1998. 22(4): 527-534. Portuguese.
18. Hoeppner MG. NR: Normas regulamentadoras relativas à segurança no trabalho. 6st ed. São Paulo: Icone; 2015. Portuguese.
19. Silva LR, Mendes R. Exposição combinada entre ruído e vibração e seus efeitos sobre a audição de trabalhadores. Revista de Saúde Pública. 2005; 39(1): 9-17. Portuguese.
20. Santos LN, Fernandes HC, Souza AP Furtado Júnior MR, Silva RMF. Evaluation of levels of noise and vibration of a tractor-spray set, for each working speed. Engenharia na Agricultura. 2014. 22(2): 112-118. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.13083/reveng.v22i2.468

21. Cuong DM, Zhu S, Zhu Y**.** Effects of tyre inflation pressure and forward speed on vibration of an unsuspended tractor. Journal of Terramechanics. 2013; 50(3): 185-1986. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jterra.2013.05.001
22. Silva AC, Furtado Júnior MR, Ribeiro LC, Fernandes HC, Teixeira RRD. Noise and vibration at the operating station of an agricultural tractor in response to tire pressure and operational speed. Revista Engenharia na Agricultura. 2017; 25(5): 454-458. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.13083/reveng.v25i5.842
23. Funes R, Andrade MJ, Bezerra SFA. Análise Ergonômica do Trabalho (AET) aplicada ao trabalho na agricultura: experiências e reflexões. Revista Brasileira de Saúde Ocupacional. 2015. 40(131): 88-97. Portuguese. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0303-7657000079013
24. Minette LJ, Silva EP, Souza AP, Silva KR. Evaluation of noise, light and heat levels of forest harvesting machines. Revista Brasileira de Engenharia Agrícola e Ambiental. 2007. 11(6): 664-667. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1415-43662007000600017
25. Lima JSS, Souza AP, Machado CC, Oliveira RB. Evaluation of some ergonomic factors in Feller-buncher and skidder tractors used in wood harvesting. Revista Árvore. 2005. 29(2): 291-298. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-67622005000200012
26. Schettino S, Moraes AC, Minette LJ. Evaluation of the occupational risks to mechanized forest harvest workers. Nativa. 2019. 7(4): 412-419. English. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.31413/nativa.v7i4.7218