

*File*

0034



STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

Norman H. Bangerter, Governor  
Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director  
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

October 15, 1986

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED  
P 001 720 933

Mr. Trevor Whiteside  
Valley Camp of Utah, Inc.  
Scofield Route  
Helper, Utah 84526

Dear Mr. Whiteside:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N86-9-11-1,  
ACT/007/001, Folder No. 8, Carbon County, Utah

The undersigned has been appointed by the Board of Oil, Gas and Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under UMC/SMC 845.11-845.20.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above-referenced violation. This violation was issued by Division Inspector Holland Shepherd on September 30, 1986. Rules UMC/SMC 845.2 et seq have been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Within fifteen (15) days after receipt of this proposed assessment, you or your agent may file a written request for an assessment conference to review the proposed penalty. (Address a request for a conference to Ms. Janice Brown at the above address.)

IF A TIMELY REQUEST IS NOT MADE, THE PROPOSED PENALTY(IES) WILL BECOME FINAL, AND THE PENALTY(IES) WILL BE DUE AND PAYABLE WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF THE PROPOSED ASSESSMENT. Please remit payment to the Division and mail c/o Janice Brown.

Sincerely,

*Mike Earl*

Mike Earl  
Assessment Officer

jmc  
Enclosure  
cc: D. J. Griffin  
7314Q



3. Would or did the damage or impact remain within the exploration or permit area? \_\_\_\_\_

	RANGE
Within Exp/Permit Area	0-7*
Outside Exp/Permit Area	8-25*

\*In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS \_\_\_\_\_

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

1. Is this a potential or actual hindrance to enforcement? Potential

RANGE

Potential hindrance	1-12
Actual hindrance	13-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is hindered by the violation. \_\_\_\_\_

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS 6

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector, the operator failed to sample several surface water monitoring sites for April and May of 1986.

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 6

III. NEGLIGENCE MAX 30 PTS

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO - NO NEGLIGENCE;  
OR Was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference, lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO - NEGLIGENCE;  
OR Was this violation the result of reckless, knowing, or intentional conduct? IF SO - GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence	0
Negligence	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault	16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Inspector indicates the operator apparently contracts out the monitoring to an engineering firm. It is the operators responsibility to ensure the samples are taken.

IV. GOOD FAITH MAX -20 PTS. (either A or B)

A. Did the operator have onsite the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area? IF SO

-EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

Immediate Compliance -11 to -20\*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

Rapid Compliance -1 to -10\*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance 0

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

\*Assign in upper or lower half of range depending on abatement occurring in 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance OR does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance? IF SO -

DIFFICULT ABATEMENT SITUATION

Difficult Abatement Situation

Rapid Compliance -11 to -20\*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance -1 to -10\*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

Extended Compliance 0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard, or the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Easy ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Good faith depends on future monitoring.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N86-9-11-1

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>8</u>
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>6</u>
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	 <u>22</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	 <u>\$240</u>

Mike Earl

ASSESSMENT DATE 10/15/86 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mike Earl