## EVENT VIOLATIONS INSPECTORS STATEMENT

Company/Mine, Lodestar Energy, INC. /White Oak NOVIES # NOR -46-3-1
Permit # C/007/001 White Oak Novies # Violation # f of f

## **SERIOUSNESS** A.

- What type of event is applicable to the regulation cited? Refer to the DOGM 1. reference list of events below and remember that the event is NOT the same as the violation. Mark and explain each event.
- Activity outside the approved permit area. a.
- Injury to the public (public safety). b.
- Damage to property. c.
- Conducting activities without appropriate approvals. d.
- Environmental harm. e.
- Water pollution.
- Loss of reclamation/revegetation potential.
- Reduced establishment, diverse and effective vegetative cover.
- No event occurred as a result of the violation.
- Other.

Explanation: The impact occurred in 1986 (when discovered) when the permittee attempted to cross a fault at an acute angle in order to access the lower seam from the # I or upper mine, Lode star Energy submitted a law to reclaim the area, but failed to follow that 2. Has the event occurred? Yes\_ No\_ inision approved

Yes: Describe it. The permittee failed to follow the approved reclamation plan, No: What would cause it to occur and what is the probability of the event(s) occurring? (None, Unlikely, Likely).

Explanation: Due to a recent loss of Engineering Dept. personnel, the permittee was not able to have a representative on site when the work was performed. The contractor was on site 2-3 hours and same had a copy of the approved plan.

3. Did any damage occur as a result of the violation?

No.

Yes: Describe the duration and extent of the damage or impact. How much damage may have occurred if the violation had not been discovered by a DOGM inspector? Describe this potential damage and whether or not it would extend off the disturbed and/or permit area.

Explanation:

However, the contractor did not follow the approved plan. When the permittee arrived to inspect the work, the contractor had removed the track hoe from the site.

Page 2 Inspector Statement Event Violations NOV400# 102-46-3-1 Violation # 10f 1

В.	DEGRE	E OF FAULT (Check the statements which apply to the violation and discuss.)	
	×	Was the violation not the fault of the operator (due to vandalism or an act of God), explain. Remember that the permittee is considered responsible for the actions of all persons working on the mine site.	
track	Explana The hoe	ation: contractor finished the project and pulled from the site before allowing Dave Mills work. The permittee is responsible to econtractor complete the work according was the violation the result of not knowing about DOGM regulations, indifference to DOGM regulations or the result of lack of reasonable care.	
making	the th	e contractor complete the work according	
<u>J</u>	<del>-( ) -</del>	Was the violation the result of not knowing about DOGM regulations, indifference to DOGM regulations or the result of lack of reasonable care.	
the	Explana app	oroved plan. Following the 11/6 inspections ler verbally agreed to return to the polete the work according to the appropriate	
Dove	Mil.	Her verbally agreed to return to the populate the work according to the app	
plan	),	orge one work according to	
,	( )	If the actual or potential environmental harm or harm to the public should have been evident to a careful operator, describe the situation and what, if anything, the operator did to correct it prior to being cited.	
	Explan	ation:	
	( )	Was the operator in violation of a specific permit condition?	
	Explan	Explanation:	
	* <u>.</u>		
	( )	Has DOGM or OSM cited the violation in the past? If so, give the dates and the	
		type of warning or enforcement action taken.	
Explanation:		ation:	

## C. GOOD FAITH

1. In order to receive good faith for compliance with an NOV or CO, the violation must have been abated before the abatement deadline. If you think this applies, describe how rapid compliance was achieved (give dates) and describe the measures the operator took to comply as rapidly as possible.

2. Explain whether or not the operator had the necessary resources on site to achieve compliance.

3. Was the submission of plans prior to physical activity required by this NOV/CO?

Yes\_No X If yes, explain.

The permitteds contractor failed to follow the approved plan, leaving a vertical embankment.

on the North end of the impact. The approved plan calls for a rejshaping of the area about the full perimeter of the inappact.

Peter Hess

Authorized Representative

Signature

3. Was the submission of plans prior to physical activity required by this NOV/CO?

Yes\_No X If yes, explain.

The permitteds contractor failed to follow the approved embankment.

The approved plan a rejshaping of the area about the full permitted plant.

Signature

Date

Date