

0051



State of Utah  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt  
Governor  
Ted Stewart  
Executive Director  
James W. Carter  
Division Director

355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203  
801-538-5340  
801-359-3940 (Fax)  
801-538-5319 (TDD)

November 8, 1993

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT  
P 074 975 467

Mr. Ken Payne  
Utah Fuel Company  
P.O. Box 719  
Helper, UT 84526-0719

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N93-39-5-3, Utah Fuel Company, Skyline Mine, ACT/007/005, Folder #5, Carbon County, Utah

Dear Mr. Payne::

The undersigned has been appointed by the Board of Oil, Gas and Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above-referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Stephen J. Demczak on September 16, 1993,, 1993. Rule R645-401-600 et. sec. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the Notice of Violation, has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

1. If you wish to informally appeal the fact of this violation, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within 30 days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within 30 days of receipt of




Page 2  
N93-39-5-3  
ACT/007/005  
November 8, 1993

this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.

**If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, 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, mail c/o Vicki Bailey.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joseph C. Helfrich". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Joseph C. Helfrich  
Assessment Officer

sm  
Enclosure  
cc: Bernie Freeman, OSM

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES  
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

COMPANY/MINE Utah Fuel Company/Skyline Mine

NOV #N93-39-5-3

PERMIT # ACT/007/005

VIOLATION 1 OF 3

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

I. **HISTORY MAX 25 PTS**

- A. Are there previous violations which are not pending or vacated, which fall within 1 year of today's date?

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 11/5/92

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

—

—

—

1 point for each past violation, up to one year;  
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one year;  
No pending notices shall be counted.

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0

II. **SERIOUSNESS (either A or B)**

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following applies. Based on the facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within which category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an Event (A) or Hindrance (B) violation? Event

A. **Event Violations Max 45 PTS**

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?  
Offsite sediment deposition.
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? Likely.

... PROBABILITY	RANGE
... None	0
... Unlikely	1-9
... Likely	10-19
... Occurred	20

**ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 16**

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

With no sediment control on the conveyor bench and topsoil pile at the South Fork, it is likely that sediment could be transported off the disturbed area.

- 3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0 - 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 0**

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Extent of the damage caused by the violation could not be quantifiably ascertained.

**B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS**

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

RANGE 0 - 25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

**ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS**

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

**TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 16**

**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 Ordinary

**ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8**

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Lack of diligence with respect to implementation of sediment structures.

**IV. GOOD FAITH MAX 20 PTS. (EITHER A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures.)**

- 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)  
(Operator complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

\* 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

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)  
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? \_\_\_\_\_ **ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS**  0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

To be evaluated upon termination of the violation.

V. **ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR**  N93-39-5-3

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u> 0 </u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u> 16 </u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u> 8 </u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u> -0 </u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u> 24 </u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u> \$ 280.00 </u>

sm

**WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES  
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING**

COMPANY/MINE Utah Fuel Company/Skyline Mine

NOV #N93-39-5-3

PERMIT # ACT/007/005

VIOLATION 2 OF 3

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

**I. HISTORY MAX 25 PTS**

- A. Are there previous violations which are not pending or vacated, which fall within 1 year of today's date?

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 11/5/92

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

—

—

—

1 point for each past violation, up to one year;  
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one year;  
No pending notices shall be counted.

**TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0**

**II. SERIOUSNESS (either A or B)**

**NOTE:** For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following applies. Based on the facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within which category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an Event (A) or Hindrance (B) violation? Event

**A. Event Violations Max 45 PTS**

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?  
Water pollution.
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? None.

...	PROBABILITY	RANGE
...	None	0
...	Unlikely	1-9
...	Likely	10-19
...	Occurred	20

**ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS**   0  

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No water pollution would occur as a result of the violation.

- 3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage? RANGE 0 - 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**   0  

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No damage.

**B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS**

- 1. Is this a potential or actual hindrance to enforcement?      RANGE 0 - 25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

**ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS**     

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

**TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B)**   0   ✓

**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 Ordinary.

**ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8**

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Lack of diligence with respect to design criteria for sediment control structures.

**IV. GOOD FAITH MAX 20 PTS. (EITHER A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures.)**

- 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)  
 (Operator complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

\* 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

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)  
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? \_\_\_\_\_ **ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS** -0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

To be evaluated upon termination of the violation.

V. **ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR** N93-39-5-3 2/3

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>0</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>8</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$ 80.00</u>

**WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES  
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING**

COMPANY/MINE Utah Fuel Company/Skyline Mine

NOV #93-39-5-3

PERMIT # ACT/007/005

VIOLATION 3 OF 3

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

**I. HISTORY MAX 25 PTS**

- A. Are there previous violations which are not pending or vacated, which fall within 1 year of today's date?

ASSESSMENT DATE 11/5/93

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 11/5/92

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

—

—

—

1 point for each past violation, up to one year;  
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one year;  
No pending notices shall be counted.

**TOTAL HISTORY POINTS** 0

**II. SERIOUSNESS (either A or B)**

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following applies. Based on the facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within which category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is this an Event (A) or Hindrance (B) violation? Event

**A. Event Violations Max 45 PTS**

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?  
Conducting activities without appropriate approvals.
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? None.

...	PROBABILITY	RANGE
...	None	0
...	Unlikely	1-9
...	Likely	10-19
...	Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Conducting activities without appropriate approvals did not occur as a result of the violation.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage? RANGE 0 - 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 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No damage occurred as a result of the violation.

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

1. Is this a potential or actual hindrance to enforcement? RANGE 0 - 25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS     

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 0 ✓

**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 Ordinary.

**ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8**

**PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS**

Lack of diligence with respect to design criteria for sediment control structures.

**IV. GOOD FAITH MAX 20 PTS. (EITHER A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures.)**

- 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)

(Operator complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

\* 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**

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)  
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT?                      **ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS**    -0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

To be evaluated upon termination of the violation.

V.    ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR            N93-39-5-3-3/3

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>0</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>8</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$80.00</u>

sm



State of Utah  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt  
Governor

Ted Stewart  
Executive Director

James W. Carter  
Division Director

355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203  
801-538-5340  
801-359-3940 (Fax)  
801-538-5319 (TDD)

November 4, 1993

Mr. Ken Payne  
Coastal States Energy Company  
P. O. Box 719  
Helper, Utah 84526

Re: Initial Review Response - Accepted, Coastal States Energy Company, Skyline Mine, ACT/007/005, Folder #2, Carbon County, Utah

Dear Mr. Payne:

The Division is in receipt of Coastal's proposed amendment to add surface facilities and has determined the application administratively complete for review purposes. This letter provides notice that the amendment has been accepted for review pursuant to R645-303-221. The amendment has been assigned the permit change number 93K.

A technical review of the application is now proceeding. You will be notified of the status of your amendment application when the review is completed. In you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daron R. Haddock".

Daron R. Haddock  
Permit Supervisor

skyllnit.93K

