

0062



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

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

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

May 27, 1992

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
P 074 979 241

Mr. Ben Grimes
Cyprus Plateau Mining Corp.
P.O. Drawer PMC
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Grimes:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N92-26-2-1, Cyprus Plateau Mining Corporation, Star Point Mine, ACT/007/006, Folder #5, Carbon County, Utah

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, Wm. J. Malencik on May 1, 1992. 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 this

Page 2
N92-26-2-1
ACT/007/006
May 27, 1992

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,



Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

jbe

Enclosure

cc: Bernie Freeman, OSM

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

COMPANY/MINE Cyprus Plateau Mining Co/Star Point Mine NOV #N92-26-2-1

PERMIT # ACT/007/006 VIOLATION 1 OF 1

ASSESSMENT DATE 05/21/92 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 05/21/92 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 05/21/91

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?
Public Safety and Damage to Property
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? Unlikely

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

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 9

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The Western portion of the course refuse pile, which is the area to which the NOV specifically applies, could in all probability potentially impound water in the event of a given rainstorm or series of precipitation events. The probability of occurrence is inevitable for a given precipitation even occurring. The probability of impounding water as a result of the inevitable rainstorm or resultant injury to the public in terms of public safety is unlikely, thus 9 points are assigned. The inspector's statement additionally revealed that the berm on the west segment of the refuse pile had the potential to impound runoff from the top of the pile. Other portions of the refuse pile not inferred by the NOV did provide adequate drainage from the top of the pile to appropriate sediment control structures (Sediment Pond #5).

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. The inspector's statement revealed that the berm on the westerly portion of the refuse pile was constructed in response to a Division Order. However, the permittee did not take the necessary step to design a proper drainage system on this segment of the refuse pile.

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) 9

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 13

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Lack of diligence with respect to design, approval, and implementation of required drainage control structures. Additionally, the inspector's statement revealed that previous conversations relative to the refuse pile in general, led the inspector to believe that the permittee was cognizant of required drainage controls attendant to the refuse pile.

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 N92-26-2-1

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>9</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>13</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>22</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$ 240.00</u>

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Information received on May 15, 1992, for consideration of this proposed assessment was not given consideration inasmuch as the documents referenced several additional documents that were not provided for consideration. The division has gone forward with this proposed assessment so as to allow the permittee an opportunity to prepare for the informal assessment conference of May 29, 1992.

jbe