0007

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

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

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

April 6, 1989

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 001 717 842

Ms. Jean Semborski
U.S. Fuel Company
Hiawatha, Utah 84527

Dear Ms. Semborski:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N89-28-3-1, ACT/007/011, 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 UMC/SMC 845.11-845.17.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. This violation was issued by Division Inspector, Daron R. Haddock on February 23, 1989. Rule UMC/SMC 845.2 et seq. 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 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. (Submit a request for conference to Vicki Bailey, 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, mail c/o Vicki Bailey.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

jb
Enclosure
MN36/25

an equal opportunity employer

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

COMPANY/MINE U.S. Fuel Company NOV # N-89-28-3-1

PERMIT # ACT/007/011 VIOLATION 1 OF 1

ASSESSMENT DATE 4/5/89 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 4/5/89 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 4/5/88

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS
N-88-28-1-1	7/13/88	1
N-88-28-2-1	8/15/88	1
N-88-28-5-1	10/7/88	1

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 3

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 violation falls. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the AO 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? Hindrance

A. Event Violations MAX 45 PTS

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent? _____
2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

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

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

_____

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_____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

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 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The inspector could determine the status of compliance on site; however, there was no information in the permit that addressed the potential environmental consequences of the unpermitted mining activity.

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A OR B) 5

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 -No negligence-

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

U.S. Fuel Company acted in good faith in allowing Genwal Coal Company to conduct mining activities (temporary coal preparation facility) within the disturbed portion of their permit area.

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)

*Assign in upper or lower half of range depending on abatement occuring 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? Difficult ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Operator used diligence to abate the violation.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N-89-28-3-1

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	3
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	5
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	0
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	-20
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	-12
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	$ -0-

MN35/88-90