File

0022

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 29, 1992

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
P 074 979 226

Mr. Bob Eccli
U.S. Fuel Company
P.O. Box A
Hiawatha, Utah 84527

Dear Mr. Eccli:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N92-41-1-1, U.S. Fuel Company, Hiawatha Mines, 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 R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above-referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Paul B. Baker on April 13, 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

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** U.S. Fuel Company/Hiawatha Mines **NOV #**N92-41-1-1

PERMIT # ACT/007/011 VIOLATION 1 OF 1

ASSESSMENT DATE 04/28/92 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 04/28/92 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 04/28/91

| PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS | EFFECTIVE DATE | POINTS |
|---|---|---|
| N92-39-7-2 | 1/11/92 | 2 |

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** 2

## 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? Occurred

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

**ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS** 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The inspector's statement revealed that the conditions at the site indicated that untreated water had left the disturbed area which resulted in additional erosion and contributions of sediment to runoff and streamflow outside 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** 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

In as much as the post SMACRA disturbance had accumulated over a period of approximately five years, resulting in approximately 10% of the total 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) 25

**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

The operator's representative believed that the area was not within the area for which the operator had responsibility. The perimeter marker placement, however, should have shown, to a careful operator, the limits of disturbance for which there was responsibility.

**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 N92-41-1-1

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | TOTAL HISTORY POINTS | 2 |
| II. | TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS | 25 |
| III. | TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS | 8 |
| IV. | TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS | -0 |
| | TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS | 35 |
| | TOTAL ASSESSED FINE | $ 500.00 |

jbe