

File

0016



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

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

355 W. North Temple • 3 Triad Center • Suite 350 • Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1203 • 801-538-5340

April 9, 1986

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 001 720 889

Mr. Dan Guy
Beaver Creek Coal Co.
PO Box 1378
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Guy:

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N86-4-2-1,
ACT/007/016, Folder #8, 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 Dave Lof on March 12, 1986. Rule UMC/SMC 845.2 et seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information submitted by you or your agent within 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. (Address a request for a conference to Ms. Jan Brown at the above address.) If no timely request is made, all pertinent data will be reviewed and the penalty will be reassessed, if necessary, for a finalized assessment. Facts will then be considered which were not available on the date of the proposed assessment due to the length of the abatement period. This assessment does not constitute a request for payment.

Sincerely,

Mike Earl

Mike Earl
Assessment Officer

jmc
Enclosure
cc: D. Griffin
7314Q

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

COMPANY/MINE Beaver Creek/Gordon Creek NOV # N86-4-2-1
 PERMIT # ACT/007/016 VIOLATION 1 OF 1

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 4/7/86 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 4/8/85

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS
<u>N84-6-13-1</u>	<u>5/01/85</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>N85-8-5-1</u>	<u>VACATED</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>C85-8-2-1</u>	<u>VACATED</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>N85-8-2-1</u>	<u>VACATED</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>N85-8-11-1</u>	<u>11/30/85</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>N85-8-6-1</u>	<u>4/12/86</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>N84-8-4-1</u>	<u>8/31/85</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>N85-8-17-1</u>	<u>1/05/86</u>	<u>1</u>

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 4

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? 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?

PROBABILITY	RANGE	MID-POINT
None	0	
Insignificant	1-4	2
Unlikely	5-9	7
Likely	10-14	12
Occurred	15-20	17

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 10

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Assessed as likely based on inspector statement that the occurance of the event is dependant on the amount of snow melt runoff. Inspector estimates as likely to occur based on amount of snow accumulated above the mine site.

3. Would or did the damage or impact remain within the exploration or permit area? No

	RANGE	MID-POINT
Within Exp/Permit Area	0-7*	4
Outside Exp/Permit Area	8-25*	16

*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 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Inspector estimates flow at the time of inspection at approximately 50 gpm. Analysis of the water indicated TSS of 28.7 m/l. Water from the effected creeks, Bryner Creek and Gordon Creek, is used for non-game fish and agriculture.

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

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

	RANGE	MID-POINT
Potential hindrance	1-12	7
Actual hindrance	13-25	19

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

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 18

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.

		MID-POINT
No Negligence	0	
Negligence	1-15	8
Greater Degree of Fault	16-30	23

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Inspector indicates the operator failed to maintain strawbales in the roadside ditch which were destroyed during snow removal.

