

0040



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

File

Scott M. Matheson, Governor
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

January 7, 1985

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 396 996 755

Mr. Dave Spillman
Soldier Creek Coal Company
P. O. Box I
Price, Utah 84501

Dear Mr. Spillman:

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N84-6-10-1,
ACT/007/018, Folder #7, 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 Bart Kale on August 10, 1984. 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 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 Mr. Lorin Nielsen, Assessment Officer, 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 be considered for the final assessment 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,

Mary Ann Wright

Mary Ann Wright
Assessment Officer

re

Enclosure

cc: D. Griffin, OSM Albuquerque Field Office
73140

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 No damage occurred. However, damage would have extended offsite had the water not been of high quality.

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) 8

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.

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

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence
 ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 12

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, operator should be well aware of required approval to transfer discharge water to another point.

IV. GOOD FAITH MAX -20 PTS. (either A or B)

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 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 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? easy ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Immediate abatement of shutting water off was required. Operator complied to this abatement. Normal compliance assessed.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N84-6-10-1

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>8</u>
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>12</u>
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	 <u>20</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	 <u>\$ 200</u>

Mary Ann Wright

ASSESSMENT DATE 12-24-84 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X PROPOSED ASSESSMENT _____ FINAL ASSESSMENT