



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

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 11, 1985

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 402 456 986

North American Equities
Blazon Mine
Suite 1401 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

Gentlemen:

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No.N84-2-11-1
ACT/007/021, 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 Sandy Pruitt on June 27, 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Mary Ann Wright'.

Mary Ann Wright
Assessment Officer

wj

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 _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS _____

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

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

	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 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, inspector was potentially hindered from reviewing June data to determine if a problem existed with the mine site affecting the stream. Assessed down for not hindering the entire inspection.

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.

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

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Greater Degree of Fault
ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 18

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Assessed as knowing as a violation of a specific permit condition. The June samples which were missed were the first set missed.

