



0036

STATE OF UTAH  
NATURAL RESOURCES  
Oil, Gas & Mining

*File*

Scott M. Matheson, Governor  
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director  
Dr. G. A. (Jim) Shirazi, Division Director

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

February 2, 1984

*P. 396-996-709*

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Dee. W. Jense, Manager  
Utah Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 899  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

*2-13-84  
2-14-84*

RE: Proposed Assessment for State  
Violation No. 83-7-10-1  
ACT/015/017, Folder # 8  
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Jense;

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 Ken Wyatt on December 20, 1983. 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 Nielson, 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.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Wright  
Assessment Officer

MAW/re

cc: J. Merriman, OSM Albuquerque Field Office

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

COMPANY/MINE Utah Power & Light NOV # 83-7-10-1  
Des-Bee-Dove Mine

PERMIT # ACT/015/017 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 2-1-84 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 2-2-83

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS

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 0

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? Environmental Harm
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 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per the inspectors statement, no damage would be likely to occur since the area of illegal waste rock disposal is bermed. Also it appeared that no topsoil was removed prior to disposal, however, the topsoil which would have been removed is reported as low productivity soil. The area has reportedly been operated in accordance with laws governing sanitary landfills in the State.

	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 As per inspector statement, no damage has been considered to have occurred and no damage is expected to occur considering the use of an approved landfill as the disposal area. The impact of the violation did occur outside of the permit area.

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) 13

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 The operator should be well aware that mining activities are to take place within the permit boundaries. The operator has a permitted disposal facility but chose to dispose of the development waste in another area. This action is considered knowing and willful. Because the operator made the illegal disposal in an already disturbed area, negligence is assessed downward from the midpoint.

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)

\*Assign in upper or lower half of range depending on abatement occurring in 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? \_\_\_\_\_ ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS \_\_\_\_\_

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Good Faith cannot be assessed at this time since, to my knowledge, the NOV has not yet been abated.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>13</u>
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>18</u>
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-</u>
TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>31</u>
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$ 420.</u>

ASSESSMENT DATE 2-1-84 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X INITIAL ASSESSMENT \_\_\_\_\_ FINAL ASSESSMENT