0041

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 28, 1985

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 402 457 355

Mr. Chris Shingleton
Utah Power and Light
Des-Bee-Dove Mine
P. O. Box 899
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

Dear Mr. Shingleton:

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation Nos. N84-2-22-1; N84-7-8-4, ACT/015/017, Cat. #8, Emery 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. Violation N84-2-22-1 was issued by Division Inspector Sandy Pruitt on November 9, 1984 and Violations N84-7-8-4 were issued on July 19, 1984 by Division Inspector Ken Wyatt. 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
Assessment Officer

re
Enclosure
cc: D. Griffin, OSM Albuquerque Field Office
73140

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
UTAH DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING
355 West North Temple 3 Triad Center Suite 350
Salt Lake City,Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

COMPANY/MINE UP&L/Des-Bee-Dove NOV # N84-7-8-4

PERMIT # ACT/015/017

VIOLATION		AMOUNT
1	OF 4	$540.
2	OF 4	280.
3	OF 4	150.
4	OF 4	vacated by inspector
	OF	
	OF	
	OF	
	OF	
	OF	
	OF	

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE $ 970.

6976-13

File

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

COMPANY/MINE UP&L/Des-Bee-Dove NOV # N84-7-8-4

PERMIT # ACT/015/017 VIOLATION 1 OF 4

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 1/25/85 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 1/26/84

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS
N83-7-10-1	6-4-84	1			

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 1

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? Loss of reclamation/revegetation potential and reduced establishment of a permanent vegetative cover.
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 19

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, erosion of the bathhouse pad downslopes has removed soil and vegetation from the slopes. The events as listed have occurred.

3. Would or did the damage or impact remain within the exploration or permit area? Yes

	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 7

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Minor rills and gullies 9-18" deep have formed. Soil loss has occurred. Damage has and would remain within 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) 26

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 10

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS This has been pointed out since the Fall of 1982 to be an area of concern. It was not cited until this NOV was issued. Per inspector's statement, the problem was caused by a lack of reasonable care.

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? Difficult ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Outside resources were needed to abate NOV. Abatement deadline extended to October 1, 1984, per operator's request. NOV was terminated October 9, 1984. Extended compliance assessed.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N84-7-8-4 #1

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	1
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	26
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	10
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	0
TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	37
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	$540.

Mary Ann Wright

ASSESSMENT DATE 1/26/85 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X PROPOSED ASSESSMENT _____ FINAL ASSESSMENT

7313Q

File

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

COMPANY/MINE UP&L/Des-Bee-Dove NOV #N84-7-8-4

PERMIT # ACT/015/017 VIOLATION 2 OF 4

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 1/25/85 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 1/26/84

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS
N83-7-10-1	6-4-84	1			

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 1

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? Damage to property/Loss of revegetation potential/Reduced establishment of an effective vegetative cover.

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 18

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, the events as listed have occurred in the form of erosion. The sediment control and drainage structures were washed out in a storm and not repaired for eleven (11) months. Damage to the road and slope has continued in that time.

3. Would or did the damage or impact remain within the exploration or permit area? Yes

	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 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Damage to the road and downslope has occurred in the form of erosion. Sediment has passed through the pond.

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) 23

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 No Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, operator has proposed a plan to fix the control and drainage structures. Approval by OSM has held up the implementation of the plan until mine is permitted.

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? Difficult ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Abatement deadline for this NOV is October 1, 1984. NOV was terminated October 9, 1984. No good faith warranted for extended compliance.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N84-7-8-4 #2

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	1
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	23
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	0
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	0
TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	24
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	$280.

ASSESSMENT DATE 1/25/85 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X PROPOSED ASSESSMENT _____ FINAL ASSESSMENT

7313Q

File

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

COMPANY/MINE UP&L/Des-Bee-Dove NOV #N84-7-8-4

PERMIT # ACT/015/017 VIOLATION 3 OF 4

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 1/25/85 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 1/26/84

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS
N83-7-10-1	6-4-84	1			

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 1

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? Loss of reclamation/revetetation potential.

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 2

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, loss of soil has been minimal, therefore, the probability that this somewhat unprotected stockpile has caused loss of revegetation potential is judged insignificant.

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 Lack of protection of the soil stockpile "could result in soil loss off the permit area into the natural drainage," per inspector's statement.

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) 10

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 4

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Assessed as a lack of diligence in seeing to the protection of the stockpiled soil. Operator contended to inspector that inspections indicated the pile was protected by revegetation efforts. Actual revegetation had low success.

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? _____ ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS NOV was terminated 8-16-84 when the inspector visited the site. The operator contacted the inspector that the work had been completed, per the statement. Work was due to be complete on 8-2-84. Insufficient file information to award good faith at at this time.

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N84-7-8-4 #3

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	1
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	10
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	4
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	
TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	15
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	$150.00

Mary Ann Wright

ASSESSMENT DATE 1/25/85 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X PROPOSED ASSESSMENT _____ FINAL ASSESSMENT

7313Q

File

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

COMPANY/MINE UP&L/Des-Bee Dove NOV # N84-2-22-1

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 _____ EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE 1/26/84

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS
N83-7-10-1					

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 1

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/Water Pollution/Loss of Revegetation potential.

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 16

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, four (4) areas along the road were severely eroded. Environmental harm is considered to have occurred. Water pollution was likely due to sediment flowing towards Cottonwood Creek. Loss of revegetation potential considered insignificant. Assessed as occurred.

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 14

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Damage in the form of severe erosion occurred. Situation began in the Spring of 1983 with the road construction. Four (4) areas along the road were deeply eroded. Damage extended offsite.

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) 30

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 12

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Per inspector's statement, the violation resulted from lack of reasonable care to maintain drainage controls on the road.

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? Difficult ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS -

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Current deadline for NOV termination is 2/7/85. Good faith not assessed at this time.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N84-2-22-1

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	1
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	30
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	12
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	-
TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	43
TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	$720.[illegible]

ASSESSMENT DATE 1/25/85 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Mary Ann Wright

X PROPOSED ASSESSMENT _____ FINAL ASSESSMENT

7313Q

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

SENDER INSTRUCTIONS
Print your name, address, and ZIP Code in the space below.
- Complete items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the reverse.
- Attach to front of article if space permits, otherwise affix to back of article.
- Endorse article "Return Receipt Requested" adjacent to number.

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, $300

U.S.MAIL

RETURN TO

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
OIL, GAS, & MINING
3 TRIAD CENTER, SUITE 350
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84180-1203

(Name of Sender)

(Street or P.O. Box)

(City, State, and ZIP Code)

N84-2-22-1 #1 [redacted] N84-7-8-4 #4 of 4

PS Form 3811, Dec. 1980

RETURN RECEIPT, REGISTERED, INSURED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

● **SENDER:** Complete items 1, 2, 3, and 4. Add your address in the "RETURN TO" space on reverse.

(CONSULT POSTMASTER FOR FEES)

1. The following service is requested (check one).
   - ☐ Show to whom and date delivered ..... ___¢
   - ☐ Show to whom, date, and address of delivery.. ___¢
2. ☐ RESTRICTED DELIVERY ___¢
   (The restricted delivery fee is charged in addition to the return receipt fee.)

TOTAL $ ___

3. ARTICLE ADDRESSED TO:
Mr Chris Shingleton, UP&L
Des-Bee-Doug Mine
PO Box 899
S.L.C. Utah 84110

4. TYPE OF SERVICE:
☐ REGISTERED ☐ INSURED
☐ CERTIFIED ☐ COD
☐ EXPRESS MAIL

ARTICLE NUMBER
P402457355

(Always obtain signature of addressee or agent)

I have received the article described above.

SIGNATURE ☐ Addressee ☐ Authorized agent

5. DATE OF DELIVERY [signature]

POSTMARK
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
JAN 30 1985

6. ADDRESSEE'S ADDRESS *(Only if requested)*

7. UNABLE TO DELIVER BECAUSE:

7a. EMPLOYEE'S INITIALS [signature]