



0022

STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson
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

July 5, 1984

P402 457 328
CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Larry Guymon
Utah Power and Light Company
% Emery Mining Corporation
P. O. Box 310
Huntington, Utah 84528

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation
No. 84-7-4-1
ACT/015/018, Folder # 8
Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Guymon:

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 April 12, 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.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Wright
Mary Ann Wright
Assessment Officer

MAW/re

c: J. Merriman, OSM Albuquerque Field Office

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

COMPANY/MINE Utah Power & Light/Deer Creek NOV # 84-7-4-1
 PERMIT # ACT/015/018 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 July 3, 1984 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR DATE July 4, 1983

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF.DATE	PTS
<u>N83-4-4-1</u>	<u>7-13-83</u>	<u>1</u>	_____	_____	_____
<u>N83-7-9-2</u>	<u>5-2-84</u>	<u>2</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 3

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

- What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent? Water Pollution
- 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 at low end of likely since the probability of the event occurring would be when the adjacent coal was disturbed and when it rained, as per inspectors statement.

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 Damage would be offsite. Assessed down from mid-point since, per inspector's statement, damage would probably not be that great.

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 4

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS Assessed down from mid-point since operation was working to abate problem at time of NOV, as per inspector's statement

