GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

BRIAN C. STEED
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

October 11, 2019

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
9590 9402 1618 6053 1299 18

Kenneth S. Fleck, Manager of Geology and Environmental Affairs
Interwest Mining Company
P.O. Box 310
Huntington, Utah 84528

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N 21220, Deer Creek Mine, C/015/0018, Task ID #5991

Dear Mr. Fleck:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Karl Housekeeper on September 16, 2019. Rule R645-401-600 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 fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

1. If you wish to informally appeal the fact of this violation, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210, Salt Lake City, UT 84116
PO Box 145801, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5801
telephone (801) 538-5340 • facsimile (801) 359-3940 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.ogm.utah.gov*

UTAH DNR OIL, GAS & MINING

2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Suzanne Steab.

Sincerely,

John Webster

John Webster
Assessment Officer

Enclosure
cc: Suzanne Steab, DOGM
Sheri Sasaki, DOGM
O:\015018.DER\WG5991 N21220\PASSLTR-10112019.DOCX

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

COMPANY / MINE Deer Creek Mine

PERMIT C/015/0018 NOV / CO # N 21220 VIOLATION 1 of 1

ASSESSMENT DATE: October 11, 2019

ASSESSMENT OFFICER: John Webster

I. HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.)

A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall one (1) year of today=s date?

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS

1 point for each past violation, up to one (1) year
5 points for each past violation in a CO, up to one (1) year
No pending notices shall be counted

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS_____

II. SERIOUSNESS (Either A or B)

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:

1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.

2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer 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 VIOLATION (Max 45 pts.)

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?
   a. Blasting without a certified blaster on site R645-301-524.200 (.121, .230, .240, and .250) as well as R645-301-524.300 & .430

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? The event was moved to Occurred

PROBABILITY	RANGE
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS: 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:
The points were assigned to "Occurred". The regulations require a certified blaster to be on site at the time of a blast. The operators MRP has a commitment on page 44 and Appendix VI to have a certified blaster on site. According to inspector's statement, "The blast exceed the 5 pound per 8/ms delay approved in the permit".

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage? RANGE 0-25

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 NA

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:
***

B. HINDRANCE VIOLATION (Max 25 pts.)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? Actual
RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B)_____

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--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE

No Negligence	0
Negligence	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault	16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Greater Degree of Fault

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 26

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

****** According to the information in the inspector statement this was listed as, "indifference to DOGM regulations. The regulations require a certified blaster to be on site at the time of a blast. In addition the MRP has a commitment on page 44 and Appendix VI to have a certified blaster on site. The blast exceed the 5 pound per 8/ms delay approved in the permit. A pre blast survey was not conducted, Local officials were not notified. A blast plan was not submitted to the Division for review and approval" Therefore the points were assigned to "Greater Degree of Fault".***

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)

(Either A or B)
(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

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

X	Immediate Compliance (Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	-11 to -20*
X	Rapid Compliance (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)	-1 to -10
X	Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)	0

*Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 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

Difficult Abatement Situation

X Rapid Compliance -11 to -20*
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

X Normal Compliance -1 to -10*
(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

X Extended Compliance 0
(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Difficult

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION # **N 21220**

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	20
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	26
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	0
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	46

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE **$2,860.00**