

0035



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangert
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

August 29, 1988

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
P 001 717 589

Mr. Martin Atwood
Co-op Mining Company
P. O. Box 1245
Huntington, Utah 84528

Dear Mr. Atwood:

Re: Correction on Proposed Assessment for State Violation No.
N88-26-12-2 #2, ACT/015/025, Folder #5, Emery County, Utah

This letter is to inform you that page 3 of the Worksheet for Assessment of Penalties sent you on August 22, 1988 was incomplete. Part V (ASSESSMENT SUMMARY) was not completed when it left our office. Please accept our apologies for this mistake and replace the worksheet with the corrected copy enclosed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joseph C. Helfrich".

Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

jb
Enclosure
10/14

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

COMPANY/MINE Co-op Mining Company NOV # N88-2-6-12-2

PERMIT # ACT/015/025 VIOLATION 2 OF 2

ASSESSMENT DATE 8/8/88 ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

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 8/8/88 EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 8/8/87

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFF. DATE	PTS
<u>N-87-11-2-1</u>	<u>12/24/87</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u>N-87-11-3-1</u>	<u>12/24/87</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u>N-87-27-1-2 #1</u>	<u>12/16/87</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u>N-87-27-1-2 #2</u>	<u>12/16/87</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </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 4

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
None	0
Insignificant	1-4
Unlikely	5-9
Likely	10-14
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Mine water discharge left the portal and entered Bear Creek.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

Potential or Actual 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 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Extent and duration minimal

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

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

RANGE

Potential hindrance 1-12

Actual hindrance 13-25

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) 20

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.

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

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Greater degree of fault

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 23

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Identification of problem previously identified during inspection of 6/14/88

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? Easy ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No abatement required aside from refraining from any further discharge.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N-88-26-12-2 #2

I. TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>4</u>
II. TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>20</u>
III. TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>23</u>
IV. TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	 <u>47</u>
 TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	 <u>\$880.00</u>