



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Norman H. Bangerter

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

September 13, 1990

**CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT**

P 074 978 747

Mr. Allen Childs  
Genwal Coal Company, Incorporated  
P. O. Box 1201  
Huntington, Utah 84528

Dear Mr. Childs:

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. 90-17-3-2,  
Crandall Canyon Mine, Genwal Coal Company, ACT/015/032,  
Folder #5, Emery County, Utah

The undersigned has been appointed by the Board of Oil, Gas and Mining as the Assessment Office 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, Lynn Kunzler on August 15, 1990. 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 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.

Within 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.

If a timely request is not made, 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 Vicki Bailey.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Helfrich  
Assessment Officer

jb

Enclosure

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

COMPANY/MINE Genwal Coal Company/Crandall Canyon

NOV # 90-17-3-2

PERMIT # ACT/015/032

VIOLATION 1 OF 2

ASSESSMENT DATE 9/13/90

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 9/13/90

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 9/13/89

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1 point for each past violation, up to on 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 Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is than 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? Unlikely

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

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The probability of occurrence of environmental harm relative to the deposition of material in the buffer zone area is unlikely; thus 5 points are assigned.

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 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The extent of potential damage would be minimal extending beyond the disturbed area; thus 8 points are assigned.

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

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

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) 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.**

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

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Ordinary

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Inspector statement revealed that most of the activity within the buffer zone was apparently done by the construction company. However, the operator is responsible for work done by all contractors on the mine site.

**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
- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| ... 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)  
 (Operator complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

\* 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

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)  
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Easy ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No plans are required to abate the violation. The abatement was completed within the abatement period required; thus normal compliance was achieved.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N90-17-3-2 #1 of 2

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>13</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>21</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$ 220.00</u>

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

COMPANY/MINE Genwal Coal Company/Crandall Canyon

NOV # 90-17-3-2

PERMIT # ACT/015/032

VIOLATION 2 OF 2

ASSESSMENT DATE 9/13/90

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 9/13/90

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 9/13/89

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1 point for each past violation, up to on 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 Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector's and operator's statements as guiding documents.

Is than 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?  
Conducting activities without appropriate approvals.

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent? Event did occur

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

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Construction activities attendant to the substation and related facilities was near completion at the time of the inspection. The operator had not obtained permit amendment prior to this activity.

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 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Extent and duration were minimal and were contained within the permit area; thus 8 points are assigned.

B. Hindrance Violations MAX 25 PTS

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

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) 28

**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 Ordinary

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 8

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Lack of diligence with respect to DOGM requirements.

**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
- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| ... 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)  
 (Operator complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

\* 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

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)  
 (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

Good faith points will be evaluated upon termination of violation.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N90-17-3-2 #2 of 2

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>28</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>8</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>36</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	<u>\$ 520.00</u>

jb  
 MNACT15032.1