

0035



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Ted Stewart
Executive Director

James W. Carter
Division Director

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340
801-359-3940 (Fax)
801-538-5319 (TDD)

November 13, 1995

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
P 074 975 975

Randolph B. Gainer
Genwal Coal Company
P.O. Box 1201
Emery, Utah 84528

Re: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N95-47-1-1, Genwal Coal Company, Crandal Canyon Mine, ACT/015/032, Folder #5, Emery County, Utah

Dear Mr. Gainer:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Board of Oil, Gas and 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, David W. Darby on August 23, 1995. Rule R645-401-600 et. sec. 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 the 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 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.
2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within 30 days of receipt



Page 2
N95-47-1-1
ACT/015/032
November 13, 1995

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 Vicki Bailey.

Sincerely,



Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

mt
Enclosure
cc: James Fulton, OSM
015032.pal

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

COMPANY/MINE Genwal Coal Company

NOV #N95-47-1-1

PERMIT # ACT/015/032

VIOLATION 1 OF 1

ASSESSMENT DATE 11-03-95

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joseph C. Helfrich

I. HISTORY MAX 25 PTS

- A. Are there any previous violations which are not pending or vacated, which fall within one year of today's date?

ASSESSMENT DATE 11-03-95

EFFECTIVE ONE YEAR TO DATE 11-03-94

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS

EFFECTIVE DATE

POINTS

0

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

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

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Large precipitation events often occur during late summer. If a large event exceeded the capacity of the primary spillway, flow would top the embankment before discharging over the emergency spillway. It is likely that the embankment would erode and finally collapse releasing all of the water in the pond.

- 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. Zero

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

No damage occurred as a result of the violation.

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) 0

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 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

Inspector statement revealed that the operator should have noticed the problem upon routine minesite reviews, especially upon a complete inspection when a contractor was conducting cleaning operations. Environmental manager was fully aware of regulations governing sedimentation ponds and is usually conscientious of mitigating and rectifying situations that can cause potential environmental or operations problems. He may have just missed this problem.

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 first or second 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? _____ ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS -10

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS

The operator exercised diligence in abating the violation.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR N95-47-1-1

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>0</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>15</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>15</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>-10</u>

TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS 20

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE \$ 200.00