



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

GREGORY S. BELL
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

Outgoing

C0150032

#3740

BK

March 22, 2011

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT

7005 0390 0000 7507 4924

Dave Shaver, Resident Agent
Genwal Resources Inc.
P. O. Box 910
East Carbon, Utah 84520-0910

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N 10073, Genwal Resources Inc.,
Crandall Canyon Mine, C/015/0032, Task ID #3740, Outgoing File

Dear Mr. Shaver:

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, Steve Christensen, on February 16, 2011. 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.

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,



Joseph C. Helfrich
Assessment Officer

Enclosure

cc: OSM Compliance Report
Suzanne Steab, DOGM
Vicki Bailey, DOGM
Price Field Office

O:\015032.CRA\WG3740\PROPOSED ASSESSMENT.DOC

U.S. Postal Service™

CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT

(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)

For delivery information visit our website at www.usps.com

OFFICIAL USE

7005 0390 0000 7507 4924

Postage	\$
Certified Fee	
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)	
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)	

Postmark
Here

Total Postage

Sent To _____
 Street, Apt. _____
 or PO Box # _____
 City, State, _____

Dave Shaver
 P.O. Box 910
 East Carbon, UT 84520-0910

PS Form 3800, June 2002

See Reverse for Instructions

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

COMPANY / MINE Crandall Canyon Mine

PERMIT C/015/0032 NOV / CO # N 10073

VIOLATION 1 of 1

ASSESSMENT DATE March 22, 2011

ASSESSMENT OFFICER Joe Helfrich

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
<u>N10043</u>	<u>04/12/2010</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>N10065</u>	<u>11/20/2010</u>	<u>1</u>

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 2

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? Hindrance

A. EVENT VIOLATION (Max 45 pts.)

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?

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

<u>PROBABILITY</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

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 0

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 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***According to the information in the inspector statement "As part of a permitting action in July of 2010 (Task ID #3582), the Permittee committed to provide information (summary/chronology information and operational costs) for the mine-water treatment system at the Crandall Canyon Mine. The commitment language that was approved clearly indicates that the information was to be submitted as an amendment to the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan (MRP). The information was not submitted as an amendment to the MRP within the agreed up on time table.

Enforcement of the State of Utah R645-Coal Mining Rules has been hindered in that the operational cost information for the mine-water treatment system is integral in determining the

level of financial assurance needed in the event that the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining is required to operate the site”.

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--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 25

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

**** According to the information in the inspector statement, the permittee was in violation of a specific permit condition, that being the requirement to submit an amendment to the MRP. A commitment to provide the summary/chronology and operational cost information for the mine-water treatment system was approved and inserted into the Crandall Canyon Mine MRP in July of 2010. The information was not submitted as an amendment to the MRP in the agreed upon time table. As a result, the Operator violated a condition of the approved MRP.*

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	-11 to -20*
	(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	
X	Rapid Compliance	-1 to -10
	(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)	
X	Normal Compliance	0
	(Operator complied within the abatement period required)	

(Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

*Assign in upper or 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 (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)	-11 to -20*
X	Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required)	-1 to -10*
X	Extended Compliance (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)	0

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Difficult, plans were required

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

***Good faith will be evaluated upon termination of the violation. As of March 22nd, 2011, negotiations between the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining and the Permittee are ongoing.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION # N 10073

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	<u>2</u>
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	<u>20</u>
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	<u>25</u>
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	<u>0</u>
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	<u>47</u>

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE \$ 2,970