

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Claim Number	: 912026-0001
Claimant	: State of Texas
Type of Claimant	: State
Type of Claim	: Removal Costs
Claim Manager	: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested	: \$2,684.82

### FACTS:

**Oil Spill Incident:** On June 20, 2011, the Texas General Land Office (TGLO) responded to the abandoned fishing vessel *Sea Joker*, in the Brownsville Shrimp Basin, Cameron County, Texas, a navigable waterway of the US. TGLO coordinated with the Coast Guard (CG) while conducting initial response. CG FOSC P.O. [REDACTED] became the Federal On Scene Coordinator's representative (FOSCR) point of contact. An estimated three-hundred and ninety gallons of oil was threatening to leak from the abandoned fishing vessel.

**Description of Removal Activities for this claimant:** TGLO conducted initial and follow up response. Invoices include personnel and equipment (vehicle use), and invoices from contractor RM Walsdorf and the disposal facility, Chemsol, Inc.

**The Claim:** On September 15, 2008, TGLO submitted a removal cost claim to the National Pollution Fund Center (NPFC) for reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of \$2,684.62.

TGLO is claiming personnel expenses of \$259.82, State equipment expenses of \$420.00, and contractor/disposal expenses of \$2,005.00.

### APPLICABLE LAW:

Under OPA 90, at 33 USC § 2702(a), responsible parties are liable for removal costs and damages resulting from the discharge of oil into navigable waters and adjoining shorelines, as described in Section 2702(b) of OPA 90. A responsible party's liability will include "removal costs incurred by any person for acts taken by the person which are consistent with the National Contingency Plan". 33 USC § 2702(b)(1)(B).

"Oil" is defined in relevant part, at 33 USC § 2701(23), to mean "oil of any kind or in any form, including petroleum, fuel oil, sludge, oil refuse, and oil mixed with wastes other than dredged spoil".

The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF), which is administered by the NPFC, is available, pursuant to 33 USC §§ 2712(a)(4) and 2713 and the OSLTF claims adjudication regulations at 33 CFR Part 136, to pay claims for uncompensated removal costs that are determined to be consistent with the National Contingency Plan and uncompensated damages. Removal costs are defined as "the costs of removal that are

incurred after a discharge of oil has occurred or, in any case in which there is a substantial threat of a discharge of oil, the costs to prevent, minimize, or mitigate oil pollution from an incident”.

Under 33 USC §2713(b)(2) and 33 CFR 136.103(d) no claim against the OSLTF may be approved or certified for payment during the pendency of an action by the claimant in court to recover the same costs that are the subject of the claim. See also, 33 USC §2713(c) and 33 CFR 136.103(c)(2) [claimant election].

33 U.S.C. §2713(d) provides that “If a claim is presented in accordance with this section, including a claim for interim, short-term damages representing less than the full amount of damages to which the claimant ultimately may be entitled, and full and adequate compensation is unavailable, a claim for the uncompensated damages and removal costs may be presented to the Fund.”

Under 33 CFR 136.105(a) and 136.105(e)(6), the claimant bears the burden of providing to the NPFC, all evidence, information, and documentation deemed necessary by the Director, NPFC, to support the claim.

Under 33 CFR 136.105(b) each claim must be in writing, for a sum certain for each category of uncompensated damages or removal costs resulting from an incident. In addition, under 33 CFR 136, the claimant bears the burden to prove the removal actions were reasonable in response to the scope of the oil spill incident, and the NPFC has the authority and responsibility to perform a reasonableness determination. Specifically, under 33 CFR 136.203, “a claimant must establish -

- (a) That the actions taken were necessary to prevent, minimize, or mitigate the effects of the incident;
- (b) That the removal costs were incurred as a result of these actions;
- (c) That the actions taken were determined by the FOSC to be consistent with the National Contingency Plan or were directed by the FOSC.”

Under 33 CFR 136.205 “the amount of compensation allowable is the total of uncompensated *reasonable* removal costs of actions taken that were determined by the FOSC to be consistent with the National Contingency Plan or were directed by the FOSC. Except in exceptional circumstances, removal *activities* for which costs are being claimed must have been coordinated with the FOSC.” [Emphasis added].

### **DETERMINATION OF LOSS:**

#### ***A. Overview:***

1. LT [REDACTED] of USCG Marine Safety Detachment Brownsville provided FOSC coordination via a signed letter.
2. The incident involved the substantial threat of discharge of “oil” as defined in OPA 90, 33 U.S.C. § 2701(23), to navigable waters.
3. In accordance with 33 CFR § 136.105(e)(12), the claimant has certified no suit has been filed in court for the claimed uncompensated removal costs.
4. The claim was submitted within the six year statute of limitations for removal costs.

5. The NPFC Claims Manager has thoroughly reviewed all documentation submitted with the claim and determined what removal costs presented were for actions in accordance with the NCP and whether the costs for these actions were reasonable and allowable under OPA and 33 CFR § 136.205.

***B. Analysis:***

NPFC CA reviewed the actual cost invoices and dailies to confirm that the claimant had incurred all costs claimed. The review focused on: (1) whether the actions taken were compensable "removal actions" under OPA and the claims regulations at 33 CFR 136 (e.g., actions to prevent, minimize, mitigate the effects of the incident); (2) whether the costs were incurred as a result of these actions; (3) whether the actions taken were determined by the FOOSC, to be consistent with the NCP or directed by the FOOSC, and (4) whether the costs were adequately documented and reasonable.


Upon review of the claim submission documents, the NPFC has determined that the rates charged by the contractor were in accordance with the rate schedule at the time services were rendered. The USCG confirmed that the response actions were directed by the FOOSC and determined to be consistent with the NCP. The NPFC has denied \$90.00, which is associated with one (1) unused 55 gallon drum, as it was never utilized for the cleanup. TGLO confirms, via email, only one of two billed drums was used for disposal.

On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the claimant did in fact incur \$2,594.82 of uncompensated removal costs and that that amount is payable by the OSLTF as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim #912026-0001. The claimant states that all costs claimed are for uncompensated removal costs incurred by the claimant for this incident on June 20, 2011. The claimant represents that all costs paid by the claimant are compensable removal costs, payable by the OSLTF as presented by the claimant.

***C. Determined Amount:***

The NPFC hereby determines that the OSLTF will pay \$2,594.82 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 912026-0001. All costs claimed are for charges paid for by the Claimant for removal actions as that term is defined in OPA and, are compensable removal costs, payable by the OSLTF as presented by the Claimant.

**AMOUNT: \$2,594.82**

Claim Supervisor: 

Date of Supervisor's review: 2/9/12

Supervisor Action: *Approved*

Supervisor's Comments: