

CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Date : 5/30/2012
Claim Number : 912066-0001
Claimant : State of Texas
Type of Claimant : State
Type of Claim : Removal Costs
Claim Manager : ██████████
Amount Requested : \$2,558.99

FACTS:

On October 25, 2011, the Texas General Land Office (TGLO) investigated a mystery oil spill discovered in Tres Palacios bay, Matagorda County, Texas, a navigable waterway of the US. TGLO coordinated with Sector Corpus Christi, MST3 ██████████, while conducting initial response. CG Federal On-Scene Coordinator's Representative (FOSCR ██████████) became the FOOSC point of contact. An estimated ten (10) gallons of oil was found in the bay. TGLO hired Palacios Marine & Industrial Coatings, Inc (PMIC) to mitigate the threat. No responsible party has been identified upon further investigation. The incident was reported to the NRC by the Claimant on October 25, 2011 via report # 993531.

Description of Removal Activities for this claimant: PMIC was hired to deploy containment boom and absorbent pads in order to contain and remove the oil found in the bay.

The Claim: On May 29, 2012 TGLO submitted a removal cost claim to the National Pollution Fund Center (NPFC) seeking reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of \$2,558.99.

TGLO is claiming contractor expenses of 2,305.05, as well as State personnel and equipment expenses of \$253.94. The claim consists of: Cover letter, TGLO Summary Cost Report, copies of photos from the incident, disposal manifest, NRC Report # 993531, TGLO proof of payment vouchers for payment of services by PMIC, PMIC rate schedule, and PMIC Invoices dated November 14 and 21, 2011. NPFC retains contractor rate schedule pricing within the Claims Division for the State of TX.

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. FOSC coordination was established via TGLO and USCG Agreement dated October 25, 2011 by Sector Corpus Christi.
2. The incident involved the 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. 33 U.S.C. § 2712(h)(1).
5. The NPFC Claims Manager has thoroughly reviewed all documentation submitted with the claim and determined that the removal costs presented were for actions in accordance with the NCP and that the costs for these actions were indeed 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 FOSC, to be consistent with the NCP or directed by the FOSC, and (4) whether the costs were adequately documented and reasonable.

Upon adjudication of this claim, the NPFC confirmed that the services provided by PMIC, Inc were billed in accordance with the rate schedule in place at the time services were rendered. The Claimant also notified the NRC and USCG to inform both agencies about the incident. The NPFC has determined that the actions undertaken were reasonable, necessary and consistent with the NCP. On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the Claimant did in fact incur \$2,558.99 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 #912066-0001.

C. Determined Amount:

The NPFC hereby determines that the OSLTF will pay \$2,558.99 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 912066-0001. 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: \$2,558

Claim Supervisor: 

Date of Supervisor's review: *5/31/12*

Supervisor Action: *Approved*