CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Claim Number	: 912070-0001
Claimant	: State of South Carolina
Type of Claimant	: State
Type of Claim	: Removal Costs
Claim Manager	: [redacted]
Amount Requested	: $3,775.43

FACTS:

Oil Spill Incident: On April 21, 2010, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SC DHEC) investigated a mystery oil spill in Stoops Creek, Richland County, South Carolina. Stoops Creek is a navigable waterway of the U.S. SC DHEC employee [redacted] coordinated with the A & D Environmental Services, logistics manager, [redacted] while conducting initial response. An estimated seven-hundred-fifty (750) gallons of non-hazardous liquids were found in the tributary that substantially threatened the navigable waterway.

Description of Removal Activities for this claimant: SC DHEC conducted initial and follow up response. Invoices include contractor charges for performing response.

The Claim: On June 14, 2012, SC DHEC presented a removal cost claim to the National Pollution Fund Center (NPFC) for reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of $3,775.43.

SC DHEC is claiming reimbursement expenses of $3,775.43.

The claim consists of the following:

SCDHEC cover letter dated June 4, 2012; NPFC OSLTF Optional Claims Form; Agency incident Summary; Map; NRC Report; System print out for proof of payment to vendor; vendor invoice; disposal manifests; receipts; and daily field logs.

APPLICABLE LAW:

"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. The NPFC has determined that the actions undertaken by the Claimant are deemed consistent with the NCP. This determination is made in accordance with the Delegation of Authority for Determination of Consistency with the NCP for the payment of uncompensated removal cost claims and is consistent with the provisions of sections 1002(b)(1)(B) and 1012(a)(4) of OPA, 33 U.S.C. §§ 2702(b)(1)(B) and 2712(a)(4).
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)(2).
5. The NPFC Claims Manager has thoroughly reviewed all documentation submitted with the claim and determined 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 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.

The claims manager validated the costs incurred and the NPFC determined the costs were reasonable, necessary and performed in accordance with the National Contingency Plan (NCP) as confirmed by the FOSC. The claims manager also determined that the response actions were properly documented in order to support the charges billed.

On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the claimant did in fact incur $3,775.43 of uncompensated removal costs and that that amount is properly payable by the OSLTF as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim #912070-0001. The claimant states that all costs claimed are for uncompensated removal costs incurred by the claimant for this incident on April 21, 2010. 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 $3,775.43 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 912070-0001. 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: $3,775.43

Claim Supervisc [redacted]

Date of Supervisor's review: *7/11/12*

Supervisor Action: ***Approved***