

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Claim Number : 912075-0001  
Claimant : State of California  
Type of Claimant : State  
Type of Claim : Removal Costs  
Claim Manager : XXXXXXXXXX  
Amount Requested : \$10,735.27

### **FACTS:**

***Oil Spill Incident:*** On December 14, 2009, the CA Department of Fish and Game, Office of Spill Prevention and Response (CA OSPR) investigated an oil spill discovered in Long Beach Berth 79, 1350 Pier B Avenue, Los Angeles County, California. It was discovered that oil had entered a nearby City of Long Beach storm water pump station, which pumps storm water through a storm drain into the Port of Long Beach. In tracing the oil back through the storm drain system, it was determined that an unknown oil was entering the storm drain along Pier B Avenue through the joints between the drain pipe sections. CA OSPR coordinated with the Coast Guard (CG) while conducting initial response. No responsible party was identified.

***Description of Removal Activities for this Claimant:*** CA OSPR monitored the response actions of United Plumbing and later Ocean Blue Environmental Services who handled the containment and recovery of the oil entering the drain system. Invoices include state personnel expenses, operating expenses and administration costs.

***The Claim:*** On July 09, 2012, CA OSPR submitted a removal cost claim to the National Pollution Fund Center (NPFC) seeking reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of \$10,735.27.

CA OSPR is claiming personnel expenses of \$10,671.39, operating expenses of \$53.20 and administration costs of \$10.68.

### **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 period of limitation for claims. 33 U.S.C. §2712(h)(2);
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 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 this claim submission, the NPFC verified the timesheets of hours worked by personnel in response to the incident and determined that the labor hours were billed appropriately as documented. On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the Claimant did in fact incur \$10,724.59 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 #912075-0001. The Claimant states that all costs claimed are for uncompensated removal costs incurred by the Claimant for this incident on December 14, 2009. The Claimant represents that all costs paid by the Claimant are compensable removal costs, payable by the OSLTF as presented by the Claimant.

In accordance with 33 CFR 136.105 (e)(8), the reasonable costs incurred by the Claimant do not include costs associated with overhead or preparation of the claim. Therefore, the \$10.68 in administrative costs is denied.

***C. Determined Amount:***

The NPFC hereby determines that the OSLTF will pay \$10,724.59 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 912075-0001. 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: \$10,724.**

Claim Supervisor: *D*

Date of Supervisor's Review: *01/11*

Supervisor Action: *Approved*