

CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Date	: 3/5/2009
Claim Number	: 909065-001
Claimant	: State of Connecticut
Type of Claimant	: State
Type of Claim	: Removal Costs
Claim Manager	: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested	: \$3,195.39

FACTS:

1. Oil Spill Incident: On November 30, 2007 at approximately 1433, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection's (CT DEP) Response Officer was dispatched to Penny Avenue in Trumbull. The Trumbull Fire Department (TFD) reported the release of motor fluids and fire suppression foam from a commercially owned garbage truck located at the referenced location. Once CT DEP arrived on site, the Response Officer was met by the Trumbull Center Fire Chief [REDACTED] and Fire Marshal [REDACTED].

The Fire Marshal advised that the Trumbull Fire Department technicians had extinguished the fire in the cab portion of the truck and were opening the storage area in order to address the fire there. He also informed CT DEP that Associated Carting of 990 Naugatuck Avenue in Milford, CT owned the garbage truck and that a representative was on site. Based on the information provided, CT DEP assessed the release and observed that two down gradient catch basins had been impacted by the motor fluids and fire suppression foam. Based on his findings, CT DEP met with Mr. [REDACTED] of Associated Carting (responsible party). CT DEP informed him of the findings and requested that he retain the services of a licensed environmental contractor to address the oil release. The responsible party later informed CT DEP that they had retained the services of Connecticut Tank Removal (CTR).

By the time CTR arrived on site, the President of Associated Carting, Mr. [REDACTED] had also arrived on scene. CTR met with Mr. [REDACTED] in order to secure a deposit at which time the responsible party informed the contractor, CTR that he had no financial way or means to secure a deposit prior to the cleanup therefore CTR refused to perform the cleanup under those circumstances. Ultimately, the responsible party requested the assistance of CT DEP to hire a contractor and handle the cleanup as he did not have the financial means to do so. CT DEP then retained CTR to handle the response for them. The incident was called into the National Response Center (NRC) via report # 856087.

CT DEP was contacted by the Federal On Scene Coordinator (FOSC), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Mr. [REDACTED], who authorized CT DEP to take the lead to handle the cleanup and he advised the intended cleanup was acceptable as consistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP). The claimant presented costs to the responsible party on August 1, 2008 and to date has not received payment.

2. Description of removal actions: CTR deployed boom and absorbents as well as activated their vac truck in order to remove any and all free floating oil. After cleanup was concluded, CTR properly disposed of all liquids and solids.

3. *The Claim:* On February 2, 2009, CT DEP submitted a removal cost claim to the National Pollution Funds Center (NPFC) for reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of \$3,195.39. The claim submission consisted of: invoices, daily field logs, disposal manifests, proof of payment, proof of presentment to the responsible party, a copy of the NRC report, a copy of the FOSC coordination log entry as provided by the EPA FOSC, and the contractor rate schedule.

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. The FOSC, Mr. [REDACTED], from USEPA coordinated response actions with the claimant and verified via a log entry dated 12/7/07.
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 on time.
5. Presentment of costs to the RP was made on August 1, 2007, prior to the submission of the claim. The NPFC also made presentment of costs to the RP.
6. 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.

On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the claimant did in fact incur \$3,195.39 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# 909065-001. The claimant states that all costs claimed are for uncompensated removal costs incurred by the claimant. 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 \$3,195.39 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 909065-001. 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: \$3,195.39

Claim Supervisor: [REDACTED]

Date of Supervisor's review:

Supervisor Action:

Supervisor's Comments: