

CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Date	: 4/9/2009
Claim Number	: A08033-002
Claimant	: NRC Environmental Services Inc
Type of Claimant	: OSRO
Type of Claim	: Removal Costs
Claim Manager	: ██████████
Amount Requested	: \$10,916.80

FACTS:

- 1. Oil Spill Incident:** On Saturday, September 13, 2008, Coast Guard Sector San Francisco received report of a sunken 125 foot commercial vessel, "Allen Cody," discharging oil in the Field Landing area of Southern Eureka. The vessel was attached to a private pier at the time it sank. The pier and the vessel are both owned by Mr. ██████████ of Redwood Forest Products.

Coast Guard personnel from Marine Safety Detachment, Humboldt Bay immediately responded to the scene and began working with the vessel's owner and contractors to control the source of the sheen and begin cleanup operations. Containment boom and absorbent pads were placed around the vessel in an effort to mitigate the effects of the oil. The vessel sank to the bottom of the bay, in 50-feet of water.

The Responsible Party (RP), Mr. ██████████ hired the Claimant, NRCES. See Claim Number A08033-001 for RP information.

This claim is for disposal costs only. NRCES planned to submit a separate claim for \$10,916.80 for disposal costs that remain in 2X20 roll off bins.

- 2. Description of Removal Activities for Claim Number A08033-001:** Following is a timeline of summarized daily response actions performed by the claimant and based on the details of the daily field logs provided by the claimant:
 - 09/13/08—NRCES arrived on site and met with Mr. ██████████ and MST1 ██████████ from MSD Humboldt Bay.
 - 09/14/08—Crews deploy and additional 1500' containment boom (totaling 1900' in water). Sorbents are deployed and recovered. Divers were able to significantly slow the release from the vessel.
 - 09/15/08—NRCES received a newly signed work authorization from RP. Dives on the site. Crews bagged and replaced sorbents while installing new material. Eel grass was removed from under the wharf. Three vessels were released with crew and a driver.
 - 09/16/08—Crews continued to tend boom, replace sorbents and recover eel grass. Divers installed lift bags. NRCES spoke with Coast Guard regarding cutting the crew back to one vessel and one standby (at Eureka yard), Coast Guard concurred. Equipment was moved to allow for a second barge deployment off pier. Claimant was told that MSSD2 ██████████ would be arriving on-site to discuss. Divers attempted to lift vessels with 16000lb of bags. The Claimant received confirmation

from MSSD2 [REDACTED] that the Coast Guard would be assuming financial responsibility of the spill beginning Tuesday, 9/16/08.

3. **Description of Removal Activities for this Claim:** Following is a timeline of summarized daily response actions performed by the claimant and based on the details of the daily field logs provided by the claimant:

- 12/04/08--NRCES collected samples from the site and delivered them to Alpha Analytical Laboratories Inc. for analysis.
- 12/19/08—NRCES applied 250 pounds of sorbent (10 twenty-five pound bags of Floor Dry) at the site.
- 01/14/09—NRCES picked up the bins and carried them to Willits, CA.
- 01/15/09—NRCES traveled from Willits, CA to Fields Landing, CA to the landfill to dump the bins; returned to Alameda yard to unload bins and then returned to Willets, CA.
- 01/16/09—NRCES traveled to Eureka Yard from Willets, CA and completed final administrative matters regarding the spill.

Disposal Manifests are included with the claim submission.

4. **Claim A08033-001:** On December 11, 2008, NRCES submitted removal cost Claim Number A08033-001 to the National Pollution Funds Center (NPFC) for reimbursement of their uncompensated removal costs in the amount of \$75,955.97 for the services they provided regarding the sinking of the commercial vessel, “Allen Cody.” NRCES was reimbursed by the NPFC in the amount of \$75,955.97 for the first phase of this response excluding the disposal costs under Claim Number A08033-001.
5. **The Claim:** On March 26, 2009, NRCES submitted a removal cost claim to the NPFC, for reimbursement of their uncompensated disposal (removal) costs in the amount of \$10,916.80.

The claim consists of daily work logs (dailies), invoices for outside services, and a weekly revenue sheet. The NPFC’s review of the actual cost invoices and dailies focused on: (1) whether the actions taken were compensable “disposal 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 are determined to be consistent with the National Contingency Plan (NCP) or directed by the (Federal On-Site Coordinator) FOSC; and (4) whether the costs were adequately documented and reasonable.

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. Findings:

1. The FOSC has provided FOSC coordination and Federal Project was opened for this incident.
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 on time.
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 as set forth below.
6. The review of the actual costs, invoices and dailies focused on the evaluation of whether such costs qualify as “Compensation Allowable” under 33 CFR§ 136.205.
7. The claimant’s removal costs included rates in accordance with their published vendor rate schedule.

B. Determined Amount:

The NPFC determines that the OSLTF will pay \$10,916.80 as full compensation for reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under Claim Number A08033-002 for disposal costs.

Claim Supervisor: [REDACTED]

Date of Supervisor’s review: *4/9/09*

Supervisor Action: *Approved*

Supervisor’s Comments: