

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION

<b>Claim Number:</b>	916026-0001
<b>Claimant:</b>	Gollott's Oil Dock & Ice House, Inc.
<b>Type of Claimant:</b>	Corporate
<b>Type of Claim:</b>	Removal Costs
<b>Claim Manager:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Amount Requested:</b>	\$1,738.06

### **FACTS:**

On January 5, 2016, spilled oil was observed near the dock owned by Gollott's Oil Dock & Ice House (Gollott's), which is also the Claimant. The Claimant's property and dock are located on the Back Bay of Biloxi, a navigable water of the United States located in Mississippi. Coast Guard Sector Mobile received the NRC notification that day, but due to darkness, did not respond until January 6. Two pockets of recoverable oil had pooled near the dock. The source of the discharge could not be determined. The Claimant offered to clean up the oil, which the CG personnel authorized. The CG Petty Officer witnessed the Claimant's employees clean up the oil. The CG personnel urged Gollott's to submit a claim to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the expense of cleaning up the oil. Therefore, the Claimant seeks the costs the business incurred for personnel time, materials and disposal of the oily material.

### **THE CLAIMANT AND THE CLAIM:**

Claimant is Gollott's Oil Dock & Ice House, Inc. On February 9, 2016, Claimant submitted a removal cost claim to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF or the Fund); requesting reimbursement of their uncompensated oil pollution removal costs associated with the response in the amount of \$1,738.06.

### **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. Coast Guard Sector Mobile provided FOSC coordination.
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 which of 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 supporting documentation 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 NPFC confirmed that the actions undertaken were reasonable and necessary and that the services were billed in accordance with the Claimant's records. The NPFC also verified the oversight of the response by the FOSC which was in fact determined to be consistent with the NCP. On that basis, the Claims Manager hereby determines that the Claimant did in fact incur \$1,737.87 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 #916026-0001. The NPFC reduces the offer by and denies \$0.19, which appears to be a calculation error on one employee's time (calculated by Claimant at \$118.26 rather than \$118.07). The Claimant states that all costs claimed are for uncompensated removal costs incurred by the Claimant for this incident.

**C. Determined Amount:**

The NPFC hereby determines that the OSLTF will pay \$1,737.87 as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # 916026-0001. All costs claimed are for charges incurred 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.

Claim Supervisor:

Date of Supervisor's review: *3/1/16*

Supervisor Action: *Approved*

Supervisor's Comments: