

U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security

United States  
Coast Guard



Director  
National Pollution Funds Center

4200 Wilson Blvd Stop 7100  
Arlington VA 20598-7100  
Staff Symbol: Ca  
Toll-Free: 1-800-280-7118  
Fax: 703-872-6113  
Email: ARL-PF-  
NPFCCCLAIMSINFO@uscg.mil

5890  
April 02, 2013

VIA EMAIL [REDACTED]@kyl.com

IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd., Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd  
c/o Keesal, Young & Logan  
ATTN: Doug Davis  
1029 West Third Avenue Suite 650  
Anchorage, AK 99501

RE: J05003-0023

Dear Mr. Davis:

The National Pollution Funds Center (NPFC), in accordance with the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), has determined that \$6,120,304.42 is full compensation for OPA claim number J05003-0023.

This determination is based on an analysis of the information submitted. Please see the attached determination for further details regarding the rationale for this decision.

All costs that are not determined as compensable are considered denied. You may make a written request for reconsideration of this claim. The reconsideration must be received by the NPFC within 60 days of the date of this letter and must include the factual or legal basis of the request for reconsideration, providing any additional support for the claims. Reconsideration will be based upon the information provided and a claim may be reconsidered only once. Disposition of the reconsideration will constitute final agency action. Failure of the NPFC to issue a written decision within 90 days after receipt of a timely request for reconsideration shall, at the option of the claimant, be deemed final agency action. All correspondence should include corresponding claim number.

Mail reconsideration request to:

Director  
NPFC CA MS 7100  
US COAST GUARD  
4200 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1000  
Arlington, VA 20598-7100

If you accept this determination, please sign the enclosed Acceptance / Release Agreement where indicated and return to the above address.

If we do not receive the signed original Acceptance / Release Agreement within 60 days of the date of this letter, the determination is void. If the determination is accepted, an original signature and a valid tax identification number (EIN or SSN) are required for payment. If you are a Claimant that has submitted other claims to the National Pollution Funds Center, you are required to have a valid Contractor Registration record prior to payment. If you do not, you may register free of charge at [www.SAM.gov](http://www.SAM.gov). Your payment will be mailed or electronically deposited in your account within 60 days of receipt of the Release Agreement.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the matter, you may contact me at the above address or by phone at 1-800-280-7118.



Donna Hellberg  
Claims Manager  
U.S. Coast Guard  
By direction

Enclosures: Claim Summary / Determination  
Acceptance / Release Agreement  
**Summary Spreadsheet of Costs**

U.S.  
Department of  
Homeland  
Security



Director  
United States Coast Guard  
National Pollution Funds Center

NPFC CA MS 7100  
US COAST GUARD  
4200 Wilson Blvd. Suite 1000  
Arlington, VA 20598-7100  
Staff Symbol: (CA)  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]@uscg.mil  
Fax: 703-872-6113

**United States  
Coast Guard**

Claim Number: J05003-0023	Claimant Name: IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd., Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd, and
---------------------------	--

I, the undersigned, ACCEPT this settlement offer of \$6,120,304.42 as full and final compensation for the removal costs identified for services provided by the vendors listed in the attached Claim Summary / Determination Form. With my signature, I also acknowledge that I accept as final agency action all costs identified in Claim Number J05003-0023 that were denied in this claim determination and for which I received no compensation.

This settlement represents full and final release and satisfaction of the amounts paid from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 for this claim. I hereby assign, transfer, and subrogate to the United States all rights, claims, interest and rights of action, that I may have against any party, person, firm or corporation that may be liable for the amounts paid for which I have been compensated under this claim. I authorize the United States to sue, compromise or settle in my name and the United States fully substituted for me and subrogated to all of my rights arising from and associated with those amounts paid for which I am compensated for with this settlement offer. I warrant that no legal action has been brought regarding this matter and no settlement has been or will be made by me or any person on my behalf with any other party for amounts paid which is the subject of this claim against the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (Fund).

This settlement is not an admission of liability by any party.

With my signature, I acknowledge that I accept as final agency action all amounts paid for Claim Number J05003-0023 as described in the attached claim determination and amounts denied in this determination for which I received no compensation.

I, the undersigned, agree that, upon acceptance of any compensation from the Fund, I will cooperate fully with the United States in any claim and/or action by the United States against any person or party to recover the compensation. The cooperation shall include, but is not limited to, immediately reimbursing the Fund for any compensation received from any other source for those amounts paid for which the Fund has provided compensation, by providing any documentation, evidence, testimony, and other support, as may be necessary for the United States to recover from any other person or party.

I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the information contained in this claim represents all material facts and is true. I understand that misrepresentation of facts is subject to prosecution under federal law (including, but not limited to 18 U.S.C. §§ 287 and 1001).

_____	_____
Title of Person Signing	Date of Signature
_____	_____
Typed or Printed Name of Claimant or Name of Authorized Representative	Signature

_____	_____
Title of Witness	Date of Signature
_____	_____
Typed or Printed Name of Witness	Signature

_____	_____	_____
DUNS #	Bank Routing Number	Bank Account Number

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Claim Number	: J05003-0023
Claimant	: IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd., Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd, and The Swedish Club
Type of Claimant	: Corporate (US)
Type of Claim	: Limit of Liability
Claim Manager	: Donna Hellberg
Amount Requested	: \$6,289,681.99

### I. INCIDENT

The M/V SELENDANG AYU (the vessel) was on a voyage from Seattle to China when, on the morning of December 6, 2004<sup>1</sup> while operating in adverse weather conditions, the crew shut down the main engine as a result of a casualty to the No. 3 cylinder. The vessel drifted toward Unalaska Island and eventually grounded on December 8 on a rocky shelf on the north shore of Unalaska Island, northeast of Spray Cape. The grounding ruptured the vessel's bottom tanks, releasing approximately 330,000 gallons<sup>2</sup> of bunkers into the waters off Unalaska Island.

### II. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM

The Claimants are the OPA responsible parties and their insurers. Ayu Navigation Sdn Bhd was the owner of the vessel and IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd. was the operator of the vessel. Sveriges Angfartygs Assurans Forening (The Swedish Club), members of the International Group of Protection and Indemnity Clubs ("International Group"), and the International Group's re-insurers were their subrogated underwriters.

### III. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. § 2708(a)(2) Claimant presented a claim to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF or the Fund) seeking a limit on its liability for the incident. At the time of the incident the applicable limit per ton was \$600; the gross tonnage for the *Selendang* was 39,755 gross ton; therefore, its limit on liability, if granted, was \$23,853,000.00. The Claims Adjudication Division conducted an analysis of evidence and facts and determined that IMC Shipping Co. Pte. Ltd, et al demonstrated entitlement to its limit of liability on 27 January 2012.

### IV. REMOVAL COST CLAIM

Claimant asserts that it incurred approximately \$148,651,185.13 in removal costs and hired 153 vendors to conduct the removal actions. The removal actions at the site ended on or about 23 June 2006, per a Pollution Report (PolRep) #110 dated 27 June 2006 issued by the FOSC for this incident. As required by 33 CFR 136.203, the RP worked closely with the FOSC throughout the response; MSO Anchorage provided FOSC coordination.

Based on the magnitude of the costs associated with this response, the NPFC anticipated that adjudication of this claim will be lengthy. Claimant and the NPFC agreed to adjudicate the costs on a phased basis. The NPFC separated the claim into smaller claims, based on vendors. Each

<sup>1</sup> See, Claimant Submission, Attachment 24, Government's Videotape Deposition of Kailash B. Singh Vol. I, 00074.

<sup>2</sup> See, Claimant's submission letter, page 3, paragraph 3.

smaller claim bears a separate claim number and after adjudication the NPFC will offer an amount for that claim. Claimant may accept the offer or request reconsideration pursuant to the Claims Regulations at 33 CFR Part 136.

**V. TENTH REMOVAL COSTS CLAIM DETERMINATION<sup>3</sup>**

The NPFC adjudicated this tenth claim (J05003-0023) in the amount of \$6.289M. The RP, through its legal representative, provided 36 binders of invoices to document the \$6.289M in removal costs claimed in this tenth determination package for costs associated with the response actions either in support of or performed by Alaska Chadux response contractor. This claim includes only the invoices paid by the RP to Chadux, who fulfilled the role of the primary response contractor performing cleanup actions. The NPFC claims manager reviewed each and every submitted invoice as well as every “daily” sheet submitted to substantiate the invoices. Additionally, the NPFC claims manager reviewed the payment record against the claimed costs for each invoice.

The review of the actual costs, invoices and dailies focused on (1) whether the actions were taken to prevent, minimize or 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.

Please see the table below for an itemization of the vendor invoices which make up this tenth payment claim determination. This determination is only deemed full and final for the identified vendor invoices listed below.

<u>Invoice #</u>	<u>Binder #</u>	<u>Amount Claimed</u>	<u>NPFC Approved</u>	<u>NPFC Denied</u>
Equip. Purchase	13	\$72,500.00	\$72,185.00	\$315.00
R04-006	14	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00
R04-007	14	\$258,341.40	\$257,775.95	\$565.45
R05-001	14	\$17,683.00	\$17,683.00	\$0.00

<sup>3</sup> The NPFC adjudicated the first removal cost claim, Claim Number J05003-001, in the amount of \$24,500,453.89. The NPFC deducted the statutory limit on liability of \$23,853,000.00 and offered \$546,484.54 as full and final compensation on or about May 21, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on June 7, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the second removal claim, Claim Number J05003-003, and offered \$ 2,168,445.20 to the Claimants on June 26, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on August 6, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the third removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0004, and offered \$3,668,595.70 to the Claimants on July 3, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on August 6, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the fourth removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0015, and offered \$23,103,264.96 to the Claimants on August 20, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on September 11, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the fifth removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0016, and offered \$15,611,776.98 to the Claimants on October 17, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on December 6, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the sixth removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0017, and offered \$9,565,222.57 to the Claimants on November 20, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on November 28, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the seventh removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0018, and offered \$8,230,390.17 to the Claimants on December 13, 2012. Claimants accepted the offer on December 17, 2012. The NPFC adjudicated the eighth removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0019, and offered \$5,004,635.21 to the Claimants on February 19, 2013. Claimants accepted offer on February 27, 2013. The NPFC adjudicated the ninth removal claim, Claim Number J05003-0022, and offered \$2,166,024.24 to the Claimants on March 21, 2013. Claimants have not yet accepted the offer at the time of the writing of this determination.

R05-002	14	\$108,270.00	\$108,270.00	\$0.00
R05-003	14	\$157,143.00	\$157,142.90	\$.10
R05-006	14	\$162,923.95	\$162,923.95	\$0.00
R05-007	14	\$8,625.00	\$8,625.00	\$0.00
R04-009	14	\$503,856.00	\$503,856.00	\$0.00
R05-019	14	\$169,988.00	\$169,988.00	\$0.00
R04-008	15-17	\$645,407.43	\$567,198.57	\$78,208.86
R05-004	18-19	\$339,548.67	\$327,480.80	\$12,067.87
R05-005	20-21	\$303,375.04	\$291,873.73	\$11,501.31
R05-009	22	\$300,487.25	\$286,967.09	\$13,520.16
R05-012	23	\$348,151.96	\$346,158.40	\$1,993.56
R05-013	24	\$37,261.85	\$37,261.85	\$0.00
R05-014	25	\$297,361.35	\$292,998.82	\$4,362.53
R05-016	26	\$299,792.51	\$292,566.78	\$7,225.73
R05-017	27	\$316,786.14	\$307,462.82	\$9,323.32
R05-018	28	\$212,216.96	\$194,616.64	\$17,600.32
R05-020	29	\$38,410.71	\$38,368.46	\$42.25
R05-021	30	\$356,366.82	\$256,268.55	\$98.27
R05-023	31	\$9,797.23	\$9,663.65	\$133.58
R05-024	32	\$22,570.12	\$22,543.12	\$27.00
R05-025	33	\$362,342.55	\$362,244.28	\$98.25
R05-026	34	\$298,059.75	\$297,978.25	\$81.50
R05-027	35	\$109,007.65	\$108,933.89	\$73.76
R05-028	36	\$108,740.38	\$108,665.88	\$74.50
R05-029	37	\$95,850.14	\$95,782.90	\$67.24
R05-030	38	\$31,502.85	\$31,204.66	\$298.16
R05-008	39	\$132,377.66	\$121,441.38	\$10,936.28
R05-031	40	\$7,147.04	\$6,760.08	\$386.96
R05-032	41	\$14,792.50	\$14,730.65	\$61.85
R05-033	42	\$40,840.66	\$40,711.06	\$129.60
R05-035	43	\$21,783.54	\$21,753.54	\$30.00
R05-036	44	\$4,542.85	\$4,502.09	\$40.76
R05-037	45	\$7,072.12	\$7,025.37	\$46.75
R05-038	46	\$9,055.65	\$9,013.15	\$42.50
R05-039	47	\$7,344.46	\$7,309.22	\$35.24
R05-045	48	\$37,407.69	\$37,368.94	\$38.75
GMS audit adj	13	(\$49.89)		(\$49.89)
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$6,289,681.99</b>	<b>\$6,120,304.42</b>	<b>\$169,377.55</b>

Claimant's sum certain for this claim is \$6,289,681.99.

The NPFC has determined that \$169,377.55 is not compensable from the OSLTF and will offer the Claimants \$6,120,304.42. As noted above, the NPFC deducted the RP's statutory limit on liability from the amount determined to be compensable under claim # J05003-001. Thus, \$6,120,304.42 is payable from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

## VI. 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". 33 U.S.C. § 2701(31).

The responsible party for a vessel or facility from which oil is discharged, or which poses a substantial threat of discharge of oil, may assert a claim for removal costs and damages under section 2713 only if the responsible party demonstrates that it is entitled to a defense to liability under section 2703 or to a limitation of liability under section 2704. 33 USC § 2708(a)(1) and (2).

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].

## VII. DETERMINATION OF LOSS:

### A. Findings of Fact:

1. MSO Anchorage, as the FOOSC for this incident, determined that the actions undertaken by the State of Alaska were performed jointly with the FOOSC and are deemed consistent with the NCP. 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. A Responsible Party was identified. 33 U.S.C. § 2701(32).
4. The claim was submitted within the six-year period of limitations for claims. 33 U.S.C. § 2712(h)(2);
5. The NPFC Claims Manager reviewed all documentation submitted with the claim and determined which removal costs were incurred for removal actions in accordance with the NCP and whether the costs for these actions were reasonable and allowable under OPA and 33 CFR § 136.205. The Claims Manager also identified denied costs and the grounds for denial.

### B. Analysis:

NPFC CA reviewed the actual cost invoices and dailies to confirm that the Claimant had obtained all rights, claims and causes of actions for the 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.

The NPFC has determined that the majority of costs incurred by the Claimant in this tenth claim determination were reasonable and necessary to mitigate the effects of the incident. Upon review of the information provided by the Claimant, the NPFC has determined that the payable costs were billed in accordance with the rate schedules and/or contracts/charter agreements in place at the time the services were rendered, unless otherwise indicated below, and were determined to be consistent with the NCP.

- 1- Equipment Purchase – NPFC denies \$315.00 for (3) handheld radios that were purchased and damaged beyond repair while they were on rental;
- 2- Inv # R04-007 – NPFC denies \$565.45 in damage repair costs;
- 3- Inv # R05-003 – NPFC denies \$.10 which appears to be a rounding issue;
- 4- Inv #R04-008 – NPFC denies \$78,208.86 which consists of long distance call charges not OPA compensable, clothing not authorized, and markup that reduced due to denied charges (see spreadsheet for itemization of items);
- 5- Inv # R05-004 – NPFC denies \$12,067.87 which consists of unauthorized calling card, personnel costs paid by GMS in excess of what vendor invoiced, and markup reduced due to denied charges (see spreadsheet for itemization of items);
- 6- Inv # R05-005 – NPFC denies \$11,501.31 which consists of unauthorized long distance charges, non OPA response purchase such as medicine, illegible receipt, items missing an underlying itemized receipt and markup reduction due to denied costs (see spreadsheet for itemization of items);

- 7- Inv # R05-009 – NPFC denies \$13,520.16 which consists of payments made by GMS in excess of the amt billed by the vendor and markup reduction on denied costs;
- 8- Inv # R05-012 – NPFC denies \$1,993.56 which is the result of a formula error and an undocumented overpayment of \$30.04;
- 9- Inv # R05-014 – NPFC denies \$4,362.53 which consists of payments made by GMS in excess of the amount billed by the vendor and associated markup reduction on denied costs;
- 10- Inv # R05-016 – NPFC denies \$7,225.73 which consists of no signed daily for certain personnel, GMS paid more than the amount invoiced by the vendor and associated markup reduction due to denied costs;
- 11- Inv # R05-017 – NPFC denies \$9,323.32 which consists of incorrect hours billed, GMS paid more than amount invoiced by the vendor and a reduction of markup on the denied items (see spreadsheet for itemization of items);
- 12- Inv # R05-018 – NPFC denies \$17,600.32 which consists of personnel not on signed dailies, formula errors, GMS paid more than amount invoiced by vendor, and reduction of markup on denied items (see spreadsheet for itemization of denied items);
- 13- Inv # R05-020 – NPFC denies \$42.25 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 14- Inv # R05-021 – NPFC denies \$98.27 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 15- Inv # R05-023 – NPFC denies \$133.58 which consists of unauthorized copy or long distance charges and items with no detailed underlying receipt and reduction of markup on denied costs (see spreadsheet for itemization of denied items);
- 16- Inv # R05-024 – NPFC denies \$27.00 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 17- Inv # R05-025 – NPFC denies \$98.25 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 18- Inv # R05-026 – NPFC denies \$81.50 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 19- Inv # R05-027 – NPFC denies \$73.76 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 20- Inv # R05-028 – NPFC denies \$74.50 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 21- Inv # R05-029 – NPFC denies \$67.24 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 22- Inv # R05-030 – NPFC denies \$298.19 which consists of overpayment and unauthorized copy charges;
- 23- Inv # R05-008 – NPFC denies \$10,936.28 which consists of third party invoicing for damage repairs and associated markup on denied repair costs;
- 24- Inv # R05-031 – NPFC denies \$386.96 which consist of cold medicine, no underlying detailed receipts and reduction of markup on denied items;
- 25- Inv # R05-032 – NPFC denies \$61.85 in unauthorized copy charges and a \$.02 rounding issue;
- 26- Inv # R05-033 – NPFC denies \$129.60 which consists of missing receipt and reduction of markup on denied item;
- 27- Inv # R05-035 – NPFC denies \$30.00 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 28- Inv # R05-036 – NPFC denies \$40.76 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 29- Inv # R05-037 – NPFC denies \$46.75 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 30- Inv # R05-038 – NPFC denies \$42.50 in unauthorized copy charges;
- 31- Inv # R05-039 – NPFC denies \$35.24 in unauthorized copy chsrge;
- 32- Inv # R05-045 – NPFC denies \$38.75 in unauthorized copy charges.

The NPFC will not itemize all the denied costs here in this Claim Summary Determination but rather will attach the spreadsheets created by the NPFC for each Chadux invoice where the Claimant can see each line item billed, claimed, paid, denied and reason for each denial. All denied costs fall within one of the six categories referenced above.

**OVERALL DENIED COSTS = \$169,377.55**

**VIII. SUMMARY**

All costs determined payable included in this determination have been reviewed and determined to be compensable as presented and in accordance with 33 USC §§ 2712(a)(4) and 2713 and the OSLTF claims adjudication regulations at 33 CFR Part 136.203 and 136.205. The costs determined to be payable are for uncompensated removal costs that are determined to be consistent with the National Contingency Plan.

The NPFC hereby determines that the NPFC offers, and the OSLTF is available to pay, **\$6,120,304.42** as full compensation for the reimbursable removal costs incurred by the Claimant and submitted to the NPFC under claim # J05003-0023.

**AMOUNT: \$6,120,304.42**

Claim Supervisor: 

Date of Supervisor's review: *4/02/13*

Supervisor Action: *Approved*