

## CLAIM SUMMARY / DETERMINATION FORM

Date	: 3/28/2011
Claim Number	: A08003-0023
Claimant	: Ms. [REDACTED]
Type of Claimant	: Private (US)
Type of Claim	: Loss of Profits and Earning Capacity
Claim Manager	: [REDACTED]
Amount Requested	: \$9,528.75

### ***FACTS***

At approximately 1251 local time on Wednesday, 07 November 2007, the container ship COSCO BUSAN allided with the fender system of the Delta Tower of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, causing a breach in the port side shell.<sup>1</sup> As a result of the breach, approximately 53,570 to 58,000 gallons of medium grade fuel oil (MFO) were discharged from fuel oil tank #4 into the San Francisco Bay, a navigable waterway of the United States.<sup>2</sup> The Coast Guard designated Regal Stone Limited (Regal) as the responsible party (RP) for the discharge. Regal accepted the designation and advertised its OPA claims process. Hudson Marine Management Services (HMMS) accepted and adjudicated claims on behalf of the RP, compensating claimants.<sup>3</sup>

### ***CLAIM AND CLAIMANT***

On 26 October 2011, Ms. [REDACTED] submitted a loss of profits & earnings claim for her client, Ms. [REDACTED] (Claimant), a licensed fisherman in northern California (District 9), in the amount of \$9,528.75 to the National Pollution Funds Center (NPFC) for reimbursement. Prior to that, in early December 2008, the claim had been submitted to the RP for consideration, but was denied on or about 10 March 2010.<sup>4</sup> Claimant asserts she lost wages due to the oil spill, because fishermen who usually fished in central California (District 10- including the San Francisco Bay) moved their fishing operations to northern California (District 9 – including the Eureka, Trinidad and Crescent City areas), and this influx of fishermen caused overfishing and decreased the amount of crab she would have normally caught.

### ***APPLICABLE LAW***

The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA) provides that each responsible party for a vessel or facility from which oil is discharged into or upon the navigable waters or adjoining shorelines or exclusive economic zone is liable for removal costs and damages. 33 U.S.C. § 2702(a). Damages include the loss of profits or impairment of earning capacity due to the injury,

<sup>1</sup> See USCG National Response Center Case # 853865 and USCG Sector San Francisco Case Report # 381733, both dated 11/07/2007.

<sup>2</sup> See USCG SITREPS/POLREPS 1 through 56 for Federal Project Number A08003.

<sup>3</sup> See letter from [REDACTED] attorney representative for the RP, to Ms. [REDACTED] NPFC, dated and sent via email on 12/15/2010.

<sup>4</sup> See cover letter for additional documentation, dated 01/17/2011, and submitted via email to the NPFC by HMMS for the RP on 1/17/2011.

destruction or loss of real property, personal property, or natural resources, which shall be recoverable by any claimant. 33 U.S.C. § 2702(b)(2)(E).

The OSLTF, which is administered by the NPFC, is available to pay claims for uncompensated damages pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 2712(a)(4) and 2713 and the OSLTF claims adjudication regulations at 33 C.F.R. Part 136. With certain exceptions a claim must first be presented to the responsible party. 33 U.S.C. § 2713(a). If the claim is either denied or not settled by any person by payment within 90 days after the date on which it was presented, the claimant may elect to commence an action in court or present the claim to the OSLTF. 33 U.S.C. § 2713(c).

Pursuant to the claims regulations, 33 C.F.R. § 136.233, a claimant must establish the following to prove loss of profits or impairment of earning capacity:

- (a) That real or personal property or natural resources have been injured, destroyed, or lost.
- (b) That the **claimant's income was reduced as a consequence of injury to, destruction of, or loss of property or natural resources, and the amount of that reduction.**
- (c) **The amount of the claimant's profits or earnings in comparable periods and during the period when the claimed loss or impairment was suffered, as established by income tax returns, financial statements, and similar documents.** In addition, comparative figures for profits or earnings for the same or similar activities outside of the area affected by the incident also must be established.
- (d) Whether alternative employment or business was available and undertaken and, if so, the amount of income received. All income that a claimant received as a result of the incident must be clearly indicated and any saved overhead and other normal expenses not incurred as a result of the incident must be established.

Under 33 C.F.R. § 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 C.F.R. § 136.235, the amount of compensation allowable for a claim involving loss of profits or impairment of earning capacity is limited to the actual net reduction or loss of earnings or profits suffered. Calculations for net reductions or losses must clearly reflect adjustments for-

- (a) All income resulting from the incident;
- (b) All income from alternative employment or business undertaken;
- (c) Potential income from alternative employment or business not undertaken, but reasonably available;
- (d) Any saved overhead or normal expenses not incurred as a result of the incident; and
- (e) State, local, and Federal taxes.

#### ***DETERMINATION OF LOSS:***

##### **Claimant's Submission**

To support her claim, Claimant submitted: a cover letter; a copy of the Optional OSLTF Claim Form; a copy of the denial letter from HMMS to Ms. [REDACTED] dated 8/26/2010; a copy of a

letter from Ms. [REDACTED] to HMMS, dated 8/17/2010; copies of the California Department of Fish and Game (CA DFG) Licenses for Claimant and Mr. [REDACTED]; a copy of the Attorney Authorization forms; a copy of the State of Wyoming Driver License for Claimant; a copy of the State of California Driver's License for Mr. [REDACTED]; copies of the CA DFG Landing Records for Claimant for 2002-2007; pictures of the vessel and its license number; a copy of the claim submission package sent to HMMS; a copy of Judge Holland's Order Number 187, *in re the Exxon Valdez*; a copy of Judge Holland's Order Number 188, *in re the Exxon Valdez*; a copy of the study by Humboldt State University Professor [REDACTED] Ph.D.; a copy of the Crab Summary of Non District 10 Fishermen list; and a copy of the List of Potential Witnesses to Damages Suffered by All Claimants.

### **NPFC Determination**

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 § 136.233, a claimant must establish loss of profits or impairment of earning capacity. The NPFC considered all the documentation submitted by Claimant, as well as the documentation submitted by HMMS and reviewed publically available State of California statistics on the subject fishery.

In 2007, the District 9 Commercial Dungeness crabbing season was originally scheduled to open on 01 December 2007. However, because of the oil spill (approximately 250 miles south) and resulting District 10 closure, it actually opened early on 28 November 2007 at 0800, 64 hours in advance of the scheduled start.<sup>5</sup> District 10 (San Francisco Bay area) fishing operations, which were scheduled to open between 15 November and 01 December 2007, were closed by Executive Order S-14-07 of California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on 13 November 2007.<sup>6</sup> However, on 29 November 2007, which was two days before the originally scheduled opening, the District 10 Dungeness crabbing area re-opened until the end of the season on June 30, 2008, after assessment by the California Department of Fish and Game (CA DFG) in consultation with the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, as it posed no significant health risk to human consumption.<sup>7</sup>

The evidence provided by Claimant included a statistical landing analysis to support a six percent reduction in pounds of crab landed by a select 25 District 9 fishing vessels, comparing the first two weeks of both December 2006 and December 2007.<sup>8</sup> The analysis does not address any trends, issues or time periods other than reported figures from 25 vessels and their catch data for the first 15 days of December. An additional ten vessels were included on the list with varying degrees of information (to make 35 vessels total), but those vessels were not included in the analysis because eight did not have usable data and two were considered outliers. Claimant is not listed on this analysis, so it does not directly apply to her.

<sup>5</sup> See CA DFG Notice to All Interested and Affected Parties, signed by Mr. [REDACTED] CA DFG, on 11/26/2007.

<sup>6</sup> See State of California Executive Order S-14-07, signed by Gov. [REDACTED] on 11/13/2007.

<sup>7</sup> See CA DFG Memorandum Re: Fisheries Suspension Lift for the 2007-2008 Season, written by Mr. [REDACTED] Director, CA DFG, on 11/29/2007.

<sup>8</sup> See Study by Preeminent Economist, Professor [REDACTED] Ph.D., submitted with the claim to the NPFC by the claimant on 10/26/2010.

In looking at the landing data provided by Claimant, she does not provide information that she landed any crabs for the remainder of the 2007-2008 season, as she only provides data up through 2007. She has not shown from where her claimed loss came. That said, when comparing the two years, she landed only 3987 lbs in December 2006, as opposed to 4913 lbs in December 2007—a 23% increase, even with the oil spill.

In order to more fully consider the arguments of Claimant, the NPFC looked at the broader data comparison between years and between areas of landings; specifically, the NPFC reviewed Dungeness crab catch data for 2007 from District 10, where the oil spill occurred, and District 9, where the claimant argues a loss of earnings.

The CA DFG reports that Dungeness crab landings in both District 9 and District 10 increased in December 2007 over the poundage landed in 2006.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, though it also shows the amount of landings in pounds were more than double in District 9 in the 2006-2007 season (7,029,287 lbs) from the 2007-2008 season (4,083,712 lbs), it is important to point out that this decrease was seen in both districts—the oil-affected District 10 (from 3,744,773 lbs to 1,998,610 lbs), and the non-oiled District 9.<sup>10</sup> District 9 saw an approximate drop of 42% in landings from 2006-2007 season to 2007-2008 season, while District 10 saw an approximate drop of 53% in landings.

The CA DFG reports that Dungeness crab landings in both District 9 and District 10 increased in December 2007 over the poundage landed in 2006.<sup>11</sup> Additionally, though it also shows the amount of landings in pounds were more than double in the 2006-2007 season from the 2007-2008 season, it is important to point out that this decrease was seen in both districts—the oil-affected District 10, and the non-oiled District 9.<sup>12</sup> CA DFG published information also reports that the number of resident Dungeness Crab Vessel Permits for District 9 declined from 106 in 2006 to 105 in 2007,<sup>13</sup> and that statewide, the number of these permits declined from 518 in 2006 to 505 in 2007.<sup>14</sup> The state reports also shows that, overall, District 9 and District 10, as well as the state as a whole, had comparable relative changes to the overall Dungeness crab landings for the December through June 2007 season, again seeming to indicate little or no regional impacts.

For this claim to be considered OPA-compensable, Claimant would not only need to provide documentation to show that she lost profits (i.e. her own personal landing logs showing a loss in

<sup>9</sup> From 2,275,836 in 2006 to 2,750,790 in 2007 for District 9; from 447,982 in 2006 to 647,543 in District 10.

Information retrieved on 3/09/2011 from CA DFG website: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings06.asp> and <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings07.asp>.

<sup>10</sup> Information retrieved on 3/09/2011 from CA DFG website: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings06.asp>, <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings07.asp> and <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings08.asp>.

<sup>11</sup> From 2,275,836 in 2006 to 2,750,790 in 2007 for District 9; from 447,982 in 2006 to 647,543 in District 10.

Information retrieved on 3/09/2011 from CA DFG website: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings06.asp> and <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings07.asp>.

<sup>12</sup> Information retrieved on 3/09/2011 from CA DFG website: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings06.asp>, <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings07.asp> and <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/landings08.asp>.

<sup>13</sup> See CA DFG District Landing spreadsheet, as provided HMMS by Ms. [REDACTED] CA FCG, on 1/05/2009, submitted to the NPFC by Mr. [REDACTED] HMMS, via email, on 2/18/2011.

<sup>14</sup> "Commercial Fishing Licenses and Permits" PDF retrieved on 3/08/2011 from CA DFG website: [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/licensing/pdffiles/cf\\_items\\_10yr.pdf](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/licensing/pdffiles/cf_items_10yr.pdf).

the 2007-2008 crabbing season), but also the documentation to quantify her alleged loss of profits and earnings totaling \$9,528.75 (i.e., W2s, copies of canceled checks, bank statements, etc.). Unless a Claimant is able to quantify this alleged loss, the claimant has not met the requirement of 33 C.F.R. § 136.233 (with emphasis on subparagraph "b" of the same regulation).

The claim is denied. Claimant has not established that her income was reduced as a consequence of injury to, destruction of or loss of property or natural resources, nor the amount of that reduction. 33 CFR 136.233(b). Additionally, Claimant has failed to establish the amount of the claimant's profits and earnings in comparable periods and during the period when the claimed loss or impairment was suffered, as established by income tax returns, financial statements, and similar documents. 33CFR136.233(c).

Determination amount: \$0.00

Amount denied: \$9,528.75

Claim Supervisor:

Date of Supervisor's review: 3/29/11

Supervisor Action: Denial Approved

Supervisor's Comments: