

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE/SUBJECT FILE 8672

2132 SCOMM 79: HOUSE SPEC. COMM. ON OIL & GAS, 1991-1992

150



Resource Development Council

for Alaska, Inc.

121 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 250, Anchorage, Alaska 99503-2035
Phone 907/276-0700 Fax 276-3887

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Becky L. Gay

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

John Rense, President, (91-92)
Curtis W. Foster, Sr. Vice Pres.
Paul Glavynovich, Vice Pres.
Rex I. Bishopp, Secretary
Kyle Sandel, Treasurer
Richard Barnes
Kelly M. Campbell
James L. Cloud
John Forcaskie
Margo Frey
Uwe L. Gross
Ruger C. Herrera
Dan H. Keck
John C. Miller
Stephan M. Rennberg
William E. Schneider
Jerome Selby
R. D. Stock
William Thomas
Lyle Von Bargen
William R. Wood

DIRECTORS

Jacob Adams
Glenn Akins
Larry G. Anderson
Sharon E. Anderson
Mark Begich
William C. Bivin
G. G. Booth
R. Dennis Brandon
Michael A. Buza
Rich Carson
Lynn C. Chrystal
John J. Cincotta, Jr.
James Cook
James V. Drew
Paula P. Easley
Lee E. Fisher
Donald S. Follows
O.K. "Easy" Gilbreth
John L. Hall
Ralph Hargrave
Alan E. Hastings
Joseph R. Henn
Karen J. Holstad
Phil R. Holdsworth
William L. Hopper
Lowell A. Humphrey
Norman Ingram
Dorothy A. Jones
John T. Kelsey
James M. Lane
R. Marc Langland
Pete Leonard
Wayne Lewis
Robert W. Loescher
A. Roy Lyons
Carl H. Marrs
Chuck H. Meacham, Sr.
Clarence "Rocky" Miller
E. H. "Pete" Nelson
John K. Norman
Wilbur O'Brien
Lonnie O'Connor
Dave Parish
Gail Phillips
Barbara J. Post
Elizabeth Rensch
Jeff Ripley
Dan M. Rowley
George R. Schmidt
William R. Snel
John L. Sturgeon
Barry Thomson
Scott Thorson
Usibelli, Jr.
Tom H. Whiteside
William H. Wilson
George P. Wuerch

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Senator Ted Stevens
Senator Frank Murkowski
Congressman Don Young

Resource Development Council

Position Paper - HB 540

2/21/92

The Resource Development Council for Alaska, Inc., strongly supports HB 540 and urges the Alaska Legislature to carefully review and approve this legislation. RDC is a non-profit, pro-economic and resource development organization with a statewide board and membership.

RDC's primary concern with HB 540 is that it corrects prior legislation which wrongly placed the emphasis on preserving an avenue for future litigation that could result from an oil spill, as opposed to placing the emphasis on a good faith response. RDC believes the response action contractor (RAC) provisions contained in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, which provide for simple negligence, are the appropriate approach in Alaska.

To increase the negligence standard to levels higher than those required by the federal government is not only unnecessary, but has threatened to shut down at least one major employer on the Kenai Peninsula, involving hundreds of jobs in that region. HB 540 addresses several concerns expressed by response action contractors, as well as those involved in the business of shipping oil.

RDC notes that 19 other coastal states have enacted legislation as protective as OPA-90 over the last 18 months, pointing to the integrity of the federal policy.

RDC firmly believes that response action contractors involved in controlling the release or threatened release of a substance should be held to the federal standard of simple negligence as outlined under OPA 90 and urges passage of HB 540.

BEFORE THE JOINT HOUSE RESOURCES COMMITTEE
AND HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE
ON OIL AND GAS

Comments on Summary of Research Project Reports
Prepared by the Citizens' Oversight Council
As Part of the Council's Report to the Legislature Under
Section 11 of HB 196 (Ch. 92 SLA 1991)

Presented by:
Jim Meitner
Spill Prevention & Response Coordinator
Tesoro Alaska Petroleum Company

February 12, 1992

On behalf of Tesoro Alaska, I want to thank the staff and Board members of the Citizens' Oversight Commission ("COC") for the effort and consideration that went into their recently released report and recommendations. Tesoro and its 575 plus Alaska employees were pleased to see that the Citizen's Oversight Commission's first recommendation favorably recognizes the concept of limited immunity for response action contractors that Tesoro sought during the last legislative session.

Tesoro's interest in this matter was discussed in detail last year; and in summary relates to 1) our interest in the Cook Inlet Spill Prevention and Response, Inc. ("CISPRI"); and 2) our reliance on continued access to Alyeska's spill response services in order to pick up our crude oil which is essential to our ability to stay in business. Tesoro is presently responsible for over 50% of the funding of CISPRI and has great reservations about CISPRI's deployment to a spill from a non-CISPRI members in the absence of

a state spill responder immunity law. The exposure to risk of costly litigation over alleged damages arising from simple negligence is viewed as a significant detractor from making CISPRI available beyond its own members needs. This need is reflected in the COC study and in recommendation number 1.

Tesoro also has an interest in having a final resolution of this matter due to our need to access the Port of Valdez in order to stay in business and continue employment of over 575 Alaskans. Alyeska has the only available initial spill response service in Prince William Sound and has placed a very high level of demonstrated financial responsibility on parties wanting access to that service. Last year's passage of HB 196 prevented a possible interruption to our ability to transport feedstock crude oil since we were unable to meet the Alyeska financial responsibility requirements in effect before the passage of HB 196.

Tesoro is willing to work with the Citizen's Oversight Council, other interested groups, and the legislature to address the other recommendations contained in the Council's report. We believe the report provides the legislature with sufficient information to meet the COC responsibilities under HB 196, and in so doing, should facilitate the legislature's prompt resolution of this matter by passing legislation that includes limited immunity for response action contractors in Alaska. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Statement
of
Mr. G. Stephen Duca
Vice President
Readiness and External Affairs
Marine Spill Response Corporation
before the
State of Alaska
Joint Hearing of the
House Special Committee on Oil and Gas
and
House Committee on Resources
February 12, 1992

Good morning Mr. Chairmen and members of the Committee. My name is G. Stephen Duca, I am the Vice President for Readiness and External Affairs at the Marine Spill Response Corporation. I welcome the opportunity to comment on the Citizens' Oversight Council recommendations and responder immunity.

Mr. Chairmen, MSRC is pleased to have been asked to participate in the public debate on Section 11 of H.B. 196 (Ch.92 SLA 1991). We have been part of this dialogue for some time, beginning with an appearance before Alaska's distinguished Oil Spill Commission in 1989 chaired by Mr. Parker and ending just last week with a statement via teleconference

presented to the Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances. Our position on the issue of Responder Immunity in Alaska is therefore a matter of long public record. Attached is pertinent correspondence which specifically addresses our concerns with H.B. 196 -- a statute which places liability on a responder rather than the responsible party where it belongs. Such a condition violates a fundamental principle of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA-90) -- "the polluter pays". I will not comment further on the particulars of H.B. 196 since our previous remarks and letters are available for your review.

However, I would like to underscore a couple of key points for the Committees' consideration. At the end of all the discussion related to H.B. 196, Alaska needs to enact a responder immunity provision at least as protective for a responder as Section 4201 of OPA-90. This is sound public policy -- which nineteen other coastal states have enacted as law. It is plain common sense that Alaskan law should be consistent with the federal liability regime that exists three miles off its coast. Oil moves swiftly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and a responder should not be slowed in his cleanup by having to take valuable time to consider the legalities and risks associated with each action taken in Alaska's jurisdiction.

Please remember that the overarching purpose of this limited immunity is to insure a bold and vigorous response during uncertain and/or emergency operating conditions. Some would have you believe that this standard was trying to get someone "off-the-hook." This is not the case, rather it places the liability on the spiller, again in accordance with the maxim of: "the polluter pays". Working in concert with the other provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, this limited responder immunity if enacted in Alaska would:

1) Promote a bold and vigorous response by persons whose sole purpose is to remove as much oil from the environment as is possible, since responders (all categories of responders) are protected from liability for good faith errors (simple negligence) under very limited circumstances.

2) By riveting liability to the responsible party it doubly insures a bold response by encouraging his prompt action. Since any liability another person (responder) is relieved of is passed on to the responsible party, there is little incentive for the responsible party to attempt to deflect liability to a responder in the first place. His best course of action is to get as much response and cleanup capability to the scene and begin operations as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairmen, one cannot be part of this debate without soon confronting the central argument made against providing this limited immunity. The issue has, unfortunately taken on the mantle of a canard. The story goes like this -- 'the only way to insure that responders will act responsibly is to make sure they are punished (incur liability) if they don't act in a prescribed way (by a contract)'. This approach to providing emergency response services of any kind, not just oil spills, is absolutely wrongheaded. It defeats the main purpose of the immunity -- the encouragement of a bold and vigorous response -- in several ways. First, the contract would have to cover all of the circumstances likely to be faced in a spill. The larger the spill the larger the number of circumstances and the larger the contract. Can you imagine a bold and vigorous response to an oil spill occurring under a contract the dimension of an encyclopedia? Can Alaska's fishermen (who proved to be so vital a force during the Valdez spill) reasonably be expected to perform in every circumstance in a way prescribed by a

spill. The industry recommended the creation of what it determined the nation did not have -- the capability to make a best effort response to catastrophic spills of persistent oils in the offshore environment. Most agree that the capability of the existing oil spill response infrastructure is sufficient to deal with the thousands of small releases that occur in the nation each year. What Valdez demonstrated was a lack of capability to deal with the catastrophic spill. MSRC closely analyzed the oil transportation patterns of persistent oils and made decisions on its operating sites based upon the threat posed by these patterns. Our analysis indicated that Alaska had two areas of likely threat - Cook Inlet and the TAPS terminus. When we reviewed the capability at these locations we found that Valdez had (and at the time was programmed to increase) a large capability to a considerable degree.

In fact, due in large measure to the work of the Alaska Legislature and Executive and Regional Citizens' Advisory Councils, Alyeska has a capability that would exceed one of MSRC's Regions and the capability of the Cook Inlet Cooperative is being upgraded. This led MSRC to conclude that there was not a need for MSRC capability in Alaska.

Although we had not received the full Citizens' Oversight Council Report by the time we had to depart for Juneau, the recommendations appear to be an outstanding example of good government at work. MSRC is pleased that the Council, in recommendation # 1, has acknowledged the essential need for the "gross negligence and willful misconduct" standard.

Because with it comes the real foundation for assuring a bold and vigorous response to oil spills in Alaska, since responders will not unreasonably fear responding in the face of the risks and uncertainties surrounding oil spill response and cleanup. Adoption of this standard will create comity between the state and federal government. This is one of the things MSRC

contract? What about tug and barge owners, operators and lessors? Every action they took could be subject to a lawsuit to determine if their actions were in accordance with the contract and therefore, was in fact covered or not covered by the immunity. Fishermen, tug and barge owners and other responders would need to rush to their lawyers to determine risk/exposure before rushing to the scene of a spill to begin the cleanup. It would be a lawyer's playground and have a chilling if not killing affect on a response effort.

Furthermore, such a condition defeats the cardinal rule of OPA-90 that "the polluter pays". Any liability that can be transferred from the spiller to other parties will be seen as an opportunity to defeat the responsibility for performance that a spiller should be held liable for. Having immunity flow to responders by way of a contract would shift the responsibility for response and cleanup performance during a spill to responders, not the spiller. OPA-90 lays the requirement for the execution of response plans on the spiller. The spiller must use private resources to cleanup, to the maximum extent practicable, a worst case spill. To enact a provision laying the responsibility for cleanup on responders would be a serious mistake, especially since there are already many protective provisions of OPA-90 that insure satisfactory performance of responders.

In your letter to MSRC President, Admiral Jack Costello you requested that I address two specific issues today: 1) MSRC's decision not to locate any of our corporation's national centers in Alaska and 2) Any disagreements that we may have with the report of the Citizen's Oversight Council.

As to the first Mr. Chairmen, I must take you back to the days just after the Valdez

has advocated for some time. MSRC wishes to commend the Council for its insight into recognizing the heart of a very complex problem. MSRC strongly urges this committee to enact this standard into any revision of H.B. 196.

The Council's recommendations then focused on conditions to assure response action contractor performance. We will speak to this below, but I want to underscore some key points with respect to the implementation of this limited immunity standard to ensure consistency with the federal standard.

1. It should apply to all responders, regardless of the category; i.e. volunteer, not-for-profit organization or for-profit organization,
2. It should only apply to acts or omissions taken in the course of rendering care, assistance or advice that are consistent with the NCP, or as otherwise directed by the President (USCG) or appropriate state officials,
3. It should not apply to the responsible party, or for acts under CERCLA,
4. It should not apply to acts that cause personal injury or wrongful death
5. And of *critical importance*, a responsible party should be held liable for any removal costs or damages that another person is relieved of.

We noted that the Council was silent about a time limit to accompany any immunity.

We take this lack of a positive statement on this critical issue as a recommendation to eliminate this feature from future Alaskan law. We concur with this position.

Council recommendations two (2) through six (6) focus on the need for, and how, the state should assure that response action contractors satisfactorily perform. MSRC has no disagreement with the basic goal or the need for response action contractors to do a good job. We also do not object to a reasonable certification program and have supported certification in the Coast Guard's process to establish vessel response plan rules under OPA-90. We do however, believe that some of the recommendations may go too far. If certification establishes standards and requirements that are too burdensome, certification could severely limit the number of persons willing or able to be responders. These types of requirements also can serve to shift responsibility away from the spiller and on to the responder or even the state. Certification should not serve to advertently or inadvertently undermine or even negate the responder's immunity. The imposition of performance standards is problematical and any certification program must be implemented so that federal/state and local requirements are integrated into an effective and efficient whole consistent with OPA-90.

Recommendation two (2) asserts that the state "...currently has no (underlining supplied) means to verify the capability and the capacity of these contractors to perform...." While we do not believe this statement is technically accurate, the ability to verify the capability and capacity of responders certainly exists under OPA-90. Section 4202 of OPA-90 requires that the President, "...shall require- (A) periodic inspection of containment booms, skimmers, vessels, and other major equipment used to remove discharges and ... periodically conduct drills of removal capability, without prior notice, in areas for which Area Contingency

Plans are required...The drills may include participation by Federal, State and local agencies, the owners and operators of vessels and facilities in the area, and private industry. The President may publish annual reports on these drill, including assessments of the effectiveness of the plans and a list of amendments made to improve plans...."(Underlining supplied.) We believe that OPA-90 provides an excellent starting point to implement this recommendation and we urge the legislature to carefully consider if additional state requirements are really needed. We do not believe that tying responder immunity to responder certification is good public policy. MSRC believes that all responders require the limited immunity of OPA-90, and so long as they act consistent with the NCP or as directed by federal and state officials that their limited immunity should be left intact. We urge the legislature not to adopt this portion of the recommendation.

Recommendation three (3) would provide for the design of "minimum professional standards" for responders. In theory this is laudable, but MSRC believes there are major hurdles to be overcome, not the least which is the creation of a bureaucratic nightmare. The Council's recommendation itself recognizes that such standards do not presently exist. Unless the program was very basic in its construct, identifying operational and logistics support performance standards and then attempting to come to some agreement on how to measure performance to these standards, while a worthy goal, will be an exceedingly arduous task for the state. One needs to ask the question, "and to what real benefit?", since there are existing provisions for the state (as well as federal and local agencies) to be a party to drills and exercises where shortfalls in performance will be identified and action plans generated to eliminate discrepancies. Returning back to our original statement - a certification program should only be implemented if federal/state and local requirements are integrated into a single

and effective whole.

We have no disagreement with the purpose of Recommendation four (4). We believe however, that this purpose can be achieved through the federally mandated Local Area Planning process found in Section 4202 of OPA-90. ADEC will be a full and active participant, among other interests in the state, in this process and therefore we urge that the need for any legislation in this area be the result of a complete review of the protection provided by the federal planning process.

Recommendation five (5) is problematical. It is assumed that the financial implication of giving direct orders to a responder, such as in the case of a mystery spill, can be worked out, but that notwithstanding, given the overarching structure of OPA-90 it is difficult to identify a real problem that needs to be solved. MSRC believes that implementation of this recommendation will create serious problems.

Section 4201 of OPA-90 states that the President "... shall ...ensure (underlining supplied) effective and immediate removal of a discharge...." It further states that in those cases where there is a substantial threat to public health or welfare that he "...shall direct all (underlining supplied) federal, State, and private actions to remove the discharge or to mitigate or prevent the threat of the discharge...." All now agree that decision-making during a spill response cannot be diffused but must attach to a single professional. The citations above demonstrate that the President will be in charge. We believe that this responsibility is being taken very seriously by the federal government. The state is a partner in the direction of these response efforts as a member of the federal Regional Response Team and Area

Committees that will be developed. The way that OPA-90 insures response and cleanup performance is by placing the burden where it belongs - on the spiller. The spiller must demonstrate to government that his plan is a reasonable one to remove, to the maximum extent practicable, a worst case spill. We see no clear and present danger that equipment and personnel will not, in the words of Recommendation five (5), "... indeed be deployed...." Please also consider that under OPA-90:

- A. The state is intimately involved with the planning for the resources needed for a worst case spill; the federal government assures that response resources are inspected and
- B. That unannounced drills are conducted to assure that what has been written in the plans, (1) actually exists and (2) will perform as agreed upon in the plans and
- C. That Title V provides for the establishment of Regional Citizens Advisory Councils for special areas that have among their many advisory roles ones to:
 - 1. provide advice and recommendations...on the policies...and regulations relating to operation of...terminal facilities and tankers which may affect the environment
 - 2. monitor...the environmental impacts of the operation of the terminal facilities and crude oil tankers
 - 3. review...the adequacy of oil spill prevention and contingency plans for the terminal facilities and the adequacy of oil spill prevention and contingency plans for crude oil tankers...

There are considerably more of these types of advisory duties, but the sum of (A) (B) and (C) above is a very high level of inspection and verification of response capability by a variety of organizations. This appears to be adequate to insure that if Alaska wants to get

something done during a response that it has a more than reasonable assurance that the resources will be there to execute the orders.

There is one more important point to consider. The recommendation speaks to a responders duty to perform. We believe that this inadvertently may deflect duty to cleanup the spill from polluters to responders. As stated above, we believe that responder performance will be demonstrated in a variety of ways; through drills and exercises - some to be unannounced, because acts must be consistent with the NCP, etc.. Likewise, inspections and inventories of equipment are part of federal law, enacted precisely for the purpose of insuring that what has been warranted in a plan can actually be delivered by the responsible party.

We believe that practically speaking, a problem does not exist in terms of the state gaining assurance that what is in a plan will be delivered and a limited responder immunity must not be held hostage to the orders of state on-scene coordinators.

Recommendation six (6) provides that certified response action contractors respond when directed by the state. Private responders have a tradition of responding if needed, however, they are not governmental resources. If the state wants to hire a contractor to perform response services it should do so as a matter of negotiated contract irrespective of responder immunity or certification.

In closing Mr. Chairmen, I want to again thank this committee for the opportunity to comment on the Citizens' Oversight Council recommendations and responder immunity in

Alaska. You know our reasons for asking you to enact legislation at least as protective as Section 4202 of OPA-90. We are encouraged by our discussions with many members of the legislature and the administration. We are encouraged by the report of your Citizens' Oversight Council. We urge you to join with the 19 other states and adopt Section 4201 of OPA-90. It is sound public policy. I would be happy to answer any questions which you may have.

Marine Spill Response Corporation
Comments to

The Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil
and Other Hazardous Substances
1/31/92

OIL SPILL RESPONSE CONTRACTOR LIABILITY REPORT

Thank you for the opportunity to be part of the process that will determine Alaska's law concerning a limited immunity for oil spill responders. I'd like to commend the Citizen's Oversight Council and the state for taking the initiative to thoroughly study such a complex matter.

The written specific comments that have been provided separately are linked to the material available to us: The Summary of Research Projects. While several of the summaries present conclusions that MSRC does not agree with, two of the summaries are of principal concern because we feel they may be indicative of a general condition, and that is that the full effect of OPA-90's many inter-linked provisions may not be clearly stated in the Research Summaries. This is important because we believe that the question of a limited responder immunity for Alaska should be addressed in a framework of full understanding of OPA-90.

The two research projects I will comment on are: (1) Response Action Contractor Provisions in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and (2) other state's response action contractor provisions. The first summary is incomplete in that there is no mention of an absolutely critical element: the assumption of any responder liability (given that certain conditions are met) by the responsible party. The second summary is also incomplete as it lists eight states that have enacted such a statute. The fact is 19 coastal states have enacted

legislation as protective as OPA-90 over the last 18 months. The majority of the six remaining jurisdictions have old "Good Samaritan" legislation that is not in conformance with OPA-90. Furthermore, three national state legislative associations (NCSL, CSG and ALEC) support the federal standard. The point here is that MSRC believes those facts are a powerful testimony of the soundness of OPA-90's provisions as public policy -- yet the full story of how other coastal legislatures have acted is not fully exposed in the research report.

Several statements/conclusions reached in the Research Report Summaries are inaccurate principally because they do not fully recognize the new responsibilities and relationships established for removal (§4201) and planning (§4202) of OPA-90. Understood in context of all of the provisions of OPA-90, it is clear that the purpose of the immunity is to promote the public welfare by insuring that responders -- no matter who they are or how they are paid, etc.-- will not be inhibited from acting boldly and decisively when confronted with the emergency conditions and potential liability surrounding marine oil spills. I say respectfully, that these provisions do not unreasonably protect responders from negligence. Rather as a matter of sound public policy, OPA-90 distributes risk between responders and the spiller, making the spiller assume liability for good faith errors made by a responder so long as the responder's acts are consistent with the National Contingency Plan, or the acts are at the direction of the federal (or in the case of state law, the Alaska) on-scene coordinator and the acts do not rise to the level of gross negligence or willful misconduct. There is no responder immunity provided in cases of personal injury or wrongful death.

We believe that these provisions go to the heart of the matter of responder performance.

They insure that responders act with due care because they are not protected if their acts rise

to gross negligence or willful misconduct. Additional protection is provided to insure that responders will not negligently perform, since only acts consistent with the National Contingency Plan or directed by government officials receive immunity. Since the responsible party is liable for any removal costs and damages that another person is relieved of; and since the provisions of OPA-90 raise limits of liability and make available a \$1 billion per incident trust fund as a source of monies for injured parties; there is now a strong incentive for spillers to act immediately with a bold response and not attempt to deflect liability to those whose purpose is to remove oil from Alaskan waters.

In the specific comments provided you will see that we feel that other research projects do not fully explain the important new relationships and responsibilities established in other sections of OPA-90. In the time I have left I would like to mention just two of these because they demonstrate the importance of considering all aspects of OPA-90 before making your recommendations on Alaskan law.

Statement: "The report states that granting such immunity causes confusion for the governmental regulators over who, in fact, controls the field response and provides no assurance that a response will be sustained."

Rebuttal: This statement is not factually correct. Granting such limited immunity encourages a bolder response rather than a potential delay, while lawyers of responders attempt to determine who may be liable for a spill. Under OPA-90, the spiller executes the response in accordance with a previously approved plan; the state is a part of the plan approval process, while state and federal

coordinators control the responder through the spiller. Response and cleanup is sustained until the U.S. Coast Guard, after consultation with the state, determines a site is clean. Federal and/or state on-scene coordinators are directors of the response if they so choose, and response plans now must state how and with what private resources the spiller will respond. If a responsible party refuses to cooperate with directed removal actions there are new, serious penalties available to force compliance; i.e., the responsible party's liability cap is removed and becomes unlimited. Also, failure to comply with a removal order can result in civil penalties of up to \$25,000 per day or three times the costs incurred by the federal Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Statement: "The report raises concern over the following potential scenario: A tanker vessel is owned by a poorly capitalized or shell corporation. The vessel owner's contingency plan shows a contract with a response action contractor. In that contract, the response action contractor reserves the ability to refuse to perform if the spiller is insolvent.

Rebuttal: This speculative scenario cannot take place. Under OPA-90 a shipper must provide a Certificate of Financial Responsibility (COFR) to the U.S. Coast Guard up to his limits of liability before being permitted to transport oil in U.S. waters. A \$1 billion per incident trust fund has been established when a spiller's liability limits are reached. Moreover, a response plan must be submitted to the U.S. Coast Guard that identifies responders and their capabilities. This plan is subject to unannounced drills and inspections insure

that what is submitted can be executed.

MSRC believes the Citizen's Oversight Council needs to fully consider the federal liability regime that exists three miles off its coast today as it makes recommendations that might adopt differing standards. MSRC further believes that Alaska should enact the same limited responder immunity provision as OPA-90. We look forward to receiving your final full report and to seeing many of you at the legislative hearings in Juneau on February 11 and 12.

Marine Spill Response Corporation
Comments to

The Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil
and Other Hazardous Substances

1/31/92

OIL SPILL RESPONSE CONTRACTOR LIABILITY REPORT

Research Project: Response Action Contractor Activity in Alaska

Pg. 2 Statement: "The report concludes that the independent operators are the class of responders most suitable for liability limits."

Rebuttal: It is not clear why independent operators are "most suitable"? For that purpose, OPA-90 does not differentiate between responders -- all responders are covered.

Pg. 2 Statement: "The report asks whether it is appropriate for a response organization created by those with a duty to respond, (i.e., oil terminal and tanker owners) to be afforded that same degree of immunity."

Rebuttal: We believe that different degrees of immunity for different categories of responders would be counter productive. Such action misses the fundamental reason for providing the limited immunity for responders: To promote the most bold and aggressive response for the protection of the environment. OPA-90 requires that a responsible party cite private spill response resources in their contingency plans to respond to a worst case discharge in adverse weather conditions. Industry and other business interests have responded by upgrading existing spill response organizations. All responders (co-ops, for-profit and not-for profit contractors, fisherman, volunteers) work for the spiller during a spill. One type of responder should not be afforded certain privileges that others are denied. The spiller is still responsible for all removal costs and damages regardless of the actions of a fisherman, their own response organization, etc. unless of course the conditions for immunity are not present.

Pg. 2 Statement: "The report states that granting such immunity causes confusion for the governmental regulators over who, in fact, controls the field response and provides no assurance that a response will be sustained."

Rebuttal: This statement is not factually correct. Granting such limited immunity encourages bolder response rather than a potential delay while lawyers of responders attempt to determine who may be liable for a spill and the risks to be assessed by responders under the current conditions and for every action

during a response and cleanup. Under OPA-90, the spiller executes the response in accordance with a previously approved plan; the state is part of the approval process, state and federal coordinators control the responder through the spiller. Response and cleanup is sustained until the U.S. Coast Guard, after consultation with the state, determines a site is clean. Federal and/or state on-scene coordinators are directors of the response if they so choose, and response plans now must state how and with what private resources the spiller will respond. If a responsible party refuses to cooperate with directed removal actions there are new, serious penalties available to force compliance; i.e., the responsible party's liability cap is removed and becomes unlimited. Also, failure to comply with a removal order can result in civil penalties of up to \$25,000 per day or three times the costs incurred by the federal Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Research Project: Risk of litigation and liability exposure for response action contractors:

Pg. 2 Statement: "Research indicated that there were no cases in the U.S. where response action contractors were sued or held liable for damages from an oil spill by virtue of their response activities."

Rebuttal: While true, the statement refers to pre-Valdez conditions. Valdez created an entirely new arena for litigation due to the adoption of OPA-90. Liability on removal costs and damages now associated with a spill the size of the Valdez can be in the billions of dollars. It should be noted that the Report Summary stated that the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation was aware that responders are concerned about this potential liability. New categories of damages are created; i.e., natural resource damage, loss of subsistence use of natural resources, real or personal property damage, net loss of tax and other revenues, loss of profits or earning capability and costs of additional public services provided during or after removal actions. It is the chilling affect of potential liability of this magnitude that responders seek protection from.

Research Project: Contractual relationships among response action contractors, contingency plan holders, and the state:

Pg. 3 Statement: "The result is that private parties may be unable to recover damages for harms caused by response action contractors if there is no other financially solvent responsible party."

Rebuttal: This statement is not factually correct. Private and public parties are fully protected because there is always a source of funds! If a response action contractor responds to a spill or threat of a spill, all damages and removal costs

associated with that spill are the responsibility of the spiller under OPA-90. A responsible party also is liable for any removal costs and damages that another person (a responder) is relieved of. Responders are fully liable in cases of personal injury or wrongful death. To insure a source of funds, the spiller must provide the U.S. Coast Guard with a Certificate of Financial Responsibility before transporting petroleum/petroleum products in U.S. waters and in the case of a spill where the responsible party cannot be determined or his liability ceiling is reached, the U.S. Coast Guard has a \$1 billion per incident fund available from a tax on the transporters oil that pays removal costs and damages associated with the spill. There is universal agreement that OPA-90 reasonably protects injured parties by insuring the availability of funds first from the responsible party, then from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Pg. 3 Statement: "Response action contractors and contingency plan holders also allocate liability for damages between each other through private contractual relationships."

Rebuttal: The research project well documents the complexity of these relationships. It is a lawyer's playground and because it is difficult for responders to understand the risks associated with sole and joint actions, and disagreements can only be resolved by litigation responders will not act with the boldness and decisiveness needed to quickly and effectively remove the oil out of the marine environment. On the other hand OPA-90's provisions encourage response by having all acts for which a responder is liable transferred back to the responsible party. This provides a twofold benefit: (1) There is no incentive for a responsible party to attempt to lay liability on responders because such liability will be assumed by him and (2) responders freed from the chilling affect of a simple negligence standard, can act boldly to promote the most effective response.

Pg. 3 Statement: "This means that the state has no way to force a response action contractor to comply with its contractual obligations. The report concludes that the state should take some action to ensure state control over response action contractors to avoid the risk that the response action contractor designated in a contingency plan could fail to perform."

Rebuttal: The state (and the federal government) have a variety of controls over response action contractors. OPA-90 requires that a response action contractor "... act in accordance with the National Contingency Plan or at the direction of the Federal On-Scene Coordinator ..." to be immune from removal costs or damages associated with rendering care, assistance or advice, etc. This is a strong incentive for responders to act with due care. The state is a party to drafting the requirements for response plans in the Local Area Planning Process and thus a party to the process of defining the response capabilities responsible parties must cite in response plans. OPA-90 requires

the Coast Guard to conduct periodic inspections of response equipment. OPA-90 requires proof of responder capability by holding unannounced drills. Also see penalty provisions previously mentioned for failure of a responsible party to comply with a removal order.

Pg. 3 Statement: "The report also concludes that because the legal standard for negligence includes full consideration of the emergency atmosphere in which response action contractors operate, response action contractors are protected from the consequences of crisis decision making and do not face an undue burden by being held to a standard of reasonable care under the circumstances."

Rebuttal: This issue of an emergency atmosphere will be determined as a matter of fact in court. Responders explicitly fear this potential litigation in that it provides an opportunity for the spiller to attempt to shift liability to the responder. This fear would have a chilling affect on response. The risks associated with good faith errors of the responder should fall on the spiller and not the responder reacting in an emergency situation. OPA-90 shifts the risk (for simple negligent acts) to the spiller, where it belongs.

Pg. 4 Statement: "On the other hand, the only way to ensure that injured parties will be compensated is to require that response action contractors exercise due care or face liability."

Rebuttal: The statement is factually incorrect. A punitive atmosphere for those responding under un-controlled circumstances; i.e., rain, wind, uncertain information defeats the purpose of initiating and sustaining a bold response. OPA-90 makes the responsible party liable for all removal costs and damages unless the responder acts with gross negligence, willful misconduct or in cases of personal injury or wrongful death. Moreover, only "approved" performance; i.e., within the National Contingency Plan or Federal On-Scene Coordinator/state officials receive immunity. If a responder acts outside these parameters then he is liable for damages. A state provision using fear of liability for responders will be directly counter to the main purpose of the federal standard. It will provide an opportunity for the responsible party to shift liability to responders. Moreover, OPA-90 provides the means to insure that injured parties will be promptly compensated. In a worst case scenario where the spiller is not identified, or the responsible party reaches his liability limit the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund will pay removal costs and damages up to \$1 billion per incident.

Research Project: The relationship between a response action contractor and a contingency plan holder under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990:

Pg. 7 Statement: "The federal government will require a contingency plan holder to demonstrate that it has a contract with a response action contractor, but it is as yet unclear

what the precise requirements will be."

Rebuttal: This is correct, but the new OPA-90 planning standard for response plans is a very high one (See Section 4202 National Response System). Response plans must demonstrate, in detail, how a vessel owner/operator using private resources alone, would cleanup a worst case discharge (loss of all cargo) in adverse weather conditions to the maximum extent practicable. Initial indications are that federal rules will require a substantial response capability to meet Congressional intent.

Pg. 7 Statement: "Currently, the Oil Pollution Act does not grant the federal government any direct authority over response action contractor activities; the government's only leverage is to give directives to the contingency plan holder who, in turn, presumably would direct the response action contractor to implement the federal order."

Rebuttal: This is factually incorrect and misleading. The Coast Guard approves (with state input into the process) response plans that are consistent with the National Contingency Plan and Area Contingency Plans for all vessels/facilities and those response plans describe the actions to be followed for a worst case spill. The capabilities of responders must be consistent with the response plan and the area plan. OPA-90 requires the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct unannounced drills, and an inventory inspection of response assets (OPA-90 §4202) as part of the means to insure that the performance of responders will be as stated in response plans. In addition, if a response is not taking place to the satisfaction of the U.S. Coast Guard, the federal government can take over full control at any time.

Pg. 8 Statement: "The report raises concern over the following potential scenario: A tanker vessel is owned by a poorly capitalized or shell corporation. The vessel owner's contingency plan shows a contract with a response action contractor. In that contract, the response action contractor reserves the ability to refuse to perform if the spiller is insolvent.

Rebuttal: This speculative scenario cannot take place. Under OPA-90 a shipper must provide a Certificate of Financial Responsibility (COFR) to the U.S. Coast Guard up to his limits of liability before being permitted to transport oil in U.S. waters. A \$1 billion per incident Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund has been established for occasions when a spillers liability limits are reached. Moreover, a response plan must be submitted to the U.S. Coast Guard that identifies responders and their capabilities. This plan is subject to unannounced drills and inspections insure that what is submitted can be executed.

Research Project: Insurance coverage availability:

Pg. 8 Statement: "Costs are based upon the following factors: (1) revenues and/or payroll size; (2) historical loss experience; (3) contractual indemnities and their value; (4) statutory immunities; and (5) the general state of the insurance market."

Rebuttal: Item (2) will reflect all pre-Valdez experience. OPA-90 substantially increased liability limits and importantly, the categories of items for which damages can be paid. This item represents a new and very large potential exposure for responders. Therefore, insurance costs considering this formula are likely to be understated.

Research Project: Response action contractor provision in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990:

Pg. 9 Statement: "The conference committee explained that it wanted to avoid possible deterrence of prompt spill response because of liability fears."

Rebuttal: A major purpose of the liability standard of OPA-90 is to provide the fastest and most complete cleanup of the environment. One way it accomplishes this is by returning liability where it belongs . . . to the spiller. Moreover, there was considerable debate and further discussion on the issue inside the executive branch. For the provision to remain in the bill and for the bill to be unanimously passed by both houses of Congress, it had to receive the concurrence of the U.S. Coast Guard, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Justice and Office of Management and Budget.



John D. Costello
President

July 26, 1991

Mr. John A. Sandor
Commissioner
Department of Environmental Conservation
P.O. Box 0
Juneau, AK 99811-1800

Dear Commissioner Sandor:

Thank you for your letter of July 2, 1991. As you know and reference in your correspondence, I wrote to your predecessor in March of 1990 requesting a meeting with appropriate state officials to discuss what role, if any, our organization might have in Alaska. We welcome the opportunity to begin this direct dialog and I have asked our Vice President for Readiness and External Affairs, Mr. G. Stephen Duca, to make the necessary arrangements.

Your letter indicated that the impediment for MSRC establishing a presence in Alaska was the nature of the state's responder liability statutes. This is really only one of our concerns. Several events have occurred in the intervening time since our letter to you that directly bear on answering the question of what role is an appropriate one for MSRC in Alaska. Since our last correspondence we have been incorporated as MSRC with a charter and by-laws that specifies our response and cleanup activities. It states in part, that we are to establish programs to render a best effort response to contain and cleanup catastrophic oil spills in coastal zone or tidal waters of the U. S., in particular open sea spills estimated to be in excess of 25,000 barrels and protected water spills estimated to be in excess of 40,000 barrels. We are specifically precluded from responding to spills of less than 1200 barrels unless certain conditions are met. This limitation was inserted into our by-laws for several reasons, one of which was to insure that we do not compete with the existing oil spill response and cleanup infrastructure. The existing infrastructure is generally recognized as having the capability to respond to the vast majority of the nations spills; i.e., small spills under 1200 barrels. In addition, you may recall that PIRO (now MSRC) was created to specifically fill a national response/cleanup capability void at the high end of the spill spectrum; i.e., the catastrophic spill.

In the aftermath of the Valdez spill and due in large part to the leadership of the Legislature and other state officials, Alyeska spill response capabilities have significantly increased in size and scope. My understanding is that current Alyeska capability is probably

equal or greater to the size of a planned MSRC regional response center. A similar response and cleanup improvement process is underway in Cook Inlet and, presumably, will result in a capability there to meet the requirements of OPA-90; i.e., the capability to respond to a "worst case discharge". It is our understanding that between the resources of Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet well over 95% of the persistent oil transported in Alaska's marine environment will be covered. In the light of this considerable capability the question must be asked "Is there really any role or indeed need for MSRC in Alaska?"

As a responder, we have carefully followed the development of Alaska's comprehensive oil spill legislation. We fully support state legislation that enhances oil spill response and clean up capability, however you should know that here are certain portions of your existing statutes that we feel could be improved. For example, requiring a capability to remove 300,000 barrels of oil in 72 hours is an unrealistic planning standard given today's technology and the average weather conditions responders must face in your state. Although the statute attempts to provide for technical relief from this standard, we believe that a very false expectation of capability has been created. Moreover, such a standard invites litigation -- a chief element in discouraging prompt responder action.

We are of course, vitally concerned with state responder immunity legislation. We were happy to see that HB 196 recognized this as a critical element in promoting an effective oil spill response system. We note however, that it falls significantly short of the national standard of immunity provided for responders in OPA-90. Some of the major concerns we have with this law include:

- o **Fifteen Day Liability Limit.** This arbitrary limit is unrealistic given the nature of oil spill response operations. The statute does not provide a liability-free opportunity to exit the scene. These provisions are a major disincentive for responders to get involved in remedial actions in the first place. Moreover, there is less likelihood for prompt responder action in cases where there is only the threat of a spill.
- o **"Backdoor" Liability.** Joint and several liability is a real disincentive for any person involved in response activities who by contract arranged for disposal or treatment of hazardous substances possessed by such person, or who accepts hazardous substances for transport to a vessel from which a release occurs.
- o **Limits on Immunity when Conflicting Orders are Received from Officials.** This provision places the responder in a quandary if conflicting orders are received from the state and federal governments.
- o **Response Action Contract Requirements and Substantial Deviation from Oil Spill Contingency Plans.** Written contracts cannot contain all the actions that should be taken during a response, yet these are the only ones that would carry immunity (except for volunteers). This will discourage expedient actions while written agreement issues are

Mr. John A. Sandor
July 26, 1991
Page Three

sorted out. Moreover, these provisions will energize the impulse to litigate so that every factual element of response action may be scrutinized to determine if "substantial deviation" from a plan actually took place.

o **Damages to Property not Caused by Oil.** Given that oil spills generate emergency operations, sometimes under adverse operating conditions, good faith accidents are sure to result. Thus, this limitation on responder immunity will have a chilling affect on response actions. As with OPA-90, the spiller -- not the responder -- should remain liable for these damages.

These are some of the issues we feel need improvement in the current statute. We believe, and parenthetically so do the legislatures of 17 other states that have enacted the federal standard over the past 18 months, that the provisions of Section 4202 of OPA-90 are sound public policy. It balances the issues of how to provide incentives for bold and decisive action with assuring that appropriate damages are allocated to the appropriate parties. The gross negligence willful misconduct standard of responder conduct is appropriate for emergency operations. Responder actions that cause personal injury and wrong death are not specially protected. Only acts that are consistent with the NCP or the directions of appropriate federal and state officials are protected. Enacting a statute that provides an immunity at least as protective as the federal standard would eliminate a major disincentive for responders in Alaska. Since the responder immunity law is subject to review including a report to the Legislature, MSRC would welcome the opportunity to work closely with you. Our role in Alaska notwithstanding, we want to ensure that your responder immunity legislation provides reasonable protection for responders. By doing so it will simultaneously facilitate a swift and effective response to help mitigate harm to your environment.

The foregoing provides you the major issues we see in Alaska in advance of our meeting so that you can have some insight into our perspective. We look forward to working up an agenda and meeting with you in the very near future,

Sincerely,



John D. Costello
President


December 31, 1991

Coastal States with Federal Responder Immunity Standard

Alabama	Hawaii	North Carolina
California *	Louisiana	Oregon
Connecticut	Maine	Texas
Delaware	Massachusetts	Virginia
Florida	Mississippi	Virgin Islands
Georgia	New Hampshire	Washington
	New Jersey	

National Legislative Organizations Supporting the Federal Responder Immunity Standard

- National Conference of State Legislatures
- Council of State Governments
- American Legislative Exchange Council



■ Indicates states which have passed responder immunity legislation.

* Federal standard was adopted but only for a maximum of 90 days.



Regional Citizens' Advisory Council / 601 West Fifth Avenue, Suite 500 / Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2254 / (907) 277-7222 / FAX (907) 277-4523

MEMORANDUM: Regional Citizens' Advisory Council
Oil Spill Prevention and Response Committee
92-1

TO: Representative Bill Hudson
 ATTN: Landa Holton
RE: Review of Draft ACCC Study
DATE: 1/14/92

The RCAC's OSPR Committee is requesting final comments on this draft Alaska Coastal Communities Cooperative Study (ACCC) by February 15, 1992.

Pursuant to a request from the Nearshore Working Group, RCAC undertook a feasibility study of the concept of a coastal communities oil spill cooperative. This co-op would provide the means for local involvement in spill response, with particular focus on shoreline protection and nearshore response, which are the major remaining gaps in the spill protection scheme for Prince William Sound and other coastal areas.

The OSPR Committee has already gone through one phase of soliciting comments on the concept; and these comments have been addressed in this draft of the study. We are forwarding a copy of this most recent draft of the feasibility study for your comments.

The RCAC endorsed the concept of a coastal communities cooperative at its December 1991 meeting. We will continue to refine the technical issues involved in creating such an organization. From those of you who cannot support this co-op concept, we invite suggestions for alternative methods to achieve our common goal.

Ray Gillespie
Gillespie & Associates
Lobbying & Governmental Affairs



10390 Mendenhall Loop Road
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Telephone: (907) 463-3375
Fax: (907) 463-5522

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate and House Oil and Gas Committees

DATE: February 10, 1992

FROM:  Ray Gillespie, for Crowley Maritime, Delta Western and Petro Marine

RE: Marine Pollution Insurance Problems

This will outline three problems non-crude carriers and operators are experiencing in obtaining marine pollution insurance to satisfy the financial responsibility and "direct action" provisions of Alaska law.

Briefly, these problems are:

1. Confusion created by apparent inconsistencies between statute and regulations concerning insurer liability/exposure when issuing a policy meeting the specific requirements of financial responsibilities statutes.
2. P&I club and insurance coverage with "direct action" endorsement is virtually unavailable to most Alaska operators in the present commercial insurance or P&I club market.
3. Whether D.E.C. has statutory authority to grant conditional operating permits to operators who have met the financial responsibility requirement dollar amounts, but can not satisfy the "direct action" endorsement due to its unavailability.

I.

LIABILITY LIMIT/EXPOSURE OF INSURERS OR GUARANTORS.

Environmental Conservation Regulation, 18 AAC 75.230 (b), requires a policy of insurance certificate or binder to carry an endorsement which reads in part as follows:

"Any other provision of this policy notwithstanding: (1) this policy insures against any liability the insured may incur under Alaska Statute 46.04.040 (i), or any provision cited in it as a result of an unlawful discharge of oil within or affecting Alaska lands or waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Alaska; however, the insurer's liability does not exceed the limits of coverage set out in Section _____ of this policy...." (emphasis added)

Alaska Statute 46.04.040 (i) reads as follows:

"Financial responsibility under this section extends to loss compensable under AS 46.03.760 (e) or 46.03.822 and an assessment under AS 46.03.758, 46.03.759, 46.03.760 (a) or 46.04.030 (g)."

This statute in combination with 18 AAC 75.230 (b) has led P&I clubs and insurance underwriters to conclude that their exposure under a policy may not be limited to the face amount of the policy even though it meets the other monetary requirements for financial responsibility (AS 46.04.030 (k)). In other words, because statutes generally supersede any inconsistent regulation, insurers have advised operators that the potential for unlimited liability and the uncertainty of a judicial interpretation of these statutes and regulations prevents insurance underwriters and P&I clubs from writing the insurance with the required endorsement.

II.

"DIRECT ACTION" PROBLEM

AS 46.04.040 (e) reads in part as follows:

"An action brought under AS 46.03.758, 46.03.759, 46.03.760 (a) or (e), 46.03.822, or AS 46.04.030 (g) may be brought in a state court directly against the insurer, the group, or any person providing evidence of financial responsibility. The applicant, and insurer, surety, guarantor, person furnishing an approved letter of credit, or other group or person providing proof of financial responsibility approved by the department shall appoint an agent or service of process in the state...." (emphasis added)

This provision requires that any insurer or P&I club submit directly to the Alaska jurisdiction and be subject directly to legal action against it in Alaska courts without first proceeding against the spilling operator. The State of Alaska or private party can, under this provision, proceed directly in Alaska courts against the insurer. Typically, P&I club coverage is an indemnity policy, which first requires a provable loss against the operator before the P&I club pays that loss. This is the so-called "direct action" provision which prevents many operators from securing coverage meeting the requirements of Alaska Statutes.

In the States of Washington and California recently enacted financial responsibility statutes do not require the "direct action" endorsement. In essence, California and Washington simply allow for P&I club and insurance coverage which meets the monetary financial responsibility requirements and requires no other showing of a "direct action" endorsement.

III.

UNCERTAINTY OF D.E.C. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE CONDITIONAL OPERATING PERMITS WHERE DIRECT ACTION ENDORSEMENTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

AS 46.04.040 (1) provides that under certain circumstances DEC may issue permits to an operator who has proof of financial

responsibility without the "direct action" endorsement. This provision has been interpreted as authority to issue conditional permits only upon proof of at least \$50 million in insurance or other financial responsibility which has the direct action endorsement. Since the maximum financial responsibility coverage for a non-crude operator (tank vessel and barges) is \$35 million under AS 46.04.040 (c) (2), the waiver or conditional permit provisions of subsection (1) is not available to them.

The D.E.C. has, however, been issuing conditional permits to non-crude operators which have complied with the monetary financial responsibility requirements, but are unable to get such coverage with the "direct action" endorsement. The "direct action" endorsement is unavailable in the market place to some, if not most, non-crude operators. Due to the commercial unavailability of financial responsibility with the required endorsement, the DEC is in the unpleasant predicament of denying operating permits to established responsible carriers who have been doing business in Alaska for years. Denial of such operating permits because of commercial unavailability of "direct action" endorsement is potentially devastating and would likely eliminate most non-crude refined product delivery to many Alaskan communities.

This provision should be revisited by the Legislature to reflect the realities of the insurance market and availability of coverage. As of last week, D.E.C. has suspended any Conditional Permits.

IV.

SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

Legislation which:

1. Places explicit language in statute which limits the exposure of an insurer or P&I club to the face amount of the policy;
2. Eliminates the "direct action" requirement;
3. Provides a substitute mechanism to "direct action" which satisfies the State of Alaska and yet recognizes the realities of the available insurance or P&I club coverage;

4. Clarifies D.E.C. authority to grant conditional operating permits to non-crude operators who have otherwise complied with the monetary requirements for financial responsibility; or

5. Combination of the above.

seapro

Southeast Alaska Petroleum Resource Organization

540 Water Street Suite 202
(907) 225-7002

Ketchikan, Alaska 99901
Fax (907) 247-1117

February 27, 1992

Representative Bill Hudson
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811


Dear Representative Hudson,

In support of your bill HB 540, which limits response action contractor liability, I am enclosing our recently approved position paper on this subject. Also, since our organization is still rather new and little known, I have included a map which shows the major locations of our network, and a map which shows the eligible facilities which have chosen not to join our network.

As you will note in our position paper, we do not believe that all of the recommendations of the Citizen's Oversight Council on this subject are in the best interest of our region. We do believe, however, that HB 540 provides exactly the conditions we think will provide the best climate for further developing environmental protection capabilities in our region.

I will, of course, provide you with any information or other assistance you may need relative to environmental protection in Southeast, the remainder of the state, and the North Pacific region.

Respectfully,



R. M. Mullen
Manager



Southeast Alaska Petroleum Resource Organization

540 Water Street Suite 202
(907) 225-7002

Ketchikan, Alaska 99901
Fax (907) 247-1117

POSITION PAPER

OIL SPILL RESPONSE ACTION CONTRACTOR LIABILITY

February 25, 1992

SEAPRO and its nineteen member companies wish to record our observations and concerns about response action contractor liability, and its likely impacts on the current and future state of environmental response capability in Southeast Alaska. We are particularly concerned by the failure of the Citizen's Oversight Council to adequately investigate the state of environmental response in rural Alaska generally, and Southeast Alaska specifically, in reaching the conclusions and recommendations contained in their report to the legislature on this subject.

Overview of Response Action Contractors in Southeast Alaska

There is only one business in the Southeast Alaska region which holds itself out as a response action contractor. That firm has very minimal capabilities which are almost totally restricted to the immediate areas around Juneau. Our region has always had to rely on existing business organizations within the region to provide response to pollution incidents and other emergencies. In addition to oil transporters and terminals, these businesses have included logging companies, construction companies, float plane and helicopter operators, tug and barge companies, fishing vessels, and many others. All of these are therefore "Response Action Contractors" as defined by state law when they enter into agreements to help respond to spills.

The services of companies like VRCA, VECO, Burlington Environmental, Foss Environmental, etc., have rarely if ever been used to respond to environmental emergencies in our region. The reason for this is the typical small size of spills, the nature of the products involved, and the logistic difficulties of deploying to the region in time to be effective. One of the primary motivations our members felt for formation of SEAPRO was the lack of response action contractors within the region.

SEAPRO is not currently a response action contractor. We are a cooperative sharing organization of predominantly local small businesses who make up the fuel and lubricating oil transportation and distribution network for all of Southeast Alaska. We also include several local companies who consume or handle large quantities of oil in support of their business activities, but who are not in the "oil business". Our organization was originally formed to act as a sharing network only in Ketchikan, but rapidly expanded to cover the entire region. We have now reached the point in our evolution where we must consider purchasing pollution response equipment in the near future and becoming some form of response entity.

All of our collective experience, along with our judgment of operating conditions within the region, forces us to conclude that there will likely never be a response action contractor of any significant ability in Southeast. We have no expectation that this situation will change any time soon because there is insufficient financial justification for bona-fide environmental or emergency contractors to capitalize a response capability which would only be profitably employed on our historical average of once a decade.

Potential Impact of Liability to Southeast Alaska Spill Response Capability

With the exception of SEAPRO member companies, almost none of the companies who have previously participated in environmental response activities in this region are aware of their potential liabilities when current state law sunsets in a few months. Additionally, since none of these companies consider themselves to be "response action contractors", it is unlikely that they will make themselves aware of their liability exposures in advance of being asked to respond to an environmental emergency. It is equally unlikely that they would submit to a "certification" process recommended by the Citizen's Oversight Council, or to the verification/inspection process which would be necessitated by such certification.

If these companies were to discover the potential extent of their liability exposure for participating in a clean up action after the current limitations sunset, it is unlikely that they will respond in a timely manner, if at all, when they are needed. The worse possible situation will be for one or more of these companies to become the target of an opportunistic law suit allowed by a lack of liability limitation. Such a situation would guarantee that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to convince local companies to respond to future emergencies, even if action were subsequently taken to limit liabilities. Given the ever increasing propensity for opportunistic law suits in our nation, and the sensitivity of regional businesses to this phenomenon, we believe that merely the possibility of such a situation will have a chilling effect on the regions environmental response capability.

Any reasonable person responding to an oil spill assumes that all liability for damages and costs resulting from the clean up will flow to the responsible party. This is as it should be. It makes no sense to imperil a contractor acting in good faith, and within the boundaries of state or federally approved contingency plans, to bear any responsibility for damages which could result from someone else's spill. Except for gross negligence, willful misconduct, or violation of law by a contractor, all damages from a hazardous substance release are the rightful responsibility of the spiller, not the third party people cleaning it up. This principle has been codified in federal law and the laws of at least 18 other coastal states. Acceptance of this principle is a condition of membership in SEAPRO and most other cooperatives.

As stated earlier, SEAPRO has evolved to the point that it must consider becoming a response entity in some form. Currently, Southeast is the only region of the state, outside the crude oil producing regions, which has taken any tangible steps to improve its environmental response capability. The steps that have been taken to date, have been entirely on the initiative of the regions businesses. In spite of some initial skepticism on the part of state and federal agencies, we have forged ahead with investment in our organization, greatly enhancing the effectiveness of the response equipment, material, and personnel in the region. We have proposed to both the state and federal agencies, cooperative steps which can be taken to provide our region and the rest of the state with marked improvement in our mutual ability to combat environmental emergencies. We want to begin taking these steps this year with or without agency participation.

However, the prospect of facing clean up costs and other damages for actions the co-op may take to mitigate environmental damage will surely weigh heavily on our decision making when considering how we may use SEAPRO to further improve the regions total response capability.

Response Action Contractor Certification in Southeast Alaska

The Citizen's Oversight Council has recommended that response action contractor liability limitation be linked to an, as yet undeveloped, certification program. While SEAPRO does not object to compliance standards for environmental response organizations, whether private companies, cooperatives or some other form, we fail to see the practicality or necessity of "certifying" entities in Southeast Alaska which meet the definition of response action under current law.

The current legal definition of response action contractor is:

(A) a person who enters into a response action contract with respect to a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance and who is carrying out the contract, including a cooperative organization formed to maintain and supply response equipment and materials that enters into a response action contract relating to a release or threatened release;

(B) a person who is retained or hired by and is under the control of a person described in (A) to provide services to the response action contract; and

(C) a person who acts as a volunteer and is engaged in a response action.

Looking at the history of spill response in Southeast, and the probable future response actions in the region, certifying the response action contractors defined above would mean establishing the standards and processes for certifying virtually every business, and many individuals in our region. This is a monumental task by any standards, and in our view, a nonsensical one.

The Citizen's Oversight Council made some very narrow assumptions of what constitutes a response action contractor, and even what constitutes a cooperative. It is our opinion that the Council did not consider the broad range of response actions that have taken place throughout this state, nor did they evaluate the complex mix of organizations and individuals who have participated, and are likely to be asked to participate in environmental response actions.

There could be some benefit to establishing certification criteria for certain categories of response action contractors, were those categories to be properly defined in the broader context of the entire state. But in any context, some agency will have to develop professional standards to measure contractor capability; will have to apply these standards through some sort of an inspection or verification process; will have to verify the continuity of certification levels, will have to measure actual contractor performance against certification standards; and will have to administer this entire process. In our view, the cost of the simplest of such a bureaucracy would be excessive for the benefit gained, especially in Southeast and other areas outside the crude oil producing regions. The time necessary to create such a system would be extreme, with no possibility that such a system could be in place before the current liability limitations sunset. And finally, it makes no sense to us to waste scarce state resources on creating such a system and supporting bureaucracy when the federal government is already in the process of doing exactly the same thing.

Summary

At no time prior to publishing its report did the Citizen's Oversight Council seek information about conditions in Southeast Alaska from either SEAPRO, its member companies, nonmember companies, or other organizations with whom we network. During their teleconferenced meetings on this subject, our representatives noted that Southeast Alaska was never discussed or even mentioned by the Council members. Additionally, it was our observation that the Council focused almost all of their attention on operations in the crude oil producing regions of the state, on one or two companies who are in the business of environmental response, on Alyeska Pipeline Company, on the Cook Inlet cooperative CISPRI, and infrequently on the Alaska Clean Seas cooperative.


We find that their report seems to be strictly and narrowly aimed at perceived conditions in Prince William Sound, and to a lesser degree, Cook Inlet. It certainly does not accurately reflect environmental response conditions in our region, and we suspect that it does not accurately reflect conditions in other regions of the state. Consequently, this basic flaw places us in the position of not concurring with much of their rationale or their proposed solutions.


We believe that the state, like the federal government, should fix all obligations for clean up costs and damages resulting from a hazardous substance release on the responsible party, where it rightfully belongs.

We are concerned that failure to adopt liability limitations for environmental emergency responders, other than the responsible party, would negatively impact our regions ability to seek rapid and effective response actions from service providers outside the SEAPRO response network. Additionally, failure to provide this type of liability limitation would seriously threaten SEAPRO's ability to continue making further improvements in the total response capability of the region.

We cannot see substantial value to be gained within our region by creating a response action contractor certification process independent of that which will be created by the federal government. We also see no value in either waiting until a certification process is developed before granting liability limitation, or in tying liability limitations to any condition other than performance in accordance with federal and state contingency plans.

We believe that limiting the potential liability of responders, whether environmental contractors, cooperatives, other commercial entities, or volunteers is essential to improving the response capabilities of our region. This limitation should be similar, if not identical to that contained in the federal Oil Pollution Act of 1990.







Oil Reform Alliance

HB 540



3/9/92

TESTIMONY OF RIKI OTT

ON BEHALF OF THE OIL REFORM ALLIANCE

BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON OIL & GAS

The Oil Reform Alliance is fundamentally opposed to the concept of liability immunity for response action contractors (RACs).

This is old news to members of this committee who heard our testimony on HB 196 last session and it's even older news to those of you aware that ORA member groups were among the primary advocates for preservation of state's rights during the formative years (1989-1990) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA90).

Committee members will recall that the primary impetus for liability immunity last session was based on the faulty premise that granting such immunity would relieve Tesoro of the \$1 billion bonding requirement demanded by Alyeska. Instead, once HB 196 passed, Alyeska increased Tesoro's bonding requirement by 20% to \$1.2 billion through an insurance combination.

In addition, the ORA maintained last session--and still does--that RAC liability immunity shifts the liability of spill response from RACs to the public because the burden of proof lies with the person bringing the case against the RAC. Under HB 540, RACs will be held to a standard of "gross negligence" which is next to impossible to prove in court as the standard stops just short of proving the RAC knowingly committed a crime. The latest version of HB 540 deletes the requirement for RAC's actions to be consistent with state-approved c-plans (under AS 46.04.030) and requires that an injured party to prove by preponderance of evidence that RAC's acts were contrary to the National Contingency Plan (NCP). This is regressive--neither OPA90 nor any other state allow a reduced adherence to the terms of the NCP.

(HB 540 does not provide immunity to RACs in cases of personal injury, wrongful death, or actions inconsistent with OSC orders or the related contingency plans, but this is consistent with existing and pre-HB 196 Alaskan law.)

Further, the ORA also maintained last session--and still does--that liability equates to responsibility. If RACs are not held legally accountable, i.e., liable, for their actions, there is no incentive for RACs to act responsibly. One of the strongest motivations for responsible response is the threat of liability for basic negligence. Last session we used examples of Exxon Valdez oil spill cleanup workers who reported wrongdoing by their contractor VECO who was at the time held to a standard of basic negligence. The concern is that with less liability (i.e., gross negligence), there will be even less care and more concerned workers. However, RAC wrongdoing did and will go largely: unaddressed--there won't be lawsuits brought on by the public--because workers refuse to testify in public for fear of losing their contract. Alaskan law only protects - marginally - public, not private, whistleblowers. Without amending this gross oversight

in the labor laws, HB 540 worsens an already bad situation; it will get workers fired for trying to protect the public interest and our natural resources will suffer unnecessary damages.

These three points (that HB 196 did not guarantee a solution for Tesoro's bonding dilemma, that it shifted the liability of spill response from RACs to taxpayers, and that it did not guarantee that RACs would act with reasonable care) were the basis for the ORA's opposition to liability immunity for RACs last session.

This session, thanks to the informative report by the Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances to the legislature (Council Report), it is very evident that the issues surrounding the request for RAC liability immunity are even more complex than first imagined. From the ORA perspective, in light of several new issues, there is even less reason to pass legislation providing RAC liability immunity.

For example, the Council Report found a large loophole in implementing contingency (c-) plans: "the state currently has no means to ensure performance of a critical RAC" pg. 10. C-plan holders contract with RACs to provide the actual spill response, but the RACs are not mandated to perform under any laws. In other words, under existing law, there is no guarantee c-plans will be implemented during a spill. HB 540 does not address this critical issue, however the Council recommends limited immunity (gross negligence) for RACs as the incentive to ensure a "bold and decisive" response in concert with a certification program to ensure "minimum professional standards" (pg. 9) and a requirement that certified RACs must be subject to orders of an OSC during a spill.

The problem with the Council's approach is twofold. First, by putting the promise of immunity before the guarantee of cleanup, it puts the cart before the horse. Alaska does not have a RAC certification program. The Council specifically states that "the problem (of RAC accountability) could be exacerbated if liability limits are granted" pg. 10. While a RAC certification process may soon be forthcoming from the federal negotiated rulemaking process, the ORA strongly believes Alaska should have our own certification procedure and a mandated duty for RACs to respond. Secondly, there is no way that a certification program, no matter how well-intentioned or well-written, will instill in RACs the duty to exercise the standard of reasonable care to which they are held liable under basic negligence law. The ORA supports the concept of RAC certification independently of, not at the expense of, the standard of basic negligence. The ORA believes the latter approach will ensure a bold, decisive, and responsible response from contractors whose actions of reasonable care should exceed "minimum professional standards."

Another major problem with HB 540 is that, like HB 196, it does not solve the problem of Tesoro's \$1.2 billion bond. The Council Report points out that the bonding requirement by Alyeska falls in the category of tariff costs which should be subject to review by either FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) (pg. 51) or, presumably, APUC (Alaska Public Utilities Commission) as being reasonably necessary and nondiscriminatory. A simple request for review from the Legislature could resolve this critical issue for Tesoro.

The third major problem with HB 540 is that it gives Alyeska limited immunity as a RAC. This is not acceptable under any scenario. As pointed out in the Council Report (pg. 50-51), Alyeska is bound by federal law (Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act) to respond to pollution caused by TAPS operations including tankers. We concur with

the Council's conclusion that Alyeska is not a RAC. Instead of providing Alyeska with immunity, legislation should be written reiterating federal law into state law. By attempting to give Alyeska limited immunity, HB 540 may actually violate that section of federal law (TAPPA) which imposes liability.

(As an interesting aside, the Council Report also mentions that DEC signed off on Alyeska's current c-plan for the Valdez Marine Terminal in which Alyeska states "a spill from a tanker is not the responsibility of Alyeska" (pg. 23 and 32). The state may already be in violation of federal law (TAPPA) which holds Alyeska responsible for spills from TAPS operations including tankers. At a minimum, legislators should ask DEC to strike all phrases absolving Alyeska of responsibility for tanker spills from legal documents (c-plans) on which the state signs off.)

The last example of a major problem with HB 540 is that it gives RAC liability immunity away with nothing in return for the public. California, at least, succeeded in tying RAC liability immunity with achieving maximum protection for the California coast. As stated in the Council Report, this created an extremely cooperative atmosphere in California in which small private RACs, major co-ops, shippers and the oil industry are working actively together to reduce risk of spills through providing sufficient funding, resources, and training to RACs (pg. 91, 103).

This creative and cooperative atmosphere sharply contrasts the hostile working relations among RACs in Alaska. Alyeska has attempted to essentially blackmail Tesoro by an unreasonable bonding requirement; Tesoro funds over 50% of CISPRI (Cook Inlet RAC), but not all operators in Cook Inlet are members of CISPRI because some "feel it is not in their best interest to join CISPRI" (pg. 99); CISPRI "pledged a \$1 million fund for orphan spills" that could presumably include spills from non-members, but Tesoro has reservations about responding to orphan spills because of risk of litigation over damages...

The ORA told this committee last session that public interest groups and volunteer RACs from California endorsed the concept of liability immunity for RACs ONLY in trade for maximum coastal protection (among other things). At present, "liability immunity has not yet been granted to any RAC in California" because "no one gets immunity until they all work together to give the state maximum achievable protection" (pg. 91, 103). And RACs in California are working together now for the promise of limited (up to 90 days) liability immunity later.

And the really remarkable thing is that California achieved all this without an 11 million gallon spill.

Isn't this what we want for Alaska? Maximum coastal protection from oil spills in place and ready to go? Maximum cooperation among response action contractors? Responders who are ready, willing and eager to respond to any spill? Guaranteed response? Alaskans deserve at least this much. We suffered an 11 million gallon spill.

Passing HB 540 won't get Alaskans any closer to what Californians are achieving today. In fact, passage of HB 540 will take us a few steps backwards towards pre-Exxon Valdez oil spill days. Don't pass this bill. Instead let's regroup and try again. There are much better ways to balance the concerns of all parties, including the oil industry, response action contractors and the public.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES NALEN
CROWLEY MARITIME CORPORATION
BEFORE THE
HOUSE OIL AND GAS COMMITTEE
STATE OF ALASKA**

MARCH 6, 1992

My name is Charles Nalen, Vice President Loss Control and Environmental Affairs, Crowley Maritime Corporation.

CROWLEY MARITIME CORPORATION

Crowley Maritime Corporation wishes to thank the Oil and Gas Committee for the opportunity to testify on the subject of evidence of financial responsibility amendments under H.B. No. 501. We believe that this legislation is critical to the continued transportation of fuel to the State of Alaska.

Crowley Maritime Corporation is a major tug and barge operator in Alaska. The company has a fleet of over 60 petroleum barges ranging in size from small lightering barges to oceangoing vessels measuring 400 by 100 feet and carrying up to 16,200 long tons of petroleum products. Our company transports and delivers approximately 100 million gallons of bulk petroleum products annually to Western Alaska. Fuel deliveries are performed to over 125 coastal and river communities capable of receiving waterborne shipments during a limited navigating season. These communities are spread across some 4,000 miles of coastline and rivers stretching from Kodiak Island to Barter Island. Virtually all of these communities and consignees are dependent on seasonal barge deliveries to conduct commerce and literally to survive. Without such marine transportation services, these communities could cease to exist, or at a minimum, suffer severe socio-economic impact.

PROTECTION & INDEMNITY CLUBS AND "DIRECT ACTION"

Like most major operators of tank vessels, our company has pollution liability coverage through the P&I Clubs. This form of indemnity protection is, in our opinion, the most extensive coverage available for pollution liability. It is not "insurance" in the traditional sense: instead, it is a system of mutual indemnification provided by pools of U.S. and international vessel operators. The concept of mutual sharing of liability, which is the foundation of the P&I system, would be destroyed by a "direct action" provision. It is for this reason that the P&I clubs have stated that they will not provide P&I coverage subject to "direct action".

Our P&I club has provided us with their comments concerning H.B. No. 501. In Section 1 of the Bill it refers to the "maximum liability" of the insurer. It is not the intention of P&I Clubs to submit to the jurisdiction of any State or Federal court, nor to be the liable party under any ACT such as this. The P&I Clubs are also concerned about the "maximum liability of the insurer being limited to the maximum amount covered by the insurance policy", which is \$500 million. With tug and barge operators, the P&I Club policy limit far exceeds the required evidence of financial responsibility.

Crowley Maritime Corporation fully supports the provision in H.B. No. 501 giving clear authority to the Department of Environmental Conservation to accept evidence of financial responsibility without being subject to direct action. Financial responsibility requirements should insure prompt payment for spill response and damages through methods that are available to the marine transportation industry. A financial responsibility standard that cannot be satisfied by vessel operators is potentially devastating to maritime commerce in the State of Alaska.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

We also support the intent of this amendment to limit the liability of the insurer. As stated by the P&I Clubs, the insurer's limitation of liability should be to maximum amount covered by the evidence of financial responsibility and not the maximum limit of the insurance policy. With federal and varying state limitation of liability limits there is the possibility of horizontal exposure to multiple limits against an insurer. Insurance underwriters have voiced their fear that each state requesting certificates of financial responsibility will construe it to be a separate limit for the same spill thus multiplying the amount an insurer would have to pay for a single spill. We appreciate the intent of this amendment to limit an insurer's liability to the amount covered by evidence of financial responsibility.

Crowley Maritime Corporation looks forward to continuing this dialogue on evidence of financial responsibility with the Committee. We believe that this legislation is taking the first step to address the certificate problem and the underlying issue of "direct action".

Thank you.

FILE COPY
DO NOT REMOVE

June 20, 1990

Dear Colleague:

As past Chairman of the Pacific Fisheries Legislative Task Force, I am attaching a copy of our recent Resolution concerning **QUALIFIED IMMUNITY AND OIL SPILLS**.

The Task Force is concerned that without qualified immunity for oil spill responders we are jeopardizing our fisheries, our fishermen, and our coast. The 5 western states are concerned that responders would be deterred from performing clean-up activities on behalf of the person or persons actually responsible for the spill if they are unduly exposed to unlimited liability in the course of their response activities.

The Members of the Task Force also expressed concern that if a state without qualified immunity were to have a spill, the responders from other neighboring states would decline to offer their services out of fear that they would be exposed to the unlimited financial risks. Some members were concerned that a person could go broke just trying to prove they were innocent.

The Task Force concluded that "the fishermen and other spill responders, who perform under adverse conditions to the best of their trained abilities and following the directions of recognized state and federal authorities, should be afforded limited immunity from lawsuits arising as a consequence of their response activities."

I urge and encourage your support for an amendment to SB 2040 which would grant limited immunity to those who respond to spills on behalf of others.

Sincerely

DAN HAUSER

**FILE COPY
DO NOT REMOVE**

**PACIFIC FISHERIES LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
RESOLUTION
Concerning "Oil Spill Responder's Limited Immunity"**

WHEREAS, it is in the interests of the citizens and resources of California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Idaho to ensure that qualified, highly trained oil spill response organizations are in place and ready to respond to oil spills anywhere along our coastlines; and

WHEREAS, the success of the modern-day spill response organization depends upon countless fishermen, subcontractors, veterinarians, and other part-time specialists who must be prepared on an emergency basis to act swiftly and unhesitantly in the face of adverse circumstances and often with far less than complete information; and

WHEREAS, these responders will be deterred from performing clean-up activities on behalf of the person or persons actually responsible for the spill if they are unduly exposed to unlimited liability in the course of their response activities;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Pacific Fisheries Legislative Task Force that the fishermen and other spill responders, who perform under adverse conditions to the best of their trained abilities and following the directions of recognized state and federal authorities, should be afforded limited immunity from lawsuits arising as a consequence of their response activities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Pacific Fisheries Legislative Task Force supports and encourages state and federal legislation which grants any person who responds to an oil spill, caused by another, immunity from liability from all costs and damages except in

cases where the responder acts with gross negligence or willful misconduct, or causes personal injury or wrongful death; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, where limitations on immunity are granted to responders, it is important that victims be fully protected and compensated for damages, and the party responsible for the spill in the first instance shall be liable for any damage caused by responder's simple negligence.

COPIES of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the Honorable George Bush, President of the United States; and Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho.

ADOPTED JUNE 16, 1990,
IN SITKA, ALASKA

W. Gene Burden
Vice President
Environmental Affairs & Government Relations

February 6, 1992

Representative Bill Hudson
Alaska State Capital
Room 114
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Subject: Response Action Contractor Liability

Dear Representative Hudson:

The legislature passed HB 196 last year (Ch. 92, SLA 1991) which provided limited immunity to oil spill response action contractors (RACs) while maintaining liability in cases involving gross negligence, intentional misconduct, and where the RAC was involved in the spill itself. This bill has a one-year sunset and will expire on June 30, 1992 unless action is taken during this session. As you are aware, Tesoro Alaska put a lot of effort in the bill's passage as we viewed it as necessary to encourage RACs to provide immediate needed cleanup services following an oil spill.

The legislation was particularly critical to Tesoro as our continued operation was actually dependent on the bill's passage. The legislation was necessary to assure our continued access to spill response services provided by Alyeska in Prince William Sound. As a result of the bill's enactment, Tesoro was able to reach an interim agreement for obtaining these services following last year's legislature with the agreement's expiration coinciding with the present expiration of HB 196 on June 30, 1992. Unfortunately, unless the legislation is made permanent, Tesoro will again face the prospects of a loss of Alaska North Slope crude oil which threatens our ability to continue operations. This is of obvious concern to each of the 575 Tesoro employees in Alaska as well as their families. It also represents a potential significant negative to the economy of Southcentral Alaska, and particularly to the Kenai Peninsula.

During last year's debates on HB 196, we sought to communicate that while Tesoro's situation may have been the catalyst for the legislation, the bill also represents good public policy. The possibility of becoming embroiled in negligence litigation is a strong deterrent to agreeing to assist in any emergency situation - including the chaotic and time consuming circumstances of an oil spill response. The fact is that the threat of becoming involved in very costly litigation is, in and of itself, a powerful disincentive whether or not the lawsuit might be won. These facts have now been recognized in 19 coastal states where RAC immunity

legislation has been enacted that coincides closely with the legislation passed in the federal Oil Pollution Act of 1990. In each case the immunity granted by these states is broader than the limited immunity provided by Alaska's HB 196. Those states and the dates of passage of their immunity laws are as follows:

Alabama.....7/29/91	Louisiana.....4/23/91	Texas.....3/28/91
California..9/22/90	Maine.....6/20/91	Virginia....4/18/90
Connecticut.6/24/91	Mississippi....4/12/91	Virgin Is...12/9/90
Delaware....1/31/91	New Hampshire..5/13/91	Washington...5/15/91
Florida.....6/11/90	New Jersey.....8/13/91	
Georgia.....4/17/91	North Carolina.6/27/91	
Hawaii.....6/90	Oregon.....7/17/91	

*Source: Oil Spill U.S. Law Report, Vol.2, No. 1, 1/92, p.15

The recognition of the need for responder immunity in Alaska is reflected in the recently released draft proposal by the Prince William Sound Regional Citizen's Advisory Council's entitled "A Coastal Communities Oil Spill Cooperative for Alaska", January 1992 prepared by International Spill Technology Corporation, College Station, Texas. The proposal introduces an organizational structure and concept that is intended to improve the response against a major oil spill in the areas of shoreline protection, nearshore response, training, coordination of fishing vessels, and protection against non-crude spills. On page 19 of their proposal a number of conditions are described as required if the co-op is to be successful. Item No. 4 is for

"[T]he Legislature is able to craft an acceptable, long-term solution to the issue of responder immunity from tort liability during the 1992 session."

This position is further clarified on page 24 of the same report under the heading "LEGAL FEASIBILITY" as

"[R]esponder immunity is necessary for the ACCC to avoid tremendous liability exposure (emphasis added). It is anticipated that the state legislature will take up the issue of immunity for spill responders again during the upcoming session."

This is also identified as a "Major Legal Issue for the ACCC" in Table 4 on page 25 of the proposal.

Alaska has shared other states' recognition of the value of responder immunity for many years, as evidenced by AS 9.65.091 which shields people who respond to declared disaster emergencies from negligence liability. Unfortunately, that statute may not

Representative Bill Hudson
February 6, 1992
Page 3


apply to RACs, since before the enactment of HB 196 the legislature had passed a statute extending liability to RACs for simple negligence (See AS 46.03.823). Moreover, AS 9.65.091 applies only to declared disasters, and only those persons whose services are requested by the state which would exclude most oil spill situations as well as many volunteer responders.

We all spent a lot of time on HB 196 last year due in part because the issue was new to Alaska. Now, it is clear that the issue is not particularly controversial in the United States and is certainly not a revolutionary concept. As illustrated above it has become settled national and state policy that:

1. A negligence standard threatens to unfairly embroil RACs in costly post-spill litigation. The crisis atmosphere and potential consequences of oil spills combined with the unacceptably high risk and cost of litigation is not offset at all by the promise of limiting jury instructions;
2. The threat of litigation deters RACs from freely entering a jurisdiction without limited liability which interferes with the formation of effective spill co-ops;
3. The enactment of the new federal liability fund as well as the State clean-up fund; unlimited strict liability on the discharger (including strict liability for any damages caused by the RAC); and federal and state requirements for proof of financial responsibility combine to make the possibility of leaving victims uncompensated for damages caused by the simple negligence of a RAC very, very remote.

Tesoro suggests that in view of the above that the legislature's debate on this issue can be considerably shorter than last year and that the legislature should act to implement a continuation of HB 196 which will address the needs of spill responders in this state, improve our capabilities to respond, and solve a critical issue for our company. Thank you for your interest in this issue. If we may be of any assistance please contact me.

Sincerely,


Gene Burden

March 9, 1992

The Honorable Bill Hudson
Chairman, House Special Committee on Oil and Gas
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

RE: CSHB 540 Providing for Limited Responder Immunity

Dear Chairman Hudson:

Alyeska Pipeline Service Company ("Alyeska"), strongly supports Good Samaritan immunity for oil spill response in Alaska. Without limited liability, financial risks and liability exposures will deter cleanup contractors and others from prompt, aggressive action when spills occur.

As you know, the federal Oil Pollution Act of 1990 ("OPA '90"), and Alaska's HB 196 last session adopted responder immunity laws to encourage immediate and effective oil spill response action. However, without legislative action this session, HB 196's provision for limited immunity against certain claims under state law will "sunset" in July. To help insure that effective and substantial resources are readily available to contain and cleanup oil spills, the state's response action contractor immunity law should be improved and made permanent.

Although its scope is also limited, the response action immunity provision in OPA '90 [33 USC & 1321 (b) (11) (c) (4)] is the best model. To date, the Virgin Islands and 18 of 24 coastal states (75%) have adopted substantially similar laws.

OPA '90 limits liability under federal law for response action if it is consistent with the National Contingency Plan or directions of federal officials. Responders are still liable for personal injuries and wrongful deaths, or if they are grossly negligent or engage in willful misconduct. Importantly, the responsible vessel owner or operator is liable for any removal costs or damages that response contractors are relieved of. We believe that the federal law draws the right balance between encouraging prompt, aggressive action by all potential response contractors, and

Letter to The Honorable Bill Hudson
March 9, 1992
Page 2

providing for recovery of property damages from the spiller if a response contractor has negligently caused them.

The United States Coast Guard has best described the important contribution limited immunity for response contractors made to the nation's comprehensive scheme for oil spill response and recovery under OPA '90. All response contractors must be encouraged to take action when spills occur, and to stay involved until an oil spill response is completed.

We urge the Committee's consideration of this important proposal to supplement the state's oil spill response laws. Alyeska Pipeline Service Company supports the adoption of Good Samaritan immunity for oil spill response action contractors on a state level, as presently stated in CSHB 540.

Very truly yours,

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY

By:


Paul M. Richards
Manager, Government Relations

PMR:ph

March 6, 1992

The Honorable Bill Hudson
Chairman, House Special Committee on Oil and Gas
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

RE: Prince William Sound Oil Spill Response Services

Dear Chairman Hudson:

Alyeska Pipeline Service Company ("Alyeska") is an oil spill response action contractor for spills in Prince William Sound on behalf of companies that own, operate or charter tank vessels in the TAPS trade. We refer to those companies as "Contracting Vessels." The scope of services to be provided by Alyeska to those companies is described in Oil Spill Response Services Agreements between Alyeska and the Contracting Vessels. The Agreements incorporate the Prince William Sound Tanker Spill Prevention and Response Plan to describe Alyeska's response plans. Exhibit A of each Agreement lists the vessels covered by that Agreement.

Under these arrangements, for large spills, Alyeska is obligated to respond for up to 72 hours to spills in Prince William Sound, while the Contracting Vessel is mobilizing its resources to take over management of the spill response. The Plan and the Agreements describe how the management transition from Alyeska to the appropriate Contracting Vessel should occur. After the transition, Alyeska's resources, including the on-water-response equipment, will be available for use by the Contracting Vessel for as long as needed and until they can be replaced by other equipment. The Contracting Vessel is contractually obligated to replace Alyeska's core equipment as rapidly as possible so that normal terminal operations may resume as soon as the Coast Guard allows it.

If the Contracting Vessel fails to assume management of the spill response in the 72 hour period, Alyeska anticipates that the Coast Guard will federalize the response, directing and paying for the effort. Alyeska has recently reiterated its verbal understanding with the Valdez Captain of the Port that Alyeska will make its resources available to the Coast Guard under a federalized response. We have written to Admiral Ciancaglini asking for an opportunity to describe this arrangement in writing.

Please contact me if you would like any other information on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY



M. F. G. Williams
Vice President-Environment & Contingencies

MFGW/RIS/md

March 2, 1992

Letter No. 92-9411-G

David E. Ciancaglini
Rear Admiral
U.S. Coast Guard
P.O. Box 25517
Juneau, Alaska 99802

Re: Coast Guard Directed Oil Spill Responses
in Prince William Sound

Dear Admiral Ciancaglini:

Alyeska Pipeline Service Company ("Alyeska") is an oil spill response action contractor for spills from TAPS trade tankers in Prince William Sound. To provide this service, Alyeska has entered into Oil Spill Response Services Agreements with five companies that either own, charter or operate tank vessels that call at Valdez. Those companies, which we refer to as Contracting Vessels, are ARCO Marine, Inc., BP Oil Shipping Company, U.S.A., Chevron U.S.A., Inc., Exxon Shipping Company, and Tesoro Alaska Petroleum Company. Exhibit A of each Agreement lists the tank vessels covered by the Agreement.

In the Agreements, Alyeska promises to manage the initial response to an oil spill for as long as 72 hours following a spill, in accordance with the Prince William Sound Tanker Spill Prevention and Response Plan. The Contracting Vessels agree to assume management of the spill response within 72 hours after notification by Alyeska. Under this arrangement, Alyeska will continue to assist the Contracting Vessel's on water response until the Alyeska resources are not needed or can be replaced. For small spills, under 1,000 barrels, Alyeska may elect to complete the entire response on behalf of the contracting vessel.

We believe that each of these companies is prepared to respond to a spill from the vessels it utilizes in Prince William Sound. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation has arrived at the same conclusion and has approved the contingency plans for the tank vessels covered by these Agreements. Alyeska has held major response drills with ARCO, BP, Exxon Shipping and Chevron and plan a similar exercise with Tesoro. Moreover, the Agreements and the PWS Plan anticipate that if the Contracting Vessel or other acceptable representative of the responsible party does not assume management of the spill

Name
March 2, 1992
Page 2

Letter No. 92-9411-G

response as required, Alyeska will ask the Coast Guard to federalize the response and assist in whatever way is appropriate, at the direction of the Federal On Scene Coordinator.

Based on discussions with Commander Ed Thompson, Captain of the Port in Valdez, there is an understanding between Alyeska and the Coast Guard that Alyeska will assist the Coast Guard if a spill response is federalized. We believe that it would be useful to have a formal procedure in place to guide transition from Alyeska management of spill response to federal control in the event such transition becomes necessary. Preparation for this contingency might be enhanced if there is a contract or Memorandum of Understanding between Alyeska and the Coast Guard describing the Coast Guard's expectations of Alyeska and establishing a management and reimbursement procedure.

It is our understanding that the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the National Contingency Plan (NCP) provide the Coast Guard with the authority and mission to direct a spill response when the responsible party does not take proper removal action or is unknown and the spill poses a substantial threat to the public health or welfare. 33 U.S.C. 1321(c) and National Contingency Plan 300.300. Section 300 of the NCP and Subpart H also describe how the Coast Guard can use private resources to fulfill this responsibility.

I would like to meet with you to discuss these issues and if you agree, begin the process of developing a procedure and an agreement tailored to meet the unique circumstances found in Prince William Sound.

There are two other issues we should address. Alyeska will respond to a discovery of crude oil on the waters of Prince William Sound even if the origin is not known. Under those circumstances, if the spiller is not quickly identified, we believe the response should be federalized.

Concerned citizens have asked about Alyeska's role in responding to phantom spills of refined petroleum products in Prince William Sound. In the past, Alyeska has responded voluntarily to such spills at the request of the Coast Guard, without seeking compensation. We will continue to be available to voluntarily assist the Coast Guard under these circumstances, with no actual duty to respond. These limitations are necessary because our resources cannot be dedicated to any effort other than our primary responsibilities to the TAPS trade vessels. We would be willing to discuss Alyeska's role in assisting the Coast


Name
March 2, 1992
Page 3

Letter No. 92-9411-G

Guard's response to phantom spills. In the case of potential spills from cruise ships, fishing support vessels or fuel barges, Alyeska should only have a voluntary support role to assist the primary plan of the spiller. The responsible parties and the Coast Guard should enter into binding contracts with other Response Action Contractors to provide response capability for these types of spills.

I will contact you soon to discuss these issues.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'M.F.G. Williams', with a horizontal line drawn through the end of the signature.

M.F.G Williams
Vice-President
Environment & Contingencies

cc: Representative Bill Hudson
Senator Sam Cotten

February 20, 1992

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY Prevention and Initial Response Services

- *Why are oil discharge prevention and contingency plans necessary?*

Under federal and state law, a vessel owner is responsible for the discharge of oil from its vessel. Crude oil tankers transiting Prince William Sound must have oil spill contingency plans, contract for various spill response resources, and post evidence of financial responsibility. Contingency plans allow the state to determine whether plan holders have access to sufficient resources to protect environmentally sensitive areas and to contain, clean up, and mitigate potential oil spills from tankers. The state also requires plan holders to demonstrate their ability to carry out contingency plans, including periodic training, exercises, and verification of ready access to equipment, supplies, and personnel. A tank vessel may not be operated within state waters without an approved contingency plan.

- *Who are the plan holders for crude oil tankers operating in Prince William Sound?*

As required by state law, tank vessel oil discharge prevention and contingency plans are held by tanker owners or operators. Alyeska operates the Trans Alaska Pipeline System on behalf of seven pipeline companies which own it. None of these own, operate, or charter tankers.

- *What are Alyeska's prevention and initial response services?*

Alyeska has developed an initial response plan (the Prince William Sound Tanker Spill Prevention and Response Plan or "Plan") which describes the services it offers to tanker vessels as an initial response contractor. The state has approved the Plan's incorporation into individual tanker contingency plans. Under the terms of the Plan and Oil Spill Response Services Agreements signed with tanker owners, operators, and charterers ("Contracting Vessels"), Alyeska provides response vessels, equipment, personnel, and training described in the Plan for as long as 72 hours following an oil spill. The initial response plan and the tanker contingency plans anticipate that, during the first 72 hours after a spill, the management of the response will transfer from Alyeska either to the appropriate Contracting Vessel or to the federal on-scene coordinator.

- *What resources has Alyeska developed to support these services?*

Alyeska has chartered escort response vessels, tugs, barges, and an oil spill recovery vessel. It has also purchased ocean and rapid deployment boom, seaskimmers, and related response equipment. In addition, Alyeska has developed area response centers, placed fishing vessels on contract to supplement response efforts, and prestaged equipment to protect hatcheries and other sensitive areas. Escort/response vessels are used for day-to-day escort of loaded tankers in Prince

William Sound as a prevention measure. Vessel crews are drilled in responding to large spills and in employing multi-vessel and multi-boom configurations. Storage capacity for recovered oil and water is unprecedented: five large barges, each ranging in true volume from 70,000 to 120,000 barrels, are part of the plan to receive collected oil and water. This capacity is also augmented by smaller barges. The selection of equipment has been balanced between using high-volume recovery equipment in the early stages of a spill, and to adjust response strategies and equipment as the oil becomes viscous and aged.

- *During the first 72 hours of an oil spill response, how will management of the response be transitioned from Alyeska to a Contracting Vessel?*

When Alyeska discovers or is advised that an oil spill from a covered vessel has occurred, it will provide the initial response, employing its response equipment and personnel. Alyeska will also notify the Contracting Vessel. Unless otherwise directed by the Contracting Vessel, or the U.S. Coast Guard, Alyeska may elect to manage and control the response to an oil spill of 1,000 barrels or less which can be contained and cleaned up by local Alyeska resources in accordance with the Plan. For larger spills, the company which has contracted for Alyeska's initial response services will assume management and control of the oil spill response either itself or through a third party approved by ADEC. The transfer of command and management of spill response operations from Alyeska must occur in a smooth and efficient manner satisfactory to the U.S. Coast Guard and ADEC. In addition, transition of spill response management could be from Alyeska to the U.S. Coast Guard in the event a spill response is federalized.

- *Following transition of the management of an oil spill response, will Alyeska resources exit the response?*

One of the requirements for transfer of command and management of spill response operations is agreement on present and future resources of people and equipment, including Alyeska resources. It is expected that Alyeska resources will remain fully engaged in a response following transition of management of spill response operations. As soon as reasonably practical, Alyeska's core equipment and personnel should be replaced in an orderly fashion with the Contracting Vessel's response organization and equipment so that Alyeska can resume normal operations at the Terminal, when tanker operations can be restored.

- *What will happen if a Contracting Vessel fails to assume management and control of an oil spill response within 72 hours?*

Under the terms of the response services agreement, Alyeska may tender management of the oil spill response directly to the U.S. Coast Guard, and acquire additional equipment and personnel, all at the Contracting Vessel's expense. When the spill management is federalized, Alyeska resources will be placed as directed by the U.S. Coast Guard.

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY
COMMENTS

ON

IMPROVING LIMITED RESPONDER
IMMUNITY

**ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY
COMMENTS
IMPROVING LIMITED RESPONDER IMMUNITY**

DATE	DESCRIPTION OF COMMENTS	TAB
02/10/92	<u>Citizens' Oversight Council Report</u> (Responder Immunity; State Orders; Tanker Spill Responsibility)	A
02/05/92	<u>Changes to Alyeska/Tesoro Agreement After HB 196</u>	B
02/05/92	<u>Alyeska Financial Responsibility Requirement</u>	C
02/04/92	<u>Responses to COC Issues</u> (Time Periods for Response Immunity; ADEC Orders; Tanker Spill Responsibility; Financial Responsibility)	D
01/30/92	<u>Improving Good Samaritan Immunity for Oil Spill Response in Alaska</u> (OPA '90 v. HB 196)	E
01/31/92	<u>Oral Presentation to Citizens' Oversight Council</u>	F
01/31/92	<u>PWS Contingency Plan Arrangements Prior to 03/89</u>	G
01/31/92	<u>Vogt Report</u> (Costs of Alyeska's Prevention & Initial Response Services)	H
01/31/92	<u>Straube Report</u> (Imposing Spill Liabilities on RAC's)	I
01/31/92	<u>ADEC Report</u> (Alyeska as a Response Action Contractor)	J
01/31/92	<u>Mertz Report</u> (Responder Immunity Does Not Reduce Spiller Liability; Purpose of Oil Response Funds; Financial Responsibility Requirements; Changes to Tesoro/Alyeska Agreement After HB 196)	K
01/30/92	<u>Frank Report</u> (TAPAA Does Not Require Alyeska to Respond to Vessel Spills)	L

February 10, 1992

Comments Regarding "Oil Spill Response Action Contractors"

A Report by the Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances

Alyeska Pipeline Service Company ("Alyeska") is pleased to provide these comments regarding a report recently submitted to the Alaska State Legislature by the Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances ("COC"). The report is entitled "Oil Spill Response Action Contractors."

COC has developed seven recommendations. Alyeska's comments follow each one.

RECOMMENDATION #1: *The liability standard for oil spill response action contractors may be limited to gross negligence or intentional misconduct, with certain conditions that ensure a reliable response.*

Comments:

- We strongly agree. Even though responders are not liable for spills, without limited immunity, the financial risks and liability exposures associated with oil spill response would deter cleanup contractors, cooperatives, and others from joining into prompt, aggressive action.
- To date, the Virgin Islands and 18 of the 24 coastal states (75%) have adopted responder immunity laws which are substantially similar to the federal model provided in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.
- The immunity is limited and subject to several conditions. The response action must be consistent with the National Contingency Plan, or federal or state orders. Responders are liable for personal injuries and wrongful deaths, or if they are grossly negligent or engage in willful misconduct. Importantly, the responsible vessel owner, operator, or charterer is liable for any removal costs or damages that responders are relieved of.

- We also strongly agree that this limited immunity ought to be available throughout the response action, and that it not be confined by an arbitrary time limit.

RECOMMENDATION #2: *Professional response action contractors should be certified by the state.*

RECOMMENDATION #3: *A certification program should contain minimum professional standards for response action contractors and direct DEC to establish the criteria by which it can readily assess a response action contractor's capability to perform as stated in a contingency plan.*

RECOMMENDATION #4: *A certification program should authorize DEC to maximize coastal protection and to enhance regional response capabilities through response action contractor certification.*

Comments:

- For the sake of national uniformity, and to avoid inconsistencies (and possible preemption), the state may wish to examine this proposal in greater detail after ongoing U.S. Coast Guard rulemaking on the same subject is completed. If supplemental state standards appear necessary, they may be considered at that time.
- Additionally, pre-certification of response action contractors should not be an additional condition for one group of responders to qualify for limited liability. We must encourage effective, prompt response efforts no matter who provides any type of care, assistance, or advice during an oil spill response, so long as it is consistent with the nation's comprehensive scheme for oil spill response or government orders.
- In addition to the legal and constitutional issues raised by this proposed disparity, an incongruity is immediately apparent. Volunteers who may need the most supervision during a response for their own safety would meet no prequalification requirement. Likewise, state, municipal, and village responders currently enjoy limited immunity for response action without any certification under a separate statute.
- The state's comprehensive contingency planning process already empowers ADEC to insure that response action contractors demonstrate their obligation and availability to respond to a discharge and discharge exercises,

and the readiness and compatibility of their equipment and other spill response resources. These oil spill response personnel must be trained, and demonstrate through drills and inspections their competency to provide immediate, effective response.

- A certification program may even be less effective as an oversight mechanism than spill exercises. ADEC can assure that a RAC is adequately prepared by comparing its response to the role described for it in a response plan. This can be done best through drills.

RECOMMENDATION #5: *Certified response action contractors must be subject to all orders of the state on-scene coordinator during an actual or threatened spill response.*

RECOMMENDATION #6: *Certified response action contractors should respond, when directed by the state on-scene coordinator, to mystery or orphan spills, except that regional cooperatives will not be required to respond outside their region of operation.*

Comments:

- Under the state and federal comprehensive oil spill prevention and response programs, sufficient controls already exist to assure effective response action without direct government control of a planholder's contractors. Moreover, ADEC is authorized to enter into contracts with private organizations to provide the personnel, equipment, or other services or supplies that may be required to respond to mystery or orphan spills. When private contracting is not feasible, it may establish and maintain the cleanup personnel and equipment which are needed at locations in the state.
- State law requires that tank vessel owners, operators, or charterers hold approved oil discharge prevention and contingency plans in order to do business in Alaska. The planholder must demonstrate the ready availability of sufficient personnel, training, equipment, and other resources to prevent, contain, cleanup, and dispose of spilled oil within the parameters of the state's planning standards.
- To augment its own prevention and response resources, a planholder will necessarily sign agreements with response action contractors. The contractors must be identified and their capabilities described. ADEC may test their proficiency and training during drills and inspections. ADEC will

insure that contractors are contractually obligated to respond as part of its plan approval process.

- A planholder must also demonstrate financial responsibility to assure the adequacy of his response and to pay damages. Possible criminal and civil penalties may also be assessed for an inadequate response.
- A planholder is liable for his negligent acts and omissions in directing a spill response. Likewise, by prematurely demanding that it also control a planholder's contractors, the state will share that liability. It must also be prepared to indemnify or immunize planholders and contractors from liabilities they may face by following state orders. Moreover, during the time that the state issues orders, it should suspend imposition of penalties upon the planholder for failure to implement its plan.
- The United States and the State of Alaska have already been granted the authority to take over and arrange for the removal of spilled oil when circumstances call for it. This is one of the purposes to be served by industry-financed oil spill response funds.
- Under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the U.S. Coast Guard by delegation is authorized to direct all federal, state, and private actions to remove an oil discharge. State control of response action contractors promises uncertainty and conflict during spill responses.
- Being generally required to respond to mystery and orphan spills would greatly increase the liabilities and risks to which RACs would be exposed. What responder will be in a position, in advance, as an additional price to be paid for limited immunity, to agree to provide services to state government without also having a specific contract which establishes the type and nature of response, types of hazardous substances, location, equipment, personnel needs, performance expectations, costs and billing arrangements, and indemnification? If a need for them currently exists, nothing prevents the state or federal government from negotiating "stand by" contracts now.
- Indeed, the State Oil and Hazardous Substance Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan discusses mystery and orphan spills. It provides that whenever a spiller is unknown or a response is inadequate, the state or federal agency having jurisdiction has the authority to "take over the response and recover expenses from the spiller." Para. 411 at 400-14 (May 1991). This is consistent with federal and state law.

- No state requires that response action contractors individually agree, in advance, to accept direct state control and to handle mystery or orphan spills as additional conditions to limited immunity. These conditions will eliminate any hope of general uniformity of liability regimes amongst the various states to better encourage RACs to cross state lines, especially to join in efforts to contain and cleanup major spills.

RECOMMENDATION #7: *The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System ("TAPS") agent should clearly maintain the duty to control and remove pollution within state boundaries related to the transportation of TAPS crude oil.*

Comments:

- This COC recommendation relies upon an erroneous legal opinion. Under federal law, Alyeska and the holders of the grant of right-of-way across Alaska for pipeline construction and operation are not liable for spills from tank vessels. In any event, limited responder immunity is not available for those who are responsible parties.
- Under the comprehensive liability framework created by Congress, vessel owners and operators carrying oil transported through the pipeline are strictly liable, along with the Trans Alaska Liability Fund, for damages, including cleanup costs, resulting from discharges of oil from their vessel.
- None of the seven pipeline companies that own TAPS, or Alyeska which operates it on their behalf, own, operate, or charter tankers; nor do they manage or control them. In addition to the numerous legal and constitutional challenges this recommendation invites, it makes no practical sense: Congress has already imposed liability and financial responsibility for tanker discharges upon owners/operators/charterers; so has the State of Alaska.
- In COC's public meeting on January 31, ADEC testified that there is no confusion regarding who bears this responsibility in Prince William Sound: "we know who the plan holders are, we know who the responsible parties are, we know who the response action contractor is." Moreover, "we have evaluated the capabilities of the response action contractors to respond and evaluated the transition management plan."

- Alyeska has, in fact, accepted a contractual duty to provide prevention and initial response services to planholders. ADEC would not have accepted and approved contingency plans without insuring that Alyeska had accepted that obligation.
- Although it owns royalty oil, the state is not an equity owner of Alyeska's prevention and initial response equipment to appropriate for its use as a regulator. Like any other transportation-related expense, the cost of oil spill preparedness is equitably distributed amongst TAPS shippers.

VIA U.S. MAIL AND FACSIMILE

February 5, 1992

The Honorable Bill Hudson, Chairman
House Committee on Oil and Gas
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801

**Re: HB 196 Impact on Financial Responsibility Requirements for the
Alyeska/Tesoro Oil Spill Response Services Agreement**

Dear Chairman Hudson:

You requested further explanation of the important change made to Alyeska's Oil Spill Response Services Agreement for Prince William Sound ("Agreement") after the legislature enacted HB 196, and adopted limited responder immunity, last year. The amendment created an alternative to the Agreement's \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement that Tesoro was not able to meet. The new alternative to financial responsibility allows companies to enter into an Agreement with Alyeska if there is \$700 million Protection and Indemnity Club ("P&I Club") coverage for a tanker and \$500 million comprehensive general liability ("CGL") insurance coverage for the company itself. Tesoro has been able to utilize this alternative to enter into an Agreement that will expire on June 30, 1992, which is the date the provisions of HB 196 will sunset, unless further action is taken by the legislature.

As you know, Alyeska operates the Trans Alaska Pipeline System on behalf of seven owner companies. Although none of these pipeline companies own, operate, or charter tankers, Alyeska has contracted to provide prevention and initial response services to tank vessel owners/operators/charterers ("shippers") in Prince William Sound. Shippers are required by state and federal laws to provide for personnel and equipment to escort vessels and to respond to tanker spills in Prince William Sound. Alyeska's prevention and initial response services are ancillary services provided to shippers so that they may continue to handle Alaska North Slope crude oil. Up to this point in time, only Alyeska has offered to provide these services. Nothing prevents others from doing so.

February 5, 1991

ADEC has approved the shippers' vessel contingency plans which incorporate Alyeska's Prince William Sound Tanker Spill Prevention and Response Plan ("Plan"). The Plan describes Alyeska's prevention and initial response services. As noted above, shippers have also signed an Agreement for provision of these services by Alyeska. As a contractual matter, shippers must demonstrate financial responsibility to support their contractual commitments, including indemnifying Alyeska against liabilities it faces as a response action contractor. Alyeska must ensure that any shipper with whom it contracts to provide initial response services can provide indemnity for any liability to which Alyeska could be exposed in responding to a spill. Without financial responsibility (self-worth), such promises would, of course, be hollow.

We are aware that there is some concern because the insurance alternative to this financial responsibility requirement totals \$1.2 billion, which is a number that is obviously greater than the original \$1 billion. We believe this concern is based on a misunderstanding of the nature of the insurance alternative. To clarify this matter, we offer two important points. First, Tesoro was not able to meet the original requirement and is able to meet the new alternative. Obviously, the bill served an immediate purpose -- as a result of its enactment, Alyeska and Tesoro avoided the disruptive consequences of a disqualification of Tesoro to receive oil spill response services from Alyeska.

Second, the new alternative does not provide Alyeska the same amount or quality of protection that the original financial responsibility requirement provided. Alyeska decided that this reduction to accommodate Tesoro and others similarly situated was an appropriate risk to take in light of the partial limitation of response action contractor liability achieved through HB 196. Under the original financial responsibility requirement, four companies entered into agreements with Alyeska by demonstrating that they had available net assets in excess of \$1 billion. In order to gain the benefit of these companies' contractual promises to Alyeska, Alyeska only has to establish that the obligation exists. The funds are then available to satisfy the obligation.

Under the new insurance alternative, there are two important differences that illustrate the decreased protection offered to Alyeska by insurance. P&I Club coverage applies to the tanker itself, for the benefit of the tanker owner. P&I Clubs have made efforts to prevent Alyeska from making claims against that coverage for third party liability claims against Alyeska arising out of an oil spill response. In the case of Tesoro, Alyeska has done what it could to create a legal basis to achieve coverage for such claims under the P&I Club policies. The ultimate resolution of

Page 3

Letter to Representative Hudson

February 5, 1991


coverage would only occur after years of expensive litigation. It is possible the courts would determine that the P&I Club coverage provided no or only severely limited benefit to Alyeska. What remains then to provide coverage to Alyeska against third party liability claims is the \$500 million CGL insurance policy, which is one half the original amount of financial responsibility. Unlike financial responsibility, Alyeska's receipt of payment from the individual insurance underwriters that make up the \$500 million total is likely to face the additional hurdle of forcing these underwriters to pay, which involves overcoming defenses to coverage raised by the insurers.

Tesoro elected not to procure the full amount of \$500 million CGL insurance. Instead, Tesoro made up part of that total by a corporate guarantee. As a result, Alyeska's Agreement with Tesoro is even more complicated than what I have described.

Indeed, this is a complicated subject. If you would like more detailed information or the opportunity to discuss this, please contact Paul Richards or myself at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY

By: 
Larry D. Wood
Senior Attorney - External Affairs

cc: Mr. Paul M. Richards

February 5, 1992

Alyeska Financial Responsibility Requirement

Alyeska operates the Trans Alaska Pipeline System on behalf of seven owner companies. Although none of these pipeline companies own, operate, or charter tankers, Alyeska has contracted to provide prevention and initial response services to tank vessel owners/operators/charterers ("shippers") in Prince William Sound. Shippers are required by state and federal laws to provide for personnel and equipment to escort vessels and to respond to tanker spills in Prince William Sound. Alyeska's prevention and initial response services are ancillary services provided to shippers so that they may continue to handle Alaska North Slope crude oil. Up to this point in time, only Alyeska has offered to provide these services. Nothing prevents others from doing so.

ADEC has approved the shippers' vessel contingency plans which incorporate Alyeska's Prince William Sound Tanker Spill Prevention and Response Plan ("Plan"). The Plan describes Alyeska's prevention and initial response services. Shippers have also signed an oil spill response services agreement for provision of these services by Alyeska. As a contractual matter, shippers must demonstrate financial responsibility to support their contractual commitments, including indemnifying Alyeska against liabilities it faces as a response action contractor. Alyeska must ensure that any shipper with whom it contracts to provide initial response services can provide indemnity for any liability to which Alyeska could be exposed in responding to a spill. Without financial responsibility such promises would, of course, be hollow. Financial responsibility (self worth) must be demonstrated in the amount of \$1 billion, but an insurance alternative in the amount of \$1.2 billion is also provided.

The financial responsibility and alternate insurance levels reflect a careful weighing of the risks which Alyeska faces as a responder, even after HB 196 and limited responder immunity passed last year. As you know, the limits of liability, and, importantly, the categories of types of damages which can be paid following an oil spill have increased substantially since 1989.

For example, in addition to removal costs, damages listed in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 include damages to natural resources, real or personal property, subsistence use, lost government revenues, loss of profits and earning capacity, and the cost of additional public services. State law likewise imposes liability for removal and

containment costs, civil penalties, damages related to injury to persons, damage to public and private property, and natural resources, and loss of income and economic benefits.

In addition, recall that Exxon has expended roughly \$4 billion in the costs of containing and cleaning up oil, and resolving federal and state claims associated with the EXXON VALDEZ oil spill. Additional third party claims faced by it, and Alyeska exceed \$50 billion. Ironically, those who would suggest that Alyeska's financial responsibility requirement is "unreasonable," must also agree that it is remarkably low in comparison to Exxon's expenditures to date, and in light of the allegations still facing the defendants in federal and state courts.

Under the Oil Pollution Act, there are certain maximum monetary limits on a spiller for liability related to oil discharges. Financial responsibility must be demonstrated to meet this liability. For example, in the case of a tanker in excess of 3,000 gross tons, the liability limit is \$1,200 per gross ton, or \$10,000,000, whichever is greater. A tanker weighing 200,000 gross tons would have a limit of liability of \$240 million under this federal law. However, the liability limit will not apply in the case of violation of an applicable federal safety, construction, or operating regulation, gross negligence, willful misconduct, or failure or refusal to report an incident, provide reasonable cooperation and assistance, or to refuse to comply with a federal order without sufficient cause. An obvious concern is that, to avoid this limitation, plaintiffs will simply allege that "gross negligence" or the violation of a regulation has occurred as a result of every spill. If the limitation on liability is compromised every time even a minor safety regulation is remotely connected to a spill, the limitation will have little meaning.

Limited exemptions for responders liability for certain damages exist under both federal and state laws. But, there are no limitations for other responder liabilities under federal law. And, under state law, there are no limits on the amount of damages that may be assessed against either a spiller or a response action contractor. Financial responsibility requirements, therefore, are set at arbitrary amounts, in the case of a tank vessel, \$300, per incident, for each barrel of crude oil storage capacity, or \$100,000,000, whichever is greater. Importantly, the financial responsibility apparently extends only to claims asserted by public authorities attributable to cleanup and restoration costs, property damage, assessment of civil penalties, etc.

Thus, using either the federal liability limitation, or the federal and state financial responsibility requirements, as a guide for private parties to establish financial

responsibility requirements in response services agreements would be unhelpful and inappropriate. It would leave a responder unprotected. On the other hand, to promote more certainty when responders and shippers are negotiating the terms of financial responsibility provisions, the legislature may wish to adopt meaningful limitations of liability under state law.

VIA U.S. MAIL AND FACSIMILE

February 4, 1992

Harry R. Bader, Ph.D, Chairman
Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances
3111 C Street, Suite 150
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Re: Limited Responder Immunity in Alaska

Dear Chairman Bader:

We appreciate the opportunity to provide additional information to you and the Council prior to your final deliberations regarding the important issue of responder immunity.

1. Time Limit for Response Immunity

You asked for a recommendation on an appropriate time limit for responder immunity during a response to a spill or threat of a spill. The appropriate duration of the limited responder immunity should extend through the entire response as established by the U.S. government and 17 of 24 coastal states plus the Virgin Islands that have considered the issue. The notion of a time limit is unrealistic given the nature of oil spill response operations; so long as spilled oil remains on water or land, ongoing, expeditious action should be encouraged to remove it. No matter how remote, an "emergency" certainly exists for any community threatened by the impact of oil. In addition, the uncertainty when a time limit begins and ends following any particular "release," may deter prompt and continuous response action for a spill or a threat of spill.

For example, when will an arbitrary time limit begin and end for a mystery or orphan spill? What is the liability of a responder who responds to the report of a threatened spill only to discover a slow leak with no objective indication of when it started? As the arbitrary time limit draws to a close, won't responders be encouraged to withdraw? Will other responders be encouraged to enter the response at that time to insure continuity of personnel and equipment? What is the justification for an artificial barrier if the responder's immunity is only limited and

the original spiller is still financially responsible for any liability which a responder is relieved from?

Mr. Mertz also describes HB 196's time limit as "arbitrary." Indeed, crisis will certainly reign "far fewer days in some cases and far more in others." Page 34, Mertz report. Even California, which is the only other state to consider an arbitrary time limitation, recognizes that the initial 60 day period may have to be extended. In short, we urge the Council to avoid endorsing unnecessary and troublesome limitations upon federal and state efforts to ensure the availability of ample response resources when spills occur.

2. Classification of Responders

We understand that the Council may recommend that responders be classified according to how they are organized and funded: immunity would evidently be limited for some, more limited for others, and perhaps entirely unavailable in one case. As you know, discrimination amongst citizens, be they private or corporate, always calls for constitutional and other legal reviews to insure that principles of equal protection and fundamental fairness are not lost in government's efforts to regulate society.

Before legal analyses would even be undertaken, however, it seems clear that this responder classification proposal, if accepted by the legislature, would virtually insure that entire groups of responders may be unnecessarily driven out of the business. Again, the challenge we face is to support, not destroy or deter, the federal and state comprehensive oil spill response schemes by encouraging effective, prompt response efforts no matter who provides any type of care, assistance, or advice, so long as it is consistent with those schemes or government orders.

Dr. Bader, there is no rational basis for treating responders differently, particularly because response action should be encouraged from any source at any time throughout a release. Again, the spiller and his insurance will still be responsible for responder liabilities that are shielded by the proposed statute. Even under the exigencies of a spill response, a responder will only enjoy limited immunity; therefore, we can be assured that his actions will reflect that concern.

Finally, our materials also stress that Alaska should join with other states to adopt uniform laws in this area for the additional reason to promote uniformity of implementation and interpretation amongst the federal government and coastal states. This will, of course, encourage responders to cross state lines, and to loan

February 4, 1991

equipment and personnel, without suffering delays and uncertainties caused by an unwarranted, restrictive, and, possibly, oppressive limited responder immunity provision in Alaska.

3. Response to ADEC Orders

We understand that, as an apparent price to be paid for limited immunity, the Council may recommend that some response organizations be required, in advance, to agree to accept ADEC orders to respond to mystery or orphan spills in their area of operation.

As you may know, the United States and the State of Alaska have already been granted the authority to take over and arrange for the removal of spilled oil when circumstances call for it. This, of course, is one of the purposes to be served by industry-funded oil spill response funds. We are aware of no situation in Alaska where responders have purposefully failed or refused to provide services for the federal or state governments when requested to undertake or complete a spill response. Consequently, what justification is driving this proposal? Is it so important, and the prospects for the "worst case scenario" erroneously described in some reports to COC so imminent, as to require further limitation of responder immunity in our state? What responder will be in a position, in advance, to agree to provide services to the federal or state governments without also having a specific contract which establishes the type and nature of response, location, equipment and personnel needs, costs and billing arrangements, etc.? If a need for them exists, nothing prevents the state or federal government from negotiating those contracts now.

In short, requiring this and additional requirements as part of the price to be paid by responders for limited immunity promises instead to create confusion, uncertainty, and a reluctance to take action when oil spills occur.

4. The Pipeline Owner Companies Are Not Liable for Tanker Spills

We understand that COC may further recommend that the pipeline owner companies, as holders of the federal right of way permit, and Alyeska, as their operating agent, be directed under state law to respond to any tanker spill in Prince William Sound. We have already explained at some length that Mr. Frank's view that TAPAA already imposes such liability is flatly wrong, but we understand that special legislation may be recommended to "clarify" the matter and adopt Mr. Frank's view as a matter of state law.

Our materials explain that Alyeska operates the Trans Alaska Pipeline System on behalf of seven pipeline companies which own it. None of these own, operate, or charter tankers. Under federal and state law, tanker owners/operators/charterers are responsible for tanker operations, and Alyeska cannot and does not manage or control them. Provision has been made by tanker operators to provide contingency plans and to demonstrate financial responsibility for those operations. In addition to the constitutional and legal issues presented by this proposal, we urge that the Council also recognize that it entirely ignores the comprehensive liability, response, and financial responsibility regime established by Congress and the legislature for tanker operations in our state and elsewhere.

As we have also explained, Alyeska does provide initial response services to tanker owners/operators/charterers, and that this service is described in a plan and in response services agreements. As a contractual matter, tanker owners/operators/charterers must demonstrate financial responsibility to support their contractual commitments, including indemnifying Alyeska against liabilities it faces as a response action contractor. Alyeska must ensure that a shipper with whom it contracts to provide initial response services can provide indemnity for any liability to which Alyeska could be exposed in responding to a spill. Without financial responsibility such promises would, of course, be hollow. Financial responsibility (self worth) must be demonstrated in the amount of \$1 billion, and Tesoro has been permitted to support its contractual capabilities with a combination of insurance and a corporate guarantee in the total amount of \$1.2 billion.

We explained that, after enactment of HB 196 last year, Alyeska created this alternative to its \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement. The insurance may consist of \$700 million P&I marine insurance coverage for the vessel and \$500 million comprehensive general liability coverage that names Alyeska as an additional insured. There is no way that Tesoro could provide a corporate guarantee, bond, or letter of credit, as originally required by Alyeska's financial responsibility standards, for either \$1 billion or \$1.2 billion. Because of uncertainties associated with coverage of contractor claims against vessel marine insurance, and the added potential difficulty of enforcing insurance coverage generally, the quality of Alyeska's financial protection has diminished substantially. Yet, the parties reached this practical solution to a difficult problem after and because HB 196 passed last year. This insurance alternative will expire when HB 196 sunsets at the end of June, 1992.

Nonetheless, the Council has indicated that it may view this arrangement as "unreasonable," and is concerned that Alyeska may use limited responder immunity to drive this and other TAPS trade tanker operations "out of business." Nothing could be farther from the truth. Alyeska worked diligently with Tesoro to reach a solution to keep it in business, and we need legislative assistance to keep that solution in place.

Although certainly adjusted in Tesoro case because of a perceived reduction in the risks faced by Alyeska when HB 196 passed, the financial responsibility level reflects a careful weighing of the risks which remain. As you know, the limits of liability, and, importantly, the categories of types of damages which can be paid following an oil spill have increased substantially since 1989.

For example, in addition to removal costs, damages listed in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 include damages to natural resources, real or personal property, subsistence use, lost government revenues, loss of profits and earning capacity, and additional public services. State law likewise includes removal and containment costs, civil penalties, and damages related to damage or injury to persons and to public and private property, natural resources, and loss of income and economic benefits. Limited exemptions for responders liability for certain damages exist under both federal and state laws.

In addition, recall that Exxon has expended roughly \$4 billion in the costs of containing and cleaning up oil, and resolving federal and state claims associated with the EXXON VALDEZ spill. Additional third party claims faced by it, and Alyeska exceed \$50 billion. Ironically, those who suggest that Alyeska's financial responsibility requirement is "unreasonable," must also agree that it is remarkably low in comparison to Exxon's expenditures to date, and in light of the allegations still facing the defendants in federal and state courts.

Under the Oil Pollution Act, there are certain maximum monetary limits on a spiller for liability related to oil discharges. Financial responsibility must be demonstrated to meet this liability. For example, in the case of a tanker in excess of 3,000 gross tons, the liability limit is \$1,200 per gross ton, or \$10,000,000, whichever is greater. A tanker weighing 200,000 gross tons would have a limit of liability of \$240 million under this federal law. However, the liability limit will not apply in the case of violation of an applicable federal safety, construction, or operating regulation, gross negligence, willful misconduct, or failure or refusal to report an incident, provide reasonable cooperation and assistance, or to refuse to comply with a federal order without sufficient cause. An obvious concern is that, to avoid this limitation,

plaintiffs will simply allege that "gross negligence" or the violation of a regulation has occurred as a result of every spill. If the limitation on liability is compromised every time even a minor safety regulation is remotely connected to a spill, the limitation will have little meaning.

And, under state law, there are no limits on the amount of damages that may be assessed against either a spiller or a response action contractor. Financial responsibility requirements, therefore, are set at arbitrary amounts, in the case of a tank vessel, \$300, per incident, for each barrel of crude oil storage capacity, or \$100,000,000, whichever is greater. Importantly, the financial responsibility apparently extends only to claims asserted by public authorities attributable to cleanup and restoration costs, property damage, assessment of civil penalties, etc.


Thus, using either the federal liability limitation, or the federal and state financial responsibility requirements, as a guide to establish financial responsibility requirements contained in response services agreements is unhelpful and inappropriate. It would leave a responder unprotected.

On the other hand, to promote more certainty when responders and responsible parties are negotiating the terms of financial responsibility provisions, COC may wish to recommend that the legislature adopt meaningful limitations of liability under state law. If enacted, those limitations would be reflected in Alyeska's financial responsibility requirements.

We trust that this information will be useful as the Council considers what recommendations it will present to the legislature. Please let us know if there is additional information which we can provide to assist those efforts.

Sincerely yours,

ALYESKA PIPELINE SERVICE COMPANY

By: 
Larry D. Wood
Senior Attorney - External Affairs

cc: COC Members
Michele D. Brown, Esq.

January 30, 1992

Improving Good Samaritan Immunity for Oil Spill Response in Alaska

Good Samaritan laws encourage action to save lives and property during emergencies.

Alaska laws limit liability of individuals or organizations who provide emergency assistance. Examples include:

- Rendering care at accident scenes.
- Providing equipment or services requested by a police agency, fire department, or other governmental agency during a state of emergency.

Similarly, the federal Oil Pollution Act of 1990 ("OPA '90") and Alaska's HB 196 adopted responder immunity laws to encourage "immediate and effective" oil spill response action.

Without liability immunity, financial risks and liability exposures would deter cleanup contractors and cooperatives from prompt, aggressive action.

However, without legislative action this session, HB 196's provision for limited immunity against certain claims under state law will "sunset" in July 1992.

To help insure that effective and substantial resources are readily available to contain and cleanup oil spills, the state's responder immunity law should be improved and made permanent.

Although its scope is also limited, the federal response action immunity provision in OPA '90 (33 USC § 1321(b)(1)(c)(4)) is the best model.

To date, the Virgin Islands and 18 of the 24 coastal states (75%) have adopted virtually identical laws.

OPA '90 limits liability under federal law for response action in federal waters if it is consistent with the National Contingency Plan or federal directions. Responders are still liable for personal injuries and wrongful deaths, or if they are grossly negligent or engage in willful misconduct. Importantly, the responsible vessel owner, operator, or charterer is liable for any removal costs or damages that responders are relieved of.