ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1991-1992 8672
7186 HOUSE RESOURCES

added to include plans for other methods of well control in addition to relief wells.

-- To modify the review procedures for oil spill contingency plans related to the Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP). DEC regulations do not require a plan holder to go through full ACMP review, but during the decision-making process DEC will itself respond to the comments of coastal districts, regional citizens' advisory councils, and the Departments of Natural Resources and Fish and Game. DEC decisions can still be appealed by coastal districts through administrative procedures.

-- To follow the lead of the U.S. Coast Guard not to allow companies to use foreign assets as proof of their ability to self-insure against losses and damages resulting from oil spills. A provision is being added to the regulations to allow waiving working capital requirements for operators who conclusively show their financial strength through other means such as bond ratings.

For further information, or a copy of the regulations package, contact Lynn Kent, DEC Spill Prevention, Planning and Management, in Juneau at 465-2630.

# # #

OIL SPILL PREVENTION, RESPONSE AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

NEW STANDARDS FOR CONTINGENCY PLANS

OIL TERMINAL FACILITIES must plan to contain, control and clean up a discharge equal to the capacity of the largest tank at the facility within 72 hours.

CRUDE OIL TANK VESSELS OR BARGES:

- vessels smaller than 500,000 barrels of cargo storage capacity must plan to contain or control and clean up a 60,000 barrel discharge
- Vessels with more than 500,000 barrel capacity must plan to contain or control and clean up a 300,000 barrel discharge
- All crude oil tank vessels or barges must demonstrate access to other equipment outside the region of operation to clean up a realistic maximum discharge and the ability to have that equipment deployed and operating at the discharge site within 72 hours.

NON-CRUDE TANK VESSELS OR BARGES—

- must plan to contain or control the greatest amount of the total oil storage capacity of the vessel
- must clean up the discharge within the shortest possible time consistent with minimizing damage to the environment.

The Regulations Say:

Regulations written to implement HB 567 tackle spill preparedness through the spill prevention and response plans that oil facilities and vessels are required to submit for State approval. The regulation now requires plans from onshore exploration and production facilities and pipelines in addition to oil tnals, tank vessels and oil barges. Plus, higher standards are required of *all* plans in three major ways:

Planning Standards — "Response Planning Standards" are one of the cornerstones of the new regulations, specifying the size of spill each vessel or facility operator must be prepared to clean up within 48 hours or 72 hours. The Response Planning Standard varies by amount of oil stored or transported, while response time depends upon type of facility.

Response Planning Standards directly affect the amounts—and thus costs—of equipment, supplies and personnel that companies must keep ready at all times in case of a spill.

Prevention — While vessels and facility operators have always been expected to prevent spills, the State now requires prevention plans and specific prevention measures that must be taken. The state will also consider the reduced risks of companiesthat incorporate significant voluntary prevention measures. This means that companies employing preventative techniques such as double hulls, for example, may have their required Response Planning Standard adjusted downward according to formulae written into regulations.

Financial Responsibility—Operators of vessels and facilities handling oil must give proof that they possess the financial resources to pay for cleanup and damages from potential spills. The regulations have been revised to broaden the acceptable forms of proof to include letters of credit and protection and indemnity clubs..

HB567 requires vessels and facilities to comply by June 1, 1992. Regulations are projected for adoption in December, 1991.Plan holders are required to upgrade their contingency plans as may be necessary to meet their new requirements and sumit any amendments in time to receive approval by June 1, 1992.

Alaska
Department of
Environmental
Conservation

DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA'S OIL SPILL REGULATIONS

Alaska
Department of
Environmental
Conservation

1989 MARCH 24
Exxon-Valdez oil spill

1990 JUNE 27, 1990
House Bill 567 takes affect

1991 MARCH 4, 1991
Mail out working draft of regulations for C-plan standards and workshop schedule

MARCH 15
Distribute working draft of regulations for financial responsibility

MARCH 19
First meeting of HB 567 work group

MAR. 20 - MAY 2
Hold informational workshops at 18 locations

JUNE 1
Incorporate public comments
Amendments to response plans due

JULY 8
Complete draft prevention regulations
Issue public notice for all regulations

JULY 8-AUGUST 21
Hold public hearings on all regulationss

AUGUST 21-OCTOBER 10
Incorporate final revisions

OCTOBER 10
Department of Law review begins

NOVEMBER
Lt. Governor review

DECEMBER
Final adoption of regulations on or about Dec. 1. Effective date 30 days later.

1992 FEBRUARY 1, 1992
Owners/operators complete amendments to response plans

PROOF OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Type of Facility	Before June 1, 1991	After June 1, 1991
OIL TERMINALS		
Oil Terminals/Crude (5,000 barrel (bbl.) and up)	$10 per bbl. of storage capacity or $1,000,000, whichever is greater, $50,000,000 maximum	$50,000,000 per incident
Oil Terminals/Non-Crude (10,000 bbl. and up)	Same as above	$25 per bbl. of storage capacity or $1,000,000, whichever is greater, $50,000,000 maximum
Oil Terminals/Crude and Non-Crude combined	Same as above	If mostly crude - $50,000,000 per incident. If mostly non-crude - $25 per bbl. of total capacity
PIPELINES & EXPLORATION FACILITIES		
Pipelines and Offshore Exploration or Production	$35,000,000 per incident	$50,000,000 per incident
Onshore Production	EXEMPT	$20,000,000 per incident
Onshore Exploration	EXEMPT	$5,000,000 per incident
VESSELS & BARGES		
Tank Vessel & Oil Barge/Crude	Trans-Alaska Pipeline related: $14,000,000. Other tankers: per Clean Water Act or $20,000,000, whichever is greater. Other barges: per CWA or $1,000,000.	$300 per bbl. per incident storage capacity or $100,000,000, whichever is greater
Tank Vessel & Barge/ Non-Crude	Same as above	$100 per bbl. storage capacity per incident or $1,000,000, whichever is greater, $35,000,000 maximum

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Alaska Coastal Management Program 50-Day Review Schedule

1. Applicant submits necessary paperwork to coordinating agency. Completeness check done.
2. Day 1 of review starts when packet declared complete. Packet distributed to all resource agencies and affected coastal districts.
3. Additional information may be requested during first 25 days. Clock may be stopped during this time.
4. Comments must be to primary reviewing agency by Day 34.
5. Coordinating agency develops *proposed* consistency determination by Day 44.
6. Reviewers have 5 days to request elevation of proposed consistency determination.
7. A conclusive consistency determination issued on Day 50 if not elevated.
8. Agency permits issued within 5 days after final determination.
9. If elevated to Directors, 15 days given to reach consensus.
10. If elevated to Commissioners, 15 days given to reach final decision.



CORRECTION

THIS DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED
TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY

Alaska Coastal Management Program 50-Day Review Schedule



1. Applicant submits necessary paperwork to coordinating agency. Completeness check done.
2. Day 1 of review starts when packet declared complete. Packet distributed to all resource agencies and affected coastal districts.
3. Additional information may be requested during first 25 days. Clock may be stopped during this time.
4. Comments must be to primary reviewing agency by Day 34.
5. Coordinating agency develops *proposed* consistency determination by Day 44.
6. Reviewers have 5 days to request elevation of proposed consistency determination
7. A conclusive consistency determination issued on Day 50 if not elevated.
8. Agency permits issued within 5 days after final determination.
9. If elevated to Directors, 15 days given to reach consensus.
10. If elevated to Commissioners, 15 days given to reach final decision.

Oil Spill Contingency Plan Review Schedule Under HB567 Regulations



Vessel Response Planning Standards (RPS) vs Risk



Crude Oil
Response Plan



*Response planning standards
must be met by the holder of

Vessel tandards*

cleanup standards that

Alaska State Legislature

REPRESENTATIVE BILL HUDSON

State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska
99801-1182
(907)465-3744 or 4991

COMMITTEES
CHAIR
House Special Committee on Oil & Gas
MEMBER
Resources
Transportation
International Trade & Tourism
FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE:
Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

February 19,. 1992

Mr. Charles E. Cole,
Attorney General
Department of Law
Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

Enclosed you will find a sponsor substitute for HB 540, relating to limited liability for response action contractors.

The original bill, HB 540, referenced AS 46.04.030. The sponsor substitute correctly references AS 46.04.200 and AS 46.04.210 on line 12 of page 1 and line 1 of page 2.

SSHB 540 is scheduled for a hearing in the House Special Committee on Oil and Gas on Monday, February 24, 1992 in Room 124 of the Capitol Building.

Accordingly, your earliest possible response to the joint letter by myself and Representative Mike Navarre of February 18, will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully,

Bill Hudson

Enclosure

Alaska State Legislature
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Official Business

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

February 18, 1982

Mr. Charles E. Cole,
Attorney General
Department of Law
State of Alaska
Room 412 Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

The Citizens' Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances recently presented their report as required by Section 11 of HB 196, Chapter 92 SLA 1991. I am enclosing for your convenient reference a copy of that report.

Recommendation number seven, on page 11 states: "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."

It will be very much appreciated if you would review this recommendation, as well as the Council's rationale.

It is our understanding that there are contracts between Alyeska Pipeline Service Company and the state of Alaska for the state right-of-way agreements, between Alyeska Pipeline Service Company and the federal government for the federal right-of-way agreements, and between Alyeska Pipeline Service Company and the federal government for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act.

After your review of the report and the various state and federal contractual agreements, it would be very much appreciated if you would prepare a legal opinion discussing Alyeska's duty to control and remove pollution within state boundaries related to the transportation of TAPS crude.

We are also enclosing a copy of a document entitled "Memorandum of Alyeska Pipeline Service Company Regarding Liability Under Trans Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act for Oil Spills From Vessels." We believe your review of this memorandum will be necessary as you prepare your response to the questions we have posed.

Further, we would appreciate your discussion of the Legislature's passage of a statute to address Alyeska's duty to respond, and how it would affect the existing contractual agreements between Alyeska and the state of Alaska and the federal government.

Additionally, for the purposes of limiting liability for actions they take in spill response efforts, it has been suggested that response action contractors be categorized as 1. volunteers, 2. professional independent operators, 3. industry spill response cooperative organizations, and 4. industries' own spill response operations, specifically Alyeska Pipeline Service Company.

We would like your review of this recommendation. Is there an equal protection problem? Since the spiller is held strictly liable, is it in the state's best interest to delineate who is acting as a volunteer, especially given the fact that Alyeska Pipeline Service Company considers itself a volunteer response action contractor?

Finally, we am enclosing a copy of legislation introduced this morning, which we anticipate will be scheduled for committee deliberation as soon as possible. Accordingly, your written response at your earliest possible convenience will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully,

Bill Hudson

Mike Navarre

Enclosures

Alaska State Legislature

REPRESENTATIVE BILL HUDSON

State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska
99801-1182
(907)465-3744 or 4991

COMMITTEES

CHAIR
House Special Committee on Oil & Gas

MEMBER
Resources
Transportation
International Trade & Tourism

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE:
Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

February 18, 1992

Mr. John Sandor, Commissioner
Alaska Department of Environmental
Conservation
410 Willoughby Avenue, Suite 105
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Commissioner Sandor:

The Citizen's Oversight Council on Oil and Other Hazardous Substances recently presented their report as required by Section 11 of HB 196, Chapter 92 SLA 1991. I am enclosing for your convenient reference a copy of that report.

There are several recommendations set forth specifically addressing the issue of the state of Alaska's providing for certification of response action contractors. Specifically, recommendations two through six discuss response action contractor certification and the Council has set forth rationales for each of those recommendations.

I would appreciate your review of the issue of certification of response action contractors by the state of Alaska.

Please discuss the current efforts now underway by the task force comprised of coastal states, the public, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the oil industry to implement a national standard for certification of response action contractors, as required by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. Specifically, I would like to know how far along the process is, and by when will the task force have in place certification standards?

It would be very much appreciated if you would provide in detail the task force, how it was organized, what states participate, the missions and goals, and any other aspects you feel will be beneficial to the Legislature as we consider pending legislation to limit the liability of response action contractors.

I am also enclosing a copy of legislation introduced this morning. I anticipate this legislation will be heard as soon as possible. Accordingly, your written response at your earliest possible convenience will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully,

Bill

Bill Hudson

Enclosures

Alaska State Legislature

REPRESENTATIVE BILL HUDSON

State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska
99801-1182
(907)465-3744 or 4991

COMMITTEES

CHAIR
House Special Committee on Oil & Gas

MEMBER
Resources
Transportation
International Trade & Tourism

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE:
Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

February 18, 1992

D. E. Ciancaglini,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard
Commander, Seventeenth Coast
Guard District
Box 25517
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Admiral Ciancaglini:

The Alaska State Legislatur currently has before it the issue of limiting the liability of response action contractors who respond to marine oil spills. I am enclosing a copy of legislation introduced this morning.

It is my understanding that the U.S. Coast Guard, under provisions set forth in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, is currently in the process of developing national standards to certify response action contractors.

Please discuss in detail the current efforts by the Coast Guard to establish such a certification program.

Additionally, I would appreciate your discussing in detail, the national contingency plan's requirements of the Marine Spill Response Corporation and how MSRC would be dispatched to respond to an oil spill in Alaska. As you know, MSRC has not placed one of the regional response centers in Alaska, and I am deeply concerned about the hundreds of miles of unprotected coast lines in Southeast Alaska and Western Alaska.

Additionally, I would appreciate your discussing in detail, the national contingency plan's requirements of the Ship Escort Response Vessels (SERV) and how SERV would be dispatched to respond to an oil spill by a tanker carrying TAPS crude from Prince William Sound to Cook Inlet as well as how the national contingency plan treats an offshore tanker spill on the down track followed by these crude oil laden tankers enroute to Lower 48 terminals.

I will be scheduling this legislation for a hearing in the House Special Committee on Oil and Gas as soon as possible. Accordingly, your written response at your earliest possible convenience will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully,

BH

Bill Hudson, Chair

Enclosures

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 (l) 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.

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

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

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.

EVALUATION, PREQUALIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OF OIL SPILL RESPONSE CONTRACTORS

NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING ISSUES: The following issues are submitted for discussion and/or resolution by the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee:

* why oil spill response contractor certification is being considered;

* the provisions of OPA 90 which provide for certification of prequalified response contractors;

* the criteria and factors to be used in evaluating a response contractor's overall capability to respond;

* the standard(s) to which contractors can be prequalified and the mechanisms for certification, inspection, validation and enforcement; and,

* the benefits and costs expected from prequalification and certification of oil spill response contractors.

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION:

A requirement of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (§311(j)(5)), is that the owner or operator of a tank vessel prepare and submit a comprehensive, spill response plan for U.S. Coast Guard approval. Paragraph (C)(iii) of that section, requires that owners/operators "identify, and ensure by contract or other means approved by the President the availability of private personnel and equipment necessary to remove...a worst case discharge" from the environment. For a tank vessel, "worst case discharge" is defined as a total loss of cargo in adverse weather. For the purposes of this rulemaking, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 311(C)(2), the USCG will address all spills in U.S. waters, not just those of "worst case" volume.

The intent of these requirements is to compel forward planning and to ensure that necessary existing resources - trained personnel, vital equipment, communications, finances, etc. - are available, operable and adequate for a future incident.

Developing response plans to meet regulatory requirements and to facilitate the rapid and effective cleanup of a major oil spill requires that there be some established standards of performance for equipment and contractor selection. Without such standards, and some means of certifying those contractors who meet them, there is no way for a tank vessel owner or operator to identify appropriate resources, or to select those contractual resources with whom he is required, by OPA 90, to establish a contractual relationship.

From a regulatory point of view, Coast Guard authority to approve or disapprove response plans carries a great responsibility to make that determination objectively. Establishing response requirements and defining standards of adequacy must be consistent throughout the United States. It cannot be determined locally. In the current regulatory and contractual environment, neither the USCG, nor the vessel owners can meet the intent of the law.

The provisions of Section 311(j)(5)(C)(iii), when implemented, can have important benefits to oil transportation interests and to the contracting industry. First, requiring owners/operators to have contractual relationships with oil spill response resources creates a demand for qualified contractors and provides an incentive to vessel owners to contract with the best value. It may involve both the vessel owners and the response industry in a symbiotic pursuit of better response capabilities. Second, by requiring contractual relationships with prequalified resources only for response plan approval the regulations can effectively limit the supply of acceptable contractors. While it is not necessary for there to be financial consideration in a contractual relationship, altering the supply-demand relationship makes it likely and may provide a means of funding contractor capitalization of response resources in exchange for guaranteed response to an oil spill.

Congress statutorily required that adequate resources reside in the private sector, not the public sector. Existing private resources in the United States include contractors ranging from small, established, waste-oil contractors and waterfront services to major hazardous waste contractors, marine spill contractors and OPA 90-inspired ventures such as NRC and a major industry cooperative, MSRC. Funding for private resources comes from subsidies by member organizations, as is the case with oil spill cooperatives, or from for-profit business activity. Ultimately, all funding comes from revenues and profits.

The existing state of the response industry (generally pre-OPA-90) is one that has developed to take advantage of profitable, routine-spill opportunities without risking the financial future of the enterprise by capitalizing for the unpredictable anomaly of a large spill. Without the requirement for (1) contractual relationships between owners and response contractors or cooperatives, (2) identifying means (i.e. certification) for selecting adequate resources and (3) a mechanism for profiting from response capability improvement there is no incentive for the private sector to improve beyond its existing status. If there were it would have already have done so.

The two most important resources in a contractor/cooperative's inventory are response equipment and trained people. Standardization of response equipment has been undertaken by Committee F20 of the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM). ASTM's charter includes the standardization of services, as well as products, and may include contractor performance standards. Because ASTM is a voluntary, consensus organization, however, it works slowly and will require 1-3 years to publish final standards for reference by the regulations. Any standards which develop in response to OPA 90 initiatives have scant chance of adoption in time to assist owners/operators or the USCG in meeting the response plan deadlines.

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION/RESOLUTION:

Issue 3 - Contractor Prequalification and Certification

* Standards. The most useful standards for contractor/cooperative selection and reliability are performance related - i.e. how much oil recovery/dispersal/disposal/etc. capacity does the organization have.

Which contractor/cooperative capabilities can be measured and standardized?

On what should those standards be based?

How can they be developed in time to meet the statutory deadline, particularly given the time required by ASTM, or any other consensus organization, to issue standards?

* Certification or licensing. Licensing of marine spill response contractors requires a bureaucratic organization to set standards, monitor compliance and enforce regulations. It requires direct government action to prequalify and approve contractors. Of necessity, it establishes a new bureaucratic process to accept applications and fees, amend rules, and process and enforce the conditions of the license. A disadvantage of licensing is that once bureaucracy establishes licensing standards they may become inflexible and fail to keep pace with the development of technology. Eventually, inflexible licensing standards could serve to inhibit the industry whose very development we wish to stimulate.

Certification to consensus standards, on the other hand, is encouraged by the Federal Government (OMB Circular 119 and USCG instructions) and provides flexibility by involving already existing, private sector organizations with charters which call for mandatory, periodic review of standards to maintain currency.

Issue questions include:

Who should certify contractual resources?

Should there be several levels of certification to address different spill volumes and requirements and to consider the variety of contractors and cooperatives already in existence? If so, how many certification levels should there be and on what capabilities/requirements should they be based?

How should the following be weighted in certifying contractors: spill and exercise performance, inventory ownership, financial capacity, managerial skills, previous history of operational performance, (others?)?

Must a contractor/cooperative own necessary equipment in order to be certified or may an enforceable, contractual guarantee of resource availability suffice for certification?

Given that certification is not instantaneous, what can be done to facilitate prequalification and identification of appropriate and acceptable response resources until there is a workable certification system?

If certification of contractors is partially based on standardized equipment how can existing, non-standardized resources be "grandfathered" to consider its existing and continued value and usefulness but also promote the adoption of better, more capable equipment?

* Certification validation and enforcement: OFFICE OF MERCHANT MARINE SAFETY INSTRUCTION 16703.1 provides guidance on self-certification/attestation and other innovative regulatory techniques. Underwriters Laboratories and American Bureau of Shipping are both pursuing registration as "agents" of the International Standards Organization and provide quality and reliability services for a fee.

Either of the two bodies above, Federal and state agencies or a combination could be used for inspection, verification of inspection and/or validation of continued certification. The least expensive and most effective means is probably one which requires government oversight but not routine inspection by the Coast Guard at the contractor level.

Should the response industry be permitted or encouraged to measure itself with regular oversight and enforcement?

If not, how should the inspection, verification and validation process be managed?

Who should be responsible for what portions?

Given the requirement for a national standard, what role should State governments play?

What should the contractor/cooperative community's role be?

If we allow self inspection/attestation how should the Federal government manage quality assurance?

How should the process be funded?

Issue 2G - Overall capabilities of response resources identified in response plan

- OPA 90 amendments require the vessel owner to identify, and ensure by contract or other means approved by the Coast Guard, the availability of private personnel and equipment sufficient to respond to a worst case discharge to the maximum extent practicable.

- Meeting this will require either:

  - a written contractual agreement with a response contractor guaranteeing personnel and equipment availability and stipulating response times within specified geographic areas;

  - certification that the required personnel and equipment resources are owned and/or operated by the vessel owner/operator and are available within stipulated response times within specified geographic areas; or

  - active membership in a local or regional oil spill removal organization that has identified personnel and equipment available within stipulated response times over specified geographic areas.

- The contractor's overall capability to respond, both existing and projected, must be considered when setting the "maximum extent practicable" planning standard.

- Equipment and personnel availability varies between for-profit contractors, not-for-profit cooperatives, or other organizations such as Marine Spill Response Corporation or the National Response Corporation. No one organization has the capability to respond on their own to a worst case discharge.

- Response resource capability assessment needs to account for relationships between commercial resources. These relationships need to be contractual to be acceptable for inclusion in a response plan.

- Contractor/co-op response overall capability is based on a number of factors. These include the availability of containment and recovery equipment, both in inventory and through cooperative or contracting arrangements; required support services such as aircraft, temporary oil storage devices, vehicles, boats, etc and the availability of personnel trained to OSHA HAZWOPER standards in 29 CFR 1910.120.

Each factor has to taken into account when evaluating resource capability.

- Issue 3 related to contractor certification discusses this in more detail.

United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

February 3, 1992

The Honorable Bill Hudson
Alaska House of Representatives
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Bill:

Thanks for the copy of your letter to Commandant Kime and your suggestion that the Coast Guard Auxiliary be expanded to include marine oil spill response. Certainly the work done by the commercial fishermen during the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill proved to be invaluable in preventing that disaster from reaching even greater heights.

I have contacted the Coast Guard to inquire as to their response to you on this concept. You may also be interested to know that I helped draft provisions that were included in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA) to help address the concern that you are raising.

Under section 4202 of the OPA (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)) tank vessels will not be able to operate off the coast of the United States or call on U.S. ports after August 18, 1993, without having onboard a vessel response plan approved by the Coast Guard. In order to approve a vessel response plan, the Coast Guard must determine that the vessel operator has, or has enforceable contracts for, sufficient personnel and equipment to respond to the maximum extent practicable to the loss of the vessel's entire cargo in adverse weather conditions. In addition, the Coast Guard must ensure that the region has available to it sufficient personnel and equipment to effectively supplement the vessel owner's resources to in fact handle the loss of the vessel's entire cargo.

If you have any questions concerning the provisions of the OPA, please contact Earl Comstock of my staff at (202) 224-3004.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

TED STEVENS

U.S. Department of Transportation
United States Coast Guard

Commandant
U.S. Coast Guard

From: Commandant
To: All Flag Officers

Subj: CONTRACTOR IMMUNITY PROVISION; STATE OIL SPIL

1. Within the past few months a number of State le have considered measures designed to provide limite from certain types of liability for certain persons oil spill removal actions. In some instances local offices have been requested to provide agency views written or oral form to State legislatures or indiv legislators.

2. In order to assure consistancy in the position response to such requests, the points outlined belo used in providing Coast Guard views on legislative pertaining to limited immunity for oil spill remova

- The availability of a viable private sector respond to oil spills and their threats is an essential element of a national oil pollution system.

- During the course of Congressional delibera associated with the enactment of the Oil Pollu 1990, the oil spill response industry stressed importance of limited immunity to its viabilit

- As a result of the industry's presentation Congress provided a limited immunity respecting "for removal costs and damages which result fr taken or omitted to be taken in the course of cara, assistance, or advice consistent with the Contingency Plan or as otherwise directed by t

- The Coast Guard supports the principle of l immunity under State law respecting liability costs and damages to the extent that such immu necessary to assure a broad-based private sect capability. The Coast Guard urges that State provisions be as consistent as possible with t immunity provision.

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 harmscaused 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: <u>The statement is factually incorrect</u>. 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 <u>outside</u> 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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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 <u>not</u> apply to the responsible party, or for acts under CERCLA,

4. It should <u>not</u> 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 tieing 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.

MSRC
Marine Spill Response Corporation

John D. Costello
President

July 26, 1991

Mr. John A. Sandor
Commissioner
Department of Environmental Conservation
P.O. Box O
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

1350 I Street, NW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005 Telephone 202 408 5700 Fax 202 371 0401

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

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.

Alyeska pipeline
SERVICE COMPANY

1835 SOUTH BRAGAW STREET, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99512 TELEPHONE (907) 279-1011 TELEX 090 25 197

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

LDW56/cas

Alyeska pipeline
SERVICE COMPANY

1835 SOUTH BRAGAW STREET ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99512. TELEPHONE (907) 278-1611 TELEX 090-25-127

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.

***

DRAFT February 27, 1992

[Preamble Language]

Contractor Certification Program

a. Purpose and Scope

This regulation establishes a response contractor certification program. It has two major purposes.

First, many spill responders are expected to be named in multiple vessel and facility response plans, and the preparers of those plans need a common basis by which the responders will be measured and credited. Spill contractors' response services must be matched to the plan holder's requirements. Certification allows plan preparers to know in advance the value the plan reviewer will give for a particular contractor's capabilities. Plan preparers must assemble a sufficient number and mix of contractors to satisfy their response planning responsibilities. In addition, certification will allow contractors to know what credit their capabilities will be given, so they can better present or market their services. Contractor certification also will allow the contractor's capabilities to be evaluated and credited on a fair, consistent and efficient basis.

A second major purpose of certification is to verify that response resources do in fact exist and are available from that contractor. The plan holder has a responsibility to verify a contractor's capability and claims, because the plan holder is responsible for performance under the response plan. The public purpose of certification is to better assure that the increased response capability required by OPA to help protect the environment from the threat of oil spills does, in fact, come about.

Contractor certification does not in any way relieve the plan holder of the plan holder's responsibility to carefully evaluate and select competent contractors. Certification is not a generalized "seal of approval" or guarantee of performance. Contractor certification is not intended to establish professional standards or provide a judgment of the many important but unquantifiable factors that would be necessary to establish an overall evaluation of a contractor's competence and skill.

Certification is simply a process by which the President's designee (e.g., the Coast Guard) will verify the existence of certain "facts" – i.e., management structure, personnel, and the inventory of response equipment, -- and, where possible, assign a particular "quantitative value" to that inventory for purposes of relating specific contractor's response services to a plan holder's particular spill size. Certification must be based whenever possible on objective and quantifiable measures. However, certain important subjective factors must be identified by the contractor in the contractor's application to provide a clearer understanding of a contractor's capabilities.

The proposed regulation reflects this intent in the definition of the term "certification". One key element of that definition is that certification is a process. Response contractors, to be cited in vessel response plans, must first file an application with the Coast Guard, identifying the service being offered, the type, quantity and location of equipment, number, training and qualifications of personnel, including corporate and individual spill response experience, management structure and certain other information about associated support. This information is factual in nature, and therefore subject to straightforward verification.

The certification definition also recognizes that certification is fundamentally the responsibility of the President under OPA-90. The President has delegated this responsibility to the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard may use other organizations to assist it in the certification process. However, the responsibility for certification remains a governmental one, because certification derives from the President's responsibility to review and approve vessel and facility response plans.

The definition of "certification" refers to the assignment of one or more "Response Values," where possible, for each of the contractor's designated response services. The translation of the type, location and quantity of equipment and personnel into a quantified capability for response is inherently a matter of judgment, particularly given the recognized limitations in spill response technology and variability in the types and conditions of any particular spill.

Each oil spill, particularly any large spill, is unique. The capability needed in a particular response will vary, involving dozens of factors, some of which cannot be accurately measured or predicted. For evaluation and quantification purposes, assumptions must be made regarding these factors. Many of these assumptions may not prove accurate or valid in any particular spill response. Many assumptions also are beyond the control of a particular responder, just as in the analogous case of response to a fire. Accordingly, this proposed regulation carefully avoids any intimation that various planning assumptions are or ever should be viewed as performance standards.

Although a contractor's capabilities must be related to a certain size spill, the assignment of individual Response Values is necessarily artificial and somewhat arbitrary. The term "Response Value" is used in this proposed rule to reflect this reality.

Although a contractor may wish to suggest a "Response Value" for each of a contractor's designated response services, the federal government retains the ultimate responsibility for the assignment of that factor.

b. Application for Certification

To obtain certification, a response contractor must first submit a certification application. The application must identify basic information about the contractor, as well as specific details regarding the contractor's available equipment, personnel, management structure and support. The type of information required, and the detail of that information, depends on the level and type of service that the contractor intends to offer. The application is intended to provided sufficient specific factual information to permit the application reviewer to assign one or more "Response Values" to each of the contractor's response services.

In addition to this quantifiable factual information, the response contractor also must provide descriptive information on certain important factors that bear on whether the contractor should be allowed to be cited in a spill response plan. For example, the application must list all notices of violation issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Coast Guard related to oil spill response operations for the last five years, and a description of the disposition of those notices. In addition, the contractor may, as supplemental information, submit information that describes the contractor's experience.

The contractor must attest that the required factual information is true and correct to the best of the contractor's information and belief as of the date of attestation. Because the application is made to a federal agency for purposes of obtaining a governmental approval, knowing false statements would be subject to enforcement action under federal law. The contractor also is obligated to notify the COTP of significant changes in response capability (see below).

As a supplement to these factual matters, the response contractor may apply for and propose one or more "Response Values" to be assigned to the contractor's capabilities, by designated geographic area for each specific type of response service. (see below). The response contractor can supply supporting analysis or argument to support its proposal. The contractor may also submit supplemental information describing the contractor's experience, regulatory awareness or other factors which the contractor believes may be relevant to an understanding of the contractor's response capabilities.

The contractor may submit the application to the reviewer any time after the rule goes into effect. [*note: the Coast Guard will need to define who will act as reviewer of contractor applications. If the Coast Guard does not want to centralize all review of contractors, then it is recommended that a teired approach such as follows be used:*] The reviewer, in the case of a contractor who requests certification only in a single Captain of the Port (COTP) zone, will be the COTP. If the contractor requests certification in more than one COTP zone, but not more than

one Coast Guard District, then the reviewer will be the District Commander. In the case of a contractor seeking certification in more than one District, the review shall be the Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

c. Certification Process

Once a certification application is received, the reviewer must make an initial review of the application to determine if it is complete. If not, the application should be immediately returned to the applicant with an explanation of the additional information needed to process the application. Once a complete application is filed, the reviewer has 45 days to assign an initial "Response Value" to the contractor, based on the representations in the application. This determination is only interim, because it is subject to subsequent verification of the factual information in the application, as well as a more refined evaluation once the agency has the opportunity for in-depth review.

The process described above is expected to result in an "interim status letter." The "Response Value" in the interim status letter may be used by plan preparers until final review and certification is complete. It is expected, given the workload of contractor and plan reviewers, that the Response Values contained in interim status letters likely will be the basis for the initial submission of response plans that are required by February of 1993. If the Response Value established by certification varies from the value used in the interim status letter, plan holders relying on that interim status will be allowed a reasonable time to supplement their resources. This may be accomplished through upgrade of the contractor capabilities or by supplementing or replacing that contractor's resources with other certified contractors.

d. Certification Criteria

The reviewer must certify any contractor who submits a true and complete application demonstrating response resources that satisfy the approval criteria. Certification may be denied if information in the application is false, or if the contractor fails to meet the approval criteria for certification of any services. An important part of contractor certification is the assignment of a Response Value or Values to the contractor's response resources for purposes of preparation of vessel or facility response plans. The reviewer will assign Response Values based on a best judgment basis, as informed by certain presumptive planning criteria. These planning criteria will be made available to contractors to allow them to suggest appropriate Response Values. A contractor whose capability does not match these presumptive norms may submit information demonstrating the equivalency of its own resources. Planning assumptions used to arrive at the Response Value may also be adjusted based upon a demonstration that other planning assumptions are more accurate for the contractor's specific equipment or personnel.

The certification of a contractor also includes the concept of the credit due a contractor given the contractor's combination of mobilization time and location. Contractors, for a given response service for a given Port Area, would be assigned a classification. Class I for a given service for a given contractor requires a mobilization time of less than [2] hours and location of the resources associated with the service within the COTP Port Area. A Class II contractor service would be located within the Port Area, and mobilization within [12] hours, or a contractor with a combination of mobilization time and location that would allow the resource to be moving within the Port Area within the [12-hour] period. Similarly, Class III would be within [24] hours, Class IV within [48] hours, and Class V within [72] hours

The Response Value would therefore be specific to a certain geographic area for a specific class of service. For example, XYZ Response Contractor could be certified for Class II on-water oil removal services for the offshore environment in a specified COTP port area in an amount of 10,000 barrels. The same contractor also may be certified for Class II on-water removal service for the nearshore harbor environment of 15,000 barrels.

Part of the certification process requires that contractors define their mobilization time. The primary goal is that equipment and/or personnel will be available and ready to deploy, upon notice, with prompt dispatch. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that first crews are dispatched and someone is working to fill any special requirements.

e. Denial of Approval and Appeals

If the reviewer finds that the contractor does not qualify, the contractor can be denied approval. The letter of denial must state why approval was denied, and explain any deficiencies, and explain the process for appeals and resubmittal. The reviewer also may approve a different Response Value for some or all of the contractor's designated services.

If the reviewer denies certification, or selects a "Response Value" less than what the contractor applied for, the contractor may appeal the decision to ... *[note: appeal process to be specified by the USCG, but with the recommendation of at least one level of internal appeal, and with at least one appeal to Washington before going to the courts].*

f. Notification of Significant Changes in Response Capability

Once a contractor has been certified, certification is valid for a period of [5] years. However, contractors are required to notify the COTP of a significant reduction of capability, as specifically identified in the certification. The proposed regulation requires this notification to be in advance, if the significant reduction is

(28)

planned, or no later than 24 hours after the contractor becomes aware of the significant change, if unplanned. The COTP can then determine whether to require plan holders to secure additional capability, or make other practicable arrangements to compensate for the reduced capability.

g. Effect on State Certification

The contractor certification established in this rule is designed to implement the requirements of OPA. Some states may have similar contractor certification requirements under individual state laws. Nothing in this rule is intended to preclude reliance on these certification rules or the federal certification process by states where it is appropriate to do so. In fact, States are encouraged to rely on the federal certification process, to the maximum extent practicable, taking into account any differences in the purposes and value of the federal certification process and the specific requirements of state law.

[REGULATORY LANGUAGE]

[NOTE: The regulations describing the contents of vessel and facility response plans will establish the types of services for which the response plan holder must rely only on certified primary response contractors]

Sec. XXX.00 Contractor Approval

(a) This section defines the process for certification of response contractor services to be cited in individual response plans.

(b) *Definitions.* For purposes of sections XXX.01-.05, the terms below shall have the following meanings:

(i) *"Certification"* is the process by which the President's designee will verify a primary oil spill response contractor's inventory of available spill response equipment, personnel, management structure, and support, and assign a Response Value for those resources within a standardized classification of designated response services, for a specific geographic area, for purposes of preparation of spill response plans.

(ii) *"Certificate"* is the final document issued following verification, inspection and final review by the reviewer.

(iii) *"Interim status letter"* means the letter sent by the reviewer to the contractor describing the initial Response Value assigned to the contractor pending verification of the factual information contained in the application and an in-depth review of the contractor's application for purposes of certification.

(iv) *President's designee"* means the federal official delegated responsibility by the President under OPA-90 for approval of response plans. Pursuant to Executive Order 12777 the President has delegated responsibility for approval of vessel response plans and transportation-related onshore facilities to the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The Commandant has delegated responsibility for certification of primary response contractors to various "reviewers" under this rule.

(v) *"Response contractor"* is any person who provides designated response equipment or services under contract or other means approved by the President directly to an owner or operator of a tank vessel or facility required to have a response plan under 33 U.S.C. 1321(j)(5), which designated equipment or services are required to be available and identified in such plan.

30

(vi) *"Reviewer"* means: (1) in the case of a response contractor seeking certification in a single COTP zone, the COTP; (2) in the case of a response contractor seeking certification in more than one COTP zone, but only one Coast Guard District, the District Commander; and (3) in the case of a response contractor seeking certification in more than one Coast Guard District, the Chief of the Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

(vii) *"Response Value"* means the value, in terms of barrels of oil for a particular defined service in a defined geographic area, that is assigned to a primary response contractor for purposes of being identified as response capability in a vessel or facility response plan.

(viii) *"Mobilization time"* means the time in which initial personnel are able to begin movement of response resources to the spill scene.

Sec. XXX.01 Contractor Certification Application Content

(a) *Required Information.* A person desiring to be a primary response contractor must file an application that contains at least the following information:

(i) Contractor's name, mailing address and phone number;
(ii) The specific response services being offered for certification;
(iii) The specific location of all spill response resources, and the areas in which spill response services using each resource is being offered;
(v) A list of all Occupation Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) notices of violation related to oil spill response operations and disposition of those notices for the last five years. Any applicant with less than five years under their current business name or organization shall provide the same information for any oil spill activities or businesses participated in by the principals in the new company within the last five years;
(vi) an organizational diagram depicting the chain of command;
(vii) a call-out list for the contractor's resources, and a description of the call-out procedure;
(viii) For each type of service, the types of oil to which the contractor is willing and able to respond.
(ix) For each type of service, the planned mobilization time for that resource.

(b) *Equipment.* For each type of service, the specific significant equipment available to be applied to that service, including:

(i) type, quantity, age, and location;

31

(ii) whether the equipment is owned or under contract;
(iii) If the equipment is contracted from another party, the application must identify:
(A) the name, address and telephone number of the owner of the equipment;
(B) the equipment's storage location and area of operation;
(C) the contractual terms regarding availability of the equipment to the contractor;
(iv) a statement of the maintenance program for such equipment, together with a description of records of such maintenance;
(v) identification of the number of operators necessary to operate the equipment over a sustained response (i.e., 30 days);
(vi) for each piece of equipment, a description of: the make, model, type, and applicable design limits (e.g., suitability for different types of oils and operating environments, as related to adverse weather);
(vii) a description of contractor's communications equipment, including the amount and frequencies, and identification of certified operators;
(viii) for any equipment not located in the COTP zone for which certification is sought, a description of the transportation capabilities available for use in a response;
(ix) a description of the readiness for mobilization of response resources and the means of mobilization.

Equipment shall be listed only if it is in a fully operable condition. Future equipment, ordered but not yet delivered and fully operable, may be listed, but it must be listed separately and so identified.

(c) *Personnel.* For each category of personnel identified as a spill response resource, the application shall, for each location:
(1) list by job category;
(2) match to the equipment list and scope of service, including the plan for how the equipment and people necessary to provide the service will be brought to bear in an incident from what source; and
(3) list training and qualifications, including OSHA Hazardous Operations training and how additional personnel are planned to be trained within what timeframe if they will be required to meet the service listed.

The application shall also list the total personnel available.

(d) *Management Structure.* The application shall identify the management structure associated with the service(s) offered.

(c) *Service-specific information.* In addition to the general information described above, the applicant must submit the following service-specific information, as applicable to the service offered:

(i) *Boom control/containment/protective booming services*
(A) Describe the platforms for deployment (number/type); and,
(B) Amount and condition (e.g., 2000' of offshore boom/vessel).

(ii) *On-water recovery services*
(A) recovery platform (for owned vessel and vessel of opportunity recovery systems):
(1) name of vessel;
(2) size/class;
(3) location; and,
(4) contract terms of availability.
(B) skimming system:
(1) make;
(2) model;
(3) manufacturer's nameplate capacity; and
(4) applicable design limits (e.g., suitability for different types of oil and different operating environments, as related to adverse weather).
(C) personnel trained to operate the equipment:
(1) name;
(2) position description; and,
(3) training or experience.

(iii) *Shoreline remediation services*
(A) number of persons available for beach cleanup
(B) description of supplies/support for beach cleanup

(iv) *Transfer/storage services*
(A) type and capacity of storage/transfer facilities

[Services considered for certification but not included at this time are source control, non-mechanical removal, wildlife treatment, lightering, salvage, fire fighting, logistic support, disposal, analysis and testing.]

33

See proposal for Spill Response Management

(f) *Attestation.* A responsible corporate official of the contractor shall sign the application, affirming that the factual information contained in the application regarding the capabilities described in paragraphs (a)-(e) is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, true and accurate as of the time of signing.

(g) *Agreement for Inspection and Participation in Drills.* The contractor shall state that the contractor agrees to submit to inspection and verification

of the designated capability cited in the application. The contractor also agrees to make itself available to participate in drills as reasonably necessary to verify the contractor's application.

(h) *Self assessment.* A primary response contractor may submit with the contractor's application a suggested Response Value for each of the contractor's response services for each geographic area to be served. The applicant should provide an explanation and analysis to support the suggested Response Value, based on standardized planning factors identified by the reviewer, or such other planning factors as the contractor shall demonstrate more accurately reflects the contractor's response capabilities. The applicant may also include other information that may bear on an applicant's capabilities, including a description of the applicant's experience and regulatory awareness and compliance.

(i) *Mobilization.* The contractor shall state the time for initial mobilization of its resources. Equipment readiness shall include being available and able to be promptly dispatched to a spill site, not counting normal maintenance and repairs.

Section XXX.02 Contractor Certification Application Procedure.

(a) *Filing address.* Applications must be filed with the appropriate reviewer. The addresses are as follows:

[provide filing addresses]

(b) *Time for Filing.* Applications may be submitted at any time after adoption of this paragraph.

Section XXX.03 Contractor Application Review

(a) *Review for completeness.* Upon receipt of a response contractor certification application, the reviewer shall promptly evaluate the application for completeness. If the application is not complete, the reviewer shall return the application promptly, identifying the deficiencies in the application.

(b) *Review for interim status.* An application shall be reviewed within 45 days of receipt of a complete application. The reviewer shall send an interim status letter within 5 days of completion of a review. If, at a later time, the reviewing agency determines that the terms of the interim status letter should be limited, it shall so notify the contractor, who shall be given a reasonable time to provide acceptable numbers or types of response resources.