

MAY 2017

VOL. 17-5

PRATT'S

# ENERGY LAW

## REPORT



### **EDITOR'S NOTE: IN THE STATES AND AROUND THE WORLD**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

### **USDA RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM FORECAST**

Taite R. McDonald, Nathaniel T. Kron, and Isabel C. Lane

### **ILLINOIS' FUTURE ENERGY JOBS ACT**

Bruce A. Bedwell, Sameer A. Ghaznavi, Melanie J. Gnazzo, and Kristin L. Parker

### **THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES "COMMON CARRIER" STATUS CRITERIA**

Anthony P. Raven, Olivia Matsushita, and Andrew R. White

### **U.S. DISTRICT COURT FINDS U.S. COAST GUARD'S NATIONAL POLLUTION FUNDS CENTER ACTED ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY WHEN DENYING OIL SPILL CLAIM**

Jonathan K. Waldron, Jeanne M. Grasso, and Sean T. Pribyl

### **SUPREME COURT RULING ON BREXIT—IMPLICATIONS AND NEXT STEPS FOR THE UK ENERGY SECTOR**

Iain Elder and Sarah Kirkness

### **THE FORECAST FOR URANIUM DEMAND, PRODUCTION, AND EXPORT, ILLUSTRATED BY DEVELOPMENTS IN GREENLAND'S URANIUM EXPORT LEGAL REGIME**

Chelsea Gunter

# Pratt's Energy Law Report

---

---

VOLUME 17

NUMBER 5

MAY 2017

---

**Editor's Note: In the States and Around the World**

Steven A. Meyerowitz 165

**USDA Renewable Energy Program Forecast**

Taite R. McDonald, Nathaniel T. Kron, and Isabel C. Lane 167

**Illinois' Future Energy Jobs Act**

Bruce A. Bedwell, Sameer A. Ghaznavi, Melanie J. Gnazzo,  
and Kristin L. Parker 171

**The Texas Supreme Court Clarifies "Common Carrier"  
Status Criteria**

Anthony P. Raven, Olivia Matsushita, and Andrew R. White 181

**U.S. District Court Finds U.S. Coast Guard's National  
Pollution Funds Center Acted Arbitrarily and Capriciously  
When Denying Oil Spill Claim**

Jonathan K. Waldron, Jeanne M. Grasso, and Sean T. Pribyl 184

**Supreme Court Ruling on Brexit—Implications and Next Steps  
for the UK Energy Sector**

Iain Elder and Sarah Kirkness 188

**The Forecast for Uranium Demand, Production, and Export,  
Illustrated by Developments in Greenland's Uranium Export  
Legal Regime**

Chelsea Gunter 198

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please email:

Jacqueline M. Morris at ..... (908) 673-1528

Email: ..... jacqueline.m.morris@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

---

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)

ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)

ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]  
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT'S ENERGY  
LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

*An A.S. Pratt® Publication*

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN**

*Partner, Sidley Austin LLP*

**ANDREW CALDER**

*Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP*

**M. SETH GINTHER**

*Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.*

**R. TODD JOHNSON**

*Partner, Jones Day*

**BARCLAY NICHOLSON**

*Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright*

**BRADLEY A. WALKER**

*Counsel, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC*

**ELAINE M. WALSH**

*Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.*

**SEAN T. WHEELER**

*Partner, Latham & Watkins LLP*

**WANDA B. WHIGHAM**

*Senior Counsel, Holland & Knight LLP*

---

## **Hydraulic Fracturing Developments**

**ERIC ROTHENBERG**

*Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP*

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail [Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com](mailto:Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com). Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house energy counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in energy-related environmental preservation, the laws governing cutting-edge alternative energy technologies, and legal developments affecting traditional and new energy providers. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Pratt's Energy Law Report, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974.

# U.S. District Court Finds U.S. Coast Guard's National Pollution Funds Center Acted Arbitrarily and Capriciously When Denying Oil Spill Claim

*By Jonathan K. Waldron, Jeanne M. Grasso, and Sean T. Pribyl\**

*The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia recently ruled that the U.S. Coast Guard's National Pollution Funds Center wrongfully denied a reimbursement claim by the Water Quality Insurance Syndicate for the costs of cleaning up an oil spill in Alaska in 2009. The authors of this article discuss the decision and its implications.*

In December 2016, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that the U.S. Coast Guard's National Pollution Funds Center ("NPFC") wrongfully denied a reimbursement claim by the Water Quality Insurance Syndicate ("WQIS") for the costs of cleaning up an oil spill in Cook Inlet, Alaska in January 2009. This opinion provided a powerful finding that a federal agency acted arbitrarily and capriciously in taking final agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). The opinion puts federal agencies on notice that agency determinations must be supported by the factual record.

## **BACKGROUND**

The NPFC was established to implement provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 ("OPA 90"), including provisions related to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund ("OSLTF"), which adjudicates claims and issues reimbursements for oil spill response and removal actions. Under OPA 90, the Responsible Party ("RP") is responsible for cleanup when an oil spill occurs, subject to limitation of liability caps. Once the limit is reached, the OSLTF makes up the difference between the limit and the cost of cleanup. The RP is not entitled to the limitation of liability if found, among other things, to have acted with "gross negligence."

---

\* Jonathan K. Waldron is a partner at Blank Rome LLP and Co-chair of the firm's Maritime and International Trade practice, concentrating his practice in maritime, international, and environmental law, including maritime security. Jeanne M. Grasso is a partner at the firm, vice chair of the Maritime and International Trade Practice Group, and focuses her practice on maritime, international, and environmental law. Sean T. Pribyl is an associate at the firm focusing his practice on maritime and international law, regulatory matters, litigation, environmental compliance, and white collar criminal law. The authors may be reached at [waldron@blankrome.com](mailto:waldron@blankrome.com), [grasso@blankrome.com](mailto:grasso@blankrome.com), and [spribyl@blankrome.com](mailto:spribyl@blankrome.com), respectively.

The case before the court involved a January 2009 allision of the supply vessel *Monarch* with an offshore oil and gas production platform, which occurred in icy waters in Cook Inlet, Alaska. The allision caused approximately 38,000 gallons of oil to spill into Cook Inlet. Ocean Marine Services, Inc. (“OMSI”), the vessel owner, responded to the spill, recovering 12,445 gallons of oil. WQIS, as OMSI’s insurer, incurred nearly \$2.7 million removal costs and expenses and, in January 2012, submitted a reimbursement claim to the NPFC for \$1.9 million—the cleanup costs less the \$800,000 limitation of liability. In its marine casualty investigation into the allision, the U.S. Coast Guard found no evidence of gross negligence.

### **FIRST AND SECOND DENIAL DECISIONS**

More than 18 months after WQIS submitted the reimbursement claim and documentation to the NPFC, the NPFC issued its First Denial Decision on June 30, 2014 concluding that the conduct of the Master of the *Monarch* amounted to “gross negligence.” In December 2014, WQIS filed a request for reconsideration. The NPFC did not respond for over a year and a half and WQIS thus filed suit in May 2015 to set aside the First Denial Decision as arbitrary and capricious.

After WQIS filed suit, the NPFC attempted to cure its initial determination by filing a Second Denial Decision on July 21, 2015 and attempted to treat its Second Denial Decision as the final agency action. WQIS moved to strike the Second Denial Decision from the administrative record as untimely due to NPFC’s failure to respond to the reconsideration request within the required 90-day period. Both parties then filed cross-motions for summary judgment.

### **THE NPFC’S DETERMINATION WAS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS**

In a Memorandum Opinion filed on December 22, 2016, the court granted WQIS’ motion for summary judgment. Initially, the court struck the Second Denial Decision as untimely, and treated the First Denial Decision as the *de facto* final agency action.

The court dedicated the remainder of its opinion to analysis of the First Denial Decision. The court noted numerous deficiencies in the NPFC’s denial of WQIS’ claim based on a “gross negligence” determination. Under the APA, a court must set aside an agency action if found to be “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.”<sup>1</sup> Applying the APA standard of review, the court found two main issues to be of particular concern:

---

<sup>1</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

- (1) the NPFC's factual findings were flawed, and
- (2) the NPFC's legal reasoning was inadequate.

First, the court rejected the NPFC's factual findings as "alternately incorrect or speculative," commenting that the NPFC not only ignored essential information in the U.S. Coast Guard's marine casualty investigation report, but also "cherry-picked" evidence. For example, the NPFC asserted that the Master had failed to determine the vessel's position after assuming his watch, and suggested the Master made two telephone calls in the midst of his last-minute maneuvers to avoid the allision, which diverted the Master's attention. The U.S. Coast Guard's report, however, did not support this finding. Accordingly, the court found the NPFC factual findings to be assumptions unsupported by evidence in the record, and made clear that the NPFC cannot ignore or exclude contrary evidence without explanation.

Second, the court found the NPFC's definition of "gross negligence" to be overly broad and contrary to agency precedent. Since OPA 90 does not define "gross negligence," and Congress has not granted the NPFC the authority to formulate its own definition, the court reviewed similar natural resource statutes to define gross negligence. The court ultimately relied on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), which requires conduct that is "reckless, willful, or wanton" for gross negligence.

The court concluded that Congress intended OPA 90 to provide for limited liability absent misconduct by an RP deemed "wanton, willful, or reckless," and the NPFC failed to articulate how its gross negligence definition applied the appropriate standard. The court further cited precedent in prior NPFC decisions that involved more egregious circumstances, yet did not find gross negligence, demonstrating inconsistency in the NPFC's application of the definition of gross negligence. Overall, the court determined that the NPFC failed to fulfill its obligation for reasoned decision-making, and was arbitrary and capricious in its methodology. Consequently, the court remanded the matter to the NPFC for a determination consistent with the correct legal standards. The government initially appealed the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. However, on February 27, 2017, the appellate court granted the government's unopposed motion for voluntary dismissal, signaling perhaps that the district court's critique of the prior denials in its opinion was indeed significantly persuasive.

## CONCLUSIONS

In recent years, some industry stakeholders have suggested the NPFC has made determinations that have run counter to the underlying purposes of OPA

90 and the OSLTF. With this ruling, the court holds accountable a federal agency for its untimely responses, and signaled that the NPFC may not deny claims absent sound legal argument and clear evidence. It remains to be seen what effect this ruling will have on other agency rulings, but the court in this case put the NPFC on notice that any denials of coverage must be based on the evidence of record and legally tenable constructions of the statute. When filing a claim with the NPFC, vessel owners and insurers should be sure to compile a complete record and not take “no” for an answer when agency decisions are not supported by the record.