



APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

2014-801

I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

Claimant Name	Last/Name of Business [REDACTED]	First	Middle
Claimant ID	[REDACTED]	Claim ID	[REDACTED]
Claim Type	Business Economic Loss		
Law Firm	[REDACTED]		

II. DECISION

Select the Compensation Amount set forth in either BP's Final Proposal or the Claimant's Final Proposal as the final outcome on the claim and check the appropriate box to signify your decision.

<input type="checkbox"/> BP's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$0
	Risk Transfer Premium	.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claimant's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$83,460.59
	Risk Transfer Premium	.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0

III. PRIMARY BASIS FOR PANELIST DECISION

Please select the primary basis for your decision. You may also write a comment describing the basis for your decision.

- Error in documentation review.**
- Error in calculation.**
- Error in RTP multiplier.**
- Error in Prior Spill-Related Payment Amount.**
- No error.**

Comment (optional):

BP appeals a BEL award to a Florida male model entity on three grounds. First it claims that certain entities found in web searches strongly suggest that Related Party issues exist in contavention of Policy 328v2. Second, it asserts that the majority of Claimant's revenue came from [REDACTED] showing large spikes in income which should have been reallocated had the vendors used Professional Services instead of the AVM methodology of Policy 495. Third, it claims from web data the possibility that [REDACTED] another business



owned by Claimant's principal, may be out-of-zone, in Miami. Claimant first objects to the citing of web data in BP's brief. Appeal Rule 7 clearly allows the panel to review such data. On the merits, however, this record reflects that the web names cited by BP are either part of Claimant's entity or their financials were not relevant to the 2007-2010 time period on which the award was based. BP's web data appears to reflect 2014 materials contrasted in brief by Claimant. BP's wrong methodology argument is the same as it has made scores of times against medical and realty practices and merits the same fate for the same reasons. Lastly, the record shows that at all relevant times Claimant's sole location was in St.Petersburg, Fl., located in the Zone. No basis exists for a remand, and Claimant's proposal is chosen as correct.