



APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

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	\$30,308
	Risk Transfer Premium	.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claimant's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$54,965.03
	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):

Claimant is a Zone D, Non-Tourism, real estate agency for [REDACTED], located in [REDACTED] Florida. Four Policy 495 criteria were triggered and the Vendor Accountants made P/L restatements and utilizing the AVM methodology recommended to the Administrator an award in the pre-RTP amount of \$54,965.00. BP filed a rather perfunctory appeal raising general issues such as improper application of Policy495 and a failure to correctly match revenues/expenses into the months the revenue earning activity actually occurred. Policy 495

requires sufficient matching of such revenues/expenses and does not require exact matching. After a review of the accountant's notes and calculations, this Panelist is satisfied sufficient matching was achieved. BP submitted an alternative award amount, but as so often occurs, no calculations as to how the alternative amount was calculated was submitted. The award of the Administrator is affirmed.