

## APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

### I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

<b>Claimant Name</b>	Last/Name of Business [REDACTED]	First [REDACTED]	Middle [REDACTED]
<b>Claimant ID</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>Claim ID</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Claim Type</b>	Business Economic Loss		
<b>Law Firm</b>	[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"/> <b>BP's Final Proposal</b>	<b>Compensation Amount</b>	<b>\$34,959</b>
	<b>Risk Transfer Premium</b>	.25
	<b>Prior Payment Offset</b>	\$0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Claimant's Final Proposal</b>	<b>Compensation Amount</b>	<b>\$41,676.12</b>
	<b>Risk Transfer Premium</b>	.25
	<b>Prior Payment Offset</b>	\$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, a [REDACTED] FL medical practice, was awarded \$41,676.12 (pre-RTP) for its BEL claim. BP raises four issues on appeal: (1) that the Settlement Program incorrectly applied policy 495; (1) the Settlement Program failed to determine whether Claimant's revenue was attributed to the correct months; (3) the Settlement Program failed to address insufficiently matched financial data; and (4) the Settlement Program applied the

wrong methodology. On the latter issue, BP did not address it in its memoranda and it is considered abandoned. When this claim began in 2012, Claimant submitted P&Ls that did not match its tax returns. It later submitted revised financial information matched to the returns; however BP argues that the Claims Administrator used the wrong, mismatched data in the calculation and that Claimant's compensation should be reduced by \$6,717.12 (pre-RTP). A de novo review of the record demonstrates that BP's argument is misplaced. There was extensive contact between the Settlement Program and the claimant concerning the revised P&Ls, and the claim properly proceeded under the AVM methodology. I find no error on the part of the Claims Administrator and affirm the award to the Claimant.