

APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

Claimant Name	Last/Name of Business [REDACTED]	First [REDACTED]	Middle [REDACTED]
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	\$90,286.59
	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):

Claimant is a Zone C, Non-Tourism related medical imaging center located in [REDACTED], Florida. The Policy 495 criteria were triggered and after the vendor accountants restated the P/Ls, the Administrator rendered an award. BP appeals stating its standard complaints that the award does not comply with the BEL framework and the requirements of Policy 495. The only specific item for review by this Panelist is whether the Equipment Expense listed on the contemporaneously prepared P/Ls is actually a Maintenance/Repair item that should have

been split 50/50 as a fixed/variable expense. BP explains it is very likely such an item. Of course, that is pure speculation. To accept that characterization would result in a reduction of only \$6,131.00. Yet BP demands remand or entry of a -0- award. No remand is permissible and under the Baseball Rules, the Claimant's final proposal is closest to correct.