1						
2	BEFORE THE WORKERS' COMPE	NSATION APPEALS BOARD				
3	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
4	JOHN DOE,					
5	Applicant,	Case No.: ADJ12345678				
6	VS.	Claim No.: WC0123456789				
7	BIG BOX and	DIMINISHED FUTURE EARNING				
8	COVERAGE CO.,	CAPACITY REBUTTAL ANALYSIS				
9	Defendant.	otor				
10						
11	I. INTRODUCTION					
12	The Workers Compensation Appeals Board issu	ed two en banc opinions, <u>Ogilvie I</u> and <u>Ogilvie</u>				
13	II, which set forth a process for disputing the diminished	future earning capacity ("DFEC") portion of the				
14	2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule ("PDRS") c	onsistent with L.C. § 4660(b)(2) and the RAND				
15	study upon which the DFEC adjustment is based. <sup>1 2 3</sup> Th	is Ogilvie DFEC rebuttal analysis follows.				
16	II. DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS					
17	A. Determine "Post-Injury Earnings of the I	njured Employee"				
18	The first step in a DFEC rebuttal analysis is to determine the injured employee's post-injury					
19	earnings. The Board in <u>Ogilvie</u> indicates the "post-injury earnings of the injured employee" may be					
20	obtained by having the injured worker obtain their wage	information from the EDD, earnings records				
21	from the Social Security Administration, tax records, or W-2 forms for the three years post injury. <sup>4</sup>					
22	In the 3.0000 years since their date of injury, Applicant earned a total of \$23,992.38. <sup>5</sup>					
23	<sup>1</sup> References to <u>Ogilvie I</u> are to <u>Ogilvie v. City and County of</u>	San Francisco (2/3/2009) 74 Cal.Comp.Cases 248				
24	<sup>2</sup> References to <u>Ogilvie II</u> are to <u>Ogilvie v</u> . City and County of (Appeals Board on bane) (Ogilvie U) Subsequent situations references	From the page numbers of the WCAB website version. San Francisco (9/3/2009) 74 Cal.Comp.Cases 1127 For to the page numbers of the WCAB website version.				
25	<sup>3</sup> En banc decisions of the Appeals Board are binding preceder compensation judges (Cal Code Regs. tit 8 § 10341: City of	nt on all Appeals Board panels and workers' f Long Beach v Workers' Comp Appeals Bd				
26	( <u>Garcia</u> ) (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 298, 313, fn. 5 [70 Cal.Com Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1418, 1425, fn. 6 [67 Cal.	D.Cases 109, 120, fn. 5]; <u>Gee v. Workers' Comp.</u> Comp.Cases 236, 239, fn. 6]; see also Gov. Code. §				
27	11425.60(b).) See Exhibit 6 for Appeals Board Reporter citat <sup>4</sup> "[T]here is nothing magical about a three-year period." <u>Ogily</u>	on cross reference chart. vie I at 23; Ogilvie II at 31. "In cases of individual				
28	injured employees, however, a longer or shorter period of post <sup>5</sup> Exhibit 8.	-injury earnings may be appropriate." <u>Id</u> .				
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis - [1]					

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	B. Determine "Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees"
2	The second step in a DFEC rebuttal analysis is to determine the post-injury earnings of similarly
3	situated employees. <sup>6</sup> According to the Board in <u>Ogilvie</u> , the primary source for post-injury earnings of
4	similarly situated employees is the "EDD's Labor Market Information Division (LMID) website." <sup>7</sup> The
5	Board recommends "extrapolations may be made from this [LMID website] quarterly data." <sup>8</sup> The EDD
6	LMID website contains wage data for various occupations (designated by the "Standard Occupational
7	Classification" system used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) grouped in "Metropolitan Statistical
8	Areas" as well as aggregated throughout the state. <sup>9</sup>
9	1. Similarly Situated Employees
10	Based upon the Applicant's job duties and, to a lesser extent their job title, the Standard
11	Occupational Classification ("SOC") selected was "47-2152." This SOC is associated with "Plumbers,
12	Pipefitters, and Steamfitters."
13	2. EDD Labor Market Information Division Wage Data
14	This information within a Metropolitan Statistical Area is then screened by the LMID "to ensure
15	that confidential information can not be inferred from an estimate." <sup>10</sup> All aggregated information is
16	available from the LMID website. <sup>11</sup>
17	In those circumstances where the sample population is too small, EDD wage data is "suppressed
18	and not released to the public." <sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup> Upon request, the LMID will run a custom report for nearby counties.
19	Each custom report per county can take up to 8 hours at a rate of \$71.00 per hour. <sup>14</sup> Even after a report is
20	run it is possible the screening process will prevent the LMID from disclosing the data from that report. <sup>15</sup>
21	
22	
23	<sup>6</sup> <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 24. <sup>7</sup> "Often, empirical wage data on 'similarly situated employees' may be gathered from EDD's Labor Market
24	Information Division (LMID) website." <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 25; <u>Ogilvie II</u> at 22. <sup>8</sup> <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 25, fn 19.
25	<sup>9</sup> Exhibit 5, Letter from Labor Market Information Division, $11/12/2009$ . <sup>10</sup> <u>Id</u> .
26	$\frac{IU}{Id}$ . <sup>13</sup> There are several reasons why a sample size within a Metropolitan Statistical Area may be too small for a
27	particular year. The most obvious is when there is an area with a low population. It is also possible that there are too few people within that particular industry or occupational group in that area for the selected year.
28	<ul> <li><sup>14</sup> Exhibit 5, Letter from Labor Market Information Division, 11/12/2009.</li> <li><sup>15</sup> <u>Id</u>.</li> </ul>
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

ng Capa [2] ty I y

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]							
1	The Board in Ogilvie suggests alternatives to the EDD data when "there may be problems with or							
2	limitations to the LMID website wage data." <sup>16</sup> However, it will always be more cost effective to use the							
3	free EDD wage information aggregated on a statewide level (as opposed to wage data aggregated within							
4	a Metro	politan Stati	stical Area) rat	ther than reque	est custom rep	orts from the L	MID.	
5		3 EDI	D wage data n	percentile with	in an occupatio	on and geogram	phic region	
6		The EDD w	egge information	on contains ho	urly rate and a	nnual income	data for variou	s occupations
0			age mornatic					s occupations,
7	at sever	al levels (me	ean, 10 <sup>th</sup> , 25 <sup>th</sup> , 5	$50^{\rm m}, 75^{\rm m}, \text{ and } 9$	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile)	, for regions ac	cross Californi	a as well as an
8	aggrega	ited calculati	on for all of C	alifornia. <sup>17</sup> Th	e benefit of us	ing this data is	that it accoun	ts for
9	"[t]emp	orary econor	mic downturns	or other facto	ors" such as flu	ctuations or tre	ends in an indu	istry or
10	geograp	ohic region. <sup>18</sup>						
11	_	<u>4. Apr</u>	olicant's percer	ntile within EI	DD wage data	for similarly si	tuated employ	rees
12		Similarly sit	tuated employe	ees' earnings i	n the year prio	r to the date of	f injury were a	s follows:19
12			1 5	L oth	5 T	<b>z</b> o th	4h	0.04
	Voor	Number of	Wage Mean	10	25	50	/5"	90 <sup>m</sup>
13	1 Cal	Employed	0	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile
14	2004	Employed 10,140	\$46,961.00	Percentile \$21,868.00	Percentile \$32,289.00	Percentile \$49,029.00	Percentile \$59,558.00	Percentile \$70,757.00
14 15	2004	Employed 10,140	\$46,961.00	Percentile \$21,868.00	Percentile \$32,289.00	Percentile \$49,029.00	Percentile \$59,558.00	Percentile \$70,757.00
13 14 15 16	2004	Employed 10,140 The injured	\$46,961.00 worker's aver	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo	Percentile \$70,757.00 we the 75th
13 14 15 16 17	2004	Employed 10,140 The injured ile for simila	\$46,961.00 worker's avera	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear pployees' earn	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to th	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p heir date of inju	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo Iry. <sup>20</sup>	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th
14 15 16 17 18	2004	The injured ile for simila	\$46,961.00 worker's averarly situated em t-Injury Earnir	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to th y Situated Em	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p teir date of inju	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo Iry. <sup>20</sup>	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th
14 15 16 17 18 19	2004	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u>	\$46,961.00 worker's averally situated em t-Injury Earnir	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo	Percentile \$32,289.00 mings of \$65,5 ings prior to th <u>y Situated Em</u>	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p teir date of inju ployees al years post-in	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo Iry. <sup>20</sup>	Percentile \$70,757.00 we the 75th
14 15 16 17 18 19	2004 percent	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of	\$46,961.00 worker's averally situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear pployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup>	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to th <u>y Situated Emp</u> yees for severa 25 <sup>th</sup>	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p teir date of inju ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup>	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo ury. <sup>20</sup> njury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup>	Percentile \$70,757.00 we the 75th llows: <sup>21</sup> $90^{\text{th}}$
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	Percent Year	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Percentile \$32,289.00 mings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severa 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p teir date of inju ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo ury. <sup>20</sup> njury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Percentile \$70,757.00 we the 75th llows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	Percent 2004 Year 2005	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770	\$46,961.00 worker's averally rly situated em t-Injury Earnin s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00	Percentile \$32,289.00 mings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severa 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p teir date of inju ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo iry. <sup>20</sup> njury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$59,079.00	Percentile \$70,757.00 we the 75th llows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	Year           2005           2006	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770 11,290	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00 \$43,597.00 \$44,210.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00 \$20,807.00 \$22,060.00	Percentile \$32,289.00 mings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severs 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00 \$29,038.00 \$29,038.00	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p eir date of inju ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00 \$40,676.00	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them about iry. <sup>20</sup> hjury are as fol $75^{th}$ Percentile \$59,079.00 \$57,955.00	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th lows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00 \$72,228.00
13         14         15         16         17         18         19         20         21         22         23	Year           2004	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770 11,290 10,300	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00 \$43,597.00 \$44,210.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00 \$20,807.00 \$22,069.00 \$24,720.00	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severs 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00 \$29,038.00 \$29,603.00 \$32,997.00	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p eir date of inju- ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,730.00 \$44,826.00	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them abo Iry. <sup>20</sup> hjury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$59,079.00 \$57,955.00 \$56,887.00 \$59,575.00	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th lows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00 \$73,228.00 \$75,305.00
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	Year           2004	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770 11,290 10,300 11,000	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00 \$43,597.00 \$44,210.00 \$47,210.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00 \$20,807.00 \$22,069.00 \$24,720.00	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severs 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00 \$29,038.00 \$29,603.00 \$32,997.00	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p eir date of inju- ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,730.00 \$44,826.00	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them above iry. <sup>20</sup> hjury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$59,079.00 \$57,955.00 \$56,887.00 \$59,575.00	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th lows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00 \$73,228.00 \$75,305.00
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	1 eat           2004           percent           Year           2005           2006           2007           2008	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770 11,290 10,300 11,000	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnir s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00 \$43,597.00 \$44,210.00 \$44,210.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00 \$20,807.00 \$22,069.00 \$22,069.00 \$24,720.00	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severs 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00 \$29,038.00 \$29,603.00 \$32,997.00	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p eir date of inju- ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,730.00 \$44,826.00 se times when "	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them above iry. <sup>20</sup> hjury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$59,079.00 \$57,955.00 \$56,887.00 \$59,575.00 there may be pro-	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th lows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00 \$73,228.00 \$75,305.00 oblems with or
13         14         15         16         17         18         19         20         21         22         23         24         25	1 eat           2004           percent           Year           2005           2006           2007           2008 <sup>16</sup> The B           limitation <sup>17</sup> The "In	The injured ile for simila <u>5. Pos</u> The earning Number of Employed 10,770 11,290 10,300 11,000 oard describes ns to LMID w nean" is an av	\$46,961.00 worker's avera rly situated em t-Injury Earnin s of similarly s Wage Mean \$43,426.00 \$43,597.00 \$44,210.00 \$44,210.00 \$47,210.00	Percentile \$21,868.00 age annual ear ployees' earn ngs of Similarl situated emplo 10 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$21,002.00 \$20,807.00 \$22,069.00 \$22,069.00 \$24,720.00 EDD wage inforta." <u>Ogilvie I</u> at data. The 50 <sup>th</sup> I	Percentile \$32,289.00 nings of \$65,5 ings prior to the <u>y Situated Em</u> yees for severs 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$27,401.00 \$29,038.00 \$29,603.00 \$32,997.00 prmation for those 25.	Percentile \$49,029.00 20.00 would p eir date of inju- ployees al years post-in 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$41,590.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,676.00 \$40,730.00 \$44,826.00 se times when " edian" is a value	Percentile \$59,558.00 lace them above any. <sup>20</sup> hjury are as fol 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$59,079.00 \$57,955.00 \$56,887.00 \$59,575.00 there may be pro- there than has	Percentile \$70,757.00 ve the 75th lows: <sup>21</sup> 90 <sup>th</sup> Percentile \$70,212.00 \$71,254.00 \$73,228.00 \$73,228.00 \$75,305.00 oblems with or If of the sample

<sup>19</sup> Exhibit 1. Data is not available for years marked with an asterisk (\*); statewide annual salary data is used instead.
 <sup>20</sup> L.C. § 4651 states, "Average annual earnings shall be taken as fifty-two times the average weekly earnings

referred to in this chapter." Given an average weekly wage of 1,260.00, Applicant's average annual earnings would be calculated as follows:  $(52 \times 1,260.00) = 65,520.00$ .

<sup>21</sup> Exhibit 1. Data is not available for years marked with an asterisk (\*); statewide annual salary data is used instead.

- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

[3]

27

28

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]					
1 2	For the post-injury earnings of similarly situated employees over 3.0000 years are as follows: PIESSE = Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees PIESSE = \$59,079.00 + \$57,955.00 + \$56,887.00					
3	Thus, for the purposes of this DFEC rebuttal analysis, the post-injury earnings of similarly					
4	situated employees is \$173,921.00.					
5	C. Calculate "Injured Employee's Proportional Earnings Loss"					
6	The injured employees' proportional earnings loss is equal to the three year total of the post-					
7	injury earnings of similarly situated employees less the three year total of the post-injury earnings of the					
8	applicant, divided by the three-year total of the similarly situated employee earnings. <sup>22 23 24</sup>					
9	Thus, if: PIEA = Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant PIESSE = Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees					
10	Then: $Proportional Earnings Loss = [(PIESSE - PIEA) / PIESSE]$					
11	In this case, the "Injured Employee's Proportional Earnings Loss" is calculated as follows:					
12	PIEA = $$23,992.38$ PIESSA = $$173,921,00$					
13	Proportional Earnings Loss = $[(\$173,921.00 - \$23,992.38)/\$173,921.00]$					
14	Thus, the Applicant's "Proportional Earnings Loss" is 0.8621.					
15	D. Calculate "Individualized Ratio of Rating Over Proportional Earnings Loss"					
16	The injured workers' "individualized ratio of rating over proportional earnings loss" or					
17	"individualized rating to loss ratio" ("IRL ratio") is the whole person impairment ("WPI") divided by the					
18	injured employee's proportional earnings loss. <sup>25</sup>					
19	Thus, if: $L = Proportional Earnings Loss$ WPI = Whole Person Impairment					
20	Then: $IRL ratio = (WPI/L)$					
21	Since the "Individualized Ratio of Rating Over Proportional Earnings Loss" is calculated using					
22	the WPI, it must be recalculated with each rating string.					
23	E. Determining Rebuttal of the DFEC Component of the 2005 PDRS					
24	Every body part under the 2005 PDRS has its own "body part code" and is associated with one of					
25	eight "FEC ranks." Each FEC rank represents a range of proportional earnings loss ratios from the 2005					
26	///					
27	<sup>22</sup> The Board also refers to the "proportional earnings loss" as the "individualized proportional earnings loss." <sup>23</sup> <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 26.					
28	$\frac{\text{Oglivie I}}{\text{Oglivie I}} \text{ at } 47.$					
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -					

ng Ca [4]

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	RAND Study. <sup>26 27</sup> Each of the eight FEC ranks was assigned a DFEC adjustment factor used for
2	adjusting the whole person impairment assigned to a particular body region. <sup>28</sup>
3	The next step in the DFEC rebuttal analysis is to compare the range of proportional earnings loss
4	ratios associated with FEC rank of the body part being rated against the injured workers' individualized
5	rating to loss ratio. <sup>29</sup> The injured workers' individualized rating to loss ratio will either fall within the
6	range of ratios for the same FEC rank, within the range of ratios for a different FEC rank, or outside the
7	boundaries of all range of ratios for the FEC ranks.
8	If the individualized rating to loss ratio:
9	• Is within the range of ratios for the same FEC rank associated with the injured body part, the
10	DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS is not rebutted. <sup>30</sup>
11	• Falls within the range of ratios for a different FEC rank, the DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS
12	has been rebutted. This new FEC rank is used to adjust the whole person impairment "before
13	adjustment for age and occupation." <sup>31 32</sup>
14	• "[F]alls outside all of the range of ratios for all FEC ranks," (below 0.450 or above 1.810) then
15	the DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted. <sup>33 34</sup> However, in this instance a
16	further step is required to calculate the new DFEC adjustment factor.
17	When an injured workers' individualized rating to loss ratio is outside all the range of ratios for
18	all FEC ranks, the Board in Ogilvie holds, "the employee's DFEC adjustment factor shall be determined
19	by applying the formula of $([1.81/a] \times .1) + 1$ , where 'a' is the employee's individualized rating to loss
20	ratio." <sup>35</sup> This DFEC adjustment factor is multiplied by the standard impairment rating (the "Whole
21	Person Impairment") to arrive at the DFEC adjusted impairment rating, "before adjustment for age and
22	occupation." <sup>36 37</sup>
23	$\frac{26}{26} \underbrace{\text{Ogilvie I}}_{27} \text{ at } 27-28.$
24	<sup>27</sup> Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, page 1-7, Table A. <sup>28</sup> Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, pages 1-7 to 1-8.
25	$\frac{10}{30} \frac{\text{Ogilvie I}}{\text{Ogilvie I}} \text{ at } 28.$ $\frac{31}{10} \text{ d} \text{ at } 29-30$
26	$\frac{32}{10}$ in 2.5 solution $\frac{32}{10}$ in 3.0. $\frac{33}{10}$ in 3.1-33.
27	<ul> <li><sup>34</sup> Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, page 1-7, Table A.</li> <li><sup>35</sup> Ogilvie I at 31; Ogilvie II at 23.</li> </ul>
28	<sup>36</sup> <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 31-32. <sup>37</sup> <u>Id</u> . at 32.
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis - [5]

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	III. SUMMARY OF DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS
2	Based on the above, the entire DFEC rebuttal analysis process may be described as follows:
3	1 Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant
1	2 Determine Post Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees
-	2. O L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L L & D _ C L & D _ C L & D _ C & D & D & D & D \\ \hline \end{tabular}
2	3. Calculate Proportional Earnings Loss
6	4. Calculate Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio
7 8	<ul> <li>5. Compare the Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks:</li> <li>a) If the same FEC rank, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has not been rebutted.</li> <li>b) If another FEC rank, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted and the</li> </ul>
9 10	<ul> <li>c) If outside all FEC ranks, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted and the rating is recalculated using a new DFEC adjustment factor according to the formula "([1.81/a] x .1) + 1, where 'a' is the employee's individualized rating to loss ratio."<sup>38</sup></li> </ul>
11	IV. SUMMARY OF EXHIBITS USED FOR DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS
12	The following exhibits include a summary of every data point used in this DFEC rebuttal
13	analysis a rating under the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, a combined values calculation
13	analysis, a fating under the 2005 Fermanent Disability Rating Schedule, a combined values calculation
14	for all ratings, a step-by-step DFEC analysis for each rating string, DFEC adjusted rating as appropriate,
15	a combined values calculation after DFEC analysis, and supporting documentation for data points used.
16	• Exhibit 1: Summary of Data Used in the DFEC Rebuttal Analysis
17	• Exhibit 2: Disability Rating Under 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule
18	• Exhibit 3: Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
19	• Exhibit 4: 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Tables A and B
20	• Exhibit 5: Letter from Labor Market Information Division, 11/12/2009
21	• Exhibit 6: Appeals Board Reporter Citation Cross Reference Chart
22	• Exhibit 7: 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Combining Ratings
23	• Exhibit 8: Evidence of Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant
24	Generated on 12/11/2009 for Jay Shergill of Pdrater (EAMS#: 16777215) by PDRater.com. Diminished
25	Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis and all exhibits Copyright 2009 PDRater.com and Jay Shergill. All rights reserved. Use of this document is subject to and consitutes agreement to all terms of use and legal
26	disclaimers of PDRater.com, hereby incorporated by reference. This document and its contents may not be copied in whole or part without the express written consent of Jay Shergill. PDRater DFEC Rebuttal Analysis Report
27	Run this calculation (or a variation) at PDRater.com by clicking here.
28	<sup>38</sup> Ogilvie I at 31; Ogilvie II at 23.
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]							
1		EXHIBIT 1						
2			Summary	of Data Used	in the DFEC	Rebuttal Ana	alysis	
2	1.	Date of Birt	h			= 04/08/19	55	
3	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	Age on Date	ry e of Iniury			= 06/05/200 = 50	15	
4	4.	Permanent a	and Stationary	Report		= Dr. Phil 9	9/1/2009	
5	5.	2005 PDRS	Occupation	on atmustices"				
2	6.	<i>Froup</i> 481: Years Since	Date of Injury	onstruction 1		= 3.0000		
6	7.	Applicant's	Average Weel	kly Wage		= \$1,260.00	)	
7	8.	Applicant's	Average Annu	ual Wage <sup>39</sup>		= \$65,520.0	)0	
/	9.	Applicant's	Earnings of Aj ZIP code	pplicant		= \$23,992.3 = 90210	38	
8	11.	Applicant's	geographic re	gion		<i>J</i> <b>01</b> 10		
		"Los Angeles	s-Long Beach-	Glendale Met	ro Div"		······································	
9	12.							
10	eren (* 1910) Plumk	"Standard C pers. Pipefitt	Ccupational C ers. and Steam	lassification" fitters."	Code 47-2152	2 is associated	with the job ti	tle
11		The job desc	cription for "S	tandard Occup	pational Class	ification" Cod	e 47-2152 is "	Assemble,
11	install,	alter, and re	pair pipelines	or pipe system	is that carry w	ater, steam, at	r, or other liqu	uids or
12	gases. 1	nay insiaii n	eanng ana coo	oung equipme	ni ana mecnan	icai control sy	stems.	
13								
15								
14								
15								
15	13.	Employmen	t Developmen	t Department	Labor Market	Information D	ivision Inform	ation <sup>41</sup>
16				Annual Wage	e or Salary Info	ormation		
17	Year <sup>42</sup>	Employed	Wage Mean	10 <sup>th</sup>	25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>
- /				Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile
18	2004	10,140	\$46,961.00	\$21,868.00	\$32,289.00	\$49,029.00	\$59,558.00	\$70,757.00
19	2005	10,770	\$43,426.00	\$21,002.00	\$27,401.00	\$41,590.00	\$59,079.00	\$70,212.00
	2006	11,290	\$43,597.00	\$20,807.00	\$29,038.00	\$40,676.00	\$57,955.00	\$71,254.00
20	2007	10,300	\$44,210.00	\$22,069.00	\$29,603.00	\$40,730.00	\$56,887.00	\$73,228.00
21	2008	11,000	\$47,210.00	\$24,720.00	\$32,997.00	\$44,826.00	\$59,575.00	\$75,305.00
~	2009	9,080	\$50,252.00	\$28,622.00	\$35,990.00	\$48,913.00	\$62,400.00	\$77,259.00
22						(()) = 2 ( ) = 1		
23	14.	Post-Injury	Earnings of Si int's average a	milarly Situat	ed Employees	("PIESSE") would place the	m above the 7	5th percentile
24		For the post	-injury earning	gs of similarly	situated emplo	ovees over 3.00	000 years are a	s follows:
24		PIE	SSE = \$59,079	9.00 + \$57,95	5.00 + \$56,882	7.00	•	
25		PIE	SSE = \$173,92	21.00				
26	$\begin{vmatrix} 39 \\ 40 \\ Exhibit$	Part II.B.4. p. 1	3; L.C. § 4651.					
20	<sup>41</sup> Annua	l wage or sala	ary and hourly w	vage informatio	n is available fo	r free at www.la	abormarketinfo.	edd.ca.gov.
27	While th	e hourly wage	e information is	usually equal to	the annual sala	ary divided by 2	080 (52 wks/yr	x 40  hrs/wk =
	<sup>42</sup> For the	yr), this is no	ot always the cas ked with an aste	se. It is best to erisk (*) the ED	optain the annua D LMID data is	u salary informa not available ar	ation directly frond the statewide	aggregate
28	annual s	alary informat	tion is used. For	further information	ation <u>see infra</u> P	art II.B.2. pp. 2-	-3. and Exhibit 3	).

- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis [7]

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	EXHIBIT 2
2	Disability Rating Under 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule
3	1. Date of Birth       = $04/08/1955$ 2. Date of Injury       = $06/05/2005$
4	3. Age on Date of Injury $= 50$ 4. Permanent and Stationary Report $= Dr. Phil 9/1/2009$ 5. 2005 DDPS Occurrentian
5	Group 481: "PLUMBER construction"
6	<u>Hand/multiple fingers - Range of motion</u> 16.05.01.00 - 2 - [1]2 - 481H - 3 = 3%
8	$\frac{\text{Knee - Range of Motion}}{50\%(17.05.04.00 - 7 - [2]8 - 481I - 12 = 14\%) = 7\%$
9	$\frac{\text{Lumbar} - \text{Diagnosis-related Estimate}}{15.03.01.00 - 9 - [5]11 - 4811 - 16 = 18\%}$
10	Psychiatric - Mental and Behavioral
11	14.01.00.00 - 3 - [8]4 - 481H - 6 = 7%
12	Using the Combined Values Chart, the combined rating is "18c7c7c3=31%". This Combined Values Chart calculation assumes the user has already combined impairments
13	properly as required by page 1-11 of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule. Exhibit 7.
14	
15	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis - [8]

Copyright O 2009 PDRater.com and Jay Shergill, Esq. All rights reserved.

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]					
1	EXHIBIT 3					
2	Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile					
	1. Date of Birth $= 04/08/1955$					
3	2. Date of Injury $= 06/05/2005$					
4	4 Permanent and Stationary Report = Dr. Phil 9/1/2009					
	5. 2005 PDRS Occupation					
5	Group 481: "PLUMBER construction"					
6	Step 1: Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant ("PIEA")					
	6. Years Since Date of Injury $= 3.0000$					
7	7. Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant <sup>43</sup> = $$23,992.38$					
8	-Step 2: Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees ("PIESSE")					
	8. Applicant's Average Weekly Wage ("AWW") = \$1,260.00					
9	9. Applicant's Average Annual Wage ("AAW") <sup>44</sup> = $$65,520.00$					
10	11. Applicant's geographic region:					
	"Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metro Div"					
11	12. Employment Development Department "Standard Occupational Classification"					
12	Code 47-2152: Flumbers, Fipejillers, and Steamjillers					
	13. Percentile earnings above Applicant's AAW for 2004 $^{45} = 90th$					
13	14. Percentile earnings below Applicant's AAW for $2004 = 75th$					
14	PIESSE = $$59,079,00 + $57,955,00 + $56,887,00$					
1.	PIESSE = \$173,921.00					
15						
16	Step 3: Calculate Proportional Earnings Loss 16. Proportional Earnings Loss formula – (DIESSE DIEA) / DIESSE					
10	17. Proportional Earnings Loss formula $= ((123)^2 - (1$					
17	18. Proportional Earnings Loss $= 0.8621$					
10						
18	19 Individualized Rating to Loss ratio formula = (WPL / Proportional Earnings Loss)					
19						
	Step 5: Compare Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks					
20	20. If the IRL ratio for the injured body part is within the range of ratios for the same FEC rank, the DEEC partial of the 2005 PDPS has not been rebutted. The rating remains the same					
21	21. If the IRL ratio for the injured body part is within the range of ratios for a different FEC rank, the					
	DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted. The rating is recalculated with the new FEC					
22	rank.					
23	22. If the IRL ratio for the injured body part is <u>outside</u> the range of ratios for all FEC ranks, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted					
	• The rating is recalculated using a new DFEC adjustment factor according to the formula					
24	"( $[1.81/a] \times .1$ ) + 1, where 'a' is the employee's individualized rating to loss ratio." <sup>46</sup>					
25	• DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81/a] \times .1) + 1$ $=([1.81/a] \times .1) + 1$					
23	• DEEC augustinent factor formula $-([1.81/(IKL Fallo)] \times .1) + 1$ (Exhibit 3 continued on page 10)					
26						
27	<sup>44</sup> Infra Part II B.4, p. 3; L.C. § 4651.					
21	<sup>45</sup> Based upon the "Annual Wage or Salary" information from the EDD LMID website for "Standard Occupational					
28	Classification" code. <u>See also</u> Exhibit 1. <sup>46</sup> <u>Ogilvie I</u> at 31; <u>Ogilvie II</u> at 23.					

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	EXHIBIT 3 (continued)
2	Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
3	<b>Body Part:</b> "Hand/multiple fingers - Range of motion" <b>Rating String:</b> 16.05.01.00 - 2 - $[112 - 481H - 3 - 3\%]$
4	Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant= \$23,992.38Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees= \$173,921.00
5	Step 2: Proportional Earnings Loss Proportional Earnings Loss = (PIESSE – PIEA) / PIESSE
6	Proportional Earnings Loss = [ (\$173,921.00 - \$23,992.38) / \$173,921.00 ] Proportional Earnings Loss = 0.8621
7	Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio") Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (WPI / Proportional Earnings Loss)
8	Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (0.02/0.8621) Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = 0.023199
9	Step 5: Compare Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks Body part code 16.05.01.00 is associated with an FEC rank of 1 (1.647 to 1.81).
10	The IRL ratio is below the lowest ratio for any of the FEC ranks (0.450). The DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted.
11	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(IRL ratio)] \times .1) + 1$ New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(0.023199)] \times .1) + 1$ New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $8.8021$
12	The rating: 16.05.01.00 = 2 = $[*8.8021118 = 481H = 22 = 25\%$
14	10.05.01.00 - 2 - [ 0.0021]10 - 40111 - 22 - 25.0
15	Body Part: "Knee - Range of Motion"
16	<b>Rating String:</b> 50%(17.05.04.00 - 7 - [2]8 - 481I - 12 = 14%) = 7% <b>Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant</b> = \$23,992.38
17	Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees= \$173,921.00Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
18	Proportional Earnings Loss = (PIESSE – PIEA) / PIESSE Proportional Earnings Loss = [ (\$173,921.00 - \$23,992.38) / \$173,921.00 ]
19	Proportional Earnings Loss = 0.8621 <b>Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")</b>
20	Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (WPI/Proportional Earnings Loss) Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (0.07/0.8621) Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = 0.081107
21	Step 5: Compare Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks Body part code 17 05 04 00 is associated with an FEC rank of 2 (1 476 to 1 646)
22	The IRL ratio is below the lowest ratio for any of the FEC ranks (0.450). The DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted.
23	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = ( $[1.81/(IRL ratio)] \times .1$ ) + 1 New DFEC adjustment factor formula = ( $[1.81/(0.081197)] \times .1$ ) + 1
24	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $3.2291$ The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of $3.2291$ .
25	New rating: $50\%(17.05.04.00 - 7 - [*3.2291]23 - 481I - 31 = 35\%) = 18\%$
26	
27	(Exhibit 3 continued on page 11)
28	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -
	[10]

	[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]
1	EXHIBIT 3 (continued)
2	Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
3	<b>Body Part:</b> "Lumbar - Diagnosis-related Estimate"
4	Kating String: $15.05.01.00 - 9 - [5]11 - 4811 - 10 = 18\%$ Step 1:Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant $=$ \$23,992.38Step 2:Post Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees $=$ \$173.021.00
5	Step 2: Post-injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees – \$175,921.00 Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
6	Proportional Earnings Loss = $(11233E - 112A) / 11233E$ Proportional Earnings Loss = $[($173,921.00 - $23,992.38) / $173,921.00]$ Proportional Earnings Loss = $0.8621$
7	Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (WPL / Proportional Farnings Loss)
8	Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = $(0.09 / 0.8621)$ Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = $0.104396$
9	Step 5: Compare Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks Body part code 15.03.01.00 is associated with an FEC rank of 5 (0.963 to 1.133)
10	The IRL ratio is below the lowest ratio for any of the FEC ranks (0.450). The DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted.
11	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(IRL ratio)] \times .1) + 1$ New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(0.104396)] \times .1) + 1$
12	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $2.7338$ The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of $2.7338$ .
13	New rating: 15.03.01.00 - 9 - [*2.7338]25 - 481I - 33 = 37%
14	
15	<b>Body Part:</b> "Psychiatric - Mental and Behavioral" <b>Rating String:</b> 14.01.00.00 - 3 - [8]4 - 481H - 6 = 7%
16	Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant= \$23,992.38Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees= \$173,921.00
17	Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss Proportional Earnings Loss = (PIESSE – PIEA) / PIESSE
18	Proportional Earnings Loss = [ (\$173,921.00 - \$23,992.38) / \$173,921.00 ] Proportional Earnings Loss = 0.8621
19	Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio") Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (WPI / Proportional Earnings Loss)
20	Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = (0.03/0.8621) Individualized Rating to Loss ratio = 0.034799
21	Step 5: Compare individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks Body part code 14.01.00.00 is associated with an FEC rank of 8 (0.45 to 0.62). The IBL ratio is below the herest still for any of the FEC ranks
22	The DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted. New DEEC adjustment factor formula = $(1181/(1000 + 1$
23	New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(IRL 1at0)] \times .1) + 1$ New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $([1.81/(0.034799)] \times .1) + 1$ New DFEC adjustment factor formula = $6.2013$
24	The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of 6.2013. New rating: 14.01.00.00 - 3 - [*6.2013]19 - 481H - 24 = 27%
26	Using the Combined Values Chart, the combined rating is "37c27c25c18=72%".
27	This Combined Values Chart calculation assumes the user has already combined impairments properly as required by page 1-11 of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule. Exhibit 7.
28	
	- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis - [11]

## **EXHIBIT 4**

### 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Tables A and B

capacity, multiply it by the appropriate adjustment factor from Table B A and round to the nearest whole number percentage. Alternatively, a table is provided at the end of Section 2 of the Schedule which provides the earning capacity adjustment for all impairment standards and FEC ranks.

Range o	of Ratios	8	
Low	High	FEC Rank	Adjustment Factor
1.647	1.810	One	1.1000 <u>00</u>
1.476	1.646	Two	1.142 <u>9857</u>
1.305	1.475	Three	1.1857 <u>14</u>
1.134	1.304	Four	1.2286571
0.963	1.133	Five	1.2714 <u>29</u>
0.792	0.962	Six	1.314 <u>3286</u>
0.621	0.791	Seven	1.3571 <u>43</u>
0.450	0.620	Eight	1.400000

Part of the Body	Ratio of Rating over Losses	FEC Rank	
Hand/fingers	1.810	One	
Vision	1.810	One	
Knee	1.570	Two	
Other	1.530	Two	
Ankle	1.520	Two	
Elbow	1.510	Two	
Loss of grasping power	1.280	Four	
Wrist	1.210	Four	
Toe(s)	1.110	Five	
Spine Thoracic	1.100	Five	
General lower extremity	1.100	Five	
Spine Lumbar	1.080	Five	
Spine Cervical	1.060	Five	
Hip	1.030	Five	
General upper extremity	1.000	Five	
Heart disease	0.970	Five	
General Abdominal	0.950	Six	
PT head syndrome	0.930	Six	
Lung disease	0.790	Seven	
Shoulder	0.740	Seven	
Hearing	0.610	Eight	
Psychiatric	0.450	Eight	

The FEC Rank for the "Other" category is based on average ratings and proportional earning losses for the following impairments:

1-7

- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

[12]



[13]

[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]

# EXHIBIT 6

## **Appeals Board Reporter Citation Cross Reference Chart**

### CITATION CROSS REFERENCE CHART APPEALS BOARD REPORTER---OFFICIAL REPORTER CITATION

2009-1999			
Case Name	Official Reporter	WCAB Rptr. Citation	
Gee v. WCAB	96 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 1418	4 WCAB Rptr. 10,101	
City of Long Beach v. WCAB	126 Cal.App.4th 298	7 WCAB Rptr. 10,051	
(Garcia)			



THE CITABLE AUTHORITY IN WORKERS' COMPENSATION Provided to you by Appeals Board Reporter - www.appealsboardreporter.com (Reprinted with permission of Appeals Board Reporter) - Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

[14]

2.

[ John Doe v. Big Box; Case No.: ADJ12345678; Claim No.: WC0123456789 ]

### **EXHIBIT 7**

### 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Combining Ratings

### Adjusting AMA Impairments and Combining Ratings

As used here, the term "adjusting" refers to adjusting an AMA impairment rating for diminished future earning capacity, occupation and age.

Except as specified below, all impairments are converted to the whole person scale, adjusted, and then combined to determine a final overall disability rating.

Multiple impairments involving the hand or foot are combined using standard AMA Guides protocols. The resulting impairment is converted to whole person impairment and adjusted before being combined with other impairments of the same extremity.

Multiple impairments such as those involving a single part of an extremity, e.g. two impairments involving a shoulder such as shoulder instability and limited range of motion, are combined at the upper extremity level, then converted to whole person impairment and adjusted before being combined with other parts of the same extremity. Note that some impairments of the same body part may not be combined because of duplication.

Impairments with disability numbers in the 16.01 and 17.01 series are converted to whole person impairment and adjusted before being combined with any other impairment of the same extremity.

Impairments of an individual extremity are adjusted and combined at the whole person level with other impairments of the same extremity before being combined with impairments of other body parts. For example, an impairment of the left knee and ankle would be combined before further combination with an impairment of the opposing leg or the back.

The composite rating for an extremity (after adjustments) may not exceed the amputation | value of the extremity adjusted for earning capacity, occupation and age. The occupational variant used to rate an entire extremity shall be the highest variant of the involved individual impairments.

- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis [15]

1-11







	S	STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA T OFFICE		4
	D	OCUMENT CO	VER SHEET		I
Is this a new case?	Yes No 🗸	Companion Cases E	Exist Walk	through Yes	. No ✓
More than 15 Com	panion Cases		-4	SSN:	
ADJ12345678 Case Number 1	Y) Sp	becific Injury	t Date: MM/DD/YYYY) (If Specific Injury, use the	(End Date start date as the speci	e: MM/DD/YYYY) fic date of injury)
Body Part 1:		+	Body	Part 3:	
Body Part 2: Other Body Parts:			Body I	Part 4:	
Please check unit to	be filed on ( check only c	ne hox )			
ADJ			Voc		RSU
Companion Cases	Sp	pecific Injury	<b>0</b>		
Case Number 2	Cu	mulative Injury (Star (F	t Date: MM/DD/YYYY) f Specific Injury, use the st	(End Date art date as the specific	e: MM/DD/YYYY)
Body Part 1:			Body	Part 3:	
Body Part 2:			Body I	Part 4:	
Other Body Parts:					
DWC-CA form 102	32.1 Rev. 11/2008 - Page 1	of 8			

-

# DOCUMENT SEPARATOR SHEET

Product Delivery Unit	ADJ
Document Type	MISC
Document Title TYPED OR WRITT	EN LETTER
Document Date Author	12/11/2009 MM/DD/YYYY WWW.PDRATER.COM
	Office Use Only
Received Date	MM/DD/YYYY

# DOCUMENT SEPARATOR SHEET

Product Delivery Unit	ADJ
	L L otor
Document Type	LEGAL DOCS
Document Title PROOF OF SERV	/ICE

Document Da	ite	01	MM/DD/YYYY	
Author	D	PDRATER		

	Office Use Only	
Received Date		

# **PDRater.com**

workers' compensation resources

Receipt Date:	12-11-2009
Receipt #:	ylevut4
Applicant:	John Doe
Employer:	Big Box
WCAB #:	ADJ12345678
Claim #:	WC0123456789

INVOICE FOR: -			
PAYMENT TO:	PAYMENT FROM:		
Jay Shergill P.O. Box 333 Clayton, CA 94517 FEIN 20-2691447 jay@pdrater.com	Pdrater 1234 Main Street Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 EAMS #: 16777215		

FOR:

ITEM	PRICE
PDRater Ogilvie DFEC Rebuttal Analysis	\$80.00
TOTAL:	\$80.00

Thank you for your business!

Jay Shergill