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## OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
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DIMINISHED FUTURE EARNING
CAPACITY REBUTTAL ANALYSIS

Defendant.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Workers Compensation Appeals Board issued two en banc opinions, $\underline{\text { Ogilvie I and Ogilvie }}$
II, which set forth a process for disputing the diminished future earning capacity ("DFEC") portion of the
2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule ("PDRS") consistent with L.C. § 4660(b)(2) and the RAND
study upon which the DFEC adjustment is based. ${ }^{123}$ This Ogilvie DFEC rebuttal analysis follows.

## II. DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS

## A. Determine "Post-Injury Earnings of the Injured Employee"

The first step in a DFEC rebuttal analysis is to determine the injured employee's post-injury earnings. The Board in Ogilvie indicates the "post-injury earnings of the injured employee" may be obtained by having the injured worker obtain their wage information from the EDD, earnings records from the Social Security Administration, tax records, or W-2 forms for the three years post injury. ${ }^{4}$

In the 3.0000 years since their date of injury, Applicant earned a total of $\$ 23,992.38$.

[^0] and not released to the public. ${ }^{12}{ }^{13}$ Upon request, the LMID will run a custom report for nearby counties. Each custom report per county can take up to 8 hours at a rate of $\$ 71.00$ per hour. ${ }^{14}$ Even after a report is run it is possible the screening process will prevent the LMID from disclosing the data from that report. ${ }^{15}$
${ }^{6}$ Ogilvie I at 24.
7 "Often, empirical wage data on 'similarly situated employees' may be gathered from EDD's Labor Market Information Division (LMID) website." Ogilvie I at 25; Ogilvie II at 22.
${ }^{8}$ Ogilvie I at 25, fn 19.
${ }^{9}$ Exhibit 5, Letter from Labor Market Information Division, 11/12/2009.
${ }^{10}$ Id.
${ }^{11}$ Id.
${ }^{12}$ Id.
${ }^{13}$ There are several reasons why a sample size within a Metropolitan Statistical Area may be too small for a 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.
${ }^{14}$ Exhibit 5, Letter from Labor Market Information Division, 11/12/2009.
${ }^{15}$ Id.

The Board in Ogilvie suggests alternatives to the EDD data when "there may be problems with or
limitations to the LMID website wage data. ${ }^{" 16}$ However, it will always be more cost effective to use the free EDD wage information aggregated on a statewide level (as opposed to wage data aggregated within a Metropolitan Statistical Area) rather than request custom reports from the LMID.

## 3. EDD wage data, percentile within an occupation and geographic region

The EDD wage information contains hourly rate and annual income data for various occupations,
at several levels (mean, $10^{\text {th }}, 25^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}, 75^{\text {th }}$, and $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile), for regions across California as well as an aggregated calculation for all of California. ${ }^{17}$ The benefit of using this data is that it accounts for "[t]emporary economic downturns or other factors" such as fluctuations or trends in an industry or geographic region. ${ }^{18}$

## 4. Applicant's percentile within EDD wage data for similarly situated employees

Similarly situated employees' earnings in the year prior to the date of injury were as follows: ${ }^{19}$

| Year | Number of <br> Employed | Wage Mean | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $50^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $75^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $90^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | 10,140 | $\$ 46,961.00$ | $\$ 21,868.00$ | $\$ 32,289.00$ | $\$ 49,029.00$ | $\$ 59,558.00$ | $\$ 70,757.00$ |

The injured worker's average annual earnings of $\$ 65,520.00$ would place them above the 75 th percentile for similarly situated employees' earnings prior to their date of injury. ${ }^{20}$

## 5. Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees

The earnings of similarly situated employees for several years post-injury are as follows: ${ }^{21}$

| Year | Number of <br> Employed | Wage Mean | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $50^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $75^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $90^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 10,770 | $\$ 43,426.00$ | $\$ 21,002.00$ | $\$ 27,401.00$ | $\$ 41,590.00$ | $\$ 59,079.00$ | $\$ 70,212.00$ |
| 2006 | 11,290 | $\$ 43,597.00$ | $\$ 20,807.00$ | $\$ 29,038.00$ | $\$ 40,676.00$ | $\$ 57,955.00$ | $\$ 71,254.00$ |
| 2007 | 10,300 | $\$ 44,210.00$ | $\$ 22,069.00$ | $\$ 29,603.00$ | $\$ 40,730.00$ | $\$ 56,887.00$ | $\$ 73,228.00$ |
| 2008 | 11,000 | $\$ 47,210.00$ | $\$ 24,720.00$ | $\$ 32,997.00$ | $\$ 44,826.00$ | $\$ 59,575.00$ | $\$ 75,305.00$ |

[^1][3]

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 $=\$ 59,079.00+\$ 57,955.00+\$ 56,887.00$
Thus, for the purposes of this DFEC rebuttal analysis, the post-injury earnings of similarly situated employees is $\$ 173,921.00$.

## C. Calculate "Injured Employee's Proportional Earnings Loss"

The injured employees' proportional earnings loss is equal to the three year total of the postinjury earnings of similarly situated employees less the three year total of the post-injury earnings of the applicant, divided by the three-year total of the similarly situated employee earnings. ${ }^{22} 2324$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Thus, if: } & \text { PIEA = Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant } \\
\text { Then: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { PIESSE }=\text { Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees } \\
\text { Proportional Earnings Loss }=[\text { [PIESSE }- \text { PIEA }) / \text { PIESSE }]
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

In this case, the "Injured Employee's Proportional Earnings Loss" is calculated as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { PIEA } & =\$ 23,992.38 \\
\text { PIESSA } & =\$ 173,921.00 \\
\text { Proportional Earnings Loss } & =[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]
\end{array}
$$

Thus, the Applicant's "Proportional Earnings Loss" is 0.8621 .

## D. Calculate "Individualized Ratio of Rating Over Proportional Earnings Loss"

The injured workers' "individualized ratio of rating over proportional earnings loss" or "individualized rating to loss ratio"("IRL ratio") is the whole person impairment ("WPI") divided by the injured employee's proportional earnings loss. ${ }^{25}$

Thus, if: $\quad L=$ Proportional Earnings Loss WPI $=$ Whole Person Impairment
Then: $\quad$ IRL ratio $=(W P I / L)$
Since the "Individualized Ratio of Rating Over Proportional Earnings Loss" is calculated using the WPI, it must be recalculated with each rating string.

## E. Determining Rebuttal of the DFEC Component of the 2005 PDRS

Every body part under the 2005 PDRS has its own "body part code" and is associated with one of eight "FEC ranks." Each FEC rank represents a range of proportional earnings loss ratios from the 2005
${ }^{22}$ The Board also refers to the "proportional earnings loss" as the "individualized proportional earnings loss."
${ }^{23}$ Ogilvie I at 26.
${ }^{24}$ Ogilvie I at 26.
${ }^{25}$ Ogilvie I at 47.

RAND Study. ${ }^{26} 27$ Each of the eight FEC ranks was assigned a DFEC adjustment factor used for adjusting the whole person impairment assigned to a particular body region. ${ }^{28}$

The next step in the DFEC rebuttal analysis is to compare the range of proportional earnings loss ratios associated with FEC rank of the body part being rated against the injured workers' individualized rating to loss ratio. ${ }^{29}$ The injured workers' individualized rating to loss ratio will either fall within the range of ratios for the same FEC rank, within the range of ratios for a different FEC rank, or outside the boundaries of all range of ratios for the FEC ranks.

If the individualized rating to loss ratio:

- Is within the range of ratios for the same FEC rank associated with the injured body part, the DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS is not rebutted. ${ }^{30}$
- Falls within the range of ratios for a different FEC rank, the DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted. This new FEC rank is used to adjust the whole person impairment "before adjustment for age and occupation. ${ }^{3131} 32$
- "[F]alls outside all of the range of ratios for all FEC ranks," (below 0.450 or above 1.810) then the DFEC component of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted ${ }^{3334}$ However, in this instance a further step is required to calculate the new DFEC adjustment factor.

When an injured workers' individualized rating to loss ratio is outside all the range of ratios for all FEC ranks, the Board in Ogilvie holds, "the employee's DFEC adjustment factor shall be determined by applying the formula of $([1.81 / \mathrm{a}] \times .1)+1$, where 'a' is the employee's individualized rating to loss ratio."35 This DFEC adjustment factor is multiplied by the standard impairment rating (the "Whole Person Impairment") to arrive at the DFEC adjusted impairment rating, "before adjustment for age and occupation., ${ }^{36} 37$

[^2]
## III. SUMMARY OF DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS

Based on the above, the entire DFEC rebuttal analysis process may be described as follows:

1. Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant
2. Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees
3. Calculate Proportional Earnings Loss
4. Calculate Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio
5. Compare the Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks:
a) If the same FEC rank, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has not been rebutted.
b) If another FEC rank, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has been rebutted and the rating is recalculated using the new FEC rank.
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." ${ }^{38}$

## IV. SUMMARY OF EXHIBITS USED FOR DFEC REBUTTAL ANALYSIS

The following exhibits include a summary of every data point used in this DFEC rebuttal analysis, a rating under the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, a combined values calculation for all ratings, a step-by-step DFEC analysis for each rating string, DFEC adjusted rating as appropriate, a combined values calculation after DFEC analysis, and supporting documentation for data points used.

- Exhibit 1: Summary of Data Used in the DFEC Rebuttal Analysis
- Exhibit 2: Disability Rating Under 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule
- Exhibit 3: Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
- Exhibit 4: 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Tables A and B
- Exhibit 5: Letter from Labor Market Information Division, 11/12/2009
- Exhibit 6: Appeals Board Reporter Citation Cross Reference Chart
- Exhibit 7: 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Combining Ratings
- Exhibit 8: Evidence of Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant

Generated on 12/11/2009 for Jay Shergill of Pdrater (EAMS\#: 16777215) by PDRater.com. Diminished 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 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 version 1.0

Run this calculation (or a variation) at PDRater.com by clicking here.
(Or you can type " http://tinyurl.com/ylevut4 " into your web browser).
${ }^{38}$ Ogilvie I at $31 ; \underline{\text { Ogilvie II }}$ at 23.

- Diminished Future Earning Capacity Rebuttal Analysis -

1. Date of Birth

## Summary of Data Used in the DFEC Rebuttal Analysis

2. Date of Injury
3. Age on Date of Injury
4. Permanent and Stationary Report
5. 2005 PDRS Occupation

Group 481: "PLUMBER construction"
6. Years Since Date of Injury
7. Applicant's Average Weekly Wage
8. Applicant's Average Annual Wage ${ }^{39}$
9. Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant ${ }^{40}$
10. Applicant's ZIP code
11. Applicant's geographic region
"Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metro Div"
12. Employment Development Department "Standard Occupational Classification"
"Standard Occupational Classification" Code 47-2152 is associated with the job title "Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Steamfitters."

The job description for "Standard Occupational Classification" Code 47-2152 is "Assemble, install, alter, and repair pipelines or pipe systems that carry water, steam, air, or other liquids or gases. May install heating and cooling equipment and mechanical control systems."
13. Employment Development Department Labor Market Information Division Information ${ }^{41}$

Annual Wage or Salary Information

| Year $^{42}$ | Employed | Wage Mean | $10^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $50^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $75^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile | $90^{\text {th }}$ <br> Percentile |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | 10,140 | $\$ 46,961.00$ | $\$ 21,868.00$ | $\$ 32,289.00$ | $\$ 49,029.00$ | $\$ 59,558.00$ | $\$ 70,757.00$ |
| 2005 | 10,770 | $\$ 43,426.00$ | $\$ 21,002.00$ | $\$ 27,401.00$ | $\$ 41,590.00$ | $\$ 59,079.00$ | $\$ 70,212.00$ |
| 2006 | 11,290 | $\$ 43,597.00$ | $\$ 20,807.00$ | $\$ 29,038.00$ | $\$ 40,676.00$ | $\$ 57,955.00$ | $\$ 71,254.00$ |
| 2007 | 10,300 | $\$ 44,210.00$ | $\$ 22,069.00$ | $\$ 29,603.00$ | $\$ 40,730.00$ | $\$ 56,887.00$ | $\$ 73,228.00$ |
| 2008 | 11,000 | $\$ 47,210.00$ | $\$ 24,720.00$ | $\$ 32,997.00$ | $\$ 44,826.00$ | $\$ 59,575.00$ | $\$ 75,305.00$ |
| 2009 | 9,080 | $\$ 50,252.00$ | $\$ 28,622.00$ | $\$ 35,990.00$ | $\$ 48,913.00$ | $\$ 62,400.00$ | $\$ 77,259.00$ |

14. Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees ("PIESSE")

The Applicant's average annual wage of $\$ 65,520.00$ would place them above the 75 th percentile. For the post-injury earnings of similarly situated employees over 3.0000 years are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PIESSE }=\$ 59,079.00+\$ 57,955.00+\$ 56,887.00 \\
& \text { PIESSE }=\$ 173,921.00
\end{aligned}
$$

[^3]${ }^{40}$ Exhibit 8.
${ }^{41}$ Annual wage or salary and hourly wage information is available for free at www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov. While the hourly wage information is usually equal to the annual salary divided by $2080(52 \mathrm{wks} / \mathrm{yr} \times 40 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk}=$ $2080 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{yr}$ ), this is not always the case. It is best to obtain the annual salary information directly from the website. ${ }^{42}$ For those years marked with an asterisk $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ the EDD LMID data is not available and the statewide aggregate annual salary information is used. For further information see infra Part II.B.2. pp. 2-3. and Exhibit 5.

## EXHIBIT 2

## Disability Rating Under 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule

1. Date of Birth
2. Date of Injury
3. Age on Date of Injury
4. Permanent and Stationary Report
5. 2005 PDRS Occupation

Group 481: "PLUMBER construction"
Hand/multiple fingers - Range of motion 16.05.01.00-2-[1]2-481H-3=3\%

Knee - Range of Motion $50 \%(17.05 .04 .00-7-[2] 8-481 \mathrm{I}-12=14 \%)=7 \%$

Lumbar - Diagnosis-related Estimate 15.03.01.00-9-[5]11-481I-16 = 18\%

Psychiatric - Mental and Behavioral 14.01.00.00-3-[8]4-481H-6 = 7\%

Using the Combined Values Chart, the combined rating is "18c7c7c3=31\%".
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.


## EXHIBIT 3

Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile

1. Date of Birth $=04 / 08 / 1955$
2. Date of Injury $=06 / 05 / 2005$
3. Age on Date of Injury
$=50$
4. Permanent and Stationary Report $=$ Dr. Phil 9/1/2009
5. 2005 PDRS Occupation

Group 481: "PLUMBER construction"
Step 1: Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant ("PIEA")
6. Years Since Date of Injury $=3.0000$
7. Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant ${ }^{43}=\$ 23,992.38$

Step 2: Determine Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees ("PIESSE")
8. Applicant's Average Weekly Wage ("AWW") $=\$ 1,260.00$
9. Applicant's Average Annual Wage ("AAW") ${ }^{44}=\$ 65,520.00$
10. Applicant's ZIP code
$=90210$
11. Applicant's geographic region:
"Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metro Div"
12. Employment Development Department "Standard Occupational Classification"

Code 47-2152: "Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Steamfitters"
13. Percentile earnings above Applicant's AAW for $2004{ }^{45}=90$ th
14. Percentile earnings below Applicant's AAW for $2004=75 t h$
15. Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees based on the 75th percentile: PIESSE $=\$ 59,079.00+\$ 57,955.00+\$ 56,887.00$ PIESSE $=\$ 173,921.00$

Step 3: Calculate Proportional Earnings Loss
16. Proportional Earnings Loss formula
$=($ PIESSE - PIEA $) /$ PIESSE
17. Proportional Earnings Loss $=[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]$
18. Proportional Earnings Loss $=0.8621$

Step 4: Calculate Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")
19. Individualized Rating to Loss ratio formula
$=($ WPI $/$ Proportional Earnings Loss $)$
Step 5: Compare Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio to range of ratios for the FEC ranks
20. If the IRL ratio for the injured body part is within the range of ratios for the same FEC rank, the DFEC portion of the 2005 PDRS has not been rebutted. The rating remains the same.
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 rank.
22. If the IRL ratio for the injured body part is outside 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 "([1.81/a] x .1$)+1$, where ' a ' is the employee's individualized rating to loss ratio." ${ }^{34}$
- DFEC adjustment factor formula
$=([1.81 / \mathrm{a}] \times .1)+1$
- DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /($ IRL ratio $)] \mathrm{x} .1)+1$
(Exhibit 3 continued on page 10)

[^4]
## EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
Body Part: "Hand/multiple fingers - Range of motion"
Rating String: $16.05 .01 .00-2-[1] 2-481 \mathrm{H}-3=3 \%$
Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant $=\$ 23,992.38$
Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees $\quad=\$ 173,921.00$
Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
Proportional Earnings Loss $=($ PIESSE - PIEA $) /$ PIESSE
Proportional Earnings Loss $=[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]$
Proportional Earnings Loss $=0.8621$
Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=($ WPI $/$ Proportional Earnings Loss $)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=(0.02 / 0.8621)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=0.023199$
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).
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.
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /($ IRL ratio $)] x .1)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /(0.023199)]$ x 11$)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=8.8021$
The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of 8.8021 .
New rating: 16.05.01.00-2-[*8.8021]18-481H-22 $=25 \%$

Body Part: "Knee - Range of Motion"
Rating String: 50\%(17.05.04.00-7-[2]8-481I-12=14\%) $=7 \%$
Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant $=\$ 23,992.38$
Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees = $=\$ 173,921.00$
Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
Proportional Earnings Loss $=($ PIESSE - PIEA $) /$ PIESSE
Proportional Earnings Loss $=[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]$
Proportional Earnings Loss $=0.8621$
Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=($ WPI / Proportional Earnings Loss $)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=(0.07 / 0.8621)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=0.081197$
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).
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.
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /($ IRL ratio $)]$ x .1$)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /(0.081197)] \times .1)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=3.2291$
The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of 3.2291.
New rating: 50\% (17.05.04.00-7-[*3.2291]23-481I-31=35\%) $=18 \%$
(Exhibit 3 continued on page 11)

## EXHIBIT 3 (continued)

Disability Rating after DFEC Rebuttal Analysis based on EDD percentile
Body Part: "Lumbar - Diagnosis-related Estimate"
Rating String: 15.03.01.00-9-[5]11-481I-16=18\%
Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant $=\$ 23,992.38$
Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees $\quad=\$ 173,921.00$
Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
Proportional Earnings Loss $=($ PIESSE - PIEA $) /$ PIESSE
Proportional Earnings Loss $=[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]$
Proportional Earnings Loss $=0.8621$
Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=($ WPI $/$ Proportional Earnings Loss $)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=(0.09 / 0.8621)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=0.104396$
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 ).
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.
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /($ IRL ratio $)] \times .1)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /(0.104396)]$ x .1$)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=2.7338$
The rating is recalculated using a DFEC adjustment factor of 2.7338 .
New rating: 15.03.01.00-9-[*2.7338]25-481I-33=37\%

Body Part: "Psychiatric - Mental and Behavioral"
Rating String: 14.01.00.00-3-[8]4-481H-6=7\%
Step 1: Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant $=\$ 23,992.38$
Step 2: Post-Injury Earnings of Similarly Situated Employees = $=\$ 173,921.00$
Step 3: Proportional Earnings Loss
Proportional Earnings Loss $=($ PIESSE - PIEA $) /$ PIESSE
Proportional Earnings Loss $=[(\$ 173,921.00-\$ 23,992.38) / \$ 173,921.00]$
Proportional Earnings Loss $=0.8621$
Step 4: Individualized Rating to Loss Ratio ("IRL ratio")
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=($ WPI / Proportional Earnings Loss $)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=(0.03 / 0.8621)$
Individualized Rating to Loss ratio $=0.034799$
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 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.
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /($ IRL ratio $)]$ x .1$)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=([1.81 /(0.034799)]$ x .1$)+1$
New DFEC adjustment factor formula $=6.2013$
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\%
Using the Combined Values Chart, the combined rating is " $37 \mathrm{c} 27 \mathrm{c} 25 \mathrm{c} 18=72 \%$ ".
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.
capacity, multiply it by the appropriate adjustment factor from Table $\mathrm{B} \underline{\mathrm{A}}$ 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.

Table A

| Range of Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low | High | FEC Rank | Adjustment <br> Factor |
| 1.647 | 1.810 | One | 1.100000 |
| 1.476 | 1.646 | Two | $1.142 \underline{9857}$ |
| 1.305 | 1.475 | Three | $1.1857 \underline{\underline{14}}$ |
| 1.134 | 1.304 | Four | $1.228 \underline{571}$ |
| 0.963 | 1.133 | Five | $1.2714 \underline{29}$ |
| 0.792 | 0.962 | Six | $1.3143 \underline{286}$ |
| 0.621 | 0.791 | Seven | $1.3571 \underline{43}$ |
| 0.450 | 0.620 | Eight | $1.4000 \underline{00}$ |

Table B

| Part of the Body | Ratio of <br> Rating <br> over <br> Losses | FEC <br> 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


## Michael Martinez
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Employment Development Department

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 ${ }^{\text {th }} \mathbf{1 4 1 8}$ | 4 WCAB Rptr. 10,101 |
| City of Long Beach v. WCAB <br> (Garcia) | 126 Cal.App.4th 298 | 7 WCAB Rptr. 10,051 |

(Reprinted with permission of Appeals Board Reporter)
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## 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule, Combining Ratings

2. 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 impaiments 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.
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EXHIBIT 8
Evidence of Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant
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EXHIBIT 8 (continued)
Evidence of Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant
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EXHIBIT 8 (continued)
Evidence of Post-Injury Earnings of Applicant


## STATE OF CALIFORNIA DWC DISTRICT OFFICE

## DOCUMENT COVER SHEET

Specific Injury
SSN: $\qquad$

ADJ12345678
Case Number 1
Cumulative Injury
(Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY)
(End Date: MM/DD/YYYY)
(If Specific Injury, use the start date as the specific date of injury)

Body Part 1:

Body Part 2:


Body Part 3:

Body Part 4:

Other Body Parts: $\qquad$

Please check unit to be filed on (check only one box)

| $\square$ | ADJ $\quad \square$ DEU $\quad \square$ SIF $\quad \square$ UEF $\quad \square \mathrm{VOC}$ | $\square$ INT | $\square$ RSU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Companion Cases



Case Number 2
Cumulative Injury
(Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY)
(End Date: MM/DD/YYYY) (If Specific Injury, use the start date as the specific date of injury)

Body Part 1: $\qquad$ Body Part 3: $\qquad$

Body Part 2: $\qquad$ Body Part 4: $\qquad$

Other Body Parts: $\qquad$

# DOCUMENT SEPARATOR SHEET  

Product Delivery Unit

Document Type

## ADJ

MISC

Document Title TYPED OR WRITTEN LETTER


Received Date MM/DD/YYYY

# DOCUMENT SEPARATOR SHEET  

Product Delivery Unit

Document Type

## ADJ

LEGAL DOCS

Document Title PROOF OF SERVICE


Office Use Only

Received Date MM/DD/YYYY

## PDRater.com

## workers' compensation resources

| Receipt Date: <br> Receipt \#: | 12-11-2009 <br> ylevut4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Applicant: | John Doe |
| Employer: | Big Box |
| WCAB \#: | ADJ12345678 |
| Claim \#: | WC0123456789 |

INVOICE FOR:

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

## FOR:

| ITEM | PRICE |
| :--- | :--- |
| PDRater Ogilvie DFEC Rebuttal Analysis |  |
|  | TOTAL: |

Thank you for your business!
Jay Shergill


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ References to Ogilvie I are to Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2/3/2009) 74 Cal.Comp.Cases 248 (Appeals Board en banc) (Ogilvie I). Subsequent citations refer to the page numbers of the WCAB website version.
    ${ }^{2}$ References to Ogilvie II are to Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (9/3/2009) 74 Cal.Comp.Cases 1127
    (Appeals Board en banc) (Ogilvie II). Subsequent citations refer to the page numbers of the WCAB website version.
    ${ }^{3}$ En banc decisions of the Appeals Board are binding precedent on all Appeals Board panels and workers' compensation judges. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10341; City of Long Beach v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Garcia) (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 298, 313, fn. 5 [70 Cal.Comp.Cases 109, 120, fn. 5]; Gee v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1418, 1425, fn. 6 [67 Cal.Comp.Cases 236, 239, fn. 6]; see also Gov. Code, § 11425.60(b).) See Exhibit 6 for Appeals Board Reporter citation cross reference chart.

    4 "[TT]here is nothing magical about a three-year period." Ogilvie I at 23 ; Ogilvie II at 31. "In cases of individual injured employees, however, a longer or shorter period of post-injury earnings may be appropriate." Id.
    ${ }^{5}$ Exhibit 8.

[^1]:    ${ }^{16}$ The Board describes alternatives to EDD wage information for those times when "there may be problems with or limitations to LMID website wage data." Ogilvie I at 25.
    ${ }^{17}$ The "mean" is an average of all the data. The $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile or "median" is a value higher than half of the sample population and lower than the other half of the same sample population.
    ${ }^{18}$ Ogilvie I at 35.
    ${ }^{19}$ Exhibit 1. Data is not available for years marked with an asterisk (*); statewide annual salary data is used instead.
    ${ }^{20}$ 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: $(52 \times \$ 1,260.00)=\$ 65,520.00$.
    ${ }^{21}$ Exhibit 1. Data is not available for years marked with an asterisk (*); statewide annual salary data is used instead.
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[^2]:    ${ }^{26}$ Ogilvie I at 27-28.
    ${ }^{27}$ Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, page 1-7, Table A.
    ${ }^{28}$ Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, pages 1-7 to 1-8.
    ${ }^{29}$ Id.
    ${ }^{30}$ Ogilvie I at 28.
    ${ }^{31}$ Id. at 29-30.
    ${ }^{32}$ Id. at 30.
    ${ }^{33}$ Id. at 31-33.
    ${ }^{34}$ Exhibit 4, 2005 PDRS, page 1-7, Table A.
    ${ }^{35}$ Ogilvie I at 31; Ogilvie II at 23.
    ${ }^{36}$ Ogilvie I at 31-32.
    ${ }^{37}$ Id. at 32.

[^3]:    ${ }^{39}$ Infra Part II.B.4. p. 3; L.C. § 4651.

[^4]:    ${ }^{43}$ Exhibit 8.
    ${ }^{44}$ Infra Part II.B.4. p. 3; L.C. § 4651.
    ${ }^{45}$ Based upon the "Annual Wage or Salary" information from the EDD LMID website for "Standard Occupational Classification" code. See also Exhibit 1.
    ${ }^{46}$ Ogilvie I at $31 ; \underline{\text { Ogilvie II at } 23 .}$

