



Workers' Compensation Division 350 Winter St. NE P.O. Box 14480 Salem, OR 97309-0405 503-947-7810 Toll free: 800-452-0288 Fax: 503-947-7581 www.wcd.oregon.gov

Industry Notice

Dec. 9, 2019

To: Insurers, self-insured employers, service companies, workers, attorneys, and other interested parties

Subject: Interpretation of "significantly limited in repetitive use" under OAR 436-035-0019

SUMMARY:

This industry notice clarifies the Workers' Compensation Division's (WCD) interpretation of when a worker is "significantly limited in the repetitive use" of a body part under OAR 436-035-0019(1), following *Broeke v. SAIF*, 300 Or App 91 (2019).

BACKGROUND:

Under OAR 436-035-0019(1), "[a] worker is entitled to a 5 percent chronic condition impairment value for each applicable body part, when a preponderance of medical opinion establishes that, due to a chronic and permanent medical condition, the worker is **significantly limited in the repetitive use**" of one or more of the listed body parts.

In *Spurger v. SAIF*, 266 Or App 183 (2014), the Court of Appeals held that, when evaluating whether a worker is "significantly limited in the repetitive use" of a body part, the relevant inquiry is whether the limitations described in the medical-opinion evidence show that the worker is significantly limited, and not whether a physician described the limitations as "significant" according to the physician's understanding of the term.

Following *Spurger*, WCD issued an <u>industry notice</u>, dated Dec. 22, 2014, that explained its interpretation and implementation of OAR 436-035-0019(1).

Recently, in *Broeke v. SAIF*, 300 Or App 91 (2019), the Court of Appeals found that WCD's interpretation of OAR 436-035-0019(1) is plausible and entitled to deference. Furthermore, the court stated OAR 436-035-0019, as interpreted by WCD, authorizes a chronic condition impairment value for a worker who can repetitively use the body part at issue for at most two-thirds of a period of time, which, according to the court, means a worker who is restricted from repetitive use of a body part for one-third or more of a period of time is entitled to a chronic condition impairment value. The court's statement regarding WCD's interpretation was not our intent, and this updated industry notice clarifies how WCD interprets and implements OAR 436-035-0019(1).

INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION:

WCD determines "whether the limitations described in the medical-opinion evidence show that the worker is significantly limited" under OAR 436-035-0019(1). "Significantly limited" is defined by neither rule nor statute. Absent statutory and administrative definition, WCD looks to a term's plain meaning. "Significant" is defined, most relevantly, as "having or expressing a meaning; meaningful" or "important; notable; valuable."

See The American Heritage Dictionary, New College Edition; see also, Webster's II New College Dictionary. "Limited" is defined as "confined or restricted." *Id*.

In applying these definitions to OAR 436-035-0019(1), WCD found it reasonable to adopt a standard to define when a confinement or restriction is important, meaningful, or notable. Accordingly, WCD interprets confined or restricted ("limited") "repetitive use" under OAR 436-035-0019(1) as important, meaningful, or notable ("significant") when the worker has permanently lost the ability to repetitively use the body part for more than two-thirds of a period of time (or said another way, when the worker is only able to repetitively use the body part for less than one-third of a period of time).

If you have questions, contact Jennifer Millemann at 503-947-7759.

Sally loen

Sally Coen, Interim Administrator Workers' Compensation Division

Distribution: GovDelivery (insurers, self-insured employers, workers, attorneys, other interested parties)