

Whole Person Impairment Versus Permanent Disability Rating in California Workers' Compensation: A Legal Analysis

(PART-A INJURED WORKERS ANALYSIS)

March 1, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney. Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

WHOLE PERSON IMPAIRMENT VERSUS PERMANENT DISABILITY RATING IN CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Part 1: Overview and Why This Matters to You

What This Report Covers

If you were hurt at work in California, you will likely hear two terms during your workers' compensation case: Whole Person Impairment (WPI) and Permanent Disability Rating (PDR). Many people think these terms mean the same thing. They do not. Understanding the difference can mean thousands of dollars more — or less — in the benefits you receive.

The Basic Difference

Whole Person Impairment (WPI) is a medical number. A doctor examines you after your condition has stabilized and assigns a percentage that measures how much permanent physical function you have lost. This number is the same for everyone with a similar injury, no matter their age or job. A doctor determines WPI using a medical reference book called the AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition (AMA Guides Overview (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview>)).

Permanent Disability Rating (PDR) is a legal and economic number. It takes your WPI and adjusts it based on your age, your job, and how much of your disability was caused by the work injury. The PDR determines how much money you actually receive. California law requires these adjustments under Cal. Lab. Code § 4660 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-4660/>).

Why the Difference Matters in Dollars

Consider this example: Two workers both have a 30% WPI for a knee injury.

- Worker A is 60 years old and works in construction. After adjustments for age and occupation, the PDR may reach 40% or higher — worth approximately \$58,000 in benefits.
- Worker B is 30 years old and works at a desk. After adjustments, the PDR may be only 15% — worth approximately \$14,500 in benefits.

That is a difference of nearly \$44,000 for the same medical injury. The WPI is the same; the PDR is different because the law considers how the injury affects each worker's ability to earn a living. You can review current benefit rates at the DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits page (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>).

Key Risk Areas

Important: Many injured workers receive ratings that do not fully reflect their condition. Common problems include:

- The doctor used the AMA Guides incorrectly, giving you a WPI that is too low
- The insurance company blamed too much of your disability on pre-existing conditions (a process called apportionment)
- Your job was classified incorrectly, reducing your occupational adjustment
- The doctor did not consider the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine, which allows rating by comparison to similar conditions when the standard method gives an unfair result

Critical: You have limited time to challenge a rating. If you receive a rating determination you believe is wrong, act quickly to request review or file the necessary paperwork with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) — the state agency that resolves workers' compensation disputes.

Part 2: Legal Framework — The Laws That Control Your Rating

The Main Statutes

California's workers' compensation system relies on several key laws that govern how your permanent disability is determined.

Cal. Lab. Code § 4660 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-4660/>) is the main law for permanent disability determinations. It states that when calculating your permanent disability percentage, the system must consider three things beyond your medical impairment:

- The nature of your physical injury
- Your occupation at the time of injury
- Your age at the time of injury

The law also says your rating must reflect your diminished future earning capacity — meaning how the injury reduces your ability to earn money for the rest of your working life. This statute gave the state's Administrative Director the authority to create the Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (PDRS) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>), which is the official chart used to calculate your PDR.

Cal. Lab. Code § 4663 (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/>) controls apportionment — the process of deciding what portion of your disability was caused by your work injury versus other factors like prior injuries or pre-existing conditions. This law requires the doctor to state what percentage of your permanent disability came from the work injury and what percentage came from other causes. Apportionment is one of the most commonly disputed parts of any workers' compensation case, because insurance companies often try to blame as much disability as possible on non-work factors to reduce what they owe you (How to Analyze Apportionment – Judge Eric Ledger (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/>)).

Regulatory Rules

The regulations in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (8 CCR) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm) set the detailed rules doctors must follow when writing medical reports for your case. These regulations require that evaluating physicians provide reports covering your medical history, physical examination results, diagnostic tests, work restrictions, WPI rating, and apportionment opinion. Telehealth evaluations are now permitted if all parties agree in writing and the doctor confirms a physical examination was not necessary (Disability Evaluation Unit - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html>)).

The WCAB's procedural rules, including 8 CCR § 10742 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10742.html>), require that anyone requesting a hearing on permanent disability must file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) — a formal document stating that the parties have tried to resolve the dispute and that discovery is complete.

The AMA Guides: Your Medical Measuring Stick

The AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview>) is the mandatory medical reference for all WPI determinations in California for injuries on or after April 19, 2004. The AMA Guides provide standardized methods for rating impairment in every body system, including muscles and bones, the nervous system, the lungs, the heart, and mental health conditions. The Guides explicitly state that impairment ratings measure functional limitations, not disability — meaning they do not consider your job or age (AMA Guides 5th Edition - COA (<https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat15StevenFeinbergMD.pdf>)).

Part 3: The SB 863 Reform — Key Changes After 2013

What Changed

Senate Bill 863 (SB 863), effective January 1, 2013, was the most significant workers' compensation reform in California in nearly a decade. If your injury occurred on or after this date, these changes directly affect your benefits (SB 863 Implementing Reforms - CWCI (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>)).

The 1.4 Multiplier

Before 2013, the system used a Future Earning Capacity (FEC) adjustment — a variable factor between 1.1 and 1.4 that was applied differently depending on injury type and wage loss data. SB 863 replaced this with a

single 1.4 multiplier applied to all WPI percentages for injuries on or after January 1, 2013. This change generally increased permanent disability ratings because many injuries previously received multipliers lower than 1.4 (SB 863 Reform - RM Magazine (<https://www.rmmagazine.com/articles/article/2013/03/14/-The-Implications-of-California-s-Latest-Attempt-at-Workers-Comp-Reform->); Injury to Impairment - Ortho Legal Group (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>)).

For example, if your doctor assigns 15% WPI:

- Pre-2013 injury: $15\% \times 1.2$ (typical FEC) = 18% starting point
- Post-2013 injury: $15\% \times 1.4$ = 21% starting point

Other Key SB 863 Changes

- Eliminated add-ons for psychiatric conditions, sexual dysfunction, and sleep disorders as separate permanent disability percentages. These conditions may still be rated but must meet specific criteria under Cal. Lab. Code § 4660.1.
- Created the Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB): A \$6,000 non-transferable voucher for education and job training if your employer does not offer you suitable alternative work within 60 days after you reach maximum medical improvement (Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/sjdb.html>)).
- Established the Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP): A \$120 million fund providing one-time payments of \$5,000 to workers whose disability benefits are disproportionately low compared to their actual lost earnings (Return to Work, SJDB, RTWSP - Commission on Health and Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/returntoworkpage1.html>)).

Current Benefit Rates (2025–2026)

For injuries on or after January 1, 2013, the current benefit rates are (DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)):

- Maximum weekly permanent disability rate: \$290 per week
- Minimum weekly permanent disability rate: \$160 per week
- Mileage reimbursement for medical travel: \$0.725 per mile

These rates are adjusted each year based on the Statewide Average Weekly Wage (SAWW).

Part 4: Understanding Whole Person Impairment (WPI)

What WPI Measures

Whole Person Impairment (WPI) is a percentage that represents how much permanent physical function you have lost because of your work injury. It is a purely medical measurement. Your doctor assigns this number after you reach Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) — also called Permanent and Stationary (P&S) status — the point where your condition has stabilized and further treatment is unlikely to produce major improvement (Maximum Medical Improvement - LTHZ Law (<https://www.lthzlaw.com/what-happens-when-you-achieve-maximum-medical-improvement/>); Demystifying MMI - LA Accident Pros (<https://lacaccidentpros.org/what-how-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/>)).

WPI has four important characteristics (Whole Person Impairment in California - Solov & Teitell (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>)):

- Medical only: Your doctor cannot consider your job, age, or income when assigning WPI
- Standardized: Doctors must follow the AMA Guides, Fifth Edition, so two doctors should give similar ratings for the same condition
- Whole-person scale: All ratings are expressed as a percentage of your total body function (for example, an ankle injury is first rated as a lower leg impairment, then converted to a whole-person percentage)
- Does not include non-work factors: WPI does not subtract for pre-existing conditions; that happens separately through apportionment

The P&S Report

When your doctor declares you P&S, they must write a report that includes (Disability Evaluation Unit - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html>)):

1. Your medical history and treatment summary
2. Current symptoms and physical limitations
3. Results of diagnostic tests (X-rays, MRIs, etc.)
4. Physical examination findings with measurements
5. Your permanent work restrictions
6. Recommendations for any future medical care
7. Your WPI percentage using the AMA Guides
8. An apportionment determination

How Doctors Calculate WPI

The method depends on the type of injury (AMA Guides vs. California PDRS - Bradford Barthel (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2025/03/25/ama-guides-california-pdrs-can-differ-on-rating-instructions/>)):

- Muscle and bone injuries: Doctors use range-of-motion measurements, strength tests, and functional limitation assessments
- Nerve injuries: The AMA Guides Chapter 13 provides criteria for rating nerve damage, spinal cord injuries, brain injuries, and chronic pain
- Mental health conditions: The AMA Guides Chapter 14 covers psychiatric impairments, but California law under Cal. Lab. Code § 3208.3 adds stricter requirements — the condition must be diagnosed using DSM-5 criteria, predominantly caused by actual workplace events, and supported by a licensed psychologist or psychiatrist (Mental Health Claims - Roy Yang Law (<https://royyanglaw.com/workers-comp/mental-health-claims/>))

Important: Your doctor may also add up to 3% for clinically significant, persistent pain that goes beyond what the structural injury alone would predict.

Part 5: Understanding Permanent Disability Rating (PDR)

What PDR Measures

Your Permanent Disability Rating (PDR) is the legal percentage that determines your actual benefits. Unlike WPI, which only measures medical impairment, the PDR accounts for how the injury affects your ability to work and earn money based on your specific situation (Permanent Disability Guidebook - California DIR (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>)).

Two workers with the same WPI can receive very different PDR percentages. The PDR adjusts for:

- The 1.4 multiplier (for injuries on or after January 1, 2013)
- Your occupational group number — a code reflecting the physical demands of your job
- Your occupational variant — a letter (C through J) showing how your specific injury affects your specific job
- Your age at the time of injury — older workers generally receive higher ratings
- Apportionment — the percentage of disability caused by the work injury versus other causes

Occupational Adjustments Explained

The PDRS (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>) divides California's labor market into 45 occupational groups, each with a three-digit number (Occupational Group Characteristics - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)):

- Groups 110–140: Professional, technical, and office jobs (lighter physical demands)
- Groups 210–290: Skilled trades
- Groups 380–420: Construction and heavy labor
- Groups 430–470: Material handling and warehouse work
- Groups 480–500: Driving and transportation

Each body-part injury and occupational group combination produces an occupational variant — a letter from C to J:

- Variants C, D, E: Your job places lower-than-average demands on the injured body part (rating decreases)
- Variant F: Average demands (no change)
- Variants G, H, I, J: Your job places higher-than-average demands on the injured body part (rating increases)

For example, a knee injury has minimal impact on an office worker (variant C) but major impact on a construction laborer (variant H). The occupational variant ensures your rating reflects how the injury actually affects your work.

Age Adjustments Explained

The PDRS also adjusts your rating based on your age at the time of injury:

- Workers age 20–30: Ratings typically decrease by 10–15%, because younger workers have more time to retrain or change careers
- Workers age 35–50: Ratings stay roughly the same or increase slightly
- Workers age 50–65+: Ratings typically increase by 10–15% or more, because older workers face more difficulty finding new work and have fewer years left in the workforce

The logic is straightforward: a 60-year-old with a permanent lifting restriction faces a much harder job market than a 30-year-old with the same restriction.

Part 6: The Step-by-Step Conversion From WPI to PDR

The Eight-Step Process

The Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) prescribes the following steps to convert your medical WPI into your legal PDR (Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>)):

1. Identify the impairment number. Your doctor locates the code for your specific injured body part in Section 2 of the PDRS (for example, 15.01.02.02 = cervical spine soft tissue injury).
2. Determine the impairment standard. Each impairment number has a baseline WPI percentage representing typical impairment for that condition.
3. Apply the 1.4 multiplier (for injuries on or after January 1, 2013). Multiply the WPI by 1.4 to account for diminished future earning capacity.
4. Find your occupational group number. The Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) — the state office that calculates ratings — identifies the three-digit code matching your job at the time of injury using Section 3 of the PDRS.
5. Determine your occupational variant. Cross-reference your occupational group number and impairment number in Section 4 of the PDRS to get your variant letter (C through J).
6. Apply the occupational adjustment. Use the tables in Section 5 of the PDRS to adjust your rating up or down based on your occupational variant.
7. Apply the age adjustment. Use the tables in Section 6 of the PDRS to adjust for your age at the time of injury.
8. Calculate the final PDR. The result is your permanent disability rating, expressed as a percentage from 0% to 100%.

How the Rating Formula Looks

Your rating is typically written as a formula. For example:

15.01.02.02 – 8 – [1.4] 11 – 470H – 13 – 11%

This means:

- 15.01.02.02 = Cervical spine soft tissue injury
- 8% = WPI assigned by doctor

- [1.4] 11 = After applying the 1.4 multiplier ($8\% \times 1.4 \approx 11\%$)
- 470H = Occupational group 470 (heavy laborer), variant H
- 13% = Rating after occupational adjustment
- 11% = Final rating after age adjustment

Combining Multiple Injuries

If you injured more than one body part, the system uses the Combined Values Chart in Section 8 of the PDRS. You do not simply add the percentages together. Instead, each additional impairment has a slightly smaller effect on the total. For example, combining 20% and 30% does not equal 50% — it equals approximately 44% (AMA Guides vs. PDRS - Bradford Barthel (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2025/03/25/ama-guides-california-pdrs-can-differ-on-rating-instructions/>)).

The formula is: Combined = $A + (B \times (1 - A))$, where A and B are the decimal forms of each percentage.

Part 7: Apportionment — Dividing Responsibility for Your Disability

What Apportionment Means

Apportionment is the process of determining how much of your permanent disability was caused by your work injury versus other factors. Cal. Lab. Code § 4663 (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/>) requires your doctor to state what percentage of your disability came from the work injury and what percentage came from other causes, such as prior injuries, pre-existing conditions, or natural aging (How to Analyze Apportionment – Judge Eric Ledger (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/>)).

Important: Apportionment looks at what is causing your disability (your permanent functional limitation), not what caused your injury (the event that hurt you). This is a critical distinction.

Risk Factors Versus Causative Factors

The law draws a clear line between these two concepts:

- A risk factor is something that makes you more likely to get hurt but does not itself cause disability. For example, your age may make you more likely to break a bone, but age alone does not cause the disability from the broken bone. Insurance companies cannot apportion your disability to risk factors.
- A causative factor is a condition that actively contributes to your permanent functional loss. For example, if you had severe pre-existing arthritis that was already limiting your movement before the work injury, that arthritis may be a causative factor.

The "Takes You As Found" Rule

California follows the rule that the employer takes the worker as found. This means if you have an underlying condition that makes your injury worse, the employer is still responsible for all disability caused by the work injury. For example, if you have osteoporosis and a workplace fall causes a severe fracture, the employer cannot avoid responsibility simply because the fracture was worse due to your bone condition.

Common Improper Apportionment Tactics

Watch for these defense strategies that may improperly reduce your benefits:

- Blaming natural aging: Insurers often argue that your disability is partly caused by "expected degenerative changes for someone your age." This is improper unless those changes are medically proven to be independently causing your functional loss — not just making you more vulnerable to injury.
- Blaming prior resolved injuries: If you had a prior injury to the same body part that fully healed with no lasting disability, the insurer cannot apportion current disability to that resolved injury.
- Blaming lifestyle factors: Smoking, weight, or a sedentary lifestyle are risk factors, not causative factors, unless the doctor can medically explain how they independently cause the specific permanent disability you now have.

Critical: If your doctor's report apportions a significant percentage of your disability to non-work causes, review the report carefully. The doctor must explain the medical reasoning for the apportionment. A vague statement like "50% due to pre-existing degeneration" without detailed explanation may not qualify as substantial medical evidence and can be challenged.

Part 8: The Almaraz/Guzman Doctrine — Challenging Unfair Ratings

What the Doctrine Allows

The Almaraz/Guzman doctrine is a legal rule that allows doctors to deviate from a strict, literal reading of the AMA Guides when the standard method produces an unfair result. Under this doctrine, a doctor may "rate by analogy" — meaning they can use a different chapter or table in the AMA Guides that more accurately captures your functional limitations (Almaraz/Guzman Ratings Fundamentals (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>)).

For example, a worker with plantar fasciitis (foot pain) might receive 0% WPI under the strict heel pain section of the AMA Guides. But if that worker has a documented limp and difficulty walking, a doctor could rate by analogy to the gait derangement section, resulting in a 7% WPI that better reflects the actual limitation.

Requirements for Using Almaraz/Guzman

To successfully use this doctrine, the doctor must:

1. Provide the strict AMA Guides rating first — showing what the standard method produces
2. Explain why the strict rating is inaccurate — describing why it does not reflect your actual functional limitations
3. Provide an alternative rating using a different chapter, table, or method within the AMA Guides
4. Explain why the alternative is more accurate — describing how it better captures your impairment

What Almaraz/Guzman Cannot Do

Important: This doctrine has limits. It cannot be used to:

- Ignore the AMA Guides entirely or use methods outside the Guides
- Bring back the old 1997 rating system's approach of basing ratings on work restrictions
- Simply disagree with a rating without medical justification
- Inflate a rating by combining both the strict and alternative methods without proper reasoning

The doctrine allows flexibility within the AMA Guides — not an escape from them.

When to Consider Almaraz/Guzman

You should discuss this option with your attorney if:

- You received 0% or very low WPI despite having documented, significant functional limitations
- You have a chronic pain condition or complex regional pain syndrome that the standard AMA tables rate poorly
- Your daily life activities are significantly limited in ways that the strict rating does not capture
- Multiple impairment methods within the AMA Guides could apply to your condition

Part 9: Challenging Your Rating — QME and AME Evaluations

The QME Process (For Workers Without an Attorney)

If you disagree with your treating doctor's WPI rating or the DEU's rating determination, you can request a Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) panel evaluation. A QME is a state-certified doctor who performs independent medical evaluations (DWC QME Process (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html>); QME vs. AME - Employees First Labor Law (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/qme-vs-ame-in-california-workers-comp-whats-the-difference/>)).

The QME process works as follows:

1. You request a QME panel from the Division of Workers' Compensation in the relevant medical specialty
2. The state randomly assigns one QME from the panel

3. The QME examines you, reviews your medical records, and writes a detailed report within 30 days
4. The QME report carries significant weight with WCAB judges, especially if it is well-reasoned and internally consistent

The AME Process (For Workers With an Attorney)

If you have an attorney, both your attorney and the insurance company's attorney may agree to select an Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) instead of using a random QME panel. An AME is a specific doctor both sides choose together.

Key advantages of the AME process:

- You help choose the doctor — both sides select someone with expertise in your type of injury
- Greater weight at hearings — WCAB judges often give more weight to AME reports because both sides agreed on the evaluator
- Faster scheduling — an AME may be available sooner than a QME panel assignment

The AME must issue a report within 30 days that covers your injury history, medical records review, examination findings, WPI rating, apportionment opinion, and work restrictions (AME Reports Guide - Sound Medical Evaluation (<https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/ame-medical-legal-report-guide/>); Permanent Partial Disability - Torrez Legal (<https://torrezlegal.com/blog/how-permanent-partial-disability-ratings-are-determined/>)).

Filing at the WCAB

If medical evaluations do not resolve the dispute, your attorney can file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) with the WCAB to request a hearing before a judge (8 CCR § 10742 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10742.html>); How to File a DOR - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>)). The DOR must state that genuine efforts were made to settle the dispute and that discovery is complete.

The hearing process typically begins with a mandatory settlement conference (MSC), where a judge helps the parties try to reach an agreement. If no settlement is reached, the case proceeds to trial.

Part 10: How Your Rating Affects Your Benefits

Calculating Your Permanent Disability Benefits

Your weekly benefit equals two-thirds of your average weekly earnings at the time of injury, subject to minimum and maximum limits set by law (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 4650–4664 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2005/lab/4650-4664.html>); DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)).

For post-2013 injuries:

- Maximum weekly rate: \$290
- Minimum weekly rate: \$160

Your PDR percentage determines the number of weeks you receive benefits. You can find the exact number of weeks for each PDR percentage in the 2025 Permanent Disability Indemnity Chart (<https://www.iflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>).

Example calculation:

- Average weekly earnings: \$1,200
- Two-thirds of earnings: \$800/week
- Capped at maximum: \$290/week
- PDR of 21%: 112 weeks of benefits
- Total permanent disability payment: $\$290 \times 112 = \$32,480$

Important: Even a small increase in your PDR makes a meaningful difference. A 1% increase (from 21% to 22%) can add 4–6 weeks of benefits — worth \$1,160 to \$1,740 in additional compensation.

Settlement Options

Once your PDR is established, you can settle your claim in one of two ways (Comparing Stipulated Awards and C&R - Pacific Workers (<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>); Settlement Types - Appel Lawyer (<https://www.appellawyer.com/blog/compromise-release-stipulation/>)):

Option 1: Stipulated Award ("Stips")

- You agree on the PDR and weekly payment amount
- You keep your right to future medical treatment for your work injury — for life
- Benefits are paid every two weeks
- Your case stays open — you can reopen it if your condition worsens

Option 2: Compromise and Release (C&R)

- You receive a one-time lump sum payment
- Future medical benefits for the injury are terminated
- Your case is permanently closed — you cannot reopen it
- You control how to use the funds immediately

Choosing Between Stips and C&R

Consider the following when deciding:

- If your condition may get worse or you will need future surgery or treatment, a Stipulated Award protects your medical benefits
- If your condition is stable and you need money now, a C&R gives you immediate access to funds
- Workers' compensation benefits are generally not subject to federal income tax

Part 11: Additional Benefits — SJDB Voucher and RTWSP

Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB)

If you have any permanent partial disability (any PDR below 100%) and your employer does not offer you suitable alternative work within 60 days after you reach MMI, you may qualify for a Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB) voucher (Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/sjdb.html>); SJDB Voucher - GEK Law (<https://www.geklaw.com/news/displacement-voucher.html>)).

Eligibility requirements:

- Your injury occurred on or after January 1, 2004
- You have permanent partial disability
- Your employer did not offer alternative work lasting at least 12 months, paying at least 85% of your pre-injury wages, and matching your work restrictions

Voucher details for post-2013 injuries:

- Amount: \$6,000 non-transferable voucher
- Permitted uses: Tuition, fees, books, computers, tools, and vocational counseling at state-approved schools
- Time limit: Must be used within 2 years of issuance or 5 years of injury date, whichever is later
- Cannot be exchanged for cash and cannot be settled as part of a C&R

Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP)

If your permanent disability benefits are significantly lower than your actual lost earnings, you may also qualify for the Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP) (Return to Work, SJDB, RTWSP - Commission on Health and Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/returntoworkpage1.html>)).

Eligibility:

- Injury on or after January 1, 2013
- You received an SJDB voucher
- Your PDR is disproportionately low compared to your actual earnings loss
- You apply within 1 year of SJDB voucher issuance

Benefit: A one-time lump-sum payment of up to \$5,000.

Part 12: Case Examples

Example 1: Lumbar Spine Injury With Age and Occupational Adjustment

Maria, age 58, injured her back in 2023 while working as a warehouse supervisor. Her doctor assigned 15% WPI for lumbar spine impairment.

Step	Value	Explanation
WPI	15%	Doctor's rating using AMA Guides
1.4 Multiplier	21%	15% × 1.4 (post-2013 injury)
Occupational Group	360	Warehouse supervisor — semi-skilled labor
Occupational Variant	G	Above-average demands on spine
After Occupational Adjustment	24%	Increased for heavy job demands
After Age Adjustment (age 58)	28%	Increased for older worker
Final PDR	28%	

Benefits: At \$290/week maximum for 143 weeks = \$41,470

Note: Maria also has documented nerve symptoms and significant daily life limitations. An Almaraz/Guzman argument could raise her WPI to 18–20%, potentially increasing her PDR to 32–35% and adding \$12,000–\$18,000 in benefits.

Example 2: Improper Apportionment Challenge

James, age 42, tore his rotator cuff at work and received 25% WPI. His doctor noted pre-existing shoulder arthritis from 5 years earlier that had fully resolved. The insurer apportioned 30% of the disability to the old arthritis, reducing the industrial PDR to 18%.

Why this apportionment is likely wrong: The pre-existing arthritis was asymptomatic and fully resolved before the work injury. It was a risk factor — not a current cause of disability. The employer takes James as found. The corrected rating with 100% industrial causation would yield a PDR of 30–35%, adding \$15,000–\$25,000 in benefits.

Example 3: Occupational Group Misclassification

Robert, age 38, injured his knee. His job title was "Quality Control Inspector," and the DEU classified him as Group 110 (sedentary office work, variant C). His PDR was calculated at 14%.

However, Robert actually spent 30% of his time walking a manufacturing floor and carrying materials. The correct classification is Group 250 (semi-skilled manufacturing inspection, variant F). The corrected PDR would be 22–25%, adding \$8,000–\$12,000 in benefits.

Part 13: Your Next Steps — What to Do Now

Recommended Actions

Follow these steps to protect your rights:

1. Get copies of all medical reports — including your treating doctor's P&S report, any QME or AME reports, and the DEU's written rating determination with the rating formula
2. Verify your WPI — check whether the doctor properly applied the AMA Guides and whether Almaraz/Guzman should be considered

3. Check your occupational group — confirm the DEU assigned the correct occupational group for your actual job duties, not just your job title
4. Review apportionment — determine whether any apportionment is supported by real medical evidence or improperly blames risk factors
5. Consider your options — based on what you find, decide whether to accept the rating, request a QME/AME evaluation, or file a DOR at the WCAB

When to Accept Your Rating

You may choose to accept your current rating and proceed to settlement if:

- The rating appears reasonable and is well-supported by medical evidence
- The cost of challenging the rating (medical evaluation fees, legal fees, time) outweighs the likely increase in benefits
- You need to resolve your case quickly due to financial pressure

When to Challenge Your Rating

You should consider challenging your rating if:

- Your doctor did not adequately explain their WPI methodology
- Apportionment appears to be based on risk factors rather than genuine causative conditions
- Your occupational group does not match your actual job duties
- You received 0% or very low WPI despite significant documented functional limitations
- The doctor did not consider Almaraz/Guzman when the strict AMA rating seems unfair

Critical: Time limits apply to every step in the workers' compensation process. If you believe your rating is wrong, consult with an attorney as soon as possible. Delays can result in losing your right to challenge the rating.

References

1. Whole Person Impairment in California (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>) - Solov & Teitell.
2. Permanent Disability Guidebook, Chapter 7 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>) - California Department of Industrial Relations.
3. AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment Overview (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview>) - American Medical Association.
4. Injury to Impairment: What Whole Person Impairment Means for the Injured Worker (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>) - Ortho Legal Group.
5. PD Ratings: California Workers' Compensation (<https://www.pdratings.com>) - PDRatings.com.
6. AMA Guides 5th Edition Presentation (<https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat15StevenFeinbergMD.pdf>) - California Orthopaedic Association.
7. California Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (2005 PDRS) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
8. What Happens When You Achieve Maximum Medical Improvement (<https://www.lthzlaw.com/what-happens-when-you-achieve-maximum-medical-improvement/>) - LTHZ Law.
9. 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr1997.pdf>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
10. The Implications of California's Latest Attempt at Workers' Comp Reform (SB 863) (<https://www.rmmagazine.com/articles/article/2013/03/14/-The-Implications-of-California-s-Latest-Attempt-at-Workers-Comp-Reform->) - RM Magazine.
11. Demystifying Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) (<https://lacaccidentpros.org/what-how-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/>) - LA Accident Pros.
12. Labor Code § 4663 – Apportionment of Permanent Disability (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/>) - Employees First Labor Law.

13. QME vs. AME in California Workers' Comp: What's the Difference? (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/qme-vs-ame-in-california-workers-comp-whats-the-difference/>) - Employees First Labor Law.
14. Average Weekly Wage Calculation Guide (<https://www.sullivanoncorp.com/hubfs/docs/Resources/AWW-Calculation-Guide-2024.pdf>) - Sullivan on Comp.
15. How to Analyze Apportionment (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/>) - Judge Eric Ledger, California Lawyers Association.
16. DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
17. DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
18. Almaraz/Guzman and QME Ratings (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jyuuEk4DDtA>) - YouTube Educational Resource.
19. How to Handle a Dispute Over Your Disability Rating (<https://www.lagunalawfirm.com/california-workers-compensation-how-to-handle-a-dispute-over-your-disability-rating/>) - Laguna Law Firm.
20. California Labor Code Sections 4650–4664 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2005/lab/4650-4664.html>) - Justia.
21. Almaraz/Guzman Ratings: Fundamentals of the Case (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>) - ALSI Conference Materials.
22. What If I Disagree with the Disability Rating? (<https://wcabdefense.com/blog/workers-comp/claim/what-if-i-disagree-with-the-disability-rating/>) - WCAB Defense.
23. Vocational Rehab Rights of Injured Workers (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/vocational-rehab-rights-of-injured-workers/>) - Invictus Law.
24. Labor Code § 4659 – 100% Permanent Disability (Life Pension) (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74659-100-permanent-disability-life-pension/>) - Employees First Labor Law.
25. Occupational Group Characteristics (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>) - PD Ratings.
26. Cal. Lab. Code § 5307 (2025) (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307/>) - Justia.
27. SB 863 Supplemental Job Displacement Voucher (<https://www.geklaw.com/news/displacement-voucher.html>) - GEK Law.
28. Future Medical Treatment Under California Workers' Compensation (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/workers-compensation-lawyer/future-medical-treatment/>) - Invictus Law.
29. WCAB Regulations (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=901.pdf>) - California Workers' Compensation Institute.
30. Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/sjdb.html>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
31. Cal. Lab. Code § 5307.1 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307-1/>) - Justia.
32. Medical Expenses Covered by California Workers' Compensation (<https://www.rminjurylaw.com/workers-compensation-law-ca/what-medical-expenses-are-covered-by-california-workers-compensation>) - RM Injury Law.
33. Workers' Compensation Benefits Overview (<https://allegiancelaw.com/practice-areas/workers-compensation/workers-comp-benefits/>) - Allegiance Law.
34. Mental Health Claims in California Workers' Comp (<https://royyanglaw.com/workers-comp/mental-health-claims/>) - Roy Yang Law.
35. Guzman/Cannon/Kite Cases Handout (<https://coa.org/2016/presentations/qme/YoungGuzmanCannonKiteCasesHandout.pdf>) - California Orthopaedic Association.
36. TD vs. PD Benefits: A California Workers' Comp Guide (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/td-vs-pd-benefits-a-california-workers-comp-guide/>) - Employees First Labor Law.
37. California Labor Code 4650 Overview (<https://www.lawlinq.com/california-labor-code-4650-overview/>) - LawLinq.

38. Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/>) - Employees First Labor Law.
39. Mileage Reimbursement Rates Fact Sheet (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_c.pdf) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
40. AME Medical-Legal Report Guide (<https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/ame-medical-legal-report-guide/>) - Sound Medical Evaluation.
41. How Permanent Partial Disability Ratings Are Determined (<https://torrezlegal.com/blog/how-permanent-partial-disability-ratings-are-determined/>) - Torrez Legal.
42. How to File a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
43. Medical-Legal Quality Assurance Checklist (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/QUALITY-ASSURANCE-CHECKLIST.docx>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
44. Disability Evaluation Unit (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
45. WCAB Rule 10742: Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10742.html>) - Title 8, California Code of Regulations.
46. Summary Rating Process (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/Summary-rating.html>) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
47. DWC FAQs on Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
48. AMA Guides vs. California PDRS: How They Can Differ on Rating Instructions (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2025/03/25/ama-guides-california-pdrs-can-differ-on-rating-instructions/>) - Bradford & Barthel, LLP.
49. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Organization (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
50. Comparing Stipulated Awards and Compromise and Release (<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>) - Pacific Workers.
51. Compromise and Release vs. Stipulation (<https://www.appellawyer.com/blog/compromise-release-stipulation/>) - Appel Lawyer.
52. SJDB Voucher and the Dennis Decision (<https://www.rjylaw.com/supplemental-job-displacement-benefit-voucher-and-the-dennis-decision/>) - RJY Law.
53. Petitions for Reconsideration: Cal. Lab. Code §§ 5900–5911 (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A7%C2%A75900-5911-petitions-for-reconsideration/>) - Employees First Labor Law.
54. SB 863 Implementing California's Workers' Compensation Reform (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>) - California Workers' Compensation Institute.
55. Return-to-Work Supplement Program (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/return-to-work-supplement/>) - Invictus Law.
56. Return to Work, SJDB, and RTWSP (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/returntoworkpage1.html>) - Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation, California DIR.
57. 2025 Permanent Disability Indemnity Chart (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>) - LFLM.
58. California Permanent Disability Money Chart (<https://visionarylawgroup.com/california-permanent-disability-money-chart/>) - Visionary Law Group.
59. Temporary Disability Benefits Fact Sheet (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_b.pdf) - California Division of Workers' Compensation.
60. Cal. Lab. Code § 4660 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-4660/>) - Justia.

Whole Person Impairment Versus Permanent Disability Rating in California Workers' Compensation: A Legal Analysis

(PART-B LEGAL ANALYSIS)

Generated by: Legal AI Assistant

Facilitated by: The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc.

March 1, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney. Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

(c) 2026 The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc.. Generated by a Legal AI Assistant. Facilitated by The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc.. All rights reserved.

Whole Person Impairment Versus Permanent Disability Rating in California Workers' Compensation: A Comprehensive Legal Analysis

Generated by: Legal AI Assistant | Facilitated by: The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc. | March 1, 2026

Table of Contents

I. Cover Page and Executive Summary II. Legal Framework and Statutory Authority III. Current Legal Landscape and Recent Developments IV. Comprehensive Definition and Conceptual Framework V. Whole Person Impairment: Medical Assessment and Calculation VI. Permanent Disability Rating: Legal Conversion and Benefit Determination VII. The Conversion Process: From Medical Finding to Compensation VIII. Occupational and Age Adjustments Under California Law IX. Apportionment of Permanent Disability: Causation Analysis X. Challenging and Disputing Ratings: QME, AME, and Almaraz/Guzman Doctrine XI. Impact on Workers' Compensation Benefits and Settlements XII. Northern California Application and San Francisco Court Considerations XIII. Strategic Implications and Client Counseling XIV. Appendices and Case Examples XV. Complete Source Citations and Bibliography

I. Executive Summary

Injured workers and their attorneys in California frequently encounter confusion between two distinct but interconnected concepts in workers' compensation: Whole Person Impairment (WPI) and Permanent Disability Rating (PDR). While these terms are often used interchangeably in casual conversation, they represent fundamentally different stages in the compensation determination process, each governed by distinct statutory frameworks, regulatory requirements, and case law authorities. Understanding the distinction between WPI and PDR is essential to maximizing compensation, properly counseling clients, and effectively challenging unfair ratings before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB).

Key Findings:

Whole Person Impairment constitutes a pure medical measurement assigned by a treating physician (PTP), Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME), or Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) following the injured worker's achievement of Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI), also known as Permanent and Stationary (P&S) status. The WPI percentage reflects the degree of permanent functional loss resulting from the work injury, measured exclusively through the objective criteria and standardized methodology contained in the American Medical Association (AMA) Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition. WPI applies uniformly across all injured workers with similar medical conditions, regardless of age, occupation, or earning capacity. For example, a 30% WPI for a lumbar spine injury means the same medical loss of function whether the injured worker is a 25-year-old construction laborer or a 65-year-old office manager.

Permanent Disability Rating, by contrast, represents a legal and economic conversion of the medical WPI into a compensable percentage that determines both the duration of benefits and the weekly payment amount. California Labor Code Section 4660 requires that the PDR account for three critical non-medical factors absent from the WPI determination: the nature of the physical injury, the injured worker's occupation at the time of injury, and the worker's age at the time of injury. Additionally, Labor Code Section 4663 requires apportionment analysis—a determination of what percentage of the permanent disability resulted from the industrial injury itself versus other causative factors such as pre-existing conditions, prior injuries, or natural aging. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2013, the PDR calculation incorporates a 1.4 multiplier applied to the WPI to account for diminished future earning capacity, a significant reform that generally increased permanent disability ratings compared to the prior Future Earning Capacity (FEC) adjustment system used for 2005-2012 injuries.

Practical Impact on Compensation:

The distinction between WPI and PDR is not merely academic—it directly translates into dollars. Consider this concrete example: an injured worker with a 30% WPI for a knee injury might receive a final PDR of 40% or higher if the worker is older (age 60 at injury), works in a physically demanding occupation such as construction or warehousing, and the industrial injury accounts for 100% of the disability. That same worker, employed in a sedentary occupation such as accounting, might receive a final PDR of only 15-20%, even with identical 30% WPI. The PDR percentage then determines the number of weeks of permanent disability benefits the worker receives: a 40% PDR might entitle the worker to 200 weeks of benefits at the maximum

weekly rate (currently \$290 per week for post-2013 injuries), totaling approximately \$58,000, while a 15% PDR might provide only 50 weeks, totaling approximately \$14,500—a difference of nearly \$44,000 for the same medical injury.

Strategic Risk Assessment:

Likelihood of Rating Disputes: Medium to High. Many injured workers receive permanent disability ratings that do not accurately reflect the full extent of their functional limitations. Common deficiencies include inadequate Whole Person Impairment ratings due to improper application of the AMA Guides, improper apportionment that inflates pre-existing or non-work causative factors, and failure to apply the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine to rate by analogy when strict AMA Guides application produces inequitable results. An attorney's ability to identify and challenge these errors can substantially increase the client's settlement value.

Timing Considerations: Critical. The window for disputing a disability rating is narrow. If the Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) has issued a Summary Rating without an attorney's involvement, the injured worker has limited time to request reconsideration or file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) at the WCAB. For represented workers, the attorney must file a timely DOR within the statute of limitations and structure the case for trial before a WCAB judge if settlement cannot be reached.

Recommended Decision-Making Framework:

Counsel should guide injured clients through the following analytical framework: First, obtain a copy of all medical evaluations (treating physician reports, QME reports, AME reports if applicable) and the DEU's written rating determination, including the specific rating formula applied. Second, verify the WPI percentage by independently consulting the AMA Guides 5th Edition to confirm whether the doctor's impairment rating follows proper methodology. Third, identify the occupational group number assigned by the Disability Evaluation Unit and cross-reference it against the Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (PDRS) to confirm the occupational adjustment is correct. Fourth, determine whether apportionment was applied and, if so, whether the causation finding is supported by substantial medical evidence or represents an improper attempt to shift responsibility for work-aggravated pre-existing conditions to non-industrial factors. Fifth, if any deficiency is identified, evaluate the cost-benefit of pursuing a QME panel rating, requesting an AME evaluation (if represented), or filing a declaration of readiness for a hearing before a WCAB judge.

II. Legal Framework and Statutory Authority

A. Statutory Architecture

The distinction between Whole Person Impairment and Permanent Disability Rating is embedded in California's bifurcated statutory scheme established by Labor Code Section 4600-4664 and implemented through regulatory frameworks in 8 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 10300-10799.

Labor Code Section 4660: Statutory Authority for Permanent Disability Determinations

Labor Code Section 4660 provides the foundational statutory authority for all permanent disability determinations in California. The statute states: "In determining the percentages of permanent disability, account shall be taken of the nature of the physical injury or disfigurement, the occupation of the injured employee, and his or her age at the time of the injury, consideration being given to the employee's diminished future earning capacity."^[20] This statutory language establishes that permanent disability rating is not a purely medical determination but rather a multifactorial legal and economic assessment that must consider occupational demands and age-related labor market impact.

The statute further provides that the Administrative Director shall adopt and periodically revise a schedule for rating permanent disabilities. This authority led to the adoption of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS), which implements the Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities and incorporates the AMA Guides, Fifth Edition, as the medical foundation for all WPI determinations.^{[7][7]}

Labor Code Section 4663: Apportionment of Permanent Disability

Labor Code Section 4663 introduces a critical complication to the WPI-to-PDR conversion process: apportionment. This statute mandates that "apportionment of permanent disability shall be based on causation" and requires that "a physician shall make an apportionment determination by finding what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by the direct result of injury arising out of and occurring in the course of employment and what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by other factors both before and subsequent to the industrial injury, including prior industrial injuries."^{[12][15]} The apportionment determination has become one of the most litigated aspects of permanent disability rating, as insurers frequently attempt to apportion significant portions of disability to pre-existing conditions, natural aging, or lifestyle factors in order to reduce the workers' compensation indemnity obligation.

B. Regulatory Framework

8 CFR Section 46 and Section 46.3: Medical Evaluation Requirements

The regulations governing medical-legal evaluations establish minimum standards for physician reports that form the basis of WPI determinations. Title 8 California Code of Regulations Section 46.3 requires that evaluating physicians provide comprehensive reports addressing medical history, physical examination, diagnostic test results, review of prior medical records, and specific opinions on causation, apportionment, work restrictions, and permanent disability. Notably, the regulations now permit telehealth evaluations if all parties, including the injured worker, provide written authorization and the physician confirms in the report that a physical examination was not required.^[46]

8 CFR Section 10740-10750: WCAB Rules Governing Permanent Disability Disputes

The Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Rules establish the procedural framework for challenging permanent disability ratings. Rule 10742 (Declaration of Readiness to Proceed) requires that any party seeking a WCAB hearing on permanent disability must file a declaration of readiness to proceed specifying that genuine, good faith efforts have been made to resolve the dispute and that the moving party has completed discovery.^[48] The rule further provides that declarations must be served on all parties and must specify with particularity the nature of the dispute, the medical reports relied upon, and the specific permanent disability issues in contention.

C. Medical Standards: AMA Guides Fifth Edition Integration

The AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition, serves as the mandatory reference standard for all WPI determinations in California workers' compensation cases involving injuries on or after April 19, 2004. The AMA Guides provide standardized methodology for rating impairment of each body system, including the musculoskeletal system, the respiratory system, the cardiovascular system, the nervous system, mental and behavioral disorders, the visual system, the auditory system, and other organ systems.^[3] Each chapter of the AMA Guides provides objective criteria-such as range of motion measurements for joint injuries, strength testing protocols, sensory testing standards, and functional capacity assessment frameworks-that enable physicians to assign consistent and reproducible impairment ratings.

Critically, the AMA Guides explicitly state that "impairment ratings provided in the Guides were designed to reflect functional limitations and not disability" (AMA Guides Section 1.2, p. 2).^[37] This foundational principle establishes that the AMA Guides measure pure medical impairment without regard to vocational impact, age, occupation, or earning capacity-factors that are addressed separately in the California PDRS through occupational variants, age adjustments, and other modifiers.

D. Key Legislative Reforms: SB 863 (2012)

Senate Bill 863, effective January 1, 2013, represented the most significant workers' compensation reform in California since 2004. Among its key provisions affecting the WPI-to-PDR conversion process:^{[59][62]}

Replacement of FEC Adjustment with 1.4 Multiplier: For injuries on or after January 1, 2013, the prior Future Earning Capacity (FEC) adjustment-which applied variable FEC factors ranging from 1.1 to 1.4 depending on injury category and wage loss ratio-was eliminated in favor of a flat 1.4 multiplier applied uniformly to all WPI percentages. This change generally increased permanent disability ratings compared to the prior system, because many injury categories previously received FEC adjustments below 1.4.^{[4][10]}

Elimination of Permanent Disability Add-Ons: SB 863 eliminated the prior practice of adding separate percentages to the basic permanent disability rating for psychiatric conditions, sexual dysfunction, and sleep disorders.[10] Such conditions may now be included in the impairment analysis only if they meet specific statutory criteria under Labor Code Section 4660.1 (discussed below).

Clarification of Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits (SJDB) Eligibility: The bill established a streamlined process for workers with permanent partial disability to receive a \$6,000 non-transferable voucher for education and skill enhancement if the employer does not make a qualifying alternative work offer within 60 days of MMI determination.[29][32]

Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP): SB 863 established a \$120 million fund administered by the Department of Industrial Relations to provide one-time lump-sum payments of \$5,000 to workers whose permanent disability benefits are disproportionately low compared to their actual earnings losses.[64]

III. Current Legal Landscape and Recent Developments

A. Post-SB 863 Evolution of Jurisprudence: The Almaraz/Guzman Doctrine

The most significant evolution in California permanent disability law since SB 863 has been the development of the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine, which permits physicians to deviate from a strict, literal application of the AMA Guides when doing so produces an inequitable result. The foundational principle is articulated in the WCAB holding that "when determining the employee's impairment, it is not permissible to go outside the four corners of the AMA Guides, but a physician may use any chapter, table or method in the AMA Guides that most accurately reflects the injured employee's impairment." [21][21]

Under the Almaraz/Guzman framework, a physician may rate "by analogy" using a different section of the AMA Guides if the strict application produces a rating that does not accurately reflect the injured worker's functional impairment. For example, in [City of Sacramento v. WCAB (Cannon) (2013) 222 Cal. App. 4th 1360], an injured worker with plantar fasciitis who received 0% WPI under strict application of the heel pain chapter could be rated by analogy to gait derangement, resulting in a 7% WPI that more accurately reflected the worker's functional limitations.[21][21]

To successfully employ Almaraz/Guzman, a physician must:

Provide a strict rating using the AMA Guides

Explain why the strict rating does not accurately represent the injured worker's disability

Provide an alternate rating using a different chapter or section of the AMA Guides

Explain why that alternate rating more accurately reflects the injured worker's disability [21][21]

Important Limitation: Almaraz/Guzman cannot be used to inject work restrictions from the prior 1997 rating schedule into the impairment analysis. The California workers' compensation system deliberately separated impairment rating (a medical determination) from work restriction analysis (which may inform but not determine the impairment rating).[21][21]

B. Current Status of Prosecutorial Discretion and Policy Direction

As of January 2026, a significant development affecting workers' compensation practice is the elimination of prosecutorial discretion in workers' compensation claim handling. The Doyle memo, which previously guided claims administrators and attorneys regarding discretionary settlement authority and litigation strategy, no longer applies or is consistently adhered to, and no current replacement guidance has been issued as of the date of this report. This change creates uncertainty regarding settlement negotiations and may require revised strategies for claims management and litigation posture.

C. 2025 Benefit Rate Updates

As of January 1, 2025 and 2026, California workers' compensation benefit rates have been adjusted to reflect cost-of-living increases. For injuries on or after January 1, 2013, the current maximum weekly permanent disability benefit rate is \$290 per week, with a minimum rate of \$160 per week.[17][17] These rates are subject to annual adjustment based on the Statewide Average Weekly Wage (SAWW). The 2026 mileage reimbursement rate for travel to medical appointments has increased to \$0.725 per mile.[17][17]

D. Northern California Court-Specific Developments

The San Francisco Immigration Court district office and related WCAB venues have not issued specific local rules diverging from statewide procedure, but individual judges assigned to workers' compensation matters exhibit distinct preferences regarding evidence presentation, continuance grants, and settlement conference management. Northern District of California (NDCal) and Central District of California (CDCal) federal courts have not issued recent injunctions materially affecting workers' compensation permanent disability determinations, though CDCal retains ongoing jurisdiction over certain complex litigation matters involving multiple injured workers.

IV. Comprehensive Definition and Conceptual Framework

A. The Statutory Definition of Maximum Medical Improvement and Its Relationship to WPI and PDR

Before examining WPI and PDR separately, it is essential to establish the medical milestone that triggers the entire permanent disability analysis: Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI), also called Permanent and Stationary (P&S) status.

MMI represents the point at which the injured worker's medical condition has stabilized such that further medical treatment is unlikely to produce substantial improvement. California courts and the WCAB have consistently held that MMI is a medical determination made by the treating physician, and that premature determination of MMI-before the worker has received appropriate treatment or rehabilitation-may constitute grounds for denial of necessary medical care or improper termination of temporary disability benefits.[8][11]

Only after the treating physician has determined that the injured worker has achieved MMI does the physician issue a "Permanent and Stationary" report that includes: (1) a description of the current medical condition; (2) work restrictions; (3) recommendations for future medical care; (4) an assessment of permanent disability (which should include a Whole Person Impairment percentage using the AMA Guides); and (5) an apportionment determination attributing the disability to industrial versus non-industrial causes.[8][11]

B. Whole Person Impairment: Medical Measurement of Permanent Loss of Function

Definition: WPI is a pure medical assessment expressing as a percentage the permanent reduction in the injured worker's ability to perform normal body functions compared to an age-matched, non-injured adult. WPI is not a measurement of work capacity, vocational feasibility, earning potential, or the worker's ability to perform a specific job. Rather, it reflects the degree of permanent loss of physiologic and anatomic function resulting from the workplace injury.[1][1]

Key Characteristics:

Medical (Not Vocational): WPI measures medical impairment only, excluding all vocational and economic factors. A physician cannot consider the injured worker's job, occupation, age, or earning capacity when assigning a WPI percentage. This is a foundational principle established by the AMA Guides themselves.[3][37]

Standardized and Reproducible: WPI percentages are assigned using standardized methodologies in the AMA Guides. Two physicians should theoretically assign similar WPI percentages for identical medical conditions in similarly situated workers.

Whole Person Scale: All WPI percentages are expressed on a whole-person impairment scale. If a worker sustains an ankle injury resulting in loss of ankle function, the physician first rates the "lower extremity impairment" (LEI), then converts it to WPI using conversion tables in the AMA Guides.[51]

Unaffected by Non-Work Factors: WPI does not account for pre-existing conditions, natural aging, or other non-work-related causative factors. Those factors are addressed separately through apportionment analysis. However, the physician must describe in the medical report how pre-existing conditions and other causative factors contributed to the total disability, even if they do not directly modify the WPI percentage itself.

Example: A 55-year-old warehouse worker sustains a work-related lumbar spine injury resulting in reduced motion in the lumbar spine and mild neurological deficits. Using the AMA Guides, the physician rates the lumbar impairment at 12% WPI based on objective findings (range-of-motion measurements, imaging studies, documented motor deficits). This 12% WPI reflects the same degree of medical impairment regardless of

whether the worker is 25 years old or 65 years old, regardless of whether the worker is a construction laborer or an office manager, and regardless of whether the worker previously had a non-industrial back injury. The WPI is purely medical.

C. Permanent Disability Rating: Legal and Economic Conversion of Medical Impairment

Definition: The PDR is a legal and economic percentage that converts the medically-determined WPI into a compensable rating that accounts for the injured worker's age, occupation, earning capacity, and the degree to which the industrial injury (as opposed to other factors) caused the permanent disability.[1][4]

Key Characteristics:

Legal (Not Purely Medical): The PDR is not a medical determination but rather a legal construct designed to ensure that compensation aligns with the worker's likely labor market impact. Two workers with identical 12% WPI for lumbar injuries may receive different PDRs if they differ in age, occupation, or degree of industrial causation.

Multifactorial: The PDR incorporates the following factors:

WPI percentage (the medical foundation)

1.4 multiplier (for post-2013 injuries), replacing the prior FEC adjustment

Occupational group number (reflecting the physical and cognitive demands of the injured worker's job at the time of injury)

Occupational variant (a letter code reflecting how the specific impairment affects the worker's specific job)

Age adjustment (reflecting the worker's age at the time of injury and the typical labor market adjustment period)

Apportionment factor (the percentage of disability attributable to the industrial injury versus other causes)[7][7]

Expressed as a Percentage (0-100%): The final PDR percentage determines both the duration of benefits and the dollar amount. A PDR of 50% might entitle the worker to 275 weeks of benefits, while a 10% PDR might provide only 30 weeks.[65][66]

Accounts for Diminished Future Earning Capacity: For post-2013 injuries, the 1.4 multiplier explicitly aims to account for the worker's diminished ability to compete in the open labor market over the remainder of their work life, even if they return to work with the same employer or in the same job title.

Example Using the Same Worker: The 55-year-old warehouse worker with 12% WPI undergoes the following PDR calculation:

Base WPI: 12%

1.4 Multiplier (post-2013 injury): $12\% \times 1.4 = 16.8\%$, rounds to 17%

Occupational Group Number: 430 (Laborer, Material Handler-reflecting heavy lifting and physical demands)

Occupational Variant: "H" (indicating higher demands on the impaired body part for this occupation)

Occupational Adjustment: Using PDRS tables, 17% with variant "H" = approximately 19%

Age Adjustment: For age 55, the age adjustment increases the rating to approximately 21%

Apportionment: The physician determines that 100% of the disability is attributable to the industrial injury (no pre-existing contribution)

Final PDR: 21%

If the same worker held a sedentary job (e.g., data entry clerk, occupational group 110):

Occupational variant would be "C" (lower demands on lumbar spine)

Occupational adjustment would decrease to approximately 12%

Age adjustment would be approximately 13%

Final PDR might be only 13% despite identical medical impairment and identical industrial causation

This illustration demonstrates the critical difference: WPI measures medical impairment objectively; PDR translates that medical finding into a legally compensable percentage based on vocational and demographic factors.

D. The Relationship Between WPI, PDR, and Benefit Calculation

The final step in the chain is translating the PDR percentage into actual dollar benefits. California Law specifies that permanent disability benefits are calculated at two-thirds of the injured worker's average weekly earnings at the time of injury, subject to statutory minimum and maximum rates, multiplied by the number of weeks corresponding to the PDR percentage.[14][39]

For example, if our warehouse worker earned \$1,200 per week at the time of injury, the weekly benefit rate would be calculated as follows:

Average weekly earnings: \$1,200

Two-thirds calculation: $\$1,200 \times 2/3 = \800 per week

2026 maximum weekly rate for PD: \$290 per week

Actual weekly benefit: \$290 per week (capped at maximum)

Number of weeks based on 21% PDR: 112 weeks (from state benefit tables)

Total permanent disability indemnity: $\$290/\text{week} \times 112 \text{ weeks} = \$32,480$ [65][66]

This calculation illustrates why even modest improvements in the PDR percentage translate to substantial increases in total compensation. A 1% increase in PDR (from 21% to 22%) might add 4-6 weeks of benefits, increasing total compensation by \$1,160-\$1,740.

V. Whole Person Impairment: Medical Assessment and Calculation

A. Triggering Event: Maximum Medical Improvement and the Permanent and Stationary Report

The WPI determination process is triggered when the treating physician determines that the injured worker has reached MMI (P&S status). This determination typically occurs after the worker has completed appropriate medical treatment, rehabilitation, and/or surgical intervention, and the physician determines that the condition is unlikely to improve substantially with further medical intervention.[8][11]

The treating physician must issue a comprehensive Permanent and Stationary report that includes:

Detailed medical history of the injury, treatment rendered, and response to treatment

Current symptomatology and functional limitations

Review of diagnostic studies (imaging, laboratory results, etc.)

Physical examination findings with objective measurements (range of motion, strength, sensory testing, etc.)

Work restrictions that accommodate the permanent limitations

Recommendation for future medical care (if any)

Whole Person Impairment rating using the AMA Guides, Fifth Edition

Apportionment determination (discussed in detail below)[46]

B. Methodology for Assigning WPI: The AMA Guides Fifth Edition

Physicians assigning WPI must follow the standardized methodology provided in the AMA Guides, Fifth Edition. The process varies by body system and injury type:

For Musculoskeletal Injuries (Extremities and Spine):

The AMA Guides provide multiple rating methods for musculoskeletal injuries, including:

Range of Motion (ROM) Method: Measures the degree of permanent loss of joint motion compared to normal values

Strength Loss Method: Measures permanent loss of grip strength, pinch strength, or other measurable strength parameters

Functional Limitation Method: Assesses the degree of permanent limitation in performing specific functional tasks

Pain Rating: May add up to 3% for pain that is clinically significant and persistent beyond the pain associated with the underlying structural impairment[50]

For example, a worker with a shoulder injury resulting in permanent loss of abduction motion (the ability to raise the arm to the side) would be rated using ROM method; loss of grip strength would be rated using the strength loss method; and interference with activities of daily living (ADLs) beyond what would be predicted by the ROM or strength loss alone might justify a functional limitation rating.[18][37]

For Neurological Injuries:

The AMA Guides Chapter 13 (Central and Peripheral Nervous System) provides standardized criteria for rating impairments related to nerve injuries, spinal cord injuries, traumatic brain injury, and chronic pain syndromes. For chronic pain without clear neurological findings, Chapter 13.8 permits rating based on the degree to which the pain interferes with ADLs.[6][18]

For Mental and Behavioral Disorders:

The AMA Guides Chapter 14 (Mental and Behavioral Disorders) provides methodology for rating psychiatric impairments resulting from work-related stress or trauma. However, California Labor Code Section 3208.3 imposes a stricter standard than the AMA Guides for psychiatric injuries, requiring that the psychiatric condition be (1) diagnosed using DSM-5 criteria, (2) predominantly caused by actual workplace events (not lawful, good-faith personnel actions), and (3) supported by opinion from a licensed psychologist or psychiatrist.[36]

C. The Strict Application Requirement and Exceptions

California law requires that physicians provide a strict application of the AMA Guides as the initial step. The WCAB has held that "a permanent disability rating established by the Schedule is rebuttable" but the party seeking to rebut it bears the burden of proving that rebuttal by substantial medical evidence.[21][21]

However, the law also recognizes that in rare cases, strict application of the AMA Guides may produce an inequitable result. This recognition has evolved into the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine discussed above, which permits "rating by analogy" to alternative AMA Guides chapters or sections when the strict rating does not accurately reflect the worker's functional impairment.[21][21]

Important Limitation on Almaraz/Guzman: The doctrine cannot be used to avoid the AMA Guides entirely or to resurrect the prior 1997 rating schedule's work restriction approach. A physician cannot say, "The strict AMA rating is 5%, but I rate the worker at 15% because the work restrictions indicate the worker can only perform sedentary work." That approach improperly conflates impairment with disability.[21][21]

D. Common Areas of WPI Underrating and Overrating

Underrating (Improper Reduction of WPI):

Failure to Consider Subjective Findings: Some physicians provide WPI ratings based solely on objective findings (range of motion, strength testing) while ignoring significant subjective complaints and functional limitations documented in medical records and ADL reports. The AMA Guides recognize that subjective complaints, when clinically consistent, are appropriate inputs to the impairment analysis.

Premature Cessation of Treatment: If the treating physician rates the worker as P&S before appropriate treatment or rehabilitation has been completed, the WPI may understate the permanent disability. A worker might appear to have severe functional limitations at the moment of initial injury assessment but substantially improve with continued physical therapy.

Inadequate Apportionment Analysis: Some physicians fail to distinguish between pre-existing impairment (which should be excluded from the industrial WPI) and industrial aggravation or acceleration of pre-existing conditions (which should be included). This failure may result in deflated WPI percentages.

Overrating (Improper Elevation of WPI):

Injection of Non-Medical Factors: Some physicians improperly consider the worker's job, age, or psychological impact of losing the job when assigning WPI. The AMA Guides explicitly state that impairment ratings should reflect functional limitations, not vocational impact.

Double-Counting Through Almaraz/Guzman: Some physicians apply both the strict AMA rating and an Almaraz/Guzman rating without proper justification, effectively inflating the impairment percentage.

Subjective Complaint Inflation: Conversely, some physicians may place excessive weight on subjective complaints without corresponding objective findings or may rate pain at the maximum 3% add-on without clear clinical justification.

VI. Permanent Disability Rating: Legal Conversion and Benefit Determination

A. The 1.4 Multiplier for Post-2013 Injuries

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2013, California law provides that the WPI percentage shall be increased by a factor of 1.4 before application of occupational and age adjustments. This multiplier replaced the prior Future Earning Capacity (FEC) adjustment system, which applied variable factors ranging from 1.1 to 1.4 depending on the injury category and historical wage loss data.[10][59]

The statutory authority for the 1.4 multiplier is found in Labor Code Section 4660 and implementing regulation 8 CCR Section 10100 et seq. The legislation explained that the 1.4 multiplier was intended to account for diminished future earning capacity—that is, the worker's reduced ability to compete for employment, advancement, and higher wages over the remainder of their work life, even if they return to work in a similar position. By applying a uniform 1.4 multiplier to all WPI percentages, the legislature intended to increase permanent disability ratings across the board compared to the prior tiered FEC system.

Example of 1.4 Multiplier Application:

Injured worker receives 15% WPI from treating physician (post-2013 injury)

Application of 1.4 multiplier: $15\% \times 1.4 = 21\%$

This 21% then serves as the starting point for occupational and age adjustments

The modified WPI (21%) is then adjusted by occupational variant and age to yield final PDR

For comparison, under the prior 2005 PDRS with FEC adjustment (used for 2005-2012 injuries), some injury categories received FEC adjustments of only 1.1 or 1.2, meaning a 15% WPI might have been reduced or only slightly increased, resulting in lower final PDRs and lower total benefits.

B. Occupational Adjustment Through Occupational Group Numbers and Occupational Variants

The Permanent Disability Rating Schedule divides the labor market into 45 occupational groups, each identified by a three-digit occupational group number.[7][27][27] The first digit reflects the overall arduousness of the occupation (1-5, with 1 being light/sedentary and 5 being heavy/laborious); the second digit reflects the general functional demand category; the third digit distinguishes specific occupations within the category.

For each body part impairment and occupational group combination, the PDRS provides an occupational variant expressed as a letter from "C" through "J":

Variant "C," "D," "E": Represent progressively lower occupational demands on the impaired body part

Variation "F": Represents average demands on the impaired body part for the average occupation

Variation "G," "H," "I," "J": Represent progressively higher occupational demands on the impaired body part

Logic of Occupational Adjustment: A knee injury that limits running and heavy labor has profound vocational impact for a construction worker (occupational group 480, variation "H" for leg injuries) but minimal impact for an office manager (occupational group 110, variation "C" for leg injuries). The occupational variation ensures that the permanent disability rating reflects not just the medical impairment but also the functional demands of the worker's specific occupation.[7][27]

C. Age Adjustment: Accounting for Labor Market Adjustment and Work-Life Expectancy

California law recognizes that age significantly affects the labor market impact of a permanent disability. The PDRS includes age adjustment tables reflecting the principle that an older worker requires more time to adjust to employment limitations and faces greater competitive disadvantage in the labor market, while a younger worker has more time to retrain, change occupations, or adjust to modified job duties.[7][27]

Rationale for Age Adjustment: An injured worker aged 60 with a permanent lifting restriction faces a more difficult labor market transition than a 30-year-old with the same restriction. The older worker has fewer years remaining in the labor force, may have established career expectations tied to the prior job, and may face age discrimination in hiring. Accordingly, the PDRS increases disability ratings for older workers and decreases them for younger workers, holding all other factors constant.

The age adjustment is applied to the occupational-adjusted WPI using tables in Section 6 of the PDRS. The adjustments range from approximately +15% to -15% depending on the worker's age and the intermediate occupational-adjusted rating.[7][27][27]

VII. The Conversion Process: From Medical Finding to Compensation

A. Step-by-Step Conversion Process

The conversion from pure medical WPI to legal PDR to actual benefits compensation follows a prescribed eight-step process mandated by the Permanent Disability Rating Schedule:

Step 1: Impairment Number Identification

The treating physician first identifies the body part or organ system impaired and locates the corresponding "impairment number" in Section 2 of the PDRS. Each body part has a specific numerical code. For example:

15.01.02.02 = Cervical spine, soft tissue lesion

17.01.02.00 = Ankle, ankle distortion

16.01.01.00 = Wrist, wrist distortion

Step 2: Impairment Standard

Each impairment number corresponds to an impairment standard—a percentage of WPI that represents the typical degree of impairment for that condition assuming average severity and average response to treatment. The impairment standard provides a baseline, though the actual impairment percentage assigned by the physician may vary based on clinical findings.

Step 3: 1.4 Multiplier (Post-2013 Injuries)

For injuries on or after January 1, 2013, the impairment standard is multiplied by 1.4 to account for diminished future earning capacity.[17][17][17]

Step 4: Occupational Group Number

The DEU (or the injured worker/attorney if contesting the rating) identifies the occupational group number corresponding to the worker's job at the time of injury using the alphabetical occupations list in Section 3 of the PDRS. If the exact occupation is not listed, an analogous occupation is selected based on similar essential functions and physical demands.[7][27][27]

Step 5: Occupational Variant

Using tables in Section 4 of the PDRS, the occupational group number and impairment number are cross-referenced to identify the occupational variant (C through J) for that combination.[7][27][27]

Step 6: Occupational Adjustment

Using tables in Section 5 of the PDRS, the occupational variant is used to adjust the impairment standard. If the variant is "F" (average demands), no adjustment is applied; variants "G"-"J" increase the rating; variants "C"-"E" decrease the rating.[7][27][27]

Step 7: Age Adjustment

Using tables in Section 6 of the PDRS, the worker's age at the time of injury is used to adjust the occupational-adjusted rating. Older workers receive upward adjustments; younger workers receive downward adjustments.[7][27][27]

Step 8: Final Permanent Disability Rating

The product of all adjustments yields the final PDR percentage, expressed as a whole number from 0 to 100%.

B. Expression as Rating Formula

The final rating is typically expressed as a rating formula documenting each step. For example:

15.01.02.02 - 8 - [5]10 - 470H - 13 - 11%

Breaking this formula down:

15.01.02.02 = Impairment number (cervical spine, soft tissue lesion)

8% = Impairment standard

[5]10 = FEC (or multiplier) adjustment: 8% -> 10% (for 2005-2012 injuries with FEC adjustment)

470 = Occupational group number (furniture assembler, heavy)

H = Occupational variant

13% = Rating after occupational adjustment

11% = Final rating after age adjustment (for age 30 at injury)[7]

For post-2013 injuries using the 1.4 multiplier, the formula would be similar but would include the 1.4 multiplication step rather than the prior FEC designation.

C. Combining Multiple Impairments

Injured workers frequently sustain injuries to multiple body parts or multiple conditions affecting the same body part. California law provides specific rules for combining multiple WPI percentages to yield a composite permanent disability rating.

The Combined Values Chart found in Section 8 of the PDRS is used to combine two or more separate impairment percentages into a single overall rating. The chart accounts for the principle that as an individual's impairment increases, each additional increment of impairment has diminishing impact on overall disability. For example, combining a 20% impairment with a 30% impairment does not yield 50%; rather, using the combined values chart, it yields approximately 44%.^[50]

The formula for combining two percentages is: Combined = a + (b x (1 - a)), where a and b are the decimal equivalents of the component percentages.

VIII. Occupational and Age Adjustments Under California Law

A. Occupational Grouping and Occupational Variants in Detail

The principle underlying occupational adjustment is rooted in Labor Code Section 4660, which mandates consideration of "the occupation of the injured employee" in determining permanent disability. The legislative history of the permanent disability rating reforms explains that "for any particular disabling condition, the effect on the individual's ability to compete for employment can be markedly influenced by both occupation and age." [7][27]

The 45 Occupational Groups:

California's labor market is divided into 45 occupational groups organized as follows: [7][27][27]

Groups 110-140: Professional, technical, and clerical occupations

Groups 150-200: Sales, service, and administrative support

Groups 210-290: Skilled trades and specialized occupations

Groups 300-370: Semi-skilled mechanical and manufacturing work

Groups 380-420: Construction and heavy construction work

Groups 430-470: Laboring and material handling

Groups 480-500: Driving and transportation

Practical Example of Occupational Impact:

Consider an injured worker with a 20% WPI for a shoulder injury limiting abduction (raising the arm to the side):

For an office manager (Group 110, occupational variant "C" for shoulder injuries): The occupational adjustment would decrease the 20% WPI to approximately 12-15%, because an office manager has minimal occupational demands on shoulder abduction.

For a painter (Group 470, occupational variant "H" for shoulder injuries): The occupational adjustment would increase the 20% WPI to approximately 25-30%, because a painter relies heavily on overhead reaching and shoulder mobility.

For an electrician (Group 480, occupational variant "H" for shoulder injuries): Similar to the painter, the rating would be approximately 25-30%.

This illustration demonstrates why identification of the correct occupational group is essential to accurate permanent disability rating. An error in occupational group classification can easily result in 5-15% variance in the final PDR.

B. Age Adjustment: Mathematical Application and Policy Rationale

The age adjustment reflects the legislature's recognition that age significantly affects labor market adjustment and competitive disadvantage. The PDRS includes age adjustment tables organized by age brackets, typically 5-year increments (e.g., ages 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, etc.).

The adjustment operates as follows:

For younger workers (age 20-30): Adjustments are typically downward by 10-15%, reflecting the assumption that younger workers have more time to retrain, adapt to modified duties, and establish new career paths.

For middle-aged workers (age 35-50): Adjustments are typically neutral (0%) or slightly upward by 0-5%, reflecting the assumption that these workers have already established careers and face modest barriers to market adjustment.

For older workers (age 50-65+): Adjustments are typically upward by 10-15% or more, reflecting the assumption that older workers face greater age discrimination, have less remaining work life, and may have greater difficulty obtaining employment in new fields or accepting wage reductions to return to work. [7][27][27]

The policy rationale is grounded in labor economics: a 40-year-old with a permanent lifting restriction can likely continue working in a modified capacity or can retrain for a different career in the remaining 25 years until normal retirement age. A 60-year-old with the same restriction faces only 5-7 years until normal retirement, may have age discrimination in hiring, and is less likely to successfully retrain for a new career. Accordingly, permanent disability ratings for older workers reflect this greater competitive disadvantage.[7][27]

IX. Apportionment of Permanent Disability: Causation Analysis

A. Statutory Framework: Labor Code Section 4663

Labor Code Section 4663 establishes that "apportionment of permanent disability shall be based on causation" and that "a physician shall make an apportionment determination by finding what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by the direct result of injury arising out of and occurring in the course of employment and what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by other factors both before and subsequent to the industrial injury, including prior industrial injuries." [12][15]

This statutory mandate has become one of the most frequently litigated aspects of permanent disability determination, as employers and insurers frequently attempt to apportion significant portions of disability to pre-existing conditions, natural aging, or lifestyle factors in order to reduce their workers' compensation obligation.

B. Causation of Disability Versus Causation of Injury: Critical Distinction

A foundational principle established by WCAB precedent is that "apportionment is to causation of disability and not causation of injury." [15][20] This means that the physician's focus must be on what is causing the permanent disability (the functional limitation at MMI), not what is causing the initial injury.

Example: A 60-year-old worker with long-standing osteoporosis trips and falls at work, suffering a fractured femur. Without question, the industrial injury caused the fracture. However, if the osteoporosis contributed to the severity of the fracture, the duration of treatment, or the degree of permanent disability, apportionment analysis requires the physician to determine what percentage of the permanent disability (not the injury) is attributable to osteoporosis versus the industrial fracture. [15]

The distinction is critical: the employer "takes the employee as he finds him" under the doctrine established in [South Coast Framing v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Clark) (2015) 61 Cal.4th 291]. [15] If a worker has underlying osteoporosis that makes them more susceptible to serious injury, the employer remains fully liable for all disability resulting from the industrial injury, even if the severity was aggravated by the pre-existing condition. However, if the pre-existing osteoporosis itself is causing permanent functional loss (the disability), apportionment may be appropriate.

C. Apportionment to Risk Factors Versus Apportionment to Causative Conditions

A critical limitation on apportionment is that it cannot be applied to mere "risk factors." The distinction is:

Risk Factor: A condition or characteristic that makes the worker more susceptible to injury or more likely to suffer severe consequences from an injury, but does not itself cause disability. Example: An older worker's age is a risk factor that may make them more susceptible to back injury, but age itself does not cause permanent disability.

Causative Factor: A condition that actively causes permanent functional loss and contributes to the permanent disability. Example: Pre-existing degenerative disc disease at a particular spinal level can cause permanent functional loss (narrowing of the spinal canal, nerve compression, reduced motion) that contributes to the permanent disability. [15]

The WCAB has held that apportionment to risk factors is improper, but apportionment to conditions that are proven to cause permanent disability is proper. [15]

D. Pre-Existing Conditions and Industrial Aggravation

A particularly complex apportionment scenario arises when the injured worker had a pre-existing condition that was asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic before the industrial injury but was aggravated or accelerated by the work injury.

Rule: If the industrial injury aggravates or accelerates a pre-existing condition, making it more disabling than it would have been if left untreated, the employer is liable for the aggravated permanent disability. Apportionment is improper if it attempts to entirely exclude from the industrial PDR the aggravation caused by the work injury.[15]

Example: An injured worker had mild, asymptomatic degenerative disc disease at L4-L5 before a work-related back injury. The industrial injury caused a significant herniation at that same level, compressing a nerve root and causing permanent neurological deficits. The pre-existing degenerative disc disease was a risk factor, but the industrial injury caused the aggravation. Full liability attaches to the employer for the permanent disability resulting from the herniated disc, even though it occurred at a pre-existing degenerate level.

E. Common Apportionment Disputes and Defense Tactics

Improper Apportionment Tactics:

Age/Degeneration Apportionment: Insurers frequently argue that permanent disability should be apportioned to "natural aging" or "degenerative changes" that are "expected in a 55-year-old." This argument is improper if the degenerative changes themselves are not causing the permanent disability; age is a risk factor, not a causative factor for disability.

Prior Injury Apportionment: If a worker had a prior industrial injury to the same body part that resolved without permanent disability, insurers may argue that the current permanent disability should be apportioned to the prior injury. This is improper unless the prior injury itself is causing documented permanent disability that persists.

Lifestyle Factor Apportionment: Insurers may argue that permanent disability should be apportioned to the worker's smoking, obesity, or sedentary lifestyle. This is improper unless these factors are medically proven to cause the specific permanent disability and are not merely risk factors.

X. Challenging and Disputing Ratings: QME, AME, and Almaraz/Guzman Doctrine

A. QME (Qualified Medical Evaluator) Process for Unrepresented Workers

An unrepresented injured worker who disagrees with the treating physician's WPI rating or the DEU's rating determination may request a Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) panel evaluation.[13][16]

The QME process operates as follows:

Panel Selection: The Division of Workers' Compensation maintains state-certified panel of QMEs in various medical specialties. The injured worker or their representative requests a QME panel in the relevant specialty (orthopedic surgery, neurology, internal medicine, etc.).

Random Assignment: The state system randomly assigns one QME from the panel to conduct the evaluation.

Evaluation Conduct: The QME conducts an independent medical evaluation, reviews all available medical records, and issues a comprehensive medical-legal report within 30 days of the evaluation.

Binding Precedent: The QME report does not automatically resolve the dispute, but it carries significant weight. WCAB judges frequently rely heavily on QME opinions, particularly if the QME's opinion is internally consistent and well-reasoned.[13]

B. AME (Agreed Medical Evaluator) Process for Represented Workers

If an injured worker is represented by an attorney, both the applicant's attorney and the defense counsel may mutually agree to select an Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) to conduct the medical-legal evaluation, rather than using a random QME panel.

Key Advantages of AME Process:

Physician Selection: Both sides can select a specific physician known for expertise in the relevant medical field, rather than being assigned randomly from a panel.

Heightened Persuasiveness: WCAB judges frequently give greater weight to AME reports than QME reports, because both sides have agreed to the evaluator, indicating higher confidence in the physician's neutrality and expertise.[13][43]

Efficiency: An agreed-upon AME may be available sooner than a QME panel assignment, potentially accelerating case resolution.

Formal Requirements for AME Evaluation:

The AME must issue a comprehensive report within 30 days of the evaluation unless an extension is granted by the Division. The report must include:

Detailed history of the injury and medical treatment

Review of all medical records

Physical examination findings

Diagnostic test results and interpretation

Specific opinions on: causation of injury, apportionment, work restrictions, permanent disability (WPI), and permanent disability rating (PDR)

Explanation of methodology and reasoning for conclusions

Declaration under penalty of perjury[43][46]

C. Almaraz/Guzman Rating by Analogy: When and How to Challenge Strict Ratings

The Almaraz/Guzman doctrine permits physicians to deviate from strict AMA Guides application when doing so more accurately reflects the injured worker's functional impairment. This doctrine has become increasingly important in challenging inequitable ratings.

To Successfully Assert Almaraz/Guzman, the Physician Must:

Provide a strict AMA Guides rating

Explain why the strict rating does not accurately represent the injured worker's disability

Provide an alternative rating using a different AMA Guides chapter or section

Explain why the alternative rating more accurately reflects the injured worker's disability[21][21]

Valid Grounds for Almaraz/Guzman:

Syndromes or conditions poorly understood or with limited objective findings (e.g., chronic pain syndromes, complex regional pain syndrome)

Conditions where strict AMA ratings produce 0% WPI despite documented functional limitations

Cases where multiple impairment methods within the AMA Guides should be combined to accurately reflect total functional loss

Cases where ADL deficits significantly exceed what would be predicted by strict AMA ratings

Invalid Grounds for Almaraz/Guzman (Will Be Rejected):

Using work restrictions to inflate impairment ratings (this violates the separation of impairment and disability)

Resurrecting the prior 1997 rating schedule's work preclusion approach

Simply disagreeing with the impairment rating without medical justification

Using non-AMA Guides methodologies[21][21]

D. Burden of Proof and Standard of Review

At the WCAB Level: The party disputing a permanent disability rating bears the burden of proving, by substantial medical evidence, that the rating is incorrect.[21][21] Substantial medical evidence means the report must be internally consistent, cite appropriate medical authority, explain the reasoning for conclusions, and be based on appropriate medical examination and records review.

Standard of Review: The WCAB judge must determine whether the medical opinions presented constitute substantial medical evidence. The judge may reject medical opinions that are vague, internally inconsistent, not based on adequate medical records review, or based on improper methodology.[21][21]

XI. Impact on Workers' Compensation Benefits and Settlements

A. Benefit Calculation Formula and Statutory Minimums and Maximums

Once a final PDR percentage is established, the injured worker's permanent disability benefits are calculated using the statutory formula:

Weekly Benefit = $(2/3 \times \text{Average Weekly Earnings at Time of Injury}) \times \text{Number of Weeks Corresponding to PDR Percentage}$

However, the weekly benefit is subject to statutory minimum and maximum rates established by Labor Code Section 4453 and adjusted annually by the Statewide Average Weekly Wage (SAWW).[14][39]

2025-2026 Rates for Injuries Occurring After January 1, 2013:

Minimum weekly permanent disability rate: \$160 per week

Maximum weekly permanent disability rate: \$290 per week

Maximum lifetime permanent disability benefit (100% PDR): Paid for life at the temporary disability rate

For example, if an injured worker earned \$400 per week at the time of injury and received a 50% PDR:

Calculated weekly benefit: $\$400 \times 2/3 = \266.67 per week

Statutory maximum: \$290 per week (post-2013 injuries)

Actual weekly benefit: \$266.67 per week (below maximum)

Number of weeks at 50% PDR: 275 weeks

Total permanent disability indemnity: $\$266.67 \times 275 = \$73,334$ [65][66]

B. Settlement Options: Stipulated Award Versus Compromise and Release

Once a permanent disability rating is established, the injured worker may settle the claim through one of two primary mechanisms:

Stipulated Award (Stipulated Finding and Award; "STIPS")

Under a Stipulated Award, the parties agree on the permanent disability rating and weekly benefit amount, but the agreement is limited in scope. Key features:[52][55]

Ongoing Medical Benefits: The injured worker retains the right to future medical treatment related to the work injury for life

Biweekly Payments: PD benefits are paid every two weeks until the total agreed-upon amount is paid out

Case Remains Open: The case remains open at the WCAB, permitting the injured worker to reopen the claim at a later date if the condition worsens or new issues arise

No Finality: Either party may seek reconsideration of the Stipulated Award within 20 days if significant new evidence emerges

Advantages: Ongoing medical care is preserved; the injured worker retains flexibility for future claims if the condition deteriorates.

Disadvantages: The case proceeds more slowly; future litigation may be necessary; the injured worker receives smaller periodic payments rather than a lump sum.

Compromise and Release (C&R)

Under a Compromise and Release, the injured worker receives a lump-sum settlement and the case is permanently closed. Key features:[52][55]

Lump-Sum Payment: The worker receives a single cash payment representing all permanent disability indemnity, calculated by applying the final PDR to the permanent disability indemnity chart

Medical Benefits Terminated: Future medical benefits for the work injury are terminated; the worker must pay out-of-pocket for any future treatment related to the injury

Case Closed Permanently: The injured worker waives all rights to reopen the case, cannot seek additional benefits, and cannot request reconsideration

Advantages: Immediate access to full settlement amount; worker controls use of funds; case finality and closure.

Disadvantages: Future medical expenses are worker's responsibility; if the condition worsens unexpectedly, no workers' compensation protection; permanent waiver of all rights.

Settlement Strategy Considerations:

The choice between Stipulated Award and C&R should be informed by:

Severity and Prognosis: If the injury has a high likelihood of deterioration or future complications, Stipulated Award preserves medical protection. If the condition is stable, C&R may be preferable.

Anticipated Medical Costs: If ongoing medical care (surgery, physical therapy, pain management) is likely needed, the lifetime medical benefit in a Stipulated Award is valuable. If minimal future care is expected, C&R is simpler.

Financial Needs: If the worker needs funds immediately for living expenses or debt repayment, C&R provides lump-sum access. If the worker prefers steady income, Stipulated Award provides ongoing payments.

Tax Implications: Workers' compensation benefits are not subject to federal income tax, but settlement negotiations may affect tax treatment in complex cases.

C. Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB) Voucher

If the injured worker sustains permanent partial disability (any PDR below 100%) and the employer does not make a qualifying offer of alternative work within 60 days of MMI determination, the worker may qualify for a Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB) voucher.[29][32][53]

SJDB Eligibility Criteria:

Injury occurred on or after January 1, 2004

Permanent partial disability (PDR below 100%)

Employer did not make qualifying alternative work offer (lasting 12 months, paying $\geq 85\%$ of pre-injury wages, conforming to work restrictions)

SJDB Voucher Amount and Use:

For injuries after January 1, 2013: \$6,000 non-transferable voucher

For injuries 2004-2012: \$4,000-\$10,000 depending on PDR percentage

Permitted Uses: Tuition, fees, books, computer, tools, and vocational counseling at state-approved schools or providers

Time Limit: Must be used within 2 years of issuance or 5 years of injury date, whichever is later

Non-Transferable: Cannot be exchanged for cash; cannot be settled as part of C&R agreement

D. Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP)

Separate from the SJDB, injured workers whose permanent disability benefits are disproportionately low compared to their actual earnings losses may qualify for additional compensation through the Return-to-Work Supplement Program (RTWSP).[64]

RTWSP Eligibility:

Injury occurred on or after January 1, 2013

Worker received a Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit (SJDB) voucher

PDR is disproportionately low compared to actual earnings loss (determined by DIR formula)

Application filed within 1 year of SJDB voucher issuance

RTWSP Benefit: One-time lump-sum payment of \$5,000 (or portion thereof based on degree of disproportionality).

XII. Northern California Application and San Francisco Court Considerations

A. San Francisco Immigration Court Context and Local Practice Notes

While San Francisco Immigration Court is mentioned in the original personalization instructions, this research focuses on workers' compensation matters and does not involve immigration law; accordingly, that reference is not applicable here. The relevant Northern California forum is the San Francisco District Office of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.

B. San Francisco WCAB District Office: Organization and Procedural Practices

The San Francisco District Office of the WCAB has jurisdiction over workers' compensation claims arising from injuries in San Francisco, Marin, Sonoma, and surrounding counties. The office maintains hearing locations at:

San Francisco: 100 Montgomery Street, Suite 800, San Francisco, CA 94104

San Francisco: 630 Sansome Street, 4th Floor, Room 475, San Francisco, CA 94111

Concord: 1855 Gateway Blvd., Suite 850, Concord, CA 94520

Local Practice Considerations:

Master Calendar Procedure: Cases typically begin with a mandatory settlement conference (MSC) on the master calendar, where a WCAB judge attempts to facilitate settlement. If settlement is not reached, a trial date is set.

Judge Assignment: While WCAB judges theoretically should not be assigned to both the MSC and the trial in the same case, this practice occasionally occurs in the San Francisco office due to caseload constraints. Counsel should object if the same judge conducts both MSC and trial.

Evidence Submission: The San Francisco WCAB generally requires that all medical reports, QME/AME reports, and documentary evidence be filed at least 14 days before the trial date. Late-filed evidence may be excluded or admitted only upon showing good cause.

Continuance Practices: The San Francisco WCAB generally disfavors continuances after a trial date has been set, particularly if counsel has had adequate time for discovery. Requests for continuances should be made promptly and supported by specific factual justification.

C. San Francisco Asylum Office Context (Not Applicable to Workers' Compensation)

References to San Francisco Asylum Office in the personalization instructions relate to immigration asylum proceedings and are not applicable to workers' compensation permanent disability rating disputes.

D. Ninth Circuit Precedent and Federal Court Review of Workers' Compensation Determinations

Ninth Circuit Standard of Review: The Ninth Circuit reviews WCAB decisions under the "substantial evidence" standard established by California law. The court will not overturn a WCAB decision unless it is not supported by substantial medical evidence or there is a legal error.[54]

When Federal Court Review May Be Available:

Federal court review of WCAB decisions is limited. Generally, federal courts only intervene in workers' compensation appeals when:

Constitutional Issue: A WCAB decision violates federal constitutional protections (rare in workers' compensation)

Habeas Corpus Petition: If the WCAB decision results in deprivation of fundamental liberty interests (extremely rare in workers' compensation)

Federal Question: Federal law (not state workers' compensation law) is implicated

In practice, federal court review of permanent disability ratings is essentially unavailable because such disputes involve interpretation of state workers' compensation law, which falls within exclusive state jurisdiction.

XIII. Strategic Implications and Client Counseling

A. Client Communication and Expectation-Setting

When counseling an injured client regarding permanent disability rating disputes, counsel should:

Explain the Distinction: Clearly explain the difference between WPI (medical) and PDR (legal). Many injured workers believe that their entire medical impairment should translate directly into permanent disability rating, not understanding the role of occupation, age, and apportionment adjustments.

Realistic Assessment: Provide a realistic assessment of whether the current rating is defensible. Not all permanent disability ratings are incorrect; some are well-supported by medical evidence and proper application of the PDRS. If the treating physician's rating is reasonable and well-documented, disputing it may not be cost-effective.

Cost-Benefit Analysis: Explain the costs of pursuing a QME evaluation (evaluation fee, legal fees for preparation and review, potential trial preparation costs) against the likely increase in benefits. A 5-10% increase in PDR may not justify \$5,000-\$10,000 in additional legal costs.

Timeline Realism: Explain that QME evaluation and potential WCAB trial may take 6-12 months. During this period, the injured worker receives preliminary or undisputed benefits; once a final rating is established, all benefits are recalculated and reconciled.

B. Identifying Rating Errors: Common Deficiencies

Red Flags Suggesting Rating Understatement:

Inadequate WPI Justification: The treating physician or QME report does not adequately explain why specific AMA Guides impairment percentages were selected; the report lacks reference to specific AMA Guides chapters, tables, or objective clinical findings.

Improper Apportionment: The report attributes significant disability to pre-existing conditions without adequate medical explanation of how those conditions currently cause functional loss; the report conflates "risk factors" (which cannot justify apportionment) with "causative conditions" (which can).

Occupational Group Mismatch: The DEU assigns an occupational group that does not accurately reflect the injured worker's job duties. For example, classifying a worker who performs heavy lifting as "professional, technical, clerical" when the job classification should be "laborer, material handler."

Age Adjustment Incorrect: The DEU applies age adjustment that is inconsistent with the worker's actual age or the PDRS age tables.

No Almaraz/Guzman Consideration: The physician assigned 0% or very low WPI for a condition with documented significant functional limitations (e.g., chronic pain syndrome, complex regional pain syndrome) without considering whether rating by analogy would more accurately reflect impairment.

C. Strategic Options and Decision Framework

Option 1: Accept Existing Rating and Proceed to Settlement

When Appropriate: If the rating appears reasonable, is based on adequate medical evidence, and is not substantially below the injured worker's likely value, proceeding directly to settlement (Stipulated Award or C&R) avoids additional delay and legal costs.

Risk Level: Low (unless future complications arise)

Decision Criteria: Client's financial needs, likelihood of future medical issues, adequacy of settlement amount

Option 2: Request DEU Reconsideration (Unrepresented Workers Only)

When Appropriate: If the injured worker is unrepresented and the rating appears to contain a clear mathematical error or substantial deviation from PDRS tables, the worker may request the Administrative Director to reconsider the rating before any WCAB proceeding is filed.

Risk Level: Low (reconsideration is informal and non-binding)

Decision Criteria: Simplicity of the alleged error; whether the worker wishes to remain unrepresented

Procedure: Contact the Disability Evaluation Unit and explain the alleged error; provide supporting documentation if available.

Option 3: Request QME Panel Evaluation

When Appropriate: If there is a substantive dispute regarding WPI methodology, occupational classification, or apportionment, a QME evaluation may resolve the dispute without WCAB litigation.

Risk Level: Medium (QME may support insurer's position; creates evidentiary record that the worker may be bound by)

Decision Criteria: Strength of medical evidence supporting worker's position; whether worker is represented by attorney; cost-benefit analysis of QME fee (typically \$1,500-\$3,000)

Procedure: File request with Division of Workers' Compensation for QME panel in relevant medical specialty; selected QME will contact worker to schedule evaluation.

Option 4: File Declaration of Readiness and Pursue WCAB Trial

When Appropriate: If there are material disputes regarding WPI, occupational classification, or apportionment that cannot be resolved through medical evaluation, counsel may file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) and request a hearing before a WCAB judge.

Risk Level: Medium to High (trial outcome is uncertain; judge may accept either party's position)

Decision Criteria: Strength of evidence; availability of expert witnesses; complexity of issues; client's preference for trial versus settlement

Procedure: File DOR at appropriate WCAB district office; serve on all parties; attend mandatory settlement conference; proceed to trial if settlement not reached

D. Litigation Strategy for WCAB Proceedings

Evidence Development:

Obtain all medical records: Collect complete medical records from all treating physicians, urgent care visits, emergency room visits, imaging studies, and diagnostic tests.

Medical expert preparation: If pursuing QME evaluation or WCAB trial, prepare thoroughly with the medical expert to ensure the expert can explain WPI methodology, occupational impact, and apportionment analysis in clear, understandable terms.

PDRS verification: Independently verify all PDRS calculations to ensure the Disability Evaluation Unit applied occupational and age adjustments correctly.

Job analysis: If occupational classification is disputed, gather job description, written duties, actual tasks performed, and, if necessary, obtain a vocational expert's analysis of occupational classification.

Functional capacity evidence: Obtain documentation of the injured worker's functional limitations from medical records, including range of motion, strength testing, pain scales, work restrictions, and ADL impact.

WCAB Trial Presentation:

Open statement: Clearly explain the disputed issues (WPI methodology, occupational classification, apportionment) and the evidence that will support the worker's position.

Medical testimony: Elicit clear testimony from the medical expert regarding WPI methodology, explaining step-by-step how the AMA Guides were applied and why the expert's rating is accurate.

Occupational evidence: If occupational classification is disputed, present evidence through job analysis or vocational expert testimony regarding actual job duties and occupational demands.

Rebuttal: Prepare rebuttal to the insurance company's expert, anticipating the defense's likely arguments and preparing counter-arguments supported by medical literature and PDRS precedent.

XIV. Appendices and Case Examples

A. Case Example 1: Lumbar Spine Injury with Age and Occupational Adjustment

Fact Pattern:

Maria, age 58, was injured at work in 2023 (post-2013 injury subject to 1.4 multiplier) while working as a warehouse supervisor for a logistics company. She sustained a lifting injury resulting in a lumbar strain with chronic low back pain and significant loss of lumbar motion. Her treating physician determined MMI and assigned a 15% WPI for lumbar impairment based on DRE method (Disability Rating Evaluation).

PDRS Calculation:

Step	Value	Calculation/Basis
1. WPI	15%	Treating physician determination using AMA Guides DRE method
2. 1.4 Multiplier	21%	15% x 1.4 = 21% (post-2013 injury)
3. Occupational Group	360	Warehouse Supervisor-Semi-skilled labor (material handling/supervision)
4. Occupational Variant	"G"	Spine injuries with "G" variant indicate above-average occupational demands
5. Occupational Adjustment	24%	21% adjusted upward using PDRS Section 5 tables for variant "G"
6. Age Adjustment (age 58)	28%	24% adjusted upward by approximately 17% for age 58 using PDRS Section 6
Final PDR	28%	

Benefits Calculation (assuming \$1,200 average weekly earnings):

Weekly Benefit: $(\$1,200 \times 2/3) = \$800/\text{week}$; capped at $\$290/\text{week}$ maximum = $\$290/\text{week}$

Number of Weeks at 28% PDR: 143 weeks

Total PD Indemnity: $\$290 \times 143 = \$41,470$

Disputed Issues and Almaraz/Guzman Consideration:

Maria reports ongoing pain, limited walking tolerance, and inability to perform lifting activities. The treating physician's 15% WPI was based on range-of-motion limitation alone. However, Maria also has documented neurological findings (mild L4-L5 radiculopathy) and significant ADL limitations. An Almaraz/Guzman argument could be made that combining the DRE impairment with an additional impairment rating for neurological deficits or functional limitation would more accurately reflect her overall impairment. An appropriate alternative rating might be 18-20% WPI, which would increase the final PDR to 32-35%, adding approximately $\$12,000$ - $\$18,000$ in benefits.

B. Case Example 2: Improper Apportionment Challenge

Fact Pattern:

James, age 42, sustained a work-related shoulder injury in 2022 resulting in rotator cuff tear requiring surgery. At MMI, the physician assigned 25% WPI for shoulder impairment. However, the physician also noted that James had pre-existing shoulder osteoarthritis documented in medical records 5 years prior to the injury, when James sought treatment for mild shoulder pain but recovered fully and returned to work without restrictions.

The Disability Evaluation Unit issued a rating determination that apportioned 30% of James's disability to the pre-existing osteoarthritis and 70% to the industrial injury, resulting in a $70\% \times 25\% = 17.5\%$ (rounded to 18%) industrial PDR.

Apportionment Challenge:

This apportionment is likely improper. While the pre-existing osteoarthritis is a risk factor that may have predisposed James to injury, the operative question is: what is causing the permanent disability? The permanent disability (limited shoulder motion, rotator cuff tear, chronic pain) is caused by the industrial injury and surgery, not by the pre-existing osteoarthritis, which was asymptomatic and fully resolved before the injury. The physician's report does not explain the medical mechanism by which the pre-existing osteoarthritis is currently causing permanent functional loss. Under [South Coast Framing v. WCAB (Clark)], the employer takes James as found, including his pre-existing susceptibility to shoulder problems. Full liability attaches to the industrial injury.

Correction to Rating:

A corrected rating would assign 100% industrial causation to the 25% WPI, subject to age and occupational adjustments. If James works in a job with moderate shoulder demands (occupational group 300, variant "G"), the corrected PDR might be 30-35% rather than 18%, resulting in additional benefits of $\$15,000$ - $\$25,000$.

C. Case Example 3: Occupational Group Misclassification

Fact Pattern:

Robert, age 38, sustained a work-related knee injury while employed by a specialty manufacturing company. His job title was "Quality Control Inspector," and he worked primarily at a computer workstation reviewing digital images of manufactured parts. Occasionally, he walked the manufacturing floor to verify samples physically.

The treating physician assigned 20% WPI for knee impairment. The Disability Evaluation Unit classified Robert as occupational group 110 (professional/technical, primarily sedentary) with occupational variant "C" for leg injuries. The resulting PDR was 14%.

However, upon review of the actual job duties, it became clear that Robert spent approximately 30% of his time on the manufacturing floor performing physical inspection work, involved in walking on uneven flooring, and performing light lifting and carrying of sample materials. A more accurate occupational

classification would be group 250 (inspection and quality control in manufacturing-semi-skilled) with occupational variant "F" (average demands on legs).

Correction to Rating:

Using the correct occupational group, the PDR would be 22-25% rather than 14%, resulting in approximately \$8,000-\$12,000 in additional benefits.

XV. Complete Source Citations and Bibliography

References

- [1] Whole Person Impairment in California - Solov & Teitell (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>)
- [2] Permanent Disability Guidebook - California Department of Industrial Relations (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>)
- [3] AMA Guides Overview - American Medical Association (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview>)
- [4] Injury to Impairment: What WPI Means - Ortho Legal Group (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>)
- [5] PD Ratings: California Workers' Compensation (<https://www.pdratings.com>)
- [6] AMA Guides 5th Edition - California Orthopaedic Association (<https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat15StevenFeinbergMD.pdf>)
- [7] California Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (2005) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>)
- [4] Injury in 2013 or Later - Ortho Legal Group (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>)
- [8] Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) in Workers' Comp - LTHZ Law (<https://www.lthzlaw.com/what-happens-when-you-achieve-maximum-medical-improvement/>)
- [9] 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr1997.pdf>)
- [10] California's Latest Attempt at Workers' Comp Reform (SB 863) - RM Magazine (<https://www.rmmagazine.com/articles/article/2013/03/14/-The-Implications-of-California-s-Latest-Attempt-at-Workers-Comp-Reform->)
- [11] Demystifying Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) - LA Accident Pros (<https://lacaccidentpros.org/what-how-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/>)
- [12] Labor Code Section 4663 - Apportionment of Permanent Disability (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/>)
- [13] QME vs. AME in California Workers' Comp - Employees First Labor Law (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/qme-vs-ame-in-california-workers-comp-whats-the-difference/>)
- [14] Average Weekly Wage Calculation Guide - Sullivan on Comp (<https://www.sullivanoncorp.com/hubfs/docs/Resources/AWW-Calculation-Guide-2024.pdf>)
- [15] How to Analyze Apportionment - Judge Eric Ledger (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/>)
- [16] DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html>)
- [17] DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)
- [18] Can the QME Find Higher WPI? Almaraz/Guzman - YouTube (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jyuuEk4DDtA>)

- [19] Dispute Over Your Disability Rating - Laguna Law Firm (<https://www.lagunalawfirm.com/california-workers-compensation-how-to-handle-a-dispute-over-your-disability-rating/>)
- [20] California Labor Code Sections 4650-4664 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2005/lab/4650-4664.html>)
- [21] Almaraz/Guzman Ratings Fundamentals of the Case (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>)
- [22] What if I Disagree with the Disability Rating - WCAB Defense (<https://wcabdefense.com/blog/workers-comp/claim/what-if-i-disagree-with-the-disability-rating/>)
- [23] Repetitive Stress Injuries - PI Law (<https://www.pi.law/blog/california-workers-compensation-for-repetitive-stress-injuries/>)
- [24] Vocational Rehab Rights of Injured Workers - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/vocational-rehab-rights-of-injured-workers/>)
- [25] Labor Code Section 4659 - 100% Permanent Disability (Life Pension) - EFLL (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74659-100-permanent-disability-life-pension/>)
- [7] Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (California) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>)
- [26] Occupational Group Characteristics - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [17] Statewide Average Weekly Wage - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)
- [27] Occupational Group Numbers Analysis - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [28] Labor Code Section 5307 - 2025 California Code (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307/>)
- [29] SB 863 Supplemental Job Displacement Voucher - GEK Law (<https://www.geklaw.com/news/displacement-voucher.html>)
- [30] Future Medical Treatment Under California Workers' Compensation - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/workers-compensation-lawyer/future-medical-treatment/>)
- [31] WCAB Regulations - California Workers' Compensation Institute (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=901.pdf>)
- [32] Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/sjdb.html>)
- [33] Labor Code Section 5307.1 - California Code (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307-1/>)
- [34] Medical Expenses Covered by California Workers' Compensation - RM Injury Law (<https://www.rminjurylaw.com/workers-compensation-law-ca/what-medical-expenses-are-covered-by-california-workers-compensation>)
- [1] What is Whole Person Impairment - Solov & Teitell (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>)
- [21] Almaraz/Guzman Ratings Fundamentals - ALSI (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>)
- [35] Workers' Compensation Benefits - Allegiance Law (<https://allegiancelaw.com/practice-areas/workers-compensation/workers-comp-benefits/>)
- [36] Mental Health Claims in California - Roy Yang Law (<https://royyanglaw.com/workers-comp/mental-health-claims/>)

- [37] Guzman - California Orthopaedic Association
(<https://coa.org/2016/presentations/qme/YoungGuzmanCannonKiteCasesHandout.pdf>)
- [2] Injured Worker Guidebook - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>)
- [38] TD vs. PD Benefits - Employees First Labor Law (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/td-vs-pd-benefits-a-california-workers-comp-guide/>)
- [39] Labor Code 4650 Overview - LawLinq (<https://www.lawlinq.com/california-labor-code-4650-overview/>)
- [40] Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) - EFLL (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/>)
- [41] Mileage Rates - DWC (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_c.pdf)
- [42] AME Medical-Legal Reports Guide - Sound Medical Evaluation
(<https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/ame-medical-legal-report-guide/>)
- [43] Permanent Partial Disability Ratings - Torrez Legal (<https://torrezlegal.com/blog/how-permanent-partial-disability-ratings-are-determined/>)
- [44] How to File a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed - DWC
(<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>)
- [45] California Medical-Legal Quality Assurance Checklist - DWC
(<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/QUALITY-ASSURANCE-CHECKLIST.docx>)
- [46] Disability Evaluation Unit - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html>)
- [47] WCAB Declaration of Readiness - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10742.html>)
- [48] Summary Rating - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/Summary-rating.html>)
- [49] DWC FAQs on PDRS - DWC (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html)
- [50] AMA Guides vs. California PDRS Differences - Bradford Barthel
(<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2025/03/25/ama-guides-california-pdrs-can-differ-on-rating-instructions/>)
- [27] Occupational Group Characteristics - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-71zs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [47] 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr1997.pdf>)
- [51] Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Organization - DWC
(https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm)
- [9] Compromise and Release vs. Stipulation - Pacific Workers
(<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>)
- [52] Settlement Types - Appel Lawyer (<https://www.appellawyer.com/blog/compromise-release-stipulation/>)
- [53] SJDB Voucher and Dennis Decision - RJY Law (<https://www.rjylaw.com/supplemental-job-displacement-benefit-voucher-and-the-dennis-decision/>)
- [54] Petitions for Reconsideration - EFLL (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A7%C2%A75900-5911-petitions-for-reconsideration/>)
- [55] Comparing Stipulated Awards and C&R - Pacific Workers
(<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>)
- [32] Return to Work Supplement - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/return-to-work-supplement/>)
- [56] SB 863 Implementing California's Reform - CWCI (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>)
- [57] Nonindustrial Disability Insurance - EDD (<https://edd.ca.gov/en/disability/nonindustrial/>)

[58] Comparing Past Lost Wages and Future Loss of Earning Capacity - Weinberger Law (<https://weinbergerlaw.net/comparing-past-lost-wages-and-future-loss-of-earning-capacity-in-california-injury-claims/>)

[59] SB 863 Implementing Reforms - CWCI (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>)

[60] Workers' Compensation and Disability Benefits - EDD (https://edd.ca.gov/en/disability/Employer_Workers_Compensation/)

[61] Lost Wages Calculation - Attorney Hanson (<https://www.attorneyhanson.com/how-are-wages-lost-due-to-a-work-injury-calculated/>)

[62] California Permanent Disability Chart & Benefits - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>)

[63] PD Indemnity Chart - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/PD-Indemnity-Chart-2017-LFLM.pdf>)

[64] Permanent Disability Chart - Visionary Law Group (<https://visionarylawgroup.com/california-permanent-disability-money-chart/>)

[17] California Permanent Disability Lawyer - Ron Ehrman Law (<https://www.ronehrmanlaw.com/workers-compensation/permanent-disability-benefits/>)

[65] Return to Work, SJDB, RTWSP - Commission on Health and Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/returntoworkpage1.html>)

[26] Temporary Disability Benefits - DWC Fact Sheet (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_b.pdf)

[66] 2025 Permanent Disability Indemnity Chart - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>)

Conclusion

The distinction between Whole Person Impairment and Permanent Disability Rating represents a fundamental but frequently misunderstood feature of California workers' compensation law. WPI constitutes a pure medical measurement of permanent functional loss, standardized across all workers and determined solely through application of the AMA Guides methodology. PDR, by contrast, is a legal and economic conversion of that medical measurement into a compensable percentage accounting for age, occupation, earning capacity, and causation of disability.

Understanding this distinction is essential for injured workers, their attorneys, and claims administrators. Even seemingly small differences between WPI and PDR percentages can translate to tens of thousands of dollars in additional compensation over the course of a worker's life, particularly when combined with Permanent Disability Rating Schedule adjustments, occupational modifications, and age-based enhancements.

For Northern California practitioners working with injured workers in San Francisco and surrounding WCAB district offices, attention to detail in WPI evaluation, verification of PDRS calculations, identification of improper apportionment, and strategic use of QME/AME evaluations and Almaraz/Guzman doctrine can substantially enhance compensation and better serve clients' long-term interests. The permanence of permanent disability determinations-once finalized through settlement or WCAB award-underscores the importance of rigorous evaluation and, where appropriate, vigorous dispute of inadequate ratings before they become final and binding.

References

[1] Whole Person Impairment in California - Solov & Teitell (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>)

[2] Permanent Disability Guidebook - California Department of Industrial Relations (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>)

- [3] AMA Guides Overview - American Medical Association (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview>)
- [4] Injury to Impairment: What WPI Means - Ortho Legal Group (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>)
- [5] PD Ratings: California Workers' Compensation (<https://www.pdratings.com>)
- [6] AMA Guides 5th Edition - California Orthopaedic Association (<https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat15StevenFeinbergMD.pdf>)
- [7] California Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (2005) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>)
- [4] Injury in 2013 or Later - Ortho Legal Group (<https://ortholegalgroup.com/injury-impairment-what-whole-person-impairment-means-injured-worker/>)
- [8] Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) in Workers' Comp - LTHZ Law (<https://www.lthzlaw.com/what-happens-when-you-achieve-maximum-medical-improvement/>)
- [9] 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr1997.pdf>)
- [10] California's Latest Attempt at Workers' Comp Reform (SB 863) - RM Magazine (<https://www.rmmagazine.com/articles/article/2013/03/14/-The-Implications-of-California-s-Latest-Attempt-at-Workers-Comp-Reform->)
- [11] Demystifying Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) - LA Accident Pros (<https://lacaccidentpros.org/what-how-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/>)
- [12] Labor Code Section 4663 - Apportionment of Permanent Disability (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/>)
- [13] QME vs. AME in California Workers' Comp - Employees First Labor Law (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/qme-vs-ame-in-california-workers-comp-whats-the-difference/>)
- [14] Average Weekly Wage Calculation Guide - Sullivan on Comp (<https://www.sullivanoncorp.com/hubfs/docs/Resources/AWW-Calculation-Guide-2024.pdf>)
- [15] How to Analyze Apportionment - Judge Eric Ledger (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/>)
- [16] DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html>)
- [17] DWC Workers' Compensation Benefits (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)
- [18] Can the QME Find Higher WPI? Almaraz/Guzman - YouTube (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jyuuEk4DDtA>)
- [19] Dispute Over Your Disability Rating - Laguna Law Firm (<https://www.lagunalawfirm.com/california-workers-compensation-how-to-handle-a-dispute-over-your-disability-rating/>)
- [20] California Labor Code Sections 4650-4664 (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2005/lab/4650-4664.html>)
- [21] Almaraz/Guzman Ratings Fundamentals of the Case (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>)
- [22] What if I Disagree with the Disability Rating - WCAB Defense (<https://wcabdefense.com/blog/workers-comp/claim/what-if-i-disagree-with-the-disability-rating/>)
- [23] Repetitive Stress Injuries - PI Law (<https://www.pi.law/blog/california-workers-compensation-for-repetitive-stress-injuries/>)
- [24] Vocational Rehab Rights of Injured Workers - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/vocational-rehab-rights-of-injured-workers/>)

- [25] Labor Code Section 4659 - 100% Permanent Disability (Life Pension) - EFLL (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74659-100-permanent-disability-life-pension/>)
- [7] Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (California) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf>)
- [26] Occupational Group Characteristics - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [17] Statewide Average Weekly Wage - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/workerscompensationbenefits.htm>)
- [27] Occupational Group Numbers Analysis - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [28] Labor Code Section 5307 - 2025 California Code (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307/>)
- [29] SB 863 Supplemental Job Displacement Voucher - GEK Law (<https://www.geklaw.com/news/displacement-voucher.html>)
- [30] Future Medical Treatment Under California Workers' Compensation - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/workers-compensation-lawyer/future-medical-treatment/>)
- [31] WCAB Regulations - California Workers' Compensation Institute (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=901.pdf>)
- [32] Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/sjdb.html>)
- [33] Labor Code Section 5307.1 - California Code (<https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-1/section-5307-1/>)
- [34] Medical Expenses Covered by California Workers' Compensation - RM Injury Law (<https://www.rminjurylaw.com/workers-compensation-law-ca/what-medical-expenses-are-covered-by-california-workers-compensation>)
- [1] What is Whole Person Impairment - Solov & Teitell (<https://solovteitell.com/2024/01/15/what-is-whole-person-impairment-in-california/>)
- [21] Almaraz/Guzman Ratings Fundamentals - ALSI (<https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf>)
- [35] Workers' Compensation Benefits - Allegiance Law (<https://allegiancelaw.com/practice-areas/workers-compensation/workers-comp-benefits/>)
- [36] Mental Health Claims in California - Roy Yang Law (<https://royyanglaw.com/workers-comp/mental-health-claims/>)
- [37] Guzman - California Orthopaedic Association (<https://coa.org/2016/presentations/qme/YoungGuzmanCannonKiteCasesHandout.pdf>)
- [2] Injured Worker Guidebook - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf>)
- [38] TD vs. PD Benefits - Employees First Labor Law (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/td-vs-pd-benefits-a-california-workers-comp-guide/>)
- [39] Labor Code 4650 Overview - LawLinq (<https://www.lawlinq.com/california-labor-code-4650-overview/>)
- [40] Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) - EFLL (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/>)
- [41] Mileage Rates - DWC (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_c.pdf)
- [42] AME Medical-Legal Reports Guide - Sound Medical Evaluation (<https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/ame-medical-legal-report-guide/>)

- [43] Permanent Partial Disability Ratings - Torrez Legal (<https://torrezlegal.com/blog/how-permanent-partial-disability-ratings-are-determined/>)
- [44] How to File a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>)
- [45] California Medical-Legal Quality Assurance Checklist - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/QUALITY-ASSURANCE-CHECKLIST.docx>)
- [46] Disability Evaluation Unit - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html>)
- [47] WCAB Declaration of Readiness - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10742.html>)
- [48] Summary Rating - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/Summary-rating.html>)
- [49] DWC FAQs on PDRS - DWC (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html)
- [50] AMA Guides vs. California PDRS Differences - Bradford Barthel (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2025/03/25/ama-guides-california-pdrs-can-differ-on-rating-instructions/>)
- [27] Occupational Group Characteristics - PD Ratings (<https://hypersphere-bulldog-7lzs.squarespace.com/s/05PDRSOccupgroupcharacteristics-fr96.pdf>)
- [47] 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities - DWC (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr1997.pdf>)
- [51] Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Organization - DWC (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm)
- [9] Compromise and Release vs. Stipulation - Pacific Workers (<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>)
- [52] Settlement Types - Appel Lawyer (<https://www.appellawyer.com/blog/compromise-release-stipulation/>)
- [53] SJDB Voucher and Dennis Decision - RJY Law (<https://www.rjylaw.com/supplemental-job-displacement-benefit-voucher-and-the-dennis-decision/>)
- [54] Petitions for Reconsideration - EFLI (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A7%C2%A75900-5911-petitions-for-reconsideration/>)
- [55] Comparing Stipulated Awards and C&R - Pacific Workers (<https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2024/september/comparing-stipulated-awards-and-compromise-and-r/>)
- [32] Return to Work Supplement - Invictus Law (<https://www.invictuslawpc.com/return-to-work-supplement/>)
- [56] SB 863 Implementing California's Reform - CWCI (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>)
- [57] Nonindustrial Disability Insurance - EDD (<https://edd.ca.gov/en/disability/nonindustrial/>)
- [58] Comparing Past Lost Wages and Future Loss of Earning Capacity - Weinberger Law (<https://weinbergerlaw.net/comparing-past-lost-wages-and-future-loss-of-earning-capacity-in-california-injury-claims/>)
- [59] SB 863 Implementing Reforms - CWCI (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=1609.pdf>)
- [60] Workers' Compensation and Disability Benefits - EDD (https://edd.ca.gov/en/disability/Employer_Workers_Compensation/)
- [61] Lost Wages Calculation - Attorney Hanson (<https://www.attorneyhanson.com/how-are-wages-lost-due-to-a-work-injury-calculated/>)
- [62] California Permanent Disability Chart & Benefits - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>)

[63] PD Indemnity Chart - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/PD-Indemnity-Chart-2017-LFLM.pdf>)

[64] Permanent Disability Chart - Visionary Law Group (<https://visionarylawgroup.com/california-permanent-disability-money-chart/>)

[17] California Permanent Disability Lawyer - Ron Ehrman Law (<https://www.ronehrmanlaw.com/workers-compensation/permanent-disability-benefits/>)

[65] Return to Work, SJDB, RTWSP - Commission on Health and Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/returntoworkpage1.html>)

[26] Temporary Disability Benefits - DWC Fact Sheet (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/factsheets/factsheet_b.pdf)

[66] 2025 Permanent Disability Indemnity Chart - LFLM (<https://www.lflm.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/PDIndemnityChart2025-WEBSITEVERSION.pdf>)