

onal Corporation River Park Drive, Suite 330 Sacramento, California 95815-4616 (916) 924-1862 (916) 924-3541 FAX www.shww.com

STEVEN I. HARRIS GEORGE WOOLVERTON JEFFREY T. LANDRES MICHAEL L. TERRY EDWARD S. MUEHL TED L. HIRSCHBERGER LINDA S. FREEMAN IAN D. PAIGE VANESSA I. HENDERSON * JAN P. FUCHS * ERIC G. HELPHREY PENEED LOGOLUSO BARRANCE Q. ZAKAR * DANIEL J. YSABAL * LISA R. KERNER SCOTT T. JELENSKY GAIL D. RACKLIFFE JOSEPH E. ZUCKERMAN KIMBERLY A. HANSEN ANNE C. BOBCHICK JOHN T. BILLINGSLEA ANTHONY CANNIZZO PAULA N. HARRIS †† LISA A. HANHART JAMES C. SHIPLEY

AURORA VASQUEZ

L. STEVEN HATTENDORF FREDERIC J. PHANEUF CHRISTIAN M SANTOS

ANGELA M SEKL MATTHEW B.WOOLVERTON MARYAM MIRMIRAN JESSE EVAN KOZMA RICHARD K. GREEN TTTTT RICHARD K. GREEN TITTI BRENDAN A. O'MELIA CARLA F.T. MULLER MONIQUE PRIDE BROOKS * † HEIDI P. PIERCE †††††† EMMANUEL K. NSAHLAI * PENNY PAXTON * *********** DAVID J. CARASH DARLENE EVANS ANNETTE KAZANDJIAN ALISSA TOBIN ZEA JEANNIE M LAGORIO

KATHLEEN PRUITT KIMBERLEY S. GASKILL CHRISTOPHER D. WARREN KYLE ROBERT HANSEN ALEXANDER W. HANSEN ROBERT A MOORE TRAVIS M. BAILEY TRAVIS M. BAILEY REED R. HEUSTIS, JR. SHELLY HAY ANDERSON TERRI N. PHAN THOMAS P. MASTRO MICHAEL R. O'NEILL ERRICK J. WINEK JEFFREY S. MARSILIO BRIAN R. HORAN MARILYN M. MOORE BRYAN S. REINER MANJIT K. BATTH KRISTINA F. WOO

LIEN SPECIALISTS TERA LOWERY RINA DEL ROSARIO SEAN TALIAFERRO SHERRI L. SHABESTARI OLIVIA INIQUEZ JOSHUA A LAZAR

*CERTIFIED SPECIALIST WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA BOARD

† ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

† ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

† THE ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

† ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

† THE ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

† THIT ALSO LICENSED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND STATE OF WASHINGTON

† THIT ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

† THIT ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

† THIT ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

† THIT ALSO LICENSED IN THE STATE OF OREGON NIA BOARD OF LEGAL SPECIALIZATION

MARK H. WILLENS ††† PETER S. KIM
DEREK A. KUHEN
PAUL S. WOLSEY

JANET ORMOND ANDRIZZI

EDITTE ALSEN
JENNIFER L. BOECK ††††
DEBRA ODOM KUTTNAUER

SU TRAN

PANEL QUALIFIED MEDICAL RE-EVALUATION: MARCH 27, 2012 @ 8:30AM

March 20, 2012

Dr. Khosrow Tabaddor 8221 N. Fresno Street Fresno, CA 93720

RE: ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL

WCAB NO .:

1) ADJ7004221; 2) ADJ7004227; 3) ADJ7010682; 4)

ADJ7976768

CLAIM NO.:

VE0700184

OUR FILE NO .: DATE OF LOSS: 300141-040 1) 6/19/08 2) 7/2/09 3) 3/26/09; 4) 6/29/11

Dear Dr. Tabaddor:

Please recall that this office represents the interests of AIMS in the above matter. Thank you for agreeing to re-examine Ms. Tiffany Anderson. This evaluation is scheduled to take place on March 27, 2012 at 8:30am in your office in Sacramento, California, please recall that you were selected from Panel #1114339 to serve as the Panel Qualified Medical Evaluator. You have evaluated Ms. Anderson on

LOS ANGELES OFFICE 3580 Wilshire Boulevard, 19TH Floor Los Angeles, California 90010 (323) 935-6669

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE 701 South Parker Street, Suite 2200 Orange, California 92868-4736 (714) 479-1180

SAN DIEGO OFFICE 750 "B" Street, Suite 2340 San Diego, California 92101 (619) 696-1436

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE 222 Kearny Street, 9TH Floor San Francisco, California 94108 (415) 734-9310

SAN BERNARDINO OFFICE 735 East Carnegie Drive, Suite 270 San Bernardino, California 92408 (909) 381-5553

SAN LUIS OBISPO OFFICE 1150 Osos Street, Suite 202 San Luis Obispo, California 93401-3692 (805) 541-0440

VENTURA OFFICE 2021 Sperry Avenue, Suite 46 Ventura, California 93003-7417 (805) 654-8994

FRESNO OFFICE 7541 North Remington Avenue, Suite 105 Fresno, California 93711 (559) 226-9030

ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL Page 2

March 20, 2012

more than one occasion. The last time was November 1, 2011. For your review, I am enclosing a copy of the November 1, 2011 report.

Since the time of your last evaluation, Ms. Anderson underwent right knee surgery. The date of that evaluation was November 28, 2011. Please re-evaluate Ms. Anderson on behalf of the parties. Please advise if any of your previously expressed opinions have changed.

This brings us to date.

Please perform your usual thorough, thoughtful and unbiased assessment, and address the specific questions asked in this referral. A complete medical evaluation should include a detailed account of the patient's injury as well as his/her past general medical condition and/or any pre-existing factors that may have contributed to or been the cause of his/her current medical condition and need for treatment. Please compare the history provided by the examinee with the history documented in the medical records. The physical examination should document all pertinent positive, negative, and non-physiological findings. For extremity injuries, please document measurements bilaterally. Please assess whether your physical examination findings are consistent with those of other examiners. Your conclusions must be supportable.

It is requested that your report comment specifically on the following:

Causation. Based on your examination of the patient and review of the available information, do you believe in your professional medical opinion that this patient has sustained an industrial injury? Are the medical findings consistent with the claimed injury? Are the subjective complaints supported by objective findings? Are there any non-physiological findings present on examination? Is there evidence of dysfunctional illness behavior? Was the injury a new problem, an aggravation or contribution to a preexisting problem, or does this reflect a temporary exacerbation? Please present your medical conclusions, to a reasonable degree of medical certainty concerning the cause, the effect, and the relationship between the cause and effect. Please explain the rationale for your conclusions.

ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL Page 3 March 20, 2012

Temporary Disability. Was there any period for which the applicant, due to the industrial injury, was temporarily disabled from work? If so, for what period of time would you estimate the applicant to have been temporarily disabled?

Permanent Disability. If a disability exists as the result of an industrial injury, has it reached maximum medical improvement (MMI)? When, in your estimation, did the condition reach this level? If the condition has not reached MMI, please provide an estimate of when it is likely to occur and what will facilitate achieving MMI. If the condition has reached MMI, please describe any permanent disability in accordance with the AMA's Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition with particular reference to Chapter 2, "Philosophy, Purpose and Appropriate Use of the Guides", and the applicable chapter(s) pertaining to the claimed injury. You should obtain the applicable data as discussed in the "Principles of Assessment" for each chapter and assure that the data is reliable. When rating impairment, please detail your methodology, including references to Tables, Figures and page numbers, If spinal impairment is rated, please explain your choice of methods and how you determined impairment. For an upper extremity rating, please complete Figure 16-1 Upper Extremity Impairment Evaluation Record (5th ed., 436-437). For a lower extremity rating, please explain the method(s) that you have chosen, with reference to Table 17-2 Guide to the Appropriate Combination of Evaluation Methods (5th ed., 526). If you feel pain is ratable, explain fully your approach according to the standards defined in Chapter 18.

As part of our focus on quality assurance, we routinely have ratings reviewed by other experts to assure appropriate application of the *Guides* and accuracy of ratings.

Apportionment. Please describe any and all factors of apportionment. Please note, LC §4663 provides that apportionment "shall be based upon causation". Reports addressing permanent disability must address causation and determine the percentage of permanent disability caused by injury and by other factors including previous disabilities, pre-existing conditions or impairments. Please discuss your findings on any apportionment to non-industrial (avocational) or pre-existing factors (pathology) as required by the recent decisions of the WCAB. Apportionment to factors that previously could not have been apportioned to,

ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL

Page 4 March 20, 2012

including pathology and asymptomatic pre-injury conditions is now permitted. The *Escobedo* decision provides that any conclusion regarding apportionment must be supported by substantial medical evidence establishing that these factors have caused permanent disability. The Board concluded that to be considered substantial evidence, your opinion about the approximate percentage of PD due to the direct results of the injury and the "approximate percent" of PD due to other factors, must be:

- Framed in terms of reasonable medical probability;
- · Based on pertinent facts and on an adequate history; and
- It must set forth reasoning in support of its conclusions;
- It must not be speculative

The court stated that the physician must explain how and why the other factors are causing permanent disability at the time of the evaluation, and how and why they are responsible for an approximate portion of the disability. If you cannot provide an opinion on apportionment, please state why. Per LC 4663(c), if you are unable to make an apportionment determination, you are to seek help from another physician to provide the opinion or refer the employee to a physician who can make an apportionment determination, it is important that you ask the examinee if there have been any previous permanent disabilities, physical impairments, awards of permanent disability, or Compromise and Release Agreements as per LC 4663(d). The response to this question must be documented.

Medical Treatment. In connection with the medical treatment provided to the applicant to date, has it been reasonable in light of the incident or injury claimed by the applicant? In your opinion, have there been any excesses in either treatment or testing? Please note that newly passed legislation provides that the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) guidelines are presumptively correct for all dates of injury.

Future Medical Care, Please state, in as much detail as possible, what future medical care, treatment, medication and surgical procedures should be provided or made available to the claimant and specify the duration. Again, please note that

ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL Page 5 March 20, 2012

American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) guidelines are presumptively correct for all dates of injury.

Ability to Return to Work. One of the primary goals of the workers' compensation system is to return the injured worker to the work force. We seek your assistance in reaching this goal. To aid you in this endeavor I have enclosed a Job Description.

Please advise if the applicant can return to full duty as describe in the Job Description or if none available, based on the applicant's description of the job duties. If the applicant is not able to return to full duty, please advise as to any limitations that the employer should be aware of.

In addressing any limitations, consider the following activities and the applicant's ability to perform each.

Standing, walking, sitting, crawling, climbing, bending, stooping, twisting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, handling/grasping, and balancing.

Include the duration in time that the applicant can perform each activity in an 8 hour work day. Also address any limitations that the applicant may have in performing these activities on consecutive days in a 5 day work week.

Include any limitations on the applicant's ability to carry or lift weight and any restriction as the duration of carrying or lifting during an 8 hour work day. Also address any limitations that the applicant may have in performing these activities on consecutive days in a 5 day work week.

Please be advised that any testing which you deem reasonably necessary in your evaluation of the applicant will need to be authorized by the defendant. Additionally, if you feel that hospitalization is necessary, you must first obtain authority from the defendant.

Your close attention to the foregoing questions will be greatly appreciated since your opinions and comments regarding these issues will be most important to the outcome of this case. Feel free to add any additional comments or information you feel is relevant or of significance to this case.

ANDERSON, TIFFANY VS. SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL

Page 6

March 20, 2012

Very truly yours,

STOCKWELL, HARRIS, WOOLVERTON & MUEHL

A Professional Corporation

KOLER. HANSEN

KRH:hv

Enclosure: Report dated November 1, 2011.

cc: Ms. Tiffany Anderson (In Pro-Per)

Ms. Mackenzie Dawson, AIMS Insurance