

**NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF
SOCIAL SECURITY CLAIMANTS' REPRESENTATIVES
(NOSSCR)**

Government Affairs Office • 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 709 • Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 457-7775 • Fax: (202) 457-7773 • email: nosscrdc@worldnet.att.net

Executive Director
Nancy G. Shor

July 31, 2009

Mary Barros-Bailey, Ph.D.
Interim Chair
Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel
Social Security Administration
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21235

*Submitted by email to
Debra.Tidwell-Peters@ssa.gov*

Dear Doctor Barros-Bailey:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit initial comments on behalf of the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives (NOSSCR) to the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel (Panel). These comments are preliminary and reflect some general issues we would like to raise at this time. We will submit comments that address and directly respond to the Panel's recommendations to be issued in September 2009.

I am the NOSSCR Director of Government Affairs. Founded in 1979, NOSSCR is a professional association of attorneys and other advocates who represent individuals seeking Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability benefits. NOSSCR members represent these individuals with disabilities in legal proceedings before the Social Security Administration (SSA) and in federal court. NOSSCR is a national organization with over 3,900 members from the private and public sectors and is committed to the highest quality legal representation for claimants.

The objective and mission of the Panel is set forth in its Charter: To offer advice and recommendations on plans to replace the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT); to advise SSA on creating an occupational information system (OIS) tailored specifically for SSA's disability programs and adjudicative needs; and to offer advice and recommendations to SSA in specified and other areas "that would enable SSA to develop an occupational information system suited to its disability programs and improve the medical-vocational adjudication policies and processes." Based on the Panel's Charter, its primary mission is to advise SSA in ways to improve the SSA adjudicative process regarding medical-vocational analysis.

We strongly support changes to make the process more efficient so long as those changes do not affect the fairness of the procedures used to determine a claimant's entitlement to benefits. The purposes of the Social Security and SSI programs are to provide cash benefits to those who need them and have earned them and who meet the eligibility criteria. While there may be ways to improve the decision-making process from the perspective of the adjudicators, the critical measure for assessing initiatives for achieving administrative changes must be how they affect the very claimants and beneficiaries for whom the system exists.

The current framework used in the Social Security and SSI disability claims process takes into account the medical-vocational factors required by the statute and calibrates those factors to benefit individuals with the most adverse vocational factors. For instance, the United States Supreme Court has noted, regarding the current Medical-Vocational Guidelines ("the Grid Rules"),¹ that:

[The guidelines] consist of a matrix of the four factors identified by Congress – physical ability, age, education, and work experience – and set forth rules that identify whether jobs requiring specific combinations of these factors exist in significant numbers in the national economy.²

The Grid Rules acknowledge the interplay between the various vocational factors used in the Grids – age, education, work experience, and residual functional capacity (RFC). The rules must, by statute, be weighed in favor of those with more adverse vocational characteristics. For example, under SSA's current framework, low education is an adverse vocational factor; lack of transferable skills is an adverse vocational factor; being limited to sedentary work is an adverse vocational factor. When these three factors are combined, the Grid Rules recognize that the occupational base is so restricted that a finding of "disabled" is warranted.

If nonexertional limitations are involved,, the Grid Rules do not apply directly, but do offer a framework, thus recognizing the difficulty in quantifying such limitations in any type of objective matrix. Other SSA policies, e.g., regulations and Social Security Rulings, provide the necessary guidance to adjudicators.

Given that the general framework works, it would be inappropriate to jettison the entirety of the current process if there are only specific parts of it that need to be changed. For example, everyone agrees that the DOT needs to be updated. That does not mean that the Panel should see that need as a reason to reform the framework as a whole.

General Principles

We believe that the Panel should focus on the following general principles in its recommendations:

¹ 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpt. P, App. 2.

² *Heckler v. Campbell*, 461 U.S. 458, 461-62 (1983).

1. The DOT job descriptions should be updated to describe the jobs that exist in today's economy.
2. The definition of "disability" in the Social Security Act (the Act) requires an individualized assessment of ability to perform substantial gainful activity by considering the individual's functional limitations in light of his/her age, education, and work experience.³ The interplay between the factors must be included.
3. Evaluation of symptoms is unique to each individual claimant, cannot be quantified, and requires an individualized assessment. Current regulations and SSA provide detailed guidance regarding the evaluation of subjective symptoms, including pain.⁴ Factors which must be included in the disability determination include:
 - Pain (which can impact physical exertional limits as well as focus and concentration);
 - Fatigue (requiring extra rest breaks during work period);
 - Reaching limitations;
 - Manipulative functions, including circumstances where person has lost effective use of one upper extremity;
 - Sensory loss (vision, hearing, feeling);
 - Dizziness (often caused as a side effect of medications);
 - Impairment of bodily functions requiring frequent restroom breaks;
 - Balance limitations due to dizziness or physical impairments;
 - Environmental limitations due to allergies;
 - Mental demands (including level of task complexity; intensity of concentration, persistence, pace; types and intensity of interpersonal interactions with co-workers, supervisors, and public; and degree of stress in work).
4. As required by the Act, only those jobs existing in "significant" numbers that a claimant is able to perform in light of his/her age, education, work experience, and residual functional capacity should be identified.
5. Any changes in the framework for analyzing medical-vocational factors must ensure that individuals who meet the statutory definition of disability are found eligible for benefits. The process cannot be subject to eligibility criteria that could be susceptible to political pressures to exclude eligible applicants. We recommend that the Panel issue a "Beneficiary Impact Statement" to determine the impact of its proposed changes on specific applicant groups.

Comments

At this time, we have some initial comments to some of the issues that the Panel is considering. Our comments are informed by the responses we received to your recent letter addressed to NOSSCR members.

³ 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(2).

⁴ 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1529 and 416.929.

I. Update Job Descriptions

We received a number of comments from NOSSCR members regarding the need to update the job descriptions currently found in the DOT. Their comments are summarized below:

- Delete jobs that no longer exist in the national economy or no longer exist in “significant” numbers.
- Ensure that job tasks are consistent with required exertional levels.
- Ensure that the exertional levels of similar jobs in the same occupation groups are consistent with each other.
- Include jobs that now exist in significant numbers, e.g., computer/IT jobs.
- Update job descriptions for accuracy.
- Update job descriptions for jobs that still exist but are performed differently now, e.g., a worker may now need computer literacy.
- Identify whether a job is full-time or part-time. The Social Security Act makes clear that, for an individual who cannot do their past relevant work, SSA must show evidence of full-time jobs that the individual would be able to do. Some jobs that were previously full-time are now considered part-time.
- Consider whether the job includes task rotation. Supervisors in some jobs are required to perform more exertional tasks if necessary. For example, a restaurant manager may need to wait on tables and clear tables. A fire department supervisor may need to respond to a fire call.
- Obtain hard data on jobs that allow for a sit/stand option.
- Obtain hard data on unskilled sedentary jobs that exist in “significant” numbers.
- SSA should coordinate with other government agencies that maintain job census data to ascertain the existence of jobs in “significant” numbers.
- Social Security Ruling (SSR) 00-4p provides guidance to adjudicators in resolving conflicts between vocational expert testimony and the DOT. We believe that, as policy guidance, SSR 00-4p works well and should be incorporated into the Panel’s recommendations. SSR 00-4p provides that a vocational source can offer evidence that differs from the DOT, including information that is not found in the DOT. In that case, the adjudicator is required to resolve the conflict by determining whether the explanation provided by the vocational source or expert is “reasonable.”

II. Skills

The definition of “skill” in SSA’s regulations and other policies, e.g., SSR 82-41, should be retained. Under SSR 82-41, a “skill” is defined as:

... [K]nowledge of a work activity which requires the exercise of significant judgment that goes beyond the carrying out of simple job duties and is acquired through performance of an occupation which is above the unskilled level (requires more than 30 days to learn). It is practical and familiar knowledge of the principles and processes of an art, science or trade, combined with the ability to apply them in practice in a proper and approved manner. This includes activities like making precise measurements, reading

blueprints, and setting up and operating complex machinery. A skill gives a person a special advantage over unskilled workers in the labor market.

As required by the regulations, SSA must look at the individual's past relevant work history, determine the skill level of that work, and if that work is semi-skilled or skilled, whether the skills can be used in other work.

A revised OIS must recognize the existence of unskilled work. Hard data should be obtained regarding unskilled jobs at the sedentary and other exertional levels that currently exist in "significant" numbers in the national economy. Under SSR 82-41:

Skills are not gained by doing unskilled jobs, and a person has no special advantage if he or she is skilled or semiskilled but can qualify only for an unskilled job because his or her skills cannot be used to any significant degree in other jobs.

Regarding transferable skills, there is no software program that can conclusively answer the question whether skills are transferable. As noted by SSR 82-41:

The table rules in Appendix 2 [the Grids] are consistent with the provisions regarding skills because the same conclusion is directed for individuals with an unskilled work background and for those with a skilled or semiskilled work background whose skills are not transferable. A person's acquired work skills may or may not be commensurate with his or her formal educational attainment.

Given SSA's policy for evaluation of transferable skills, an individualized assessment is required. For example, under current regulations:

(1) For individuals age 50 to 54, a finding of disabled is warranted if claimant, limited to sedentary work, has a high school education which does not provide for direct entry into skilled work and has no transferable skills from semi-skilled or skilled past work.⁵

(2) In order to find transferability of skills to skilled sedentary work for individuals who are of advanced age (55 and over), there must be very little, if any, vocational adjustment required in terms of tools, work processes, work settings, or the industry.⁶

The regulations and SSR 82-41 provide guidance in determining transferability of skills, which is part of the larger issue of vocational adjustment. These agency policy directives make it clear that a generalized categorization, assuming that the individual has acquired certain skills, is inappropriate, and that the adjudicator must make an individualized assessment of the claimant, including consideration of exertional and nonexertional limitations, past work, whether any skills were acquired in semi-skilled or skilled past work, and whether the claimant's limitations allow acquired skills to be used in other jobs.

III. Mental Demands of Jobs

⁵ 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpt. P, App. 2, § 201.00(g).

⁶ 20 C.F.R., Part 404, Subpt. P, App. 2, § 201.00(f).

As noted above, evaluation of nonexertional limitations requires an individualized assessment. These types of limitations cannot be quantified, which is recognized by SSA regulations precluding the use of the Grid Rules if a claimant has only nonexertional impairments. This approach is particularly important for individuals with work limitations caused by mental impairments.

Any attempt to create a quantifiable matrix or rating system to be used in such cases would be subject to close scrutiny regarding its legality, based on a past effort by SSA. In the 1980s, SSA had an illegal, clandestine policy to deny the claims of individuals and terminate the benefits of beneficiaries with mental impairments. The agency used a form to rate the severity of 17 signs and symptoms and decided the claim based on the numerical rating. An individualized assessment of the individual's ability to work was not performed at any step of the process. Class actions were filed, challenging this policy. The courts found the procedure unlawful because it used a presumption that did not provide for the evaluation of residual functional capacity required by law.⁷ We strongly oppose any type of rating system that would provide a "bright line" determining who is disabled and who is not if they have nonexertional limitations.

In response to the litigation and congressional action, SSA changed its policies regarding the assessment of limitations caused by mental impairments. Social Security Ruling (SSR) 85-15 still provides crucial guidance in the evaluation of mental residual functional capacity, stating that the mental RFC finding requires "careful consideration." SSR 85-15 describes the basic mental demands of competitive, remunerative, unskilled work:

- The ability (on a sustained basis) to understand, carry out, and remember simple instructions;
- The ability to respond appropriately to supervision, coworkers, and usual work situations; and
- The ability to deal with changes in a routine work setting.

SSA 85-15 states that "[a] substantial loss of ability to meet any of these basic work-related activities would severely limit the potential occupational base. This, in turn, would justify a finding of disability because even favorable age, education, or work experience will not offset such a severely limited occupational base."

We believe that the policy guidance regarding the basic mental demands of work in SSR 85-15 must be retained.

Stress. A particular job is not, in and of itself, stressful. It is the individual's response to stress that is critical in evaluating mental RFC. SSR 85-15 provides excellent guidance addressing how stress should be assessed and emphasizing "the importance of thoroughness in evaluation on an individualized basis." SSR 85-15 cautions against creating any type of presumption in evaluating stress regarding a specific individual:

⁷ *City of New York v. Heckler*, 578 F. Supp. 1109 (E.D.N.Y. 1984), *aff'd*, 742 F.2d 729 (2nd Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 476 U.S. 467 (1986); *Mental Health Ass'n of Minn. v. Schweiker*, 554 F. Supp. 157 (D.Minn. 1982), *aff'd*, 720 F.2d 965 (8th Cir. 1983).

The reaction to the demands of work (stress) is highly individualized, and mental illness is characterized by adverse responses to seemingly trivial circumstances. The mentally impaired may cease to function effectively when facing such demands as getting to work regularly, having their performance supervised, and remaining in the workplace for a full day. A person may become panicked and develop palpitations, shortness of breath, or feel faint while riding in an elevator; another may experience terror and begin to hallucinate when approached by a stranger asking a question. Thus, the mentally impaired may have difficulty meeting the requirement of even so-called “low stress” jobs.

Because response to the demands of work is highly individualized, the skill level of a position is not necessarily related to the difficulty an individual will have in meeting the demands of the job. A claimant’s condition may make performance of an unskilled job as difficult as an objectively more demanding job, for example, a busboy need only clear dishes from tables. But an individual with a severe mental disorder may find unmanageable the demand of making sure that he removes all the dishes, does not drop them, and gets the table cleared promptly for the waiter or waitress. Similarly, an individual who cannot tolerate being supervised may be not able to work even in the absence of close supervision; the knowledge that one’s work is being judged and evaluated, even when the supervision is remote or indirect, can be intolerated for some mentally impaired persons. Any impairment-related limitations created by an individual’s response to demands of work, however, must be reflected in the RFC assessment.

We urge the Panel to incorporate the guidance provided in SSR 85-15 in its recommendations.

We also recommend that the Panel find methods to measure and evaluate the individual’s ability to withstand work environment stressors.

IV. Job Accommodation

Current and long-standing SSA policy does not consider “reasonable accommodation” in determining whether an individual can perform a specific job. We believe that this policy is appropriate and should continue.

The “reasonable accommodation” provision in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the SSA disability determination process provide two different but complimentary remedies for individuals with disabilities. The main purpose of the ADA is to provide a clear and comprehensive mandate to end discrimination against persons with disabilities. Nothing in the ADA should be construed to limit any other federal law that provides greater or equal protection of the rights of persons with disabilities.

While concepts of disability under the Social Security Act involve broad, hypothetical vocational patterns, determining whether the ADA applies in a specific employment situation and whether it has been violated requires a number of *individual* assessments. The appropriate method of “reasonable accommodation” is determined on a case-by-case basis

involving evidence about the *particular* employment situation. Determining whether a *particular* accommodation imposes “undue hardship,” and thus is not required under the ADA, requires another individualized, case-by-case determination.

In contrast, there is no “reasonable accommodation” requirement in the Social Security Act. Instead, the issue of available jobs in *significant* numbers is addressed on a hypothetical basis under the Act’s statutory definition of disability. Trying to determine reasonable accommodations by a hypothetical class of employers for hypothetical jobs is thus antithetical to the purpose of the ADA.

Over the years, there are some who have attempted to merge the purposes of the ADA and the Social Security and SSI disability programs. However, the distinction between the two programs was recognized by SSA as long ago as 1993 when the former SSA Associate Commissioner for the Office of Hearings and Appeals addressed the issue when it first arose in some ALJ hearings. He noted:

Whether or how an employer might be willing (or required) to alter job duties to suit the limitations of a specific individual would not be relevant because our assessment must be based on broad vocational patterns ... rather than on any individual employer’s practices.

He concluded that “the ADA and the disability provisions of the Social Security Act have different purposes and have no direct application to one another.”⁸

The United States Supreme Court also has recognized that the two programs were designed for different purposes and can coexist. In *Cleveland v. Policy Management Systems Corp.*,⁹ the U.S. Supreme Court noted that the Social Security Act provides cash benefits to individuals under a “disability” as defined in the Act, while the ADA “seeks to eliminate unwarranted discrimination against disabled individuals.”¹⁰ The Supreme Court found that “there are too many situations in which an SSDI claim and an ADA claim can comfortably exist side by side” and thus held it would not apply a negative presumption that an individual who applies or receives SSDI cannot pursue an ADA claim.¹¹ The Supreme Court provided specific examples how the ADA and SSDI programs “can comfortably exist side by side.”

Specifically relevant to the Panel’s work, the Supreme Court described how the ADA defines a “qualified individual” to include a disabled person who can perform essential functions of a specific job “with reasonable accommodations,” a factor that is not part of Social Security statutory definition of disability. Thus, an ADA claim that a plaintiff can perform a specific job with reasonable accommodation “may well prove consistent with an SSDI claim that the plaintiff could not perform her own job (or other jobs) *without* it.”¹²

⁸ Memorandum dated June 2, 1993, from Daniel Skoler, Associate Commissioner of the Office of Hearings and Appeals [now known as the Officer of Disability Adjudication and Review].

⁹ *Cleveland v. Policy Management Systems Corp.*, 526 U.S. 795 (1999). The Supreme Court cited to the Skoler Memorandum. *Id.* at 803.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 801.

¹¹ *Id.* at 802.

¹² *Id.* at 803.

Introduction of the ADA into the disability process is not appropriate because the purposes of the two programs are not the same. The ADA ensures that persons with disabilities have equal access in both public and private arenas. The Social Security Act, on the other hand, provides cash benefits to persons determined unable to engage in substantial gainful activity.

* * * *

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments to the work of the Occupational Information Development Advisory Panel. We look forward submitting more comprehensive comments in response to the Panel's recommendations to be issued in September 2009.

Sincerely,

Ethel Zelenske
Director of Government Affairs