December 8, 1998

In the Matter of:	
Julia Cope	
(Widow of Robert W. Cope)	
Claimant	
	Case Nos.: 1997-LHC-1589
against	1998-LHC-0741
Electric Boat Corporation	
Employer/Self-Insurer	OWCP Nos.: 1-119873
	1-136421
and	
Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, United States Department of Labor	
Party-in-Interest	

Appearances:

Carolyn P. Kelly, Esq.
For the Claimant

Peter D. Quay, Esq.
For the Employer/Self-Insurer

Before: **DAVID W. DI NARDI**
Administrative Law Judge

DECISION AND ORDER - AWARDING BENEFITS

This is a claim for workers' compensation benefits under the the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act as amended (33 U.S.C. §901, **et seq.**), herein referred to as the "Act." The hearing was held on March 4, 1998 in New London, Connecticut at which time all parties were given the opportunity to present evidence and oral arguments. The following references will be used: TR for the official hearing transcript, ALJ EX for an exhibit offered by this Administrative Law Judge, CX for a Claimant's exhibit, DX for a Director's exhibit, JX for a Joint Exhibit and RX for an Employer's exhibit. This decision is being rendered after having given full consideration to the entire record.

Post-hearing evidence has been admitted as:

Exhibit No.	**Item**	**Filing Date**
CX 1	Attorney Kelly's Letter Filing	11/30/98
JX 1	Parties' Stipulations	11/30/98
CX 2	Attorney Kelly's Fee Petition	11/30/98
RX 1	Attorney Quay's Objection to Fee Petition	12/07/98

The record was closed on December 7, 1998 as no further documents were filed.

Stipulations and Issues

The parties stipulate (JX 1), and I find:

1. The decedent worked for General Dynamics, Electric Boat Division in Groton, Connecticut in the 1940's and then from 1956 until 1981 as a maintenance machinist.

2. Up until at least the mid 1970's the decedent was exposed to asbestos products as he worked throughout the shipyard.

3. As early as 1981 the decedent was found to have pleural plaques and some shortness of breath.

4. In September of 1995 after a bronchoscopy with biopsy, the decedent was diagnosed with squamous cell carcinoma of the right upper lung which had metastasized. (CX-1).

5. The date of death was March 18, 1996.

6. The decedent's death certificate listed carcinoma of the lung as the immediate cause of death. (CX-2.)

7. The lung cancer was caused in part by decedent's exposure to asbestos.

8. The claimant, **JULIA COPE**, was married to the decedent on November 21, 1939. (CX-3).

9. She continued to be his spouse until the time of his death.

10. The widow has not remarried.

11. The widow spent $5,745.00 for funeral services for the decedent.

12. The applicable average weekly wage, the national average effective on October 1, 1995 is $391.22.

13. The applicable rate of compensation for the claimant widow as of March 19, 1996 is $195.61 per week.

The unresolved issues in this proceeding are:

1. Attorney's fee

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

As noted above, this claim came on for the hearing before this Administrative Law Judge with regard to an injury allegedly received by the decedent as a result of exposure to asbestos while he was employed at the Employer's maritime facility in Groton, Connecticut. Decedent passed away on March 18, 1996. The parties now submit that they have resolved all issues in dispute and the parties request that an agreed compensation order incorporating the stipulated facts be entered as an Order and payments be made as stipulated.

As the parties have voluntarily resolved the disputed issues, an appropriate **ORDER** will be issued.

On the basis of the totality of this record I make the following:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

This Administrative Law Judge, in arriving at a decision in this matter, is entitled to determine the credibility of the witnesses, to weigh the evidence and draw his own inferences from it, and he is not bound to accept the opinion or theory of any particular medical examiner. **Banks v. Chicago Grain Trimmers Association, Inc.**, 390 U.S. 459 (1968), **reh. denied**, 391 U.S. 929 (1969); **Todd Shipyards v. Donovan**, 300 F.2d 741 (5th Cir. 1962); **Scott v. Tug Mate, Incorporated**, 22 BRBS 164, 165, 167 (1989); **Hite v. Dresser Guiberson Pumping**, 22 BRBS 87, 91 (1989); **Anderson v. Todd Shipyard Corp.**, 22 BRBS 20, 22 (1989); **Hughes v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.**, 17 BRBS 153 (1985); **Seaman v. Jacksonville Shipyard, Inc.**, 14 BRBS 148.9 (1981); **Brandt v. Avondale Shipyards, Inc.**, 8 BRBS 698 (1978); **Sargent v. Matson Terminal, Inc.**, 8 BRBS 564 (1978).

The Act provides a presumption that a claim comes within its provisions. **See** 33 U.S.C. §920(a). This Section 20 presumption

"applies as much to the nexus between an employee's malady and his employment activities as it does to any other aspect of a claim." **Swinton v. J. Frank Kelly, Inc.**, 554 F.2d 1075 (D.C. Cir. 1976), **cert. denied**, 429 U.S. 820 (1976). Claimant's uncontradicted credible testimony alone may constitute sufficient proof of physical injury. **Golden v. Eller & Co.**, 8 BRBS 846 (1978), **aff'd**, 620 F.2d 71 (5th Cir. 1980); **Hampton v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.**, 24 BRBS 141 (1990); **Anderson v. Todd Shipyards**, **supra**, at 21; **Miranda v. Excavation Construction, Inc.**, 13 BRBS 882 (1981).

However, this statutory presumption does not dispense with the requirement that a claim of injury must be made in the first instance, nor is it a substitute for the testimony necessary to establish a "**prima facie**" case. The Supreme Court has held that "[a] **prima facie** 'claim for compensation,' to which the statutory presumption refers, must at least allege an injury that arose in the course of employment as well as out of employment." **United States Indus./Fed. Sheet Metal, Inc., v. Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, U.S. Dep't of Labor**, 455 U.S. 608, 615 102 S. Ct. 1318, 14 BRBS 631, 633 (CRT) (1982), **rev'g Riley v. U.S. Indus./Fed. Sheet Metal, Inc.**, 627 F.2d 455 (D.C. Cir. 1980). Moreover, "the mere existence of a physical impairment is plainly insufficient to shift the burden of proof to the employer." **Id.** The presumption, though, is applicable once claimant establishes that he has sustained an injury, **i.e.**, harm to his body. **Preziosi v. Controlled Industries**, 22 BRBS 468, 470 (1989); **Brown v. Pacific Dry Dock Industries**, 22 BRBS 284, 285 (1989); **Trask v. Lockheed Shipbuilding and Construction Company**, 17 BRBS 56, 59 (1985); **Kelaita v. Triple A. Machine Shop**, 13 BRBS 326 (1981).

To establish a **prima facie** claim for compensation, a claimant need not affirmatively establish a connection between work and harm. Rather, a claimant has the burden of establishing only that (1) the claimant sustained physical harm or pain and (2) an accident occurred in the course of employment, or conditions existed at work, which could have caused the harm or pain. **Kier v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.**, 16 BRBS 128 (1984); **Kelaita**, **supra**. Once this **prima facie** case is established, a presumption is created under Section 20(a) that the employee's injury or death arose out of employment. To rebut the presumption, the party opposing entitlement must present substantial evidence proving the absence of or severing the connection between such harm and employment or working conditions. **Parsons Corp. of California v. Director, OWCP**, 619 F.2d 38 (9th Cir. 1980); **Butler v. District Parking Management Co.**, 363 F.2d 682 (D.C. Cir. 1966); **Ranks v. Bath Iron Works Corp.**, 22 BRBS 301, 305 (1989); **Kier**, **supra**. Once claimant establishes a physical harm and working conditions which could have caused or aggravated the harm or pain the burden shifts to the employer to establish that claimant's condition was not caused or aggravated by

his employment. **Brown v. Pacific Dry Dock**, 22 BRBS 284 (1989); **Rajotte v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 18 BRBS 85 (1986). If the presumption is rebutted, it no longer controls and the record as a whole must be evaluated to determine the issue of causation. **Del Vecchio v. Bowers**, 296 U.S. 280 (1935); **Volpe v. Northeast Marine Terminals**, 671 F.2d 697 (2d Cir. 1981); **Holmes v. Universal Maritime Serv. Corp.**, 29 BRBS 18 (1995). In such cases, I must weigh all of the evidence relevant to the causation issue. **Sprague v. Director, OWCP**, 688 F.2d 862 (1st Cir. 1982); **Holmes, supra**; **MacDonald v. Trailer Marine Transport Corp.**, 18 BRBS 259 (1986).

Injury

The term "injury" means accidental injury or death arising out of and in the course of employment, and such occupational disease or infection as arises naturally out of such employment or as naturally or unavoidably results from such accidental injury. **See** 33 U.S.C. §902(2); **U.S. Industries/Federal Sheet Metal, Inc., et al., v. Director, Office of Workers Compensation Programs, U.S. Department of Labor**, 455 U.S. 608, 102 S.Ct. 1312 (1982), **rev'g Riley v. U.S. Industries/Federal Sheet Metal, Inc.**, 627 F.2d 455 (D.C. Cir. 1980). A work-related aggravation of a pre-existing condition is an injury pursuant to Section 2(2) of the Act. **Gardner v. Bath Iron Works Corporation**, 11 BRBS 556 (1979), **aff'd sub nom. Gardner v. Director, OWCP**, 640 F.2d 1385 (1st Cir. 1981); **Preziosi v. Controlled Industries**, 22 BRBS 468 (1989); **Januszewicz v. Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company**, 22 BRBS 376 (1989) (**Decision and Order on Remand**); **Johnson v. Ingalls Shipbuilding**, 22 BRBS 160 (1989); **Madrid v. Coast Marine Construction**, 22 BRBS 148 (1989). Moreover, the employment-related injury need not be the sole cause, or primary factor, in a disability for compensation purposes. Rather, if an employment-related injury contributes to, combines with or aggravates a pre-existing disease or underlying condition, the entire resultant disability is compensable. **Strachan Shipping v. Nash**, 782 F.2d 513 (5th Cir. 1986); **Independent Stevedore Co. v. O'Leary**, 357 F.2d 812 (9th Cir. 1966); **Kooley v. Marine Industries Northwest**, 22 BRBS 142 (1989); **Mijangos v. Avondale Shipyards, Inc.**, 19 BRBS 15 (1986); **Rajotte v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 18 BRBS 85 (1986). Also, when claimant sustains an injury at work which is followed by the occurrence of a subsequent injury or aggravation outside work, employer is liable for the entire disability if that subsequent injury is the natural and unavoidable consequence or result of the initial work injury. **Bludworth Shipyard, Inc. v. Lira**, 700 F.2d 1046 (5th Cir. 1983); **Mijangos**, **supra**; **Hicks v. Pacific Marine & Supply Co.**, 14 BRBS 549 (1981). The term injury includes the aggravation of a pre-existing non-work-related condition or the combination of work- and non-work-related conditions. **Lopez v. Southern Stevedores**, 23 BRBS 295 (1990); **Care v. WMATA**, 21 BRBS 248 (1988).

Nature and Extent of Disability

It is axiomatic that disability under the Act is an economic concept based upon a medical foundation. **Quick v. Martin**, 397 F.2d 644 (D.C. Cir. 1968); **Owens v. Traynor**, 274 F. Supp. 770 (D.Md. 1967), **aff'd**, 396 F.2d 783 (4th Cir. 1968), **cert. denied**, 393 U.S. 962 (1968). Thus, the extent of disability cannot be measured by physical or medical condition alone. **Nardella v. Campbell Machine, Inc.**, 525 F.2d 46 (9th Cir. 1975). Consideration must be given to Claimant's age, education, industrial history and the availability of work she can perform after the injury. **American Mutual Insurance Company of Boston v. Jones**, 426 F.2d 1263 (D.C. Cir. 1970). Even a relatively minor injury may lead to a finding of total disability if it prevents the employee from engaging in the only type of gainful employment for which he is qualified. (**Id**. at 1266)

An employer can establish suitable alternate employment by offering an injured employee a light duty job which is tailored to the employee's physical limitations, so long as the job is necessary and claimant is capable of performing such work. **Walker v. Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.**, 19 BRBS 171 (1986); **Darden v. Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.**, 18 BRBS 224 (1986). Claimant must cooperate with the employer's re-employment efforts and if employer establishes the availability of suitable alternate job opportunities, this Administrative Law Judge must consider claimant's willingness to work. **Trans-State Dredging v. Benefits Review Board, U.S. Department of Labor and Tarner**, 731 F.2d 199 (4th Cir. 1984); **Roger's Terminal & Shipping Corp. V. Director, OWCP,** 784 F.2d 687 (5th Cir. 1986). An employee is not entitled to total disability benefits merely because he does not like or desire the alternate job. **Villasenor v. Marine Maintenance Industries, Inc.,** 17 BRBS 99, 102 (1985), **Decision and Order on Reconsideration**, 17 BRBS 160 (1985).

An award for permanent partial disability in a claim not covered by the schedule is based on the difference between claimant's pre-injury average weekly wage and his post-injury wage-earning capacity. 33 U.S.C. §908(c)(21)(h); **Richardson v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 23 BRBS (1990); **Cook v. Seattle Stevedoring Co.**, 21 BRBS 4, 6 (1988). If a claimant cannot return to his usual employment as a result of his injury but secures other employment, the wages which the new job would have paid at the time of claimant's injury are compared to the wages claimant was actually earning pre-injury to determine if claimant has suffered a loss of wage earning capacity. **Cook, supra**. Subsections 8(c)(21) and 8(h) require that wages earned post-injury be adjusted to the wage levels which the job paid at time of injury. **See Walker v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority**, 793 F.2d 319, 18 BRBS 100 (CRT) (D.C. Cir. 1986); **Bethard v. Sun Shipbuilding & Dry**

Dock Co., 12 BRBS 691, 695 (1980).

It is now well-settled that the proper comparison for determining a loss of wage-earning capacity is between the wages claimant received in his usual employment pre-injury and the wages claimant's post-injury job paid **at the time of his injury. Richardson, supra; Cook, supra.**

Death Benefits and Funeral Expenses Under Section 9

Pursuant to the 1984 Amendments to the Act, Section 9 provides Death Benefits to certain survivors and dependents if a work-related injury causes an employee's death. This provision applies with respect to any death occurring after the enactment date of the Amendments, September 28, 1984. 98 Stat. 1655. The provision that Death Benefits are payable only for deaths due to employment injuries is the same as in effect prior to the 1972 Amendments. The carrier at risk at the time of decedent's injury, not at the time of death, is responsible for payment of Death Benefits. **Spence v. Terminal Shipping Co.**, 7 BRBS 128 (1977), **aff'd sub nom. Pennsylvania National Mutual Casualty Insurance Co. v. Spence**, 591 F.2d 985, 9 BRBS 714 (4th Cir. 1979), **cert. denied**, 444 U.S. 963 (1975); **Marshall v. Looney's Sheet Metal Shop**, 10 BRBS 728 (1978), **aff'd sub nom. Travelers Insurance Co. v. Marshall**, 634 F.2d 843, 12 BRBS 922 (5th Cir. 1981).

A separate Section 9 claim must be filed in order to receive benefits under Section 9. **Almeida v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 12 BRBS 901 (1980). This Section 9 claim must comply with Section 13. **See Wilson v. Vecco Concrete Construction Co.**, 16 BRBS 22 (1983); **Stark v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.**, 6 BRBS 600 (1977). Section 9(a) provides for reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $3,000. 33 U.S.C.A. §909(a) (West 1986). Prior to the 1984 Amendments, this amount was $1,000. This subsection contemplates that payment is to be made to the person or business providing funeral services or as reimbursement for payment for such services, and payment is limited to the actual expenses incurred up to $3,000. Claimant is entitled to appropriate interest on funeral benefits untimely paid. **Adams v. Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company**, 22 BRBS 78, 84 (1989).

Section 9(b) which provides the formula for computing Death Benefits for surviving spouses and children of Decedents must be read in conjunction with Section 9(e) which provides minimum benefits. **Dunn v. Equitable Equipment Co.**, 8 BRBS 18 (1978); **Lombardo v. Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.**, 6 BRBS 361 (1977); **Gray v. Ferrary Marine Repairs**, 5 BRBS 532 (1977).

Section 9(e), as amended in 1984, provides a maximum and

minimum death benefit level. Prior to the 1972 Amendments, Section 9(e) provided that in computing Death Benefits, the average weekly wage of Decedent could not be greater than $105 nor less than $27, but total weekly compensation could not exceed Decedent's weekly wages. Under the 1972 Amendments, Section 9(e) provided that in computing Death Benefits, Decedent's average weekly wage shall not be less than the National Average Weekly Wage under Section 6(b), but that the weekly death benefits shall not exceed decedent's actual average weekly wage. **See Dennis v. Detroit Harbor Terminals**, 18 BRBS 250 (1986), **aff'd sub nom. Director, OWCP v.Detroit Harbor Terminals, Inc.**, 850 F.2d 283 21 BRBS 85 (CRT) (6th Cir. 1988); **Dunn, supra**; **Lombardo, supra**; **Gray, supra**.

In **Director, OWCP v. Rasmussen**, 440 U.S. 29, 9 BRBS 954 (1979), **aff'g** 567 F.2d 1385, 7 BRBS 403 (9th Cir. 1978), **aff'g sub nom. Rasmussen v. GEO Control, Inc.**, 1 BRBS 378 (1975), the Supreme Court held that the maximum benefit level of Section 6(b)(1) did not apply to Death Benefits, as the deletion of a maximum level in the 1972 Amendment was not inadvertent. The Court affirmed an award of $532 per week, two-thirds of the employee's $798 average weekly wage.

However, the 1984 amendments have reinstated that maximum limitation and Section 9(e) currently provides that average weekly wage shall not be less than the National Average Weekly Wage, but benefits may not exceed the lesser of the average weekly wage of Decedent or the benefits under Section 6(b)(1).

Medical Expenses

An Employer found liable for the payment of compensation is, pursuant to Section 7(a) of the Act, responsible for those medical expenses reasonably and necessarily incurred as a result of a work-related injury. **Perez v. Sea-Land Services, Inc.**, 8 BRBS 130 (1978). The test is whether or not the treatment is recognized as appropriate by the medical profession for the care and treatment of the injury. **Colburn v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 21 BRBS 219, 22 (1988); **Barbour v. Woodward & Lothrop, Inc.**, 16 BRBS 300 (1984). Entitlement to medical services is never time-barred where a disability is related to a compensable injury. **Addison v. Ryan-Walsh Stevedoring Company**, 22 BRBS 32, 36 (1989); **Mayfield v. Atlantic & Gulf Stevedores**, 16 BRBS 228 (1984); **Dean v. Marine Terminals Corp.**, 7 BRBS 234 (1977). Furthermore, an employee's right to select his own physician, pursuant to Section 7(b), is well settled. **Bulone v. Universal Terminal and Stevedore Corp.**, 8 BRBS 515 (1978). Claimant is also entitled to reimbursement for reasonable travel expenses in seeking medical care and treatment for her work-related injuries. **Tough v. General Dynamics Corporation**, 22 BRBS 356 (1989); **Gilliam v. The Western Union**

Telegraph Co., 8 BRBS 278 (1978).

Interest

Although not specifically authorized in the Act, it has been accepted practice that interest at the rate of six (6) percent per annum is assessed on all past due compensation payments. **Avallone v. Todd Shipyards Corp.**, 10 BRBS 724 (1978). The Benefits Review Board and the Federal Courts have previously upheld interest awards on past due benefits to ensure that the employee receives the full amount of compensation due. **Watkins v. Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.**, 8 BRBS 556 (1978), **aff'd in pertinent part** and **rev'd on other grounds sub nom. Newport News v. Director, OWCP**, 594 F.2d 986 (4th Cir. 1979); **Santos v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 22 BRBS 226 (1989); **Adams v. Newport News Shipbuilding**, 22 BRBS 78 (1989); **Smith v. Ingalls Shipbuilding**, 22 BRBS 26, 50 (1989); **Caudill v. Sea Tac Alaska Shipbuilding**, 22 BRBS 10 (1988); **Perry v. Carolina Shipping**, 20 BRBS 90 (1987); **Hoey v. General Dynamics Corp.**, 17 BRBS 229 (1985). The Board concluded that inflationary trends in our economy have rendered a fixed six percent rate no longer appropriate to further the purpose of making claimant whole, and held that ". . . the fixed six percent rate should be replaced by the rate employed by the United States District Courts under 28 U.S.C. §1961 (1982). This rate is periodically changed to reflect the yield on United States Treasury Bills . . . ." **Grant v. Portland Stevedoring Company**, 16 BRBS 267, 270 (1984), **modified on reconsideration**, 17 BRBS 20 (1985). Section 2(m) of Pub. L. 97-258 provided that the above provision would become effective October 1, 1982. This Order incorporates by reference this statute and provides for its specific administrative application by the District Director. The appropriate rate shall be determined as of the filing date of this Decision and Order with the District Director.

Attorney's Fee

Claimant's attorney, having successfully prosecuted this claim, is entitled to a fee to be assessed against the Employer. Claimant's attorney filed a fee application on November 30, 1998 (CX 2), concerning services rendered and costs incurred in representing Claimant between January 9, 1997 and November 11, 1998. Attorney Kelly seeks a fee of $2,790.75 (including expenses) based on 11.75 hours of attorney time and 11.00 hours of paralegal time.

The Employer filed a response to the fee petition filed by Claimant's counsel, stating that there was no objection to the hourly rates or services being sought. (RX 1)

In light of the nature and extent of the excellent legal

services rendered to Claimant by his attorney, the amount of compensation obtained for Claimant and the Employer's acceptance of the requested fee, I find a legal fee of $2,790.75 (including expenses) is reasonable and in accordance with the criteria provided in the Act and regulations, 20 C.F.R. §702.132, and is hereby approved. The expenses are approved as reasonable and necessary litigation expenses. As the parties have amicably resolved the matter, I shall approve the fee for the entire period of time in the interest of judicial efficiency.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and upon the entire record, I issue the following compensation order. The specific dollar computations of the compensation award shall be administratively performed by the District Director.

It is therefore ORDERED that:

1. The self-insurer on behalf of the employer pay the claimant, **JULIA COPE**, death benefits from March 19, 1996, based upon the national average weekly wage of $391.22 in accord with Section 9 of the Act, such benefits to continue for as long as she is eligible therefor.

2. The respondent self-insurer shall reimburse or pay claimant reasonable funeral expenses of $3,000.00 pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Act.

3. The respondents shall pay for or reimburse claimant for such reasonable, appropriate and necessary medical care and treatment as the decedent's work-related injury may have required subject to the provisions of the Act.

4. The respondents will be entitled to a credit for certain third party recoveries in the amount of $24,301.09.

5. Interest shall be paid by the Respondents on all accrued benefits at the T-bill rate applicable under 28 U.S.C. §1961 (1982), computed from the date each payment was originally due until paid. The appropriate rate shall be determined as of the filing date of this Decision and Order with the District Director.

6. Claimant's attorney has filed herewith a fully supported and fully itemized fee petition, sending a copy thereof to respondent's counsel who shall then have fourteen (14) days to comment thereon.

7. The Respondents shall pay to Claimant's attorney, Carolyn P. Kelly, the sum of $2,790.75 (including expenses) as a reasonable

fee for representing Claimant herein before the Office of Administrative Law Judges between January 9, 1997 and November 11, 1998.

_____

DAVID W. DI NARDI
Administrative Law Judge

Dated:
Boston, Massachusetts
DWD:jgg