

Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation 1200 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-4026

				NOV 1 8 2005	i
R	and Latrob	Hourly Employee e Plants - A (the "Plan")	s of Standard		
Dear	•				
April is not stated entitl	14, 2003 determinential entitled to a d	_	r client, it from PBGC.	For the r	easons
must h entitl June Disabi July	ave become disaled to a guarante 27, 2002. His lity Award state 2002." There	tion letter, PBG bled prior to Pl eed disability be s Social Secur tes "you became fore, PBGC conc eed disability	an terminatio enefit. The Pl ity Administ disabled und luded that	n in order an termina ration (er our ru	ted on "SSA")
	n a November 2 ination as foll	6, 2003 letter,	PBGC furthe	r explaine	ed its

You requested why you were denied a permanent incapacity retirement. To be eligible for this type of retirement from PBGC you would have to be disabled due to a physical injury or disease which prevents you from engaging in further employment with the Company or in any other gainful employment or occupation before June 27, 2002, the Date of Plan Termination.

You did not meet this requirement since you were still an active employee at the Latrobe plant until July 12, 2002.

In your March 17, 2004 appeal, you contended that was "injured and disabled prior to June 30, 2002." In support, you presented: (1) a letter from (2	ou 2)
medical records of (3) a statement h	_
that he was unable to do his job after May, 2002, ar	-
(4) statements by five co-workers that, because wa	35
unable to perform his job, they did some of his work for him. The	ne
appeal record also contains reports of medical treatment from 199 to 2004 and the SSA Disability Award.	9 7

Plan Terms

Section 3.040 of the Plan provides that a participant shall be entitled to Permanent Incapacity Retirement under the following conditions:

- (a) Any Participant who has completed at least 15 years of Continuous Service and who shall have become ... permanently incapacitated prior to his attainment of age 65 shall be entitled to a pension upon his retirement determined in accordance with 3.040(c).
- (b) A Participant shall be deemed to be permanently incapacitated (as the term "permanently incapacitated" is used in this Agreement) and shall be retired only:
 - (1) If he has been totally disabled by bodily injury or disease so as to be prevented thereby from engaging in any occupation or employment; and
 - (2) After such total disability shall have continued for a period of five consecutive months and in the opinion of a qualified physician, it will be permanent and continuous during the remainder of his life.

Section 3.040, however, provides that a participant shall not be entitled to Permanent Incapacity Retirement if his incapacity results from criminal enterprise, habitual drunkenness, addiction to narcotics, or future service in the armed forces for which the participant receives a military pension.

Discussion

For PBGC to guarantee a disability benefit, a participant must have satisfied the Plan requirements — other than application for the benefit, retirement, or completion of a waiting period — on or before the Plan termination date, June 27, 2002.

The Appeals Board has considered evidence on this issue from

·
employment records, and your client's explanation of his employment
history.
·
primary physician, summarized his
medical history in a January 12, 2004 letter. He described visits
concerning pulmonary complaints as early as 1997, but said that
evaluations and management regarding work status in
1999 were made by a pulmonologist,
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
wrote that he saw on January 7, 2002,
when he reported great difficulty at work because of shortness of
_
breath. At the time, noted that he had "some bronchospastic COPD, certainly aggravated by smoking, maybe
aggravated by his work " He referred to a
pulmonologist, and told him that work decisions
would be left to Dr
would be left to bi.
treate that he gate it comits Time of
wrote that he saw in early June of
2002, again reported great difficulty carrying out
his usual work duties. stated: "I believe this to be
accurate, based on my findings of expiratory rhonchi and diminished
breath sounds."
statement describes the effect of his breathing
difficulties on his ability to do his jobstated that
in May, 2002, he could no longer do his job in the steel plant and
that he had so much trouble breathing that he had to sit most of
the first that the most of the first
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work.
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself.
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways disease. He also said that had sleep apnea, which
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways disease. He also said that had sleep apnea, which needed treatment.
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways disease. He also said that had sleep apnea, which needed treatment. said he had a long discussion about whether it
the time. He stated that in June and part of July, his co-workers did a great percentage of his work. Five of his co-workers submitted statements stating that they helped with his work because his health problems did not allow him to do it himself. In your appeal, you state that was unable to see the lung doctor, until July, 2002 due to schedule. When saw on July 23, 2002, he wrote that pulmonary function studies indicated restrictive disease and noted his history of obstructive airways disease. He also said that had sleep apnea, which needed treatment.

Examination notes from and laboratory tests show that did suffer from sleep apnea, which was subsequently treated.				
Employment records show that was present at work until July 12, 2002, but his statement explained that he was unable to do his job starting in June: "The only reason I was at the plant from June of 2002 to July of 2002 was because everybody else did my job." As noted, signed statements from five of his co-workers confirm that they helped him do his job because he was unable to do it himself.				
By July 2002, was disabled under the rules of the SSA. Additionally, PBGC and the Appeals Board was provided with copious medical reports, some prepared before Plan termination and some after, that formed the basis for the SSA finding. The Appeals Board found, based on these medical records and the other information submitted to PBGC and the Board, that: (1) medical condition and his inability to perform his job likely was substantially the same on the Plan's termination date (June 27, 2002) as on the date that SSA found that he was disabled; and (2) had become "permanently incapacitated" within the meaning of section 3.040 of the Plan on or before the Plan's termination date. Accordingly, the Board found that is entitled to a disability pension.				
<u>Decision</u>				
For the reasons stated above, the Board changed PBGC's determination and found that is entitled to a guaranteed disability benefit.				
PBGC will issue a new determination with a new 45-day right of appeal that will state the terms and the amount of his disability pension payable by PBGC. In the meantime, if Mr. Steeves needs other information from PBGC, he may call the Customer Contact Center at 1-800-400-7242.				
Charles W. Vernor				
Charles W. Vernon				
Chair, Appeals Board				
cc:				