

electrophysiological and neuroimaging testing.

(3) Diffuse pulmonary fibrosis in an individual age 55 or older which reduces FEV1 to 1.45 to 2.05 (L, BTPS) or less depending on the individual's height.

(4) Amputation of leg at hip.

Nonpermanent impairment refers to a case in which any medical improvement in the person's impairment(s) is possible. This means an impairment for which improvement cannot be predicted based on current experience and the facts of the particular case but which is not at the level of severity of an impairment that is considered permanent. Examples of nonpermanent impairments are: regional enteritis, hyperthyroidism, and chronic ulcerative colitis.

(d) *Frequency of review.* If an annuitant's impairment is expected to improve, generally the Board will review the annuitant's continuing eligibility for disability benefits at intervals from 6 months to 18 months following the Board's most recent decision. The Board's notice to the annuitant about the review of the annuitant's case will tell the annuitant more precisely when the review will be conducted. If the annuitant's disability is not considered permanent but is such that any medical improvement in the annuitant's impairment(s) cannot be accurately predicted, the Board will review the annuitant's continuing eligibility for disability benefits at least once every 3 years. If no medical improvement is expected in the annuitant's impairment(s), the Board will not routinely review the annuitant's continuing eligibility. Regardless of the annuitant's classification, the Board will conduct an immediate continuing disability review if a question of continuing disability is raised pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

(e) *Change in classification of impairment.* If the evidence developed during a continuing disability review demonstrates that the annuitant's impairment has improved, is expected to improve, or has worsened since the last review, the Board may reclassify the annuitant's impairment to reflect this change in severity. A change in the classification of the annuitant's im-

pairment will change the frequency with which the Board will review the case. The Board may also reclassify certain impairments because of improved tests, treatment, and other technical advances concerning those impairments.

(f) *Review after administrative appeal.* If the annuitant was found eligible to receive or to continue to receive disability benefits on the basis of a decision by a hearings officer, the three-member Board or a Federal court, the agency will not conduct a continuing disability review earlier than 3 years after that decision unless the annuitant's case should be scheduled for a medical improvement expected or vocational reexamination diary review or a question of continuing disability is raised pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section.

(g) *Waiver of timeframes.* All cases involving a nonpermanent impairment will be reviewed by the Board at least once every 3 years unless the Board determines that the requirements should be waived to ensure that only the appropriate number of cases are reviewed. The appropriate number of cases to be reviewed is to be based on such considerations as the backlog of pending reviews, the projected number of new applications, and projected staffing levels. Therefore, an annuitant's continuing disability review may be delayed longer than 3 years following the Board's original decision or other review under certain circumstances. Such a delay would be based on the Board's need to ensure that backlogs, and new disability claims workloads are accomplished within available medical and other resources and that such reviews are done carefully and accurately.

[56 FR 12980, Mar. 28, 1991, as amended at 65 FR 20372, Apr. 17, 2000; 74 FR 63603, Dec. 4, 2009]

§ 220.187 If the annuitant's medical recovery was expected and the annuitant returned to work.

If the annuitant's impairment was expected to improve and the annuitant returned to full-time work with no significant medical limitations and acknowledges that medical improvement has occurred, the Board may find that

the annuitant's disability ended in the month he or she returned to work. Unless there is evidence showing that the annuitant's disability has not ended, the Board will use the medical and other evidence already in the annuitant's file and the fact that he or she has returned to full-time work without significant limitations to determine that the annuitant is no longer disabled. (If the annuitant's impairment is not expected to improve, the Board will not ordinarily review his or her claim until the end of the trial work period, as described in § 220.170.)

Example: Evidence obtained during the processing of the annuitant's claim showed that the annuitant had an impairment that was expected to improve about 18 months after the annuitant's disability began. The Board, therefore, told the annuitant that his or her claim would be reviewed again at that time. However, before the time arrived for the annuitant's scheduled medical reexamination, the annuitant told the Board that he or she had returned to work and the annuitant's impairment had improved. The Board investigated immediately and found that, in the 16th month after the annuitant's began, the annuitant returned to full-time work without any significant medical restrictions. Therefore, the Board would find that the annuitant's disability ended in the first month the annuitant returned to full-time work.

APPENDIX 1 TO PART 220 [RESERVED]

APPENDIX 2 TO PART 220—MEDICAL-VOCATIONAL GUIDELINES

Sec.

- 200.00 Introduction.
- 201.00 Maximum sustained work capability limited to sedentary work as a result of severe medically determinable impairment(s).
- 202.00 Maximum sustained work capability limited to light work as a result of severe medically determinable impairment(s).
- 203.00 Maximum sustained work capability limited to medium work as a result of severe medically determinable impairment(s).
- 204.00 Maximum sustained work capability limited to heavy work (or very heavy work) as a result of severe medically determinable impairment(s).

200.00 *Introduction.* (a) The following rules reflect the major functional and vocational patterns which are encountered in cases which cannot be evaluated on medical considerations alone, where an individual with a severe medically determinable physical or

mental impairment(s) is not engaging in substantial gainful activity and the individual's impairment(s) prevents the performance of his or her vocationally relevant past work. They also reflect the analysis of the various vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) in combination with the individual's residual functional capacity (used to determine his or her maximum sustained work capability for sedentary, light, medium, heavy, or very heavy work) in evaluating the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity in other than his or her vocationally relevant past work. Where the findings of fact made with respect to a particular individual's vocational factors and residual functional capacity coincide with all of the criteria of a particular rule, the rule directs a conclusion as to whether the individual is or is not disabled. However, each of these findings of fact is subject to rebuttal and the individual may present evidence to refute such findings. Where any one of the findings of fact does not coincide with the corresponding criterion of a rule, the rule does not apply in that particular case and, accordingly, does not direct a conclusion of disabled or not disabled. In any instance where a rule does not apply, full consideration must be given to all of the relevant facts of the case in accordance with the definitions and discussions of each factor in the appropriate sections of the regulations.

(b) The existence of jobs in the national economy is reflected in the "Decisions" shown in the rules; i.e., in promulgating the rules, administrative notice has been taken of the numbers of unskilled jobs that exist throughout the national economy at the various functional levels (sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy) as supported by the "Dictionary of Occupational Titles" and the "Occupational Outlook Handbook," published by the Department of Labor; the "County Business Patterns" and "Census Surveys" published by the Bureau of the Census; and occupational surveys of light and sedentary jobs prepared for the Social Security Administration by various State employment agencies. Thus, when all factors coincide with the criteria of a rule, the existence of such jobs is established. However, the existence of such jobs for individuals whose remaining functional capacity or other factors do not coincide with the criteria of a rule must be further considered in terms of what kinds of jobs or types of work may be either additionally indicated or precluded.

(c) In the application of the rules, the individual's residual functional capacity (i.e., the maximum degree to which the individual retains the capacity for sustained performance of the physical-mental requirements of jobs), age, education, and work experience must first be determined. When assessing the person's residual functional capacity, the Board