

FILED: December 26, 2013

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OREGON

In the Matter of the Compensation of David D. Walker, Claimant.

SAIF CORPORATION
and QUANTUM RESOURCE RECOVERY,
Petitioners,

v.

DAVID D. WALKER,
Respondent.

Workers' Compensation Board
0904014, 0902172, 0902171, 0902170

A150552

Argued and submitted on February 07, 2013.

David L. Runner argued the cause and filed the briefs for petitioners.

Jodie Phillips Polich argued the cause for respondent. With her on the brief was Law Offices of Jodie Anne Phillips Polich, P.C.

Before Ortega, Presiding Judge, and Sercombe, Judge, and Hadlock, Judge.

SERCOMBE, J.

Affirmed.

1 SERCOMBE, J.

2 In this workers' compensation case, SAIF Corporation (SAIF) and
3 employer Quantum Resource Recovery (Quantum) seek judicial review of an order of the
4 Workers' Compensation Board (board), which determined that the worsening of
5 claimant's preexisting L4-5 disc herniation was a "consequential condition" under ORS
6 656.005(7)(a)(A) because a compensable injury to claimant's left foot was "the major
7 contributing cause" of that condition.¹ See ORS 656.005(7)(a)(A) ("No injury or disease
8 is compensable as a consequence of a compensable injury unless the compensable injury
9 is the major contributing cause of the consequential condition."). On review, SAIF
10 initially argues that, because the disc herniation preceded the foot injury by at least two
11 years, it is not "legally or logically possible" that the disc herniation was a consequence
12 of the foot injury that followed it. SAIF further contends, alternatively, that there is not
13 substantial medical evidence to support a finding of an actual *worsening* of claimant's L4-
14 5 herniation as a consequence of the foot injury, but only evidence of a "symptomatic
15 aggravation" of that condition. We review the board's order for substantial evidence and
16 errors of law, ORS 656.298(7); ORS 183.482(8), and for the reasons below, we conclude
17 that substantial evidence supports the board's determination that the worsening of
18 claimant's L4-5 disc herniation was a consequential condition of the 2008 foot injury.
19 Accordingly, we affirm.

20 In 2004, before beginning work with Quantum, claimant fell out of a truck

¹ For ease of reference, we refer to petitioners collectively as SAIF.

1 and struck his lower back while working in Arizona. He reported lower back pain and
2 occasional tingling in his right thigh. In May 2006, claimant underwent an MRI scan of
3 the lumbar spine. The MRI revealed a 4-to-5-mm L4-5 disc protrusion, which had a
4 slight mass effect on the right L5 nerve root.

5 In October 2006, while working for Quantum, claimant heard a "pop" and
6 experienced lower back pain as he was pushing heavy barrels. Thereafter, claimant had
7 pain and tenderness in his right lower back and some numbness and tingling down his left
8 leg, and he underwent a second lumbar MRI scan in November 2006. That scan showed
9 that the L4-5 disc protrusion had "increased noticeably because of extruded disc
10 material," as compared to the earlier MRI, and that there was mass effect on both the L5
11 and the S1 nerve root sleeves.

12 SAIF accepted the October 2006 injury as a lumbar strain. Claimant
13 received treatment for that injury over the next year and by October 2007 was determined
14 to be medically stationary. In November 2007, the claim for lumbar strain was closed
15 with no award of permanent impairment. In February 2008, claimant wrote to SAIF,
16 asking it to add a "worsening * * * of L4 and L5 disc protrusion" to his claim. SAIF
17 denied that request, relying on an April 2008 opinion from Dr. Bergquist that the October
18 2006 injury was not a material cause of the disability or need for treatment of claimant's
19 disc herniation. Claimant did not pursue review of that denial, and it became final by
20 operation of law.

21 In August 2008, while working at Quantum, a pallet jack fell onto

1 claimant's left foot. SAIF accepted a left foot crush injury. A few months later, during
2 treatment with Dr. Thomas, claimant reported severe back pain, a limited range of motion
3 in his lower back, and right leg pain with radiculopathy.² In early November 2008,
4 claimant underwent a third MRI. The reviewing radiologist reported that the disc
5 material at the L4-5 level was still protruding into the spinal canal, but there was no
6 "significant interval change in its size or contours" as compared to the second 2006 MRI.

7 Dr. Wayson saw claimant in December 2008. Wayson noted that claimant
8 had an injury in October 2006 with back pain and right leg pain. Wayson further noted
9 that, following claimant's August 2008 left foot injury, he was compensating for his left
10 foot, which "led to an aggravation of his right leg symptoms and he has become
11 progressively uncomfortable." Wayson's assessment was of "lumbar radiculopathy
12 secondary to a disc herniation." After seeing Wayson, claimant sent a letter to SAIF
13 requesting acceptance of "[l]umbar disc herniation, L4-5" and "[l]umbar radiculitis
14 secondary to #1" as new or omitted medical conditions. The letter further stated that
15 claimant's "file indicates that according to some of the medical evidence [he] may have a
16 preexisting condition in his lower back. If appropriate please process this request as a
17 worsening of the above referenced conditions."

18 In January 2009, Dr. Carr performed an independent medical evaluation.
19 Carr noted that, before claimant's October 2006 back injury, he had degenerative disc

² Radiculopathy or radiculitis "is a generalized term that most commonly refers to pain or numbness and can encompass a variety of underlying conditions." *Armenta v. PCC Structural, Inc.*, 253 Or App 682, 692 n 7, 292 P3d 573 (2012).

1 disease at L4-5. In Carr's view, following the October 2006 back injury, claimant
2 suffered a "definite pathological worsening of the disc protrusion" and "radicular
3 symptoms which would be called radiculitis which in [his] opinion were secondary to the
4 worsening of the disc herniation at L4-5." Carr believed that the 2006 injury "was the
5 major contributing cause of the disability and need for treatment following the combined
6 condition" but the October 2006 back injury "ceased to be the major contributing cause of
7 disability and need for treatment at the time [claimant] was declared medically
8 stationary."

9 As to the 2008 foot injury, Carr believed that it combined with the
10 preexisting disc condition to cause the resulting need for treatment of the lower back. In
11 Carr's view, the altered gait due to the foot injury "alter[ed] the stresses on the back" and
12 "produce[d] symptomatic aggravation of the degenerative disc disease." Carr believed
13 that the 2008 foot injury "and its sequela was a *material* contributing cause of
14 [claimant's] disability and need for treatment for his low back following the work
15 incident[,] but he did not believe that the foot injury was the *major* contributing cause of
16 the disability and need for treatment resulting from the combined condition. (Emphasis
17 added.) Rather, Carr believed that the preexisting disc condition--not the 2008 foot
18 injury--was the major contributing cause of the disability and the need for treatment.

19 In February 2009, Wayson wrote to claimant's counsel that, "[f]or the most
20 part [he] agree[d] with Dr. Carr's assessment * * *." Specifically, Wayson

21 "believe[d] that [claimant's] primary injury is the work injury of October of
22 2006 in which he suffered a progression of his disc herniation at L4-5. I

1 think that that is the underlying and the primary cause for his need for
2 treatment.

3 "He has remained symptomatic since that [time] and the foot injury
4 [of] 2008 has led to an exacerbation, but the primary underlying cause is
5 the disc herniation of 2006.

6 "Therefore, I disagree with Dr. Carr's conclusion on page 16 that 'it
7 is not the continuing and major contributing cause to his current disability.'
8 I do believe that the underlying disc herniation is and continues to be
9 symptomatic."

10 Later in February 2009, SAIF denied the conditions for "L4-5 disc herniation" and "L4-5
11 radiculitis." SAIF amended that denial in June 2009, stating that, with respect to the
12 October 2006 injury, the April 2008 denial of the disc herniation was final and claimant's
13 L4-5 radiculitis was "a product of the previously denied L4-5 disc herniation."

14 In August 2009, Wayson signed a concurrence letter prepared by claimant's
15 counsel after a conference between them. That letter explained that Wayson had the
16 opportunity to review a "formal exhibit pack," including the MRIs from 2006, and that he
17 agreed that "the major contributing cause, more than 50.1%, of [claimant's] current low
18 back condition, diagnosed as an L4-5 disc herniation with radiculopathy/radiculitis, is his
19 August 21, 2008 injury where he sustained a crush injury to his left foot." Wayson
20 further agreed that,

21 "as a result of the crush injury to his left foot [claimant] altered his gait by
22 increasing use and weight bearing on his right leg. As a result of his altered
23 gait due to the crush injury to his left foot *his low back condition has been*
24 *worsened* irritating the nerves in his low back causing inflammation and
25 increased symptoms. Your opinion is based on the history provided to you
26 by [claimant] of increased pain after this injury, as well as your
27 examination, including his decreased sensation in an L5-S1 distribution on
28 the right side, giveaway weakness in his right lower extremity, and positive
29 straight leg raise testing. In your opinion these are all verifiable and

1 reproducible * * * findings of an actual worsening of [claimant's] L4-5 disc
2 *herniation*. It is your opinion that the major contributing cause, more than
3 50.1% of *this worsening* is [claimant's] altered gait due to the crush injury
4 to his left foot."

5 (Emphases added.) Carr responded to Wayson's opinion during a deposition in October
6 2009. He testified that he did not agree with Wayson that there was a pathological
7 worsening. Carr noted that the decreased sensation and positive straight leg raising were
8 both observed prior to the 2008 injury and that the 2008 MRI showed that the disc
9 fragment was no larger than it was when the MRI was taken after the 2006 injury.
10 Thomas, who had treated claimant just after his injury, signed a concurrence letter
11 prepared by SAIF's counsel in which he agreed with Carr's conclusions regarding
12 claimant's disc herniation.

13 At a hearing held in November 2010, an administrative law judge (ALJ)
14 considered claimant's "L4-5 disc protrusion and radiculitis claims" and reasoned that,
15 "[f]or these conditions to be compensable as consequences of [the 2008 injury,] * * * the
16 injury [must] be the major contributing cause of these conditions." Noting that Carr "did
17 not believe that the 2008 injury and sequela caused the disc herniation, or did anything
18 more than cause a symptomatic aggravation of the L4-5 condition and radiculitis," the
19 ALJ reasoned that whether "the L4-5 disc protrusion and radiculitis is compensably
20 related to the work injury depends on the persuasiveness of Dr. Wayson's opinion" that
21 claimant's foot injury "was the major contributing cause of claimant's current low back
22 condition * * *."

23 The ALJ noted that Wayson's opinion "was based on claimant's history, as

1 well as on findings of decreased sensation, give[a]way weakness in the right lower
2 extremity and positive straight leg raise testing." But the ALJ credited Carr's response
3 that "give[a]way weakness is not an objective finding and not true weakness" and further
4 noted that another doctor "had documented positive straight leg raising and decreased
5 sensation in his pre-August 2008 * * * examinations, so these findings were not new."
6 Further, the ALJ reasoned that "Wayson's August 7, 2009 concurrence letter reflects a
7 change in his opinion, compared to his February 11, 2009 opinion[,] but "Wayson did
8 not explain in his August 7, 2009 concurrence letter why he changed his opinion * * *."
9 For those reasons, the ALJ "[did] not find Dr. Wayson's August 7, 2009 opinion to be
10 persuasive" and affirmed SAIF's "denial issued in the 2008 claim * * *."

11 Claimant appealed the ALJ's decision to the board. Addressing the 2008
12 foot crush injury, the board reasoned that "[t]he parties do not dispute that the claimed
13 L4-5 disc herniation should be analyzed [as] a 'consequential condition.' Therefore,
14 claimant must prove that the accepted crush injury to the left foot was the major
15 contributing cause of his L4-5 disc herniation with radiculitis." According to the board,
16 Wayson's opinion that the altered gait "resulted in a worsened L4-5 herniated disc with
17 radiculitis" established a compensable consequential condition. Although the board
18 noted that, in August 2009, Wayson had partially agreed with Carr's opinion that the foot
19 injury was not the major contributing cause of the worsened disc herniation, the board
20 explained that Wayson's February 2009 opinion was consistent with his August 2009
21 opinion that the foot injury "exacerbat[ed] or worsen[ed] claimant's underlying L4-5 disc

1 herniation." Further, the board noted that, before giving the later opinion, Wayson had
2 the opportunity to review all of the then-available medical records, and his review of
3 those additional materials was sufficient to explain his change in opinion.

4 As to Wayson's August 2009 opinion, the board determined that Wayson's
5 conclusion of a "'worsened' L4-5 disc herniation" were supported by "'verifiable and
6 reproducible'" findings that were not present before the 2008 foot injury, such as
7 "'giveaway weakness in [the] right lower extremity' and 'increased pain' and
8 inflammation." Finally, the board noted that Carr's opinion was "consistent" with a
9 consequential condition in that he "agreed that the injury materially contributed to a
10 'symptomatic aggravation' * * *." In the board's view, however, "Wayson's opinion [was]
11 better explained and more consistent with claimant's symptoms and the overall record[.]"

12 Ultimately, the board reversed "[t]hat portion of the ALJ's order that upheld
13 SAIF's denial of the L4-5 disc herniation with radiculitis as a consequence of the August
14 2008 work injury * * *." One member of the board dissented from that reversal. The
15 dissenting board member, crediting Carr's opinion, disagreed that the medical evidence
16 was sufficient to establish that the 2008 foot injury was the major contributing cause of a
17 pathological worsening of the L4-5 disc herniation.

18 On judicial review, SAIF first raises a threshold issue as to what the board
19 decided in its order. SAIF argues that the board's order requires SAIF to accept the "disc
20 herniation in toto"--not the worsening of the disc herniation caused by the foot injury.
21 With that view of the order, SAIF makes the straightforward argument that "a

1 'consequential condition' must follow the 'compensable injury' that allegedly causes it";
2 there is no dispute that "the L4-5 disc herniation occurred two years *before* the
3 compensable left foot injury"; and therefore it is not "legally or logically possible" that
4 the disc herniation was a consequence of the foot injury that followed it.

5 With regard to the worsening of claimant's L4-5 disc herniation, SAIF
6 argues that "the record in this case, including Dr. Wayson's opinion, does not logically
7 allow a lay fact-finder such as the board to find a worsening of anything other than
8 symptoms." Relying on Carr's opinion that there was not a pathological change in the
9 disc herniation, SAIF argues that "[t]here [was] no evidence that the disc herniation itself
10 was made larger or otherwise worse by the 2008 left foot injury." In SAIF's view, then,
11 the board improperly determined that the disc herniation was compensable merely
12 because the altered gait due to the foot injury caused an increase in radiculitis and other
13 symptoms of claimant's preexisting disc herniation.³

³ SAIF does not dispute that the L4-5 disc herniation is a separate condition arising from the 2008 foot injury. *See Fred Meyer, Inc. v. Crompton*, 150 Or App 531, 536, 946 P2d 1171 (1997) ("[A] consequential condition is a separate condition that arises from the compensable injury, for example, when a worker suffers a compensable foot injury that results in an altered gait that, in turn, results in back strain."). Further, at no point has SAIF argued that the worsening of claimant's disc herniation must be viewed as a combined condition under ORS 656.005(7)(a)(B), rather than a consequential condition, on the theory that the foot injury combined with the preexisting disc herniation to bring about claimant's disability or need for treatment. *See* ORS 656.005(7)(a)(B) ("If an otherwise compensable injury combines at any time with a preexisting condition to cause or prolong disability or a need for treatment, the combined condition is compensable only if, so long as and to the extent that the otherwise compensable injury is the major contributing cause of the disability of the combined condition or the major contributing cause of the need for treatment of the combined condition."); *Fred Meyer, Inc. v. Evans*, 171 Or App 569, 573-74, 15 P3d 1261 (2000) (rejecting employer's argument that when a

1 In response, claimant acknowledges that the L4-5 disc herniation was
2 diagnosed years before the foot injury, but he argues that his claim related to the foot
3 injury "is based on a *worsening* of [that] prior L4-5 disc condition * * *." (Emphasis
4 added.) According to claimant, "the board specifically addressed the major contributing
5 cause of [his] L4-5 disc herniation condition, including a finding that it was worsened by
6 his August 2008 left foot crush injury[.]" Claimant contends that substantial medical
7 evidence supported that finding; the board relied on Wayson's opinion that the foot injury
8 caused an altered gait that was the major contributing cause of an "actual worsening" of
9 the L4-5 disc herniation.

10 As to the threshold issue of the scope of the board's order, we agree with
11 claimant that the board, relying on Wayson's opinion, found that the *worsening* of
12 claimant's L4-5 disc herniation was a consequential condition of the 2008 foot injury.
13 Although the board at times referenced claimant's "L4-5 disc herniation" or "disc
14 herniation with radiculitis" without using the term "worsening," those references must be
15 understood in the context of the board's entire order, the parties' arguments to the board
16 and the ALJ, and--most importantly--the medical evidence that the board reviewed.
17 There is no question that claimant's disc herniation at L4-5 preexisted the 2008 injury,

compensable injury makes a preexisting condition worse, that condition must be treated as a consequential condition rather than a combined condition and reasoning that claimant's degenerative disc disease in her neck that preexisted her injury was "not a separate condition that arose from the compensable injury; it preexisted and combined with it"). We therefore consider the worsening of the disc herniation as a consequential condition under ORS 656.005(7)(a)(A).

1 and so with respect to the relationship between the 2008 injury and the L4-5 disc
2 herniation, the parties' oral arguments to the ALJ and their written submissions to the
3 board focused on a worsening of the L4-5 disc herniation. Those arguments were based
4 on the medical evidence: both Carr and Wayson believed that the 2008 injury caused a
5 worsening of some sort. As the board's review of the evidence makes clear, however, the
6 doctors disagreed as to the nature of that worsening--that is, whether claimant's altered
7 gait gave rise to an actual worsening of his underlying L4-5 disc herniation or simply
8 caused a symptomatic worsening with no worsening in the disc herniation itself.⁴

9 The remaining question for our review, then, is whether there is substantial
10 evidence to support the board's determination that the 2008 foot injury was the major
11 contributing cause of the worsening of claimant's L4-5 disc herniation. ORS

⁴ We also reject SAIF's argument that the board erred by failing to separately analyze claimant's request for acceptance of the L4-5 disc herniation and the radiculitis secondary to that herniation. SAIF advances that contention in support of its larger claim that the board found the disc herniation compensable solely because the 2008 injury caused an increase in radiculitis. As the board's order explains, however, Wayson found an "actual worsening of [claimant's] disc herniation" based on his examination and findings of a symptomatic worsening following the 2008 injury--not simply based on the presence of radiculitis following the 2008 injury. To the extent that SAIF separately argues that the board erred in ordering acceptance of the claimed radiculitis because claimant's radiculitis or radiculopathy was merely a symptom of the L4-5 disc herniation, SAIF did not present that argument to the board. *See Armenta v. PCC Structural, Inc.*, 253 Or App 682, 692 n 7, 292 P3d 573 (2012) (noting that "this court has openly debated [radiculopathy's] status as a 'condition,' though that is ultimately a question of fact to be decided based on the medical evidence in individual cases"); *Young v. Hermiston Good Samaritan*, 223 Or App 99, 101, 107, 194 P3d 857 (2008) (finding that "radiculopathy," defined by the medical evidence as "pain that radiates along the course of a nerve root that exits from the spine," was a "symptom and not a condition"). Moreover, any argument that radiculitis--which was claimed as "secondary to" the L4-5 disc herniation--was not properly found to be compensable fails in light of the board's conclusion that the 2008 foot injury caused an actual worsening of the L4-5 disc herniation.

1 183.482(8)(c). Specifically, we must determine whether the board's evaluation of expert
2 medical opinions is supported by evidence that, considering the record as a whole, would
3 permit a reasonable person to make the findings. *Armstrong v. Asten-Hill Co.*, 90 Or App
4 200, 206, 752 P2d 312 (1988); *SAIF v. Pepperling*, 237 Or App 79, 84-85, 238 P3d 1013
5 (2010) ("In reviewing the board's evaluation of [an expert's] opinion, we do not substitute
6 our judgment for that of the board; rather, we determine whether the board's evaluation of
7 that evidence was reasonable." (Citation omitted.)). To determine whether a particular
8 finding is supported by substantial evidence, we "evaluate evidence against the finding as
9 well as evidence supporting it to determine whether substantial evidence exists to support
10 that finding." *Garcia v. Boise Cascade Corp.*, 309 Or 292, 295, 787 P2d 884 (1990). In
11 a case involving conflicting medical evidence, "we will reverse the board 'only when the
12 credible evidence apparently weighs overwhelmingly in favor of one finding and the
13 [b]oard finds the other without giving a persuasive explanation.'" *SAIF v. Pruitt*, 198 Or
14 App 253, 258, 108 P3d 586 (2005) (quoting *Armstrong*, 90 Or App at 206). Put more
15 bluntly, "if there are doctors on both sides of a medical issue, whichever way the [b]oard
16 finds the facts will probably have substantial evidentiary support." *Armstrong*, 90 Or
17 App at 206.

18 The evidentiary support for a worsening claim generally comes in two
19 forms: direct proof of a pathological worsening or a medical expert's opinion that
20 worsened symptoms constitute a worsening of the underlying condition. *See SAIF v.*
21 *Walker*, 330 Or 102, 118, 996 P2d 979 (2000) ("[B]ecause evidence of worsened

1 symptoms is relevant to the question whether the compensable condition actually has
2 worsened, and might in some cases be the best evidence regarding that fact, a physician
3 may rely upon that kind of evidence in determining whether the compensable condition
4 has worsened * * *."); *SAIF v. January*, 166 Or App 620, 624, 998 P2d 1286 (2000) (if a
5 medical expert's opinion establishes that the symptomatic worsening represents an actual
6 worsening of the underlying condition, then such evidence may carry the worker's
7 burden); *Johnson v. SAIF*, 194 Or App 689, 694, 96 P3d 830 (2004) (describing MRI
8 results as evidence of a pathological change).⁵

9 Here, SAIF contends that there was no evidence that the disc herniation
10 was made worse by the left foot injury and that "the only evidence [was] that there was
11 no such worsening" because, in Carr's opinion, the disc fragment shown in the 2008 MRI
12 was no larger than in the 2006 MRI. That argument ignores the evidence of an actual
13 worsening that the board relied upon: Wayson concluded that, based on objective
14 findings of giveaway weakness and increased pain and symptoms following the 2008 foot
15 injury, claimant's underlying disc herniation at L4-5 had actually worsened. Under
16 *Walker*, that opinion was sufficient to establish an actual worsening, and "[w]hether that

⁵ Both parties--and the medical experts on which they rely--speak to the worsening of the condition in this case as an "actual worsening," *i.e.*, the statutory standard for worsening in aggravation cases. ORS 656.273(1) ("A worsened condition resulting from the original injury is established by medical evidence of an actual worsening of the compensable condition supported by objective findings."). As noted, SAIF has not argued that an actual worsening of a condition cannot be viewed as consequential condition under ORS 656.005(7)(a)(A); rather, SAIF has argued that the evidence in the record shows nothing more than a symptomatic worsening resulting from the 2008 foot injury.

1 opinion was persuasive was for the [b]oard to determine." *January*, 166 Or App at 624.

2 That Carr reached a different conclusion by focusing on the 2008 MRI
3 results does not render Wayson's opinion without any value, so that the board's order
4 lacks substantial evidence. As this court has recognized, evidence of an actual worsening
5 may come in the form of evidence of a pathological worsening, such as an MRI, or in the
6 form of expert medical opinion based on symptomatic worsening. *See Johnson*, 194 Or
7 App at 694 (noting that claimant presented evidence of "an increase in symptoms, such as
8 her urinary incontinence and difficulty walking" along with evidence of pathological
9 changes such as a "build up of scar tissue" shown in an MRI). And SAIF has presented
10 no authority for the principle that, as a matter of law or of medicine, evidence of
11 pathological changes trumps contrary medical evidence--*i.e.*, an expert medical opinion--
12 that worsening symptoms constitute a worsening underlying condition. Rather, SAIF
13 presented an opinion from Carr, who viewed the MRI results as the "most important"
14 evidence that the disc herniation had not worsened. But even as Carr focused on the MRI
15 results to support his opinion, he did not opine that the MRI results were irrefutable and
16 definitive evidence that claimant's L4-5 disc herniation had not worsened, without regard
17 to contrary evidence of a symptomatic worsening.

18 Ultimately, the "divided medical opinion" in this case left the board "in the
19 position of evaluating the evidence." *Dillon v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 172 Or App 484, 489,
20 19 P3d 951 (2001); *Bluemer v. Southland Industries*, 221 Or App 252, 260, 190 P3d 418
21 (2008) (rejecting claim "that the board erred in not giving more weight to the opinion of

1 [one medical expert], who was the treating physician and who relied on a more complete
2 medical history" because that argument merely suggested that the board erred in
3 weighing the evidence). As the board recognized, Carr's and Wayson's disagreement was
4 based on a fine distinction between a worsening of symptoms and a worsening of the
5 underlying condition itself. In resolving those conflicting opinions, one member found
6 Carr's opinion more persuasive, but a majority of the board found that "Wayson's opinion
7 [was] better explained and more consistent with claimant's symptoms and the overall
8 record[.]" Our role on judicial review is not to reweigh the evidence or "choose sides"
9 among the medical experts or the members of the board. *Armstrong*, 90 Or App at 206.
10 Based on our review of the record, the board's resolution of the conflicting medical
11 evidence was not unreasonable. Accordingly, we conclude that substantial evidence
12 supports the board's finding that the 2008 foot injury was the major contributing cause of
13 the worsening of claimant's L4-5 disc herniation.

14 Affirmed.