

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],  
Claimant

Reg. No: 2008-12462  
Issue No: 2009;4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
August 7, 2008  
Muskegon County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jay W. Sexton

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held in Muskegon on August 7, 2008. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Brenda Hodson (FIM).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

ISSUES

- (1) Did claimant establish a severe mental impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P) or 90 days (SDA)?
- (2) Did claimant establish a severe physical impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P) or 90 days (SDA)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

(1) Claimant is an MA-P/SDA applicant (November 19, 2007) who was denied by SHRT (April 3, 2008) due to claimant's failure to establish an impairment which meets the department's severity and duration requirements.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—47; education—11<sup>th</sup> grade; post high school education—none; work experience—commercial/industrial painter (20 years).

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since 2000 when he worked as a commercial/industrial painter.

(4) Claimant has the following unable-to-work complaints:

- (a) COPD;
- (b) Asthma;
- (c) Bronchitis;
- (d) Cold feet;
- (e) Goes to hospital a lot;
- (f) Poor eye sight.

(5) SHRT evaluated claimant's medical evidence as follows:

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (April 3, 2008)**

Claimant was admitted in 9/2007 due to an acute exacerbation of COPD (page 62). His tobacco abuse was noted to have been rather substantial in the past and **it was noted that the single most important intervention for him was to quit smoking.** His chest x-ray was hyperinflated, but otherwise clear (page 39). Claimant had significant wheezes and rales on presentation to the hospital. He was hyperinflated with increased AP diameter (page 62). On the second day of his hospitalization his oxygen saturation was 95 percent on room air. His chest exam revealed fairly well preserved overall air exchange and excursion. He did have moderate bilateral expiratory wheeze and some medium rhonchi. There was no rales and he was clear to percussion. Extremities revealed no edema and no cyanosis (page 67).

The DHS-49 form was completed on a one-time exam in 4/2007 so the doctor stated that he was unable to comment on the exertional capacity questions (page 4).

ANALYSIS: Claimant was admitted in 9/2007 due to an acute exacerbation of his COPD. He improved during his hospitalization.

\*\*\*

(6) Claimant lives with a friend and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dish washing (sometimes), cleaning (sometimes), light cleaning (sometimes), vacuuming, laundry and grocery shopping (sometimes). Claimant was hospitalized in 2008 to treat an exacerbation of his COPD. Claimant does use a cane, a walker, a wheelchair or a shower stool. He does not wear a brace on his neck, arms or legs.

(7) Claimant does not have a valid driver's license and does not drive an automobile. Claimant is not computer literate.

(8) The following medical/psychological records are persuasive:

(a) The SHRT summary of the medical evidence is presented in paragraph #5, above.

(9) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (non-exertional) mental condition expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. Claimant does not allege disability based on a mental impairment.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. While it is true that claimant has a diagnosis of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), there is no medical evidence in this record that claimant is physically unable to perform substantial gainful activity.

(11) Claimant's has applied for federal disability benefits from the Social Security Administration. Social Security recently denied his application; claimant filed a timely appeal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

**CLAIMANT'S POSITION**

Claimant thinks he is entitled to MA-P/SDA based on the impairments listed in paragraph #4, above.

**DEPARTMENT'S POSITION**

The department thinks that claimant has the functional capacity to perform normal work activities.

The department thinks that claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security Listing.

The department thinks that the medical record shows claimant's COPD condition is improving, or is expected to improve within 12 months of the date of onset or from the date of his most recent treatment.

The department denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application due to a lack of the required severity and duration.

**LEGAL BASE**

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.... 20 CFR 416.905

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms)... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include --

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;
- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and
- (6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the

client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

3. Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

**Claimant has the burden of proof** to show by a preponderance of the medical evidence in the record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes. PEM 260/261. "Disability" as defined by MA-P/SDA standards is a legal term which is individually determined by a consideration of all factors in each particular case.

### **STEP 1**

The issue at Step 1 is whether claimant is performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). If claimant is working and is earning substantial income, he is not eligible for MA-P/SDA.

SGA is defined as the performance of significant duties over a reasonable period of time for pay. Claimants who are working, or otherwise performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA), are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The medical/vocational evidence of record shows that claimant is not currently performing SGA.



Therefore, claimant meets the Step 1 disability test.

**STEP 2**

The issue at Step 2 is whether claimant has impairments which meet the SSI definition of severity/duration.

Unless an impairment is expected to result in death, it must have lasted or be expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 20 CFR 416.909.

Also, to qualify for MA-P/SDA, claimant must satisfy both the gainful work and the duration criteria. 20 CFR 416.920(a).

If claimant does not have an impairment or combination of impairments which profoundly limit his physical/mental ability to do basic work activities, he does not meet the Step 2 criteria.

The medical evidence of record establishes that claimant has a significant impairment (asthma/COPD), but it does not establish that claimant's breathing impairment meets both the severity and duration requirements.

**STEP 3**

The issue at Step 3 is whether claimant meets the Listing of Impairments in the SSI regulations. Claimant does not allege disability based on the Listing.

Therefore, claimant does not meet the Step 3 disability test.

**STEP 4**

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do his previous work. Claimant previously worked as a commercial/industrial painter. Claimant's previous job as a painter, requires that he work with aromatic compounds, which exacerbate his COPD. For this reason, claimant is not able to return to his previous work as a commercial/industrial painter.

**STEP 5**

The issue at Step 5 is whether claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to do other work.

Claimant has the burden of proof to show by the medical/psychological evidence in the record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

First, claimant does not allege disability based on a mental disorder.

Second, claimant's disability is based primarily on his COPD/asthma impairment. While the medical evidence does establish that claimant has a severe breathing impairment (asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) he does experience significant improvement after being treated at the hospital. Claimant's periodic hospital visits reduce the severity of claimant's COPD and prevent him from establishing the required severity and duration.

Furthermore, the medical evidence of record states that "the single most important intervention for him was to quit smoking." Despite the advice of claimant's doctors, claimant continues to smoke and in turn continues to exacerbate his COPD.

Since claimant has decided against following his medical advice to quit smoking, he is unable to qualify for MA-P/SDA benefits at this time

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his breathing dysfunction. Claimant currently performs many Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) and has an active social life with his roommate. Considering the medical record as a whole, in combination with claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform unskilled sedentary work (SGA). This means he is able to work as a ticket taker for a theater, as a parking lot attendant and as a greeter for [REDACTED].

The department correctly denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application based on Step 5 of the sequential analysis, as presented above.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant does not meet the MA-P/SDA disability requirements under PEM 260/261.

Accordingly, the department's denial of claimant's MA-P/SDA application is, hereby, AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Jay W. Sexton  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 7, 2009

Date Mailed: September 14, 2009

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

JWS/vmc

cc:

