

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: 2008-15531  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
August 6, 2009  
Branch 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, an in-person hearing was held on August 5, 2008, in Coldwater. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED].

The department was represented by Jamie Bauerly (FIM).

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/retro/SDA applicant (September 14, 2007) who was denied by SHRT (May 14, 2008) due to claimant's failure to establish an impairment which meets the severity and duration requirements. Claimant requests retro-MA for August 2007.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—51; education—10<sup>th</sup> grade; post-high school education—none; work experience—steel fabricator/welder, tree surgeon, and general laborer for a steel company.

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since August 2007 when he worked as a steel fabricator/welder.

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

- (a) Degenerative disc disease of the neck;
- (b) Status post rotator cuff tear;
- (c) degenerative disc disease of the low back.

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

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (May 14, 2009)**

The medical evidence of record reported claimant status-post surgically repaired left femoral neck fracture 3/31/2007. The treating orthopedist reported 12/6/2007 the status of conditions was improving. There was full use of both upper extremities and the right lower extremity for extremity for repetitive actions. Restrictions were not expected to last more than 90 days. There were no mental limitations and home care needs were met (page B10).

ANALYSIS: The condition improved with treatment.

\* \* \*

(6) Claimant lives with his wife, daughter and two grandchildren and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing and bathing.

Claimant uses a cane occasionally (3 times a month). Claimant does not use a walker,

wheelchair, or a shower stool. Claimant does not wear a brace on his neck. He does not wear braces on his 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 records are persuasive:

(a) A SHRT summary of the evidence is provided 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 a mental impairment as the basis for his disability.

(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 found true that claimant had orthopedic surgery on his neck (repaired left femoral neck fracture in 8/31/2007), the physician reports that he is making good progress toward recovering full function. The record suggests that claimant's neck condition will continue to improve over time.

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

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

#### **CLAIMANT'S POSITION**

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

**DEPARTMENT'S POSITION**

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

The department thinks that claimant's condition is improving, or is expected to improve within 12 months of the date of his next surgery.

The department denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application due to lack of 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 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, the 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.

Claimant's degenerative disc disease of the neck, his bilateral rotator cuff tear condition and the degenerative disc disease in his low back taken collectively meet the severity and duration requirements.

Claimant meets the Step 2 disability test.

### **STEP #3**

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

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 steel cutter/welder for a steel fabrication facility. Claimant's work as a steel fabricator was heavy work. Since claimant has degenerative disc disease in his neck and low back in combination with bilateral rotator cuff tears, he is no longer able to do the lifting (100 pounds or more) required of a steel fabricator.

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 4 eligibility test.

### **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 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 a mental impairment as the basis for his disability.

Second, claimant thinks he is disabled based on the combination of his degenerative disc disease in the neck, bilateral rotator cuff tears, and degenerative disc disease of the low back accompanied by pain.

Medical evidence of record shows that claimant is status post-surgical repair of a left femoral neck fracture in August 2007. The treating orthopedist reported that claimant's December 2007 neck surgery was successful and that his condition was improving. Claimant has full use of both upper extremities and the lower extremity for repetitive actions. The medical evidence does show that claimant is not able to do the heavy lifting restrictions which preclude him from returning to his work as a steel fabricator. However, the combination of claimant's degenerative disc disease (neck and low back) in combination with his bilateral rotator cuff tears do not prevent him from doing sedentary work.

Third, claimant thinks he is disabled based on the neck, low back and rotator cuff pain secondary to his left femoral neck fracture and generative disc disease. Evidence of pain, alone, is insufficient to establish disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant's testimony about his pain is credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In summary, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his degenerative disc disease, bilateral rotator cuff tears and back pain.

Claimant currently performs some Activities of Daily Living and has an active social life.

During the hearing, claimant was able to respond appropriately to the questions presented and was able to speak on his own behalf. The evidence of record, in combination with claimant's testimony shows that claimant is able to perform unskilled sedentary work, including employment as a ticket taker for a theater, as a parking lot attendant, or as a greeter for

██████████.

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

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: December 11, 2009

Date Mailed: December 11, 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 receipt 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/kgw/tg

cc:

