

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: 2008-5807
Issue No: 2009; 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
March 12, 2008
Ottawa 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 Holland on March 12, 2008. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

Claimant was represented at the hearing by [REDACTED] from [REDACTED].

The department was represented by Dan Boder (Program Manager).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

Claimant requested additional time to submit new medical evidence requested by SHRT. Claimant waived the timeliness requirement so her new medical evidence could be reviewed by SHRT. Claimant did not submit new medicals by Record Close Date.

ISSUES

(1) Did claimant establish a severe mental impairment expected to preclude her 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 her 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 (August 28, 2007) who was denied by SHRT (January 25, 2008) due to insufficient medical evidence. SHRT requested that claimant obtain a new physical examination report.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age--39; education--9th grade, post-high school education--none; work experience--worked in a sheltered workshop on an assembly line making canoes, also as a machinist for engine power components.

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since she worked at [REDACTED] making canoes in 2006.

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

- (a) Major Depressive Disorder;
- (b) Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD);
- (c) Vertigo;
- (d) Rule out heart dysfunction.

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

OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (January 25, 2008)

Claimant reported she was treated 9/2007 for an overdose. No additional records were submitted for review of current functional capacity.

ANALYSIS: Current medical information is needed.

* * *

(6) Claimant lives with her fiancé and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dish washing, light cleaning (sometimes), mopping (sometimes), vacuuming (sometimes), and grocery shopping. Claimant does not use a cane, walker, wheelchair or shower seat. She does wear a brace on her right hand when she is sleeping.

(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 [REDACTED] medication review was reviewed.

The psychiatrist provided the following history: Claimant is actually doing really good. She is smiling more. No anxiety. Helplessness, hopelessness, worthlessness, depression, crying spells, and decrease sleep have gone. She has her own apartment. She is very excited to move out. She is going to come to all of her groups now because she will not need a ride or she could take the bus. No nightmares or flash-backs. No psychoses. She is not hearing things or seeing things. She is not drinking. She sees her daughter off and on, but her unsupervised visitations have gone back to being supervised. In her mind the only thing she did was ask "S" as to how "T" was doing and that was enough for them to do away with unsupervised visitation. The reason for that might be that "S" began distressed without having to tell her mother as to how "T" is doing. Patient really had no intention of hurting her child. She definitely had no intention of upsetting "S". And she really did not realize that that would upset "S" at all and I am not sure if it did upset "S". Overall, she has been doing really well and she has her children's best interests at heart.

MENTAL STATUS EXAM:

Claimant looks a little older than her 39 years. She is cooperative and pleasant. She makes good eye contact. No psychomotor agitation or retardation. No involuntary movements. No tremors. She was smiling with good eye contact. She has good hygiene and fairly good grooming. No depression this time. Her mood she said was 'good.' There was no helplessness, hopelessness, or worthlessness. She was not suicidal or homicidal. She does get tearful when she talks about not having seen her son in a long time. Her judgment, insight and cognition is good. There is no paranoia. Her affect is usually broad. Overall, she is doing well. No psychoses. No formal thought disorder.

* * *

The psychiatrist provided the following diagnosis: Axis I-- Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, chronic; Major Depressive Disorder, severe with psychotic features, improving; Alcohol Abuse in early remission.

AXIS V/GAF--55.

(9) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute mental (non-exertional) condition expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The recent evaluation by claimant's psychiatrist shows the following diagnoses: Axis I--PTSD, chronic; Major Depressive Disorder, severe, with psychotic features, improving; alcohol abuse in early remission. Axis V/GAF--55.

(10) The probative medical evidence, standing alone, does not establish an acute (exertional) condition expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions. The medical records do not show any severe diagnoses.

(11) Claimant's primary complaint is depression.

(12) Claimant has applied for federal disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. Her application was recently denied. Claimant filed a timely appeal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

CLAIMANT'S POSITION

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

DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

The department thinks that the medical records currently in the department's file are inadequate for purposes of determining claimant's current Residual Functional Capacity.

SHRT requested additional medical information in the form of a new physical examination report.

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 her 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, she 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 and 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.

Claimant meets the Step 1 eligibility 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 from the date of application. 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 her physical and/or mental ability to do basic work activities, she does not meet the Step 2 criteria. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

SHRT found that claimant does not meet the severity and duration requirements due to inadequate medical evidence.

Claimant does not meet the Step 2 eligibility test.

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 a Listing.

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

STEP 4

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do her previous work. Claimant previously worked on an assembly line in a sheltered workshop making canoes.

The medical evidence does not establish any mental or physical reason why claimant could not return to her work at the canoe factory.

Claimant does not meet 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.

For purposes of this analysis, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms are defined in the [REDACTED], published by the [REDACTED] at 20 CFR 416.967.

The medical/vocational evidence of record, taken as a whole, establishes that claimant is able to perform unskilled sedentary work. Claimant is able to work as a ticket taker for a theatre, as a parking lot attendant, and as a greeter for [REDACTED].

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on her Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and her major depression. Claimant currently performs numerous activities of daily living, lives with her fiancé and has an active social life. This means that claimant is able to perform sedentary work (SGA).

Based on this analysis, the department correctly denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application.

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. Claimant is not disabled for MA-P/SDA purposes based on Step 5 of the sequential analysis, as described above.

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: August 31, 2009

Date Mailed: August 31, 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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.

JWS/cv

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names of the recipients listed in the 'cc:' field.