

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: 2009-12338
Issue No: 2009; 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
May 5, 2009
Kalamazoo 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 on May 5, 2009, in Kalamazoo. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Robert Cairns (ES).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

Claimant requested additional time to submit new medical evidence. Claimant's new medical evidence was mailed to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) on May 5, 2009. Claimant waived the timeliness requirements so his new medical evidence could be reviewed by SHRT. After SHRT's second disability denial, the Administrative Law Judge issued the decision below.

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 (October 20, 2008) who was denied by SHRT (February 12, 2009) due to inadequate medical evidence. SHRT requested a new physical examination from an independent consultative internist.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—55; education—high school diploma; post high school education—attended [REDACTED] for one semester (Business Administration Major); work experience—chore services provider for Department of Human Services, maintenance technician for [REDACTED] providing lawn and burial services, crew chief for maintenance crew at [REDACTED].

(3) Claimant has not performed substantial gainful activity since October 2006 when he worked as a chore service provider for his mother.

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

- (a) Unable to lift more than 10 pounds repetitively;
- (b) Arthritis in both knees;
- (c) MRI study shows disc bulging;
- (d) Degenerative disc disease;
- (e) Chronic back pain.

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

OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (February 12, 2009):

SHRT decided that claimant's medical records were insufficient to make a determination on his ability to work. SHRT requested a consultative physical examination performed by an internist.

(6) Claimant lives at a local mission and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dishwashing (sometimes), light cleaning (sometimes), vacuuming, laundry (needs help), grocery shopping (needs help carrying his groceries). Claimant uses a cane on a daily basis. He does not use a walker, a wheelchair, or a shower stool. Claimant does not wear braces. Claimant did not receive inpatient hospital services in 2008 or 2009.

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

(8) The following medical reports are persuasive:

(a) An August 12, 2008 Medical Examination Report (DHS-49) was reviewed. The RN/PAC provided the following background:

Claimant has a medical history of bilateral foot neuropathy, which has resolved and chronic low-back pain, secondary to facet disease in degenerative disc.

The RN/PAC provided the following assessment:

- (1) Mild BPH;
- (2) Umbilical hernia;
- (3) Scrotal mass;
- (4) Chronic low back pain secondary to degenerative changes;
- (5) Peridontal disease.

(9) Claimant does not allege a severe mental impairment as the basis for his disability. There are no probative psychiatric reports in the record. Claimant did not provide a DHS-49D or DHS-49E to establish his mental residual functional capacity.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment, or combination of impairments, expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The medical reports do establish that

claimant is unable to lift more than ten pounds. However, the medical report dated August 12, 2008 provides the following diagnoses: mild hypertension, umbilical hernia, scrotal mass, chronic low back pain secondary to degenerative changes and periodontal disease. The medical evidence in the record does not establish that claimant's physical impairments totally preclude all work activities.

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

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

CLAIMANT'S POSITION

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

DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

The department thinks that claimant's medical evidence is insufficient to determine disability based on MA-P/SDA standards.

SHRT requested that claimant provide an updated consultative internal medicine exam to establish his current residual functional capacity.

LEGAL BASIS

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 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, are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The vocational evidence of record shows that claimant was 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.

Claimant must establish an impairment which is expected to result in death, has existed for at least 12 months, and totally prevents all basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.909.

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

Since the severity/duration requirement is a *de minimus* requirement, claimant meets the Step 2 disability 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 the Listings.

However, SHRT evaluated claimant's eligibility based on SSI Listing 1.02. SHRT decided that claimant does not meet any of the applicable 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 chore services provider for his mother. He received payment from the department for his services as a chore services provider.

The medical evidence of record establishes that claimant has difficulty lifting large amounts and has difficulty standing on his feet for extended periods of time.

Based on claimant's current physical impairments, including bilateral arthritis in bilateral knees, bulging discs and degenerative disc disease, he is not able to return to his prior work as a chore services provider for the department.

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 4 disability 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/psychiatric evidence in the record that his combined impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

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

Second, claimant alleges disability based on bilateral arthritis of the knees, bulging discs and degenerative disc disease.

The medical evidence of record does establish that claimant has a reduced ability to sit and lift. However, the medical evidence at this time does not preclude sedentary employment.

Finally, claimant testified that a major impediment to his return to work was his leg and back pain. Unfortunately, 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 profound and credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his combination of impairments. Claimant currently performs many activities of daily living and has an active social life with other persons residing at the [REDACTED].

Considering the entire medical record, in combination with claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform simple unskilled sedentary work (SGA). In particular, claimant is able to perform work that has a sit-stand option. In this capacity, claimant is able to work as a ticket taker for a theater, as a parking lot attendant and as a greeter for [REDACTED]. Because of the handicapper laws recently enacted in the United States, there are many jobs available for persons who are confined to a wheelchair or a walker.

Consistent with this analysis, 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 and 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: August 28, 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 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/tg

cc:

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