

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: 2009-15758

Issue No: 2009/4031

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

June 9, 2009

Saginaw County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Marlene B. Magyar

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 June 9, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified. She was assisted by [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the department properly determine claimant is not disabled by Medicaid (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) eligibility standards?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- (1) On January 22, 2008, claimant applied for disability-based MA/SDA.
- (2) When the department denied that application, claimant filed a timely hearing request dated June 20, 2008.

(3) Claimant's hearing was held by telephone conference on June 9, 2009.

(4) Claimant is a 50-year-old, divorced high school graduate (DOB: 7/25/60).

(5) Claimant has an unskilled work history in cashiering, clerking and monitoring security alarms which included secretarial duties; she has remained unemployed since her most recent extensive hospitalization between January 16, 2008 and February 11, 2008 (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 5 and 15).

(6) Claimant stands approximately 5'1" tall and she is medically obese at approximately 214 pounds (BMI=39.1)(Department Exhibit #3, pg 7).

(7) Claimant has a remote polysubstance abuse history now in remission; additionally, she reported at hearing she was not currently in any substance abuse or mental health treatment or counseling at that time (Department Exhibit #3, pg 2).

(8) Claimant has a longstanding smoking habit; however, she reported at hearing she decreased her intake from more than a pack per day to one and a half packs per week after her 2008 hospitalization (See Finding of Fact #5 above).

(9) Claimant's May 16, 2008 pulmonary function test (PFT) reveals moderately to severely reduced diffusion, but only mild reduction in claimant's FVC, FEV1 and FEV1/FVC ratio; additionally, no evidence of air trapping and normal lung capacity which responds well to bronchodilator maintenance was seen (i.e., the prescription inhalers claimant now uses daily).

(10) Claimant's January 2008 emergency hospitalization was precipitated by cardiac symptoms which resulted in a severe mitral regurgitation diagnosis via EKG testing.

(11) On January 24, 2008, claimant underwent mitral valve replacement with a mechanical valve, after which, she was taken to intensive care in stable condition (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 172 and 173).

(12) Claimant's hospital course was complicated by bacteremia, discovered via blood culture at admission and resolved during hospitalization with drug levofloxacin (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 177 and 178).

(13) Claimant's medical history is complicated by Wolff-Parkinson-White Syndrome post ablation, as well as a transient ischemic attack (mini stroke) in September 2007 and longstanding lower back pain not uncommon in medically obese patients (Department Exhibit #1, pg 68).

(14) Claimant's excessive fatigue and chronic low back pain have continued since her June 2008 hospitalization despite medication compliance.

(15) Additionally, in July 2008 (six months post hospitalization), claimant underwent an independent psychological evaluation during which she reported chronic crying episodes combined with daily feelings of sadness/helplessness/hopelessness and isolative behaviors (Department Exhibit #3, pgs 1-5).

(16) The psychologist diagnosed claimant with Personality/Adjustment/Dysthymic Disorders and assessed her Global Assessment Function (GAF) at 48 with a guarded prognosis.

(17) Nearly one year later, at claimant's MA/SDA hearing on June 9, 2009, claimant credibly endorsed these same symptoms.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The SDA program differs from the federal MA regulations in that the durational requirement is 90 days. This means that the person's impairments must meet the SSI disability standards for 90 days in order for that person to be eligible for SDA benefits.

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged, 20 CFR 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908 and 20 CFR 416.929. By the same token, a conclusory statement by

a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind is not sufficient without supporting medical evidence to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered, including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicant takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3). The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitations in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(94).

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).

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

**Sedentary work.** Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

**Light work.** Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

Claimant is an unemployed individual closely approaching advanced age with an unskilled work history. In cases like this, additional governing regulations which must be considered in disability determination cases state as follows:

Individuals approaching advanced age (age 50-54) may be significantly limited in vocational adaptability if they are restricted to sedentary work. When such individuals have no past work experience or can no longer perform vocationally relevant past

work and have no transferrable skills, a finding of disabled ordinarily obtains.

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).

Based on Finding of Fact #1-#17 above, this Administrative Law Judge answers:

Step #1: No.

Step #2: Yes.

Step #3: No.

Step #4: No.

Step #5: No.



Under these circumstances, Medical-Vocational Grid Rule 201.12 directs a finding of disabled.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department erred in determining claimant was not disabled at all times relevant to the filing of her January 22, 2008 MA/SDA application.

Accordingly, the department's action is REVERSED, and this case is returned to the local office for application reinstatement and processing to determine whether claimant met all of the other financial and non-financial eligibility factors necessary to qualify for assistance under that application, with coverage determined in accordance with the department's policy as long as all remaining eligibility factors were met. **SO ORDERED.**

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Marlene B. Magyar  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 31, 2010

Date Mailed: September 2, 2010

**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.

2009-15758/mbm

MBM/db

cc:

