## STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

# ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Claimant

Reg. No:2009-22770Issue No:2009/4031Case No:1000Load No:1000Hearing Date:1010July 8, 2009Kent 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 July 8, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified. She was assisted by J

## **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 February 11, 2009, claimant applied for disability-based MA/SDA.

(2) Claimant appealed the department's denial of that application and her contested case hearing was held on July 8, 2009.

#### 2009-22770/mbm

(3) Claimant is a 45-year-old female with an extensive polysubstance abuse history in remission since December 27, 2008, per her hearing testimony.

(4) Claimant has a general equivalency diploma (GED) and an unskilled work history; however, she has not been employed since 2007 (Department Exhibit #1, pg 6)(See also Finding of Fact #10 below).

(5) Claimant testified she was diagnosed as HIV positive in 1995, but as of her 2009 hearing date she acknowledged she was not taking any of the generally-prescribed AIDS maintenance drugs and, while the most recent bloodwork submitted by her attorney (4/21/08) documents the presence of the HIV virus, it does not confirm full blown AIDS (Client Exhibit A, pgs 51 and 52).

(6) Claimant has a long history of mental health counseling and substance abuse treatment, both in-patient and out-patient.

(7) The most recent mental health assessment submitted by claimant's attorney, dated March 2, 2009, recommends continued out-patient counseling; additionally, this assessment states claimant appears motivated and has no barriers to treatment (Client Exhibit A, pgs 1-3).

(8) Claimant's Global Assessment Function (GAF) was assessed at 59 at that time (moderate symptoms), despite her diagnosed Bipolar and Anxiety Disorders (Client Exhibit A, pgs 2 and 3).

(9) Claimant lives independently in set of the set o

(10) Claimant has not been employed since her brief, temporary services job ended in2007 due to lack of work; after that claimant's car got repossessed, per her hearing testimony.

(11) Claimant's only mental health prescription medication as of the 2009 hearing datewas a l, to be used as a sleep aid (per her testimony).

(12) After claimant's MA/SDA hearing, all the additional medical evidence submitted by her attorney was reviewed by the department's State Hearing Review Team doctors (SHRT).

(13) SHRT issued an opinion on January 26, 2010, which states claimant is capable of performing substantial gainful employment activities despite her diagnosed mental impairments.

(14) At hearing, claimant stated her hips and feet hurt a lot and she is always tired; however, no objective medical evidence was presented to support the existence of any severe physical impairments which could be expected to (See also Finding of Fact #10 above).

(15) Claimant also stated at hearing she takes ibuprophen for pain management and she was looking for work through the state of the sta

### 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.

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.

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).

Medium work. Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

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).

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).

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).

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 <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 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 is not disqualified from receiving MA/SDA at Step 1, because she has not been

gainfully employed since 2007.

At Step 2, claimant's mental health diagnoses (Bipolar/Anxiety Disorders) meet the *de minimus* level of duration and severity necessary to continue the required analysis solely on her mental impairments. However, it must be noted absolutely no severe physical impairments have been shown. Furthermore, it must be noted the law does not require an applicant to be completely symptom free before a finding of lack of disability can be rendered. In fact, if an applicant's symptoms can be managed to the point where substantial gainful employment can be achieved, a finding of not disabled must be rendered. This Administrative Law Judge finds claimant's current medications appear fully capable of adequate symptom management, given the objective documentary evidence presented.

At Step 3, the medical evidence on this record does not support a finding that claimant's diagnosed mental impairments, standing alone or combined, are severe enough to meet or equal any specifically listed impairments; consequently, the analysis must continue.

At Step 4, nothing on this record supports a finding claimant is incapable of returning to unskilled medium exertional level activity of the type she formerly performed (machine operator). As such, this Administrative Law Judge finds a disability denial at Step 4 would be appropriate. However, even if an analysis of Step 5 was required (which it is not), claimant would be unsuccessful in establishing a legally disabling condition.

At Step 5, an applicant's age, education and previous work experience (vocational factors) must be assessed in light of the documented impairments. Claimant is a younger individual with a high school equivalency education and an unskilled work history. Consequently, at Step 5, this Administrative Law Judge finds, from the medical evidence of record, that claimant retains the residual functional capacity to perform either medium or light exertional work activities on a sustained basis. As such, claimant is not disabled under the MA/SDA rules, because she can return to other work, as directed by Medical Vocational Rules 202.20 and 203.28.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department properly determined claimant is not disabled by MA/SDA eligibility standards.

Accordingly, the department's action is AFFIRMED.

<u>/s/</u> Marlene B. Magyar Administrative Law Judge for Ismael Ahmed, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>August 26, 2010</u>

Date Mailed:\_ August 26, 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.

MBM/db

