

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: 2010-10940  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
January 11, 2010  
Sanilac County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

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 hearing was held on January 11, 2010.

ISSUE

Was the denial of claimant's application for MA-P for lack of disability correct?

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 applied for MA-P on August 28, 2009.
- (2) Claimant is 54 years old.
- (3) Claimant has a 10<sup>th</sup> grade education.
- (4) Claimant is not currently working.
- (5) Claimant has a prior work history consisting of a dietary aide.

- (6) Claimant is 5'4" and weighs 262 lbs.
- (7) Claimant is morbidly obese with a BMI of 45.
- (8) Claimant has a history of joint pain, Hypertension, and Diabetes Mellitus.
- (9) On February 24, 2009, an independent Department examiner completed a Neurological and Orthopedic Supplemental Report.
- (10) Claimant retains the capacity to carry, push, and pull less than 30 lbs, and stoop, squat and raise from squatting occasionally. Claimant does not require an assistive device for ambulation.
- (11) The independent Department examiner also completed a physical examination.
- (12) Claimant suffers from chronic joint pain resulting from wear and tear in her hips and legs. There is no evidence of joint laxity, crepitation, or effusion. Claimant's range of motion is diminished. Claimant's dexterity is unimpaired.
- (13) On [REDACTED], claimant was admitted into [REDACTED]. Claimant complained of chest pain. Claimant was diagnosed with accelerated uncontrolled Hypertension with chest pain, unstable Angina, uncontrolled Diabetes Mellitus Type II, Hyponatremia, Dyslipidemia, and Acute and Chronic renal failure.
- (14) Echocardiogram showed some normal sinus rhythm with some T-wave inversions in an anterolateral lead. Selective Coronary Arteriography showed 50% stenosis in the distal tip of the left anterior descending coronary artery without any critical atherosclerotic occlusive disease.

Claimant underwent Cardiac Catheterization, which did not show any significant occlusive coronary artery disease.

- (15) Claimant has an ejection fraction of 50%-55%.
- (16) Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with a guarded prognosis.
- (17) On October 26, 2009, a DHS-49, Medical Examination Report, was completed by claimant's treating source.
- (18) Claimant's functional capacity was limited and the limitations are expected to last more than 90 days. Claimant retains the capacity to lift up to 10 lbs frequently and up to 20 lbs occasionally; however, claimant should never lift objects weighing 25 lbs or more. Claimant can stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8-hour day, and sit less than 6 hours in an 8-hour day. Claimant retains the ability to use all her extremities for repetitive action. Claimant was in a stable condition.
- (19) On September 24, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied MA-P.
- (20) On October 14, 2009, claimant filed for hearing.
- (21) On December 11, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team denied MA-P and Retro MA-P.
- (22) On January 11, 2010, a hearing was held before the Administrative Law Judge.

#### 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).

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition of the term “disabled” as is used by the Social Security Administration for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

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

This is determined by a five step sequential evaluation process where current work activity, the severity and duration of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are considered. These factors are always considered in order according to the five step sequential evaluation, and when a determination can be made at any step as to the claimant’s disability status, no analysis of subsequent steps are necessary. 20 CFR 416.920

The first step that must be considered is whether the claimant is still partaking in Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). 20 CFR 416.920(b). To be considered disabled, a person must be unable to engage in SGA. A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount (net of impairment-related work expenses) is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The amount of monthly earnings considered as SGA depends on

the nature of a person's disability; the Social Security Act specifies a higher SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals and a lower SGA amount for non-blind individuals. Both SGA amounts increase with increases in the national average wage index. The monthly SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals for 2009 is \$1,640. For non-blind individuals, the monthly SGA amount for 2009 is \$980.

In the current case, claimant has testified that she is not working, and the Department has presented no evidence or allegations that claimant is engaging in SGA. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant is not engaging in SGA, and thus passes the first step of the sequential evaluation process.

The second step that must be considered is whether or not the claimant has a severe impairment. A severe impairment is an impairment expected to last 12 months or more (or result in death), which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. The term "basic work activities" means 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 purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1988). As a result, the Department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. This is a *de minimus* standard in the disability determination that the court may use only to disregard trifling matters. As a rule, any impairment that can reasonably be expected to significantly impair basic activities is enough to meet this standard.

In the current case, claimant has presented medical evidence of joint pain, hypertension with unstable angina, and poorly controlled diabetes mellitus that has decreased her functional limitations, including walking, carrying, lifting, sitting, and standing, according to the great weight of the evidence by claimant’s medical records and examination by independent Department examiners. The Administrative Law Judge finds that this is a significant impairment to claimant’s performance of basic physical work activities, and is therefore enough to pass step two of the sequential evaluation process.

In the third step of the sequential evaluation, we must determine if the claimant’s impairment is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This is, generally speaking, an objective standard; either claimant’s impairment is listed in this appendix, or it is not. However, at this step, a ruling against the claimant does not direct a finding of “not disabled”; if the claimant’s impairment does not meet or equal a listing found in Appendix 1, the sequential evaluation process must continue on to step four.

After considering the listings contained in Section 4.00 (Cardiovascular System), the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant’s medical records do not contain

medical evidence of an impairment that meets or equals a listed impairment. A listings disability finding for chronic heart failure requires, among other factors, systolic failure with left ventricular end diastolic dimensions greater than 6.0 cm or ejection fraction of 30 percent or less during a period of stability, not during an episode of acute heart failure. Claimant has an ejection fraction of 50%-55%; therefore, claimant does not meet this listing. Claimant also does not meet the listing for diabetes mellitus in Section 9.00 (Endocrine System). A listings disability finding for diabetes requires, among other factors, neuropathy demonstrated by significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in two extremities resulting in sustained disturbance of gross and dexterous movements, or gait and station, or acidosis, or retinitis proliferans. None of the medical evidence thus far presented to the Administrative Law Judge contains any allegations or indications of the above.

Evaluation under the disability regulations requires careful consideration of whether the claimant can do past relevant work (PRW), which is our step four, and if not, whether they can reasonably be expected to make vocational adjustments to other work, which is our step five. When the individual's residual functional capacity (RFC) precludes meeting the physical and mental demands of PRW, consideration of all facts of the case will lead to a finding that

- 1) the individual has the functional and vocational capacity to for other work, considering the individual's age, education and work experience, and that jobs which the individual could perform exist in significant numbers in the national economy, or

- 2) The extent of work that the claimant can do, functionally and vocationally, is too narrow to sustain a finding of the ability to engage in SGA. SSR 86-8.

Given that the severity of the impairment must be the basis for a finding of disability, steps four and five of the sequential evaluation process must begin with an assessment of the claimant's functional limitations and capacities. After the RFC assessment is made, we must determine whether the individual retains the capacity to perform PRW. Following that, an evaluation of the claimant's age, education and work experience and training will be made to determine if the claimant retains the capacity to participate in SGA.

RFC is an assessment of an individual's ability to do sustained work-related physical and mental activities in a work setting on a regular and continuing basis—meaning 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, or an equivalent work schedule. RFC assessments may only consider functional limitations and restrictions that result from a claimant's medically determinable impairment, including the impact from related symptoms. It is important to note that RFC is not a measure of the least an individual can do despite their limitations, but rather, the most. Furthermore, medical impairments and symptoms, including pain, are not intrinsically exertional or nonexertional; the functional limitations caused by medical impairments and symptoms are placed into the exertional and nonexertional categories. SSR 96-8p, 20 CFR 416.945 (a).

However, our RFC evaluations must necessarily differ between steps four and five. At step four of the evaluation process, RFC must not be expressed initially in terms of the step five exertional categories of "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very



heavy” work because the first consideration in step four is whether the claimant can do PRW as they actually performed it. Such exertional categories are useful to determine whether a claimant can perform at her PRW as is normally performed in the national economy, but this is generally not useful for a step four determination because particular occupations may not require all of the exertional and nonexertional demands necessary to do a full range of work at a given exertional level. SSR 96-8p.

Therefore, at this step, it is important to assess the claimant’s RFC on a function-by-function basis, based upon all the relevant evidence of an individual’s ability to do work related activities. Only at step 5 can we consider the claimant’s exertional category.

An RFC assessment must be based on all relevant evidence in the case record, such as medical history, laboratory findings, the effects of treatments (including limitations or restrictions imposed by the mechanics of treatment), reports of daily activities, lay evidence, recorded observations, medical treating source statements, effects of symptoms (including pain) that are reasonably attributed to the impairment, and evidence from attempts to work. SSR 96-8p.

RFC assessments must also address both the remaining exertional and nonexertional capacities of the claimant. Exertional capacity addresses an individual’s limitations and restrictions of physical strength, and the claimant’s ability to perform everyday activities such as sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing and pulling; each activity must be considered separately. Nonexertional capacity considers all work-related limitations and restrictions that do not depend on an individual’s

physical strength, such as the ability to stoop, climb, reach, handle, communicate and understand and remember instructions.

Symptom, such as pain, are neither exertional or nonexertional limitations; however such symptoms can often affect the capacity to perform activities as contemplated above and thus, can cause exertional or nonexertional limitations. SSR 96-8.

In the current case, it is undisputed that claimant has exertional limitations as a result of her unstable angina and moderate degeneration of her knees. On October 26, 2008, claimant's treating source completed a DHS-49, Medical Examination Report, and stated that claimant retains the ability to stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8-hour day. Claimant retains the capacity to lift up to 10 lbs frequently and 20 lbs occasionally. Claimant has no limitations in her ability to use her extremities for repetitive action. Similarly, on February 24, 2009, an independent Department examiner reported that claimant retains the capacity to carry, and push and pull less than 30 lbs, and stoop and squat occasionally.

Treating source opinions cannot be discounted unless the Administrative Law Judge provides good reasons for discounting the opinion. *Rogers; Bowen v Commissioner*, 473 F. 3d 742 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007). The undersigned sees no reason to discount claimant's treating source opinions. Although there is a minor discrepancy regarding claimant's carrying and lifting abilities, the greater limitations reported by claimant's treating source is attributable to claimant's hospitalization on July 28, 2009, after the independent Department examiner's evaluation on February 24, 2009. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant has a disabling

impairment when considering the functions of walking and standing, carrying and lifting, and squatting and stooping. Claimant should avoid climbing. Claimant has few or no postural limitations (e.g. stooping), visual limitations or communicative (hearing, speaking) limitations.

Claimant's PRW includes a dietary aide. This job, as typically performed and as described by the claimant, requires lifting medium objects. It also requires a degree of standing and walking. Therefore, given the functional requirements as stated by claimant (which is consistent with how this job is typically performed), and claimant's functional limitations as described above, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant does not retain the capacity to perform her past relevant work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the Administrative Law Judge must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite you limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987).

At step five, RFC must be expressed in terms of, or related to, the exertional categories when the adjudicator determines whether there is other work that the individual can do. However, in order for an individual to do a full range of work at a

given exertional level, such as sedentary, the individual must be able to perform substantially all of the exertional **and nonexertional functions** required at that level. SSR 96-8p. The individual has the burden of proving that they are disabled and of raising any issue bearing on that determination or decision. SSR 86-8.

If the remaining physical and mental capacities are consistent with meeting the physical and mental demands of a significant number of jobs in the national economy, and the claimant has the vocational capabilities (considering age, education and past work experience) to make an adjustment to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined that the claimant is not disabled. However, if the claimant's physical, mental and vocational capacities do not allow the individual to adjust to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined at this step that the claimant is disabled. SSR 86-8.

For the purpose of determining the exertional requirements of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very heavy". These terms have the same meaning as are used in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. In order to evaluate the claimant's skills and to help determine the existence in the national economy of work the claimant is able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semiskilled and skilled. SSR 86-8.

These aspects are tied together through use of the rules established in Appendix 2 to Subpart P of the regulations (*20 CR 404, Appendix 2 to Subpart P, Section 200-204 et. seq*) to make a determination as to disability. They reflect the analysis of the various vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) in combination with the individual's residual functional capacity (used to determine his or her maximum

sustained work capability for sedentary, light, medium, heavy, or very heavy work) in evaluating the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity in other than his or her vocationally relevant past work. Where the findings of fact made with respect to a particular individual's vocational factors and residual functional capacity coincide with all of the criteria of a particular rule, the rule directs a conclusion as to whether the individual is or is not disabled. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(a).

In the application of the rules, the individual's residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience must first be determined. The correct disability decision (i.e., on the issue of ability to engage in substantial gainful activity) is found by then locating the individual's specific vocational profile. Since the rules are predicated on an individual's having an impairment which manifests itself by limitations in meeting the strength requirements of jobs, they may not be fully applicable where the nature of an individual's impairment does not result in such limitations, e.g., certain mental, sensory, or skin impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(c)-200.00(d).

In the evaluation of disability where the individual has solely a nonexertional type of impairment, determination as to whether disability exists shall be based on the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations. The rules do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled for individuals with solely nonexertional types of impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(e)(1).

However, where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments resulting in both strength limitations and nonexertional limitations, the rules are considered in determining first whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on

the strength limitations alone; if not, the rule(s) reflecting the individual's maximum residual strength capabilities, age, education, and work experience provide a framework for consideration of how much the individual's work capability is further diminished in terms of any types of jobs that would be contraindicated by the nonexertional limitations. Furthermore, when there are combinations of nonexertional and exertional limitations which cannot be wholly determined under the rules, full consideration must be given to all of the relevant facts in the case in accordance with the definitions and discussions of each factor in the appropriate sections of the regulations, which will provide insight into the adjudicative weight to be accorded each factor.

Claimant is fifty-four years old, with a 10th grade education. Claimant has prior work experience performed at the medium exertional levels. Claimant's exertional impairments likely render claimant unable to perform work at the light level, even though claimant is able to lift 10 lbs frequently and 20 lbs occasionally, because claimant only retains the ability to stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8-hour day, while light work requires a significant amount of walking. Therefore, claimant's walking and standing limitations render her able to perform work only at the sedentary level. However, even if claimant is able to perform work at the sedentary level, consideration of claimant's age, limited education, and history of unskilled work, claimant is considered disabled under the Grid. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 201.00(g).


Therefore, after careful review of claimant's medical records and the Administrative Law Judge's personal interaction with claimant at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's exertional impairments render claimant unable to engage in a full range of even sedentary work activities on a regular and

continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986). The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that, given claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite claimant's limitations. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is disabled for the purposes of the MA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Claimant is medically disabled as of July 2009.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby REVERSED and the Department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application dated August 28, 2009, if not done previously, to determine Claimant's non-medical eligibility. The Department shall inform Claimant of the determination in writing. The Department shall set this case for review in July 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan W. Owens  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 07/01/10

Date Mailed: 07/01/10

**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

2010-10940/JWO

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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

JWO/dj

cc:

