

STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-27681
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 6, 2010
Wayne County DHS (19)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on Tuesday, July 6, 2010. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED] and testified. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department").

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The records were due in September 2010. Several email communications to the Department (March 29th, April 18th, April 26th, May 3rd, May 10th, May 18th, May 31st, June 30th, and August 9th) were made in attempts to secure the requested information. The records were never received. Ultimately, this decision is based on the current record and testimony of the Claimant.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") benefit programs?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits on November 13, 2009.

2. On February 24, 2010, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 3, 4)
3. On March 1, 2010, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On March 12, 2010, the Department received the Claimant’s timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit 1, p. 2)
5. On April 1, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 2)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to neck and back pain, abdominal pain, acid reflux, Crohn’s disease, Hepatitis C, shingles, and seizures.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to bipolar disorder, depression, and anxiety.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was [REDACTED] with an [REDACTED] birth date; was approximately 5’11” in height; and weighed about 180 pounds.
9. The Claimant has a high school education with an employment history as a welder, a foreman, machine builder, and carpenter.
10. The Claimant’s impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance program is established by the 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, formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (“BAM”), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (“BEM”), and the Bridges Reference Tables (“RFT”).

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). 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 make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a). Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

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 limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2).

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1). The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945.

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled or not disabled at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a). An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do

basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity; therefore is not ineligible for disability under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b). Examples 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.

Id.

The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985).

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to neck and back pain, abdominal pain, acid reflux, Crohn's disease, Hepatitis C, shingles, seizures, depression, anxiety, and bipolar disorder.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was fracture to the left humerus. The Claimant was unable to lift/carry any weight; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours in an 8-hour work day; able to perform repetitive actions with his upper right extremity with the exception of pushing/pulling which he was unable to perform with any extremity. The Claimant was unable to perform repetitive actions with his feet/legs. The Claimant suffers from fatigue due to his Hepatitis C and has insomnia. Mentally, the Claimant was limited in his comprehension, memory, sustained concentration, reading/writing, and social interaction.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment which documented deformity of the surgical neck of the humerus noting degenerative change in the AC joint space. A glenoid spur was also found.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a neurological evaluation. The physical examination revealed slight deformity of the left shoulder with restricted movements not being able to reach above shoulder level. X-rays revealed degenerative disc disease at C5-6 and C6-7. In addition to the healing fracture, the Claimant may have carpal tunnel syndrome on the left side.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment for his cervical spine and left shoulder. The Claimant had a greater tuberosity fracture which was essentially healed. The physical examination found significant pain with range of motion of the neck and pain with Spurling's testing noting radiculopathy symptoms radiating into the left and right upper extremities. The impression was degenerative disc disease of the cervical spine with radiculopathy. Pain management, epidural injections, and cervical decompression and fusion surgery were planned/recommended.

On [REDACTED] a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were depression, Hepatitis C, chronic pain, and osteoarthritis. The Claimant's condition was deteriorating and he was found unable to lift/carry any weight; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours during an 8-hour workday; sit less than 6 hours during this same time frame; and unable to operate foot/leg controls but able to perform repetitive actions with his upper extremities. The Claimant's multi-joint pain and fatigue was also noted. Mentally, the Claimant was limited in his comprehension, memory, sustained concentration, reading/writing, and social interaction.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented some medical evidence establishing that he has physical and mental impairments that impact his ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimus* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. The Claimant asserts disabling impairments due to neck and back pain, abdominal pain, acid reflux, Crohn's disease, Hepatitis C, shingles, seizures, depression, anxiety, and bipolar disorder.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system), Listing 11.00 (neurological), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective evidence. In doing so, it is found that the evidence does not support a finding of disabled, or not disabled, based on the intent and severity requirements of a listed impairment. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a)

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1). Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy, is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967. Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a). 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. *Id.* Jobs

are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met.

Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b). Even though 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. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.*

Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c). An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.*

Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.*

Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e). An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands (exertional requirements, i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparison is made of the individual's residual functional capacity with the demands of past relevant work. *Id.* If an individual can no longer do past relevant work, the same residual functional capacity assessment along with an individual's age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an individual can adjust to other work which exists in the national economy. *Id.* Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions include difficulty to function due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i) – (vi). If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only

affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2). The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.*

The Claimant's employment history consisted of work as a welder, foreman, machine builder and carpenter. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work as a welder, foreman and machine operator is classified as semi-skilled light/medium work while the employment as a carpenter considered semi-skilled heavy work.

The Claimant testified that he can lift/carry less than 10 pounds; walk short distances; stand for one hour; sit for less than 2 hours; and has difficulty bending and or squatting. The Claimant's treating physician found the Claimant's condition was deteriorating, placing him in less than sedentary activity. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. 20 CFR 416.920. In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is unable to return to past relevant work. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibility under Step 5 is required.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity and age, education and work experience is considered to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v). At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 53-years-old thus considered to be closely approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. The Claimant has a high school education. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983). Individuals approaching advanced age (age 50-54) may be significantly limited in vocational adaptability if they are restricted to sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.963(d).

In this case, the evidence reveals that the Claimant suffers from Hepatitis C, fatigue, degenerative disc disease, glenoid spur, healing fracture to the left humerus, radiculopathy, osteoarthritis, and depression. The Claimant's condition was deteriorating and he was limited to the equivalent of sedentary activity. Mentally, the Claimant was limited in his comprehension, memory, sustained concentration, reading/writing, and social interaction. The Claimant's pain was documented as severe. Accordingly, the total impact caused by the combination of physical and mental impairments suffered by the Claimant is considered. In doing so, it is found that the Claimant maintains the physical and mental abilities to perform sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record and in consideration of the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II], specifically Rule 201.14, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 5 for purposes of the MA-P program.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program; therefore, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER


The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate processing of the November 13, 2009 application, determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant of the determination in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant was entitled to receive with respect to the November 13, 2009

application, if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with Department policy.

4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in accordance with Department policy in September 2012.


Colleen M. Mamelka
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 23, 2011

Date Mailed: August 23, 2011

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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

CMM/cl

cc:

