

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 201026826
Issue No: 2009, 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 27, 2010
Hillsdale County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

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 April 27, 2010. This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge Ivona Rairigh. Judge Rairigh is no longer affiliated with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System Administrative Hearings for the Department of Human Services. This hearing decision was completed by Administrative Law Judge Landis Y. Lain by considering the entire record.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P), and State Disability Assistance (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) On December 18, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, Retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On January 26, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 201.21.
- (3) On February 5, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.

- (4) On March 17, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On March 31, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: The evidence supports that the claimant has severe conditions that do not meet or equal listing level conditions. The claimant has physical conditions that would reasonably allow the claimant to perform sedentary tasks. While not originally alleged the claimant does seek psychiatric care and a recent evaluation notes that despite limitations the claimant would retain the ability to perform simple and repetitive tasks. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of sedentary work of a simple and repetitive nature. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of 47 years old has at least a high school education and a history of sedentary and light skill employment Medicaid-P is denied using Vocational Rule 201.20 as a guide. Retroactive Medicaid-P was considered in this case and was also denied. State Disability is denied per PEM 261 because of nature and severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days. Listings 1.02, 4.04, 12.04, 12.06 and 14.04, 14.05 and 14.06 were considered in this determination.
- (6) The hearing was held on April 27, 2010. At the hearing claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
- (7) Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on May 21, 2010.
- (8) On May 27, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating that claimant is capable of performing work which is restricted in excessive overhead reaching of the left upper extremity. Claimant can perform light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b) pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.21. This may be consistent with past relevant work. However there is no detail description of past work to determine this. In lure of denying benefits is capable of performing past work a denial to other work based on a Vocational Rule will be used.
- (9) On the date of hearing claimant was a 47-year-old female whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant was 5'6" tall and weighs 118 pounds. Claimant had a Bachelors of Arts Degree in education and was nine credits short of a Masters Degree. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.

- (10) Claimant last worked November 2008 for [REDACTED] as a music teacher. Claimant was receiving disability but it ended in December of 2009.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: Connected tissue disease, depression, chest pain, cardiac catheterization, lupus, polymyocytosis.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

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).

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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since 2008. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The objective medical evidence on the record indicates that on February 1, 2010, myocardial perfusion was conducted and the conclusion was no evidence of ischemia or infarct. Normal wall motion. Normal left ventricular ejection fraction of 57%. (Pg 394)

A rheumatology report dated April 6, 2009, indicates that claimant had her smoking down to just a couple cigarettes a day. She had no alcohol or drug use. Her blood pressure was 130/100, her pulse was 88, respiration 16 (Pg 432)

She had mottling of her fingers and toes. There is just a little bit of redness on her neck that does not appear to be an obvious rash. There were no other abnormalities noted on the skin exam. The eyes have no inflammation and the pulmonary area CTA without crackles or rubs cardiovascular regular rate and rhythm without murmur, rubs or gallop. Muscular skeletal, no synovitis. She has allodymia and diffuse tenderness to touch. She was diagnosed with fibromyalgia, undifferentiated connective tissue disease, Raynaud's, anxiety and depression, chronic fatigue and poor sleep. (Pg 433)

On August 6, 2009, progress notes indicates that her blood pressure was 130/90, pulse was 96, respiration 16. She had purplish mottling of hands and feet consistent with her Raynaud's/acrocyanosis. No ulcers noted. In the eyes there was no inflammation. In the pulmonary area there was CTA cardiovascular there was regular rate and rhythm. No synovitis other than right first IP joint. Allodynia and diffuse tenderness though somewhat better than usual in the muscular skeletal area. (Pg 435)

On October 7, 2009, progress report indicates that her blood pressure was 138/88, pulse 88 and respiration 20. HEENT no inflammation or ulcers. In the skin she has purplish mottling of her fingers and toes. In the eyes there is no inflammation, pulmonary there is CTA, cardiovascular regular rate and rhythm, musculoskeletal right first IP joint has some mild synovitis. Diffuse tenderness consistent with fibromyalgia still present and the impression was fibromyalgia and anxiety and connective tissue disease (Pg 437)

On September 17, 2009, claimant had a portable chest x-ray with conclusion of unremarkable portable chest. The lungs were well expanded and clear. No pleural effusion or pneumothorax visualized. The view of the chest showed the heart, mediastinum and hilar structures within normal limits. (Pg 509)

A medical examination report dated December 31, 2009, indicates the claimant was 64 ½ inches tall and weigh 122.6 pounds. Her blood pressure was 110/80 and she was right hand dominant. She was normal in the HEENT, respiratory, cardiovascular and abdominal areas. The clinical impression was that she was deteriorating. She could occasionally lift 10 pounds or less but never lift 20 pounds or more. She could stand or walk less than 2 hours in an 8 hour day and she could sit less than 6 hours in an 8 hour day. She did use a cane for ambulation and she could use both of her upper extremities with pushing or pulling but not simple grasping, reaching or fine manipulating and she could not operate foot or leg control with neither foot nor leg. (Pgs 26 and 27)

She was limited in the areas of memory, sustained concentration, following simple directions and social interactions (Pg 28)

Her gait was slow, antalgic with evidence of bi-lateral left extremity weakness, left shoulder is worse than the right and since she has sensation in the lower extremity, soft speech and she was depressed and cry easily she was in counseling. The clinical impression that she was stable but deteriorating. (Pg 27)

A medical record information she indicates that claimant's current medical diagnosis are under Undifferentiated Connected Tissue Disease, Raynaud's Disease, Fibromyalgia, Cricoarytenoid Arthritis, Polymyositis, Dysphagia, Arthralgias at multiple sites, Synovitis of the right first IP joint Collagen disease, Macrocytosis and Myalgias/myostis. She also has Major Depression Disorder, ADHD and General Anxiety Disorder (Pg 29)

Claimant testified on the record that she does have a driver's license but she is not allowed to drive because of her physical condition. Claimant does cook simple meals in the microwave and does some minimal cleaning of her home. Her hobby is her two dogs. She quit smoking three months before the hearing, does not drink or do any drugs.

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of her body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file which support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impression is that claimant is stable and deteriorating; however, the only finding made is that claimant has some tenderness and pain in her musculature. There is no medical finding that claimant has any muscle

atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, claimant has restricted herself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon her reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges the following disabling mental impairments: depression, anxiety.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon her failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny her again at Step 4 based upon her ability to perform her past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which she has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

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 has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment or that she is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of her. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and she should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Claimant has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that she has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent her from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 47) with a more than a high school

education and a skilled work history with limited to sedentary work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocation Rule 202.21.

The department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with her impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

/s/

Landis Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 19, 2011

Date Mailed: _____

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.

LYL/cr

cc:

