

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-55442
Issue No.: 2009/4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 19, 2011
Wayne County DHS (49)

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 Wednesday, January 19, 2011. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED], and testified. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

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 program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon 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 August 23, 2010.
2. On August 26, 2010, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 2, 3)
3. On August 23, 2010, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On September 7, 2010, the Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing.

5. On October 7, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 2)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to bilateral keratoconus and retinal detachment and repair, corneal scarring, vision loss, and allergies.
7. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment(s).
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 41 years old with an [REDACTED] birth date; was 6’ in height; and weighed approximately 265 pounds.
9. The Claimant has the equivalent of a high school education with an employment history as a general laborer.
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 (“MA”) program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services (“DHS”), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, 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 Manual (“BRM”).

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 applicants 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 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) An individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual is working and the work is a substantial, gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i)

In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of disability benefits 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 bilateral keratoconus and retinal detachment and repair, corneal scarring, vision loss, and allergies.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating Optometrist wrote a letter on behalf of the Claimant stating that in 1996 with soft contact lenses the Claimant's visual acuity was 20/50 and 20/200. Spectacle visual acuity was 20/80 and 20/200. Topography revealed estasias involving more than 50% of each cornea with Fleischer rings present. As a result, eye glasses were not longer an option.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was evaluated by an Optometrist who confirmed the Claimant's diagnoses of bilateral keratoconus, retinal detachment and repair which has resulted in reduced visual acuity recorded as 20/400 for both the right and left eyes. With correction for high myopia and astigmatism with conventional corrective lenses, acuity was recorded as 20/200 for both eyes. Biomicroscopy revealed extreme neovascularization of the right eye, indicative of over wear and/or lack of oxygen to the cornea. Corneal scarring was present in both eyes. Anterior segment photos documented his conditions.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating Optometrist completed a letter on behalf of the Claimant confirming that the Claimant has keratoconus described as "a disabling eye condition that destroys vision." The Claimant has developed blood vessel growth into his corneas and eyeglasses are not an option. The best corrected vision is 20/200 and 20/400.

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 objective medical evidence establishing that he does have physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. Accordingly, the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, 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 disability due to due to bilateral keratoconus and retinal detachment and repair, corneal scarring, vision loss, and allergies.

Listing 2.00 discusses special senses and speech impairments. Visual disorders are abnormalities of the eye, the optic nerve, the optic tracts, or the brain that may cause a loss of visual acuity or visual fields. 2.00A1 Evidence to establish statutory blindness must show that the visual acuity in the better eye or the visual field in the better eye with the use of corrective lenses is 20/200 or less or that the visual field limitation is such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees. 2.00A2 Listing 2.02 provides that the loss of visual acuity is met when the remaining vision in the better eye after best correction is 20/200 or less.

In this case, the record establishes that the Claimant vision, after best correction, ranges between 20/200 and 20/400. In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant's visual impairment meets, or is the medical equivalent thereof, a listed

impairment within 2.00, specifically 2,02. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code ("MAC R") 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and BRM. 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 benefit program therefore the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the August 23, 2010 application to 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 if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.
4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in February 2012 in accordance with department policy.

Colleen M. Mamelka

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

2010-55442/CMM

Date Signed: 1/24/2011

Date Mailed: 1/24/2011

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/jlg

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covering several lines of text in the cc field.