

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No. 201119715  
Issue No. 2009  
Case No. [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 9, 2011  
Wayne County DHS (49)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** [REDACTED]

**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 held on May 9, 2011. The claimant appeared and testified. On behalf of Department of Human Services (DHS), [REDACTED] Specialist, appeared and testified.

**ISSUE**

Whether DHS properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits on the basis that Claimant is not a disabled individual.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On 11/9/10, Claimant applied for SDA and MA benefits including retroactive MA benefits for 10/2010.
2. Claimant's only basis for MA and SDA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On 11/29, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibit 6) and DHS subsequently denied Claimant's application for MA and SDA benefits (see Exhibits 4-5).
4. On 1/25/11, Claimant requested a hearing (Exhibit 1) concerning the denial of SDA and MA benefits.

5. On 3/4/11, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 31-32).
6. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 53 year old woman ( [REDACTED] ) with a height of 5'3 ½" and weight of 200 pounds.
7. Claimant is a former smoker (quit in summer of 2010) with no relevant history of alcohol or drug usage.
8. Claimant's highest completed year of education was 12<sup>th</sup> grade.
9. Claimant claimed to be a disabled individual based on an alleged impairment with her lung.

### **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). DHS (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 Reference Tables Manual (RTM).

MA provides medical assistance to individuals and families who meet financial and nonfinancial eligibility factors. The goal of the MA program is to ensure that essential health care services are made available to those who otherwise would not have financial resources to purchase them.

The Medicaid program is comprised of several sub-programs which fall under one of two categories; one category is FIP-related and the second category is SSI-related. BEM 105 at 1. To receive MA under an SSI-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled. *Id.* Families with dependent children, caretaker relatives of dependent children, persons under age 21 and pregnant, or recently pregnant, women receive MA under FIP-related categories. *Id.* AMP is an MA program available to persons not eligible for Medicaid through the SSI-related or FIP-related categories. It was not disputed that Claimant's only potential category for Medicaid would be as a disabled individual.

Disability is established if one of the following circumstances applies:

- By death for the month of death.
- The applicant receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits.
- SSI benefits were recently terminated due to financial factors.

201119715/CG

- The applicant receives Retirement Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) on the basis of being disabled
- RSDI eligibility is established following denial of the MA benefit application (under certain circumstances). BEM 260 at 1-2.

It was not disputed that none of the above circumstances apply to Claimant. Accordingly, Claimant may not be considered for Medicaid eligibility without undergoing a medical review process which determines whether Claimant is a disabled individual.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of disability as found in the federal regulations. 42 CFR 435.540(a). Disability is federally defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity (SGA) 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 nearly identical definition of disability is found under DHS regulations. BEM 260 at 8.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does ALL of the following:

- Performs significant duties, and
- Does them for a reasonable length of time, and
- Does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id.* at 9.

Significant duties are duties used to do a job or run a business. *Id.* They must also have a degree of economic value. *Id.* The ability to run a household or take care of oneself does not, on its own, constitute substantial gainful activity. *Id.*

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish a disability 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.

Federal regulations describe a sequential five step process that is to be followed in determining whether a person is disabled. 20 CFR 416.920. If there is no finding of disability or lack of disability at each step, the process moves to the next step. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4).

The first step in the process is to determine whether a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). If a person is performing SGA, then the person must be found not disabled. In the present case, it was not disputed that Claimant was not performing SGA at the time of the application or at the time of the administrative hearing. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step two.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the 12 month duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(ii). The impairments may be combined to meet the severity requirement. If a severe impairment is not found, then a person is deemed not disabled. *Id.*

The impairments must significantly limit a person's basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(5)(c). "Basic work activities" refers to the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. *Id.* Examples of basic work activities includes: physical functions (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling); capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking; understanding; carrying out, and remembering simple instructions; use of judgment; responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a mere de minimus standard upon claimants to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). *Higgs v. Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988); *Pickering v. Chater*, 951 F. Supp. 418, 424 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), citing *Dixon v. Shalala*, 54 F.3d 1019, 1030 (2d Cir. 1995). Similarly, Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been interpreted so that a claim may be denied at step two for lack of a severe impairment only where the medical evidence establishes only a slight abnormality or combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work even if the individual's age, education, or work experience were specifically considered. *Barrientos v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 1, 2 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirement is intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1986).

Claimant testified that she has lung damage which causes her various physical obstacles. The medical documents support multiple diagnosis that Claimant suffers from COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder) and bullae on her lung.

Claimant testified that she is often short of breath and tires easily caused by her lung problems. Claimant's testimony is supported by a diagnosis (see Exhibits 12-13) from Consultants in Sleep & Pulmonary Medicine dated 11/15/10. Claimant's fatigue and

shortness of breath would impact all physical basic work activities. Such an impairment meets the second step requirement of having a serious impairment. Accordingly, it is found that Claimant has a serious impairment and the analysis may proceed to step three.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires a determination whether the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If Claimant's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the 12 month requirement, then the claimant is deemed disabled. If an impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

The listed impairment that Claimant is most likely to meet would be based on pulmonary function. Listing 3.02 covers disabilities for chronic pulmonary insufficiency and reads:

**3.02 Chronic pulmonary insufficiency**

**A.** Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease due to any cause, with the FEV<sub>1</sub> equal to or less than the values specified in table I corresponding to the person's height without shoes.

**Table I**

<b>Height without Shoes (centimeters)</b>	<b>Height without Shoes (inches)</b>	<b>FEV<sub>1</sub> Equal to or less than (L,BTPS)</b>
155-160	61-63	1.15

**or**

**B.** Chronic restrictive ventilatory disease, due to any cause, with the FVC equal to or less than the values specified in Table II corresponding to the person's height without shoes. (In cases of marked spinal deformity, see 3.00E.);

**Table II**

<b>Height without Shoes (centimeters)</b>	<b>Height without Shoes (inches)</b>	<b>FVC Equal to or less than (L,BTPS)</b>
-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

155-160	61-63	1.35
---------	-------	------

Claimant had lung testing performed on 8/5/10 and 10/22/10 (see Exhibits 33-34). Claimant's FEV1 (forced expiratory volume in 1 second) was measured as 2.05 (pre-bronch) and 2.21 (post-bronch). Both values place Claimant above the FEV1 value required to meet a listed impairment.

Claimant's FVC (forced vital capacity) was also tested on 10/22/10. Claimant's pre-bronch FVC was 2.91 and her post-bronch FVC was 3.20. Again, Claimant's lung testing indicates scores above the requirements to meet a listed impairment with Social Security Administration. Accordingly, Claimant does not meet a listed impairment and the analysis proceeds to step four.

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 it is determined that a claimant can perform past relevant work. *Id.*

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 (i.e. exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967. The definitions for each are listed below.

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 are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). Examples of non-exertional limitations include difficulty functioning 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.*

Claimant has an employment history as work as a cleaner and with the [REDACTED] as a mail clerk. Claimant's duties as a cleaner involved housework like activities (e.g. vacuuming, mopping, dusting). Claimant's duties as a mail clerk involved lifting and moving parcels of various weights and significant periods of standing. The undersigned would classify Claimant's history of employment as involving light work. It must then be determined whether Claimant's impairments keep her from performing light work

Claimant's medical records provided some assistance on this issue. It was determined that Claimant was capable of meeting her needs in her home (see Exhibit 11). It was recommended that Claimant be placed on work restriction and school restriction (see Exhibit 13); the restrictions were not specified. The same diagnosis also indicated "Desk job is appropriate. Disability is appropriate." The undersigned deems this recommendation as a limitation to sedentary employment. If Claimant is limited to sedentary employment, she could not perform light work. Accordingly, it is found that Claimant is not capable of performing light work and the disability analysis may proceed to step five.

At the fifth step in the analysis, the burden shifts from Claimant to DHS to present proof that 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). The age for younger individuals (under 50) generally will not seriously affect the ability to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.963(c)

The undersigned was most persuaded by the medical conclusion that Claimant is capable of desk work; this would qualify as sedentary employment. Though the same recommendation also indicated that "disability is appropriate", the undersigned is more inclined to accept the recommendation which allows the highest level of work Claimant is capable of performing.

As a [REDACTED] year old person, Claimant is considered to be closely approaching advanced age. Claimant is a high school graduate. Claimant has a history of semi-skilled labor that would not likely be transferrable to other employment. Claimant's circumstances are described by Medical Vocational Rule 201.14 which directs a finding that Claimant is a disabled person. Accordingly, it is found that DHS erred in determining that Claimant was not a disabled person for purposes of MA benefits.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. DHS policies for SDA are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

State Disability Assistance (SDA) provides financial assistance to disabled adults who are not eligible for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits. BEM 100 at 4. The goal of the SDA program is to provide financial assistance to meet a disabled person's basic personal and shelter needs. *Id.* To receive SDA, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person, or age 65 or older. BEM 261 at 1.

A person is disabled for SDA purposes if the claimant:

- Receives other specified disability-related benefits or services, see Other Benefits or Services below, or
- Resides in a qualified Special Living Arrangement facility, or
- Is certified as unable to work due to mental or physical disability for at least 90 days from the onset of the disability; or
- Is diagnosed as having Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS).

The undersigned has already found Claimant to be disabled for purposes of MA benefits by finding that Claimant has physical impairments expected to last one year or more. This finding makes Claimant automatically eligible for SDA benefits based on the lesser 90 day requirement. It is found that DHS improperly denied Claimant SDA benefits based on the finding that Claimant was not a disabled individual.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds that DHS improperly denied Claimant's application requesting SDA and MA benefits. It is ordered that DHS:

- reregister Claimant's application dated 11/9/10 for MA (including retroactive benefits) and SDA benefits;
- process Claimant's application based on the finding that Claimant is a disabled individual; and
- supplement Claimant for any benefits not received as a result of the improper denial.

The actions taken by DHS are REVERSED.

  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 13, 2011

Date Mailed: June 13, 2011

201119715/CG

**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.

CG/ctl

cc:

[REDACTED]

Wayne County DHS (49)/1843

[REDACTED]

Administrative Hearings