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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-58754

Issue No.: 2009

Case No.: Hearing Date:

September 19, 2012

County: Kalamazoo

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Ad ministrative Law Judge upon Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Mi chigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due not ice, an inperson hearing was commenced on September 19, 2012, at the DHS office in Kalamazoo County. Claiman t, represented by personally appeared and test ified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist

ISSUE

Whether the Department of Human Serv ices (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and Retro-MA benefits?

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 October 26, 2011, Claimant applied for MA-P and Retro-MA.
- (2) On March 1, 2012, the Medical Re view Team (MRT) denied Claimant's MA/Retro-MA application indicati ng Claimant's impairment lacked duration. (Department Exhibit A, pp 27-28).
- (3) On March 6, 2012, the department case worker sent Claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On June 6, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

- (5) On July 27, 2012, the State Hear ing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the denial of MA-P and Retro-MA indicating Claimant retains the capacity to perform light exertional tasks. (Department Exhibit B).
- (6) Claimant alleges disability based on a history of congestive hear t failure, nonischemic cardiomyopathy, left ve ntricle-dysfunction, pulmonary edema, mitral valv e-regurgitation, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and uncontrolled hypertension.
 - (7) On July 19, 2011, Claimant was brought to the em ergency center by ambulance complaining of difficultie s breathing. Chest x-rays showed moderate interstitial edema and va scular congestion cons istent wit h congestive heart failure. The electrocardiogram on July 20, 2011. revealed s evere global hypok inesis of the left ventricle with severely reduced systolic function, vis ually estimated at 20 percent. Moderate mitral regurgitation noted. The stress test on July 21, 2011 showed no evidence of ischemia; however t he study was abnormal and showed dilated car diomyopathy with an ejection fraction of 15 percent . A small fixed defect was noted in the inferior wall most consistent with artifact. He was diagnosed with new-onset congestive heart failure/pulmonary edema. Claimant was dischar ged on July 22, 2011 with instructions to follow-up with his primary care physician. (Department Exhibit A, pp 41-78).
 - (8) On October 30, 2011, Claim ant went to the emergency department complaining of shortness of breath and chest heaviness. He had a history of congestive heart failure and hypertension. He reported that he wears a life vest and just had an appointment with his cardiologist on 10/27/11 where his ejection fraction was down to 10 percent echocardiogram. The electrocardiogr am showed a normal sinus rhythm with biatrial enlargement, left ventricu lar hypertrophy. T wave abnormality (consider lateral ischemia) and pr olonged QT. The chest x-rays were suggestive for congestive heart failure and associated interstitial edema. He was diagnosed with acute decompens ated systolic dysfunction and hypertension and admitted to the hospi tal. Claimant was discharged on November 3, 2011 with instructions to follow up with his cardiologist in 2 to 3 weeks for placement of automatic implantable cardiac defibrillator. For now, he was instructed to c ontinue wearing his exter nal defibrillator (life vest). (Department Exhibit A, pp 87-117).
 - (9) On December 7, 2011, Claimant was admitted to the hospital for nonischemic cardiomyopathy with severe left ventricular systolic dysfunction status post dual chamber im plantable cardioverter defibrillator placement on 12/7/11 without complication. Ej ection fraction <u>15 percent</u>, per 2-dimensional echocardiogram. He was dis charged in stable condition on December 8, 2011 with instruct ions to return in 7 to 10 days. (Department Exhibit A, pp 118-119).

- (10) On February 3, 2012, Claimant was admitted to the hospital secondary to shortness of breath and atypical chest pain. He was diagnosed with acute bronchitis with under lying chronic obst ructive pulmonary dis ease, mild congestive heart failure exacer bation, severe nonischemic cardiomyopathy with known ejection fraction of 15 percent, short episodes of nonsustained ventricular tachycardia, status post implantable cardiac defibrillator, atypical chest pain, and hypertension.
- (11) Claimant is a 53 y ear old man whose birthday is Claimant is 6'1" tall and weighs 169 lbs. Claimant completed high school.
- (12) Claimant was appealing the denial for Social Security disability at the time of the hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medic al Assistance (MA) program is est ablished by the Title XIX of the Socia I 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 Independenc e Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L 400.105. Department polic ies are found in the Bri dges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Under the Medicaid (MA) program:

"Disability" is:

... the inability to do any subs tantial gainful activ ity by reason of any medically dete rminable physical or mental impairment which c an be expect ed to result in death or which has lasted or can be expect ted to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months. 20 CFR 416.905.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered, including: (1) the location/dur ation/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 limitations in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(94).

In determining whet her you are disabled, we will consider all of your symptoms, including pain, and the extent to which y our symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with objective m edical evidence, and other evi dence. 20 CF R 416.929(a). Pain or other symptoms may cause a limit ation of function bey ond that which can be determined on the basis of the anatomical, physiological or psychological abnormalities considered alone. 20 CFR 416.945(e).

In evaluating the intensity and persistence of your s ymptoms, including pain, we will consider all of the available evidence, including your medical history, the medical sign s and laboratory findings and stat ements about how your symptoms affect you. We will then determine the extent to which your alleged functional limitations or restrictions due to pain or other symptoms c an reasonably be accepted as consistent with the medical signs and laboratory findings and other evidence to decide how your symptoms affect your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.929(a).

The person claiming a physica I 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/labor atory findings, diagnos is/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged, 20 CF R 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaint s are not, in and of the mselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CF R 416.908 a nd 20 CF R 416.929. By the same token, a conclus ory statement by a physici an or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind is not sufficient without supporting medical evidence to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929.

A set order is used to deter mine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past wor k, 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 experienc e. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment, or combination of impair ments, 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 (suc h as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of dis ease 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 bas ic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities with out 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).

The residual functional capac ity is what an individual can do desp ite 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 class ify 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 involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Alt hough 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 sedent ary if walking and standing are required occas ionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a). 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). Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone

can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c). Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weig hing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she c an also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decis ion about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other ev idence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regula tions require that s everal considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 1. Does the client perf orm Substantial Gainful Activit y (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
- 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 cli ent is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analys is c ontinues t o Step 3. 20 CF R 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 year s? 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).

Based on Finding of Fact #6-#11 above this Administrative Law Judge answers:

Step 1: No.

Step 2: Yes.

- Step 3: Yes. Claimant has show n, by clear and convincing documentary evidence and credible testimony, his cardiovascular impair ments meet or equal Listing 4. 02(A) and 4.02(B):
- **4.02** *Chronic heart failure* while on a regimen of prescribed treatment, with symptoms and s igns described in 4.00D2. The required level of severity for this impairment is met when the requirements in *both A and B* are satisfied.
- **A.** Medically documented presence of one of the following:
- 1. Systolic failure (see 4.00D1a(i)), with left ventricular end diastolic dimensions greater than 6.0 cm or ejection fraction of 30 percent or less during a period of st ability (not during an episode of acute heart failure);

AND

- **B.** Resulting in one of the following:
- 1. Persistent symptoms of heart failure which very seriously limit the ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities of daily living in an individual for whom an MC, preferably one experienced in the care of patients with cardiovascular disease, has concluded that the performance of an exer cise test would present a significant risk to the individual; or
- 2. Three or more separate epi sodes of acute congestive heart failure within a consec utive 12-month period (see 4.00A3e), with evidence of fluid retention (see 4.00D2b (ii)) from clinic all and imaging assessments at the time of the episodes, requiring acute extended physician intervention such as hospitalization or emergency room treatment for 12 hours or more, separated by per iods of stabilization (see 4.00D4c); or
- 3. Inability to perform on an ex ercise tolerance test at a workload equivalent to 5 METs or less due to:
- a. Dyspnea, fatigue, palpitations, or chest discomfort; or
- b. Three or more consec utive premature ventricular contractions (ventri cular tachycardia), or increasing frequency of ventricular ectopy with at least 6 premature ventricular contractions per minute; or

- c. Decrease of 10 mm Hg or more in systolic pressure below the baseline systolic blood pressure or the preceding systolic pressure measured during exercise (see 4.00D4d) due to left ventricular dysfunction, despite an increase in workload; or
- d. Signs at tributable to inadequate cerebral perfusion, such as ataxic gait or mental confusion.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides the department erred in determining Claimant is not currently disabled for MA/Retro-MA eligibility purposes.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **REVERSED**, and it is ORDERED that:

- 1. The department shall process Claimant's October 26, 2011, MA/Retro-MA application back to July, 2011, and shall award him all the benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remain ing financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
- 2. The department shall rev iew Claimant's medica I cond ition for improvement in February, 2014, unless his Social Security Administration disability status is approved by that time.
- 3. The department shall obtain updated medical evidence from Claimant's treating physicians, physical therapists, pain clinic notes, etc. regarding his continued treatment, progress and prognosis at review.

It is SO ORDERED.

Vicki L. Armstrong
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 11, 2013

Date Mailed: February 12, 2014

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der 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 Hear ings will not orde rarehearing 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical erro r, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

VLA/las

