

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-55596
Issue No.: 2009; 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: August 21, 2012
County: Ingham

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge upon Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due notice, a telephone hearing was commenced on August 21, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Lead Worker [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The new evidence was forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) for consideration. On October 10, 2012, the SHRT found Claimant was not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department of Human Services (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P), Retro-MA and State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 March 12, 2012, Claimant filed an application for MA-P, Retro-MA and SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On May 7, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro-MA indicating that she was capable of

performing other work , pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920(f). SDA was denied due to lack of duration.

- (3) On May 11, 2012, the department case worker sent Claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On May 24, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On July 6, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant was not disabled and retains the capacity to perform a wide range of simple, unskilled, light work. (Department Exhibit B, pp 1-2).
- (6) Claimant has a history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), Barrett's esophagus, chronic pain, hypertension, palpitations, angina, idiopathic edema, vein disease, arthritis, asthma, anxiety and depression.
- (7) Claimant is a 48 year old woman whose birthday is [REDACTED] Claimant is 5'2" tall and weighs 223 lbs. Claimant completed high school.
- (8) Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

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, (DHS or department), 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 (RFT).

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 Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Current legislative amendments to the Act delineate eligibility criteria as implemented by department policy set forth in program manuals. 2004 PA 344, Sec. 604, establishes the State Disability Assistance program. It reads in part:

Sec. 604 (1). The department shall operate a state disability assistance program. Except as provided in subsection (3), persons eligible for this program shall include needy citizens of the United States or aliens exempt from the Supplemental Security Income citizenship requirement who are at least 18

years of age or emancipated minors meeting one or more of the following requirements:

(b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

Specifically, this Act provides minimal cash assistance to individuals with some type of severe, temporary disability which prevents him or her from engaging in substantial gainful work activity for at least ninety (90) days.

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 (e.g., 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 3 to Step 4. 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 416.945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both Steps 4 and 5. 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, Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity and testified that she has not worked since February, 2010. Therefore, she is not disqualified from receiving disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the individual's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The individual 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, Claimant alleges disability due to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), Barrett's esophagus, chronic pain, hypertension, palpitations, angina, idiopathic edema, vein disease, arthritis, asthma, anxiety and depression.

On December 29, 2010, Claimant was released to return to work as of January 3, 2011 by her gastrologist.

On January 11, 2011, Claimant saw her primary care physician complaining of a sore throat, itchy ears, sinus pressure and headache and nausea. She was diagnosed with acute sinusitis and bronchitis. Her EGD showed no progression of Barrett's esophagus. Her high liver enzymes concerned her gastrologist. The ultrasound of her liver looked good. She was prescribed Azithromycin and a nebulizer and inhaler.

On January 26, 2011, Claimant was diagnosed with viral gastroenteritis. She was instructed to continue her nebulizer and inhaler at home. Because the upper respiratory infection (URI) was thought to be viral, she was not prescribed antibiotics.

On February 9, 2011, Claimant was referred by her primary care physician to her gastrologist. She had abnormal liver enzymes related to her obesity. She had additional complaints of diarrhea and abdominal pain. Her abnormal function study was likely a component of fatty liver disease. Regarding the diarrhea, she was advised to maintain a high fiber diet.

On June 16, 2011, Claimant saw her primary care physician for an IBS flare-up. Her PCP took her off work for a week, with a return date of 6/20/11 and a warning to her employer that she may require frequent breaks to use the restroom.

On July 20, 2011, Claimant presented to the emergency room and was evaluated for bilateral thigh pain, dyspnea, asthma exacerbation and generalized weakness. She was prescribed Norco and released in stable condition.

On January 21, 2012, Claimant went to the emergency room and was diagnosed with acute bronchitis and bronchospasm. She was in mild respiratory distress with diffuse wheezes over both lungs. She was administered Albuterol and Atrovent and her wheezes diminished. The chest x-rays showed no acute disease. She was discharged in improved condition.

On April 16, 2012, Claimant underwent a psychological evaluation on behalf of the disability determination service. The psychologist opined that her ability to understand, remember and carry out simple instructions was not significantly impacted. Her ability to respond appropriately to others, including co-workers and supervisors, and to adapt to changes in a work setting, did not appear to be severely impacted. Her ability for work related activities with reliability, consistency and persistence appeared to be moderately impacted. Workability secondary to physical/medical problems would need to be determined with a physical/medical examination. Diagnosis: Axis I: Generalized anxiety disorder; Depression; Stress exacerbation of somatic problems; Axis V: GAF=60. Prognosis is guarded.

On April 19, 2012, Claimant underwent an internal medicine examination on behalf of the department. The examining psychologist opined that Claimant presented to the clinic for evaluation of multiple complaints, including COPD, shortness of breath, chronic back pain and hypertension. Her blood pressure was 145/95 and still not fully controlled. There was no evidence of end-organ damage. She did have some grade ¼ edema of her lower extremities with varicosities and tenderness. There was no ligamentous laxity of the knee. She was able to ambulate without the use of any assistive devices and only had a mild limp to the left. Essentially, her gait and station were normal without the cane. She does have peripheral neuropathy of the lower extremities with a sensory gradient to both pain and temperature. Her grip strength and dexterity were intact in both hands. Her abdomen was obese without tenderness to palpation.

On July 19, 2012, Claimant presented to the emergency department with left lower extremity pain and swelling. She appeared to be in no acute distress. She had bilateral 1+ pitting edema of the lower extremities involving both feet, both ankles and both lower legs. Her left thigh had moderate erythema and tenderness and mild swelling located in the anterior and medial aspect of lower thigh. Her left leg had mild erythema, tenderness and swelling located in the anterior and medial aspect of the upper leg. She had limited weight bearing capability secondary to pain. Signs of infection were present in her left thigh and left leg. Her lower extremity ultrasound was negative. She was diagnosed with left lower leg pain, left leg superficial thrombophlebitis and cellulitis of the left thigh and left leg. Claimant was administered Norco and Zofran. She was discharged in stable condition.

On August 6, 2012, Claimant presented to the emergency department complaining of right lower extremity pain, swelling, redness and tingling. She appeared in no acute distress. She had 2+ edema of the right lower extremity involving the foot, ankle and lower leg. Her right thigh had moderate erythema and tenderness, mild swelling and a medium sized ecchymosis located in the medial aspect of mid thigh. Extremities were otherwise negative. No limp in gait. The ultrasound revealed thrombosis of right superficial great saphenous vein. No evidence for deep vein thrombosis. She was diagnosed with right leg superficial thrombophlebitis and cellulitis of the right thigh, and discharged in good condition.

As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, Claimant has presented some limited medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, 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 individual's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. Claimant has alleged physical and mental disabling impairments due to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), Barrett's esophagus, chronic pain, hypertension, palpitations, angina, idiopathic edema, vein disease, arthritis, asthma, anxiety and depression.

Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system) and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders), were considered in light of the objective evidence. Based on the foregoing, it is found that Claimant's impairment(s) does not meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment; therefore, Claimant cannot be found disabled at Step 3. Accordingly, 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 individual'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 are 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 additional 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, e.g., 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 of the individual's residual functional capacity to the demands of past relevant work must be made. *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 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 (e.g., 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's prior work history consists of work in collections and as a factory line worker. In light of Claimant's testimony, and in consideration of the Occupational Code, Claimant's prior work is classified as unskilled, light and medium work.

Claimant testified that she is able to walk short distances and can lift/carry approximately 5 pounds. The objective medical evidence notes no limitations. 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 Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, Claimant cannot be found able to return to past relevant work. Accordingly, Step 5 of the sequential analysis 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, Claimant was 48 years old and was, thus, considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. Claimant graduated from high school. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from Claimant to the Department 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).

In this case, the evidence reveals that Claimant suffers from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), Barrett's esophagus, chronic pain, hypertension, palpitations, angina, idiopathic edema, vein disease, arthritis, asthma, anxiety and depression. The objective medical evidence notes no limitations. In light of the foregoing, it is found that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis which includes the ability to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform at least sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.13, it is found that Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

The department's Bridges 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 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, Claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P, Retro-MA and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

