

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201343662  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 5, 2013  
County: Macomb DHS (36)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on August 5, 2013, from Sterling Heights, Michigan. Participants included the above-named claimant. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] testified and appeared as Claimant's authorized hearing representative (AHR). [REDACTED], Claimant's spouse, also testified on behalf of Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Specialist.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) for 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 December 26, 2012, Claimant applied for MA benefits, including retroactive MA benefits from November 2012.
2. Claimant's only basis for MA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On March 6, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 1-2).
4. On March 12, 2013, DHS denied Claimant's application for MA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action informing Claimant of the denial.

5. On April 19, 2013, Claimant's AHR requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA benefits.
6. On July 9, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual, in part, by application of Medical-Vocational Rule 201.25
7. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 44 year old male with a height of 5'9" and weight of 230 pounds.
8. Claimant has no known relevant history of tobacco, alcohol or illegal substance abuse.
9. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
10. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant had no ongoing medical coverage.
11. Claimant alleged disability based on impairments and issues including: low cognitive functioning, anxiety, neuropathy in legs and cardiac-related problems.

### **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 (RFT).

Prior to a substantive analysis of Claimant's hearing request, it should be noted that Claimant's AHR noted special arrangements in order to participate in the hearing; specifically, an in-person hearing was requested. Claimant's AHR's request was granted and the hearing was conducted accordingly.

It should also be noted that Claimant presented a new document (Exhibit 133) at the hearing. The document was a note from a treating physician stating that Claimant was unable to return to work due to continued recovery from bypass surgery. Typically, medical packets are returned to SHRT upon the presentation of new medical evidence. The note, though from a physician, was a general conclusion from a physician and not technically "medical" evidence.

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 (10/2010), p. 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 though DHS does always offer the program to applicants. It was not disputed that Claimant's only potential category for Medicaid eligibility would be as a disabled individual.

Disability for purposes of MA benefits 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;
- the applicant receives Retirement Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) on the basis of being disabled; or
- RSDI eligibility is established following denial of the MA benefit application (under certain circumstances).

BEM 260 (7/2012) pp. 1-2

There was no evidence that any 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. *Id.* at 2.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of SSI 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 functionally identical definition of disability is found under DHS regulations. BEM 260 (7/2012), p. 8.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does 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).

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 considers a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The monthly amount depends on whether a person is statutorily blind or not. The 2011 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,000. The 2012 income limit is \$1010/month.

In the present case, Claimant denied having any employment since the date of the MA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Claimant's testimony. Without ongoing employment, it can only be concluded that Claimant is not performing SGA. It is found that Claimant is not performing SGA; 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 include:

- 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/or
- dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a 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 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988). 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 when the medical evidence establishes 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).

SSA specifically notes that age, education, and work experience are not considered at the second step of the disability analysis. 20 CFR 416.920 (5)(c). In determining whether Claimant’s impairments amount to a severe impairment, all other relevant evidence may be considered. The analysis will begin with the relevant submitted medical documentation.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 11-114) from an admission dated November 20, 2012 were presented. It was noted that Claimant presented with left-sided chest pain. It was noted that Claimant was found to have an ejection fraction of 35%. It was noted that LAD showed 90% proximal stenosis and 80% mid stenosis. It was noted that circumflex showed 80% mild stenosis. It was noted that coronary artery bypass graft x5 was performed. It was noted that Claimant was discharged on November 25, 2012 in stable condition.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibits 115-116) dated December 28, 2012 from a physician was presented. It was noted that the physician first treated Claimant on November 20, 2012 and last examined Claimant on December 20, 2012. It was noted that Claimant’s recovery was as expected for heart bypass surgery. It was noted that Claimant’s neurology was grossly intact and that the sternum incision was healing well. An impression was given that Claimant’s condition was improving. It was noted that Claimant can meet household needs.

A letter (Exhibits 124) dated March 7, 2013 from a treating cardiologist was presented. It was noted that Claimant’s EF was 55%-60%. It was noted that Claimant had mild tricuspid regurgitation and trace mitral regurgitation.

A letter (Exhibits 122-123) dated June 13, 2013 from a treating cardiologist was presented. It was noted that Claimant reported chest pain and fatigue. The following impressions were noted: atherosclerotic CAD, ST elevation myocardial infarction of the inferior wall, and EF of 25% improved to 55% after revascularization. One of Claimant’s medications was discontinued in an attempt to reduce fatigue. A stress test was ordered to rule out ischemic heart disease.

A note on a prescription form (Exhibit 133) dated June 13, 2013 was presented. It was noted that Claimant was unable to return to work due to continued recovery from bypass surgery.

A stress test report (Exhibit 121) dated June 17, 2013 was presented. It was noted that the test ended early due to fatigue. It was noted that the stress test results were equivocal concerning EKG changes which were suggestive of ischemia.

A letter (Exhibit 120) from a cardiologist dated June 17, 2013 was presented. It was noted that a myoview s.p.e.c.t. imaging study was performed and that Claimant's EF was within normal range at 54%.

The presented evidence established that Claimant had serious heart problems resulting in multiple bypass surgery in November 2012. It was also established that Claimant has ongoing fatigue following the surgery. The degree and cause of fatigue remains undiagnosed and will be discussed below. Claimant's ongoing fatigue is found to be a significant work restriction.

As of the hearing, it had been approximately nine months since Claimant underwent multiple bypass surgery. Claimant and his spouse testified that Claimant has ongoing fatigue causing Claimant to perform very few activities requiring exertion. It is not definitively established that Claimant's restrictions will last 12 months or longer though it is probable that Claimant's undiagnosed fatigue will continue for at least three more months. Thus, it is found that Claimant meets the durational requirements for establishing disability.

As it was found that Claimant established significant impairment to basic work activities for a period longer than 12 months, it is found that Claimant established having a severe impairment. Accordingly, the disability analysis may move 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 the impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Claimant's most prominent impairment appears to be heart-related issues, specifically CAD. Cardiovascular impairments are covered by Listing 4.00. CAD is best covered by Listing 4.04 which reads:

**4.04 Ischemic heart disease**, with symptoms due to myocardial ischemia, as described in 4.00E3-4.00E7, while on a regimen of prescribed treatment (see 4.00B3 if there is no regimen of prescribed treatment), with one of the following:

**A.** Sign- or symptom-limited exercise tolerance test demonstrating at least one of the following manifestations at a workload equivalent to 5 METs or less:

1. Horizontal or downsloping depression, in the absence of digitalis glycoside treatment or hypokalemia, of the ST segment of at least -0.10 millivolts (-1.0 mm) in at least 3 consecutive complexes that are on a level baseline in any lead other than a VR, and depression of at least -0.10 millivolts lasting for at least 1 minute of recovery; or
2. At least 0.1 millivolt (1 mm) ST elevation above resting baseline in non-infarct leads during both exercise and 1 or more minutes of recovery; or

3. Decrease of 10 mm Hg or more in systolic pressure below the baseline blood pressure or the preceding systolic pressure measured during exercise (see 4.00E9e) due to left ventricular dysfunction, despite an increase in workload; or

4. Documented ischemia at an exercise level equivalent to 5 METs or less on appropriate medically acceptable imaging, such as radionuclide perfusion scans or stress echocardiography.

OR

**B.** Three separate ischemic episodes, each requiring revascularization or not amenable to revascularization (see 4.00E9f), within a consecutive 12-month period (see 4.00A3e).

OR

**C.** Coronary artery disease, demonstrated by angiography (obtained independent of Social Security disability evaluation) or other appropriate medically acceptable imaging, and in the absence of a timely exercise tolerance test or a timely normal drug-induced stress test, an MC, preferably one experienced in the care of patients with cardiovascular disease, has concluded that performance of exercise tolerance testing would present a significant risk to the individual, with both 1 and 2:

1. Angiographic evidence showing:

a. 50 percent or more narrowing of a nonbypassed left main coronary artery; or

b. 70 percent or more narrowing of another nonbypassed coronary artery; or

c. 50 percent or more narrowing involving a long (greater than 1 cm) segment of a nonbypassed coronary artery; or

d. 50 percent or more narrowing of at least two nonbypassed coronary arteries; or

e. 70 percent or more narrowing of a bypass graft vessel; and

2. Resulting in very serious limitations in the ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities of daily living.

It is concerning that Claimant underwent a stress test which was stopped prematurely. It was noted that Claimant performed 10.1 METs. Looking at Part A, the amount of METs performed on the stress test was too high to satisfy the above listing.

Turning to Part B, Claimant underwent one ischemic episode which required revascularization. There is not evidence of three episodes of ischemia requiring vascularization.

Looking at Part C, there is an absence of verified evidence to justify meeting any of the above listing requirements. Thus, Claimant does not meet the listing for ischemic heart disease.

Listings for neuropathy (Listing 11.14) and anxiety (Listing 12.06) were considered based on Claimant's testimony. Both listings were summarily rejected due to a lack of supporting evidence.

It is found that Claimant failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves 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.

Claimant testified that he worked for three years as a carpenter. Claimant's testimony was that he had not worked prior to 2007. Claimant's spouse testified that Claimant performed out-of-state carpentry work prior to 2007. The contradiction did not bolster Claimant's testimony.

Claimant testified that his employment consisted of cutting wood, nailing, significant bending and carrying around 4-5 pounds of weight. Claimant credibly testified that he is unable to perform past employment because of ongoing fatigue. It is found that Claimant is unable to perform his past employment and the analysis may proceed to step five.

In the fifth step in the process, the individual's RFC in conjunction with his or her age, education, and work experience, are considered to determine whether the individual can engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. SSR 83-10. 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).

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.* In using the rules of Appendix 2, an individual's

circumstances, as indicated by the findings with respect to RFC, age, education, and work experience, is compared to the pertinent rule(s).

For purposes of this decision, only an evaluation of sedentary employment will be undertaken. Sedentary employment requires no more than a two hour period of standing and/or walking and lifting no more than ten pounds.

Claimant testified that his fatigue is so severe that he could not perform any employment. The testimony was consistent with a physician note which determined that Claimant was unable to return to work in June 2013. Though the physician note was from a treating physician, it was not clear why Claimant was so restricted. No ongoing diagnosis was made for Claimant's heart condition. Claimant's EF was noted as being within the normal range. Even a prematurely ended stress test is indicative of work restrictions but not necessarily restriction from sedentary type employment. Based on the presented evidence, it is found that Claimant is capable of performing sedentary employment.

Claimant and his spouse each testified that Claimant was restricted by low cognitive functioning. Both implied that Claimant was illiterate. There was no evidence to substantiate the claim. For purposes of this decision, it will be accepted that Claimant is illiterate.

Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (younger individual less than 45), education (illiterate), employment history (unskilled), Medical-Vocational Rule 201.23 is found to apply. This rule dictates a finding that Claimant is not disabled. Accordingly, it is found that DHS properly found Claimant to be not disabled for purposes of MA benefits.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS properly denied Claimant's MA benefit application dated December 20, 2012 based on a determination that Claimant is not disabled. The actions taken by DHS are **AFFIRMED**.



Christian Gardocki  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 21, 2013

Date Mailed: August 21, 2013

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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 (60 days for FAP cases).

The claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CG/aca

cc:

