

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-7781
Issue No.: 2009; 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 12, 2013
County: Wayne-35

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge upon the 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 March 12, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

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)?

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 April 6, 2011, Claimant filed an application for MA-P/Retro-MA and SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On September 27, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P/Retro-MA and SDA.
- (3) On October 8, 2012, the department caseworker sent Claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On October 16, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On December 17, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found the medical evidence of record does not establish a disabling mental or

physical impairment that would preclude basic work activity. (Depart Ex. B).

- (6) Claimant has a history of congestive heart failure, emphysema, strokes, hyperlipidemia, attention deficit disorder, dyslipidemia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus, psoriasis, chronic obstructive sleep apnea, hyperlipidemia, gastroesophageal reflux disease, osteoarthritis, and hypertension.
- (7) On August 2, 2010, an EEG was performed. The results of the EEG were abnormal due to the presence of frontally dominant generalized slowing. The focal slowing was indicative of a focal cerebral dysfunction in the involved area. (Depart Ex. C, p 16).
- (8) On April 11, 2011, Claimant's treating physician performed a medical examination of Claimant. Claimant was diagnosed with uncontrolled diabetes, hyperlipidemia, hypertension, cerebral artery occlusion with infarct and obstructive chronic bronchitis. He had residual right sided hemiparesis with gait impairment and weakness of the right upper extremity which limited his activities of daily living. He also may need oxygen but he could not be tested because he has no insurance. Based on the exam, Claimant's treating physician opined that Claimant could not work at his usual occupation or at any other job and he needed assistance with shopping and housework. (Depart Ex. C, pp 1-2; 63-66).
- (9) On July 6, 2011, Claimant followed up with his treating physician concerning his blood pressure, diabetes, COPD, sleep apnea and cholesterol control. Claimant complained of lethargy which decreased his coordination and his ability to stay alert. Claimant also presented with a sudden onset of weakness in his right leg. The weakness resulted in Claimant dragging his right leg. The symptoms of COPD were worsened by exercise as he is only able to walk about 40 feet before he gets very short of breath. The sleep apnea is associated with dyspnea on exertion. The hypertension is compliant with medications and non-compliant with diet. The severity of the hyperlipidemia is described as severe. In regards to hyperlipidemia, there is a significant past medical history of diabetes mellitus, liver problems, elevated cholesterol, and elevated triglycerides. The hyperlipidemia is associated with dyspnea. The severity of the diabetes mellitus is severe. The pattern of diabetes mellitus has been generally not adequately controlled and is described as new onset with one seizure. (Depart Ex. C, pp 60-61).
- (10) On December 7, 2011, Claimant had a pulmonary function test which revealed Claimant's FEV1 was 1.14 and his FVC was 1.97. (Depart Ex. C, p 71).

- (11) On April 9, 2012, Claimant followed up with his primary care physician concerning his diabetes. He was diagnosed with diabetes, neuropathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and hypoglycemia. He was instructed to maintain tight control of his blood sugar numbers to stabilize and prevent progression of neuropathy. He was advised to check his feet on a daily basis and wear proper fitting shoes. He took all medications as prescribed during the sensing period and followed a typical diet. He carries a sugar source at all times. (Depart Ex. C, pp 112-113).
- (12) On May 29, 2012, Claimant underwent a stress test. There was no evidence of stress-induced ischemia and ejection fraction was 59%. (Depart Ex. C, p 116).
- (13) On July 24, 2012, Claimant saw a respiratory specialist for his shortness of breath. He had a chronic cough with daily sputum production. He admitted to intermittent wheezing. His most recent chest x-ray was furnished. The right costophrenic angle was obscured, but the lateral view done on 3/30/12 showed some chronic reticular markings at the right and left lung base. He was alert and oriented with a slight congestive loose cough. Crowding in the posterior wall airway noted. Inspection of the chest revealed increased AP diameter. His lungs revealed positive rhonchi bilaterally otherwise distant breath sounds. He had some weakness in the right leg. He was diagnosed with chronic bronchitis, dyspnea, congestive heart failure, obesity, and obstructive sleep apnea. (Depart Ex. C, pp 92-93).
- (14) On August 23, 2012, Claimant underwent a medical examination on behalf of the department. Claimant was diagnosed with dyslipidemia, diabetes mellitus, psoriasis, chronic obstructive sleep apnea, gastroesophageal reflux disease, and hypertension. Claimant used a cane for ambulation. His neurological examination was normal except for right sided weakness. The examining physician opined that Claimant's condition was stable. (Depart Ex. A, pp 10-11).
- (15) Claimant is a 55 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'6" tall and weighs 200 lbs. Claimant completed high school.
- (16) 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 the Title XIX of the Social 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 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).

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.

Under the Medicaid (MA) program:

"Disability" is:

. . . 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.

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 limitations in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(94).

In determining whether you are disabled, we will consider all of your symptoms, including pain, and the extent to which your symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with objective medical evidence, and other evidence. 20 CFR 416.929(a). Pain or other symptoms may cause a limitation of function beyond 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 symptoms, including pain, we will consider all of the available evidence, including your medical history, the medical signs and laboratory findings and statements 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 can 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 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 to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged, 20 CFR 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908 and 20 CFR 416.929. By the same token, a conclusory statement by a physician 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 determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, 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 experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment, or combination of impairments, 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 (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease 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 basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without 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 capacity is what an individual can do despite 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 classify 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. 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. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally 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 weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

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

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

2. 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 client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 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 years? 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-#16 above this Administrative Law Judge answers:

Step 1: No.

Step 2: Yes.

Step 3: Yes. Claimant has shown, by clear and convincing documentary evidence and credible testimony, his respiratory impairments meet or equal Listing 3.02(A) and 3.02(B):

3.02 Chronic pulmonary insufficiency

A. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease due to any cause, with the FEV₁ equal to or less than the values specified in table I corresponding to the person's height without shoes.

Table I

Height without Shoes (centimeters)	Height without Shoes (inches)	FEV₁ Equal to or less than (L,BTPS)
154 or less	60 or less	1.05
155-160	61-63	1.15
161-165	64-65	1.25
166-170	66-67	1.35
171-175	68-69	1.45
176-180	70-71	1.55
181 or more	72 or more	1.65

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.

Table II

Height without Shoes (centimeters)	Height without Shoes (inches)	FVC Equal to or less than (L,BTPS)
154 or less	60 or less	1.25
155-160	61-63	1.35
161-165	64-65	1.45
166-170	66-67	1.55
171-175	68-69	1.65
176-180	70-71	1.75

181 or more	72 or more	1.85
-------------	------------	------

In this case, Claimant's FEV1 is 1.97 and his FVC is 1.14. Therefore, according to both Tables, he meets Listing 3.02(A) and 3.02(B).


DECISION AND ORDER

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

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

1. The department shall process Claimant's April 6, 2012, MA/Retro-MA/SDA application, and shall award him all the benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
2. The department shall review Claimant's medical condition for improvement in April, 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: April 2, 2013

Date Mailed: April 2, 2013

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.

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

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical error, 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

cc:

