

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2014-2300  
Issue No(s): 2009, 4009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 6, 2014  
County: Eaton

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Colleen Lack

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 6, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED], the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit programs?

**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 July 22, 2013, Claimant applied for Medicaid (MA-P) and SDA.
2. On September 24, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) found Claimant not disabled.
3. On September 26, 2013, the Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On October 1, 2013, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.

5. On November 22, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant not disabled.
6. Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to Crohn's disease, Barrett's esophagus, torn rotator cuff, and COPD.
7. Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to anxiety.
8. At the time of hearing, Claimant was [REDACTED] years old with a [REDACTED], birth date; was 5'6" to 5'7" in height; and weighed 120 pounds.
9. Claimant has an [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] with an employment history of working as an [REDACTED]
10. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The 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 BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

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 416.913. 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 (i.e. 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 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 three to step four. 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 four and five. 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, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore is not ineligible for disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant 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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 416.921(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 Crohn's disease, Barrett's esophagus, torn rotator cuff, COPD and anxiety.

On April 25, 2013, Claimant attended a consultative examination for his Social Security Administration case. The physician's impression noted Claimant was a thin, 56-year-old male with a history of COPD, Crohn's, Barrett's esophagus and right rotator cuff tear. Regarding COPD, it was noted Claimant recently stopped smoking, there were no recent respiratory tract infections or fatigue from shortness of breath and there was adequate prophylaxis. Regarding Crohn's, it was noted Claimant had a long term history of the disease, no history of surgeries, history of frequent diarrhea off

medications that he cannot afford, and a normal abdominal examination. Regarding Barrett's esophagus, there was a family history, history of frequent pain with nighttime awakenings, and use of Prilosec. Regarding right rotator cuff tear it was noted there was a history of difficulty working secondary to right shoulder pain, expression of pain on ranges of motion consistent with right shoulder pathology with limitation of ranges of motion. However, the physician concluded the exam report:

Notwithstanding the difficulties of maintaining employment in the face of frequent diarrhea; the Claimant should be able to work in a seated or standing position with no limitations in walking. Use of bilateral extremities for lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling is decreased secondary to buy shoulder pain. Bilateral handgrip strength is below normal on the right; however, the Claimant should be able to use both hands for fine manipulation. There is no limitation in climbing stairs, ladders or scaffolding.

(Exhibit A, pages 33-42).

There was no objective medical evidence specifically documenting anxiety. However, Claimant's testimony was that the anxiety, in part, related to issues with leaving his home due to Crohn's. Crohn's with frequent diarrhea was documented in the consultative examination report.

Claimant declined the opportunity to leave this hearing record open to provide the additional medical documentation he planned to obtain for his upcoming Social Security Administration hearing.

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 medical evidence establishing that he does have some physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, the 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 Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. The evidence confirms treatment/diagnose of history of COPD, Crohn's disease, Barrett's esophagus and right rotator cuff tear.

Listing 5.00 (digestive system) was considered in light of the objective evidence. There was no objective evidence that met the intent and severity requirement of a digestive system impairment, such as gastrointestinal hemorrhaging requiring blood transfusion,

obstructions of stenotic areas in the small intestine or colon, abnormal blood work, and involuntary weight loss of at least 10 percent from baseline.

Listing 3.00 discusses respiratory system impairments. The pulmonary function study completed with the consultative examination did not meet the requirements of listing 3.02 (chronic pulmonary insufficiency).

Listing 1.00 discusses musculoskeletal system impairments. To meet listing 1.02B (major dysfunction of a joint) the evidence must show involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, or wrist-hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively. The consultative examination report indicates a right shoulder rotator cuff tear, but no involvement of a major joint in the left upper extremity was documented and the exam report noted both hands could be used for fine manipulation.

Ultimately, the objective medical records establish some physical impairments; however, the evidence does not meet the intent and severity requirements of a listing, or its equivalent. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 3; therefore, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Before considering the fourth step in the sequential analysis, a determination of the individual's residual functional capacity ("RFC") is made. 20 CFR 416.945. An individual's RFC is the most he/she can still do on a sustained basis despite the limitations from the impairment(s). *Id.* The total limiting effects of all the impairments, to include those that are not severe, are considered. 20 CFR 416.945(e).

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 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 (exertional requirements, i.e. 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 with the demands of past relevant work. *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 to function 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 this case, the evidence confirms treatment/diagnoses of Crohn's, Barrett's esophagus, right rotator cuff tear and a history of COPD. Claimant's testimony indicated he is most limited by the issues related to Crohn's disease, such as frequent diarrhea, bleeding, cramping, spasms and pain. Claimant stated the Barrett's esophagus wakes him up most nights, he experiences burning, bile waking him up in the morning choking, and at times food not going down properly causing intense pain. Claimant stated his shoulder rarely bothers him now unless he is doing something, but would likely cause problems with activities like working overhead. Claimant also testified he gets short of breath with activity, such as carrying laundry. However, the objective medical evidence does not support the severity of most of the limitations Claimant described. The only objective medical evidence was the April 25, 2013 consultative examination report. For example, the report indicated a normal abdominal examination regarding the Crohn's; and noted no recent respiratory tract infections or fatigue from shortness of breath and there was adequate prophylaxis regarding the COPD. After review of the entire record and considering the Claimant's testimony, it is found, at this point, that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform at least unskilled, limited, light work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(a). Limitations

being avoidance of cold, heat, humidity, pulmonary irritants and hazards as well as occasional postural limitations.

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 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 is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3).

Claimant's prior employment was as an [REDACTED] which is considered skilled, medium work. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit 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. As noted above, the objective evidence does only contain the April 25, 2013, Claimant consultative examination report, which does not support the severity of most of the limitations Claimant described. In light of the entire record and Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that Claimant is not be able to perform past relevant work. Accordingly, Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4.

In Step 5, an assessment of Claimant'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 [REDACTED] years old and, thus, considered to be advanced age for MA-P purposes. Claimant has an Associates Degree. Claimant has a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with an employment history of skilled work as an [REDACTED] but these skills would not transfer to other non-related employment. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the 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).

In this case, the objective findings confirm treatment/diagnoses of Crohn's, Barrett's esophagus, right rotator cuff tear and a history of COPD. However, the objective medical evidence does not support the severity of most of the limitations Claimant described. In light of the foregoing, it is found that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis to meet the



physical and mental demands required to perform at light work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(b), with some limitations of avoidance of cold, heat, humidity, pulmonary irritants and hazards as well as occasional postural limitations.

After review of the entire record, and in consideration of the Claimant's age, education, work experience, RFC, and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 202.08, Claimant is found not disabled at Step 5.


The SDA program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS 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 BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found not disabled for purposes SDA benefits as the objective medical evidence also does not establish a physical or mental impairment that met the federal SSI disability standard with the shortened duration of 90 days. The objective medical evidence does not support the severity of most of the limitations Claimant described. In light of the foregoing, it is found that Claimant's impairments did not preclude work at the above stated level for at least 90 days.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA and SDA benefit programs.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.



---

Colleen Lack  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 2/27/14

Date Mailed: 2/27/14

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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.

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).

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

CL/tb

cc:

