

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201367105
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 14, 2014
County: Kalamazoo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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, an in-person hearing was held on January 14, 2014, from Kalamazoo, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of L [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [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.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (Department) properly determine that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) based on disability?

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 7, 2013, the Claimant submitted an application for Medical Assistance (MA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On June 11, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) because it determined that the Claimant's impairments did not meet the durational requirement.
3. On June 14, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.

4. On August 30, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.
5. On November 5, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the Medical Review Team's (MRT) denial of Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefits.
6. On March 5, 2013, after reviewing the additional medical records, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found the Claimant to be disabled as of March 1, 2014, based on his age and vocational capabilities.
7. On March 5, 2013, after reviewing the additional medical records, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the determination of the Medical Review Team (MRT) that the Claimant does not meet the disability standard for the period of January 1, 2013, through February 28, 2014.
8. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).
9. The Social Security Administration (SSA) denied the Claimant's federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) application and the Claimant reported that a SSI appeal is pending.
10. The Claimant's birthday is [REDACTED].
11. Claimant is 5' 7" tall and weighs 154 pounds.
12. The Claimant has a high school equivalent education. The Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
13. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
14. The Claimant has past relevant work experience as a tree trimmer where he was required to work at heights and lift over 100 pounds, which is considered unskilled work.
15. The Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work.
16. The Claimant's disability claim is based on coronary artery disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic neck pain, and chronic back pain.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, Rule 400.901 - 400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who

requests a hearing because his claim for assistance has been denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903. Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-44.

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.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...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 that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order.

STEP 1

Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is not disabled.

At step 1, a determination is made on whether the Claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that he has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, he is not disabled regardless of how severe his physical or mental impairments are and regardless of his age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

The Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

STEP 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 not disabled.

At step two, a determination is made whether the Claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921). If the Claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he is not disabled. If the Claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The Claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months, or result in death.

The Claimant was born on June 7, 1959. He is 5' 7" tall and weighs approximately 154 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to coronary artery disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic neck pain, and chronic back pain.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

The Claimant was hospitalized in January of 2013 and underwent cardiac catheterization and placement of 4 stents. The Claimant was found in a consultative evaluation to have a reduced range of motion of his cervical spine but had a normal range of motion otherwise. The Claimant was treated for chest pain and loss of consciousness. Laboratory tests revealed that the Claimant's enzymes were negative. A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with vasovagal syncope. A post hospital check on February 18, 2013, was normal.

The Claimant was diagnosed with stage 3 chronic kidney disease by a treating physician. Laboratory tests revealed that the Claimant has a moderately reduced glomerular filtration rate (GFR).

The Claimant has a history of injury after falling out of a tree in 2011.

The Claimant is capable of caring for his personal needs, preparing meals, shopping for groceries, and washing dishes. The Claimant is capable of walking for up to 2 miles. The Claimant smokes cigarettes and drinks two beers twice each month.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has established a severe physical impairment that has more than a de minimus effect on the Claimant's ability to

perform work activities. The Claimant's impairments have lasted continuously, or are expected to last for twelve months.

STEP 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.

At step three, a determination is made whether the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the Claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for coronary artery disease under section 4.05 Recurrent arrhythmias because the objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant suffers from uncontrolled and recurrent episodes of cardiac syncope or near syncope despite prescribed treatment and documented by resting or ambulatory electrocardiography. The Claimant was diagnosed by a treating physician in January of 2013 with vasovagal syncope. A post hospital check on February 18, 2013, was normal.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for chronic neck and back pain under section 1.04 Disorders of the spine, because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from nerve root compression resulting in loss of motor strength or reflexes, or resulting in a positive straight leg test. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant has been diagnosed with spinal arachnoiditis. The objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant's impairment has resulted in an inability to ambulate effectively.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for chronic kidney disease under section 6.02 Impairment of renal function because the objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant undergoes chronic hemodialysis. The Claimant has not required a kidney transplant. The objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant's serum creatinine level is 4 mg per deciliter or greater over a three month period.

The medical evidence of the Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in federal code of regulations 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.

STEP 4

Can the client do the former work that he performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is not disabled.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, a determination is made of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(c)). An individual's residual functional capacity is his ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from his impairments. In making this finding, the undersigned must consider all of the Claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, a determination is made on whether the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his past relevant work (20 CFR 404.1520(f) and 416.920(f)). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. In addition, the work must have lasted long enough for the Claimant to learn to do the job and have been SGA (20 CFR 404.1560(b), 404.1565, 416.960(b), and 416.965). If the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do his past relevant work, the Claimant is not disabled. If the Claimant is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth and last step.

After careful consideration of the entire record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567 and 416.967.

The Claimant has past relevant work experience as a tree trimmer where he was required to work at heights and lift over 100 pounds. The Claimant's prior work fits the description of heavy work.

There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that the Claimant is able to perform work substantially similar to work performed in the past.

STEP 5

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that the Claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) for Substantial Gainful Activity.

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, client is not disabled.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), a determination is made whether the Claimant is able to do any other work considering his residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the Claimant is able to do other work, he is not disabled. If the Claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirement, he is disabled.

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. 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. 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. 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. 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 objective medical evidence indicates that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment and that he is physically able to do less strenuous tasks if demanded of him. The Claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light work.

The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to the Claimant's ability to perform work.

It should be noted that the Claimant continues to smoke despite the fact that his doctor has told him to quit. Claimant is not in compliance with his treatment program. If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their

ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

The Claimant is seeking Medical Assistance (M.A.) based on disability for the closed period of January 1, 2013, through February 28, 2014. Claimant was born on June 7, 1959. At the time of the application, he was considered to be a person closely approaching advanced age, 50-54, with a high school education, and a history of unskilled work. Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work. Medical Assistance (M.A.) is denied using Vocational Rule 202.13 as a guideline.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds Claimant not disabled from January 1, 2013, through February 28, 2013 for purposes of Medical Assistance (M.A.) benefits.

The federal regulations include the following guidelines for evaluating age.

We will use each of the age categories that applies to you during the period for which we must determine if you are disabled. We will not apply the age categories mechanically in a borderline situation. If you are within a few days to a few months of reaching an older age category, and using the older age category would result in a determination or decision that you are disabled, we will consider whether to use the older age category after evaluating the overall impact of all the factors of your case. 20 CFR 416.963(b).

As of March 1, 2013, the Claimant meets the definition of a person of advanced age, over 55, with a high school education, and a history of unskilled work. Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work. Medical Assistance (M.A.) is approved using Vocational Rule 202.04 as a guideline.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds Claimant to be disabled as of March 1, 2013, for purposes of Medical Assistance (M.A.) benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination that the Claimant was not disabled from January 1, 2013, through February 28, 2014 is **AFFIRMED**.

Based on the March 5, 2013, determination of the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT), the Department is **ORDERED** to initiate a review of the Claimant's eligibility for Medical Assistance (M.A.) based on disability as of March 1, 2013, if it is not already done so, to determine if all other non-medical eligibility criteria are met. The Department shall inform the claimant of the determination in writing. It is further **ORDERED** that the

Department shall review this case in one year from the date this Decision and Order is mailed to determine the Claimant's eligibility for continuing benefits.



Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 26, 2014

Date Mailed: March 26, 2014

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

201367105/KS

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

KS/hj

cc:

