

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201369805
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: February 20, 2013
County: Jackson 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 February 20, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and her authorized hearings representative [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] and [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 26, 2013, the Claimant submitted an application for Medical Assistance (MA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On July 1, 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 she is capable of other work despite her impairments.
3. On July 2, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.
4. On September 19, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.

5. On November 13, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) reversed the Medical Review Team's (MRT) denial of Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefits finding disability as of November 5, 2013, but upholding the MRT denial of disability before November 5, 2013.
6. On May 5, 2014, after reviewing the additional medical records, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) again upheld the determination of the Medical Review Team (MRT) that the Claimant does not meet the disability standard before November 5, 201.
7. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).
8. 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.
9. The Claimant is a 49-year-old woman, whose birth date is [REDACTED].
10. Claimant is 5' 4" tall and weighs 230 pounds.
11. The Claimant is a high school graduate.
12. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
13. The Claimant has past relevant work experience as a housekeeper where she was required to make beds, clean bathrooms, vacuum floors, dust furniture, and lift objects weighing up to 15 pounds.
14. The Claimant's disability claim is based on arthritis, joint pain, back pain, impaired vision, sarcoidosis, asthma, pneumonia, stomach and colon problems, obesity, diabetes, a learning disability, mood disorder, anxiety, and personality disorder.

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 her 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 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 she 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, she is not disabled regardless of how severe her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

The Claimant testified that has not been employed since 2004 and is not currently engaged in substantial gainful activity, which was not disputed by the Department during the hearing. Therefore this Administrative Law Judge finds that 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, she 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 she 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 is a 49-year-old woman that is 5' 4" tall and weighs 230 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to arthritis, joint pain, back pain, impaired vision, sarcoidosis, asthma, pneumonia, stomach and colon problems, obesity, diabetes, a learning disability, mood disorder, anxiety, and a personality disorder.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with depression on October 18, 2012.

A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with diabetes on August 13, 2012.

A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with osteoarthritis on October 12, 2013.

The Claimant underwent a polysomnography study on March 7, 2012, and was diagnosed with obstructive sleep apnea, moderate obesity, and asthma.

On October 2, 2012, a treating physician found the Claimant to have a normal Forced expiratory volume in 1 second measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of 1.66 L, and a forced vital capacity measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of 1.94 L.

On October 5, 2012, a treating physician found the Claimant to be suffering from acute flare of chronic asthma with acute purulent bronchitis, asymmetrical edema, and sarcoidosis. On November 28, 2012, a treating physician found the Claimant to be suffering from asthma exacerbation and possible acute bronchitis. On December 10, 2012, a treating physician found the Claimant was suffering from resolving acute purulent asthmatic bronchitis and acute sinusitis. A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with pneumonia that was resolved since February 1, 2013, but development of a small area of atelectasis in the left mid-lung. An x-ray scan of the Claimant's lungs on February 6, 2013, found no evidence of pneumonia. On March 13, 2013, a treating physician found resolution of the Claimant's atelectasis. On March 13, 2013, the Claimant received

inpatient treatment with difficulty in breathing, and was discharged on March 18, 2013 following meticulous breathing treatments.

An x-ray scan of the Claimant's left foot on April 12, 2013, found a tiny left Achilles calcaneal spur and soft tissue swelling dorsal and medial to the left foot, but no evidence of fracture-dislocation. A magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan of the Claimant's right knee revealed grade II to III chondromalacia patella with trace joint effusion and minimal prepatellar bursitis.

An echocardiogram test on January 21, 2013, found the Claimant has normal global left ventricular systolic function, a trace amount of mitral regurgitation, and mild tricuspid regurgitation with mild pulmonary hypertension. On February 28, 2013, the Claimant was admitted for a cardiac catheterization and was discharged on March 4, 2013. On April 8, 2013, a treating physician found the Claimant to be doing extremely well from a cardiac standpoint.

On October 5, 2012, a treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with edema but found no evidence of deep venous thrombosis in the left lower extremity.

On October 8, 2013, the Claimant was admitted to the hospitalist service secondary to sepsis syndrome in her right arm where she denied shortness of breath, and was discharged on October 10, 2013.

A consultative psychologist found the Claimant to have a verbal intelligence score of 65, a performance intelligence score of 80, and a full scale intelligence score of 69 on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III. The consultative psychologist diagnosed the Claimant with depressive disorder, borderline intellect, and found her to have serious symptoms and serious impairments in social and occupational functioning.

On April 22, 2013, a treating physician determined that the Claimant is capable of lifting 25 pounds occasionally, and 20 pounds frequently. The Claimant was found to be capable of grasping, reaching, pushing, pulling, and fine manipulation, but limited to standing less than 2 hours in an 8-hour workday.

The evidence on the record indicates that the Claimant's was been diagnosed with obesity and asthma by treating physicians, which has resulted in significant impairments to stand and perform other work related tasks. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds 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 arthritis under section 14.09 Inflammatory Arthritis because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate an impairment involving a weight-bearing joint and resulting in an inability to ambulate effectively. The objective evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant lacks the ability to perform fine and gross movements with each upper extremity.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for joint pain under section 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant's impairment involves a weight bearing joint resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, or an impairment of an upper extremity resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for a 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 objective medical evidence on the record as a whole does not contain evidence supporting a finding that the Claimant meets or equals a condition listed in section 2.00 Special Senses and Speech.

The Claimant does not meet a listing for asthma, sarcoidosis, or pneumonia under section 3.03 Asthma because the Claimant does not meet the criteria for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease under section 3.02A because for a person that is 64 inches tall, the Claimant was not found to have a forced expiratory volume in 1 second measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of less than 1.25 L or less, and a forced vital capacity measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of 1.45 L or less. A treating physician found the Claimant to have a Forced expiratory volume in 1 second measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of 1.66 L, and a forced vital capacity measured in liters of air at body temperature and pressure saturated (LBTSP) of 1.94 L. The evidence presented on the record does not support a finding that the Claimant suffers from asthma attacks in spite of treatment and requiring physician intervention at least once every 2 months when evaluated over a 12 month period. The evidence on the record supports a finding of significant physician treatment for asthma

but not of prolonged symptomatic episodes lasting one or more days and requiring intensive treatment over a 12 months period.

The evidence on the record as a whole does not support a finding that the Claimant's condition meets or equals a listing under section 5.00 Digestive System.

The Claimant has been found to be obese by her treating physicians but the evidence on the record as a whole does not support a finding that her weight results in an impairment under another body system, or that it exacerbates another condition to the point that she meets or equals a listed impairment under the federal regulations.

The effects of diabetes are most readily observed through its impairments of other body systems. The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for diabetes under Section 9.00 Endocrine because the objective medical evidence does not support a finding of another severe impairment in another body system caused by diabetes. The Claimant's diabetes will be further considered when evaluating her residual functional capacity.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for a learning disability, because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from mental incapacity and an inability to follow directions. A psychologist found the Claimant to have a verbal intelligence score of 65, a performance intelligence score of 80, and a full scale intelligence score of 69 on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III. The evidence does not support a finding of a verbal, performance, or full scale intelligence score of 59 or less. The evidence does not support a finding that her physical impairments in combination with her learning disability prevent significant work-related functions. The evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant has marked limitations of her activities of daily living, social functioning, or that she suffers from repeated episodes of decompensation.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for mood disorder under section 12.04 Affective disorders because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from marked restrictions of activities of daily living or social functioning. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from repeated episodes of decompensation or is unable to function outside a highly supportive living arrangement.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for anxiety under section 12.06 Anxiety-related disorders because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from marked restrictions of activities of daily living or social functioning. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from repeated episodes of decompensation. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant is completely unable to function outside the home.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for a personality disorder under section 12.08 Personality disorders because the objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant suffers from marked restrictions of her activities of daily living or social functioning, or that she suffers from repeated episodes of decompensation.

The medical evidence of the Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she 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 she 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 her ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from her 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 her 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 her 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.

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.

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).

To determine the skills required in the national economy of work you are able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled. These terms have the same meaning as defined in. 20 CFR 416.968.

Unskilled work. Unskilled work is work which needs little or no judgment to do simple duties that can be learned on the job in a short period of time. The job may or may not require considerable strength. For example, we consider jobs unskilled if the primary work duties are handling, feeding and offbearing (that is, placing or removing materials from machines which are automatic or operated by others), or machine tending, and a person

can usually learn to do the job in 30 days, and little specific vocational preparation and judgment are needed. A person does not gain work skills by doing unskilled jobs. 20 CFR 416.968(a).

A treating physician determined that the Claimant is capable of lifting 25 pounds occasionally and 20 pounds frequently. The Claimant is capable of grasping, reaching, pushing, pulling, and fine manipulation of objects. The Claimant is limited to standing less than 2 hours in an 8 hour workday but is capable of performing simple work related tasks while seated. 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 housekeeper where she was required to make beds, clean bathrooms, vacuum floors, dust furniture, and lift objects weighting up to 15 pounds. The Claimant's prior work fits the definition of light work and unskilled work.

The evidence on the record supports a finding that the Claimant is capable of performing light work. The Claimant's prior work required significant standing and the Claimant is capable of performing light work were less standing is required. The Claimant may not be capable of performing the same job that she held in the past, but is capable of performing related light work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that the Claimant is unable to perform work that is 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 her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the Claimant is able to do other work, she is not disabled. If the Claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirement, she 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).

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

The Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. 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.

Medical vocational guidelines have been developed and can be found in 20 CFR, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 200.00. When the facts coincide with a particular guideline, the guideline directs a conclusion as to disability. 20 CFR 416.969.

Claimant is 49-years-old, a younger person, under age 50, 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 202.20 as a guideline.

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).

When evaluated as a person closely approaching advanced age, 50-54, with a high school education, and a history of unskilled work, then 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, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds Claimant disabled not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (M.A.) benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is AFFIRMED REVERSED.



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

Date Signed: May 29, 2014

Date Mailed: May 29, 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

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:

