

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2014-32679
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 24, 2014
County: Wayne (35)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

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; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on July 24, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. [REDACTED] testified and appeared as Claimant's authorized hearing representative. Participants included the above-named Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Hearings Facilitator.

ISSUE

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) for the reason that Claimant is not a disabled individual.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On [REDACTED], Claimant applied for MA benefits, including retroactive MA benefits from 11/2012 (see Exhibits 19-21).
2. Claimant's only basis for MA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On [REDACTED], the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 23-25).

4. On [REDACTED], DHS denied Claimant's application for MA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action (Exhibits 5-7) informing Claimant of the denial.
5. On [REDACTED], Claimant's AHR requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA benefits (see Exhibit 3).
6. On [REDACTED], SHRT determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibit 91), in part, by reliance on a Disability Determination Explanation (Exhibits 70-79) determining that Claimant can perform past relevant employment.
7. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 56-year-old male with a height of 5'10" and weight of 130 pounds.
8. Claimant has no known relevant history of alcohol or illegal substance abuse.
9. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12th grade.
10. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was an ongoing Healthy Michigan Plan recipient since 4/2014.
11. Claimant alleged disability based on impairments and issues including lower back pain (LBP), hand arthritis, COPD, hip pain, and dyslexia.

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. Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) and Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Prior to a substantive analysis of Claimant's hearing request, it should be noted that Claimant's AHR noted special arrangements in order to participate in the hearing; specifically, an in-person hearing was requested. Claimant's AHR subsequently amended the request to a telephone hearing. A telephone hearing was held in accordance with Claimant's AHR's amended request.

The Medicaid program is comprised of several sub-programs which fall under one of two categories; one category is FIP-related and the second category is SSI-related. BEM 105 (10/2010), p. 1. To receive MA under an SSI-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or

disabled. *Id.* Families with dependent children, caretaker relatives of dependent children, persons under age 21 and pregnant, or recently pregnant, women receive MA under FIP-related categories. *Id.* AMP is an MA program available to persons not eligible for Medicaid through the SSI-related or FIP-related categories though DHS does always offer the program to applicants. It was not disputed that Claimant's only potential category for Medicaid eligibility would be as a disabled individual.

Disability for purposes of MA benefits is established if one of the following circumstances applies:

- by death (for the month of death);
- the applicant receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits;
- SSI benefits were recently terminated due to financial factors;
- the applicant receives Retirement Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) on the basis of being disabled; or
- RSDI eligibility is established following denial of the MA benefit application (under certain circumstances).

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

There was no evidence that any of the above circumstances apply to Claimant. Accordingly, Claimant may not be considered for Medicaid eligibility without undergoing a medical review process which determines whether Claimant is a disabled individual. *Id.*, p. 2.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of SSI disability as found in the federal regulations. 42 CFR 435.540(a). Disability is federally defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity (SGA) by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months. 20 CFR 416.905. A functionally identical definition of disability is found under DHS regulations. BEM 260 (7/2012), p. 8.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does the following:

- Performs significant duties, and
- Does them for a reasonable length of time, and
- Does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id.*, p. 9.

Significant duties are duties used to do a job or run a business. *Id.* They must also have a degree of economic value. *Id.* The ability to run a household or take care of oneself does not, on its own, constitute substantial gainful activity. *Id.*

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish a disability through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints

are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a).

Federal regulations describe a sequential five step process that is to be followed in determining whether a person is disabled. 20 CFR 416.920. If there is no finding of disability or lack of disability at each step, the process moves to the next step. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4).

The first step in the process considers a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The monthly amount depends on whether a person is statutorily blind or not. "Current" work activity is interpreted to include all time since the date of application. The 2012 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,010.

Claimant credibly denied performing any employment since the date of the MA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Claimant's testimony. Based on the presented evidence, it is found that Claimant is not performing SGA and has not performed SGA since the date of MA application. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step two.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the 12 month duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(ii). The impairments may be combined to meet the severity requirement. If a severe impairment is not found, then a person is deemed not disabled. *Id.*

The impairments must significantly limit a person's basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(5)(c). "Basic work activities" refers to the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. *Id.* Examples of basic work activities include:

- physical functions (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling)
- capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking, understanding; carrying out, and remembering simple instructions
- use of judgment
- responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and/or
- dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a de minimus standard upon claimants to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10th Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10th Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6th Cir. 1988). Similarly, Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been interpreted so that a claim may be denied at step two for lack of a severe impairment only when the medical evidence establishes a slight abnormality or combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an

individual's ability to work even if the individual's age, education, or work experience were specifically considered. *Barrientos v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 1, 2 (1st Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirement is intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1st Cir. 1986).

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

Treating physician documents (Exhibits 57-61; A19; A26) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant reported 10/10 hip pain with prolonged standing. It was noted that Claimant had painful hip range of motion. It was noted that Claimant was prescribed Tramadol. It was noted that an x-ray of Claimant's hip was negative. Treatment for COPD was also noted.

An internist examination report (Exhibits 35-55; 83-90) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that the report was completed by a consultative physician. It was noted that Claimant reported breathing difficulties related to COPD. It was noted that Claimant smokes one pack of cigarettes per day, down from two packs. It was noted that Claimant reported that he can walk between ¼- ½ mile and two flights of stairs. It was noted that Claimant complained of various pains, in his hands, right wrist, lower back, knee, and shoulders. It was noted that Claimant reported that he had arthritis in his hip. Diagnoses of probable degenerative disc disease, degenerative disease of the shoulders, COPD, and dyslexia were noted. It was noted that Claimant could perform all 23 listed work abilities which included sitting, standing, pulling, dressing, tying shoes, and writing; it was also noted that Claimant was limited in bending, stooping, pushing, and carrying. Limited ranges of motion were noted in Claimant's right hip, lumbar, bilateral knees, and bilateral shoulders. It was noted that an x-ray of Claimant's lumbar revealed minimal rotoscolosis and mild degenerative arthritis. It was noted that x-rays of Claimant's right hip revealed mild degenerative arthritis. The examining physician performed respiratory testing (see Exhibits 51-55; 80-82) on Claimant. Claimant's best FEV1 was 2.20. Claimant's best FVC was 2.88.

Hospital documents (Exhibits A1-A7) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant presented with a complaint of constant chest pain, ongoing for 3-5 days. It was noted that chest x-rays demonstrated COPD and no acute process. It was noted that rib x-rays demonstrated no fractures. A diagnosis of chest wall strain was noted. It was noted that Claimant was negative for pulmonary embolus.

Treating physician documents (Exhibits A16-A18; A27-A29) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant reported depression symptoms. A prescription for Celexa was noted.

Treating physician documents (Exhibits A14-A15; A24-A25) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of a cough. It was noted that Claimant smoked one pack of cigarettes per day. A diagnosis of acute bronchitis was noted.

Treating physician documents (Exhibits A11-A13; A21-A23) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of right hip pain (pain level 10/10). It was noted that Claimant was evicted the previous week and that he was lifting 20-25 pound objects. It was noted that Claimant tried treating pain with NSAIDs, Motrin, Aleve, and ice, each without complete resolution. It was noted that Claimant had 5/5 strength in all extremities. It was noted that Claimant had full hip range of motion though hip pain with resistance was noted with abduction and adduction. Claimant's gait was noted as non-antalgic. It was noted that tandem and heel-to-toe walking was performed without difficulty. Trendelenburg of the right hip was noted. An MRI of Claimant's hip was recommended but declined due to a lack of insurance.

Treating physician documents (Exhibits A9-A10) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of chest and joint pain. A prescription for Tylenol/codeine #4 was noted for joint pain treatment. A prescription for Symbicort was noted for COPD treatment. A prescription for Celexa was noted for treatment of depression treatment. It was noted that Claimant was advised to quit smoking.

Claimant alleged disability in part, due to respiratory restrictions. A diagnosis of COPD was verified. The diagnosis is sufficient to meet the de minimus standard required at step 2.

Claimant alleged disability, in part, based on hip and lumbar pain. Medical records noted that Claimant's hip began in 2002, after he was rear-ended in a motor vehicle accident (see Exhibit A11). Regular treatment for hip and back pain was verified. It was also verified that Claimant received relatively serious pain medications, presumably for joint pain. The evidence was minimally sufficient to establish walking and lifting restrictions.

Medical evidence also established that Claimant had walking and manipulating restrictions since at least 11/2012, the first month that Claimant seeks MA benefits. It is found that Claimant has a severe impairment and the analysis may proceed to step three.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires a determination whether the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If Claimant's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the 12 month requirement, then the claimant is deemed disabled. If the impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

A listing for joint dysfunction (Listing 1.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaints of knee pain. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish that Claimant is unable to ambulate effectively.

A listing for spinal disorders (Listing 1.04) was considered based on Claimant's LBP complaints. This listing was rejected due to a failure to establish a spinal disorder resulting in a compromised nerve root.

A listing for respiratory function (Listing 3.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaints of dyspnea. The listing was rejected because Claimant's respiratory function exceeds listing requirements.

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

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (RFC) and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if it is determined that a claimant can perform past relevant work. *Id.*

Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1). Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

Claimant testified that he worked as a master jeweler for 9 of the past 15 years. Claimant testified that the work was intricate and delicate. Claimant testified that carpal-tunnel syndrome prevents him from performing his past work. Claimant's complaints of hand pain were documented. Radiology or diagnoses were not documented. A master jeweler is employment which requires extremely fine hand dexterity; slight hand impairments could drastically affect Claimant's performance.

Claimant also testified that master jeweler employment requires exposure to chemicals and dust. Claimant testified that chemicals and dust exacerbate his COPD. Claimant's testimony was credible.

It is found that Claimant's complaints of hand pain and breathing restrictions were sufficient to find that Claimant cannot perform past relevant employment. Accordingly, the analysis may proceed to step five.

In the fifth step in the process, the individual's RFC in conjunction with his or her age, education, and work experience, are considered to determine whether the individual can

engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. SSR 83-10. While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983).

To determine the physical demands (i.e. exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967. The definitions for each are listed below.

Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a). Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met.

Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.*

Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c). An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.*

Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.*

Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e). An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). Examples of non-exertional limitations include difficulty functioning due to nervousness, anxiousness,

or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i)-(vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2)

The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.* In using the rules of Appendix 2, an individual's circumstances, as indicated by the findings with respect to RFC, age, education, and work experience, is compared to the pertinent rule(s).

Given Claimant's age, education and employment history a determination of disability is dependent on Claimant's ability to perform light employment. Social Security Rule 83-10 states that the full range of light work requires standing or walking, off and on, for a total of approximately 6 hours of an 8-hour workday.

Claimant complained of recurring hip pain from 3/2014-7/2014. The reported pain levels would likely preclude Claimant's ability to perform light employment.

In 3/2014, no hip abnormalities were found. In 4/2014, x-rays revealed mild degenerative arthritis. Mild degenerative arthritis is indicative of ambulation difficulties that would make light employment extremely difficult, though not necessarily unreasonably difficult.

It was verified in 4/2013 that Claimant had range of motion restrictions in his right hip. Claimant's right hip range of motion improved based on 4/2014 documentation. Claimant's 4/2014 documentation contained mixed messages concerning the severity of Claimant's hip problems.

Strength of 5/5 in all extremities, non-antalgic gait, improved range of motion, and ability to performing various walking tests are all indicative of an ability to perform light employment. It was also noted that Claimant had pain with motion and was positive for Trendelburg sign. Trendelberg is understood to be consistent with a person with weak or paralyzed hip abductor muscles. Overall, the evidence was indicative that Claimant could not perform light employment.


Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (advanced age), education (high school- no direct entry into skilled employment), employment history (semi- skilled with no transferrable skills), Medical-Vocational Rule 201.06 is found to apply. This rule dictates a finding that Claimant is disabled. Accordingly, it is found that DHS improperly found Claimant to be not disabled for purposes of MA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds that DHS improperly denied Claimant's application for MA benefits. It is ordered that DHS:

- (1) reinstate Claimant's MA benefit application dated [REDACTED], including retroactive MA benefits from 11/2012
- (2) evaluate Claimant's eligibility for MA benefits subject to the finding that Claimant is a disabled individual;
- (3) initiate a supplement for any benefits not issued as a result of the improper application denial; and
- (4) schedule a review of benefits in one year from the date of this administrative decision, if Claimant is found eligible for future benefits.

The actions taken by DHS are **REVERSED**.


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

Date Signed: 8/15/2014

Date Mailed: 8/15/2014

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

CG/hw

cc:

