

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2014-21513
Issue No(s): 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 22, 2014
County: Lapeer

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 May 22, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] the Claimant, [REDACTED], husband, and [REDACTED], Authorized Hearing Representative. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist and Hearing Facilitator.

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. The evidence was received, reviewed, and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. The SHRT found Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final determination.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) benefit program?

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 August 7, 2013, Claimant applied for Medicaid (MA-P) and retroactive MA-P.
2. On October 3, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) found Claimant not disabled.
3. On October 8, 2013, the Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On December 27, 2013, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.

5. On March 11, 2014, and July 31, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant not disabled.
6. Claimant alleged disabling impairments including back pain, knee pain, osteopenia, arthritis, asthma, depression and anxiety.
7. At the time of hearing, Claimant was 57 years old with a [REDACTED], birth date; was 5'2" in height; and weighed 204 pounds.
8. Claimant completed the 12th grade and has a work history including front office assistant and deli manager.
9. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

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, Claimant 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 disabling impairments including back pain, knee pain, osteopenia, arthritis, asthma, depression and anxiety. While some older medical records were submitted and have been reviewed, the focus of this analysis will be on the more recent medical evidence.

August 2012 to June 2013, doctor's office records document diagnosis and treatment of multiple problems, including allergic reaction, acute otitis media, anxiety disorder, aphthous ulcer, backache, esophageal reflux, hyperlipidemia, dysuria, pelvic pain, and restless leg syndrome. A September 24, 2012, bone density report states that the study was normal. September 11, 2012 x-rays of the cervical spine showed degenerative disc disease C3-4 and C5-6 levels as well as degenerative facet arthritis C3-4 through C6-7. September 11, 2012, x-rays of the lumbar spine showed degenerative disc disease L5-S1 as well as mild degenerative facet arthritis L4-5 and L5-S1. September 11, 2012, x-rays of the sacrum/coccyx showed degenerative and osteopenic changes.

A December 13, 2012, cardiology record indicates a referral due to a recent episode of chest pains. Assessment indicated hypercholesterolemia, anxiety, peptic ulcer, inguinal hernia, and chest pain. It was noted Claimant had a lot of anxiety. A January 3, 2013, cardiology record indicates a negative stress test and medical management would be continued for hypercholesterolemia and anxiety.

On January 30, 2013, Claimant attended a consultative psychological examination. Diagnoses were generalized anxiety disorder and dysthymic disorder. The examiner was not able to review any mental health records. The examiner's impression was that Claimant's mental abilities to understand, attend to, remember, and carry out instructions was not overtly impaired. Claimant's abilities to respond appropriately to co-workers and supervision and to adapt to change and stress in the workplace was moderately impaired.

On March 15, 2013, Claimant attended a consultative medical examination. Diagnoses were neck pain without radiculopathy and low back pain without radiculopathy. The examiner was able to review the September 2012 x-ray reports. The examiner's opinion was that Claimant was able to sit, stand and walk a total of eight hours per day, she can interact with people, and had no lifting restrictions.

April 2013 to June 2013 Community Mental Health (CMH) records documents diagnoses of panic disorder without agoraphobia and depressive disorder. Claimant reported some improvements with anxiety since starting therapy.

Claimant was hospitalized June 7-11, 2013, for a severe allergic reaction to lamictal, hypertension, depression and anxiety.

July 2013 to October 2013, CMH records documents diagnoses of panic disorder without agoraphobia and depressive disorder. The records indicate Claimant has been quite stable to fairly stable emotionally, complaint with medications, and fairly regular in her therapy sessions.

A July 1, 2013, cardiology record indicates Claimant reported a new medication seems to be working and she is no longer experiencing chest pains. Blood pressure was noted to be well controlled.

An August 26, 2013, neurological evaluation indicated impressions of restless leg syndrome, low back pain, and probable obstructive sleep apnea. Claimant's gait was independent and tandem gait was within normal range. Claimant was able to walk on heels and toes without difficulties.

An August 28, 2013, CT of the lumbar spine showed lumbar degenerative disc disease, spondylosis and facet degenerative changes most notable at L5-S1 and to a lesser degree at L4-L5 as well as osteopenia.

July 2013 and December 2013, doctor's office records document diagnosis and treatment of several ongoing problems, including anxiety disorder, restless leg syndrome, anemia, hyperlipidemia, esophageal reflux, and costochondritis/Tietze's disease.

An October 2-4, 2013, baseline polysomnogram and CPAP titration records document obstructive sleep apnea with a favorable response to CPAP.

A March 2014 record from CMH indicates Claimant reached her goals and was discharged. Claimant's medications were already being prescribed by her primary care provider and she was aware of community resources.

April and May 2014, counseling records document a diagnosis of panic disorder with agoraphobia. It was noted that Claimant has a long history of anxiety and panic attacks, which causes her significant difficulty with daily functioning.

A June 2014, neurological evaluation indicated impressions of restless leg syndrome without symptoms of radiculopathy, low back pain, and obstructive sleep apnea. Claimant's gait was independent and tandem gait was within normal range. Claimant was able to walk on heels and toes without difficulties.

A June 12, 2014, DHS-49 Medical Examination Report from one of Claimant's doctors documented a diagnosis of anxiety. It was marked that Claimant had no physical limitations. It was noted that Claimant has mental limitation with the ability to deal with stress, is on medications and seeing a counselor. Psychiatry evaluation was pending.

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 medical evidence establishing that she does have some limitations on the 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, or can be expected to last, 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 recent diagnosis and treatment of multiple conditions, including back pain, esophageal reflux, hyperlipidemia, restless leg syndrome, obstructive sleep apnea, depression, anxiety, and panic disorder.

Based on the objective medical evidence, considered listings included: 1.00 Musculoskeletal System, 11.00 Neurological, and 12.00 Mental Disorders. However, the medical evidence was not sufficient to meet the intent and severity requirements of any 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.*

The evidence confirms recent diagnosis and treatment of multiple conditions, including back pain, esophageal reflux, hyperlipidemia, restless leg syndrome, obstructive sleep apnea, depression, anxiety, and panic disorder. Claimant's testimony indicated she can walk 10 minutes, stand 20-30 minutes, sit 20-30 minutes, and lift a gallon of milk but not anything much heavier. Claimant's testimony regarding her physical limitations is not fully supported by the medical evidence and found only partially credible. While back pain is documented, the March 15, 2013 consultative medical examination report indicated Claimant could sit, stand, and walk a total of eight hours, she can interact with people, and had no lifting restrictions. The August 2013 and June 2014, neurological evaluations, in part, indicated Claimant had an independent, normal gait. Further, the June 12, 2014, DHS-49 Medical Examination Report indicated Claimant did not have any physical limitations. Accordingly, the medical records support a finding that Claimant physically could perform medium work. The non-exertional mental limitations must also be considered. The records document a long history of anxiety and panic disorder. The CMH treatment records indicate improvement with medication and therapy. The January 30, 2013, consultative psychological examiner's impression was that Claimant's mental abilities to understand, attend to, remember, and carry out instructions was not overtly impaired. Claimant's abilities to respond appropriately to co-workers and supervision and to adapt to change and stress in the workplace was moderately impaired. Only the April 2014 and later records indicate agoraphobia with the panic disorder. It appears they may have been more recent worsening of mental health symptoms. Overall the records indicate that when present, there were only moderate impairments related to dealing with stress and interacting with others. After review of the entire record it is found, at this point, that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform limited medium work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(c) on a sustained basis. Limitations would include simple, unskilled tasks and limited interaction with co-workers and the public.

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 has a work history of including front office assistant and deli manager. Both the front office assistant and deli manager at a small country store work would involve interacting with the public. In light of the entire record and Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that Claimant is not able to perform her past relevant work. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4; therefore, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 5. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

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 57 years old and, thus, considered to be advanced age for MA-P purposes. Claimant completed the

12th grade and has a work history including front office assistant and deli manager. 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).


The evidence confirms recent diagnosis and treatment of multiple conditions, including back pain, esophageal reflux, hyperlipidemia, restless leg syndrome, obstructive sleep apnea, depression, anxiety, and panic disorder. As noted above, Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform limited medium work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(c) on a sustained basis. Limitations would include simple, unskilled tasks and limited interaction with co-workers and the public. Even considering these limitations, significant jobs would still exist in the national economy.

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 203.15, Claimant is found not disabled at Step 5.

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 program.

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: December 30, 2014

Date Mailed: December 30, 2014

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides or has its principal place of business in the State, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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/hj

cc:

