

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-019479  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 11, 2015  
County: Oakland (2)

**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, an in-person hearing was held on February 11, 2015, from Madison Heights, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant. [REDACTED], Claimant's spouse, testified on behalf of Claimant. [REDACTED] testified and appeared as Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR). Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Supervisor, and [REDACTED], Specialist.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) eligibility 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.
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 15-16).
4. On [REDACTED], DHS denied Claimant's application for MA benefits and mailed a Benefit Notice (Exhibits 13-14) informing Claimant of the denial.

5. On [REDACTED], Claimant's AHR requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA benefits.
6. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 57 year old female.
7. Claimant has not earned substantial gainful activity since before the first month of benefits sought.
8. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12<sup>th</sup> grade plus certification as a licensed practical nurse.
9. Claimant has a history of semi-skilled employment, with no known transferrable job skills.
10. Claimant alleged disability based on restrictions related to left hand and leg weakness from cerebrovascular accidents (CVA).

### **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).

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.* 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.

SGA means a person does the following: performs significant duties, 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 SGA. *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 2014 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,070.

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 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 presented medical documentation.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 27-116; 120) from an admission dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant presented with complaints of slurred speech, drooling, and headache. Claimant also reported left arm weakness, ongoing for 1 year. It was noted that Claimant was left-handed. Left-sided facial droop was observed. A CT report of Claimant's head noted an impression of acute to subacute right cerebral

frontoparietal infarction. It was noted that Claimant had symptomatic carotid occlusive disease with greater than 70% stenosis of the right carotid artery. Physical therapy notes indicated 3/5 left-sided upper extremity strength. It was noted that Claimant was independent with ADLs and functional mobility. Noted discharge diagnoses included cerebrovascular accident. A discharge date of [REDACTED] was noted. A plan to return in 4 weeks for a carotid endarterectomy was noted.

A physician office visit document (Exhibit A7) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that a recent angiogram showed severe carotid stenosis. Left-sided weakness was noted.

A physician office visit document (Exhibit 217) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that Claimant was unable to attend previously scheduled physical therapy due to a lack of insurance. It was noted that Claimant needed medications related to hypertension and diabetes mellitus.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 123-216; A9-A13) from an admission dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant underwent a right carotid endarterectomy. Claimant testified that her surgeon does not use stenting, and instead he scrapes out any blockage. Claimant testified that she was conscious throughout the surgery. Discharge instructions noted no heavy lifting for 2 weeks. A discharge date of [REDACTED] was noted.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibits 25-26) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The form was completed by a physician that Claimant stated was a surgeon who saw Claimant beginning in 7/2014 and performed surgery on Claimant in 9/2014. Listed diagnoses of right carotid stenosis with right hemispheric cerebrovascular accident were noted. An impression was given that Claimant's condition was improving. Physical examination findings noted left arm and hand weakness. Claimant's physician noted that Claimant was unable to use her left arm or hand for lifting, grasping, or writing. Standing and sitting restrictions were not stated. It was noted that Claimant can meet household needs.

Physician office visit documents (Exhibits A14-A15) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant was doing well, post-surgery. Assessments of uncontrolled DM, HTN, peripheral vascular disease, and CVA history were noted. Ongoing complaints of left arm weakness were noted.

A Residual Functional Capacity Form (Exhibits A1-A8) dated [REDACTED] was presented. Claimant testified that the physician began treating Claimant in 7/2014. A diagnosis of post-CVA was noted.

Claimant testified that she had her first stroke in 2013 but was not hospitalized. Claimant testified that she began having left arm weakness and fatigue after her first stroke. Claimant testified that she had a second stroke in 7/2014. It was then discovered

that she had stenosis of her right carotid artery. Claimant testified that her doctor told her that if she did not have surgery, she would likely continue to have strokes. Claimant testified that as a result of her strokes, she has left arm and hand weakness and some degree of fatigue affecting her ability to ambulate and lift/carry. Claimant's testimony was consistent with presented records.

It is found that Claimant established significant impairment to basic work activities for a period longer than 12 months. Accordingly, it is found that Claimant established having a severe impairment and the disability analysis may proceed to Step 3.

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 central nervous system vascular accident (Listing 11.04) was considered based on Claimant's CVA history. The listing was rejected due to Claimant's failure to establish, after three month post-CVA, either of the following: ineffective speech or communication, or significant and persistent motor dysfunction with multiple extremities.

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 she has 35 years of experience as a licensed practical nurse. Claimant testified that she worked in various settings (e.g. hospitals, private residences, nursing homes...) but that her duties remained constant. Claimant testified that 90% of her workday was spent standing. Claimant testified that she was responsible for various patient needs such as tube feedings. Claimant testified that her job also required her to sometimes lift patients and provide shots. Claimant testified that her left arm weakness would prevent her from performing the required lifting or writing of her past nurse duties.

Claimant's testimony was consistent with presented medical documentation. It is found that Claimant is unable to perform past relevant employment and the disability analysis may proceed to the final step.

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.

Physician statements of restrictions were provided. Treating source opinions cannot be discounted unless the Administrative Law Judge provides good reasons for discounting the opinion. *Rogers v. Commissioner*, 486 F. 3d 234 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Bowen v Commissioner*. Physician statements of Claimant's ability to ambulate and lift/carry were provided.

Claimant's physician listed restrictions on a Residual Functional Capacity Form dated [REDACTED]. Claimant's physician noted that Claimant could stand a few hours, with breaks in-between, though not for 6-8 hours per workday. Claimant's physician also noted that Claimant would be unable to sit for 6-8 hours per workday. The basis of the restrictions was weakness caused by past CVAs. The physician stated that Claimant was capable of walking for 1 block. Claimant was found capable of regularly lifting/carrying 5-10 pounds. Squatting and kneeling were noted as difficult.

There is little basis to accept Claimant's physician restriction that Claimant is unable to sit 6-8 hours per workday. It is not understood how left-sided weakness from strokes

limits Claimant's ability to sit. Claimant testified that she has no sitting restriction. Claimant's physician's sitting restrictions are rejected.

Claimant's physician's stated lifting/carrying and standing restrictions were reasonably supported by medical records verifying that Claimant suffered multiple strokes and a degree of left arm and hand damage. Accepting Claimant's physician's stated restrictions to be accurate, Claimant is likely capable of sedentary employment, but not light employment.

Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (advanced age), education (high school with no direct entry into skilled employment which Claimant can perform), employment history (semi-skilled with no known 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];
- (2) evaluate Claimant's eligibility for 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 Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **2/17/2015**

Date Mailed: **2/17/2015**

CG / hw

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, 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 48909-8139

CC:

