

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2014-31535
Issue No(s): 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 23, 2014
County: Van Buren

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 July 23, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] the Claimant, and [REDACTED], Authorized Hearing Representative. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], General Services Program Manager.

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 and reviewed.

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 October 30, 2013, Claimant applied for Medicaid (MA-P) and retroactive MA-P.
2. On December 19, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) found Claimant not disabled.
3. On December 26, 2013, the Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On March 10, 2014, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.
5. On May 15, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant not disabled.

6. Claimant alleged disabling impairments including: diabetes with complications including toe amputations and neuropathy; back pain; arthritis; asthma; and depression.
7. At the time of hearing, Claimant was 55 years old with an [REDACTED], birth date; was 5'10.5" in height; and weighed 260 pounds.
8. Claimant completed the 7th grade as well as vocational school programs for trade plumber and CDL.
9. At the time of hearing, Claimant had a current CDL Class A license.
10. Claimant has a work history including truck driving and heavy equipment operator.
11. 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: diabetes with complications including toe amputations and neuropathy; back pain; arthritis; asthma; and depression. While some older medical records were submitted and have been reviewed, the focus of this analysis will be on the more recent medical evidence.

Claimant was hospitalized October 15, 2013 through November 1, 2013, for osteomyelitis, with additional problems including diabetic foot ulcer, sepsis, diabetes, hypertension, anemia, hyponatremia, leukocytosis, right foot pain, peripheral neuropathy, depression, acute kidney injury, hematemesis, hypoxia, acute respiratory failure with hypercapnia, neck abscess and history of noncompliance with medical treatment. The records indicate acute and chronic osteomyelitis was found on biopsy of the right foot. Prior partial amputations were noted in the records, a partial amputation of the right great toe and a September 2013 amputation of the left great toe. On October 18, 2013, Claimant underwent a partial foot amputation of the remainder of the right great toe as well as the 2nd toe. Claimant also underwent incision and drainage of the neck abscess during this hospitalization.

Claimant was referred for treatment with the wound and burn clinic in December 2013 for diabetes with complication and chronic osteomyelitis of ankle and foot. The December 2013, records, in part, indicate a non-healing foot ulcer for two years. The right great toe osteomyelitis history includes a partial amputation four years prior and

the October 2013 amputation of the remainder of the right great toe as well as the 2nd toe. In November 2013, sutures were removed, but the wound dehisced. Claimant's diabetes was noted to be not well managed in the treatment records. Claimant has had ongoing treatment with the wound clinic for the non-healing right foot surgical wound through October 2014, but this has not been continuous. For example, a September 2014 record indicates Claimant was last seen in May 2014. While noncompliance is noted throughout the treatment records, some of these issues may relate to the noted pending Medicaid status and at times not having medication for diabetes control or pain. However, Claimant was also repeatedly offered assistance with finding doctors. Other non-compliance issues included with not complying with instructions regarding dressing care. It was also noted that during a prolonged time Claimant did not return to the wound clinic, he was cutting off the callus himself with a pocket knife. Additionally, an October 2014 record, in part, indicates Claimant reported he was walking on his foot quite a bit. Lastly, it is noted that, a March 14, 2014 record, in part, indicated Claimant was spending a lot of time driving his truck.

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 he 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 diabetic foot ulcer, osteomyelitis, diabetes, hypertension, anemia, peripheral neuropathy, depression, acute kidney injury, neck abscess and history of noncompliance with medical treatment.

Based on the objective medical evidence, considered listings included: 1.00 Musculoskeletal System and 9.00 Endocrine 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 diabetic foot ulcer, osteomyelitis, diabetes, hypertension, anemia, peripheral neuropathy, depression, acute kidney injury, neck abscess and history of

noncompliance with medical treatment. Claimant's testimony indicated he can walk 15 minutes, stand up to 10 minutes, sit 30 minutes, and lift 10 pounds. Claimant testified he does not use any assistive devices. Claimant's testimony regarding his limitations is not fully supported by the medical evidence and found only partially credible. The treatment records indicate multiple issues with medical noncompliance, not all of which would be due to a lack of insurance. Examples include the March 2014 record noting Claimant reported he was driving his truck quite a bit and the October 2014 record noting Claimant reported he was walking on his foot quite a bit. The After review of the entire record it is found, at this point, that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform medium work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(c) on a sustained basis.

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 including truck driving and heavy equipment operator. As described by Claimant, the truck driving was full time for about 12 years and more recently turned part time. Claimant used to have to lift up to 50 pounds with unloading the truck. Otherwise, most of the work day would be spent sitting. Claimant's past truck driving work, as described, was mostly sitting with lifting up to medium exertional level weights. In light of the entire record and Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that Claimant is able to perform his past relevant work. Accordingly, the Claimant is found not disabled at Step 4.

However, even if the analysis were to continue, Claimant would also be found disabled at the next Step.

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 55 years old and, thus, considered to be advanced age for MA-P purposes. Claimant completed the 7th grade and vocational school programs for trade plumber and CDL, with a current CDL Class A as of the time of the hearing. Skills from the past work would not be transferable to other types of work. 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 diabetic foot ulcer, osteomyelitis, diabetes, hypertension, anemia, peripheral neuropathy, depression, acute kidney injury, neck abscess and history of noncompliance with medical treatment. As noted above, Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform medium work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(c) on a sustained basis.

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 203.12, Claimant is found not disabled at Step 5.

It is also noted that even if the Claimant had been found disabled under the 5 Step analysis, Claimant's failure to follow prescribed treatment would then have to be considered. SSR 82-59.

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 benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.



Colleen Lack
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director
Michigan Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 23, 2015

Date Mailed: January 23, 2015

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:

