



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: September 19, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 18-008063
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice Spodarek

HEARING DECISION

Following Petitioner'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. After due notice, an administrative hearing was held on September 11, 2018, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) initiating a conference call from Lansing, Michigan. All other parties appeared in-person at the county Department of Health and Human Services (Department or Respondent). Petitioner appeared and testified. [REDACTED] parent, appeared as a witness on behalf of Petitioner. The Respondent was represented by Sheryl Latinen, ES worker.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 [REDACTED] Petitioner applied for SDA, a cash benefit program based on disability, with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.
2. Petitioner is a beneficiary of the Medicaid program and receives medical benefits under the Healthy Michigan Plan (HMP).
3. On August 2, 2018, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied.
4. On August 2, 2018, the Department issued notice, and on August 10, 2018, Petitioner filed a timely hearing request.

5. Petitioner has an SSI application pending with the Social Security Administration, with a [REDACTED] application date, and an alleged onset date of disability of March 28, 2018. Petitioner has applied for SSI multiple times, and to date, has never been approved.
6. As of the date of application, Petitioner was a 40-year-old, standing 5' 5" tall and weighing 150 pounds. Petitioner's Body Mass Index (BMI) is 25, classifying Petitioner as 'overweight' under the BMI.
7. Petitioner testified to no alcohol/drug abuse problems. Petitioner stated that she has a medical marijuana card and a cocaine history of abuse.
8. Petitioner smokes. Petitioner has a nicotine addiction.
9. Petitioner has a driver's license but has been told not to drive until her seizures are controlled.
10. Petitioner has a high school diploma level of education.
11. Petitioner testified that she has no income. Petitioner lives with her parents who pay for Petitioner's lifestyle needs.
12. Petitioner is not currently working. Petitioner's work history on page 12 which Petitioner completed only lists two jobs in her entire life, in 2017 and 2018 doing maintenance and direct care. Petitioner testified that she also worked as a nanny for three years in Tennessee, and in stocking shelves in a grocery store through an employment agency. Petitioner testified that she worked about "50% of the time" during the last 15 years.
13. Petitioner alleges disability based on physical/mental impairments as listed on page 10--"heart, neurological, mental, black out, fatigue." Petitioner testified that her primary impairment is PNES--psychogenic non-epileptic seizures. MRT reports that Petitioner is not on medication for her seizures.
14. Petitioner did not present any additional medical evidence other than those collected and contained in Respondent's evidentiary packet.
15. The MRT findings and conclusions are adopted and incorporated by reference herein.
16. Petitioner did not present evidence of severe impairments that interfere with the ability to engage with activities of daily living (ADL).
17. Petitioner testified to the ability to fix food, do light housework, and laundry.
18. Petitioner testified that she does not need any assistance with her bathroom and grooming needs.

19. Petitioner did not present evidence of exercising.
20. Petitioner could not identify any exhibits in the medical packet as medical evidence to support a claim of disability due to the inability to work.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Health and 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 Department of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

For the SDA program, the Department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1.

As to the disability assessment, the State of Michigan follows the general guidelines with regards to the MA program to show SDA statutory disability with one major exception: duration for the SDA program is due to a disability which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 90 days. Unless otherwise noted below, the MA regulations, policy and law are followed.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

Disability" is:

...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.

Federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required.

These steps are:

1. If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b). Monthly income limit for 2017 presumptive SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,170.00. If the applicant is not engaged SGA or presumptive SGA, the analysis continues to Step 2.
2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.909(c).
3. Does the impairment appear on a special Listing of Impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment that meets the duration requirement? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. Sections 200.00-204.00(f).
5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do

other work. If yes, the analysis ends, and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application, Petitioner has the burden of proof:

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required to establish statutory disability. Statements alone made by the applicant and/or the applicant's physician are not sufficient. Rather, regulations require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate an any applicant's or physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

...Medical reports should include:

- (1) Medical history;
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results. of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as sure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms) ... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...The medical evidence...must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.
- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques.
- (c) **Psychiatric signs** are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological

abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated;

- (d) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

- (1) The nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question;
- (2) The probable duration of your impairment; and
- (3) Your residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques.... 20 CFR 416.927.

It is noted that Congress removed obesity from the Listing of Impairments shortly after the removal of drug and alcohol addiction. This removal reflects the view of a strong behavioral component. In addition, these behavioral driven impairments are not considered to fall within the category of diseases under consideration of statutory disability under the social security disability program.

Applying the sequential analysis herein, Petitioner is not ineligible at the first step as Petitioner is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). This second step is a de minimis standard. Ruling any ambiguities in Petitioner's favor, this Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that Petitioner meets both. The analysis continues.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meet or equals one of the Listings of Impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Petitioner does not. The analysis continues.

The fourth step of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by Petitioner in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

Petitioner testified that her primary alleged impairment, PNES, is a psychological and not a neurological diagnosis. That is, Petitioner clarified, it is a mental impairment. As such, at Step 4 of the analysis, there is insufficient evidence to support that this diagnosis rises to statutory disability. Without such, the analysis stops at Step 4 and a finding of not disabled must be found.

In the alternative, should the analysis continue at Step 5, this step of the analysis applies the biographical data of the applicant to the Medical Vocational Grids to determine the residual functional capacity of the applicant to do other work. 20 CFR 416.920(g). A careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record requires a consistent finding as the MRT in this case that the medical vocational grids require a finding of not disabled pursuant to the light work medical vocational grid rules. A review of those rules would indicate that Petitioner is classified as a 'Younger Individual' at age 40, with the result according to Rule 202.20 that Petitioner is not found to be disabled.

It is noted that Petitioner's smoking is the "individual responsibility" types of behavior reflected in the *SIAS v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 861 F2d 475 (6th Cir 1988) decision. In *Sias*, the Petitioner was an obese, heavy smoker who argued that he could not afford support hose prescribed by his doctor for acute thrombophlebitis. The doctor also advised Petitioner to reduce his body weight. The court said in part:

...The Petitioner's style of life is not consistent with that of a person who suffers from intractable pain or who believes his condition could develop into a very quick life-threatening situation. The Petitioner admitted to the ALJ he was at least 40 pounds overweight; ignoring the instructions of his physician, he has not lost weight.

...The Social Security Act did not repeal the principle of individual responsibility. Each of us faces myriads of choices in life, and the choices we make, whether we like it or not, have consequences. If the Petitioner in this case chooses to drive himself to an early grave, that is his privilege—but if he is not truly disabled, he has no right to require those who pay Social Security taxes to help underwrite the cost of his ride. *Sias*, supra, p. 481.

In *Sias*, the Petitioner was found not truly disabled because the secretary disregarded the consequences resulting from the Petitioner's unhealthy habits and lifestyles—including the failure to stop smoking. *Awad v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 734 F2d 288, 289-90 (6th Cir 1984).

Petitioner does have medically determinable impairments that would reasonably cause some of the alleged symptoms. However, the intensity, persistence, or alleged functionally limiting effects of pain or other symptoms are not altogether substantiated by objective medical evidence. Petitioner's conditions result in some limitations on her ability to perform work related activities. However, the evidence does not support that Petitioner's conditions are severe enough to keep her from working. While Petitioner may not be able to return to past relevant work, based on the evidence of record, the medical vocational grid requires a finding that Petitioner can adjust to other work.

It is noted that Petitioner received the entire copy of the medical exhibits prior to the administrative hearing. Petitioner failed to indicate which exhibits supported a claim that there is substantial and credible medical evidence to show that Petitioner cannot work. Petitioner's complaint of symptoms is not recognized as statutorily disabling absent corroboration requirements pursuant to 20 CFR 416.929. Claimant further failed to meet the burden of proof required by 20 CFR 416.912(c) and further as required by the sufficiency requirements found at 20 CFR 416.913(b), and .913(d), and .913(e).

Petitioner's complaints and descriptions of symptoms are not consistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence pursuant to the requirements found at 20 CFR 416.913(b), .913(d), and .913(e).


Based on the record established in this matter and the applicable law, and for the reasons set forth herein, statutory disability is not shown, and thus, the Department's denial must be upheld.

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 Petitioner not disabled for purposes of the SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

JS/hb



Janice Spodarek
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; 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

DHHS

Kathleen Verdoni
411 East Genesee
PO Box 5070
Saginaw, MI 48607

Saginaw County, DHHS

BSC2 via electronic mail

L. Karadsheh via electronic mail

Petitioner

[REDACTED]