

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████,

Claimant

Reg. No: 2009-17141

Issue No: 2009

Case No: ██████████

Load No: ██████████

Hearing Date:

May 27, 2009

Wayne County DHS (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held in Detroit, Michigan on April 29, 2009. The Claimant appeared by telephone and testified. The Claimant was represented by ██████████ of ██████████, Inc. ██████████ appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") 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. The Claimant submitted a public assistance application seeking MA-P retroactive for March 2008 on June 13, 2008. (Exhibit 2E, 2F)

2. On September 17, 2008, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) deferred the disability determination requesting the Department schedule an internal medicine examination for the Claimant. (Exhibit 1, p. 1)
3. On October 8, 2008, the Claimant attended the Department ordered evaluation. (Exhibit 1, pp. 3 – 6)
4. On October 31, 2008, the MRT determined the Claimant was not disabled finding him capable of performing other work for MA-P purposes. (Exhibit 1, p. 1, 2)
5. On November 17, 2008, the Department sent the Claimant and his authorized representative, an eligibility notice informing the Claimant he was found not disabled. (Exhibit 1, p. 1a)
6. On February 12, 2009, the Department received the Claimant’s written request for hearing protesting the disability determination. (Exhibit 2A)
7. On April 21, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 3, pp. 1, 2)
8. On May 15, 2009, the Social Security Administration found the Claimant disabled effective his date of application, January 22, 2009. (Exhibit 4)
9. The Claimant’s alleged physical disabling impairments are due shortness of breath, congestive heart failure, an enlarged heart (cardiomegaly), and hypertension.
10. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairments.
11. The Claimant’s impairment(s) has lasted, or is expected to last, continuously for a period of at least 12 months.
12. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 55 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 6’ tall and weighed 165 pounds.

13. The Claimant completed through the 7<sup>th</sup> grade and has a work history of providing general labor services.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (“MA”) program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services (“DHS”), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (“PAM”), the Program Eligibility Manual (“PEM”), and the Program Reference Manual (“PRM”).

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 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) 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 416.929(a)

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 applicants 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 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) Additionally, 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) In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity and last worked in 2007. The Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of 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 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(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 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c) Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(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 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, the Claimant alleges disability on the basis of an enlarged heart, shortness of breath, congestive heart failure, and hypertension.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to the hospital after complaints of progressive shortness of breath and cough. After examination the Claimant was found to have severe mitral regurgitation. The Claimant was transferred to the cardiovascular intensive care unit with an ejection fraction ("EF") of 15%. The Claimant underwent a cardiac catheterization on [REDACTED]. The Claimant's final diagnoses were congestive heart failure, severe cardiomyopathy, severe mitral regurgitation, pre-op renal insufficiency and elevated liver enzymes.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was transferred from one hospital to another post mitral valve repair and Maze procedure with elevated troponin, after complaints of progressive shortness of breath, chest pain, and swelling of the lower extremities. The physical examination documented irregular heart rhythm with crackles/wheezing of the right lung. Chest x-rays documented cardiomegaly and right base pleural effusion. The shortness of breath and chest

pain were found secondary to congestive heart failure. The 2D-echocardiogram documented an initial EF of 20% prior to the mitral valve repair. Subsequent to the procedure the Claimant's EF was 40 – 45%. Abnormal liver function was noted and the Claimant's hypertension was noted as controlled. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD") secondary to smoking was also documented. Further, mitral valve regurgitation was also diagnosed. The EKG revealed atrial fibrillation, left ventricular hypertrophy and ST and T-wave abnormalities. A consultative examination found the Claimant with a dilated cardiomyopathy and severe mitral regurgitation. Another episode of congestive heart failure, post surgical intervention was documented. The Claimant's white blood cell count was elevated and the Claimant was found with a rare staph aureus.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a Department ordered evaluation with an internist. The Claimant compliance with prescribed treatment was noted. Ultimately, the Claimant was diagnosed with uncontrolled hypertension however his angioplasty ring for his mitral valve was documented as working well. In addition, an upper respiratory infection was diagnosed.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented objective medical evidence establishing that he does have some physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. Accordingly, 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 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 Claimant has alleged disabling physical impairments due, in part, to an enlarged heart, shortness of breath, hypertension. Appendix I, Listing of Impairments, discusses the analysis and criteria necessary to support a finding of a listed impairment.

Listing 3.00 defines respiratory system impairments. Respiratory disorders, along with any associated impairment(s), must be established by medical evidence sufficient enough in detail to evaluate the severity of the impairment. 3.00A Evidence must be provided in sufficient detail to permit an independent reviewer to evaluate the severity of the impairment. *Id.* A major criteria for determining the level of respiratory impairments that are episodic in nature, is the frequency and intensity of episodes that occur despite prescribed treatment. 3.00C Medical evidence must include information documenting adherence to a prescribed regimen of treatment as well as a description of physical signs. *Id.*

In this case, the record is insufficient to meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment within 3.00 thus the Claimant cannot be found disabled under this listing.

The Claimant also asserts physical disabling impairment(s) due to chronic heart failure, shortness of breath, and hypertension. Listing 4.00 defines cardiovascular impairment in part, as follows:

- . . . any disorder that affects the proper functioning of the heart or the circulatory system (that is, arteries, veins, capillaries, and the lymphatic drainage). The disorder can be congenital or acquired. Cardiovascular impairment results from one or more of four consequences of heart disease:
- (i) Chronic heart failure or ventricular dysfunction.
  - (ii) Discomfort or pain due to myocardial ischemia, with or without necrosis of heart muscle.

- (iii) Syncope, or near syncope, due to inadequate cerebral perfusion from any cardiac cause, such as obstruction of flow or disturbance in rhythm or conduction resulting in inadequate cardiac output.
- (iv) Central cyanosis due to right-to-left shunt, reduced oxygen concentration in the arterial blood, or pulmonary vascular disease.

An uncontrolled impairment means one that does not adequately respond to the standard prescribed medical treatment. 4.00A3f In a situation where an individual has not received ongoing treatment or have an ongoing relationship with the medical community despite the existence of a severe impairment, the disability evaluation is based on the current objective medical evidence. 4.00B3a If an individual does not receive treatment, an impairment that meets the criteria of a listing cannot be established. *Id.* Hypertension (high blood pressure) generally causes disability through its effect on other body systems and is evaluated by reference to specific body system(s) affected (heart, brain, kidneys, or eyes). 4.00H1 Hypertension, to include malignant hypertension, is not a listed impairment under 4.00 thus the effect on the Claimant's other body systems were evaluated by reference to specific body parts. Cardiomyopathy is evaluated under 4.02, 4.04, 4.05 or 11.04 depending on its effects on the individual. 4.00H3

Listing 4.02 discusses chronic heart failure. To meet the required level of severity while on a regimen of prescribed treatment the following must be satisfied:

- A. Medically documented presence of one of the following:
  - 1. Systolic failure (see 4.00D1a(i)), with left ventricular end diastolic dimensions greater than 6.0 cm or ejection fraction of 30 percent or less during a period of stability (not during an episode of acute heart failure); or
  - 2. Diastolic failure (see 4.00D1a(ii)), with left ventricular posterior wall plus septal thickness totaling 2.5 cm or greater on imaging, with an enlarged left atrium greater than or equal to 4.5 cm, with normal or elevated ejection fraction during a period of stability (not during an episode of acute heart failure);

**AND**

B. Resulting in one of the following:

1. Persistent symptoms of heart failure which very seriously limit the ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities of daily living in an individual for whom an MC, preferably one experienced in the care of patients with cardiovascular disease, has concluded that the performance of an exercise test would present a significant risk to the individual; or
2. Three or more separate episodes of acute congestive heart failure within a consecutive 12-month period (see 4.00A3e), with evidence of fluid retention (see 4.00D2b (ii)) from clinical and imaging assessments at the time of the episodes, requiring acute extended physician intervention such as hospitalization or emergency room treatment for 12 hours or more, separated by periods of stabilization (see 4.00D4c); or
3. Inability to perform on an exercise tolerance test at a workload equivalent to 5 METs or less due to:
  - a. Dyspnea, fatigue, palpitations, or chest discomfort; or
  - b. Three or more consecutive premature ventricular contractions (ventricular tachycardia), or increasing frequency of ventricular ectopy with at least 6 premature ventricular contractions per minute; or
  - c. Decrease of 10 mm Hg or more in systolic pressure below the baseline systolic blood pressure or the preceding systolic pressure measured during exercise (see 4.00D4d) due to left ventricular dysfunction, despite an increase in workload; or
  - d. Signs attributable to inadequate cerebral perfusion, such as ataxic gait or mental confusion.

In the record presented, the Claimant was diagnosed with cardiomegaly [enlargement of the heart], congestive heart failure, and hypertension. The Claimant's medical record does not support a finding that the Claimant's physical impairment(s) meet or equal the intent or severity requirement of a listed impairment, or equivalent thereof, as detailed above. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iii) According to the medical evidence alone, the Claimant cannot be found to be disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance program within Listing 4.00.

Listing 5.00 discusses adult digestive system impairments. Disorders of the digestive system include gastrointestinal hemorrhage, hepatic (liver) dysfunction, inflammatory bowel disease, short bowel syndrome, and malnutrition. 5.00A Medical documentation necessary to meet the listing must record the severity and duration of the impairment. 5.00B The severity and duration of the impairment is considered within the context of the prescribed treatment. 5.00C1 Side effects of prescribed treatment is also evaluated. 5.00C2, 3

In this case, the objective medical records document elevated liver enzymes and pre-op renal insufficiency. These same records however are insufficient to meet the intent or severity of a listed impairment within 5.00. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibility under Step 4 is considered. 20 CFR 416.905(a)

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) 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.

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.*

Over the past 15 years, the Claimant worked as a general laborer whose primary responsibilities included lifting up to 100 pounds with a good deal of walking, standing, pushing

and pulling. Given these facts, the Claimant's past work history is classified as unskilled, heavy work.

The Claimant testified that he can lift/carry approximately 10 pounds; can sit for long periods of time; can stand for 15-20 minutes; and experiences difficulty bending and squatting. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. 20 CFR 416.920 In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is not able to return to past relevant work as a general laborer therefore the fifth-step in the sequential evaluation process is required.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual'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, the Claimant was 55 years old thus considered to be of advanced age for MA-P purposes and has a limited education. Disability is found disabled 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

adversity of functional restrictions to sedentary work at advanced age (55 and over) for individuals with no relevant past work or who can no longer perform vocationally relevant past work and have no transferable skills, warrants a finding of disabled in the absence of the rare situation where the individual has recently completed education which provides a basis for direct entry into skilled sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.968(d)(4)

In the record presented, the Claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to meet at least the physical and mental demands required to perform sedentary work. The Claimant, with a limited education is of advanced age. After review of the entire record and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II) as a guide, specifically Rule 201.01, it is found that the Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA-P program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant is disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance program.

It is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED
2. The Department shall initiate review of the June 13, 2008 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his representative of the determination.
3. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for any lost benefits he was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.

4. In light of the SSA favorable determination, a review date is not necessary.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen M. Mamelka  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 06/02/09

Date Mailed: 06/02/09

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to the Circuit within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

CMM/jlg

cc:

