

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],  
Claimant

Reg. No.: 2010-33585  
Issue No.: 2009/4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
June 7, 2010  
Macomb County DHS (12)

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 Clinton Township, Michigan on Monday, June 7, 2010. The Claimant appeared and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of new medical evidence. The records were forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On June 18, 2010, the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") benefit programs?

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 an application for public assistance seeking MA-P and SDA benefits on April 9, 2009.
2. On September 22, 2009, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 275-276)
3. The Department sent an Eligibility Notice to the Claimant informing her that she was found not disabled.
4. On April 21, 2010, the Department received the Claimant’s written Request for Hearing. (Exhibit 2)
5. On May 14, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) determined that the Claimant was not disabled finding the Claimant capable of performing past relevant work. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant’s alleged physical disabling impairment(s) are due to back pain, severe asthma, chest pain, coronary artery disease, hypertension, and obesity.
7. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 54 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’1” in height; and weighed 210 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with an employment history of a caregiver, cashier, and general laborer.

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”), formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (“BAM”), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (“BEM”), and the Bridges Reference Manual (“BRM”).

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 416.927

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 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) 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 is not ineligible for disability 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 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, the Claimant alleges physical disability on the basis of back pain, severe asthma, chest pain, coronary artery disease, hypertension, and obesity.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of increased chest pain. A stress test revealed significant stenosis on cardiac catheterization. The chest x-ray showed no acute pulmonary process. An x-ray revealed cardiomegaly with bilateral thoracic opacity. The Claimant underwent a coronary artery bypass graft times two of the left internal mammary artery and was discharged on the [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted status post incision and drainage. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the Claimant had coronary artery bypass graft performed with sternal wound debridement and sternal wire removal with wound VAC insertion. The Claimant remained intubated after surgery for two days. The Claimant developed extremity cellulites, positive for deep vein thrombosis. A muscle flap procedure was performed from which the Claimant progressed well. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a department ordered evaluation. The Pulmonary Function Studies revealed shortness of breath but normal lung function with no

marked improvement in FEV<sub>1</sub> after bronchodilator. The results of the Pulmonary Function Study revealed a Forced Vital Capacity (“FVC”) for 4 tests as 1.78, 2.21, 2.30, and 2.07 before bronchodilator. The Forced Expiratory Volume at 1 second (“FEV<sub>1</sub>”) for each test was 1.48, 1.96, 2.07, and 1.67. The results 10 minutes after the bronchodilator for the FVC were 1.51, 2.27, 2.05, and 2.27 with the FEV<sub>1</sub> at 1.28, 2.02, 1.83, and 2.04.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital’s emergency room with complaints of chest pain. After evaluation, which found the Claimant with acute chest pain with unstable angina and hypertensive emergency, the Claimant was admitted. A stress test found no evidence of active cardiac ischemia and her blood pressure was controlled with medication. On [REDACTED] the Claimant was discharged with the diagnoses of accelerated hypertension, chest pain, known atherosclerotic coronary artery disease/coronary artery bypass grafting in the past, hyperlipidemia, and obesity. The Claimant’s medication non-compliance due to insurance issues was also noted.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment for her blood pressure. The Claimant’s prescription medication was renewed.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant sought treatment for a cough and decrease in appetite.

On [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], the Claimant attended follow-up appointments.

Overall the Claimant was doing well.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the clinic with elevated blood pressure (160/90). The Claimant was instructed to reduce her sodium intake and increase her medication.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment for her blood pressure. The physical examination was unremarkable and her blood pressure was 120/80.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment regarding her blood pressure and right knee pain. The physical examination was unremarkable and her blood pressure was 127/75.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended an appointment for shortness of breath. Labs were ordered.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed by a nurse practitioner on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were coronary artery bypass graft, coronary artery disease (2008) abnormal blood sugar, and hypertension. The Claimant was in stable condition and was limited to lifting/carrying less than 10 pounds; standing and/or walking less than 2 hours during an 8 hour workday with sitting at less than 6 hours during this same time span; was able to perform repetitive actions with all extremities; and did not medically require an assistive device for ambulation. Symptoms of fatigue were self reported as were reports regarding difficulty in retaining information and anxiety in large crowds.

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 some medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical limitations on her 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 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 physical disabling impairments due to back pain, severe asthma, coronary artery disease, hypertension, and obesity.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal impairments), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system impairments), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular impairments) and 9.00 (endocrine impairments) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence. Ultimately, it is found that the Claimant's impairment(s) do not meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment thus she cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 3. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 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.*

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 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 Claimant's prior work history includes employment as a caregiver, cashier, and general laborer. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work is classified as unskilled, light work.

The Claimant testified that she can lift/carry approximately 10 pounds; can stand for 10 minutes; can walk short distances with a cane; can sit for approximately 1 to 1 ½ hours; has difficulty holding things with her right hand; and experiences difficulty when squatting and/or bending. The objective evidence established that the Claimant was in stable condition and was limited to lifting/carrying less than 10 pounds; standing and/or walking less than 2 hours during an 8 hour workday with sitting at less than 6 hours during this same time span; was able to

perform repetitive actions with all extremities; and did not medically require an assistive device for ambulation. 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 thus the fifth step in the sequential evaluation 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, a high school graduate, was 54 years old thus considered to be closely approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. 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).

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 as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). As noted above, sedentary work involves sitting and lifting no more than 10 pounds at time with occasional walking and standing to carry out the job duties. After review of the entire record and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.15, it is found that the Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program.

The State Disability Assistance (“SDA”) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code (“MAC R”) 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and BRM. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. BEM 261 Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program. BEM 261

In this case, there is insufficient evidence to support a finding that the Claimant’s impairment has disabled her under the SSI disability standards. Accordingly, it is found that the Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs.

It is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

*Colleen M. Mamelka*

---

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

Date Signed: 6/23/2010

Date Mailed: 6/23/2010

**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:

