

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-34917
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 21, 2010
Oakland County DHS (04)

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 conducted from Pontiac, Michigan on Monday, June 21, 2010. The Claimant appeared and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") benefit program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon 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 benefits on May 27, 2009.
2. On June 16, 2009, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") determined the Claimant was not disabled finding her capable of past work. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
3. The Department sent the Claimant an Eligibility Notice informing her that she was found not disabled.

4. On October 7, 2009, the Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing.
5. On May 25, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") determined that the Claimant was not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant's alleged physical disabling impairment(s) are due to a pinched nerve, leg pain, and incontinence, shortness of breath, chest pain, coronary artery disease, acid reflux, headaches, and dizziness.
7. The Claimant's alleged mental impairments are due to anxiety, depression, and obsessive compulsive disorder ("OCD").
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 41 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5'5" in height; and weighed 160 pounds.
9. The Claimant has a limited education and a work history as a general laborer.
10. The Claimant's impairment(s) have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12-months or longer.

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 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 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)

In addition to the above, when evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 20 CFR 416.920a(a) First, an individual's pertinent symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1) When a medically determinable mental

impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual's significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2) Functional limitation(s) is assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2) Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication, and other treatment and the effect on the overall degree of functionality is considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1) In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining an individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(3) The degree of limitation for the first three functional areas is rated by a five point scale: none, mild, moderate, marked, and extreme. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4) A four point scale (none, one or two, three, four or more) is used to rate the degree of limitation in the fourth functional area. *Id.* The last point on each scale represents a degree of limitation that is incompatible with the ability to do any gainful activity. *Id.*

After the degree of functional limitation is determined, the severity of the mental impairment is determined. 20 CFR 416.920a(d) If severe, a determination of whether the impairment meets or is the equivalent of a listed mental disorder is made. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(2) If the severe mental impairment does not meet (or equal) a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(3)

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 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 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 disability due to pinched nerve, leg pain, and incontinence, shortness of breath, chest pain, coronary artery disease, acid reflux, headaches, dizziness, depression, anxiety, and OCD. In support of her claim, some medical records documenting the Claimant's medication review were submitted.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant received emergent treatment for chest pain. The final diagnosis was acute chest pain.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent a successful angioplasty and stenting of the ostial left circumflex, and successful kissing balloon dilation of the ostial and CAD and left circumflex.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with chest pain. The Claimant had cardiac catheterization which revealed a 55% ejection fraction. The following day, the Claimant had triple bypass surgery without complication. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of right-sided pain. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of acute viral syndrome (resolved), atherosclerotic coronary occlusive hypertensive heart disease, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD").

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment post CABG x3. Chest x-rays found no active pulmonary disease with any significant change from the [REDACTED] study. The Claimant was in stable condition and her wound was healing satisfactorily.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a psychiatric evaluation. The Claimant's symptoms were characterized by crying spells, anxiety, lack of sleep, lack of appetite, isolating self, past suicidal thoughts, lack of energy, fatigue, lack of motivation, and not wanting to get out of bed. Conversely, the manic symptoms were characterized by sudden bursts of energy, obsessive cleaning, hypervocal speech, and racing thoughts. The Claimant was diagnosed with bipolar disorder (not otherwise specified) with a Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") of 40.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of acute chest pain. On [REDACTED], an EKG was performed which revealed sinus arrhythmia. On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent left heart catheterization, left internal mammary, saphenous vein graft inject x2, and left ventriculogram without complication. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnosis of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease and hypertensive heart disease.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment. The Claimant was diagnosed with Atherosclerotic heart disease status post bypass surgery with catheterization, chronic pain, hypertensive cardiovascular disease, and hyperlipidemia.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a psychiatric evaluation. The Claimant was diagnosed with severe major depressive disorder, recurrent without psychotic features. The GAF was 45.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of chest pain. The ejection fraction was 62 percent. The Claimant was treated and discharged back to the jail the [REDACTED]. The discharge diagnoses were coronary artery disease and chest pain.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was brought to a psychiatric facility with suicidal thoughts and bingeing on drugs and alcohol. The Claimant had three previous suicide attempts; two in her teens and one in her early twenties. The Claimant was assessed and diagnosed with major depressive disorder recurrent, moderate with a GAF of 35. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] to the hospital due to severe chest pain. The discharge diagnoses from the program were the same as her assessment. The GAF remained the same.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to the hospital after complaints of chest pain. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of acute coronary artery syndrome.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a Mental Status Evaluation. The Claimant was found to have low-average to average intelligence with poor concentration. The Claimant was diagnosed with major depressive disorder, recurrent without serious psychotic features, anxiety disorder, and poly-substance dependence.

The GAF was 45. The Claimant was found to be a poor candidate for the independent management of her benefits.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was coronary artery disease. The Claimant was limited to occasionally lifting/carrying of 25 pounds and was able to perform repetitive actions with her extremities.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of chest pain. The EKG and x-rays were unremarkable. The Claimant was treated for an upper respiratory infection.

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 and mental 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 and mental disabling impairments pinched nerve, leg pain, and incontinence, shortness of breath, chest pain, coronary artery disease, acid reflux, headaches, dizziness, depression, anxiety, and OCD.

The objective medical records establish that the Claimant has a history of poly-substance abuse. In consideration of the Claimant's other severe impairments as detailed above, it is found that the substance abuse is a contributing factor however the Claimant's functional limitations would remain independent of the abuse. 20 CFR 416.935

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective findings. Ultimately, it is found that although the Claimant may meet a listing, the objective evidence does not support a finding of disabled, or not disabled, based on the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment. 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 consists of employment at a fast food restaurant, residential and commercial cleaning, as a cashier, and at an automotive plant working on the assembly line. 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 5 pounds; can walk short distances, can sit for about 30 minutes; gets dizzy when standing for extended periods, and has some difficulty squatting and/or bending. The objective evidence limits the Claimant to the occasionally lifting/carrying of 25 pounds with the ability to perform repetitive actions with her extremities. The Claimant's mental limitations were more restrictive with a GAF ranging between 35 and 40. 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 was 41 years old thus considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant 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). Where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments that results in both strength limitations and non-exertional limitations, the rules in Subpart P are considered in determining whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on the strength limitations alone, and if not, the rule(s) reflecting the individual's maximum residual strength capabilities, age, education, and work experience, provide the framework for consideration of how much an individual's work capability is further diminished in terms of any type of jobs that would contradict the nonexertional limitations. Full consideration must be given to all relevant facts of a case in accordance with the definitions of each factor to provide adjudicative weight for each factor.

In the record presented, the total impact caused by the combination of medical problems suffered by the Claimant must be considered to include subjective complaints of severe pain. Pain is a non-exertional impairment. *Cline v Sullivan*, 939 F2d 560, 565 (CA 8, 1991) In applying the two-prong inquiry announced in *Duncan v Secretary of Health & Human Services*, 801 F2d 847 (CA6, 1986) it is found that the objective medical evidence establishes an underlying medical condition (coronary artery disease, CABG x3, hypertensive heart disease, incontinence) can reasonably be expected to produce the alleged disabling pain. *Id.* at 853. In this case, the Claimant's chest pain and mental limitations are well documented. In light of the foregoing, it is found that the combination of the Claimant's physical and mental impairments have a major affect on her ability to perform basic work activities such that the Claimant is unable to meet the physical and mental demands necessary to perform even sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record, it is found that the Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the May 27, 2009 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and her representative of the determination in accordance with department policy.

- 3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.
- 4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in August 2011 in accordance with department policy.

Colleen M. Mamelka

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

Date Signed: 07/09/2010

Date Mailed: 07/09/2010

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 Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing 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:

