

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2011-2752  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 14, 2011  
DHS County: Wayne (82-82)

**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 Monday, March 14, 2011. The Claimant appeared and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department").

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received, reviewed, and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On May 20, 2011, SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

**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 an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits on July 13, 2010.
2. On July 23, 2010, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 6, 7)

3. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On October 14, 2010, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit 2)
5. On November 8, 2010, and May 20, 2011, SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 5)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to leg pain, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD"), emphysema, collapsed lung, lung mass, chest pain, and high blood pressure.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to anxiety and depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 46 years old with a [REDACTED], birth date; was 5'6" in height; and weighed 155 pounds.
9. The Claimant has a limited education with an employment history of working at a fast food restaurant as a cook and cashier.

### **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, 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 (e.g., 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 to 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 3 to Step 4. 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 4 and 5. 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 and, 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 leg pain, COPD, emphysema, collapsed lung, lung mass, chest pain, high blood pressure, anxiety, and depression.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative psychiatric evaluation. The Claimant's depression was improving with medication. The Psychiatrist opined that the Claimant is able to work provided her depression is controlled and her physical condition permits. The diagnoses were major depression, recurrent type, in partial remission with a Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") of 55. The prognosis was guarded.

On this same date, [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative physical examination. The diagnoses were history of bullous emphysema with remote episodes of spontaneous pneumothorax, history of Graves' disease status post treatment and on thyroid replacement therapy, history of hypertension, and history of depression (currently in near remission). The Internist opined that the Claimant was able to engage in employment.

On April 16, 2010, the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of possible collapsed lung. A chest x-ray revealed a complete left-sided pneumothorax. A chest tube was inserted and the follow-up x-ray showed a nearly complete re-expansion. A CT scan documented a mass on the right lung which did not require a biopsy. The Claimant was discharged on April 21<sup>st</sup> with the diagnoses of pneumothorax left lung with chest tube insertion, COPD with acute exacerbation, acute bronchitis, history of radioactive iodine treatment for hyperthyroidism, nodular density right middle lobe (most likely calcified granuloma), and cystic bullae.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative physical examination. The current diagnoses were hypertension, mild refraction error, history of asthma and COPD, and non-specific bilateral knee pain. The Claimant's condition was marked stable and deteriorating on the Medical Examination Report. A Pulmonary Function Test ("PFT") revealed a Forced Vital Capacity ("FVC") for 3 tests as 2.73, 2.51, and 1.89 before bronchodilator. The Forced Expiratory Volume at 1 second ("FEV<sub>1</sub>") for each test was 1.44, 1.36, and 1.89. The results 10 minutes after the bronchodilator for the FVC were 3.66, 3.57, and 3.53 with the FEV<sub>1</sub> at 2.21, 2.09, and 2.12. The Claimant was found to have severe obstruction with a lung age of 77.

On this same date, the Claimant attended a consultative psychiatric evaluation. The Claimant did not have any memory problems and was able to get along with others. Further, she is able to understand, remember, and follow directions. The diagnosis was dysthymic disorder in partial remission. The GAF was 60 and her prognosis was guarded. The Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment was also completed.

The Claimant was not significantly limited in 9 of the 20 factors and showed no evidence of limitation in the remaining 11 factors.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The Claimant was in stable condition and found able to frequently lift/carry 25 pounds with the occasional lifting/carrying of 50 pounds or more; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours during an 8-hour work day; and able to perform repetitive actions with her extremities.

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 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 disabling impairments due to leg pain, COPD, emphysema, collapsed lung, lung mass, chest pain, high blood pressure, anxiety, and depression.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence. There was evidence of bilateral knee pain; however, the records do not meet Listing 1.02. The Claimant's pulmonary impairment is severe. However, the results from the PFT were above 1.35 for the FEV and above 1.55 for the FVC; thus, a listing within 3.00 is not met. Similarly, the objective findings did not meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment within 4.00 and/or 12.00. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 3. 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 are 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 additional 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, e.g., 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 to the demands of past relevant work must be made. *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 (e.g., 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 work history includes employment history of working at a fast food restaurant as a cook and cashier. 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 about 30 pounds with frequently lifting/carrying of 10 pounds; walk less than one block; stand about 20 minutes; sit all day; and has difficulty bending and/or squatting. The objective medical evidence found the Claimant's condition was stable and she was able to frequently lift/carry 25 pounds with the occasional lifting/carrying of over 50 pounds; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours in an 8-hour work day; and able to perform repetitive actions with her extremities. Regarding the 2-hour stand/walk limitation, the Internist noted that it was subjective. Mentally, the evidence showed very little limitations. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit an individual's 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 and medical records, it is found that the Claimant is able to return to past relevant work doing unskilled light work. Accordingly, the Claimant is found not disabled at Step 4 with no further analysis required.




**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Colleen M. Mamelka**  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 3, 2011

Date Mailed: June 8, 2011

**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/pf

cc:

