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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2011-43035 Issue No.: 2009 Case No.: Hearing Date: November 3, 2011 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 held in Pontiac, Michigan on T hursday, November 3, 2011. The Claimant appeared and testified. The Claimant was represented by appeared on behalf of the Department

of Human Services ("Department").

ISSUE

Whether the Department proper ly 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 t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. The Claimant submitt ed an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits on December 17, 2010.
- 2. On May 3, 2011, the Medical Review Te am ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
- 3. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
- 4. On May 18, 2011, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit 2)

- 5. On August 17, 2011, the State Hear ing Review Team ("SHRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
- 6. The Claim ant alleged physical dis abling impairments due to decreased lung capacity after the removal of a tumor in the left lung, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD"), high blood pressure, and congestive heart failure.
- 7. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment(s).
- 8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was years old with a birth date; was 5'8" in height; and weighed 305 pounds.
- 9. The Claimant has the equivalent of a high school education and an employment history working as a secretary and office assistant.
- 10. The Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance 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, formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridge s Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridges Elig ibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Tables ("RFT").

Disability is defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental im pairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expect ed 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 esta blish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinica l/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescri bed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related ac tivities o r ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CRF 413.913. An individual's subjective pain com plaints ar e not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disab ility. 20 CF R 416.908; 2 0 CFR 4 16.929(a). Similarly, conclusor v 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, t he 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 nt 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 ext ent of his or her function on al 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 fivestep analysis requires the trier of fact to cons ider an individual's current work activit y; 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 det ermine whether an individual c an perform past relev ant work; and residual functional I capacity along with vocational factors (i .e. age, education, and work experienc e) 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 indi vidual'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 f unctional capacity is the most an indiv idual can do d espite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CF R 945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluat ed at both steps four and five. 20 CF R 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an i ndividual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individ ual h as 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 i ndividual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 4 16.912(a). An impair ment or combination of impairments is n ot severe if it does not signific antly limit an i ndividual's physical or m ental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The in dividual has the resp onsibility 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 general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 41 6.912(a). An impair ment or combination of impairments is not severe if i t does not signific antly limit an in dividual's physica I or mental ability to do basic wor k activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). As outlined abov e, the first step looks at the indivi dual's current work activity. An indiv idual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the i ndividual is working and the work is a

substantial, gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i). The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and an y other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CF R 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

In the record presented, the Claimant testified that she is currently working part-time as a secretary and that her mont hly gross earnings are under \$1,000.00. Employment verifications establish that at least th rough the Claimant was working two part-time jobs which would put her over the substantial gainful activity ("SGA") level established by Social Security Administration. As discussed during the hearing, if the Claimant's gross earnings are over \$1,000.00/month, she cannot be found disabled. In light of the conflicting evidence (working one job versus two) and in consideration of the Claimant's testimony, the Claimant will not be found ineligible at Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impa irment(s) is considered under St ep 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence et o substantiate the alleged disa bling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purpos es, 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 signific antly limits an in dividual'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 walk ing, 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.
- ld.

The second step allows for dismissal of a di sability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowe n,* 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may

still be employed as an admin istrative 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 qu alifies 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 di sability due to decreased lung capacity after the removal of a tumor in the left lung, COPD, high blood pr essure, and congestiv e heart failure.

On the Claimant presented to the hos pital with complaints of shortness of breath. Chest x-rays found catheter placement, le basilar atelectasis, and cardiomegaly. The Claimant was discharged on the basilar atelectasis, and with the diagnos es of congestive heart failure, mitral valve regure gitation, hypertens ion, cardio myopathy, pulmonary hypertension, acute respiratory failure, diabetes mellitus, hypo thyroidism, obstructive sleep apnea, and morbid obesity.

On **Construction** the Claimant attended a follow-up appoint ment. The diagnoses were c ongestive heart failur e di astolic with s evere mitral regurgitation (angiographically nor mal coronary arteries), hypertension, pulmonary hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hypothyroidism, obstructive sleep apnea, and obesity. The Claimant was found able to return to work, noti ng if unsuccessful, she would be deemed permanently and totally disabled.

On **Claimant** 2011, the Medica I Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The phys ical examination was normal with the exception of shortness of breath. The Claimant was in stable condition and found able to occasionally lift/carry 20 pounds, stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8-hour workday, and able to perform repetitive actions with her extremities. The Claimant did not require an assistive device for ambulation.

As previously noted, the Claim ant bears t he burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to s ubstantiate the alleged disabling im pairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presen ted some objective medical evidence establishing that she does have physic al limitations on her abilit y to perform basic work activities. That being stated, the Claim ant is currently working, at I east on a part-time basis. In addition, the durational requir ement has not been met. Ultim ately, in light of the *de minimus* standard, the Claimant's eligibility at Step 3 will be considered.

In the third step of the seque ntial analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment, or co mbination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. The Cla imant asserts disabling

impairments due to decreased lung capacity after the removal of a tumor in the left lung, COPD, high blood pressure, and congestive heart failure.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal s ystem), Li sting 3.00 (respirator y system), and Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5. 00 (digestive system), and Listing 9.00 (endocrine system) were cons idered in light of the objective medical evidenc e. Ultimately, it is found that the Claimant suffers from serious medical conditions: however, the Claimant's impairm ents do not meet the intent, severity, and durationa I requirement of a listing; therefore she cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 3. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibi lity is considered under Step 4. 20 CF R 416.905(a).

The fourth step in analyzing a dis ability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual f unctional capacity ("RFC") and pas t relevant em ployment. 20 CF R 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 lear n the position. 20 CF R 416.960(b)(1). Vocational fact ors of age, education, and work experience, and whet her the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the natio nal economy is not consider ed. 20 CF R 416.960(b)(3). RFC is as sessed 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 c lassified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 2 0 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 j ob 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 r equired occasionally and other sedentary lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with criteria are met. Light work involves 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 invo lves sit ting 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 thes e activities . Id. A n individual capab le 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 object s weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). A n individual capable of heavy work is also c apable 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, walk ing, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are consider ed nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparis on of the individual's residual functional c apacity 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 a ge, 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 tole rating some physical f eature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolera te 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-e xertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendi x 2 do not direct factual conclusions o f disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416. 969a(c)(2). The determination of whether disability e xists is b ased upon the princi ples in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situat ions in Appendix 2. ld.

The Claimant's current and past work history consists of employment as a secretar y and office assistant. In light of the Claim ant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work is classified as unskilled sedentary work.

The Claimant testified that she is able to walk short distances; lift/carry about 10 pounds; stand for about 10 minutes; sit for more than 2 hours; and is able to bend but not squat. The objective medical ev idence from the treating physician places the Claimant at the equivalent of sedentary activity. If the im pairment 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 ex ist. 20 CFR 416.920. In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is able to return to past relevant work thus she 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. Mamilka

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

Date Signed: November 14, 2011

Date Mailed: November 14, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative hearings

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CMM/cl

