

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg No.: 2012-52811
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 14, 2011
Wayne County DHS (31)

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 telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on Wednesday, December 14, 2011. The Claimant appeared and testified. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department").

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time frame 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 ("S HRT") for consideration. On June 4, 2012, this office received the SH RT determination which 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") 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, retroactive to June 2010, and SDA benefits on August 16, 2010.

2011-52811/CMM

2. On July 18, 2011, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
3. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination on July 28, 2011.
4. On September 8, 2011, the Department received the Claimant’s written request for hearing. (Exhibit 2)
5. On November 14, 2011 and May 31, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to back pain, asthma, sarcoidosis, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, anemia, skin rash, and arthritis.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to depression and anxiety.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was [REDACTED] years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’7” in height; and weighed 191 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college and an employment history as a cashier, as an inspector, in stock/maintenance, machine operator, and as a disc jockey.

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 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 Tables (“RFT”).

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 416.913. 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 416.945(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 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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 416.921(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).

2011-52811/CMM

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to back pain, sarcoidosis, asthma, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, anemia, skin rash, arthritis, depression, and anxiety.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of general body pain. The Claimant was treated and discharged with the diagnoses of multiple joint pain and elevated blood pressure.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was treated for acute asthma exacerbation.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was admitted to the hospital with complaints of breathing difficulties. The Claimant was placed on steroids, oxygen, and given breathing treatments. Chest x-rays revealed bibasilar infiltrates. The Claimant required two units of blood with a hemoglobin count of 7.3. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of exacerbation of asthma, arthralgias, difficulty breathing, iron deficiency anemia, and rule out sarcoidosis secondary to bilateral lymphadenopathy and hilar enlargement.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a consultative evaluation. The Claimant was found able to walk without an assistive device and able to bend, stoop, carry, push, and pull. There were no physical limitations with sitting, standing, and walking. The impressions were complaints of generalized pain at hips (bilaterally), knees, elbows, and thumbs; hypertension, sarcoidosis (need to follow-up with pulmonologist); and history of former alcohol and marijuana abuse.

On this date, a Medical Source Statement of Ability to do Work-Related Activities (Physical) was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The Claimant was found able to occasionally (1/3 of an 8 hours workday) lift/carry 51 to 100 pounds; frequently (1/3 to 2/3 of an 8 hour workday) lift/carry 11 to 50 pounds; and continuously (more than 2/3 of an 8 hour workday) lift/carry up to 10 pounds. The Claimant was found able to sit, stand walk for 1 hour without interruption and able to sit/stand for 3 hours of an 8 hour workday and walk for 2 hours during this same time span. The Claimant is able to reach, handle, finger, feel, push, and pull with both upper extremities and able to operate foot/leg controls. Ultimately, the Claimant was found to have no limitations. Range of motion testing was unremarkable.

On [REDACTED] Pulmonary Function Test revealed the Forced Expiratory Volume at 1 second ("FEV₁") of 1.52, 1.53, and 1.46 and a Forced Vital Capacity ("FVC") of 2.51, 2.44, and 2.40 before treatment. Post bronchodilator, the FEV₁ was 1.65, 1.60, and 1.64 and the FVC was 2.52, 2.55, and 2.56. The results showed moderate obstruction with a lung age of 86.

2011-52811/CMM

On [REDACTED] a Pulmonary Function Test revealed the FEV₁ of 1.31, 1.30, and 1.22 and a FVC of 2.06, 1.91, and 1.83. The results showed moderate obstruction and low vital capacity possible due to restriction.

On [REDACTED] a CT of the thorax revealed mediastinal and right hilar lymphadenopathy with the largest lymph node measuring approximately 1.9 cm. Multiple micronodules bilaterally were documented noting more severe in the upper lobes. The impressions were consistent with the Claimant's history of sarcoidosis with mediastinal and pulmonary parenchymal findings (further evaluation recommended) and the possibility of an infectious process and neoplasm were not excluded.

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 limited medical evidence establishing that she does have some possible physical limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. In light of the *de minimus* standard, the sequential analysis will continue.

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, knee pain, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, diabetes, sleep apnea, and headaches.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 8.00 (skin disorders), Listing 9.00 (endocrine system), Listing 11.00 (neurological disorders), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence. There were no objective findings of major joint dysfunction or nerve root impingement; persistent, recurrent, and/or uncontrolled (while on prescribed treatment) cardiovascular impairment; or end organ damage due to the Claimant's high blood pressure. There was no evidence of diabetes, sleep apnea, skin rash, or headaches. The Claimant's FEV₁ was above 1.35 (based on the Claimant's 5'7" height) and there was no evidence to establish that the Claimant experienced attacks, despite prescribed treatment, that required physician intervention, which occurred at least once every 2 months or at least 6 times a year. Mentally, there was no evidence to show marked limitations in any functional area or repeated episodes of decompensation. The Claimant's alleged mental impairments were not supported by the evidence. Although the objective medical records establish physical impairments, these records do not meet the intent and severity requirements of a listing, or its equivalent. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled at Step 3; therefore, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Before considering the fourth step in the sequential analysis, a determination of the individual's residual functional capacity ("RFC") is made. 20 CFR 416.945. An individual's RFC is the most he/she can still do on a sustained basis despite the limitations from the impairment(s). *Id.* The total limiting effects of all the impairments, to include those that are not severe, are considered. 20 CFR 416.945(e).

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 to 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.*

In this case, the Claimant alleged disability based on back pain, sarcoidosis, asthma, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, anemia, skin rash, arthritis, depression, or anxiety. The Claimant testified that she is able to walk short distances; grip/grasp without issue; sit for 10 minutes; lift/carry approximately 10 pounds; stand for less than 2 hours; and has difficulties bending and/or squatting. The objective medical evidence does not contain any significant physical or mental limitations. After review of the entire record and considering the Claimant's testimony, it is found, at this point, that the Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform at least unskilled, limited, sedentary work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(a). Limitations being the alternation between sitting and standing at will.

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).

The Claimant's prior employment was that of a cashier, as an inspector, in stock/maintenance, machine operator, and as a disc jockey. In consideration of the Claimant's testimony and Occupational Code, the prior employment as a disc jockey is classified as semi-skilled, light work while the other employment is considered unskilled, light work. 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. As noted above, the objective evidence does not contain any physical restrictions that would preclude employment. The Claimant testified that she was unable to perform her previous employment due, in part, to back pain. In light of the entire record and the Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that the Claimant is unable to perform past relevant work. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4.

In Step 5, an assessment of the Claimant'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 [REDACTED] years old and, thus, considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college. 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). The age for younger individuals (under 50) generally will not seriously affect the ability to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.963(c).

In this case, the objective findings reveal that the Claimant suffers with asthma, shortness of breath, sarcoidosis, anemia, bilaterallymphadenopathy, and joint pain. The Claimant testified that she was able to perform some physical activity comparable to sedentary activity with some limitations. In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform at least sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record finding no contradiction with the alleged non-exertional limitations, and in consideration of the Claimant's age, education, work experience, RFC, and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rules 201.27 and 201.28, the Claimant is found not disabled at Step 5.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and RFT. 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. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

2011-52811/CMM


In this case, the Claimant is found not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program; therefore, she is found not disabled for purposes of SDA benefit program.

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 and SDA benefit programs.

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 15, 2012

Date Mailed: June 15, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (60 days for FAP cases)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court 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.

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

- A rehearing **MAY** 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:

2011-52811/CMM

- 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

cc:

