

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2011-9128  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 22, 2011  
DHS County: Wayne (82-15)

**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 Tuesday, March 22, 2011. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED], 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 ("SHRT") for consideration. On May 25, 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 March 23, 2010. (Exhibit 1, pp. 54 – 65)
2. On September 9, 2010, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled.

3. On September 18, 2010, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT decision.
4. On September 24, 2010, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing.
5. On December 21, 2010, and May 25, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to hand/leg numbness, shortness of breath, asthma, sleep apnea, congestive heart failure, edema, abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, poor circulation, incontinence, and stroke.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to anxiety and depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 42 years old with an [REDACTED], birth date; was 5' in height; and weighed 180 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some vocational training and an employment history as a hair stylist.

### **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).

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 are 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 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 hand/leg numbness, shortness of breath, asthma, sleep apnea, congestive heart failure, edema, abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, poor circulation, incontinence, stroke, anxiety, and depression. In support of her claim, some older records were submitted from as early as [REDACTED] which document treatment/diagnoses of stage IV endometriosis, pelvic pain, dysmenorrhea, infertility, premenstrual syndrome, right adrenal pheochromocytoma, right hepatic lobe mass, uterine leiomyoma, ovarian cysts, and asthma.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was diagnosed with pelvic pain, endometriosis, infertility, weight gain, and abdominal bloating.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant sought treatment for chronic pelvic pain and infertility. A laparoscopy and tubal perfusion test was planned.

2011-9128/CMM

On [REDACTED], ultrasounds revealed uterine fibroids, complex cyst in the left ovary, and adnexal mass on the right ovary with lesions.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a preoperative appointment. A laparoscopy was scheduled for [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], a laparoscopy and tubal patency test were performed without complication. The post-operative diagnoses were pelvic adhesion and right tubal occlusion.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment. The Claimant had "excellent" response to surgery.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant sought treatment for pelvic pain. The diagnoses were anxiety and depression (not otherwise specified), infertility, insomnia with sleep apnea, panic disorder, premenstrual tension, and uterine endometriosis.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment for her severe stage IV endometriosis. Due to the severe symptoms, the Claimant was bedridden three out of four weeks.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was treated for acute bronchitis.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant sought treatment for nausea, vomiting, abdominal bloating, diarrhea, chronic abdominal pain, and dry cough. The physical examination was unremarkable. The impressions were intermittent nausea, vomiting with abdominal bloating and associated diarrhea (uncertain etiology), chronic abdominal pain, recent bronchitis, morbid obesity, pheochromocytoma (status post resection), depression and anxiety, bowel and urinary incontinence, polycystic ovarian disease, hypertension, and history of hepatic tumor (status post resection).

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment. The diagnoses were mild reactive airway disease.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was diagnosed with acute conjunctivitis and acute urinary tract infection.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent a colonoscopy which revealed polyps and hemorrhoids.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was diagnosed with acute sinusitis, acute pharyngitis, and middle ear infection.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative evaluation. The diagnoses were history of endometriosis, asthma, obstructive sleep apnea (poorly corrected with C-PAP machine), polycystic ovary syndrome, remote history of pheochromocytoma, and depression. The Internist opined that due to the severity and chronic nature of the symptoms, the Claimant's ability to perform work-related activities was minimal.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of abdominal pain. An ultrasound revealed fibroid uterus and normal appearing ovaries. The Claimant was treated and discharged with the diagnoses of pelvic pain and uterine fibroids.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant sought treatment for polycystic ovarian syndrome ("PCOS"), fibroid tumors, and endometriosis. A hysterectomy was recommended.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician wrote a letter on behalf of the Claimant confirming treatment for intractable, chronic nausea, vomiting, abdominal bloating, diarrhea, and abdominal pain. Medical history includes a history of pheochromocytosis, hepatic tumor, severe endometriosis, hypertension, depression with associated anxiety, bowel and urinary incontinence, and polycystic ovarian disease.

On [REDACTED], a Total Abdominal Hysterectomy and Bilateral Salpingo-Oophorectomy ("TSO-BSO") was performed without complication. Microscopic findings of the uterus, cervix, bilateral fallopian tubes, and ovaries were proliferative endometrium and prominent adenomyosis, numerous intramural and subserosal leiomyomata (one is focally cellular), chronic cervicitis with extensive squamous metaplasia, numerous cystic follicles (small and large) in the left ovary, and corpora albicantia in the right ovary. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was treated for and diagnosed with acute sinusitis.

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 due to hand/leg numbness, shortness of breath, asthma, sleep apnea, congestive heart failure, edema, abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, poor circulation, incontinence, stroke, anxiety, and depression.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system), Listing 11.00 (neurological system), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective evidence. Ultimately, based on the medical evidence, it is found that the Claimant's impairment(s) do not meet the intent and severity requirements 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 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 prior work history consists of work as a hair systlist. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work is classified as semi-skilled light work.

The Claimant testified that she is able to walk short distances; sit and/or stand for short periods of time; lift/carry less than 10 pounds; and is unable to bend and/or squat. he medical evidence revealed that due to the Claimant severe symptoms, she was bedridden 3 out of 4 weeks. 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 analysis 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 42 years old and, thus, considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some vocational training. 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 for 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 this case, the evidence reveals that the Claimant suffers from severe pelvic pain, endometriosis, uterine fibroids, complex cyst in the left ovary, adnexal mass on the right ovary with lesions, anxiety, depression, insomnia, sleep apnea, panic disorder, sinusitis, asthma, chronic nausea, vomiting, incontinence, and abdominal pain/bloating. In [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent a total hysterectomy without complication. As a result, the Claimant's conditions will likely improve. There was no objective evidence that the Claimant was unable to meet her personal needs or had any functional limitations that would affect the Claimant's activities of daily living, social functioning, concentration, persistence, or pace, and/or episodes of decompensation. The Claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to meet at least the physical and mental demands required to perform sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire

2011-9128/CMM

record finding no contradiction in the Claimant's nonexertional limitations, and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.28, it is found that the Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

**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 Medical Assistance 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 13, 2011

Date Mailed: June 21, 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.

2011-9128/CMM

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:

