

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],  
Claimant

Reg. No: 2007-30139  
Issue No: 2009, 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
February 9, 2009  
Wayne County DHS (59)

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 February 9, 2009. The Claimant appeared and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

At the Claimant's request, the record was extended to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The additional records were received and reviewed. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final determination.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") and the State Disability Assistance ("SDA") 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 a public assistance application seeking MA-P, Retro MA-P from May 2006, and SDA benefits on August 30, 2006.
2. The Department failed to timely process the application.
3. On July 3, 2007, the Department received a Hearing Request on behalf of the Claimant protesting in essence, the Department's failure to process the August 30, 2006 application. (Exhibit 2)
4. On July 27, 2007, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") determined the Claimant was not disabled finding the Claimant's impairment(s) did not prevent employment of 90 days or more for SDA purposes, and finding the impairment was non-severe for MA-P purposes. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
5. On August 17, 2007, the Department sent the Claimant an eligibility notice informing the Claimant he was found not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 33, 34)
6. On October 17, 2007, the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") found the Claimant not disabled based upon a lack of duration. (Exhibit 3, pp. 1, 2)
7. On November 13, 2007, the Department received a second Request for Hearing, this time protesting the determination that the Claimant was not disabled.
8. The Claimant's alleged physical disabling impairments are due to chronic left ankle pain and back pain, pancreatitis, diabetes, shortness of breath, digestive problems, hypertension and chest pain.

9. The Claimant's alleged mental disabling impairments are due to learning disorder with functional illiteracy and mental deficiency.
10. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 40 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5' 11" and weighed 125 pounds.
11. The Claimant completed through the 7<sup>th</sup> grade in a special education program and has a work history of providing general labor for a roofing contractor.
12. The Claimant's impairment(s) has lasted, or is expected to last, continuously for a period of at least 12 months.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance ("MA") program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services ("DHS"), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual ("PAM"), the Program Eligibility Manual ("PEM"), and the Program Reference Manual ("PRM").

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 416.929(a)

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 applicants takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3) The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2)

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is

required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945 Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1) An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv)

In addition to the above, when evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 20 CFR 416.920a(a) First, an individual's pertinent symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1) When a medically determinable mental impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual's significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2) Functional limitation(s) is assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2) Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication, and other treatment and the effect on the overall degree of functionality is considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1) In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining an individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(3) The degree of limitation for the first three functional areas is rated by a five point scale: none, mild, moderate, marked, and extreme. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4)

A four point scale (none, one or two, three, four or more) is used to rate the degree of limitation in the fourth functional area. *Id.* The last point on each scale represents a degree of limitation that is incompatible with the ability to do any gainful activity. *Id.*

After the degree of functional limitation is determined, the severity of the mental impairment is determined. 20 CFR 416.920a(d) If severe, a determination of whether the impairment meets or is the equivalent of a listed mental disorder. 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)

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) As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. An individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual 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 any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6) In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity. The Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of 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 based on functional illiteracy with mental deficiency, chronic left ankle and back pain, pancreatitis, diabetes, shortness of breath, digestive problems, and and chest pain.

During the hearing, the Claimant denied he was seeking disability on the basis of a mental impairment(s) however older records were submitted that document a mental status examination and IQ testing. The Claimant completed through the 7<sup>th</sup> grade in a special education

curriculum. On [REDACTED], the [REDACTED] was administered. A Full Scale IQ of 67 (1<sup>st</sup> percentile, Deficient Range) was obtained from a Verbal IQ of 68 and Performance IQ of 73. These result meant that the Claimant's true aggregate IQ fell between 64 and 72 thus between the Deficient and the Borderline Deficient Ranges. Numerous deficits of mental functioning were noted. Further, the Claimant's severe, chronic and ongoing (at that time) alcohol dependency and cannabis and crack cocaine abuse was noted. Long-term residence substance abuse treatment of at least 6 months was recommended. The Claimant's Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 50 and his prognosis was poor. Records from [REDACTED] document the Claimant with Adjustment disorder with mixed emotion features with a GAF of 35- 40.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] after complaints of vomiting, shortness of breath and upper abdominal pain. The Claimant was discharged with a diagnosis of abdominal pain "probably" secondary to pancreatitis. Supine and upright examination of the abdomen documented scoliotic curvature at the thoracolumbar spine.

On [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], the Claimant was again admitted to [REDACTED] resulting in a diagnosis of acute pancreatitis.

On [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to [REDACTED] emergency room after complaints of pain in the mid-epigastric region, nausea, and vomiting. Imaging studies documented chronic calcific pancreatitis with calcifications of the pancreas. Lab work revealed hemoglobin of 14.7 and creatinine of .8. An EKG was within normal limits and positive for atrial fibrillation. An MRI of the abdomen showed a pseudocyst on the pancreas with suggestion of nodularity in the main pancreatic duct. The patient was found to have a new onset of diabetes mellitus type 2. The discharge diagnosis was pancreatitis.



On [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] after complaints of abdominal pain accompanied with nausea and vomiting. Laboratory tests documented the Claimant's hemoglobin at 11.9 and his creatinine was .7. The Claimant's pain was attributed to his chronic pancreatitis.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] after complaints of mid-abdominal pain. A CAT scan revealed evidence of infiltration of fat around the pancreatic head with evidence of some chronic pancreatitis changes. His creatinine was .6. The Claimant was treated for pain and initially started on a clear diet. On [REDACTED], the Claimant was discharged with a final diagnosis of pancreatitis.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to [REDACTED] with complaints of mid-epigastric pain. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the pain attributed to pancreatitis.

Similarly, on [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] after complaints of mid-epigastric pain. A CT scan of the abdomen and pelvis with contrast documented acute and chronic pancreatitis with some degree of necrotizing pancreatitis not ruled out. No bowel obstruction was found and ultimately, the Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with a diagnosis of pancreatitis.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] with complaints of mid-epigastric pain. The discharge summary was not submitted.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] based upon increase abdominal pain, nausea, and vomiting. A CT scan documented the Claimant's chronic pancreatitis. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with a BMI of 18.1.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's lab results documented positive tests for cannabinoids, opiates, and tricyclics. The Claimant's creatinine was 1.1.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was referred to [REDACTED] due to substance abuse. The Claimant was admitted due to pancreatitis and abdominal pain. The report notes that the Claimant has not drunk in over two years. No further records were submitted regarding this particular stay.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was submitted on the Claimant's behalf. The Claimant's current diagnoses were listed as chronic pancreatitis, hypertension, and diabetes mellitus. Additionally, the Claimant's abdominal pain was noted as well as 20/20 vision in each eye. The Claimant was listed in stable condition but limited to lifting/carrying less than 10 pounds occasionally; sit about 6 hours in an 8-hour workday; did not require an assistive device and was unable to push/pull with either upper extremity.

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 objective medical evidence establishing that he does have physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. Accordingly, 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 asserts physical disabling impairment(s) due in part to left ankle and back pain. Listing 1.00 defines musculoskeletal system impairments.

Disorders of the musculoskeletal system may result from hereditary, congenital, or acquired pathologic processes. 1.00A Impairments may result from infectious, inflammatory, or degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events, or neoplastic, vascular, or toxic/metabolic diseases. 1.00A Regardless of the cause(s) of a musculoskeletal impairment, functional loss for purposes of these listings is defined as the inability to ambulate effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment, or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment. Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. 1.00B2b(1) Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity function to permit independent ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s) that limits the functioning of both upper extremities. (Listing 1.05C is an exception to this general definition because the individual has the use of only one upper extremity due to amputation of a hand.) *Id.* To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to be able to carry out activities of daily living. 1.00B2b(2) They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. . . . *Id.* When an individual's impairment involves a lower extremity uses a hand-held assistive device, such as a cane, crutch or walker, the medical basis for use of the device should be documented. 1.00J4 The requirement to use a hand-held assistive device may also impact an individual's functional capacity by virtue of the fact that one or both upper extremities are not available for such activities as lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling. *Id.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

- 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint(s) due to any cause: Characterized by gross anatomical deformity (e.g. subluxation, contracture, bony or fibrous ankylosis, instability) and chronic joint pain and stiffness with signs of limitation of motion or other abnormal motion of the affected joint(s), and findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging of joint space narrowing, bony destruction, or ankylosis of the affected joint(s). With:
- A. Involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively as defined in 1.00B2b; or
  - B. Involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, wrist, hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively a defined in 1.00B2c
- 1.03 Reconstructive surgery or surgical arthrodesis of a major weight-bearing joint, with inability to ambulate effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b, and return to effective ambulation did not occur, or is not expected to occur, within 12 months of onset.
- 1.04 Disorders of the spine (e.g., herniated nucleus pulposus, spinal arachnoiditis, spinal stenosis, osteoarthritis, degenerative disc disease, facet arthritis, vertebral fracture), resulting in compromise of a nerve root (including the cauda equine) or spinal cord. With:
- A. Evidence of nerve root compression characterized by neuro-anatomic distribution of pain, limitation of motion of the spine, motor loss (atrophy with associated muscle weakness or muscle weakness) accompanied by sensory or reflex loss and, if there is involvement of the lower back, positive straight-leg raising test (sitting and supine); or
  - B. Spinal arachnoiditis, confirmed by an operative note or pathology report of tissue biopsy, or by appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by severe burning or painful dysesthesia, resulting in the need for changes in position or posture more than once every 2 hours; or
  - C. Lumbar spinal stenosis resulting in pseudoclaudication, established by findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by chronic nonradicular pain and weakness, and resulting in inability to ambulate

effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b. (see above definition)

\* \* \*

1.06 Fracture of the femur, tibia, pelvis, or one or more of the tarsal bones. With:

A. Solid union not evident on appropriate medically acceptable imaging and not clinically solid;

AND

B. Inability to ambulate effectively as defined in 1.00B2b, and return to effective ambulation did not occur or is not expected to occur within 12 months of onset.

In this case, medical documentation establishes that the Claimant has a disc bulge/herniation and that he previously had surgery on his left ankle. The Claimant does not require a cane or other assistive device to walk and there was no evidence of continued complication as a result of the prior surgery. Ultimately, there was insufficient evidence presented to supporting a finding of a listed impairment within 1.00 as detailed above therefore the Claimant is not disabled under this Listing.

The Claimant has alleged physical disabling impairments due in part to shortness of breath. Listing 3.00 defines respiratory system impairments. Respiratory disorders, along with any associated impairment(s), must be established by medical evidence sufficient enough in detail to evaluate the severity of the impairment. 3.00A Evidence must be provided in sufficient detail to permit an independent reviewer to evaluate the severity of the impairment. *Id.* A major criteria for determining the level of respiratory impairments that are episodic in nature, is the frequency and intensity of episodes that occur despite prescribed treatment. 3.00C Attacks of asthma, episodes of bronchitis or pneumonia or hemoptysis (more than blood-streaked sputum), or respiratory failure as referred to in paragraph B of 3.03, 3.04, and 3.07, are defined

as prolonged symptomatic episodes lasting one or more days and requiring intensive treatment, such as intravenous bronchodilator or antibiotic administration or prolonged inhalational bronchodilator therapy in a hospital, emergency room or equivalent setting. 3.00C Hospital admissions are defined as inpatient hospitalizations for longer than 24 hours. *Id.* Medical evidence must include information documenting adherence to a prescribed regimen of treatment as well as a description of physical signs. *Id.*

In this case, medical records confirm treatment for shortness of breath however there record is devoid of any diagnoses that would meet or be the equivalent of a listed impairment within 3.00. Accordingly, the Claimant is not disabled under this Listing.

The Claimant also alleged physical disabling impairments based upon hypertension and chest pain. Listing 4.00 defines cardiovascular impairment in part, as follows:

. . . any disorder that affects the proper functioning of the heart or the circulatory system (that is, arteries, veins, capillaries, and the lymphatic drainage). The disorder can be congenital or acquired. Cardiovascular impairment results from one or more of four consequences of heart disease:

- (i) Chronic heart failure or ventricular dysfunction.
- (ii) Discomfort or pain due to myocardial ischemia, with or without necrosis of heart muscle.
- (iii) Syncope, or near syncope, due to inadequate cerebral perfusion from any cardiac cause, such as obstruction of flow or disturbance in rhythm or conduction resulting in inadequate cardiac output.
- (iv) Central cyanosis due to right-to-left shunt, reduced oxygen concentration in the arterial blood, or pulmonary vascular disease.

An uncontrolled impairment means one that does not adequately respond to the standard prescribed medical treatment. 4.00A3f In a situation where an individual has not received ongoing treatment or have an ongoing relationship with the medical community despite the existence of a severe impairment, the disability evaluation is based on the current objective medical evidence. 4.00B3a If an individual does not receive treatment, an impairment that

meets the criteria of a listing cannot be established. *Id.* Hypertension (high blood pressure) generally causes disability through its effect on other body systems and is evaluated by reference to specific body system(s) affected (heart, brain, kidneys, or eyes). 4.00H1 Hypertension, to include malignant hypertension, is not a listed impairment under 4.00 thus the effect on the Claimant's other body systems were evaluated by reference to specific body parts.

In the record presented, the Claimant was diagnosed with hypertension and was positive for atrial fibrillation. Although the diagnoses are medically documented, this same documentation does not meet the intent and severity requirements of a listed impairment within 4.00. Accordingly, the Claimant can not be found disabled under this Listing.

Listing 5.00 defines digestive system impairments. Disorders of the digestive system include gastrointestinal hemorrhage, hepatic (liver) dysfunction, inflammatory bowel disease, short bowel syndrome, and malnutrition. 5.00A Medical documentation necessary to meet the listing must record the severity and duration of the impairment. 5.00B The severity and duration of the impairment is considered within the context of the prescribed treatment. 5.00C1 Weight loss due to any digestive disorder, to include pancreatic insufficiency and malabsorption is evaluated under Listing 5.08 by using the Body Mass Index ("BMI"). 5.00G1 BMI is the ratio of weight loss to the square of an individual's height. 5.00G2 Listing 5.08 discusses weight loss due to any digestive disorder despite continuing treatment as prescribed with BMI of less than 17.50 calculated on at least two evaluations of least 60 days apart within a consecutive 6-month period. If an individual has a severe medically determinable impairment(s) that does not meet a listing, a determination is made regarding whether the impairment medically equals a listing. 5.00K2; 20 CFR 416.926

In this case, the Claimant has presented extensive medical records detailing hospitalizations due to chronic/acute pancreatitis. Medical Records from May of 2006 document the Claimant's height at 5'11" and his weight at 185 pound. At the time of hearing, the Claimant weighed approximately 120 pounds, thus, assuming the accuracy of his weight, the BMI is less than 17.5. There was no evidence of endocrine system failure. The weight loss is attributed to his digestive disorder however there was insufficient documentation presented to meet the intent and severity requirements of a Listed impairment within 5.00.

The Claimant also asserts physical disabling impairments due to diabetes mellitus with neuropathy. Listing 9.08 discusses diabetes mellitus and, in order to meet this Listing, an individual must also establish:

- A. *Neuropathy* demonstrated by significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in two extremities resulting in sustained disturbance of gross and dexterous movements, or gait and station (see 11.00C); or
- B. *Acidosis* occurring at least on the average of once every 2 months documented by appropriate blood chemical tests (pH or pCO<sub>2</sub> or bicarbonate levels); or
- C. *Retinitis proliferans*; evaluate the visual impairment under the criteria in 2.02, 2.03, or 2.04.

11.00C. Persistent disorganization of motor function in the form of paresis or paralysis, tremor or other involuntary movements, ataxia and sensory disturbances (any or all of which may be due to cerebral, cerebellar, brain stem, spinal cord, or peripheral nerve dysfunction) which occur singly or in various combinations establish a neurological impairment. 11.00C The degree of interference with locomotion and/or interference with the use of fingers, hands, and arms are considered. *Id.* Visual disorders are abnormalities of the eye, the optic nerve, the optic tracts, or the brain that may cause a loss of visual acuity or visual fields. 2.00A1 A loss of visual acuity



limits your ability to distinguish detail, read, do fine work, or to perceive visual stimuli in the peripheral extent of vision. *Id.* The loss of visual acuity is met when vision in the better eye after best correction is 20/200 or less. 2.02 Similarly, the loss of visual efficiency is established when the better eye of 20% or less after best correction.

In the record presented, medical records document the Claimant's diabetes mellitus. The records do not establish significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in two extremities. Ultimately, there were insufficient records presented to support a finding of disabled under this Listing.

As stated above, during the hearing the Claimant stated he was not seeking disability based upon a mental impairment(s) however some limited older records were submitted and the Request for Hearing provides otherwise. Listing 12.00 encompasses adult mental disorders. The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work, and whether these limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 12.00A The existence of a medically determinable impairment(s) of the required duration must be established through medical evidence consisting of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings, to include psychological test findings. 12.00B The evaluation of disability on the basis of a mental disorder requires sufficient evidence to (1) establish the presence of a medically determinable mental impairment(s), (2) assess the degree of functional limitation the impairment(s) imposes, and (3) project the probable duration of the impairment(s). 12.00D The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work consideration, and whether these

limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months.

12.00A

Listing 12.02 discusses organic mental disorders which relate to psychological or behavioral abnormalities associated with dysfunction of the brain. History and physical examination or laboratory tests demonstrate the presence of a specific organic factor judged to be etiologically related to the abnormal mental state and loss of previously acquired functional abilities. The required level of severity for these disorders are met when the requirements in both A and B are satisfied, or when the requirements in C are satisfied.

- A. Demonstration of a loss of specific cognitive abilities or affective changes and the medically documented persistence of at least one of the following:
  - 1. Disorientation to time and place; or
  - 2. Memory impairment, either short-term (inability to learn new information), intermediate, or long-term (inability to remember information that was know sometime in the past); or
  - 3. Perceptual or thinking disturbances (e.g., hallucinations, delusions); or
  - 4. Change in personality; or
  - 5. Disturbance in mood; or
  - 6. Emotional liability (e.g., explosive temper outbursts, sudden crying, etc.) and impairment in impulse control; or
  - 7. Loss of measured intellectual ability of at least 15 I.Q. points from premorbid levels or overall impairment index clearly within the severely impaired range on neuropsychological testing, e.g., Luria-Nebraska, Halstead-Reitan, etc;

AND

- B. Resulting in at least two of the following:

1. Marked restriction of activities of daily living; or
2. Marked difficulties in maintaining social functioning; or
3. Marked difficulties in maintaining concentration, persistence, or pace; or
4. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration;

OR

- C. Medically documented history of a chronic organic mental disorder of at least 2 years' duration that has caused more than a minimal limitation of ability to do basic work activities, with symptoms or signs currently attenuated by medication or psychosocial support, and one of the following:
1. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration; or
  2. A residual disease process that has resulted in such marginal adjustment that even a minimal increase in mental demands or change in the environment would be predicted to cause the individual to decompensate; or
  3. Current history of 1 or more years' inability to function outside a highly supportive living arrangement, with an indication of continued need for such an arrangement.

Listing 12.05 discusses mental retardation which refers to significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning with deficits in adaptive functioning which initially manifest during the developmental period; i.e. the evidence demonstrates or supports the onset of the impairment before age 22. The required level of severity for this disorder is met when the requirements in A, B, C, or D are satisfied.

- A. Mental incapacity evidenced by dependence upon others for personal needs (e.g., toileting, eating, dressing, or bathing) and inability to follow directions, such that the use of standardized measures of intellectual functioning is precluded;

OR

- B. A valid verbal, performance, or full scale IQ of 59 or less;

OR

- C. A valid verbal, performance, or full scale IQ of 60 through 70 and a physical or other mental impairment imposing an additional and significant work-related limitation of function;

OR

- D. A valid verbal, performance, or full scale IQ of 60 through 70, resulting in at least two of the following:
  - 1. Marked restriction of activities of daily living; or
  - 2. Marked difficulties in maintaining social functioning; or
  - 3. Marked difficulties in maintaining concentration, persistence, or pace; or
  - 4. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration

Listing 12.09 defines substance addiction disorders as behavioral changes or physical changes associated with the regular use of substances that affect the central nervous system. The required level of severity for these disorders is met when the requirements in any of the following are satisfied:

- A. Organic mental disorders. Evaluate under 12.02.
- B. Depressive syndrome. Evaluate under 12.04.
- C. Anxiety disorders. Evaluate under 12.06.
- D. Personality disorders. Evaluate under 12.08.
- E. Peripheral neuropathies. Evaluate under 11.14.
- F. Liver damage. Evaluate under 5.05.
- G. Gastritis. Evaluate under 5.00.
- H. Pancreatitis. Evaluate under 5.08.

I. Seizures. Evaluate under 11.02 or 11.03.

In this case, the record does not establish disability based upon Listing 12.02, 12.05 and/or 12.09. The objective medical records establish the Claimant has a past history of substance abuse. In consideration of the Claimant's other severe impairments as detailed above, it is found that the substance use is not a contributing factor material to the determination of disability and the Claimant's functional limitations would remain independent of the abuse. 20 CFR 416.935 Ultimately, based upon the entire hearing record, it is found that the Claimant's medical record does not support a finding that the Claimant's physical and/or mental impairment(s) are "listed impairments" or equivalent to a listed impairments discussed above. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iii) Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled at Step 3 therefore subsequent steps in the sequential evaluation process are necessary.

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv) An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1) Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR

416.967 Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a) Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.* Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c) An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.* Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d) An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.* Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e) An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands (exertional requirements, i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying,

pushing, or pulling) are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a) In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparison of the individual's residual functional capacity with the demands of past relevant work. *Id.* If an individual can no longer do past relevant work the same residual functional capacity assessment along with an individual's age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an individual can adjust to other work which exists in the national economy. *Id.* Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions include difficulty function due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i) – (vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2) The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.*

Over the past 15 years, the Claimant worked as a general laborer for a commercial roofing contractor whose primary responsibilities included carrying and lifting just under 100 pounds up and down ladders, walking, squatting, and bending. In the light of the foregoing, and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's past employment is considered unskilled heavy work.

The Claimant testified that he can lift/carry approximately 10 pounds; walk one block but in pain with dizziness and shortness of breath. The Claimant is able to squat and does not have problems performing repetitive actions with his arms/hands except has difficulty pushing and/or pulling. The Claimant cannot climb ladders. The medical records document that the Claimant is limited to lifting/carrying less than 10 pounds occasionally; sit about 6 hours in an 8-hour workday; did not require an assistive device and was unable to push/pull with either upper extremity. 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 this case, the Claimant is unable to perform past relevant work therefore the fifth-step in the sequential evaluation process 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 40 years old thus considered a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant has a limited education and is illiterate. Disability is found disabled if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler*



*v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983).

In the record presented, the total impact caused by the combination of medical problems suffered by the Claimant must be considered. In doing so, it is found that the combination of the Claimant's physical and mental impairments have a major effect on his ability to perform basic work activities. Further, the Claimant's fatigue and unpredictable, severe bouts of abdominal pain prevent the Claimant from performing work activities on a regular and continuing basis. Any work attempts would be marred by frequent absences which would not be tolerated in the work place. *Douglas v Sec of Human Services*, 836 F2d 392, 396 (CA 8 1987) In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant does not have the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record it is found that the Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

The State Disability Assistance ("SDA") program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code ("MAC R") 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in PAM, PEM, and PRM. 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 (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, because the Claimant was found disabled for the purposes of the MA-P program, the Claimant is disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

It is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the August 30, 2006 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his authorized representative of the determination.
3. The Department shall supplement the Claimant any lost benefits he was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.
4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in accordance with department policy in August of 2010.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen M. Mamelka  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 07/30/09

Date Mailed: 07/30/09

**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 the Circuit 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.

CMM/jlg

cc:

