

[REDACTED]

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.: 2008-24550  
Issue No.: 2009, 4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
October 8, 2008  
Wayne County DHS (76)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Judith Ralston Ellison

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9; and MCL 400.37 upon Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, the Claimant appeared at a hearing held on October 8, 2008 at the Department of Human Service (Department) in Wayne County.

The closing date was waived. Additional medical records were ordered and submitted to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT). SHRT denied the application. The matter is now before the undersigned for final decision.

ISSUES

Whether the Department properly determined the Claimant is "not disabled" for purposes of Medical Assistance based on disability (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- (1) On February 21, 2008 the Claimant applied for MA-P and SDA.
- (2) On April 8, 2008 the Department denied the application; and on February 10, 2008 the SHRT guided by Vocational Rule 202.20 denied the application finding medical records support the ability to perform other light work.
- (3) On May 23, 2008 the Claimant filed a timely hearing request to protest the Department's determination.
- (4) Claimant's date of birth is [REDACTED]; and the Claimant is forty-six years of age.
- (5) Claimant completed grade 12 and two years of college; and can read and write English and perform basic math.
- (6) Claimant last worked in December 2006 as Board of Education assistant to special education; and prior as assistant manager at [REDACTED] was a picture framer, worked a security job and from 1987-1992 was a cement mason.
- (7) Claimant has alleged a medical history of a December 2006 injury leaving left radiculopathy from C5-6, cervical nerve damage, lumbar nerve damage, sleep apnea using a CPAP, shortness of breath on exertion and frustration.
- (8) December 2006; January, May, August and September 2007, in part:

December 2006: X-rays right shoulder, right elbow and lumbar spine. IMPRESSIONS: negative right shoulder; normal right elbow, normal lumbar spine. [REDACTED]

January 2007: MRI lumbar spine: IMPRESSION: Mild anterior spondylosis and reactive marrow changes throughout lower thoracic and lumbar spine. No focal disc herniation or stenosis of lower thoracic and lumbar spine. [REDACTED]  
Return to work with no use of right upper extremity January 2007.  
[REDACTED]

Mat 2007: CT scan abdomen and pelvis: IMPRESSION: Liver, spleen, pancreas, kidneys, aorta, bowel mesentery are normal. No evidence of lymphopathy or significant diverticulosis. Small

amount fluid in pelvis unknown etiology. Ultrasound follow up recommended

August 2007: Bone scan: IMPRESSION: no lesion identified in sacroiliac or left inguinal region. [REDACTED]. Department Exhibit (DE) 1, pp. 14-58

September: Based on an Independent Examination, review of medical records and test results: "I have no objective abnormality to correspond with her subjective complaints. She can return to work in her former capacity without restriction and is no longer in need of treatment. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

(9) September 2008, in part:

September: Independent Medical Evaluation: C/O pain in neck, back and numbness of left side to feet emanating from a work injury December 2006. Gave oral history but no medical records/testing results were submitted. Current medications: Vicodin, Klonopin, Zanaflex and MiraLax. Fully independent in ADLs and driving. Gets outside help with her pets and outdoors chores. Lives alone.

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION: Objectively I find tenderness in left S1 joint with positive Gaelin's maneuver, Faber exam and asymmetric PSIS motion. Upper neuron findings on left side of her body. IMPRESSION: Left sacroilitis. History of left rotator cuff repair. Possible traumatic brain injury or cervical myelopathy producing left sided findings. [REDACTED]  
Claimant Exhibit pp. 1-30.

(10) January 2009, in part:

Follow up examination: Neck pain with cervical radiculopathy. Range of motion of neck decreased. Disk bulge at C5-C6. For back pain: EMG showed evidence of bilateral L5-S1 radiculopathy and need for therapy. Bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. To sue wrist splints. Medications Zanaflex, Vicodin, Klonopin. Return to office four weeks. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Claimant Exhibit 4.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.1 *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).

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a)

“Disability” is:

. . . 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 CFR416.905

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity; the severity of impairment(s); residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. A determination that an individual is disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation. Then evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activities (SGA). 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, under the first step, Claimant testified to not performing SGA since December 2006 but a trial work period was evident in the medical records in 2007. Therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from MA at step one in the evaluation process.

Second, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a “severe impairment” 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Basic work activities mean the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 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. 20 CFR 416.921(b)

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. The court in *Salmi v Sec’y of Health and Human Servs*, 774 F2d 685 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1985) held that an impairment qualifies as “non-severe” only if it “would not affect the claimant’s ability to work,” “regardless of the claimant’s age, education, or prior work experience.” *Id.* At 691-92. Only slight abnormalities that minimally affect a claimant’s ability to work can be considered non-severe. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988); *Farris v Sec’y of Health & Human Servs*, 773 F2d 85, 90 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1985).

In this case, the Claimant has presented sufficient medical evidence to support a finding that Claimant had more than minimal physical limitations. See finding of facts 8-10. The impairments have met the duration period of 20 CFR 416.909.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's physical impairments are listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. Based on the hearing record, the undersigned finds that the Claimant's medical record will not support findings that the impairments are "listed impairment(s)" or equal to a listed impairment 20 CFR 416.920(d). According to the medical evidence, alone, the Claimant cannot be found to be disabled.

Based on the medical records available, the Claimant has cervical radiculopathy with some range of motion limitations. Under Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Listing 1.00, *Musculoskeletal System* was reviewed for the facts established in the medical records. The musculoskeletal system listings are established when there is a severe loss of function. 1.00B. *Loss of function.*

1. *General.* Under this section, loss of function may be due to bone or joint deformity or destruction from any cause; miscellaneous disorders of the spine with or without radiculopathy or other neurological deficits; amputation; or fractures or soft tissue injuries, including burns, requiring prolonged periods of immobility or convalescence.

2. *How We Define Loss of Function in These Listings*

a. *General.* 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. The inability to ambulate effectively or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively must have lasted, or be expected to last, for at least 12 months. For the purposes of these criteria, consideration of the ability to perform these activities must be from a physical standpoint alone. We will determine whether an

individual can ambulate effectively or can perform fine and gross movements effectively based on the medical and other evidence in the case record, generally without developing additional evidence about the individual's ability to perform the specific activities listed as examples in 1.00B2b(2) and 1.00B2c.

*b. What We Mean by Inability To Ambulate Effectively*

(1) *Definition.* 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. Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity functioning (see 1.00J) 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.)

(2) *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. They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. Therefore, examples of ineffective ambulation include, but are not limited to, the inability to walk without the use of a walker, two crutches or two canes, the inability to walk a block at a reasonable pace on rough or uneven surfaces, the inability to use standard public transportation, the inability to carry out routine ambulatory activities, such as shopping and banking, and the inability to climb a few steps at a reasonable pace with the use of a single hand rail. The ability to walk independently about one's home without the use of assistive devices does not, in and of itself, constitute effective ambulation.

*c. What we mean by inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively.* Inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively means an extreme loss of function of both upper extremities; *i.e.*, an impairment(s) that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. To

use their upper extremities effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining such functions as reaching, pushing, pulling, grasping, and fingering to be able to carry out activities of daily living. Therefore, examples of inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively include, but are not limited to, the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level.

In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds the Claimant is not disabled at the third step for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) program because the medical records do not establish the intent or severity of a loss of function. Sequential evaluation under step four or five is necessary. 20 CFR 416.905.

In the fourth step of the sequential evaluation of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment(s) prevents Claimant from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e) Residual functional capacity (RFC) will be assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what you can do in a work setting. RFC is the most you can still do despite your limitations. All the relevant medical and other evidence in your case record applies in the assessment. See 20 CFR 416.945.

Claimant's past relevant work was working with special education children. Work prior to that is too strenuous given the medical records and appropriate medical testing results. The Claimant testified at hearing she is unable to lift the children from the prior work experience. But the undersigned notes description given to medical examiners: independence in ADLs, household abilities except outside her home; and importantly the Claimant is able to drive three days of seven. Driving a vehicle demonstrates a significant physical ability is the use of upper



and lower extremities. But the undersigned accepts the testimony of the Claimant and decides the Claimant cannot return to past relevant work. Evaluation must proceed under step five.

In the fifth step of the sequential evaluation of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine: if the claimant's impairment(s) prevent him/her from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based on the claimant's:

- (1) "Residual function capacity," defined simply as "what you can still do despite your limitations," 20 CFR 416.945.
- (2) Age, education and work experience, and
- (3) The kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her impairments.

20 CFR 416.960. *Felton v DSS*, 161 Mich App 690, 696-697, 411 NW2d 829 (1987).

It is the finding of the undersigned, based upon the medical evidence, objective physical findings, and hearing record that Claimant's RFC for work activities on a regular and continuing basis is functionally limited to sedentary work because of pain and the other facts in the medical records. See finding of fact 8-10. Appendix 2 to Subpart P of Part 404—Medical-Vocational Guidelines 20 CFR 416.967(a):

*Sedentary work.* Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 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. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met.

Claimant at forty-six is considered *younger individual*; a category of individuals age 45-49. Under Appendix 2 to Subpart P: Table No. 1—Residual Functional Capacity: Maximum Sustained Work Capability Limited to Sedentary Work as a Result of Severe Medically

Determinable Impairment(s), Rule 201.21 for individuals, age 45-49; education: high school graduate or more; previous work experience, skilled or semi-skilled—skills not transferable; the Claimant is “not disabled” per Rule 201.21.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 1939 PA 280, as amended. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.1 et seq., and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

A person is considered disabled for purposes of SDA 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. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in PEM 261.

In this case, there is insufficient evidence to support a finding that Claimant’s impairments meet the disability requirements under SSI disability standards and prevent substantial gainful activities for ninety days. This Administrative Law Judge finds the Claimant is “not disabled” for purposes of the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Claimant is “not disabled” for purposes of the Medical Assistance program and the State Disability Program.

It is ORDERED; the Department’s determination in this matter is AFFIRMED.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Judith Ralston Ellison  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 03/26/09

Date Mailed: 03/27/09

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 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.

JRE/jlg

cc:

