

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-10796  
Issue No.: 2009/4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 11, 2010  
Wayne County DHS (17)

**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 Monday, January 11, 2010. The Claimant appeared and testified. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The records were received, reviewed, and entered as Exhibit 4. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") benefit programs?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon 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 and SDA benefits on June 20, 2009.
2. On September 24, 2009, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 2, 3)

3. On October 9, 2009, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination. (Exhibit 1, p. 1)
4. On November 10, 2009, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit 2)
5. On December 18, 2009, the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to back, neck, and shoulder pain, disc herniation, radiculopathy, closed head injury, poor balance, vertigo, and memory deficit.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairment(s) due to anxiety and depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 42 years old with a [REDACTED] date of birth; was 5'7" in height; and weighed 260 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some vocational training and an employment history as in managed home care.
10. The Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance ("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"), 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 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 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 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 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 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 back, neck, and shoulder pain, disc herniation, radiculopathy, closed head injury, poor balance, vertigo, memory deficit, anxiety, and depression.

On [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], a WAIS-III and WMS-III tests were administered as part of the Claimant's neuropsychological evaluation. By way of background, the Claimant suffered a closed head injury on [REDACTED]. The WAIS III revealed a full scale IQ of 77. The WMS-II found working memory was significantly impaired. The H-R test was performed which showed the Claimant's overall impairment index of .9 strongly suggested that the Claimant had significant brain damage. The Claimant was diagnosed with dementia due to head trauma, mood disorder with depressive features, and a Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") of 55. The significant brain impairment affected functioning in a number of areas to include abstract thinking, categorization, mental flexibility, and problem solving. The Claimant was also found to have moderate-severe depression. The Claimant was recommended to apply for long-term disability.

On [REDACTED], a Magnetic Resonance Angiography showed no evidence of an aneurysm of high grade flow reducing lesion as well as no evidence of arteriovenous malformation. A 4mm pineal gland cyst was noted on the MRI of the brain.

On [REDACTED], an ENG was performed and was within normal limits.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative mental status examination. The Claimant had difficulties answering questions. Ultimately, the Claimant was diagnosed with depressive disorder (not otherwise specified), possible dementia and conversion disorder. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 50 and her prognosis was poor.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a consultative evaluation. The Claimant had severe tenderness in the cervical paraspinal muscles with significant pain in the left shoulder on range of motion. Severe pain of the lumbar spine was also documented. The Claimant was found to have a history of motor vehicle accident in 2008 which resulted in a closed head injury with frequent headaches, dizziness, and memory loss; left shoulder pain; and possible lumbar and right lower extremity radiculopathy.

On [REDACTED], a MRI of the lumbar spine revealed mild degenerative disc disease at L5-S1 with disc herniation and shallow proximal foraminal protrusion with mild left facet arthropathy with capsulovsynovitis which resulted in left proximal foraminal narrowing without nerve root compression. The MRI of the cervical spine revealed mild right paracentral cord compression at C4-5 and end plate spondylosis resulting in indentation of the thecal sac and mild central/left paracentral cord compression.

On [REDACTED], a nerve conduction study was performed in the upper and lower extremities. The EMG found electro diagnostic evidence of C5-6 radiculopathy. Lumbar radiculopathy could not be ruled out.

On [REDACTED], an ultrasound was performed of the right thyroid nodule.

On [REDACTED], the Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant by the treating physician. The current diagnoses were multilevel disc protrusions, closed head injury with poor balance and memory problems, vertigo, radiculopathy, and anxiety stress. The Claimant's impairments were expected to last more than 90 days and she was limited to the occasional lifting/carrying of less than 10 pounds; standing and/or walking at least 2 hours during an 8 hour work day; sitting less than 6 hours during this same time frame; unable to reach, push, pull with her upper extremities; and unable to operate foot/leg controls. The Claimant was able to do simple grasping and fine manipulation with her hands/arms. The Claimant's memory was also limited. The Claimant was unable to meet her needs in the home.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of back pain. The physical examination revealed limited range of motion in the back and soft

tissue tenderness. X-rays found no fracture and were otherwise unremarkable. The Claimant was discharged with the diagnosis of back pain.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent a cardiac catheterization, left ventriculography, and selective coronary arteriography without complication due to an abnormal stress test. The ejection fraction was 60 percent.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician referred her for evaluation of a blood disorder.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician referred her for treatment of hand pain.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of abdominal pain, nausea, and vomiting. The Claimant's mental state was altered. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of upper gastrointestinal bleed secondary to Grade II-IV varices, alcoholic liver cirrhosis, and therapeutic paracentesis.

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 back, neck, and shoulder pain, disc herniation, radiculopathy, closed head injury, poor balance, vertigo, memory deficit, anxiety, and depression.

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.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

- 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)

In this case, the objective medical evidence reveals degenerative disc disease, foraminal protrusion, mild left facet arthropathy, capsulitis with foraminal narrowing, mild right paracentral cord compression at C4-5 and end plate spondylosis

resulting in indentation of the thecal sac and central/left paracentral cord compression, and radiculopathy. The evidence also documents severe pain, tenderness, and weakness. Based on the medical evidence, the Claimant's impairment(s) meet, or are the medical equivalent thereof, a listed impairment within Listing 1.00, specifically 1.04. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

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 BAM, BEM, and BRM. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

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

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The The Department shall initiate review of the June 20, 2009 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant of the determination in accordance with department policy.
3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant 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 December 2011 in accordance with department policy.

*Colleen M. Mamelka*

---

Colleen M. Mamelka  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 12/1/2010

Date Mailed: 12/1/2010

**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 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/jlg

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names and contact information of the recipients listed in the 'cc:' field.