

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2012-38630  
Issue No.: 2009; 4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 15, 2012  
County: Midland County

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

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, a telephone hearing was held on May 15, 2012. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Whether the Department of Human Services (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 November 29, 2011, Claimant filed an application for MA and SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 24, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P, indicating Claimant was capable of performing other work, pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920(f). SDA was denied for lack of duration. (Department Exhibit A, pp 4-5).
- (3) On March 1, 2012, the department sent notice to Claimant that his application for Medicaid and SDA had been denied.
- (4) On March 7, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

- (5) On April 16, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the denial of MA-P benefits indicating Claimant retains the capacity to perform light work. SDA was denied due to lack of duration. (Department Exhibit B).
- (6) Claimant has a history of degenerative joint disease, arthritis, and degenerative disc disease.
- (7) Claimant is a [REDACTED] man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'8" tall and weighs 150 lbs. Claimant completed the eleventh grade and has not worked since December 2010.
- (8) Claimant had applied for Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

### 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, (DHS or department), 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 Reference Tables Manual ("RFT").

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Current legislative amendments to the Act delineate eligibility criteria as implemented by department policy set forth in program manuals. 2004 PA 344, Sec. 604, establishes the State Disability Assistance program. It reads in part:

Sec. 604 (1). The department shall operate a state disability assistance program. Except as provided in subsection (3), persons eligible for this program shall include needy citizens of the United States or aliens exempt from the Supplemental Security Income citizenship requirement who are at least 18 years of age or emancipated minors meeting one or more of the following requirements:

(b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days.

Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

Specifically, this Act provides minimal cash assistance to individuals with some type of severe, temporary disability which prevents him or her from engaging in substantial gainful work activity for at least ninety (90) days.

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).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity and testified that he has not worked since 2004. Therefore, he is not disqualified from receiving disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the individual's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The individual 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, Claimant alleges disability due to degenerative joint disease, arthritis, and degenerative disc disease.

In 2009, an MRI of Claimant's lumbar spine revealed considerable degenerative narrowing of the L5-S1 disc space. There was also a subtle asymmetric prominence at the right posterolateral aspect of the L4-L5 disc including evidence of a defect in the right posterolateral part of the disc annulus, though no actual herniated disc fragment was observed. The posterior surfaces of the upper 3 lumbar discs and the T12-L1 disc were within normal limits. The MRI of the cervical spine showed an asymmetrically prominent right posterior and posterolateral marginal spurring at the C3-C4 interspace with intervening projection of disc material which was considered an example of so called "hard disc," wherein herniated disc material has become partially calcified/ossified. The posterior surfaces of C2-C3 and C4-C5 discs were slightly irregular in outline without definite evidence of disc bulge or focal herniation. There was degenerative narrowing of the C5-C6 disc space with near circumferential projection of disc material and marginal spurring; slight asymmetric prominence of the right posterolateral aspect was consistent with localized right posterolateral herniation superimposed upon the more generalized process. There was a simple 1-2 mm bulge at the posterior surface of C6-C7, but no significant abnormality of the C7-T1 disc.

On August 13, 2011, Claimant underwent a medical examination performed by the Disability Determination Service. Claimant's chief complaints were back pain, neck, right shoulder pain, right hand pain, and left and right knee pains. His musculoskeletal examination revealed no evidence of joint laxity, crepitation, or effusion. Grip strength was diminished on the right with Jamar Dynamometer testing showing a compression of 25 pounds with the right hand and 80 pounds with the left. His dexterity was unimpaired. Claimant could pick up a coin, button clothing, and open a door. He had no difficulty getting on and off the examination table, no difficulty heel and toe walking and no difficulty squatting or hopping. He walked with a normal gait and without the use of an assistive device. Claimant was diagnosed with degenerative joint disease which affects his knees, fingers, lumbar spine, shoulders (right shoulder in particular), and his right hand. The examination was otherwise negative except for range of motion in the lumbar spine, shoulders, and wrists.

As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). In the present case, Claimant testified that he has problems with his back, hands, neck and legs. Based on the lack of objective medical evidence that the alleged impairment(s) are severe enough

to reach the criteria and definition of disability, Claimant is denied at step 2 for lack of a severe impairment and no further analysis is required.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

/S/  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 6/4/12

Date Mailed: 6/4/12

VLA/ds

