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



Reg No.: 2012-4715 Issue No.: 4031 Case No.: Hearing Date: January 17, 2012 Wayne County DHS (55)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 D etroit, Michigan on Tuesday, January 17, 2012. The Claimant appeared and testified. Department of Human Services ("Department").

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision, in order to allow for the submis sion of additi onal medical evidence. The records were received, reviewed, and forw arded to the State Hearing Review Team ('SHRT") for consideration. On July 17, 2012, this office received the SHR T determination which found the Cla imant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department proper ly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance ("SDA") benefit program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substa ntial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Claimant submitt ed an application f or public assistance seeking SDA benefits on August 2, 2011. (Exhibit 1, pp. 257 – 276)

- 2. On October 7, 2011, the Medical Re view Team ("MR T") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 5, 6)
- 3. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
- 4. On October 10, 2011, Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing. (Exhibit 1, p. 2)
- 5. On December 2, 2011 and July 9, 2012, the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 2)
- 6. The Claimant alleged physical disabli ng im pairments due to right leg and foot pain with weakness, right arm/elbow pain , neck pain, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, hepatitis C, and urinary incontinence.
- 7. The Claimant alleged mental disable ing impairments due to mood disorder and depression with psychotic features and suicidal ideations.
- 8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was years old with a date; was 6'3½" in height; and weighed 215 pounds.
- 9. The Claim ant has the equiv alent of a high school education with some c ollege and an employment history as a security guard, apprentice carpenter, restaurant owner, and warehouse worker.
- 10. The Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

As a preliminary matter, the Claimant pr Shabazz as confirmed by the Claimant dur number. eviously went by the name of Barabbas ing the hearing and by the social security

The Medical Assistance 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, formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridge s Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridges Elig ibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Tables ("RFT").

The State Disability Assist ance program, which pr ovides financia I assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Depa rtment administers the

SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policie s are found in BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a phys ical or menta I impairment which m eets federal SSI dis ability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefit s based on disab ility or blindness automatically qua lifies an individua I as disab led for purposes of the SDA program.

Disability is defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental im pairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expect ed 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 esta blish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinica l/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescri bed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related ac tivities o r ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 416.913. An individual's subjective pain com plaints ar e not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disab ility. 20 CF R 416.908; 2 0 CFR 4 16.929(a). Similarly, conclusor y 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, t he 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 nt 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 ext ent of his or her function on al 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 fivestep analysis requires the trier of fact to cons ider an individual's current work activit y; 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 det ermine whether an individual c an perform past relev ant work; and residual functiona I capacity along with vocational factors (i .e. age, education, and work experienc e) 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

that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at determination cannot be made а 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 indi vidual'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 f unctional capacity is the most an indiv idual can do d espite the limitations based on all rele vant evidence. 20 CFR 416.945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity ass essment is eval uated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 41 6.920(a)(4). In determinin g disa bility, an in dividual's functional c apacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, di sability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 4 16.912(a). An impair ment or combination of impairments is n ot severe if it does not signific antly limit an i ndividual's physical or m ental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The in dividual has the resp onsibility 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 m ental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 2 0 CF R 41 6.920a(a). First, an i ndividual's pertinent sym ptoms, signs, a nd 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 h the impairment(s) interferes with an assessed based upon the extent to whic individual's ability to func tion independently, appropriately, effectively, and on а sustained basis. Id.; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2). Chronic m ental disorders, structured the effect on the overall degree of settings, medication, and other treatment and functionality is considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1). In addi tion, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social f unctioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensat ion) are consider ed when deter mining 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 lim itation in the fourth functional area. Id. The last point on each scale repr esents a degree of limitation t hat 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 lis ted mental disorder is made. 20 CF R 416.920a(d)(2). If the severe mental impairment does not meet (or equal) a listed

impairment, an individual's residual functi 416.920a(d)(3).

onal capacity is assessed. 20 CF

R

As outlined above, the first step looks at the i ndividual'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 impa irment(s) is considered under St ep 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence et o substantiate the alleged disa bling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purpos es, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 416. 920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an in dividual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 416.921(b). Examples include:

- 1. Physical functions such as wa lking, 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.
- ld.

The second step allows for dismissal of a di sability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowe n*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an admin istrative convenience to screen o ut 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 qu alifies 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 Claima nt alleges disability due to right leg an d foot pain with weakness, right arm/elbow pain, neck pain, shortness of br eath, high blood pressure, hepatitis C, urinary incontinence, mood disorder, and depression with psychotic features and suicidal ideations.

In support of his claim, some older records from as early as were submitted which document treatment/diagnoses of chronic back pain, sinusitis, and left leg/arm numbness.

On the Claimant sought treatment for a poss ible s exually transmitted disease.

On the Claimant was admitted to the Veteran's Hospital with a history of depression with suicidal i deations and auditory and visual hallucinations. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 18 at admission. The Claimant lacked adequate housing. The Claimant was a discharged on **Generation**^h with the diagnos es of depression with psyc hotic features, subs tance induced mood di sorder, and cannabis dependence. The GAF was 50 at discharge an d he was found able to me et his d aily needs.

On the Claimant presented for medic ation review for his depression. The Claimant's prescribed treatment was adjusted and his GAF was 60.

On the Claimant was diagnosed with congestive heart failure.

On the Claimant presented to urgent care wit h complaints of bilateral groin pain. A blood draw was sent out for syphilis and urine testing.

On the Claimant attended a c onsultative evaluation. T he physical examination noted the Cl aimant failed getting on the ex amination table with moderate limited range of motion of both shoulders and lumbar spine. The Claimant was unable to bend and had a limping gait favoring the ri ght. Moderate to severe limited range of motion of the right knee with moderate limitations on the left knee was do cumented. The impressions were hypertension, coronary artery disease with high cholesterol, borderline diabetes, history of seizures and stroke, lumbar degenerative disc disease (moderate to severe), bilateral knee arthritis (right worse than left), hepatitis C, history of substance abuse, and depression. The Claimant required a cane for ambulation.

On this same date, the Claimant attended a c onsultative psychiatric evaluation. The diagnoses were major depress ive disorder, recurrent with ps ychotic features and polysubstance abuse by history. The GAF was 60 and the Claimant was found unable to manage benefit funds.

On **Construction**, the Claimant presented to urgent care for his medication renewal. The phys ical examination was unremark able. T he current problem list was hypertension, hyperlipidemia, hepatitis C, impotence, alcohol abuse, cannabis dependence, adjustment disor der with depressed mood, ch ronic pain syndrome, depression, syncope, ureteritis, other (or unknown) substance-induced mood disorder, and acute sinusitis.

As previously noted, the Claim ant bears t he burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to s ubstantiate the alleged disabling im pairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presen ted some medical evidence establishing that he does have some physical and mental limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. The medic al evidence has establis hed t hat the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, t hat has more than a *de minimus* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuous ly for twelve months; therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the seque ntial an alysis 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 physic al disabling impairments due to right leg and foot pain with weakness, right arm/elbow pain, neck pain, shortness of breath, high blood pressu re, hepatitis C, urinary incontinence, mood disorder, and depres sion with psychotic features and suic idal ideations.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listi ng 3.00 (respiratory syst em), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (dig estive system), and Listing 12. 00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective medi cal evidence. The objective records show that the Claim ant had moderate to severe lim ited range of motion of the right knee with moderate limitat ions on the left. There were no objective findings of major joint(s) dysfunction or nerve root impingement; ongoing treatment for shortness of breath; or persistent, recurr ent, and/or uncontrolled (while on prescribed treatment) cardiovascular impair ment or end organ dam age resulting from the Claimant's high blood pressure. The evidenc e shows a history of hepatitis C and ur inary incontinence; however, the Claimant has not required any treatment for these conditions. Finally, the evidence does not show that the Claimant's symptoms persist despite prescribed treatment or that the Claimant has very serious limitations in his ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities of daily living. Mentally, there was no evidence of any marked limitations in any functional area noting the Claimant's mental status was improved with prescribed treatment. Although the objective medical records establis h some physical and mental im pairments, these records do not meet the intent and severity requirements of a listing, or its equivalent. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be

found disabled, or not disabled at Step 3; therefore, th e Claimant's e ligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Before considering the fourth step in t he sequential analys is, a determination of the individual's residual functional capacity ("RFC") is made. 20 CFR 416.945. An individual's RFC is the most he/she can still do o n a sustained bas is despite th e limitations from the impairment(s). *Id.* The total limiting effects of all the impairments, to include those that are not severe, are considered. 20 CFR 416.945(e).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are c lassified as sedentary, light, medium, hea vy, and very heavy. 2 0 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 j ob is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Id. Jobs equired occasionally and other sedentary are sedentary if walking and standing are r criteria are met. Light work involves li fting 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 invo lves sit ting 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 thes e activities. Id. A n individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fin е 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 li fting 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 tim e with frequent lifting or carrying of object s weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). A n individual capable of heavy work is also c apable 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, walk ing, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are consider ed nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparis on of the individual's residual functional c apacity 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 a ge, 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 to 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 so me physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. ca n't tolerate dust or fumes); or di fficulty performing the manipulative or postur al functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 4 16.969a(c)(1)(i) - (vi). If the imp airment(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 CF R 416.969a(c)(2). The determination of whether disability exists is bas ed upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situat ions in Appendix 2. Id

In this case, the Claimant alleged disabi lity based on right leg and foot pain wit h weakness, right arm/elbow pain, neck pain, shortness of br eath, high blood pressure, hepatitis C, urinary incontinence, mood disorder, and depression with psychotic features and suicidal ideations. The Clai mant testified that he is ab le to walk ¼ mile with h is cane and one block without it; grip/grasp without issue; sit for 2 hours; lift/carry less than 100 pounds; stand for less than 2 hours; and is able to bend and squat with some difficulties. The objective medic al evidence does not contain any significant limitations. After review of the entire record and considering the Claimant's testimony, it is found, at this point, that the Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform at least unskilled, limited, sedentary work as defined by 20 CFR 416.96 7(a). Limitations being the alternation between sitting and standing at will.

The fourth step in analyzing a dis ability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual f unctional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant em ployment. 20 CF R 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 lear n the position. 20 CF R 416.960(b)(1). Vocational fact ors of age, education, and work experience, and whet her the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3).

The Claimant's prior employment history was a security guard, apprentice carpenter, restaurant owner, and warehous e worker. In consider ation of the Claimant's testimony and Occupational Code, the prior remployment as a security guard is classified a sunskilled sedentary while his warehouse work is considered uns killed, light work. The Claimant's work as an apprentice carpenter and restaur ant owner is considered semi-skilled, light to medium work. 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. As noted above, the objective evidence

does not contain any significant physical or mental restrictions that would preclude employment. The Claimant testified to limitations consistent with sedentary to light work. In light of the entire record and the Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that the Claimant is able to perform past relevant work as a security guard. Accordingly, the Claimant is found not disabled for purposes of the SDA program at Step 4 with no further analysis 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 SDA benefit program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

Collein M. Mamilka

Colleen M. Mamelka Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 31, 2012

Date Mailed: July 31, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at

Re Michigan Administrative Hearings consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CMM/cl

CC:

