

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg No.: 2012-68562  
Issue No.: 2009, 4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 14, 2012  
Wayne County DHS (31)

**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 Wednesday, November 14, 2012. The Claimant appeared and testified. Participating on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department") was [REDACTED].

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 forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On January 3, 2013, this office received the SHRT determination which found the Claimant not disabled. 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 on 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 May 11, 2011.
2. On April 16, 2012, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)

3. On May 3, 2012, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination. (Exhibit 3)
4. On August 2, 2012, the Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing. (Exhibit 4)
5. On September 27<sup>th</sup> and December 21, 2012, the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 5)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to carpal tunnel syndrome ("CTS"), restless leg syndrome, arthritis, blurred vision, high blood pressure, edema, angina, irritable bowel syndrome ("IBS"), acid reflux, diabetes, neuropathy, and sleep apnea.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 45 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5'4" in height; and weighed 265 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college and vocational training and an employment history as a nursing assistant and child care provider.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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 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 Tables ("RFT").

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 416.913. 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 (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 416.945(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 are 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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(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 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 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 CTS, restless leg syndrome, arthritis, blurred vision, high blood pressure, edema, angina, IBS, acid reflux, diabetes, neuropathy, sleep apnea, and depression.

In support of her claim, some older records from 2009 and 2010 were submitted which document treatment/diagnoses of anxiety, diabetes mellitus (uncontrolled) with neuropathy, hypertension, dyslipidemia, hepatitis B, ankle pain, proteinuria, anemia, GERD, joint pain, obesity, depression, lower extremity edema, CTS, and obstructive sleep apnea.

On February 5, 2011, the Claimant was admitted to a psychiatric hospital with major depression and suicidal ideations. The Claimant was brought to the hospital for treatment for hyperglycemia where she was treated and discharged with the diagnoses of hyperglycemia and depression. The Claimant was transferred back to the psychiatric hospital. The Claimant was discharged on February 9<sup>th</sup> with the diagnoses of major depressive disorder and personality disorder. Post-traumatic stress disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, borderline personality disorder, and antisocial personality disorder were not ruled out. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 50.

2012-68562/CMM

On February 11, 2011, the Claimant sought treatment for nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal pain, and body aches. The Claimant was discharged the following day with the diagnoses of nausea, vomiting, fever, urinary tract infection, and viral syndrome.

On April 27, 2011, the Claimant was treated/diagnosed with atypical chest pain, hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes mellitus, degenerative joint disease, and neuropathy.

On July 26, 2011, a Medical Examination Report was partially completed by the Claimant's treating physician (sleep medicine) on behalf of the Claimant. The Claimant was in stable condition and able to meet her needs in the home.

On this same date a Psychiatric/Psychological Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were major depression, recurrent, dysthymic disorder, and panic disorder. The GAF was 50.

On this same date, a Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The Claimant was markedly limited in 7 of the 20 factors (mostly related to her ability for sustained concentration/pace in a work environment) with moderate limitations in 10 factors. The Claimant was not significantly limited in her ability to carry out simple, one of two step instructions.

On July 28, 2011, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant by her family practitioner. The current diagnoses were insulin dependent diabetes mellitus, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and lower extremity neuropathy. The Claimant was in stable condition and able to meet her needs in the home.

On July 29, 2011, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The physical examination documented obesity and an A1c of 7.4, but was otherwise normal. The Claimant was in stable condition and able to meet her needs in the home.

On August 11, 2011, a Medical Examination Report was completed by the Claimant's gastrologist on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was IBS. The Claimant was in stable condition.

On September 15, 2011, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were history of congestive heart failure, obstructive sleep apnea, diabetes mellitus, uncontrolled hypertension, and dyslipidemia. The Claimant was in stable condition and able to meet her needs in the home.

2012-68562/CMM

On October 7, 2011, the Claimant was treated/diagnosed with chest pain and diabetes mellitus. The Claimant was treated and discharged with the diagnoses of hyperglycemia and skin ulcer.

On February 3, 2012, the Claimant was admitted to the hospital with complaints of chest pain. The Claimant's history of coronary disease (20% blockage), bipolar disorder, IBS, anemia, hepatitis B, diabetes mellitus, anxiety, ovarian cysts, and peripheral neuropathy were noted. The discharge summary was not submitted; however, the Claimant remained hospitalized until at least February 5<sup>th</sup> with the diagnoses of atypical chest pain, neuropathy, constipation (IBS), diabetes mellitus, hypertension, dyslipidemia, morbid obesity, and anemia.

On March 22, 2012, a consultative psychiatric evaluation was performed. The Claimant did not appear to have any cognitive deficits finding her able to understand, remember, and follow through with directions. The diagnoses were dysthymic disorder in partial remission and panic disorder with agoraphobia. The GAF was 55 with a guarded prognosis.

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 medical evidence establishing that she does have physical and mental limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The degree of functional limitation on the Claimant's activities, social function, concentration, persistence, or pace is moderate to marked. The degree of functional limitation in the fourth area (episodes of decompensation) is a 2. 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 evidence confirms treatment/diagnose of anxiety, diabetes mellitus with neuropathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, obstructive sleep apnea, lower extremity edema, CTS, enteritis, hepatitis B, ankle pain, proteinuria, GERD, anemia, IBS, obesity, depression, atypical chest pain, personality disorder, degenerative joint disease, dysthymic disorder, panic disorder with agoraphobia, bipolar disorder, and peripheral neuropathy.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system), Listing 9.00 (endocrine system), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence. There was no evidence of major joint dysfunction, fracture, or nerve

root impingement, nor was there evidence of ongoing treatment, despite adherence to prescribed treatment, of any respiratory impairment. The medical records do not establish a severe cardiac impairment or end organ damage as a result of the Claimant's hypertension. The objective finds do not meet the requirements of a digestive or endocrine impairment(s). The Claimant's treating physicians place the Claimant in stable condition finding her able to meet her needs in the home. Mentally, there was evidence of marked limitations; however the evidence does not show medically documented persistence, either continuous or intermittent symptoms necessary to meet a listing. Although the objective medical records establish physical and mental impairments, these records do not meet the intent and severity requirements of a listing, or its equivalent. Accordingly, the Claimant can not be found disabled, or not disabled at Step 3; therefore, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Before considering the fourth step in the sequential analysis, 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 on a sustained basis despite the 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 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 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 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.*

In this case, the evidence confirms treatment/diagnose of anxiety, diabetes mellitus with neuropathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, obstructive sleep apnea, lower extremity edema, CTS, enteritis, hepatitis B, ankle pain, proteinuria, GERD, anemia, IBS, obesity, depression, atypical chest pain, personality disorder, degenerative joint disease, dysthymic disorder, panic disorder with agoraphobia, bipolar disorder, and peripheral neuropathy. The Claimant testified that she is able to walk short distances; grip/grasp with issues of dropping things due to her CTS; sit for less than 2 hours; lift/carry less than 10 pounds; stand for less than 2 hours; and is unable to bend and/or squat. Physically, the evidence places the Claimant in stable condition. Mentally, the Claimant's treating source imposed marked restrictions, mainly related to the ability to work. Conversely, the consultative evaluation found no cognitive deficits finding her able to understand, remember, and follow through with simple directions. After review of the entire record and considering the Claimant's testimony, and giving weight to the treating source, it is found, that the Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity to perform at least unskilled, limited, sedentary work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(a). Limitations being the alternation between sitting and standing at will.

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).

The Claimant's prior employment was as a nursing assistant and child care provider. In consideration of the Claimant's testimony and Occupational Code, the prior employment is classified as a nursing assistance is considered semi-skilled medium work while work as a child care provider is considered unskilled, light 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. In light of the entire record and the Claimant's RFC (see above), it is found that the Claimant is unable to perform past relevant work. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4.

In Step 5, an assessment of the Claimant'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 45 years old and, thus, considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college and vocational training. Disability is found 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). The age for younger individuals (under 50) generally will not seriously affect the ability to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.963(c).

In this case, the evidence confirms treatment/diagnose of anxiety, diabetes mellitus with neuropathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, obstructive sleep apnea, lower extremity edema, CTS, enteritis, hepatitis B, ankle pain, proteinuria, GERD, anemia, IBS, obesity, depression, atypical chest pain, personality disorder, degenerative joint disease, dysthymic disorder, panic disorder with agoraphobia, bipolar disorder, and peripheral

neuropathy. The treating physicians place the Claimant in stable condition. Mentally, in July of 2011, the Claimant had moderate limitations in her ability to remember locations, and work-like procedures; understand, remember, one or two-step instructions; carry out detailed instructions, and maintain attention and concentration for extended periods. The Claimant was also moderately limited in her ability to make simple work-related decisions. Additionally, marked limitations were documented related to the Claimant's ability to understand and remember detailed instructions; perform activities within a schedule, maintain regular attendance, and be punctual within customary tolerances; sustain an ordinary routine without supervision; work in coordination with or proximity to others without being distracted by them; and complete a normal workday and worksheet without interruptions from psychologically based symptoms and to perform at a consistent pace without an unreasonable number and length of rest periods. The Claimant had one psychiatric hospitalization in February 2011. In March 2012, the consultative evaluation found no cognitive deficits finding her able to understand, remember and follow through with directions. The GAF was 55. In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform at least unskilled, sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record and in consideration of the Claimant's age, education, work experience, RFC, and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rules 201.21 and 201.22, the Claimant is found not disabled at Step 5.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The 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 BAM, BEM, and RFT. 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 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 not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program; therefore, she is found not disabled for purposes of SDA benefit program.

### **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.

*Colleen M. Mamelka*

---

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

Date Signed: January 17, 2013

Date Mailed: January 17, 2013

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (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 timely 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 **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** 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  
Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CMM/tm

cc:

