

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201363369  
Issue No.: 2009; 4009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 8, 2014  
County: Ingham County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 8, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and her attorney, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]. During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (Department) properly determine that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) based on disability 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 May 24, 2013, the Claimant submitted an application for Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On July 29, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) because it determined that she is capable of performing other work despite her impairments.
3. On July 29, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.
4. On August 8, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.

5. On September 30, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the Medical Review Team's (MRT) denial of Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits.
6. On March 21, 2014, after reviewing the additional medical records, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) again upheld the determination of the Medical Review Team (MRT) that the Claimant does not meet the disability standard.
7. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).
8. The Social Security Administration (SSA) denied the Claimant's federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) application and the Claimant reported that a SSI appeal is pending.
9. The Claimant is a 42-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED].
10. Claimant is 5' 5" tall and weighs 335 pounds.
11. The Claimant is a high school graduate. The Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
12. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
13. The Claimant has past relevant work experience providing customer service for a collection agency.
14. The Claimant's disability claim is based on osteoarthritis, neuropathy, and anxiety.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, Rule 400.901 - 400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because her claim for assistance has been denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903. Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-44.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 Supplemental Security Income (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.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...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.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order.

#### STEP 1

Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is not disabled.

At step 1, a determination is made on whether the Claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that she has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, she is not disabled regardless of how severe her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

The Claimant testified that she has not been employed since 2006 except for a failed attempt at returning to her previous work in 2010. The Claimant is not currently engaged in substantial gainful activity, which was not disputed by the Department during the hearing. Therefore this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

#### STEP 2

Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is not disabled.

At step two, a determination is made whether the Claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921). If the Claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, she is not disabled. If the Claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The Claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months, or result in death.

The Claimant was a 42-year-old woman at the time of her application that is 5' 5" tall and weighs 335 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to osteoarthritis, neuropathy, and anxiety.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

An x-ray scan of the Claimant's knee revealed no fracture or dislocation. Moderate tricompartmental degenerative changes and spur formation were observed. The Claimant experiences a worsening of her medial compartment narrowing, but her soft tissues are unremarkable.

A magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan of the Claimant's lumbar spine revealed lumbar facet syndrome and lumbar degenerative disc disease with no evidence of radiculopathy.

A magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan revealed broad disc bulge and facet arthropathy producing borderline central canal stenosis and bilateral neural foramen narrowing at the L2-3 level. Lateral disc bulge and facet arthropathy producing bilateral neural foramen narrowing at the L3-4 and L4-5 levels were also found, but there was no evidence of central canal stenosis.

A treating osteopathic doctor found the Claimant to have a slow gait without assistance, and that she is capable of lifting 10 pounds occasionally, standing less than 2 hours in an 8-hour workday, and sitting less than 6 hours in an 8 hour workday. The Claimant is capable of grasping, reaching, and fine manipulation with both hands, but not pushing or pulling, or operating foot controls.

The Claimant experiences stiffness and significant pain in her back. The Claimant takes Ibuprofen twice a day, as well as using a back brace and

an electro-shock device to deal with this pain. The Claimant reported that her pain is significantly reduced upon taking the Ibuprofen.

A treating physician diagnosed the Claimant with anxiety, depression, chronic pain, sleep disturbance, obesity, hypertension, joint pain, and headaches. The Claimant reported suffering from anxiety as the result of harsh weather conditions and loss of electricity at home. The Claimant reported that she self-medicates by smoking cigarettes but also achieves some relief from her prescribed medications.

The Claimant is capable of preparing meals, shopping for groceries, vacuuming floors, and folding laundry. The Claimant is capable of caring for her personal needs without assistance including showering and dressing herself. The Claimant smokes a pack of cigarettes every two and a half days.

The evidence on the record indicates that the Claimant's was been diagnosed with osteoarthritis, chronic pain, and obesity by a treating physician, which has resulted in significant impairments to her ability to sit and stand for an eight hour workday. The level of pain the Claimant testified that she experience is the type that could reasonably be expected as a result of the conditions she has been diagnosed with by her treating physicians. This level of pain combined with her obesity, hypertension, and osteoarthritis could reasonably be expected to interfere with her ability to perform work related activities. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds a severe physical impairment that has more than a de minimus effect on the Claimant's ability to perform work activities. The Claimant's impairments have lasted continuously, or are expected to last for twelve months.

### STEP 3

Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4.

At step three, a determination is made whether the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the Claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for osteoarthritis under section 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant's impairment involves a weight bearing joint resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, or an impairment of an upper extremity resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively. A treating osteopathic doctor found the Claimant to be unable to push or pull with her hands, but is capable of

grasping, reaching, and fine manipulation. The Claimant's treating physician found to be capable of a slow gait.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for osteoarthritis or neuropathy under section 14.09 Inflammatory Arthritis because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate an impairment involving a weight-bearing joint and resulting in an inability to ambulate effectively. The objective evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant lacks the ability to perform fine and gross movements with each upper extremity. A treating osteopathic doctor found the Claimant to be unable to push or pull with her hands, but is capable of grasping, reaching, and fine manipulation. The Claimant's treating physician found to be capable of a slow gait.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for anxiety under section 12.06 Anxiety-related disorders, because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from marked restrictions of her activities of daily living or social functioning. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from repeated episodes of decompensation. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant is completely unable to function outside her home.

The Claimant's impairment does not meet a listing for hypertension. The objective medical evidence indicates that medical evidence does not support a finding of a severe impairment of a body system secondary her severe hypertension. The Claimant's hypertension will be further considered when evaluating her residual functional capacity.

Obesity is a medically determinable impairment that is often associated with disturbance of the musculoskeletal system, and disturbance of this system can be a major cause of disability in individuals with obesity. The combined effects of obesity with musculoskeletal impairments can be greater than the effects of each of the impairments considered separately. Therefore, when determining whether an individual with obesity has a listing-level impairment or combination of impairments, and when assessing a claim at other steps of the sequential evaluation process, including when assessing an individual's residual functional capacity, adjudicators must consider any additional and cumulative effects of obesity. 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.

A treating physician found the Claimant to have medically determinable obesity that in combination with her osteoarthritis and anxiety has a significant impact on her ability to perform work related activities. There is no separate listing for obesity, but the effects of obesity may increase the severity of coexisting or related impairments to the extent that the combination of impairments meets the requirements of a listing.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that despite the Claimant's osteoarthritis and chronic pain, when considered in combination with the Claimant's medically determinable obesity, does not meet or equal an impairment listed in the federal regulations. Despite the significant impairment's to the Claimant's ability to perform work related activities the Claimant maintains the capability of effective and unassisted ambulation with a slow gait. The Claimant also maintains the capability of grasping and fine manipulation of objects with her hands. Therefore, the Claimant's condition does not meet or equal a listed impairment as a result of obesity.

The medical evidence of the Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she would meet a statutory listing in federal code of regulations 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.

#### STEP 4

Can the client do the former work that she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is not disabled.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, a determination is made of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(c)). An individual's residual functional capacity is her ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from her impairments. In making this finding, the undersigned must consider all of the Claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, a determination is made on whether the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of her past relevant work (20 CFR 404.1520(f) and 416.920(f)). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. In addition, the work must have lasted long enough for the Claimant to learn to do the job and have been SGA (20 CFR 404.1560(b), 404.1565, 416.960(b), and 416.965). If the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do her past relevant work, the Claimant is not disabled. If the Claimant is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth and last step.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium, and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

**Sedentary work.** Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

**Light work.** Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the 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.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

**Medium work.** Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds.

If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

To determine the skills required in the national economy of work you are able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled. These terms have the same meaning as defined in. 20 CFR 416.968.

Unskilled work. Unskilled work is work which needs little or no judgment to do simple duties that can be learned on the job in a short period of time. The job may or may not require considerable strength. For example, we consider jobs unskilled if the primary work duties are handling, feeding and offbearing (that is, placing or removing materials from machines which are automatic or operated by others), or machine tending, and a person can usually learn to do the job in 30 days, and little specific vocational preparation and judgment are needed. A person does not gain work skills by doing unskilled jobs. 20 CFR 416.968(a).

Semi-skilled work. Semi-skilled work is work which needs some skills but does not require doing the more complex work duties. Semi-skilled jobs may require alertness and close attention to watching machine processes; or inspecting, testing or otherwise looking for irregularities; or tending or guarding equipment, property, materials, or persons against loss, damage or injury; or other types of activities which are similarly less complex than skilled work, but more complex than unskilled work. A job may be classified as semi-skilled where coordination and dexterity are necessary, as when hands or feet must be moved quickly to do repetitive tasks. 20 CFR 416.968(b).

Skilled work. Skilled work requires qualifications in which a person uses judgment to determine the machine and manual operations to be performed in order to obtain the proper form, quality, or quantity of material to be produced. Skilled work may require laying out work, estimating quality, determining the suitability and needed quantities of materials, making precise measurements, reading blueprints or other specifications, or making necessary computations or mechanical adjustments to control or regulate the work. Other skilled jobs may require dealing with people, facts, or figures or abstract ideas at a high level of complexity. 20 CFR 416.968(c).

We consider you to have skills that can be used in other jobs, when the skilled or semi-skilled work activities you did in past work can be used to meet the requirements of skilled or semi-skilled work activities of other jobs or kinds of work. This depends largely on the similarity of



occupationally significant work activities among different jobs. 20 CFR 416.968(d).

The Claimant has past relevant work experience performing customer service at a collection agency. The Claimant's past relevant work experience fits the description of semi-skilled work in that it required specific training and the application of judgment despite the fact that it did not require physical skills requiring considerable dexterity. The Claimant's prior work is of a type that requires skills that could be transferred to other semi-skilled work in that customer services skills are applicable to a broad variety of work settings. The Claimant's past relevant work fits the description of sedentary work in that it requires occasionally lifting and carrying articles like docket files, ledges, and small tools.

After careful consideration of the entire record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567 and 416.967. The Claimant's treating osteopathic doctor found her to be capable of lifting 10 pounds occasionally, which is consistent with the performance of sedentary work. Despite the treating physician's opinion that the Claimant is capable of sitting less than 6 hours in an 8 hour workday, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is capable of performing sedentary work despite her impairments. The Claimant's treating osteopathic doctor determined that she is capable of grasping and manipulating objects despite her impairments. The Claimant testified that her significant pain is substantially reduced when treated with medication and therapy. The Claimant testified that she is capable of vacuuming floors, folding laundry, and preparing quick meals. The Claimant has been diagnosed with anxiety but the evidence available on the record does not support a finding that she is no longer capable of performing semi-skilled tasks as a result. Based on the evidence on the record as a whole, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is capable of sedentary work if she maintains compliance with her physician's treatment plan.

Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is capable of performing sedentary work, and there is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that the Claimant is unable to perform work substantially similar to work performed in the past.

#### STEP 5

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that the Claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) for Substantial Gainful Activity.

Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, client is not disabled.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), a determination is made whether the Claimant is able to do any other work considering her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the Claimant is able to do other work, she is not disabled. If the Claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirement, she is disabled.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

The objective medical evidence indicates that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment and that she is physically able to do less strenuous tasks if demanded of her. The Claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform sedentary work.

The Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing.

The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to the Claimant's ability to perform work.

Medical vocational guidelines have been developed and can be found in 20 CFR, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 200.00. When the facts coincide with a particular guideline, the guideline directs a conclusion as to disability. 20 CFR 416.969.

Claimant is 42-years-old, a younger person, under age 50, with a high school education, and a history of semi-skilled work with skills that are transferrable to other semi-skilled work. The Claimant's Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform sedentary work. Medical Assistance (M.A.) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) is denied using Vocational Rule 201.28 as a guideline.

The Department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 261 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-8. Because the Claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that the Claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the Claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds Claimant  disabled  not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (M.A.) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's determination is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED.



Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 11, 2014

Date Mailed: April 11, 2014

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be received in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

201363369/KS

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

KS/hj

cc:

