

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-23422
Issue No(s): 4009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 7, 2014
County: Wayne (31)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez

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 May 7, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] ES, and [REDACTED] Hearings Facilitator.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) and/or 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. Claimant applied for SDA on November 18, 2013.
2. Claimant is 50 years old.
3. Claimant has a high school education.
4. Claimant is not currently working.
5. Claimant has a history of less than gainful employment.

6. Claimant has a medical history of low back pain, swelling of the legs, and swelling of the brain.
7. A treating source examination noted that claimant was barely able to ambulate, had extreme lower back pain, and limited range of motion.
8. This examination gave claimant limitations consistent with sedentary activity.
9. Objective medical records support the findings of the treating source examination.
10. On December 13, 2013, the Medical Review Team denied SDA, stating that claimant could perform other work.
11. On January 3, 2014, claimant was sent a notice of case action.
12. On January 14, 2014, claimant filed for hearing.
13. On April 17, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team denied SDA, specifically stating that the medical evidence supported a finding of a capacity to perform light exertional tasks.
14. The only piece of medical evidence in the file making a finding claimant's residual functional capacity is the treating source evaluation that found claimant limitations consistent with sedentary work.
15. On May 7, 2014, a hearing was held before the Administrative Law Judge.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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.

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition of the term “disabled” as is used by the Social Security Administration for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

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

This is determined by a five step sequential evaluation process where current work activity, the severity and duration of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are considered. These factors are always considered in order according to the five step sequential evaluation, and when a determination can be made at any step as to the claimant’s disability status, no analysis of subsequent steps are necessary. 20 CFR 416.920

The undersigned fully adopts the findings of the State Hearing Review Team, with the exception of their RFC evaluation; the undersigned holds that this finding is not supported by competent evidence. As such, the undersigned will proceed to step five of the disability process.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the Administrative Law Judge must determine if the claimant’s impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant’s:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as “what can you still do despite you limitations?” 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987).

At step five, RFC must be expressed in terms of, or related to, the exertional categories when the adjudicator determines whether there is other work that the individual can do. However, in order for an individual to do a full range of work at a given exertional level, such as sedentary, the individual must be able to perform substantially all of the exertional and nonexertional functions required at that level. SSR 96-8p. The individual has the burden of proving that they are disabled and of raising any issue bearing on that determination or decision. SSR 86-8.

If the remaining physical and mental capacities are consistent with meeting the physical and mental demands of a significant number of jobs in the national economy, and the claimant has the vocational capabilities (considering age, education and past work experience) to make an adjustment to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined that the claimant is not disabled. However, if the claimant's physical, mental and vocational capacities do not allow the individual to adjust to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined at this step that the claimant is disabled. SSR 86-8.

For the purpose of determining the exertional requirements of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very heavy". These terms have the same meaning as are used in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. In order to evaluate the claimant's skills and to help determine the existence in the national economy of work the claimant is able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semiskilled and skilled. SSR 86-8.

These aspects are tied together through use of the rules established in Appendix 2 to Subpart P of the regulations (*20 CR 404, Appendix 2 to Subpart P, Section 200-204 et. seq*) to make a determination as to disability. They reflect the analysis of the various vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) in combination with the individual's residual functional capacity (used to determine his or her maximum sustained work capability for sedentary, light, medium, heavy, or very heavy work) in evaluating the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity in other than his or her vocationally relevant past work. Where the findings of fact made with respect to a particular individual's vocational factors and residual functional capacity coincide with all of the criteria of a particular rule, the rule directs a conclusion as to whether the individual is or is not disabled. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(a).

In the application of the rules, the individual's residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience must first be determined. The correct disability decision (i.e., on the issue of ability to engage in substantial gainful activity) is found by then locating the individual's specific vocational profile. Since the rules are predicated on an individual's having an impairment which manifests itself by limitations in meeting the strength requirements of jobs, they may not be fully applicable where the nature of an individual's impairment does not result in such limitations, e.g., certain mental, sensory, or skin impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(c)-200.00(d).

In the evaluation of disability where the individual has solely a nonexertional type of impairment, determination as to whether disability exists shall be based on the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations. The rules do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled for individuals with solely nonexertional types of impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(e)(1).

However, where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments resulting in both strength limitations and nonexertional limitations, the rules are considered in determining first whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on the strength limitations alone; if not, the rule(s) reflecting the individual's maximum residual strength capabilities, age, education, and work experience provide a framework for consideration of how much the individual's work capability is further diminished in terms of any types of jobs that would be contraindicated by the nonexertional limitations. Furthermore, when there are combinations of nonexertional and exertional limitations which cannot be wholly determined under the rules, full consideration must be given to all of the relevant facts in the case in accordance with the definitions and discussions of each factor in the appropriate sections of the regulations, which will provide insight into the adjudicative weight to be accorded each factor.

Claimant is 50 years old, with a high school education and a no evidence of a gainful work history. The undersigned holds that claimant's exertional impairments render claimant able to perform work at the sedentary level, after considering claimant's medical records, treating source statements and objective medical testing.

The only piece of evidence in the file that makes a reference to claimant's RFC limitations is a treating source examination conducted on November 25, 2013. This examination opines that claimant has limitations consistent with sedentary work.

SHRT found that the evidence of record was consistent with light limitations; given that the only evidence of record consisted of this examination, an examination from October, 2013 that found similar issues, and an August 2013 MRI that supported these findings, and no other evidence, the undersigned is unable to determine where SHRT's determination of a light RFC came from.

Admittedly, while the undersigned may have been content to hold that the evidence of record was insufficient to make a determination, SHRT found enough evidence to find claimant limited, and the undersigned does not see a reason to overrule SHRT's findings of sufficient evidence. However, as the evidence of record clearly states that claimant is limited to sedentary, not light, activity, an assumption must be made that SHRT simply misread the evidence in the packet.

There is no vocational evidence which establishes that the claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that, given claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite claimant's limitations.

Furthermore, no evidence has been provided that any job skills that claimant possesses from his skilled work are transferrable to other professions. For a finding of transferability of skills to skilled sedentary work for individuals of advanced age, there must be very little, if any, vocational adjustment required in terms of tools, work processes, work settings, or the industry. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 201.00(f).

Therefore, using a combination of claimant's age, education level (which does not provide for direct entry into skilled work), and previous work experience, a finding of disability is directed. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 201.12. Claimant is disabled with an onset date of August 13, 2013. Therefore, the Department erred when it denied claimant's SDA application for lack of disability.

As stated above, where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments resulting in both strength limitations and nonexertional limitations, the rules are considered in determining first whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on the strength limitations alone. As we are able to make a determination based solely on exertional limitations, an examination of claimant's nonexertional limitations, such as pain, though quite relevant to claimant's overall health, is not required and will not be made here.

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 MA and/or SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is AFFIRMED REVERSED.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO INITIATE THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. The Department is ORDERED to process claimant's SDA application of November 8, 2013 and award all benefits that claimant is entitled to receive under the appropriate regulations.
2. The Department is ORDERED to conduct a review of this case in December, 2014.



Robert J. Chavez
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 19, 2014

Date Mailed: June 19, 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:

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

RJC/tm

cc:

