

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-010312
Issue No.: 4009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 29, 2014
County: Wayne (57)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

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; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 29, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Hearings Facilitator, and [REDACTED], Medical Contact Worker.

ISSUE

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's State Disability Assistance (SDA) application for the reason that Claimant is not a disabled individual.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On [REDACTED], Claimant applied for SDA benefits.
2. Claimant's only basis for SDA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On [REDACTED], the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 4-5).
4. On [REDACTED], DHS denied Claimant's application for SDA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action informing Claimant of the denial.
5. On [REDACTED], Claimant requested a hearing disputing the denial of SDA benefits.

6. On [REDACTED], an administrative hearing was held.
7. During the hearing, Claimant and DHS waived the right to receive a timely hearing decision.
8. During the hearing, the record was extended 30 days to allow Claimant to submit radiology reports pertaining to his spine; an Interim Order Extending the Record was subsequently mailed to both parties.
9. Claimant failed to submit additional medical records.
10. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 41 year old male with a height of 5'9" and weight of 200 pounds.
11. Claimant has no known relevant history of alcohol or illegal substance abuse.
12. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12th grade.
13. Claimant alleged disability based on restrictions related to diagnoses of right hand pain and radiating back pain.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

SDA provides financial assistance to disabled adults who are not eligible for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits. BEM 100 (1/2013), p. 4. The goal of the SDA program is to provide financial assistance to meet a disabled person's basic personal and shelter needs. *Id.* To receive SDA, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person, or age 65 or older. BEM 261 (1/2012), p. 1.

A person is disabled for SDA purposes if he/she:

- receives other specified disability-related benefits or services, see Other Benefits or Services below, or
 - resides in a qualified Special Living Arrangement facility, or
 - is certified as unable to work due to mental or physical disability for at least 90 days from the onset of the disability; or
 - is diagnosed as having Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS).
- Id.*

There was no evidence that any of the above circumstances apply to Claimant. Claimant testified that he received SSI benefits (see Exhibits A1-A9) which ended in 2012 when Claimant began a 2-3 year prison sentence. Claimant's previous approval for SSI benefits is not binding on his current application for SDA benefits. Accordingly, Claimant may not be considered for SDA eligibility without undergoing a medical review process (see BAM 815) which determines whether Claimant is a disabled individual. *Id.*, p. 3.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of SSI disability as found in the federal regulations. 42 CFR 435.540(a). Disability is federally defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity (SGA) 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. As noted above, SDA eligibility is based on a 90 days period of disability.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does the following:

- Performs significant duties, and
- Does them for a reasonable length of time, and
- Does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id.*, p. 9.

Significant duties are duties used to do a job or run a business. *Id.* They must also have a degree of economic value. *Id.* The ability to run a household or take care of oneself does not, on its own, constitute substantial gainful activity. *Id.*

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish a disability through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a).

Federal regulations describe a sequential five step process that is to be followed in determining whether a person is disabled. 20 CFR 416.920. If there is no finding of disability or lack of disability at each step, the process moves to the next step. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4).

The first step in the process considers a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The monthly amount depends on whether a person is statutorily blind or not. "Current" work activity is interpreted to include all time since the date of application. The 2014 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,070.

Claimant credibly denied performing any employment since the date of the MA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Claimant's testimony. Based on the presented evidence, it is found that Claimant is not performing SGA and has not performed SGA since the date of application. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step two.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the 12 month duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(ii). The impairments may be combined to meet the severity requirement. If a severe impairment is not found, then a person is deemed not disabled. *Id.* The 12 month durational period is applicable to SSA and MA benefits; as noted above, SDA eligibility requires only a 90 day duration of disability.

The impairments must significantly limit a person's basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(5)(c). "Basic work activities" refers to the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. *Id.* Examples of basic work activities include:

- physical functions (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling)
- capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking, understanding; carrying out, and remembering simple instructions
- use of judgment
- responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and/or
- dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a *de minimus* standard upon claimants to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10th Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10th Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6th Cir. 1988). Similarly, Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been interpreted so that a claim may be denied at step two for lack of a severe impairment only when the medical evidence establishes a slight abnormality or combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work even if the individual's age, education, or work experience were specifically considered. *Barrientos v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 1, 2 (1st Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirement is intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1st Cir. 1986).

SSA specifically notes that age, education, and work experience are not considered at the second step of the disability analysis. 20 CFR 416.920 (5)(c). In determining whether Claimant's impairments amount to a severe impairment, all other relevant evidence may be considered. The analysis will begin with a summary of the relevant submitted medical documentation.

Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) physician office visit documents (Exhibits 16-18) dated [REDACTED] were presented. Medical history noted a herniated disc from 2009 and right ulnar nerve damage from 1996. Decreased range of motion in Claimant's right hand was noted.

MDOC physician documents (Exhibits 19-21) dated [REDACTED] were presented. A complaint of ongoing lumbar pain, radiating to the right calf, was noted. It was noted that symptoms were relieved by over-the-counter meds. A physical examination noted no abnormalities. A negative straight-leg raising test was noted. Lumbar curvature was noted as flat. A strict avoidance of risky behaviors was noted. On [REDACTED], naprosyn was prescribed (see Exhibit 30).

MDOC physician documents (Exhibits 26-27) dated [REDACTED] were presented. An indeterminate hepatitis C testing result was noted.

MDOC mental health screening documents (Exhibits 22-25) from 10/2012 were presented. The documents were not notable.

MDOC nursing documents (Exhibits 28-29) dated [REDACTED] were presented. An ongoing complaint of radiating back pain (10/10) was noted. It was noted that Claimant reported that naprosyn reduces pain from a level 10 to a pain level of 9. It was noted that Claimant reported the ability to sleep only for 2 hours due to pain. Right lower back tenderness and limited ranges of motion were noted. It was noted that Claimant dragged his right leg when ambulating. A plan of Tylenol (650mg) was noted as prescribed.

MDOC treatment documents (Exhibits 31-34) dated [REDACTED] were presented. An impression of a normal thoracic spine and lumbar dextroscoliosis were noted following radiology.

MDOC treatment documents (Exhibits 35-40) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant was lying on floor outside of cell complaining of right hip pain. Claimant was instructed to use warm compresses, perform mild stretching, and to stay hydrated. Flexeril was prescribed.

MDOC treatment documents (Exhibits 41-49) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of severe right leg and foot pain and numbness. Skepticism was noted when Claimant complained of severe pain after his right foot was touched. Naprosyn was noted as stopped. Malingering was a noted illness. Lumbar curvature was noted as normal.

A MDOC treatment document (Exhibit 50) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that authorization was sent to a hospital for past x-rays, MRIs, and EMGs.

MDOC treatment documents (Exhibits 55-57) dated [REDACTED] were presented. It was noted that Claimant underwent special accommodation screening. No special accommodations were noted.

A MDOC treatment document (Exhibit 58) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that Claimant presented with PPD; further explanation was not apparent.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibits 11-13) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The form was completed by an orthopedic surgeon with an approximate two year history of treating Claimant. Claimant's physician listed diagnoses of right-sided radiculopathy and chronic back pain (L4-L5). Over-the-counter anti-inflammatory meds were noted as Claimant's current medications. An impression was given that Claimant's condition was deteriorating. It was noted that Claimant required assistance with chores, laundry, shopping, and meal preparation. It was noted that Claimant walks with a slightly antalgic gait. It was noted that Achilles and quadriceps tendons were bilaterally diminished.

Claimant testified that he has standing and lifting restrictions related to back pain. Presented radiology verified some degree of narrowing which can reasonably be expected to cause pain when standing or lifting/carrying.

It is found that Claimant established a severe impairment. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step three.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires a determination whether the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If Claimant's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the 12 month requirement, then the claimant is deemed disabled. If the impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

A listing for joint dysfunction (Listing 1.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaints of right hand pain. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish that Claimant is unable to perform fine and gross movements.

A listing for spinal disorders (Listing 1.04) was considered based on Claimant's LBP complaints. This listing was rejected due to a failure to establish a spinal disorder resulting in a compromised nerve root.

It is found that Claimant failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves to step four.

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 it is determined that a claimant can perform past relevant work. *Id.*

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). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

Claimant testified that he worked in 2003-2004 as a laborer. Claimant testified that his job duties included demolishing or gutting building. Claimant's testimony implied that he does not have the strength to perform his past job.

Claimant testified that he worked in 2009 as a manager of an apartment building. Claimant's testimony implied that he is unable to perform the standing required of his past employment.

For purposes of this decision, Claimant's testimony that he is unable to perform past employment will be accepted. Accordingly, the analysis may proceed to step five.

In the fifth step in the process, the individual's RFC in conjunction with his or her age, education, and work experience, are considered to determine whether the individual can engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. SSR 83-10. 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).

To determine the physical demands (i.e. exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967. The definitions for each are listed below.

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 are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). Examples of non-exertional limitations include difficulty functioning 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 using the rules of Appendix 2, an individual's circumstances, as indicated by the findings with respect to RFC, age, education, and work experience, is compared to the pertinent rule(s).

Given Claimant's age, education and employment history a determination of disability is dependent on Claimant's ability to perform sedentary employment. For sedentary employment, periods of standing or walking should generally total no more than about 2 hours of an 8-hour workday. Social Security Rule 83-10.

Physician statements of restrictions were provided. Treating source opinions cannot be discounted unless the Administrative Law Judge provides good reasons for discounting the opinion. *Rogers v. Commissioner*, 486 F. 3d 234 (6th Cir. 2007); *Bowen v Commissioner*.

Claimant's physician opined that Claimant was to less than 2 hours of standing and/or walking (see Exhibit 12). Claimant's physician opined that Claimant was restricted from performing repetitive pushing/pulling and from operating foot/leg controls. Claimant's physician stated that restrictions were based on x-ray findings dated [REDACTED].

A radiography report dated [REDACTED] (Exhibits 14-15) of Claimant's lumbar was presented. In comparison to radiography dated 4/7/12, mild space narrowing was noted at L4-L5 and L5-S1. An impression of no significant interval changes with some lumbarization of S1 was noted.

Radiology findings verify some degree of discomfort. "Some lumbarization" and "mild space narrowing" is not particularly consistent with standing restrictions of less than 2 hours per day or lifting restrictions of less than 10 pounds. Presented radiology was consistent with finding that Claimant can, at a minimum, perform sedentary employment.

There are occasions when spinal x-ray reports are insufficient to verify spinal dysfunction. Claimant was given 30 days from the date of hearing to present additional spinal radiology reports (e.g. CT or MRI reports). Additional documents were not provided. This consideration also supports a finding that Claimant can perform sedentary employment.

Claimant testified that he was capable of sitting for 2 hour periods. Claimant's physician provided no indication of sitting restrictions. The evidence was consistent with finding that Claimant can perform the sitting required of sedentary employment.

Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (younger individual aged 18-44), education (high school), employment history (semi-skilled with no known transferrable skills), Medical-Vocational Rule 201.28 is found to apply. This rule dictates a finding that Claimant is not disabled. Accordingly, it is found that DHS properly found Claimant to be not disabled for purposes of SDA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS properly denied Claimant's SDA benefit application dated [REDACTED] based on a determination that Claimant is not disabled.

The actions taken by DHS are **AFFIRMED**.



Christian Gardocki
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **12/12/2014**

Date Mailed: **12/12/2014**

CG / hw

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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 48909-8139

CC:

