

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-016655
Issue No.: 4009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 03, 2015
County: SANILAC

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, telephone hearing was held on March 03, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], eligibility specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (Department) properly determine that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for 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 August 25, 2014, the Claimant submitted an application for State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On October 3, 2014, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for State Disability Assistance (SDA) because it determined that her impairments do not prevent all work for more than 90 days.
3. On October 20, 2014, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.
4. On November 12, 2014, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.
5. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).

6. 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.
7. The Claimant is a 49-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED].
8. Claimant is 5' 6" tall and weighs 235 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a college graduate.
10. The Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
11. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
12. The Claimant has past relevant work experience working production control where she was required to sit at a desk, input data into a computer, and distribute the results of her findings.
13. The Claimant's disability claim is based on fibromyalgia and osteoarthritis.

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 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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program.

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 for a year and 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 prevent any work for more than 90 days? 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 is expected to prevent any work for more than 90 days.

The Claimant is a 49-year-old woman that is 5' 6" tall and weighs 235 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to fibromyalgia and osteoarthritis.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

The Claimant has been diagnosed with fibromyalgia, osteoarthritis, and arthralgia. A consultative physician found that the Claimant's ability to sit and stand during a normal work day is not impaired. A consultative physician found the Claimant to be capable of lifting 20 pounds frequently and lift 30 pounds occasionally. The consultative physician found the Claimant to be capable of bending, stooping, squatting, crouching, crawling, reaching, pushing, pulling, handling, grasping, fingering, and feeling. A consultative physician found the Claimant to be capable of normal and unassisted ambulation without assistive devices. The consultative physician found that the Claimant has no visual or communicative limitations.

The Claimant is being treated for chronic fibromyalgia with worsening symptoms during cold weather and during the morning.

The Claimant testified that she suffers from severe pain can be reduced but not limited with medication.

The evidence on the record indicates that the Claimant's was been diagnosed with fibromyalgia and osteoarthritis by a treating physician. The Claimant testified that she suffers from severe and chronic pain. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the severe pain described by the Claimant could be reasonably be expected to arise from her medically determinable impairments as diagnosed by her treating physician. The Claimant's severe pain could reasonably be expected to interfere with the completion of work related tasks on a sustained basis.

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.

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 does not meet a listing for fibromyalgia. The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, do not support a finding that her condition meets a listed impairment based on a diagnosis of fibromyalgia.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for arthritis 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.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for fibromyalgia or 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 impairment in each upper extremity resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively. Inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively includes the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level.

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).

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).

A consultative physician found the Claimant to be capable of lifting 30 pounds occasionally and that she retains the ability to reach, push, pull, handle, grasp, finger, and feel objects. The Claimant's ability to sit during a normal day is not impaired. There findings are not contradicted by any findings by her treating physician, or any medical signs or laboratory findings submitted on the record.

After careful consideration of the entire record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567 and 416.967.

The Claimant has past relevant work experience working production control where she was required to sit at a desk and input data. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant's prior fits the description of sedentary work.

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 light.

The Claimant testified that she suffers from severe and chronic pain that could be expected to arise from her diagnosed conditions. 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 49 years-old, a younger person, under age 50, with a more than a high school education, and a history of unskilled work. Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work. State Disability Assistance (SDA) is denied using Vocational Rule 202.20 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 not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is AFFIRMED.



Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Acting DHS Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **4/9/2015**

Date Mailed: **4/9/2015**

KS/sw

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which 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:

