

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-019307  
Issue No.: 4009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 5, 2015  
County: Wayne (35)

**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 from February 5, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Hearings Facilitator.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's State Disability Assistance (SDA) eligibility 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 8-9).
4. On [REDACTED], DHS denied Claimant's application for SDA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action (Exhibit 50) informing Claimant of the denial.
5. On [REDACTED], Claimant requested a hearing disputing the denial of SDA benefits (see Exhibits 2-5).

6. As of the date of application, Claimant was a 51 year old male.
7. Claimant has not earned substantial gainful activity since before the first month of benefits sought.
8. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12<sup>th</sup> grade.
9. Claimant has a history of unskilled employment, with no transferrable job skills.
10. Claimant alleged disability based on restrictions related to diagnoses of carpal-tunnel syndrome (CTS), hip pain related to a gunshot wound, leg pain related to a previous surgery, depression, and anxiety.

### **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. 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 day period of disability.

SGA means a person does the following: performs significant duties, 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 SGA. *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 SDA 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 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 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 presented evidence.

Claimant testified that he was shot three times in 2002- once in his right hand, once in his right hip, and once in his right leg. Claimant testified that the bullet in his hip was not removed because surgery could cause nerve damage.

A neurologist report (Exhibits 32-34) dated [REDACTED] was presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of right hand pain, lumbar pain, and neck pain. It was noted that Claimant recently purchased CTS braces which reduced his hand pain. Mild right foot drop and 4+/5 right leg strength was noted. An assessment of symptoms suggestive of cervical and lumbar degenerative disease without radiculopathy was noted. Bilateral CTS was also noted as a possibility. A back brace was noted as prescribed.

A CT cervical spine report (Exhibits 30-31) dated [REDACTED] was presented. Marked narrowing at C5-C6 with mild posterior spur formation was noted. Mild sclerosis and

moderate foraminal narrowing was noted at C5 and C6. An impression of spondylosis at C5-C6 was noted.

A radiology report of Claimant's lumbar spine (Exhibits 28-29) dated [REDACTED] was presented. An impression of partial sacralization of L5 and mild degenerative disease at L5-S1 was noted.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibits 15-17) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The form was completed by a treating neurologist with an approximate 9 month history of treating Claimant. A diagnosis of neck and back pain was noted. Current medications included gabapentin, Norco, and Flexeril. Physical examination findings included the following: right foot drop, right hand scar from gunshot wound, and stiff paraspinal muscles. An impression was given that Claimant's condition was stable. It was noted that Claimant can meet household needs.

A Psychiatric Evaluation (Exhibits 21-25) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The form was completed by a treating psychiatrist with no history of treating Claimant. A distant history of drug and alcohol abuse was noted. It was noted that Claimant reported depression and paranoia since getting shot in 2003. Notable observations of Claimant included the following: normal thought process, auditory hallucinations, sad and anxious mood, alert, orientation x4, fair attention and concentration, good insight, and good judgment. An Axis I diagnosis of major depressive disorder (severe with psychotic features) was noted. Claimant's GAF was noted to be 35. A fair-to-good prognosis was noted.

A Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment (Exhibits 26-27) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The assessment was noted as completed by a treating psychiatrist. Claimant's psychiatrist found that Claimant was markedly restricted in the ability to travel to unfamiliar places. Moderate restrictions were noted in the following work-related abilities:

- Remembering locations and other work-like procedures
- Understanding and remembering 1 or 2-step directions
- Understanding and remembering detailed instructions
- Carrying out simple 1-2 step directions.
- Carrying out detailed instructions
- Maintaining concentration for extended periods
- Performing activities within a schedule and maintaining attendance and punctuality
- Sustaining an ordinary routine without supervision
- Working in coordination or proximity to other without being distracting
- Making simple work-related decisions
- Completing a normal workday without psychological symptom interruption
- Accepting instructions and responding appropriately to criticism
- Responding appropriately to changes in the work setting
- Being aware of normal hazards and taking appropriate precautions
- Setting realistic goals or making plans independently of others.

Claimant presented pain clinic appointment documents (Exhibits A1-A2). The appointments were for [REDACTED].

Patient Instructions (Exhibit A3) dated [REDACTED] from a physician were presented. The instructions were indicative that Claimant underwent a lumbar epidural injection.

Claimant testified that he has standing and ambulation restrictions. Based on Claimant's medical history of gunshot wounds, epidural injections, foot drop, and lumbar degenerative disease, some degree of ambulation and standing restrictions can be inferred. It is found that Claimant has a severe impairment and the 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 hip and leg dysfunction. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish that Claimant is unable to ambulate effectively.

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

A listing for peripheral neuropathies (Listing 11.14) was factored based on a diagnosis of CTS. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in multiple extremities.

A listing for affective disorder (Listing 12.04) was considered based on diagnoses of depression. This listing was rejected due to a failure to establish marked restrictions in social functioning, completion of daily activities or concentration. It was also not established that Claimant required a highly supportive living arrangement, suffered repeated episodes of decompensation or that the residual disease process resulted in a marginal adjustment so that even a slight increase in mental demands would cause decompensation.

It is found that Claimant failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves to Step 4.

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 stated that he previously worked at a deli counter for 7 months. Claimant testified that his job required extensive periods of standing while waiting on customers. Claimant also testified that he was responsible for cleaning equipment and bringing food to and from the display area.

Claimant testified that his other employment from the last 15 years involved various temporary work. Claimant testified that his temp jobs typically involved some type of physical labor.

Claimant testified that he is unable to perform the standing required of his past employment. Claimant's testimony was consistent with presented evidence. It is found that Claimant is unable to perform past employment and the analysis may proceed to the final step.

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 light employment. Social Security Rule 83-10 states that the full range of light work requires standing or walking, off and on, for a total of approximately 6 hours of an 8-hour workday.

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 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Bowen v Commissioner*.

Claimant estimated that he was limited to walking approximately 3 blocks. Claimant testified that he was capable of standing for 10-15 minute periods before leg pain prevented further standing.

On a Medical Examination Report dated [REDACTED], Claimant's neurologist opined that Claimant was restricted as follows over an eight-hour workday, less than 2 hours of standing and/or walking, and less than 6 hours of sitting. Claimant's physician opined Claimant from repetitive right leg actions. A restriction of occasional lifting of 10 pounds or less, never 20 pounds or more was noted. Restrictions were noted to be based on radiology.

Medical documents were generally consistent with Claimant's and his neurologist's stated restrictions. The provided standing restrictions were consistent with an inability to perform light employment. It is found that Claimant is restricted to sedentary employment.

Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (approaching advanced age), education (high school with no direct entry into skilled employment), employment history (unskilled), Medical-Vocational Rule 201.12 is found to apply. This rule dictates a finding that Claimant is disabled. Accordingly, it is found that DHS improperly 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 improperly denied Claimant's application for SDA benefits. It is ordered that DHS perform the following actions:

- (1) reinstate Claimant's SDA benefit application dated [REDACTED];
- (2) evaluate Claimant's eligibility subject to the finding that Claimant is a disabled individual;
- (3) initiate a supplement for any benefits not issued as a result of the improper application denial; and
- (4) schedule a review of benefits in one year from the date of this administrative decision, if Claimant is found eligible for future benefits.

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



---

**Christian Gardocki**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **2/11/2015**

Date Mailed: **2/11/2015**

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:

