



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: October 6, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 17-009164  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie**

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Petitioner'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. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on August 30, 2017, from [REDACTED], Michigan. The Petitioner was represented by herself and her son and chore provider, [REDACTED]. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by [REDACTED], Hearing Facilitator.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) program?

**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], Petitioner applied for SDA.
2. On [REDACTED], the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Petitioner's application for SDA per BEM 261 because the nature and severity of the Petitioner's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days and is capable of performing other work under Medical Vocation Grid Rule 201.24 per 20 CFR 416.920(f).
3. On [REDACTED], the Department Caseworker sent Petitioner a notice that her application was denied.

4. On [REDACTED], the Department received a hearing request from Petitioner, contesting the Department's negative action.
5. Petitioner is a 45 year-old woman whose date of birth is [REDACTED]. Petitioner is 5' 6" tall and weighs 178 pounds. Petitioner completed the 11<sup>th</sup> grade of High School. She was special education in all classes. Petitioner can read, write and do basic math. Petitioner was last employed at [REDACTED] as a cashier at the light level in January 2016. She was also employed as a packer and prep cook at the medium level.
6. Petitioner's alleged impairments are asthma, degenerative disc disease, arthritis in the knees, carpal tunnel syndrome in bilateral hands, lupus, fibromyalgia, seizures, bipolar disorder, and anxiety.
7. Petitioner was seen for a follow up visit for her left knee of injections from her treating specialist at [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. She was positive for moderate fatigue, skin rash, joint pain, and muscle pain. She was given an injection in the right knee of depo-medrol 40 mg lidocaine w/o epinephrine 2.0 ml. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 1-3.
8. On [REDACTED], Petitioner was seen by her treating psychiatrist for a medication review at [REDACTED]. There was no evidence of a severe thought disorder or risk factors. She was diagnosed with major depressive disorder, recurrent episode with psychotic features. There were no changes to the treatment plan or medications. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 10-16.
9. On [REDACTED], Petitioner was seen by her treating neurologist at [REDACTED]. She was seen for medication management. Her assessment was radiculopathy, lumbar region, chronic right lower extremity radiating pain; low back pain, chronic; and long term current use of opiate analgesic. She is stable on medications. Petitioner had a right leg nerve root block a year ago that helped with her pain. She would like to repeat that procedure again. Petitioner was given another right leg nerve block with 30 day follow up. Her medications were continued. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 4-5.
10. On [REDACTED], Petitioner underwent an MRI at [REDACTED]. She had a history of low back pain. The Radiologist's clinical impression was bulging disc with right foraminal herniation and probable right paracentral cranially extruded herniation originating from the L4-5 disc. There was right L4 nerve root impingement. She had broad based herniation at L5-S1. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 8-9.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. 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.

The Department conforms to State statute in administering the SDA program.

2000 PA 294, Sec. 604, of the statute states:

Sec. 604. (1) The department shall operate a state disability assistance program. Except as provided in subsection (3), persons eligible for this program shall include needy citizens of the United States or aliens exempted from the supplemental security income citizenship requirement who are at least 18 years of age or emancipated minors meeting 1 or more of the following requirements:

- (a) A recipient of supplemental security income, social security, or medical assistance due to disability or 65 years of age or older.
- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal supplemental security income disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability. Under SSI, 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.

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience are reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work). 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

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).

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.

Pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920, a five-step sequential evaluation process is used to determine disability. An individual's current work activity, the severity of the impairment, the residual functional capacity, past work, age, education and work experience are evaluated. If an individual is found disabled or not disabled at any point, no further review is made.

The first step is to determine if an individual is working and if that work is "substantial gainful activity" (SGA). If the work is SGA, an individual is not considered disabled regardless of medical condition, age or other vocational factors. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

Secondly, the individual must have a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe." 20 CFR 404.1520(c). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of 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; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p. If the Petitioner does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, the Petitioner is not disabled. If the Petitioner has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The third step in the process is to assess whether the impairment or combination of impairments meets a Social Security listing. If the impairment or combination of impairments meets or is the medically equivalent of a listed impairment as set forth in Appendix 1 and meets the durational requirements of 20 CFR 404.1509, the individual is considered disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

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

The fourth step of the process is whether the Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his past relevant work. 20 CFR 404.1520(f). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Petitioner actually performed it or as is it generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. If the Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to do past relevant work, then the Petitioner is not disabled. If the Petitioner is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth step.

In the fifth step, an individual's residual functional capacity is considered in determining whether disability exists. An individual's age, education, work experience and skills are used to evaluate whether an individual has the residual functional capacity to perform work despite limitations. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

Here, Petitioner has satisfied requirements as set forth in steps one and two of the sequential evaluation. However, Petitioner's impairments do not meet a listing as set forth in Appendix 1, 20 CFR 416.926 for step 3. Therefore, vocational factors will be considered to determine Petitioner's residual functional capacity to do relevant work and past relevant work.

In the present case, Petitioner was seen for a follow up visit for her left knee of injections from her treating specialist at [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. She was positive for moderate fatigue, skin rash, joint pain, and muscle pain. She was

given an injection in the right knee of depo-medrol 40 mg lidocaine w/o epinephrine 2.0 ml. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 1-3.

On [REDACTED], Petitioner was seen by her treating psychiatrist for a medication review at [REDACTED]. There was no evidence of a severe thought disorder or risk factors. She was diagnosed with major depressive disorder, recurrent episode with psychotic features. There were no changes to the treatment plan or medications. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 10-16.

On [REDACTED], Petitioner was seen by her treating neurologist at [REDACTED]. She was seen for medication management. Her assessment was radiculopathy, lumbar region, chronic right lower extremity radiating pain; low back pain, chronic; and long term current use of opiate analgesic. She is stable on medications. Petitioner had a right leg nerve root block a year ago that helped with her pain. She would like to repeat that procedure again. Petitioner was given another right leg nerve block with 30 day follow up. Her medications were continued. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 4-5.

On [REDACTED], Petitioner underwent an MRI at [REDACTED]. She had a history of low back pain. The Radiologist's clinical impression was bulging disc with right foraminal herniation and probable right paracentral cranially extruded herniation originating from the L4-5 disc. There was right L4 nerve root impingement. She had broad based herniation at L5-S1. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 8-9.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner is physically limited when it comes to her back. She is getting relief from a nerve block injection in her right leg that lasted one year. Petitioner redid the procedure on [REDACTED]. She was stable on her current regiment of medications for controlling her pain of narcotics and opioids. Petitioner is in therapy and taking medications for her mental impairments. There was no evidence of a severe thought disorder or risk factors.

It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical and psychological findings that Petitioner testified that she does not perform any of her daily living activities because she has a chore provider. However, that severity of limitation is not supported by the objective medical evidence on the record. Petitioner does feel that her condition has worsened because of her back and medications. Petitioner stated that she does have mental impairments where she is taking medication and in therapy. Petitioner stopped smoking cigarettes in 2013, where before she smoked a ½ a pack of cigarettes a day. She stopped drinking in 2015, where before she did not drink much. She does not use nor has she ever used illegal and illicit drugs. Petitioner did not feel there was any work she could do.

At Step 4, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has established that she cannot perform any of her prior work. She was previously employed at [REDACTED] as a cashier at the light level in [REDACTED]. She was also employed as a packer and prep cook at the medium level. Petitioner is taking medication and in

therapy for her mental impairments. She is physically limited with her back issues. She is taking opioids and narcotics for pain. Therefore, Petitioner is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 4. Petitioner is not capable of performing her past work. However, the Administrative Law Judge will still proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

The objective medical evidence on the record is sufficient that Petitioner lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her previous employment or that she is physically unable to do any tasks demanded of her. Petitioner's testimony as to her limitation indicates her limitations are non-exertional and exertional.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work)... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

In the instant case, Petitioner testified that she has bipolar disorder, and anxiety. Petitioner is taking medication and in therapy for her mental impairments. See MA analysis step 2. There was no evidence of a serious thought disorder or risk factors.

In the final step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine if the Petitioner's impairment(s) prevent the Petitioner from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the Petitioner's:

1. residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your 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 Petitioner could perform despite her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

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).

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).

At Step 5, Petitioner can meet the physical requirements of sedentary work, based upon the Petitioner's physical abilities. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger aged individual with a high school education, and unskilled work history, who is limited to sedentary work, is not on the grid. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2. The Medical-Vocational guidelines are not strictly applied with non-exertional impairments such as bipolar disorder, and anxiety. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 200.00. Using the Medical-Vocational guidelines as a framework for making this decision and after giving full consideration to Petitioner's mental and physical impairments, the Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner could not perform sedentary work and that Petitioner does meet the definition of disabled under the SDA program.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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 Petitioner disabled for purposes of the SDA benefit program. Petitioner could not perform sedentary work and that Petitioner does meet the definition of disabled under the SDA program.



Accordingly, the Department's determination is **REVERSED**.

The Department is ordered to begin doing 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 of initiating a redetermination of Petitioner's eligibility for SDA retroactive to her SDA application dated [REDACTED], with a medical review required November 2018.

Based on policy, the Department should provide Petitioner with written notification of the Department's revised eligibility determination and issue Petitioner any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.

CF/hb



---

**Carmen G. Fahie**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; 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

**DHHS**

[REDACTED]

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]