



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: January 29, 2020
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-012365
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

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; 42 CFR 438.400 to 438.424; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on December 18, 2019, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner appeared and represented himself. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by Julie McLaughlin, Hearing Facilitator and Family Independence Manager.

During the hearing, Petitioner waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional records. The documents referenced by the Disability Determination Service (DDS) totaling 196 pages were received and marked into evidence as Exhibit B, with page numbers identified in the top left-hand corner. The record closed on December 30, 2019, and the matter is now before the undersigned for a final determination based on the evidence presented.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determine that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit 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] 2019, Petitioner submitted an application seeking cash assistance on the basis of a disability.

2. On October 10, 2019, 2019, the Disability Determination Service (DDS)/Medical Review Team (MRT) found Petitioner not disabled for purposes of the SDA program (Exhibit A, pp. 64-70).
3. On October 21, 2019, the Department sent Petitioner a Notice of Case Action denying the application based on DDS/MRT's finding of no disability (Exhibit A, pp. 19-20).
4. On [REDACTED] 2019, Petitioner reapplied for SDA. He did not allege any worsening of the conditions described in the August 5, 2019 application or any new conditions not previously identified in the [REDACTED] 2019 application.
5. On November 12, 2019, the Department sent Petitioner a Notice of Case Action denying the [REDACTED] 2019 application based on DDS/MRT's finding of no disability (Exhibit A, pp. 8-9).
6. On [REDACTED], 2019, the Department received Petitioner's timely written Request for Hearing (Exhibit A, pp. 3-4).
7. Petitioner alleged disabling impairment due to loss of vision in his left eye.
8. On the date of the hearing, Petitioner was 59 years old with a [REDACTED] 1960 birth date; he is 5'10" in height and weighs about 178 pounds.
9. Petitioner has a high school degree and some college.
10. At the time of application, Petitioner was not employed.
11. Petitioner has an employment history of work as a machine operator and a parts inspector.
12. Petitioner has a pending disability claim with the Social Security Administration.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

Petitioner applied for cash assistance alleging a disability. A disabled person is eligible for SDA. BEM 261 (April 2017), p. 1. An individual automatically qualifies as disabled for purposes of the SDA program if the individual receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefits based on disability or blindness. BEM 261, p. 2. Otherwise, to be considered disabled for SDA purposes, a person must have a physical or mental impairment for at least ninety days which meets federal SSI disability standards, meaning the person is unable to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment. BEM 261, pp. 1-2; 20 CFR 416.901; 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Determining whether an individual is disabled for SSI purposes requires the application of a five step evaluation of whether the individual (1) is engaged in substantial gainful activity (SGA); (2) has an impairment that is severe; (3) has an impairment and duration that meet or equal a listed impairment in Appendix 1 Subpart P of 20 CFR 404; (4) has the residual functional capacity to perform past relevant work; and (5) has the residual functional capacity and vocational factors (based on age, education and work experience) to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) and (4); 20 CFR 416.945. If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step in this process, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4).

In general, the individual has the responsibility 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, if a mental disability is alleged, to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments. 20 CFR 416.912(a); 20 CFR 416.913. 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). Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, are insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927(d).

Step One

The first step in determining whether an individual is disabled requires consideration of the individual's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i). If an individual is working and the work is SGA, then the individual must be considered not disabled, regardless of medical condition, age, education, or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b); 20 CFR 416.971. SGA means work that involves doing significant and productive physical or mental duties and that is done, or intended to be done, for pay or profit. 20 CFR 416.972.

In this case, Petitioner was not working during the period for which assistance might be available. Because Petitioner was not engaged in SGA, he is not ineligible under Step 1, and the analysis continues to Step 2.

Step Two

Under Step 2, the severity and duration of an individual's alleged impairment is considered. If the individual does not have a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment (or a combination of impairments) that meets the duration requirement, the individual is not disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii). The duration requirement for SDA means that the impairment is expected to result in death or has lasted, or is expected to last, for a continuous period of at least 90 days. 20 CFR 416.922; BEM 261, p. 2.

An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities mean the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs, such as (i) physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling; (ii) the capacity to see, hear, and speak; (iii) the ability to understand, carry out, and remember simple instructions; (iv) use of judgment; (v) responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and (vi) dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b). A claim may be denied at Step 2 only if the evidence shows that the individual's impairments, when considered in combination, do not have more than a minimal effect on the person's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Social Security Ruling (SSR) 85-28.

The individual bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. While the Step 2 severity requirement may be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint, under the de minimis standard applied at Step 2, an impairment is severe unless it is only a slight abnormality that minimally affects work ability regardless of age, education and experience. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862-863 (CA 6, 1988), citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). A claim may be denied at Step 2 only if the evidence shows that the individual's impairments, when considered in combination, are not medically severe, i.e., do not have more than a minimal effect on the person's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Social Security Ruling (SSR) 85-28. If such a finding is not clearly established by medical evidence or if the effect of an impairment or combination of impairments on the individual's ability to do basic work activities cannot be clearly determined, adjudication must continue through the sequential evaluation process. *Id.*; SSR 96-3p.

The medical evidence presented at the hearing, and in response to the interim order, was reviewed and is summarized below.

On [REDACTED], 2018, Petitioner complained of eye redness at a medical visit, and the doctor referred him to an ophthalmologist (Exhibit B, pp. 105-106). That same day, he was examined by an ophthalmologist at [REDACTED]. He complained of constant redness in his left eye beginning two weeks earlier. He also had throbbing eye pain, especially when he turned his head to either side, and light sensitivity. (Exhibit B, pp.

168-171.) On [REDACTED] 2018, Petitioner was diagnosed with serous retinal detachment of the left eye by [REDACTED] and referred to a retinal specialist (Exhibit B, pp. 185-187).

Petitioner's vision continued to be assessed by [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], 2018; [REDACTED], 2019; and [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] 2019 (Exhibit A, pp. 145-183). At the [REDACTED] [REDACTED], 2019 visit, he agreed to cataract surgery and his [REDACTED] 2019 records indicate that the visit was for a 3-week post-op evaluation, at which time the lens was removed and the eye could be reevaluated by the retinal specialist for the status of detached retina (Exhibit B, pp. 145-148, 156-159).

On [REDACTED], 2018, Petitioner had his first visit with a retinal specialist at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. He reported blurred vision of the left eye with tearing and itching and worsening over the preceding two weeks. He was diagnosed with serous choroidal detachment, non-kissing of the left eye. The doctor also found serous retinal detachment, secondary to serous choroidal effusion, macular hole, panuveitis, and nuclear sclerosis (but the cataract was not visually significant). (Exhibit B, pp. 140-143.) At the [REDACTED] 2018 visit, the specialist noted that serous choroidal detachment symptoms other than vision were much improved, but serous retinal detachment of the left eye had increased as the effusion receded. (Exhibit B, pp. 136-139.) At the [REDACTED] 2018 visit, the specialist found that the serous choroidal detachment was resolving but persistent and the serous retinal detachment of the left eye was a total detachment with possible early PVR (peripheral vascular resistance). It was noted that the macular hole in the left eye was the possible cause of the retinal detachment and that the panuveitis had improved but added a risk for any retinal detachment repair. (Exhibit B, pp. 133-135.) At the [REDACTED], 2018 visit, the ophthalmologist recommended surgery but advised Petitioner that he would regain some vision but how much was not guaranteed due to the severity of the retinal detachment. (Exhibit A, pp. 129-132.) At the [REDACTED] 2018 visit, the doctor continued to recommend surgery (Exhibit A, pp. 126-128).

At the [REDACTED], 2019 visit to the retinal specialist, Petitioner reported no changes. The doctor found that the panuveitis appeared stable but surgery continued to be recommended for the tractional retinal detachment, possibly combined with a retinal tear and secondary to serous choroidal effusion, possibly exacerbated by macular hole, even though there was a possibility of re-detachments and the visual outcome would be poor. (Exhibit A, pp. 123-125.) On [REDACTED], 2019, the specialist examined Petitioner and found that the tractional retinal detachment with PVR had progressed to total retinal detachment, possibly combined with a retinal tear and secondary to serous choroidal effusion and possibly exacerbated by macular hole. The doctor continued to stress the need for surgery. Petitioner was referred for a cataract examination of the left eye and possible cataract surgery which would allow a better view of the posterior segment of the eye and better state for the surgery of the retina. (Exhibit B, pp. 120-122.)

At the [REDACTED], 2019 visit, after the cataract surgery, the retinal specialist concluded that Petitioner's panuveitis appeared stable, but surgery would be scheduled for the

tractional retinal detachment possibly combined with a retinal tear, secondary to serious choroidal effusion and possibly exacerbated by macular hole. The visual outcome would be poor. (Exhibit B, pp. 117-119.)

In consideration of the *de minimis* standard necessary to establish a severe impairment under Step 2, the foregoing medical evidence is sufficient to establish that Petitioner suffers from severe impairments that have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 90 days. Therefore, Petitioner has satisfied the requirements under Step 2, and the analysis will proceed to Step 3.

Step Three

Step 3 of the sequential analysis of a disability claim requires a determination if the individual'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 an individual'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 416.909), the individual is disabled. If not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Based on the medical evidence presented in this case, listings 2.02 (loss of central acuity), 2.03 (contraction of the visual field in the better eye), and 2.04 (loss of visual efficiency, or visual impairment, in the better eye) were considered. Because Petitioner's vision in the right eye was not significantly impacted, the medical evidence presented does **not** show that Petitioner's impairments meet or equal the required level of severity of any of the listings in Appendix 1 to be considered as disabling without further consideration. Therefore, Petitioner is not disabled under Step 3 and the analysis continues to Step 4.

Residual Functional Capacity

If an individual's impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment under Step 3, before proceeding to Steps 4 and 5, the individual's residual functional capacity (RFC) is assessed. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. RFC is the most an individual can do, based on all relevant evidence, despite the limitations from the impairment(s), including those that are not severe, and takes into consideration an individual's ability to meet the physical, mental, sensory and other requirements of work. 20 CFR 416.945(a)(1), (4); 20 CFR 416.945(e).

RFC is assessed based on all relevant medical and other evidence such as statements provided by medical sources, whether or not they are addressed on formal medical examinations, and descriptions and observations of the limitations from impairment(s) provided by the individual or other persons. 20 CFR 416.945(a)(3). This includes consideration of (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicant takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3). The applicant's pain must be assessed

to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2).

Limitations can be exertional, nonexertional, or a combination of both. 20 CFR 416.969a. If individual's impairments and related symptoms, such as pain, affect only the ability to meet the strength demands of jobs (i.e., sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling), the individual is considered to have only exertional limitations. 20 CFR 416.969a(b).

The exertional requirements, or physical demands, of work in the national economy are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967; 20 CFR 416.969a(a). 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 and occasionally walking and standing. 20 CFR 416.967(a). 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 the light 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 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). 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). Very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e).

If an individual has limitations or restrictions that affect the ability to meet demands of jobs **other than** strength, or exertional, demands, the individual is considered to have only nonexertional limitations or restrictions. 20 CFR 416.969a(a) and (c). Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions 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., unable to 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).

In this case, Petitioner alleges only nonexertional limitations due to his impairments. Petitioner testified that he lived alone in an apartment and cared for his own hygiene, did his own chores, and dressed himself. He could do his own shopping and could drive although his night vision was affected. He had no problems sitting. Because of medication he took for his eye pressure, he was waiting for the doctor to advise him if he had any lifting restrictions. He could walk a city block but was concerned about his balance because of a lack of depth perception. He acknowledged that his limitations were due to his loss of vision in his left eye and its affect on his depth perception.

A two-step process is applied in evaluating an individual's symptoms: (1) whether the individual has a medically determinable impairment that could reasonably be expected to produce the individual's alleged symptoms and (2) whether the individual's statement about the intensity, persistence and limiting effects of symptoms are consistent with the objective medical evidence and other evidence on the record from the individual, medical sources and nonmedical sources. SSR 16-3p.

The medical record shows a complete retinal detachment and significant vision loss of the left eye and although surgery was recommended, the retinal specialist indicated a poor vision outcome would be likely. There is no medical evidence to support any weight or walking limitations. Therefore, based on the medical record presented, which supports Petitioner's total vision loss in the left eye, as well as Petitioner's testimony, Petitioner has only nonexertional limitations due to his loss of vision of the left eye. Petitioner's nonexertional RFC would limit him from precision work and heights.

Petitioner's RFC is considered at both Steps 4 and 5. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4), (f) and (g).

Step Four

Step 4 in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of Petitioner's RFC and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). Past relevant work is work that has been performed by Petitioner (as actually performed by Petitioner or as generally performed in the national economy) within the past 15 years that was SGA and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1) and (2). An individual who has the RFC to meet the physical and mental demands of work done in the past is not disabled. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3); 20 CFR 416.920. Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy are **not** considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3).

Petitioner's work history in the 15 years prior to the application consists of work as a machinist and parts inspector. In both jobs, Petitioner was required to visually examine and manipulate parts. Because of his nonexertional RFC due to his limited vision, Petitioner is incapable of performing past relevant work. Because Petitioner is unable to perform past relevant work, he cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4, and the assessment continues to Step 5.

Step 5

If an individual is incapable of performing past relevant work, Step 5 requires an assessment of the individual's RFC and age, education, and work experience to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(v); 20 CFR 416.920(c). If the individual can adjust to other work, then there is no disability; if the individual cannot adjust to other work, then there is a disability. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(v).

At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from Petitioner to the Department to present proof that Petitioner has the RFC to obtain and maintain substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(c)(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). 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).

When the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the exertional aspects of work-related activities, Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix 2, 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). However, 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).

In this case, Petitioner was 59 years old at the time of application and at the time of hearing, and, thus, considered to be advanced age. His exertional RFC is not affected, but, because of the vision loss in his left eye, he has nonexertional limitations due to this vision loss. Taking into consideration Petitioner's testimony that he accomplishes most activities of daily living without assistance, it is found that, even though he cannot perform past relevant work, those limitations would not preclude him from engaging in other simple, unskilled work activities on a sustained basis. Therefore, Petitioner is able to adjust to other work and is **not** disabled at Step 5.

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 **not disabled** for purposes of the SDA benefit program.

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

ACE/tlf



Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
for Robert Gordon, 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 Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR 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. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

Via Email:

MDHHS-Muskegon-Hearings
BSC3 Hearing Decisions
L. Karadsheh
MOAHR

Petitioner – Via First-Class Mail:

██████████
██
██