



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], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: April 24, 2020
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-013325
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Lain

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 March 3, 2020, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by Petitioner [REDACTED]. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department or Respondent) was represented by April Nemec, Hearings Facilitator. This hearing was held by Administrative Law Manager Marya Nelson-Davis. This Hearing Decision and Order was completed by Administrative Law Judge Landis Lain.

Respondent's Exhibit A pages 1-327 (Medical Packet) were admitted as evidence.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined 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 filed an application for SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) Petitioner receives Medical Assistance (MA) benefits and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.
- (3) On December 4, 2019, the Medical Review Team denied Petitioner's SDA application stating that Petitioner could perform other work.

- (4) On December 5, 2019, the Department caseworker sent Petitioner notice that his application was denied.
- (5) On December 20, 2019, Petitioner filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
- (6) On January 6, 2020, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System received the Hearing Summary and attached documentation.
- (7) On March 3, 2020, the hearing was held.
- (8) Petitioner is a 50-year-old man whose date of birth is [REDACTED], 1969. He is 5'10" tall and weighs 197 pounds.
- (9) Petitioner last worked in 2013-2014 in recycling/sorting trash. He also worked as a laborer, tearing off roofs and in temporary jobs.
- (10) Petitioner alleges as disabling impairments: hypertension, severe depression, learning disability, asthma, carpal tunnel syndrome, back injury, right knee problem, bipolar, anxiety, gunshot wound to head in 1989.

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, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). 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. BAM 600.

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

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. 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 is 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.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment. 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include:

- (1) Medical history;
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms). 20 CFR 416.913(b).

The person claiming a physical, or mental, disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for a recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities, or ability to reason

and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged. 20 CFR 416.913.

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include:

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;
- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and
- (6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

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 your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

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).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
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. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. 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, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, Petitioner is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since October 2018. Petitioner is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

This Administrative Law Judge did consider the entire record in making this decision. The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates:

Petitioner lives alone and has no driver's license. He walks two blocks every day. He does exercises for his hands. He cannot sweep or vacuum.

Medical documentation indicates a non-severe condition:

A Disability Determination Explanation, dated December 2, 2019, Residual Functional Capacity Assessment indicates that Petitioner can occasionally carry 25 lbs. and frequently carry 20 lbs. He can stand and sit for about six of an eight hour workday. He has unlimited ability to push or pull. He can frequently climb stairs, climb ladders/ropes/scaffolds, stoop, crawl, crouch and kneel. He has unlimited ability to balance. He has no manipulative, visual, communicative limitations. He is to avoid concentrated exposure to vibration.

The Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment indicates that Petitioner is not significantly limited in most areas and moderately limited in the ability to understand and remember detailed instructions; the ability to carry out detailed instructions; the ability to maintain attention and concentration for extended periods; the ability to interact appropriately with the general public; the ability to get along with coworkers or peers without distracting them or exhibiting behavioral extremes; and the ability to respond appropriately to changes in the work setting. Based on the seven strength factors of residual functional capacity Petitioner demonstrates the medium maximum sustained work capacity pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 203.18. Petitioner is not disabled, as his condition is not severe enough to keep him from working. (Pages 13-27)

A November 13, 2019 medical examination report indicates that the patient was cooperative in answering questions and following commands. He appears mildly depressed. He appears as stated age. He is dressed in a sweatshirt, jeans and tennis shoes. The patient's immediate, recent and remote memory is intact with normal concentration. The patient's insight and judgment of all appropriate. The patient provides a good effort during the examination. The patient is right-handed. Blood pressure was 114/70. Pulse equals 83 and regular. Respiration rate equals 14. Weight was 198 pounds. Height was 69 inches. Skin was normal. Visual acuity in both eyes was 20/20 without corrective lenses. Pupils are equal, round, and reactive to light. The patient can hear conversational speech without limitation or aids. The neck was supple without masses. The chest breath sounds are clear to auscultation and symmetrical. There is no accessory muscle use. The heart had regular rate and rhythm without enlargement. There is a normal S1 and S2. The abdomen has no organomegaly or masses. Bowel sounds are normal. The vascular system had no clubbing or scion else is appreciated. There was no edema present. Peripheral pulses are intact. Hair growth is present on the lower extremities. In the musculoskeletal area there's no evidence of joint laxity, crepitation or effusion. Grip strength remains intact. Dexterity is unimpaired. The patient could button clothing and open the door. The patient had no difficulty getting on and off the examination table, no difficulty heel and toe walking, mild difficulty squatting at no difficulty standing three seconds on either foot. Range of motion was normal. Cranial nerves are intact. Motor strength is intact. Muscle tone is normal. Sensory is intact to light touch and pin prick. The patient walks with a normal gait without the use of an assistive device. Most of the patient's symptoms appear to be due to tenosynovitis and tendonitis. He does not have findings of carpal tunnel disease today or joint instability. He does not have findings of

crepitation. He has relatively well-preserved range of motion. He is not undergoing any specific treatment now. He does not appear overtly deconditioned although he does have a history of depression which may be contributing to the symptoms. He is not on any specific treatment now. There are no focal neurological deficits today. He is on Depakote and has been seizure free for over 10 years. (Pages 214-217)

A November 13, 2019, psychological evaluation indicates that based on this examination Petitioner is at least mentally capable of understanding, attending to, remembering in carrying out instructions related to non-complex work-related behaviors that do not involve significant academic skill. He says he is dyslexic. Petitioner's abilities to perform activities within a schedule, any consistent pace, maintain regular attendance, be punctual with a custom tolerance and complete normal workday and work with without interruptions from psychological symptoms are mildly impaired. Petitioner's abilities related to social interaction such as responding appropriately to coworkers, supervision and others in the workplace mildly impaired. Petitioner's mental abilities relating to adaptation and self-management such as traveling to unfamiliar places and adapting to changing stress and the workplace are mildly impaired. His diagnosis is unspecified anxiety disorder with a history of gunshot wound. History of marijuana and alcohol abuse. He is able to manage his own benefit funds and his prognosis is guarded. (Pages 218-221)

An April 26, 2018, medical examination report indicates that Petitioner weighed 221 pounds. His BMI was 30.82. Temperature was 98.4°. His blood pressure was 128/86. He presented with anxiety, panic attacks, insomnia and fatigue. (Pages 257-261)

A March 15, 2018, medical examination report indicates that Petitioner weighed 209 pounds and his BMI was 29.15. His blood pressure was 120/88. He presented with back pain and hip pain but denied thoracic pain. (Pages 252-255)

An August 8, 2017, medical examination report indicates that petitioner complained of a left knee injury. He weighed 217 pounds. His BMI was 30.26. His temperature was 97.9°. Blood pressure was 126/88. The impression was chronic left knee pain. He was prescribed Ibuprofen. (Pages 245-250)

At Step 2, Petitioner has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that Petitioner suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has reports of pain in multiple areas of his body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by Petitioner. There are few laboratories or x-ray findings listed in the file. The clinical impression is that Petitioner is stable. There is no medical finding that Petitioner has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, Petitioner has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his reports of

pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that Petitioner has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that Petitioner has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Petitioner alleges as disabling mental impairments: depression, anxiety, panic attacks.

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).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating Petitioner suffers severe mental limitations. There is a mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. Petitioner was oriented x3 at all psychiatric evaluations. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Petitioner from working at any job. Petitioner was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Petitioner was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that Petitioner suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Petitioner must be denied benefits at this step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If Petitioner had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of Petitioner's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

At Step 3, the medical evidence of Petitioner's condition does not give rise to a finding that Petitioner would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner's medical record does not support a finding that Petitioner's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR Part 404, Part A.

Listing 1.04, the disorders of the spine was considered and is not supported by medical evidence. Petitioner does not have a compromise of the nerve root, or the spinal cord. He does not have evidence of nerve root compression, atrophy with associate of muscle weakness or muscle weakness. He retains the ability to ambulate effectively. He does not have spinal arachnoiditis ideation which is confirmed by an operative report or pathology report of tissue biopsy.

If Petitioner had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon his ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a

finding that Petitioner is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if Petitioner had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that Petitioner does not have residual functional capacity.

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).

Petitioner has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Petitioner's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform sedentary work even with his impairments. Petitioner has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. Petitioner's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform sedentary work. Thus, he does not currently retain the capacity to perform prior work at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Petitioner from working at any job. Petitioner was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Petitioner was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Petitioner'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 Petitioner's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that Petitioner has no residual functional capacity. Petitioner is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform medium, light or sedentary work even with his impairments. **Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines (Medical Vocational Rule 203.18), a person closely approaching advanced age (age 50), high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to sedentary, light or medium work is not considered disabled.** Petitioner demonstrates the medium maximum sustained work capacity pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 203.18.

Careful consideration has been given to Petitioner's allegations and symptoms. Petitioner has established that his physical and mental condition could cause problems with daily and work functioning. However, the totality of the evidence does not support total disability. The Petitioner's medically determinable impairments could reasonably be expected to produce alleged symptoms, but Petitioner's statements concerning the intensity, persistence and limiting effects of these symptoms are not entirely credible when compared to the limitations suggested by the objective medical evidence contained in the file.

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. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because Petitioner does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA based upon disability and because the evidence of record does not establish that Petitioner is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, Petitioner does not meet the disability criteria for SDA benefits.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that Petitioner was not eligible to receive State Disability Assistance based upon disability.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied Petitioner's application for State Disability Assistance benefits. Petitioner should be able to perform a wide range of sedentary work even with his impairments. The Department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED** based upon the substantive information contained in the file.

LL/hb



Carmen Fahie
Administrative Law Judge for Supervising
Administrative Law Judge Marya A. Nelson-Davis
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

DHHS

Genesee County, via electronic mail

BSC2 via electronic mail

L. Karadsheh via electronic mail

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI