# STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

# ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

**ISSUE** 

Claimant

Reg. No: 2010-17955

Issue No: 1030; 3052 Case No: 100721473

Load No:

Hearing Date: March 18, 2010

Genesee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne L. Keegstra

## HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 18, 2010. The claimant personally appeared and provided testimony.

Did the claimant receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits from May, 2009 through August, 2009? FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. The claimant was receiving FIP and FAP benefits when she received two Notices of Overissuance (DHS-4358-A) one for FIP and one for FAP.
- 2. The claimant reported an income stop on June 3, 2009. The income was not removed from the FIP and FAP budget until November 2, 2009.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, et seq. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Department policy states:

#### **BENEFIT OVERISSUANCES**

#### **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

#### **All Programs**

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). This item explains OI types and standard of promptness. PAM, Item 700, p. 1.

#### **Definitions**

The Automated Recoupment System (ARS) is part of CIMS that tracks all FIP, SDA and FAP OIs and payments, issues automated

collection notices and triggers automated benefit reductions for action programs.

Overissuance Type identifies the cause of an overissuance.

**Recoupment** is a DHS action to identify and recover a benefit overissuance. PAM 700, p. 1.

#### PREVENTION OF OVERISSUANCES

### **All Programs**

DHS must inform clients of their reporting responsibilities and act on the information reported within the standard of promptness. PAM 700, p. 2.

During eligibility determination and while the case is active, clients are repeatedly reminded of reporting responsibilities, including:

- . Acknowledgments on the application forms, and
- Explanation at application/redetermination interviews, and
- . Client notices and program pamphlets.

DHS must prevent OIs by following PAM 105 requirements and by informing the client or authorized representative of the following:

- Applicants and recipients are required by law to give complete and accurate information about their circumstances.
- Applicants and recipients are required by law to promptly notify DHS of any changes in circumstances within 10 days.
- Incorrect, late reported or omitted information causing an OI can result in cash repayment or benefit reduction.
- A timely hearing request can delete a proposed benefit reduction. The client must repay the OI if:
  - .. the hearing request is later withdrawn, or

- .. the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (SOAHR) denies the hearing request, **or**
- .. the client or administrative hearing representative fails to appear for the hearing and SOAHR gives DHS written instructions to proceed, **or**
- .. the hearing decision upholds the department's actions.

See PAM 600

Record on the application the client's comments and/or questions about the above responsibilities. PAM 700, p. 2.

#### **OVERISSUANCE TYPES**

#### **Department Error**

### **All Programs**

A department error OI is caused by incorrect action (including delayed or no action) by DHS staff or department processes. Some examples are:

- . Available information was not used or was used incorrectly
- Policy was misapplied
- . Action by local or central office staff was delayed
- . Computer or machine errors occurred
- Information was not shared between department divisions (services staff, Work First agencies, etc.)
- Data exchange reports were not acted upon timely (Wage Match, New Hires, BENDEX, etc.)

If unable to identify the type of OI, record it as a department error.

#### FIP, SDA, CDC, and FAP

Department error OIs are not pursued if the estimated OI amount is less than \$125 per program.

**Exception:** There is no threshold limit on CDC **system** errors. RRS in central office will recoup these types of overissuances.

# FIP, SDA and FAP Only

**Note:** The department error threshold was lowered to \$125 effective August 1, 2008.

## FIP and SDA Only

Treat an OI due to excess assets as a department error **unless** IPV caused it.

# **CDC Only**

CDC department errors and CDC provider department errors must be pursued beginning October 1, 2006. If the CDC department error OI period included the month of October 2006, include the months previous to October 2006 when determining the OI amount.

**Note:** Department errors will be assigned to the provider or the client depending on the type of department error that occurred. See PAM 705 for examples.

# MA, SER and ESS Only

Recoupment of department error OIs are not pursued. PAM 700, pp. 3-4.

#### **Client Error**

## All Programs

A **client error** OI occurs when the client received more benefits than they were entitled to because the client gave incorrect or incomplete information to the department.

A client error also exists when the client's timely request for a hearing results in deletion of a DHS action, **and** 

- . The hearing request is later withdrawn, or
- . SOAHR denies the hearing request, or
- . The client or administrative hearing representative fails to appear for the hearing and SOAHR gives DHS written instructions to proceed, **or**

The hearing decision upholds the department's actions. See PAM 600. PAM Item 700, p. 5.

#### **OVERISSUANCE THRESHOLD**

## FIP, SDS, CDC and FAP Only

Department error OIs are not pursued if the estimated OI amount is less than \$125 per program.

Client error OIs are not established if the OI amount is less than \$125, unless:

- the client or provider is active for the OI program, or
- the OI is a result of a Quality Control (QC) audit finding. PAM 700, p. 7.

Department policy provides that a client error OI will be pursued if the amount of the OI is \$125 or more. PAM 700. A department error OI will be pursued if the amount of the OI is \$125 or more. PAM 700. In this case, the department representative testified that the notice of overissuance was sent from Lansing automatically through the BRIDGES computer system. The department representative testified that she had reviewed the case and could find no basis for the OI. In fact, the department representative found that the department error was that the claimant's income stop (which was timely reported by the claimant on June 3, 2009 was not budgeted in the claimant's FIP and FAP budgets until November, 2009. This would clearly result in an underissuance of benefits, not an overissuance. The department agreed that the claimant's income should have been removed when it was reported as ending.

The department representative testified that the case should be rebudgeted from June through November, 2009. The department will remove the claimant's earned income and issue the claimant any retroactive FIP and FAP benefits that she is entitled to receive. The claimant also testified that Bridges was already recouping benefits due to the supposed OI. Thus, the

2010-17955/SLK

department must stop any recoupment on the claimant's FIP and FAP case and return to the

claimant any benefits that have already been recouped.

**DECISION AND ORDER** 

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions

of law, decides that the department improperly determined there was any OI from May, 2009

through August, 2009 and the department is not entitled to recoup this amount from the claimant.

Accordingly, the department's decision is REVERSED. The department shall:

Dismiss the OI of FIP and FAP from May, 2009 through August, 2009 and stop any

collection on this action.

2. Return any collections already retained from the claimant to repay this OI.

3. Rebudget the claimant's FIP and FAP benefits back to June, 2009, removing the

claimant's earned income.

Issue the claimant any retroactive FIP and FAP benefits that she is entitled to 4.

receive.

SO ORDERED.

Suzanne L. Keegstra Administrative Law Judge

for Ismael Ahmed, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 6, 2010

Date Mailed: April 15, 2010

7

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

