

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No. 201121243  
Issue No. 3002  
Case No. [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 22, 2011  
Wayne County DHS (18)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 22, 2011. The claimant appeared and testified. On behalf of Department of Human Services (DHS), [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], appeared and testified.

**ISSUE**

Whether DHS properly determined Claimant's 3/2011 Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefit issuance as \$67/month.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant was an ongoing FAP benefit recipient.
2. Claimant was not a senior (over 60 years of age), disabled person or disabled veteran.
3. Claimant was part of a FAP benefit group of one person.
4. Claimant received \$484/two weeks in gross unemployment compensation (UC) benefits.
5. Claimant was responsible for a \$750/month shelter obligation.

6. On 2/12/11, DHS determined that Claimant was eligible for \$67/month in FAP benefits effective 3/2011.
7. On 2/23/11, Claimant requested a hearing disputing the 3/2011 FAP benefit issuance.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Food Assistance Program (formerly known as the Food Stamp 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the FAP pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.10, *et seq.*, and Michigan Administrative Code R 400.3001-3015. DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RTM). Updates to DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Policy Bulletin (BPB).

In the present case, Claimant disputed the \$16/month FAP benefit issuance for 3/2011. Claimant's primary argument is that she received additional FAP benefits in the past and questioned why her FAP benefits would be reduced if her circumstances had not changed. Though Claimant would be understandably confused if a benefit change occurred when her circumstances have not, determining the correctness of Claimant's 3/2011 FAP benefits has nothing to do with what she received in FAP benefits for prior months. BEM 556 outlines the proper procedures for calculating FAP benefits.

It was not disputed that Claimant received biweekly UC benefits of \$484/2 weeks. DHS is to count the gross amount of UC in calculating FAP benefits. BEM 503 at 24. DHS converts biweekly non-child support income into a 30 day period by multiplying the income by 2.15. BEM 505 at 6. Multiplying Claimant's countable biweekly income by 2.15 results in a monthly countable income amount of \$1040.

DHS uses certain expenses to determine net income for FAP eligibility and benefit levels. BEM 554 at 1. For groups without a senior (over 60 years old), disabled or disabled veteran (SDV) member, DHS considers the following expenses: child care and excess shelter (housing and utilities) up to a capped amount and court ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members. For groups containing SDV members, DHS also considers the medical expenses for the SDV group member(s) and the full excess shelter expense. Claimant's FAP benefit group is not an SDV group.

Verified child support, day care and medical expenses (medical expenses for SDV groups only are subtracted from Claimant's monthly countable income to determine Claimant's adjusted gross income. Claimant did not claim to have any of these expenses.

Claimant's one-person FAP benefit group received a standard deduction of \$141. RFT 255. The standard deduction is given to all FAP benefit groups though the amount varies based on the benefit group size. The standard deduction is also subtracted from the countable monthly income to calculate the group's adjusted gross income. The adjusted gross income amount is found to be \$899.

Claimant stated that she is currently not responsible for a shelter obligation but previously was responsible for a \$750/month obligation. DHS gives a flat utility standard to all clients. BPB 20 10-008. The utility standard of \$588 (see RFT 255) encompasses all utilities (water, gas, electric, telephone) and is unchanged even if a client's monthly utility expenses exceed the \$588 amount. The total shelter obligation is calculated by adding Claimant's housing expenses to the utility credit (\$588); this amount is found to be \$1338.

DHS only credits FAP benefit groups with what DHS calls an "excess shelter" expense. This expense is calculated by taking Claimant's total shelter obligation and subtracting half of Claimant's adjusted gross income. Claimant's excess shelter amount is found to be \$889 (rounding up). However, because Claimant's FAP benefit group does not have an SDV member, Claimant's excess shelter amount is capped; the current cap amount is \$458. RFT 255 at 1.

Claimant's net income is determined by taking Claimant's adjusted gross income (\$899) and subtracting the allowable excess shelter expense (\$458). Claimant's net income is found to be \$441. A chart listed in RFT 260 is used to determine the proper FAP benefit issuance. Based on Claimant's group size and net income, Claimant's FAP benefit amount is found to be \$67, the same amount calculated by DHS. It is found that DHS properly calculated Claimant's FAP benefits for the benefit month of 3/2011.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS properly determined Claimant's FAP benefit issuance for 3/2011 as \$67/month. The actions taken by DHS are AFFIRMED.



Christian Gardocki  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 04/01/11

Date Mailed: 04/06/11

**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 60 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt 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.

CG/dj

cc:

