STATE OF MICHIGAN MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No: 2011-44280

Issue No: 2014

Case No:

Hearing Date: August 31, 2011

Grand Traverse County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notic e, a telephone hearing was held on August 31, 2011. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Hum an Services (the department) properly determine that claimant had excess income for purposes of Medical Assistance (MA) and a deductible spend-down?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- Claimant had an active Medical Assistance case as an SSI recipient.
- (2) Claimant's income increased to \$ in monthly RSDI income. (Exhibits 1-3)
- (3) Claimant was eligible for terminated SSI Medical benefits from January 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. (Exhibits 4-6)
- (4) The department caseworker conducted a case review and determined that claimant's deductible spend-down should be \$ 100 per month.
- (5) On June 15, 2011, based upon the new budget, the department caseworker notified claimant that her new monthly dedu ctible would be per month effective June 27, 2011.

(6) On June 21, 2011, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

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 oppor tunity for a hearing shall be granted to an ap plicant who requests a hearing because his or her clai m for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients h ave the right to contes t a department decision affecting elig ibility or benefit levels whenev er it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an adm inistrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Michigan provides Medical Assist ance Michigan provides MA eligib le clients under two general classifications: Group 1 and Group 2 MA. Claimant qualified under the Group 2 classification becaus e she received RSDI in come which consists of clie into whose eligibility results from the strate designating certain types of individuals as medically needy. BEM, Item 105. In order to qualify for Group 2 MA, a medically needy client must have income that is equal to or less than transfer protected monthly income level. Department policy sets forth a method for determining the basis maintenance level by considering:

- 1. The protected income level.
- 2. The amount diverted to dependents,
- 3. Health insurance and premiums, and
- 4. Remedial services if det ermining the eligibility for claimants in adult care homes.

If the claim ant's income exceeds the protected income level, the excess income must be used to pay medical expenses before Group 2 MA coverage can begin. This process is known as a deductible spend-down. The policy requires the department to count and budget all income received that is not specifically excluded. There are three main types of income: countable earned, countable eunearned, and excluded. Earned income means income received from another person or organization or from self-employment for duties that were performed for remuneration or profit. Unearned income is any

income that is not earned. The amount of income c ounted may be more than the amount a person actually receives, because it is the amount before deductions are taken, including the deductions for taxes and garnishments. The amount before any deductions are taken is called the gross amount. PEM, Item 500, p. 1. The net income limit for QMB is Medical Assistance eligibility for a person in claimant's circumstances is pursuant to BEM 544.

In the inst ant case, the department calculat ed claimant's monthly income based up on nearned income of \$ from the Soc ial Security her receipt of monthly u Administration. The department gave claimant a general unearned income exclusion of and an insurance premium deduction of \$ for a total of \$ in total net monthly income. Federal regulations at 42 CFR 435.831 provid e standards for the determination of the MA monthly protected income levels. The department, in this case, is in compliance with the Program Refere nce Manual, Tables, Charts, and Schedules, Table 240-1. Table 240-1 indica tes that the claimant's mont hly protected income lev el for claimant's fiscal group of one person is \$ per month which leaves her with a n (\$ excess income in the amount of \$ in net income - \$ in protected income in excess income). The department's determination that claimant has exces s income for purposes of Medical Assistance and QMB-MA eligibility is in compliance with department policy.

Deductible spend-down is a proc ess which allows the customer with excess income to become eligible for Group 2 MA if sufficient allowable medical expenses are incurred. BEM, Item 545, p. 1. Meeting the spend-down means reporting and verifying allowable medical expenses that equal or exceed the spend-down amount for the calendar month tested. BEM, Item 545, p. 9. The group must report expenses by the last day of the third month following the month it wants MA co verage for. BEM, Item 130, explains verification and timeliness standards. BEM, Item 545, p. 9.

The department's determination that claimant had a spend-down in the amount of \$978 per month is correct based upon the information contained in the file.

Claimant's allegations that the spend-down is too expensive, that she cannot afford the spend-down and that the policy is unfair are equitable argum ents to be excus ed for department policy.

The claimant's grievance centers on dissatisfaction with the department's current policy. The claim ant's request is not within the scope of authority delegated to this Administrative Law Judge pursuant to a written directive signed by the Department of Human Services Director, which states:

Administrative Law J udges hav e no aut hority to make decisions on constitutional gr ounds, ov errule statutes, overrule promulgated regulations or overrule or make exceptions to the department policy set out in the program manuals.

Furthermore, administrative adjudication is an exercise of execut ive power rather than judicial power, and restricts the egranting of equitable remedies. *Michigan Mutual Liability Co. v Baker*, 295 Mich 237; 294 NW 168 (1940).

Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge fi nds that the department has est ablished by the necessary, competent, material, and subst antial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant had excess income for purposes of Medical Assistance benefit eligibility and when it determined that claimant had a monthly deductible spend-down in the amount of per month. (Exhibit 14)

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides that the department has appropriately 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 claimant had excess income for purposes of Medical Assistance eligibility, no longer met the income criteria for Low Income Medical Assistance benefits and opened a deductible spend-down case for claimant in the amount of per month based upon claim ant's possession of excess income.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

Landis		<u>/s/</u> Y. Lain
20.1010		Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
Date Signed:	September 7, 2011	
Date Mailed:	September 7, 2011	

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der 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 Hear ings will not orde rarehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

2011-44280/LYL

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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LYL/alc

