


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201148521  
Issue No.: 6019  
Case No.:   
Hearing Date: October 27, 2011  
County: Wayne (76)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 27, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Nicole Carey, Assistant Payment Supervisor, Steven Reimer, Family Independence Manager, and Shanna Young, Triage Coordinator.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?     | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)?           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |

**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  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).     | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA).           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On July 27, 2011, the Department
  - denied Claimant's application       closed Claimant's case due to lack of need.
3. On July 27, 2011, the Department sent
  - Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the       denial.       closure.
4. On August 11, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
  - denial of the application.       closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, the Department denied Claimant's July 11, 2011, CDC application because she lacked a need for CDC benefits. In order to be eligible for CDC benefits, a parent must meet a "need" criteria under BEM 703. An approved need exists under BEM 703 when a parent is unable to provide child care because of (i) family preservation, (ii) high school completion, (iii) an approved activity, or (iv) employment.

In this case, Claimant admitted she was unemployed at the time she applied for CDC benefits but anticipated a renewed need for child care because she was going to begin participating in her Jobs, Employment and Training (JET) program again. In processing Claimant's application, however, the Department learned that, as of July 14, 2011, Michigan Works, the agency administering Claimant's JET program, had designated Claimant as not participating in an approved activity after discovering that she had been terminated from her employment with a private employer on [REDACTED], and had not reengaged with Michigan Works after her employment was terminated. Claimant subsequently participated in a triage on July 28, 2011 in connection with her JET program. Because Claimant was not employed and was not an active participant in the JET program when she applied for CDC benefits, the Department properly denied Claimant's CDC application on the basis of a lack of need.

At the hearing, Claimant testified that she was attending school and had advised her caseworker that she was in school. The caseworker credibly testified that Claimant had not informed him of her participation in any educational program at the time she submitted her CDC application and that he first learned of her school attendance at an August 8, 2011 prehearing conference in connection with the instant hearing. Furthermore, the Department testified that Claimant had never had her program approved by the Department. For a client's participation in an employment preparation and/or training activity or a post-secondary education program to constitute an approved need under BEM 703, the activity or program must be approved by the Department. The Department testified that, as of the date of the hearing, Claimant had not sought or obtained approval from the Department for her educational program. Under these circumstances, the Department did not act contrary to Department policy in failing to consider Claimant's need for CDC benefits based on her school participation.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

properly denied Claimant's application       improperly denied Claimant's application  
 properly closed Claimant's case               improperly closed Claimant's case


for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department  did act properly.  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

  
**Alice C. Elkin**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 11/01/11

Date Mailed: 11/03/11

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (60 days for FAP cases)

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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at  
Michigan Administrative hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

ACE/dj

cc:

