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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-13319 Issue No.: 2018; 3022; 6021

Case No.:

Hearing Date: December 19, 2011

County: Wayne (49)

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 Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on December 19, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inclu ded Claim ant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Servic es (Department) included Eligibility Specialist, and Family Independence Specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly reduce Claimant's Food Assist ance Prog ram (FAP) benefits?

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Medical Assistanc e (MA) benefits unde r the Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) program?

Did the Department properly close Claim ant's Ch ild Deve lopment and Care (CDC) case?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FAP, TMA and CDC benefits.
- 2. On October 22, 2011, the Department closed Claimant's CDC case.
- 3. On November 8, 2011, the Department sent Cla imant a Notic e of Case Action notifying her that her TMA case would close effective January 1, 2012, and that her

- FAP benefits would decrease to \$16 per mont h effective December 1, 2011, based on her increased income.
- 4. Before December 1, 2011, the Departm ent recalculated Claimant's FAP budget and determined that Claimant was entitled to \$31 per month in FAP benefits effective December 1, 2011.
- 5. On November 16, 2011, Claimant filed a reques t fo r hearing, disputing the Department's actions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established purs uant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.
∑ The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) program] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, and is implemented by the federal r egulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 400.3015.
☑ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial 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 proogram 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, <i>et seq</i> .
☐ The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3 151 through R 400.3180.
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establishhed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial 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 Depart ment provides servic es to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.

FAP Benefits

Claimant acknowledged that the Department used the correct figures for her gross biweekly income and her monthly housing expenses when it recalculated her FAP budget. A review of Claimant 's FAP budget shows that the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it concluded that Claimant was entitled to a monthly FAP allotment of \$31. BEM 554, 556; RFT 255.

Medical Assistance Case

Pursuant to the November 8, 2011, Notice of Case Acti on, the Department notified Claimant that it was closing her Transitional Medicaid (TMA) case effective January 1, 2012. Although the Notice indicates that the TMA chase was being chosed because Claimant was not under 21, pregnant, or a caretaker of a minor child in the home, at the hearing, the Department explained that her case was being chosed because she could not continue to receive TMA in excess of twelve months. Families may receive TMA for up to 12 months, and TMA eligibility continues until the end of the 12-month TMA period except in limited circumstances not applicable in the current case. BEM 111. In this case, the Department testified, and Claim ant agreed, that Claimant and her child had started receiving TMA coverage on November 1, 2010. Thus, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it notified Claimant of the closure of her TMA case based on the lapse of the 12-month period of eligibility.

CDC Benefits

CDC case.

At the hearing, the Department conceded that it had prem aturely closed Claimant's CDC case and agree d to (i) reinstate her CDC case for the period from October 22, 2011 to December 1, 2011, and (ii) issue s upplements to Claimant's provider for any CDC benefits Claimant was entitled to receive during this period but did not. Claimant agreed to this settlement.

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 identification in the department is the Department in the Department in the Department is the Department in the Department in the Department in the Department is the Department in the De
case. in did not act properly when it prematurely closed Claimant's CDC case.
Accordingly, for the reasons stated above and on the record, the Department's decision

is \boxtimes AFFIRMED with respect to the reduction of Claimant's FAP benefits and closure of her TMA case and \boxtimes REVERSED with respect to its premature closure of Claimant's

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

- 1. Remove the negative action closing Claimant's CDC case on October 22, 2011;
- 2. Begin reinstating Claimant's CDC case for the period from October 22, 2011 t o December 1, 2011; and
- 3. Issue supplements to Claimant's CDC provider for any CDC ben efits Claimant was entitled to receive but did not for the peri od from October 22, 2011, to December 1, 2011.

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

Date Signed: December 28, 2011

Date Mailed: December 28, 2011

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

ACE/ctl

