

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-14142
Issue No.: 3002
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 4, 2012
County: Oakland County DHS (03)

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 January 4, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] Eligibility Specialist, and [REDACTED] Family Independence Manager.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly calculate Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits for November 1, 2011, ongoing?

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 is an ongoing recipient of FAP benefits.
2. Claimant's group size is one.
3. In October 2011, the Department recalculated Claimant's FAP benefits to include her unearned income.
4. Effective November 1, 2011, the Department reduced Claimant's monthly FAP benefits from \$200 to \$173.
5. On November 15, 2011, Claimant filed a request for hearing, disputing the Department's action.

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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 through R 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 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 ACS, R 400.3151 through R 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.

Additionally, Claimant's monthly FAP benefits were reduced to \$173 beginning November 1, 2011, after the Department included Claimant's unearned income in her FAP budget. Claimant acknowledged that she received gross monthly income of \$653 in Retirement, Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) benefits, and, at the time her

FAP budget was run, she paid her \$115 Medicare premium from this benefit. She also acknowledged that she was the sole member of her FAP group.

At the hearing, the Department testified that Claimant paid monthly rent of \$449. Claimant testified that she paid a portion of her monthly rental obligation, and her son paid the remainder. A review of Claimant's FAP budget shows that, while the Department properly calculated Claimant's income, it did not include any of Claimant's monthly rental obligations in the calculation of her excess shelter deduction. Because there was testimony that Claimant did pay at least some portion of her monthly rental obligation, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it failed to include these payments in the calculation of Claimant's excess shelter deduction. BEM 554. The inclusion of such expenses may result in an increase in the monthly FAP benefits which Claimant is entitled to receive. BEM 554, 556; RFT 255.

At the hearing, Claimant indicated that she had additional medical expenses not reflected in her FAP budget. However, she admitted that she had not informed her caseworker of these expenses prior to the hearing. Claimant was advised to discuss these additional expenses with the Department.

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 when .
 did not act properly when calculated Claimant's monthly FAP benefits.

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

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

1. Begin recalculating Claimant's FAP budget for November 2011, ongoing, to include shelter expenses paid by Claimant, if any, in accordance with Department policy;
2. Issue supplements for any FAP benefits Claimant was entitled to receive but did not from November 1, 2011 ongoing; and
3. Notify Claimant of the Department's decision in writing in accordance with Department policy.


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

Date Signed: January 10, 2012

Date Mailed: January 10, 2012

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/ctl

cc: [REDACTED]
Oakland County DHS (03)/1843

A. [REDACTED]
File Elkin