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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



 Reg. No.:
 2012 19815

 Issue No.:
 3002, 3003

 Case No.:
 Image: County Description

 Hearing Date:
 January 18, 2012

 County:
 Macomb County DHS (20)

## ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

## 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 18, 2011 from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her Authorized Hearing Representative, Dana Obey. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

#### <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly  $\Box$  deny the Claimant's application  $\Box$  close Claimant's case  $\boxtimes$  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

	imes
1	

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 for: 🔀 received benefits for:



Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Dovelopment and Care (CDC).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

- 2. On November 1, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's application
   Closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits
   due to excess income.
- On October 24, 2011, the Department sent
   □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) □ denial. □ closure. □ reduction.
- 4. On October 21, 2011, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the

 $\Box$  denial of the application.  $\Box$  closure of the case.  $\Box$  reduction of benefits.

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

☐ 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.

 $\boxtimes$  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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (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 decreased the Claimant's food assistance on November 1, 2011. A review of the FAP budgets submitted as evidence indicates that the Department correctly included the Claimant's RSDI income of \$1090, which was confirmed by the Claimant. The Department also used the correct rent of \$650 when calculating the benefits. There were no other deductions that the Department was required to include based on the Claimant's information submitted. The Claimant's FAP benefits were correctly computed at \$136 per month.

The Claimant's chief concern was that the reduction in benefits made it difficult for her to have sufficient funds to purchase food as she is diabetic and requires special food. As explained at the hearing, the Department is required to follow a specific formula applied to all individuals when computing FAP benefits. After a review of the FAP budgets and excess shelter deductions as prepared by the Department, it is determined that the Department correctly reduced the Calimant's FAP benefits and its computation of the FAP benefits are correct.

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, due to excess income, the Department

denied Claimant's application

reduced Claimant's benefits

closed Claimant's case

for:  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  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  $\square$  did act properly  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\square$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  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:

Lynn M. Ferris

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 24, 2012

Date Mailed: January 24, 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

LMF/hw

# 201219815/LMF

CC:

