

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-28910
Issue No.: 3002
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: February 29, 2012
County: Macomb (50-20)

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 February 29, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input 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 for: received benefits for:

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

2. On February 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On January 25, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4. On January 28, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the case. 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.

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 AACCS, 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 reduced Claimant's monthly FAP benefits to \$128 effective February 1, 2012, based on an increase in Claimant's gross monthly unemployment benefits. Claimant requested a hearing disputing the reduction in benefits.

At the hearing, the Department produced Claimant's FAP budget for February 2012. The Department testified that it based Claimant's monthly gross unearned income on Claimant's biweekly unemployment benefits of \$396. The Department calculated Claimant's gross unearned monthly income of \$842 by multiplying his biweekly unemployment benefit payments by 2.15, in accordance with Department policy. BEM 505. At the hearing, Claimant expressed some confusion regarding the gross amount of unemployment he received. However, the Department, by accessing the Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency's database, presented evidence that Claimant received biweekly payments of \$392. Claimant did not present any evidence to counter the Department's evidence.

From the gross income of \$842, the Department properly subtracted the \$146 standard deduction available to Claimant's FAP group size of one. RFT 255. In calculating Claimant's FAP budget, the Department also considered monthly housing expenses of \$491, which Claimant confirmed, and the standard heat and utility deduction of \$553 available to all FAP recipients and concluded that Claimant was entitled to an excess shelter deduction of \$459, the maximum available to individuals who are not classified as Senior/Disabled/Veteran (SDV) group members. BEM 554; RFT 255. Based on the foregoing figures, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it concluded that Claimant was entitled to \$128 per month in FAP benefits effective February 1, 2012. BEM 550; BEM 556; RFT 260.

At the hearing, Claimant also expressed concerns regarding ongoing changes in his FAP benefits despite the fact that there had been no changes in his income. The Department presented evidence that Claimant's December 2011 and January 2012 FAP benefits were based on gross monthly income of \$775. A review of the evidence after the hearing showed that Claimant had received weekly unemployment benefits of \$196 beginning on October 8, 2011. However, prior to that time, he received a weekly unemployment benefit payment of \$149 on October 1, 2011, and weekly unemployment benefit payments of \$164 from August 8, 2011 to September 24, 2011. Thus, there were fluctuations in Claimant's unemployment benefits which would explain fluctuations in the amount of FAP benefits paid to Claimant.

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 properly improperly

- denied Claimant's application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- 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, for the reasons stated above and on the record, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED.



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

Date Signed: March 6, 2012

Date Mailed: March 6, 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.

2012-28910/ACE

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/pf

cc:

