

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201231376  
Issue No.: 3002  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 11, 2012  
County: Wayne (19)

**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 April 11, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] Assistance Payment Supervisor, and [REDACTED] Assistance Payment Worker.

**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 March 1, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On February 8, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
4. On February 6, 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 AAC, 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, at the hearing, the Department testified that Claimant's FAP case was subject to a random review for the period October 2011 through December 2011. As a result of the review, the Department learned that Claimant was receiving child support for her daughter of \$133.94 in October 2011, \$154.09 in November 2011, and \$125.13 in December 2011. The Department recalculated Claimant's FAP budget based on this additional income and sent Claimant a February 8, 2012, Notice of Case Action advising her that her FAP benefits would decrease to \$262 effective March 1, 2012, based on her receipt of child support.

At the hearing, the Department produced Claimant's FAP budget for March 2012 ongoing. The Department testified that Claimant's income consisted of (i) her monthly gross Social Security Income (SSI) benefits of \$698, (ii) her \$14 in monthly State SSI Payment (SSP) benefits (based on the \$42 quarterly payment) and (iii) the average child support she received from October 2011 to December 2011 of \$138. Because Claimant began receiving child support in October 2011 and the amounts over the subsequent two months was consistent, the Department properly averaged the three months of child support payments in budgeting Claimant's monthly child support income. BEM 505. Claimant verified the amount of her SSI, SSP and the child support received from October 2011 to December 2011. Added together, the three sources of income totaled \$849, consistent with the amount shown as Claimant's monthly unearned income in her FAP budget.

From the gross income, the Department properly subtracted the \$146 standard deduction available to Claimant's FAP group size of two. RFT 255. While Claimant is a Senior/Disabled/Veteran (SDV) member eligible for a deduction for medical expenses she incurs in excess of \$35 (BEM 554), Claimant testified that she had no medical expenses. Claimant confirmed that her monthly housing obligation was \$151, as reflected in the budget. The Department also applied the standard heat and utility deduction of \$553 available to all FAP recipients in calculating Claimant's FAP budget. 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 \$262 per month in FAP benefits. BEM 550; BEM 556; RFT 260.

At the hearing, Claimant also expressed concerns about a letter of child support noncooperation that temporarily resulted in a decrease in her FAP benefits until the matter was corrected. Claimant was advised that, because that issue arose after her request for hearing in the instant case, she needed to file a new request for hearing with respect to the child support noncooperation issue.

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: April 16, 2012

Date Mailed: April 16, 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:

2012-31376/ACE

- 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/cl

cc:

