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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012 33848 Issue No.: 3003, 6019 Case No.:

Hearing Date: April 9, 2012

County: Oakland County DHS (02)

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 April 9, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Exercise (ES.

<u>ISSUE</u>

Due to excess income, did the Department pro ☐ deny the Claimant's application for Child D ☐ close Claimant's case ☐ reduce Claimant'	evelopment and Care						
☐ 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 CD	C: X received benefits for FAP:						
 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). 	 ☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA). ☒ Child Development and Care (CDC). 						

2.	On December 18, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's CDC application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3.	On March 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's FAP benefits due to excess income.
4.	On December 29, 2011, CDC, On February 10, 2012 the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
5.	On February 3, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the
	\boxtimes denial of the application. \square closure of the case. \boxtimes reduction of benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective October 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence pency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity 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 Aprogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance 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, a thorough review of the income used to calculate both the Claimant's food assistance (FAP) and eligibility for CDC was made during the hearing. The earned income was based upon the Employment Verification received by the Claimant's employer which included monthly income for December. The Claimant also reviewed the earned income amount and confirmed that it was correct. Exhibit 4.

The unearned income was based upon a three month average of child support payments received by the Claimant for her two children for the three month period beginning September 2011 through November 2011. Exhibit 5. The Department correctly averaged the child support due to the fact that the November amounts received fluctuated and were higher than previous months. The Claimant received 3 child support payments in November 2011, which was more than the two payments generally received. However, as explained at the hearing, the Department must include all income received by the recipient during the period being reviewed. In this case, the Department properly averaged the 3 month period rather than used November 2011 alone (which was the highest month). The unearned income total of \$1226 is correct and is based upon a three month average.

Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, and the testimony of the parties, it is determined that the Department correctly reduced the Claimants' FAP benefits due to an increase in gross income and correctly denied the Claimant's application for CDC benefits. The Claimant's gross income was determined to be \$2017.50, and is correct. The income limit for CDC for a family of 3 persons is \$1990 and thus the Claimant's income exceeded the income limit. RFT 270. Exhibit 9.

At the hearing, the Claimant advised that she has only received 2 child support payments beginning January 2012 through March 2012. Therefore Claimant should reapply for CDC benefits, as her income has decreased; and request that her FAP benefits be recalculated going forward due to the decrease in child support received.

Based upon the above Fin- stated on the record, the income, the Department	Administrative	Law Judge	concludes		
denied Claimant's a	oplication for Cl	DC			

reduced Claimant's benefits for FAP

201233848/LMF

☐ closed Claimant's case
for:
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 \int \text{did act properly} \text{did not act properly}.
Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED 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: April 10, 2012

Date Mailed: April 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 <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.

201233848/LMF

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail to:
Michigan Administrative hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

