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

### IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No.:	2012 37658
Issue No.:	3002, 3003
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	April 2, 2012
County:	Macomb County DHS (12)
-	• • • •

## 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 2, 2012. from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included . ES.

### ISSUE

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

imes	

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: R received benefits for:

Х
$\sim$

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 February 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application
  Closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
- On February 1, 2012, the Department sent
  □ Claimant
  □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
  □ denial. □ closure. □ reduction.
- 4. On February 17, 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.

 $\boxtimes$  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 presented a FAP budget and the FAP excess shelter calculation for review at the hearing. A review of the budget with the Claimant indicated that both the earned and unearned income amounts received by the Claimant were reviewed and confirmed by the Claimant as correct. The unearned income totalled \$1624 (which includes the Claimant's RSSDI \$982 and RSDI for her 3 children who each receive \$214); and the earned income of \$620 earned by the Claimant was also correct. Exhibits 2 and 3. The Claimant's rent in the amount of \$604 and a untility allowance of \$553 granted to all FAP recipeints when computing the FAP budget were included and thus the excess shelter deduction is correct. Exhibits 4 and 5. The FAP budgets were reviewed, and it is determined that the Department correcly calculated and reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits.

The Claimant indicated that she still pays Medicare Part B premium, however the Department, based upon the SOLQ report, did not include this amount as a medical expense as it is noted as reimbused by the State of Michigan. The exclusion of this expense was based upon the best information available, and is correct. BAM 130. The Department testified that the state's reimbusement of these expenses to the Claimant is lagging behind by 3 months. As advised at the hearing, the Claimant should check back with the Department within one month to determine the status of the Part B premium payment by the State and her reimbursement for any premiums paid after September 2011. Exhibit 1.

It is noted that the Claimant recieves RSDI and is entitled to submit, and have included in her FAP budget calculation, any and all ongoing medical expenses subject to a \$35 disregard. The Claimant was advised at the hearing that her ongoing medical bills could be included in her FAP budget upon submission of medical bills to the Department.

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

calculated and reduced Claimant's benefits

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  $\square$  did act properly  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\boxtimes$  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: April 3, 2012

Date Mailed: April 3, 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 to: Michigan Administrative hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

#### LMF/hw

