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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-50899 Issue No.: 2003, 3008 Case No.:

Hearing Date: June 6, 2012 County: Wayne (43)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administ rative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on Wednesday, June 6, 2012. The Claimant appeared and testified. Partic ipating on behalf of Department of Human Services ("Department") was participated on behalf of the Office of Child Support.

<u>ISSUE</u>

Whether the Department properly terminated FAP and MA benefits effective April 1, 2012 based on the failure to complete the redetermination process?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. The Claimant was an ongoing FAP and MA recipient.
- 2. On May 1 4, 2011, the Office of Child Support ("OCS") sent the First Contact Letter to the Claimant requesting the Cl aimant contact the OCS to provide information regarding the non-c ustodial parent to be submitted no later than August 9, 2011. (Exhibit 1)
- The OCS did not receive any information.

- 4. On August 18, 2011, the OCS sent a Final Customer Contact Letter to the Claimant requesting information regarding the non-custodial parent be submitted no later than December 29, 2011. (Exhibit 2)
- 5. On September 1, 2011, the Claimant's FAP benefits were reduced to \$200.00, reflecting one group member, as a result of non-compliance with the FIP (cash assistance) benefit program.
- 6. The OCS did not have any communication with the Claimant regarding the non-custodial parent.
- 7. On January 6, 2012, the OCS sent a Non-Cooperation Notice to the Claimant informing her that she was found to be non-cooperative based on the failure to respond to the two previously sent letters. (Exhibit 3)
- 9. The redetermination packet was not received by the due date.
- 10. On April 19, 2012, the Department sent a Notice of Case Action to the Claimant regarding the closure of the MA case.
- 11. On April 27, 2012, the Department re ceived the Claimant's written request for hearing protesting the FAP allotment and the closure of MA benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the

Bridges Eligibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Tables ("RFT").

The F amily Independence Program ("FIP") was establis hed pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public L aw 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department, formerly known as the Family Independence Agenc y, administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3101 through 400. 3131. FIP replaced t he Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

☑ The Food Assistance Program ("FAP"), formerly known as the Food Stamp program, is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amend ed, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR"). The Department, formerly known as the Fami ly Independence Agency, administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, Rules 40 0.3001 through 400.3015.

Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR"). The Department of Human Services, form erly known as the Family Independenc e Agency, administers the MA proogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L 400.105.
☐ The Adult Medical Program ("AMP") is established by 42 USC 131 5, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
☐ The State Disability Assistance ("SDA") program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human Services, formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 through 400.3180.
☐ The Child Development and Care ("CDC") program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent 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 Fede ral Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Depart ment provides servic es to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.5001 through 400.5015.

Parents have a responsibility to meet their children's needs by providing support and/or cooperating with the depar timent including the Office of Child Support ("OCS"), the Friend of the Court, and the prosecuting attorney to establish paternity and/or obtain support from an absent parent. BEM 255. Cooperation is a condition of eligibility. BEM 255. The head of household and the parent of children must comply with all requests for action or information needed to establis high paternity and/or obtain child support on behalf of children for whom they receive as sistance, unless a claim of good cause for not cooperating has been granted or is pending. BEM 255.

For FAP and MA purposes, the failure to cooperate without good cause results in member disqualification. BEM 255. The remaining eligible group members will continue to receive benefits. BEM 255. Bridges will not restore or reopen benefits for a disqualified member until the client cooperates (as reco rded on the child support non-cooperation record) or support/paternity action is no longer needed. BEM 255. A disqualified member is returned to the eligible group, active for benefits, in the month of cooperation. BEM 255.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial a nd ongoing eligibility to include the completion of the necessary forms. BAM 105. Verification means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements. BAM 130. Clients are allowed 10 calendar days (or other time limit

specified in policy) to provide the requested verification(s). BAM 130. For FAP and MA purposes, benefits stop at the end of the benefit period **unless** a redetermination is completed **and** a new benefit period is checker expired. BAM 210. If the client does not complete the redetermination process, benefits expire at the end of the benefit period. BAM 210.

In this case, the OCS sent two letters to the Claimant, one dated May 1, 2011 and the second dated August 18, 2011, requesting information regarding the non-custodial parent. The Claimant testified that she sent in the requested information in May 2011; however, the OCS never received it. After the second letter was received, indicating it was a Final Customer Contact Letter, the Claimant did not contact the OCS to inquir e why she received the letter in light of her the estimony that she had complied. Instead, there was no communication which resulted in the imposition of the non-cooperation sanction in January 2012. Generally, the imposition of the sanction would have resulted in the Claimant's FAP benefits being reduced as a result of the Claimant being removed from the group. Here, the Claim ant was previously found non-compliant with the work-related requirements and, thus, she was already removed from the FAP group effective September 1, 2011.

Regarding the redetermination: The Claimant acknowledged receipt of the redetermination and agreed she did not submit the packet by the April 5, 2012 due date. On April 19, 2012, the Depart ment sent a Notice of Case Action to the Claimant informing her that benefits would termi nate effective May 1, 2012 unless the redetermination was completed and a new benefit period was certified. The Claimant requested a hearing; however, the redetermination packet was not received until May 1, 2012, after the benefit period had expired.

Ultimately, under the facts presented, the Depar tment es tablished it acted in accordance with department policy when it found the Claimant non-cooperative with the OCS resulting in the imposition of the sanction. Additionally, the Department established it acted in accordance with department policy when the benefits were terminated effective May 1, 2012 after not rece iving the redetermination and, therefore, a new benefit period was not certified. Accordingly, the Department's actions are AFFIRMED.

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 reco rd, finds that the Department establishe d it acted in accordanc e with policy when it imposed the non-cooper ation sanction and when it terminated benefits after not being able to complete the redetermination process.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated above and on the record.

Collein M. Mamilka

Colleen M. Mamelka
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>June 8, 2012</u> Date Mailed: <u>June 8, 2012</u>

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

