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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	2012-61986
Issue No.:	3008
Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	February 20, 2013 Wayne (18)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative 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 held on February 20, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included cl aimant. Participant s on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included FIM,

ISSUE

Did the Departm ent properly \Box deny Claiman t's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:

	\times
j	

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 t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Cla imant applied for benefits received benefits for:

\times	
\square	
님	

Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

- Medical Assistance (MA).
- Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).
- State Disability Assistance (SDA).
- Child Development and Care (CDC).

- On July 1, 2012, the Department

 denied Claimant's application
 closed Claimant's case
 due to failure to comply with Jobs, Education, and Training (JET).
- On June 14, 2012, the Department sent
 □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the □ denial. □ closure.
- 4. On June 25, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown 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 Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly 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 Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independ ence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and MC L 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (A	MP) is es	tablished by 42 USC	1315, and is
administered by the Department	pursuant to MCL	. 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .	

The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA)) program, which provides financial ass istance
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 s	eq., and 20 00 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through
Rule 400.3180.	

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed 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 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Policy lists various reasons a claimant may miss a JET appointment.

GOOD CAUSE FOR NONCOMPLIANCE

Good cause is a valid reason for noncomplianc e with employment and/or self-sufficien cy-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. A clai m of good cause must be verified and documented for member adds and recipients. Document the good c ause determination in Bridges and the FSSP under the Participation and Compliance tab.

If it is determined during triage the client has good cause, and good cause issues have been resolved, send the clien t back to the work participation pr ogram. There is no need for a new work participation program referral.

Good cause includes the following: (BEM 233A, p.3: January 1, 2013.)

No Child Care

The client requested child care services from DHS, the work participation program, or other employment services provider prior to case closure for noncompliance and child c are is needed for an eligible child, but none is appropriate, suitable, affordable and within reasonable distance of the client's home or work site.

Appropriate. The car e is appropriate to the ch ild's age, disabilities and other conditions.

Reasonable distance. The total commuting time to and from work and the child care facility does n ot exceed three hours per day.

Suitable provider. The provider meets applicable state and local standards. Als o, unlic ensed providers who are not registered/licensed by the DHS Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing must meet DHS enr ollment requirements; see BEM 704.

Affordable. The child care is provided at the rate of payment or reimbursement offered by DHS. (BEM 233A, pp. 3-4: January 1, 2013).

Here, the Claimant notified the Department, a week prior to her triage; that her child care provider would no longer care for her child, that she no longer had a provider, and was looking for a replacement.

The Department argues that bec ause the Claimant's daycare case is open then it falls to the Claimant to replace the child care.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Co nclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

properly denied Claimant's application	improperly denied Claimant's application
properly closed Claimant's case	ig i improperly 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 i did act properly. i did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \square FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes 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:

1. Initiate the reopening of the Claimant's FIP retroactively and assist the Claimant in finding a CDC provider.

Michael J. Bennane Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 4, 2013

Date Mailed: April 4, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (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 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 <u>MAY</u> 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - 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

MJB/cl