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

	TIL	A A	TTC	$\mathbf{n}$	<b>~</b> E.
IN	ΙН	MΑ	TTE	ĸ	JF:

Reg. No.: 201264502

Issue No.: 3003 Case No.:

Hearing Date: August 13, 2012

County: Wayne (76)

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

## **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 August 13, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Element (Department).

## **ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department ☐ close Claimant's case ☑ reduce Claimar			
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?		
<u>FINDINGS</u>	OF FACT		
The Administrative Law Judge, based on evidence on the whole record, finds as mate	•		
Claimant	☑ received benefits for:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).		

# 201264502/ACE

[	On August 1, 2012, the Department
	On July 3, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4. (	On July 9, 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
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ninistered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
Res 42 l Age	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
prog imp Reg Age	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) gram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is lemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Sec The	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for o	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
and	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE IXX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 100, 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 produced a FAP budget for Claimant showing the calculation of his monthly FAP benefits for May 1, 2012 and ongoing. The budget showed that Claimant had unearned income of \$712, consisting of his monthly gross Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits of \$698, which Claimant confirmed, and monthly gross State SSI Payment (SSP) benefits of \$14 (based on a \$42 quarterly payment). Although Claimant testified that he had received only \$28 in SSP benefits, the Department credibly testified that, because Claimant had been receiving SSI benefits only since May 2012, he had only received two months' SSP benefits for the quarter ending June 2012 but would receive \$42 quarterly payments beginning with his next quarterly SSP payment.

Claimant's FAP budget also took into consideration the standard deduction of \$146 available to Claimants' FAP group size of one and an excess shelter deduction of \$270, which was based on the standard heat and utility standard deduction of \$553 available to all FAP recipients. BEM 554; RFT 255.

The Department testified that no shelter expenses were included in the calculation of Claimant's excess shelter deduduction in the FAP budget because Claimant had failed to provide verification of such expenses. Shelter expenses are not included in a FAP budget if a client does not verify the expenses. BEM 554. Claimant testified that he had begun paying monthly rent of \$200 in November 2011 and had met with his worker at the end of the year to show her his rent receipts. He further testified that he indicated in his redetermination that no change had occurred with respect to his rent because he assumed that the \$200 monthly rental obligation he had verified at the end of the year had been included in his FAP budget. Claimant's worker testified that she did not receive any verification of rent in 2011 and had not requested any shelter verification in connection with the FAP redetermination because no shelter had been previously budgeted into Claimant's FAP budget and Claimant had indicated that he had no change in shelter expenses. Because there was no written verification on file to establish Claimant's shelter expenses, the Department acted in acccordance with Department policy in excluding such expense until it received acceptable verification.

A client's FAP budget also includes deductions for medical expenses over \$35 incurred by a Senior/Disabled/Veteran (SDV) member of the FAP group and child support payments made by the FAP group. BEM 554. At the hearing, Claimant testified that he paid child support and had medical expenses that were not included in his FAP budget. However, Claimant admitted that he had not disclosed to the Department the child support payments he made. Although the Department had a medical expense for Claimant from 2010, overdue expenses are not properly considered in a FAP budget. BEM 554. Because the Department did not have notice of Claimant's child support payments or documentation of any allowable medical expenses, the Department properly excluded these expenses from the calculation of Claimant's FAP benefits.

A review of Claimant's FAP budget shows that the Department calculated Claimant's monthly FAP benefits at \$111 for May 1, 2012, ongoing, and continuing for August 1, 2012 ongoing, following the redetermination, in accordance with Department policy.

2012 ongoing, following the redetermination, in accordance with Department policy.
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 $\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \ $
<ul><li>☐ denied Claimant's application</li><li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li><li>☐ closed Claimant's case</li></ul>
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   ☐ 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: August 21, 2012

Date Mailed: August 21, 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:

### 201264502/ACE

- 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 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
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

### ACE/hw

CC:

