

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-56038
Issue Nos.: 2021, 3015, 5022
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 28, 2012
County: Wayne (82-18)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

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 June 28, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application for State Emergency Relief (SER) and close Claimant's cases for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medical Assistance Program (MA)?

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 SER benefits and received benefits for FAP and MA.
2. On May 21, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's SER application because there was not a direct threat to health or safety.
3. On July 1, 2012, the Department closed Claimant's MA and FAP cases due to Claimant's assets having value over the asset limits.
4. On May 21, 2012, and May 29, 2012, the Department sent Claimant notice of the SER denial and FAP and MA closures.

5. On May 31, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the SER application and closure of the FAP and MA cases.

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 State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by 1999 AC, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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.

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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (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, Claimant owns a home in which she is not currently living. BEM 400, "Assets," states on page 24 that a home in which the customer is not living does not receive a homestead exclusion and is regarded as an asset for calculating benefit eligibility and benefit levels. BEM 400, p. 24. BEM 400 also sets out the asset limits for the different programs. The asset limit for the FAP program is \$5,000, and the asset limit for the MA program is \$3,000. *Id.*, pp. 4-5.

Claimant's real property asset has an assessed value of \$23,300. Claimant paid \$11,000 for the home. It is found and determined that Claimant's assets are over the asset limits for these programs.

Also, in this case, Claimant's SER application was denied properly based on ERM 304, "Home Ownership." ERM states that the Department is only to authorize those home repairs "if the repair(s) is essential to remove a direct threat to health or safety or is required by law or a mobile home park regulation.... **SER does not pay for improvements or nonessential repairs.**" ERM 304, p. 2 (boldface in original).

Accordingly, it is found and determined that a direct threat to health or safety, i.e., an emergency, is not present in this case. The home repairs requests are not for repairs where people live currently so no one is endangered at this time. The Department acted properly in denying SER benefits.

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 the Department


- properly denied SER Claimant's application and
- properly closed Claimant's FAP and MA cases.

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 act properly. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's SER FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.



Jan Leventer
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 2, 2012

Date Mailed: July 2, 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 **MAY** 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
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

JL/pf

cc:

