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

IN THE MATTER OF:				
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-77348 1005 November 26, 2012 Wayne (35)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane				
HEARING DECISION				
This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 November 26, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Departm ent properly $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $				
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?	_	sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt 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:				
Food Assistance Program (FAP).		sistance (AMP). ssistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On September 6, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case due to noncompliance with work-related programs.
3.	On September 6, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective October 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) ogram] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial ecurity 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 encey) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L 0.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
for Se pro	The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human ervices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 20 00 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through alle 400.3180.
an 19	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establishhed by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Title program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal 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.

Additionally, in the instant case, the claimant's child care provider was found not suitable due to not meeting the department's provisions. The claimant testified that she was not able to find a suitable provider in the time alloted by the department.

On September 6, 2012, the cl aimant attended a triage at wh ich the claimant testified that she could not find suit able child care. The departm ent found this to be not good cause for failing to participate in required activity.

Pertanent policy may be found in BEM 230A:

Lack of Child Care

In the Employment Services - Deta il screen in Bridges, select the No child c are for child under six deferral reason and reply to questions regarding child care when a single parent who personally provides care for a child under age six in the FIP EDG and adequate child care is unavailable. Adequate child care meets all of the following:

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

Reasonable distance. The total commuting time to and from work and child care facilities does not exceed three hours per day.

Suitable provider. The provider meets applicable state and loca I standards. Unlicensed providers who are not registered/licens ed by the DHS Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing must meet DHS enrollment requirements.

Affordable. The c hild care is prov ided at the rate of payment or reimbursement offered by DHS.

Clients who need ass istance in finding a licensed or registered provider should be referred to Great Start C onnect. The online Web-based early learning resource site can be accessed at www.greatstartforkids.com. All active licensed and registered provi ders are searchable. If additiona I assistance is needed, clients can be referred to 1-877-614-7328, to search the Great Start Regional Chil d Car e Resource Center serving their county. Resource centers c an provide personal consultation for families in need of child care. If a prov ider cannot be located, the client needs to provide verification. (BEM 230A, pp7-8, August 30, 2012).

Here, the department was awar e of the claimant's lack of child care because it had denied approval for the child c are provider that the claimant already had. Despite this knowledge the department failed to provide the assistance called for in policy.

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 □ properly closed Claimant's case □ improperly denied Claimant's application □ improperly closed Claimant's case 			
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 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.			
$\hfill \square$ 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 back to the closure of her FIP and replace any lost benefits.			
m.m.			
Michael J. Bennane Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services			
Date Signed: January 9, 2013			
Date Mailed: January 9, 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 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

MJB/cl

