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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201317556

Issue No.: 3002

Case No.:

Hearing Date: January 23, 2013

County: Wayne (19)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

#### **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 held on J anuary 23, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participant s on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist.

#### <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly decrease Cla imant's F ood Ass istance Program (FAP) benefits?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- Claimant is an ongoing recipient of FAP benefits.
- 2. In connection with a FAP redet ermination, the Department recal culated Claimant's FAP budget to include employment income that was not previously budgeted.
- 3. On October 18, 2012, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action informing him that his monthly FAP benefiths would decrease to \$468 for October 2012 and to \$584 for November 2012 ongoing.
- 4. On December 17, 2012, Claimant filed a request for hearing disputing the Department's actions.

## **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 purs uant 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.
∑ The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) program] is establis hed by the Food St amp 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 Family Independenc e Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 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 (AMP) is established 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) progr am, 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 seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3 151 through R 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 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.
Additionally in appropriant with Claiman 4's EAD and termination the Department

Additionally, in connection with Claiman t's FAP r edetermination, the Department recalculated Claimant's FAP budget for Oc tober 1, 2012, ongoi ng. The Department testified that, due to the inclusion of Claimant's employment income which had not been included in prior budgets, Claimant was eligible for F AP benefits of \$468 f or October 2012 and \$584 for November 1, 2012, ongoing.

At the hearing, the Claimant's F AP budget for October 2012 and November 1, 2012, ongoing were reviewed. Claimant verified his weekly income and his group size of five. The Department calculated Claimant's gross monthly earned income in accordance with Department policy and applied the standard deduction he was eligible to receive. BEM 505 (October 1, 2010), p 6; RFT 255 (October 1, 2012), p 1. Howev er, the October 2012 FAP budget did not include the ear ned income deduction that Claimant was eligible to receive. BEM 556 (July 1, 2011 ), p 3. Because the Department was unable to provide any valid explanation as to why Claimant did not receive the earned income deduction in his October 2012 FAP budget, parti cularly where he receiv ed it in the November 2012 ongoing FA P budget, which had the same employment income relied on in the October 2012 FAP budget, the Depar tment did not satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when calculated Claimant's net income.

A review of the FAP budgets for Oc tober 2012 and Novem ber 2012 ongoing also showed that there were no hou sing expenses included in the calculation of Claimant's excess shelter deduction. Claimant testified that he provided a copy of his lease, which showed monthly rent of \$750, in connection with his redetermination. At the hearing, the Department acknowledged that Claimant's monthly rent should have been included in the calculation of his monthly excess shelter deduction and, consequently, his monthly FAP benefits, and agreed to include those expenses in a recalculation of Claimant's FAP budgets for October 1, 2012 ongoing as long as Claimant re-verified those expenses.

### **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 when . ☑ did not act properly when it calculated Claimant's FAP budget for October 2012 and November 2012 ongoing.
Accordingly, for the reasons stated on the record and above, the Department's decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to AND REVERSED IN PART with respect to .
oxed THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

- Begin recalculating Clai mant's FAP budget for Octo ber 2012 and November 2012 ongoing consistent wit h this Hear ing Decision and in accordanc e with Department policy, including requesting any required verifications of shelter expenses;
- 2. Issue supplements to Claim ant for any FAP benefits he was eligible to receive bu t did not for October 1, 2012, ongoing; and

3. Notify Claimant in writing of its decision in accordance with Department policy.

Alice C. Elkin

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

Date Signed: January 30, 2013

Date Mailed: January 30, 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

ACE/cl

cc: