

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-19057  
Issue No.: 4013  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 8, 2013  
County: Wayne (82-19)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Eric Feldman

**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 May 8, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department properly  deny the Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?           | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?             |

**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 benefits for:  received benefits for:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).           | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).             |

2. On November 29, 2012, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action notifying him of the denial of his SDA application effective December 1, 2012, due to excess income. Exhibit 1.
3. On December 17, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  denial of the application.  closure of the case.  reduction of benefits.

### **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 Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

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

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (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.

SDA is a cash program for individuals who are not eligible for FIP and are disabled or the caretaker of a disabled person. BEM 214 (January 2010), p. 1. An SDA eligibility determination group (EDG) consists of either a single adult or adult and spouse living together. BEM 214, p. 1. The EDG means those persons living together whose information is needed to determine eligibility for assistance. BEM 515 (November 2012), p. 1. Financial need must exist in order to receive benefits. BEM 518 (November 2012), p. 1. For SDA purposes, all earned and unearned income available to the claimant that is not specifically excluded, is countable. BEM 500 (November 2012), p. 3. The amount counted may be more than the client actually receives because the gross amount is used prior to any deductions. BEM 500, p. 3. The SDA payment standard for an individual and spouse living in an independent living arrangement, which is Claimant's situation, is \$315.00. RFT 225 (October 2011), p. 1.


In this case, the Department testified that both Claimant and his wife received Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) income. Claimant's gross RSDI income is \$695, and his wife's gross RSDI income is \$1,088.90. Claimant testified that he agreed with these amounts. When both amounts are added together, it equals a gross RSDI income of \$1,783.90. At the hearing, the Department presented as evidence the SDA Income test (Exhibit 1), and that budget reflected a total RSDI income of \$1,755. This amount is different from the Department's testimony. The Department testified that the \$1,755 might have reflected Claimant's and his wife's total gross RSDI income for 2011. Nevertheless, the \$1,755 RSDI income which the Department used still exceeded the SDA standard; therefore, the Department properly denied the application due to excess income. Accordingly, the Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

**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  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated above and on the record.

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

Date Signed: May 15, 2013

Date Mailed: May 16, 2013

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

EJF/pf

cc:

