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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-63738

Issue No(s).: 6006

Case No.: Hearing Date: Februar

Hearing Date: February 11, 2014

County: Wayne County DHS #55

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen Lack

HEARING DECISION

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Se rvices (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Res pondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in acc ordance with 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18, 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250, 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33, and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on Febr uary 11, 2014, from Lansin g, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included Lead Agent, OIG office.

Respondent did not appear. The DHS-828, Notice of Debt Collection Hearing wa
not returned as undeliverable. This matter having been initiated by the Department an
due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in Respondent's
absence in accordance with Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative
Manual (BAM) 725 (7-1-2013), pp. 16-22.

П	Partici	pants	on	behalf	of Re	espondent	included

ISSUE

Did Respondent receive an OI of	
Family Independence Program (FIP)	☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)
☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)	☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)
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:

1.	Respondent was a rec ipient of \square FIP \square FAP \square SDA \boxtimes CDC be nefits from the Department.
2.	The Department alleges Respondent received a ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☒ CDC OI during the period August 1, 2006, through July 5, 2007, due to ☐ Department's error ☐ Respondent's error.
3.	The Department alleges that Respondent received a \$ OI that is still due and owing to the Department.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Service s Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Child Development and Car e (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 t o 9858q; and the Personal Respons ibility and Work Opportunity Reconcilia tion Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services t o adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

The OIG L ead Agent testified that address the Notice of Debt Collection hearing was sent to the Respondent at was her address of record with the Department at the time the Department requested the hearing in July 2012. The OIG Le ad Agent testified that when he checked again the morning of the February 11, 2014 telephone hearing proceedings, that the Respondent's address had been updated. However, the OIG Lead Agent was not able to tell when the Respondent's address was updated with the Department. Further, the DHS-828, Notice of Debt Collection Hearing was not returned as undeliverable. Accordingly, the hearing was held in Respondent's absence in accordance with BAM 725 (7-1-2013), pp. 16-22.

When a client group receives more benefits t han it is entitled to receive, DHS mus t attempt to recoup the overi ssuance (OI). BAM 700, p 1 (12-1-2011). An overissuance (OI) is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what it was eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). BAM 700, p 1 (12-1-2011).

An agency error OI is caused by incorrec taction (including delayed or no action) by DHS staff or DIT staff or department processes. BAM 700, p 3 (12-1-2011). If unable to identify the type of OI, the Department records it as an agency error. BAM 700, p 3 (12-1-2011).

A client error OI occurs when the client re ceived more benefits than they were entitled to because the client gave inc orrect or in complete information to the department. BAM 700, p 5 (12-1-2011).

A Claimant must report changes in circumstance that potentia Ily affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, p.7 (12/1/2011).

Client and Agency error Ols ar e not pursued if the estimated Ol amount is less than \$125 per program. BAM 700, p 7 (12-1-2011).

The Department of Human Services (DHS) may provide payment for child care services for qualifying families when the parent(s)/substitute parent(s) is unavailable to provide the child care because of employment, education and/or because of a health/social condition for which treatment is being recdeved and care is provided by an eligible provider. Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) 703 p.1 (7-1 -2006) Certa in specified relatives can be enrolled as a relative care provider. PEM 704, pp. 2-3 (7-1-2006)

There are f our CDC need reasons. Each paren t/substitute parent of the child needing care must have a valid need reas on during the time child care is requested. Each need reason must be verified and exists only when each parent/substitute parent is unavailable to provide the care because of:

1) family preserva tion, 2) high school completion, 3) Michigan Works Agency appr oved activity, 4) employment. PEM 708, p.3 (7-1-2006)

The child care need calculation is based on a "best estimate" of the Parent/Substitute Parent's work or approved activity schedule. PEM 710, p. 1 (7-1-2006) Need is determined at application, redetermination, and when a change in work or activity hour s is reported. PEM 710, p.1 (7-1-2006)

Here, the Department contends that Respondent received an OI of CDC benefits due to the Respondent's continuing to receive CDC benefits when she was not attending Work First and when the CDC provi der was hospitalized. On a June 2006 applic ation for other benefit programs, the Respondent reported she needs or currently pays for child care services for two children based on Michigan Works Agency or other approved education or training. Accordingly, the ongoing CDC need determination was based on the Respondent's reported participation with Work First. The Work First documentation establishes that the Responde nt did not attend Work Firs t from July 18, 2006 through May 31, 2007. Additionally, it was verified with the Administrator of the nursing hom e that the Respondent's enrolled CDC provider was admitted to the facility on March 15, 2007, released on J une 29, 2007, and could not have provide d child car e for anyone during that time. The OIG Lead Agent explained that the CDC pay period that June 29, 2007 fell within did not end until July 5, 2007. Accordingly, the Department determined the Respondent received an Ol of CDC benefit is for the period of Augu through July 5, 2007.

Date Mailed: February 19, 2014

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The record ev idence shows that the Respondent received on OI of C DC benefits during the period of August 1, 2006 through July 5, 2007 base d on the combination of not attending Work First from July 18, 2006 through May 31, 2007 and the enrolled CDC relative provider bei ng unable to provide the child care from March 15, 2007 through June 29, 2007, when t he provider was admitted to a nursin g home.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon of Law, finds that the Department ☐ did establish a ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC					
DECISION AND ORDER					
Accordingly, the Department is					
 ☑ AFFIRMED. ☐ REVERSED. ☐ AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to to . ☑ The Department is ORDERED to initia accordance with Department policy. 	and REVERSED IN PART with respect te collection procedur es for a \$ OI in				
Date Signed: February 19, 2014	Colleen Lack Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services				

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the req uest of a p arty within 30 days of the mailing date of this De cision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final deci sion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request (60 days for FAP cases).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

• Newly discovered evidence that existe d at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;

- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights
 of the client:
- Failure of the ALJ to a ddress in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

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

CL/hj

CC: