


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 14-000552
Issue No.: 3001
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: MAY 1, 2014
County: Clinton

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael S. Newell

HEARING DECISION

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 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 tele hearing was held on April 30, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Hearings Facilitator.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly calculate Claimant's FAP allotment?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. On March 26, 2014 the Department issued a Notice of Case Action decreasing Claimant's FAP to \$ [REDACTED] per month.
2. On March 31, 2014, Claimant requested a hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The

Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Additionally, The Department's computer system known as "Bridges" uses certain expenses to determine net income for FAP eligibility and benefit levels. BEM 554. For groups with no senior/disabled/disabled veteran (SDV) member, Bridges uses the following: (1) dependent care expense; (2) excess shelter up to the maximum in RFT 255; (3) court ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members. BEM 554. For groups with one or more SDV member, Bridges uses the following; see BEM 550: (1) dependent care expense; (2) excess shelter (3) court ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members; and (4) medical expenses for the SDV member(s) that exceed \$35. BEM 554.

The Department shall complete either a manually-calculated or Bridges budget to document expenses every time an expense change is reported. BEM 554. The Department must verify the responsibility to pay and the amount of certain expenses. BEM 554. The Department must document verification in the case record. BEM 554. The Department shall not budget expenses that require verification until the verification is provided. BEM 554. The Department must determine eligibility and the benefit level without an expense requiring verification if it cannot be verified. BEM 554. The Department treats subsequently provided verification from an eligible FAP group as a change. A supplement for lost benefits is issued only if the expense could not be verified within 30 days of the application and the local office was at fault. BEM 554. Expenses are used from the same calendar month as the month for which the Department is determining benefits. BEM 554. Expenses remain unchanged until the FAP group reports a change. BEM 554. The Department determines the amount of monthly income from biweekly checks by averaging any biweekly check and multiplying the average biweekly check amount by 2.15. RFT 505. The Department determines the amount of monthly income from weekly checks by averaging the weekly checks and multiplying the average by 4.3.

Claimant's total gross income during the relevant period was \$ [REDACTED]. The Department properly determined Claimant's adjusted gross income to be \$ [REDACTED]. Claimant's Standard Deduction of \$151 is appropriate. RFT 255.

The Excess Shelter deduction of \$ [REDACTED] property reflected the housing cost of \$ [REDACTED] and utility deduction of \$ [REDACTED] minus 50% of Adjusted Gross Income. See BEM 554, 556.


RFT 260 provides that a FAP group of this size with a net monthly income after deductions of \$ [REDACTED] would be eligible to \$ [REDACTED] per month in FAP benefits if otherwise eligible. The Department did not err in determining Claimant's monthly FAP benefits.

Claimant testified that she had a specific diet that her doctor found to be medically necessary. There is no legal provision to increase FAP benefits based on dietary needs.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it calculated her FAP allotment.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.


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

Date Signed: **5/8/2014**

Date Mailed: **5/8/2014**

MSN/las

cc:

