

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 15-008569
Issue No.: 1000, 2000, 3001
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 29, 2015
County: Wayne (19)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

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 telephone hearing was held on June 29, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant, [REDACTED], Claimant's spouse, testified on behalf of Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) included [REDACTED], hearing facilitator.

ISSUE

The issue is whether MDHHS properly terminated Claimant's Food Assistance program (FAP) eligibility.

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 was an ongoing FAP benefit recipient.
2. Claimant was a member of a 5-person FAP benefit group.
3. On [REDACTED], MDHHS terminated Claimant's FAP eligibility, effective May 2015, due to excess FAP benefit group income.
4. On [REDACTED], Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the termination of FAP benefits; Claimant also disputed unspecified actions concerning her Medical Assistance (MA) and Family Independence Program (FIP) eligibility.

5. Claimant testified that she no longer had disputes concerning MA and FIP eligibility.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. MDHHS (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131. MDHHS policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. MDHHS (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k. MDHHS policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Claimant requested a hearing, in part, to dispute her FIP and MA eligibility. Claimant did not specify which MDHHS actions were disputed. Claimant testified that she had no current dispute concerning MA or FIP eligibility. Claimant's testimony equated to a withdrawal of her hearing request concerning FIP and MA benefits. Claimant's hearing request concerning FIP and MA benefits will be dismissed due to Claimant's hearing request withdrawal.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. MDHHS (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001-.3011. MDHHS policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Claimant requested a hearing, in part, to dispute a termination of FAP benefits. MDHHS presented a Notice of Case Action (Exhibits 1-2) which included a budget summary of all FAP budget factors. Claimant did not dispute any of the numbers budgeted by MDHHS.

The analysis will proceed to determine if MDHHS properly determined Claimant's FAP eligibility. BEM 556 outlines how MDHHS is to calculate FAP eligibility.

Claimant testimony conceded that her husband's employment income as of [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (the date of MDHHS determination) was \$2691. MDHHS counts 80% of a FAP member's timely reported monthly gross employment income in determining FAP benefits. Applying the 20% deduction to the employment income creates a countable monthly employment income of \$2136 (dropping cents).

It was not disputed that a FAP group benefit member received \$747/month (federal and state SSI combined) in Supplemental Security Income. Adding the group's SSI to the countable employment income results in a running total of \$2883

DHHS uses certain expenses to determine net income for FAP eligibility and benefit levels. BEM 554 (October 2014), p. 1. For groups without a senior (over 60 years old), disabled or disabled veteran (SDV) member, MDHHS considers the following expenses: child care, excess shelter (housing and utilities) up to a capped amount and court-ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members. For groups containing SDV members, MDHHS also considers the medical expenses for the SDV group member(s) and an uncapped excess shelter expense. Claimant's group is an SDV group because of Claimant's disability.

Verified medical expenses for SDV groups, child support and day care expenses are subtracted from a client's monthly countable income. Claimant testimony conceded that her group had no such expenses.

Claimant's FAP benefit group receives a standard deduction of \$192. RFT 255 (October 2014), p. 1. The standard deduction is given to all FAP benefit groups, though the amount varies based on the benefit group size. The standard deduction is subtracted from the FAP group's countable monthly income to calculate the group's adjusted gross income. The adjusted gross income amount is found to be \$2691.

It was not disputed that Claimant's housing expense was \$775/month. MDHHS factored the maximum utility credit of \$553 (see RFT 255) in Claimant's FAP budget. Claimant's total shelter expenses are found to be \$1328.

MDHHS only credits FAP benefit groups with what is called an "excess shelter" expense. This expense is calculated by subtracting half of Claimant's adjusted gross income from Claimant's total shelter obligation. Claimant's excess shelter amount is found to be \$0.

The FAP benefit group's net income is determined by taking the group's adjusted gross income and subtracting the allowable excess shelter expense. Claimant's FAP benefit group's net income is found to be \$2691. A chart listed in RFT 260 is used to determine

the proper FAP benefit issuance. Based on Claimant's group size and net income, Claimant's proper FAP benefit issuance is found to be \$0, the same amount calculated by MDHHS.

Claimant credibly testified that her spouse's income decreased since MDHHS terminated her FAP eligibility. Claimant also conceded that MDHHS was unaware of the reduction before her FAP eligibility ended. Claimant's testimony does not change the above analysis because MDHHS had no obligation to budget what Claimant had not yet reported. Claimant would have to reapply for FAP benefits if she wishes MDHHS to reconsider her FAP eligibility.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that Claimant withdrew her hearing request concerning unspecified FIP and MA disputes. Claimant's hearing request is **PARTIALLY DISMISSED**.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS properly terminated Claimant's FAP eligibility, effective May 2015. The actions taken by MDHHS are **AFFIRMED**.



Christian Gardocki
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **7/2/2015**

Date Mailed: **7/2/2015**

CG / hw

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from MAHS within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS **MAY** order a

rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion. MAHS **MAY** grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed 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 address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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 48909-8139

cc:

