

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

████████████████████  
████████████████████  
██████████  
████████████████████████████████████████

MAHS Reg. No.: 15-017707  
Issue No.: 3008  
Agency Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: November 18, 2015  
County: Macomb-District 12

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun**

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Petitioner'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; and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 18, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner appeared for the hearing and was represented by her mother as Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR), ██████████ who also has Power of Attorney. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by ██████████, Hearings Facilitator.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly calculate the amount of Petitioner's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Petitioner was an ongoing recipient of FAP benefits.
2. Petitioner's FAP benefits were reduced to \$149 monthly, effective October 1, 2015.
3. On September 22, 2015, Petitioner requested a hearing disputing the amount of her FAP benefits.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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. The Department (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.

In this case, Petitioner requested a hearing disputing the Department's calculation of her FAP benefits in the amount of \$149. At the hearing, the Department stated that Petitioner's FAP budget was reviewed and her benefits decreased from \$150 to \$149 due to changes in policy. The Department provided the FAP EDG Net Income Results Budget for the period of October 1, 2015, which was reviewed to determine if the Department properly corrected and calculated the amount of Petitioner's FAP benefits. (Exhibit A).

All countable earned and unearned income available to the client must be considered in determining the Petitioner's eligibility for program benefits. BEM 500 (July 2015), pp. 1 – 5. The Department considers the gross amount of money earned from Retirement Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) in the calculation of unearned income for purposes of FAP budgeting. BEM 503 (October 2015), pp. 28. The Department concluded that Petitioner had unearned income of \$742 which came from her monthly RSDI benefit. The Department presented a SOLQ in support of its testimony and Petitioner confirmed the amount relied on by the Department. (Exhibit B). Therefore, the Department properly calculated Petitioner's gross unearned income.

The deductions to income on the net income budget were also reviewed. Petitioner is the only member of her FAP group and is a senior/disabled/veteran (SDV) member of the FAP group. BEM 550 (October 2015), pp. 1-2. Groups with one or more SDV members are eligible for the following deductions to income:

- Dependent care expense.
- Excess shelter.
- Court ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members.
- Medical expenses for the SDV member(s) that exceed \$35.
- Standard deduction based on group size.
- An earned income deduction equal to 20% of any earned income.

BEM 554 (October 2015), p. 1; BEM 556 (July 2013), p. 3.

In this case, Petitioner did not have any earned income and there was no evidence presented that she had any out of pocket dependent care, child support, or medical

expenses over \$35. Therefore, the budget properly did not include any deduction for earned income, dependent care expenses, child support, or medical expenses. Based on her confirmed one-person group size, the Department properly applied the \$154 standard deduction. RFT 255 (October 2015), p. 1.

In calculating Petitioner's excess shelter deduction of \$438, the budget shows that although Petitioner stated her rent had increased, based on the information available to the Department at the time the budget was completed and based on Petitioner's failure to report her increased monthly rental expenses on her previous Mid-Certification Contact Notice, the Department properly considered monthly rent of \$580. (Exhibit C; Exhibit D). The budget shows that the Department applied the \$119 non-heat electric standard and the \$33 telephone standard. The Department stated that the \$539 heat and utility (h/u) standard was not applied when calculating the excess shelter deduction.

At the hearing, Petitioner testified that while she is not responsible for heating expenses, she is responsible for air conditioning cooling expenses. Department policy provides that FAP groups who pay for cooling (including room air conditioners) are eligible for the h/u standard if they verify they have the responsibility to pay for non-heat electric. BEM 554, pp. 16-17. Because the Department had verification of Petitioner's responsibility to pay for non-heat electric expenses and because Petitioner is responsible for cooling expenses, the Department should have applied the \$539 h/u standard when calculating Petitioner's excess shelter deduction.

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 because of the errors in the calculation of Petitioner's excess shelter deduction, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it calculated Petitioner's FAP benefits.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Recalculate Petitioner's FAP budget for October 1, 2015, ongoing, taking into consideration her responsibility for cooling expenses;
2. Issue FAP supplements to Petitioner from October 1, 2015, ongoing, in accordance with Department policy; and
3. Notify Petitioner in writing of its decision.



---

**Zainab Baydoun**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **11/20/2015**

Date Mailed: **11/20/2015**

ZB / tlf

**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: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]