

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

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

Reg. No.: 15-000757
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: March 12, 2015
County: Oakland-District 2

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun

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 March 12, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and ██████████, who served as Interpreter. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████, Assistance Payment Supervisor and ██████████, Assistance Payment Worker.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly calculate the amount of Claimant'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. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FAP benefits.
2. On December 28, 2014, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action informing her that effective February 1, 2015, her FAP benefits would be reduced to \$16 monthly. (Exhibit A)
3. On January 5, 2015, Claimant submitted a hearing request disputing the Department's actions.

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 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

As a preliminary matter, although the Department's hearing summary references Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) case, Claimant confirmed that she requested a hearing disputing the Department's actions with respect to the amount of her FAP benefits.

At the hearing, the Department presented the FAP EDG Net Income Results Budget for February 1, 2015, which was reviewed to determine if the Department properly concluded that Claimant was eligible to receive \$16 in monthly FAP benefits. (Exhibit B). All countable earned and unearned income available to the client must be considered in determining the Claimant's eligibility for program benefits. BEM 500 (July 2014), pp. 1 – 4. The Department considers the gross amount of money earned from Supplemental Security Income (SSI) in the calculation of unearned income for purposes of FAP budgeting. BEM 503 (July 2014), pp. 31-32. State SSI Payments (SSP) are issued quarterly in the amount of \$42 and the payments are issued in the final month of each quarter; see BEM 660. The Department will count the monthly SSP benefit amount (\$14) as unearned income. BEM 503, p.33; see RFT 248 (January 2015), p. 1.

The Department concluded that Claimant had unearned income of \$747 which it testified came from \$733 in SSI benefits and \$14 in SSP benefits for Claimant. Although the Department did not present a SOLQ in support of its testimony, Claimant confirmed that she receives \$733 in SSI and \$14 SSP benefits. Therefore, the Department properly calculated Claimant's gross income.

The deductions to income on the net income budget were also reviewed. Claimant is the only member of her FAP group and is a senior/disabled/veteran (SDV) member of the group. BEM 550 (February 2014), 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 2014), p. 1; BEM 556 (July 2013), p. 3.

In this case, Claimant did not have any earned income and there was no evidence presented that she had any 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 2014), p. 1.

In calculating Claimant's excess shelter deduction, the Department considered Claimant's \$211 monthly rental/housing expenses. (Exhibit B, p. 3). The Department explained that because Claimant was no longer eligible for the \$553 heat and utility (h/u) standard, the excess shelter deduction was determined to be \$0. See BEM 554, pp. 16-19; BEM 556, pp. 4-5; RFT 255, p. 1. Claimant testified that she was responsible for telephone costs; however, these costs were not reported to the Department prior to the hearing. Claimant was informed that provided she submit verification of her telephone expenses, the Department would consider them towards the excess shelter deduction and future budgets. A review of the excess shelter deduction budget and Department policy shows that the Department properly determined that Claimant was eligible for an excess shelter deduction of \$0.

After further review it was found that, the Department properly reduced Claimant's gross income of \$747 by the \$154 standard deduction, resulting in monthly net income of \$593. Based on net income of \$593 and a FAP group size of one, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it concluded that Claimant was eligible for monthly FAP benefits of \$16. BEM 556; RFT 260 (October 2014), p. 8.

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 Claimant's FAP benefits for February 1, 2015, ongoing.

DECISION AND ORDER

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



Zainab Baydoun
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **3/19/2015**

Date Mailed: **3/19/2015**

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 party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (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:

Device Type	Percentage of Respondents
Smartphone	85%
Tablet	72%
Smartwatch	48%
Smart TV	35%
Smart Home Assistant	28%
Smart Car	15%
Smart Thermostat	12%
Smart Light Bulbs	10%
Smart Door Lock	8%
Smart Security Camera	5%