

Date Mailed: March 10, 2020 MOAHR Docket No.: 20-000294

Agency No.:
Petitioner:

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

## **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; 42 CFR 438.400 to 438.424; 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 March 4, 2020, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner appeared and was unrepresented. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by Karron Walker, specialist.

# <u>ISSUE</u>

The issue is whether MDHHS properly determined Petitioner's Food Assistance Program (FAP) eligibility beginning December 2019.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The administrative law judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. As of November 2019, Petitioner was a recipient of FAP benefits as a member of a 1-person benefit group.
- 2. As of November 2019, Petitioner was a senior (over 60 years old) and/or disabled.
- 3. As of December 2019, Petitioner received gross monthly Retirement, Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) of \$946.
- 4. As of Petitioner had the following monthly expenses: for child support, for dependent care, and in medical.

- 5. As of 2019, Petitioner was responsible for monthly housing expenses averaging Petitioner was also responsible for heat and/or cooling costs.
- 6. On \_\_\_\_\_, 2019, MDHHS determined Petitioner was eligible for \_\_\_\_ per month in FAP benefits beginning December 2019.
- 7. On January 9, 2020, Petitioner requested a hearing to dispute her FAP eligibility for December 2019.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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. MDHHS policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Petitioner requested a hearing to dispute a reduction in FAP benefits to p. 3. A Notice of Case Action dated October 22, 2019, stated that Petitioner was eligible for in FAP benefits beginning 2019. Exhibit A, pp. 9-10. The Notice of Case Action dated October 22, 2019, listed all relevant budget factors. MDHHS also presented budget pages for Petitioner's FAP eligibility from December 2019 which listed all budget factors. Exhibit A, pp. 19-21. During the hearing, all budget factors were discussed with Petitioner.

BEM 556 outlines the factors and calculations required to determine FAP eligibility. The first consideration in FAP eligibility is income.

The disputed FAP determination factored an unearned income of \$946. Documentation from Social Security Administration obtained from a data exchange listed Petitioner's monthly RSDI as \$946. Exhibit A, pp. 6-8. Petitioner acknowledged that her RSDI was correctly budgeted.

MDHHS uses certain expenses to determine net income for FAP eligibility and benefit levels. BEM 554 (October 2015), p. 1. For groups without a senior (over 60 years old), disabled or disabled veteran (SDV) member, MDHHS considers the following expenses: childcare, excess shelter (housing and utilities) up to a capped amount and court-ordered child support and arrearages paid to non-household members (see *Id.*). For groups containing SDV members, MDHHS also considers the medical expenses above \$35 for each SDV group member(s) and an uncapped excess shelter expense. Countable expenses are subtracted from a client's monthly countable income.

Petitioner was senior and/or disabled. Petitioner's testimony acknowledged having no child support or dependent care expenses. For medical expenses, MDHHS factored

monthly medical expenses of retitioner's testimony acknowledged that her actual medical expenses were approximately per month. As the budgeting of medical expenses is favorable for Petitioner, the analysis will accept that Petitioner's monthly medical expenses are Applying a mandatory copayment of results in countable medical expenses. Petitioner's FAP benefit group size justifies a standard deduction of see RFT 255). The standard deduction is given to all FAP benefit groups, though the amount varies based on the benefit group size. The standard deduction and countable expenses are subtracted from the countable monthly income to calculate the group's adjusted gross income. Subtracting the standard deduction and countable expenses from Petitioner's income results in an adjusted gross income of MDHHS budgeted Petitioner's housing costs to be Petitioner acknowledged that her expenses from the disputed benefit month were as MDHHS budgeted.<sup>2</sup> MDHHS credited Petitioner with a responsibility for heating costs and issued a standard heating/utility (h/u) credit of RFT 255 (October 2019) p. 1. Generally, the h/u credit covers all utility expenses and is the maximum credit available.3 Adding Petitioner's housing and utility credits results in a total shelter obligation of MDHHS only credits FAP benefit groups with an "excess shelter" expense. The excess shelter expense is calculated by subtracting half of Petitioner's adjusted gross income from Petitioner's total shelter obligation. Petitioner's excess shelter amount is (rounding up to nearest dollar). The FAP benefit group's net income is determined by taking the group's adjusted gross income and subtracting the allowable excess shelter expense. The result is a net income of . A chart listed in RFT 260 is used to determine the proper FAP benefit issuance.

Based on Petitioner's group size and net income, Petitioner's proper FAP benefit issuance for December 2019 is the same issuance amount was calculated by MDHHS. Thus,

MDHHS properly determined Petitioner's FAP eligibility.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner should be aware that if MDHHS corrects the medical expenses, the result may be a further reduction of FAP benefits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Petitioner testified that her housing expenses have since increased. Petitioner was advised to submit verification of her increased housing costs so the increase may be factored in future FAP determinations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> MDHHS allows additional credits for "actual utility expenses". Such expenses are only allowed for utility installation charges, water well installation and maintenance, and septic installation and maintenance. BEM 554 (October 2019) p. 15. There was no evidence of applicable exceptions.

# **DECISION AND ORDER**

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS properly determined Petitioner's FAP eligibility for December 2019 to be \$66. The actions taken by MDHHS are **AFFIRMED**.

CG/cg

Christian Gardocki

Administrative Law Judge for Robert Gordon, Director

Department of Health and Human Services

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

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

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P.O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

Via Email: MDHHS-Wayne-15-Hearings

M. Holden D. Sweeney

**BSC4- Hearing Decisions** 

MOAHR

Petitioner - Via First-Class Mail:

