

State of West Virginia DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES Office of Inspector General Board of Review

	Board of Review Post Office Box 1736 Romney, WV 26757	
Joe Manchin III		Martha Yeager Walker
Governor		Secretary
	January 18, 2006	
		
		
		
Dear Mr:		

Attached is a copy of the findings of fact and conclusions of law on your hearing held December 29, 2005. Your hearing request was based on the Department of Health and Human Resources' denial of Food Stamp benefits for children who were living in your home during the months of June, July, and August 2005.

In arriving at a decision, the State Hearing Officer is governed by the Public Welfare Laws of West Virginia and the rules and regulations established by the Department of Health and Human Resources. These same laws and regulations are used in all cases to assure that all persons are treated alike.

Eligibility for the Food Stamp Program is based on current policy and regulations. Regulations state that the coupon allotment is determined by finding the countable income and the number in the benefit group. In order to be an eligible recipient of Food Stamp benefits, the client must meet the eligibility requirement of residency. The State agency shall not impose any durational residency requirements. The State agency shall not require an otherwise eligible household to reside in a permanent dwelling or have a fixed mailing address as a condition of eligibility. Nor shall residency require an intent to reside permanently in the state or project area. Persons in a project area solely for vacation purposes shall not be considered residents. (West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual 8.2, 10.4 and Code of Federal Regulations §7 CFR § 273.3)

The information, which was submitted at the hearing, revealed that the Department's denial of Food Stamp benefits is based on a "visitation" clause in DHHR's residency policy that is not supported by the Code of Federal Regulations.

It is the decision of the State Hearing Officer to **reverse** the action of the Agency to deny Food Stamp benefits for Children, whom you reported, to be residing in your home.

Sincerely,

Sharon K. Yoho State Hearing Officer Member, State Board of Review

Chairman, Board of Review Ann Hubbard, DHHR

cc:

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN RESOURCES BOARD OF REVIEW

Claimant,	
v.	Action Number: 05-BOR-6659
West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources	
Respondent.	
I. INTRODUCTION:	
2005 for This he Chapters Manual, Chapter 700	earing Officer resulting from a fair hearing concluded on December 29, earing was held in accordance with the provisions found in the Common 0 of the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources. This ember 29, 2005 on a timely appeal filed September 6, 2005.
All persons giving testimony	were placed under oath.
II. PROGRAM PURPOSE:	
<u> </u>	amps is set up cooperatively between the Federal and State Government Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources.
abundance of food to safeguar nutrition among low-income h	ap Program is to provide an effective means of utilizing the nation's rd the health and well-being of the nation's population and raise levels of nouseholds. This is accomplished through the issuance of food coupons to ibility criteria established by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S.
III. PARTICIPANTS:	
, Claimant Ann Hubbard, Income Mainte Presiding at the hearing was S Review.	enance Worker, DHHR Sharon K. Yoho, State Hearing Officer and a member of the State Board of

IV. QUESTION TO BE DECIDED

The question to be decided is whether the Agency was correct in their denial of Food Stamp benefits for children reported to be residing in your household.

V. APPLICABLE POLICY:

West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual § 8.2,10.4 7 CFR § 273.3 & 7 CFR § 273.18 - Code of Federal Regulations.

VI. LISTING OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE ADMITTED:

Department Exhibits: D-1 Court order, 05/26/00, re	
VII. FINDINGS OF FACT:	
Service Center on June 17, 2005 and requeste	Stamp benefits when he called the DHHR Customer ed that children,, and be ch they would be residing in his home during the
(2) The Customer Service Center advised Mr they were visiting and did not intend to reside	that his children could not be added because in West Virginia.
(3) and resided with the claiman resided with the claiman 25, 2005, the children returned to Virginia for	t from July 3, 2005 thru August 25, 2005. On August
·	te that the primary physical custody for these children is ginia. The orders further disclose that the Mother,
an increase in his Food Stamp benefits for the	to the claimant, on July 26, 2005, that his request for e children was denied. The reason for denial was children are visiting and therefore cannot be considered
(6) The Board of Review has visited this issue of	n three other occasions through the Fair Hearing

process with this same claimant. The Department's decision to deny benefits for these children was

- reversed in all three occasions. These reversals contend that the Department's policies are in conflict with Federal Regulations.
- (7) West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual § 10.4,C, contains policy relating income disregards and deductions and computation of and eligibility for Food Stamp benefits. It also states: To determine the coupon allotment, find the countable income and number (of persons) in the benefit group.
- (8) West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual § 8.2 (All Programs) states that in order to be eligible to receive benefits, (paragraph #2), the client must meet the eligibility requirement of residence. The client must live within the borders of West Virginia. Intent to remain permanently in West Virginia is not a requirement, although the client must reside in the State for purposes other than vacation or visitation. A time limit **cannot be set** (emphasis added) for how long the client must live in West Virginia. The client cannot be required to maintain a permanent or fixed dwelling. (Paragraph #3) An individual remains a resident of the former state until he arrives in West Virginia with the intention of remaining indefinitely.
- (9) West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual, Chapter 8.2,A,3 (Food Stamps) Prolonged Absence From the Home, provides that regardless of the reason for the absence, any person expected to be absent from the home for a full calendar month or more is not eligible to be included in the AG.
- (10)According to West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual Chapter 8.2,A,3,(a), (Food Stamps) Temporary visits with the intent to return do not affect the individual's place of residence, unless he has been or is expected to be absent from the home for a full calendar month.
- (11)West Virginia Income Maintenance Manual Chapter 8.2,A,3(c), (3rd example) provides the following: A divorced man and woman both live in West Virginia. On May 15 the woman reports her oldest child will be visiting his father during summer vacation from June 11 to September 1. After proper notice, the oldest child is removed from the woman's AG for July and August, because he will be absent from the home for those two full calendar months. The father applies for FS for the child on July 1 and is denied, because the child's place of residence is still with the mother and he is only temporarily visiting his father.
- (12)The Code of Federal Regulations, found at 7 CFR § 273.3 state that no individual may participate as a member of more than one household or in more than one project area, in any month. **The State agency shall not impose any durational residency requirements**. (emphasis added) The State agency shall not require an otherwise eligible household to reside in a permanent dwelling or have a fixed mailing address as a condition of eligibility. Nor shall residency require an intent to reside permanently in the state or project area. Persons in a project area solely for vacation purposes shall not be considered residents.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Policy reveals that eligibility and benefit levels for the Food Stamp Program are based on countable income and the number of individuals in the benefit group. In order to be a recipient of Food Stamp benefits, the individual(s) must meet the eligibility requirement of residency. Temporary visits with the intent to return do not affect the individual's place of residence, unless he has been or is expected to be absent from the home for a full calendar month. Any person expected to be absent from the home for a

full calendar month or more is not eligible to be included in the AG (Assistance Group). This person would, at that point, be considered a resident elsewhere.

The Code of Federal Regulations provides that the State agency shall not impose any durational residency requirements. The State agency shall not require an otherwise eligible individual to reside in a permanent dwelling or have a fixed mailing address as a condition of eligibility. Nor shall residency require an intent to reside permanently in the state or project area. Persons in a project area solely for vacation purposes shall not be considered residents. In addition to the requirements included in the CFR, the Department's Policy adds an Example which stipulates that if a child is participating in a parental visitation with a parent for two full months, he must be removed from the Food Stamp benefits of the first parent and is ineligible to be included in the Food Stamp benefits of the second parent. The CFR does not include visitation in the residency requirements as a means to exclude otherwise eligible individuals. Evidence reveals that this Food Stamp household has been under-issued benefits for the periods of June, July and August 2004. The Food Stamp Program Purpose, as stated in Section II, dictates that: "The purpose of the Food Stamp Program is to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's population and raise levels of nutrition among low-income households." It is very clear that Mr. 's household is considered a low-income household, eligible for Food Stamp benefits. The addition of two to three household members for a period of more than two full months would undoubtedly cause an adverse effect to the health and well-being of the total household if additional benefits were not received. Children who are placed in a joint custody arrangement might also spend the summer months with one parent who has joint legal and physical custody. The time spent during the summer months might not be indicated in a custody order as "visitation," however, the summer time spent in the custodial parent's home could likely be the same length as was for the children residing in this claimant's home. It is clear that the intent of the Federal Regulations is to insure eligibility for all household members who reside together and that residency should not be considered for only those who intend to reside permanently. The children in this case were participating in court-ordered visitation that exceeded a full calendar month, during which time, they resided in the home of Mr.

. It is the finding of this Hearings Examiner that these children were eligible recipients of the Food Stamp program and should have been included in the active Food Stamp case of Mr.

IX. DECISION:

The denial by the Department to include the children as Budget Group members during the months of June, July and August 2005 is reversed. The Department is ordered to issue Food Stamp benefits to the claimant for the period of time, which the children resided during the summer months while taking into consideration the date in which the client made his request.

X. RIGHT OF APPEAL

See Attachment

XI. ATTACHMENTS:
The Claimant's Recourse to Hearing Decision
Form IG-BR-29
ENTERED this 18th Day of January 2006.

Sharon K. Yoho State Hearing Officer