

Appeal No.	Date	County	Basis of Appeal	Issue
1153787	02/20/04	Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether the adoption subsidy amount of \$650 is correct.
1157791	02/24/04	Franklin	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1158341	02/24/04	Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's proposed adoption subsidies are correct.
1162943	03/29/04	Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's proposed adoption subsidy is correct.
1171501	05/14/04	Wayne	Amount of Assistance	Whether the PCSA negotiated in good faith and whether the increase in AA is appropriate.

1175496	06/30/04 Lorain	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1182021	08/10/04 Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether AA in the amount of \$576 is appropriate in appellants' case.
1189307	09/29/04 Franklin	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1185852	10/26/04 Franklin	Amount of Assistance	Whether appellants demonstrated a need for increased AA benefits.
1151302	01/20/04 Ashtabula	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1153664	01/21/04 Franklin	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1155579 01/30/04 Lorain Amount of Assistance Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1159696 04/14/04 Franklin Amount of Assistance Whether the PCSA negotiated in good faith and whether the increase in AA is appropriate.

1171145 05/24/04 Cuyahoga Amount of Assistance Whether the PCSA negotiated in good faith and whether the proposed increase in AA is appropriate.

1171374 06/21/04 Medina Amount of Assistance Whether the Agency negotiated in good faith and reached a mutual agreement with appellants regarding an increase in AA benefits.

1174066	06/11/04 Summit	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1175098	06/10/04 Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1167504	08/04/04 Medina	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's proposed AA amount is correct.

1180233	08/20/04 Lorain	Amount of Assistance	Whether the PCSA negotiated in good faith and whether the increase in AA is appropriate.
1151249	09/30/04 Holmes	Amount of Assistance	Whether the PCSA negotiated in good faith and whether the proposed AA amount is appropriate.
1168496	09/27/04 Cuyahoga	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1187787	09/08/04 Hamilton	Amount of Assistance	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA is correct.
1157796	03/31/04 Stark	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA and SAMS is correct.
1148809	01/08/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1151955	01/22/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1153993	01/16/04 Mahoning	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of AA application is correct.
1187435	09/15/04 Lorain	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1156252	02/12/04 Lucas	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1164388	03/25/04 Lucas	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1160920	04/20/04 Montgomery	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application is correct.
1165888	04/16/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1168425	04/30/04 Cuyahoga	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1159884	05/03/04 Cuyahoga	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA benefits is correct.
1164711	06/08/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1173227	06/07/04 Stark	Eligibility	Whether appellants' request to extend AA benefits beyond the child's 18th birthday is correct.
1174967	06/16/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1182597	08/05/04 Montgomery	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1183906	08/12/04 Hamilton	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.
1159961	02/26/04 Butler	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1188073	09/17/04 Muskingum	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1188912	09/22/04 Henry	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA benefits is correct.
1169019	09/21/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA benefits is correct.
1186107	09/03/04 Cuyahoga	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA benefits is correct.

1187435	09/15/04 Lorain	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1188272	09/14/04 Butler	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1193357	10/22/04 Franklin	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA benefits is correct.
1194184	10/27/04 Carroll	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's reduction of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1165887 11/02/04 Franklin Eligibility Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1195653 11/02/04 Cuyahoga Eligibility Whether the Agency's reduction of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1193676 11/19/04 Ashland Eligibility Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for AA benefits is correct.

1197210 11/03/04 Shelby Eligibility Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1198359	11/19/04 Cuyahoga	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1137481	01/28/04 Morrow	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1143503	01/20/04 Stark	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.
1150186	03/31/04 Butler	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1161737 03/19/04 Cuyahoga Eligibility Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA is correct.

1161408 03/17/04 Lucas Eligibility Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1168207 04/29/04 Cuyahoga Eligibility Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1166414	06/21/04 Lucas	Eligibility	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.
1173227	06/07/04 Stark	Eligibility	Whether appellants' request to extend AA benefits beyond the child's 18th birthday is correct.
1190516	10/07/04 Cuyahoga	Eligibility	Whether the Agency issued adverse notice to appellant in a timely manner, advising appellant that AA benefits were terminated.

1147942 03/31/04 Franklin Post Final Whether the Agency's denial of Post Finalization Adoption Assistance is correct.

02/10/04 Sandusky Post Final Whether the Agency's denial of Post Finalization Adoption Assistance is correct.

1157594
1184899 09/09/04 Lorain Post Final Whether the Agency's denial of Post Finalization Adoption Assistance is correct.

1186178 09/17/04 Muskingum Post Final Whether the Agency's denial of Post Finalization Adoption Assistance is correct.

1153664 02/18/04 Franklin Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1157791 03/15/04 Franklin Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1153787 03/19/04 Franklin Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency's approval of \$650/month instead of \$750/month is correct.

1165888 & 1166513 05/03/04 Franklin Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA and approval of latchkey and respite care services are correct.

1151249 04/07/04 Holmes Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' request for increased AA is correct.

1171145 06/09/04 Cuyahoga Administrative Appeal Decision Whether the Agency and appellant have failed to negotiate and agree upon an appropriate amount of assistance.

1147942	05/14/04 Franklin	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the HO was correct in determining that the appellant had met all remaining eligibility criteria.
1159839	03/30/04 Miami	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the Agency granted the correct amount of funding for the respite care they approved.
1151614	03/05/04 Logan	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the Agency failed to reimburse appellant for \$189.22.
1187922	09/17/04 Stark	State Subsidy	Whether the Agency's proposed termination of appellants' AA based upon House bill 95 is correct.
1203565	01/19/05 Cuyahoga	State Subsidy	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' AA benefits is correct.

1154558	02/05/04 Hamilton	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the Cincinnati district office hearings unit was correct in denying appellants' request for a state hearing.
1156252	03/03/04 Lucas	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the Agency is correct to propose suspension of appellants' AA benefits.
1166512	05/03/04 Franklin	Administrative Appeal Decision	Whether the Agency is correct to deny latchkey services and respite care within the AA program.
1149501	01/30/04 Franklin	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.

1146815	01/29/04 Cuyahoga	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1156331	02/06/04 Cuyahoga	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1160819	03/12/04 Franklin	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.

1163387	06/09/04 Morgan	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1176066	06/18/04 Greene	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1182785	08/06/04 Butler	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1187571	11/10/04 Franklin	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1160463	03/05/04 Erie	NRAE	Whether the Agency's denial of appellants' application for reimbursement of nonrecurring expenses is correct.
1136215	01/29/04 Lake	PASSS	Whether the Agency's deni:

Reasoning	Outcome	Status
-----------	---------	--------

No evidence was presented to indicate that \$650 per month in AA payments was insufficient.

Overruled.

Because the child's needs were being met with the current subsidy payment in combination with the Medicaid card, HO determined that there was no justification for the increase.

Overruled.

HO determined that appellants offered no evidence to suggest that proposed AA amounts were insufficient.

Overruled.

Furthermore, the children's expenses are covered by Medicaid.

HO determined that appellants offered no evidence to suggest that proposed AA amounts were insufficient.

Overruled.

Furthermore, the children's expenses are covered by Medicaid.

HO determined that negotiations between Agency and appellants were conducted in good faith and that AA was appropriate because appellants failed to provide documentation supporting their request.

Overruled.

HO considered Overruled.
appellants' request for an
increase in AA by
examining all costs
associated with the
request. Because the loss
of income could not be
directly attributed to the
child's special needs,
then the denial of
increase was correct
because the costs of
rehabilitative treatment
were adequately covered
by the present AA
amount.

HO determined AA in Overruled.
the amount to be
appropriate at the time
because no evidence was
presented to indicate the
rate is not sufficient to
meet the needs of the
child within the
circumstances of the
family.

HO determined that the Overruled.
Agency and adoptive
parents had effectively
negotiated the AA
subsidy amount and also
that the denial of an
increase in AA amount
was appropriate..

HO determined that appellants offered no evidence to suggest that there was need for such an increase in AA benefits. Pursuant to OAC 5101:2-47-38, appellants may request an AA increase at any time but must also provide appropriate documentation. Overruled.

Although Agency and appellants appear to have initiated and participated in negotiations regarding the requested increase in AA, several important factors were not considered, and thus, the denial was incorrect. Sustained.

HO determined that the Agency correctly denied the appellant's request for an increase in AA because Medicaid as well as the father's health benefits currently cover the child's costs for therapy. Overruled.

HO finds that the Agency Sustained.
did not follow the
statutory provisions
which require AA
modifications to be
reached after
negotiations and mutual
agreement. Because no
negotiation took place,
the denial of appellant's
proposed AA
modification was
incorrect.

HO determined that Sustained.
Agency decided AA in
the amount of \$0 without
any consideration to the
childrens' present or
future needs. Because the
Agency made a unilateral
and uninformed decision,
it was incorrect.

Because the Agency Sustained.
failed to confer with
appellants regarding the
increased AA rate, the
Agency did not negotiate
in good faith.

HO determined that the Sustained.
Agency and appellant
had not reached a mutual
agreement as required by
statute, and therefore, the
denial of increase in AA
benefits is inappropriate.

HO determined that the Agency neither appeared at the hearing nor provided any justification for denying appellants' request for increased AA rate. Therefore, the denial was incorrect. HO ordered Agency pay appellants the increased AA rate. Sustained.

Because the Agency failed to provide an adoption policy for the appellants, then the determination for increased AA is based upon the adoptive family and child's needs. Therefore, the denial of appellants' request is inappropriate. Sustained.

HO determined that a complete negotiation had not occurred as required by statute. Therefore, the Agency's proposed AA amount was incorrect and a negotiation is ordered to be scheduled. Sustained.

HO determined that appellants and the Agency did not complete their negotiations as no signed document was ever produced. Additionally, HO determined that the parties did not negotiate in good faith based upon the amount of time that has lapsed since the last negotiation.

Sustained.

HO determined that the Agency needed to re-evaluate the children's difficulty of care level. Also, the app mutually agree to amend the current arrangement.

Sustained.

While the Agency appears to be considering the children's needs and the family's circumstances, it failed to offer its adoption policy into evidence to show the amounts offered to appellant have been made in accordance with its policy. Therefore, it is unclear how the current payment amount was determined.

Sustained.

HO determined that the denial of appellants' AA application was incorrect because there was no subsequent negotiation meeting to determine if additional funds were necessary. Sustained.

HO determined that there was no evidence or testimony that the child met the ADC requirement because the child was either ineligible for or not in receipt of Supplemental Security Income. Overruled, in part. Sustained, in part.

Therefore, the denial of the AA amount was correct. However, denial of the SAMS amount was incorrect because the Agency used incorrect information regarding appellants' income..

HO determined that there was no evidence of the child's mental or physical disability. Overruled.

HO determined that there was no evidence of the child's mental or physical disability. Overruled.

HO determined that the adoption was incomplete because the proper documentation, which stated that all attempts were made to keep the child with the biological mother. Therefore, the denial was correct. Appellant needs to refile.

Overruled.

HO determined that the child was over the age of eighteen and was not diagnosed with any mental or physical disability. Therefore, the termination of AA benefits was correct.

Overruled.

HO determined that the child has been placed with the Department of Youth Services and that the appellant is no longer supporting the child. Therefore, termination of the AA benefits was correct.

Overruled.

Because appellant misunderstood the date upon which the child's AA would be terminated, HO determined that the Agency would terminate AA coverage as planned but continue Medicare payments for the child's medication until a decision is made on her pending SSI claim.

Overruled.

Pursuant to statutory provisions, HO determined that Adoption Link did not provide documentation to suggest that efforts were made to place the child with adoptive parents who did not require AA coverage.

Overruled.

HO determined that the appellant provided no evidence to suggest that the AA was inadequate.

Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS.

Overruled.

HO determined that the denial of appellants' AA application was correct because the child did not meet the ADC-relatedness requirement in that the appellant's income exceeded the need standard.

Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS.

Overruled.

HO determined that Agency has neither taken nor proposed any negative action against appellant. Therefore, the appeal is untimely. Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS. Overruled.

Because there was no evidence of mail delivery problems, HO determined that the appellants' appeal, which was filed more than 3 years after the AA termination, was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that Agency was correct because the increase in AA benefits was due to private school tuition cost. The Agency indicated that private school tuition cost was not a special need covered by the AA benefit. Overruled.

HO determined that the Agency's action was correct because the child was 18 years of age and had no documented mental or physical disability. Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS. Overruled.

HO determined that the denial was correct because at the time of the request, the child did not require Aid for Dependent Children ("ADC") when removed from the biological parent. Appellants did not appeal the decision. Overruled.

HO determined that the denial was correct appellants failed to provide statutorily required documentation to establish the child's eligibility.. Overruled.

HO determined that the denial was correct because the child did not meet the ADC-relatedness requirement when removed from the biological parent, and also, appellants' income exceeded the ADC income standard. Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS. Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS. Overruled.

Because the child is 18 years of age and no documentation has been provided indicating a physical or mental disability, the HO determined that termination of appellants' AA was correct. Overruled.

Because the child currently lives with an aunt and uncle, appellants have only minimal expenses to cover for the child. Therefore, the reduction was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that the denial was correct because appellants filed this appeal more than 4 years after the initial decision. Pursuant to OAC 5101:6-7-01 and 5101:6-8-01, state hearing decisions are final and appeals must be made within 15 days after such a decision is made. Overruled.

Pursuant to OAC 5101:6-3-02, hearing requests must be filed within 90 days of a decision. Because appellants' hearing request comes more than 90 days after the reduction, HO finds the request untimely. Overruled.

HO determined that the denial of appellants' AA application was correct because the child did not meet the ADC-relatedness requirement in that the appellant's income exceeded the need standard. Overruled.

Because the child was returned to her biological mother, she does not meet the "special needs" criteria which would enable her to receive continued AA benefits. HO determined that the termination was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that the proposed termination was correct because the child was eighteen years of age, and the child had neither been diagnosed with a disability by SSA, nor did he participate in a program with ORS. Overruled.

HO determined that the Agency's action was incorrect because the parties had not met and fully negotiated the needs of the child. Additionally, HO determined that the Agency made reasonable efforts to place the child in a home which did not require AA benefits, but the Court botched its efforts.. Sustained.

Because there was evidence of mail service problems, HO determined that the termination was incorrect because it was outside the control of both the Agency and the adoptive parents. Sustained.

HO determined that the denial of appellants' AA benefits was incorrect because the child met ADC-relatedness requirements at the time of removal. Overruled.

Despite a lack of submitted documentation, HO determined that the proposed termination was incorrect because the child has a mental or physical handicap and, therefore, is entitled to an extension of those benefits. Sustained.

HO determined that the denial was incorrect because the Agency, based upon the best information available, exhausted all possible means of obtaining information regarding the child's ADC-relatedness. Having met the other 4 criteria, the child qualified for AA benefits. Sustained.

HO determined that the denial was incorrect because the Agency, based upon the best information available, exhausted all possible means of obtaining information regarding the child's ADC-relatedness. Having met the other 4 criteria, the child qualified for AA benefits. Sustained.

The Agency denied AA Sustained.

benefits to appellants
because it found that the
child was not "removed"
from the home within the
meaning of the statute.

HO determined that the
denial was incorrect
because removal
occurred once the
grandmother took
custody of the child,
regardless of where
the child lived.

HO determined that
Agency has neither taken
nor proposed any
negative action against
appellant. Therefore, the
appeal is untimely.

HO determined that the Sustained.

Agency failed to notify
appellants of the
impending termination
within the statutorily
prescribed period of 15
days. Therefore, because
the child has been
returned to the home, the
retroactive AA payments
are to be paid.

Because appellant was not advised about adoption assistance prior to finalization of the adoption, HO determined that the Agency should consider appellant for such benefits, given the fact that she meets all other requirements other than timeliness of application. Sustained.

Because appellant was not advised about adoption assistance prior to finalization of the adoption, HO determined that the Agency should consider appellant for such benefits, given the fact that she meets all other requirements other than timeliness of application. Sustained.

Because appellant was not advised about adoption assistance prior to finalization of the adoption, HO determined that the Agency should consider appellant for such benefits, given the fact that she meets all other requirements other than timeliness of application. Sustained.

The Agency denied AA benefits to appellants because it determined that Georgia was responsible for ensuring the child's placement and care. HO determined that the denial was incorrect because the Agency failed to demonstrate that Georgia had custody and that Muskingum County did not.

Sustained.

HO determined that the Agency was correct to deny the increased AA coverage with regard to the child's psychological needs because those costs were covered by the parents' medical insurance. However, the denial was incorrect with regard to the child's reading needs because the child needed an additional 3 month tutoring block..

Overruled
in part.
Sustained
in part.

HO determined that the Agency was correct to deny the increased AA coverage because the child did not demonstrate an increased level of need. Basic needs such as food and clothing are provided by adoptive parents and are not considered for AA coverage.

Denial is
affirmed.

Based upon the evidence presented, appellants neither suffered financial hardship nor demonstrated need for the additional AA coverage. Therefore, HO determined that the limited approval was correct. Denial is affirmed.

Based upon the evidence presented, appellants neither suffered financial hardship nor demonstrated need for the additional AA coverage. Therefore, HO determined that the denial was correct. Denial is affirmed.

Based upon the evidence presented, appellants neither suffered financial hardship nor demonstrated need for the additional AA coverage. Therefore, HO determined that the denial was correct. Denial is affirmed.

HO determined that the Agency and appellant had not reached a mutual agreement as required by statute, and therefore, no decision can be made until such agreement is reached. Affirmed.

HO failed to support the determination that the appellant met all eligibility requirements. Therefore, HO's determination was unsupported and incorrect. Overruled.

Despite HO's clerical error in the analysis, the amount of funding was correct based upon the evidence presented. Sustained.

Due to a clerical mistake, appellants did not receive \$189.22 of AA benefit for their two adopted children. The Agency has failed to reimburse the appellants and is now ordered to do so. Sustained.

HO determined that Agency's proposed termination was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that the denail was correct because the child did not meet the ADC-relatedness requirement when removed from the biological parent, and also, appellants' income exceeded the ADC income standard. Overruled.

The hearing record indicated that the appellant had already been heard on this issue, and pursuant to OAC 5101:6-5-03©(6), a state hearing may be denied if the issue has already been decided. Therefore, the HO was correct to deny the hearing. Sustained.

HO correctly determined that the child is no longer in the custody of the parent and also that the parent is no longer providing support for the child. Sustained.

Because the appellant is not eligible for AA coverage, HO was correct to deny latchkey services and respite care. Sustained.

Based upon the evidence presented, HO determined that the denial was correct because appellant did not meet statutorily prescribed eligibility criteria prior to the adoption finalization. Overruled.

Although appellants submitted an application for reimbursement with the Agency prior to finalization of the adoption, they failed to gather required verification. Therefore, the denial was correct because the forms were incomplete. Overruled.

NRAE reimbursements cover legal expenses pertaining to a given child's adoption; however, this funding is not appropriate for reimbursement of basic needs such as food and clothing or other traveling expenses prior to the adoption. HO determined that reimbursement was appropriate for some but not all of the appellants' expenses. Overruled.

HO determined that appellants failed to include with their application 1 of the 3 statutorily prescribed criteria which is an order confirming that the child cannot nor should not be returned to the biological parents. Based upon this omitted document, the denial was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that the documentation lacked the Court's signature and also that the appellants had other avenues for reimbursement. Overruled.

HO determined that the appellant and Agency had not signed the adoption decree. Therefore, the documentation was incomplete and denial of reimbursement was correct. Overruled.

Because the appellant and the Agency did not sign the request for NRAE, the denial was correct. Overruled.

HO determined that appellants failed to include the child's social medical history report, and therefore, the Agency's denial was correct. Overruled.

Despite the original paperwork being misplaced, all parties acknowledge that the appellants are entitled to reimbursement. Sustained.

Therefore, HO finds the denial to be incorrect. ial of lump sum payment is correct.