

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED]

Claimant

Reg. No: 2009-18138  
Issue No: 1038  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
May 13, 2009  
Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne L. Keegstra

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 13, 2009. The claimant personally appeared and provided testimony.

ISSUE

Did the department properly determine that the claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits be terminated due to Work First/Jobs, Education and Training (WF/JET) noncompliance in March, 2009?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The claimant was a mandatory participant with the WF/JET program.
2. The claimant did not have any hours of participation for the week of February 1, 2009, and did not have any hours of participation any time after this date (Department Exhibit #5).

3. WF/JET employee met with the claimant on February 23, 2009, because the claimant had refused a job offer with [REDACTED]. The claimant was given a five-day compliance test for job searching (Department Exhibit #3).

4. The claimant did not submit any job search logs for the five day compliance test (Department Exhibit #3).

5. The department mailed the claimant a Notice of Noncompliance (DHS-2444), scheduling a triage for the claimant on March 19, 2009 (Department Exhibit #1).

6. The claimant did attend the triage. The claimant reported that she was never called for employment [REDACTED] and that she continued to do her job searching for the five-day compliance test, although she presented no logs to show she had been job searching. No good cause was granted (Department Exhibit #2).

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Department policy states:

#### **DEPARTMENT PHILOSOPHY**

##### **FIP**

DHS requires clients to participate in employment and self-sufficiency-related activities and to accept employment when offered. Our focus is to assist clients in removing barriers so they can participate in activities which lead to self-sufficiency.

However, there are consequences for a client who refuses to participate, without good cause.

The goal of the FIP penalty policy is to obtain client compliance with appropriate work and/or self-sufficiency-related assignments and to ensure that barriers to such compliance have been identified and removed. The goal is to bring the client into compliance.

Noncompliance may be an indicator of possible disabilities. Consider further exploration of any barriers.

## **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

### **FIP**

A Work Eligible Individual (WEI), see PEM 228, who fails, without good cause, to participate in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, must be penalized.

See PEM 233B for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) policy when the FIP penalty is closure. For the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) penalty policy, see PEM 233C. PEM 233A, p. 1.

### **NONCOMPLIANCE WITH EMPLOYMENT AND/OR SELF-SUFFICIENCY-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

As a condition of eligibility, all WEIs and non-WEIs must work or engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities. Noncompliance of applicants, recipients, or member adds means doing any of the following without good cause:

- . Failing or refusing to:
  - .. Appear and participate with the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment service provider.
  - .. Complete a Family Automated Screening Tool (FAST), as assigned as the first step in the FSSP process.
  - .. Develop a Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) or a Personal Responsibility Plan and Family Contract (PRPFC).

- .. Comply with activities assigned to on the Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) or PRPFC.
- .. Appear for a scheduled appointment or meeting.
- .. Participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities.
- .. Accept a job referral.
- .. Complete a job application.
- .. Appear for a job interview (see the exception below).
- . Stating orally or in writing a definite intent not to comply with program requirements.
- . Threatening, physically abusing or otherwise behaving disruptively toward anyone conducting or participating in an employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activity.
- . Refusing employment support services if the refusal prevents participation in an employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activity. PEM 233A, pp. 1-2.

### **GOOD CAUSE FOR NONCOMPLIANCE**

Good cause is a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. A claim of good cause must be verified and documented for member adds and recipients. Document the good cause determination on the DHS-71, Good Cause Determination and the FSSP under the “Participation and Compliance” tab.

See “School Attendance” PEM 201 for good cause when minor parents do not attend school.

### **Employed 40 Hours**

#### **Client Unit**

#### **Good cause includes the following:**

- . The person is working at least 40 hours per week on average and earning at least state minimum wage.

- . The client is physically or mentally unfit for the job or activity, as shown by medical evidence or other reliable information. This includes any disability-related limitations that preclude participation in a work and/or self-sufficiency-related activity. The disability-related needs or limitations may not have been identified or assessed prior to the noncompliance.

### **Illness or Injury**

The client has a debilitating illness or injury, or an immediate family member's illness or injury requires in-home care by the client.

### **Reasonable Accommodation**

The DHS, employment services provider, contractor, agency, or employer failed to make reasonable accommodations for the client's disability or the client's needs related to the disability. PEM 233A, pp. 3-4.

### **No Child Care**

The client requested Child Day Care Services (CDC) from DHS, the MWA, or other employment services provider prior to case closure for noncompliance and CDC is needed for a CDC-eligible child, but none is appropriate, suitable, affordable and within reasonable distance of the client's home or work site.

- . **Appropriate.** The care is appropriate to the child's age, disabilities and other conditions.
- . **Reasonable distance.** The total commuting time to and from work and child care facilities does not exceed three hours per day.
- . **Suitable provider.** The provider meets applicable state and local standards. Also, providers (e.g., relatives) who are NOT registered/licensed by the DHS Office of Child and Adult Services must meet DHS enrollment requirements for day care aides or relative care providers. See PEM 704.
- . **Affordable.** The child care is provided at the rate of payment or reimbursement offered by DHS.

### **No Transportation**

The client requested transportation services from DHS, the MWA, or other employment services provider prior to case closure and reasonably priced transportation is not available to the client.

**Illegal Activities**

The employment involves illegal activities.

**Discrimination**

The client experiences discrimination on the basis of age, race, disability, gender, color, national origin, religious beliefs, etc. PEM 233A, p. 4.

**Unplanned Event or Factor**

Credible information indicates an unplanned event or factor which likely prevents or significantly interferes with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities. Unplanned events or factors include, but are not limited to the following:

- . Domestic violence.
- . Health or safety risk.
- . Religion.
- . Homelessness.
- . Jail.
- . Hospitalization.

**Comparable Work**

The client quits to assume employment comparable in salary and hours. The new hiring must occur before the quit.

**Long Commute**

Total commuting time exceeds:

- . Two hours per day, NOT including time to and from child care facilities, **or**
- . Three hours per day, including time to and from child care facilities. PEM 233A, pp.4-5.

**NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTIES FOR ACTIVE FIP CASES AND MEMBER ADDS**

The penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP closure. Effective April 1, 2007, the following minimum penalties apply:

- . For the first occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months unless the client is excused from the noncompliance as noted in “First Case Noncompliance Without Loss of Benefits” below.
- . For the second occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months.
- . For the third and subsequent occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 12 calendar months.
- . The penalty counter also begins April 1, 2007 regardless of the previous number of noncompliance penalties.

### **TRIAGE**

JET participants will not be terminated from a JET program without first scheduling a “triage” meeting with the client to jointly discuss noncompliance and good cause. Locally coordinate a process to notify the MWA case manager of triage meetings including scheduling guidelines.

Clients can either attend a meeting or participate in a conference call if attendance at the triage meeting is not possible. If a client calls to reschedule an already scheduled triage meeting, offer a phone conference at that time. Clients must comply with triage requirement within the negative action period.

When a phone triage is conducted for a first noncompliance and the client agrees to comply, complete the DHS-754, First Noncompliance Letter, as you would complete in a triage meeting. Note in the client signature box “Client Agreed by Phone”. Immediately send a copy of the DHS-754 to the client and phone the JET case manager if the compliance activity is to attend JET.

Determine good cause based on the best information available during the triage and prior to the negative action date. Good cause may be verified by information already on file with DHS or MWA.

If the FIS, JET case manager, or MRS counselor do not agree as to whether “good cause” exists for a noncompliance, the case must be forwarded to the immediate supervisors of each party involved to reach an agreement.

DHS must be involved with all triage appointment/phone calls due to program requirements, documentation and tracking.

**Note:** Clients not participating with JET must be scheduled for a “triage” meeting between the FIS and the client. This does not include applicants. PEM 233A, p. 7.

### **Good Cause Established**

If the client establishes good cause within the negative action period, do **NOT** impose a penalty. See “Good Cause for Noncompliance” earlier in this item. Send the client back to JET, if applicable, after resolving transportation, CDC, or other factors which may have contributed to the good cause. Do not enter a new referral on ASSIST. Enter the good cause reason on the DHS-71 and on the FSSP under the “Participation and Compliance” tab.

### **Good Cause NOT Established**

If the client does NOT provide a good cause reason within the negative action period, determine good cause based on the best information available. If no good cause exists, allow the case to close. If good cause is determined to exist, delete the negative action. PEM 233A, pp. 10-11.

The claimant disputes that she was noncompliant with her WF/JET program requirements. The claimant testified that she never received a call for employment with [REDACTED], not that she refused the job. The claimant does not dispute that she was given a five-day compliance test to continue her job search logs. The claimant reports that she spent a couple days in [REDACTED] office trying to get into GED classes. The claimant further reported that she did not “in house” job searching and some “out house” job searching. The claimant explained that “in house” job searching is using the computer to find job leads or fill out applications. “Out house” job searching is actually visiting the site and applying to the employer. The claimant testified that during her five-day compliance test she performed both “in house” and “out house” job searching. The claimant was asked why she didn’t turn in her logs to show that she was compliant with the job searching and she stated that she turned in the “in

house” logs and WF/JET must have lost them. This Administrative Law Judge asked the claimant what happened to her “out house” job search logs. The claimant indicated that she had the copies. When the claimant was asked why she didn’t provide them at the triage appointment or if she had them to submit for this hearing, claimant testified that she had thrown them away prior to the triage, so she couldn’t provide them.

In this case, even if this Administrative Law Judge accepts the claimant’s testimony that she didn’t refuse the job, but wasn’t offered the job, the claimant was still noncompliant with WF/JET program requirements. This Administrative Law Judge notes that the claimant hadn’t participated in WF/JET any hours since February 8, 2009. Further, the claimant was specifically given a five-day compliance test to perform her job searches. The claimant testified that she was in the office with [REDACTED] for three of these days attempting to get into GED classes. However, this is not credible as the department pointed out that it would not take three days to determine if she could be in GED classes. Further, [REDACTED] completed the case notes for the claimant and [REDACTED] is the employee that entered the case notes indicating the claimant was noncompliant and did not complete her five-day compliance test. Also, this Administrative Law Judge does not find it credible that the claimant completed and turned in “in house” job logs that were lost and that the claimant threw away her “out house” job logs.

Noncompliance is defined in policy as failing to appear and participate with the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment service provider and failure to participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities without good cause. PEM 233A. Good cause is defined as a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. PEM 233A.

While the claimant disputes that she was noncompliant, this Administrative Law Judge does find that the claimant did not complete her job search logs and participate for her required hours with WF/JET. Thus, the claimant is found to have been noncompliant. The claimant provides no reasons for her noncompliance. There is no evidence of any good cause for the claimant's noncompliance. Thus, good cause is not established for the claimant's noncompliance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly concluded that the claimant was noncompliant with WF/JET program requirements and properly determined that the claimant's FIP case should be terminated for the noncompliance in March 2009.

Accordingly, the department's actions are UPHeld. SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne L. Keegstra  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 21, 2009

Date Mailed: May 26, 2009

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

2009-18138/SLK

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

SLK/om

cc:

