

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: 2009-21074

Issue No: 1038

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

August 11, 2009

St. Joseph County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Steven M. Brown

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 conducted from [REDACTED] on August 11, 2009.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly denied Claimant's application for Family Independence Program (FIP) 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) On March 11, 2009, Claimant applied for FIP benefits.
- (2) On April 6, 2009, the Department mailed Claimant notice of her April 13, 2009 appointment at Michigan Works/Work First (WF) in [REDACTED]. (Exhibit 3)

(3) On April 7, 2009, the Department completed and faxed a FIA Transportation Referral Form to the [REDACTED] for bus transportation for Claimant to the April 13, 2009 WF orientation. (Exhibit 5)

(4) On April 10, 2009, Claimant was informed by telephone that she was scheduled to attend WF orientation on April 13, 2009. Claimant called Claimant's caseworker's supervisor because she had two appointments which caused a conflict and he agreed to reschedule her WF appointment to April 20, 2009.

(5) On April 16, 2009, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action, DHS-1605, which informed her that her application for FIP benefits had been denied. (Exhibit 9)

(6) On April 18, 2009, Claimant received the Notice of Case Action.

(7) On April 20, 2009, Claimant contacted the [REDACTED] and was told that they did not have a ride set up for her. She also called WF and was told to contact her caseworker given that she had received a denial letter.

(8) On April 23, 2009, the Department received Claimant's hearing request protesting the denial of her application for FIP benefits.

#### 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 Bridges Administrative

Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Department policy states that clients must be made aware that public assistance is limited to 48 months to meet their family's needs and that they must take personal responsibility to achieve self-sufficiency. This message, along with information on ways to achieve independence, direct support services, non-compliance penalties, and good cause reasons, is initially shared by DHS when the client applies for cash assistance. Jobs, Education and Training (JET) program requirements, education and training opportunities, and assessments will be covered by the JET case manager when a mandatory JET participant is referred at application. BEM 229, p. 1.

Federal and State laws require each work eligible individual (WEI) in the FIP and FAP group to participate in the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment service unless temporarily deferred or engaged in activities that meet participation requirements. These clients must participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities to increase their employability and obtain employment. JET is a program administered by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG) through the [REDACTED]). The JET program serves employers and job seekers for employers to have skilled workers and job seekers to obtain jobs that provide economic self-sufficiency. A WEI who refuses, without good cause, to participate in assigned employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities is subject to penalties. BEM 230A, p. 1.

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).
  - .. Comply with activities assigned on the FSSP.
  - .. Provide legitimate documentation of work participation.
  - .. Appear for a scheduled appointment or meeting related to assigned activities.
  - .. 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. BEM 233A, pp. 1-2.

The Department is required to send a DHS-2444, Notice of Employment and/or Self-Sufficiency Related Noncompliance within three days after learning of the

noncompliance which must include the date of noncompliance, the reason the client was determined to be noncompliant, the penalty that will be imposed and the triage date within the negative action period. BEM 233A, p. 7-8

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. If it is determined at triage that the client has good cause, and good cause issues have been resolved, the client should be sent back to JET. BEM 233A, p. 3-4

Good cause should be determined 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. Good cause must be considered even if the client does not attend, with particular attention to possible disabilities (including disabilities that have not been diagnosed or identified by the client) and unmet needs for accommodation. BEM 233A, p. 7

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 not less than 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 not less than 3 calendar months.

- . For the third and subsequent occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for not less than 12 calendar months.
  
- . The penalty counter also begins April 1, 2007 regardless of the previous number of noncompliance penalties. PEM 233A, p. 6

In the instant case, there is no dispute that Claimant was originally scheduled to attend WF on April 13, 2009 and the Department allowed her to reschedule it to April 20, 2009. Claimant then received a denial letter, was told by the [REDACTED] that it did not have a ride set up for her and was told by WF that she needed to contact her caseworker given that she received a denial letter. There was clearly a miscommunication in this matter which resulted in Claimant not attending WF and having her application for FIP benefits denied.

With the above said, and based on the testimony and documentation presented at hearing, I do not find that the Department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's application for FIP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, does not find that the Department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's application for FIP benefits.

Accordingly, the Department's FIP eligibility determination is REVERSED, it is SO ORDERED. The Department shall:

- (1) Process Claimant's March 11, 2009 FIP application.
- (2) Issue Claimant supplemental benefits she is entitled to, if any.
- (3) Notify Claimant in writing of the Department's revised determination.

(4) Claimant retains the right to request a hearing if she would like to contest the Department's revised determination.

/S/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven M. Brown  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 18, 2009

Date Mailed: August 18, 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.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt 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.

SMB/db

cc:

