

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: 2010-12575  
Issue No: 1038; 3029  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
February 17, 2010  
Calhoun 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 February 17, 2010. The claimant personally appeared and provided testimony, along with her boyfriend, [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the department properly determine the claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case should be closed for Work First/Jobs, Education and Training (WF/JET) program noncompliance in November, 2009 and sanction the claimant from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) group?

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's boyfriend, [REDACTED], was a mandatory WF/JET program

participant. The claimant completed orientation on June 8, 2009. At that time, he signed an acknowledgement that his hours for the two-parent household were required to be 35 hours per week without using daycare services and 55 hours per week if the family was using daycare services. (Department Exhibit 17 – 26).

2. The claimant submitted no approved job searches for the weeks of October 18 and October 25, 2009. The claimant received zero hours of attendance for each of those weeks. (Department Exhibit 31 – 32).

3. On November 10, 2009, the claimant was mailed a Notice of Noncompliance (DHS-2444), scheduling a triage appointment for November 19, 2009. (Department Exhibit 1-2).

4. The claimant did attend the triage appointment and provided no reason for not submitting his job searches. No good cause was found. (Department Exhibit 3).

5. On November 20, 2009, the claimant was mailed a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) that informed the claimant his FIP benefits were closing and he was being sanctioned from the FAP group. (Department Exhibit 4 – 9).

6. This was the claimant's second instance of noncompliance. (Department Exhibit 10)

7. The claimant submitted a hearing request on December 1, 2009.

#### 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).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. 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 BEM 228, who fails, without good cause, to participate in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, must be penalized.

See BEM 233B for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) policy when the FIP penalty is closure. For the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) penalty policy, see BEM 233C. BEM 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 related to assigned activities.
  - .. Provide legitimate documentation of work participation.
  - .. 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.

### **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 in Bridges and the FSSP under the “Participation and Compliance” tab.

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

### **Employed 40 Hours**

#### **Client Unfit**

#### **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. BEM 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. BEM 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. BEM 233A, pp.4-5.

### **EFIP**

EFIP unless noncompliance is job quit, firing or voluntarily reducing hours of employment.

### **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. BEM 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. BEM 233A, pp. 10-11.

### **When to Disqualify**

- . Disqualify a FAP group member for noncompliance when:
- . The client was active both FIP and FAP on the date of the FIP noncompliance, and
- . The client did not comply with FIP employment requirements, and
- . The client is not deferred from FAP work requirements (see DEFERRALS in PEM 230B), and the client did not have good cause for the noncompliance. PEM 233B, p. 1.

### **DEFERRALS**

Clients meeting one of the criteria below are temporarily deferred from employment-related activities.

#### **Age**

Defer a person who is:

- . under age 16 or at least age 60; **or**
- . a 16- or 17-year old who is not the grantee; **or**
- . a grantee age 16 or 17 who
  - .. lives with a parent or person in that role, **or**
  - .. attends school at least **half time**, **or**

- .. is enrolled in an employment/training program at least **half time**.

See PEM 240 and 245 for verification requirements. PEM, Item 230B, pp. 3-4.

### **Care of a Child**

Defer one person who personally provides care for a child under age 6 in the FAP group. PEM, Item 230B, p. 4.

Noncompliance is defined by department policy as failing or refusing to do a number of activities, such as attending and participating with WF/JET, completing the FAST survey, completing job applications, participating in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, providing legitimate documentation of work participation, etc. BEM 233A. In this case, the claimant appears to be claiming that he was not noncompliant. The claimant and his girlfriend testified that the claimant completed the job search hours for the week of October 18, 2009, but that he couldn't make it to WF/JET on the following Monday to turn in the documentation because he had to take a drug and dexterity test for a temporary job that he had gotten. The claimant further testified that he also completed the job searches for October 25, 2009, but was told that he wasn't allowed to turn them in because he was being placed into triage status.

The WF/JET case notes do indicate there was a telephone message left by the claimant for WF/JET on October 26, 2009, that indicated his son had an appointment and that he was going to have a drug test for that day. The claimant provided no documentation of either the doctor appointment or the drug test to this Administrative Law Judge or to the department.

However, the WF/JET staff member also documented a conversation with [REDACTED], on November 2, 2009, that indicated the claimant reported that he didn't have a job yet. The staff member told [REDACTED] to make sure he continues to job search to remain in compliance. This contradicts his claims that he was told he couldn't turn in his completed job searches for the

week of October 25, 2009. The job searches from the week of October 25, 2009 would have been turned in on November 2, 2009, the day the staff member had the conversation with the claimant. Thus, it is not credible that the claimant was told he could not turn in his job searches.

Even beyond this, [REDACTED] was deferred from WF/JET participation in August, 2009. At that time, [REDACTED] became responsible for completing the 35 hours per week. In reviewing the claimant's participation hours, it is clear that he was not meeting his requirements since September, 2009. The week of September 6, 2009, he only participated for 16 hours. The week of September 13, 2009, he only participated for 24 hours. The week of September 20, September 27 and October 4, he only participated for 20 hours. The week of October 11, 2009, he participated for 21 hours. Thus, the claimant never participated for his required amount of hours for the month of September.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] testified that they didn't know that [REDACTED] would be responsible for the full 35 hours once [REDACTED] was deferred. However, [REDACTED] had a previous triage for not meeting hourly requirements on September 10, 2009. This Administrative Law Judge finds it hard to believe that he wouldn't have had a clear understanding of what his requirements were after having a triage on the exact same issue of not meeting his hourly requirements.

Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge does find that the claimant was noncompliant with his WF/JET program requirements. The claimant did not participate with WF/JET for his required amount of hours as early as September, 2009. The department properly determined he was noncompliant with program requirements.

The claimant provides no good cause for his noncompliance. 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. BEM 233A. The

claimant indicated that he couldn't turn in his job search sheets on October 26, 2009 due to an appointment with his son and for a drug test. However, the claimant provides no documentation at triage or at this hearing to support his absence. Further, the claimant was noncompliant with his participation hours on multiple other weeks. Thus, this Administrative Law Judge does not find that the claimant's reason for nonparticipation equates to good cause as contemplated by department policy.

The claimant does not meet any of the policy criteria for deferral from FAP work requirements as [REDACTED] girlfriend is already deferred from WF/JET and can care for the child under the age of six. BEM 233B; BEM 230B. Thus, the department properly determined [REDACTED] should be sanctioned for the FIP noncompliance and removed from the FAP group.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly determined the claimant was noncompliant with WF/JET program requirements without good cause and properly determined his FIP case should be terminated and he should be removed from the FAP program group.

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: February 25, 2010

Date Mailed: March 2, 2010

**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 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 [REDACTED]

cc: [REDACTED]