

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201123934

Issue No: 1038

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Washtenaw County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge by authority of MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37. Claimant's request for a hearing was received on [REDACTED]. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department of Human Services (Department) properly sanctioned the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for noncompliance with the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) program?

**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 received FIP benefits until April 1, 2011.
2. The Department referred the Claimant to the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits.
3. The Claimant the Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when she turned in an assignment log with 32 entries that the Department was unable to verify.
4. The Department conducted a triage meeting on February 24, 2011.
5. On March 1, 2011, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her FIP benefits as of April 1, 2011.

6. The Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing on March 8, 2011, protesting the termination of her 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), Reference Table Manual (RFT), 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. PEM 229, p. 1.

Federal and State laws require each work eligible individual (WEI) in the FIP and RAP group to participate in the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment-related activities 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 stable employment. JET is a program administered by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG) through the Michigan Works Agencies (MWAs). 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. PEM 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) or a Personal Responsibility Plan and Family Contract (PRPFC).
  
- Comply with activities assigned to on the Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (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. PEM 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. PEM 233A, p. 9

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. PEM 233A, p. 4, 5

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. PEM 233A, p. 9

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, Item 233A.

Noncompliance, without good cause, with employment requirements for FIP/RAP(SEE PEM 233A) may affect FAP if both programs were active on the date of the FIP noncompliance. PEM 233b, p. 1 The FAP group member should be disqualified for noncompliance when all the following exist:

- The client was active both FIP and FAP on the date of the FIP noncompliance, and
- The client did not comply with FIP/RAP employment requirements, and
- The client is subject to a penalty on the FIP/RAP program, and
- The client is not deferred from FAP work requirements, and

- The client did not have good cause for the noncompliance. PEM 233B, p.2

The Department should budget the Last FIP grant amount on the FAP budget for the number of months that corresponds with the FIP penalty (either three months for the first two noncompliances or 12 months for the third and subsequent noncompliances) after the FIP case closes for employment and/or self sufficiency-related noncompliance. The Last FIP grant amount is the grant amount the client received immediately before the FIP case closed.

In this case, the Claimant was a FIP recipient until April 1, 2011, and the Department had referred her to the JET program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits. The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when she turned in a JET assignment log with 32 entries that the Department was unable to verify. The Department conducted a triage meeting on February 24, 2011, where the Claimant was given the opportunity to establish good cause for her noncompliance with the JET program. The Department did not find good cause. On March 1, 2011, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her FIP benefits as of April 1, 2011.

The Claimant argued that she had complied with her JET assignment. The Claimant submitted copies of her JET assignment log supporting her testimony that she had completed her JET assignment as instructed.

The Department's representative testified that the Claimant's job search log contains numerous entries that cannot be verified and were fraudulently submitted by the Claimant. The Department's representative testified that while attempting to make collateral contacts to verify the Claimant's JET assignment log entries, several of the contact numbers provided by the Claimant did not correspond to the business that the Claimant listed on her assignment log.

The Claimant testified that the evidence she submitted supports her argument that she did not submit a fraudulent JET assignment log. The Claimant testified that each job search log entry has a corresponding set of initials from a person at each business she visited.

The Department gave the opportunity at the triage meeting on February 24, 2011, to present evidence that she either complied with the JET program, or that she had good cause for her noncompliance. Although the triage meeting was a more appropriate venue for the Claimant to establish that her assignment log was accurate, this Administrative Law Judge reviewed the Claimant's evidence to determine whether the Department would have reached a different conclusion if the Claimant had submitted her documentation at the proper time.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the initials on the Claimant's job search log do not verify that the Claimant properly completed her JET assignment. The only way to verify that these sets of initials are authentic would be through collateral

contacts to each of the businesses listed on the assignment log. The initials on the Claimant's assignment log cannot be verified because large portions of the phone numbers submitted by the Claimant do not correspond to the businesses she claimed to have visited.

A few incorrect telephone numbers could be explained as a clerical error, but the extent of the information of the Claimant's assignment log that cannot be verified suggests that the Claimant did not actually complete her JET assignment.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant submitted a fraudulent JET assignment log and was therefore noncompliant with the JET program.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, the Department's determination that the Claimant did not have good cause for her noncompliance with the JET program is reasonable. The Department has established that it acted properly when it sanctioned the Claimant's FIP benefits for noncompliance with the JET program.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department acted in accordance with policy when it sanctioned the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for noncompliance with the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) program.

The Department's FIP sanction is AFFIRMED. It is SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: \_\_\_\_5/9/11\_\_\_\_

Date Mailed: \_\_\_\_5/9/11\_\_\_\_

