

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201218260  
Issue No: 1038  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 17, 2012  
Bay 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 November 30, 2011. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on Tuesday, January 17, 2012.

**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 was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient until December 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 Department deferred the Claimant's participation in the JET program from June of 2011 through September of 2011, so that he could provide his [REDACTED] with "eyes on parenting" as prescribed by the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
4. The Claimant's [REDACTED] was enrolled in school on a full time basis as in October of 2011.
5. On October 10, 2011, the Department sent the Claimant notice of a JET appointment scheduled for October 17, 2011.
6. The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when he failed to attend his scheduled JET appointment on October 17, 2011.

7. The Department conducted a triage meeting on November 10, 2011.
8. On November 15, 2011, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of December 1, 2011.
9. The Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing on November 30, 2011, protesting the sanctioning of his 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. BEM 229.

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. BEM 230A.

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. BEM 233A.

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.

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.

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.

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. BEM, Item 233A.

Noncompliance, without good cause, with employment requirements for FIP/RAP(SEE BEM 233A) may affect FAP if both programs were active on the date of the FIP noncompliance. BEM 233b. 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. BEM 233B.

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.

The Claimant was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient until December 1, 2011, and the Department had referred him to the JET program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits. The Department deferred the Claimant's participation in the JET program from June of 2011 through September of 2011, so that he could provide his [REDACTED] with "eyes on parenting" as prescribed by the [REDACTED]. The Claimant's [REDACTED] was enrolled in school on a full time basis in October of 2011. On October 10, 2011, the Department sent the Claimant notice of a JET appointment scheduled for October 17, 2011. The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when he failed to attend his scheduled JET appointment on October 17, 2011. The Department conducted a triage meeting on November 10, 2011, where the Claimant was given the opportunity to establish good cause for noncompliance with the JET program. The Claimant did not attend this meeting and the Department did not find good cause. On November 15, 2011, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of December 1, 2011.

The Claimant argued that his [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] and that his [REDACTED] condition is a barrier to his participation in the JET program that is beyond his control. The Claimant testified that his [REDACTED] requires continuous close supervision. The Claimant provided documentation showing that the [REDACTED] requires continuous "eyes on parenting." The Claimant does not dispute that his [REDACTED] was enrolled in school on a full time basis in October of 2011, but argued that his [REDACTED] frequently refuses to attend school. The Claimant testified that his [REDACTED] refusal to attend school is a symptom of his disabling impairment.

The Department considers a FIP recipient to be a non-work eligible individual when that person is caring for a child who is disabled and living in the home when the child does not attend school fulltime.

The Claimant argued that transportation is a barrier to his participation in the JET program that is beyond his control.

The Department's representative testified that the Claimant was provided with bus passes and that the Claimant's home is within walking distance of a bus stop.

The Claimant argued that a lack of suitable day care is a barrier to his participation in the JET program that is beyond his control. The Claimant testified that his [REDACTED] requires [REDACTED] while he participates in the JET program. The Claimant testified that his preferred childcare provider was not approved by the Department and that he has been unable to locate another appropriate daycare provider.

The Department will provide assistance with day care for recipients of FIP benefits that are participating in the JET program. No evidence was presented during the hearing

that the Claimant participated in the JET program, or that no suitable childcare providers were available.

A claim of good cause must be verified and documented. BEM 233A. In this case, the Claimant did not attend the triage meeting, and the Department considered whether he had good cause without his input. The Department's representative testified that resources were available that would allow the Claimant to overcome the transportation and childcare barriers that interfered with his participation in the JET program. Additionally, the Claimant failed to establish that his son would not receive adequate supervision while enrolled in school on a full time basis.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, the Department's determination that the Claimant did not have good cause for his 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: January 24, 2012

Date Mailed: January 24, 2012

**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 60 days of the filing of the original request.

201218260/KS

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.

KS/tb

cc:

