

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 201247148
Issue No: 1038
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 23, 2012
Saginaw County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christopher S. Saunders

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 23, 2012. The claimant appeared and provided testimony.

ISSUE

Did the department properly terminate and sanction the claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits for noncompliance with Work First/Jobs, Education and Training (WF/JET) requirements?

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 had applied for FIP benefits and was referred to the WF/JET program as a participant.
2. As part of her WF/JET participation, the claimant was required to submit a signed community service contract and submit job search logs in order to show her monthly hours.
3. The claimant was scheduled to attend WF/JET on March 23, 2012 and to submit a signed and completed community service contract on that date.
4. The claimant attended her appointment but did not have a signed and completed community service contract.
5. The clamant was then given until March 26, 2012 to submit the signed and completed community service contract.

6. The claimant did not submit a signed and completed community service contract by March 26, 2012, nor did she submit job search logs for the month of March 2012.
7. Due to the claimant not submitting job search logs or a signed and completed community service contract, the claimant was sent a notice of noncompliance (DHS 2444) on March 30, 2012, scheduling a triage for April 10, 2012. (Department Exhibits 4-5).
8. The department did not find that the claimant had good cause for her noncompliance.
9. The claimant was sent a notice of case action (DHS1605) on April 12, 2012 stating that her FIP case would be closing with a lifetime sanction due to at least a third instance of noncompliance. (Department exhibits 19-24).
10. The claimant filed a request for hearing on April 17, 2012, protesting the closure of her FIP case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility for benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. BAM 600. The department provides an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine its appropriateness. BAM 600.

The regulations that govern the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are contained in the Michigan Administrative Code (Mich Admin Code) Rules 400.901 through 400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to a recipient who is aggrieved by an agency action resulting in suspension, reduction, discontinuance, or termination of assistance. Mich Admin Code 400.903(1).

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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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 the department when the client applies for cash assistance. Jobs, Education and Training (JET) program requirements, education and training opportunities, and assessments are 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 Refugee Assistance Program (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 Energy, Labor and Economic Growth (DELEG) 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 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.

Department policy states:

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 work participation program or other employment service provider.
 - Complete a Family Automated Screening Tool (FAST), as assigned as the first step in the Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) process.
 - Develop a 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.
- Participate in required activity.
- 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 pages 1-2.

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. BEM 233A. Department policy defines good cause as follows:

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.

Good cause includes the following:

Employed 40 Hours

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

Client Unfit

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 a spouse or child'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.

No Child Care

The client requested child care services from DHS, the work participation program, or other employment services provider prior to case closure for noncompliance and child care is needed for an 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 the child care facility does not exceed three hours per day.
- **Suitable provider.** The provider meets applicable state and local standards. Also, unlicensed providers who are NOT registered/licensed by the DHS Bureau of Children and Adult Licensing must meet DHS enrollment requirements; see BEM 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 work participation 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 or religious beliefs.

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.

EFIP

EFIP unless noncompliance is job quit or voluntarily reducing hours of employment. BEM 233A pages 4-5.

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. The department coordinates the process to notify the MWA case manager of triage meetings including scheduling guidelines.

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 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.

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, the client is offered a telephone conference at that time. Clients must comply with triage requirement within the negative action period. 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.

If the department finds that the client has been noncompliant without good cause, the department must impose penalties. Department policy clearly states the penalties that must be imposed for noncompliance without good cause and for the action to be taken should the department determine that good cause has been established:

NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTIES FOR ACTIVE FIP INDIVIDUALS AND MEMBER ADDS

The penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP EDG closure. Effective October 1, 2011, the following minimum penalties apply:

- For the individual's first occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for not less than three calendar months.
- For the individual's second occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for not less than six calendar months.
- For the individual's third occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for a lifetime sanction.

The individual penalty counter begins April 1, 2007. Individual penalties served after October 1, 2011 will be added to the individual's existing penalty count.

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.

In the case at hand, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant was noncompliant with the WF/JET program by not submitting a completed community service contract.

The claimant testified that she was not able to get set up with community service and in turn submit a signed and completed contract because she was homeless, she had transportation issues, and she had medical issues. In relation to the claimant's assertion that she was having medical issues, she provided no medical documentation of any kind to the department to show that she was suffering from any sort of mental or physical issues. Therefore, the claimant did not present proper documentation of good cause in relation to her claimant of health issues.

With respect to the claimant's good cause claim as to homelessness, the claimant testified that she has been staying with an acquaintance and that she was allowed to stay there as long as she did not divulge the address of where she was staying. The claimant has a separate address where she receives her mail. The claimant testified that she had been staying with the acquaintance off and on for three months. The BPG glossary defines a homeless person as "persons who do not reside in a permanent dwelling or have a fixed mailing address". BPG page 21. Based on the evidence, it does appear that the claimant has a fixed mailing address. Therefore, she would not meet the definition of homeless as set forth in policy. Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge does not find that the claimant has good cause as to her claim of homelessness.

With respect to the claimant's assertion that she was having transportation issues, the claimant testified that she was not able to find community service because she had no transportation for the community service. The claimant was given bus passes by the

department when she first indicated that she was having transportation issues. However, she testified that she lived too far from a bus stop to be able to use them. At the time the claimant was to submit the community service contract she was working part-time and she was still attending work first. The claimant was able to procure transportation to attend her job and to make her appointments at work first. Because the department had supplied the claimant with bus passes and because the claimant was still able to attend WF appointments and her part-time job, the Administrative Law Judge does not find that the claimant has presented good cause due to a lack of transportation.

The Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant has not presented good cause for her noncompliance with the WF/JET program. Accordingly, the department acted properly in accordance with policy in terminating and sanctioning the claimant's FIP case.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly terminated and sanctioned the claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits for noncompliance with WF/JET requirements.

Accordingly, the department's actions are **AFFIRMED**. SO ORDERED.

/s/

Christopher S. Saunders
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 30, 2012

Date Mailed: May 30, 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 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.

201247148/CSS

CSS/cr

cc:

