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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

### **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on from

### <u>ISSUE</u>

Whether the Department of H uman Servic es (Department) properly san ctioned the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for noncompliance wit h 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:

- The Claimant was an ongoing Fam ily Independence Program (FIP) recipient until
- 2. The Department referred the Claimant to the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits.
- 3. On scheduled to attend an orientation to the JET program on ...
- 4. The Claimant was noncompliant with the J ET program when he failed to attend or reschedule his JET orientation by
- 5. The Department conducted a triage meeting on



- 6. On the Department not ified the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Claimant that it would not be a sanction his FIP benefits as of the Department not if the Depa
- 7. The Department received the Claim ant's request for a hearing on 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 Reconc iliation 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 Ai d to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. De partment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Elig ibility Manual (BEM), Refe rence Table Manual (RF T), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Department policy states that clients must be made aware that public as sistance 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 as sessments will be covered by the JET case manager when a mandatory JET participant is referred at application. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 229 (December 1, 2011).

Federal and State laws require each work eligib le individual (WEI) in the FIP and RAP group to participate in the Jobs, Educati on and T raining (JET) Program or other employment-related activities unless temporar ily deferred or engaged in activities that meet participation requirements. These c lients must participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities to incr ease their employabilit y and obtain stab le employment. JET is a program administer ed by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (D LEG) through the Mi chigan Works Agencies (MWAs). The JET program serves employers and job seekers for employers to have skille d workers and job seekers to obtain jobs that provide economic self-sufficiency. A WEI who refuses, without good cause, to participate in as signed employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities is subject to penalties. Department of Human Services Bridge s Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A (December 1, 2011).

Noncompliance of applic ants, 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 Se If-Sufficiency Plan (F SSP) or a Personal Respons ibility 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-sufficiencyrelated 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 behav ing 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 s elfsufficiency-related ac tivity. Department of Human Services Bridges Elig ibility Manual (BEM) 233A (October 1, 2012).



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 nonc ompliance wit h employ ment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant per son. A claim of good c ause must be verified and doc umented 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 besit 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 ident ified by the client) and unmet needs for accommodation. BEM 233A.

The penalty for noncomplianc e 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 mont hs unless the client is excused from the noncompliance as noted in "First Case Noncompliance Without Loss of Benefits" below.
- For the second occur rence 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 num ber of noncompliance penalties. BEM 233A.

Noncompliance, without good c ause, with employment requirements for FIP/RAP m ay affect FAP if both programs were active on t he date of the FIP nonc ompliance. Department of Human Services Bri dges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233B (October 1, 2012). The FAP group member should be disqualified for noncompliance when all the following exist:

 The client was active bot h FIP and FAP on the date of the FIP noncompliance, and



- The client did not comply wit h FIP/RAP employment requirements, and
- The client is s ubject to a penalty on the FIP/RA P program, and
- The client is not deferred from FAP work requirements, and
- The c lient did not have good c ause for the noncompliance. BEM 233B.

The Department should budget the Last FIP grant amount on the FAP budget for the number of months that corres ponds with the FIP penalty (e ither three months for the first two noncomplianc es or 12 months for the third and subseq uent noncompliances) after the FIP case closes for employment and/or self sufficiency-related noncompliance. The Last F IP grant amount is the grant amount the client received immediat ely before the FIP case closed.

The Claimant was an ongoing Family Independ ence Program (FIP) recipient until
, and the Depa rtment had referred him to the JET program as a
condition of receiving FIP benefits. On the D epartment notified the
Claimant that he had been scheduled to attend an orientat ion to the JET program on
The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when he failed to
attend or reschedule his JET appointment by . The Department
conducted a triage meeting on where the Claimant was given the
opportunity to establish good cause for noncompliance with the JET program. The
Claimant did not attend the triage meeting and the Department did not find good cause.
On the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction his
Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits as of

The Claim ant did not dispute that he failed to attend the reschedule this appointment. The Claimant testified that he did not receive notice of the appointment or the triage meeting.

The proper mailing an d addressing of a letter cr eates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidenc e. *Stacey v Sankovic h*, 19 Mi ch A pp 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). In this case, the Claimant failed to rebut the presumption of receipt.

Good cause is a v alid reas on for noncom pliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. A cl aim of good cause must be verified and documented for member adds and recipients. BEM 233A. In this case, the Claimant failed to present sufficient evidence to establish good cause for his noncompliance.



Based on t he 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 Claim ant's FIP benefits for nonchemic ompliance with the JET program.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides that the D epartment 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: <u>03/05/2013</u>

Date Mailed: 03/05/2013

<u>NOTICE</u>: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing MAY be granted if there is newly disc overed evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration MAY be granted for any of the following reasons:
- misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
- typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:



• the failure of the ALJ to address ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at

Michigan Administrative hearings Recons ideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

## KS/tb

