

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201310548
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 2, 2013
County: Marquette

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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 2, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [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 was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient until November 1, 2012.
2. On August 3, 2012, the Medical Review Team determined that the Claimant is capable of participating in the JET program.
3. The Department referred the Claimant to the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits, and scheduled her to attend JET programming on October 9, 2012.

4. The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when she failed to attend or reschedule her JET appointment by October 18, 2012.
5. The Department conducted a triage meeting on October 30, 2012.
6. On October 20, 2012, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her FIP benefits as of November 1, 2012.
7. On November 2, 2012, the Department notified the Claimant that the results of the triage meeting were that no good cause had been found.
8. The Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing on November 8, 2012, protesting the sanctioning 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. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 229 (December 1, 2011).

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. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A (December 1, 2011).

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. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility 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 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 233A.

Noncompliance, without good cause, with employment requirements for FIP/RAP may affect FAP if both programs were active on the date of the FIP noncompliance. Department of Human Services Bridges 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 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 November 1, 2012, and the Department had referred her to the JET program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits. On August 3, 2012, the Medical Review Team determined that the Claimant is capable of participating in the JET program. The Department scheduled the Claimant to attend JET programming on October 9, 2012.

The Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program when she failed to attend or reschedule her JET appointment by October 18, 2012. The Department conducted a triage meeting on October 30, 2012, where the Claimant was given the opportunity to establish good cause for noncompliance with the JET program. The Department did not find good cause. On October 20, 2012, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her FIP benefits as of November 1, 2012. On November 2, 2012, the Department notified the Claimant that the results of the triage meeting were that no good cause had been found.

The Medical Review Team made a determination that the Claimant is capable of participating in the JET program despite her non-exertional impairments. No evidence was presented during the hearing that the Claimant had requested any reasonable accommodations that would have made it easier for her to perform a JET assignment.

The Claimant did not dispute that she failed to attend her JET appointment. Department records indicate that the Claimant admitted during the triage meeting that she had forgotten the appointment. The Claimant testified that she had good cause for her failure to attend her JET appointment.

Good cause exists where it can be established that there are barriers to participation in the JET program that are beyond the client's control. A claim of good cause must be verified and documented. BEM 233A.

In this case, the Claimant testified that she was under extreme duress on the date of her JET appointment. The Claimant testified that she was overwhelmed by the responsibility of caring for her children, attending school, and other stressful events involving close family members. The Claimant submitted two letters supporting both her credibility and her claim that she was under a considerable amount of stress, which cause her to miss her JET appointment.

This Administrative Law Judge agrees that the Claimant is a conscientious, hard working person that faces a considerable amount of stress in her life.

However, based on the evidence and testimony presented during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is capable of performing a JET assignment despite the obstacles she faces in life. Furthermore, the Claimant failed to present sufficient evidence to support a finding that she had good cause that would justify her failure to attend her JET appointment on October 9, 2012.

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: January 4, 2013

Date Mailed: January 4, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (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 timely 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 discovered 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 other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

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

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

KS/tb

cc:

