

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 20132680
Issue No: 1038
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 30, 2013
Washtenaw County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

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 received by the Department of Human Services (department) on September 28, 2012. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 30, 2013. Claimant appeared and provided testimony. The department was represented by [REDACTED], a JET/PATH coordinator, and Ryan Clemons, a family independence coordinator, both the department's Washtenaw County office, and [REDACTED], a PATH team leader with the PATH (formerly Michigan Works) program.

ISSUE

Whether the department properly closed and sanctioned Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits based on Claimant's 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. At all times relevant to this hearing, Claimant was a recipient of FIP benefits and, as a recipient of FIP benefits, Claimant was a mandatory WF/JET participant unless otherwise deferred from participation.
2. On July 20, 2012, Claimant signed a JET policy document regarding reporting a school/training activity and, in doing so, acknowledged with her signature her understanding of the requirements of the JET program including, among other things, her school and activity log requirements and her required 30 hours of weekly participation in vocational training. (Department Exhibit F)

3. On August 31, 2012, Michigan Works advised Claimant both verbally and in writing with a Noncompliance Warning Notice that she was noncompliant with the JET program due to her failure to submit her required participation hours for the month of August 2013. The Notice further informed Claimant that she must attend a reengagement appointment on September 5, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. in order to avoid triage and a potential FIP case closure. (Department Exhibits A; D, p. 4)
4. On September 4, 2012, Claimant contacted her case worker and advised of her unavailability to attend her September 5, 2012 reengagement appointment and the appointment was rescheduled for September 6, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. (Department Exhibit A)
5. Claimant neither attended nor called in advance to reschedule her September 6, 2012 reengagement appointment. (Department Exhibit D, p. 3)
6. On September 6, 2012, the department mailed Claimant a Notice of Noncompliance (DHS 2444) and a Notice of Case Action for her failure to participate as required in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. The Notices indicated that, unless good cause was established, her FIP case would be closed effective October 1, 2012 for a lifetime sanction as this was Claimant's fourth non-compliance. The Notice of Noncompliance also scheduled a triage appointment for Claimant on September 13, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. (Department Exhibits B, C, E)
7. Claimant attended the September 13, 2012 triage appointment, at which time the department deferred a determination of whether Claimant established good cause until after the department reviewed the school attendance logs previously submitted by Claimant to the department. (Department Exhibit A)
8. The school attendance logs submitted by Claimant to the department establish that Claimant completed 25 of the 30 required hours for the week of August 6, 2012, 27 of the required 30 hours for the week of August 13, 2012, 21 of the required 30 hours for the week of August 20, 2012, and 26 of the required 30 hours for the week of August 27, 2012. In total, Claimant completed 99 of the required 120 hours for the month of August 2012, resulting in the department's determination that Claimant did not establish good cause for her noncompliance. (Department Exhibit A; D, pp 1-8)
9. Effective October 1, 2012, Claimant's FIP case was closed and subject to a lifetime sanction for her failure to participate as required in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. (Department Exhibits C, E)

10. On October 30, 2012, Claimant submitted a hearing request protesting the closure of her FIP case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600. The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. MAC R 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 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 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 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 Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) 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.

According to BEM 233A, refusing suitable employment means doing **any** of the following:

- Voluntarily reducing hours or otherwise reducing earnings.
- Quitting a job,
- Firing for misconduct or absenteeism (not for incompetence).

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.

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.

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.

Good cause includes the following:

- The person is working at least 40 hours per week on average and earning at least state minimum wage.
- 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.
- The client has a debilitating illness or injury, or a spouse or child’s illness or injury requires in-home care by the client.

- 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.
- The client requested child care services from DHS, PATH, 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.
- The care is appropriate to the child's age, disabilities and other conditions.
- The total commuting time to and from work and the child care facility does not exceed three hours per day.
- 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.
- The child care is provided at the rate of payment or reimbursement offered by DHS.
- The client requested transportation services from DHS, PATH, or other employment services provider prior to case closure and reasonably priced transportation is not available to the client.
- The employment involves illegal activities.
- The client experiences discrimination on the basis of age, race, disability, gender, color, national origin or religious beliefs.
- 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.
- The client quits to assume employment comparable in salary and hours. The new hiring must occur before the quit.

- 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.

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

- For the first occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for not less than three calendar months.
- For the second occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for not less than six calendar months.
- For the third and subsequent occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for a lifetime sanction. BEM 233A.

Department policy further indicates that the individual penalty counter begins April 1, 2007. BEM 233A. Individual penalties served after October 1, 2011 will be added to the individual's existing penalty count.

Department policy further indicates that a noncompliant group member will be sanctioned from the FAP group for the FIP noncompliance if they are not deferred from FAP work requirements. BEM 233B.

In this case, on September 6, 2012, the department found that Claimant was noncompliant with the JET program due to Claimant's failure to submit her required participation hours for the month of August 2012. And, while Claimant attended her September 13, 2012 triage appointment, because Claimant did not provide good cause for her noncompliance, the department ultimately closed Claimant's FIP case and imposed a lifetime sanction on Claimant's receipt of FIP benefits, as this was Claimant's fourth noncompliance.

At the January 30, 2013 hearing, Claimant testified that she believed she had met her required weekly hours of participation in the JET program for the month of August 2012 because it was her understanding that a portion of her hours of participation at her externship would also be considered as study time for which she would be given credit. However, the department representative testified that Claimant was only credited for one hour of study time for every one hour of class room time, such that Claimant's two hours of class room time equated to two hours of study time and resulted in four hours of total participation time.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine.

Dep't of Community Health, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record, including the attendance logs submitted by Claimant for the month of August 2012, and notes that Claimant was indeed given credit for study time as indicated by the department but, despite this credit, Claimant still fell short of her required weekly hours of participation for the month of August 2012. Given that Claimant acknowledged her understanding of her school and activity log requirements when she signed a JET document on July 20, 2012 setting forth these requirements and her required 30 hours of weekly participation in vocational training, this Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, Claimant has failed to show good cause for her failure to participate as required in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities and the department properly closed and imposed a lifetime sanction on Claimant's FIP case due to her non-compliance with WF/JET requirements.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly closed and imposed a lifetime sanction on Claimant's FIP case due to her non-compliance with WF/JET requirements. The department's actions are therefore **UPHELD**.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

/s/_____

Suzanne D. Sonneborn
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 4, 2013

Date Mailed: February 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.

The Claimant may appeal this 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 errors, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that affect the substantial rights of Claimant;
 - The failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

A request for a rehearing or reconsideration must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at:

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

SDS/cr

cc:

