

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201329106  
Issue No: 1038  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 14, 2013  
St. Clair County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** C. Adam Purnell

**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 March 14, 2013. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] (Claimant) and [REDACTED] (Claimant's father) Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (PATH Coordinator) and [REDACTED] (PATH Case Manager).

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly terminate and sanction Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) 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. Claimant was a FIP recipient and a mandatory WF/JET participant.
2. Claimant, as part of her mandatory WF/JET participation, was required to attend employment related activity during the week of November 26, 2012.
3. Claimant did not have any WF/JET approved reduced participation requirements.
4. Claimant failed to call or show up for her community service site (St. Vincent DePaul) during the week of November 26, 2012.

5. On December 7, 2012, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Noncompliance (DHS-2444) because she failed to participate as required in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. Claimant's Triage appointment was scheduled for December 19, 2012 at 9:00a.m.
6. On December 19, 2012, Claimant attended Triage and stated that she had good cause because her father had to be taken to the hospital during the period of time in question. The Department found Claimant did not show good cause for her noncompliance.
7. The Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) on December 19, 2012, which closed Claimant's FIP benefits for 6 months effective January 1, 2013.
8. Claimant submitted a hearing request on February 8, 2013 protesting the closure of her FIP benefits.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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). 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. BAM 600.

The Family Independence Program (FIP), also referred to as "cash assistance" 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).

The Department requires clients to participate in employment and self-sufficiency related activities and to accept employment when offered. BEM 233A. The focus is to assist clients in removing barriers so they can participate in activities which lead to self-sufficiency. BEM 233A. However, there are consequences for a client who refuses to participate, without good cause. BEM 233A.

The goal of the FIP penalty policy is to obtain client compliance with appropriate work and/or self-sufficiency related assignments and to ensure that barriers to such

compliance have been identified and removed. BEM 233A. The goal is to bring the client into compliance. BEM 233A.

A Work Eligible Individual (WEI) and non-WEIs<sup>1</sup>, who fails, without good cause, to participate in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, must be penalized. BEM 233A. Depending on the case situation, penalties include the following: (1) delay in eligibility at application; (2) ineligibility (denial or termination of FIP with no minimum penalty period); (3) case closure for a minimum of three months for the first episode of noncompliance, six months for the second episode of noncompliance and lifetime closure for the third episode of noncompliance. BEM 233A.

Federal and state laws require each work eligible individual (WEI) in the FIP and Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) group to participate in the JET Program or other employment-related activities unless temporarily deferred or engaged in activities that meet participation requirements. BEM 230A. These clients must participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities to increase their employability and obtain stable employment. BEM 230A. WEIs not referred to the work participation program will participate in other activities to overcome barriers so they may eventually be referred to the work participation program or other employment service provider. BEM 230A. A WEI who refuses, without good cause, to participate in assigned employment and/or other self-sufficiency related activities is subject to penalties. BEM 230A.

An applicant, recipient or a member add is noncompliant if he or she, without good cause, fails or refuses to do any of the following: (1) appear and participate with the JET Program or other employment service provider; (2) complete a Family Automated Screening Tool (FAST), as assigned as the first step in the Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (FSSP) process; (3) develop a FSSP or a Personal Responsibility Plan and Family Contract (PRPFC); (4) comply with activities assigned to on the FSSP; (5) provide legitimate documentation of work participation; (6) appear for a scheduled appointment or meeting related to assigned activities; (7) participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities; (8) accept a job referral; (9) complete a job application; (10) appear for a job interview.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Except ineligible grantees, clients deferred for lack of child care, and disqualified aliens. See BEM 228.

<sup>2</sup> The Department will not apply the three month, six month or lifetime penalty to ineligible caretakers, clients deferred for lack of child care and disqualified aliens. Failure to complete a FAST or FSSP results in closure due to failure to provide requested verification. Clients can reapply at any time. BEM 233A.

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: (1) **working full-time at minimum wage** - the person is working at least 40 hours per week on average and earning at least state minimum wage; (2) **physically/mentally unfit** - the client is physically or mentally unfit for the job or activity, as shown by medical evidence or other reliable information<sup>3</sup>; (3) **illness/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; (4) **failure to accommodate** - 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; (5) **child care not provided** - 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; (6) **special child care** - the care is appropriate to the child's age, disabilities and other conditions; (7) **commuting time** - the total commuting time to and from work and the child care facility does not exceed 3 (three) hours per day; (8) **appropriate child care** - the provider meets applicable state and local standards<sup>4</sup>; (9) the child care is provided at the rate of payment or reimbursement offered by DHS; (10) **transportation not provided** - the client requested transportation services from DHS, the work participation program, or other employment services provider prior to case closure and reasonably priced transportation is not available to the client; (11) **illegal** - the employment involves illegal activities; (12) **discrimination** - the client experiences discrimination on the basis of age, race, disability, gender, color, national origin or religious beliefs; (13) **unplanned event** - credible information indicates an unplanned event or factor which likely prevents or significantly interferes with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities<sup>5</sup>; (14) **new employment** - the client quits to assume employment comparable in salary and hours (the new hiring must occur before the quit); (15) **total commuting time** - total commuting time exceeds 2 (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. BEM 233A.

The penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP closure. BEM 233A. Depending on the case situation, penalties include the following: (1) delay in eligibility at

---

<sup>3</sup> 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. BEM 233A.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Unplanned events or factors include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) domestic violence; (2) health or safety risk; (3) religion; (4) homelessness; (5) jail and (6) hospitalization. BEM 233A.

application; (2) ineligibility (denial or termination of FIP with no minimum penalty period); (3) case closure for a minimum of three months for the first episode of noncompliance, six months for the second episode of noncompliance and lifetime closure for the third episode of noncompliance. BEM 233A.

The sanction period begins with the first pay period of a month. BEM 233A. Penalties are automatically calculated by the entry of noncompliance without good cause in the Department's computer system known as Bridges. This applies to active FIP cases, including those with a member add who is a WEI work participation program participant. BEM 233A.

Here, there is no dispute that Claimant failed to appear for community service at St. Vincent DePaul. Claimant contends that she has good cause because she had to accompany her father to the hospital after he had suddenly developed an aneurysm. Claimant testified that she called Michigan Works on November 27<sup>th</sup> or November 28<sup>th</sup> to report that she was in the hospital with her father. Claimant also testified that she did not call [REDACTED] because she did not know the number. Claimant was unsure but she believed she may have talked to someone named [REDACTED] at the Michigan Works office. Claimant's father also testified that he was brought into the hospital during the week in question.

The Department responded by stating that Claimant was responsible for contacting her community service site before or shortly after the event. According to the Department, Claimant never called [REDACTED] at any time following her father's stay at the hospital.

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). 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). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant had good cause because she provided credible testimony that during the time in question her father's sudden aneurysm and subsequent hospitalization is "an unplanned event or factor which likely prevents or significantly interferes with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities." Accordingly, Claimant has good cause for her failure to participate in community service during the week in question.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the material and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, Claimant has shown good cause for her failure to attend community service during the week of November 26, 2012. As a result, the Department did not properly close Claimant's FIP case for non-compliance.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department did not properly Claimant's FIP case for noncompliance with WF/JET requirements and the 6 (six) month sanction is **REVERSED**.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

- The Department shall initiate steps to reinstate Claimant's FIP benefits back to the date of closure (January 1, 2013).
- The Department shall initiate steps to reengage Claimant with the WF/JET program (or PATH program).
- The Department shall provide Claimant with any supplemental or retroactive FIP benefits that she is entitled to receive per policy.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/\_\_\_\_\_

C. Adam Purnell  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 19, 2013

Date Mailed: March 20, 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 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.

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

CAP/cr

cc:

