

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201329114  
Issue No: 1038  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 23, 2013  
County: Wayne County DHS #76

**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 received on January 28, 2013. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 23, 2013. Claimant personally appeared and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Family Independence Manager) and [REDACTED] (Family Independence Specialist).

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly terminated and sanctioned 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. Claimant was a FIP recipient and a mandatory WF/JET participant.
2. On October 8, 2012, the Department mailed Claimant a Work Participation Program Appointment Notice (DHS -4785) which scheduled Claimant to attend a WF/JET appointment for October 22, 2012 at 1:00p.m.
3. On October 17, 2012, the Department mailed Claimant a second Work Participation Program Appointment Notice (DHS-4785) which scheduled Claimant to attend a WF/JET appointment for October 29, 2012 at 1:00p.m.

4. On October 29, 2012, the Department mailed Claimant a Work Participation Program Appointment Notice (DHS-4785) which scheduled Claimant to attend a WF/JET appointment for November 13, 2012 at 1:00p.m.
5. Claimant did not have any WF/JET approved reduced participation requirements.
6. Claimant failed to attend any of the above required appointments
7. On November 26, 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 4, 2012 at 9:00a.m.
8. On December 4, 2012, Claimant did not attend Triage. The Department found Claimant did not show good cause for her noncompliance.
9. The Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) on November 26, 2012, which closed Claimant's FIP benefits for 3 effective January 1, 2013.
10. Claimant submitted a hearing request on January 28, 2013 protesting the closure of her FIP benefits.
11. This is Claimant's first non-compliance with the WF/JET program.

### **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) 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 (RTM), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

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.

The work participation program is administered by the Workforce Development Agency, State of Michigan (WDASOM) through the Michigan one-stop service centers. BEM 230A. The work participation program serves employers and job seekers for employers to have skilled workers and job seekers to obtain jobs that provide economic self-sufficiency. BEM 230A.

A number of FIP clients have disabilities or live with a spouse or child(ren) with disabilities that may need accommodations to participate in assigned activities. The needs of persons with disabilities are highly individual and must be considered on a case-by-case basis. DHS must make reasonable efforts to ensure that persons with disability-related needs or limitations will have an effective and meaningful opportunity to benefit from DHS programs and services to the same extent as persons without disabilities. Efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities may include modifications to program requirements, or extra help, as explained below. Failure to recognize and accommodate disabilities undermines efforts to assist families in achieving self-sufficiency. BEM 230A.

**A disability that requires reasonable accommodation must be verified by an appropriate source, such as a doctor, psychologist, therapist, educator, etc.** BEM 230A. Clients are required to engage in self-sufficiency and family strengthening activities even if they are deferred from work participation program or work activities and may be subject to penalties if they do not participate as required. BEM 230A. When clients with verified disabilities are fully participating to their capability, they are counted as fully engaged in meeting work participation requirements regardless of the hours in which they are engaged, even if they do not meet federal work requirements. BEM 230A.

Certain clients have particular circumstances which may make their participation in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities problematic. Unless otherwise deferred, they must be referred to the work participation program. BEM 230A.

A person with short-term incapacity may be deferred for up to 3 (three) months. BEM 230A. A person with a short-term incapacity is a person with a mental or physical illness, limitation, or incapacity expected to last less than 3 (three) months which

prevents participation. BEM 230A. The Department will verify the short-term incapacity and the length of the incapacity using a DHS-54A, Medical Needs, or DHS-54E, Medical Needs - Work Participation Program, or other written statement from an M.D./D.O. BEM 230A. Then, the Department shall set the medical review date accordingly, but not to exceed three months. BEM 230A. BEM 230A. specifically prohibits the Department from advising with a short-term incapacity to apply for SSI. BEM 230A.

A person with long-term incapacity, or disability, may be deferred. BEM 230A. At intake, redetermination or anytime during an ongoing benefit period, when an individual claims to be disabled or indicates an inability to participate in work or the work participation program for more than 90 days because of a mental or physical condition, the client should be deferred. BEM 230A. Conditions include medical problems such as mental or physical injury, illness, impairment or learning disabilities. BEM 230A. This may include those who have applied for RSDI/SSI. BEM 230A.

Determination of a long term disability is a two step process. BEM 230A. The client must fully cooperate with both steps. BEM 230A. **Step One: Establishment of Disability.** Once a client claims a disability he/she must provide DHS with verification of the disability when requested. BEM 230A. The verification must indicate that the disability will last longer than 90 calendar days. BEM 230A. If the verification is not returned, a disability is not established. BEM 230A. The client will be required to fully participate in the work participation program as a mandatory participant. BEM 230A. **Step Two: Defining the Disability.** For verified disabilities over 90 days, the specialist must obtain an MRT decision by completing the medical packet. BEM 230A. The client must provide DHS with the required documentation such as the DHS-49 series, medical and/or educational documentation needed to define the disability. BEM 230A. If the client does not provide the requested verifications, the cases should be placed into closure for failure to provide needed documentation; see BAM 815, Medical Determination and Obtaining Medical Evidence. BEM 230A. Potentially disabled individuals are not sent to the work participation program while waiting for the verification of disability. BEM 230A.

A FIP 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 (PRPF C); (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>1</sup> BEM 233A.

---

<sup>1</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.

JET-FIP 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. BEM 233A. The department coordinates the process to notify the MWA case manager of triage meetings including scheduling guidelines. BEM 233A.

FIP clients can either attend a meeting or participate in a conference call if attendance at the triage meeting is not possible. BEM 233A. If a client calls to reschedule an already scheduled triage meeting, the client is offered a telephone conference at that time. BEM 233A. Clients must comply with triage requirement within the negative action period. BEM 233A.

For FIP, 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 for FIP purposes 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. 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 life time closure for the third episode of noncompliance. BEM 233A.

The FIP 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, Claimant challenges the Department’s closure of her FIP based on noncompliance with JET. Claimant alleges that she has a disability which prevents her participation and, alternatively, she contends that she did not receive any of the JET appointment notices. Claimant argued that she was in the hospital during either all or a

portion of the time at issue. Claimant testified that she was not going to risk her life to attend JET. Claimant did not provide any evidence in the record to support her contentions. The Department, on the other hand, asserted that Claimant never disclosed any disability and failed to provide any medical documentation excusing her missed appointments.

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 NW 2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

With regard to Claimant's assertion that she did not receive the appointment notices, the mailbox rule applies. Michigan adopts the mailbox rule which is a presumption under the common-law that letters have been received after being placed in the mail in the due course of business. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). In other words, the proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt but that presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Under the mailbox rule, evidence of business custom or usage is allowed to establish the fact of mailing without further testimony by an employee of compliance with the custom. *Good, supra*. Such evidence is admissible without further evidence from the records custodian that a particular letter was actually mailed. *Good supra* at 275. "Moreover, the fact that a letter was mailed with a return address but was not returned lends strength to the presumption that the letter was received." *Id* at 276. The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id*.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. Claimant failed to provide any evidence to support her medical conditions or that she was in the hospital at any time-let alone the time periods covering the appointments. Moreover, Claimant's testimony regarding failure to receive the appointment notices is not credible and is disposed of by the mailbox rule. Claimant has failed to overcome the presumption of receipt. Based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department properly closed Claimant's FIP case due to noncompliance with JET.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the material and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, Claimant has failed to show good cause for failing to complete her attendance requirements. As a result of Claimant's

noncompliance with JET without good cause, the Department properly closed 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 closed Claimant's FIP case for noncompliance with WF/JET requirements and the 3 (three) month FIP sanction is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/

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

Date Signed: April 29, 2013

Date Mailed: April 29, 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.

201329114/CAP

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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAP/aca

cc:

