

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201427464  
Issue No.: 1008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 13, 2014  
County: Otonagon County DHS

**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 March 13, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department of Human Services (Department) properly sanctioned the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities?

**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.
2. The Department referred the Claimant and group member D.G. to the Partnership Accountability Training Hope (PATH) program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits.
3. The Claimant was temporarily deferred from the PATH program.
4. Group member D.G. was found to be noncompliant with the PATH program when he failed to complete the requirements of a re-engagement agreement that he signed on January 13, 2014.
5. The Department conducted a triage meeting on February 4, 2014.

6. On January 28, 2014, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her FIP benefits as of March 1, 2014.
7. The Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing on February 4, 2014, 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, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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).

Federal and state laws require each work eligible individual (WEI) in the FIP group to participate in Partnership. Accountability. Training. Hope. (PATH) or other employment-related activity 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 employment. PATH is administered by the Workforce Development Agency, State of Michigan through the Michigan one-stop service centers. PATH serves employers and job seekers for employers to have skilled workers and job seekers to obtain jobs that provide economic self-sufficiency. PATH case managers use the One-Stop Management Information System (OSMIS) to record the clients' assigned activities and participation. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A (October 1, 2013), p 1.

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, p 1.

Noncompliance of applicants, recipients, or member adds means doing any of the following without good cause:

- Failing or refusing to:
  - 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.
  - Participate in required activity.
- Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (July 1, 2013), pp 2-3.

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. BEM 233A, pp 3-4.

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:

No Transportation: 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 penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP EDG closure. Effective October 1, 2011, the following minimum penalties apply:

- For the individual's first occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for not less than three calendar months.
- For the individual's second occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for not less than six calendar months.
- For the individual's third occurrence of noncompliance, Bridges closes the FIP EDG for a lifetime sanction. BEM 233A.

A noncompliant person must serve a minimum one-month or six-month Food Assistance Program (FAP) disqualification period unless one of the criteria for ending a disqualification early exists. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233B (July 1, 2013), p 10.

In this case, the Claimant was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient until March 1, 2014, and the Department had referred both her and group member D.G. to the PATH program as a condition of receiving FIP benefits. Group member D.G. was noncompliant with the PATH program when he failed to complete the requirements of a re-engagement agreement he signed to on January 13, 2014. The re-engagement agreement obligated group member D.G. to provide the Department with completed logs showing that he completed the required amount of PATH assignments. The Department conducted a triage meeting on February 4, 2014, where the Claimant was given the opportunity to establish good cause for noncompliance with the PATH program. The Claimant participated in the triage meeting, but the Department did not find good cause. On January 28, 2014, the Department notified the Claimant that it would sanction her Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits as of March 1, 2014.

The Claimant testified that a lack of reliable transportation was a barrier to group member D.G. completing the number of hours necessary to satisfy the re-engagement agreement.

The Department's representatives testified that group member D.G. was offered assistance with public transportation to overcome his transportation issues.

The Claimant testified that she had requested assistance with repairs to her automobile.

However, there is no entitlement to Direct Support Services such as automobile repairs, and the Department was not obligated to repair the Claimant's automobile.

The Claimant testified that the people authorized to sign log sheets verifying participation in the PATH program were not always available, and therefore the logs could not always be submitted timely.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant failed to establish a good cause barrier to the submission of assignment logs in a timely manner that was beyond her control.

If a participant is active FIP and FAP at the time of FIP noncompliance, determination of FAP good cause is based on the FIP good cause reasons outlined in BEM 233A. For the FAP determination, if the client does not meet one of the FIP good cause reasons, determine the FAP disqualification based on FIP deferral criteria only as outlined in BEM 230A, or the FAP deferral reason of care of a child under 6 or education. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233B (July 1, 2013), p 2.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, the Department's determination there was no good cause for the noncompliance of group member D.G. is reasonable. The Department has established that it acted properly when it sanctioned the Claimant's FIP benefits for noncompliance with self-sufficiency related activities.

### **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) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits for noncompliance with the Partnership. Accountability Training. Hope. (PATH) program.

The Department's FIP sanction is **AFFIRMED**. It is SO ORDERED.



---

Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 19, 2014

Date Mailed: March 19, 2014

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/hj

cc:

