

**STATE OF FLORIDA**  
**REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION**

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellant

R.A.A.C. Docket No. 19-02091

vs.

Referee Decision No. 0036501808-02U

Employer/Appellee

---

**ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION**

---

This case comes before the Commission for consideration of an appeal of the decision of a reemployment assistance appeals referee that held the claimant's receipt of pension benefits completely disqualified him from benefits starting August 25, 2019. For the reasons stated below, the Commission affirms the referee's decision but corrects it to hold the claimant *partially* disqualified (subject to a \$262 reduction in his weekly benefit amount) from July 28, 2019.

The referee's decision advised that a request for review should specify any and all contentions of error with respect to the referee's decision, and that contentions of error not specifically raised in the request for review may be considered waived. The Commission has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes.

The Commission's review is generally limited to the issues before the referee and the evidence and other pertinent information contained in the official record. The referee has the responsibility to develop the hearing record, weigh the evidence, judge the credibility of the witnesses, resolve conflicts in the evidence, and render a decision supported by competent, substantial evidence. The Commission reviews the evidentiary and administrative record and the referee's decision to determine whether the referee followed the proper procedures, adequately developed the evidentiary record, made appropriate and properly supported findings, and properly applied the reemployment assistance law established by the Florida Legislature. The Commission cannot reweigh the evidence and the inferences to be drawn from it. Further, absent extraordinary circumstances, the Commission cannot give credit to testimony contrary to that accepted as true by the referee.

### **Procedural Background and Relevant Facts**

The claimant filed a claim for reemployment assistance benefits effective June 9, 2019, creating a base period for his claim from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018, and a maximum weekly benefit amount of \$275. The Department subsequently issued the non-monetary determination under review in this case, Issue Identification No. 0036 5018 08-01, on October 21, 2019. That determination held the claimant disqualified from August 25, 2019, because he received a pension from a base period employer, which when prorated weekly is in excess of his weekly benefit amount. The claimant timely appealed the determination and, after conducting a hearing, the referee affirmed the determination. The claimant has appealed the referee's decision to the Commission.

The referee made the following findings of fact (as corrected):

The claimant is an orchestral musician and [member] of the America Federation of Musicians, a musicians' union. The claimant has been employed seasonally<sup>1</sup> by the listed employer since 1983. The claimant is paid a union pension benefit of \$1,135.36 monthly. The claimant was denied benefits starting August 1, 2019, based on this pension benefit. The listed employer contributes to the union fund based on the claimant's work. The claimant has made no contribution to the benefit.

The evidence showed that the employer contributed to the pension fund pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement.

Although referred to in the testimony and the decision as a "union" pension, the American Federation of Musicians and Employers' Pension Fund (hereinafter "the Fund") is technically a "multiemployer" pension plan under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"). *See* 29 U.S.C. § 1002(37). Under ERISA, employer representatives on the Fund's board of trustees are equal in number, responsibility, and authority to the union's trustees. Moreover, the Fund is funded by contributions from participating employers as well as investment return. *See* Agreement and Declaration of Trust Establishing the American Federation of Musicians and Employers' Pension Fund (as restated April 1, 2005), at Art. 9.1, of which we take official notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> The orchestra's season typically runs from late September to May.

### Legal Analysis

On appeal to the Commission, the claimant argues that he should not be disqualified from receiving reemployment assistance benefits because his pension benefits are paid by the union pension plan and not by the employer. This issue has not yet been addressed in a Commission precedential order. Because it is a recurring issue, we address it herein. After thorough consideration, we affirm the referee's conclusion that the pension benefits received by the claimant are disqualifying but correct the referee's decision to reflect the claimant is partially disqualified rather than totally disqualified from receipt of benefits.

The applicable provision, Section 443.101(8), Florida Statutes, states, in relevant part, that a claimant is disqualified from receipt of reemployment assistance benefits as follows:

(8) For any week with respect to which he or she has received, from a base period employer, benefits from a retirement, pension, or annuity program embodied in a union contract or either a public or private employee benefit program, except:

(a) For any week in which benefits from a retirement, pension, or annuity program, as referred to in this subsection, are less than the weekly benefits that would otherwise be due under this chapter, he or she is entitled to receive for that week, if otherwise eligible, benefits reduced by the amount of benefits from the retirement, pension, or annuity program, prorated to a weekly basis;

(b) For any week in which an individual has received benefits from a retirement, pension, or annuity program, as referred to in this subsection, for which program he or she has paid at least one-half of the contributions, the individual is entitled to receive for that week, if otherwise eligible, benefits reduced by one-half of the amount of benefits from the retirement, pension, or annuity program, prorated on a weekly basis . . . .

Subsection (8) is not a model of clear and precise drafting. At first blush, the language "received, from a base period employer," might appear to support an interpretation that disqualifying benefits must be paid directly by the employer, but the remainder of the subsection, the Florida legislative history, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act ("FUTA") upon which it is based, and ERISA all preclude such an interpretation. In the context of all these aids to interpretation, the language of the provision becomes clear—it includes any pension benefit that was funded or paid into by one of the claimant's base period employers.

Reconstructing the language with the parenthetical prepositional phrase “from a base period employer,” removed to emphasize the independent clause it interrupts, leads to the following restatement: “For any week with respect to which he or she has received . . . benefits from a retirement, pension, or annuity program embodied in a union contract or either a public or private employee benefit program . . .” This reconstruction is appropriate because, prior to a 1981 amendment, that is essentially how the clause read.<sup>2</sup> See Ch 81-42, § 1, at 96, Laws of Fla. (SB 237).

Moreover, if the phrase “from a base period employer” meant the employer had to pay the benefits directly, or alternatively from an employer-created plan, the phrase “embodied in a union contract” would largely be a nullity because such benefits are almost invariably paid from employer contributions into a multiemployer pension fund sponsored by a union. Indeed, once the requirements of ERISA are understood, a requirement that the benefit be paid directly “from a base period employer” would make the entire subsection a nullity because under ERISA, tax-qualified pension benefits must be paid by a trust created for that purpose, and not directly by the employer. Thus, we review federal law first to gain an understanding of the reason the Florida provision exists, as well as its meaning.

### *FUTA and State Law*

As we have previously noted, Florida’s reemployment assistance law contains numerous provisions that were adopted in compliance with federal mandates. See R.A.A.C. Docket No. 18-00490 (August 6, 2018).<sup>3</sup> Such compliance is crucial—without it, Florida might be held ineligible for millions of dollars in federal funding for administration of the reemployment assistance and CareerSource systems. 42 U.S.C. § 502(a); 26 U.S.C. § 3304. Even more significantly, non-compliance with some provisions could result in the loss of *billions* of dollars in FUTA tax credits.<sup>4</sup> Not surprisingly, when the Legislature overhauled the law in 2011, they made compliance with federal law the touchstone of statutory interpretation:

The Legislature hereby declares its intention to provide for carrying out the purposes of this chapter in cooperation with the appropriate agencies of other states and of the Federal Government as part of a nationwide employment security program, *and particularly to provide for meeting the*

---

<sup>2</sup> The purpose for the addition of the phrase “from a base period employer” will be discussed below.

<sup>3</sup> Available at [http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac\\_finalorders/18-00490.pdf](http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/18-00490.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> The standard FUTA tax rate for employers is 6.0%. 26 U.S.C. § 3301. However, employers in states whose laws are certified to be in compliance with FUTA mandates are entitled to a tax credit of up to 5.4%, making the effective tax rate only 0.6%. 26 U.S.C. § 3302(b). Loss of the federal certification would result in an effective FUTA tax rate for Florida employers of 1000% of the current rate. 26 U.S.C. § 3303.

requirements of Title III, *the requirements of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act*, and the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, entitled “An Act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the states in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes,” each as amended, *in order to secure for this state and its citizens the grants and privileges available under such acts. All doubts as to the proper construction of any provision of this chapter shall be resolved in favor of conformity with such requirements.*

§443.031, Fla. Stat. (emphasis added).

The relevant FUTA provision specifies the relationship between the employer and the pension:

[T]he amount of compensation payable to an individual for any week which begins after March 31, 1980, and which begins in a period with respect to which such individual is receiving a governmental or other pension, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or any other similar periodic payment which is based on the previous work of such individual shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount equal to the amount of such pension, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or other payment, which is reasonably attributable to such week except that —

(i) the requirements of this paragraph shall apply to any pension, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or other similar periodic payment only if —

(I) such pension, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or similar payment is under a plan *maintained (or contributed to)*<sup>5</sup> by a base period employer or chargeable employer (as determined under applicable law) . . . .

26 U.S.C. § 3304(a)(15)(A) (emphasis added). In FUTA, therefore, pension payments must be disqualifying if a base period employer contributed to the plan paying the benefits. That is clearly the case here.

---

<sup>5</sup> The language “maintained (or contributed to)” in FUTA shows a proper recognition of how ERISA Titles I (the labor provisions) and II (the IRC provisions) govern pension plans. Under ERISA, employers *do not* pay pension benefits. Rather, they may “sponsor” or “administer” the plan and trust(s) required by ERISA to be established to fund the benefits. They also contribute to such a plan, or one established by or for multiple employers, such as a union-sponsored plan. A pension plan itself is a separate legal entity under ERISA and is the statutory payor of the benefits. For this additional reason, interpreting subsection (8) to apply only to pension plans where benefits are directly paid by the employer would essentially nullify any applicability of the provision.

As explained by the U. S. Department of Labor, this provision creates a floor for disqualification, not a ceiling:

States may, of course, disregard the . . . requirement that the deduction be made only if the retirement income is derived under a plan that a base period or chargeable employer contributed to or maintained, and, instead, provide that all such retirement income be deductible from unemployment compensation benefits.

However, States may not exempt any retirement income that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) from deduction . . . .

Emp't & Training Admin., U.S. Dep't of Labor, UIPL No. 22-87, para. 6(c) (April 30, 1988). Florida had the choice to make all employer-based pension payments disqualifying, or to limit the disqualification to payments made by base-period employers. It chose the latter, as we see next.<sup>6</sup>

### *Florida Legislative Amendments*

At the time of the 1981 amendment cited earlier, Florida's provision contained no reference to base period employers. However, in 1981 the provision was amended in two respects. First, it added the phrase "from a base period employer" to the clause requiring disqualification. Second, it added the language currently found in subparagraph (8)(b), permitting reduction of the disqualification if the employee made at least 50% of the contributions funding his benefits. These two amendments took advantage of permissive authority to reduce the scope of the disqualifications to the federal minimum. Nothing in the history suggests that the intent of adding the phrase "from a base period employer" was intended to require that payments to the claimant be made directly from the employer—indeed, doing so would have made the statute contrary to federal mandate. This amendment does not support reading a direct-payment obligation into the statute.

---

<sup>6</sup> Florida also chose to permit reduction of the disqualification when the employee contributed to the pension. That provision is irrelevant to the facts of this case.

### *Holding as to Applicability of Subsection (8)*

Given the federal statutory precursors, the legislative history, and the language of the Florida provision read in context, we conclude that under Florida law pension benefits are disqualifying if they were received from a pension plan either established by or contributed to by a base period employer. As such, the benefits received in this case are disqualifying, and the referee's decision is affirmed in this respect.

### *Calculation of the Pension Disqualification*

Our conclusion that multiemployer or "union" pension plan payments are disqualifying if a base period employer contributed to them does not fully resolve this case. While the referee properly interpreted the law, a calculation error resulted in the claimant erroneously being deemed completely disqualified. While the claimant is receiving disqualifying income in the form of a pension benefit, the claimant's prorated weekly pension benefit is not in excess of his weekly benefit amount, as found by the referee.

As indicated above, Florida's provision partially disqualifies claimants who are receiving retirement income in an amount that is less than their weekly reemployment assistance benefit amount. Since \$1,135.36 (the claimant's monthly pension benefit) times 12 (the number of months in one year) divided by 52 (the number of weeks in one year) equals a prorated weekly amount of \$262 (rounded to the last full dollar), the record reflects the claimant's weekly benefit amount should be reduced by \$262. Thus, the claimant is entitled to a reduced weekly benefit amount of \$13 (the weekly benefit amount of \$275 minus the prorated weekly pension amount of \$262). Consequently, the referee's decision that the claimant is disqualified is corrected to reflect that the claimant is *partially disqualified and is subject to a \$262 reduction in his weekly benefit amount*.

Second, the record reflects the claimant began receiving disqualifying income in the form of his pension benefit on August 1, 2019; consequently, the *issue start-date of August 25, 2019*, reflected in the referee's decision and the Department's CONNECT system, is corrected to reflect an *issue start-date of July 28, 2019*. Accordingly, the claimant is subject to a \$262 reduction in his weekly benefit amount from July 28, 2019.

*Final Matters*

The claimant's request for review also includes an inquiry as to whether the claimant can apply for benefits on the weeks he does not receive a pension payment. It appears the claimant is asking whether the disqualification applies only to the actual week that he *receives* his monthly pension payment. The statute requires that the pension payment be prorated to a weekly basis, §443.101(8), Fla. Stat.; this is because disqualifying income, like interim earnings, is attributed to the period *for which it is paid* rather than *in which it is received*. Consequently, the fact that he receives the payment monthly rather than weekly is irrelevant.

Department records reflect that the claimant was paid his maximum weekly benefit in the amount of \$275 for the weeks ending August 3, 10, 17, and 24, 2019. As indicated above, the claimant was entitled to only partial benefits during these weeks in the amount of \$13 per week. The Department is directed to investigate and issue a determination, consistent with the decision in this case, regarding whether the claimant received any sum as benefits under the reemployment assistance law to which the claimant is not entitled as provided in Section 443.151(6), Florida Statutes.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> As a result of our order, the claimant may have other accrued but unpaid weeks of benefits. The claimant may also be able to file additional weeks during the current claim year if he has not been reemployed.

The referee's decision, as corrected, is affirmed. The clamant is partially disqualified and subject to a \$262 reduction in his weekly benefit amount from July 28, 2019.

It is so ordered.

REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

Frank E. Brown, Chairman  
Thomas D. Epsky, Member  
Joseph D. Finnegan, Member

This is to certify that on

3/31/2020 ,

the above order was filed in the office of the Clerk of the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, and a copy mailed to the last known address of each interested party.

By: Benjamin Bonnell

Deputy Clerk



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY  
 REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM  
 PO BOX 5250  
 TALLAHASSEE, FL 32314 5250



\*83180370 \*

**Docket No.0036 5018 08-02**

Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

***CLAIMANT/Appellant***

***EMPLOYER/Appellee***

**APPEARANCES:**

Claimant

Employer

**DECISION OF APPEALS REFEREE**

**Important appeal rights are explained at the end of this decision.**

**Derechos de apelación importantes son explicados al final de esta decisión.**

**Yo eksplike kèk dwa dapèl enpòtan lan fen desizyon sa a.**

**Issues Involved:**

**RETIREMENT PENSION OR ANNUITY:** Whether the claimant received, from a base period employer, benefits from a retirement, pension or annuity program embodied in a union contract or a public or private employee benefit program, pursuant to Section 443.101(8), Florida Statutes.

**Findings of Fact:** The claimant is an orchestral musician and employer of the \_\_\_\_\_ a musicians union. The claimant has been employed seasonally by the listed employer since 1983. The claimant is paid a union pension benefit of \$1,135.36 monthly. The claimant was denied benefits starting August 1, 2019, based on this pension benefit. The listed employer contributes to the union fund based on the claimant's work. The claimant has made no contribution to the benefit.

**Conclusions of Law:** The law provides that a claimant will be disqualified for benefits for any week with respect to which benefits were received from a base period employer, a retirement, pension, or annuity program embodied in a union contract or from a public or private

employee benefit program. For any week in which such benefits are less than the weekly benefit amount of the reemployment assistance benefit claim, reemployment assistance benefits will be reduced by the amount of the retirement, pension or annuity program, prorated to a weekly basis. If the claimant paid at least one half of the contributions of the retirement, pension, or annuity program, Reemployment Assistance benefits will be reduced by one half of the amount of the retirement, benefit or annuity benefits prorated on a weekly basis.

The claimant is paid a pension which is disqualifying. It does not matter that the pension is paid by the union. This base period employer has paid into the fund providing the benefit and the claimant has made no contribution.

**Decision:** The determination dated September 23, 2019, is AFFIRMED.

If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, unless specified in this decision. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

This is to certify that a copy of the above decision was distributed/mailed to the last known address of each interested party on November 7, 2019.

**B. BENNITT**  
Appeals Referee

*Paulette A. Allison*

By:

PAULETTE ALLISON, Deputy Clerk

**IMPORTANT - APPEAL RIGHTS:** This decision will become final unless a written request for review or reopening is filed within 20 calendar days after the distribution/mailed date shown. If the 20<sup>th</sup> day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.004, filing may be made on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday. If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

**A party who did not attend the hearing for good cause may request reopening, including the reason for not attending, at [connect.myflorida.com](http://connect.myflorida.com) or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date of the confirmation page will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Department's Web Site.**

A party who attended the hearing and received an adverse decision may file a request for review to the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, TALLAHASSEE, FL 32301-2975; (Fax: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org>. If mailed, the postmark date will be the filing date. If faxed, hand-delivered, delivered by courier service other than the United States Postal Service, or submitted via the Internet, the date of receipt will be the filing date. To avoid delay, include the docket number and the last five digits of the claimant's social security number. A party requesting review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee's decision, and provide factual and/or legal support for these challenges. Allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived.

There is no cost to have a case reviewed by the Commission, nor is a party required to be represented by an attorney or other representative to have a case reviewed. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has not been fully integrated into the Department's CONNECT system. While correspondence can be mailed or faxed to the Commission, no correspondence can be submitted to the Commission via the CONNECT system. All parties to an appeal before the Commission must maintain a current mailing address with the Commission. A party who changes his/her mailing address in the CONNECT system must also provide the updated address to the Commission, in writing. All correspondence sent by the Commission, including its final order, will be mailed to the parties at their mailing address on record with the Commission.

**IMPORTANTE - DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN:** Esta decisión pasará a ser final a menos que una solicitud por escrito para revisión o reapertura se registre dentro de 20 días de calendario después de la distribución/fecha de envío marcada en que la decisión fue remitida por correo. Si el vigésimo (20) día es un sábado, un domingo o un feriado definidos en F.A.C. 73B-21.004, el registro de la solicitud se puede realizar en el día siguiente que no sea un sábado, un domingo o un feriado. Si esta decisión descalifica y/o declara al reclamante como inelegible para recibir beneficios que ya fueron recibidos por el reclamante, se le requerirá al reclamante rembolsar esos beneficios. La cantidad específica de cualquier sobrepago [pago excesivo de beneficios] será calculada por la Agencia y establecida en una determinación de pago excesivo de beneficios que será emitida por separado. Sin embargo, el límite de tiempo para solicitar la revisión de esta decisión es como se establece anteriormente y dicho límite no es detenido, demorado o extendido por ninguna otra determinación, decisión u orden.

**Una parte que no asistió a la audiencia por una buena causa puede solicitar una reapertura, incluyendo la razón por no haber comparecido en la audiencia, en [connect.myflorida.com](https://connect.myflorida.com) o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha de la página de confirmación será la fecha de presentación de una solicitud de reapertura en la página de Internet del Departamento.**

Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Servicios de Reempleo; Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, TALLAHASSEE, FL 32301-2975; (Fax: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org>. Si la solicitud es enviada por correo, la fecha del sello de la oficina de correos será la fecha de registro de la solicitud. Si es enviada por telefax, entregada a mano, entregada por servicio de mensajería, con la excepción del Servicio Postal de Estados Unidos, o realizada vía el Internet, la fecha en la que se recibe la solicitud será la fecha de registro. Para evitar demora, incluya el número de expediente [*docket number*] y los últimos cinco dígitos del número de seguro social del reclamante. Una parte que solicita una revisión debe especificar cualquiera y todos los alegatos de error con respecto a la decisión del árbitro, y proporcionar fundamentos reales y/o legales para substanciar éstos desafíos. Los alegatos de error que no se establezcan con especificidad en la solicitud de revisión pueden considerarse como renunciados.

No hay ningún costo para tener un caso revisado por la Comisión, ni es requerido que una parte sea representado por un abogado u otro representante para poder tener un caso revisado. La Comisión de Apelación de Asistencia de Reempleo no ha sido plenamente integrado en el sistema CONNECT del Departamento. Mientras que la correspondencia puede ser enviada por correo o por fax a la Comisión, ninguna correspondencia puede ser sometida a la Comisión a través del sistema CONNECT. Todas las partes en una apelación ante la Comisión deben mantener una dirección de correo actual con la Comisión. La parte que cambie su dirección de correo en el sistema CONNECT también debe proporcionar la dirección actualizada a la Comisión, por escrito. Toda la correspondencia enviada por la Comisión, incluida su orden final, será enviada a las partes en su dirección de correo en el registro con la Comisión.

**ENPÒTAN - DWA DAPÈL:** Desizyon sa a ap definitiv sòf si ou depoze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat distribisyon/postaj. Si 20yèm jou a se yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje, jan sa defini lan F.A.C. 73B-21.004, depo an kapab fèt jou aprè a, si se pa yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje. Si desizyon an diskalifye epi/oswa deklare moun k ap fè demann lan pa kalifye pou alokasyon li resevwa deja, moun k ap fè demann lan ap gen pou li remèt lajan li te resevwa a. Se Ajans lan k ap kalkile montan nenpòt ki peman anplis epi y ap detèmine sa lan yon desizyon separe. Sepandan, delè pou mande revizyon desizyon sa a se delè yo bay anwo a; Okenn lòt detèminasyon, desizyon oswa lòd pa ka rete, retade oubyen pwolonje dat sa a.

**Yon pati ki te gen yon rezon valab pou li pat asiste seyans lan gen dwa mande pou yo ouvri ka a ankò; fòk yo bay rezon yo pat ka vini an epi fè demann nan sou sitwèb sa a, [connect.myflorida.com](https://connect.myflorida.com) oswa alekri nan adrès ki mansyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat cofimasyon page sa pral jou ou ranpli deman pou reouvewti dan web sit depatman.**

Yon pati ki te asiste odyans la epi li resevwa yon desizyon negatif kapab soumèt yon demann pou revizyon retounen travay Asistans Komisyon Apèl la, Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, TALLAHASSEE, FL 32301-2975; (Faks: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org>. Si poste a, dat tenm ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Si fakse, men yo-a delivre, lage pa sèvis mesajè lèt pase Etazini Sèvis nan Etazini Nimewo, oswa soumèt sou Entènèt la, dat yo te resevwa ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejis la ak senk dènye chif nimewo sekirite sosyal demandè a sosyal demandè a sekirite. Yon pati pou mande revizyon ta dwe presize nenpòt ak tout akizasyon nan erè ki gen rapò ak desizyon abit la, yo epi bay sipò reyèl ak / oswa legal pou defi sa yo. Alegasyon sou erè pa espesyalman tabli nan demann nan pou revizyon yo kapab konsidere yo egzante.

Pa gen okenn kou pou Komisyon an revize yon ka, ni ke yon pati dwe reprezante pa yon avoka oubyen lòt reprezantan pou ke la li a revize. Komisyon Apèl Asistans Reyanbochaj pa te entegre antyèman nan sistèm CONNECT Depatman an. Byenke korespondans kapab fakse oubyen pòste bay Komisyon an, okenn korespondans pa kapab soumèt bay Komisyon an atravè sistèm CONNECT. Tout pati ki nan yon apèl devan Komisyon an dwe mentni yon adrès postal ki ajou avèk Komisyon an. Yon pati ki chanje adrès postal li nan sistèm CONNECT la dwe bay Komisyon an adrès ki mete ajou a tou. Tout korespondans ke Komisyon an voye, sa enkli manda final li, pral pòste voye bay pati yo nan adrès postal yo genyen nan achiv Komisyon an.

---

An equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. All voice telephone numbers on this document may be reached by persons using TTY/TDD equipment via the Florida Relay Service at 711.