

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
P.O. Box 30763, Lansing, MI 48909
(877) 833-0870; Fax: (517) 334-9505

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████,

Appellant

_____ /

Docket No. 2009-13656 HHS
Case No. ██████████
Load No. ██████████

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 42 CFR 431.200 *et seq.*, following the Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on ██████████. ██████████ (Appellant) appeared and testified on his own behalf. Also appearing as witnesses for the Appellant were his chore provider, ██████████, and daughter, ██████████.

██████████, represented the Department of Community Health (Department). Also appearing as a witness for the Department was ██████████, ██████████, and ██████████, ██████████ Department of Human Services (DHS).

ISSUE

Did the Department properly reduce the Appellant's Adult Home Help Services award?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence presented, I find, as material fact:

1. Appellant is a Medicaid beneficiary. He suffers from hypertension, congestive heart failure and arteriosclerotic heart disease. (*Exhibit 1, p. 13*)
2. On ██████████, ██████████ issued to the Appellant an Advance Negative Action Notice informing him that his Home Help Services were being reduced based on the results of a ██████████, in-home assessment. During the assessment, the Appellant discussed his abilities and indicated that his chore provider "lives" with him. The Appellant's Home Help Service payment was therefore reduced

from ██████████ to ██████████ per month.

3. The chore provider spends a significant amount of time at the Appellant's residence, but possesses a valid driver's license or Michigan Identification Card that reflects an address different than that of the Appellant.
4. The Appellant is capable of ambulating slowly on his own, although his gait is unsteady at times due to balance issues. (*Exhibit 1, p. 9*)
5. On ██████████, the Appellant filed his request for hearing with the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules for the Department of Community Health.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance Program is established pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). It is administered in accordance with state statute, the Administrative Code, and the State Plan under Title XIX of the Social Security Act Medical Assistance Program.

Home Help Services (HHS) are provided to enable functionally limited individuals to live independently and receive care in the least restrictive, preferred settings. These activities must be certified by a physician and may be provided by individuals or by private or public agencies.

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT The Adult Services Comprehensive Assessment (DHS-324) is the primary tool for determining need for services. The comprehensive assessment will be completed on all open cases, whether a home help payment will be made or not. ASCAP, the automated workload management system provides the format for the comprehensive assessment and all information will be entered on the computer program.

Requirements for the comprehensive assessment include, but are not limited to:

- A comprehensive assessment will be completed on all new cases.
- A face-to-face contact is required with the client in his/her place of residence.
- An interview must be conducted with the caregiver, if applicable.
- Observe a copy of the client's social security card.
- Observe a picture I.D. of the caregiver, if applicable.
- The assessment must be updated as often as necessary, but minimally at the six month review and annual re-determination.
- A release of information must be obtained when requesting documentation from confidential sources and/or sharing information from the department record.

- Follow specialized rules of confidentiality when ILS cases have companion APS cases.

Functional Assessment

The **Functional Assessment** module of the **ASCAP** comprehensive assessment is the basis for service planning and for the HHS payment. Conduct a functional assessment to determine the client's ability to perform the following activities:

Activities of Daily Living (ADL)

- Eating.
- Toileting.
- Bathing.
- Grooming.
- Dressing.
- Transferring.
- Mobility.

Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)

- Taking Medication
- Meal preparation and cleanup.
- Shopping.
- Laundry.
- Light housework.

Functional Scale ADL's and IADL's are assessed according to the following five point scale:

1. Independent: Performs the activity safely with no human assistance.
2. Verbal assistance: Performs the activity with verbal assistance such as reminding, guiding or encouraging.
3. Some human assistance: Performs the activity with some direct physical assistance and/or assistive technology.
4. Much human assistance: Performs the activity with a great deal of human assistance and/or assistive technology.
5. Dependent: Does not perform the activity even with human assistance and/or assistive technology.

Note: HHS payments may only be authorized for needs assessed at the 3 level or greater.

Time and Task The worker will allocate time for each task assessed a rank of 3 or higher, based on interviews with the client and provider, observation of the client's abilities and use of the reasonable time schedule (RTS) as a guide. The RTS can

be found in **ASCAP** under the **Payment** module, Time and Task screen. When hours exceed the RTS rationale must be provided.

IADL Maximum Allowable Hours

There are monthly maximum hour limits on all IADLs except medication.

The limits are as follows:

- Five hours/month for shopping.
- Six hours/month for light housework.
- Seven hours/month for laundry.
- 25 hours/month for meal preparation.

These are **maximums**; as always, if the client needs fewer hours, that is what must be authorized. Hours should continue to be prorated in shared living arrangements. If there is a need for expanded hours, a request should be submitted to:

MDCH
Attn: Long Term Care, Systems Development Section
Capitol Commons, 6th Floor, Lansing, MI 48909

Necessity For Service

The adult services worker is responsible for determining the necessity and level of need for HHS based on:

- Client choice.
- A complete comprehensive assessment and determination of the client's need for personal care services.
- Verification of the client's medical need by a Medicaid enrolled medical professional. The client is responsible for obtaining the medical certification of need. The Medicaid provider identification number must be entered on the form by the medical provider.

The Medical Needs form must be signed and dated by one of the following medical professionals:

- Physician.
- Nurse practitioner.
- Occupational therapist.
- Physical therapist.

Exception: DCH will accept a DHS-54A completed by a VA physician or the VA medical form in lieu of the medical needs form.

The medical professional certifies that the client's need for service is related to an existing medical condition. The medical professional does not prescribe or authorize personal care services. If the medical needs form has not been returned, the adult services worker should follow-up with the client and/or medical professional. If the case is closed and reopened within 90 days with no changes in the client's condition, a new DHS-54A is not necessary.

Do **not** authorize HHS prior to the date of the medical professional signature on the DHS-54A.

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ADULT SERVICES MANUAL (ASM) 363; PAGES 3 through 9 of 24
INDEPENDENT LIVING SERVICES PROGRAM PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
ASB 2008-002
9-1-2008

A Medicaid beneficiary bears the burden of proving he or she was denied a medically necessary and appropriate service. See, e.g., *J.K By and Through R.K. v Dillenberg*, 836 F Supp 694, 700 (Ariz, 1993). Whether the Appellant satisfied her burden here must be determined in accord with the preponderance of the evidence standard. See, e.g., *Aquilina v General Motors Corp*, 403 Mich 206, 210; 267 NW2d 923 (1978).

Proof by a preponderance of the evidence requires that the fact finder believe that the evidence supporting the existence of the contested fact outweighs the evidence supporting its nonexistence. See, e.g., *Martucci v Detroit Police Comm'r*, 322 Mich 270, 274; 33 NW2d 789 (1948).

Regarding an appeal filed with the State Office of Administrative Hearing and Rules for the Department of Community Health, the Administrative Law Judge is given ultimate discretion to determine the weight and credibility of the evidence presented. *Wiley v Henry Ford Cottage Hosp*, 257 Mich App 488, 491; 668 NW2d 402 (2003); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996) (the fact finder is provided with the unique opportunity to observe or listen to witnesses; and, it is the fact finder's responsibility to determine the credibility and weight of the testimony and other evidence provided).

It is the province of the Administrative Law Judge to adjudge the credibility and weight to be afforded the evidence presented. *Maloy v. Stuttgart Memorial Hosp.*, 316 Ark. 447, 872 S.W.2d 401 (1994).

The DHS witness testified she eliminated transferring based on her personal observations of the Appellant and his apparent ability to transfer, albeit slowly, from sitting to standing positions. The Appellant provided no substantive testimony challenging these findings.

The DHS worker also testified she spoke with the landlord about the living arrangements and was told that the Appellant's chore provider was living in the Appellant's apartment without benefit of being on the lease. Although the apartment manager was not present at the hearing and therefore could not be examined regarding these alleged statements, I have no reason to suspect the DHS worker's credibility.

The Appellant acknowledges he may have told the services worker his chore provider resides with him, but at hearing claims that his chore provider spends a lot of time at his apartment, but does not live there.

IADL pro-ration policy does not specifically define "shared" living arrangements. It also does not specifically identify how shared living arrangements are determined. Policy provides only that, if others are "living" in the home, prorate the IADLs by at least ½ and more if appropriate.

For purposes of determining whether the chore provider "lives" with the Appellant, it is important to note the difference between "domicile" and "residence."

The *Merriem Webster Dictionary* defines "domicile" as a dwelling place, place of residence, a person's fixed, permanent and principal home for legal purposes. However, "residence" is more specifically defined as the act or fact of dwelling in a place for some time; or, the act or fact of living or regularly staying at or in some place for the discharge of a duty or the enjoyment of a benefit. The place where one actually lives is distinct from one's domicile or a place of temporary sojourn.

The specific issue can therefore be articulated as whether, by virtue of spending a significant portion of time with the Appellant in the Appellant's apartment, is the chore provider "living" with the Appellant?

The chore provider produced a valid Michigan driver's license and/or identification card. The address reflected on the identification was read into the record, after which time it was determined to be different than that of the Appellant.

However, on cross-examination, the chore provider acknowledged that the address listed on the identification is the residence of another individual with whom he occasionally stays. The chore provider further acknowledged he is residing at this location without benefit of being on that resident's lease agreement.

A preponderance of the evidence presented supports a conclusion that the Appellant's chore provider spends a significant portion of time in the Appellant's apartment, sleeps on the Appellant's bed while the Appellant sleeps on a sofa in the living room, and is therefore "residing" at this address for purposes of the IADL pro-ration policy.

DECISION AND ORDER

Based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, I decide that the Department properly reduced the Appellant's Home Help Service award, by eliminating transferring and pro-

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 2009-13656 HHS
Decision and Order

rating IADLs based on shared living status.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

The Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Stephen B. Goldstein
Administrative Law Judge
for Janet Olszewski, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: 5/11/2009

***** NOTICE *****

The State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules for the Department of Community Health may order a rehearing on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. The State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules for the Department of Community Health will not order a rehearing on the Department's motion where the final decision or rehearing cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. The Appellant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 60 days of the mailing date of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 60 days of the mailing date of the rehearing decision.



