

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. 2009-16011 QHP
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 her own behalf.

██████████, appeared on behalf of ██████████ ('Medicaid Health Plan', or 'MHP'). Also appearing as a witness for the MHP was ██████████.

ISSUE

Did the Medicaid Health Plan properly deny Appellant's request for a lumbar home traction unit?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Appellant is a Medicaid beneficiary, who is currently enrolled with ██████████, a Medicaid health plan. She suffers chronic back pain associated with a diagnosis of lumbago. (*Exhibit 1, page 4*)

2. On ██████████, the MHP denied the Appellant's request for a Saunders Home Traction Unit. The reason provided by the MHP for the denial is that the particular unit (procedure code E0855) is not listed on the Michigan Department of Community Health Medical Supplier/Durable Medical Equipment/Prosthetics and Orthotics Database, and therefore not a covered service.
3. On ██████████, the Appellant filed a 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 Social Welfare Act, the Administrative Code, and the State Plan under Title XIX of the Social Security Act Medical Assistance Program.

On May 30, 1997, the Department received approval from the Health Care Financing Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, allowing Michigan to restrict Medicaid beneficiaries' choice to obtain medical services only from specified Medicaid Health Plans.

The Respondent is one of those Medicaid Health Plans.

The covered services that the Contractor has available for enrollees must include, at a minimum, the covered services listed below (List omitted by Administrative Law Judge). The Contractor may limit services to those which are medically necessary and appropriate, and which conform to professionally accepted standards of care. Contractors must operate consistent with all applicable Medicaid provider manuals and publications for coverages and limitations. If new services are added to the Michigan Medicaid Program, or if services are expanded, eliminated, or otherwise changed, the Contractor must implement the changes consistent with State direction in accordance with the provisions of Contract Section 1-Z.

*Article II-G, Scope of Comprehensive Benefit Package. MDCH contract
(Contract) with the Medicaid Health Plans,
September 30, 2004.*

The major components of the Contractor's utilization management plan must encompass, at a minimum, the following:

- Written policies with review decision criteria and procedures that conform to managed health care industry standards and processes.

- A formal utilization review committee directed by the Contractor's medical director to oversee the utilization review process.
- Sufficient resources to regularly review the effectiveness of the utilization review process and to make changes to the process as needed.
- An annual review and reporting of utilization review activities and outcomes/interventions from the review.

The Contractor must establish and use a written prior approval policy and procedure for utilization management purposes. The Contractor may not use such policies and procedures to avoid providing medically necessary services within the coverages established under the Contract. The policy must ensure that the review criteria for authorization decisions are applied consistently and require that the reviewer consult with the requesting provider when appropriate. The policy must also require that utilization management decisions be made by a health care professional who has appropriate clinical expertise regarding the service under review.

*Article II-P, Utilization Management, Contract,
September 30, 2004*

1.10 NONCOVERED ITEMS

Items that are not covered by Medicaid include, but are not limited to:

- Adaptive equipment (e.g., rocker knife, swivel spoon, etc.)
- Air conditioner
- Air purifier
- Enteral formulae to accommodate psychological or behavioral conditions, food preferences, allergies, loss of appetite, or noncompliance with a specialized diet
- Environmental Control Units
- Equipment not used or not used properly by the beneficiary
- Exam tables/massage tables
- Exercise equipment (e.g., tricycles, exercise bikes, weights, mat/mat tables, etc.)
- Generators
- Hand/body wash

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 2009-16011 QHP
Decision and Order

- Heating pads
- Home modifications
- Hot tubs
- House/room humidifier
- Ice packs
- Items for a beneficiary who is non-compliant with a physician's plan of care (or) items ordered for the purpose of solving problems related to noncompliance (e.g., insulin pump)
- Items used solely for the purpose of restraining the beneficiary for behavioral or other reasons
- Lift chairs, reclining chairs, vibrating chairs
- More than one pair of shoes on the same date of service
- New equipment when current equipment can be modified to accommodate growth
- Nutritional formulae representing only a liquid form of food
- Nutritional puddings/bars
- Over-the-counter shoe inserts
- Peri-wash
- Portable oxygen, when oxygen is ordered to be used at night only
- Power tilt-in-space or reclining wheelchairs for a long-term care resident because there is limited staffing
- Pressure gradient garments for maternity-related edema
- Prosthetic appliances for a beneficiary with a potential functional level of K0
- Regular or dietetic foods (e.g., Slimfast, Carnation instant breakfast, etc.)
- Room dehumidifiers
- School Items (e.g., computers, writing aids, book holder, mouse emulator, etc.)
- Second units for school use
- Second wheelchair for beneficiary preference or convenience
- Sensory Devices (e.g., games, toys, etc.)
- Sports drinks/juices
- Stair lifts
- Standard infant/toddler formulae
- Therapy modalities (bolsters, physio-rolls, therapy balls, jett mobile)
- Thickeners for foods or liquids (e.g., Thick – it)
- Toothettes
- Transcutaneous Nerve Stimulator when prescribed for headaches, visceral abdominal pain, pelvic pain, or temporal mandibular joint (TMJ) pain
- Ultrasonic osteogenesis stimulators
- UV lighting for Seasonal Affective Disorder

- Vacu-brush toothbrushes
- Weight loss or "light" products
- Wheelchair lifts or ramps for home or vehicle (all types)
- Wheelchair accessories (e.g., horns, lights, bags, special colors, etc.)
- Wigs for hair loss

Michigan Department of Community Health
Medicaid Provider Manual
Medical Supplier
Version Date: April 1, 2008; Pages 14 and 15

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 that burden 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 Appellant testified she cannot use traction units that hang over a door, or are situated on a raised platform. She indicated the unit prescribed by her physician will allow her to utilize the device while lying on the floor. She otherwise provided no substantive challenge to the MHP's assertion that the requested equipment is not a Medicaid-covered benefit.

The MHP presented credible evidence that the procedure code associated with the Saunders unit is not included on the equipment-specific database published by the Department in relation to medical supply/durable equipment policy.

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 2009-16011 QHP
Decision and Order

Because the Appellant did not present any legally sustainable challenge to the MHP's actions in this case, I conclude the MHP appropriately denied the Saunders home traction unit.

DECISION AND ORDER

Based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, I decide that the MHP appropriately denied Appellant's prior authorization request for the Saunders home traction unit (procedure code E0855).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

The Medicaid Health Plan's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

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

cc: [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: 5/21/2009

***** NOTICE *****

The State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules 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 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 30 days of the mailing date of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the mailing date of the rehearing decision.



