

Docket No. 2010-23460 EDW
Decision and Order

4. The Appellant was scheduled for re-assessment [REDACTED]. Following completion of the assessment, [REDACTED] determined she was no longer eligible for participation in the MI Choice Waiver services. She is not eligible for nursing facility placement, thus did not meet eligibility criteria.
5. An exception review was requested and completed [REDACTED]. The exception review determined she did not meet criteria for frailty or any other of the established criteria.
6. The Appellant does not contest the assessment's results for Doors 1-7, however asserts she should qualify for services through the MPRO exception criteria for frailty.
7. The Appellant appealed the determination on or about [REDACTED].

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.

This Appellant is claiming eligibility for services through the Department's Home and Community Based Services for Elderly and Disabled (HCBS/ED). The waiver is called MI Choice in Michigan. The program is funded through the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicare Services to the Michigan Department of Community Health (Department). Regional agencies, in this case the Waiver Agency, function as the Department's administrative agency.

Waivers are intended to provide the flexibility needed to enable States to try new or different approaches to the efficient and cost-effective delivery of health care services, or to adapt their programs to the special needs of particular areas or groups of recipients. Waivers allow exceptions to State plan requirements and permit a State to implement innovative programs or activities on a time-limited basis, and subject to specific safeguards for the protection of recipients and the program. Detailed rules for waivers are set forth in subpart B of part 431, subpart A of part 440 and subpart G of part 441 of this chapter. *42 CFR 430.25(b)*

Docket No. 2010-23460 EDW
Decision and Order

1915(c) (42 USC 1396n (c) allows home and community based services to be classified as “medical assistance” under the State Plan when furnished to recipients who would otherwise need inpatient care that is furnished in a hospital SNF, ICF or ICF/MR and is reimbursable under the State Plan. (42 CFR 430.25(b)).

Effective November 1, 2004, the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) implemented revised functional/medical eligibility criteria for Medicaid nursing facility, MI Choice, and PACE services. Federal regulations require that Medicaid pay for services only for those beneficiaries who meet specified level of care criteria.

Section 4.1 of the Medicaid Provider Manual Nursing Facilities Section references the use of an online Michigan Medicaid Nursing Facility Level of Care Determination tool (*Michigan Medicaid Nursing Facility Level of Care Determination, March 7, 2005, Pages 1 – 9 or LOC*). The LOC must be completed for all Medicaid-reimbursed admissions to nursing facilities or enrollments in MI Choice or PACE on and after November 1, 2004.

The Level of Care Assessment Tool consists of seven-service entry Doors. The doors are: Activities of Daily Living, Cognition, Physician Involvement, Treatments and Conditions, Skilled Rehabilitative Therapies, Behavior, or Service Dependency. In order to be found eligible for MI Choice Waiver services, the Appellant must meet the requirements of at least one Door. The Department presented testimony and documentary evidence that the Appellant did not meet any of the criteria for Doors 1 through 7.

Door 1
Activities of Daily Living (ADLs)

Scoring Door 1: The applicant must score at least six points to qualify under Door 1.

(A) Bed Mobility, (B) Transfers, and (C) Toilet Use:

- Independent or Supervision = 1
- Limited Assistance = 3
- Extensive Assistance or Total Dependence = 4
- Activity Did Not Occur = 8

(D) Eating:

- Independent or Supervision = 1
- Limited Assistance = 2
- Extensive Assistance or Total Dependence = 3
- Activity Did Not Occur = 8

The evidence presented is uncontested that the Appellant is independent in bed mobility, transfers, toileting and eating. She did not score at least six (6) points, thus did not qualify through Door 1. There is uncontested evidence the Appellant uses a lift chair and requires 30 seconds to get up out of her lift chair and an additional 30 seconds following standing

Docket No. 2010-23460 EDW
Decision and Order

before she begins walking. Furthermore, she requires 30 seconds to get up from the toilet following use. There is no evidence the extra time required for her transfers, toileting or use of a lift chair changes the score for Door 1.

Door 2
Cognitive Performance

Scoring Door 2: The applicant must score under one of the following three (3) options to qualify under Door 2.

1. "Severely Impaired" in Decision Making.
2. "Yes" for Memory Problem, and Decision Making is "Moderately Impaired" or "Severely Impaired."
3. "Yes" for Memory Problem, and Making Self Understood is "Sometimes Understood" or "Rarely/Never Understood."

No evidence was presented indicating the Appellant has severely impaired decision making or that she has a memory problem. She can make himself understood. The evidence presented is uncontested that the Appellant did not qualify under Door 2.

Door 3
Physician Involvement

The LOC indicates that to qualify under Door 3 the applicant must

...[M]eet either of the following to qualify under

1. At least one Physician Visit exam AND at least four Physicians Order changes in the last 14 days, OR
2. At least two Physician Visit exams AND at least two Physicians Order changes in the last 14 days.

There was no evidence presented the Appellant had met any of the criteria listed for Door 3 at the time of the assessment, [REDACTED] There was evidence presented the Appellant currently has a physician visit in her home at least one (1) time per month. This began following the [REDACTED] assessment, in [REDACTED] thus it was not considered at assessment, nor is it material to the disposition of the matter at hand. Evidence was put into the record that a new assessment is being scheduled with the Appellant at this time. This evidence may be considered at the time of the new assessment.

Door 4
Treatments and Conditions

In order to qualify under Door 4 the applicant must receive, within 14 days of the assessment date, any of the following health treatments or demonstrated any of the following health conditions:

- A. Stage 3-4 pressure sores
- B. Intravenous or parenteral feedings
- C. Intravenous medications
- D. End-stage care
- E. Daily tracheostomy care, daily respiratory care, daily suctioning
- F. Pneumonia within the last 14 days
- G. Daily oxygen therapy
- H. Daily insulin with two order changes in last 14 days
- I. Peritoneal or hemodialysis

The material and reliable evidence demonstrates that Appellant did not qualify under Door 4. The Appellant had initially scored through this door because she was taking daily oxygen therapy. She was no longer doing so as of the time of assessment in [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Door 5
Skilled Rehabilitation Therapies

The level of care tool provides that the applicant must:

...[H]ave required at least 45 minutes of active ST, OT or PT (scheduled or delivered) in the last 7 days and continues to require skilled rehabilitation therapies to qualify under Door 5

There was no assertion, nor evidence demonstrating the Appellant qualified by meeting the Door 5 criteria set forth above.

Door 6
Behavior

In order to qualify under Door 6 the Appellant must meet one of the following two (2) criteria:

- 1. A "Yes" for either delusions or hallucinations within the last 7 days.
- 2. The applicant must have exhibited any one of the following behaviors for at least 4 of the last 7 days (including daily): Wandering, Verbally Abusive, Physically Abusive, Socially Inappropriate/Disruptive, or Resisted Care.

Docket No. 2010-23460 EDW
Decision and Order

No evidence was presented demonstrating that Appellant met the criteria set forth above.

Door 7
Service Dependency

LOC page 7 provides that the applicant could qualify under Door 7 if she is currently being served in a nursing facility (and for at least one (1) year) or by the MI Choice or PACE program, and requires ongoing services to maintain his or her current functional status. The Appellant had not been in the program for a period of at least one (1) year at the time of assessment in [REDACTED], thus she does not satisfy this criteria.

MPRO exception criteria was explicitly set forth at hearing. The MPRO witness testified at length specifically regarding the frailty criteria stating that if it takes at least five (5) real minutes to perform an activity of daily living such as transferring, it could meet the exception criteria. The evidence is that it takes 30 seconds to one (1) minute to get out of the chair and then rest prior to walking. There was no evidence presented five (5) real minutes is required for any activity of daily living. Additionally, there was testimony that another of the frailty criteria is requiring at least 15 minutes rest due to shortness of breath or debilitating pain following activity. The evidence of record is that five (5) to ten (10) minutes rest is required due to shortness of breath. There was evidence of pain, however not specifically asserting the pain is debilitating and causes inaction for at least 15 minutes following activity. There was no evidence presented the Appellant met any of the remaining frailty criteria which including falls within the last two (2) months, physician visits and order changes, again within the last two (2) months or inability to take medication properly with medication set up.

This ALJ gave the Appellant every opportunity to establish she meets the criteria as set forth in the MDCH criteria. There was no evidence presented that she does. While this ALJ is sympathetic to the Appellant's position, she does not have authority to override or disregard the policy set forth by the Department.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Waiver Agency properly terminated the Appellant's MI Choice Waiver services.

**Docket No. 2010-23460 EDW
Decision and Order**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

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

Jennifer Isiogu
Administrative Law Judge
for Janet Olszewski, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:



Date Mailed: 05/27/2010

***** 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 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 of the rehearing decision.