

**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. 2010- 3281HHS

Case 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.*, upon the Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on ██████████. ██████████ appeared on behalf of the Appellant. She had no witnesses. ██████████, appeals review officer, represented the Department. Her witness was ██████████, ASW.

PRLIMINARY MATTER

At the threshold of hearing the Appellant's case was consolidated with that of his brother [Michael 2010-3285] regarding enforcement of IADLS reduction in payment pursuant to shared household policy.

The Appellant's reference to medication passing on behalf of ██████████ was brought by the representative. On objection from the department the ALJ ruled that the cases remained consolidated and that the only issue for review was shared household since medication dispensing was not addressed in either appeal and was not reduced in either reassessment.

The Appellant's representative was advised that she could bring that issue under separate cover at a later date if she was aggrieved. The petition(s) did not address medication(s).

ISSUE

Did the Department properly reduce the Appellant's Home Help Services (HHS)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. At the time of hearing the Appellant is a ██████████ male, Medicaid beneficiary. (Appellant's Exhibit 1)
2. The Appellant is afflicted with Wolf Hirschhorn Syndrome, seizure disorder, asthma, DM, and acid reflux. (Department Exhibit A, p. 18)
3. On ██████████, the ASW ██████████] conducted a reassessment for the Appellant that led to a reduction in services owing to a shared household. (Department's Exhibit A, throughout and Testimony)
4. The Appellant lives with his family of (5) five. (See Testimony)
5. On ██████████, an Advance Negative Action Notice was sent to the Appellant informing him of the reduction in accordance with proration policy.
6. His HHS benefit was reduced from ██████████ per month to ██████████ on the basis of shared household at (5) five household members. (See Testimony of Blackwell)
7. He was advised of his further appeal rights. (Department's Exhibit A, pp. 2, 8)
8. The instant appeal was received by the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules for the Department of Community Health on ██████████
██████████

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 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 customer in his/her place of residence.
- An interview must be conducted with the caregiver, if applicable.
- Observe a copy of the customer'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 agency 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 customer'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.

Adult Service Manual (ASM), §363, pp. 2, 3 of 24, 9-1-2008.

Service Plan Development

Address the following factors in the development of the service plan:

- Do not authorize HHS payments to a responsible relative or legal dependent of the client.
- The extent to which others in the home are able and available to provide the needed services. Authorize HHS only for the benefit of the client and not for others in the home. If others are living in the home, prorate the IADL's by at least 1/2, more if appropriate.
- The availability of services currently provided free of charge. A written statement by the provider that he is no longer able to furnish the service at no cost is sufficient for payment to be authorized as long as the provider is not a responsible relative of the client.
- HHS may be authorized when the client is receiving other home care services if the services are not duplicative (same service for same time period).

(Emphasis supplied) *Supra*, p. 5 of 24.

The Department witness testified that on reassessment it was determined that the Appellant lives with his family. There are (5) five people (family members) living at the Appellant's residence. The Department witness stated that the Appellant's IADLs were reduced by a factor of 5 – according to DHS policy on shared households.

The Appellant's representative said that the Appellant's brother Martin [not a subject of this appeal] lives independently in a basement apartment without household participation. She had no evidence to support that claim, however.

On review of the testimony and the evidence the Administrative Law Judge finds that the comprehensive assessment was accurate and drawn according to policy. The Appellant shares a household and following reassessment that shared living arrangement has been correctly established at (5) five.

However, the policy on shared household also states that proration begins "...at least 1/2, more if appropriate." Given the lack of testimony about the basement dwelling brother the question on appropriateness of including him in the proration is legitimate. The Appellant failed to persuade this reviewer [on these facts] that the Department's proration was in error.

A comprehensive assessment and the application of proration policy is the responsibility of the ASW. The Appellant failed to preponderate that the application of proration policy was inaccurate.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department properly reduced the Appellant's HHS payment by application of shared household policy.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

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

Dale Malewska
Administrative Law Judge
for Janet Olszewski, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:



Date Mailed: 1/13/2010

***** 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 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.