

**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. 2011-4686 OB
Case No.76072488

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on ██████████. ██████████
██████████ appeared on behalf of the Appellant. The Appellant was present.

██████████ (DCH or Department), represented the Department.

██████████, and
██████████, appeared as witnesses.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determine that the Appellant did not require the services of a nursing facility?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Appellant is a Medicaid beneficiary.
2. The Appellant is ██████████. He has no current AXIS I diagnosis; AXIS II severe mental retardation; AXIS III Cerebral Palsy, epilepsy, severe mental impairment, hypertension, herpes, constipation; AXIS IV severe mental retardation since birth, unable to verbalize, unable to provide assistance with his ADLs; AXIS V GAF: 20. (Exhibit A, page 10)

3. The Appellant's ██████████ is his Guardian and representative at hearing. (Exhibit D)
4. The Appellant lived in his ██████████ home, where she was his primary caregiver. As he got older and bigger, the Appellant's ██████████ found it more difficult to care for him so efforts began to find an alternative appropriate living situation, such as a CLF home, but a three county search was unsuccessful. (Exhibit A, page 11)
5. On ██████████, the ██████████ (CMH) ██████████ completed a Pre-Admission Screening on the Appellant. (Exhibit A)
6. On ██████████ the Department issued a determination that the Appellant did not require the services of a nursing facility, but did require specialized mental health/developmental disabilities services. The result of the determination was that the Appellant may not be admitted to a nursing facility. (Exhibit B)
7. On ██████████, the ██████████ provided notice to the Appellant's guardian of the Department's determination. (Exhibit C).
8. On ██████████, the Department received the request for an Administrative Hearing filed on the Appellant's behalf. (Exhibit D).
9. On ██████████, the Appellant moved into a group home, the ██████████. The Appellant's ██████████ has been happy with the care the Appellant has been receiving there. (██████████ Testimony)

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.

Department policy related to preadmission screening was developed to comply with the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (OBRA). This Nursing Home Reform Act mandated a Preadmission Screening and Annual Resident Review (PASARR).

The intent of PASARR is to require "preadmission screening and annual review of the need for admitting or retaining individuals with mental illness (MI) or mental retardation

(MR) in nursing facilities (NF) that are certified for Medicaid [and, if so, whether they needed specialized services for their MI or MR]. Also included was a requirement...that States institute an appeals system for individuals who may be transferred or discharged from...Medicaid NF's or who wish to dispute a PASARR determination. **The purpose of the statutory provisions is to prevent the placement of individuals with MI or MR in a nursing facility unless their medical needs clearly indicate that they require the level of care provided by a nursing facility.**" (Federal Register, November 30, 1999, pages 56450-56451). (Bold emphasis added by ALJ).

The Michigan Department of Community Health is the state mental health authority, mental retardation authority and Medicaid agency. The Director of the Department has assigned the responsibility of making PASARR determinations to the Department's Office of Specialized Nursing Home/OBRA Programs.

Federal law requires that the state mental health or mental retardation authorities conduct PASARR reviews.

Specifically CFR 483.106 provides in pertinent part:

Basic Rule-

(a) Requirement. The State PASARR program must require—

(1) Preadmission screening of all individuals with mental illness or mental retardation who apply as new admissions to Medicaid NFs on or after January 1, 1989;

(2) Initial review, by April 1, 1990, of all current residents with mental retardation or mental illness who entered Medicaid NFs prior to January 1, 1989; and

(3) At least annual review, as of April 1, 1990, of all residents with mental illness or mental retardation, regardless of whether they were first screened under the preadmission screening or annual resident review requirements.

(c) Purpose. The preadmission screening and annual resident review process must result in determinations based on a physical and mental evaluation of each individual with

mental illness or mental retardation, that are described in §§ 483.112 and 483.114.

(d) Responsibility for evaluations and determinations. The PASARR determinations of whether an individual requires the level of services provided by a NF and whether specialized services are needed-

(1) For individuals with mental illness, must be made by the State mental health authority and be based on an independent physical and mental evaluation performed by a person or entity other than the State mental health authority; and

(2) For individuals with mental retardation, must be made by the State mental retardation or developmental disabilities authority.

(e) Delegation of responsibility—

(1) The State mental health and mental retardation authorities may delegate by subcontract or otherwise the evaluation and determination functions for which they are responsible to another entity only if-

(i) The State mental health and mental retardation authorities retain ultimate control and responsibility for the performance of their statutory obligations;

(ii) The two determinations as to the need for NF services and for specialized services are made, based on a consistent analysis of the data; and

(iii) The entity to which the delegation is made is not a NF or an entity that has a direct or indirect affiliation or relationship with a NF.

§ 483.128 PASARR evaluation criteria.

(a) Level I: Identification of individuals with MI or MR. The State's PASARR program must identify all individuals who are suspected of having MI or MR as defined in § 483.102. This identification function is termed Level I. Level II is the function of evaluating and determining whether NF services and specialized services are needed. The State's performance of the Level I identification function must provide at least, in the case of first time identifications, for

the issuance of written notice to the individual or resident and his or his legal representative that the individual or resident is suspected of having MI or MR and is being referred to the State mental health or mental retardation authority for Level II screening.

* * * * *

(e) The State's PASARR program must use at least the evaluative criteria of § 483.130 (if one or both determinations can easily be made categorically as described in § 483.130) or of §§ 483.132 and 483.134 or § 483.136 (or, in the case of individuals with both MI and MR, §§ 483.132, 483.134 and 483.136 if a more extensive individualized evaluation is required).

§ 483.132 Evaluating the need for NF services and NF level of care (PASARR/NF).

(a) Basic rule. For each applicant for admission to a NF and each NF resident who has MI or MR, the evaluator must assess whether—

(1) The individual's total needs are such that his or his needs can be met in an appropriate community setting;

(2) The individual's total needs are such that they can be met only on an inpatient basis, which may include the option of placement in a home and community-based services waiver program, but for which the inpatient care would be required;

(3) If inpatient care is appropriate and desired, the NF is an appropriate institutional setting for meeting those needs in accordance with § 483.126; or

(4) If the inpatient care is appropriate and desired but the NF is not the appropriate setting for meeting the individual's needs in accordance with § 483.126, another setting such as an ICF/MR (including small, community-based facilities), an IMD providing services to individuals aged 65 or older, or a psychiatric hospital is an appropriate institutional setting for meeting those needs.

██████████
Docket No. 2011-4686 OB
Decision and Order

(b) Determining appropriate placement. In determining appropriate placement, the evaluator must prioritize the physical and mental needs of the individual being evaluated, taking into account the severity of each condition.

(c) Data. At a minimum, the data relied on to make a determination must include:

- (1) Evaluation of physical status (for example, diagnoses, date of onset, medical history, and prognosis);
- (2) Evaluation of mental status (for example, diagnoses, date of onset, medical history, likelihood that the individual may be a danger to himself/herself or others); and
- (3) Functional assessment (activities of daily living).

(d) Based on the data compiled in § 483.132 and, as appropriate, in §§ 483.134 and 483.136, the State mental health or mental retardation authority must determine whether an NF level of services is needed.

Federal Law and Department policy require Pre-Admission Screening of applicants for admission to nursing facilities and Annual Resident Review. In Michigan PASARR is a two-step/level process that must be completed prior to admission to a nursing facility, promptly after a significant change in a resident's physical or mental condition, and not less than annually. If the Level I screen indicates an individual may be mentally ill or mentally retarded, a Level II screen must be performed by the CMH to determine the need for nursing facility services, specialized services, and/or mental health services. *DCH Medicaid Provider Manual, Nursing Facility Coverages, Section 8 PASARR Process, 8.0, 8.1, 8.2, July 1, 2010, Pages 21 – 24.* The DCH Office of Specialized Nursing Home/OBRA Programs then makes determinations required by federal law, including whether the individual (Appellant) requires nursing home services.

On ██████████ the ██████████ conducted a Pre-Admission Screening for the Appellant. (Exhibit A). On ██████████ the Department issued a determination that the Appellant does not require nursing facility services but does need specialized mental health services. (Exhibit B). On ██████████ the ██████████ provided notice to the Appellant's guardian of the Department's determination. (Exhibit C). The Appellant, through his guardian, appealed the Department's decision. The question at hearing is whether the Appellant requires a nursing facility level of care.

The OBRA Coordinator for Appeals and Department representative, explained that the Appellant does not require nursing facility level of care. There are no special treatments or procedures, therapies or conditions which require the direct interventions and/or

██████████
Docket No. 2011-4686 OB
Decision and Order

monitoring by a registered nurse. However, this is not the correct standard for determining if nursing facility level of care is required.

§42 CFR 483.108 Relationship of PASARR to other Medicaid processes.

(b) In making their determinations, however, the State mental health and mental retardation authorities must not use criteria relating to the need for NF care or specialized services that are inconsistent with this regulation and any supplementary criteria adopted by the State Medicaid agency under its approved State plan.

The State Medicaid agency has adopted the Michigan Medicaid Nursing Facility Level of Care Determination tool as “consistent” criteria for all its long-term services, including nursing facility, MI Choice and PACE services. The tool’s seven door criteria must be met by all nursing facility participants in order to receive Medicaid reimbursement. (*DCH Medicaid Provider Manual, Nursing Facility Coverages, January 1, 2010, Pages 7 – 10* or LOC). No evidence was presented indicating that the Michigan Medicaid Nursing Facility Level of Care determination tool was used in the Appellant’s case. While a Michigan Medicaid Nursing Facility Level of Care Determination should have been completed, it would not have changed the outcome of the Appellant’s case.

As noted by the OBRA Coordinator for Appeals and Department representative, the Appellant’s care needs can be provided for in the community based setting or at home with services provided by the HAB waiver. The Appellant’s ██████████ did not recall any discussion about the HAB waiver, and testified she would have considered these options for keeping the Appellant at home. The Supervisor of Services testified that the Appellant has been approved for HAB waiver services, but the discussions were brief. For example, specialized equipment such as a Hoyer lift was considered, but due to the home’s structure it may not be possible to put a Hoyer lift in the home, and permission from a landlord would have to be obtained since the home is a rental. She also explained that additional staffing was discussed, but this could only be when the Appellant is in the home, not while he is out at the day program.

Subsequent to the Department’s determination, the Appellant moved into a group home. It is uncontested that the Appellant’s current placement in the group home is meeting his needs. While the Appellant’s ██████████ has been happy with the care at the group home, she was concerned about what would happen if the Appellant’s condition changes and he needs nursing facility level of care services in the future. She stated she only wants what is best for the Appellant. She stated that the Appellant may need hip surgery which will require significant post operative care and rehabilitation. The OBRA Coordinator for Appeals and Department representative explained that a new evaluation can be completed if the Appellant’s condition changes. Nursing home

Docket No. 2011-4686 OB
Decision and Order

placement would be possible if the new evaluation found the Appellant required nursing facility level of care.

The evidence in this case establishes that the Pre-admission Screening was performed and the review properly resulted in a determination that the Appellant did not require nursing facility level of services, but does require specialized mental health/developmental disabilities services.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department properly determined the Appellant did not require nursing facility services.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

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

Colleen Lack
Administrative Law Judge
for Olga Dazzo, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: 3/3/2011

***** 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.