

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH**
P. O. Box 30763, Lansing, MI 48909
(877) 833-0870; Fax (517) 334-9505

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████,

**Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Case No. 28616366**

Appellant

DECISION AND ORDER

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

After due notice, a hearing was held on Thursday, ██████████. ██████████, Appellant's mother, appeared and testified on behalf of the Appellant. ██████████, Appellant's grandmother also appeared as a witness for the Appellant

██████████, Manager of Due Process, appeared and testified on behalf of ██████████ County Community Mental Health (CMH or the Department). ██████████, Utilization Management Coordinator, appeared as a witness for the Department.

ISSUE

Did the CMH properly reduce Appellant's respite hours?

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 who is currently receiving Medicaid covered specialty services and supports of Support Coordination, Medical Reviews, outpatient therapy, Community Living Supports, and Respite Care Services through ██████████ County Community Mental Health (CMH). (Exhibit 1, Testimony)
2. CMH is under contract with the Department of Community Health (MDCH) to provide Medicaid covered services to people who reside in the CMH service area.
3. The Appellant is a ██████ year old Medicaid beneficiary whose date of birth is

Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Decision and Order

- ██████████. (Exhibit 2, p. 1). The Appellant has cerebral palsy, with visual and cognitive impairment. (Exhibit 5, p.18).
4. The Appellant lives in the family home with her mother, step father, and other siblings. (Exhibit 2, pp. 1, 3, and Exhibit 5, p. 17).
 5. Appellant's mother is her primary caregiver. (Exhibit 2, p. 1, 3).
 6. Appellant attends ██████████ School from September to June, 6:45 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. daily. (Exhibit 2, p. 3, Testimony).
 7. On or about ██████████, a formal request was made to the CMH for 80 hours per month of respite. On ██████████, the CMH conducted a Respite Assessment. As a result of the Assessment, Appellant's mother was approved for 42 hours of respite per month. (Exhibit 2, pp. 1-4).
 8. On ██████████, CMH sent an Adequate Action Notice to the Appellant's mother notifying her that 42 hours of Respite per month of the 80 hours requested were approved effective ██████████. Medical necessity not met for additional hours. The notice included rights to a Medicaid fair hearing. (Exhibit 3, pp 5-7).
 9. The Michigan Administrative Hearing System received Appellant's request for hearing on ██████████. (Exhibit 7).

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.

Title XIX of the Social Security Act, enacted in 1965, authorizes Federal grants to States for medical assistance to low-income persons who are age 65 or over, blind, disabled, or members of families with dependent children or qualified pregnant women or children. The program is jointly financed by the Federal and State governments and administered by States. Within broad Federal rules, each State decides eligible groups, types and range of services, payment levels for services, and administrative and operating procedures. Payments for services are made directly by the State to the individuals or entities that furnish the services.

42 CFR 430.0

██████████
Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Decision and Order

The State plan is a comprehensive written statement submitted by the agency describing the nature and scope of its Medicaid program and giving assurance that it will be administered in conformity with the specific requirements of title XIX, the regulations in this Chapter IV, and other applicable official issuances of the Department. The State plan contains all information necessary for CMS to determine whether the plan can be approved to serve as a basis for Federal financial participation (FFP) in the State program.

42 CFR 430.10

Section 1915(b) of the Social Security Act provides:

The Secretary, to the extent he finds it to be cost-effective and efficient and not inconsistent with the purposes of this subchapter, may waive such requirements of section 1396a of this title (other than subsection(s) of this section) (other than sections 1396a(a)(15), 1396a(bb), and 1396a(a)(10)(A) of this title insofar as it requires provision of the care and services described in section 1396d(a)(2)(C) of this title) as may be necessary for a State...

The State of Michigan has opted to simultaneously utilize the authorities of the 1915(b) and 1915(c) programs to provide a continuum of services to disabled and/or elderly populations. Under approval from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) the Department of Community Health (MDCH) operates a section 1915(b) and 1915(c) Medicaid Managed Specialty Services and Support program waiver. CMH contracts with the Michigan Department of Community Health to provide services under the waiver pursuant to its contract obligations with the Department.

Medicaid beneficiaries are entitled to medically necessary Medicaid covered services for which they are eligible. Services must be provided in the appropriate scope, duration, and intensity to reasonably achieve the purpose of the covered service. See *42 CFR 440.230*.

CMH witness ██████████, Utilization Management Coordinator and Limited Licensed Psychologist, explained the assessment for respite care services is done at the time of the individual planning meeting. Thereafter, it is received by Utilization Management along with a request for authorization of respite care and the Utilization Management Coordinators use their scoring tool to score out the hours of respite to be authorized. The authorization is based on documentation from the clinical records as required by the Medicaid policy for determining medical necessity.

██████████
Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Decision and Order

██████████ stated the Department does not provide a screening tool for respite care so the CMH has its own screening tool. The scoring tool allows them to translate the information on the respite assessment into the number of respite hours needed in that case. She stated the clinicians who do the respite assessments are not given the scoring tool so they cannot manipulate the assessment to affect the number of respite hours to be approved. They are simply charged with obtaining accurate information from the client when filling out the respite assessment.

██████████ noted that their scoring tool had changed in the past year. ██████████ stated Genesee County realized they were an outlier compared to other counties in the State and they decided to review the assessment tools being used by the other counties. Under their prior scoring tool, there was a threshold of 20 hours, which has now been eliminated. ██████████ stated they clarified the behavioral section to remove the subjectivity from the scoring and eliminated variability in the scoring. ██████████ stated that in her professional opinion the scoring tool now being used by the CMH accurately reflects the client's needs for respite services.

██████████ reviewed Appellant's Respite Assessment. (Exhibit 2, pp.1-4) She testified that according to their scoring tool, Appellant was given 2 respite hours because there are 2 or more caregivers in the home one who is working full time, 2 respite hours were also given because the Appellant's primary caregiver has a health condition that interferes with the provision of care, 1 respite hour was given because Appellant is verbally abusive daily, and 2 respite hours were given because Appellant has temper tantrums daily.

██████████ testified Appellant was also given 4 respite hours because Appellant requires total assistance with mobility, 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with oral care, 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with eating, 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with bathing, 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with toileting, and 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with dressing.

██████████ further testified that 3 respite hours were given because Appellant requires food to be in small bite sized pieces, and 4 respite hours were given because Appellant requires total assistance with grooming; for a total of 42 respite hours per month.

██████████ testified that she referred to the Medicaid Provider Manual policy section for determination of medical necessity. She further noted the policy allows a PIHP to employ various methods in order to determine the amount scope and duration of services, including respite services. ██████████ stated that respite services are to provide a temporary break for an unpaid caregiver; it is not intended to be provided on a continuous or daily basis. (Exhibit 4, pp. 8-14).

██████████ completed the adequate action notice that was sent to the Appellant on ██████████. On the notice she marked a denial of service to a current consumer.

She indicated 42 hours of Respite per month were approved of the 80 requested. ██████████ stated on the form that medical necessity was not met for the additional hours requested. ██████████ acknowledged that a new assessment for respite care can be done at anytime, if new or additional information becomes available. She further stated that the Appellant is a minor child and the parents are expected to provide the Appellant the same level of care as they would for any of their other children.

██████████, Appellant's mother, testified she thought that a lot of the things in the paperwork were not correct. ██████████ indicated the case manager never asked her all the things on the assessment form, they just assumed things. ██████████ further indicated the person who did the assessment was not their case manager; it was a supervisor who filled in. She said they did not have a stable case manager, and she did not feel they were treated fairly and did not get the correct number of respite hours.

██████████ Appellant's grandmother testified there were things on the assessment checked 'never', that should not have been checked 'never'. ██████████ indicated the Appellant bites herself, bumps her head, and has other problems not noted. ██████████ indicated the supervisor who filled out the assessment did not ask her daughter the proper questions. They did not know what was on the assessment.

██████████ stated the Appellant is blind and can't walk. She needs toilet training and can't clean herself properly. She can't bathe herself. She can do some feeding but needs some assistance. Appellant is currently in therapy. ██████████ stated that her daughter has strained her back and needs all the extra help she can get. ██████████ acknowledged that she was Appellant's Respite worker and CLS worker.

The *Medicaid Provider Manual, Mental Health/Substance Abuse*, section articulates Medicaid policy for Michigan. Its states with regard to respite:

17.3.J. RESPITE CARE SERVICES

Services that are provided to assist in maintaining a goal of living in a natural community home by temporarily relieving the **unpaid** primary caregiver (e.g., family members and/or adult family foster care providers) and is provided during those portions of the day when the caregivers are not being paid to provide care. Respite is not intended to be provided on a continuous, long-term basis where it is a part of daily services that would enable an unpaid caregiver to work elsewhere full time. In those cases, community living supports, or other services of paid support or training staff, should be used. Decisions about the methods and amounts of respite should be decided during person-centered planning. PIHPs may not require active clinical treatment as a prerequisite for receiving respite care. These services do

not supplant or substitute for community living support or other services of paid support/training staff.

*MPM, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Section,
October 1, 2011, Page 118.*

The CMH is mandated by federal regulation to perform an assessment for the Appellant to determine what Medicaid services are medically necessary and determine the amount or level of the Medicaid medically necessary services that are needed to reasonably achieve her goals. The Department's *Medicaid Provider Manual, Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Medical Necessity Criteria, Section 2.5* lists the criteria the CMH must apply before Medicaid can pay for outpatient mental health benefits. The Medicaid Provider Manual sets out the eligibility requirements as:

2.5.B. DETERMINATION CRITERIA

The determination of a medically necessary support, service or treatment must be:

- Based on information provided by the beneficiary, beneficiary's family, and/or other individuals (e.g., friends, personal assistants/aides) who know the beneficiary; and
- Based on clinical information from the beneficiary's primary care physician or health care professionals with relevant qualifications who have evaluated the beneficiary; and
- For beneficiaries with mental illness or developmental disabilities, based on person-centered planning, and for beneficiaries with substance use disorders, individualized treatment planning; and
- Made by appropriately trained mental health, developmental disabilities, or substance abuse professionals with sufficient clinical experience; and
- Made within federal and state standards for timeliness; and
- Sufficient in amount, scope and duration of the service(s) to reasonably achieve its/their purpose.
- Documented in the individual plan of service.

Medicaid Provider Manual, Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Medical Necessity Section, October 1, 2011, p. 13.

Applying the facts of this case, including the documentation contained in the respite assessment, supports the CMH position that the Appellant's mother's respite needs could be met with the 42 respite hours per month authorized. The testimony of the Appellant's mother and grandmother did not change the result, and essentially all of the

██████████
Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Decision and Order

matters addressed by ██████████ in her testimony were covered by the respite assessment and the corresponding number of hours that were awarded for respite care.


The Medicaid Provider Manual explicitly states that recipients of B3 supports and services, the category of services for which Appellant is eligible, is not intended to meet every minute of need, in particular when parents of children without disabilities would be expected to be providing care:

Decisions regarding the authorization of a B3 service (including the amount, scope and duration) must take into account the PIHP's documented capacity to reasonably and equitably serve other Medicaid beneficiaries who also have needs for these services. The B3 supports and services are not intended to meet all the individual's needs and preferences, as some needs may be better met by community and other natural supports. Natural supports mean unpaid assistance provided to the beneficiary by people in his/her network (family, friends, neighbors, community volunteers) who are willing and able to provide such assistance. It is reasonable to expect that parents of minor children with disabilities will provide the same level of care they would provide to their children without disabilities. MDCH encourages the use of natural supports to assist in meeting an individual's needs to the extent that the family or friends who provide the natural supports are willing and able to provide this assistance. PIHPs may not require a beneficiary's natural support network to provide such assistance as a condition for receiving specialty mental health supports and services. The use of natural supports must be documented in the beneficiary's individual plan of service.

*MPM, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Section,
October 1, 2011, Page 105*

A review of the Medicaid Provider Manual supports the CMH position that B3 supports and services are not intended to meet all of an individual's needs and that it is reasonable to expect that Appellant's family would provide care for the period of time proposed by the CMH without use of Medicaid funding.

This administrative law judge must follow the CFR and the state Medicaid policy, and is without authority to grant respite hours not in accordance with the CFR and state policy. The CMH provided sufficient evidence that it adhered to the CFR and state policy in not authorizing respite other than to provide temporary relief for the Appellant's mother. Further, the administrative law judge is limited to making a decision based on the information the CMH had at the time it decided to authorize the Appellant's services at 42 hours of respite per month. The Appellant, who bears the burden of proving by a


Docket No. 2011-54165 CMH
Decision and Order


preponderance of evidence that there was medical necessity for the additional hours of respite requested, did not meet that burden.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the 42 respite hours per month approved for Appellant's mother are appropriate.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

The CMH decision is AFFIRMED.



William D. Bond
Administrative Law Judge
Michigan Administrative Hearing System
for Olga Dazzo, Director
Department of Community Health

cc:



Date Mailed: 10/31/2011

***** 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.