

**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:

██████████,

Appellant

Docket No. 2012-4502 CMH
Case No. 69293326

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), pursuant to M.C.L. § 400.9 and 42 C.F.R. § 431.200 *et seq.*, upon the Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on ██████████. ██████████, Appellant's mother, appeared and testified on behalf of Appellant. ██████████, Manager of Due Process, appeared on behalf of the ██████████ County Community Mental Health (CMH). ██████████, Care Coordinator in the Utilization Management Department, appeared as a witness for the CMH.

ISSUE

Did the CMH properly deny Appellant's request for 65 hours of respite care services per month and instead authorize 40 (later 41) hours of such services per month?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Appellant is a 24 year-old female who has been diagnosed with a mental impairment and cerebral palsy. (Testimony of ██████████). Appellant is also non-verbal. (Testimony of ██████████).
2. The 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. Appellant had been receiving 65 hours of respite care services per month through the CMH. (Testimony of ██████████).
4. On ██████████, the CMH conducted another Respite Assessment.

Docket No. 2012-4502 CMH
Decision and Order

(Exhibit 1, pages 1-4). Appellant's mother again requested 65 hours of respite care per month. (Exhibit 1, page 2).

5. Based on the assessment and the scoring tool used by the CMH, the CMH found that 41 hours of respite care per month were medically necessary. (Testimony of [REDACTED]).
6. On [REDACTED], the CMH sent notice to Appellant notifying her that the request for 65 hours per month of respite was denied, but that 40 hours of respite per month were approved effective [REDACTED]. (Exhibit 1, pages 5-7).
7. The Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) received a complete Request for Hearing by Appellant on [REDACTED]. (Exhibit 2, page 1).
8. Subsequently, the error in the authorization of Appellant's respite hours was discovered and the CMH changed Appellant's respite hours to 41 hours of respite care services per month. (Testimony of [REDACTED]).
9. During the hearing, the CMH's representative stated that, based on new testimony presented that day, the CMH would increase Appellant's respite hours to 44 hours per month, effective the day of the hearing. (Testimony of Kleinedler).

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 C.F.R. § 430.0)

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 C.F.R. § 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...

(42 U.S.C. § 1396n(b))

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.

The Medicaid Provider Manual (MPM), Mental Health/Substance Abuse Section, articulates the relevant policy and, with respect to respite care services, it states:

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)

However, Medicaid beneficiaries are only entitled to medically necessary Medicaid covered services and the Specialty Services and Support program waiver did not waive the federal Medicaid regulation that requires that authorized services be medically necessary. See 42 C.F.R. § 440.230. The MPM also describes the criteria the CMH must apply before Medicaid can pay for outpatient mental health benefits:

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.

(MPM, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Section,
October 1, 2011, page 13)

██████████
Docket No. 2012-4502 CMH
Decision and Order

In addition to requiring medical necessity, the MPM also states that B3 supports and services, such as respite care services, are 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)

Here, CMH witness ██████████, Care Coordinator for the Utilization Management Section of the CMH, testified regarding the assessment and allocation of respite hours in this case. ██████████ testified that MDCH does not provide a screening tool for respite care, so the CMH has developed its own tool that is only used in ██████████ County. According to ██████████, staff from Child and Family Services meets with the parent(s) and fills out the respite assessment form. However, in conducting the respite assessment, the staff that complete the respite assessments are not given the scoring tool so they cannot manipulate the answers on the assessment or affect the number of respite hours to be approved. Those clinicians are simply charged with obtaining accurate information from the client when filling out the respite assessment. Subsequently, Utilization Management receives a request for authorization, along with the respite assessment, and Utilization Management Coordinators apply a scoring tool and assign respite hours based on the respite assessment.

██████████
Docket No. 2012-4502 CMH
Decision and Order

██████████ further testified that the scoring tool was changed in the past year in part because the CMH was an outlier in awarding respite hours and the old scoring tool was deemed too subjective. For example, the starting point of 20 hours of respite care per month under the prior scoring tool has been eliminated. Another change was to clarify the behavioral section in order to remove the subjectivity from the scoring and achieved more accurate and uniform scoring within their department. ██████████ also testified that, in her professional opinion, the scoring tool now being used by the CMH accurately reflects the client's needs for respite services.

With respect to Appellant's score, ██████████ testified that, according to the scoring tool, Appellant was awarded 2 respite hours per month because her father's health problems interfere with her care and 4 respite hours because there is an average of 3 or more interventions per night. ██████████ also testified that, per the scoring tool, Appellant was awarded 1 respite hour per month because she has weekly temper tantrums, and 1 respite hour because she wanders weekly.

██████████ further testified Appellant was awarded 2 respite hours per month because Appellant requires shadowing or has an unsteady gait with respect to mobility, 4 respite hours because she requires total physical assistance with self care-oral care, 2 respite hours because Appellant is independent after set up with respect to self care-eating, 3 respite hours because Appellant requires assistance with self care-bathing, 3 respite hours because Appellant requires some assistance with self care-toileting, and 4 respite hours because Appellant requires total assistance with self care-dressing.

██████████ also testified that, Appellant was awarded 3 respite hours per month because of her dietary needs, 4 respite hours because she requires total physical assistance with grooming, 3 respite hours because she is over the age of 18 and still requires medication administration, 2 respite hours because she is limited to non-verbal communication, and 3 respite hours because she requires extensive prompting and encouragement in the area of participation.

According to ██████████, if anything in the "other clinical needs" section justifies additional respite hours, then the scorer could contact the scorer's supervisor and have additional hours awarded. The scoring tool allows for 13 such discretionary hours. No such hours were awarded in this case.

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

Appellant's mother testified that Appellant is a wonderful girl, but that her psychological and physical problems have recently increased following a sexual assault she suffered at school. For instance, it now takes two people to medicate Appellant. According to

██████████
Docket No. 2012-4502 CMH
Decision and Order

Appellant's mother, it is also more difficult to care for Appellant while the lawsuit that they brought as a result of the sexual assault is pending.

With respect to Appellant's behavior, her mother testified that Appellant will get mad and physically abuse others, including Appellant's mother, on occasion. (Testimony of ██████████). Appellant's mother also testified that she did not bring up or discuss such abuse during the assessment. (Testimony of ██████████).

With respect to eating, Appellant's mother testified that Appellant lost some teeth, started having sores and suffered pain in her mouth following the sexual assault. (Testimony of ██████████). Appellant's mother also testified that she assists Appellant in eating when she needs a fork or spoon, and that such meals take place 2 to 3 times a week. (Testimony of ██████████). Appellant's mother further testified that she assists Appellant when she eats the treats she receives once a week. (Testimony of ██████████). However, Appellant's mother also agrees that, during the assessment, she said that Appellant is independent after set up with respect to self care-eating and did not identify any further needs. (Testimony of ██████████).

In response to some of Appellant's mother's testimony, which it characterized as new, the CMH decided to grant Appellant an additional 3 hours of respite care, effective immediately. (Testimony of ██████████). One additional hour was added to due to Appellant's need for assistance with eating while 2 additional hours were added because of Appellant's physical abuse toward others. (Testimony of ██████████). The CMH declined to award any further additional hours and, in total, Appellant will now receive 44 hours of respite services per month.

Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that there was medical necessity for the additional hours of respite requested. Here, Appellant did not meet that burden of proof. The CMH adequately explained what led to a decrease in Appellant's respite hours and how it calculated the number of respite hours that are medically necessary. It also provided evidence that it adhered to the relevant regulations and state policy by not authorizing respite other than to provide temporary relief for Appellant's parents. Appellant's representatives argues that Appellant's needs have only worsened, but this Administrative Law Judge must follow the Code of Federal Regulations and the state Medicaid policy, and is without authority to grant respite hours not in accordance with those regulations and policies.

Applying the relevant policy and facts in this case, the CMH's earlier decision to deny the request for 65 hours of respite care services per month and only authorize of 41 hours of respite care services per month must be sustained as it is reflective of the need for assistance and provides Appellant's caregivers with significant, temporary relief. The CMH indicated it will now increase Appellant's respite hours to 44 hours per month based on new information presented during the hearing, but this Administrative Law Judge is limited to reviewing the CMH's decision in light of the information available at the time and, based on that information, the CMH's decision must be affirmed.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the number of hours of respite care per month approved for Appellant is proper based on the information available at the time.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

The CMH decision is AFFIRMED.

Steven J. Kibit
Administrative Law Judge
for Olga Dazzo, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:



Date Mailed: 1/26/2012

***** NOTICE *****

The Michigan Administrative Hearing System 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 Michigan Administrative Hearing System 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.