

STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
P. O. Box 30763, Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-2484; Fax (517) 373-4147

IN THE MATTER OF:

Docket No. 14-012695 CMH

██████████

██████████

██████████

Appellant

_____ /

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge, pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 42 CFR 431.200 *et seq.*, and upon a request for a hearing filed on behalf of the minor Appellant.

After due notice, a hearing was held on ██████████. The hearing was held by the undersigned Administrative Law Judge in-person.

██████████, an attorney with ██████████, represented Appellant. ██████████ Appellant's father; ██████████ Appellant's representative payee with ██████████ Appellant's supports coordinator at ██████████ and ██████████ a behaviorist with ██████████; testified as witnesses for Appellant. ██████████, a supervisor at ██████████, and ██████████, an adult advocate with ██████████, were also present on Appellant's behalf, but did not testify,

██████████, Assistant Corporation Counsel, represented Respondent ██████████ Community Mental Health (CMH). ██████████ a Supervisor at the CMH's ██████████ and ██████████, an outside consultant, testified as witnesses for the CMH. ██████████, Director of the CMH's ██████████, was also present on Respondent's behalf, but did not testify.

ISSUE

Did the CMH properly deny Appellant's request for ██████ hours per week of Community Living Supports (CLS) and, instead, only authorize ██████ hours per week of such services?

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 CMH is under contract with the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) to provide Medicaid covered services to beneficiaries who reside in its service area.

██████████
Docket No. 14-012695 CMH
Decision and Order

2. Appellant is a ██████ year-old Medicaid beneficiary who has been diagnosed with Autistic Disorder and lives with his parents and sister. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 12, 20, 31, 36).
3. Appellant has been receiving services through the CMH, including supports coordination, CLS, respite care services, occupational therapy (OT), psychiatric services, and speech and language therapy (SLT). (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 19; Testimony of ██████████).
4. Appellant also attends school full-time, and he receives limited SLT and OT at school. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 19; Testimony of ██████████).
5. On ██████████, the CMH conducted an annual assessment of Appellant's needs and services. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 12-34).
6. During that assessment, it was noted that, while Appellant has made some progress in the past year, he continued to experience substantial functional limitations in self-care; expressive and receptive language; self-direction; and in age-appropriate daily tasks such as eating, dressing, toileting, grooming, bathing, neighborhood mobility, and meal preparation. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 19-21).
7. It was also noted during the assessment Appellant will engage in property damage, self-harmful behaviors, socially inappropriate behaviors, physically aggressive behaviors, temper tantrums, distractive behaviors, and pica behaviors. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 20-21, 29).
8. Additionally, Appellant will wander while out in the community and is limited in his safety abilities, such as stranger danger. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 20-21).
9. On ██████████, ██████████, a person-centered planning (PCP) meeting was held with respect to Appellant's services for the upcoming year. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 36-54).
10. During that meeting, it was noted that Appellant had improved during the past year in his activities of daily living; his fine and gross motor skills; sensitivity to touch; communication skills; challenging behaviors; and tolerance to change. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 49).
11. Despite that improvement, it was also noted that Appellant continues to have substantial functional limitations in a number of areas and it was recommended that he continue receiving services through the CMH. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 49-53).

██████████
Docket No. 14-012695 CMH
Decision and Order

12. With respect to Appellant's CLS specifically, Appellant's family requested █████ hours per week to assist him with hygiene and safety; meal preparation; creative and learning activities; everyday tasks such as grooming and dressing; implementing his behavioral treatment plan; implementing his OT and SLT exercises; community activities; independence with community integration; training in skills necessary to complete his schoolwork and homework; supervision with safety; and toileting. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 39-40).
13. However, in reviewing Appellant's request, the CMH determined that Appellant should only be authorized for █████ hours per week of CLS. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 8; Testimony of █████)
14. On █████, the CMH sent Appellant written notice that the request for CLS was partially denied. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 7).
15. Regarding the reason for the partial denial, the notice stated:

CLS services are intended to improve the consumer's independence and community integration based on age appropriate goals and expectations and 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.

Respondent's Exhibit A, page 7

16. Appellant's family filed a local appeal with respect to the CMH's decision and a hearing was held on █████. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 56).
17. On █████, the local dispute hearing officer issued a decision upholding the authorization of █████ hours per week of CLS. (Respondent's Exhibit A, pages 56-58).
18. On █████, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) received the request for hearing filed in this case. (Respondent's Exhibit A, page 10).

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

Additionally, 42 CFR 430.10 states:

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 also 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 USC 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.

Among the services that can be provided pursuant to that waiver are CLS and, with respect to that service, the applicable version of the Medicaid Provider Manual (MPM) states:

17.3.B. COMMUNITY LIVING SUPPORTS [CHANGE MADE 7/1/14]

NOTE: This service is a State Plan EPSDT service when delivered to children birth-21 years. **(text added 7/1/14)**

Community Living Supports are used to increase or maintain personal self-sufficiency, facilitating an individual's achievement of his goals of community inclusion and participation, independence or productivity. The supports may be provided in the participant's residence or in community settings (including, but not limited to, libraries, city pools, camps, etc.).

Coverage includes:

- Assisting (that exceeds state plan for adults), prompting, reminding, cueing, observing, guiding and/or training in the following activities:
 - meal preparation
 - laundry
 - routine, seasonal, and heavy household care and maintenance
 - activities of daily living (e.g., bathing, eating, dressing, personal hygiene)
 - shopping for food and other necessities of daily living

CLS services may not supplant services otherwise available to the beneficiary through a local educational agency under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or state plan

services, e.g., Personal Care (assistance with ADLs in a certified specialized residential setting) and Home Help or Expanded Home Help (assistance in the individual's own, unlicensed home with meal preparation, laundry, routine household care and maintenance, activities of daily living and shopping). If such assistance appears to be needed, the beneficiary must request Home Help and, if necessary, Expanded Home Help from the Department of Human Services (DHS). CLS may be used for those activities while the beneficiary awaits determination by DHS of the amount, scope and duration of Home Help or Expanded Home Help. If the beneficiary requests it, the PIHP case manager or supports coordinator must assist him/her in requesting Home Help or in filling out and sending a request for Fair Hearing when the beneficiary believes that the DHS authorization of amount, scope and duration of Home Help does not appear to reflect the beneficiary's needs based on the findings of the DHS assessment.

- Staff assistance, support and/or training with activities such as:
 - money management
 - non-medical care (not requiring nurse or physician intervention)
 - socialization and relationship building
 - transportation from the beneficiary's residence to community activities, among community activities, and from the community activities back to the beneficiary's residence (transportation to and from medical appointments is excluded)
 - participation in regular community activities and recreation opportunities (e.g., attending

classes, movies, concerts and events in a park; volunteering; voting)

- attendance at medical appointments
- acquiring or procuring goods, other than those listed under shopping, and non-medical services
- Reminding, observing and/or monitoring of medication administration
- Staff assistance with preserving the health and safety of the individual in order that he/she may reside or be supported in the most integrated, independent community setting.

CLS may be provided in a licensed specialized residential setting as a complement to, and in conjunction with, state plan coverage Personal Care in Specialized Residential Settings. Transportation to medical appointments is covered by Medicaid through DHS or the Medicaid Health Plan. Payment for CLS services may not be made, directly or indirectly, to responsible relatives (i.e., spouses, or parents of minor children), or guardian of the beneficiary receiving community living supports.

CLS assistance with meal preparation, laundry, routine household care and maintenance, activities of daily living and/or shopping may be used to complement Home Help or Expanded Home Help services when the individual's needs for this assistance have been officially determined to exceed the DHS's allowable parameters. CLS may also be used for those activities while the beneficiary awaits the decision from a Fair Hearing of the appeal of a DHS decision. Reminding, observing, guiding, and/or training of these activities are CLS coverages that do not supplant Home Help or Expanded Home Help.

Community Living Supports (CLS) provides support to a beneficiary younger than 18, and the family in the care of their child, while facilitating the child's independence and integration into the community. This service provides skill development related to activities of daily living, such as bathing, eating, dressing, personal hygiene, household chores and safety skills; and skill development to achieve or

maintain mobility, sensory-motor, communication, socialization and relationship-building skills, and participation in leisure and community activities. These supports must be provided directly to, or on behalf of, the child. These supports may serve to reinforce skills or lessons taught in school, therapy, or other settings. For children and adults up to age 26 who are enrolled in school, CLS services are not intended to supplant services provided in school or other settings or to be provided during the times when the child or adult would typically be in school but for the parent's choice to home-school.

MPM, July 1, 2014 version
Mental Health/Substance Abuse Chapter, pages 120-121

However, while CLS is a covered service, Medicaid beneficiaries are still only entitled to medically necessary Medicaid covered services and the Specialty Services and Support program waiver did not affect the federal Medicaid regulation that requires that authorized services be medically necessary. See 42 CFR 440.230.

Regarding medical necessity, the applicable version of the MPM states:

2.5 MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA

The following medical necessity criteria apply to Medicaid mental health, developmental disabilities, and substance abuse supports and services.

2.5.A. MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA

Mental health, developmental disabilities, and substance abuse services are supports, services, and treatment:

- Necessary for screening and assessing the presence of a mental illness, developmental disability or substance use disorder; and/or
- Required to identify and evaluate a mental illness, developmental disability or substance use disorder; and/or
- Intended to treat, ameliorate, diminish or stabilize the symptoms of mental illness, developmental disability or substance use disorder; and/or

- Expected to arrest or delay the progression of a mental illness, developmental disability, or substance use disorder; and/or
- Designed to assist the beneficiary to attain or maintain a sufficient level of functioning in order to achieve his goals of community inclusion and participation, independence, recovery, or productivity.

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;
- Based on clinical information from the beneficiary's primary care physician or health care professionals with relevant qualifications who have evaluated the beneficiary;
- For beneficiaries with mental illness or developmental disabilities, based on person-centered planning, and for beneficiaries with substance use disorders, individualized treatment planning;
- Made by appropriately trained mental health, developmental disabilities, or substance abuse professionals with sufficient clinical experience;
- Made within federal and state standards for timeliness;

- Sufficient in amount, scope and duration of the service(s) to reasonably achieve its/their purpose; and
- Documented in the individual plan of service.

2.5.C. SUPPORTS, SERVICES AND TREATMENT AUTHORIZED BY THE PIHP

Supports, services, and treatment authorized by the PIHP must be:

- Delivered in accordance with federal and state standards for timeliness in a location that is accessible to the beneficiary;
- Responsive to particular needs of multi-cultural populations and furnished in a culturally relevant manner;
- Responsive to the particular needs of beneficiaries with sensory or mobility impairments and provided with the necessary accommodations;
- Provided in the least restrictive, most integrated setting. Inpatient, licensed residential or other segregated settings shall be used only when less restrictive levels of treatment, service or support have been, for that beneficiary, unsuccessful or cannot be safely provided; and
- Delivered consistent with, where they exist, available research findings, health care practice guidelines, best practices and standards of practice issued by professionally recognized organizations or government agencies.

2.5.D. PIHP DECISIONS

Using criteria for medical necessity, a PIHP may:

- Deny services:
 - that are deemed ineffective for a given condition based upon professionally and scientifically recognized and accepted standards of care;
 - that are experimental or investigational in nature; or
 - for which there exists another appropriate, efficacious, less-restrictive and cost-effective service, setting or support that otherwise satisfies the standards for medically-necessary services; and/or
- Employ various methods to determine amount, scope and duration of services, including prior authorization for certain services, concurrent utilization reviews, centralized assessment and referral, gate-keeping arrangements, protocols, and guidelines.

A PIHP may not deny services based **solely** on preset limits of the cost, amount, scope, and duration of services. Instead, determination of the need for services shall be conducted on an individualized basis.

*MPM, July 1, 2014 version
Mental Health/Substance Abuse Chapter, pages 12-14*

Moreover, in addition to medical necessity, the MPM also identifies other criteria for B3 supports and services such as CLS:

SECTION 17 – ADDITIONAL MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES (B3s) [CHANGE MADE 7/1/14]

PIHPs must make certain Medicaid-funded mental health supports and services available, in addition to the Medicaid State Plan Specialty Supports and Services or Habilitation Waiver Services, through the authority of 1915(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (hereafter referred to as B3s). The intent of B3 supports and services is to fund medically necessary supports and services that promote community inclusion and participation, independence, and/or productivity when identified in the individual plan of service as one or more goals developed during person-centered planning. NOTE: Certain services found in this section are State Plan EPSDT services when delivered to children birth-21 years, which include community living supports, family support and training (Parent-to-Parent/Parent Support Partner) peer-delivered services, prevention/direct models of parent education and services for children of adults with mental illness, skill building, supports coordination, and supported employment. **(text added 7/1/14)**

17.1 DEFINITIONS OF GOALS THAT MEET THE INTENTS AND PURPOSE OF B3 SUPPORTS AND SERVICES

The goals (listed below) and their operational definitions will vary according to the individual's needs and desires. However, goals that are inconsistent with least restrictive environment (i.e., most integrated home, work, community that meet the individual's needs and desires) and individual choice and control cannot be supported by B3 supports and services unless there is documentation that health and safety would otherwise be jeopardized; or that such least restrictive arrangements or choice and control opportunities have been demonstrated to be unsuccessful for that individual. Care should be taken to insure that these goals are those of the individual first, not those of a parent, guardian, provider, therapist, or case manager, no matter how well intentioned. The services in the plan, whether B3 supports and services alone, or in combination with state plan or Habilitation Supports Waiver services, must reasonably be expected to achieve the goals and intended

outcomes identified. The configuration of supports and services should assist the individual to attain outcomes that are typical in his community; and without such services and supports, would be impossible to attain.

* * *

17.2 CRITERIA FOR AUTHORIZING B3 SUPPORTS AND SERVICES

The authorization and use of Medicaid funds for any of the B3 supports and services, as well as their amount, scope and duration, are dependent upon:

- The Medicaid beneficiary's eligibility for specialty services and supports as defined in this Chapter; and
- The service(s) having been identified during person-centered planning; and
- The service(s) being medically necessary as defined in the Medical Necessity Criteria subsection of this chapter; and
- The service(s) being expected to achieve one or more of the above-listed goals as identified in the beneficiary's plan of service; and
- Additional criteria indicated in certain B3 service definitions, as applicable.

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.

Provider qualifications and service locations that are not otherwise identified in this section must meet the requirements identified in the General Information and Program Requirement sections of this chapter.

*MPM, July 1, 2014 version
Mental Health/Substance Abuse Chapter, pages 117-118*

Here, it is undisputed that Appellant requires some CLS and it is only the amount of hours to be authorized that is at issue, with Appellant requesting █ hours per week of CLS and the CMH only authorizing █ hours per week of such services.

According to the CMH's witnesses, it determined that █ hours per week was sufficient to meet the goals and objectives related to Appellant's CLS in his person-centered plan. In particular, they relied on the policy stating that 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 and its own determination that Appellant's two parents are appropriate natural supports to meet Appellant's needs in some areas. █ also noted in her testimony that a review of the service logs completed by Appellant's CLS workers revealed that the workers spend a significant amount of time assisting Appellant with school activities and that the workers do not assist Appellant in implementing his OT exercises, SLT exercises or behavioral plan, despite those objectives also being in Appellant's person-centered plan.

In response, Appellant's witnesses testified that Appellant continues to lack age-appropriate skills and that he is substantially limited as compared to children his own age. Appellant's father also testified that Appellant benefits from the CLS services and that, with the █ hours per week that Appellant was receiving, there was some improvement and that Appellant continues to need the same level of assistance in order to keep improving. Appellant's father further testified that he and Appellant's mother assist Appellant as much as they can, but that they still need significant assistance in order to help Appellant keep improving, especially given that Appellant's mother works full-time, the father has some health issues, and they have a daughter to care for as

██████████
Docket No. 14-012695 CMH
Decision and Order

well. Appellant's father and supports coordinator also testified that neither they nor the CLS workers have received any training on how the CLS workers are to complete their service logs.

Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the CMH erred in denying the request for additional CLS. Taking into account the relevant policies and evidence, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge finds that Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this case and the CMH's decision regarding the partial denial of CLS must therefore be affirmed.

Per the above policy, CLS may be authorized to minors in support of facilitating the child's independence and integration into the community. However, the policy also provides that the CLS must be medically necessary and that 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.

In this case, Appellant has been authorized for a significant amount of services, including █ hours of CLS per week, █ hours of respite care services per week, SLT, and OT; and, while the additional CLS hours sought by Appellant would likely be beneficial, it is not clear that those additional hours are medically necessary.

As noted by the CMH, Appellant is a minor and the above policy specifically provides that 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. Here, Appellant has two parents in the home and, while Appellant requires much more care than a typical █ year-old and his parents also face common issues relating to work and caring for their other child, they should be able to provide him with the expected level of care and significant natural supports.

Appellant also attends school full-time and usually sleeps through the night, which further limits the time needed for his parents or CLS workers to provide any necessary support.

Additionally, while Appellant generally disputes the partial denial and his witnesses, particularly his father, claim that he needs more time, Appellant's witnesses did not identify any specific need or activity that Appellant would need more time for and such a broad request for more time suggests general child care concerns or a preference for trained staff rather than any specific need for CLS.

Taking into account the applicable policies; the minor Appellant's natural supports; the lack of any identified specific need for more hours; and the significant services Appellant already receives; this Administrative Law Judge finds that Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof with respect to the denial of additional CLS. Accordingly, the decision to only authorize █ hours a week of CLS is affirmed.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the CMH properly denied Appellant's request for █████ hours per week of CLS and instead authorized █████ hours per week of such services.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

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

Steven Kibit

Steven J. Kibit
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

Date Signed: ████████████████████

Date Mailed: ████████████████████

SK/db

cc: ████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████

***** 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.