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) 373-4147

IN THE MATTER OF:

Docket No. 2014-30266 CMH
Case No.

Appellant
_____________________/

DECISION AND ORDER

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

After due notice, a hearing was held . , Appellant's guardian, appeared on Appellant's behalf. Appellant also appeared and testified. Appellant's witnesses were , Adult Services Worker, Department of Human Services (DHS), and , .

, Quality Assurance Coordinator, represented Community Mental Health (CMH or WMCMH). , Team Leader, Adult Case Management and , Case Manager, appeared as witnesses for the CMH.

ISSUE

Does Appellant meet the eligibility requirements for Medicaid Specialty Supports and Services through CMH as someone with a serious mental illness?

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 year-old Medicaid beneficiary, born , who has been receiving services through CMH. (Exhibit 1).

2. CMH is required to provide Medicaid covered services to Medicaid eligible clients it serves. (Testimony)

3. Appellant is diagnosed with substance use disorder. Appellant does not have a

current diagnosis of mental illness. (Exhibit A, p 1; Testimony)

4. In a progress note dated [redacted], Appellant's assigned case manager indicated that because Appellant no longer has a diagnosis of serious mental illness, he no longer meets the criteria for services. Appellant's case manager discussed a discharge plan for Appellant with her supervisor. (Exhibit A, p 2; Testimony)

5. On [redacted], Appellant's case manager contacted Appellant's guardian to discuss Appellant's discharge from WMCMH services. Appellant's guardian was in agreement with the discharge. The discharge plan discussed included helping Appellant find a place to live, ensuring that he has a primary care physician, and linking and coordinating Appellant with substance abuse treatment. (Exhibit A, p 2; Testimony)

6. On [redacted], Appellant's case manager met face to face with Appellant to discuss his discharge. Appellant's case manager offered Appellant information regarding inpatient substance abuse treatment, but Appellant declined. (Exhibit A, p 2; Testimony)

7. In a discharge summary dated [redacted], Appellant's case manager indicated that she and Appellant's guardian had mutually agreed to discharge Appellant from WMCMH services and that Appellant was provided information on how to obtain substance abuse treatment. (Exhibit A, p 2; Testimony)

8. The Michigan Mental Health Code, Medicaid Provider Manual, and the MDCH/CMHSP Mental Health Supports and Services Contract specify that the CMH is responsible for treating the most severe forms of mental illness and that the Medicaid Health Plans are responsible for treating mild to moderate conditions.

9. On [redacted], CMH provided Appellant with a notice indicating that his case would be closed. The notice informed Appellant of his right to a fair hearing. (Testimony)

10. On [redacted], the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) received Appellant's request for an Administrative Hearing. (Exhibit 1)

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

> 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—

Under approval from the Center for Medicaid and Medicaid Services (CMS) the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) operates a section 1915(b) waiver called the Medicaid Managed Specialty Services and Support program waiver. CMH contracts with the MDCH to provide services under the Managed Specialty Service and Supports Waiver and other State Medicaid Plan covered services. CMH must offer, either directly or under contract, a comprehensive array of services, as specified in Section 206 of the Michigan Mental Health Code, Public Act 258 of 1974, amended, and those services/supports included as part of the contract between the Department and CMH.

The Department's *Medicaid Provider Manual, Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Beneficiary Eligibility, Section 1.6* makes the distinction between the CMH responsibility and the Medicaid Health Plan (MHP) responsibility for Medicaid specialized ambulatory

mental health benefits. The Medicaid Provider Manual provides:

> A Medicaid beneficiary with mental illness, serious emotional disturbance or developmental disability who is enrolled in a Medicaid Health Plan (MHP) is eligible for specialty mental health services and supports when his needs exceed the MHP benefits. (Refer to the Medicaid Health Plans Chapter of this manual for additional information.) Such need must be documented in the individual's clinical record.
>
> The following table has been developed to assist health plans and PIHPs in making coverage determination decisions related to outpatient care for MHP beneficiaries. Generally, as the beneficiary's psychiatric signs, symptoms and degree/extent of functional impairment increase in severity, complexity and/or duration, the more likely it becomes that the beneficiary will require specialized services and supports available through the PIHP/CMHSP. For all coverage determination decisions, it is presumed that the beneficiary has a diagnosable mental illness or emotional disorder as defined in the most recent Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association.

In general, MHPs are responsible for outpatient mental health in the following situations:	**In general, PIHPs/CMHSPs are responsible for outpatient mental health in the following situations:**
The beneficiary is experiencing or demonstrating mild or moderate psychiatric symptoms or signs of sufficient intensity to cause subjective distress or mildly disordered behavior, with minor or temporary functional limitations or impairments (self-care/daily living skills, social/interpersonal relations, educational/vocational role performance, etc.) and minimal clinical (self/other harm risk) instability. The beneficiary was formerly significantly or seriously mentally ill at some point in the past. Signs and symptoms of the former serious disorder have substantially moderated or remitted and prominent functional disabilities or impairments related to the condition have largely subsided (there has been no serious exacerbation of the condition within the last 12 months). The beneficiary currently needs ongoing routine	The beneficiary is currently or has recently been (within the last 12 months) seriously mentally ill or seriously emotionally disturbed as indicated by diagnosis, intensity of current signs and symptoms, and substantial impairment in ability to perform daily living activities (or for minors, substantial interference in achievement or maintenance of developmentally appropriate social, behavioral, cognitive, communicative or adaptive skills). The beneficiary does not have a current or recent (within the last 12 months) serious condition but was formerly seriously impaired in the past. Clinically significant residual symptoms and impairments exist and the beneficiary requires specialized services and supports to address residual symptomatology and/or functional impairments, promote recovery and/or

medication management without further specialized services and supports.	prevent relapse. The beneficiary has been treated by the MHP for mild/moderate symptomatology and temporary or limited functional impairments and has exhausted the 20-visit maximum for the calendar year. (Exhausting the 20-visit maximum is not necessary prior to referring complex cases to PIHP/CMHSP.) The MHP's mental health consultant and the PIHP/CMHSP medical director concur that additional treatment through the PIHP/CMHSP is medically necessary and can reasonably be expected to achieve the intended purpose (i.e., improvement in the beneficiary's condition) of the additional treatment.

Medicaid Provider Manual
Mental Health and Substance Abuse Section
October 1, 2013, p 3

“Serious mental illness” is defined in the Mental Health Code as follows:

> 330.1100d Definitions; S to W.
> Sec. 100d.
>
> * * * *
>
> (3) “Serious mental illness” means a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder affecting an adult that exists or has existed within the past year for a period of time sufficient to meet diagnostic criteria specified in the most recent diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders published by the American psychiatric association and approved by the department and that has resulted in functional impairment that substantially interferes with or limits 1 or more major life activities. Serious mental illness includes dementia with delusions, dementia with depressed mood, and dementia with behavioral disturbance but does not include any other dementia unless the dementia occurs in conjunction with another diagnosable serious mental illness. The following disorders also are included only if they occur in conjunction with another diagnosable serious mental illness:
>
> (a) A substance abuse disorder.
>
> (b) A developmental disorder.

(c) A "V" code in the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders.

* * * *

MCL 330.1100d(3)

Appellant's former case manager testified that when Appellant is intoxicated or under the influence of intoxicating drugs he has exhibited symptoms mimicking a mental illness. However, when Appellant is sober, those symptoms are not present in a severe and persistent manner. Appellant's former case manager testified that Appellant had been in a secure facility for over one year, with no access to alcohol, and after this period of sobriety, an assessment showed that Appellant did not have a severe and persistent mental illness. Appellant's former case manager indicated that while Appellant's sustained use of intoxicating substances has resulted in many difficulties for Appellant, Appellant does not have a diagnosis of mental illness. Appellant's former case manager indicated that Appellant's condition would best be treated through substance abuse treatment providers and that it appears that Appellant maintains his best quality of life when he is in a structured setting receiving substance use treatment combined with support group involvement, such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA). Appellant's former case manager also testified that Appellant's Medicaid insurance makes him potentially eligible for substance abuse services and the CMH has provided Appellant and his guardian with information on these services.

Appellant's guardian testified that Appellant has refused to go to substance abuse treatment since his discharge from services at CMH and he has not been doing very well since that time. Appellant's guardian indicated that Appellant has difficulty managing his own affairs and needs the supports and counseling he had been receiving through CMH. Appellant's guardian testified that Appellant has been receiving services through CMH for many years and he needs those services to continue.

Appellant's Adult Services Worker (ASW) through the Department of Human Services (DHS) testified that she has worked with Appellant over the years trying to find him placement in the community and that without CMH's support, it is nearly impossible to place him. Appellant's ASW indicated that it was CMH who petitioned for Appellant to get a guardian appointed back in [redacted], so it is difficult to understand how CMH can now say he does not need their services. Appellant's ASW testified that regardless of Appellant's alcohol use he is still anxious and paranoid and will end up in jail or homeless without CMH's assistance. Appellant's ASW testified that since Appellant was discharged from CMH services he has failed in two home placements and is now temporarily staying with relatives, who cannot really have him in the home because they have young children. Appellant's ASW also indicated that during Appellant's most recent placement, a doctor diagnosed him with personality disorder and generalized anxiety disorder.

In response, CMH's Team Leader testified that when CMH petitioned the court to appoint a guardian for Appellant back in [redacted], it was unclear what his primary problem was, so the

petition indicated both substance abuse and mental illness. CMH's Team Leader testified, however, that since Appellant's forced sobriety for a period of more than one year, it became clear that he did not have a severe and persistent mental illness. CMH's Team Leader also pointed out that CMH does not serve all Medicaid recipients; CMH only treats Medicaid recipients with serious mental illnesses.

In this case, the CMH applied the proper eligibility criteria to determine whether Appellant was eligible for Medicaid covered mental health services and properly determined he is not because he is not a person with a serious mental illness. As indicated above, the Medicaid Provider Manual provides that the CMH is responsible for treating the most severe forms of mental illness. Here, when Appellant is intoxicated or under the influence of intoxicating drugs he has exhibited symptoms mimicking a mental illness, but those symptoms are not present in a severe and persistent manner when Appellant is sober. Accordingly, Appellant does not meet the eligibility criteria for Medicaid Specialty Supports and Services through CMH.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that:

The CMH properly determined that the Appellant does not meet the eligibility requirements for Medicaid Specialty Supports and Services through CMH.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

The Department's decision is AFFIRMED.



Robert J. Meade
Administrative Law Judge
for James K. Haveman, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

cc:

RJM/skb

Date Signed: April 3, 2014

Date Mailed: April 3, 2014

***** NOTICE *****

The Michigan Administrative Hearing System for the Department of Community Health 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.