

STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

REQUEST: March 5, 2019

AGENCY: MAP
FH #: 7921217Y

In the Matter of the Appeal of	:
	: DECISION
	AFTER
	: FAIR
	HEARING
from a determination by the New York City	:
Department of Social Services	:

JURISDICTION

Pursuant to Section 22 of the New York State Social Services Law (hereinafter Social Services Law) and Part 358 of Title 18 NYCRR, (hereinafter Regulations), a fair hearing was held on April 9, 2019, in New York City, before an Administrative Law Judge. The following persons appeared at the hearing:

For the Appellant



For the Managed Long-Term Care plan

Deborah Ferguson, Fair Hearing Specialist and Fair Hearing Representative

ISSUE

Was the determination by the Managed Long-Term Care plan, Centers Plan for Healthy Living, to deny the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the amount Personal Care Services hours from fifty-two and one-half (52.5) hours per week (7.5 hours per day x 7 days) to twenty-four (24) hour daily care correct with regard to the adequacy of Personal Care Services?

FINDINGS OF FACT

An opportunity to be heard having been afforded to all interested parties and evidence having been taken and due deliberation having been had, it is hereby found that:

1. The Appellant, age eighty-two, has been in receipt of a Medical Assistance authorization, Medicaid benefits, and has been enrolled in a Medicaid Managed Long Term Care plan with Centers Plan for Healthy Living.

2. The Appellant resides with her daughter, age forty (40).
3. The Appellant has been in receipt of an authorization of Personal Care Services in the amount of fifty-two and one-half (52.5) hours per week (7.5 hours x 7 days).
4. On May 2, 2018, a registered nurse assessor completed a Uniform Assessment System- New York Assessment Report of the Appellant's personal care needs based upon an in-person evaluation of the Appellant by a registered nurse assessor on said date.
5. On May 2, 2018, the registered nurse assessor completed a Client Task Sheet which recommends weekly Personal Care Services in the amount of 52.5 hours.
6. The Appellant's family requested that the Plan authorize an increase in the Appellant's Personal Care Services to eighty-four (84) hours per week (12 hours per day x 7 days).
7. On October 24, 2018, a registered nurse assessor completed a Client Task Sheet which recommends weekly Personal Care Services in the amount of 49.00 hours.
8. On October 26, 2018, the Plan completed a Uniform Assessment System- New York Assessment Report of the Appellant's personal care needs based upon an in-person evaluation of the Appellant by a registered nurse assessor on October 24, 2018.
9. The October 26, 2018, nurse's assessment found that the Appellant requires the following level of assistance with the following tasks of daily living: total dependence with meal preparation, ordinary housework, managing finances and shopping; maximal assistance with managing medications, stairs, transportation, bathing, dressing upper and lower body, walking, locomotion and toilet transfers; extensive assistance with toilet use; limited assistance with bed mobility and eating.
10. The October 26, 2018, nurse's assessment reported that there has been no change in the Appellant's status in the 90-day period preceding the visit with regard to the Appellant's abilities in carrying out her activities of daily living and that there has been no change in the Appellant's overall self-sufficiency.
11. The Appellant has been diagnosed with the following medical conditions: age related cognitive decline, allergy to certain foods, brain aneurysm, localization related to epilepsy with complex partial seizures, central vertigo, cerebral infarction due to thrombosis of carotid artery, constipation, deformative arthritis, dizziness and giddiness, essential (primary) hypertension, full incontinence of feces, gastro-esophageal reflux disease without esophagitis, hemiplegia and hemiparesis following other nontraumatic intracranial hemorrhage affecting left non-dominant side, history of falling, insomnia, fatigue, pain, transient cerebral ischemic attack, abnormalities of gait and mobility, age-related cataract urinary incontinence, vascular dementia, and weakness.

12. By written notice of Initial Adverse Determination which is dated November 26, 2018, the Plan determined to deny the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the Appellant's Personal Care Services to eighty-four (84) hours per week (12 hours per day x 7 days) on the grounds that the requested increase in Personal Care Services hours is not medically necessary.

13. The Plan's November 26, 2018, notice provides the following particulars regarding the reason for the Plan's denial of the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the Appellant's Personal Care Services:

"You ambulate with a seated rollator or cane.

Your daughter pre-pours your medications and provides you with reminders to take them.

You can activate an emergency plan.

You use incontinence supplies (diapers, panty liners, and gloves).

You are able to feed yourself once your meals are prepared by your Personal Care Aide.

You can transfer on and off the toilet and take care of your toileting needs with some assistance.

You require supervision and safety as a standalone service.

14. The Appellant requested an internal appeal.

15. By written notice of Final Adverse Determination Denial Notice which is dated January 28, 2019, the Plan advised that the Plan was upholding the Plan's November 26, 2018 determination to deny the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the Appellant's authorization of Personal Care Services.

16. The Plan's January 28, 2019, notice provides the following particulars regarding the reason for the Plan's continued denial of the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the Appellant's Personal Care Services:

"You recently underwent a follow-up face-to-face clinical assessment on October 24, 2018, utilizing the New York State Department of Health's Uniform Assessment System Tool that showed some of your abilities to perform physical functioning stayed and some improved since your prior assessment that was completed by Centers Plan for Health Living on May 2, 2018.

Your abilities to perform physical functioning stayed the same for dressing lower body, walking, bathing, transfer toilet (getting on and off the toilet), meal preparation, medication management, and ordinary housework.

Your abilities to perform physical functioning improved for toilet use, eating, and bed mobility (moving around the bed).

In summary, some of your abilities to perform physical functioning stayed the same and some improved; therefore, your hours stay the same at 7.5 hours per day, 7 days a week, for a total of 52.5 hours per week.

17. On March 5, 2019, a fair hearing request was made in this matter.

18. At the hearing, on March 25, 2019, the Appellant's representative amended the issue for Personal Care Services to one of adequacy with regard to a need for daily overnight services.

APPLICABLE LAW

Section 358-5.9 of the Regulations provides that, at a fair hearing concerning the denial of an application for or the adequacy of Medical Assistance benefits or Services, the Appellant must establish that the Agency's denial of assistance or benefits was not correct or that the Appellant is eligible for a greater amount of assistance or benefits.

The Department's Managed Care Personal Care Services (PCS) Guidelines dated May 2013 advise that requests for PCS must be reviewed for benefit coverage and medical necessity of the service in accordance with Public Health Law (PHL) Article 49, 18 NYCRR 505.14 (a), the Medicaid Managed Care (MMC) Model Contract and these guidelines. As such, denial or reduction in services must clearly set forth a clinical rationale that shows review of the enrollee's specific clinical data and medical condition; the basis on which request was not medically necessary or does not meet specific benefit coverage criteria; and be sufficient to enable judgment for possible appeal. If the determination results in a termination or reduction, the reason for denial must clearly state what circumstances or condition has changed to warrant reduction or termination of previously approved services.

The NYS Department of Health, Office of Health Insurance Programs, Guidelines for the Provision of Personal Care Services in Medicaid Managed Care (published May 31, 2013), Section III (Authorization and Notice Requirements for Personal Care Services) subsection d (Level and Hours of Service), requires that the authorization determination notice, whether adverse or not, must include the number of hours per day, the number of hours per week, and the personal care services function (Level I/Level II):

- i. that were previously authorized, if any;
- ii. that were requested by the Enrollee or his/her designee, if so specified in the request;
- iii. that are authorized for the new authorization period; and
- iv. the original authorization period and the new authorization period, as applicable.

By Dear Health Plan Administrator letter dated March 2, 2015, the Department advised of the implementation of model notices as of May 15, 2015, for use by Managed Long-Term Care (MLTC) Partial Cap and Medicaid Advantage Plus (MAP) plans, as follows:

Model MLTC Initial Adverse Determination Notice

This model notice was developed for all administrative and medical necessity Actions, except for Actions based on a restriction to benefits. The model contains gray placeholder fields for both static (unchanging) plan-specific information, such as the time allowed to file an appeal, and dynamic fields that change with each Action notice. It is important that plans create mechanisms to ensure the various dynamic placeholders are utilized correctly to match the Action being taken. The model only addresses content requirements, all other notice procedures and requirements such as determination timeframes, provider notice, translations, special needs formats, clinical peer/health professional review, etc., remain the same.

As a reminder, the clinical rationale MUST:

- State the enrollee and the nature of his/her medical condition;
- State the medical service, treatment or procedure in question;
- State the basis or bases on which the plan/utilization review agent determined that the service, treatment or procedure is or was not medically necessary, experimental/investigational, or not materially different from an alternate in-network service, which demonstrates that the plan/agent considered enrollee-specific clinical information in its determination.
- Be sufficiently specific to enable the enrollee and the enrollee's health care provider to make an informed judgment regarding 1) whether or not to appeal the adverse determination, and 2) the grounds for such an appeal; and
- Be written in easily understood language.

Managed Long-Term Care Action Taken – Denial, Reduction or Termination of Benefits (211) (LDSS-4687 02/15)

This model notice is designed to ensure enrollees are made aware of their due process rights and must be included with the Model MLTC Initial Adverse Determination Notice and all other Action notices, including those for restrictions to benefits. Considerable input from the advocate community was solicited to help clarify the language, *e.g.* regarding aid continuing rights for services that are stopped, reduced, or restricted. Plans must develop mechanisms to ensure the form is appropriately completed for the Action being taken.

Below is a list of certain new and noteworthy aspects of this model notice:

The “MLTC reference number” may be any number the plan utilizes to track actions, authorizations, or notices.

FH# 7921217Y

“will not be increased” checkbox is to be utilized when an enrollee asks for more of a service during an authorization period, but the increase is denied. This is particularly relevant for enrollees in receipt of CBLTCS or who are homebound.

“detailed explanation of change in medical condition or social circumstances.” This information MUST be included in the reason for denial if the Action determines to reduce or stop CBLTCS the enrollee has been receiving.

“ADD SPECIFIC BENEFIT CITATION AS APPLICABLE; for common actions and their corresponding citations, see the citation reference table” The regulatory citations have been updated and cover most medically necessary decisions. However, where there are specific regulations or statutes that govern the Medicaid managed care benefit, the plan must complete this section with additional appropriate citations. The Department will be providing a reference table of common citations that apply to MLTC, such as 18 NYCRR 505.14(a) for personal care services. However, it is the duty of each plan to research and include appropriate citations for every form it sends. Deadline “Date+60” This date must be calculated from the date of the notice, informing the enrollee of the last date by which they must request a fair hearing.

- Deadline “Date+60” This date must be calculated from the date of the notice, informing the enrollee of the last date by which they must request a fair hearing.

- Essential action information is repeated in the box on the Fair Hearing Request Form sheet. This sheet is separate to allow the enrollee to request a fair hearing by mail and still retain their original notice. The information is repeated to facilitate OTDA processing of the fair hearing request.

Part 438 of 42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) pertains to provision of Medicaid medical care, services and supplies through Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), Prepaid Inpatient Health Plans (PIHPs), Prepaid Ambulatory Health Plans (PAHPs) and Primary Care Case Managers (PCCMs), and the requirements for contracts for services so provided.

Section 438.210 of 42 CFR Subpart D provides, in pertinent part:

- (a) Coverage - Each contract with an MCO, PIHP, or PAHP must do the following:
 - (1) Identify, define, and specify the amount, duration, and scope of each service that the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP is required to offer.
 - (2) Require that the services identified in paragraph (a)(1) of this section be furnished in an amount, duration, and scope that is no less than the amount, duration, and scope for the same services furnished to beneficiaries under fee-for-service Medicaid, as set forth in Sec. 440.230.

18 NYCRR 505.14(a)(5) provides that:

Personal care services include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

(ii) Level II shall include the performance of nutritional and environmental support functions and personal care functions.

(a) Personal care functions include assistance with the following:

- (1) bathing of the patient in the bed, the tub or in the shower;
- (2) dressing;
- (3) grooming, including care of hair, shaving and ordinary care of nails, teeth and mouth;
- (4) toileting; this may include assisting the patient on and off the bedpan, commode or toilet;
- (5) walking, beyond that provided by durable medical equipment, within the home and outside the home;
- (6) transferring from bed to chair or wheelchair;
- (7) turning and positioning;
- (8) preparing meals in accordance with modified diets, including low sugar, low fat, low salt and low residue diets;
- (9) feeding;
- (10) administration of medication by the patient, including prompting the patient as to time, identifying the medication for the patient, bringing the medication and any necessary supplies or equipment to the patient, opening the container for the patient, positioning the patient for medication and administration, disposing of used supplies and materials and storing the medication properly;
- (11) providing routine skin care;
- (12) using medical supplies and equipment such as walkers and wheelchairs; and
- (13) changing of simple dressings.

When the district, in accordance with 505.14(a)(4), determined the patient is appropriate for

the Personal Care Services Program, a care plan must be developed that meets the patient's scheduled and unscheduled day and nighttime personal care needs. In determining the appropriate amount of hours to authorize, the district must review the physician's order and the nursing and social assessments to assure that the authorization and scheduling of hours in combination with any informal support contributions, efficiencies and specialized medical equipment, is sufficient to meet the patient's personal care needs.

The assessment process should also evaluate the availability of informal supports who may be willing and available to provide assistance with needed tasks and whether the patient's day or nighttime needs can totally or partially be met through the use of efficiencies and specialized medical equipment including, but not limited to, commode, urinal, walker, wheelchair, etc.

Social services districts should authorize assistance with recognized, medically necessary personal care services tasks. Social services districts are NOT required to allot time for safety monitoring as a separate task as part of the total personal care services hours authorized (see GIS 99 MA/013, GIS 99 MA/036). However, districts are reminded that a clear and legitimate distinction exists between "safety monitoring" as a non-required independent stand-alone function while no Level II personal care services task is being provided, and the appropriate monitoring of the patient while providing assistance with the performance of a Level II personal care services task, such as transferring, toileting, or walking, to assure the task is being safely completed.

Completing accurate and comprehensive assessments is essential to safe and adequate care plan development and appropriate service authorization. Adhering to Department assessments requirements will help assure patient quality of care and district compliance with the administration of the Personal Care Services Program.

General Information System message GIS 97 MA 033 notified local districts as follows:

The purpose of this GIS is to provide further instructions regarding the Mayer v. Wing court case, which applies to social services districts' reductions or discontinuations of personal care services. [Mayer v. Wing, 922 F. Supp. 902 (SDNY, 1996)]. The Mayer case is now final, and the Department is issuing these additional instructions to comply with the court's final order in this case.

Districts were first advised of the Mayer case in May 1996. (Please refer to GIS 96 MA/019, issued May 28, 1996.) As described in that GIS message, the Mayer case prohibits social services districts from using task-based assessment plans ("TBA plans") to reduce the hours of any personal care services recipient whom the district has determined needs 24-hour care, including continuous 24-hour services ("split-shift"), 24-hour live-in services ("live-in") or the equivalent provided by informal or formal supports. This GIS message identifies the policies and procedures districts must follow in order to comply with this particular provision of the Mayer case.

This particular provision of the Mayer case applies only when the district has first determined that the MA recipient is medically eligible for split-shift or live-in services. To determine whether the recipient is medically eligible for split-shift services or live-in services, the district must continue to follow existing Department regulations and policies. As is currently required, the district must assure that the nursing and social assessments fully document and support the determination that the recipient is, or is not, medically eligible for split-shift or live-in services.

When the district has determined that the MA recipient is medically eligible for split-shift or live-in services, it must next determine the availability of informal supports such as family members or friends and formal supports such as Protective Services for Adults, a certified home health agency or another agency or entity. This requirement is no different from current practice. And, as under current practice, the district must assure that the nursing and social assessments fully document and support its determination that the recipient does, or does not, have informal or formal supports that are willing and able to provide hours of care.

Remember that the contribution of family members or friends is voluntary and cannot be coerced or required in any manner whatsoever. A district may choose to implement so-called "statements of understanding" to reflect a family member's or friend's voluntary agreement to provide hours of care to a recipient whom the district has determined is medically eligible for split-shift or live-in services. (See 95 LCM-76, section III, issued July 18, 1995, for a description of statements of understanding.)

In addition to clarifying requirements for client notices under Mayer, the Department's regulations also reflect a Court ruling in Mayer regarding the use of task based assessments [18 NYCRR 505.14(b)(5)(v)(d)]. Specifically, social services districts are prohibited from using task-based assessments when authorizing or reauthorizing personal care services for any recipient whom the district has determined needs 24-hour care, including continuous 24-hour services (split-shift), 24-hour live-in services or the equivalent provided by a combination of formal and informal supports or caregivers. In addition, the district's determination whether the recipient needs such 24-hour personal care must be made without regard to the availability of formal or informal supports or caregivers to assist in the provision of such care. GIS 01 MA/044, issued on December 24, 2001.

Once the district has determined that the recipient is medically eligible for split-shift or live-in services and determined whether the recipient has informal or formal supports that are willing and able to provide hours of care, the district can assure that it is complying with the Mayer case by following the appropriate guidelines set forth below:

1. Recipient is medically eligible for split-shift services but has no informal or formal supports:

The district should authorize 24-hour split-shift services for this recipient if the recipient otherwise meets the fiscal assessment requirements. The district must not use a TBA plan to reduce this recipient's personal care services.

FH# 7921217Y

2. Recipient is medically eligible for split-shift services and has informal or formal supports:

The district should authorize services in an amount that is less than 24-hour split-shift services if the recipient otherwise meets the fiscal assessment requirements. The amount that is authorized, when combined with the amount that informal or formal supports are willing and able to provide, would equal 24 hours. The district must not use a TBA plan to reduce this recipient's services because the recipient is receiving the "equivalent" of split-shift services: part of the services are funded by the MA program and part of the services are provided by the informal or formal supports.

3. Recipient is medically eligible for live-in services but has no informal or formal supports:

The district should authorize 24-hour live-in services for this recipient if the recipient otherwise meets the fiscal assessment requirements. The district must not use a TBA plan to reduce this recipient's personal care services.

4. Recipient is medically eligible for live-in services and has formal or informal supports:

The district should authorize services in an amount that is less than 24-hour live-in services if the recipient otherwise meets the fiscal assessment requirements. The amount that is authorized, when combined with the amount that the informal or formal supports are willing and able to provide, would equal 24 hours. The district must not use a TBA plan to reduce this recipient's services because the recipient is receiving the "equivalent" of live-in services: part of the services are funded by the MA program and part of the services are provided by the informal or formal supports.

Important Additional Information on TBA Plans:

Until notified otherwise by the Department, the following also apply to the use of TBA plans:

1. A district cannot use a TBA plan unless the TBA plan was already in use on March 14, 1996, or the district had the Department's approval as of that date to implement a TBA plan. This complies with the temporary restraining order in Dowd v. Bane, which the Department notified districts of in a previous GIS message, 96 MA/013, issued April 4, 1996.

2. Districts are not required to include safety monitoring as an independent task on their task-based assessment (TBA) forms. The Department recently obtained a stay of the August 21, 1997, federal court order that had required safety monitoring to be included as an independent TBA task. [See GIS 97 MA/26, issued November 6, 1997, informing districts of the stay of the order in Rodriguez v. DeBuono (SDNY, 1997).]

Pursuant to GIS 03 MA/003, issued on January 24, 2003, task-based assessments must be

developed which meet the scheduled and unscheduled day and nighttime needs of recipients of personal care services. This GIS was promulgated to clarify and elaborate on the assessment of Personal Care Services pursuant to the Court's ruling in Rodriguez v. Novello and in accordance with existing Department regulations and policies.

Social services districts, including those using locally developed task-based assessment instruments, must complete a comprehensive assessment of the patient's health care needs in order to determine the patient's appropriateness for services and the amount, frequency and duration of a service authorization. Department regulations (18 NYCRR 505.14) require both a social and nursing assessment in the Personal Care Services patient assessment process.

The assessment process should evaluate and document when and to what degree the patient requires assistance with personal care services tasks and whether needed assistance with tasks can be scheduled or may occur at unpredictable times during the day or night.

In accordance with GIS 12 MA/026, published October 3, 2012, pursuant to the directives of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, in connection with the case of Strouchler v. Shah, the GIS directs that, when determining whether a person requires 24-hour split-shift care or live-in care, the local professional director must consider whether the physician's order and other required assessments document the following:

- The existence of a medical condition that directly causes the person to need frequent assistance with personal care services tasks during the night;
- The specific task or tasks with which the person requires frequent assistance during the night;
- The frequency at which the person requires assistance with these tasks during the night;
- Whether the person requires similar assistance with these tasks during the daylight hours and, if not, why not;
- The informal supports or formal services that are willing, able and available to provide assistance with the person's nighttime tasks;
- The person's ability to use adaptive or specialized equipment or supplies to meet his or her documented medical need for assistance with nighttime tasks; and whether the person's physician has documented that, due to the person's medical condition, he or she could not safely use the equipment or supplies; and
- Whether a live-in aide would likely be able to obtain an uninterrupted five hours of sleep were live-in services to be authorized.

18 NYCRR 505.14(a)(4) provides a new definition of "Live-in 24-Hour Personal Care Services" as follows: Live-in 24-hour personal care services means the provision of care by one personal care aide for a patient who, because of the patient's medical condition, needs assistance during a calendar day with toileting, walking, transferring, turning and positioning, or feeding and whose need for assistance is sufficiently infrequent that a live-in 24-hour personal care aide would be likely to obtain, on a regular basis, five hours daily of uninterrupted sleep during the aide's eight hour period of sleep.

18 NYCRR 505.14(a)(2) provides a new definition of “Continuous Personal Care Services” (“Split-Shift Care”) as follows: Continuous personal care services means the provision of uninterrupted care, by more than one personal care aide, for more than 16 hours in a calendar day for a patient who, because of the patient’s medical condition, needs assistance during such calendar day with toileting, walking, transferring, turning and positioning, or feeding and needs assistance with such frequency that a live-in 24-hour personal care aide would be unlikely to obtain, on a regular basis, five hours daily of uninterrupted sleep during the aide’s eight hour period of sleep.

GIS 15 MA/24, published on December 31, 2015, advises of the revisions to the Personal Care Services (PCS) and Consumer Directed Personal Assistance (CDPA) regulations at 18 NYCRR section 505.14 and 18 NYCRR section 505.28, and notes the following changes:

The definitions of “some assistance” and “total assistance” are repealed in their entirety. This means, in part, that a “total assistance” need with certain activities of daily living is no longer an eligibility requirement for continuous personal care services or continuous consumer directed personal assistance.

“Turning and positioning” is added as a specific Level II personal care function and as a CDPA function.

The definitions and eligibility requirements for “continuous personal care services,” “live-in 24-hour personal care services,” “continuous consumer directed personal assistance” and “live-in 24-hour consumer directed personal assistance” are revised as follows:

- a. Continuous personal care services means the provision of uninterrupted care, by more than one personal care aide, for more than 16 hours in a calendar day for a patient who, because of the patient’s medical condition, needs assistance during such calendar day with toileting, walking, transferring, turning and positioning, or feeding and needs assistance with such frequency that a live-in 24-hour personal care aide would be unlikely to obtain, on a regular basis, five hours daily of uninterrupted sleep during the aide’s eight hour period of sleep.
- b. Live-in 24-hour personal care services means the provision of care by one personal care aide for a patient who, because of the patient’s medical condition, needs assistance during a calendar day with toileting, walking, transferring, turning and positioning, or feeding and whose need for assistance is sufficiently infrequent that a live-in 24-hour personal care aide would be likely to obtain, on a regular basis, five hours daily of uninterrupted sleep during the aide’s eight hour period of sleep. Services shall not be authorized to the extent that the individual’s need for assistance can be met by voluntary assistance from informal caregivers, by formal services other than the Medicaid program, or by adaptive or specialized equipment or supplies that can be provided safely and cost-effectively.

DISCUSSION

The record in this matter establishes that the Appellant, age eighty-two (82), is seeking an authorization for an increase of Personal Care Services from her current fifty-two and one-half (52.5) hours per week (7.5 hours per day x 7 days). The initial request was for an increase to eighty-four (84) hours per week (12 hours per day x 7 days). The Appellant's fair hearing representative testified at the hearing in this matter that the family is now seeking an authorization to increase Personal Care Services to twenty-four (24) hours of daily constant care services via "split-shift" care aides. The reason given by the Appellant's representative, who is her sister, is the Appellant's safety particularly with regard to falls in the night.

With regard to the adequacy of the Appellant's Personal Care Services, the record establishes that the Appellant has been reported to have the following degree of need for the following activities of daily living: total dependence with meal preparation, ordinary housework, managing finances and shopping; maximal assistance with managing medications, stairs, transportation, bathing, dressing upper and lower body, walking, locomotion and toilet transfers; extensive assistance with toilet use; limited assistance with bed mobility and eating

It is noted that, with regard to application of the regulations in this matter, the definitions of "some assistance" and "total assistance" are no longer considered with regard to degree of need. Thus, "total assistance" need with certain activities of daily living is no longer an eligibility requirement for continuous personal care services or continuous consumer directed personal assistance.

At the hearing the Appellant's sister testified that the Appellant wears pull-ups and uses chux with regard to her bladder and bowel incontinence issues. The Appellant's sister also testified that the Appellant's daughter assists the Appellant with changing of these diapers and overnight toileting on an approximately once per overnight basis. The Appellant's daughter also assists with medication management approximately twice daily, in the morning and at bed time. However, the Appellant's sister noted that the Appellant's daughter works full time and leaves the home at approximately 6:00 am and returns at approximately 6:00 pm. The Plan's representative at the hearing did not rebut nor refute the aforesaid testimony of the Appellant's sister regarding assisting with the Appellant's toileting needs overnight.

The evidence as presented by both parties in this matter has been carefully reviewed and the contentions of the respective parties have been fully considered. The request for "split-shift" services is unsupported in the record. One overnight assist of the Appellant, in general, is no so severe enough as to prevent a home attendant/Personal Care Aide, from receiving a minimum of five (5) uninterrupted hours of sleep. Nor do the safety concerns of the Appellant's family regarding overnight falls prevention constitute a qualifiable stand-alone task with regard to the Appellant's Personal Care Service needs.

The record in this matter, therefore, establishes that the Plan's determination to deny a request for an authorization to increase Personal Care Services to twenty-four (24) hour daily services is not correct and cannot be sustained.

DECISION AND ORDER

The determination by Centers Plan for Healthy Living, to deny the Appellant's request for an authorization to increase the amount Personal Care Services hours from fifty-two and one-half (52.5) hours per week (7.5 hours per day x 7 days) to twenty-four (24) hour daily care, is not correct and is reversed.

Centers Plan for Healthy Living is directed to:

1. Immediately provide to the Appellant an authorization of Personal Care Services in the amount of twenty-four (24) hour daily care via "live-in" care aides.
2. Continue the authorization of Personal Care Services in the amount of twenty-four (24) hour daily care via "live-in" care aides unchanged.


Should Centers Plan for Healthy Living need additional information from the Appellant in order to comply with the above directives, it is directed to notify the Appellant and the Appellant's Representative promptly in writing as to what documentation is needed. If such information is required, the Appellant or the Appellant's Representative must provide it to the Managed Long-Term Care plan promptly to facilitate such compliance.

As required by Section 358-6.4 of the Regulations, Centers Plan for Healthy Living must comply immediately with the directives set forth above.

DATED: Albany, New York
04/16/2019

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul R. Pendergast", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Commissioner's Designee