

DSS-4357EL

WGIUPD

GENERAL INFORMATION SYSTEM

11/26/97

DIVISION: Office of Medicaid Management

PAGE 1

GIS 97 MA/033

TO: Personal Care Services Program Directors and Social Services Attorneys

FROM: Ann Clemency Kohler, Director, Office of Medicaid Management

SUBJECT: Clarifying instructions regarding Mayer v. Wing (S.D.N.Y., 1996)

EFFECTIVE DATE: Immediately

CONTACT PERSON: Personal Care Services Monitoring Staff

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 (S.D.N.Y., 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.)

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.

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 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 (S.D.N.Y., 1997).]

Should districts have questions regarding this information, they should contact the following Personal Care Program monitoring staff: Margaret Willard or George Fleury. Ms. Willard may be contacted at (518) 473-5569 or on-line at AW8310. Mr. Fleury may be contacted at (518) 486-7548 or on-line at AW5610.