



FILED

Oct 16, 2023, 9:58 am
OFFICE OF FAIR HEARINGS

**STATE OF FLORIDA
AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF FAIR HEARINGS**

[REDACTED]

PETITIONER,

AHCA Case No.: 23-FH1741

vs.

**AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE
ADMINISTRATION,**

RESPONDENT.

_____ /

FINAL ORDER

Pursuant to notice, the undersigned convened a telephonic Fair Hearing on the instant case on September 12, 2023, at 9:10 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (“EST”).

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

Petitioner’s Authorized Representative

For the Respondent:

Lee Ann Williams
Medical/Health Care Program Analyst
Agency for Health Care Administration

STATEMENT OF ISSUE

The issue is whether Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent’s decision to terminate Petitioner’s Behavior Analysis (“BA” or “ABA”) services was correct.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

All parties and witnesses appeared telephonically. Petitioner’s Authorized Representative and [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”), appeared on behalf of Petitioner.

Lee Ann Williams (“Ms. Williams”), Medical/Health Care Program Analyst and Fair Hearing Liaison with the Agency for Health Care Administration (“Agency” or “AHCA”), appeared on behalf of Respondent. Dr. David Bicard (“Dr. Bicard”), Board Certified Behavior Analyst and Director of Clinical Operations for eQHealth Solutions Inc. (“eQHealth”), appeared as a witness for Respondent.

Prior to the hearing, Petitioner sent to the Office of Fair Hearings and Respondent a forty-one (41)-page evidence packet. The forty-one (41)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “23-FH1741 Additional Supporting Documents.pdf”. Absent an objection from the Respondent, the undersigned admitted the forty-one (41)-page evidence packet into evidence as Petitioner’s Composite Exhibit 1 (“PCE 1”).

Prior to the hearing, Respondent sent to the Office of Fair Hearings and Petitioner a two-hundred and fifty (250)-page evidence packet and a forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet. The two-hundred and fifty (250)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file titles “[REDACTED] FH 09.12.2023 1-187.pdf” and “[REDACTED] FH 09.12.2023 188-250.pdf”. The forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “23-FH1741 Agency Evidence Legal Authorities 49 pages.pdf”. Absent an objection from the Petitioner, the undersigned admitted the two-hundred and fifty (250)-page evidence packet into evidence as Respondent’s Composite Exhibit 1 (“RCE 1”) and the forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet into evidence as Respondent’s Composite Exhibit 2 (“RCE 2”).

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner receives Medicaid services on a fee-for-service basis from the Agency. eQHealth is a Quality Improvement Organization contracted by the Agency to review prior authorization requests for services. See page 2 of RCE 2.

2. Petitioner is [REDACTED]. See page 16 of RCE 1. Petitioner is diagnosed with [REDACTED]. *Id.*

3. Petitioner requested continuation of BA services; specifically, 2,080 units of code 97153; 208 units of code 97155; and 208 units of code 97156. *Id.* at 22. In a Notice of Outcome (“NOO”), dated July 5, 2023, Respondent terminated Petitioner’s ABA services. The NOO explained the basis for the termination as follows:

[T]he requested services are not medically necessary under the following standard(s):

Consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational.

The NOO further provided:

PR Clinical Rationale – Denial: The recipient has been in services with this provider for over a year. The provider did not submit significant modifications to the treatment plan in response to the pend. According to the Florida Medicaid State Plan (Appendix 9.3.b), the data provided must show evidence that the frequency of the maladaptive behavior(s) has decreased since the last review and, if not, that there is a modification of the behavior plan. The recommendations for procedural modifications include: additions/changes to treatment plan to impact behaviors targeted for reduction. Procedural modifications should include one or more of the following: antecedent manipulation modifications, modifications of prompting procedures used in acquisition, modifications in consequence-based strategies- - ones that either reduce maladaptive behavior or reinforce replacement behavior (e.g., manipulation of reinforcement schedules, switch to a different decelerative procedure), or if lack of progress was due to therapist error (e.g., poor data collection or poor training on intervention methods), how the provider will address human error. The provider has not addressed the lack of progress during the last observation period and did not amend the treatment plan in relation to the lack of progress. The information submitted does not meet standards of care within the field of behavior analysis. This request is denied.

...

Pages 22 – 23 of RCE 1.

4. Petitioner requested reconsideration of the Respondent's decision. In a Notice of Reconsideration Determination ("NRD"), dated July 18, 2023, Respondent upheld its decision. *Id.* at 34 – 35. The NRD explained the basis for the decision as follows:

PR Recon Determination: At reconsideration all documents were carefully reviewed. According to the Florida Medicaid State Plan (Appendix 9.3.b), the data provided must show evidence that the frequency of the maladaptive behavior(s) has decreased since the last review and, if not, that there is a modification of the behavior plan. The recommendations for procedural modifications include: additions/changes to treatment plan to impact behaviors targeted for reduction. Procedural modifications should include one or more of the following: antecedent manipulation modifications, modifications of prompting procedures used in acquisition, modifications in consequence-based strategies- - ones that either reduce maladaptive behavior or reinforce replacement behavior (e.g., manipulation of reinforcement schedules, switch to a different decelerative procedure), or if lack of progress was due to therapist error (e.g., poor data collection or poor training on intervention methods), how the provider will address human error. The recommendations are insufficient to support continued care.

...

Pages 34 – 35 of RCE 1.

5. On July 18, 2023, Petitioner requested a Fair Hearing to challenge the termination of ABA services. *Id.* at 8. On August 15, 2023, the undersigned issued an Order Scheduling Fair Hearing by Telephone and Prehearing Instructions, scheduling the hearing for September 12, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. EST. *Id.*

6. Dr. Bicard is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst at the doctoral level. Dr. Bicard testified to the following at the Fair Hearing:

- a. Petitioner's services were not terminated because services are no longer necessary. Rather, the reason for the denial includes that services were not within

generally accepted professional standards of care within the field of behavior analysis. Services also did not meet specifications in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy. Petitioner has participated in services with this provider for approximately [REDACTED].

- b. According to the Board Certified Behavior Analysts reviewing the treatment plan, Petitioner's maladaptive behaviors were not improving. The provider continued to work on certain replacement skills that Petitioner could already do very well, but there were other replacement behaviors that Petitioner could not do for which there was no change in protocol to help Petitioner improve. The reviewers of the treatment plan sent requests for information to the provider regarding Petitioner's lack of progress. The provider did not respond to these requests.
- c. Petitioner's maladaptive behaviors are minor and are not high-intensity behaviors that significantly interfere with daily functioning. The maladaptive behaviors are not improving. According to the treatment plan, the data for the maladaptive Argumentative behavior demonstrate ineffective treatment and a lack of information regarding the behavior. See page 190 of RCE 1.
- d. The behavior of [REDACTED] is not improving with the treatment identified by the provider. There is a high degree of variability in the data and no information to suggest that the interventions attempted by the provider are effectively reducing the behavior. *Id.* at 194. The treatment plan demonstrates ineffective treatment concerning this behavior. The most recent information regarding this

behavior suggests that the behavior should not be intervened upon, as it may serve a body regulatory function.

- e. Petitioner's maladaptive behavior of [REDACTED] is not responding to the treatment implemented by the provider. There is a high degree of variability in the data. *Id.* at 197. This does not meet standards of care within the field of behavior analysis, nor specifications regarding improvement outlined in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy.
- f. The treatment plan does not exhibit a clear strategy for the treatment of the maladaptive behavior of [REDACTED]. There is a high degree of variability in the data. The behavior is slightly worsening in frequency throughout the authorization period. The provider has not implemented or suggested different ways to treat this behavior. *Id.* at 201. [REDACTED] is a treatment lacking evidence of effectiveness and is not effective for Petitioner.
- g. Petitioner's [REDACTED] behavior has worsened throughout the authorization period, and there is a lack of information in the treatment plan regarding why this behavior worsened or what the provider intended to do differently regarding treatment. *Id.* at 205.
- h. According to the treatment plan, Petitioner can [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at a rate of [REDACTED] or higher. *Id.* at 208. Petitioner can also [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 210. It is unclear why data are still being collected on these behaviors.

- i. [REDACTED] are not a component of behavior analysis treatment, and the provider's treatment is unclear. According to the data, Petitioner cannot engage in these [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 209. This is not a covered goal in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy.
- j. The replacement behavior of [REDACTED] demonstrates high variability. There are very few data points above fifty percent, and the data are inconclusive. *Id.* at 211. The replacement behavior of [REDACTED] demonstrates high variability. There appear to be periods when no data were collected. *Id.* at 212. The provider did not indicate what was being done to improve the behavior. Many of these goals are conversational and may be better taught within the context of speech therapy. Dr. Bicard questioned the fitness of behavior analysis for addressing these conversational goals.
- k. The behavior of [REDACTED] does not meet medical necessity criteria. *Id.* at 215. The behavior of [REDACTED] demonstrates highly variable data and no clear progress. *Id.* at 216. Other data regarding replacement behaviors were not collected consistently throughout the authorization period. The replacement behavior of [REDACTED] is not an intervention within the field of behavior analysis. *Id.* at 223.
- l. In all, it does not appear that Petitioner's maladaptive behaviors are improving and that the provider is using interventions that are not within the scope of ABA.
- m. Petitioner may seek services from a different ABA provider.

7. [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] of Petitioner. [REDACTED] testified to the following at the Fair Hearing:

- a. Petitioner transferred from private school to public school, which is the reason for Petitioner’s worsening maladaptive behaviors throughout the authorization.
- b. Petitioner also changed grades and teachers, which impacts [REDACTED] behaviors. Petitioner switched schools at the beginning of August, but was told about the change in [REDACTED] to prepare [REDACTED] for the transition, which also impacted behaviors.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

8. The Agency’s Office of Fair Hearings has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and the parties pursuant to section 409.285(2), Florida Statutes (2019). This order is the final administrative decision of AHCA under section 409.285(2)(a).

9. This hearing was held as a *de novo* proceeding pursuant to Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.100(17)(b).

10. Because Respondent terminated a previously approved service, Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.100(17)(g) assigns the burden of proof to the Respondent. The standard of proof in an administrative hearing is a preponderance of the evidence. The preponderance of the evidence standard requires proof by “the greater weight of the evidence” (Black’s Law Dictionary at 1201, 7th Ed.)

11. The Florida Medicaid Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy (October 2017) (“BA Policy”), incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code. R. 59G-4.125, governs BA services available under Florida Medicaid. The BA Policy provides as follows:

1.0 Introduction

Behavior analysis (BA) services are highly structured interventions, strategies, and approaches provided to decrease maladaptive behaviors and increase or reinforce appropriate behaviors.

...

1.4.5 Medically Necessary/Medical Necessity

As defined in Rule 59G-1.010, F.A.C.

...

4.0 Coverage Information

4.1 General Criteria

Florida Medicaid covers services that meet all of the following:

- Are determined medically necessary
- Do not duplicate another service
- Meet the criteria as specified in this policy

4.2 Specific Criteria

Florida Medicaid covers the following BA services in accordance with the applicable Florida Medicaid fee schedule(s), or as specified in this policy:

4.2.1 Behavior Assessment

One per fiscal year, per recipient, when completed within 30 days of the start of the assessment.

4.2.2 Behavior Analysis

Up to 40 hours per week, per recipient, consisting of services identified on the recipient's behavior plan in order to reduce maladaptive behaviors and to restore the recipient to his or her best functional level. Services include:

- Implementing behavior analysis interventions, and monitoring and assessing the recipient's progress towards goals in the behavior plan
- Behavior analysis interventions, for example, discrete trial teaching, task analysis training, differential reinforcement, non-contingent reinforcement, conducting task analyses of complex responses, and teaching using chaining, prompting, fading, shaping, response cost, and extinction
- Training the recipient's family, caregiver(s), and other involved persons on the implementation of the behavior plan and intervention strategies (the recipient must be present when clinically appropriate)

...

4.3 Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment

As required by federal law, Florida Medicaid provides services to eligible recipients under the age of 21 years, if such services are medically necessary to correct or ameliorate a defect, a condition, or a physical or mental illness. Included are diagnostic services, treatment, equipment, supplies, and other measures described in sectioned 1905(a) of the Social Security Act, codified in Title 42 of the United States Code 1396d(a). As such, services for recipients under the age of 21 years exceeding the coverage described within this policy or the associated fee schedule may be approved, if medically necessary. For more information, please refer to Florida Medicaid's General Policies on authorization requirements.

12. Appendix 9.0 of the BA Policy provides Review Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services.

These Review Criteria state as follows:

Review Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services

Behavior analysis (BA) services are considered as either the treatment of choice or as an adjunct treatment modality for a variety of conditions and disorders where maladaptive behaviors are part of the recipient’s clinical presentation, including behavioral manifestations of diagnoses such as Autism Spectrum Disorder and other behavioral health conditions.

Critical Elements Necessary for ANY Type of Behavior Analysis Service:

The following critical elements **MUST** be satisfied to qualify for BA services:

- a. Eligibility – The recipient must meet all criteria for BA services as outlined in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, Rule 59G-4.125, F.A.C.
- b. Medical necessity – The recipient must meet medical necessity criteria as outlined in Rule 59G-1.010, F.A.C.
- c. The recipient currently engages in maladaptive behaviors
- d. These maladaptive behaviors interfere with the recipient’s daily functioning

1. Criteria for Initial Behavior Analysis Assessment - BOTH of the following **MUST** be satisfied:

- a. **ALL** critical elements are met
- b. Provide submits a valid written physician’s order as stipulated in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, Rule 59G-4.125, F.A.C.

2. Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services and Reassessments – ALL of the following **MUST** be satisfied:

- a. **ALL** critical elements are met
- b. An assessment or, if applicable, a reassessment, authored by a lead analyst, is provided. An assessment of the maladaptive behavior(s) is a necessary element of the process of identifying the frequency and magnitude of the behaviors as well as the variables associated with the occurrence of the maladaptive behavior(s). This helps in defining what are the functional consequences of the problem behavior(s) so that an adequate behavior plan can be implemented. This (re)assessment **MUST** include, at a minimum, **ALL** of the following:
 - i. A clear operational description of the maladaptive behavior(s)
 - ...
- c. A behavior plan authored or updated by a lead analyst. The behavior plan is the cornerstone of the delivery of behavior analysis services and

it is based on the information obtained in the assessment. It proposes specific interventions to reduce or eliminate the maladaptive behavior. These interventions take into consideration the variables, both present before the behavior, as well as after the behavior, that influence the occurrence of the maladaptive behavior(s). This plan also includes replacement appropriate behaviors for the recipient to engage in instead of the maladaptive behaviors in order to obtain the same function. The plan must be detailed enough to warrant the requested services and include mechanisms to monitor its effectiveness. This **MUST** include, at a minimum, **ALL** of the following:

- i. Observable and measurable descriptions of the maladaptive behavior(s)
- ii. Identified function of the maladaptive behavior(s) behavior as a result of the assessment or reassessment conducted
- iii. Goals and strategies for changing the maladaptive behavior(s)
- iv. Written detailed description of when, where, and how often these goals will be addressed and proposed strategies will be implemented
- v. System for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan
- vi. Safety and crisis plan, if applicable
- vii. Summary and recommendations
- viii. Discharge criteria
- ix. Transition plan (if applicable)

NOTE: Although the assessment and behavior plan were addressed separately in section 2, both of them can be submitted as a single document.

3. Criteria for Continuation of Treatment at the Present Level and/or Using Current Methods: Providers must ensure that ALL of the following criteria are met to request continuation of treatments at the present level or using the current methods. If criteria for 3a is met, but criteria for 3b and/or 3c are not met, then a reduction of the treatment level and/or change of treatment methods may be warranted.

- a. ALL criteria listed in 2a, 2b, and 2c regarding critical elements, assessment or reassessment, and behavior plan, are met.
- b. The data provided must show evidence that the frequency of the maladaptive behavior(s) has decreased since the last review and, if not, that there is a modification of the behavior plan.
- c. The level of functional impairment justifies continuation of BA services. The reviewer utilizes the information provided below as a guide as it relates to the level of functional impairment as expressed through the following behaviors:
 - i. Safety – aggression, self-injury, property destruction, elopement

- ii. Communication – problems with expressive/receptive language, poor understanding or use of non-verbal communications, stereotyped, repetitive language
- iii. Self-stimulating, abnormal, inflexible, or intense preoccupations
- iv. Self-care – difficulty recognizing risks or danger, grooming, eating, or toileting
- v. Other – behaviors not identified above

13. States must provide Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (“EPSDT”) services to Medicaid-eligible children under age 21 when requested under the Medicaid state plan. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(43); 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(4). According to 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(r)(5), EPSDT services mean, in relevant part, the following items and services:

Such other necessary health care, diagnostic services, treatment, and other measures described in subsection (a) of this section to correct or ameliorate defects and physical and mental illness and conditions discovered by the screen services, whether or not such services are covered under the state plan.

14. Petitioner is under age 21, and therefore EPSDT applies to [REDACTED] request for services. However, a state may place medical necessity limitations on EPSDT services. *See* 42 C.F.R. §§ 440.230(a), (b), (d). Fla. Stat. § 409.905(2) limits EPSDT services with a medical necessity standard:

The [Agency] shall pay for early and periodic screening and diagnosis of a recipient under age 21 to ascertain physical and mental problems and conditions and all services determined by the agency to be medically necessary for the treatment, correction, or amelioration of these problems and conditions, including personal care, private duty nursing, durable medical equipment, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, respiratory therapy, and immunizations.

15. The Definitions Policy, incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.010, defines “Medically Necessary” or “Medical Necessity” as follows:

The medical or allied care, goods, or services furnished or ordered must meet the following conditions:

- Be necessary to protect life, to prevent significant illness or significant disability, or to alleviate pain
- Be individualized, specific, and consistent with symptoms or confirmed diagnosis of the illness or injury under treatment, and not in excess of the patient’s needs
- Be consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational
- Be reflective of the level of service that can be safely furnished, and for which no equally effective and more conservative or less costly treatment is available statewide
- Be furnished in a manner not primarily intended for the convenience of the recipient, the recipient’s caretaker, or the provider

The fact that a provider has prescribed, recommended, or approved medical or allied care, goods, or services does not, in itself, make such care, goods or services medically necessary or a medical necessity or a covered service.

16. The Florida Medicaid Authorization Requirements Policy (“Authorization Policy”), incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.053, provides as follows:

3.2.1 Continued Authorization Requests

The QIO shall not deny or reduce the amount, frequency, or duration of a service that is already being provided, unless:

- The reduction is to correct for factual error or omissions in prior certifications.
- There is a documented improvement in the recipient’s medical condition.
- There is a documented change in the recipient’s circumstances.
- The reviewing physician determines the recipient will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level.

17. In the instant case, Respondent terminated Petitioner’s ABA services. See ¶ 3. In the NOO dated July 5, 2023, Respondent explained that continuing services at the prior level was not medically necessary, specifically, that it did not meet the requirement that services must be “consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational.” *Id.* Respondent further explained

that “the information submitted does not meet standards of care within the field of behavior analysis.” *Id.*

18. As provided by the EPSDT requirements, the recipient must meet the medical necessity criteria as outlined in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.010. As provided in section 2.83 of the Definitions Policy, a component of medical necessity is that services must be “consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational.” As shown by the record, Petitioner’s maladaptive behaviors and replacement behaviors are not improving. *See* ¶ 6. Dr. Bicard described the data depicting several of these behaviors as variable and exhibiting minimal progress. *Id.* Dr. Bicard identified behaviors in the treatment plan that have worsened throughout the authorization period, that do not meet medical necessity criteria, that are not covered under the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, and that are not pertinent to the field of behavior analysis. *Id.* Dr. Bicard also identified behaviors that would be better treated by therapies other than behavior analysis therapy. *Id.* Dr. Bicard testified that the provider did not outline clear treatment goals and was unresponsive when asked to provide additional information for review. *Id.* Dr. Bicard’s testimony demonstrates that this provider is rendering ineffective treatment. As Petitioner has not made substantial improvements, the record shows that Petitioner will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level.


19. As QIO for the Agency, eQHealth is authorized to terminate services when “the reviewing physician determines the recipient will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level.” *See* ¶ 16. As discussed, *supra* ¶ 18, Petitioner has not made progress in reducing ■ maladaptive behaviors, nor in improving ■ replacement behaviors.

20. Upon consideration of the testimony provided, evidence submitted, and applicable polices, the undersigned concludes that Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the termination of ABA services, with this provider, was necessary. Looking at all the evidence relevant to the particular needs of Petitioner, Respondent has demonstrated that the previously authorized services, based on the treatment plan at issue in this case and administered by this provider, are not necessary to correct or ameliorate a defect or a physical and mental illness or condition. Accordingly, Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent's termination of ABA services was correct.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:

Respondent's termination of ABA services is **AFFIRMED**. Petitioner's appeal based on Respondent's termination is **DENIED**.

DONE and ORDERED this 16th day of October, 2023, in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.

Joseph Mabry
 23-FH1741
2023.10.16 07:58:55
-04'00'

JOSEPH MABRY, Hearing Officer
Agency for Health Care Administration
Office of Fair Hearings
2727 Mahan Drive, Mail Stop # 11
Tallahassee, FL 32308-5407

NOTICE OF A RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

A PARTY WHO IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THIS FINAL ORDER IS ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW, WHICH SHALL BE INSTITUTED BY FILING THE ORIGINAL NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH THE AGENCY CLERK OF AHCA, AND A COPY, ALONG WITH THE FILING FEE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, WITH THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL IN THE APPELLATE DISTRICT WHERE THE AGENCY MAINTAINS ITS

HEADQUARTERS OR WHERE A PARTY RESIDES. REVIEW PROCEEDINGS SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FLORIDA APPELLATE RULES. THE NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST BE FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE RENDITION OF THE ORDER TO BE REVIEWED.

Copies Furnished To:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

AHCA Medicaid Hearing Unit
MedicaidHearingUnit@ahca.myflorida.com