



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

FILED

Feb 22, 2024, 8:42 am

OFFICE OF FAIR HEARINGS

AHCA Case No.: 23-FH2828

[REDACTED]

PETITIONER,

vs.

AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE
ADMINISTRATION,

RESPONDENT.

_____ /

FINAL ORDER

Pursuant to notice, the undersigned convened a telephonic Fair Hearing on the instant case on January 16, 2024, at 9:18 a.m. Eastern Standard Time ("EST").

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

Petitioner's Authorized Representative

For the Respondent:

Marielisa Amador
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 provider, [REDACTED] (" [REDACTED] "), Board Certified Behavior Analyst, appeared

on behalf of Petitioner. [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”), [REDACTED] of Petitioner, attended as a witness for Petitioner.

Marielisa Amador (“Ms. Amador”), Medical/Health Care Program Analyst for the Agency for Health Care Administration (“Agency” or “AHCA”), appeared on behalf of Respondent. Dr. Joseph Darling (“Dr. Darling”), Board Certified Behavior Analyst at the doctoral level and Second Level Reviewer for eQHealth Solutions Inc. (“eQHealth”), appeared as a witness for Respondent.

Marissa, interpreter number 365114, appeared to offer translation services for the Petitioner.

Petitioner did not introduce any exhibits at the hearing. Prior to the hearing, Respondent sent to the Office of Fair Hearings and Petitioner a one-hundred and thirty-one (131)-page evidence packet and a forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet. The one-hundred and thirty-one (131)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “[REDACTED] FH 01.16.2024.pdf”. The forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “23-FH2828 AHCA Evidence (Pages 1-49 of 49).pdf”. Absent an objection from the Petitioner, the undersigned admitted the one-hundred and thirty-one (131)-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 21 of RCE 1. Petitioner is diagnosed with [REDACTED]. *Id.*

3. As provided in the Petitioner’s treatment plan, Petitioner is engaging in the following maladaptive behaviors: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; and [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 95-99. Petitioner’s treatment plan shows the following progress: for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]; for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]; for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]; for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]; for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]; and for [REDACTED], Petitioner reduced [REDACTED] incidents from approximately [REDACTED]. *Id.*

4. Petitioner requested continuation of BA services; specifically, 3,120 units of code 97153; 416 units of code 97155; and 208 units of code 97156. In a Notice of Outcome (“NOO”), dated October 3, 2023, Respondent terminated Petitioner’s ABA services. *Id.* at 26. 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.
Individualized, specific, and consistent with symptoms or confirmed diagnosis of the illness under treatment, and not in excess of the patient’s needs.

The NOO further provided:

PR Clinical Rationale – Denial: Provider, there are names in the treatment plan other than the recipient’s. The plan and interventions are not individualized to this recipient (p41).

Provider, there are behaviors listed for decrease and goals for increase that do not meet medical necessity criteria (). All goals must significantly interfere with normal functioning by threatening access to typical environments and negatively affecting activities of daily living.

Provider, there are caregiver goals listed that do not meet medical necessity criteria (data collection). All goals must include those to address recipient behaviors/skill deficits that significantly interfere with normal functioning by threatening access to typical environments and negatively affecting activities of daily living.

The definitions of behaviors under treatment must be written according to generally accepted practice within the field of ABA and according to AHCA standards of care (the Florida Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, page 6, 9.2.1). The behavioral definitions must be clear, complete, objective and free of unobservable intentional states. The behaviors should have clear boundaries, definite on-sets and off-sets, should not overlap with other target behaviors definitions (), and not be a listing of behaviors that the recipient is engaging in. The behavior definitions in this treatment plan do not conform to generally accepted standards of care within the field of applied behavior analysis. The provider was requested to review and amend the definitions and the provider did not respond to the request.

The recipient shows no to minimal progress across all goals with repeating data paths. The recipient has been working on the same goals for over years. The provider has submitted graphed data that do not reflect information in their treatment plan. The data appear fabricated. 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 you 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 sufficiently 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.

Reviewer

...

Pages 26 – 27 of RCE 1.

5. On November 6, 2023, Petitioner requested a Fair Hearing to challenge the termination of ABA services. *Id.* at 8. On December 1, 2023, the undersigned issued an Order Scheduling Fair Hearing by Telephone and Prehearing Instructions, setting the hearing for January 16, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. EST. *Id.*

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

a. The treatment plan did not meet the medical necessity criteria that services be individualized and not in excess of the patient’s needs. The treatment plan was also not consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards.

b. Board Certified Behavior Analysts read the treatment plan and compared it to established guidelines in ABA. The plan was denied by the second reviewer due to the name of another recipient in the plan, behaviors and caregiver goals that did not meet medical necessity, definitions which did not meet ABA standards, and a lack of progress. The determination was based on the practice guidelines of ABA, which indicate that these services are ineffective.

c. The definitions of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] do not define behavior according to ABA standards. See page 91 of RCE 1. [REDACTED] shows a negligible decrease, and, after [REDACTED] years of ABA treatment, still occurs [REDACTED] of the time. *Id.* at 95. There were no changes in procedure to facilitate a decrease. *Id.* [REDACTED] is a very dangerous behavior. [REDACTED] is occurring [REDACTED], and the data begin in March of 2023. *Id.* at 98. It is unusual that

this dangerous behavior appeared after [REDACTED] of treatment. There was not much of a decrease during the authorization. *Id.*

- d. After [REDACTED] years of therapy, each of Petitioner's replacement behaviors occurs below [REDACTED], apart from [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 100-101. The first short term objective for [REDACTED] took [REDACTED] months to achieve, and the second took [REDACTED] months. *Id.* at 103. This is extremely slow progress, and it will be years before Petitioner will be able to participate in skills independently.
 - e. All replacement skills begin with verbal prompt, and the prompts have occurred for [REDACTED] for many skills. *Id.* at 104. Research demonstrates that this approach to teaching replacement skills encourages prompt dependence, rather than independence. Research has identified prompt dependence as a maladaptive behavior, so this treatment plan is turning adaptive behaviors into maladaptive behaviors. The plan was denied due to very slow progress, and this plan will not benefit Petitioner, as the maladaptive behaviors are not decreasing and the replacement skills are not increasing. There has been no significant progress over the last six months, and the reviewers cannot make a determination on a revised plan that was not submitted.
 - f. The treatment plan also contains the name of another person, indicating the procedure was not written for Petitioner. *Id.* at 125. Petitioner may go to another provider to request services.
7. [REDACTED] is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. [REDACTED] testified to the following at the Fair Hearing:

- a. The plan was individualized and had a clinical rationale. [REDACTED] was removed from the plan. The overlapping [REDACTED] was mastered and removed from the plan. Parent data collection has also been removed. [REDACTED] stated everything from the rationale has been fixed.
 - b. Many elements of Dr. Darling’s testimony have been corrected in the latest plan, which was not submitted because the parent did not want to submit for reconsideration. The parent wanted to pursue a Fair Hearing. The other name in the plan was a typing error. The behaviors have been reducing, and treatment has been effective. Petitioner’s [REDACTED] has seen improvement.
8. [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] of Petitioner. [REDACTED] testified to the following at the Fair Hearing.
- a. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] has seen a change since Petitioner began treatment. Petitioner needs the services.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

9. 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).
10. This hearing was held as a *de novo* proceeding pursuant to Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.100(17)(b).
11. 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.)

12. 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.

13. 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

14. 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.

15. Petitioner is under age 21, and therefore EPSDT applies to ■ 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.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. In the instant case, Respondent terminated Petitioner's ABA services. See ¶ 4. In the NOO dated October 3, 2023, Respondent explained that continuing services at the prior level was not medically necessary, specifically, that it did not meet the requirements that services must be "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational", as well as "individualized, specific, and consistent with symptoms or confirmed diagnosis of the illness under treatment, and not in excess of the patient's needs." *Id.* Respondent further explained that "the provider has not addressed the lack of progress during the last observation period and did not amend the treatment plan sufficiently in relation to the pack of progress." *Id.*

19. 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, two components of medical necessity are that services must be "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational", as well as "individualized, specific, and consistent with symptoms or confirmed diagnosis of the illness under treatment, and not in excess of the patient's needs." As shown by the record, the final treatment plan submitted for eQHealth's review falls below the standards of applied behavior analysis. See ¶ 6. Dr. Darling provided credible testimony that the treatment plan contained definitions that did not meet ABA standards, as well as presented a very dangerous behavior which emerged years into treatment and occurs many times per week with minimal decrease throughout the authorization. *Id.* Most of Petitioner's replacement behaviors are also occurring below [REDACTED]. *Id.* Dr. Darling asserted minimal progress over the last six months and explained that the treatment plan is

designed to facilitate very slow progress and prompt dependence. *Id.* As prompt dependence is a maladaptive behavior, the treatment plan is turning adaptive behaviors into maladaptive behaviors. *Id.* Although [REDACTED] testified that the issues with the plan have since been resolved, the denial of services was based on the treatment plan submitted for review. As the treatment plan does not exhibit sufficient progress after [REDACTED] years of therapy, the treatment plan is not “consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards.” As the treatment plan’s design facilitates slow progress and prompt dependence, the treatment plan is not “individualized, specific, and consistent” with Petitioner’s treatment needs. As such, Respondent has demonstrated that it is not medically necessary to continue services with the current provider.

20. 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* ¶ 17. As discussed, *supra* ¶ 19, Petitioner has not made sufficient progress in reducing [REDACTED] maladaptive behaviors and improving [REDACTED] replacement behaviors after [REDACTED] years of treatment. Here, the insufficiencies of the treatment plan submitted for review are well documented.


21. 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 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, 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 22nd day of February 2024, in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.

Joseph Mabry
 23-FH2828
2024.02.22
07:53:33 -05'00'

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:




AHCA Medicaid Hearing Unit
MedicaidHearingUnit@ahca.myflorida.com