

Submitter : Mrs. Carla Haynes
Organization : Henderson County Board of Education
Category : Individual

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

see attachment

CMS-2287-P-676-Attach-1.DOC

CMS-2287-P-676-Attach-2.TXT

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary...for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Ms. Pamela Wares
Organization : Marshall Public Schools/CEC
Category : Academic

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See Attachment

CMS-2287-P-677-Attach-1.TXT

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Mrs. Sara Bright
Organization : Louisa County Public Schools
Category : Individual

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

I strongly oppose eliminating the administrative claiming for transportation of students for medical reasons. This was only recently approved and there has not been a clear set of data to give reason to stop this claiming. Reimbursement for the transportation, over time, may enable schools to purchase additional specially equipped buses and shorten the time students are being transported.

Submitter : Mrs. Kristen Ladner-Esculano
Organization : Exceptional Education Department, Picayune
Category : Individual

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

see attached

CMS-2287-P-679-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Ms. Sheila Lehman
Organization : Cedar Rapids Community Schools
Category : Academic

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See attachment

CMS-2287-P-680-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Mrs. Sonja Clay
Organization : Mrs. Sonja Clay
Category : Congressional

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See attachment

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES
OFFICE OF STRATEGIC OPERATIONS & REGULATORY AFFAIRS

Please note: We did not receive the attachment that was cited in this comment. We are not able to receive attachments that have been prepared in excel or zip files. Also, the commenter must click the yellow "Attach File" button to forward the attachment.

Please direct your questions or comments to 1 800 743-3951.

Submitter : Mr. Kenneth Kassees
Organization : CEC
Category : Local Government

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See Attachment

CMS-2287-P-682-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Mr. Clifford Hart
Organization : American Falls School District, Idaho
Category : Academic
Issue Areas/Comments

Date: 11/05/2007

GENERAL

GENERAL

"See Attachment

CMS-2287-P-683-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Dr. Penelope Wong

Date: 11/05/2007

Organization : Centre College

Category : Academic

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See Attachment also

As a teacher educator who prepares our nation's future educators to work with special needs students, I am deeply concerned about this proposal which will further compromise the welfare of an already vulnerable population.

CMS-2287-P-684-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary...for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Submitter : Mrs. Michelle Urbanek
Organization : Jackson County Intermediate School District
Category : Individual

Date: 11/05/2007

Issue Areas/Comments

GENERAL

GENERAL

See attachment.

CMS-2287-P-685-Attach-1.DOC

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-2287-P
P.O. Box 8018
Baltimore, MD 21244-8018

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization of teachers, administrators, parents, and others concerned with the education of children with disabilities, gifts and talents, or both. As a member of CEC, I am writing in response to the September 7, 2007 *Federal Register* announcement requesting public comment on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for Medicaid-eligible children who receive services under Part B and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Introduction

I am deeply concerned about the devastating impact that the proposed Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations for the elimination of reimbursements for transportation and administrative claiming under Medicaid will have on the welfare of children with disabilities. The elimination of these reimbursements would inevitably shift the financial responsibility for these claims to individual school districts and early childhood providers across the nation. The Administration estimates that the elimination of these reimbursements will provide a savings of \$635 million in the first year and \$3.6 billion over the next five years. However, there is no corresponding increase in funding for the federal special education law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), that will enable schools and early childhood providers to make up for the reduction in Medicaid reimbursements to schools and early childhood providers.

Major Issues and Concerns

I have major issues with the proposed rule to eliminate the Medicaid reimbursement for transportation and administrative claiming. I believe it is flawed and should be withdrawn. I recognize that the proposed rule, in some cases, seeks to address legitimate policy issues. However, according to the background for the proposed regulations, "school-based administrative activities do not meet the statutory test under section 1903(a)(7) of being 'necessary....for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.'" I strongly disagree with this statement. The provision of transportation services and administrative claiming under Medicaid are indeed necessary for carrying out state Medicaid plans. Many medically provided services under Medicaid are provided at the school and early childhood settings where Medicaid-eligible children attend, whether or not those services are provided by employees of the state or the local Medicaid agency. This is particularly relevant because the background to the proposed regulations also states that, "CMS recognizes that schools are valid settings for the delivery of Medicaid services", yet the proposed rules would still not recognize the need for transportation to

and from school for Medicaid-eligible children who take advantage of these services at school and early childhood settings.

In addition, the proposed regulations state that they were drafted, “Due to inconsistent application of Medicaid requirements by schools to the types of administrative activities conducted in the school setting...” However, the studies that conclude that the misfeasance conducted by some schools in claiming Medicaid reimbursements only took into account an insignificant number of schools. CMS should rightly impose sanctions on those schools and early childhood providers that improperly or illegally misrepresent claims for Medicaid reimbursement; punishing every school and early childhood provider nationwide is not the proper course of action to take in this instance.

I believe that Congress and the Administration should work together to achieve consensus on appropriate policies and procedures to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries receive the highest quality services, consistent with Title XIX of the Social Security Act, and to ensure that states operate their Medicaid programs to achieve the best outcomes and in the most publicly accountable manner. I believe that this proposed rule prevents a necessary dialogue between federal officials, state Medicaid officials, other state officials (including individuals responsible for programs for people with mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, and child welfare), services providers, and representatives of affected Medicaid populations. I am not aware of any meaningful effort by the Secretary of HHS or CMS to work with affected stakeholders to address current policy concerns. Indeed, I am troubled by dubious enforcement actions and audits by the HHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) that have appeared more focused on limiting federal expenditures than improving the appropriateness or effective administration of services under Medicaid.

Legal Basis for Providing Transportation and Administrative Claiming

The proposed CMS regulations to eliminate Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming contradict current law. There is firm legal standing for the allowable use of Medicaid claiming for transportation and administration.

First, Section 1903(c) of the Title XIX of the Social Security Act states that “nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting, or authorizing the Secretary to prohibit or restrict, payment under subsection (a) for medical assistance for covered services furnished to a child with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized education program established pursuant to part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or furnished to an infant or toddler with a disability because such services are included in the child's individualized family service plan adopted pursuant to part C of such Act.” Clearly the proposed regulations would be in direct conflict with this provision of law and would not further the purposes of Title XIX of the Social Security Act.

Second, school-based claiming was protected in the courts in the 1987 *Bowen* case, when the appellate court ruled that school-based Medicaid claims were reimbursable, and the Supreme Court elected to let that decision stand by denying cert.

Third, the proposed rules would not comply with Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) services. Under current law, states must provide EPSDT services to all children who are eligible for the Medicaid program. This is one of the mandates that states must meet in order to operate a Medicaid program. Through EPSDT, Medicaid-eligible children must be seen periodically by health care professionals. In 1989 the law was amended to mandate that states provide any necessary Medicaid service that a child requires regardless of whether the state specifically covers the service as part of its regular Medicaid program. A state cannot restrict the services that it provides under the EPSDT mandate; it must make all types of services available, including the services children with disabilities require.

Fourth, under the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988, states are permitted to obtain limited funds for Individualized Education Program-related services and for early intervention/family support services as defined in the individualized family service plan (IFSP). The proposed regulations would deny legally allowable claims to provide services under IEPs and IFSPs.

Finally, the proposed rules would go beyond the regulatory scope and power of the Executive Branch and is inconsistent with Medicaid law. To the extent that policy changes are needed, I believe that the legislative process is the appropriate arena for addressing these issues.

Federal Cost Shifting and Reduced Levels of Service

The proposed rules for the elimination of the Medicaid transportation and administrative claiming will be a huge financial hit to already cash-strapped schools and early childhood providers. The federal government has not even provided half of the promised funds for the IDEA, and denying schools and early childhood providers in this country an additional \$635 million will only make a bad situation worse. This in turn will shift the financial burden to state and local governments to pay a greater share for required services under IEPs and IFSPs, and the frequency and/or intensity of those services may be reduced.

Conclusion

The proposed CMS rules to eliminate the transportation and administrative claiming for schools and early childhood providers under Medicaid are both misguided and contrary to existing legal precedent. For the reasons stated here, I urge the Secretary of Health and Human Services to withdraw the proposed rule.

Thank you for allowing the public to provide comments on the Notice for Proposed Rule Making for the elimination of school administration expenditures and transportation for school-age children under the Medicaid program, and thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.