DOH.sm.DCAppeals@health.ny.gov by scan SAPA File BOA by scan cc:



Department of Health

KATHY HOCHUL
Governor

JAMES V. McDONALD, M.D., M.P.H. Commissioner

JOHANNE E. MORNE, M.S. Acting Executive Deputy Commissioner

January 16, 2024

CERTIFIED MAIL/RETURN RECEIPT

c/o The Grand at Guilderland 428 State Route 146 Guilderland, New York 12009

Gloria Murray, Ombudsman Coordinator Long Term Care Ombudsman Program Catholic Charities Tri-County Services 1462 Erie Boulevard, 2nd Floor Schenectady, New York 12305 Nyoki Tate, NHA The Grand at Guilderland 428 State Route 146 Guilderland, New York 12009

Barbara Phair, Esq.
Abrams Fensterman, LLP
3 Dakota Drive, Suite 300
Lake Success, New York 11042

RE: In the Matter of

Discharge Appeal

Dear Parties:

Enclosed please find the Decision After Hearing in the above referenced matter. This Decision is final and binding.

The party who did not prevail in this hearing may appeal to the courts pursuant to the provisions of Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules. If the party wishes to appeal this decision it may seek advice from the legal resources available (e.g. their attorney, the County Bar Association, Legal Aid, etc.). Such an appeal must be commenced within four (4) months from the date of this Decision.

Sincerely,

Natale J. Bordeaus 1 mg

Natalie J. Bordeaux Chief Administrative Law Judge Bureau of Adjudication

NJB: Enclosure STATE OF NEW YORK : DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

In the Matter of an Appeal, pursuant to 10 NYCRR § 415.3, by

Appellant,

from a determination by

THE GRAND AT GUILDERLAND

Respondent,

to discharge him from a residential health : care facility.

Hearing Before:

Matthew C. Hall

Administrative Law Judge

COPY

DECISION

Held via

WEBEX Videoconference

Hearing Dates:

January 10, 2024

Parties:

The Grand at Guilderland

428 State Route 146

Guilderland, New York 12009
By: Barbara Phair, Esq.

By: Gloria Murray, Ombudsman

JURISDICTION

The Grand at Guilderland (the Facility), a residential health care facility subject to Article 28 of the New York Public Health Law, determined to discharge/transfer (the Appellant) from the Facility. The Appellant appealed the determination to the New York State Department of Health (the Department) pursuant to 10 New York Codes Rules, and Regulations (NYCRR) Section 415.3(i).

HEARING RECORD

ALJ Exhibits:

I - Notice of Hearing and

Discharge Notice

Facility Exhibits:

1 - Physician's Progress Note

2 - Occupational Therapy Discharge Summary

3 - Medicaid Eligibility Details

4 - Resident Invoice

5 - Progress Notes

6 - CRU Summary Sheet

7 - Admission Summary

8 - Brief Interview for Mental Status (BIMS)

Facility Witnesses:

Renee Shafer, Nurse Practitioner

Karlie Yavorek, Director of Rehabilitation

Judie Lawson, Charge Nurse

Tekayo Melton, Finance Coordinator

Cassandra Skinner, Director of Social Work

Appellant's Exhibits: None

Appellant's Witnesses: Gloria Murray, Ombudsman Coordinator

Appellant testified on her own behalf.

ISSUE

Has the Facility established that the determination to discharge the Appellant is correct?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Citations in parentheses refer to testimony (T) of witnesses and exhibits (Exhibit) found persuasive in arriving at a particular finding. Conflicting evidence, if any, was considered and rejected in favor of cited evidence.

- 1. The Appellant was admitted to the Facility on
- 2023, with primary diagnoses including

(PTSD). (Ex. 6.)

- 2. The Appellant received physical therapy at the Facility and completed her therapy goals on 2023. The Appellant is alert and oriented with a BIMS score of 15.(Ex.2.)
- 3. By notice dated 2023, the Facility determined to discharge the Appellant on 2023, on

the grounds of failure to pay the Facility after being given reasonable notice. (ALJ I.)

- 4. During the Appellant's stay at the Facility, from 2023, to 2024, the Appellant has refused to pay her bill and has been uncooperative with possible payment plans to pay for her outstanding bill. During this period, the Appellant has amassed an outstanding debt of \$ due to the Facility. (Ex. 4.; T. Melton.)
- 5. The Facility determined to discharge the Appellant to the located at

. (ALJ I.)

- 6. The Appellant owns a home in the community, but discharge to her home is not possible because the home has been deemed uninhabitable by the town of Guilderland. (T. Skinner, Appellant.)
- 7. The Appellant no longer requires residential health care. She has met her goals and has no skilled needs. She ambulates with the assistance of a rolling walker and requires no assistance with her Activities of Daily Living (ADLs), other than verbal cues. She is independent in all areas. (ALJ I., Ex. 6.; T. Shafer, Yavorek, Lawson.)

- 8. It is the professional opinion of Appellant's caregivers at the Facility, including the Facility's Attending Physician, that discharge to the community, including to a shelter, is appropriate for Appellant. (Ex. 1, T. Shafer, Yavorek, Lawson, Skinner.)
- 9. The Appellant remains at the Facility pending the outcome of this appeal.

APPLICABLE LAW

A residential health care facility (also referred to in the Department of Health Rules and Regulations as a nursing home) is a facility which provides regular nursing, medical, rehabilitative, and professional services to residents who do not require hospitalization. Public Health Law Sections 2801(2)(3); 10 NYCRR Section 415.2(k).

A resident may only be discharged pursuant to specific provisions of the Department of Health Rules and Regulations (10 NYCRR Section 415.3[i][1]).

The Facility alleges the Appellant's discharge is permissible pursuant to 10 NYCRR Section 415(i)(1)(i)(b), which states in relevant part:

[T]ransfer and discharge shall be permissible when the resident has failed, after reasonable and appropriate notice, to pay for...a stay at the facility. For a resident who becomes eligible for Medicaid after admission to a facility, the facility may charge a resident only allowable charges under Medicaid. Such transfer or discharge shall be permissible only if a charge is not in dispute....

10 NYCRR Section the hearing procedures at .Under §415.3(i)(2)(ii), the Facility bears the burden to discharge is necessary and the discharge plan is appropriate. Under the New York State Administrative Procedures Act (SAPA) Section 306(1), a decision in an administrative proceeding must be in accordance with substantial evidence. Substantial evidence means such relevant proof as a reasonable mind may accept as adequate to support conclusion or fact; less than preponderance of evidence, but more than mere surmise, conjecture or speculation and constituting a rational basis for decision, Stoker Tarantino, 101 A.D.2d 651, 475 N.Y.S.2d 562 (3rd Dept. 1984), appeal dismissed 63 N.Y.2d 649.

DISCUSSION

The Appellant was admitted to the Facility on 2023, with primary diagnoses including

(Ex. 6.)

Medicaid recipients in nursing homes are responsible for paying a certain amount of their nursing home costs each month. This amount, which is termed the recipient's Net Available Monthly (NAMI) is calculated by the recipient's local services district. The resident's local social services district has determined that her share of the costs to stay and be treated at the Grand at Guilderland is \$ per month from the date of her admission to the present time. The Appellant has "completely refused to pay full NAMI," and the Facility has "never received The Appellant and the Facility staff have the full NAMI." previously reached agreements regarding payback plans, but the Appellant has never followed through on these agreements and currently does not pay her NAMI at all. As of the date of this in arrears. (Ex. 4; hearing, the Appellant was \$ Melton.)

The Appellant claimed that she cannot pay her NAMI to the Facility because she needs the money to bring her home up to habitable standards. When asked what improvements she has made to her home over the past months, the Appellant could not provide a coherent response. She has continued to live at and receive care

2023. (Ex. 4.; T.

from the Facility rent free since | Appellant.)

Additionally, the Appellant no longer requires the care of a skilled nursing facility. She is independent in her ADLs, transfers independently, ambulates with the help of a rolling walker, and can administer her own mediations. It is the professional opinion of the Appellant's caregivers at the Facility, including the Facility's attending physician, nurse practitioner, rehabilitation director, charge nurse, and social work director, that with verbal cueing, discharge to the community, including to a shelter, is appropriate for the Appellant. (T. Shafer, Yavorek, Lawson, Skinner.)

The Facility has proven its determination to discharge the Appellant is correct due to the Appellant's failure to pay for her care at the Facility and that she has shown no intention of paying in the future. Discharge to a shelter is appropriate as the Appellant is both mentally and physically capable of caring for herself.

CONCLUSION

The Grand at Guilderland has established that its determination to discharge the Appellant is correct and the proposed discharge location is appropriate.

DECISION

The appeal by Appellant is therefore DENIED.

The Facility is authorized to discharge the Appellant upon receipt of this decision.

This Decision may be appealed to a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to Article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR).

DATED: Albany, New York January 16, 2023

Matthew C. Hall

Administrative Law Judge

To:

C/O The Grand at Guilderland 428 State Route 146 Guilderland, New York 12009

Gloria Murray, Ombudsman Coordinator Long Term Care Ombudsman Program Catholic Charities Tri-County Services 1462 Erie Boulevard, 2nd Floor Schenectady, New York 12305

Nyoki Tate, Nursing Home Administrator The Grand at Guilderland 428 State Route 146 Guilderland, New York 12009

Barbara Phair, Esq.
Abrams Fensterman, LLP
3 Dakota Drive Suite 300
Lake Success, New York 11042