

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

The Arizona Legislature has directed the AHCCCS Administration to establish a program within legislative appropriation. Due to the State's severe budget crisis, the Legislature has not appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the AHCCCS program at current eligibility levels. Reducing eligibility standards involves difficult decisions which the Administration realizes will have significant impacts on the lives of some Arizona residents. The Freeze of the Childless Adult Program is one of several steps the Administration must take to establish a program within appropriated funds. The AHCCCS Administration has previously limited or eliminated optional services and continues to explore other service limitations. In addition, the AHCCCS Administration has previously reduced provider rates, and additional provider rate reductions are planned for October 1, 2011.

Absent a waiver from the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health & Human Service, AHCCCS, as the State's Medicaid program, is required as a matter of federal law to maintain eligibility standards relating to most pregnant women, children, certain caretakers of children, the elderly, and persons who are blind or disabled. However, the childless adult program and the MED program are not subject to the federal Maintenance of Eligibility requirements which prohibit reduction of the eligibility standards. Because AHCCCS does not have a sufficient appropriation to provide health care coverage to all persons who qualify for the Childless Adult program on and after July 8, 2011, AHCCCS is implementing a freeze on July 8, 2011 with the goal of preserving coverage to the greatest extent possible for this population. Childless Adult members who are eligible prior to July 8, 2011 and who continue to remain eligible will retain their AHCCCS coverage. To minimize the number of persons losing eligibility, AHCCCS and DES have undertaken a review of a significant number of childless adult cases to ensure that they are not entitled to continued eligibility under another eligibility category.

<u>Numb:</u>	<u>Date/ Commentor:</u>	<u>Comment:</u>	<u>Response:</u>
1.	05/08/11 Cindy Vlosic	I have read repeatedly in The Republic that childless adults will be dropped from the AHCCCS program in October. What was the criteria used in making this decision? Do childless adults suffer from more diseases? Do they incur higher costs for ACCCHS? Please help me to understand how and why this group of enrollees has been singled out.	AHCCCS' current plan is to close the AHCCCS Care program to new enrollment effective July 8, 2011, not to disenroll all childless adults in October. The Childless Adult population is a waiver program for adults who have not been determined Medicaid eligible with a categorical link (aged, blind, disabled, pregnant, under 18 or parent of a deprived child). Members in the childless adult program like members in the MED program are not subject to the Maintenance of Eligibility

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

			<p>requirements in the Affordable Care Act and therefore AHCCCS can implement a freeze for this population.</p>
2.	06/20/11 Reuben Howard Pasqua Yaqui Tribe	<p>The Pascua Yaqui Tribe does not agree with the proposal to freeze the enrollment into AHCCCS for Childless adults, effective July 1. We believe it does not meet the “maintenance of effort” of the Medicaid Act requirement for adolescence that are aging out of the CPS system or individuals that have been diagnosed with a mental health illness, or Native Americans . Excluding these individuals will cause irreparable harm to their health and well-being. Not covering the adolescent aging out of the CPS system is not the ethical or moral thing to do to a group of individuals that have little or no support to meet the challenges of adulthood.</p> <p>We believe that not covering individuals diagnosed with a Mental Health Illness needing psychotropic medications is placing society at risk and shifting the cost to the legal system. The State Behavioral Health Services Department has not adequately developed a transition plan on how the SMI population will be handled. The transition plan needs to be presented to the RHBA and TRBHA for review and comment with meaning full consultation.</p> <p>The potential negative impact to the AI/AN population and the Indian health care system is of great concern to the tribal leaders. Approximately half of the American Indian population in Arizona is enrolled in the state’s Medicaid program. The majority is enrolled in the American Indian Health Program (AIHP) and obtains their health care at IHS and tribally operated facilities, but there are significant numbers who are enrolled in the managed care health plans in order to access other provider networks of which the new Demonstration Waiver may have a more serious impact. As a result American Indians who are enrolled in the AHCCCS managed care health plans will fall off the AHCCCS program and will highly likely end up needing to access direct care at IHS and tribally operated clinics. It has</p>	<p>Upon federal approval of the Childless Adult Phase Out Plan, the AHCCCS Administration will implement a freeze to the childless adult population. Because this is a waiver population they are not subject to the Maintenance of Eligibility requirements.</p> <p>Any Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI) adult, who is eligible under the Childless Adult program will be moved into the SSI MAO program.</p> <p>AHCCCS currently has a request pending with the federal government for a demonstration project that would exclude persons receiving services through the Indian Health Service and 638 facilities from the freeze.</p> <p>Children who are aging out of Section 1931 of the Social Security Act, Sixth Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (SOBRA), Young Adult Transition Insurance (YATI) and KidsCare will continue to be considered for AHCCCS Care after July 7, 2011.</p>

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

		<p>been noted that the impact of proposed AHCCCS changes will immediately affect about 27,000 American Indians in the state who could lose eligibility. The impacts on IHS and tribal health programs is a decrease of approximately 23% ^[1] in Medicaid revenue affecting services, purchasing of equipment, medical and pharmacy supplies, facility repairs/renovations and reductions in staffing. Approximately half of IHS funding is obtained through total third party revenue – Medicare, Medicaid and Private Insurance. IHS relies on outside hospitals for referred care for AHCCCS members. Reduction in eligibility limits ability to refer patients to non IHS providers due to lack of Medicaid coverage, therefore access to care is greatly reduced. The loss of Medicaid revenue will have a ripple effect throughout the system. Most concerning is the ability of IHS/Tribal hospitals to maintain their accreditation status. The budget shortfalls of the State of Arizona should not be passed onto IHS and tribal facilities who receive 100% federal pass through funds for providing services to Medicaid eligible patients. The receipt of the 100% federal pass through funds should continue for <u>both</u> mandatory and optional services delivered at an IHS and tribal facility and not be arbitrarily reduced by parties that do not fully understand the impact of their decisions. This action will not cost the State of Arizona any state funds but will add to the economic recovery directly because a large portion of the FMAP dollars are spent for supplies and services with businesses off reservation.</p>	
3.	06/20/11 Ellen S. Katz William Morris Institute	<p>The Institute is a non-profit program that advocates on behalf of low-income Arizonans. As part of our work, we focus on public benefit programs, such as Medicaid. The Institute objects to AHCCCS' proposed rulemaking because the proposed rulemaking violates the Arizona Constitution and state law. AHCCCS wants the authority to close enrollment on July 1, 2011, for childless adults not otherwise in the State Plan as a mandatory or optional category and the additional flexibility to delay closure, reopen eligibility or terminate coverage for some or all childless adults. AHCCCS proposes to review available resources on a monthly basis.</p> <p>AHCCCS claims it is initiating this rulemaking in response to the</p>	<p>The William Morris Institute filed a Petition for Special Action challenging the AHCCCS Administration's freeze of the Proposition 204 population effective July 8, 2011.</p> <p>The AHCCCS Administration has addressed the Institute's arguments in its Response to the Petition for Special Action filed with the Supreme Court on June 21, 2011, setting forth the reasons why</p>

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>“legislative requirement that the Administration adopt rules regarding eligibility necessary to implement a program within available appropriations.” Paragraph 6 of Preamble to Proposed Rule.</p> <p>AHCCCS notes the Legislature appropriated approximately \$550 million less in state funds than needed for the AHCCCS program. It also notes that the federal government informed AHCCCS that childless adults who are not in the State Plan are not subject to the federal Maintenance of Effort (“MOE”) requirement in 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(gg). AHCCCS’ claim that “closing new eligibility” for childless adults is “consistent with federal authority” is both incorrect and not relevant. The federal government took no position on whether closing enrollment is appropriate and regardless, whatever the federal government’s interpretation of the MOE requirements in federal law, that interpretation is not relevant to the mandatory requirements in Proposition 204 and the Voter Protection Act.</p> <p>Finally, AHCCCS claims it is not seeking federal authority to continue the childless adult population as “described in the current Demonstration Project.” Rather, AHCCCS seeks unlimited authority to reduce income eligibility for a “non-enrollment” program. AHCCCS expects the freeze to reduce childless adult enrollment by 50% in one year and to save the State \$190 million. Paragraph 9 of Preamble.</p> <p>For the following reasons, AHCCCS must withdraw this rule:</p> <p>A. AHCCCS’ Proposed Rule for Authority to Freeze Enrollment or Reduce Eligibility for Persons Under 100% of the Federal Poverty Level Violates State Law and the Arizona Constitution</p> <p>In November 2000, the citizens of Arizona passed Proposition 204 that expanded AHCCCS coverage to all persons with incomes up to 100% of the federal poverty level. A.R.S. § 36-2901.01. Proposition 204 provides that the Legislature can only change financial eligibility “to a percentage of the federal poverty guidelines that is <i>even more inclusive</i>.” A.R.S. § 36-2901.01(A) (emphasis added). In addition, the initiative prohibits any cap on the number of eligible persons who can enroll in AHCCCS. <i>Id.</i> Because it was approved by a majority of the votes cast, the Voter Protection Act in the Arizona Constitution provides that the Governor cannot veto and the</p>	<p>AHCCCS has the legal authority to implement the freeze for the childless adult population.</p> <p>The Governor and Director cannot provide services to the childless adult population in excess of funds that have been appropriated for the childless adult population. A.R.S. § 36-2901.01(B) appropriates monies only from the tobacco litigation settlement fund. The statute does not authorize AHCCCS to use money other than the tobacco litigation settlement fund. Because the funds from the tobacco litigation settlement fund are not sufficient to support new member enrollment in the childless adult program on and after July 8, 2011, AHCCCS has proposed rules to freeze the childless adult population consistent with the available funding. Only the Legislature has the authority to appropriate funds to AHCCCS for this program, therefore, AHCCCS must institute the freeze until additional monies are appropriated by the Legislature for this purpose.</p> <p>The Arizona Legislature has directed the AHCCCS Administration to establish a program within legislative appropriation. Due to the State’s severe budget crisis, the Legislature has not appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the AHCCCS program at</p>
--	---	--

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>Legislature cannot repeal Proposition 204. <i>See</i> Ariz. Const., Art. IV, Part 1, Section 1, Subsections 6(A) and (B). Pursuant to the Voter Protection Act, legislative amendments are limited to ones that further the purpose of the voter initiative and are approved by 3/4 of the members of each legislative branch. <i>Id.</i> Subsection 6(C). Thus, by state law and Constitution, Arizona is required to provide AHCCCS coverage to all persons whose incomes are at or below 100% of the federal poverty level.</p> <p>Proposition 204 also mandated that the Director of AHCCCS shall use Arizona Tobacco Litigation Settlement Funds first “to fully implement and fully fund the programs and services required as a result of the expanded definition of an eligible person pursuant to Section 36-2901.01.” A.R.S. § 36-2901.02(B). Moreover, “[t]o ensure sufficient monies are available to provide benefits to <u>all</u> persons who are eligible,” Proposition 204 directed that funding “shall” come from the Arizona Tobacco Litigation Fund and “shall be supplemented <u>as necessary</u>, by any other available sources <u>including legislative appropriations</u> and federal monies.” A.R.S. § 36-2901.01(B). (emphasis added).</p> <p>These provisions are straightforward that the voters who approved Proposition 204 intended all Arizonans with incomes up to 100% of the federal poverty level would receive AHCCCS and the state would fund their coverage. AHCCCS’ claim that if the Legislature fails to appropriate sufficient funds, that ends the inquiry, is simply wrong. To make this claim, AHCCCS adopts a statutory construct that conflicts with the rules of statutory construction adopted by the courts.</p> <p>1. AHCCCS’ Interpretation Violates the Rules of Statutory Construction</p> <p>The plain language of Proposition 204 is that the state is obligated to provide health care benefits to all individuals with incomes at or below the federal poverty level. The “primary objective in construing statutes adopted by initiative is to give effect to the intent of the electorate.” <i>Arizona Early Childhood</i>, 221 Ariz. at 470, 212 P. 3d 808 quoting <i>State v. Gomez</i>, 212 Ariz. 55, 57, 127 P.3d 873, 875 (2006). <i>See also, Jett v. City of Tucson</i>, 180 Ariz. 115, 119, 882 P.2d 426, 430 (1994) (“Our primary purpose is to</p>	<p>current eligibility levels. Reducing eligibility standards involves difficult decisions which the Administration realizes will have significant impacts on the lives of some Arizona residents. The Freeze of the Childless Adult Program is one of several steps the Administration must take to establish a program within appropriated funds. The AHCCCS Administration has previously limited or eliminated optional services and continues to explore other service limitations. In addition, the AHCCCS Administration has previously reduced provider rates, and additional reductions are planned for October 1, 2011. Absent a waiver from the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health & Human Service, AHCCCS, as the State’s Medicaid program, is required as a matter of federal law to maintain eligibility standards relating to most pregnant women, children, certain caretakers of children, the elderly, and persons who are blind or disabled. While it is unfortunate that the State can no longer afford to provide health care coverage to all persons who may qualify for the Childless Adult program in the future, AHCCCS is implementing a freeze effective July 8, 2011 with the goal of preserving coverage to the greatest extent possible. AHCCCS will continue to cover all persons who are determined eligible for the Childless Adult program prior to July 8, 2011. Furthermore, we are transitioning</p>
--	--	---

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>effectuate the intent of those who framed the provision and, in the case of an [initiative], the intent of the electorate that adopted it"). If the language is clear and unambiguous, a court can apply it without using other means of statutory construction. <i>See Hayes v. Continental Ins. Co.</i>, 178 Ariz. 264, 268, 872 P.2d 668, 672 (1994).</p> <p>In addition, when construing a statute, courts interpret the provisions in the context of the entire statute. <i>Ariz. Dep't of Econ. Sec. v. Superior Court</i>, 186 Ariz. 405, 408, 923 P.2d 871, 874 (App. 1996). It is also important that the court "give each word, phrase, clause and sentence meaning so that no part of the [statute] is rendered superfluous, void, insignificant, redundant or contradictory." <i>Patterson v. Maricopa County Sheriff's Office</i>, 177 Ariz. 153, 156, 865 P.2d 814, 817 (App. 1993). To claim that "available" funds is limited to whatever the Legislature decides to appropriate, nullifies all the other provisions in Proposition 204 and thwarts the clear intent and purpose of the initiative.</p> <p>1. AHCCCS' Interpretation Conflicts with the Statements in the Voting Materials</p> <p>Initiatives are "fundamental to Arizona's scheme of government." <i>Calik v. Kongable</i>, 195 Ariz. 496, 500, 990 P.2d 1055, 1059 (1999). When interpreting an initiative, the court must "identify the reasonable interpretation that is most consistent with the intent of the voters in adopting the measure." <i>Gomez</i>, 212 Ariz. at 58-59, 127 P 3d at 876-77. To determine the voters' intent, the court will examine, among other things, the materials included in the Secretary of State's publicity pamphlet that is available to all voters before a general election. <i>See, e.g. id.</i> (examining findings in publicity pamphlet to determine purpose of an initiative measure); <i>Calik</i>, 195 Ariz. at 501, 990 P.2d at 1061 (relying upon Legislative Council's analysis in publicity pamphlet in determining voters' intent); <i>Jett</i>, 180 Ariz. at 119-20, 882 P.2d at 430-31 (holding that publicity pamphlet material entitled to "some weight"); <i>Laos v. Arnold</i>, 141 Ariz. 46, 48, 685 P.2d 111, 113 (1984) (finding that Legislative Council's analysis, contained in publicity pamphlet, provided intent of framers and electorate).</p>	<p>some members to other eligibility categories, such as the elderly and those with serious mental illnesses.</p>
--	---	---

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

		<p>The Publicity Pamphlet provided to every voter for the 2000 election contained an analysis by the Arizona Legislative Council about Proposition 204. Publicity Pamphlet at 160 available at www.azsos.gov/election2000/info/pubphamplet/English/prop204.htm. The Pamphlet noted that Proposition 204 would require Arizona to deposit all of the money it receives over the next 25 years from the Tobacco Litigation Settlement into a specific account and use the funds to increase the number of people who are eligible for coverage in the AHCCCS program. The Legislative Council observed that “[i]f Proposition 204 passes, people who earn up to 100% of the federal poverty level will qualify to receive health care under AHCCCS.” <i>Id.</i> According to the Legislative Council, future Legislatures could change the eligibility requirements to allow more people to qualify to receive health care under AHCCCS but that the Legislature and the AHCCCS administration could not reduce or limit the number of persons who would be able to enroll in AHCCCS. <i>Id.</i></p> <p>The Legislative Council analysis in the publicity pamphlet regarding Proposition 204 was quite clear that coverage for eligible individuals was mandatory. It stated that without limitation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Future Legislatures could change the eligibility requirements to allow more people to qualify to receive health care under AHCCCS <i>but the Legislature and the AHCCCS administration could not reduce or limit the number of persons who would be able to enroll in AHCCCS.</i> (emphasis added).</p> <p><i>Id.</i></p> <p>There were two ballot initiatives in 2000 that wanted to use the Tobacco Litigation Settlement Funds. The Proposition 204 Fiscal Impact Summary included as part of the publicity pamphlet discussed the competing ballot proposition, Proposition 200, called Healthy Children, Healthy Families, and noted that the competing proposition also fully spent the Tobacco Litigation Settlement Funds. The Proposition 204 fiscal impact summary provides that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A second ballot proposition, Healthy</p>	
--	--	---	--

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

		<p>Children, Healthy Families (Proposition 200), also fully spends the Tobacco Settlement. If both initiatives pass, and Healthy Children, Healthy Families receives more votes than this initiative, this initiative would still go into effect. <i>However, the entire projected state cost of the program would need to be paid from its general or other revenues.</i> (emphasis added).</p> <p><i>Id.</i> Thus, Legislative Council fully understood the impact of Proposition 204 and took pains to point out that if both propositions passed, but Proposition 200 received more votes, then all the funding for Proposition 204 would have to come from the general fund.</p> <p>The Legislative Council Analysis and the Fiscal Impact Summary made it clear that if Tobacco Litigation Settlement Funds were insufficient to support the expanded population, then the projected state cost of expanding the AHCCCS eligible population would have to be paid from the state's general fund or other revenues.</p> <p>At the time Arizona voters were asked to approve the voter-initiated legislation, neither the measure's proponents nor its opponents thought that the Governor, the Legislature or AHCCCS had any discretion to decide whether to provide health care benefits to the individuals protected by Proposition 204. It was understood to be a mandatory obligation and that fact was conveyed forcefully to the voting public. It was that fact the opponents of Proposition 204 prominently used to try to defeat the measure. In November 2000, Proposition 204 was approved by 63% of the voters.</p> <p>The arguments in the publicity pamphlet also leave no doubt about the intended purpose of the initiative and the impact of its passage on the AHCCCS program. AHCCCS is required to provide health care coverage to the Proposition 204 population.</p> <p>By proposing this rule, AHCCCS is violating Proposition 204 and the Voter Protection Act.</p> <p>The persons the citizens of Arizona mandated eligible for the State Medicaid program include childless adults, the very persons upon whom</p>	
--	--	---	--

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>AHCCCS seeks to impose an enrollment freeze and/or reduced eligibility. Proposition 204 and the Arizona Constitution require AHCCCS to cover these persons. AHCCCS cannot ignore the Arizona state law and Constitution. Therefore based on Proposition 204 and the Voter Protection Act, AHCCCS must withdraw its proposed rule.</p> <p>B. The State Failed to Consider Other Proposals</p> <p>As explained above, a purported budget deficit cannot be a proper basis for a freeze on enrollment or reduced eligibility. But even if it did, Arizona’s request is unsupported factually. The premise of the proposed rulemaking is that the State has no other option except to balance its budget by radical cuts to the health care provided to its low-income citizens. This is the only rationale given for the proposed rulemaking. The rationale is not supported by the facts.</p> <p>The Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association submitted a proposal to the Governor and the Legislature to impose a hospital provider assessment, a nursing facility assessment, and a nursing home quality assessment to generate additional matching federal Medicaid funds. The legislative leadership rejected the proposal. The Legislature and the Governor also failed to propose any other assessments that might bridge the financial gap described.</p> <p>The legislative leadership took the position that it would not entertain discussion of new sources of revenue because these would be “taxes” and many legislators had taken a “no tax” pledge. The Institute notes the proposal and the no tax pledge solely as evidence that the State has other options, options it chose to reject. For this reason, as well, AHCCCS must withdraw its proposed rule.</p> <p>C. Recent Financial Predictions do not Support the Claim of Insufficient Funds</p> <p>The state expects to save only \$190 million by freezing enrollment for the Proposition 204 population. Paragraph 9 of the Preamble. Recent revenue forecasts for the current fiscal year 2011 are estimated to be \$252 million higher than anticipated. <i>See</i> JLCB Staff Report – Preliminary May Review Update, June 8, 2011, available at www.azleg.gov/jlbc/preliminarymayrevenueupdate.pdf. Thus, it appears</p>	<p>The Legislature has directed the agency to establish a program within available appropriations. Just as AHCCCS does not have the authority to appropriate additional funds for the administration of the program, AHCCCS does not have the authority to impose provider assessments.</p> <p>Although recent revenue forecasts are estimated to be \$250M higher than anticipated, only the legislature-not AHCCCS-can make a determination whether funds other than the tobacco funds are available from other sources. In the absence of an additional appropriation, AHCCCS must implement this freeze to</p>
--	---	--

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>there are sufficient funds for the AHCCCS program. Based on the recent fiscal predictions, AHCCCS must withdraw its proposed rule.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D. The History of the KidsCare Freeze Shows AHCCCS will Continue the Freeze.</p> <p>AHCCCS' claim that it wants/needs the flexibility to assess resources on a monthly basis is belied by AHCCCS' handling of KidsCare. In December 2009, AHCCCS requested permission to amend its Children's Health Insurance Program ("CHIP") State Plan to freeze enrollment on KidsCare. Pursuant to the approval, AHCCCS amended Section 4.3.1 of the State Plan and put a retroactive enrollment freeze on KidsCare effective January 1, 2010. The enrollment cap is in place "until such time that the AHCCCS Administration is able to verify that funding is sufficient, and the Governor agrees that the AHCCCS Administration may begin processing new applications." As of today, the KidsCare freeze is still in place and there are almost 102,000 children on the wait list. There is no reason to think the childless adult freeze will be lifted either.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">E. The Proposed Rule Fails to Satisfy the Federal Requirements for a Section 1115 Demonstration Waiver</p> <p>Section 1115 of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1315(a) authorizes the Secretary under certain conditions to approve "experimental, pilot or demonstration projects" that are "likely to assist in promoting the objectives of the Medicaid Act." The changes AHCCCS proposes to make to health care coverage for childless adults in the proposed rule are part of its March 31, 2011, amended request for a demonstration waiver. While the Institute submitted comprehensive and detailed comments and objections to the amended waiver request, the Institute reiterates its objections to the</p>	<p>establish a program within existing appropriations. In the event that the legislature does make a supplemental appropriation to AHCCCS this rule provides the director with the flexibility to modify eligibility standards.</p> <p>AHCCCS has continued the freeze on the KidsCare program due to a lack of legislative appropriation for that program.</p> <p>At this time the proposed rule is intended to implement the phase out of the childless adult population described in the demonstration project due to expire September 30, 2011. Any continuation of the childless adult population or any population similar to the current childless adult population will depend upon federal approval of a new demonstration project effective October 1, 2011. AHCCCS</p>
--	---	---

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>portion of the request that is encompassed by the proposed rule. This portion of the amended request violates the federal requirements for a Section 11115 demonstration project.</p> <p>The hallmark of Section 1115 is its requirement of research or experimentation. Thus, section 1115</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">was not enacted to enable states to save money or to evade federal requirements but to ‘test out new ideas and ways of dealing with problems of public welfare recipients.’ [citation omitted]. A simple benefit cut, which might save money, but has no research or experimental goal, would not satisfy this requirement. Rather, the ‘experimental or demonstration project’ language strongly implies that the Secretary must make at least some inquiry into the merits of the experiment. She must determine that the project is likely to yield useful information or demonstrate a novel approach to program administration.</p> <p><i>Beno v. Shalala</i>, 30 F.3d 1057, 1069 (9th Cir. 1994). In <i>Beno</i>, the Ninth Circuit held Section 1315(a) “plainly obligates the Secretary to evaluate the merits of a proposed state project, including its scope and potential impact” on recipients. <i>Id.</i> at 1068. Under <i>Beno</i>, there are three main parts to the required analysis. First, the Secretary must determine that the project has research or demonstration value. <i>Id.</i> at 1069. Second, the proposed project must assist in promoting the objectives of the Act. <i>Id.</i> As part of this assessment, the Secretary must consider the impact the demonstration project has on the persons the Medicaid Act was intended to protect. <i>Id.</i> Part of this assessment implies the collection of data. <i>Id.</i> at 1070-71 and fn. 30. Finally, the Secretary can only approve Section 1315 projects for the “extent and period” necessary. <i>Id.</i> at 1071.</p> <p>The only rationale for the proposed changes to the State Medicaid program in the proposed rule is to save state funds. The state seeks</p>	<p>recognizes that an amendment of this proposed rule may be necessary depending on the precise nature of any terms and conditions of any new demonstration project.</p>
--	--	--

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

	<p>permission to manage its Medicaid program within budgetary constraints. This rationale does not satisfy the statutory requirements for a Section 1115 waiver. In addition, there is no research or experimental purpose to the changes in the proposed rule. Because it is an improper section 1115 request, AHCCCS should withdraw the proposed rule.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">F. AHCCCS Improperly Seeks Unlimited Authority to Determine Eligibility for Childless Adults</p> <p>In the proposed administrative rule AHCCCS seeks unlimited authority to set any eligibility standard it wants subject to what it determines are “available” state funds. There are no defined parameters or objective standards of eligibility. This type of request for undefined and overreaching authority must be withdrawn. There is no authority for such a request under federal law. In addition, this request nullifies any public notice and meaningful input requirements in 42 U.S.C. § 1315 (d)(1). AHCCCS must withdraw this proposed rule.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">G. AHCCCS’ Proposal to Give Public Notice of Program Changes on its Website is Inadequate</p> <p>Coupled with the unlimited authority AHCCCS seeks, AHCCCS proposes to provide limited public notice of any changes to the childless adult coverage by only posting the change on its website 30 days prior to the change unless it determines a shorter notice is necessary to “maintain [the program] within available funding.” AHCCCS does not intend to have a public comment period or public meeting prior to any determinations. This type of process fails to comply with the public notice and meaningful input requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 1315 (d)(1). For this reason, as well,</p>	<p>At this time the proposed rule is intended to implement the phase out of the childless adult population described in the demonstration project due to expire September 30, 2011. Any continuation of the childless adult population or any population similar to the current childless adult population will depend upon federal approval of a new demonstration project effective October 1, 2011. AHCCCS recognizes that an amendment of this proposed rule may be necessary depending on the precise nature of any terms and conditions of any new demonstration project.</p> <p>The freeze on enrollment is part of AHCCCS’ plan for the phase out of the Childless Adult population as provided for in the demonstration project due to expire September 30, 2011, and as such, the public notice requirements of 42 U.S.C. 1315 do not apply to the phase out. Continuation of federal financial participation for any population similar to the current childless adult population,</p>
--	--	---

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

		AHCCCS must withdraw its proposed rulemaking.	<p>including any less inclusive population, will depend upon federal approval of a new demonstration project beginning October 1, 2011. AHCCCS is complying with requirements regarding public notice and input with respect to the application for new waiver authority as required by the federal agency that ensures that the Medicaid program is administered consistent with federal requirements.</p> <p>State law does require a 30 day notice and comment period prior to final rulemaking. AHCCCS is in compliance with that requirement by virtue of this solicitation of comments on its proposed rule.</p> <p>Consistent with Arizona Laws 2010, Seventh Special Session, Chapter 10, Section 34, AHCCCS provided public notice of this 30 day comment period prior to promulgating any final rules. Public hearings are not required by the State law.</p>
4.	06/20/11 Janice York	I think u should not cut heathlcare, a lot of sick people that dont have jobs are very effected by this. I understand that some people abuse it but thank of all the people that is really sick and they need it to get medicine or be treated, i think u really should re consider your decision.	As described in the introduction the AHCCCS Administration's goal is to preserve the agency's core program within the available appropriations.
5.	06/20/11 Jesus Diaz	I just wanted to take the time to write this e-mail to express my opinion about the proposed childless adult law that would disqualify them	As described in the introduction the AHCCCS Administration's goal is to

Expansion Population Freeze 2011 Public Comments

		<p>for AHCCCS benefits. I want to express first of all that I am a current student at NAU pursuing a degree in Masters of Administration emphasized in Health Sciences and Public Management. With that stated, I feel that this proposed law would adversely affect the citizens of Arizona and the overall health of the population. This will negatively impact the workforce with a major increase in chronic illnesses and diseases. Medical facilities will have to treat these conditions with no medical insurance to reimburse these facilities for their services forcing them to make major cuts and decreasing quality of care. In the long-run, this is going to cause a greater problem in both the business and health aspect of Arizona; considering its current financial issues due to economic reasons. There has to be a better solution that our leadership at the Legislature can conjure up with that will not affect the citizen health. I think Arizona government is forgetting the main purpose and that is to be public servants and work for the people and not against them. I hope that my opinion in this matter is taken into consideration and not just another e-mail.</p>	<p>preserve the agency's core program within the available appropriations.</p>
6.	06/20/11 SouthMountain Concrete	<p>What can we do to change this new law starting July 1st. I work in a hospital where there are at least 1/3 of clients that are homeless. Leaving them without health insurance is going to effect staff and patients. Pts wont get treated and will be able to spread more disease. The hospitals will not collect on bills. We are all going to go down hill.</p>	<p>As described in the introduction the AHCCCS Administration's goal is to preserve the agency's core program within the available appropriations.</p>