

DISTRICT COURT, DENVER COUNTY
STATE OF COLORADO
Court Address: 1437 Bannock Street
Denver, CO 80202

Plaintiff(s):
COLORADO CROSS-DISABILITY COALITION, a
Colorado Corporation,
JULIE REISKIN,
PAMELA CARTER,
DEBRA MILLER, as parent and guardian for her son,
BRIAN MILLER,
ANNE-MARIE MOKRITSKY-MARTIN,
LAURA HERSHEY,
ROBIN STEPHENS,
PATRICK HAM, as parent and guardian for his son,
PATRICK HAM,
CRYSTAL HUNTER,
HOLLY FISCUS,
KRISTINA SAWYCKYJ,
MARION HAMBY,
DEBBIE LANE, and
LINDA S. IVEY,
for themselves and all others similarly situated,

v.

Defendant(s):
JOAN HENNEBERRY, Executive Director of the
Department of Health Care Policy and Financing, in her
Official Capacity, and
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE
POLICY AND FINANCING.

Attorney or Party Without Attorney:
Kevin W. Williams
Carrie Ann Lucas
Colorado Cross-Disability Coalition
655 Broadway, Suite 775
Denver, CO 80203
Phone Number: 303.839.1775
Fax Number: 303.839.1782
E-mail: kwilliams@ccdconline.org

EFILED Document

CO Denver County District Court 2nd JD

Filing Date: Jun 21 2010 11:56AM MDT

Filing ID: 31742093

Review Clerk: Eric Dew

Δ COURT USE ONLY Δ

Case Number: 09CV11761

Ctrm.: 3

E-mail: clucas@ccdconline.org	
Atty. Reg. #: 28117	
Atty. Reg. #: 36620	

AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs, by and through undersigned counsel, bring this Amended Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”), pursuant to Rule 15(a), Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure, against Joan Henneberry, in her official capacity as director and the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (“Department”) for violations of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, various provisions of the Medicaid Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1396, and state law regarding the Department’s obligations with respect to Medicaid services.

2. Plaintiffs (“Individual Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”) are all individuals with disabilities and/or the parents and guardians of individuals with disabilities who receive Medicaid-funded home health care and need attendant care services in their homes through the Colorado Consumer Directed Support Services (“CDASS”) program. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25.5-6-1101 *et seq.* The CDASS program is administered by the Department. All Individual Plaintiffs are members of the proposed class.

3. Plaintiff Colorado Cross-Disability Coalition (“CCDC”) is a non-profit statewide disability rights advocacy membership organization. The Individual Plaintiffs are CCDC members.

4. According to the Department’s website and training manual prepared for clients receiving services under the CDASS program, the purpose of the CDASS program is as follows:

Consumer Directed Attendant Support Services (CDASS) allow people with disabilities to manage their attendant care. In CDASS, you [the CDASS client] hire, train, supervise, manage, and if necessary, fire your attendants. You may also have an authorized representative direct your services on your behalf if you need that assistance, or if your doctor indicates that you require that assistance. In CDASS, you control your attendant care, rather than having an agency do it. You make attendant care decisions and take responsibility for them. CDASS gives you more flexibility in your daily routine, giving you the opportunity to take greater control of your life.

CDASS is intended to:

Increase your independence and self-sufficiency

Improve the quality of attendant support you receive

Enable you to have a more healthy and productive life
Allow you greater flexibility and control in managing your support needs
Place you in the role of making decisions about attendant support

The Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (the Department) is responsible for the development and oversight of CDASS. For more information please visit the Department's at this website: <http://www.colorado.gov/hcpf>.¹

5. In or around September of 2009, as a result of statewide budget cuts in 2009, the Department, through its contracted case management agencies for CDASS clients, known as single entry point agencies ("SEP's"),² cut 1.5 percent of all CDASS clients' allocations ("September 2009 cuts").

6. Under the CDASS program, each client is provided an allocation of funds to pay attendants ("Individual Allocation").

7. The amount of the Individual Allocation is determined based on an evaluation of need established by the Department related to the type and amount of attendant care services the client requires.³

8. In or about December of 2009, CDASS' clients' Individual Allocations for services were cut again ("December 2009 cuts") by differing and inconsistent amounts.

9. The Department's method for making these cuts was arbitrary, capricious, and without a lawful basis or justification.

10. The Department failed to provide advance notice of the cuts to CDASS clients, failed to provide notice in a timely manner, failed to provide adequate notice to meet the requirements of due process, and failed to notify clients of their rights to appeal the cuts and to request a hearing.

11. CDASS clients in the proposed class all experienced the following:

1. They did not receive advance notice of the September 2009 reduction in

¹ The Department's website regarding the CDASS program can be found at <http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite/HCPF/HCPF/1210324172195>.

² See Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25.5-6-104(k) (definition of "single entry point").

³ See description of CDASS program *infra*.

allocation;

2. they did not receive notice of the December 2009 reduction in allocation;
3. they did not receive advance notice of a change in the administrative fee charged to their allocations;
4. they received some form of notification of the cuts after the allocation amount was already reduced.

12. Plaintiff Class Representatives and CCDC seek the following:

1. A Court Order enjoining Defendants from implementing and maintaining all improper reductions of CDASS clients' allocations;
2. A Court Order enjoining Defendants to restore their allocation amounts to those that existed prior to the state's improper implementation of allocation reductions;
3. Damages for Class Members;
4. Recovery of Class Members' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to article 6, section 9 of the Colorado Constitution and section 24-34-505.6(1) of the Colorado Revised Statutes.

14. Venue is proper within this District pursuant to Rule 98 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.

15. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, various federal statutes, including, without limitation, the Medicaid Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1396, various state statutes and the common law of Colorado.

16. Declaratory and ancillary relief is authorized pursuant to C.R.S. § 13-51-106 and Rule 57 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.

17. Injunctive relief is authorized pursuant to Rule 65 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.

PARTIES

18. Plaintiff Colorado Cross-Disability Coalition (“CCDC”) is a Colorado non-profit corporation located in Denver, Colorado. CCDC has many members who are CDASS clients or the parents and guardians of CDASS clients.

19. Plaintiff Julie Reiskin currently resides in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiff Reiskin is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

20. Plaintiff Pamela Carter currently resides in Denver, Colorado. Plaintiff Carter is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

21. Plaintiff Debra Miller and her son Brian Miller currently reside in Thornton, Colorado. Plaintiff Miller is the parent and guardian of Brian Miller, who is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

22. Plaintiff Anne-Marie Mokritsky-Martin currently resides in Boulder, Colorado. Plaintiff Martin is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

23. Plaintiff Laura Hershey currently resides in Englewood, Colorado. Plaintiff Hershey is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

24. Plaintiff Robin Stephens currently resides in Englewood, Colorado. Plaintiff Stephens is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

25. Plaintiff Patrick Ham and his son Patrick Ham currently reside in Fort Collins, Colorado. Plaintiff Patrick Ham is the parent and guardian of Patrick Ham, who is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

26. Plaintiff Crystal Hunter currently resides in Thornton, Colorado. Plaintiff Hunter is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

27. Plaintiff Holly Fiscus currently resides in Highlands Ranch, Colorado. Plaintiff Fiscus is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

28. Plaintiff Kristina Sawyckyj currently resides in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Plaintiff Sawyckyj is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

29. Plaintiff Marion Hamby currently resides in Greenwood Village, Colorado. Plaintiff Hamby is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

30. Plaintiff Debbie Lane currently resides in Nederland, Colorado. Plaintiff Lane is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

31. Plaintiff Linda S. Ivey currently resides in Thornton, Colorado. Plaintiff Ivey is eligible for and receives Medicaid-funded attendant care services through the CDASS program.

32. Defendant Joan Henneberry is Executive Director of the Department, the single state agency designated to administer the Colorado Medical Assistance Program under Title XIX of the Social Security Act and Colorado statutes. As such, she is responsible for general administration and supervision of the Colorado Medicaid Program and the CDASS program.

33. Defendant Department is the state agency responsible for insuring appropriate home health care and long term care services are provided to individuals who are eligible to receive Medicaid-funded long term care. The Department is responsible for the administration of the CDASS program. Defendant Department is located in Denver, Colorado.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

34. This is a class action brought by the Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b) of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure. This class is defined as follows:

All clients of the CDASS program whose Individual Allocation Amounts were or will be reduced improperly by the Department and who have been or will be denied due process by the Department's failure to provide advance notice of the cuts and an opportunity for a fair hearing.

35. Defendants' implementation and application of recent budget cuts and other reductions in class members' Medicaid benefits in the CDASS program presents questions of law and fact common to all Plaintiffs and class members, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Whether the September 2009 cuts as applied to CDASS client allocations violated Class Members' rights under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations;

2. Whether the December 2009 cuts as applied to CDASS client allocations violated Class Members' rights under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations;
3. Whether the implementation of either or both of the September 2009 cuts and December 2009 cuts violated Class Members' rights under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations;
4. Whether the Department was required to provide advance notice to Class Members sufficient to meet the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations.
5. Whether the Department provided advance notice to Class Members sufficient to meet the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations.
6. Whether the Department's policy of not providing advance notice to Class Members prior to reducing Individual Allocations is sufficient to meet the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and federal and state statutes and implementing regulations.

36. The Individual Plaintiffs are members of the above-defined class. There are no conflicts between the interests of the named Plaintiffs and the class. The Individual Plaintiffs interests in this litigation are identical to the interests of all Class Members.

37. On information and belief, there are approximately one thousand fifty-six CDASS clients currently, and it is unknown how many applicants there are and new CDASS clients added to the program during the pendency of this lawsuit.

38. Defendants' improper implementation and maintenance of budget cuts and other benefit reductions as applied to the CDASS program unlawfully reduce Medicaid benefits and services for all Class Members.

39. Defendants' improper notice provides no mechanism for Class Members to appeal or request a hearing regarding the reductions in their allocations.

40. Defendants' articulated policy that individual advance notice is not required prior

to reducing Individual Allocations has harmed all existing Class Members and will harm all Class Members in the future.

41. The proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical and impossible.

42. Joinder is also impractical because class members -- who, by definition as Medicaid recipients, are low-income and unlikely to be able to afford legal services -- lack the ability and financial means to maintain individual actions.

43. Common issues of law and fact predominate over any individual questions, and adjudication of the rights of the class is superior to other methods of adjudicating the controversies concerning the Defendants' policies and practices at issue in this action.

44. Adjudicating the issues through means other than a class action could risk placing inconsistent obligations on the Defendants, varying interpretations of the common rights of the class members, and repetitive analysis and redress of a class-wide problem.

45. The claims of the Individual Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the class in that each is an applicant for or recipient of CDASS services and each runs the risk of having those benefits wrongfully denied, reduced, suspended or terminated despite continuing eligibility solely as a result of the improper implementation and maintenance of the state's budget cuts and other benefit reductions as applied to the CDASS program and improper notice of such reductions.

46. The Individual Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class they represent. They are represented by the CCDC Legal Program, a public interest law legal program and organization experienced in class action litigation and the law governing Medicaid benefits.

47. Since the filing of this lawsuit, additional CDASS clients have contacted CCDC's Legal Program with complaints identical to those of the Class Representatives. These CDASS clients have been added as Individual Plaintiffs.

48. The Defendants and their agents, employees, and successors in office have acted and will act on grounds generally applicable to the class that the Class Representatives represent, thereby making appropriate injunctive or declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.

49. The Individual Plaintiffs and the proposed Plaintiff class are directly and beneficially interested in the Defendants' performance of their mandatory duty to comply with the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, and the applicable federal and Colorado statutes and implementing regulations.

50. The Plaintiffs and the Class Members are directly and beneficially interested in and adversely affected by the Defendants' actions and those actions imminently threaten substantial and irreparable injury.

BACKGROUND

51. The CDASS program was created in 2003 as a method for providing attendant care services to eligible Medicaid recipients in Colorado as an alternative to receiving those services through a designated home health care agency. *See generally* Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25.5-6-1102 *et seq.*

52. Immediately prior to the creation of the CDASS program, all Medicaid-eligible clients who received long term care services outside of institutions like nursing facilities were required to receive services through a home health care agency.

53. In the pre-CDASS system, the Department authorized and administered payments to SEP's who then authorized long term home health care agencies to administer all aspects of in-home attendant care service and to receive payment. Such administration, included, without limitation, the following: The screening and hiring of attendants, the training of attendants, all decision-making regarding the type of service attendants and/or nurses provided to clients, decision-making related to which attendants worked for which clients in their homes, scheduling of attendants in clients' homes, and the length of time for attendant care visits in clients' homes.

54. Clients receiving in-home attendant care services from agencies expressed dissatisfaction *inter alia* with the lack of control they had over the day-to-day management of attendants working in their homes, the inability to control when and which attendants were in their homes, and the hiring, termination, training and supervision of attendants who worked for them in their homes each day.

55. Until the CDASS program began, clients had virtually no choice in who would work for them doing personal care in the clients' homes each day. Those who advocated for the CDASS program did so, in part, because of serious quality of care and access issues within the home health care agency model system.

56. The CDASS program was designed to accomplish two important purposes: (1) To save the Department money by eliminating the overhead and payments made to home health care agencies for activities that Medicaid clients are capable of doing themselves (e.g., hiring, terminating, training and supervising attendants); and (2) to provide Medicaid clients with much greater control, flexibility and responsibility for their attendant care.

57. Under the CDASS program, the Department pays an intermediary service

organization (“ISO”) to process and administer employment applications and payroll for attendants. *See* 10 Colo. Code Regs. 2505-10-8.551.1 (definition of “Intermediary Service Organization”).

58. CDASS clients are responsible for the hiring, supervision, training, management, termination, scheduling, tracking of attendant hours worked and submission of employee timesheets to the ISO, and arranging for backup attendant services if and when the scheduled attendant is unable to work.

59. The ISO is paid a fee that is a percentage of each CDASS client’s total allocation.

60. Under CDASS, there is no home health care agency involvement in the provision of client attendant care services.

61. CDASS clients receive far better quality of services by managing their own care.

62. The Department contracts with SEP’s throughout Colorado who, just as they do under the non-CDASS home health care system, continue to provide case management services to CDASS clients. CDASS clients contact their SEP case worker if there are any problems; otherwise, CDASS clients are required only to have twice yearly face-to-face meeting with their case worker to address any ongoing needs or concerns. *See generally* 10 Colo. Code Regs. 2505-10-8.393 (description of “single entry point” duties and functions).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING TO PLAINTIFF CCDC

63. CCDC has many members who are individuals with disabilities eligible for Medicaid-funded long term care services. Many CCDC members are CDASS clients.

64. CCDC has been involved in the creation, implementation and execution of the CDASS program.

65. CCDC members actively worked with members of the Colorado General Assembly and personnel within the Department to create the CDASS program alternative to the home health care agency model of attendant care service delivery.

66. Some of CCDC’s staff members and board members are Medicaid recipients who use attendant care services who advocated for the creation and implementation of the CDASS program and currently receive services under the CDASS program.

67. CCDC has been actively involved in the ongoing operation of the CDASS program including holding positions on the CDASS Advisory Committee, a committee of CDASS clients and Department personnel and, sometimes, a representative from the ISO, and

other interested parties, which advises the Department regarding continuing CDASS program issues and concerns.

68. CCDC has worked with the Department closely to insure the success and progress of the program and has been active with advising the Department and the new ISO during the recent transition of the previous ISO to the new ISO.

69. Despite CCDC's expertise, representation of many members who are CDASS clients and extensive involvement in the creation, implementation and ongoing success of the CDASS program and advisement to the Department to notify CDASS clients regarding the budget cut process, the Department implemented the state budget cuts as applied to CDASS clients without notifying CDASS clients in advance or the CDASS advisory committee.

70. CCDC's purpose is to work for systemic change that promotes independence, self-reliance, and full inclusion for people with disabilities in the entire community. As part of that purpose, CCDC seeks to ensure that persons with disabilities have access to, can participate in and have meaningful input into publicly funded services like the Medicaid Program that impact their lives.

71. CCDC's mission includes striving to ensure that no individual with a disability is isolated and segregated into an institution when appropriate services are available and can be funded to enable such individuals to live in their own homes.

72. CCDC supports consumer direction in long term home health care delivery services.

73. CCDC supports ensuring that CDASS recipients have appropriate allocation amounts available and budget within those allocations, which requires advance notice of changes in clients' Individual Allocations to keep within their Allocation budgets.

74. CCDC engages in extensive outreach as well as advocacy regarding the CDASS program. This effort and this purpose have been and continue to be adversely affected by the Department's failure to provide class members with due process.

75. Defendants' actions have caused and continue to cause distinct, palpable, and perceptible injury to CCDC.

76. CCDC has devoted resources, which could have been devoted to its other outreach, advocacy, and educational efforts, to combating Defendants' violations of law.

77. CCDC has devoted resources, which could have been devoted to its other outreach, advocacy, and educational efforts, to counseling members and others who have been injured by Defendants' violations of law.

78. Defendants' violations of Class Members' due process rights have required and continue to require CCDC to make a greater effort -- and to allocate significant resources -- to educate the public that such Defendants' conduct is wrong and otherwise to counteract the adverse impact of such unlawful conduct. This perceptibly impairs CCDC's counseling, advocacy, educational, and training missions.

79. CCDC also has devoted and continues to devote resources -- including but not limited to those devoted to the present lawsuit -- to identifying and counteracting the sources of Defendants' unlawful conduct.

80. CCDC's injuries -- including, without limitation, those described herein -- are traceable to Defendants' violations of law alleged in this Complaint and will be redressed by the relief requested in it.

81. The participation of individual CCDC members in the lawsuit is not required either to resolve the claims at issue or to formulate relief.

82. CCDC has been harmed by Defendants' practices as set forth in this Complaint.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO THE CLASS

83. There are approximately one thousand fifty-six CDASS clients.

84. The September Cut reductions to CDASS clients' allocations applied to every single CDASS client.

85. Each CDASS client's allocation has been reduced since November of 2009 to pay a higher administrative fee to the new ISO.

86. The additional amount paid to the ISO reduces the amount of funds available for CDASS clients to pay their attendants.

87. The application of the cuts to and the reduction of allocation for CDASS clients -- although applied to all CDASS clients -- have not been done uniformly.

88. As explained below, the Department has caused different percentage reductions of each CDASS client's allocation without an explanation to those clients as to how the Department arrived at and applied the percentage reduction. The percentage reductions do not correspond with the 1.5 percent and 1 percent reductions allegedly required by the state budget cuts imposed by the Department.

89. On information and belief, the September 2009 cuts decreased every CDASS client's allocation by 1.5 percent.

90. The December Cuts decreased every CDASS client's allocation amount by more than 2 percent.

91. In Colorado's home health care system, payment for home health care services are broken into three categories for purposes of determining the amount the Department pays for the service: (1) health maintenance, 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.510.1 (*citing* 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.552.1); (2) personal care, 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.510.1 (*citing* 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.489; and (3) homemaker, 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.510.1 (*citing* 10 Colo. Code. Regs. 2505-10-8.490).

92. Under Colorado's system, the Department pays a higher rate for services provided that fit into the category of health maintenance services as these services are considered to require a higher level of skill and knowledge to perform.

93. On information and belief, only CDASS clients received a 1.5 percent across-the-board reduction in their allocation, including services provided at the higher reimbursement rate for health maintenance tasks.

94. On information and belief, no other non-CDASS Medicaid clients receiving long term care home health services received such an across-the-board reduction.

95. On information and belief, all non-CDASS clients receiving home health care services received a 1.5 percent reduction in the amount paid for personal care and homemaker services, but not health maintenance services.

96. The reduction experienced by CDASS clients for the September cut was a 1.5 percent decrease for all three services was greater than reductions for all non-CDASS clients.

97. CDASS clients did not receive any notice explaining why the disparity in this reduction occurred.

98. CDASS clients were informed by the Department that the 1.5% cut would apply only to homemaker and personal care services.

99. CDASS clients were not provided a right to appeal or request a hearing regarding the disparate reduction.

100. In or about October, 2009, the Department contracted with a new ISO.

101. Without input from CDASS clients, the Department negotiated an increased payment to the ISO.

102. The new ISO is paid eleven percent of each CDASS client's allocation.

103. The former ISO was paid ten percent of each CDASS client's allocation.

104. In the June 17, 2009 CDASS Advisory Committee meeting minutes, the Department told the committee that the "new [ISO] contract will not affect client allocations."

105. The increased ISO fee was implemented effective December 1, 2009 for all CDASS clients.

106. CDASS clients did not receive any advance notice explaining the amount of the reduction resulting from the increased ISO fee.

107. CDASS clients were not provided a right to appeal or request a hearing regarding this reduction resulting from the increase in the ISO fee.

108. No CDASS client received advance notice of the September Cut; however:

1. Some Class Members received no notice of this reduction at all.
2. Some Class Members did not receive any written explanation of the reasons or basis for this cut.
3. Some Class Members received a written letter from their SEP's explaining that the Department had cut 1.5 percent of their CDASS allocations after the reduction had happened.
4. Letters received after the September Cut had been implemented did not explain that only CDASS clients' allocations were reduced so that this reduction applied to their entire allocation rather than to personal care and homemaker services only.
5. Some Class Members were informed of this reduction by telephone and/or messages left by their SEP case workers, but not in writing.
6. No Class Member received notification that the Class Member had a right to appeal or request a hearing regarding this reduction.
7. No Class Member received notification of the legal basis for this

reduction.

109. No CDASS client received advance notice of the December Cut; however:

1. Some Class Members received no notice of this reduction at all.
2. Some Class Members did not receive any written explanation of this reduction.
3. Some Class Members received a written letter from their SEP's explaining that the Department had reduced 1.0 percent of their CDASS allocations and some unspecified amount to pay the increased ISO payment with no explanation of the amount of the increased ISO payment.
4. Some class members received letters after the reduction was made that the ISO fee would be increased from 8 % to 11 % of the client's allocation;
5. Some class members received letters after the reduction was made that the ISO fee would be increased from 10% to 11% of the client's allocation;
6. Some Class Members were informed of this reduction by telephone and/or messages left by their SEP case workers.
7. No Class Member received notification that the Class Member had a right to appeal or request a hearing regarding this reduction.
8. No Class Member received notification of the legal basis for this reduction.
9. No Class Member received an explanation for the increased ISO payment or the basis for its calculation.

110. The ISO fee is capped at ten percent pursuant to the waiver application approved by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

111. CDASS clients' unused monthly allocation funds can be used to pay for attendant care in another month over the amount of their monthly allocations ("Unspent Funds"). Unspent Funds are available for use by the CDASS client for one year from the client's certification date. The certification date is the date the client becomes eligible for CDASS services and renews annually. Any remaining Unspent Funds return to the state.

112. On information and belief, with respect to the December 2009 cuts, Class

Members' allocation reductions differ and reflect a much larger reduction than 1.0 percent. For example, for the following individual plaintiffs:

1. Plaintiff Reiskin's allocation changed 4.06%.
2. Plaintiff Carter's allocation changed 4.06%.
3. Plaintiff Miller's allocation changed 2.14%.

113. If the Department is permitted to implement and continue to apply the September 2009 cuts and December 2009 cuts as it has, CDASS clients will suffer irreparable harm including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Having funds that were available to pay for attendant care services improperly removed from their CDASS allocations;
2. Being unaware of what their allocation amount is;
3. Being unaware of the basis for what amount of their allocation is being used the pay the new ISO;
4. Being forced to use allocation amounts that are insufficient to meet their needs;
5. Risking over budgeting of their CDASS allocations for attendant care services based on inaccurate and improper allocation amounts.

114. Because the Department implemented these reductions without a legal justification, CDASS clients must have an opportunity to appeal the allocation changes.

115. Because the Department implemented reductions in allocations to CDASS clients that it did not apply to non-CDASS clients who receive long term care home health services, CDASS clients must have an opportunity to appeal the allocation changes.

116. Because the Department increased the amount of CDASS allocations to pay the ISO, CDASS clients must have an opportunity to appeal the allocation changes.

117. The Department did not provide sufficient notice to CDASS clients regarding allocation changes to meet the requirements of due process.

118. Since the filing of this lawsuit, without explanation, CDASS clients' allocations have been fluctuating beyond changes specifically identified herein.

119. Some CDASS clients' allocations were raised slightly retroactive to September of 2009; however, the total reduction effective September 1, 2009 was still greater than 2% for each client.

120. On information and belief, the Department intends to cut an additional one percent from all CDASS clients' allocations on July 1, 2010.

121. On information and belief, most CDASS clients have not been provided with notice of an additional reduction in allocation amounts for July 1, 2010; however, the one percent cut was announced to the CDASS advisory committee on June 16, 2010.

122. Class members have all sustained harm from Defendants' arbitrary and capricious application of these cuts.

123. Class members have all sustained harm because of Defendants' lack of appropriate notice of allocation reductions.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING TO INDIVIDUAL PLAINTIFFS

124. Plaintiffs have been and will continue to be damaged by the Department's actions and will suffer irreparable harm if the Department's conduct does not change.

Julie Reiskin

125. Plaintiff Julie Reiskin is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

126. Plaintiff Reiskin received a letter dated October 13, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5% "effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction."

127. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

128. Plaintiff Reiskin's letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

129. Plaintiff Reiskin's letter did not provide Ms. Reiskin with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

130. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Reiskin of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff

Reiskin may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

131. Plaintiff Reiskin was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

132. Plaintiff Reiskin received a letter December 2, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced by 1% “effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

133. Ms. Reiskin’s allocation amount was reduced 4.06% from September of 2009 to December of 2009.

134. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Reiskin with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

135. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Reiskin of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Reiskin may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

136. The letter also stated, “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships, LLC,” but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was “adjusted.”

137. Plaintiff Reiskin was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced for this reason.

138. Plaintiff Reiskin has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants’ conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of her allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Pamela Carter

139. Plaintiff Pamela Carter is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

140. Plaintiff Carter received a letter dated October 13, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5% “effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

141. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance,

personal care and homemaker -- performed.

142. Plaintiff Carter's letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

143. Plaintiff Carter's letter did not provide Ms. Carter with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

144. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Carter of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Carter may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

145. Plaintiff Carter was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

146. Plaintiff Carter received a letter December 2, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced by 1% "effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction."

147. Ms. Carter's allocation amount was reduced 4.06% from September of 2009 to December of 2009.

148. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Carter with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

149. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Carter of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Carter may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

150. The letter also stated, "Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships, LLC," but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was "adjusted."

151. Plaintiff Carter was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced for this reason.

152. Plaintiff Carter has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants' conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of her allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Debbie Miller

153. Debbie Miller is the parent of and guardian for Brian Miller who is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

154. Plaintiff Miller received a letter dated October 13, 2009 informing him that his allocation had been reduced 1.5% “effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

155. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

156. Plaintiff Miller’s letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

157. Plaintiff Miller’s letter did not provide Mr. Miller with a notice of his right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

158. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Miller of his right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Miller may represent himself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

159. Plaintiff Miller was not provided with prior notice that his CDASS allocation would be reduced.

160. Plaintiff Miller received a letter December 2, 2009 informing him that his allocation amount had been reduced by 1% “effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

161. Mr. Miller’s allocation amount was reduced 2.14% from September of 2009 to December of 2009.

162. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Miller with a notice of his right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

163. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Miller of his right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Miller may represent himself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

164. The letter also stated, “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships, LLC,” but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was “adjusted.”

165. Plaintiff Miller was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced for this reason.

166. Plaintiff Miller has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants' conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of his allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Anne-Marie Mokritsky-Martin

167. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

168. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin received a letter dated October 20, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced by 1.5% effective September 1, 2009 as a result of state budget cuts and this reduction was not appealable.

169. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

170. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

171. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin with a notice of her rights to appeal the reduction in allocation.

172. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

173. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

174. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin received no letter regarding the December cut.

175. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin had a series of e-mail exchanges with her case worker, Department employees and others trying to determine what the changes were to her allocation amount. She received conflicting responses.

176. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

177. Plaintiff Mokritsky-Martin has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants' conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of her allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Laura Hershey

178. Plaintiff Laura Hershey is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

179. Plaintiff Hershey received a letter dated October 14, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5% "effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction."

180. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

181. Plaintiff Hershey's letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

182. Plaintiff Hershey's letter did not provide Ms. Hershey with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

183. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hershey of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hershey may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

184. Plaintiff Hershey was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

185. Plaintiff Hershey received a letter December 14, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced by 1% "effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction."

186. Ms. Hershey's allocation amount was reduced 2.13% from September of 2009 to December of 2009.

187. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Hershey with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

188. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hershey of her right to have a hearing

conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hershey may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

189. The letter also stated, “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships, LLC,” but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was “adjusted.”

190. Plaintiff Hershey was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced for this reason.

191. Plaintiff Hershey has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants’ conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of her allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Robin Stephens

192. Plaintiff Robin Stephens is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

193. Plaintiff Stephens received a letter dated October 14, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5% “effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

194. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker – performed.

195. Plaintiff Stephens’ letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

196. Plaintiff Stephens’ letter did not provide Ms. Stephens with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

197. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Stephens of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Stephens may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

198. Plaintiff Stephens was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

199. Plaintiff Stephens received a letter December 14, 2009 informing her that her

allocation amount had been reduced by 1% “effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

200. Ms. Stephens’s allocation amount was reduced 2.13% from September of 2009 to December of 2009.

201. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Stephens with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

202. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Stephens of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Stephens may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

203. The letter also stated, “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships, LLC,” but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was “adjusted.”

204. Plaintiff Stephens was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced for this reason.

205. Plaintiff Stephens has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants’ conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of her allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Patrick Ham

206. Plaintiff Patrick Ham is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

207. Plaintiff Ham received a letter dated October 9, 2009, informing him that his allocation had been reduced by 1.5%, effective September 1, 2009.

208. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

209. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

210. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Ham with a notice of his right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

211. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Ham of his right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Ham may represent himself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

212. Plaintiff Ham was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

213. Plaintiff Ham received a letter dated December 1, 2009 informing him that his allocation amount had been reduced again by 1% and that the administrative fee had increased to 11%.

214. Plaintiff Ham's allocation actually changed 4.06% between September and December of 2009.

215. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Ham with a notice of his right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

216. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Ham of his right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Ham may represent himself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

217. This letter informed Plaintiff Ham that the reduction was already effective as of December 1, 2009.

218. The letter also stated, "Additionally, effective December 1, 2009, the administrative fee will be 11% for PPL[.]" but does not explain how the allocation amount was adjusted.

219. Plaintiff Ham was not provided with prior notice that his CDASS allocation would be reduced.

220. Plaintiff Ham has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants' conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of his allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Crystal Hunter

221. Plaintiff Crystal Hunter is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

222. Plaintiff Hunter received a letter dated October 13, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5% "effective 9/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate

reduction.”

223. The actual reduction based on the number identified in the letter was approximately .97%

224. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker – performed.

225. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

226. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Hunter with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

227. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hunter of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hunter may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

228. Plaintiff Hunter was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

229. Plaintiff Hunter received a letter dated December 9, 2009, informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced again by 1%, effective December 1, 2009.

230. This letter further stated, “Previously you received a letter from Scott Harner stating your monthly allocation effective 09/01/2009 was \$17,478.52. This was incorrect. Your monthly allocation for services with the administrative fee removed was \$15,889.56 from 09/01/09-11/30/09.”

231. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Hunter with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation, and did not explain the disparity between the October 13 letter and this letter.

232. The actual reduction change from September to December 2009 was 2.14%.

233. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hunter of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hunter may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

234. This letter informed Plaintiff Hunter that the reduction was already effective as of

December 1, 2009 “to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

235. The letter also stated, “Please adjust your attendant support management plan and budgeting for services to reflect your new allocation.”

236. Plaintiff Hunter was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

237. Plaintiff Hunter has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by Defendants’ conduct unless Defendants are ordered to restore the amount of his allocation improperly removed and to provide advance notice of any future allocation cuts.

Holly Fiscus

238. Plaintiff Holly Fiscus is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

239. On information and belief, Plaintiff Fiscus was sent a letter on October 14, 2009, informing her that her Individual Allocation had been reduced by 1.5%, effective September 1, 2010 “in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

240. The letter stated, “Please adjust your attendant support management plan and budgeting for services to reflect your new allocation.”

241. This change in location applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker – performed.

242. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

243. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Fiscus with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

244. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Fiscus of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hunter may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

245. Plaintiff Fiscus was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

246. Plaintiff Fiscus received a letter dated December 11, 2009 informing her that her

“CDASS allocation has been reduced by 1% effective 12/1/09 in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

247. The letter also informed Ms. Fiscus that “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new administration fee for Public Partnerships LLC.”

248. The letter did not explain the amount of the administrative fee adjustment.

249. The percentage change in allocation amount for Ms. Fiscus from September to December was 2.14%.

250. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Fiscus with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

251. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Fiscus of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Fiscus may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

252. Plaintiff Fiscus was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

253. Plaintiff Fiscus has been harmed and will continue to be harmed unless this Court orders a reinstatement of her pre-September 2009 CDASS allocation amount and orders Defendant provide Plaintiff Fiscus with appropriate due process before attempting to reduce her CDASS allocation.

Kristina Sawyckyj

254. Plaintiff Kristina Sawyckyj is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

255. Plaintiff Sawyckyj received a letter dated October 15, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced by 1.5%, effective September 1, 2010.

256. The letter stated, “Please adjust your attendant support management plan and budgeting for services to reflect your new allocation.”

257. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker -- performed.

258. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction

between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

259. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Sawyckyj with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

260. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Sawyckyj of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Sawyckyj may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

261. Plaintiff Sawyckyj was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

262. Plaintiff Sawyckyj received a letter December 10, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been changed as follows: "A 3% increase of the monthly administrative fee for the company providing Fiscal Management Services (FMS). The new FMS company as of 12/11/09 is Public Partnership Limited. The monthly administrative fee has gone from 8% to 11% as of 12/1/09. (Please note that the previous FMS admin fee had been recently reduced to 8% in Sept 2009. So this is returning the FMS admin fee back to a previous rate.) This increase will be deducted from the total monthly CDASS allocation, so you will see a decrease in your monthly CDASS allocation."

263. The letter stated the reductions in allocation were effective December 1, 2010.

264. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Sawyckyj with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation and said the reduction was "not appealable."

265. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Sawyckyj of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Sawyckyj may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

266. Plaintiff Sawyckyj was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

267. Plaintiff Sawyckyj has been harmed and will continue to be harmed until this Court orders a reinstatement of her pre-September 2009 CDASS allocation amount and orders Defendant to provide Plaintiff Sawyckyj with appropriate due process before attempting to reduce her CDASS allocation.

Marion Hamby

268. Plaintiff Marion Hamby is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

269. Plaintiff Hamby received a letter dated October 8, 2009 informing her that her allocation had been reduced 1.5%, effective September 1, 2009, “in order to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

270. The letter stated, “Please adjust your attendant support management plan and budgeting for services to reflect your new allocation.”

271. This change in allocation applied to all types of services -- health maintenance, personal care and homemaker – performed.

272. This letter did not provide an explanation of the disparity in the benefit reduction between the CDASS program and other home health care services programs.

273. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Hamby with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

274. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hamby of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hamby may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

275. Plaintiff Hamby was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

276. Plaintiff Hamby received a letter December 10, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced another 1%.

277. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Hamby with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

278. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Hamby of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Hamby may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

279. This letter informed Plaintiff Hamby that the reduction was already effective as of December 1, 2009 “to comply with the provider rate reduction.”

280. The letter also stated, “Your allocation has also been adjusted to allow for the new

administration fee for Public Partnerships. LLC,” but does not explain what the amount of the fee is or how the allocation amount was “adjusted.”

281. Plaintiff Hamby was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

282. Plaintiff Hamby has been harmed and will continue to be harmed until this Court orders a reinstatement of her pre-September 2009 CDASS allocation amount and orders Defendant to provide Plaintiff Hamby with appropriate due process before attempting to reduce her CDASS allocation.

Debbie Lane

283. Plaintiff Debbie Lane is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

284. Plaintiff Lane is believed to have had an allocation reduction of 1.5% as of September 1, 2009.

285. Plaintiff Lane never received a letter regarding this reduction.

286. Plaintiff Lane was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

287. Plaintiff Lane received an e-mail message dated December 11, 2009 informing her that her allocation amount had been reduced, stating “they have asked us to do small reductions again to CDASS allocations.”

288. This e-mail did not explain the basis for the reduction.

289. This e-mail did not explain when the reduction was applicable.

290. This letter did not provide Plaintiff Lane with a notice of her right to appeal the reduction in allocation.

291. This letter provided no notice to Plaintiff Lane of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Lane may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

292. Plaintiff Lane was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

293. Plaintiff Lane has been harmed and will continue to be harmed until this Court orders a reinstatement of her pre-September 2009 CDASS allocation amount and orders Defendant to provide Plaintiff Lane with appropriate due process before attempting to reduce her CDASS allocation.

Linda Ivey

294. Plaintiff Linda Ivey is qualified to receive long term care services through the CDASS program.

295. Plaintiff Ivey is believed to have had an allocation reduction of 1.5% as of September 1, 2009 and additional reductions as of December 1, 2009.

296. Plaintiff Ivey was not provided with prior notice that her CDASS allocation would be reduced.

297. Plaintiff Ivey was not provided with advance notice of her right to have a hearing conducted regarding the allocation reduction, how to request such a hearing, and that Plaintiff Ivey may represent herself or use legal counsel or other spokesperson to assist with the hearing.

298. Plaintiff Ivey been harmed and will continue to be harmed until this Court orders a reinstatement of her pre-September 2009 CDASS allocation amount and orders Defendant to provide Plaintiff Ivey appropriate due process before attempting to reduce her CDASS allocation.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK
The Medicaid Act

299. Medicaid is a medical assistance program for the indigent, supported jointly by state and federal funds. 42 U.S.C. § 1396 *et seq.* States are not required to participate in the Medicaid program, but if a state chooses to participate, it must comply with the requirements of the federal Medicaid Act and its implementing regulations. State Medicaid programs are implemented according to comprehensive written plans for medical assistance. 42 U.S.C. § 1396. State plans must be submitted to the Secretary of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for approval, to ensure compliance with federal law.

300. The federal Medicaid program requires a state to establish or designate a single State agency that is responsible for administering or supervising the administration of the State's Medicaid program. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a (a)(5). Colorado has chosen to participate in the Medicaid program, and it accepts federal matching funds for its program expenditures. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 26-4-105. Colorado has designated Defendant Department as the single State agency that is responsible for administering and supervising the administration of Colorado's

Medicaid program.

301. Through its participation in Medicaid, The Department is required to provide home health services to categorically needy recipients ages twenty-one and over. 42 C.F.R. § 441.15(b)(1); *see also* 42 C.F.R. § 441.70 (definition of home health services).

302. The CDASS program is a long term home health care services delivery option provided by the Department.

303. Applicants for and recipients of Medicaid have the right to an administrative hearing whenever the State agency “takes action to suspend, terminate, or *reduce*” services or eligibility. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1396a-(a)(3); 42 C.F.R. § 431.200; *see also* 42 C.F.R. 431.201. The state Medicaid agency’s fair hearing system “must meet the due process standards set forth in *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970) and any additional standards specified in this subpart.” 42 C.F.R. § 431.205.

304. Before “denying, suspending, terminating or *reducing* benefits,” the state Medicaid agency must “issue and publicize its hearing procedures” which inform every applicant or recipient in writing of: his right to a hearing; how to request a hearing; and that the beneficiary may represent herself or use legal counsel, a relative, a friend or other spokesperson.” 42 C.F.R. § 431.206 (emphasis added). The notice required to be provided to recipients must be provided ten days prior to the date of the adverse action. 42 C.F.R. § 431.11. The notice must be provided “[a]t the time of any action affecting [the Medicaid client’s] claim,” 42 C.F.R. § 431.206(c)(2).

305. The required notice must provide the following:

1. The reasons for the intended action;
2. the specific regulations that support, or the change in Federal or State law that requires, the action;
3. an explanation of the individual’s right to request an evidentiary hearing if one is available, or a State agency hearing; or,
4. in cases of an action based on a change in law, the circumstances under which a hearing will be granted; and
5. an explanation of the circumstances under which the Medicaid benefit is continued if a hearing is requested.

42 C.F.R. § 431.210.

306. In the case at bar, the Department failed to provide notice, or, in those cases where SEP's sent letters to CDASS clients, failed to provide notice in a timely manner, and failed to provide notice that complies with the requirements of due process as set forth in 42 C.F.R. § 431.210 above.

307. The Department's unlawful notice has caused CDASS clients harm and will continue to cause CDASS clients harm until the Department is ordered to provide CDASS clients with a notice that enables CDASS clients to manage their allocations and CDASS services as required under the program.

308. All CDASS clients were entitled to and are entitled to an opportunity for a hearing on the reductions of their allocations; however, the Department "need not grant a hearing if the sole issue is a Federal or State law requiring an automatic change adversely affecting some or all recipients." 42 C.F.R. § 431.220(b).

309. With respect to the September 2009 cuts, the "sole issue" of the reduction in CDASS' clients was not a change in Federal or State law as CDASS clients and only CDASS clients had their allocations reduced across-the-board, including health maintenance services. No change in Federal or State law permitted the Department to cut services for this subset of long term care health services clients and no other.

310. With respect to the December 2009 cuts, the amount of allocation reduction devoted to the increased ISO payment was not related to any change in Federal or State law.

311. The December Cuts also were greater than 2%, which would have been the amount reduced based on the 1% budget cut and 1% administrative fee increase.

312. The Department unlawfully failed to provide advance notice of these reductions to CDASS clients.

313. The Department unlawfully failed to provide CDASS clients with an opportunity to have a hearing.

314. CDASS clients were harmed and will continue to be harmed by the Department's failure to provide an opportunity for a hearing regarding their allocation reductions.

Consumer Directed Attendant Support System

315. Under state law regarding the CDASS program, the Department:

shall implement a consumer-directed care service model that allows eligible persons to

receive a direct payment through a voucher to purchase qualified services. . . . The state department shall design and implement the consumer-directed care service model with input from consumers of home- and community-based services or their authorized representatives. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25.5-6-1102(1).

316. The Department implemented the September 2009 cuts and December 2009 cuts without the input of CDASS clients.

317. In order to qualify and to remain eligible for the consumer-directed care service model authorized by this section, a person shall: (a) Be eligible for home- and community-based services; (b) Be willing to participate; (c) Obtain a statement from his or her primary care physician or advanced practice nurse indicating that the person has sound judgment and the ability to direct his or her care or has an authorized representative; (d) Demonstrate the ability to handle the financial aspects of self-directed care or has an authorized representative who is able to handle the financial aspects of the eligible person's care; and (e) Meet any other qualifications established by the state board by rule. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25.5-6-1102(2).

318. All class members meet the qualification and eligibility requirements for the CDASS program.

319. In the CDASS program, each client or authorized representative submits an Attendant Support Management Plan ("ASM") to the client's SEP caseworker in advance of acceptance into the program, receives training and must take a test regarding the ability to self-direct and manage attendant care, and must meet with an SEP caseworker twice a year to ensure the program is working effectively and to see if any changes in services are needed.

320. Individual Allocations for each CDASS client means the following:

[F]unds made available by the Department to Program Participants and administered by an Intermediary Service Organization. These funds shall be available each month that a Program Participant meets program eligibility and shall be calculated based on the Program Participant's history of attendant support utilization or on the personal care, homemaker, home health aide, and nursing services defined in the client's care plan. 10 Colo. Code Regs. § 2505-10.8551.1.

321. The Department's reductions in CDASS clients' allocations were based on factors in violation of the CDASS regulations, including without limitation, the reduction of CDASS clients' allocations attributable to the increased ISO payment.

322. Covered services in the CDASS program shall be attendant support, which includes skilled nursing services and home health aide services, Long Term Home Health and Long Term with Acute Episode Home Health as defined under the Home Health Program at 10

COLO. CODE REGS. 2505-10, §8.520 et seq. and Personal Care and Homemaker Services, as defined under the Long-Term Care Program at 10 Colo. Code Regs. 2505-10, §§ 8.489, 8.490 and 8551.2.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Violations of the Medicaid Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1396 et seq.)

323. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of this Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

324. Reducing Medicaid to eligible CDASS clients and applicants due to the Department's implementation of the budget cuts identified herein violates the Federal Medicaid Act and implementing regulations as more fully described in this Complaint.

325. As a direct and proximate result of the actions of Defendants and the implementation of budget cuts, Plaintiffs have suffered and will suffer immediate and irreparable harm as described herein.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Violations of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, 42 U.S.C. § 1983)

326. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of this Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

327. Defendants' failure to provide adequate notice and grant Plaintiffs and Plaintiff class members an opportunity for a pre-reduction administrative hearing violates the right of Plaintiffs and each and every member of the class are entitled to and were denied by the Department due process of law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

328. As a direct and proximate result of the actions and inactions of Defendants, Plaintiffs have suffered and will suffer immediate and irreparable harm as described herein.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

329. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of this Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

330. Plaintiffs and Defendants have a real and actual controversy as to the implementation and maintenance of the allocation reductions as described herein and the consequences to Plaintiffs that have resulted and will result from the implementation of the

budget cuts.

331. A judicial determination as to the parties' rights and obligations under applicable law will fully and finally resolve the uncertainty and controversy between the parties.

332. This Court has authority to make such a determination pursuant to Colo. Rev. Stat. § 13-51-106 and Rule 57 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

333. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of this Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

334. Plaintiffs have been and will be irreparably harmed if Defendants are allowed to implement budget cuts without adequate safeguards to ensure that Plaintiffs do not suffer the wrongful reduction of allocations and medical assistance under the CDASS program. The wrongful reduction of allocations violates the right of Plaintiffs and each and every member of the class to due process of law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. There exists no adequate remedy at law for the harm that Plaintiffs will suffer due to Defendants' actions.

335. Plaintiffs are entitled to a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants from implementing the budget cuts in the CDASS program until such time as Defendants can demonstrate that they are able to ensure that timely and accurate allocation amounts and medical assistance will be provided to Plaintiffs and members of the class and that applicable laws and statutes will not be violated as a result of the implementation of the budget cuts and allocation reductions in the CDASS program.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request:

1. Certify the proposed class and order that this action be maintained as a class action pursuant to Colorado Rule of Civil Procedure 23;
2. Declare that the implementation of the budget cuts and other reductions in allocations in the CDASS program will result in the wrongful reduction of assistance under the CDASS program and will violate the Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution, federal statutes, the Colorado Constitution and statutes and implementing regulations;
3. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from improperly applying the budget cuts in the CDASS program until such time as Defendants can demonstrate that they are

able to ensure that timely and accurate benefits will be provided to Plaintiffs and members of the class and that applicable laws and statutes will not be violated as a result of implementation of budget cuts and allocation reductions;

4. Permanently enjoin Defendants from failing to continue to provide timely and accurate benefits and to Plaintiffs and members of the class;

5. Award Plaintiffs actual damages, interest, costs and expert witness fees as provided by law;

6. Award Plaintiffs reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and applicable Colorado law; and

7. Grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

JURY DEMAND: Plaintiffs demand a jury on all issues which can be heard by a jury.

Dated: June 21, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

COLORADO CROSS-DISABILITY COALITION
LEGAL PROGRAM

/s/ Kevin W. Williams
Kevin W. Williams
Legal Program Director

Address of Colorado Cross-Disability Coalition:

655 Broadway, Suite 775
Denver, Colorado 80203

Address of Julie Reiskin:

3645 Milwaukee Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

Address of Pamela Carter:

3645 Milwaukee Street
Denver, Colorado 80205

Address of Plaintiffs Debbie and Brian Miller:

8400 Adams Way
Thornton, Colorado 80229

Address of Plaintiff Anne-Marie Mokritsky-Martin

676 Poplar Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80304

Address of Plaintiff Laura Hershey

4411 South Washington Street
Englewood, Colorado 80113

Address of Plaintiff Robin Stephens

4411 South Washington Street
Englewood, Colorado 80113

Address of Plaintiffs Pat and Patrick Ham

1050 Hessen Drive
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524

Address of Plaintiff Crystal Hunter

9595 Pecos Street, Lot # 697
Thornton, Colorado 80260

Address of Plaintiff Holly Fiscus

9217 South Sugarstone Circle
Highlands Ranch, Colorado 80130

Address of Plaintiff Kristina Sawyckyj

1113 Keith Drive
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80916

Address of Plaintiff Marion Hamby

5975 South Gaylord Way

Greenwood Village, Colorado 80121

Address of Plaintiff Debbie Lane:

236 Range Road
Nederland, CO 80466

Address of Plaintiff Linda S. Ivey:

10 East Garden # 37
Windsor, CO 80550