



# NAMI PA, Berks County Affiliate

(An affiliate of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill)  
P.O. Box 6642, Wyomissing, PA. 19610-0642

Telephone: (610) 736-3095

Original: 2296

November 1, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO:

*Karole Aldridge*  
*Willie*  
*OLC*  
*Harriet*  
*File*

Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431, Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Director Zogby:

NAMI-PA, Berks County Affiliate, with its 100+ members, **is strongly opposed** to the action that DPW proposes to eliminate Medical Assistance for a targeted population.

NAMI of Berks County has been made aware the Department of Public Welfare has issued **proposed regulations** that would eliminate prescription medication coverage for over 7,000 Pennsylvanians in the near future (2003). Most of these Pennsylvanians are on Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) which gives them monthly incomes slightly above the established federal poverty level.

Some of these targeted Pennsylvanians are people with mental illnesses. They are receiving SSDI either based upon their past earnings or on the earnings of a retired or deceased parent or spouse. The prescription coverage for these mentally ill individuals is currently provided by a special category of Medical Assistance known as "NMP spend down."

DPW's proposed regulations would eliminate entirely the "NMP spend down" category of Medical Assistance. Although these affected individuals might qualify for Medical Assistance under another category known as "MNO spend down," this category does not cover prescription medications. As DPW staff may well know, the costs of modern, effective medications for the mentally ill are extremely expensive and beyond the incomes received by people enrolled for SSDI.

Furthermore, DPW staff should be aware that people with mental illnesses require their medications on a daily, regular basis to live a "more normal" life in their communities. OMHSAS is promoting the successful release of patients from State mental health facilities under CHIPP with its concomitant savings of taxpayers' money. Targeting 7,000 Pennsylvanians with discontinuance of their Medical Assistance may put the State of Pennsylvania at risk of seeing the in-patient census increase at its remaining mental health facilities. People with mental illnesses that cannot afford expensive medication will become unstable and require hospitalizations at potentially greater expense to the State.


Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy, DPW

November 1, 2002  
Page 2

The elimination of prescription medication coverage for people with mental illnesses under the current "MNP spend down" category of Medical Assistance is a very bad idea for DPW to contemplate.

NAMI of Berks County recommends the Department of Public Welfare retract its regulation proposal and leave the current system of Medical Assistance in tact. The pursuit of altering or eliminating Medical Assistance for the mentally ill should be discontinued immediately.

Sincerely,



Donald R. Levan  
President

cc: NAMI Pennsylvania

Administrative Services  
November 1, 2002

Brian McLaughlin  
2921 Berkeley RD.  
Erie, PA 16506

#14-477-42

Original: 2296

11/1/02

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Policy  
DPW  
Room 431 Health and Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed elimination of medication benefit in the "NMP Spend Down" category.

Any reduction in medication benefits will negatively impact persons with mental illness. As you know access to medication enables persons with mental illness control their symptoms. Access enables them to avoid emergency hospitalizations and in some cases imprisonment. Clearly restricting access to medication will result in greater expense and personal tragedy.

I look forward to your positive action regarding this issue. Thank you for your attention to this most important issue.

Sincerely,

  
Brian McLaughlin

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO: Kayla Aldridge  
Willie  
OLC  
Homes  
Full

# CARIE

**Executive Director**  
Diane A. Menio, MS

**Board of Directors**  
Steven J. Devlin, PhD  
Chair

Emily Amerman, MSW  
Vice-Chair

Elizabeth R. Balderston, MSS  
Secretary

Ann Sholly, PA-C  
Treasurer

Willo Carey  
Louis G. Colbert, MSW  
Nora Dowd, JD  
Carl George  
Florina Gogarnoiu, MBA  
John M. Harris, MBA  
Trudy Haynes  
William Kavesh, MD  
Rose Koren Moody  
Arnold Phillips  
Rebecca Snyder Phillips, MSN, RN  
Arnold Tiemeyer, MDiv

**Members Emeritus**  
Margaret Burns  
Thomas W. Clark, MD  
Rev. Francis A. Shearer  
Bernice Soffer, MSW  
Roger K. Stephens, MSW  
Josephine Terrell  
Margaret Yeakel, DSW

**National Advisory Council**  
Robert Applebaum, PhD  
William F. Benson  
Msgr. Charles J. Fahey, DDiv  
Terry Fulmer, PhD  
Iris Freeman, MSW  
Elma Holder, MPH  
Robert Hudson, PhD  
Rosalie Kane, PhD  
Brian Lindberg, MMHS  
Karl Pillemer, PhD  
Lori Rosenquist Griswold, PhD  
Robyn Stone, DrPH

October 31, 2002

NOV - 6 AM 9:31

Chairman John R. McGinley, Jr. Esq.  
Independent Regulatory Review Commission  
333 Market Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Original: 2296

RE: Income Provisions for Categorically NMP-MA and MNO-MA

Dear Chairman McGinley:

On behalf of CARIE, the Center for Advocacy for the Rights and Interests of the Elderly, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations for the elimination of the Non-Money Payment (NMP) spend-down. CARIE opposes these proposed regulations. The changes are clearly not in the best interest of the public. We hope you will consider our concerns and make needed revisions before the final regulations are published and promulgated.

As you know, NMP spend-down is a safety net program for Pennsylvanians with costly medical bills. The NMP spend-down allows individuals to deduct the amount paid in medical bills from their monthly income to become eligible for Medical Assistance (MA). It is a cumbersome process where the individual needs to show proof of monthly income and provide receipts each month to prove that they have spent their income on approved medical expenses. Most individuals who utilize the program are just above the income limit for Medicaid. They either have no or limited savings, or have spent their savings because of their illness. All have high monthly medical expenses. To participate in this program, one must pay a minimum of \$137/month (the difference between the Healthy Horizons and SSI levels) and most spend closer to \$250/month. Because of the cumbersome process and the expensive monthly payment (which can be likened to a premium), only those with high out-of-pocket costs are even able to participate in this program. Older Pennsylvanians rely on the NMP spend-down program to help pay for high prescription medication costs and other medical expenses not covered by Medicare.

The Department of Public Welfare (DPW) estimates that over 7,000 individuals, including many older adults will lose their benefits. This program is certainly not a "budget buster" for the Commonwealth. However, its loss will leave many with no place to turn for help at a time when they need it most. Absent healthcare coverage, older Pennsylvanians will not take prescribed medications.

More Than 25 Years  
**25**  
in Service to the Elderly

**Center for Advocacy for the Rights and Interests of the Elderly**  
100 North 17th Street, Suite 600 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
T: 215.545.5728 F: 215.545.5372 W: [www.carie.org](http://www.carie.org)



A United Way Agency

Their conditions will deteriorate. And, they will end up requiring more costly hospital or nursing home care. It is also important to mention that Pennsylvania loses the federal matching funds and may lose \$418 million in federal funding that is being proposed to help states that do not decrease MA benefits. (U.S. Senate Bill 812 allowing for this provision has already passed the Senate.)

We are pleased to see DPW's plan to automatically review recipients for other programs that may help them pay for medical expenses. (Described in the *Affected Persons and Organizations* comment section) Individuals are often unaware that they are eligible for certain benefits or programs. However, we recommend adding language to the *Fiscal Impact, Commonwealth* comment section to reflect the loss of federal funding.

CARIE understands the growing fiscal challenges that DPW is facing. It is important to consider that just as the state is facing financial problems, so too are individuals and families with catastrophic or terminal illnesses. These individuals and families need the support of the state at a time when they have nowhere else to turn. Additionally, the fiscal impact on the Department of allowing these most chronically ill individuals to deteriorate to a point at which they will need hospital or nursing home care and will be eligible for MA coverage of the cost of that care needs to be considered. Earlier this year, the citizens of Pennsylvania as well as the nation anxiously watched the rescue of the 18 miners from the Quecreek mining accident. The Commonwealth can be proud of its response to this accident. Governor Schweiker and other officials demonstrated strong leadership and marshaled the needed resources to have a successful resolution to the crisis. The same response in terms of leadership and resources should be given to the 7,000 individuals who are sick and need support from the Commonwealth. It would have been unconscionable to leave the miners to die. It is unconscionable to leave those with dire medical needs with nowhere to turn for help.

Recently, CARIE helped a 62-year-old Hispanic woman with no health insurance apply to the spend-down program. She has multiple medical problems and has monthly prescription drug costs of over \$200. She is married and the couple's joint income is just over the Medicaid limit, and she will not be eligible for PACE until she turns 65. She cannot afford to pay for her heart and blood pressure medications or prescriptions for arthritis. Spend-down will allow her to get the prescription drugs and medical care that she needs.

CARIE suggests that rather than cut this vital program to save costs, DPW should look at its proposed regulations for pharmaceutical services (55 PA. Code Ch. 1121). The *Need for the Proposed Rulemaking* references a study done by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) entitled, "Medicaid Pharmacy – Actual Acquisition Costs of Brand Name Prescription Drug Products." DPW references this study and others to justify the change in reimbursement for prescription drugs from the Average Wholesale Price (AWP) minus 10% to minus 15%. In September 2002, the OIG issued a follow-up report, "Medicaid Pharmacy – Additional Analyses of the Actual Acquisition Cost of Prescription Drug Products (A-06-02-00041)." OIG concluded the following:


- “For single source innovator drugs: pharmacies purchased the drugs at an estimated discount of 17.2% below AWP.
- For all drugs without FULs: pharmacies purchased the drugs at an estimated discount of 27.2% below AWP.
- For multiple source drugs without FULs: pharmacies purchased the drugs at an estimated discount of 44.2% below AWP. (Innovator multiple source drugs at an estimated discount of 24.4% and 54.2% for non-innovator multiple source drugs.)
- For multiple source drugs with FULs: pharmacies purchased the drugs at an estimated discount of 72.1% below AWP.”

OIG recommends that if states use a reimbursement system based on the AWP, they should use a four-tiered payment system (based on the above categories) to bring pharmacy reimbursement more in line with the actual acquisition cost of prescription drugs. OIG stated, “using a single percentage discount does not adequately consider the large fluctuations in actual discounts between brands and generics that we found during our additional analysis.” CARIE believes that rather than cut the spend-down program, DPW could realize significant savings by implementing OIG’s recommendations.

Founded in 1977, CARIE is a non-profit organization dedicated to improving the quality of life for frail older adults. CARIE’s focus of concern spans the long term care continuum of long-term care needs from those who are homebound to those who are institutionalized. Older adults who experience physical or psychological impairment frequently have difficulty advocating for themselves and are often a silent group. CARIE works to protect their rights and promote awareness of their special needs and concerns.

If you need any further clarification regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (215) 545-5728, extension 244 or at [menio@carie.org](mailto:menio@carie.org).

Sincerely,



Diane A. Menio  
Executive Director

# 14-477-25

Original: 2296

193 Koval Court  
Delmont, PA 15626  
November 1, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health and Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

NOV 04 2002

REFER TO: *Kayle Aldridge*  
*W/Ch*  
*OLC*  
*James*  
*Fell*

Re: Proposed Department of Welfare Regulations

I am only one individual, but I am involved as a volunteer with many aspects of the areas that will be impacted by the proposed regulations. My friends in the mental health community are very upset by them. My friends in the disability community are upset about the Medicaid spend-down. My friends who are elder-law attorneys are upset about certain aspects of the spend-down for seniors. My friends in small personal homes are afraid they might have to close.

I think the timing of the proposed regulations is all wrong. Many of us have been trying to get legislation passed that will define the differences in them. These regulations will treat all personal homes and assisted living facilities the same. There are huge differences in how small personal homes should be run versus the way large assisted living facilities should be run. It is not clear that the two different types of residences should even be regulated by the same department. I see no need for the Department of Welfare to be involved in regulating facilities that have no residents on welfare or Medicaid.

Please put off adopting these regulations until all of the concerns from so many different people are addressed. Give the new administration, whomever it is going to be, the chance to work with the many different groups that have so many concerns about them. The regulations are supposed to help the residents in these facilities, not harm them.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara N. Dickman

*Barbara N. Dickman*

NOV 04 2002

6732 22 9-10000000

**Jubilee Soup Kitchen**  
(412) 261-5417

**Jubilee Pantry**  
(412) 683-0739

**Jubilee Medical Clinic**  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 110 / 114

**Jubilee Job Corner / Social Outreach**  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 106

**John Heinz Child Development Center**  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 113

**Jubilee Educational Programs**  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 109 / 111



## **Jubilee Association, Inc.**

**P.O. Box 42251 • Pittsburgh, PA 15203-0051**

Original: 2296

November 6, 2002

Independent Regulatory Review Commission  
333 Market, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Sister Liguori Rossner, and I am the Executive Director of the *Jubilee Association/Jubilee Soup Kitchen*. The *Jubilee Association* is 23 years old and serves in the Hill District of Pittsburgh. We come into contact each day with persons who are disabled, those without medical coverage and witness the effects of this hardship on themselves and society.

We are opposed to the elimination of NMP Spend-Down as proposed by the DPW. We know that this proposed legislation will further increase the hardships of disabled people and will eventually cost the state and the taxpayers more money, as these persons health deteriorates. It is imperative that the DPW withdraw this proposal or at least delay its going forward until the new Governor and his administration has had a chance to study the impact of the proposed cuts and to consider alternatives.

The fragile lives of our disabled Pennsylvania citizens demand that we do all that is possible to relieve their burdens. Adding to their hardships by eliminating the Spend-Down provisions will be unconscionable. Their dignity as citizens of Pennsylvania demands that we help them lead as independent lives as possible. They are the most vulnerable people among us and there are certainly other ways to save the Commonwealth money.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

  
Sister Liguori Rossner  
Executive Director



**IRRC**

---

**From:** dawn carter [nubyncandi@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 06, 2002 11:04 AM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** DPW's proposed cut of NMP spend down

Original: 2296

Dear Zogby,

I am a single mother of 3, and my last child had alot of health problems. He was diagnosed with chronic asthma at the age of 2 months old, and i have been in and out of hospital emergency rooms with him since that time. The thought of not being able to get his medication through my Access card is very scary. First he has to has his treatments every 6 hours on a good day and very 2 hours when he is recovering from an asthma attack. If his medication wasn't covered then he would be hospitalized more than he would be at home. I have 2 older children that need me at home as well. If I had to spend all my time in the hospital with my baby, where would that leave my 2 other children and as a loving mother that thought is just uncomprehensable. It would also impact greatly on my availability to work. Having a job would be the furthest thing from my mind if I had to spend my time in the hospital with my baby because that is the only way I could afford the medication that he needs. I feel that if this law passes there is going to be many many families in the same situation as myself, almost living in the hospitals because they can not afford the medication(s) for their family member(s). I know the thought of spending more time in the hospital than I already do is very stressful. Children thrive when they are happy and healthy and having to stay in the hospital is alot of stress on parent and child. I think it is well know that children develop health and mental problems when under to much stress. Needless to say, I feel as the spokesperson for my family that if this law passes we will be greatly affected. The affects of this law can and promises to be very stressful on my family's health. I really hope you will reconsider your position on this law, alot of families will be greatly affected by it.

Thank you,  
Dawn Carter-Gates

---

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online  
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

NOV 06 2002 11:04 AM  
2296 - 6 11:04 AM  
2296 - 6 11:04 AM

Jubilee Soup Kitchen  
(412) 261-5417

Jubilee Pantry  
(412) 683-0739

Jubilee Medical Clinic  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 110 / 114

Jubilee Job Corner / Social Outreach  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 106

John Heinz Child Development Center  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 113

Jubilee Educational Programs  
(412) 261-0373 Ext. 109 / 111

Original: 2296



## Jubilee Association, Inc.

P.O. Box 42251 • Pittsburgh, PA 15203-0051

14-477-61

November 6, 2002

Mr. Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Health and Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 12 2002

REFER TO:

*Karols Aldridge*  
Welkie  
OLC  
Klamer  
Kell

Dear Mr. Zogby:

My name is Sister Liguori Rossner, and I am the Executive Director of the *Jubilee Association/Jubilee Soup Kitchen*. The *Jubilee Association* is 23 years old and serves in the Hill District of Pittsburgh. We come into contact each day with persons who are disabled, those without medical coverage and witness the effects of this hardship on themselves and society.

We are opposed to the elimination of NMP Spend-Down as proposed by the DPW. We know that this proposed legislation will further increase the hardships of disabled people and will eventually cost the state and the taxpayers more money, as these persons health deteriorates. It is imperative that the DPW withdraw this proposal or at least delay its going forward until the new Governor and his administration has had a chance to study the impact of the proposed cuts and to consider alternatives.

The fragile lives of our disabled Pennsylvania citizens demand that we do all that is possible to relieve their burdens. Adding to their hardships by eliminating the Spend-Down provisions will be unconscionable. Their dignity as citizens of Pennsylvania demands that we help them lead as independent lives as possible. They are the most vulnerable people among us and there are certainly other ways to save the Commonwealth money.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

  
Sister Liguori Rossner  
Executive Director

#14-477-59



Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health and Welfare Bldg. Room 431  
Harrisburg, Pa. 17120

Original: 2296

DON'T TAKE DOWN THE SPEND DOWN!

Dear Mr. Zogby,

I am a volunteer worker for the American Cancer Society in Somerset, Pa. My work is primarily with needy cancer patients.

I oppose the total elimination of the Spend Down program by the Department of Public Welfare, because it will hurt the patients to whom I provide service.

I urge you to withdraw your proposal NOT to cover prescription or medical equipment for people with disabilities and elderly persons who have slightly too much income to qualify for medical assistance.

To use this method of balancing DPN's budget is false economy, and will end up costing the state much more money than the savings realized, when patients have to be hospitalized at a later date, primarily because they were unable to afford medicine that would have stabilized their conditions.

Thank you for your consideration of my input.

*Mildred A. Elder*

Mildred A. Elder  
American Cancer Society  
168 W Union St  
Somerset, Pa. 15501  
814 445 2584  
Fax: 814 443 9585

11/6/02

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 08 2002

*Karole Aldridge*  
REFER TO: Willie  
OHC  
Hoover  
File

Pennsylvania Division - Central Region, Somerset  
168 West Union Street, Somerset, PA 15501 t) 814.445.2584 f) 814.443.9585  
Cancer Information 1.800.ACS.2345 www.cancer.org

The official registration and financial information of the American Cancer Society, Pennsylvania Division may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of State by calling toll free, within Pennsylvania, 800.732.0999. Registration does not imply endorsement.

NOV 2 2 2002  
RECEIVED  
OFFICE OF INCOME MAINTENANCE  
BUREAU OF POLICY

**IRRC**

---

**From:** Debra Herman [namiindiana@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 05, 2002 1:31 AM  
**To:** IRRC; namiindiana@hotmail.com  
**Subject:** Do not cut out prescriptions for SSI, SSDI clients

To whom it may concern,

**Original: 2296**

Please, please do not take the step of the DPW cutting out the coverage for prescriptions for those of us on SSI, and SSDI. This is very, very frightening as this would cause extreme hardship and disability for us all. Many of us who suffer with mental illnesses would become much worse causing untold trauma to ourselves and everyone around us even to the possible point of death.

Do not do this. We have come so far and have so very much further to go in the overall care and support of those with mental illnesses. Please do not allow this back slide. It would be a tragedy and a travesty.

Sincerely,  
Deb Herman, President  
National Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Indiana County of PA

---

Choose an Internet access plan right for you -- try MSN!  
<http://resourcecenter.msn.com/access/plans/default.asp>

NOV 05 2002 1:31 PM  
MAIL ROOM  
U.S. MAIL

IRRC

---

**From:** Joan Freda [yet.fred@verizon.net]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 05, 2002 8:24 AM

**Original:** 2296

**To:** IRRC

**Subject:** Inappropriate DPW Proposal

I am writing to state my objections to the DPW's proposed regulation to eliminate the Non-Money Payment Spend Down Category of Medical Assistance. If put into effect, this regulation would leave many very needy low- income people without prescription coverage, just the opposite of what the regulation was designed to do in the first place. A policy decision of such a substantial nature requires legislative review; the DPW should not be able to bring about such a change on it own.

Sincerely,  
Joan Freda

RECEIVED  
NOV 06 2002  
10:41 AM  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

11/6/2002

#14-477-48

Edward Zogby  
Director Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431  
Health & Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, Pa. 17120

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFERTO: Willie  
Karrle Aldridge  
OKC  
Homer  
Fill

Original: 2296

Dear Sir:

I am a professional staff person who works at Wernersville State Hospital. I am deeply concerned that D.P.W. is considering cut backs on anything as significant as the consumers ability to pay for their needed medications. Here we stress the need for medications, that the clients should not stop their meds for any reason, yet here the very group that leads the Hospital is saying that the regulations are to be changed causing some (7000 Pennsylvanians) consumers to lose the needed income to pay for their medications. This has to stop! The Hospitals are getting smaller yet the rolls will increase as consumers will not be able to get the "supports" that D.P.W. should provide. This is some backward way of saving MONEY. How do you figure any money will be saved as people decompensate and need to be rehospitalized? Who pays those bills? Consumers who are willing to work and be contributors to the community should not be penalized for the fact that they are motivated and earning a small income. Yet cannot afford to pay all their expenses if they don't work or pay for their medications if they do work.... Let's not remove the supports that help people remain in the community and continue to have productive lives.

Sincerely,

*Patricia Perfect*

Patricia Perfect CPRP,CRT,TASW  
Wernersville State Hospital  
P.O.Box 300  
Wernersville, Pa. 19565



1902 Market Street  
Camp Hill, PA 17011-4710  
info@ucpofpa.org  
[www.ucpofpa.org](http://www.ucpofpa.org)

Phone 717.761.6129  
Fax 717.761.2534  
TTY 717.761.6950  
1.866.761.6129

#14-477-44

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO: Karole Aldridge  
Willie  
OFC  
Hoover  
File

Dear Mr. Zogby,

My comments are directed to you regarding the DPW proposal to eliminate the NMP spend down category of Medicaid eligibility. We believe this will have a serious negative impact on thousands of Pennsylvanians with disabilities who need medical care and prescription drugs to maintain their health.

It is particularly troubling that the result of withdrawing eligibility from this group of recipients will likely increase both hospitalizations and institutionalizations. This flies in the face of other efforts in the Department to shift resources to maintain community living as a viable and cost effective alternative to nursing home care.


We recognize the economic pressures facing the State, but we feel strongly that this is not a group where any cost savings are worth the human and societal toll it would take.

Thank you for consideration of my comments on behalf of Pennsylvanians with disabilities.

Sincerely,

Joan W. Martin  
Executive Director

RECEIVED  
NOV 11 2002  
OFFICE OF INCOME MAINTENANCE  
BUREAU OF POLICY



Original: 2296

#14-477-50



# FAX TRANSMITTAL

PAGES: 1 (including cover)

DATE: Nov. 4

FAX #: 717 787-6765

TO: Edward J. Zogby, Director - Bureau of Policy  
Health & Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

## MESSAGE:

I oppose the elimination of our state program to cover prescriptions or durable medical equipment for people with disabilities and elderly persons who have slightly too much income to qualify for free Medical Assistance, but far too little income to meet their prescription, equipment and medical needs.

As the statewide planner for the PA Division of the American Cancer Society, I am well aware of the problems that cancer patients and their families experience because of the hidden economic costs of the disease. I also am a member of the Quality of Life workgroup for the design of the Commonwealth's new cancer plan and we often discuss these financial problems and their consequences. In fact, the economic burden of cancer costs is at the top of our workgroup list as we write the new cancer plan.

I urge the Department to withdraw the regulations, or to at the least delay their consideration until a new administration can carefully consider their impact. This action is of particular concern for our families in rural areas where the numbers of un- and under-insured are very unstable. Withdrawing these benefits affects these families directly.

Julia Bucher RN, Ph.D.  
Cancer Control Planner  
Pennsylvania Division, Inc.  
R.R. 3, Box 1576  
Milton, PA 17847  
Phone: 570-742-7443  
Fax: 570-742-4328  
Email: [jbucher@cancer.org](mailto:jbucher@cancer.org)

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO: Waller

*Harole Aldridge*  
*Waller*  
*OLC*  
*Waller*  
*File*

For the most up to date cancer information call 1-800-227-2345 or visit our website at [www.cancer.org](http://www.cancer.org)



**IRRC**

---

**From:** brewster.fay@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Monday, November 04, 2002 4:04 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** Prescription Drug coverage  
**Original:** 2296

Dear Sirs:  
"The elimination of prescription drug coverage for over 7000 lower income Pennsylvanians with disabilities or chronic medical conditions is directly at odds with the efforts of the General Assembly to expand prescription coverage. As such, this represents a policy decision that definitely requires legislative review. Legislative review is made more necessary by DPW's failure to consider any regulatory or nonregulatory alternatives."  
PLEASE HELP US INSURE THE HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF EVERY CITIZEN OF THIS STATE WITHOUT EXCEPTION!!!  
Thank you for your consideration of this life and death matter,  
Brewster Fay

Brewster Fay  
brewster.fay@verizon.net

NOV 04 2002 4:04 PM  
IRRC  
2296

**IRRC**

---

**From:** Bob Lahner [Lahnerb@quakerchem.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 04, 2002 2:17 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** SS Prescription Drugs

**Original: 2296**


To whom it may concern,

Please do not delete the prescription drug coverage for those making a "little too much" from the SS program. My sister has post traumatic stress syndrome and can not work full time. She does the best she can but has a home to maintain and prescriptions to fill. If this coverage is removed she may very well in all likelihood have to decide when to eat and when to get her prescriptions filled. She does not and has not collected from welfare but this may her over the edge. So PLEASE take care of our semi incapacitated residents.

A Very Concerend Brother

Bob Lahner

NOV 04 2002  
11:00 AM  
IRRC



# 14-477-26

1902 Market Street  
Camp Hill, PA 17011-4710  
info@ucpofpa.org  
www.ucpofpa.org

Phone 717.761.6129  
Fax 717.761.2534  
TTY 717.761.6950  
1.866.761.6129

Original: 2296

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

NOV 04 2002

REFER TO: Willie  
*Harold Aldridge*  
*OLC*  
*Appel*  
*Fill*

Dear Mr. Zogby,

My comments are directed to you regarding the DPW proposal to eliminate the NMP spend down category of Medicaid eligibility. We believe this will have a serious negative impact on thousands of Pennsylvanians with disabilities who need medical care and prescription drugs to maintain their health.

It is particularly troubling that the result of withdrawing eligibility from this group of recipients will likely increase both hospitalizations and institutionalizations. This flies in the face of other efforts in the Department to shift resources to maintain community living as a viable and cost effective alternative to nursing home care.

We recognize the economic pressures facing the State, but we feel strongly that this is not a group where any cost savings are worth the human and societal toll it would take.

Thank you for consideration of my comments on behalf of Pennsylvanians with disabilities.

Sincerely,

Joan W. Martin  
Executive Director

NOV 04 2002 11:14AM  
OFFICE OF INCOME MAINTENANCE  
BUREAU OF POLICY

# 14-477-54

Original: 2296

## PENNSYLVANIA HEALTH LAW PROJECT

650 SMITHFIELD ST., SUITE 2130  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222  
TELEPHONE: (412) 434-5779  
FAX: (412) 434-0128

924 CHERRY STREET, SUITE 300  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107  
TELEPHONE: (215) 625-3663  
FAX: (215) 625-3879  
HELP LINE: 1-800-274-3258

101 S. SECOND ST., SUITE 5  
HARRISBURG, PA 17101  
TELEPHONE: (717) 236-6310  
FAX: (717) 236-6311  
Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 04 2002

**Comments of the PA Health Law Project on behalf of  
the Consumer Subcommittee of the Medical Assistance Advisory Committee,  
the PA Council on Independent Living, the Consumer Health Coalition and  
the Philadelphia Unemployment Project  
on DPW Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non-Money Payment Spend Down  
Category of Medical Assistance- (55 PA Code §181)  
IRRC # 2296, Regulation # 14-477, Published October 5, 2002 at 32 PaB 4860**

REFER TO:

*Harold Aldridge*  
*Willie*  
*OLC*  
*Hayes*  
*Kule*

DPW lacks legal authority to promulgate this proposed regulation.

This regulation does not implement or set criteria for a program. Instead, it completely eliminates a program, namely the "NMP spend down" category of Medical Assistance. Were this program created by DPW regulation, DPW would have the legal authority to eliminate it. However, this category of Medical Assistance was created as a direct result of the PA Supreme Court's interpretation of federal law in *Crammer v. DPW*, 449 Pa. 528, 296 A.2d 815 (1972). Mrs. Crammer was on Social Security Disability and was over income for "categorically needy" Medical Assistance. Although she could have qualified for Medical Assistance under the "Medically Needy Only" ("MNO") category, that category did not (and still does not) cover prescription medications. The Supreme Court determined that federal law, as implemented by state statute, required DPW to deduct her medical expenses (including her prescription drug expenses) from her income in determining her "available" income for purposes of determining eligibility for categorically needy Medical Assistance.

NMP spend down is the direct result of the *Crammer* decision. This category of Medical Assistance continues to provide prescription drug coverage for people on Social Security who would otherwise only qualify for a category of Medical Assistance that does not cover prescriptions ("MNO"). DPW is attempting to overturn the Supreme Court's decision by way of regulation. It lacks legal authority to do so.

The proposed regulation is not in the public interest because of the economic or fiscal impact on the Commonwealth.

For persons on Social Security Disability under 65 who are over income for regular Medical Assistance, NMP is usually the only prescription coverage they can obtain. However, many people on Social Security Disability have high prescription costs as a result of the numerous and/or costly medications prescribed to treat their disabling medical conditions. With the elimination of NMP spend down, many of those 7000 people will no

longer be able to afford their medications.<sup>1</sup> Without their medications, their preexisting medical conditions are likely to worsen resulting in an increased rate of hospitalization, or nursing home placement which Medical Assistance WILL cover (under the "MNO spend down" category which will continue). The result is potentially greater costs to the Medical Assistance program for inpatient and long term care services as a result of the elimination of the NMP spend down category.

In addition to increased costs to Medical Assistance, there is the potential for increased costs to PACENet. At least one of our clients who is eligible for PACENet is using NMP spend down instead of PACENet because he incurs less out of pocket costs than he would under PACENet. Forcing him and others similarly situated to switch to PACENet would have a negative fiscal impact on the Commonwealth because the State bears the full cost of PACENet while there is a 53% federal contribution to Medical Assistance.

Finally, there is the potential loss of \$418 million in increased federal Medicaid reimbursement. Under federal legislation that has already passed the Senate (S. 812), states that had not restricted Medical Assistance eligibility since January 2002 would be eligible for a one time increase in federal matching funds for Medical Assistance. Eliminating NMP spend down would make PA ineligible to receive those additional funds should this legislation become law.

The proposed regulation is not in the public interest because of the economic or fiscal impact on political subdivisions.

The City of Philadelphia operates District Health Centers which provide some free medications to uninsured individuals. With the loss of prescription coverage through the elimination of NMP spend down, there will be more individuals seeking free medications which will place an additional fiscal burden on the City District Health Centers and ultimately on the City itself. There is also likely to be increase fiscal pressure on counties which provide free or reduced price psychiatric medications to persons in the County mental health system who lack prescription coverage. In counties that do not provide free psychotropic medications, there are likely to be increased mental health treatment costs as people decompensate after they are no longer able to afford their medications. Increased costs are likely to be seen in crisis intervention, hospitalization and intensive outpatient services. There are also potential increases in costs of homelessness services and our criminal justice system.

The proposed regulation is not in the public interest because of the economic or fiscal impact on the private sector.

Persons with chronic medical conditions such as MS often need medications to maintain a level of functioning that enables them to perform activities of daily living on their own. If they lose prescription coverage and are no longer able to afford their medications, their functional level will deteriorate. As a result, there will be increased burdens on family members to assist the individual with bathing, feeding, dressing, toileting and other basic activities of daily living. It is not uncommon for a spouse to leave a job when their husband

---

<sup>1</sup> The connection between loss of coverage and low income people discontinuing their medications has verified by researchers. See *Termination of Medi-Cal Benefits*, Lurie, et.al., New England Journal of Medicine, Vol. 314, No. 19, p. 1268 (May 8, 1986)

or wife deteriorates to the point that they are no longer able to care for themselves. Providing prescription coverage to a person with a chronic serious illness can forestall or even prevent that from happening.

The proposed regulation is not in the public interest because it undermines the protection of the public health.

The majority of the people on NMP spend down have high prescription costs. People on Social Security who are above the regular MA eligibility limit (federal poverty level- currently \$738 month) must spend at least \$136 a month towards medications or other uncovered medical costs in order to qualify for Medical Assistance under NMP spend down. Most of the people we have seen on NMP spend down have prescription costs of \$200 a month or more. Few people on fixed incomes of \$800 or \$900 a month can afford to pay one quarter to one third of their monthly income towards prescriptions and few people on NMP spend down have other options for prescription coverage (people under 65 cannot qualify for PACE).

The inevitable result of eliminating this program is that people with disabilities or chronic health conditions who have high prescription costs and incomes slightly above the poverty level will be unable to afford their medications and their health will suffer as a result. With over 7000 people currently on NMP spend down, the loss of the financial ability of so many Pennsylvanians to afford their medications is certainly a public health issue.

DPW has stated that some of the 7196 people who would be affected by the elimination of NMP spend down "may be eligible for MNO spend down."<sup>2</sup> That overlooks that fact that Pennsylvania does not cover prescription drugs under the MNO category. If people who are on NMP spend down now did not need prescription coverage, they would probably be on MNO already as you don't have to submit paid bills every month to qualify for MNO as you do for NMP. In fact, our experience indicates that most of the people on NMP spend down are also on Medicare. MNO coverage, which does not include prescription drugs, is of little value to those individuals.

Furthermore, if there were a significant number of people who could realistically be expected to move from NMP to MNO, the costs from the increased numbers of people on MNO would have to be factored into DPW's calculations of cost savings. DPW has not factored in any costs resulting from an increase in numbers of people on MNO in their Regulatory Analysis Form, a clear indication that DPW does not realistically expect many people to actually move to the MNO program.<sup>3</sup>

The Department's own Medical Assistance Advisory Committee concurs that the proposed regulation is not in the public interest because it undermines the protection of public health. Under federal law, DPW must convene and consult with a Medical Assistance Advisory Committee on policy issues. On July 25, 2002, DPW consulted with its Medical Assistance Advisory Committee regarding the proposed elimination of NMP spend down. In response, the Committee passed a resolution which "urges the Department to continue the NMP coverage because it is so important to seniors and persons with disabilities."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Regulatory Analysis Form, #14, p.3.

<sup>3</sup> Regulatory Analysis Form, #20, p.5

<sup>4</sup> Notes of Medical Assistance Advisory Committee meeting of July 25, 2002,

The proposed regulation is not reasonable in consideration of possible conflict with statutes.

The PA Supreme Court has interpreted federal and state statutes as requiring NMP spend down. See discussion of *Crammer v. DPW* above.

The proposed regulation represents a policy decision of such a substantial nature that it requires legislative review.

The elimination of prescription drug coverage for over 7000 lower income Pennsylvanians with disabilities or chronic medical conditions is directly at odds with the efforts of the General Assembly to expand prescription coverage. As such, this represents a policy decision that definitely requires legislative review. Legislative review is made more necessary by DPW's failure to consider any regulatory or nonregulatory alternatives.<sup>5</sup> Finally, DPW cites the need to "preserve funds" as the basis for this regulation. As this proposed regulation is part of broader efforts to reduce costs in Medical Assistance, the General Assembly, as the body that enacts the State Budget, has an important role in reviewing how and to what extent cost controls will be imposed on the Medical Assistance program.

The proposed regulation will NOT bring PA's Medical Assistance program "more in line with other states".

DPW has noted that other states do not have NMP spend down. However, of the 33 states that have MNO Medical Assistance (which PA does), 31 states cover prescription drugs under their MNO program.<sup>6</sup> Since PA does not cover prescription drugs under its MNO program, the NMP spend down is PA's functional equivalent of 31 other states' MNO program.

PA Health Law Project  
101 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> St.  
Suite 5  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

---

<http://www.dpw.state.pa.us/omap/geninf/maac/omap072502minutes.asp>

<sup>5</sup> Regulatory Analysis Form, #22 & #23, p.6

<sup>6</sup> *Medicaid Prescription Drug Benefits: Findings from a National Survey*, Schwalberg, et.al., Kaiser Commission on Medicaid & the Uninsured, Table 1, p.5 (October 2001)

### A Few People who Rely on NMP Spend-down

A caller who has several medical conditions recently lost her Medical Assistance because she started to receive her Social Security when she turned 62 years of age. With that increase in household income, both she and husband (who is on Medicare) were knocked off of MA. Her husband's bills are covered by the Medigap plan that the state is paying for. The caller, however, has several medical bills for cancer treatment and other ailments including: chemotherapy; bandages for lymphoedema in her arms; and diagnostic tests, including liver scan and echocardiogram. She was able to use the NMP Spend-down program to cover her expenses. After Blue Cross Special Care Premium was counted towards the spend-down, she had approximately \$80 each month that she needed to spend-down.

A caller from Berks County has gets \$746 / month in SSDI and needs to spend-down each month to become eligible for MA coverage. She has Medicare as well, but she has very high prescription costs every month.

A Fifty-six year-old Philadelphia resident who lives with her two grandchildren makes \$767/month in SSDI and her granddaughter gets \$520 in Social Security survivor's benefits. The caller's Medicare HMO only pays for generic medications and she has several medications for her diabetes and allergies that do not have a generic alternative so that if she bought all of her medications she would have to pay about \$500/month. Caller was able to spend \$165/month on her medications and use NMP spend-down to pay for the remainder of her medications.

An Allegheny County resident who is 68 years old who is on Medicare lost her Medical Assistance when her SSDI increased. She now needed help with the co-pays and deductibles and prescriptions. The woman was able to use NMP spend-down to pay for her medical expenses that were not covered by Medicare.

An elderly woman in Westmoreland County who had Medicare A & B and a monthly income of \$818 from SSDI was able to spend-down \$139.50 each month to be able to pay for her medications and other medical expenses that were not covered by Medicare.

A man in Philadelphia who had atypical schizophrenic and whose medications are not on the Special Pharmaceutical Benefits Program medication list, relies on NMP spend-down to be able to pay for his psychiatric medications.

A Montgomery County resident who makes \$864/month in SSDI (including Part B) uses NMP spend-down to pay for a part of his prescription costs for his pain medications that usually exceed \$340 per month.



A couple from central Pennsylvania have been on spend-down for about four months. He is 72, she 67. He is a Korean War Vet. He has recently started getting \$180 vet pension, but they decreased his SSDI by \$210/month. Their household income is about \$935. They each pay \$54 for Medicare premiums and they spend-down an additional \$44.35 per month. In recent years he has had cancer treatment that included a radical prostatectomy and the removal of his lymph nodes. He is currently free of cancer and pain. Both he and wife are diabetic. Both have also had recent back operations. She is still active, despite quadruple bypass heart surgery but takes 20 pills a day, for her high blood pressure, heart disease and diabetes. They report that they absolutely depend on spend-down to be able to afford their medications; that they couldn't live without it.

### A Few People who Rely on MNO

A 20 year-old Cambria County resident who had \$8000 in medical bills from an emergency appendectomy and no health insurance was able to use MNO Spend-down to pay for these bills.

An uninsured Philadelphia resident who had unpaid hospital bills from six months earlier, also needed help paying for a recent emergency room visit. The emergency room staff had helped her apply for ongoing coverage but she was denied coverage due to excess income as she worked part time. By using her old outstanding bill and her recent emergency room bill she was able to get MNO spend-down coverage that would pay for part of her emergency room visit and give her health insurance that would pay for follow up care that she needed; care she could not have afforded on her own.

A Philadelphia resident who had been purchasing the Special Care Plan health insurance product let her coverage lapse because the cost was too high for her and it had a lot of restrictions that seemed to be excessive given the cost. She had to wait three months after she dropped her coverage before she could be eligible for the less expensive Adult Basic Program. While she waited to become eligible for the Adult Basic she was able to use unpaid hospital bills from five months earlier to become eligible for MNO Spend-down Program.

An uninsured man incurred \$15,000 in hospital bills but the hospital he was in did not help him apply for Medical Assistance at that time. Several months later, when he was able to get about and attend to his medical bills he was able to apply use MNO Spend-down to cover his ongoing expenses so that he would not get further into debt while he attempted to pay off these large bills.

RECEIVED  
NOV 15 11 03 AM '02  
REVIEW COMMISSION

Margaret S. White  
602 Creek Road  
Kennett Square, PA 19348-2622  
(610) 444-2638 (home)  
(610) 692-1926 (work)  
Miki@Kennett.net

#14-477-60

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

November 4, 2002

NOV 04 2002

Department of Public Welfare  
Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health and Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

REFER TO: *Willie Hoover*  
*Karole Aldridge*  
*OLC*  
*File*

Dear Mr. Zogby:


On July 18, 1993 I received a gift, my daughter Sara E. White. She is beautiful, loved and well cared for. You have the opportunity to allow her to remain in the custody of her parents, (myself and her father), or force our family apart and remand her custody to the state of Pennsylvania.

Her existence is dependant on the durable medical equipment now covered by her medical assistance. Such items as, a feeding pump, oxygen tubing, and iron lung, a wheelchair (now on order), syringes, medications for allergies and the digestion of pediasure, and diapers. We are currently unable to absorb the cost of raising a child with severe disability without the financial assistance of the state of Pennsylvania.

God gave us a gift, now the state of Pennsylvania wants to take that gift away from us. I grew up in Pennsylvania and have received recognition from the state senate for my citizenship and commitment in caring about for my community. I am an active member of the Kennett Square Lions Club, a Puppy Home for Canine Partners for Life, and an eleven year employee of The Crime Victims' Center of Chester County, Inc. I care about the quality of life of the residents of the state of Pennsylvania. I am asking the state of Pennsylvania to care about my family.


Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. Please consider taking the time to make a difference in the life of a child. Don't take the spend down or a least delay your consideration to eliminate the program.

Sincerely,



Margaret S. White  
aka Sara's mom

cc: Feather O'Connor Houstoun, Chris Ross, IRRC



THE CRIME VICTIMS' CENTER OF CHESTER COUNTY, INC.  
 236 WEST MARKET STREET  
 WEST CHESTER, PA 19382-2903  
 (610) 692-1926  
 FAX NUMBER (610) 692-4959

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	Edward S. Zogby	FROM:	Peggy White
COMPANY:		DATE:	11/4/02
FAX NUMBER:	717-787-6765	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	2
PHONE NUMBER:		SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:	
RE:		YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:	

URGENT     FOR REVIEW     PLEASE COMMENT     PLEASE REPLY     PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:




United Way Member Agency

\*A copy of the official registration and financial information may be obtained from the PA Department of State by calling toll free, within Pennsylvania 1 (800) 732-0999. Registration does not imply endorsement.\*

RECEIVED TIME NOV. 4. 10:05AM

PRINT TIME NOV. 4. 10:06AM



# 14-477-350-0  
REVENUE COMMISSION

November 4, 2002

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
PA Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431  
Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

RE: Opposition to Discontinuing the Non-Money Payment Spend-Down Program

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing to express my concern about the proposal to discontinue the Spend Down Program.

My mother has diabetes and depends on these programs to help her with the cost of prescriptions. My parents are on a fixed income and do not yet qualify for Medicare or Medical Assistance..

I urge you NOT to pass regulations that would eliminate this greatly needed program which serves those 7000 vulnerable Pennsylvanians who are on fixed incomes that are slightly higher than the Medical Assistance eligibility guidelines. At the very least, please delay consideration of this action until a new administration can carefully consider the impact of the health of those who would be affected.

Thank you for this consideration.

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Sincerely,

NOV 04 2002

Jay Frederick Jr.  
957 Monroe Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17113

REFER TO: Karoly Aldridge  
Willie  
OLC  
Hoover  
File



#14-477-39

125 Lucy Avenue, Hummelstown, PA 17036

Office - (717) 533-5111

Fax - (717) 533-2587

Email: pahlodge@cancer.org

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Original: 2296

NOV 04 2002

REFER TO: Hande Albadar  
Willie  
OLC  
Hansen  
File

November 4, 2002

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health & Welfare Bldg., Room 431  
Harrisburg, Pa 17120

Dear Mr. Zogby,

My name is Andrea Costik and I manage a facility that is owned by The American Cancer Society called Hope Lodge. Similar to a Ronald McDonald House, we provide lodging free of charge to patients and families who must travel a distance to receive treatment at local hospitals.

With the changing times we see in medicine, the majority of my patients who stay at Hope Lodge are Stem Cell Transplant recipients. During this procedure, the recovery process is a long and difficult battle. On average, these patients will usually stay at Hope Lodge an average of four to six months.

As you can imagine, we have seen our share of patients with costly prescriptions and other medical expenses. Those who are currently on Medical Assistance still incur a tremendous amount of debt.

I am asking that you do not propose regulations that will eliminate the Non-Money Spend Down Program. For some this is the only opportunity they have for a chance at life.

Sincerely,

*Andrea M. Costik*

Andrea M. Costik  
Manager



RECEIVED TIME NOV. 4. 4:04PM

PRINT TIME NOV. 4. 4:05PM

NOV 04 2002

1424 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102-2505  
Phone: 215.981.3700, Fax: 215.981.0434  
Web Address: www.cisphila.org

Original: 2296

REFER TO:

*Kayle Albridge*  
*Mellie*  
*Stoney*  
*Fule*

**Comments On DPW Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non-Money Payment Spenddown  
Category of Medical Assistance and Restricting Deductions for Medically Needy Only  
Spenddown (55 Pa.Code § 181)  
Published October 5, 2002 at 32 Pa. B. 4860**

Submitted on November 4, 2002 by Community Legal Services, Inc., on behalf of Action Alliance for Senior Citizens, the Philadelphia Unemployment Project, and the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization

On behalf of its client groups, Action Alliance for Senior Citizens, Philadelphia Unemployment Project, the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization and many individual clients, Community Legal Services, Inc. of Philadelphia submits the following comments regarding DPW's proposed regulations eliminating or restricting two Medical Assistance programs, the NMP spenddown program and the MNO spenddown program, by restricting deductions.

**1. DPW does not have the legal authority to eliminate NMP spenddown by proposed regulation.**

DPW's proposed regulation would completely eliminate the NMP spenddown program. DPW would only have the legal authority to eliminate a program if it had been created by DPW regulation. Instead, NMP spenddown was created by the order of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in Crammer v. DPW, 449 Pa. 528, 296 A.2d 815 (1972). The Supreme Court interpreted federal law, as implemented by state statute, to require DPW to deduct a person's prescription drug and other medical expenses from her income in determining her available income (i.e., to permit her to use it as a spenddown) for purposes of determining eligibility for categorically needy Medical Assistance. The NMP spenddown program resulted directly from the Crammer decision, and it currently permits applicants, like Ms. Crammer, to deduct medical expenses from their income in order to qualify for MA. DPW does not have the authority to ignore the Supreme Court's order and eliminate this program by way of regulation.

**2. Rather than saving money, the proposed regulations would overburden state programs and ultimately cost the state more in the long run.**

DPW's preamble to the proposed regulations observes that, as a result of the proposed cuts, it expects 7,196 people to lose MA coverage under NMP, and 14,802 people to lose coverage under MNO. The comments suggest that some of these people will be able to get coverage under other state insurance programs, and DPW makes an offhand acknowledgment that there may be a fiscal impact on other programs as they experience a rise in enrollment. Despite common sense and the dictates of the Regulatory Review Act, DPW makes no attempt to estimate the counterbalancing expenses. In fact, the fiscal impact is likely to be profound, and to cancel out most or all of the savings that DPW predicts from the spenddown cuts.

## A. NMP

Pennsylvanians who rely on NMP spenddown are almost all seriously disabled or elderly people who must spend at least \$158 per month on medical expenses, usually prescription drugs, in order to qualify for MA. Typically, they receive Social Security Disability or Veteran's Administration benefits, which place them just beyond the Healthy Horizons income limit of \$739 per month.<sup>1</sup> We can assume that these people are in serious need of continuing medical care, because otherwise they would avoid the constant monthly ordeal of NMP verification and obtain six months of coverage under MNO. Patients turn to NMP because they have high prescription costs, due to the need to treat their disabling medical conditions. Without their prescriptions, then, the effect on their health will be predictable -- they will be forced to seek treatment in hospitals or nursing homes, where their bills will escalate rapidly and they will very quickly qualify for MNO coverage through spenddown. The state will then be obliged to cover their bills once again, except that the bills will be much higher. DPW has not acknowledged these costs in its calculations of cost savings, which do not reflect any new costs from an increase in MNO enrollments offsetting those who lose MNO, even though the department explicitly predicts that many people who lose NMP will indeed switch to MNO.

Since MNO does not cover prescriptions, those people who are at least 65 years old will also enroll in PACE or PACENET in order to get prescription coverage. The shift from NMP to PACE and PACENET may actually be counterproductive - it may end up costing the state more overall, due to the loss of federal matching funds. Although there PACE and PACENET enrollees must cover a portion of their costs through modest copayments, the rest is entirely state-funded, so that the state must cover 100% of the cost, beyond an initial copay. Under NMP the federal government provides matching funds that cover 54% of all costs, beyond the initial spenddown and copayments. If more than half those terminated from NMP switch to PACE or PACENET, Pennsylvania will actually lose money. For the department to fail to even quantify its estimate of this effect is reason alone to reject this rulemaking.

Some people who lose NMP will also apply for adultBasic, the entirely state-funded insurance program for low-income adults. Although adultBasic has limited enrollment, to the extent that slots are available, they will be filled by former NMP recipients, who will crowd out the working poor who were the original intended beneficiaries of adultBasic. This will force Pennsylvania to make an undesirable choice: to leave needy people uninsured, or to devote additional state dollars to the program, again negating the savings DPW has predicted.

In addition, the loss of NMP will increase fiscal pressure on local governments. Mentally ill patients who cannot get NMP coverage for their psychotropic medications will turn to hard-pressed county mental health systems, which will either have to provide the medications themselves or pay for the inevitable hospitalizations that will occur when people are off of their medications. Moreover, Philadelphia, and other counties that operates primary care health

---

<sup>1</sup> Healthy Horizons has an eligibility level set at the federal poverty level.

centers, will be asked to provide medications in ever increasing numbers, and without reimbursement. As more people turn to these centers, the increased fiscal burden will fall on the city and counties. Again, DPW is silent about the effects of this cost shifting.

**B. MNO**

The 14,800 people that DPW proposes to cut off from MNO coverage, by eliminating old unpaid bills as deductions from income, will, like their NMP counterparts, become more ill as they go without access to preventive care, doctor's visits, and treatment. Eventually, many of these people will return to the MNO program, as they incur new hospital bills that are less than three months old and thus still qualify as deductions, even under DPW's reduced program. Some will also seek coverage under adultBasic, crowding out the working poor even faster than expected.

**3. The Commonwealth's public health will be damaged, as thousands of Pennsylvanians will suffer from deteriorating health and untreated conditions.**

The proposed spenddown cuts will initially result in a loss of MA coverage for nearly 22,000 Pennsylvanians, as DPW acknowledges. The effect will be that these people, most already afflicted with serious illness or disability, will be forced to go without doctors or medicine, and they and their families will have to deal with the consequences of increased sickness and untreated disease and injury. To the extent that health care providers continue to treat them, the cost will be past along to the Commonwealth's already overburdened health care system and especially to local governments.

**A. NMP**

NMP spenddown patients must spend at least \$158 per month just to qualify for NMP, and in most cases they pay considerably more: all of their monthly income above the \$602 spenddown target.<sup>2</sup> Without NMP, they will have to pay the entire cost of care, or else go without prescriptions and other medical care. For people with incomes in the range of \$800 - \$1000 per month, which is typical for NMP spenddown, spending down requires paying \$208 to \$408 per month on medical expenses alone, or 26% to 41% of their entire income for the month, with only \$602 left over for all other expenses. Without this program, even this modest safety net will be lost. Obviously, these people are already stretched to the limit, and without NMP they will simply go without the prescriptions and other care that they need to maintain their health.

---

<sup>2</sup> The spenddown target derives from the categorically needy program, SSI, that provides automatic MA coverage for the disabled and elderly. Currently the SSI program sets eligibility at \$572.40 per month and provides a \$20 disregard for any type of income; the NMP program allows an additional \$10 disregard. Thus the spenddown level, or target, is set at \$602 (\$572 + \$20 + \$10). See *Crammer; Brown v. Beal* 404 F. Supp. 770 (E.D. Pa. 1975).



The problem is compounded by the fact that the MA program reimburses pharmacies at reduced rates, due to its ability to negotiate contracts. Left without MA prescription coverage, low income people have to pay full market rate for all of their prescriptions, and for people with serious illnesses, these drugs can often cost hundreds of dollars per month.

DPW suggests that people who lose NMP can enroll in other programs, but in fact the number of people who can obtain benefits through other programs will be quite limited. Many, perhaps most, NMP terminees will be eligible for MNO through that program's spenddown (because they will meet either the age or disability criteria), but MNO does not cover prescriptions, the most important benefit provided by NMP. MNO enrollment will still go up, as people without their medications become hospitalized or enter nursing homes, but they will still be without a way to obtain their medications, and some, if not all, of their savings will be eroded, and at tremendous human cost.

The other alternatives suggested by DPW are unlikely to prove of much assistance. The new Medical Assistance for Workers with a Disability (MAWD) program requires that disabled people with incomes above the Healthy Horizons limit perform work in order to qualify for benefits, and while this program offers real potential for those Social Security Disability recipients who are able to work, vast numbers of SSD recipients are simply unable to do any work at all, and will never qualify for MAWD. Moreover, the elderly are not eligible for MAWD.

The new adultBasic program does not cover prescription drugs, and, in any event, the limited number of slots are almost completely filled now, and it is unlikely that there will be more spots by the time NMP spenddown terminations go into effect next year. PACE and PACENET do cover prescriptions, of course, but they offer only a limited benefit, and they are not available to anyone under 65.

CLS has a client who illustrates perfectly the importance of NMP spenddown for maintaining the health of recipients. Mary Zoolalian,<sup>3</sup> a resident of Northeast Philadelphia, cares for her 36-year-old son, who receives Social Security Disability payments that place him slightly above the Healthy Horizons limit - a little under \$800 per month. As a schizophrenic with high blood pressure and arthritis, he must take several expensive medications to control his symptoms; he could never afford these medications on his own, as the total costs of the drugs he must take is several times his total SSD payment each month. With NMP spenddown, he pays \$185 each month towards the cost of his medications, and the rest is paid for by the NMP Medical Assistance program. Without coverage for his medications, he would undoubtedly have to be institutionalized, losing his psychic and physical connection to his family and costing the state much more money. He will not be eligible for PACE or PACENET for several decades, and the packages of benefits offered by MNO or adultBasic would be of little use to him. Furthermore, with his mental illness and multiple physical conditions, it is highly doubtful that he could

---

<sup>3</sup> Names of all clients are used with their permission.

perform part-time work and thus qualify for the MAWD program. NMP spenddown is essential for him to remain stable, relatively healthy, and living in the community with his family.

## **B. MNO**

MNO recipients often do not receive medical bills until more than three months have elapsed since the date of service. Providers commonly take several months to send out bills, especially if they are trying to work out other coverage (e.g., trying to bill MA first). With DPW's proposed new restrictions, these clients would lose the ability to obtain MNO based on unpaid medical expense deductions, even though they often have enormous debt due to medical bills. This would not be because of their own delay, but because they had no reason to know that they had to make an application for MA coverage. This will generally leave these people with no other options, because, even if there were private insurance plans that they could purchase at their income level, people with catastrophic illness or injury are excluded from risk pools due to pre-existing condition exclusions.

As MNO spenddown now operates, low-income people with unpaid medical bills can get MA coverage for new expenses that arise, while making arrangements to pay off the old bills in a feasible manner. This coverage is essential, because each hospitalization can cost thousands of dollars; a single 24-hour stay at a hospital can often cost over \$2,000, and a typical hospital stay of several days, with the attendant tests and lab work, will usually run into the five figures. Under its proposal, DPW anticipates that nearly 15,000 such people will lose MA coverage, but the department's comments do not take account of the toll that these cuts would take on those MNO recipients. Unpaid medical bills are one of the primary causes of personal bankruptcies, and without the ability to qualify for MNO, thousands of people who must go into the hospital will not have coverage for either the old or the new bills, and will be left with staggering debt that they cannot hope to repay. The result would be, not just predictable, but certain: thousands of Pennsylvanians will have to choose between either going without necessary care, or else incurring thousands of dollars in expenses that they will never be able to afford. Those who forego treatment will severely jeopardize their health. Those who seek treatment will be pursued in court by providers and collection agencies for bills that they cannot pay, and will lose their houses or file for bankruptcy; in either case, their credit will be ruined.

### **4. Health care providers will be hurt by the cuts.**


The loss of insurance coverage for 22,000 low income Pennsylvanians also poses a threat to the Commonwealth's medical providers. Without the certainty of MA reimbursement, providers will have to pursue low-income patients even more aggressively than they do now, by going to court and obtaining judgments which have little worth in any event against the impoverished. Many more uninsured people will be forced to file for bankruptcy, and providers, as unsecured creditors, will recover little, if anything, in return for their services. Providers will nevertheless be hit with rising costs, because people without access to preventive care or health-sustaining medications will increasingly turn to emergency rooms for care, driving up costs and

clogging up an already over-burdened system.


**Conclusion**

The proposed cuts to the NMP and MNO spenddown programs are penny-wise and pound-foolish. If the state were to deliberately cut off 22,000 of our most severely ill and disabled residents from medical coverage, the cost in individuals' damaged health, rising personal bankruptcies, increasing uncompensated care, and overburdened state insurance programs will be felt for years to come. Recognizing these pitfalls, both the entire Income Maintenance Advisory Committee and the entire Medical Assistance Advisory Committee voted to oppose these proposed regulations, and their advice should be heeded. Community Legal Services recommends that the department avert a greater fiscal crisis in the future by withdrawing the proposed regulations and maintaining insurance coverage for Pennsylvania's citizens.

Respectfully submitted,



Brendan P. Lynch  
Richard P. Weishaupt  
Jonathan Stein  
John Whitelaw



**CS COMMUNITY  
LEGAL SERVICES, INC.**

1424 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102-2505  
 Phone: 215.981.3700  
 Web Address: www.cisphila.org

**FAX TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET**  
 FAX NUMBER: 215.981.0436

DATE: 11/4/02  
 TO: Ed Zogby  
 FAX NUMBER: 717-787-6765  
 ORGANIZATION: Bar. Policy, DPW  
 FROM: Brendan Lynch  
 DIRECT DIAL: 215-981-3713  
 TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET): 7  
 MESSAGE: Comments on proposed spandown  
regulations

Please call the direct dial number above if there are any problems with this transmission. The information contained in this fax transmittal is legally privileged and confidential and intended only for the use of the individual or organization named above. If you receive this message but are not the intended recipient, please destroy the fax transmittal and notify the sender at the above direct dial number. Thank you for your cooperation.

**TO BE COMPLETED AFTER FAX HAS BEEN TRANSMITTED:**

DATE OF TRANSMISSION: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

OPERATOR: \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED TIME NOV. 4. 5:04PM

PRINT TIME NOV. 4. 5:06PM



#14-477-40

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy



NOV 04 2002

*Karole Aldridge*

REFER TO: Willie

*OLC  
Homes  
File*

November 4, 2002

To: Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Dept. of Public Welfare  
Bureau of Policy

Original: 2296

Re: Support for Non-Money Payment Spend Down Program

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing to express my opposition to eliminating the Non-Money Payment Spend Down Program. It is a vital program that helps people enormously.

As an employee of the American Cancer Society, I interact with cancer patients with medical bills on a regular basis. Often, they need the kind of financial assistance this program offers, since they are not so poor to qualify for Medical Assistance but don't have enough income to meet their medical needs.

Please consider keeping the Non-Money Payment Spend Down Program.

Thank you,

*Pamela Mayberry*  
Pamela Mayberry  
Cancer Control Specialist

Original: 2296

#14-477-33

November 4, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
PA Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431  
Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

NOV 04 2002

*Karole Aldridge*  
REFER TO: *Willie*  
*OLC*  
*Almon*  
*File*

RE: Opposition to Discontinuing the Non-Money Payment Spend-Down Program

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing to express my concern about the proposal to discontinue the Spend Down Program.

As Regional Director of Patient Services at the American Cancer Society, PA Division, Southeast Region, I am aware that a serious illness creates major financial hardships for many, many people. Those who are elderly and on a fixed income who have Medicare do not have the means to pay for prescriptions and medical equipment not covered by their policies – and the Spend Down program has been a lifesaver for these people. Those who are younger but disabled also face expenses that can only be alleviated by the Spend Down program.


I urge you NOT to pass regulations that would eliminate this greatly needed program which serves those 7000 vulnerable Pennsylvanians who are on fixed incomes that are slightly higher than the Medical Assistance eligibility guidelines. At the very least, please delay consideration of this action until a new administration can carefully consider the impact of the health of those who would be affected.

Thank you for this consideration.

Sincerely,

*Lorraine Curtis*

Lorraine Curtis  
7816 Cresheim Road  
Philadelphia, PA 19118  
(215) 248-1036



Original: 2296

# 14-477-36

Department of Public Welfare  
Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health and Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Fax: 717-787-6765



J. Michael Fitzpatrick  
Chairman of the Board

Sandra Norman, PhD  
President

Garry L. Pincok  
Chief Executive Officer

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I work for the American Cancer Society, PA Division, Inc. We have been working diligently to become more involved in the underserved population of Pennsylvania. My concern for those people is my reason for writing to you today.

I oppose your proposal to eliminate the NMP Spend-Down program. The proposal would ultimately cost the Commonwealth more money when people end up needing expensive hospital and nursing home care. Please withdraw the proposal to eliminate the NMP Spend-Down program, or at least delay going forward until a new administration has had a chance to study the impact of the proposed cuts and to consider alternatives. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Joyce Rosborough*

Joyce Rosborough  
American Cancer Society  
Route 422 and Sipe Avenue  
Hershey, PA 17033-0897

Phone: 717-533-6144  
Fax: 717-534-1075

Office of Edward J. Zogby  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 04 2002

*Karole Aldridge*

REFER TO: Willie  
OLC  
Homer  
File


Pennsylvania Division, Inc.  
Route 422 and Sipe Avenue, P.O. Box 897, Hershey, PA 17033-0897 ☎ 717 533.6144 ☎ 717.534 1075  
Cancer Information 1.800.AC'S 2345 www.cancer.org

Remember the American Cancer Society, Pennsylvania Division, Inc., in your Will, Trust, or Insurance Policy

The official registration and financial information of the American Cancer Society, Pennsylvania Division may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of State by calling toll free, within Pennsylvania, 800.732.0699. Registration does not imply endorsement.

RECEIVED TIME NOV. 4. 3:08PM

PRINT TIME NOV. 4. 3:09PM



November 4, 2002

#14-477-37

RECEIVED  
BUREAU OF POLICY  
INCOME MAINTENANCE  
REVIEW COMMISSION

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Dept. of Public Welfare  
Health and Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
Fax: 717-787-6765

Original: 2296

Dear Mr. Zogby,

I am writing to let you know that I oppose the proposed regulation that would eliminate the Non-Money Payment Spend Down program. I work in the Patient Services Department at the American Cancer Society and interact with, on a daily basis, those who are in need of this program to pay for their medical needs.

The elimination of this program would hurt the population I work with, causing hardship that may impact on their ability to obtain medical treatment, durable medical equipment, and prescription drugs. The proposed regulation would also hurt those in the community with other disabilities and the elderly who have slightly too much income to qualify for Medical Assistance, but far too little income to meet their medical needs.

Please consider withdrawing the regulation or delay its consideration until a new administration can carefully consider the impact on the health of Pennsylvania's most vulnerable citizens.

Thank you for you time.

Sincerely,

*Jessica H. Woehr*


Jessica H. Woehr  
211 Candlewood Way  
Harleysville, PA 19438  
215-260-2143

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 04 2002

*Kayle Adridge*  
REFER TO: *Willis*  
*OLC*  
*Hogues*  
*file*





# 14-477-34

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health & Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

FAX: 717 787-6765

I heard the PA Dept of Public Welfare is planning to eliminate subsidizing prescriptions or durable medical equipment for people with disabilities and elderly persons who have slightly too much income to qualify for free Medical Assistance, but far too little income to meet their prescription, equipment and medical needs. I thoroughly oppose the total elimination of this program. I am not, at this time, concerned about my needs because I am not in that part of the population as yet. But I am well aware of the needs of other senior citizens and disabled individuals who most benefit from this program.

So, if you would withdraw the regulations, or at least delay their consideration until a new administration can carefully consider the impact on the health of Pennsylvania's most vulnerable citizens, and the economy of the state. Please, don't take down the spend down.

Thanks you for giving me the chance to express my opinion.

Janet Souliard  
434 Cedar Ave  
Hershey, Pa 17033  
Email : jsoul@comcast.net

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 04 2002

REFER TO:

*Harold Adridge*  
*Wellis*  
*OLC*  
*Howes*  
*File*



#14-477-32

Original: 2296

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Monday, November 04, 2002

NOV 04 2002

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health & Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

REFER TO: Willie  
Kayle Aldridge  
OLC  
Hoover  
File

FAX: 717 787-6765

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I wish convey my feelings regarding the elimination of the Spend Down Program provided to clients receiving Public Assistance. After being involved with the SPOC program for over a twelve-year period I became very aware of the various loopholes. I no longer work with clients of the SPOC / TANF programs. There are parts of the Spend Down Program that I do not agree with, clothing, car repairs, etc; however when it comes to prescription and medical equipment I think this program should stay with restriction including health related costs.

As a Cancer Control Specialist with the American Cancer Society, I see the need for cancer diagnosed patients who's medication is costly and the are on fixed incomes just above the Medical Assistance levels; spend down of prescriptions and medical equipment are a must. I realize that you are making an effort to balance the budget, but taking needed medication from Cancer patients should not be your target.

Good Luck in your upcoming decisions.

Sincerely,

*Cheryl Krider*

Cheryl Krider,  
Cancer Control Specialist  
Crawford / Mercer Units  
American Cancer Society

Pennsylvania Division - Crawford Unit  
464 Pine Street, Meadville, PA 16335 ☎ 814.337.8300 ☎ 814.337.8303  
Cancer Information 1.800.ACS.2345 www.cancer.org

The official registration and financial information of the American Cancer Society, Pennsylvania Division may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of State by calling toll free, within Pennsylvania, 800.732.0999. Registration does not imply endorsement.

RECEIVED TIME NOV. 4. 2:04PM

PRINT TIME NOV. 4. 2:06PM

**IRRC**

**From:** Tom Zemaitis [Zemaitis@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 03, 2002 8:19 PM  
**To:** IRRC

**Original:** 2296

**Subject:** Elimination of Medication Coverage

I urge you to please re-consider the proposal to eliminate prescription coverage for PAA residents on Social Security Disability whose incomes are slightly above the federal poverty level.

Please do not allow the DPWA to eliminate the category of Medial Assistance entirely. For some clients, this is the only source of support available for them to procure their medications. Any attempt to eliminate prescription coverage for clients with mental illness is a very bad idea.

I recently had a problem with my coverage for my daughter who is mentally ill. I decided that until I could resolve the problem, I would purchase those medications by myself. So, we renewed all five medications she is currently taking. Much to my surprise, when I went to the pharmacy to pick up the meds, my bill was \$560.00 for a one month supply.

Needless to say, I was unable to purchase her meds and had to beg a two day supply from the pharmacy until I worked out the problem with the coverage. It was a devastating two days until I took care of the problem. Many people with mental illness have no family members to run this kind of interference. Please do not interrupt their care.

In the end, lack of sufficient coverage for medications is very costly. When people can't receive their appropriate medications, they end up sick and hospitalized. This is a far greater cost to all of us. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mary Lou and Tom Zemaitis

RECORDED  
INDEXED  
NOV 04 2002  
FBI - MEMPHIS

# IRRC

---

**From:** Grammy0632@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 03, 2002 7:22 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** A"NMP spend down A" **Original:** 2296

It has just come to my attention that the state of Pennsylvania is considering dropping the above coverage for people on SSD. I can't believe anyone would believe this is a good idea. I am particularly concerned with the coverage for people with mental health problems. The drugs used to treat mental health are some of the most expensive and in most cases allow the patient taking them to function and in many cases to work, even if it is only part time. I would think everyone would think having these people as productive members of the community would be to everyone's advantage. So many of the mental health services have been curtailed, now to cause some of the patients to not be able to afford their medication is ludicrous. Please give this matter your top priority. We can afford to go backward in this area.

Sincerely,

Marian Lahner  
15 Pumpkinhill Road  
Levittown, Pa. 19056

NOV 03 2002 7:27 PM  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

**IRRC**

**From:** Wisdomjf@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 02, 2002 7:45 AM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** NMP Spend Down  
November 2, 2002

NOV - 4 AM 7:26

REVIEW COMMISSION

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431, Health and Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

RE: NMP Spend Down

Dear Mr. Zogby:

When I fell ill I was working in medicine, directing and teaching Family Medicine residents when and how it was important to medical diagnosis and treatment to pay attention to issues of class, family structure, ethnicity/race/religion, and psychological style (as well the impact of perceived differences in all of these on what the patient was inclined to hear or volunteer). I was also putting the finishing touches on my dissertation in the anthropology and sociology of medicine, in a department where the emphasis was very clinical.

owned a lovely house, had no debt, had a good automobile, was a single mom, and had a very bright future.

even had some savings.

was healthy and never even knew about disability benefits.

became ill with an illness I thought was a one-week flu. Unfortunately and unbelievably it was not and instead was ultimately diagnosed as myalgic encephalomyelitis, which, later, in the U.S., was given a name that's very controversial now and in the process of being changed because of it's lack of any scientific basis and invitation of stigma, "chronic fatigue syndrome."

Unfortunately, at the beginning of the illness, very little to nothing was known about it in the U.S. As a result, though I had an initial and substantial remission I wasn't advised properly by rather excellent doctors. We assumed I was in recovery mode, with the result that, not knowing that recovery mode was almost impossible to fully achieve in most cases, especially when I worked for over a year as it came on, which undermined my health terribly (some people come to a halt far earlier, with the result of not being in as bad shape when they can't go on) and I got significantly worse and harder to treat.

As a result I've also developed severe osteoporosis.

The medical history is paralleled by a horrible decline in my financial situation. Long ago I went through my savings because disability income simply couldn't cover the expenses of living, which became extremely modest. Finally, I had to learn about sources of welfare, and have qualified for Medicaid in the category.

Without Medicaid I'd be dead. However onerous Medicaid in our state often can be, there is no way for me to survive without it. None. My prescribed medications per year run approximately \$10,000. By which I mean, those that Medicaid pays for. Besides that I have huge noncovered medical expenses and medically related expenses. Huge. I'm on a walker, suffer huge amounts of muscle pain and fatigue, and flu-like aching. I'm still trying new treatments when they become available and are covered, as I can't spend any more out of pocket. That limits my chances for recovery because many of the treatments that are now working are not yet covered, placing many people with my illness into a two-class system.

But without Medicaid there'd be a third-dying patients. As I couldn't maintain myself at all if I had to cover what Medicaid does. I barely can with Medicaid.

1/4/2002

have a printout from what they paid last year. And careful figures and receipts for what was uncovered last year, which my physicians validate as necessary. There's not one item I can do without and not get incredibly worse and have to be placed in a nursing home to die.

I am bright. I yearn for more of a life. In fact, just going through the yearly applications to qualify for Medicaid, Food Stamps, and housing help through HUD make such inroads into my limited energy almost too much to really be intellectually productive or maintain what small social contacts I want and desperately need. I've lost friends because of my poverty and because I'm taken up with maintaining my welfare. But without Medicaid that situation would be a luxury, not something to lament!!!

I'm home alone a lot. I can't even afford to rent a video. Or purchase a CD player to play the very few CDs I have. My clothes are bought in the one thrift store I can get to. This computer was given to me by a very kind person, but if it goes (and I don't have money to get the maintenance done on it that's needed) I don't know where I'll be. The Internet has helped my morale but yet more it's allowed me to be up to date on the latest solid research into my illness or finding the least expensive source of medical equipment, etc.

I beg of you not to drop this program. If anything there are reforms in how Medicaid is run that would help the State and the recipients, which should get attention. Dropping this won't save the State money I wouldn't think. When a program allows people to just manage is removed they become sicker and more costly wards of the state. Not to mention any issues in human decency that I was brought up to believe our society, unlike others, stands for.

I have a friend in Australia who I email periodically who is shocked beyond belief at what I'm going through. We can't let this nation do less for its impoverished ill and still be a model for democracy all over the world.

I'm starting to hurt and ache and won't take the time to edit this or spell check even-just email as is. I don't even shamefully know how to do an attachment, because I don't have the stamina left over from all these kind of demands and my illness to sit down and read a manual or even use "help" to learn how, which I know is easy.

Please, please, it will be the destruction of my life as well as, I'm sure, others if you eliminate this program. I have no one to turn to for help of this magnitude.

Sincerely,

Judith Fleet Wisdom  
#617 Penn Center House  
1900 JFK Blvd.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

P.S. I live in a small apt in a co-op. While the monthly charges are cheap I can't afford them, and get Section 8 help. But since it's not a rental place I am responsible to pay for major appliances. I live in constant fear of my refrigerator breaking. Yet I couldn't live anywhere else given the requirements of my illness, access to necessities, etc. I could elaborate on this but am too weary. Anyway, I'm too ill to move and there's nothing really cheaper. I pay \$393 per month! And part is paid by HUD. Please know that you'll destroy my life if you lift this program.

cc: IRRC

11/4/2002

November 3, 2002.

NOV 4 AM 11:25

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION  
333 Market St., 14th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Original: 2296

## COMMENTS ON NMP PROPOSED REGULATIONS

The undersigned members of the Managed Care Coalition strongly object to the DPW proposal to eliminate the NMP 'spend-down' category of Medical Assistance.

The Managed Care Coalition is based at Liberty Resources Inc., the Philadelphia-area Center for Independent Living. The Managed Care Coalition Coordinator and many members of the Coalition frequently receive calls from individuals caught in situations without medical insurance. Typically the caller looking for help is newly disabled or has a progressive disease. They often have had to leave their employment and apply for SSDI; then they realize they will not have any medical or prescription coverage for two years until Medicare starts to cover them. The other commonly heard crisis is that which occurs when a Person With Disability has an increase in their SSDI income which makes them ineligible for Medical Assistance.

The NMP 'spend-down' has been the only type of medical coverage these individuals can access in these sort of medical crisis'. Imagine receiving a call from the elderly mother of a previously healthy and gainfully employed 40 year-old man, suddenly paralyzed and unable to speak as a result of a massive stroke, after she has just realized her son's SSDI approval means he will have no insurance for 2 years. Without NMP, this young man would have been unable to see a physician or purchase prescription drugs.

It seems coincidental to the members of the Managed Care Coalition that DPW would propose cutting the NMP 'spend-down' at the same time it was rolling out the Adult Basic Coverage Program. Although the Coalition applauds the inception of the ABC Program, the fact that the Governor diverted the Tobacco Money legislated to fund it meant that the ABC Program would not be able to serve all the underinsured in Pennsylvania.

The Coalition believes there is still a need for important interim medical and prescription drug coverage such as the NMP 'spend-down' provides and that the startup of a new Medical Assistance Program (ABC) does not necessarily mean other MA categories are duplication.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Gretchen Bell, Coordinator of the Managed Care Coalition  
MCC members: Jennifer DePaul, Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Assoc.  
John Leinmiller, United Cerebral Palsy  
Lawrence Brick, PA Society for Advancement of the Deaf  
Mark Davis, AIDS Activities Coordination Office  
Dorothy Ruffin, Liberty Resource Board Member  
John Gladstone, Pennsylvania ADAPT

# IRRC

---

**From:** RBell19015@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 03, 2002 10:37 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** comments on NMP proposed regulations



NMP.ltr.doc

RECEIVED  
NOV 13 2002  
10:37 PM  
IRRC



**IRRC**

---

**From:** AGHawthorne@aol.com

**Sent:** Sunday, November 03, 2002 12:25 PM

**To:** IRRC

**Original:** 2296

**Cc:** Theotisbraddy@aol.com

**Subject:** Re: PIE Alert:Comments due Monday on loss of prescription coverage

Hello -

I am a social worker and I have 20 years experience in the field of Human and Social Services.

Here is a snapshot of how some of my clients will be impacted by the loss of prescription coverage.

There is a woman who has suffered from CMI (Chronic Mental Illness) for many years. After paying her rent, food, bus pass, phone and electric bills, she has about \$17.00 left at the end of the month. She also has physical disease processes to manage, including insulin dependent diabetes. If she loses the prescription coverage she will be homeless.

There is an older woman who has a roommate to help with physical and financial needs. She was retired, but recently returned to work 3 days a week because she was having difficulty making ends meet. Without the prescription coverage, she will be eating tuna 7 nights a week instead of 1, she will not be able to pay the cabfare to and from doctor's appointments (she cannot take public transportation b/c she is physically unable to do so), she will not be able to purchase any clothing, will have to get rid of cable and do without a phone.

I could continue. I ask the legislators to examine other options to address budget issues. How about stopping your pay increases for 5 years? Or, reducing some of the legislative perks? Further, I ask the legislators if they could live like some Pennsylvanians live for 1 week, remembering that many folks live looking over the edge everyday.

Sincerely,

Allison G. Hawthorne  
AGHawthorne@AOL.com

MISSOURI COMMISSION ON  
2002 NOV 03 AM 12:27

**IRRC**

---

**From:** JanEppy@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 02, 2002 11:32 AM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** In reference to proposed DPW regulation

**Original:** 2296

Director  
Independent Regulatory Review Commission  
Harrisburg, Pa. 17120

Sir:

I am writing to say that I do not like your proposed regulations that would eliminate prescription coverage for over 7000 Pennsylvanians, most of whom are on Social Security Disability with incomes slightly above the federal poverty level. Some of these individuals are people with mental illnesses who are receiving Social Security Disability, either based on their past earnings or on the earnings of a retired or deceased parent or spouse. The prescription coverage of Medical Assistance known as "NMP spend down". DPW's proposed regs would eliminate that category of Medical Assistance entirely. although hte affected individuals might qualify for Medical Assistance uner a different category (MNO sped down), that category does not cover prescription drugs.

For these reasons I object and think this proposal is a bad idea.

Yours Truly,

Jan Eppihimer  
710 Ridge Dr.  
Douglasville, Pa.19518

NOV 02 11:32 AM '02  
IRRC

Thad Kaminski  
1802 Kimball Avenue  
Arnold, PA 15068

2002 NOV -5 AM 9:20

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
REVIEW COMMISSION

November 1, 2002

Original: 2296

Independent Regulatory Review Commission  
333 Market St., 14th flr.  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

**Re: Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non- Money Payment Spend Down Medical Assistance**


Dear Sirs,

My son is suffering from schizophrenia, he is on SSDI and his medication and treatment is covered under medical assistance. He pays for his Blue Cross insurance, about \$150 per month, which he must have to qualify for the spend-down. To be covered under medical assistance he must spend down to about \$400 per month.

I cannot believe that this is being proposed. There is no way he can pay for this treatment, medication, rent, food etc. Without the prescription coverage, these mentally ill folks would get off their meds and would be a disaster. The medications is what keeps them stable, out of the hospital, out of trouble, and out of jail. Hospital costs would at least be ten times the cost of prescription drugs. Many would become homeless, in jail, and the cost to society would be prohibitive. The proposed regulations is not in the public interest because of the economic or fiscal impact on the tax payers and the community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Thad Kaminski  
1802 Kimball Ave  
Arnold, PA 15068

724 339 1339 e mail: kaminski@salsgiver.com

## **TALKING POINTS FROM:**

### **INTERIM REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEW FREEDOM COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH**

**Mental illness is a serious public health problem that is highly treatable and must be addressed.**

- Nearly 15 million people in the United States have a serious mental illness. (SAMHSA, National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 2001.)
- Serious mental illness ranks second in terms of shortened life expectancy and years lived with a severe and persistent disability. (HHS, Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, 1999.)
- One in 10 children and adolescents have a severe emotional disorder, placing them at higher risk for substance abuse, dropping out of school, violence, and suicide. (HHS, National Action Agenda for Children's Mental Health, 2001) (NAMI web site at: <http://www.nami.org/youth/index.html>)
- Mental illness is highly treatable. For example, available treatments for bipolar (manic depressive) disorder have been found to prevent recurrent episodes for 75 to 80 percent of individuals with this condition. (American Psychiatric Association web site at: [http://www.psych.org/pub\\_pol\\_adv/research.cfm](http://www.psych.org/pub_pol_adv/research.cfm))
- The public mental health system provides critical services and support to more than 6 million people to minimize the impact of mental illness and to promote mental health and recovery.

**The approach to public mental health in the United States is flawed.**

- Many of the problems in the public mental health system are the result of **underfunding**.
- The federal government has not accepted an appropriate level of responsibility for funding services to individuals with mental illnesses.
- The most significant federal program specifically designed to support states in providing mental health services to individuals with mental illnesses – the Community Mental Health Services Performance Partnership Block Grant – is funded at \$433 million – a fraction of the \$23 billion spent by state mental health agencies on the public mental health system. Other federal programs provide more financial support, but they are designed to serve people with other illnesses and often do not recognize the persistent, cyclical nature of mental illnesses or the critical non-medical supports (such as housing and peer support) that are essential to successful recovery.

- Pursuant to a blatantly discriminatory provision in Medicaid law, Medicaid does not provide a federal contribution for inpatient services received in psychiatric hospitals. In addition, because of this same provision, states are unable to receive Medicaid waivers to support specially tailored packages of services delivered in community settings. This lack of adequate federal support in either setting often leads to frequent and expensive hospital readmissions (*a de facto* “revolving door” policy) or to involvement with the criminal justice system.
- At the state level, per capita spending by state mental health agencies nationwide declined by 10 percent over the last 20 years, despite increasing costs and increasing demand for services. (NASMHPD Research Institute, Funding Sources and Expenditures of State Mental Health Agencies, Fiscal Year 2001.)
- Stigma remains an important obstacle to effective mental health services. This is especially true with respect to violence, although research clearly shows that individuals with mental illnesses are no more likely to be violent than their non-mentally ill peers.

**Despite these obstacles, there have been significant advances in the quality of mental health services and many opportunities exist for knowledge-based improvements.**

- A wealth of evidence-based research clearly shows that many psychiatric interventions are both cost-effective and effective in facilitating successful living in the community. Some of these interventions include Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) models, supported employment, and newer medications.
- Many agencies and levels of government collaborate to more effectively serve people with mental illnesses. For example, new programs with local police departments and court systems help to divert individuals with mental illnesses from jail and into the public mental health system.
- Most mental health services and treatment can safely and effectively be delivered in community-based settings. As a result, states have successfully reduced the number of beds in state hospitals from more than 600,000 in the mid-1960s to about 50,000 today.

**IRRC**

---

**From:** Jtlah@aol.com

**Sent:** Friday, November 01, 2002 8:16 PM

**Original:** 2296

**To:** IRRC

**Subject:** Drug Coverage

I have been informed that there is a possibility that drug coverage may be eliminated for people on SS disability that have Medicare. My daughter falls into this category. She has mental health problems (bipolar) as well as many physical health problems

(Gastro and a knee replacement next month). She has SS and a very little earned income. Without drug coverage she would be dead (she has tried to commit suicide twice already) A loss a drug coverage would push her over the edge. I am retired and can only help her so much. Please do not drop drug coverage.

Thank you very much

Ted Lahner

NOV 01 4 27 PM '02  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES  
MEDICARE COMMISSION

**IRRC**

---

**From:** Pete Kennedy [Peter.Kennedy@PAE.NMSS.ORG]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 01, 2002 2:31 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** DPW Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non-Money Payment Spend Down Category of Medical Assistance

Original: 2296

Dear Regulatory Staff,

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society would like to comment on DPW Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non-Money Payment Spend Down Category of Medical Assistance- (55 PA Code §181) IRRC # 2296,

In a time of budget crunch and fiscal responsibility we ask you to reject the proposed regulations. In a time of Olmstead Supreme court decision (keeping people in the community) and treating people with dignity and respect regardless of an individuals financial holdings please reject DPW's proposal. Twenty percent of the people with MS depend on these programs to cover extensive and expensive therapies to maintain their chronic condition as best they can.

Regulation # 14-477, Published October 5, 2002 at 32 PaB 4860.NMP is usually the only prescription coverage they can obtain. However, many people on Social Security Disability have high prescription costs as a result of the numerous and/or costly medications prescribed to treat their disabling medical conditions. With the elimination of NMP spend down, many of those 7000 people will no longer be able to afford their medications. Without their medications, their preexisting medical conditions are likely to worsen or progress faster, increasing hospitalization, or nursing home placement which Medical Assistance WILL cover (under the "MNO spend down" category which will continue). The result is potentially greater costs to the Medical Assistance program for inpatient and long term care services as a result of the elimination of the NMP spend down category.

Over 3,000 people with MS depend on the commonwealth to partner with the Federal matching programs to afford a quality of life minimizing pain, controlling medical conditions and avoiding secondary problems if primary care is not provided.

There is the potential loss of \$418 million in increased federal Medicaid reimbursement. Under federal legislation that has already passed the Senate (S. 812), states that had not restricted Medical Assistance eligibility since January 2002 would be eligible for a one time increase in federal matching funds for Medical Assistance. Eliminating NMP spend down would make PA ineligible to receive those additional funds should this legislation become law.

Finally, the Department's own Medical Assistance Advisory Committee concurs that the proposed regulation is not in the public interest because it undermines the protection of public health. The inevitable result of eliminating this program is that people with disabilities or chronic health conditions who have high prescription costs and incomes slightly above the poverty level will be unable to afford their medications and their health will suffer as a result. With over 7000 people currently on NMP spend down, the loss of the financial ability of so many Pennsylvanians to afford their medications is certainly a public health issue.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Pete Kennedy

VP Programs

National MS Society

peter.kennedy@pae.nmss.org <mailto:peter.kennedy@pae.nmss.org>

800 548 4611

RECEIVED  
NOVEMBER 1 2002  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

NOV-6 AM 9:22

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
REVIEW COMMISSION

324 Haverford Street  
Johnstown, PA 15905-1829

November 1, 2002

Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I wish to comment on the proposed regulations that would eliminate prescription coverage for many persons on Social Security Disability with incomes slightly above the federal poverty level.

While our son, permanently disabled by schizophrenia and Pervasive Developmental Delay, may not be affected because his income is too low, his situation reflects the pennywise and pound-foolish nature of the proposed action.

People with a mental illness often have other physical problems requiring expensive drugs (heart, lungs, etc.) which if not treated via pharmacy could lead to severe complications requiring more expensive intervention like surgery and hospitalization.

In addition to his very expensive psychiatric drugs, our son needs prescription drugs for seizure disorder, three very expensive new drugs for hiatal hernia, acid reflux, swallowing difficulties and constipation--all related to or complicated by his primary diagnosis of a mental illness and congenital problem. His use of these drugs is preventing more expensive procedures like surgery, hospitalization, or even permanent institutionalization which could lead to a greater burden for taxpayers.

Thank you for considering my remarks.

Very sincerely yours,



Helen Ott, Founding Pres.  
National Alliance for  
the Mentally Ill,  
Cambria County Affil.

cc: Independent Regulatory Review Commission



**IRRC**

---

**From:** 0126797@storm.bucks.edu  
**Sent:** Friday, November 01, 2002 7:28 PM  
**To:** IRRC  
**Subject:** Drug coverage elimination

**Original: 2296**

I have a friend who is on SS disability. She has severe health problems. She is on many expensive medications and could not live without them. For her to lose this coverage would be a death sentence. Please don't drop this coverage. We need to find money to expand coverage, not reduce it.  
John

-----  
This message was sent using Endymion MailMan.  
<http://www.endymion.com/products/mailman/>

NOV 01 2002 7:27 PM  
0126797@STORM.BUCKS.EDU

**IRRC**

---

**From:** CircleFriendsDIC@aol.com

**Sent:** Friday, November 01, 2002 1:57 PM

**Original:** 2296

**To:** IRRC

**Subject:** RE: Health Law Project

Dear Director of Independent Regulatory Review Committee,

We all know that people with disabilities need medicine to survive or to overcome thier problems. Without the medicine they return to a life that well, frankly, that is degrading and filled with stigma. money or funding for those with a disability do not have enough money to raise themselves above the poverty level. People can self-distruct in just days without their medicines. By taking away their medicine, you show your lack of feeling for those that are disabled.

Sincerely,

Andy Bishop

Activities Coordinator at the Circle of Friends Drop-In Center, Reading, PA

NOV 01 2002 1:57 PM  
CIRCLE OF FRIENDS  
DIPLOMA OF DISTINCTION

11/1/2002

Thad Kaminski  
1802 Kimball Avenue  
Arnold, PA 15068

#14-477-24

Original: 2296

RECEIVED  
NOV -6 PM 3:23  
REVIEW COMMISSION

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

November 1, 2002

NOV 04 2002

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

REFER TO: Konole, Aldridge  
Willie  
OLC  
Homes  
File


Re: Proposed Regulations Eliminating Non- Money Payment Spend Down Medical Assistance

Dear Sir,

My son is suffering from schizophrenia, he is on SSDI and his medication and treatment is covered under medical assistance. He pays for his Blue Cross insurance, about \$150 per month, which he must have to qualify for the spend-down. To be covered under medical assistance he must spend down to about \$400 per month.

I cannot believe that this is being proposed. There is no way he can pay for this treatment, medication, rent, food etc. Without the prescription coverage, these mentally ill folks would get off their meds and would be a disaster. The medications is what keeps them stable, out of the hospital, out of trouble, and out of jail. Hospital costs would at least be ten times the cost of prescription drugs. Many would become homeless, in jail, and the cost to society would be prohibitive. The proposed regulations is not in the public interest because of the economic or fiscal impact on the tax payers and the community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
  
Thad Kaminski  
1802 Kimball Ave  
Arnold, PA 15068

724 339 1339 e mail: kaminski@salsgiver.com

## TALKING POINTS FROM:

### INTERIM REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEW FREEDOM COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH

**Mental illness is a serious public health problem that is highly treatable and must be addressed.**

- Nearly 15 million people in the United States have a serious mental illness. (SAMHSA, National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 2001.)
- Serious mental illness ranks second in terms of shortened life expectancy and years lived with a severe and persistent disability. (HHS, Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, 1999.)
- One in 10 children and adolescents have a severe emotional disorder, placing them at higher risk for substance abuse, dropping out of school, violence, and suicide. (HHS, National Action Agenda for Children's Mental Health, 2001) (NAMI web site at: <http://www.nami.org/youth/index.html>)
- Mental illness is highly treatable. For example, available treatments for bipolar (manic depressive) disorder have been found to prevent recurrent episodes for 75 to 80 percent of individuals with this condition. (American Psychiatric Association web site at: [http://www.psych.org/pub\\_pol\\_adv/research.cfm](http://www.psych.org/pub_pol_adv/research.cfm))
- The public mental health system provides critical services and support to more than 6 million people to minimize the impact of mental illness and to promote mental health and recovery.

**The approach to public mental health in the United States is flawed.**

- Many of the problems in the public mental health system are the result of underfunding.
- The federal government has not accepted an appropriate level of responsibility for funding services to individuals with mental illnesses.
- The most significant federal program specifically designed to support states in providing mental health services to individuals with mental illnesses – the Community Mental Health Services Performance Partnership Block Grant – is funded at \$433 million – a fraction of the \$23 billion spent by state mental health agencies on the public mental health system. Other federal programs provide more financial support, but they are designed to serve people with other illnesses and often do not recognize the persistent, cyclical nature of mental illnesses or the critical non-medical supports (such as housing and peer support) that are essential to successful recovery.

- Pursuant to a blatantly discriminatory provision in Medicaid law, Medicaid does not provide a federal contribution for inpatient services received in psychiatric hospitals. In addition, because of this same provision, states are unable to receive Medicaid waivers to support specially tailored packages of services delivered in community settings. This lack of adequate federal support in either setting often leads to frequent and expensive hospital readmissions (a *de facto* “revolving door” policy) or to involvement with the criminal justice system.
- At the state level, per capita spending by state mental health agencies nationwide declined by 10 percent over the last 20 years, despite increasing costs and increasing demand for services. (NASMHPD Research Institute, Funding Sources and Expenditures of State Mental Health Agencies, Fiscal Year 2001.)
- Stigma remains an important obstacle to effective mental health services. This is especially true with respect to violence, although research clearly shows that individuals with mental illnesses are no more likely to be violent than their non-mentally ill peers.

**Despite these obstacles, there have been significant advances in the quality of mental health services and many opportunities exist for knowledge-based improvements.**

- A wealth of evidence-based research clearly shows that many psychiatric interventions are both cost-effective and effective in facilitating successful living in the community. Some of these interventions include Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) models, supported employment, and newer medications.
- Many agencies and levels of government collaborate to more effectively serve people with mental illnesses. For example, new programs with local police departments and court systems help to divert individuals with mental illnesses from jail and into the public mental health system.
- Most mental health services and treatment can safely and effectively be delivered in community-based settings. As a result, states have successfully reduced the number of beds in state hospitals from more than 600,000 in the mid-1960s to about 50,000 today.

OFFICE OF INCOME MAINTENANCE  
BUREAU OF POLICY  
REVIEW COMMISSION

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

# 14-477-62

NOV 13 2002

REFER TO: Karole Aldridge  
Willie  
OLC  
Homes  
File

November 1, 2002

Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Department of Public Welfare  
Bureau of Policy  
Health and Welfare Bldg, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Original: 2296

Dear Mr. Zogby,

Don't take down the spend down!

I am opposed to the total elimination of the spend down for low-income elderly and disabled people in Pennsylvania.

I am a social worker and work with people who have very limited incomes and resources. It is the responsibility of a free society to ensure that a basic quality of life is offered to all its citizens. If there must be cutbacks, there must be other non-essential places to cut. Human service cuts convey a message that some of our people are disposable. This is not so.

Fight for what is right.

Thank you.

*Stephanie Costello MSW*

Stephanie Costello MSW, ACSW, LSW  
234 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

# 14-477-41

**Shobhana L. Kanal, LSW**  
191 Presidential Blvd., #1006  
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004  
(610) 667-6036  
shobhanakanal@hotmail.com

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

November 1, 2002

Original: 2296

NOV 06 2002

Department of Public Welfare  
Edward J. Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Health and Welfare Building, Room 431  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

REFER TO: Willie  
Kangle Aldridge  
OLC  
Harvey  
File

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am a clinical social worker, currently employed in a community mental health clinic in Philadelphia. I am writing to oppose the elimination of the NMP Spend-Down as proposed by DPW.

Some of my agency's clients are among the thousands of Pennsylvanians who currently depend on this program. We see many people under 65 who are disabled and must use the Spend-Down program to afford important medical, mental health, and prescription drug services. Even with the Spend-Down, these individuals and families live on very limited budgets; without the Spend-Down, they would go without needed medical services in order to pay for basic needs such as food and shelter.

I am aware that DPW must address budget concerns of its own, and that this need has led to the proposal to eliminate the Spend-Down. In the long run, however, eliminating the Spend-Down will cost DPW and the taxpayers more money, not less. People with heart disease who lose access to important medications will likely end up in the hospital; likewise for people with diabetes who cannot afford to keep a stable supply of insulin on hand. Hospital and nursing-home stays will have to be funded by Medical Assistance, at far higher costs than would have been incurred had the same patients continued to stay in the community and receive outpatient care made possible by the Spend-Down.

I ask that DPW withdraw the proposal to eliminate the NMP Spend-Down, or at least postpone it until a new administration has had time to study the likely impact of such a policy change.

Thank you for your time and attention, and for your efforts on behalf of low-income residents of Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

*Shobhana L. Kanal, LSW*

Shobhana L. Kanal, LSW

# 14-477-49

Original: 2296

324 Haverford Street  
Johnstown, PA 15905-1829  
November 1, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

REFER TO:

*Kayle Aldridge*  
*Wells*  
*OLC*  
*Hansen*  
*ESB*

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I wish to comment on the proposed regulations that would eliminate prescription coverage for many persons on Social Security Disability with incomes slightly above the federal poverty level.

While our son, permanently disabled by schizophrenia and Pervasive Developmental Delay, may not be affected because his income is too low, his situation reflects the pennywise and pound-foolish nature of the proposed action.

People with a mental illness often have other physical problems requiring expensive drugs (heart, lungs, etc.) which if not treated via pharmacy could lead to severe complications requiring more expensive intervention like surgery and hospitalization.

In addition to his very expensive psychiatric drugs, our son needs prescription drugs for seizure disorder, three very expensive new drugs for hiatal hernia, acid reflux, swallowing difficulties and constipation--all related to or complicated by his primary diagnosis of a mental illness and congenital problem. His use of these drugs is preventing more expensive procedures like surgery, hospitalization, or even permanent institutionalization which could lead to a greater burden for taxpayers.

Thank you for considering my remarks.

Very sincerely yours,

*Helen Ott*

Helen Ott, Founding Pres.  
National Alliance for  
the Mentally Ill,  
Cambria County Affil.

cc: Independent Regulatory Review Commission





ORIGINAL: 2296

# 14-477-63

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 07 2002

**NAMI PENNSYLVANIA**

**Delaware County Chapter**

P.O. Box 1493

Havertown, PA 19083

*Letter was # 14-478-49  
changed to the above.*

REFER TO:

*Karol Aldridge*

*Willie*

*Oh C*

*Hoover*

*Fell*

November 1, 2002

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing on behalf of the Delaware County Chapter of the NAMI- PA (Pennsylvania's Voice on Mental Illness). Our Chapter has membership in excess of 200 families in Delaware County.

I have learned with alarm that DPW is proposing regulations to eliminate NMP spend down under Medical Assistance. This can only be a humanitarian disaster for approximately 7,000 Pennsylvania citizens who are dependent on NMP spend down.

Many of the 7,000 individuals suffer severe mental illnesses. Their mental stability and ability to live in the community are achieved only with medications which often cost hundreds of dollars per month. (The Medical Assistance cost, of course, is less because of negotiated reimbursement rates.) These people often receive Social Security disability benefits only a little above the threshold for regular Medical Assistance. If they are forced to buy their medications on their own, they will be thrown into utter poverty. There is a danger that many of them will forgo medication, and then decompensate and be back in the hospital at much greater expense to the public. Some will find themselves unable to afford a place to live and will end up living on the street or staying in make shift shelters such as church basements.


How can Pennsylvania balance its budget on the backs of its most needy and vulnerable citizens? That will be a humanitarian disaster right in our own backyard - not in some war-torn overseas country.

RECEIVED - NOV 15 2002

Edward Zogby  
November 1, 2002  
page 2

Therefore, I urge you on behalf of both the directly affected individuals and their families and loved ones not to issue the regulations which will deprive our neediest citizens of the opportunity to get prescriptions under the NMP spend down plan.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel R. Fredland". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "D".

Daniel R. Fredland  
Secretary

cc: Independence Regulatory Review Commission  
Editor, *Delaware County Daily Times*

#14-478-49

Original: 2296



Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

**NAMI PENNSYLVANIA**

NOV 07 2002

**Delaware County Chapter**

P.O. Box 1493

Havertown, PA 19083

REFER TO: *Karole Aldridge*  
*Wellee*  
*OKC*  
*Hoover*  
*File*

November 1, 2002

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing on behalf of the Delaware County Chapter of the NAMI- PA (Pennsylvania's Voice on Mental Illness). Our Chapter has membership in excess of 200 families in Delaware County.

I have learned with alarm that DPW is proposing regulations to eliminate NMP spend down under Medical Assistance. This can only be a humanitarian disaster for approximately 7,000 Pennsylvania citizens who are dependent on NMP spend down.


Many of the 7,000 individuals suffer severe mental illnesses. Their mental stability and ability to live in the community are achieved only with medications which often cost hundreds of dollars per month. (The Medical Assistance cost, of course, is less because of negotiated reimbursement rates.) These people often receive Social Security disability benefits only a little above the threshold for regular Medical Assistance. If they are forced to buy their medications on their own, they will be thrown into utter poverty. There is a danger that many of them will forgo medication, and then decompensate and be back in the hospital at much greater expense to the public. Some will find themselves unable to afford a place to live and will end up living on the street or staying in make shift shelters such as church basements.

How can Pennsylvania balance its budget on the backs of its most needy and vulnerable citizens? That will be a humanitarian disaster right in our own backyard - not in some war-torn overseas country.

Edward Zogby  
November 1, 2002  
page 2

Therefore, I urge you on behalf of both the directly affected individuals and their families and loved ones not to issue the regulations which will deprive our neediest citizens of the opportunity to get prescriptions under the NMP spend down plan.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daniel R. Fredland". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Daniel R. Fredland  
Secretary

cc: Independence Regulatory Review Commission  
Editor, *Delaware County Daily Times*

Brian McLaughlin  
2921 Berkeley RD.  
Erie, PA 16506

#14-477-42

Original: 2296

11/1/02

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Policy  
DPW  
Room 431 Health and Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17101


Dear Mr. Zogby:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed elimination of medication benefit in the "NMP Spend Down" category.

Any reduction in medication benefits will negatively impact persons with mental illness. As you know access to medication enables persons with mental illness control their symptoms. Access enables them to avoid emergency hospitalizations and in some cases imprisonment. Clearly restricting access to medication will result in greater expense and personal tragedy.

I look forward to your positive action regarding this issue. Thank you for your attention to this most important issue.

Sincerely,

  
Brian McLaughlin

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO:

*Kayle Aldridge*  
*Willie*  
*OLC*  
*Homer*  
*Full*



# NAMI PA, Berks County Affiliate

(An affiliate of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill)

P.O. Box 6642, Wyomissing, PA. 19610-0642

Telephone: (610) 736-3095

Original: 2296

November 1, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

NOV 05 2002

REFER TO:

*Karole Addridge*  
Willie  
OLC  
Horn  
Full

Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431, Health & Welfare Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Director Zogby:

NAMI-PA, Berks County Affiliate, with its 100+ members, **is strongly opposed** to the action that DPW proposes to eliminate Medical Assistance for a targeted population.

NAMI of Berks County has been made aware the Department of Public Welfare has issued **proposed regulations** that would eliminate prescription medication coverage for over 7,000 Pennsylvanians in the near future (2003). Most of these Pennsylvanians are on Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) which gives them monthly incomes slightly above the established federal poverty level.

Some of these targeted Pennsylvanians are people with mental illnesses. They are receiving SSDI either based upon their past earnings or on the earnings of a retired or deceased parent or spouse. The prescription coverage for these mentally ill individuals is currently provided by a special category of Medical Assistance known as "NMP spend down."

DPW's proposed regulations would eliminate entirely the "NMP spend down" category of Medical Assistance. Although these affected individuals might qualify for Medical Assistance under another category known as "MNO spend down," this category does not cover prescription medications. As DPW staff may well know, the costs of modern, effective medications for the mentally ill are extremely expensive and beyond the incomes received by people enrolled for SSDI.

Furthermore, DPW staff should be aware that people with mental illnesses require their medications on a daily, regular basis to live a "more normal" life in their communities. OMHSAS is promoting the successful release of patients from State mental health facilities under CHIP with its concomitant savings of taxpayers' money. Targeting 7,000 Pennsylvanians with discontinuance of their Medical Assistance may put the State of Pennsylvania at risk of seeing the in-patient census increase at its remaining mental health facilities. People with mental illnesses that cannot afford expensive medication will become unstable and require hospitalizations at potentially greater expense to the State.


Mr. Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy, DPW

November 1, 2002  
Page 2

The elimination of prescription medication coverage for people with mental illnesses under the current "MNP spend down" category of Medical Assistance is a very bad idea for DPW to contemplate.

NAMI of Berks County recommends the Department of Public Welfare retract its regulation proposal and leave the current system of Medical Assistance in tact. The pursuit of altering or eliminating Medical Assistance for the mentally ill should be discontinued immediately.

Sincerely,



Donald R. Levan  
President

cc: NAMI Pennsylvania

RECEIVED  
NOV 1 2002  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE  
BUREAU OF POLICY

# 14-477-25

Original: 2296

193 Koval Court  
Delmont, PA 15626  
November 1, 2002

Office of Income Maintenance  
Bureau of Policy

Edward Zogby, Director  
Bureau of Policy  
Department of Public Welfare  
Room 431 Health and Welfare Bldg.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

NOV 04 2002

REFER TO: *Kayle Aldridge*  
~~*Wick*~~  
*OLC*  
*James*  
*Fell*

Re: Proposed Department of Welfare Regulations

I am only one individual, but I am involved as a volunteer with many aspects of the areas that will be impacted by the proposed regulations. My friends in the mental health community are very upset by them. My friends in the disability community are upset about the Medicaid spend-down. My friends who are elder-law attorneys are upset about certain aspects of the spend-down for seniors. My friends in small personal homes are afraid they might have to close.

I think the timing of the proposed regulations is all wrong. Many of us have been trying to get legislation passed that will define the differences in them. These regulations will treat all personal homes and assisted living facilities the same. There are huge differences in how small personal homes should be run versus the way large assisted living facilities should be run. It is not clear that the two different types of residences should even be regulated by the same department. I see no need for the Department of Welfare to be involved in regulating facilities that have no residents on welfare or Medicaid.

Please put off adopting these regulations until all of the concerns from so many different people are addressed. Give the new administration, whomever it is going to be, the chance to work with the many different groups that have so many concerns about them. The regulations are supposed to help the residents in these facilities, not harm them.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara N. Dickman

*Barbara N. Dickman*

NOV 05 2002  
PA DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WELFARE  
COMMISSION