

1 THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. ZILLY
2
3
4
5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

T.R., by and through his guardian and next friend, R.R.; S.P., by and through her mother and next friend, DH; C.A., by and through her mother and next friend, A.A.; T.F., by and through her father and next friend, D.F.; P.S., by and through his mother and next friend, W.S.; T.V., by and through his guardian and next friend, C.D.; E.H. by and through his mother and next friend, C.H.; E.D., by and through his mother and next friend, A.D.; and L.F.S., by and through his mother and next friend, B.S.

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUSAN N. DREYFUS, not individually, but solely in her official capacity as Secretary of the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services; and J. DOUGLAS PORTER, not individually, but solely in his official capacity as the Director of the Washington State Health Care Authority,

Defendants.

No. 2:09-cv-01677-TSZ

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY RELIEF**

CLASS ACTION

The named Plaintiffs herein, by and through their counsel, and on behalf of themselves and the class they represent, and with the opposing party's written consent to file an amended pleading, allege as follows:

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF - 1
(Case No. 2:09-cv-01677-TSZ)

Disability Rights Washington
315 5th Avenue South, Suite 850
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 324-1521 • Fax: (206) 957-0729

I. BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This Complaint asserts a class action lawsuit to enforce the rights of Washington's Medicaid eligible children under the age of 21, with mental health needs, to receive the intensive home and community-based mental health services necessary to correct or ameliorate their mental health conditions.

2. Since at least the year 2002, Washington's Department of Social and Health Services ("DSHS") has commissioned and issued numerous studies and reports that confirm the inadequacy of the State's current system of mental health care for Washington's Medicaid children and that recommend the wide-spread adoption of intensive home and community-based mental health services ("Intensive HC-based Services"). Yet, to date, Washington's Medicaid children have little or no access to such services.

3. The State's failure to ensure that Washington's Medicaid eligible children are provided necessary, Intensive HC-based Services violates: (1) the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment ("EPSDT") provisions of Title XIX of the federal Social Security Act ("Medicaid Act"); and (2) the Integration Mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (the "ADA") and Rehabilitation Act.

4. Within Washington's Medicaid system, many children with significant mental health needs can only access a limited tool kit of weekly office-based therapy and medication management. If those limited services are insufficient, the only option generally available for these children is hospitalization in an acute care psychiatric hospital or placement in a long term institutional mental health facility.

5. The named Plaintiffs in this action are ten children between the ages of nine and 17 who suffer from various psychiatric and behavioral disorders. They and the Plaintiff class cannot access critical Intensive HC-based Services due to Defendants' failure to provide them with information and notice of their right to access such services, failure to administer adequate

1 screening and assessments to address the children's community mental health needs, and failure
 2 to manage the State's Medicaid mental health system so as to ensure that these children actually
 3 have access to and are provided the Intensive HC-based Services necessary to correct ameliorate
 4 their mental health conditions.

5 6. As a result of the Defendants' failure to arrange and provide for necessary
 6 Intensive HC-based Services, the named Plaintiffs and thousands of other similarly situated
 7 children have suffered: a) family separation and instability, including homelessness, eviction,
 8 foster care placement, and out-of-state placement; b) repeated and avoidable hospitalizations; c)
 9 unnecessary and harmful juvenile detention; d) segregation through unnecessary, prolonged and
 often harmful institutionalization; and e) worsening mental and physical health conditions
 10 contributing to their decline socially, academically and in daily living.

11 7. Plaintiffs and the class of children they represent, are cycling in and out of
 12 hospitals, juvenile detention centers, long-term psychiatric institutions, and foster care
 13 placements that may be hundreds of miles away from their homes and families. Children should
 14 grow up at home, not in institutions, and the revolving door of institutionalization and lack of
 15 services must end.

16 8. Three of the named Plaintiffs are currently institutionalized; five have recently
 17 been discharged after almost a year or more of institutionalization and are currently being
 18 deprived of necessary post discharge services that would allow them to remain safely at home.
 19 Each of these children has experienced multiple hospitalizations or institutionalization. The
 20 remaining two named Plaintiffs have avoided hospitalization or institutionalization but have been
 21 denied the Intensive HC-based Services they need to address their significant mental health
 22 symptoms of self harming behaviors and threatened suicide. If these children do not receive
 23 immediate treatment they are at high risk of institutionalization and will join the other named
 Plaintiffs in the cycle of institutionalization and denial of services.

1 9. This failure to provide intensive HC-based Services has decreased the chance that
 2 each of these children, and the class they represent, will become independent and productive
 3 adults.

4 10. The named Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief to enforce the
 5 Medicaid Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act and the Fourteenth
 6 Amendment to the United State's Constitution so that Intensive HC-based Services will be
 7 available to them and others similarly situated.

8 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9 11. This class action for declaratory and injunctive relief arises under 42 U.S.C. §§
 10 1983 and 1988, the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12131 et seq. ("ADA") and
 11 Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794. Defendants are state actors
 12 whose actions giving rise to this suit were under color of state law.

13 12. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 1333(a).
 14 Plaintiffs' claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are authorized under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and
 15 2202 and Rules 57 and 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

16 13. Venue is appropriate in the Western District of Washington pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
 17 § 1331(b) because Defendants are sued in their official capacity and perform their official duties
 18 by and through offices within the District and thus resides therein, and a substantial part of the
 19 events and omissions giving rise to the claims herein occurred in this District. Many of the
 20 named Plaintiffs also reside in this District.

21 **III. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

22 14. Historically, children with intensive mental health care needs were either treated
 23 in large institutional asylums or were left untreated and faced a future of juvenile detention and
 24 adult incarceration, homelessness or ever declining psychological, physical and social
 25 conditions. There is now widespread agreement among children's mental health experts that

1 these restrictive, institutional treatment centers pose additional risks and can be a harmful
 2 environment for children. By contrast, years of research and clinical experience have proven that
 3 intensive home and community-based mental health services are both successful and cost
 4 effective. Such services are now relied upon as a necessary treatment modality even for children
 5 with the most severe emotional and behavioral problems. As a result, courts around the country
 6 have required that state Medicaid programs ensure the provision of Intensive HC-based Services
 7 under Medicaid's EPSDT requirements. And, recognizing their legal obligation and the
 8 effectiveness of such services, several states have voluntarily reformed their systems to ensure
 9 that such services are made available to their Medicaid children and youth.

10 15. DSHS has repeatedly received recommendations for, and has itself recognized the
 11 need for, wide-spread adoption and expansion of Intensive HC-based Services but has failed to
 12 implement the necessary systemic changes to provide for the delivery of these services statewide.
 13 While pilot programs exist, they are available only to a fraction of the population and are often
 14 funded by non-Medicaid funds. Other services may become available only if the child's parent
 15 relinquishes custody to the foster care system, tearing the child away from a caring and loving
 16 family environment and introducing further instability. And, while a few community mental
 17 health providers offer limited home and community-based services to Medicaid children, these
 18 services are frequently inadequate and offered only to a privileged few or in restrictive
 19 circumstances.

20 16. By failing to create and support intensive services in children's homes and
 21 communities, and only offering intensive services in restrictive institutional settings, the system
 22 is placing Plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff class at risk of (and in many cases ensuring)
 23 avoidable psychiatric hospitalizations or commitment to the juvenile delinquency system.

24 17. The cost to taxpayers of failing to provide necessary treatment and services to
 25 children is well documented: inadequate care leads to a worsening of symptoms, with costlier

1 consequences requiring more expensive responses. The cost in lost opportunities to the children
 2 themselves—through higher school drop out rates, involvement in the juvenile and criminal
 3 justice systems, and a very real prospect of a lifetime of cycling in and out of state psychiatric
 4 hospitals—cannot be calculated.

5 18. The harm to the named Plaintiffs and to the Plaintiff class is irreparable. While
 6 the Defendants delay systemic reform, the childhood of each of the named Plaintiffs and Plaintiff
 7 class members is literally slipping away as they spend days, weeks, months, and years in
 8 institutions, detention centers, and out of home placements far from their families and
 9 communities. Injunctive and declaratory relief are necessary and appropriate because absent
 10 relief ensuring that Plaintiffs are provided necessary and legally required services, the named
 11 Plaintiffs and the class they represent will continue to suffer as a result of Defendants' continued
 12 violations of their legal rights.

13 IV. PARTIES

14 A. The Plaintiff Children

15 19. **T.R.** is a ten-year-old boy from King County with significant mental health care
 16 needs. Although his treatment team recognizes that his condition will only worsen in an
 17 institutional environment, he is unable to access the intensive home and community-based
 18 mental health services that would allow him to safely return home. Instead he has remained
 19 confined for the last nine months at the state psychiatric hospital for children on the grounds of
 20 Western State Hospital. T.R. brings this action through his sister, legal guardian and next friend,
 21 R.R. T.R. is a Medicaid recipient, for whom Defendants have failed to arrange and provide for
 22 necessary Intensive HC-based Services, in King County, Washington.

23 20. **S.P.** is a 16-year-old girl from Spokane County, Washington with significant
 24 mental health care needs. S.P. was recently discharged from an inpatient psychiatric facility and,
 25 like the five times she had been previously discharged, was denied the Intensive HC-based

1 Services that she requires to remain safely at home. As a result, shortly thereafter she was
 2 recommitted and is currently institutionalized. S.P. brings this action by and through her mother
 3 and next friend, D.H. S.P. is a Medicaid recipient for whom Defendants have failed to arrange
 4 and provide for necessary Intensive HC-based Services, in Spokane County, Washington.

5 21. **C.A.** is a 15-year-old girl from Island County, Washington with significant mental
 6 health care needs. By the time she was 14, C.A. had been hospitalized three times due to
 7 depression and a suicide attempt, and she had begun cutting herself. Although she can be treated
 8 at home with Intensive HC-based Services, she is currently institutionalized. C.A. brings this
 9 action by and through her mother and next friend, A.A. C.A. is a Medicaid recipient for whom
 10 Defendants have failed to arrange and provide for necessary Intensive HC-based Services in
 11 Island County, Washington.

12 22. **T.F.** is a 15-year-old girl from Spokane County, Washington with significant
 13 mental health care needs. In order to receive Intensive HC-based Services, T.F. is currently
 14 placed in a foster home in Kennewick, Washington, over 150 miles away from her home and
 15 family. Due to the lack of available Intensive HC-based Services, she has been in out-of-home
 16 placements and institutions since she was ten years old. T.F. brings this action by and through
 17 her father and next friend, D.F. T.F. is a Medicaid recipient, for whom Defendants have failed to
 18 arrange and provide for necessary Intensive HC-based Services, in Spokane County,
 19 Washington.

20 23. **P.S.** is a 17-year-old boy from King County, Washington with significant mental
 21 health care needs. Because P.S. has been repeatedly denied necessary Intensive HC-based
 22 Services, he has spent his childhood bouncing between institutions, hospitals, and juvenile
 23 detention. P.S. brings this action through his mother and next friend, W.S. P.S. is a Medicaid
 recipient, for whom Defendants have failed to arrange and provide for necessary Intensive HC-
 based Services in King County, Spokane County, and Yakima County, Washington.

1 24. **T.V.** is an eleven-year-old boy from Spokane County, Washington with
 2 significant mental health care needs. After a year at the state psychiatric hospital for children,
 3 T.V. was recently discharged and is currently being denied the step-down Intensive HC-based
 4 Services he needs to prevent relapse. T.V. brings this action by and through his legal guardian,
 5 C.D. T.V. is a Medicaid recipient, for whom Defendants have failed to arrange and provide for
 6 necessary Intensive HC-based Services, in Spokane County, Washington.

6 25. **E.H.** is a 15- year-old boy from Whitman County, Washington with mental
 7 health care needs. In spite of frequent incidents of self-harm, attempted suicide, and threats to
 8 others, E.H. was recently discharged from an institution and has yet again been denied the
 9 Intensive HC-based Services that would stabilize him in his home. E.H. brings this action by
 10 and through his mother and next friend, C.H. E.H. is a Medicaid recipient, for whom Defendants
 11 have failed to arrange and provide for necessary Intensive HC-based Services, in Whitman
 12 County, Washington.

12 26. **E.D.** is a ten-year-old boy King County, Washington with significant mental
 13 health care needs from. E.D. has never been institutionalized, but he has serious and dangerous
 14 unmet mental health needs that are placing him at risk of falling into the vicious cycle of
 15 hospitalizations that his fellow named Plaintiffs have suffered. E.D. brings this action by and
 16 through his mother and next friend, A.D. E.D. is a Medicaid recipient for whom Defendants
 17 have failed to arrange and provide for necessary Intensive HC-based Services in King County,
 18 Washington.

18 27. **L.F.S.** is a nine-year-old boy from Spokane County, Washington with mental
 19 health care needs. L.F.S. has been exhibiting severe mental health symptoms for the last five
 20 years, but has yet to receive an adequate assessment of his condition or Intensive HC-based
 21 Services. L.F.S brings this action by and through his mother and next friend, B.S. L.F.S. is a

1 Medicaid recipient, for whom Defendants have failed to arrange and provide for necessary
 2 Intensive HC-based Services in Spokane County, Washington.

3 **B. The Defendants**

4 28. Susan N. Dreyfus is Secretary of the Washington State Department of Social and
 5 Health Services. Secretary Dreyfus is named solely in her official capacity as DSHS Secretary
 6 for declaratory and prospective injunctive relief. Until July 1, 2011, DSHS administered
 7 Washington's Medicaid program. Secretary Dreyfus is the designated State Mental Health
 8 Authority under Washington's Community Mental Health Services Act, RCW 71.24. RCW
 9 71.24.035. Secretary Dreyfus's duties include assuring access to mental health treatment
 services for children, RCW 71.24.035.

10 29. J. Douglas Porter is the Director of the Washington State Health Care Authority
 11 ("HCA"). Director Porter is named solely in his official capacity as the Director of the
 12 Washington HCA for declaratory and prospective injunctive relief. As of July 1, 2011, the HCA
 13 Director is the official within the executive branch of Washington State with final decision-
 14 making authority over matters relating to Washington's Medicaid program, RCW 71.24.035.

15 30. Secretary Dreyfus and Director Porter each have responsibilities for ensuring that
 16 Washington's Medicaid and mental health services are administered in a manner consistent with
 state and federal law.

17 **V. THE CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 31. This action is brought as a statewide class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)
 19 and 23(b)(2). The proposed class consists of all current or future Medicaid-eligible residents of
 20 Washington under the age of 21 who have or may in the future have a mental illness or condition
 21 and who need, or may in the future need, but are not receiving, intensive home and community-
 based mental health services in order to correct or ameliorate their mental illness or condition.

1 32. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. By way of
 2 example, DSHS data shows that there are more than 75,000 children between the ages of zero
 3 and 17 who are low-income with a mental health diagnosis in the moderate to severe range and
 4 thus would likely benefit from Intensive HC-based Services that are routinely unavailable
 5 statewide. Plaintiff class, which includes all Medicaid-eligible children under the age of 21, is
 6 larger than this estimate. Furthermore, the class is fluid in that new members are regularly
 7 created.

8 33. All members of the class share common issues of law and fact with respect to
 9 Defendants' obligation to ensure that Washington's Medicaid eligible children are provided
 10 legally mandated Intensive HC-based Services required under the EPSDT provisions of the
 11 federal Medicaid Act, the Integration Mandate of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act, and that
 12 such children are receiving notice of their rights under Medicaid.

13 34. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the class they
 14 represent.

15 35. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class they
 16 represent. Plaintiffs know of no conflict of interest among the class members, and have a
 17 personal and clearly defined interest in vindicating their rights and the rights of the class
 18 members they represent to obtain necessary Intensive HC-based Services and notice of their
 19 rights under Medicaid. The relief the named Plaintiffs seek will inure to the benefit of the
 20 Plaintiff class as a whole. The Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys experienced in federal class
 21 action litigation and knowledgeable in the areas of disability and Medicaid law.

22 36. Prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would create a risk of
 23 inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual class members which would
 establish incompatible standards of conduct or could as a practical matter be dispositive of the

1 interests of the other members or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their
 2 interests.

3 37. Defendants' ongoing actions and omissions have affected and will affect the class
 4 generally, thereby making appropriate final injunctive and declaratory relief with respect to the
 5 class as a whole.

6 VI. STATEMENT OF FACTS

7 A. Statutory Background

8 The Federal Medicaid Act and the EPSDT Mandate

9 38. Medicaid is a cooperative federal and state funded program authorized and
 10 regulated pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act ("Medicaid Act"), providing for a
 11 medical assistance program for certain groups of low-income persons. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1396, *et*
 12 *seq.* One of the purposes of the Medicaid program is to provide services to help such families
 13 and individuals attain or retain the capability for independence or self-care. *Id.*

14 39. State participation is voluntary; however, states that choose to accept federal
 15 funding and participate in the Medicaid program must adhere to the minimum federal
 16 requirements set forth in the Social Security Act, as amended, and its implementing regulations,
 17 42 U.S.C. § 1396 *et seq.* Through the Medicaid program, states receive federal matching funds
 18 for their own programs in the form of reimbursements by the federal government for a portion of
 19 the cost of providing Medicaid benefits.

20 40. The Medicaid Act mandates that states provide Early and Periodic Screening
 21 Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) services to Medicaid eligible children under the age of 21.
 22 The EPSDT mandate obligates states to ascertain children's physical and mental impairments,
 23 and to arrange for or provide such health care, treatment, or other measures that are necessary to
 treat or ameliorate impairments and conditions, 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A); 42 U.S.C.

1 § 1396d(a)(4)(B). EPSDT was created to be the “nation’s largest preventative health program
 2 for children.” H.R. 3299, 101st Cong. § 4213 (1989).

3 41. Under the Medicaid Act, every participating state must implement an EPSDT
 4 program consisting of the following services:

- 5 a. informing all persons in the state who are under the age of 21 and eligible for
 6 medical assistance of the availability of early and periodic screening,
 7 diagnostic and treatment services as described in 42 U.S.C. § 1396d®;
- 8 b. providing or arranging for the provision of such screening services in all
 9 cases where they are requested; and
- 10 c. providing or arranging for corrective treatment the need for which is
 11 disclosed by such child health screening services. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(43).

12 42. Under EPSDT, states must provide and arrange for all of the treatment services
 13 listed in 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a) for EPSDT eligible children when necessary to correct or
 14 ameliorate a psychiatric, behavioral, or emotional condition of a child or youth under the age of
 15 21.

16 43. Home health care services, 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(7); rehabilitative services, 42
 17 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(13); case management services, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396d(a)(19), 1396n(g); and
 18 personal care services, 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(24) are among the services listed in 42 U.S.C.
 19 § 1396d(a) and encompass Intensive HC-based Services. Courts have held that intensive home
 20 and community-based mental health services are covered Medicaid services that must be
 21 provided by the state under the EPSDT mandate (*see, e.g., Rosie D. v. Romney*, 410 F. Supp.2d
 22 18 (D. Mass 2006)).

23 44. While states may adopt managed care concepts, contract with entities to oversee
 24 the delivery of services, and arrange services through provider networks, the states remain
 25 responsible for ensuring compliance with all relevant Medicaid requirements, including the

1 mandates of the EPSDT program. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396a(a)(5), 42 U.S.C. § 1396u-2; 42 U.S.C.
 2 § 1396a(a)(43). The state must ensure that the managed care entity has the capacity to offer the
 3 full range of necessary and appropriate preventive and primary services for all enrolled
 beneficiaries. 42 U.S.C. § 1396u-2(b)(5).

4 45. In addition to the EPSDT mandate, states must comply with the Constitutional
 5 Due Process requirements under the Fourteenth Amendment, the Medicaid Act's due process
 6 requirements and comparability requirements. U.S. Const. amend. XIV; 42 U.S.C.
 7 § 1396a(a)(3); 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(B).

8 **The Americans with Disabilities Act and the Integration Mandate**

9 46. Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. § 12131 *et*
 10 *seq.*, prohibits public entities from discriminating against or excluding a qualified individual with
 11 a disability from enjoying or participating in the benefits of services, programs, or activities of
 the public entity on the basis of disability. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130.

12 47. Regulations promulgated to implement Title II of the ADA require public entities
 13 to “provide services, programs, and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the
 14 needs of qualified individuals with disabilities.” 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(d). The Medicaid program
 15 is a public entity, and as such Medicaid services must be provided in the most integrated setting
 16 appropriate to the individual’s needs.

17 48. The United States Supreme Court has determined that unnecessary
 18 institutionalization constitutes discrimination and that Title II requires states to “provide
 19 community-based treatment for persons with mental disabilities when 1) the State’s treatment
 20 professionals determine that such placement is appropriate, 2) the affected persons do not oppose
 21 such treatment, and 3) the placement can be reasonably accommodated, taking into account the
 22 resources available to the State and the needs of others with mental disabilities.” *Olmstead v.*
L.C., 527 U.S. 581, at 607 (1999).

1 **B. Washington's Delivery of Medicaid Funded Mental Health Services for Children**

2 49. Washington has chosen to participate in the Medicaid program. RCW
 3 43.20A.010. As a result, it receives billions of dollars every year from the federal government to
 4 fund the State's program. Indeed, approximately 50-65% of every dollar spent by the State on its
 5 Medicaid program is funded by the federal government.

6 50. In addition to the standard Medicaid funding received from the federal
 7 government, the State of Washington has or shall receive up to an additional \$339 million from
 8 the federal government as part of an increase in the percentage of Medicaid funded pursuant to
 9 the stimulus package enacted as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
 10 (Pub. L. No. 111-5) ("ARRA"). These additional federal funds are designed to help states
 11 support their Medicaid programs by relieving budgetary pressure on state governments during
 12 difficult economic times.

13 51. States that choose to accept federal funding and participate in the Medicaid
 14 program must designate a "single state agency" to administer the Medicaid program at the state
 15 level. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(5). In Washington, DSHS is the single state agency that is
 16 designated to administer Washington's Medicaid program. Although Medicaid allows states to
 17 provide mandatory Medicaid services through contractors, DSHS remains responsible for
 18 ensuring that the mandates of the Medicaid Act are met, including EPSDT.

19 52. DSHS is authorized under state law to "make grants and/or purchase services
 20 from counties, combinations of counties, or other entities, to establish and operate community
 21 mental health programs." RCW 71.24.030.

22 53. The federal government has waived specific Medicaid provisions to allow DSHS
 23 to implement a pre-paid capitated mental health program for individuals with significant mental
 24 health needs. Under this capitated mental health waiver, DSHS may pre-pay fixed "capitated"
 25 amounts to geographically designated Regional Support Networks (RSNs), who in turn locally

1 administer community mental health services to Medicaid eligible individuals who meet specific
 2 access to care standards.

3 54. The capitated mental health waiver does not permit DSHS to deny, reduce, or
 4 terminate services listed in 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a) to Medicaid children for reasons not relating to
 5 each child's individual needs. The waiver only permits DSHS to provide for additional services
 6 to individuals enrolled on the waiver, although these services are not otherwise available to the
 general Medicaid population.

7 55. The capitated mental health waiver did not affect the State's obligation under the
 8 EPSDT mandate to ensure that children have access to all services listed in 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)
 9 if necessary to correct or ameliorate their conditions. Thus, these services must be provided
 10 regardless of whether the children's conditions otherwise meet the access to care standards
 applicable to the managed care program.

11 56. The waiver also did not affect the Defendants' obligations under the Due Process
 12 provisions of the Medicaid Act.

13 57. Washington's Medicaid State Plan and capitated mental health waiver provide
 14 coverage for intensive home and community-based mental health services such as intensive care
 15 coordination, comprehensive home assessment, mobile crisis intervention, home and
 16 community-based crisis stabilization, intensive home and community-based behavioral and
 17 therapeutic services for children and their families, training on independent living, social and
 18 communication skills in a natural environment, personal care services, and respite, among other
 services or supports.

19 58. Under its capitated mental health waiver, DSHS contracts directly with
 20 independent RSNs (currently totaling 13) to administer mental health services in their
 21 communities. RCW 71.24.035(2); WAC 388-865-0200. In turn, each of the RSNs subcontract

1 with various licensed community mental health agencies and/or health care service providers to
 2 provide mental health services to eligible recipients within each region.

3 59. Secretary Dreyfus's responsibilities with respect to the RSNs include, but are not
 4 limited to: 1) developing and adopting rules establishing state minimum standards for the
 5 delivery of mental health services by licensed services providers and RSNs; 2) establishing a
 6 standard contract or contracts for RSNs; 3) entering into contracts with RSNs; 4) assuring that
 7 the special needs of children and low-income persons are met; and 5) denying all or part of the
 8 funding allocations to RSNs based upon formal findings of noncompliance with the terms of the
 RSNs. RCW 71.24.035.

9 60. The RSNs' obligations include: 1) contracting as needed with licensed service
 10 providers, or in the absence of a licensed service provider entity, becoming a licensed service
 11 provider entity for the purpose of providing services not available from licensed service
 12 providers; 2) monitoring and performing biennial fiscal audits of licensed service providers who
 13 have contracted with the regional support network to provide services; and 3) assuring that the
 special needs of children and low-income persons are met. RCW 71.24.045.

14 61. DSHS has been aware since at least 2002 that its RSN system was failing to
 15 adequately meet the mental health needs of Washington's Medicaid children. *See JLARC 2002*
16 Children's Mental Health Study Report 02-5, p. 9 ("This study finds that Washington has not
 17 met the Legislature's intent to establish a coordinated, efficient and effective system of public
 18 mental health care for children"). Yet, the State has taken no action to correct this failing.
 Indeed, as recently as April 2009, another report prepared for DSHS described the RSN system
 19 as "a system that has high levels of regional variation, limited access to care, a lack of
 20 standardized care management and unclear roles and authority between state agencies, the RSNs
 21 and some of the provider systems." *See Improving Care: Options for Redesign of Washington's*
22 Mental Health System (April 2009).

1 62. DSHS has similarly known for years that many of Washington's Medicaid
 2 children are not receiving the Intensive HC-based Services they need and that these children are
 3 underserved by the limited array of mental health services made available to them. Repeatedly,
 4 DSHS has received and generated reports confirming and reiterating the State's ongoing failure
 5 to provide Intensive HC-based Services, and the resulting harm to Washington's children. For
 6 example:

7 a. *Capacity and Demand Study for Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital and Community*
 8 *Residential Beds Final Report* (November 2004). As early as 2004, DSHS
 9 acknowledged that community-based services are essential to prevent harm to
 10 children:

11 “The expansion of community based services for children and
 12 adolescents is essential to minimize the need for foster care, residential,
 13 or inpatient services as well as to promote effective integration back into
 14 the community once an individual has left any of these treatment
 15 alternatives...Community based services can minimize these disruptions
 16 and the corresponding risks (e.g. trauma from separation) that may occur
 17 with inpatient and residential treatment options while also offering
 18 effective outcomes and comparatively lower cost of care.”

19 b. *Children's Acute and Non-Acute Inpatient Psychiatric and Residential Treatment*
 20 *White Paper* (August 2006). This DSHS white paper contained the following
 21 stark conclusions:

22 1) “Program shortages and inconsistencies in local community
 23 (RSN) intensive community-based care and diversion
 24 resources [to divert children from institutionalization] result
 25 in acute community hospitalizations and for those who do
 26 not improve, or frequently decompensate, the need for
 27 Children's Long-Term Inpatient Programs (CLIP);” and
 28 2) “The same shortages in community based alternatives that
 29 increase the need for CLIP admissions, result in lengthened
 30 stays when there are few or no “step-down”, or intermediate
 31 care resources for youth and their families to utilize post-
 32 discharge [from a CLIP facility].”

c. *CLIP System Improvement Workgroup* (September 2007). This workgroup paper documented similar observations about the delivery of community mental health services to children:

- 1) "Adequate assessments are not available to quickly access intensive services to prevent long term treatment;"
- 2) There is "[l]imited coordination, policy and agreement among service providers/systems;"
- 3) There is a "[l]ack of effective coordination for pre & post services [for children before and after they are institutionalized];"
- 4) There is "[n]o aftercare in the community including discharge planning by/with allied systems;"
- 5) There are "[p]rogrammatic limitations in meeting each child's needs;" and
- 6) "[The] System[s] needs [are] placed over child and family needs."

d. *Intensive Children's Mental Health Services Summary Report* (Fall 2009). In this report DSHS's Mental Health Division identified several significant problems with its delivery of mental health services for children, including:

- 1) “a limited array of intensive community and family-based services for children and youth;”
- 2) “insufficient transitional programs to support successful returns to the community;” and
- 3) “insufficient targeted treatment and security options for special populations such as youth with co-occurring developmental disabilities and mental health needs, and highly aggressive youth.”

To address these issues, a workgroup consisting of DSHS officials and other stakeholders recommended expanding transition and aftercare services for children being discharged from CLIP facilities and 24/7 mobile and in-home crisis services connected to longer-term stabilization beds.

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF - 18
(Case No. 2:09-cv-01677-TSZ)

Disability Rights Washington
315 5th Avenue South, Suite 850
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 324-1521 · Fax: (206) 957-0729

e. *Children’s Mental Health Services – Synopsis on Gaps and Recommendations related to SSHB1088 from DSHS Assistant Secretaries and Administrators* (2009). Most recently, DSHS issued a document related to SB 1088 to identify gaps in Children’s Mental Health services. In the document DSHS acknowledged that the ‘Frequency, duration, and type of [mental health] treatment modality offered [to Washington’s Medicaid children] are inappropriate and/or limited,’ and “Wraparound, respite, crisis mobilization, day treatment and integrated dual disorder services are not available especially in rural areas.”

63. Despite such information and notice, the Defendants have failed to take adequate actions providing or arranging for the Intensive HC-based Services children in Washington need and are not receiving, despite the legal mandate to provide for such services, her knowledge of the deficiencies within DSHS's mental health system for children, her receipt of recommendations for how to improve the system, and the long standing acknowledgment by DSHS that the lack of intensive services results in trauma for children.

64. In many areas of Washington, children with mental health needs who are on Medicaid only receive weekly therapy and medication management. Children who cannot safely remain in their own homes with these limited services and without necessary Intensive HC-based Services must turn for help to acute care hospitals such as Fairfax, Children's Hospital, Kitsap Mental Health, and Sacred Heart, where they are placed on locked child and adolescent psychiatric wards.

65. Some of the children who cycle in and out of these acute care facilities are eventually placed in one of four Children's Long term Inpatient Psychiatric ("CLIP") facilities located in Lakewood, Tacoma, Seattle, and Spokane. CLIP services are administered by DSHS. These facilities are often hundreds of miles away from the child's home and family, which causes harm of prolonged separation and creates significant barriers to providing necessary

1 family therapy, discharge planning, and services to reintegrate children back into their home and
 2 communities.

3 66. While the State and the RSNs offer some limited home and community-based
 4 services, these services are made available only to a fortunate few and the limited services that
 5 are offered are often subject to arbitrary limits and onerous, if not draconian, restrictions. For
 example:

- 6 a. The few existing Medicaid funded in-home supports and case management
 7 programs have limited slots and have narrow access standards which require that
 8 a child's mental health condition meet a certain level of severity, which is
 9 narrower than the "necessary to correct or ameliorate" standard for EPSDT. This
 10 results in many children having to deteriorate in order to get the care they need. If
 11 a child is able to access these services, the services are often limited by arbitrary
 12 caps and restrictions unrelated to the child's needs.
- 13 b. In some areas of Washington, more intensive services may be available through
 14 Washington's foster care system, but in order to access these services parents of
 15 Medicaid children must first give up their custodial rights.
- 16 c. In other regions of the State, children can only access necessary intensive mental
 17 health interventions if they have been charged or found guilty of a crime through
 18 the local and state juvenile justice system.
- 19 d. While Washington has implemented a few pilot programs around the state to
 20 provide community-based supports, these pilot programs have limited capacity,
 21 are not funded with Medicaid, and are not treated as a Medicaid entitlement. The
 22 pilot programs reach only a reported 79 children, resulting in a very small
 23 percentage of children who are able to access limited services—largely based
 upon where they happen to live.

1 67. Some services, such as community-based therapeutic mentoring and intensive
 2 mobile crisis stabilization services, are routinely unavailable to children on Medicaid in much of
 3 the state.

4 68. Children served by the mental health system do not get notice of their right under
 5 EPSDT to request and receive services necessary to correct or ameliorate their conditions.
 6 DSHS's contracts with the RSNs only require that each RSN provide Medicaid recipients under
 7 the age of 21 with a copy of the "Mental Health Benefits Booklet" published by DSHS. This
 8 publication does not adequately inform children and their families that Intensive HC-based
 9 Services are available under EPSDT. Consequently, many families are poorly positioned to
 10 request services their children need because they do not know that these mental health services
 11 are coverable by Medicaid. *See DSHS Report, Children's Mental Health Gaps Response,*
Summary of Findings Across Data Sources (2007) (identifying lack of information to families as
 12 a major barrier to effective access to services).

13 69. Children and their families do not receive prior written notice when the
 14 Community Mental Health Agency denies, reduces or terminates Medicaid services, nor do they
 15 receive any notice that they have a right to request a hearing to challenge such denials,
 16 suspensions, reductions, and terminations of their mental health services.

17 70. The DSHS website states that recipients only receive action notices if their
 18 services are denied, suspended, reduced, or terminated when such action is made by the RSN,
 19 and not the result of a community mental health agency decision. If a community mental health
 20 agency decides to deny, suspend, reduce, or terminate Medicaid services, DSHS has no adequate
 21 regulations, policies, or procedures requiring providers to ensure recipients' of their due process
 22 rights.

1

2 **C. The Plaintiff Children's Experience with Washington's Public Mental Health**

3 **System**

4 **1) Currently Institutionalized Children**

5 **T.R. (Ten-Year-Old Boy)**

6

7 71. T.R. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
community-based mental health services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health
conditions or reduce his behavioral symptoms.

8

9 72. Since T.R.'s single mother died when he was six years old, T.R. and his brother
have lived with their older sister, R.R., who is T.R.'s legal guardian and next friend. R.R., a
single mother, also cares for her seven year-old son.

10

11 73. T.R. has had serious behavioral symptoms since his mother's death in 2005. In
2008, after his symptoms worsened, T.R. was diagnosed with Oppositional Defiant Disorder,
Attention Deficient Hyperactivity Disorder, and Mood Disorder Not Otherwise Specified. In the
last two years, T.R. has been admitted into the psychiatric unit of the community hospital on four
occasions. Due to his inability to access necessary services, T.R. is currently institutionalized at
the state psychiatric hospital for children on the grounds of Western State Hospital.

12

13 74. T.R.'s symptoms have not improved, and his hospital treatment team has
indicated that the institutionalized setting in which he is receiving services is harmful to him.
The team recommended that T.R. be discharged to his sister's home with intensive home and
community-based mental health services that were not available to him prior to his admission to
the state hospital.

14

15 75. Prior to his most recent institutionalization, T.R.'s Care Plan included one-to-one
in-home "case aid" services and mobile crisis services.

16

17 76. When T.R.'s symptoms escalated, his sister called the crisis team for help, but on
multiple occasions there either was no response or the crisis team refused to come to T.R.'s

1 home and instructed his sister to call the police. The crisis services were only approved for 30
 2 days at a time, so T.R. and his sister had no assurances that crisis services would be available to
 3 T.R. when the next crisis arose.

4 77. By November 2008, after T.R. was hospitalized again in an acute psychiatric unit.
 5 His community treatment team recommended that his one-to-one in-home “case aid” services be
 6 increased to over 40 hours per week. His records documented that the “case aides” were
 7 “helpful” to address T.R.’s symptoms and in “keeping his life consistent.” However, by the end
 8 of December 2008, T.R. had met the funding cap the RSN had set for in-home “case aid”
 9 services. Although T.R. continued to need these services to help manage his symptoms, the
 “case aides” were terminated.

10 78. T.R.’s therapist requested an exception to the RSN’s policy for him to continue
 11 receiving case aids or to allow a brief stay at a residential facility, but her request was denied.
 12 T.R. later began receiving some additional case aid services but at a significantly reduced level
 13 of only 20% of the hours he had been receiving.

14 79. With these inadequate services, T.R.’s mental health continued to decline and
 15 T.R. was admitted to the state psychiatric hospital for children in February 2009. While initially
 16 successful after his admission, T.R.’s condition soon quickly deteriorated. In October 2009,
 17 T.R.’s hospital treatment team informed his sister that they believed the hospital was not the
 18 appropriate environment to treat his mental health needs. Specifically, the team identified the
 19 rotation of clinical residents that occurs in a teaching facility and the turn over of patients at the
 20 hospital as a source of continual trauma that was detrimental to treating T.R. His treatment team
 21 concluded that these inherent aspects of the state hospital program were harming T.R. and
 22 undermining his recovery. T.R.’s treatment team has recommended discharge back to his sister’s
 23 home based on their conclusion that a stable family home is clinically more appropriate.

1 80. To manage T.R.'s symptoms in the community, where T.R. must receive
 2 treatment in order to achieve greater emotional stability and move toward a productive future,
 3 T.R. will need more intensive and long-term mental health services and supports in his home and
 4 community than he had before his hospital admission.

5 81. If T.R. were provided with adequate and appropriate Intensive HC-based
 6 Services, he would improve significantly and be able to live at home with his family rather than
 7 at the children's psychiatric hospital on the grounds of Western State Hospital. Without these
 8 services, T.R. has little hope of avoiding worsening symptoms, harm to himself or others,
 9 repeated hospitalizations, continued institutionalization, and separation from his family.

10 82. Prior to T.R.'s recent institutionalization, R.R. sought intensive home and
 11 community-based services for T.R. through Medicaid and believed that the services provided by
 12 the RSN were the maximum allowable under Medicaid. She never received notice of the
 13 availability of Intensive HC-based Services under the Medicaid program or T.R.'s right to a fair
 14 hearing to dispute the denial, reduction, and termination of services.

15 **S.P. (16-Year-Old Girl)**

16 83. S.P. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 17 community-based mental health services she needs to correct or ameliorate her mental health
 18 conditions or reduce her behavioral symptoms.

19 84. S.P.'s current diagnoses include Schizophrenia, paranoid type, and Attention
 20 Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. As a result of her conditions, she hears voices, has visual
 21 hallucinations, experiences paranoid delusions that her family members want to harm her, is
 22 irritable, and displays aggression, depression, and low self-esteem. She is currently
 23 institutionalized and has been denied the Intensive HC-based Services that she needs to correct
 or ameliorate her mental health conditions.

1 85. S.P. has been exhibiting mental health symptoms since she was in kindergarten.
 2 She struggled in school, had multiple truancies, and was ultimately unable to cope in a school
 3 environment for more than two hours a day.

4 86. In 2005, S.P. participated in a five week facility-based day treatment program at a
 5 local community hospital in Spokane, Washington. Even after completing this program, S.P.
 6 was subsequently involuntarily hospitalized seven times in the psychiatric unit of the local
 7 hospital, and was twice involuntarily committed for long term treatment at a CLIP facility
 8 approximately 300 miles away from her home. At the end of each stay, she was discharged to
 9 the same inadequate array of weekly therapy, medication management, and case management
 10 services that had failed her in the past. During this time, S.P. was not offered or provided any
 11 additional Intensive HC-based Services to help cope with, control, or reduce her symptoms.

12 87. The second time S.P. was discharged from the Tacoma CLIP facility in June
 13 2009, her treating mental health professional recommended specific home and community-based
 14 mental health services and identified as “essential services” the provision of one-to-one home-
 15 based, independent living and social skills training, enhanced supervision support during early
 16 evening unstructured time, and community-based training in the development of coping skills.

17 88. After discharge, S.P. requested these services but was told they were not
 18 available. S.P.’s services were again limited to the weekly office-based therapy and medication
 19 management by a psychiatric nurse that she had received after every prior unsuccessful
 20 discharge.

21 89. S.P.’s condition again deteriorated over the summer of 2009. She began to
 22 experience command hallucinations, was afraid to accept medication from her mother, and began
 23 threatening others in response to her hallucinations. As a result, she was again involuntarily
 24 committed to the local community hospital’s psychiatric unit.

1 90. When S.P. was discharged from the hospital on September 11, 2009, she was
 2 approved for one of two slots in a new program in Spokane, Washington, that promised her more
 3 home services. However, the services available through this program were also inadequate to
 4 satisfy the recommendations of her treating mental health professional. For example, S.P. could
 5 not access a sufficient number of service hours or services during the times when her mother was
 6 at work.

7 91. Although S.P.'s treating mental health professional was concerned that another
 8 institutionalization would not be in her best interest, she ultimately recommended that S.P. return
 9 to a CLIP placement due to the lack of sufficient Intensive HC-based Services. In October 2009,
 10 S.P. was involuntarily ordered to the state children's psychiatric hospital on the grounds of
 11 Western State Hospital, hundreds of miles from her home and family.

12 92. If S.P. were provided with adequate and appropriate EPSDT mental health
 13 services, she would improve significantly and be able to live at home with her family. In order
 14 to ameliorate S.P.'s condition and avoid further institutionalization, S.P. needs and has requested
 15 the Intensive HC-based services recommended by her treating mental health provider. These
 16 essential services have not been made available to her, and as a result, she has experienced an
 17 increase in her symptoms, has harmed herself and others, and has become socially isolated by
 18 recurring or prolonged institutionalization.

19 93. S.P. and her mother never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-
 20 based Services through the Medicaid program, or a notice about her right to request a hearing to
 21 dispute denials, reductions, or terminations of her services.

22 **C.A. (15-Year-Old Girl)**

23 94. C.A. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 24 community-based mental health services she needs to correct or ameliorate her mental health
 25 conditions or reduce her behavioral symptoms.

1 95. Prior to entering adolescence, C.A. demonstrated no mental health needs and was
 2 an honor roll student. However, by the time she was 14 years old, she had been hospitalized
 3 three times due to depression and suicide attempts, had begun cutting herself, and had jumped
 4 out of a second story window.

5 96. C.A.'s mental health diagnosis is Major Depressive Disorder.

6 97. C.A.'s first hospitalization was for thirteen days in December 2007. Upon
 7 discharge, C.A. received recommendations for medication management and individual and
 family therapy.

8 98. By February 2008, C.A. was again hospitalized. She was discharged one week
 9 later with recommendations that she continue outpatient therapy, specifically cognitive
 10 behavioral techniques for managing depression and anxiety, interpersonal therapy and distress
 11 tolerance. Additional recommended services included parent support, coaching and education
 12 for C.A.'s mother to assist her in effectively dealing with C.A.'s emotional instability and
 chronic suicidal ideation in the home setting.

13 99. Despite her two hospitalizations within ten weeks, no comprehensive home-based
 14 assessment was completed to determine what services C.A. needed.

15 100. Upon discharge from the hospital in February 2008, C.A. did not receive
 16 Intensive HC-based Services, nor was she assessed for such services. Instead, C.A.'s mother
 17 was referred to the abuse and neglect system to access in-home services that should have been
 18 provided for under Medicaid, and to apply for the Children's Hospital Alternative Program
 ("CHAP"). C.A. was not able to access these services for several months.

19 101. Without the Intensive HC-based Services she needed, C.A. continued to
 20 experience serious depression and hopelessness after discharge. Two months later, in April
 21 2008, C.A. jumped from a second story window and was re-admitted to the psychiatric hospital.

1 Upon discharge, C.A. again continued to receive only limited mental health services, specifically
 2 medication management and therapy.

3 102. On September 25, 2008, C.A. went to the emergency room at the local
 4 community hospital complaining of seeing shadows and fairies, and hearing footsteps. She was
 5 not admitted and did not receive Intensive HC- based Services.

6 103. In November 2008, C.A. was enrolled in the CHAP. This program was supposed
 7 to provide Intensive HC-based Services but the services she actually received were inadequate.
 8 The services C.A. received in the CHAP program were: a) individual therapy at the office of the
 9 community mental health agency - over an hour's drive from her home; b) weekly in-office
 10 family therapy that was attended by C.A.'s mother while C.A. was in her individual session; and,
 11 c) medication management to stabilize her mood. C.A. also attended a few "therapeutic
 12 photography" sessions with a technician at the community mental health agency and on a few
 13 occasions, had a "case aid" take her on a short visit to a local coffee shop.

14 104. C.A. was offered out-of-home respite through therapeutic foster care as an
 15 intermediary step to prevent acute hospitalization. On the one occasion she attempted to use this
 16 service, she became distressed and had to return home in the middle of the night.

17 105. Notably, the reported goal of C.A.'s CHAP services was to "work with [her
 18 mother] in maintaining C.A. in her home until a CLIP comes through." The service was not
 19 intended as an alternative to a CLIP inpatient treatment or to avoid institutionalization.

20 106. C.A. entered a CLIP facility in May 2009. She has worked hard with her
 21 treatment team and met benchmarks set for her. She is described as a "star" in group therapy and
 22 has maintained high levels in the facility's reward system.

23 107. C.A.'s mother travels the 63 miles each way from their home in Island County to
 the CLIP facility twice a week to attend family therapy sessions and visit her child. Facility
 based family therapy sessions have had limited effectiveness.

1 108. C.A. is a very bright child and is capable of advanced academic work. However,
 2 opportunities for her to receive accelerated educational services at the CLIP have been limited.
 3 C.A. sees her intelligence as a strength she can build on, and experiences hopelessness when she
 4 cannot do challenging academic work.

5 109. C.A.'s mother is deeply committed to support her child's recovery and bringing
 6 her home. However, the local mental health agency did not provide sufficient services to C.A.
 7 prior to her admission and C.A. must have Intensive HC-based Services to be safe at home.

8 110. C.A. never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-based Services
 9 through the Medicaid program, or a notice about her right to request a hearing to dispute denials,
 reductions, or terminations of her services.

10 **2) Children Discharged from Institutions Not Receiving Adequate Services**

11 **T.F. (15-Year-Old Girl)**

12 111. T.F. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home or
 13 community-based mental health services she needs to correct or ameliorate her mental health
 14 conditions and reduce her behavioral symptoms.

15 112. T.F. has been diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder, Oppositional Defiant Disorder,
 16 and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. As a result of her psychiatric disorders and history of sexual
 17 abuse by a non-parent, she exhibits severe symptoms of anxiety, including self-harming
 behaviors.

18 113. When T.F. was ten years old, she had two suicide attempts that resulted in
 19 inpatient treatment at her local hospital's psychiatric unit. Based on these incidents, DSHS's
 20 Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) took custody of her. Both T.F. and her father
 21 want her to return to her father's home, but DCFS continues to have custody because T.F. needs
 22 Intensive HC-based Services that have not been made available to her outside of the foster care
 23 system.

1 114. In October 2008, T.F. was briefly returned to her father after receiving a year of
 2 inpatient psychiatric treatment at the CLIP facility in Spokane. At discharge, the treatment team
 3 at the CLIP recommended that T.F. receive individual counseling, individual and family sessions
 4 to transition home, group therapy, and structured recreational activities to model appropriate
 behaviors.

5 115. T.F.'s discharge plan included medication management, individual counseling,
 6 twelve hours per week of therapeutic aids and transitional counseling services from the CLIP
 7 facility. T.F. did not actually receive these services due to inflexible service hours and a lack of
 8 available and qualified therapeutic aid providers.

9 116. No group therapy or structured recreational activities was offered. T.F. also has
 10 not been provided mobile crisis services or home based crisis stabilization services to respond
 11 when her symptoms escalated. During this period, T.F. was hospitalized, arrested, and expelled
 12 from school for such things as threatening to overdose on her prescription medications and
 getting into altercations with other students.

13 117. Faced with a lack of insufficient services, T.F. was institutionalized again at the
 14 CLIP facility in January 2009. When T.F. was ready for discharge from the CLIP facility in May
 15 2009, she asked to return home to her father. However, she was advised that the structured
 16 supports T.F.'s treatment team recommended for her were only available in a congregate care
 facility. DSHS placed T.F. in a treatment facility in Coeur D'Alene, Idaho and told her that she
 17 had to complete the program in order to return home to her father.

18 118. While she was in Coeur D'Alene, the facility relied on law enforcement to
 19 address her mental health crises: T.F. was arrested eight times and spent the vast majority of the
 20 time between May and October 2009 in the local Juvenile Detention Center. As a result of her
 21 repeated arrests and incarcerations, the institution did not implement T.F.'s treatment plan or

1 provide T.F. with the family and individual therapy she needs. Ultimately, the facility
 2 discontinued services, leaving her in the custody of Idaho's juvenile criminal system.

3 119. T.F. requested to go home with her father and for services to be delivered to her in
 4 her father's home, but DSHS did not make any arrangements for her to receive services at home.
 5 T.F. needs to be in a stable setting long-term with Intensive HC-based Services.

6 120. T.F.'s DCFS case manager reports that he is unable to find a therapeutic group
 7 home or foster home in the Spokane area. T.F. has stated that being away from her family is a
 8 primary source of stress and anxiety for her. Nonetheless, in November 2009, T.F. was moved
 9 to the closest community placement option for her in Washington – a foster care placement in
 Kennewick, 155 miles away from her family.

10 121. T.F.'s father is committed to visitations and family therapy, knowing that these
 11 will help T.F. recover, but fears that the great distance between his home and the foster care
 12 home will result in less frequent contact with her. T.F.'s father has limited resources to pay for
 13 regular travel, has an inflexible schedule on his job, and is concerned about the impact of the
 upcoming winter on his ability to travel such a distance.

14 122. T.F. is currently being harmed by her separation from her family and the lack of
 15 services. Without the availability of Intensive HC-based Services in her own community, T.F. is
 16 at risk of further harm from the separation of her family, institutionalization, incarceration, and
 17 an increase in her behavioral symptoms.

18 123. T.F. never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-based Services
 19 through the Medicaid program, or a notice about her right to request a hearing to dispute denials,
 reductions, or terminations of her services.

1 **P.S. (17-Year-Old Boy)**

2 124. P.S. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 3 community-based mental health services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health
 4 conditions or reduce his behavioral symptoms.

5 125. P.S. has been diagnosed with severe Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (Primary),
 6 Bipolar Disorder Not Otherwise Specified, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder Not
 7 Otherwise Specified, and Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. P.S. was abused during the first eight years
 8 of his life. As a result of his mental health conditions and his traumatic childhood, P.S.
 9 experiences traumatic flashbacks, sleep problems, headaches, and problems concentrating. P.S.
 10 also exhibits severe symptoms of suicidal attempts, and self harming behaviors that include
 11 cutting himself, burning himself, and banging his head.

12 126. P.S. came to live with his grandmother at the age of eight. During the years he
 13 lived with her in Yakima County, the only community mental health services he could access
 14 were in-office counseling and medication management. With these limited services, his
 15 symptoms did not improve. He attempted suicide, experienced a series of school expulsions,
 16 arrests, and involuntary hospitalizations.

17 127. Beginning with his involuntary commitment in October 2007, P.S. was moved
 18 between numerous out-of-home placements, including the CLIP facility in Spokane, crisis
 19 response centers in Yakima and Kennewick, and the psychiatric unit of the community hospital.
 20 In November 2008, P.S. was discharged from the CLIP facility with the following
 21 recommendations: placement in a therapeutic foster home with respite care; specialized school
 22 setting; behavioral health specialist to provide one-to-one attention; monitoring during
 23 unstructured times; and development of a behavioral plan.

24 128. Upon discharge, P.S.'s Yakima treatment team had identified no placement
 25 options. P.S. did not receive the services recommended by the CLIP facility, and instead was

1 discharged to a crisis bed in Yakima without any one-to-one support. P.S. ran away the first
 2 weekend and was missing for several days.

3 129. In December 2008, the Casey Family Foundation agreed to fund a six-month
 4 treatment program in Marylhurst, Oregon. P.S. was discharged from the facility in late May
 5 2009 with the following recommendations: highly structured group home setting; independent
 6 living skills training, mental health therapy, crisis support and medication management;
 7 discharge placement familiar and sensitive to the effects and reactions to trauma.

8 130. Upon return to Washington, P.S. did not receive the services that were
 9 recommended for him by his treating mental health professionals.

10 131. From May until August 2009, P.S. again rotated between temporary placements
 11 while his Yakima based treatment team struggled to identify a placement that would accept him.
 12 During this period, P.S. was not provided with a comprehensive home assessment or mental
 13 health therapy, and received only sporadic medication management.

14 132. Fearing for P.S.'s safety and hoping that there would be more mental health
 15 services in King County, P.S.'s grandmother sent him to live with his biological mother in
 16 Seattle in August 2009. P.S. requested mental health treatment in King County, but was initially
 17 denied because his Medicaid coupon was from another county. After obtaining a King County
 18 medical coupon the following month, P.S. completed the intake process at a community mental
 19 health agency in King County, Washington on September 23, 2009.

20 133. P.S. made multiple requests for an appointment with a psychiatrist to check his
 21 medication levels and physical tolerance of the six different medications that had been prescribed
 22 by the Oregon facility. However, P.S. has yet to meet with a psychiatrist. P.S.'s community
 23 mental health provider directed P.S. to see his family doctor for monitoring of his psychotropic
 medications during the delay.

1 134. The only services P.S. has been able to access at his community mental health
 2 agency in King County are weekly counseling in the therapist's office

3 135. P.S. has requested other necessary services, including mobile crisis stabilization
 4 services, home behavioral assessments and aids, therapeutic mentoring, but none of these
 5 services have been made available to him. P.S. was informed that he would be put on the
 6 waiting list for "wrap around" case management services and parent support.

7 136. P.S. has experienced five separate mental health crisis events since coming to
 8 Seattle in August, including one event of suicidal ideation and four physical altercations with the
 9 youth in his community. His counselor has been notified of these incidents and has
 10 acknowledged that P.S. should not be left unsupervised. However, the services P.S. needs and
 11 has requested have not been provided for or arranged by the Defendants.

12 137. P.S. is experiencing harm due to the lack of services. For example, after a recent
 13 mental health crisis, P.S.'s mother was informed by the apartment complex in which they live
 14 that they were going to be evicted because of P.S.'s actions. P.S. and his family had to scramble
 15 to find a new home. During the turmoil, P.S. received no mental health therapy services from his
 16 community mental health provider.

17 138. Without necessary Intensive HC-based Supports, P.S. is experiencing increased
 18 symptoms. He is socially isolated from his peers, has experienced physical injuries, and has
 19 been suspended from school. If P.S.'s needs continue to go unmet, he will continue to be at risk
 20 of experiencing an increase in his symptoms, additional physical injuries, incarceration, and
 21 additional long-term institutionalizations.

22 139. P.S. never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-based mental health
 23 services through the Medicaid program, or a notice about his right to request a hearing to dispute
 denials, reductions, or terminations of his services.

1 **T.V. (11-Year-Old Boy)**

2 140. T.V. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home or
 3 community-based mental health services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health
 4 conditions, or to reduce his behavioral symptoms.

5 141. T.V. has been diagnosed with Mood Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified; Post
 6 Traumatic Stress Disorder, chronic; Oppositional Defiant Disorder, chronic; and Attention
 7 Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, inattentive type. As a result of his conditions and traumatic
 8 history, T.V. displays severe symptoms of aggression, sudden outbursts of rage, elopement, and
 9 self-harming behaviors. T.V. continues to have difficulty concentrating and socializing
 10 appropriately with peers.

11 142. Before his second birthday, T.V. was removed from his biological parent's home
 12 due to severe neglect, and bounced between five different placements until he was finally placed
 13 with C.D. as a foster child. When T.V. was seven-years-old, after he had bonded with C.D. and
 14 her family, but before C.D. had established third party custody, he was transferred to a different
 15 foster home for fifteen months where he was the victim of sexual assault.

16 143. Following T.V.'s return to C.D.'s custody at age eight, T.V. began to exhibit
 17 severe symptoms of a serious mental health condition. T.V. was hospitalized at the local
 18 community hospital's psychiatric unit five times over the next eighteen months, and received day
 19 treatment through the hospital's outpatient program and at a community mental health provider.
 20 Without adequate mobile crisis services, he had incidents in which he was arrested and detained.
 21 Ultimately, T.V. was institutionalized for over a year at the state psychiatric hospital for children
 22 on the grounds of Western State Hospital in Lakewood, WA, 300 miles away from his home and
 23 family.

24 144. When T.V. was discharged from the state children's hospital in August 2009, the
 25 hospital's treatment team recommended "significant support as an outpatient in the school and

1 home setting" as well as individual and family therapy in order to continue his progress and
 2 "prevent further hospitalizations."

3 145. Upon discharge, T.V. was enrolled at a local community mental health provider
 4 so that he could receive case management services, and was offered weekly office-based therapy,
 5 an anger management group, and monthly medication management check-ups. C.D. repeatedly
 6 requested "step-down" transitional services, including community-based therapeutic mentoring
 7 and in-home behavioral aids to help T.V. practice the de-escalation skills he learned at the state
 hospital in a natural environment.

8 146. T.V.'s current case manager informed C.D. that she agreed the services C.D.
 9 requested would clinically benefit T.V., but advised that these services are only made available
 10 to children with more severe symptoms. As a result, T.V. could not access the services he
 11 needed to succeed in his community, to prevent his condition from worsening again, or to reduce
 his symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

12 147. Denied the Intensive HC-based Services he needs, T.V.'s symptoms have
 13 worsened over the last few months to the point that he recently threatened to jump out of a
 14 window to commit suicide. Prior to the onset of these symptoms, the services that could have
 15 prevented his condition from worsening were unavailable to him. His case manager has now
 16 referred T.V. to a program that provides in-home services, but he has not yet been approved and
 17 has been told that there is a waiting list.

18 148. If T.V. does not receive services to prevent his condition from worsening again,
 19 he is at risk of harm from himself and at risk of being re-hospitalized and separated from his
 family again.

20 149. T.V. never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-based Services
 21 through the Medicaid program, or a notice about his right to request a hearing to dispute denials,
 22 reductions, or terminations of his services.

1 **C. Children Never Institutionalized**

2 **E.H. (15-Year-Old Boy)**

3 150. E.H. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 4 community-based services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health conditions and
 5 reduce his behavioral symptoms.

6 151. E.H. has been diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder, Attention Deficit Disorder,
 7 Oppositional Defiant Disorder, and has violent behavioral symptoms. E.H.'s mood cycles
 8 between manic phases characterized by racing and grandiose thoughts and phases in which he is
 9 depressed and explicitly articulates a wish to die. He makes threats and attempts to commit
 suicide, and has injured himself on numerous occasions by hitting and cutting himself.

10 152. E.H.'s symptoms have been documented since he was a toddler. By the time he
 11 was four-years-old, E.H. was taking medications to manage his behaviors, had therapeutic aid
 12 services, and was in counseling.

13 153. Between 2004 and 2006, E.H.'s condition began to worsen. In March 2005,
 14 E.H.'s symptoms escalated to the point his mother called the police, and he was arrested and
 15 detained in juvenile detention. His provider began recommending out-of-home placements, but
 his mother chose not to give up custody.

16 154. In February 2007, E.H. was hospitalized at an acute psychiatric hospital in
 17 Spokane, Washington after threatening to kill his parents and to harm himself. He was
 18 discharged with a plan to receive counseling from the community mental health provider in
 Whitman County.

19 155. In November 2008 the acute psychiatric hospital in Spokane admitted E.H. for
 20 inpatient treatment. The hospital did not have a pediatric bed for him and transferred him to an
 21 acute psychiatric hospital in Coeur D'Alene, Idaho. When he was discharged on December 5,
 22 2008, his plan specified that he was to receive "comprehensive wraparound services" from his

1 mental health provider in Whitman County. This plan included necessary services that he did
 2 not receive. Specifically, he never received “one-on-one individual social skills, education, and
 3 coaching,” or assistance from the community mental health provider in becoming integrated into
 4 “community based social activities”.

5 156. Until he was most recently hospitalized, E.H. was receiving weekly therapy,
 6 medication management from a psychiatrist two hours away, and respite services. E.H. was not
 7 receiving any in-home behavioral services, and his crisis services were generally limited to
 8 telephone consultations and emergency room visits, despite his persistent self-harming and
 aggressive behaviors.

9 157. In October 2009, E.H. was re-admitted to the acute psychiatric hospital in Coeur
 10 D'Alene, Idaho after he attempted to commit suicide. Fifteen days later, he was discharged with
 11 recommendations to follow up with the local community mental health provider.

12 158. In order to be successfully discharged home, he needs Intensive HC-based
 13 Services. If E.H. does not receive these services, he is at risk of long term institutionalization or
 suffering significant injuries or death at his own hands.

14 159. E.H. never received notice of the availability of intensive home and community-
 15 based mental health services through the Medicaid program, or a notice about his right to request
 16 a hearing to dispute denials, reductions, or terminations of his services.

17 **E.D. (10-Year-Old Boy)**

18 160. E.D. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 19 community-based mental health services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health
 conditions or reduce his behavioral symptoms.

20 161. E.D. has been diagnosed with General Anxiety Disorder, Attention Deficit
 21 Disorder, and Oppositional Defiant Disorder, and a possibility of Bipolar Disorder.

1 162. Beginning when E.D. was four-years-old, he experienced multiple removals from
 2 his mother's custody and experienced incidents of sexual abuse by a non-relative. E.D.'s mental
 3 health conditions and traumatic history of abuse and separations from his family have resulted in
 4 E.D. experiencing significant symptoms of aggression, sudden outbursts of anger, and self-
 5 harming behaviors. His symptoms are on a rapid "cycle" in which they tend to dramatically
 6 worsen and get better about every five days.

7 163. In June 2009, E.D. received an outpatient psychiatric evaluation at his local
 8 community hospital's psychiatric unit. These recommendations included further evaluation for
 9 autism spectrum disorder, "appropriate crisis interventions" and "intensive home interventions,
 as well as wraparound services and case management."

10 164. In August 2009, E.D.'s mother learned that E.D. had still not been placed on the
 11 waiting list for an autism assessment when she has requested it back in December 2008, and so
 12 she made another request. E.D. did not receive this assessment until November 19, 2009 and has
 13 yet to receive results.

14 165. In August 2009, E.D.'s mother attempted to access services during an episode
 15 when E.D.'s behavioral symptoms escalated to the point where she had serious safety concerns.
 16 She was told by the community mental health agency to take him to the emergency room or to
 17 call "9-1-1" if she needed help getting him there. At the hospital, E.D.'s mother requested
 18 inpatient treatment, but was turned away without any other immediate services.

19 166. In August 2009, the local community mental health agency in King County
 20 conducted an intake assessment. E.D.'s mother reported that E.D. has symptoms of anger and
 21 aggression that were so severe that he assaulted and threatened to kill her and his brother and
 22 destroy their property. The assessment resulted in the mental health professional requesting a
 23 benefit of "3A1 Tier" for E.D., which is the second to highest level of outpatient services
 available. E.D.'s mother never received any written notice that he had been assessed at this level

1 of care, what services were included in this level of care, what other services were available from
 2 the mental health agency or Medicaid, or how the agency determines who can access these
 3 services.

4 167. Currently, E.D. only receives weekly office-based therapy, and monthly
 5 medication management appointments at the community mental health agency. He is not
 6 receiving and has not been offered any Intensive HC-based Services including the “appropriate
 7 crisis interventions, intensive home interventions as well as wrap around services and case
 management” recommended by the community hospital in June 2009.

8 168. E.D.’s mother requested Intensive HC-based Services from her Medicaid
 9 provider, but she was told the mobile crisis intervention, wraparound, and behavioral testing she
 10 requested are not available. She did not receive any written notice of a denial. The provider told
 11 E.D.’s mother he would be referred to their more intensive program for additional services, but
 12 she has not received any further information about whether the referral was made, what services
 13 could be available to E.D. in that program, or whether E.D. has been approved.

14 169. Without necessary mental health services, E.D.’s symptoms have not improved.
 15 As a result of his behavioral symptoms, he has significant difficulties in school, has been
 16 suspended on multiple occasions, and is at risk of expulsion. If E.D. does not receive the
 17 treatment he needs, E.D. will continue to be at risk of being removed from his home due to his
 18 undertreated impulsive and aggressive behaviors that place him at significant risk of getting
 19 arrested, hospitalized, or institutionalized in a long term facility.

20 170. E.D. has never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-based Services
 21 through the Medicaid program, or a notice about his right to request a hearing to dispute denials,
 22 reductions, or terminations of his services.

1 **L.F.S. (9-Year-Old Boy)**

2 171. L.F.S. is a Medicaid recipient who is not receiving the intensive home and
 3 community-based mental health services he needs to correct or ameliorate his mental health
 4 conditions or reduce his behavioral symptoms.

5 172. L.F.S. has been diagnosed with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder,
 6 Combined Type, Disruptive Behavior Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified, Mood Disorder, Not
 7 Otherwise Specified, Mild Mental Retardation, and possible diagnoses of Bipolar Disorder,
 8 Schizophrenia, and Psychosis Not Otherwise Specified. His symptoms include being assaultive,
 9 engaging in dangerous behaviors, resisting personal care activities, and significant problems with
 his sleep.

10 173. When L.F.S. was four-years-old, soon after he and his family fled to the United
 11 States as political refugees from Cuba, he received a psychiatric assessment from his community
 12 mental health agency which identified his behavioral symptoms as symptoms of a serious mental
 13 health condition. At that time, L.F.S.'s mother reported that L.F.S. had a history of being
 14 extremely volatile, aggressive, impulsive, and over reactive, and had recently taken a knife and
 threatened to kill her and himself.

15 174. L.F.S. began receiving medication management from a community mental health
 16 agency and weekly office-based therapy from a second community mental health agency. Years
 17 later, in April 2009, L.F.S.'s symptoms were still so unstable that his treating psychiatrist
 18 discussed the possibility of hospitalization with his mother. Instead, the family chose to continue
 19 attempting to address his needs at home. L.F.S. had a crisis plan which instructed his mother to
 20 take him to the emergency room if necessary, but he was never offered any home or community-
 based crisis intervention or other services.

21 175. L.F.S.'s therapist requested a neuropsychological assessment on January 21, 2009
 22 to determine whether L.F.S. has Bipolar or psychotic disorders and determine the reason for
 23

1 L.F.S.'s inability to academically progress. When L.F.S.'s mother learned that an appointment
 2 was not available through her Medicaid provider for another six months, L.F.S.'s therapist began
 3 making requests that the RSN authorize payment for an assessment by an "out-of-network"
 4 provider that could see him sooner. The RSN denied the therapist's and L.F.S.'s request, and the
 5 neuropsychological evaluation did not occur until October 19, 2009.

6 176. According to L.F.S.'s treating mental health provider, he needs additional
 7 assessments that he has not yet received, including a comprehensive strengths-based assessment
 8 that includes home observations of his behaviors and interactions with his family, a Functional
 9 Scale and Adaptive Skills assessment, and a sleep study.

10 177. Additionally, his mental health provider has recommended Intensive HC-based
 11 Services including services delivered by Spanish speaking providers or with qualified Spanish
 12 interpreters, therapeutic aid services, home services including a behavior plan and training for
 13 L.F.S.'s mother on implementation, mobile crisis intervention and home stabilization services,
 14 home family therapy, home individual therapy, and training and support for L.F.S.'s mother from
 15 a parent partner. L.F.S. is not receiving any of these services.

16 178. If L.F.S. does not receive the services and assessments he needs, he will continue
 17 to struggle academically and experience conflict at home and school, and he will be at risk of
 18 experiencing an increase in his symptoms, hospitalization, and school failure.

19 179. L.F.S. and his mother never received notice of the availability of Intensive HC-
 20 based Services through the Medicaid program, or a notice about his right to request a hearing to
 21 dispute denials, reductions, or terminations of his services.

22 **D. Intensive Home and Community-based Mental Health Care Services are Effective
 23 and Necessary**

24 180. There is virtual unanimity among mental health experts that children with serious
 25 mental health problems require an array of individualized services tailored to meet their needs.

1 Programs implementing such individualized services have been successfully provided to children
 2 and have proven more effective and cost efficient than congregate and institutional care.

3 181. In 2002, the Secretary of DSHS, Dennis Braddock, convened a taskforce of
 4 judges, foster care providers, court commissioners, county prosecutors, group home providers,
 5 sheriffs, sex offender treatment professionals, high level DSHS administrators and others
 6 involved in serving children and families to look at the long term care needs of children with
 7 serious mental illness and emotional disturbance. The resultant report, referred to as "The
 Braddock Report," found that:

8 "Traditionally, community-based interventions have been dismissed as
 9 inappropriate on the theory that these youth present too high a risk to self, family
 safety and community. But to the contrary, wraparound services and multi-
 10 systemic treatment that involve the participation of the family, the youth, multiple
 11 health, educational, social service and other system partners are proving to be
 successful in improving the health and well being of youth with severe emotional
 and behavioral needs, reducing the need for hospitalization and other expensive
 "crisis" placements."

12 Select Committee on Adolescents in Need of Long Term Placement, DSHS Washington, *Final*
 13 *Report* (2002).

14 182. Intensive HC-based Services are also cost effective. For example, compare
 15 Medicaid hospitalization rate of \$707-1475 (per day) to the cost of Multi-Systemic Therapy at
 16 approximately \$60 (per day).

17 183. Intensive home and community-based services encompass a broad and flexible
 18 array of services necessary to treat a child's mental health condition at home and in the
 19 community in which he or she resides and includes but is not limited to intensive care
 coordination; mobile services provided on site as necessary to assist a child experiencing a
 20 behavioral health crisis; short term crisis stabilization services to prevent or ameliorate a
 21 behavioral crisis; skilled staff to provide therapy in the home setting or other natural environment
 22 in order to improve the youth's functioning in the those settings and prevent need for an out of
 23

1 home placement; trained mentors available to work with the child in a natural setting to support,
 2 coach, and train youth in age-appropriate behaviors, interpersonal communications, problem-
 3 solving and conflict resolution; training on independent living, social and communication skills
 4 in a natural environment such as skill-building guidance to children and parents (e.g. modeling
 5 appropriate behaviors and communication techniques); personal care services for assistance with
 6 daily living tasks; and respite care to further stabilize the family home.

7 184. Despite this consensus among the State's own mental health professionals that
 8 Intensive HC-based Services are necessary, the Defendants have failed to ensure that children
 9 receiving treatment through Medicaid funded programs receive the services to which they are
 entitled by law.

10 **E. The Failure to Provide Intensive HC-based Services Results in Serious and
 Irreparable Harm**

11 185. Failure to provide intensive home and community-based mental health services
 12 results in significant harm including unnecessary and prolonged institutionalization, non-
 13 improvement or a decline in mental and physical health, reduced social interaction, academic
 14 success and quality of life, a declining family environment and police intervention and
 15 confinement within the juvenile justice system.

16 **Unnecessary and Prolonged Institutionalization**

17 186. DSHS has recognized that:

18 “The lack of community placement and diversion alternatives
 19 contributes to: 1) increasing demand [for institutional beds] on the
 “front end” [and] 2) protracted or stalled discharge planning on the
 “back end.” In essence the lack of such services results in the
 “Boarding” of youth who are committed to inpatient treatment on
 acute community hospital units (e.g., Sacred Heart).”

20 *Issue Statement: Briefing Paper about CLIP Process Kid Team
 21 Discussion and Recommendations (April 2007).*

22 187. The average length of a stay in Washington's CLIPs is 297 days, with some
 23 populations staying much longer. Children under age 13 average 476 days. A white paper

1 issued in 2006 concluded that the leading cause of discharge delays from CLIPS is the lack of
 2 discharge placement and family readiness. *Children's Acute and Non-acute Inpatient*
 3 *Psychiatric and Residential Treatment White Paper* (2006); *See also Capacity and Demand*
 4 *Study for Inpatient Psychiatric Hospital and Community Residential Beds – Adults and Children,*
 5 *State of Washington DSHS* (November 2004) (recommending therapeutic foster care and
 6 additional community programming to reduce average length of stay).

7 188. Beyond the length of stay, over-reliance on restrictive, institutional settings is
 8 often harmful to children with mental health problems, placing them in a setting that is
 9 antithetical to their successful treatment, in part because removing a child from her parents or a
 caring adult is, itself, harmful.

10 189. Moreover, hospitals and restrictive institutions are designed to offer short-term
 11 stabilization and behavior management, not intensive, individualized services.

12 190. The experience of the named Plaintiffs is illustrative and, unfortunately, typical.
 13 T.F. was institutionalized three times by the time she was 14; T.V. was hospitalized five times
 14 over 18 months before being institutionalized for over a year at the state children's psychiatric
 15 hospital; S.P. has cycled in and out of the local hospital psychiatric unit five times in the last year
 16 and is currently hospitalized due to inadequate community services; P.S. was institutionalized
 17 twice at a CLIP facility and hospitalized multiple times; and C.A. is in an inpatient facility due to
 the lack of community services.

18 **Non-improvement or a Decline in Mental and Physical Health**

19 191. Children who do not receive appropriate treatment cannot get better and are at
 20 risk of getting worse. If the decline is severe, many will face the risk of institutionalizations that
 21 could continue for years. Children, like T.V., who cannot access recommended intensive
 22 services because Defendants' policies and practices deem their symptoms to be not severe

1 enough, must deteriorate to the point they are at risk of hospitalization when their condition will
 2 be harder to treat.

3 192. The lack of Intensive HC-based Services often also result in physical harm from
 4 self harming behaviors (self-burning, cutting or head banging), forced restraint by police or
 5 others, fighting due to aggression or confusions, harm due to command hallucinations and other
 6 causes. For example, C.A., P.S., and E.H. have cut themselves; P.S. has been injured in physical
 7 altercations; and T.F. was almost hit by a car during an episode when she attempted to elope
 from a treatment facility.

8 193. Children with mental health symptoms also are at high risk of suicide.
 9 Washington State's Department of Health recently released a report acknowledging that on
 10 average, two Washington youth commit suicide each week, and that Washington's youth suicide
 11 rate is higher than the national average. *See Washington State's Plan for Youth Suicide*
 12 *Prevention 2009.* T.F., P.S., C.A., and E.H. have all had suicidal ideations and have made
 13 attempts to take their own lives.

13 **Reduced Social Interactions, Academic Success and Quality of Life**

14 194. The lack of Intensive HC-based Services results in increased risk of school failure
 15 and drop out, and a marked decline in the quality of life. S.P. has become so anxious about
 16 social interactions that she could attend school only two hours a day. E.D. scores in the 80th
 17 percentile for intelligence, but his inability to relate to peers and his condition causes problems in
 18 school, at home and in the community. C.A.'s self esteem is bolstered by academic challenge
 19 but institutionalized, she has no outlet for her intellectual curiosity, and she has little hope for the
 future.

20 195. The symptoms experienced by these children can be barriers to developing
 21 positive peer relationships. Furthermore, the cycle of institutionalizations faced by many of
 22 these children threatens to foreclose any chance these children have of developing healthy,

1 stable, long term relationships on which to build attachments, self-confidence and social skills,
 2 leading to a lifetime of challenges with marital, familial and peer relationships, and social
 3 isolation.

4 **Declining Family Environment**

5 196. A failure to provide intensive home and community-based mental health services
 6 is disruptive to the family and often results in out of home placements, involuntary foster care
 7 and occasionally homelessness, eviction, or transfers among family members struggling to
 8 provide appropriate care. T.R., S.P., C.A. and T.F. are all currently in long-term out-of-home
 9 placements. P.S. and T.V. have experienced long-term displacement and are at risk of future
 10 institutionalization. P.S. and his family were forced to move to avoid eviction due to his mental
 11 health crises. Those that remain at home struggle on a day-to-day basis with their families living
 12 in fear of harm to their other children, themselves and others family members and friends.

13 **Police Intervention and Confinement within the Juvenile Justice System**

14 197. Many children with mental health needs are arrested, detained, and taken into
 15 custody by Washington's Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA). The State of
 16 Washington has found that 62% of children enter the custody of JRA with unmet mental health
 17 needs.

18 198. Confinement within a juvenile detention facility and police intervention is not a
 19 substitute for Intensive HC-based Services. Physical restraint frequently exacerbates these
 20 children's symptoms, treatment is frequently unavailable and these children are torn from their
 21 families. Yet this is a tool frequently used in place of Intensive HC-based Services, particularly
 22 mobile crisis care. For example, T.F. was placed in a facility in Idaho which used police
 23 intervention in response to her mental health crises, was arrested while in the facility eight times
 during her first four months of treatment, and spent the vast majority of the past six months in
 juvenile criminal detention. At only 11-years-old, T.V. has been arrested and detained on

1 multiple occasions. P.S., T.F., T.R. and E.D.'s only crisis plan was to call "9-1-1" for police
 2 intervention. P.S. has Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and arrest by the police further traumatizes
 3 him and exacerbates his condition. P.S. has requested a crisis plan and mobile crisis services to
 4 avoid relying on the police, but the Defendants have failed to provide coverage for this necessary
 service.

5 199. As one recent report stated:

6 "The concept of prevention – prevention of failure in school, job loss,
 7 homelessness, criminal behavior and untold suffering – seems hardly to exist
 within the public mental health system."

8 *Children's Mental Health in Washington State: A Public Health Perspective Needs Assessment*,
 9 Washington Department of Health (November 2007). In order to protect Washington's
 10 Medicaid children and prevent further harm, Defendants must be compelled to comply with its
 11 legal obligations.

12 **VII. REQUISITES FOR RELIEF**

13 200. By reason of the factual allegations set forth above, an actual controversy has
 14 arisen and now exists between Plaintiffs and the Defendants. Plaintiffs contend that their rights
 15 under the Constitution and laws of the United States are being violated, while the Defendants are
 16 charged with enforcing and complying with those legal requirements. A declaration from this
 17 Court that Plaintiffs' rights have been violated is therefore necessary and appropriate.

18 201. Defendants' failure to comply with the requirements of federal and state law will
 19 result in irreparable harm to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at
 20 law to address the wrongs described herein. Plaintiffs therefore seek injunctive relief restraining
 21 Defendants from engaging in the unlawful and unconstitutional acts and policies described
 herein.

VIII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Violations of the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) Provisions of the Medicaid Act

202. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

203. Defendants have failed to establish policies, procedures, and practices to ensure Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class receive adequate notice of the specific behavioral and mental health treatment services available under the EPSDT provisions of the federal Medicaid Act, including intensive, community and home-based mental health services, which has the effect of denying these services to children with physical or mental illnesses or conditions, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(43)(A).

204. Defendants have failed to provide or otherwise arrange for Plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff class to receive the EPSDT early and periodic screening and diagnostic services that would otherwise determine the existence of any physical or mental illnesses or conditions, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396(a)(43)(B), 1396d(a)(4)(B), and 1396d(r)(1)(A).

205. Defendants have failed to provide or otherwise arrange for Plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff class to receive the necessary behavior and mental health services, including intensive, community and home-based mental health services, that would treat or ameliorate their physical or mental illnesses or conditions, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396a(a)(43)(C), and 1396d(r)(5).

206. Defendants' actions and omissions described above violate 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by depriving Plaintiffs and the members of the Plaintiff class of their statutory rights under the EPSDT provisions of the federal Medicaid Act to receive necessary screening, diagnostic, and treatment services and to receive notice of the availability of these services.

1

COUNT II

Violation of the Comparability Provisions of the Federal Medicaid Act

2

3 207. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as
though fully set forth herein.

4

5 208. The “comparability” requirement of the Medicaid Act requires that all
6 categorically needy individuals with comparable needs receive comparable Medicaid funded
7 services. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(B). The State violates the “comparability” requirement if it
8 reduces, denies, or terminates a Medicaid funded service for an individual for a reason other than
the individual’s needs consistent with 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(30)(A).

9 209. The Defendants have failed to establish or maintain policies, procedures, or
10 practices that will prohibit reductions, terminations, or denials of medically necessary intensive
11 in home and community-based mental health services to children and youth on the bases of their
12 diagnoses, geographic location, and qualifications for child welfare DCFS services, in violation
of 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(B), which is enforceable by Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

13

COUNT III

Violation of the Due Process Provisions of the Federal Medicaid Act

14

15 210. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as
though fully set forth herein.

16

17 211. The Medicaid Act requires that participating states provide an opportunity for a
18 fair hearing for any individual whose request for Medicaid services have been denied or provided
19 with reasonable promptness. 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(3).

20 212. Defendants have failed to establish and maintain customs, policies, and practices
21 to provide Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class with adequate written notice of
22 reductions, terminations, and denials of Medicaid funded intensive home and community-based

23

1 services and their rights to a pre-termination or reduction fair hearing, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §
2 1396a(a)(3), which is enforceable by Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3 **COUNT IV**
4 **Violation of the Due Process Provision of the Fourteenth Amendment**
5 **of the United States Constitution**

6 213. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as
7 though fully set forth herein.

8 214. The Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution establishes the right for
9 Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class to receive adequate notice of reductions,
10 terminations, and denials of Medicaid funded services and their right to a fair hearing to
11 challenge such actions prior to implementation. *See Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970); 42
12 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(3).

13 215. Defendants have failed to establish and maintain customs, policies, and practices
14 to provide Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class with adequate written notice of
15 reductions, terminations, and denials of Medicaid funded intensive home and community-based
16 services and their rights to a pre-termination or reduction fair hearing in violation of the Due
17 Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, which is enforceable by
18 Plaintiffs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

19 **COUNT V**
20 **Violation of Americans with Disabilities Act**
21 **and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act**

22 216. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as
23 though fully set forth herein.

24 217. Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class have behavioral, emotional, and
25 psychiatric impairments that qualify them as individuals with disabilities within the meaning of
26 the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12131(2), and are “otherwise qualified individuals with a disability”
27 within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794.

1 218. Defendants are public officials of a public entity subject to the provisions of the
 2 ADA. 42 U.S.C. § 12131(1)(A). Defendants' agency receives federal financial assistance, and
 3 Defendants are thus subject to the provisions of the Rehabilitation Act.

4 219. Defendants have failed to administer services, programs, and activities in the most
 5 integrated setting appropriate to the needs of children who need intensive mental health services
 6 in violation of the ADA and Rehabilitation Act.

7 220. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff
 8 class on the basis of their disabilities by failing to make reasonable modifications in their
 9 policies, practices, or procedures. Reasonable modification of Defendants' policies, practices, or
 10 procedures would not fundamentally alter the nature of their services, programs, or activities, but
 11 rather would further Defendants' stated goals. 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(7).

12 221. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff
 13 class solely on the basis of disability in violation of the Rehabilitation Act and ADA by: (i)
 14 failing to provide reasonable accommodations to allow Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff
 15 class to participate fully in Defendants' programs and receive adequate services; and (ii) failing
 16 to provide and support appropriate community-based placements, instead requiring Plaintiffs and
 17 members of the Plaintiff class to be confined in restrictive, institutional settings in order to access
 18 necessary mental health services.

19 222. Defendants' acts and omissions alleged herein have denied and continue to deny
 20 Plaintiffs and members of the Plaintiff class the opportunity to benefit from Defendants'
 21 services, programs, and activities.

IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

23 A. Assume jurisdiction over this action and maintain continuing jurisdiction until
 24 Defendants are in full compliance with every order of this Court;

1 B. Certify that Plaintiffs may maintain this action as a class action pursuant to
2 Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and appoint the individual named Plaintiffs
3 as Class representatives;

4 C. Declare that Defendants' policies, practices, acts, and omissions violate the
5 EPSDT and Comparability provisions of the Medicaid Act, which requires the Defendants to
6 provide for necessary intensive in-home and community-based mental health services;

7 D. Declare that Defendants' policies, practices, acts, and omissions violate the due
8 process provision of the Medicaid Act and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment
9 to the United States Constitution, which require the Defendants to provide notice to the Plaintiffs
10 and members of the Plaintiff class informing them of their rights when a Medicaid service is
11 terminated, suspended, reduced or denied and providing them with a pre-termination opportunity
12 to appeal such action;

13 E. Declare that Defendants' policies, practices, acts, and omissions violate the
14 Plaintiffs' rights to receive mental health services in the most integrated setting appropriate to
15 their needs under the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act;

16 F. Grant a preliminary and permanent injunction requiring the Defendants to:

- 1 1. establish and implement policies, procedures, and practices to screen and
2 assess members of the Plaintiff class for unmet mental health needs,
3 including intensive home and community-based services, to ensure that
4 class members are reliably identified and adequately served;
- 5 2. conduct professionally-adequate assessments of all Plaintiffs and members
6 of the Plaintiff class who reside in private or public mental health facilities
7 to determine whether intensive home and community-based mental health
8 services are necessary to treat or ameliorate their behavioral, emotional, or
9 psychiatric conditions;

- 1 3. conduct professionally-adequate assessments of all Plaintiffs and members
- 2 of the Plaintiff class who reside in private or public mental health
- 3 facilities, and to determine whether or not such children are receiving
- 4 mental health services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their
- 5 individual needs.
- 6 4. provide meaningful notice to Medicaid-eligible children and their families
- 7 of the availability of the full range of Medicaid-funded mental health, and
- 8 behavioral services available under EPSDT program, including intensive
- 9 home and community-based services;
- 10 5. establish and implement policies, procedures, and practices that are
- 11 sufficient to ensure that the Plaintiffs and all members of the Plaintiff class
- 12 promptly receive coverage of necessary, intensive home and community-
- 13 based mental health services, including professionally-adequate
- 14 assessments, crisis and case management services;
- 15 6. establish and implement policies, procedures, practices, and
- 16 reimbursement rates to ensure that sufficient qualified providers are
- 17 available to offer intensive home and community-based mental health
- 18 services, including professionally-adequate assessments, crisis, and case
- 19 management services throughout the state and in a culturally appropriate
- 20 manner;
- 21 7. remove any barriers or criteria which prevent Medicaid-eligible children
- 22 from applying for and accessing necessary EPSDT mental health services,
- 23 including intensive home and community-based mental health services;
8. promptly provide intensive home and community-based mental health
- services to all Plaintiffs who would benefit from them;

1 G. Award to the Plaintiffs the reasonable costs and expenses incurred in the
2 prosecution of this action, including but not limited to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and

3 H. Award such other equitable and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

4 DATED this 24th day of October, 2011.

5 */s/Regan Bailey*

6 Regan Bailey, WSBA No. 39142

7 reganb@dr-wa.org

8 Susan Kas, WSBA No. 36592

9 susank@dr-wa.org

10 **DISABILITY RIGHTS WASHINGTON**

11 315 5th Avenue South, Suite 850

12 Seattle, WA 98104

13 (206) 324-1521

5 */s/Patrick Gardner*

6 Patrick Gardner, CB No. 208199

7 pgardner@youthlaw.org

8 Bryn Martyna, CB No. 239852

9 bmartyna@youthlaw.org

10 Leecia Welch, WSBA No. 26590

11 lwelch@youthlaw.org

12 **NATIONAL CENTER FOR YOUTH LAW**

13 405 14th Street, 15th Floor

14 Oakland, CA 94612

15 (510) 835-8098

16 */s/Susan E. Foster*

17 Susan E. Foster, WSBA No. 18030

18 SFoster@perkinscoie.com

19 Frederick B. Rivera, WSBA No. 23008

20 FRivera@perkinscoie.com

21 Travis A. Exstrom, WSBA No. 39309

22 TExstrom@perkinscoie.com

23 Laura T. Ewbank

24 LEwbank@perkinscoie.com

25 **PERKINS COIE LLP**

26 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800

27 Seattle, WA 98101-3099

28 (206) 359.8000

29 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16 */s/ Kimberly Lewis*

17 Kimberly Lewis, CB No.

18 lewis@healthlaw.org

19 **NATIONAL HEALTH LAW PROGRAM**

20 2639 S. La Cienega Blvd.

21 Los Angeles, CA 90034

22 (310) 204-6010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 27th day of October 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following attorneys for Defendants: John McIlhenney Jr. (JohnM5@atg.wa.gov); Bill G. Clark (BillC2@atg.wa.gov); Eric Nelson (EricN1@atg.wa.gov); and Catherine R. Hoover (CatherineH1@atg.wa.gov).

/s/Frederick B. Rivera
Frederick B. Rivera, WSBA No. 23008

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF - 56**
(Case No. 2:09-cv-01677-TSZ)

Disability Rights Washington
315 5th Avenue South, Suite 850
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 324-1521 • Fax: (206) 957-0729