

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

714/744 P STREET  
P.O. BOX 942732  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94234-7320



March 10, 1993

Letter No. 93-17

TO: All County Welfare Directors  
All County Administrative Officers  
All County Medi-Cal Program Specialists/Liaisons

SUBJECT: TERMINATION OF REFUGEE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE (RMA)

REFERENCES: EMC2 DHS #93038

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the outcome of a lawsuit filed by Evergreen Legal Services in Federal District Court in Seattle against the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

A hearing was held on January 8th, and the Court extended the preliminary injunction against DHHS to January 26th, at which time the Judge was to hear testimony and issue an order in the case. On February 12, 1993, the District Court issued an Order on Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Injunction. The order states that DHHS, in issuing its grant announcements and request for proposal (RFP), constituted rule-making without compliance with the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Accordingly, the Secretary of DHHS is enjoined from entering or implementing the proposed Private Resettlement Program (PRP) contracts, grants, and policies. The Secretary is further enjoined from terminating the existing cash and medical assistance programs for refugees until a valid new program is in place, or until further order of the Court.

Counties are directed to continue the present RMA program.

If you have any questions, please contact Elena Lara at (916) 657-0712.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Frank S. Martucci, Chief  
Medi-Cal Eligibility Branch

Enclosure

*File*

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10 (7-80)

FAX TRANSMITTAL

# of pages 2

To *Merlyn*

From *B. Chesnik*

Dep. Agency

Phone #

Fax # *916-323-1136*

Fax #

NSN 7540-01-317-7088

5010-101

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

MAILED  
RECEIVED

FEB 12 1993

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BUC VAN NGUYEN, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

DORNA E. SHALALA, Secretary of  
Health & Human Services,  
Defendant.

and

SAAD MOSSA, et al.,  
Intervenor  
Defendants.

NO. C92-1867WD

ORDER ON CROSS-MOTIONS  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
AND INJUNCTION

I. INTRODUCTION

This case presents the question whether the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in changing benefits programs for newly-arrived refugees, engaged in rule-making without complying with the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 553.

In late 1992, former Secretary Louis W. Sullivan set out to revoke the existing cash and medical assistance programs for

*U.S.D.C.*

*120*

02/17/1993 17:12 FROM DHHS/HCF/DER

TO

ES123456789

FROM HOPKINS &amp; SUTTER, DC

(SAT) 2/13/93 17:58

NO. 3060641313 P. 3

refugees and to establish a new program.<sup>1</sup> He published for comment in the Federal Register a proposed rule that would terminate the existing programs. He also issued two grant announcements and a request for proposal (RFP) that described the substance of the proposed new program. The announcements and RFP were not published for notice and comment.

Plaintiffs, who are recently-arrived refugees eligible for federally-funded cash and medical assistance, and organizations which help such refugees, brought suit alleging that the grant announcements and RFP were substantive rules that must be published for notice and comment before they can be adopted. The APA requires agencies, in promulgating rules, to provide notice of the proposed rule, an opportunity for public comment, and an explanation of the rule ultimately adopted. 5 U.S.C. § 553(b) and (c).

The intervenor defendants are an Iraqi refugee and ten voluntary nonprofit agencies that help resettle refugees. The intervenors, like the former Secretary, argue that the APA was not violated.

On December 22, 1992, the court issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) enjoining the Secretary from terminating the existing cash and medical assistance programs and from entering or implementing contracts, grants, and policies under the proposed new program. Dkt. # 50. By stipulation of the parties the TRO

<sup>1</sup>The named defendant, Donna E. Shalala, succeeded Secretary Sullivan on January 22, 1993. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d)(1), Secretary Shalala is now substituted as the defendant in this case.

FROM HOPKINS' &amp; SUTTER, DC

was extended from December 31, 1992, to January 10, 1993. Oct. 4 99. After further briefing, the court adopted the TRO as a preliminary injunction. Oct. 4 99 (January 2, 1993).

On an expedited schedule, all parties have moved for summary judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. The issues are whether the Secretary has engaged in rule-making without complying with the notice and comment requirements of the APA, and whether a permanent injunction should be entered. A hearing was held on January 24, 1993. The arguments of counsel, and all materials filed, have been fully considered.

#### 12. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Refugee Act of 1980, 8 U.S.C. §§1521-1525, authorized the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to provide cash and medical assistance for up to thirty-six months after a refugee enters the United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1522(a)(1). The length of time for which a refugee is eligible for such benefits has been reduced by HHS from thirty-six to eighteen months in 1982, from eighteen to twelve months in 1988, and from twelve to eight months in 1992. The first two reductions were preceded by notice and comment. 46 Fed. Reg. 60,629 (Dec. 11 1981) (notice of reduction to eighteen months); 47 Fed. Reg. 10,841 (Mar. 12, 1982) (interim final rule codifying reduction to eighteen months); 52 Fed. Reg. 38,795 (Oct. 19, 1987) (notice of reduction to twelve months); 53 Fed. Reg. 12,222 (Aug. 24, 1988) (final rule codifying reduction to twelve months). The agency used emergency procedures under the APA's

ORD ON CROSS-MTNS FOR S/J & INJUNCTION - 3

1 was extended from December 11, 1991, to January 10, 1993. Dkt. 4  
2 99. After further briefing, the court adopted the TRO as a  
3 preliminary injunction. Dkt. 3 99 (January 2, 1993).

4 On an expedited schedule, all parties have moved for summary  
5 judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. The issues are whether  
6 the Secretary has engaged in rule-making without complying with  
7 the notice and comment requirements of the APA, and whether a  
8 permanent injunction should be entered. A hearing was held on  
9 January 26, 1993. The arguments of counsel, and all materials  
10 filed, have been fully considered.

#### 11 II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

12 The Refugee Act of 1980, 8 U.S.C. §§1521-1525, authorized the  
13 office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the Department of  
14 Health and Human Services (HHS) to provide cash and medical  
15 assistance for up to thirty-six months after a refugee enters the  
16 United States. 8 U.S.C. § 1522(e)(1). The length of time for  
17 which a refugee is eligible for such benefits has been reduced by  
18 HHS from thirty-six to eighteen months in 1982, from eighteen to  
19 twelve months in 1988, and from twelve to eight months in 1992.  
20 The first two reductions were preceded by notice and comment. 47  
21 Fed. Reg. 60,629 (Dec. 11 1981) (notice of reduction to eighteen  
22 months); 47 Fed. Reg. 10,841 (Mar. 12, 1982) (interim final rule  
23 codifying reduction to eighteen months); 52 Fed. Reg. 38,795 (Oct  
24 19, 1987) (notice of reduction to twelve months); 53 Fed. Reg.  
25 12,222 (Aug. 24, 1988) (final rule codifying reduction to twelve  
26 months). The agency used emergency procedures under the APA's

FROM HOPKINS &amp; SUTTER, DC FOR DOUGLAS SCOTT.

(SAT) 02/18/93 16:21 1000/NO. 3060641310 P. 5

1 good cause exception, 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(B), to reduce the eligi-  
2 bility period to eight months. See 57 Fed. Reg. 1115 (Jan. 10  
3 1992).

4 On November 2, 1992, former Secretary Sullivan published in  
5 the Federal Register, for comment, a notice of a proposed rule  
6 that would terminate the existing state-administered cash and  
7 medical assistance programs. 57 Fed. Reg. 49419 (1992). The  
8 November 2 notice announced that the current programs would be  
9 replaced by a new private resettlement and medical program (PRP).  
10 Under the PRP, cash and medical assistance would be administered  
11 through grants and contracts with private nonprofit agencies.

12 On October 19, 1992, the Secretary published an announcement  
13 soliciting grant applications from private organizations operating  
14 refugee assistance programs. 57 Fed. Reg. 47718 (1992). The  
15 announcement stated that refugees enrolled in the new program  
16 "will be eligible for a specified number of months of transitional  
17 cash assistance." 57 Fed. Reg. 47718, 47723. "This eligibility  
18 period will be specified in the Supplemental Notice." *Id.* at  
19 47718. The supplemental notice, published on November 17, 1992,  
20 set the eligibility period at seven months. 57 Fed. Reg. 54243,  
21 54244 (1992) ("the [proposed program's] eligibility period is  
22 seven months"). Refugees are presently eligible for eight months  
23 of cash assistance. See 57 Fed. Reg. 42897 (Sept. 17 1992) (rule  
24 continuing eight-month eligibility period for FY 1993).

25 On November 5, 1992, ORR issued a Request for Proposal No.  
26 105-93-6205 entitled "Administrative Services for the Refugee

ORD ON CROSS-MINS FOR S/J & INJUNCTION - 4

FROM HOPKINS &amp; SCITLER DC FROM BOOLE SEATTLE

(SAT) 2:13 93 17:03 2002/02/18 10:30:06 41310 P. 6

1 Benefit Plan." The RFP solicited proposals for administration of  
 2 the private medical program. Currently, refugees receive medical  
 3 coverage through Medicaid. The RFP announced a shift from Medic-  
 4 aid to "managed care." Under the managed care system, a refugee  
 5 would have to select as his or her primary care physician a  
 6 physician listed by a "preferred provider organization" (PPO),  
 7 where such PPO networks are in place. Currently, refugees receiv-  
 8 ing medical assistance may select their physicians. The RFP also  
 9 omitted any provision for various treatment and services available  
 10 under the current program, including interpreters for non-English  
 11 speaking patients, family planning services, and non-emergency  
 12 dental care. See Declaration of Janet Varon (Dkt. # 5 at 2-3);  
 13 Brief of Amicus Curiae, Exh. A and B (Dkt. # 98). The RFP also  
 14 would initiate co-payments for visits to doctor's office and  
 15 emergency rooms, mental health counseling, and prescription drugs.  
 16 Id.

17 The grant announcements and the medical RFP were not pub-  
 18 lished for notice and comment. The Secretary thus sought to  
 19 reduce the eligibility period for emergency cash assistance, and  
 20 to decrease the scope of medical assistance in certain respects,  
 21 without complying with APA rule-making procedures.

### 22 xxx. discussion

23 The "principal purpose" of section 553 of the APA is "to  
 24 provide that the legislative functions of administrative agencies  
 25 shall so far as possible be exercised only upon public participa-  
 26 tion." 5, Doc. No. 243, 78th Cong., 2d sess. 257 (1946). That

ORD ON CROSS-MOTION FOR S/J & INJUNCTION - 5

FEB-17-1993 17:35 FROM DHHS/ACF/OPR  
FROM HOPKINS & SUTTER, DC

TO 29163231136 P.01  
(SAT) 2/13/93 18:00 NO. 3060641310 P. 8

At issue here is whether the grant announcements and RFP were substantive rules requiring notice and comment, or whether they fell within one of the exceptions. "The exceptions to (the notice and comment requirements of) section 551 will be 'narrowly construed and only reluctantly countenanced.'" San Diego Air Sports Center, Inc., 887 F.2d at 969 (quoting Alaraz v. Block, 746 F.2d 393, 612 (9th Cir. 1984)).

Defendant and intervenors contend that the challenged provisions were general statements of policy or interpretive and procedural rules. An agency action must satisfy two requirements to qualify as a general statement of policy: (1) it "must operate only prospectively," and (2), it "must not establish a 'binding norm' or be finally determinative of the issues or rights" to which it is addressed. Kada-Lana v. Vifonatriok, 813 F.2d 1046, 1014 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted). "The critical factor to determine whether a directive announcing a new policy constitutes a rule or a general statement of policy is 'the extent to which the challenged [directive] leaves the agency, or its implementing official, free to exercise discretion to follow, or not to follow, the [announced] policy in an individual case.'" Id. at 1013 (citations omitted).

The announcements and RFP in this case were more than mere general statements of policy or interpretive or procedural rules. The grant announcements, for example, did not suggest that the grantees would be free to alter the period of eligibility for cash

ORD ON CROSS-MOVS FOR S/U & INJUNCTION - 7



1 keeping measures; they represent significant changes in the  
2 benefits available to refugees.

3 The former Secretary's argument that he would be free, under  
4 the statute, to proceed with or without rules, is unavailing when  
5 he has in fact engaged in rule-making. See Idroz v. Heckler, 800  
6 F.2d 871 (9th Cir. 1986).

7 As noted in an earlier order, "[h]ad the Secretary chosen to  
8 publish for notice and comment the proposed changes affecting  
9 benefits, the parties could now be on the verge of implementing a  
10 timely change based upon full information." Order on Plaintiff's  
11 Motion for Temporary Restraining Order at 5 (Dkt. # 50) (December  
12 22, 1992). But that procedure was not followed.

13 For the reasons stated, the former Secretary's issuance of  
14 the grant announcements and RFP constituted rule-making without  
15 compliance with the notice and comment requirements of the Admin-  
16 istrative Procedure Act. Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion for  
17 partial summary judgment is granted, and the motions of defendant  
18 and the intervenors are denied.

19  
20 **V. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIM RE ALLEGED FAILURE  
21 TO CERTIFY AND PROVIDE A COMPARABLE MEDICAL PROGRAM**

22 Plaintiffs also seek judgment on the ground that the Secra-  
23 tary has violated Pub. L. No. 102-39, 106 Stat. 1792, by failing  
24 to certify and provide a private medical program that is compara-  
25 ble to the existing program. Because the APA issue is decisive,  
26 this claim need not be reached.

## VI. INJUNCTION

A court "shall" set aside agency action found to be "without observance of procedure required by law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D). Accordingly, the Secretary must be and is hereby enjoined from entering or implementing the proposed FRY contracts, grants, and policies.

The Secretary has also proposed to terminate the existing cash and medical assistance programs for refugees. The Refugee Act of 1980 states that the Director of ORR "shall, to the extent of available appropriations . . . insure that cash assistance is made available to refugees . . . ." 8 U.S.C. § 1521(a)(1)(A) (emphasis added). A termination of the existing programs, in the absence of a valid replacement program, would violate the statute. Accordingly, the Secretary is further enjoined from terminating the existing cash and medical assistance programs for refugees until a valid new program is in place, or until further order of the court.

The clerk is directed to send copies of this order to all counsel of record.

Dated: February 12, 1993.

  
William L. Dwyer  
United States District Judge

State of California

Health and Welfare Agency

**FAX COVERSHEET**Date: 2-18-93To: ELAINA LARAFax #: ( 1 ) 657-3224Subject: **Telefax Verify Phone Number: (916) 324-1576.**From: **California Department of Social Services**Sender: Ellen HortonBureau: Refugee and Immigration Programs BureauSection: PolicySender's Phone #: ( 1 ) 323-2094This coversheet and 7 ~~4~~ page(s) were sent. Time 2:00 AM/PM

WE ARE SENDING ON A CANNON FAXPHONE 24. THE TELEPHONE NUMBER FOR THE FAX MACHINE IS (916) 323-1136.

**COMMENTS:***Please review & update if necessary - Thanks!*