Transition Scenarios and Cliff Effects

When Protection Expires at the Worst Possible Moment

Andre's Story

Andre Williams, 58, worked construction for 30 years until a back injury ended his career. Pain management with medication and monthly steroid injections allows him to work modified duty at a warehouse, stocking lower shelves and operating a sit-down forklift. He works 60 hours monthly, below the 80-hour threshold but within the reduced requirement his medical exemption allows. The exemption acknowledges he can work but not at the level standard requirements demand.

Next month he turns 60. Work requirements include automatic exemption for anyone 60 or older. His birthday is December 15. This should be straightforward. But his warehouse closes for inventory in December, offering him only two weeks of work, about 48 hours total.

His medical exemption expired October 31 after his six-month review showed improved pain control. The doctor noted he was doing better, managing shifts more consistently. The note was meant as encouragement. The state interpreted it as sufficient improvement to end medical exemption. Andre filed for renewal but the process takes 45 days minimum.

November doesn't go as planned. His pain flares mid-month. He misses three shifts. The medication that usually helps stops working as well. His doctor adjusts prescriptions, but the new medication takes two weeks to reach therapeutic levels. By month's end, he's accumulated only 48 hours, not the 60 his partial exemption allowed or the 80 standard requirements demand.

December 1 arrives. His November hours don't meet the threshold. The automated system flags him for non-compliance. He receives termination notice: coverage ends December 31 for failure to meet November requirements. His medical exemption renewal is still processing. His birthday is December 15, which would trigger automatic exemption on January 1, but his coverage ends December 31 for November non-compliance.

He loses health coverage two weeks before he would have qualified for permanent exemption. The coverage termination means his January medications aren't covered. His monthly injection appointment is January 8, which he cancels because he can't afford the $800 out-of-pocket cost. By February, when he might reapply for coverage, his pain is unmanaged and he can no longer work even modified duty.

The transitions aren't mysterious. Birthdays happen on predictable schedules. Treatment programs have known end dates. Children age out of care thresholds on their birthdays. These predictable transitions create preventable coverage loss when systems don't build grace periods, graduated requirements, or transition planning.

Demographics and Scope

Every expansion adult subject to work requirements will eventually face transition scenarios. The question is not whether transitions occur but when and how many times.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

Age-based transitions affect hundreds of thousands annually. ***Approximately 400,000-550,000 expansion adults turn 60 each year, moving from work requirements to automatic age exemption.*** Another 180,000-240,000 turn 19, aging out of child status protections and transitioning to adult work requirements. These transitions happen at precise moments with no ambiguity about timing. The system knows exactly when they will occur. Yet the system treats them as surprises requiring immediate compliance rather than foreseeable events requiring proactive planning.

The age 60 transition carries particular stakes. Adults approaching 60 have accumulated chronic conditions over decades. They take more medications, see more specialists, and depend more heavily on consistent coverage than younger adults. They also face age discrimination that makes rapid employment establishment after coverage loss nearly impossible. The 55-59 age cohort represents the population with most to lose from transition failures and least capacity to recover.

Caregiving transitions occur with similar predictability. ***About 220,000-290,000 expansion adults annually see children age out of care-based exemption thresholds.*** In states with children-under-6 exemptions, approximately 180,000 caregivers lose exemption status as children turn 6. These transitions also occur on specific dates with perfect predictability, yet transition planning rarely begins until the deadline arrives.

The caregiving transition timing creates particular challenges because child care arrangements and school enrollment don't align with work requirement calendars. A child turning 6 in August enters kindergarten in September, but the caregiving exemption may have expired in August. After-school care waiting lists may run months long. Summer care differs entirely from school-year care.

Treatment completion transitions affect 150,000-200,000 expansion adults annually. Residential treatment typically runs 30-90 days, creating specific end dates when treatment exemptions expire and work requirements activate. The completion dates are known from admission, yet transition planning rarely begins until discharge day.

The treatment completion timing matters for recovery outcomes. Research consistently shows that employment obtained in the first three months post-treatment has lower retention than employment obtained after six months of recovery stability. Rushing people into employment immediately upon treatment completion to satisfy work requirements may undermine the recovery stability sustainable employment requires.

Medical improvement transitions occur when someone shows sufficient improvement that medical exemptions expire. Surgery recovery, acute illness resolution, mental health stabilization, and chronic condition management all create scenarios where someone transitions from too sick to work to capable of working. ***Roughly 180,000-240,000 expansion adults annually experience this transition.***

Postpartum transitions create cascading complexity. ***About 220,000-290,000 expansion adult women deliver babies annually.*** Pregnancy exemptions end at delivery or shortly after. Postpartum recovery exemptions end 6-12 weeks later. These create cascading transitions from pregnancy exemption to postpartum exemption to infant care exemption to work requirements, each transition point a potential coverage cliff.

The typical expansion adult experiences 2-4 major transition points during their coverage period. Each transition requires successful navigation to maintain continuous coverage. The compound probability of failing at least one transition increases with each additional transition point.

Timing concentration creates predictable volume surges. January sees high volume as people who lost coverage in December attempt to reestablish eligibility. September sees caregiving transitions as children return to school. May-June sees treatment completion volume as residential programs started in winter reach completion. December transitions create particular harm because ACA marketplace enrollment timing means coverage gaps can extend for months.

Demographic vulnerability concentrates among those approaching permanent protection. Older adults aged 55-59 approaching age 60 exemption face the highest stakes transitions. They have the most to lose from coverage gaps due to accumulated chronic conditions and higher medication costs. They have the least capacity to quickly reestablish coverage due to age discrimination in hiring. Women with young children face multiple rapid transitions as pregnancy, postpartum, and early childhood exemptions expire in quick succession.

Failure Modes: When Systems Prioritize Administrative Simplicity

Work requirement systems fail people during transitions through design choices that prioritize administrative simplicity over human reality. The same precision that makes transitions predictable makes coverage loss preventable if systems chose to prevent it.

The immediate activation problem creates the first systematic failure. Exemptions end at precise moments while work capacity returns gradually. A woman's pregnancy exemption expires on her due date. Her medical exemption expires eight weeks postpartum. Both dates are administratively clean. But her actual capacity to work returns over weeks or months depending on delivery complications, infant health, and child care availability.

The system demands immediate full compliance the month after exemption ends. No gradual return. No recognition that return to work is a process rather than an event. Someone who can manage 20 hours weekly the first month post-exemption and 40 hours by the third month faces termination in month one for failing to meet 80-hour requirements.

The documentation timing trap catches people whose paperwork moves slower than administrative calendars. Andre filed medical exemption renewal 30 days before expiration. The application sits in queue for 45 days. The exemption expires on schedule. Work requirements activate immediately. He receives termination notice for failing to meet requirements during the month when exemption renewal was pending but not yet processed. The delay was the system's, not his. The consequence falls entirely on him.

The birthday cliff affects age-based and caregiving exemptions with particular cruelty. Someone turning 60 on December 15 loses coverage December 31 for November non-compliance, missing automatic age exemption by two weeks. A child turning 6 on September 15 triggers parent's exemption loss September 30, requiring the parent to establish work hours before school year even begins. The birthday cliff is particularly perverse because transition timing is perfectly predictable.

Quarterly reporting creates additional birthday timing randomness. Someone whose child turns 6 in January has three months to establish work hours before quarterly reporting deadline. Someone whose child turns 6 in March has one month to establish work hours before the same deadline. The difference in available transition time is pure timing accident with no relationship to actual transition difficulty.

The perverse incentive against improvement creates perhaps the cruelest failure mode. ***Medical exemption expiration triggered by health improvement creates incentive to avoid demonstrating improvement.*** Someone managing chronic pain knows that reporting improvement might trigger exemption review and potential loss. Andre's doctor noted he was "doing better." That clinical observation, intended as positive news, triggered exemption review that ultimately cost him coverage. The system punishes improvement rather than supporting it.

State Policy Choices: Supporting Transitions or Creating Cliffs

States can design systems that support rather than penalize transitions. The choice reveals underlying assumptions about whether administrative simplicity or member protection takes priority.

Grace periods create buffer time between exemption expiration and full work requirement activation. Arkansas implements 180-day grace periods following exemption expiration, among the most generous proposed. This recognizes that transitions take time and that coverage stability during transitions improves long-term outcomes. Most state proposals include 90-120 day grace periods.

The grace period ***length should match transition complexity.*** Medical exemption ending might trigger 90-day grace. Caregiving exemption expiration might trigger 120-day grace for child care arrangement complexity. Treatment completion might trigger 180-day grace for recovery stabilization needs.

Georgia's Pathways program provides only two months before coverage termination. This timeline is insufficient for most meaningful transitions. Someone completing residential treatment in October who cannot immediately find employment loses coverage by December, before the six-month recovery stability point research identifies as critical.

For age-based transitions approaching automatic exemption, grace periods prevent coverage loss in final weeks before permanent protection. Andre's situation, losing coverage two weeks before permanent protection, becomes impossible when grace periods bridge the gap.

Graduated requirements phase in work expectations rather than demanding immediate full compliance. The first month after exemption expiration requires 40 hours. The second month requires 60 hours. The third month reaches full 80 hours. This recognizes that employment often starts part-time, that job search takes time, and that immediate full compliance is often impossible.

Graduated requirements ***work particularly well for partial capacity scenarios***. Someone cleared for 20 hours weekly work meets 40-hour monthly requirement. For people with permanent partial limitations, graduated requirements can be permanent rather than time-limited, providing ongoing accommodation without repeated medical exemption renewals.

Proactive transition planning shifts from crisis response to advance support. Notification 90 days before exemption expiration allows advance planning. Care coordinators initiate transition planning at exemption approval rather than waiting for expiration. Someone approved for six-month treatment exemption receives immediate connection to vocational rehabilitation services.

The proactive approach requires system changes. Eligibility systems must flag upcoming transitions and route alerts to appropriate staff. Care coordination protocols must include transition planning as standard element. Communication systems must reach members at addresses and phone numbers that may change during transitions. The infrastructure investment is modest compared to crisis response costs when transitions fail.

Exemption bridging prevents cliff effects through temporary continuation during employment search. Someone whose treatment exemption expires receives 90-day employment search exemption automatically. Treatment completion creates unique employment barrier: the person has been out of workforce for 30-180 days with treatment facility as most recent "employer." Bridging provides time to navigate this challenge.

Retroactive corrections restore coverage when documentation proves exemption should have continued. Someone whose medical exemption renewal was approved two weeks after coverage terminated has coverage retroactively restored. States allowing retroactive corrections protect people from temporary documentation delays. States prohibiting retroactive corrections make any coverage loss permanent even when documentation later proves exemption should have continued.

The Accountability Question

Critics of extensive transition support raise concerns about enabling avoidance rather than supporting legitimate transitions.

The gaming concern suggests people might deliberately time transitions to avoid requirements. This concern has face validity but limited application. Predictable transitions like birthdays, children aging to school age, and treatment completion cannot be "gamed" because they occur on fixed schedules. Someone cannot change when they turn 60, when their child turns 6, or when a 90-day treatment program ends. Andre couldn't choose when his birthday fell or when his warehouse closed for inventory.

Medical improvement transitions involve more discretion about when someone is "ready" to return to work, creating theoretical space for strategic delay. However, most people with genuine medical barriers want to work when medically able rather than maintaining exemption status. The financial incentive flows toward employment rather than toward prolonging exemption. Higher income from employment exceeds what Medicaid income limits allow.

The complexity argument points to administrative burden of tracking different hour thresholds for different members at different transition stages. Technology solves this better than rigid rules. Automated systems calculate correct monthly threshold based on member's transition stage. Graduated requirements become less complex than appeals processes required when immediate full requirements cause coverage loss.

The cost argument notes that grace periods extend support periods. However, cost comparison requires accounting for coverage loss costs. Emergency use increases when people lose coverage. Crisis interventions increase when medication discontinuation destabilizes chronic conditions. Research from Arkansas showed coverage loss didn't increase employment but did increase financial hardship and delayed care.

Stakeholder Roles in Supporting Transitions

Managed care organizations track member transition status through eligibility systems. Automated alerts flag approaching exemption expirations, triggering outreach protocols. Care coordinators receive notification 90 days before any exemption expires, ensuring no transition occurs without advance planning. The tracking system should distinguish transition types requiring different support intensity. Someone turning 60 receives simple notification of upcoming automatic exemption. Someone whose caregiving exemption is expiring receives intensive child care, employment, and benefits navigation support.

The MCO role in transition support ***requires investment in proactive infrastructure.*** Care coordinators need training on transition-specific interventions. Data systems need capability to identify upcoming transitions across the member population. Outreach protocols need standardization so consistent support reaches everyone approaching transition regardless of which care coordinator manages their case.

The MCO financial incentive for transition support is clear. Coverage loss during transition means member churn, administrative costs of disenrollment and potential re-enrollment, and loss of capitation during coverage gaps. Members who lose coverage during transitions often return sicker. The acute care costs when they return exceed the transition support costs that would have prevented the gap.

Providers play critical roles in transition documentation. Physicians documenting medical improvement should understand that their clinical notes trigger exemption reviews. The physician who writes "patient can work 20-25 hours weekly in sedentary role with accommodations" provides foundation for graduated requirements matching actual capacity. The physician who writes "patient cleared to return to work" without specification triggers full 80-hour requirement regardless of actual capacity.

Provider training on work requirement implications matters. Many physicians don't understand that their clinical documentation affects patients' coverage. The note intended to celebrate improvement becomes the trigger for exemption loss. Providers who understand the system can document more precisely: "Patient has shown improvement in pain management. Current capacity approximately 60 hours monthly of modified duty. Full-time physical labor remains contraindicated." This documentation supports graduated requirements rather than triggering immediate full requirement activation.

Treatment facilities should initiate employment transition planning 30 days before discharge rather than waiting until discharge day. Someone completing 90-day residential treatment receives employment readiness services starting day 60, vocational rehabilitation connection day 70, and recovery-friendly employer introductions day 80.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

Employers partnering with treatment programs, vocational rehabilitation, and community organizations create transition-friendly hiring. Recovery-friendly employers receive referrals from treatment programs with understanding that early recovery requires flexibility. The explicit partnership means employers know what to expect and treatment programs know which employers to recommend. Employers offering supported employment or transitional employment specifically for people navigating health-related transitions provide pathways matching transition reality.

Community-based organizations provide trusted intermediary services during transitions. ***Faith communities*** connected to treatment programs can offer recovery support and employment connections simultaneously. ***Recovery community organizations provide peer support*** from people who successfully navigated post-treatment employment. Community health workers who know both the member and local employers can facilitate introductions considering transition circumstances.

Andre's Situation as Structural Pattern

Andre Williams lost Medicaid coverage two weeks before his 60th birthday would have triggered automatic permanent exemption. His situation illustrates multiple failure modes converging. The medical exemption expired because his doctor noted improvement. The renewal application moved slower than the calendar. His pain flared at exactly the wrong moment. The December warehouse closure eliminated his backup plan. Each element was foreseeable. The combination was preventable.

The cascade effects extend beyond Andre. His unmanaged pain means he can no longer work even modified duty. His February reapplication for coverage, if he navigates it successfully, will find him in worse condition than before. His employer loses a trained worker who understood his limitations. His family loses his income contribution. The healthcare system gains an emergency department user who was previously managing his condition through regular care.

The convergence reflects system design rather than bad luck. Documentation processing timelines don't coordinate with exemption expiration dates. Employer seasonal patterns aren't considered. Health fluctuations within chronic conditions aren't accommodated. The cumulative effect of multiple administrative simplifications is catastrophic for people whose circumstances intersect multiple failure points.

Andre needed two more weeks of coverage. His medical exemption renewal was processing. His age exemption would begin January 1. The November pain flare could have been accommodated through grace period, graduated requirements, or proactive transition planning. Instead, the system treated his transition as compliance failure rather than predictable life event requiring support.

States implementing grace periods, graduated pathways, and proactive notification prevent most transition-related coverage loss. States leaving members to navigate transitions without support create coverage gaps at precisely the moments when coverage is most needed. Andre's January injection that he couldn't afford will cost far more in emergency care than the grace period that could have bridged his transition.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

The policy question is whether transition timing is member responsibility or system responsibility. Andre's birthday was always December 15. The state knew this years in advance. The failure to protect him during final weeks before permanent exemption represents choice, not necessity.

References

1. Sommers, B.D., Baicker, K., & Epstein, A.M. (2012). Mortality and access to care among adults after state Medicaid expansions. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 367(11), 1025-1034.
2. Sommers, B.D., Goldman, A.L., Blendon, R.J., Orav, E.J., & Epstein, A.M. (2019). Medicaid work requirements: Results from the first year in Arkansas. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 381(11), 1073-1082.
3. Wagner, J. (2019). Arkansas Medicaid work requirement results in coverage loss, no employment gains. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
4. Ku, L., Steinmetz, E., & Bruen, B.K. (2013). Continuous-eligibility policies stabilize Medicaid coverage for children and could be extended to adults with similar results. *Health Affairs*, 32(9), 1576-1582.
5. Artiga, S., Ubri, P., & Zur, J. (2017). The effects of premiums and cost sharing on low-income populations: Updated review of research findings. Kaiser Family Foundation.
6. Hinton, E., Musumeci, M., Rudowitz, R., Antonisse, L., & Hall, C. (2018). Section 1115 Medicaid demonstration waivers: The current landscape of approved and pending waivers. Kaiser Family Foundation.
7. Guth, M., & Hinton, E. (2018). Section 1115 Medicaid demonstration waivers under the Trump administration. Kaiser Family Foundation.
8. Musumeci, M., Chidambaram, P., & Watts, M.O. (2018). Key questions about Medicaid work requirements. Kaiser Family Foundation.
9. Garfield, R., Rudowitz, R., & Damico, A. (2017). Understanding the intersection of Medicaid and work. Kaiser Family Foundation.
10. Chan, M.K. (2024). Georgia's Medicaid waiver experiment shows work requirements restrict health care access. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
11. Karpman, M., Zuckerman, S., Gonzalez, D., & Kenney, G.M. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic was associated with increased employment hardship for Medicaid enrollees. *Health Affairs*, 40(12), 1928-1934.
12. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2023). Re-approval of Georgia Pathways Section 1115 demonstration.
13. Ohio Department of Medicaid. (2025). Group VIII Work Requirement and Community Engagement Section 1115 Demonstration Waiver Application.
14. Alker, J., Hoadley, J., & Kenney, G.M. (2018). Medical frailty and Medicaid work requirements: Issues for children with special health care needs and their parents. Georgetown University Center for Children and Families.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

15. Dorn, S., Gordon, R., Hoadley, J., et al. (2019). Medicaid work requirements in Arkansas: Experience and opinions of enrollees. Urban Institute.
16. Grogan, C.M., & Park, S. (2017). The racial divide in state Medicaid expansions. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 42(3), 539-572.
17. Commonwealth Fund. (2024). Few Georgians enrolled in state's Medicaid work requirement program.
18. Gifford, K., Ellis, E., Edwards, B.C., et al. (2018). States focus on quality and outcomes amid waiver uncertainty. Kaiser Family Foundation.
19. Musumeci, M., Chidambaram, P., & O'Malley Watts, M. (2019). Medicaid financial eligibility for seniors and people with disabilities. Kaiser Family Foundation.
20. Health Policy Ohio. (2025). Medicaid work requirements in Ohio.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*