Veterans with Service Connected Disabilities

When Military Service Creates Barriers Civilian Systems Don't Recognize

Carlos' Story

Carlos Rodriguez, 34, still hears the explosion sometimes. Not the actual sound, which his damaged eardrums can no longer fully process, but the memory of it, arriving in moments that should be ordinary. A car backfiring. A door slamming at the warehouse where he works security. Thunder during summer storms. Each sound carries him back to the road outside Kandahar in 2013, to the IED that killed two members of his squad and left him with injuries the VA would rate at 70 percent service-connected disability.

He served from 2009 to 2015, two deployments to Afghanistan. The explosion gave him a traumatic brain injury affecting memory and processing speed, hearing loss requiring aids, chronic pain from a back injury, and PTSD that transformed ordinary workplace situations into threats. The VA recognized this with a 70 percent rating, determining his service had significantly impaired his functioning. What the rating didn't provide was exemption from Medicaid work requirements, which don't recognize anything below 100 percent disability.

Carlos works security at a warehouse, the job he found after three others failed. Retail ended when a shoplifter confrontation triggered a panic response. A call center lasted two months before constant noise became unbearable. Overnight grocery stocking ended when a dropped pallet sent him into a dissociative episode. The warehouse works because it's quiet and overnight, requiring rounds rather than confrontations. He manages 60 hours monthly on good months. Work requirements demand 80.

VA appointments consume time the system won't recognize. Weekly PTSD therapy takes two hours including travel. Monthly pain management adds three more. Quarterly TBI follow-ups add still more. Total: 10 to 15 hours monthly maintaining treatment that keeps him functional. If those counted toward requirements, he'd approach compliance. They don't.

The VA covers service-connected conditions but not everything else. His diabetes isn't service-connected, so the VA won't treat it. Medicaid fills these gaps. Without it, insulin costs $350 monthly. A verification notice arrived at an address he'd left. By the time it reached him, the deadline had passed. His coverage terminated. He stretched insulin until it ran out. The diabetic ketoacidosis that followed put him in the emergency room for four days. The bill exceeded $40,000.

Carlos served his country for six years. His country gave him injuries limiting his capacity and a rating acknowledging those limits. The same country now demands 80 hours from someone the VA determined can provide 60.

Demographics and Scope

Approximately 400,000 to 650,000 expansion adults are veterans, representing 2 to 3.5 percent of the expansion population. Concentration varies significantly by state, with higher proportions in Texas, California, North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia where major military installations create veteran communities that persist after discharge. These veterans span eras from Vietnam through

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

post-9/11 conflicts, with different patterns of service-connected conditions reflecting different wars, different exposures, and different medical recognition of injuries.

Service-connected disability ratings below 100 percent create the central tension between VA recognition and work requirement exemption criteria. The VA rating system recognizes degrees of impairment from 0 to 100 percent based on specific conditions and their documented functional impacts. A 70 percent rating like Carlos's indicates "significant impairment" according to federal standards, but not "total disability" as work requirements define exemption eligibility. The gap between these standards means veterans can have substantial, federally documented functional limitations while not qualifying for automatic work requirement exemptions that typically require SSI or SSDI eligibility. The VA has already determined they cannot work at full capacity. Work requirements proceed as if that determination never occurred.

Common service-connected conditions creating employment barriers include PTSD affecting 15 to 20 percent of post-9/11 veterans with symptoms including hypervigilance, anxiety in workplace settings, difficulty with authority figures, and unpredictable triggering from environmental stimuli. TBI from blast exposures causes executive function deficits, processing speed limitations, memory problems, and difficulty with complex task sequencing. Musculoskeletal injuries create chronic pain requiring medication management and mobility limitations restricting job types. Hearing loss affects communication and requires workplace accommodations many employers won't provide. Military Sexual Trauma affects workplace functioning for thousands of veterans who may face retraumatization in employment settings without disclosing the underlying cause to employers or verification systems.

The VA-Medicaid coverage intersection creates administrative complexity requiring navigation of two parallel systems. VA covers service-connected conditions while Medicaid covers everything else, including conditions that develop after service or that the VA determines are unrelated to military duty. Dental care, vision, mental health services for non-service-connected conditions, and many prescription drugs are often better covered by Medicaid than VA. Veterans need both systems functioning simultaneously, navigating two bureaucracies with different rules, different verification requirements, different exemption criteria, and different appeals processes. Neither system coordinates automatically with the other.

Veterans represent 8 percent of homeless adults despite being only 6 percent of the general adult population. Housing instability complicates work requirement verification in the same ways it affects other populations, but veterans face additional challenges in the transition from military housing to civilian arrangements. Military service provides housing; discharge removes it. Veterans who separate without established civilian housing face immediate instability during the same period they must establish civilian employment and navigate new healthcare systems. The verification address problems that affect homeless populations compound for veterans during transition.

Failure Modes

The VA rating and exemption confusion creates the foundational failure. A 70 percent VA rating represents a federal determination, based on medical evaluation and documented evidence, that someone has significant functional impairment due to military service. The rating process involves medical examinations, service record review, and formal adjudication. Work requirements operate as if this determination doesn't exist, requiring separate documentation, separate assessment,

and separate exemption processes that may reach different conclusions about identical conditions. A veteran with a VA rating indicating they cannot sustain full-time employment must prove that same limitation again through an entirely different system using different standards.

PTSD workplace triggers narrow employment options severely in ways that standard work requirements don't recognize. Conditions creating hypervigilance and anxiety in workplace settings eliminate customer service roles where confrontation is possible, environments with loud or unpredictable noises, positions involving authority conflicts that can trigger military-related trauma, and settings with specific sensory characteristics matching combat environments. Veterans with combat PTSD may be limited to a small subset of available jobs, with those compatible jobs often providing fewer hours than requirements demand. The veteran isn't refusing to work; the veteran is working in the only environments where work remains possible.

The appointment burden and time conflict forces impossible choices that demonstrate how work requirements fail to account for the treatment sustaining work capacity. VA mental health therapy, pain management, and specialty follow-ups consume 10 to 15 hours monthly for veterans with multiple service-connected conditions. These appointments maintain the stability that enables any employment. Should they count as qualifying activities? Under most state frameworks, they don't. The treatment maintaining work capacity competes with work hours rather than supplementing them, creating a zero-sum choice between maintaining health and meeting requirements. Veterans choosing to skip appointments to accumulate work hours risk the decompensation that makes work impossible. Veterans prioritizing treatment fall short of hour thresholds despite contributing productive activity that the system refuses to recognize.

Credential translation failure wastes military training and extends the period of unemployment or underemployment. Military specialties don't always have civilian equivalents despite involving sophisticated skills. A military medic has training that civilian employers value, but state licensing requirements may not recognize military certifications. A military logistics specialist has supply chain expertise, but civilian credentials require separate testing and fees. Veterans with years of specialized military experience find themselves starting over in civilian careers, underemployed despite documented expertise, unable to access jobs matching their skills during the period when work requirements demand immediate employment. The credential gap extends the transition vulnerability.

Dual system navigation requires managing two bureaucracies simultaneously while dealing with conditions that impair exactly that capacity. VA processes and Medicaid processes operate independently, with different documentation requirements, different deadlines, different appeals systems, and different definitions of disability. Veterans must coordinate across systems that don't coordinate with each other. A veteran with TBI affecting executive function must track requirements from two agencies, meet deadlines set by two calendars, maintain documentation for two sets of standards. The administrative burden that challenges any population compounds for veterans managing cognitive impairments that military service caused.

The transition timing vulnerability compounds everything during the period of maximum instability. The first two years after discharge represent the highest risk period as veterans learn civilian employment markets, establish healthcare in new systems, build civilian social networks, find housing outside military infrastructure, and adjust to civilian workplace cultures that operate differently from military command structures. Work requirements hitting during this period catch veterans at their most vulnerable, demanding stable employment verification from people whose

lives are by definition in transition. The veteran who will be stable in three years may lose coverage in month four because transition takes time that rigid requirements don't allow.

State Policy Choices

States implementing work requirements face five fundamental choices regarding veterans, each involving tradeoffs between administrative simplicity and accommodation of federally recognized limitations.

First, whether to integrate VA disability ratings into exemption determinations. States could accept VA ratings of 50 percent or higher as automatic exemptions, recognizing that the federal government has already invested resources determining significant functional impairment exists. The VA rating process is rigorous, documented, and based on medical evidence. Accepting it would reduce duplicate assessment while honoring federal findings about veterans' capacity. Alternatively, states can maintain separate Medicaid exemption determinations, requiring veterans to document through a second system conditions the VA has already evaluated. This approach treats VA ratings as irrelevant despite their federal authority, demanding duplicate proof of limitations already federally established.

Second, whether VA appointments count as qualifying activities. Counting mental health therapy, pain management, TBI rehabilitation, and specialty treatment toward the 80-hour requirement would recognize that maintaining work capacity requires time investment. The appointments aren't optional leisure; they're medical necessity sustaining whatever employment remains possible. Treating them as qualifying activities acknowledges that veterans managing service-connected conditions are engaged in productive activity even when not employed. Requiring separate employment hours forces veterans to choose between treatment and compliance, potentially destabilizing the conditions that treatment manages.

Third, whether to recognize military credentials and training. States could expedite civilian licensing for military-trained specialties, accepting military training documentation for licensing requirements, waiving redundant testing, and accelerating veterans' path to employment matching their skills. Many states have made progress here, but gaps remain. Alternatively, states can require full civilian training regardless of military background, treating military experience as irrelevant to civilian qualification. This extends unemployment or underemployment during the period work requirements demand immediate employment, penalizing veterans for skills civilian systems won't recognize.

Fourth, whether to provide transition grace periods for recently discharged veterans. A 12-month grace period post-discharge would allow time for establishing civilian employment, navigating new healthcare systems, finding stable housing, and building the civilian infrastructure that stable employment requires. Transition takes time even for veterans without service-connected conditions; for those managing disabilities, it takes longer. Applying requirements immediately catches veterans during their most unstable transition period, measuring compliance during the window when compliance is structurally most difficult regardless of effort or capacity.

Fifth, whether to build VA-Medicaid coordination infrastructure. Integrated systems sharing exemption determinations, disability documentation, and appointment information would reduce duplicate processes and prevent conflicting decisions about identical conditions. Data sharing agreements could allow Medicaid systems to recognize VA determinations without requiring veterans to prove the same facts twice. Maintaining separate processes requires veterans to

navigate both systems independently while managing conditions that impair their capacity for administrative complexity. The coordination infrastructure costs money to build but prevents the coverage gaps that cost more to address through emergency care.

Stakeholder Roles

The VA healthcare system can coordinate with state Medicaid on disability determinations, provide functional capacity assessments, document appointment burden, and support veterans navigating dual systems. Integration between VA ratings and Medicaid exemptions would require VA willingness to share information and Medicaid willingness to accept federal findings as authoritative. ***The VA has infrastructure for disability determination that Medicaid systems lack;*** leveraging existing VA processes prevents duplicative assessment while reducing burden on veterans required to prove the same limitations repeatedly.

Veterans Service Organizations including the VBA, American Legion, VFW, and Disabled American Veterans can provide navigation assistance helping veterans understand and meet work requirements, advocate for VA rating recognition in state policy, support employment leveraging military skills through job placement programs, and connect veterans to services addressing housing, substance use, and mental health barriers that compound work requirement challenges. These organizations have established relationships with veteran communities and expertise in navigating military-related bureaucracies. Expanding their role to include Medicaid work requirement navigation leverages existing infrastructure and trusted relationships.

State Medicaid agencies can build veteran-specific navigation capacity, train eligibility workers on VA rating systems and service-connected conditions, accept VA disability determinations where appropriate rather than requiring separate assessment, count VA appointments as qualifying activities recognizing their role in maintaining work capacity, and integrate with VA data systems rather than requiring veterans to serve as intermediaries between bureaucracies. States with large military installations have particular incentive to develop veteran-specific accommodation capacity given concentration of affected populations.

Employers participating in veteran hiring programs can recognize military training and credentials, provide veteran-friendly workplaces understanding service-connected limitations and their workplace implications, offer flexible scheduling accommodating VA appointment needs without penalizing attendance, and develop positions suited to veterans with partial capacity who can contribute meaningfully but not at full-time levels. Employment partnerships connecting state workforce agencies with veteran-focused employers can accelerate placement in compatible positions.

Military transition programs can educate separating service members about Medicaid work requirements before discharge when intervention is easier, connect to employment services before separation rather than after, coordinate healthcare transitions anticipating the shift from military to VA and Medicaid coverage, and ensure veterans understand documentation requirements they'll face in civilian systems. Proactive transition support prevents the gaps that work requirements can widen into coverage loss.

Return to Carlos

Carlos's 70 percent VA disability rating represents federal acknowledgment that his military service significantly impaired his functional capacity. The rating process considered his PTSD, TBI, chronic

pain, and hearing loss. Medical examiners reviewed his service records, conducted examinations, and documented findings. An adjudicator weighed the evidence and concluded these service-connected conditions limit what he can do. The determination wasn't casual or cursory; it followed established federal procedures for recognizing military injury.

Work requirements reached no such conclusion, or rather no conclusion at all. They treated his VA rating as irrelevant to whether he should work 80 hours monthly. The federal system said he has significant limitations. The state system said prove it again through our process, on our timeline, using our standards. Two arms of the same government reached different conclusions about the same person's capacity based on the same conditions.

He was working at capacity. His 60 hours represented maximum sustainable employment given conditions his service caused. His 10 to 15 hours of VA appointments represented treatment necessary to maintain that capacity. Combined, he contributed more than 70 hours monthly of productive activity. The system demanded 80 hours of a specific type and found him deficient. The gap wasn't between his effort and requirements; it was between what his service left him able to do and what civilian systems demanded he do anyway.

The coverage termination that followed wasn't theoretical harm. Carlos is out of the hospital now, his diabetes back under control with insulin from a VA emergency prescription that provided temporary coverage for an acute crisis. He has reapplied for Medicaid while managing conditions the coverage termination worsened. His A1C is higher than before the gap. The ketoacidosis damage may affect his kidneys permanently, adding to the organ stress his service-connected conditions already created. The four-day hospitalization cost more than a year of Medicaid coverage would have. The system saved nothing and harmed someone whose sacrifice it had already acknowledged.

He served his country. His country recognized his service damaged him. The policy question his story raises is whether VA disability ratings should inform Medicaid work requirement exemptions. The federal government has already determined that Carlos has significant functional impairment. The assessment process was thorough and the conclusion documented. Requiring state Medicaid systems to conduct separate assessments reaching potentially different conclusions about the same conditions wastes resources while denying recognition to veterans whose disabilities have already been federally verified.

States will make choices about how to treat veterans like Carlos. They can integrate VA findings or ignore them. They can count treatment time or exclude it. They can accommodate transition or demand immediate compliance. The choices aren't technical; they're statements about whether civilian systems will recognize what military service cost and what federal agencies have already concluded about that cost's consequences.

Carlos will navigate whatever system Texas builds. He'll do so while managing conditions his service caused, seeking treatment his service requires, and working at capacity his service limited. Whether the system recognizes his reality or ignores it is a policy choice. The question is whether state systems will recognize what federal systems have already determined, or whether veterans like Carlos will continue falling through the gap between acknowledgment of sacrifice and accommodation of its consequences.

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

References

1. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2024). *VA benefits and health care utilization*. Washington, DC: Veterans Health Administration.
2. Epidemiology Program, Post-Deployment Health Group. (2024). *Analysis of VA health care utilization among OEF/OIF/OND veterans*. Washington, DC: Department of Veterans Affairs.
3. Fulton, J. J., et al. (2015). The prevalence of posttraumatic stress disorder in Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 31, 98-107.
4. RAND Corporation. (2008). *Invisible wounds of war: Psychological and cognitive injuries, their consequences, and services to assist recovery*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
5. Tanielian, T., & Jaycox, L. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Invisible wounds of war*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
6. Hoge, C. W., et al. (2004). Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 351(1), 13-22.
7. Seal, K. H., et al. (2009). Trends and risk factors for mental health diagnoses among Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(9), 1651-1658.
8. Veteran's Administration. (2024). *Compensation 101: How did I get this rating?* Washington, DC.
9. Congressional Budget Office. (2024). *Veterans' disability compensation: Trends and policy options*. Washington, DC.
10. Institute of Medicine. (2007). *A 21st century system for evaluating veterans for disability benefits*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
11. Tsai, J., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2015). Risk factors for homelessness among US veterans. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 37(1), 177-195.
12. Blue Star Families. (2023). *Military family lifestyle survey*. Washington, DC.
13. Prudential Financial. (2012). *Veterans' employment challenges*. Newark, NJ.
14. U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2014). *Transitioning veterans: DOD needs to improve performance reporting*. Washington, DC.
15. Elbogen, E. B., et al. (2013). Criminal justice involvement, trauma, and negative affect in Iraq and Afghanistan war era veterans. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80(6), 1097-1102.
16. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2023). *Veterans and military families*. Rockville, MD: SAMHSA.
17. National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2024). *Veteran homelessness*. Washington, DC.
18. U.S. Department of Labor. (2024). *Employment situation of veterans*. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
19. Morin, R. (2011). *The difficult transition from military to civilian life*. Pew Research Center.
20. Kintzle, S., & Castro, C. A. (2018). Examining veteran transition to the workplace through military transition theory. In P. D. Harms & P. L. Perrewé (Eds.), *Occupational stress and well-being in military contexts* (pp. 117-127). Emerald Publishing.

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

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