When the Disability Itself Prevents Documentation: Autism, IDD, and the Redetermination Penalty

Disclaimer: *I was diagnosed with Autism around age 10, was labeled an Aspie a few years later, and would be considered a high functioning autistic adult in today's lingo. I have been called 'neuro-divergent', although I strongly prefer 'neuro-gifted'. From actively hiding my autism, to indifference, to openly discussing it – my understanding of myself in my early 50s is still a work in progress. For me, this article is deeply personal. I feel a deep kinship to every parent managing autism in their children and every person diagnosed with autism.*

The six-month redetermination cycle creates systematic barriers for all Medicaid expansion adults. For two interconnected populations—adults with autism, intellectual disabilities, and developmental disabilities attempting to navigate work requirements themselves, and their family caregivers—the burden compounds in ways standard exemption processes cannot accommodate.

A critical distinction: Most people with significant autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities qualify for Medicaid through SSI/SSDI disability pathways, facing annual redetermination with automatic work requirement exemptions. This analysis focuses on a specific subset: those who entered Medicaid through expansion before disability determination, or whose conditions weren't initially considered severe enough for SSI but still create substantial work and documentation barriers. These adults face semi-annual cycles with work requirements rather than annual cycles with automatic exemptions.

The irony is profound. People whose disabilities are "too mild" for SSI but severe enough to impair work capacity and administrative navigation face the most intensive requirements—semi-annual redetermination with work verification rather than annual cycles with exemptions. They fall in the gap between recognized disability and typical functioning, experiencing the worst of both worlds.

Adults with autism and IDD in this expansion pathway face work requirements designed for neurotypical populations. Those who can work with supports struggle to document fluctuating capacity. Those who cannot work face exemption processes requiring executive function, bureaucratic navigation, and self-advocacy skills their disabilities specifically impair.

Their caregivers must re-document permanent conditions and re-prove constant care responsibilities every six months through systems designed for temporary circumstances. Exemption categories exist but assume typical caregiving and typical disabilities, failing when both caregiving and disability are intensive, permanent, and incompatible with standard processes.

January 2027 brings work requirements and accelerated redeterminations simultaneously for expansion adults. The conditions and responsibilities that qualify people for exemptions prevent them from navigating the processes required to maintain those exemptions.

When the Disability Itself Prevents Documentation

Adults with autism, intellectual disabilities, and developmental disabilities in the expansion pathway facing work requirements fall into three categories. The first includes adults who work but whose disabilities create documentation barriers. Someone with autism working in food service

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

might struggle with the executive function required to track hours, remember reporting deadlines, or navigate online portals. Someone with mild intellectual disability might maintain reliable employment but be unable to read exemption forms or understand bureaucratic instructions. Someone with ADHD combined with learning disabilities might lose paperwork or become overwhelmed by multi-step processes despite steady employment.

These adults aren't seeking exemptions. They work as required. But verification systems don't accommodate their cognitive processing differences. Monthly reporting assumes executive function capacity that autism and IDD specifically impair. Online portals assume digital literacy and interface comprehension that developmental disabilities affect.

The second category includes adults with episodic conditions. Autism with co-occurring mental health challenges, IDD with periodic medical complications, developmental disabilities with fluctuating capacity. These adults work during stable periods but experience complete incapacity episodes. Someone with autism and bipolar disorder might maintain employment for months, then experience psychiatric crisis requiring hospitalization. Someone with Down syndrome and dementia might work productively until cognitive decline accelerates. Someone with autism and severe anxiety might function until sensory overload triggers complete shutdown.

Standard work requirements don't accommodate episodic capacity. Eighty hours monthly assumes consistent availability. Someone who works 120 hours during good months and zero during crisis months averages 60 hours over six months but fails compliance each crisis month. The medical exemption process requires documentation during periods when seeking help is hardest. Between crisis, hospital discharge, and return to work, the exemption deadline passes. Coverage terminates during recovery when health stability depends on continuous care.

The third category includes adults who genuinely cannot work. Those with significant intellectual disability, Level 3 autism requiring very substantial support, or multiple co-occurring conditions creating severe limitations. These adults should qualify for medical exemptions without difficulty. But exemption processes assume capacity for self-advocacy, bureaucratic navigation, and documentation gathering that these disabilities fundamentally impair.

Consider the 25-year-old with significant intellectual disability and autism who entered Medicaid through expansion. He lives semi-independently with support services but cannot manage employment. He needs a medical exemption. The exemption application requires obtaining medical records from multiple providers, scheduling appointments specifically for documentation, explaining functional limitations to unfamiliar providers, completing multi-page forms with complex questions, tracking submission deadlines, following up on missing documentation, and appealing if denied. Each step assumes cognitive and social capacities that intellectual disability and autism specifically affect. The process designed to determine whether someone can work becomes a test of whether someone can navigate bureaucracy.

The Executive Function Barrier

Executive function enables planning, organization, time management, and task completion. Forms must be obtained, appointments scheduled, records gathered, documents submitted, deadlines tracked, follow-ups completed. This multi-step sequence occurring over weeks requires the executive function capacities that autism, ADHD, and many developmental disabilities impair.

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

Someone with autism might have exceptional skills in their area of special interest, high intelligence, and clear communication abilities but complete inability to initiate and sustain multi-step bureaucratic processes. This isn't laziness. The disability affects the specific cognitive processes needed for the task. Someone with significant ADHD might intend to complete exemption paperwork but become distracted before finishing or feel overwhelming anxiety that paralyzes action. Someone with moderate intellectual disability might not understand what documentation is required or what constitutes sufficient proof.

States could accommodate executive function challenges through supported decision-making, allowing trusted supporters to assist with applications, accepting verbal applications, or providing dedicated navigation assistance. Most states design processes assuming neurotypical executive function, creating systematic exclusion of people whose disabilities affect these capacities.

The Episodic Challenge for Expansion Adults with Autism/IDD

Episodic conditions fluctuating between capacity and incapacity create impossible documentation requirements for expansion adults facing semi-annual cycles. Someone with autism and anxiety disorders might work successfully when environmental stressors remain manageable but experience complete shutdown during crises. Work requirements assume stable capacity. Eighty hours monthly works for someone who can consistently work twenty hours weekly. It fails for someone who can work forty hours weekly during good months but zero during crisis months.

Medical exemptions should accommodate episodic conditions through flexible hour requirements, partial-month exemptions, or averaged compliance over longer periods. Someone working 120 hours during three good months and zero hours during three crisis months averages sixty hours over six months, below the eighty-hour standard but demonstrating substantial capacity and effort. Exemption processes designed for stable conditions don't accommodate fluctuation. Applying for temporary exemption during crisis requires navigating bureaucracy while in crisis. By the time approval arrives, the crisis has often resolved. Then the next crisis hits, requiring new application, new documentation, new processing time.

Rapid exemption processes triggered by healthcare utilization patterns could help. Emergency department visits, psychiatric hospitalizations, or significant medication changes could automatically trigger temporary exemptions for expansion adults. Few states have built systems responsive enough for this real-time accommodation.

The Caregiver Documentation Burden

Parents and family members caring for adults with autism, IDD, or developmental disabilities face caregiver exemption requirements every six months. The disability is permanent. The caregiving is constant. But documentation must be refreshed biannually as if conditions change.

Someone caring full-time for an adult child with severe autism must prove the care recipient's disability severity, prove they provide the care rather than someone else or institutional services, prove the care prevents them from working 80 hours monthly, and renew this documentation every six months. The care that prevents work also prevents documentation. Time spent on paperwork is time not providing care. Stress of documentation deadlines compounds stress of caregiving responsibilities.

Documentation requirements invade privacy or don't exist in standardized forms. Birth certificates prove relationship but not that the child requires full-time care. Medical records establish diagnosis but proving the parent provides care rather than residential services requires attestations that aren't standard practice. Guardianship documentation helps but many family caregivers don't have formal guardianship despite providing full-time care.

The semi-annual cycle intensifies burden for expansion adult caregivers. Someone caring for a child with autism since birth has documented these same conditions repeatedly through eligibility applications, special education evaluations, Social Security disability determinations, and Medicaid redeterminations. The six-month cycle doesn't acknowledge that autism is permanent, requiring yet another round of documentation proving what hasn't changed.

The Intersection: Adults with Autism/IDD Who Are Also Caregivers

Some adults with autism or mild IDD provide caregiving for other family members with disabilities. Someone with high-functioning autism caring for a parent with dementia. Someone with mild intellectual disability caring for a sibling with more severe disabilities. These individuals face compounding documentation requirements.

They must document their own disability status for potential medical exemption. They must document caregiving responsibilities for potential caregiver exemption. They must coordinate between multiple providers, multiple documentation streams, multiple exemption applications. The cognitive load exceeds capacity. Executive function challenges affecting their own care multiply when coordinating care for others.

Standard exemption categories assume you're either the person with disability OR the caregiver, not both simultaneously. Someone who is both faces unclear pathways. Do they apply for medical exemption based on their own autism? Or caregiver exemption based on parent's dementia? Or both? If both, how do overlapping conditions get documented without redundant provider appointments and paperwork?

The Communication Barrier

Many adults with autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities have communication differences affecting how they interact with eligibility systems, healthcare providers, and bureaucracies. Someone with autism might communicate clearly in writing but become overwhelmed in verbal phone interactions. Someone with IDD might understand spoken language but struggle reading complex forms. Someone nonverbal might use communication devices that state eligibility workers aren't trained to interpret.

Redetermination notices arrive by mail in standard English at reading levels many adults with IDD cannot comprehend. Phone systems for questions require navigating automated menus, waiting on hold, and explaining situations to unfamiliar people—exactly the interactions that communication disabilities make difficult. Online portals assume computer literacy and interface navigation that cognitive disabilities affect.

The burden falls on individuals to request accommodations they may not know exist or lack capacity to request. Someone with autism might not realize they can request written rather than phone communication. Someone with IDD might not know to ask for simplified language. Someone nonverbal might not know systems can accommodate communication devices. Accommodations that would make the process accessible exist but aren't automatically provided.

What These Populations Reveal About Policy Design

Adults with autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities reveal fundamental assumptions embedded in work requirement and redetermination design. The policies assume neurotypical cognitive function. They assume stable rather than episodic capacity. They assume bureaucratic navigation ability separate from work capacity. They assume caregiving for people with disabilities is temporary rather than permanent. They assume disabilities will be formally diagnosed and documented through standard channels.

When these assumptions don't hold, the policy creates systematic failure. Not because people aren't trying. Because the requirements exceed capacity that the qualifying conditions themselves impair. Exemptions exist on paper but the exemption process requires capabilities that exempt conditions prevent.

The six-month cycle for expansion adults intensifies this mismatch. Learning bureaucratic processes takes time for people with cognitive disabilities. Just as processes become familiar, the cycle repeats. The frequency prevents developing sustainable routines while never allowing complete forgetting and fresh learning. It's a timing that maximizes cognitive load for people with the least capacity to handle it.

What Actually Helps

Automatic exemptions based on SSI or SSDI receipt would protect adults with formally recognized disabilities without requiring separate documentation. If someone qualified for federal disability benefits, states could accept that determination rather than requiring redundant evaluation. This protects people with significant disabilities while avoiding documentation burden.

Representative payee authority for Medicaid redetermination would allow the same person managing SSI benefits to handle Medicaid renewal without separate guardianship proceedings. Many adults with IDD have representative payees who manage their finances but lack authority for healthcare decisions. Extending that authority would provide supported decision-making without court involvement.

Supported decision-making models allow trusted people to assist with applications and documentation without formal guardianship. Many adults with autism or mild IDD maintain independence in most life areas but need help with bureaucratic processes. Systems could accept assistance from designated supporters without requiring power of attorney or guardianship.

Simplified language and visual communications would make materials accessible to people with intellectual disabilities. Notices written at fifth-grade level with pictures explaining each step. Videos demonstrating processes. In-person assistance automatically offered rather than requiring request. Mandatory navigation support recognizing that optional assistance will be underutilized by people who don't realize they need help.

Annual rather than semi-annual exemption renewal for people with permanent conditions would reduce burden without reducing protections. Autism doesn't improve in six months. Intellectual disability doesn't resolve. Down syndrome doesn't remit. Requiring documentation twice yearly for permanent conditions multiplies burden without improving accuracy.

Presumptive exemption while documentation is gathered would prevent coverage loss during processing delays. Someone with clear disability shouldn't lose coverage because provider appointments take time to schedule or medical records take weeks to obtain. Coverage should continue presumptively until exemption determination is complete.

Crisis exemptions available immediately by phone would help people with episodic conditions. Someone hospitalized for psychiatric crisis or medical emergency could call a hotline, explain the situation, and receive temporary exemption while formal documentation is completed. This prevents coverage loss during exactly the periods when coverage is most critical.

Provider attestation focused on functional capacity rather than diagnostic severity would simplify documentation. Providers could complete simple checkbox forms: "This patient cannot consistently work 80 hours monthly due to medical conditions" rather than detailed functional capacity assessments. Attestation rather than evaluation reduces provider burden while providing adequate information for exemption decisions.

EHR integration enabling direct submission from providers to state systems would bypass member intermediation. Provider completes attestation during appointment, clicks submit, state receives documentation instantly. Member gets notification that provider submitted. This eliminates lost paperwork, mail delays, and coordination burden on members with organizational challenges.

Peer support and navigation services would help members with autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities access accommodations and complete processes. Peers who have successfully navigated the system can provide credibility through shared experience that professional navigators lack. Training peer navigators specifically for autism and IDD populations would create accessible support.

Family navigator programs would support caregivers managing both their own documentation and care recipient's needs. Someone familiar with autism could help families understand exemption options, gather documentation efficiently, coordinate between providers, and appeal if denied. This reduces burden on families already overwhelmed by caregiving responsibilities.

The Stakes

Expansion adults with autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities, and their family caregivers, represent populations where redetermination burden compounds most severely. They face requirements requiring capacities their conditions specifically impair. When coverage loss occurs, consequences extend beyond healthcare access.

Adults with autism losing Medicaid often lose access to behavioral health services that enable independent living. Adults with IDD losing coverage may lose supported employment services that provide both income and meaningful activity. Caregivers losing coverage may experience health deterioration that compromises their ability to provide care, destabilizing family systems.

The six-month cycle creates recurring crisis for populations already managing chronic stress. Families that have navigated complex systems for years—special education, developmental disability services, Social Security disability, Medicaid—face yet another layer of bureaucracy testing exactly the capacities that disabilities impair.

The policy question isn't whether these populations should contribute to society through work. Many adults with autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities work and want to work. Their family caregivers provide essential care enabling others to work. The question is whether documentation requirements match capacity, whether exemption processes are accessible, whether systems accommodate disability realities, and whether the six-month cycle serves any purpose beyond generating administrative burden for populations least equipped to handle it.

The stakes couldn't be higher. Losing Medicaid doesn't just affect one person. It often affects entire family systems where multiple members have disabilities or provide care. The redetermination cycle becomes a test not just of state administrative capacity but of whether policy acknowledges the reality of living with and caring for autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities.

This completes the Article 4 series examining redetermination processes for expansion adults. Article 4A addressed system architecture and timing. Article 4B examined vulnerable populations broadly. Article 4C explored infrastructure and stakeholder coordination. Article 4D focused specifically on autism, IDD, and developmental disabilities—examining both adults with these conditions facing work requirements themselves and their family caregivers. These populations reveal where redetermination burden compounds most severely and where policy design reveals deepest assumptions about disability, capacity, caregiving, and obligation within the expansion adult population facing semi-annual cycles.

References

1. Sommers BD, et al. "Consequences of Medicaid Work Requirements in Arkansas: Two-Year Impacts on Coverage, Employment, and Affordability of Care." *Health Affairs*. 2020;39(9):1524-1532.
2. Musumeci M, et al. "Medicaid Enrollees with Complex Care Needs: Characteristics, Costs, and Coverage." Kaiser Family Foundation. May 2019.
3. Parish SL, et al. "Material Hardship Among US Families Raising Children with Disabilities." *Exceptional Children*. 2015;82(1):62-81.
4. Gallagher S, et al. "The Association Between Exposure to Childhood Autism and Parental Divorce." *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2012;42(10):2018-2025.
5. Kogan MD, et al. "A National Profile of the Health Care Experiences and Family Impact of Autism Spectrum Disorder Among Children in the United States, 2005-2006." *Pediatrics*. 2008;122(6):e1149-e1158.
6. Cidav Z, et al. "Maternal Labor Force Participation and Use of Autism Services." *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2013;43(11):2583-2595.
7. National Council on Disability. "Quality of Life for People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities." March 2018.
8. Hinton E, et al. "5 Key Facts About Medicaid Work Requirements." Kaiser Family Foundation. February 2025.

9. Moynihan D, Herd P, Harvey H. "Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means." Russell Sage Foundation. 2015.
10. American Academy of Pediatrics. "Family-Centered Care and the Pediatrician's Role." *Pediatrics*. 2012;129(2):394-404.

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