Physician Practices and the Exemption Burden

When clinical care meets administrative gatekeeping.

When Medicaid work requirements take effect in December 2026, physician practices become essential infrastructure for a function they never sought: documenting who cannot work. Medical exemptions require provider attestation. Provider attestation requires appointments, clinical time, and judgment calls that blur the line between healing and bureaucracy. For the 18.5 million expansion adults subject to requirements, accessing a physician becomes not just about treatment but about maintaining coverage itself.

The burden falls unevenly. Safety-net practices serving high concentrations of Medicaid patients face appointment backlogs for exemption documentation while simultaneously managing clinical care for populations with complex needs. Rural practices with physician shortages confront the reality that documentation bottlenecks may determine coverage outcomes as much as medical necessity. Primary care physicians already spending 15.5 hours weekly on paperwork and administrative tasks now inherit responsibility for a new category of government documentation with real consequences for patients who fail to obtain it.

Understanding how physician practices fit into exemption infrastructure requires examining both the clinical workflow challenges and the ethical tensions inherent in asking healers to certify who qualifies for government benefits.

The Documentation Demand

OB3 establishes exemption categories requiring medical documentation. Medical frailty, pregnancy and postpartum status, physical disability, mental health conditions, substance use disorder treatment engagement, and caregiving for disabled family members all require clinical attestation in most state frameworks. The specific documentation requirements vary by state, but the fundamental pattern holds: someone must confirm that a person cannot consistently meet 80-hour monthly work requirements due to health circumstances.

The volume calculation reveals the challenge. If 20 to 30 percent of the 18.5 million expansion adults potentially qualify for medical exemptions, that represents 3.7 to 5.5 million exemption applications requiring provider involvement. Semi-annual redetermination cycles double the documentation flow since exemptions must be renewed every six months under OB3's framework. Annual provider documentation volume reaches 7.4 to 11 million attestations, concentrated among safety-net practices serving Medicaid populations.

The time burden compounds across these numbers. Conservative estimates suggest 15 to 30 minutes per exemption attestation when including chart review, patient discussion, form completion, and submission. At the lower bound, 7.4 million attestations at 15 minutes each equals 1.85 million provider hours annually. At the upper bound, 11 million attestations at 30 minutes each equals 5.5 million provider hours. This documentation workload lands on top of existing clinical responsibilities in practices already struggling with administrative burden.

Distribution of this burden follows Medicaid enrollment patterns. Federally Qualified Health Centers serve roughly one in six Medicaid beneficiaries and will face disproportionate

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

documentation demands. A 2024 Commonwealth Fund survey found that over 70 percent of FQHCs already report primary care physician, nurse, or mental health professional shortages. These same practices become exemption documentation bottlenecks when their patient populations need attestations at scale.

The specialty distribution matters as well. Primary care physicians typically document general medical exemptions. Psychiatrists and behavioral health providers document mental health exemptions. Oncologists, rheumatologists, neurologists, and other specialists document condition-specific exemptions. Each specialty faces documentation demands proportional to its Medicaid patient panel and the prevalence of exemption-qualifying conditions within that panel.

The Clinical Workflow Challenge

Integrating exemption documentation into clinical practice requires workflow redesign that few practices have undertaken. The default pathway fails: patients request exemption letters, administrative staff field calls, providers receive faxed or emailed requests outside clinical encounters, documentation happens after hours or between appointments, and turnaround stretches from days to weeks while coverage hangs in the balance.

The appointment bottleneck creates perverse incentives. Patients seek medical appointments not primarily for care but for documentation. Clinics serving high Medicaid populations become overwhelmed with exemption requests that consume appointment slots needed for actual clinical care. Wait times extend as documentation demand competes with treatment demand. The system creates pressure to separate exemption appointments from clinical care, which requires administrative infrastructure most safety-net practices lack.

Electronic health record integration offers theoretical solutions but practical challenges. EHR vendors have not universally built exemption documentation workflows into their systems. Template standardization varies by state since each jurisdiction defines its own attestation requirements. Practices operating across multiple states face multiple documentation formats with no standardization. The technical infrastructure enabling streamlined exemption documentation exists conceptually but remains underdeveloped practically.

Provider portal access to state eligibility systems enables direct submission without patient intermediation, but implementation varies. States with sophisticated digital infrastructure allow providers to submit attestations directly. States with legacy systems require paper forms, faxes, or patient-mediated submission that introduces delay and error. Practices cannot invest in integration infrastructure without knowing which state systems will ultimately require connectivity.

The staffing model question emerges from workflow analysis. Should physicians personally complete exemption attestations, or should clinical support staff handle administrative components while physicians provide clinical sign-off? Nurse practitioners and physician assistants can document exemptions within their scope of practice, potentially extending capacity. Medical assistants can prepare documentation for provider review. Social workers can coordinate exemption applications and gather supporting information. Optimal staffing models depend on practice size, patient volume, and state documentation requirements that remain unclear 14 months before implementation.

The Functional Assessment Problem

Medical exemptions under work requirements typically require functional assessment rather than diagnostic confirmation. The relevant question is not whether someone has diabetes or depression but whether their health conditions prevent them from consistently meeting 80-hour monthly work requirements given their available accommodations, transportation, and job market realities.

This functional focus creates clinical judgment challenges that diagnostic documentation does not. A diagnosis of moderate osteoarthritis confirms a medical condition. Whether that condition prevents work depends on job availability, physical demands of accessible employment, pain management effectiveness, and factors extending well beyond clinical assessment. Providers asked to attest that someone "cannot work" are making judgments that incorporate economic and social considerations alongside medical ones.

The invisible disability problem intensifies functional assessment difficulty. Mental health conditions, chronic pain, autoimmune disorders, neurological conditions, and cognitive impairments may not present obviously during clinical encounters. Someone with bipolar disorder may appear stable during an appointment but experience episodes of incapacity that prevent sustained employment. Someone with chronic fatigue syndrome may seem fine briefly but cannot maintain consistent daily function. Someone with severe anxiety may work in some contexts but not others. Traditional documentation approaches asking whether someone has a qualifying condition miss the functional reality that matters for work capacity.

States emphasizing diagnostic documentation over functional assessment create one set of problems: people whose conditions don't fit neat categories lose coverage despite genuine incapacity. States emphasizing functional assessment create different problems: providers must make judgments they lack expertise to make, incorporating labor market realities, job availability, and accommodation possibilities into medical attestations.

The episodic condition challenge compounds functional assessment difficulty. Some conditions are stable. A spinal cord injury creates permanent disability that exemption processes can document once and maintain indefinitely. But many conditions fluctuate. Multiple sclerosis produces periods of relative function and periods of severe limitation. Major depressive disorder cycles through episodes. Rheumatoid arthritis flares and subsides. Chronic pain varies with treatment response, stress, and factors that defy prediction.

Exemption systems designed for stable conditions fail episodic populations. Documentation capturing a single moment in time misses the pattern of incapacity that matters. Someone documented during a good period loses exemption and then faces coverage loss when their condition worsens. Someone documented during a bad period gains exemption but then faces re-evaluation pressure when they temporarily improve. The exemption renewal cycle every six months intersects poorly with conditions that don't follow six-month patterns.

The Compensation Question

Exemption documentation currently operates as unfunded administrative work. Providers complete attestations without reimbursement, absorbing the time cost as practice overhead. This

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

model cannot scale to millions of annual attestations without creating access barriers, documentation delays, or provider withdrawal from Medicaid participation.

The economics illuminate the problem. A primary care practice serving 2,000 Medicaid expansion adults might face 400 to 600 exemption applications annually if 20 to 30 percent qualify. At 20 minutes per attestation, that represents 133 to 200 hours of provider time. At median primary care hourly compensation around $100, the practice absorbs $13,000 to $20,000 in unfunded documentation work annually. For practices already operating on thin margins serving Medicaid populations reimbursed below commercial rates, this additional burden threatens financial sustainability.

Payment models for exemption attestation have not been established. States could pay flat fees per attestation, perhaps $35 to $50 per completed form. States could allow billing under evaluation and management codes when exemption documentation occurs during clinical encounters. States could establish administrative stipends for practices serving high volumes of Medicaid patients. Each approach has implementation complexity, and no standard has emerged.

The absence of compensation creates predictable consequences. Providers prioritize paid clinical work over unpaid administrative work. Documentation turnaround extends as exemption requests queue behind reimbursable activities. Patients with urgent deadlines cannot obtain timely attestations. Coverage losses occur not because exemptions were inappropriate but because documentation systems couldn't process volume within required timeframes.

Compensation also affects provider willingness to participate in Medicaid programs at all. Medicaid already reimburses below Medicare and far below commercial rates. Adding unreimbursed administrative burden accelerates provider decisions to limit Medicaid panels or exit Medicaid participation entirely. In areas with limited provider availability, patients may lose both exemption documentation access and clinical care access as practices withdraw from the populations most needing both.

The Ethical Tension

Physicians face genuine ethical questions when asked to serve as gatekeepers for government benefits. The clinical relationship rests on patient trust and provider advocacy. Documentation determining coverage eligibility introduces a third party with interests potentially divergent from patient welfare.

The clinical separation perspective holds that healthcare providers should focus exclusively on healing. Asking physicians to document work exemptions compromises therapeutic relationships by introducing government administrative functions into clinical encounters. Patients may withhold information fearing it will affect exemption determinations. Providers may face pressure to approve exemptions for patients who don't clearly qualify or deny exemptions for patients who clearly do but lack adequate documentation. The mixing of clinical and administrative functions corrupts both.

The whole-person perspective counters that healthcare already addresses social determinants. Providers screen for food insecurity, housing instability, and domestic violence. Work requirements represent another social determinant affecting health outcomes. Documentation supporting

exemptions enables continued coverage enabling continued care. The administrative function serves clinical goals by maintaining patient access to healthcare that their conditions require.

The pragmatic perspective observes that providers will be involved regardless of philosophical preferences. Patients will request exemption documentation. States will require provider attestation. The question is not whether providers participate but how they participate efficiently while minimizing burden and maintaining clinical integrity. Standardized forms, streamlined workflows, and appropriate compensation enable provider participation without corrupting clinical relationships.

Each perspective has merit. Individual providers and practices will navigate these tensions differently. The policy challenge is creating systems that respect provider concerns while ensuring patients can access exemption documentation their medical circumstances warrant.

The Denial Dilemma

Providers completing exemption attestations must sometimes decline to support exemption applications. A patient requesting documentation may not have conditions meeting exemption criteria. A patient may have conditions that limit work capacity but not to the degree preventing compliance with requirements. A patient may seek exemption for non-medical reasons that provider attestation cannot legitimately support.

Denial creates clinical relationship challenges. The patient seeking exemption believes they qualify. The provider assessing medical circumstances concludes otherwise. The resulting disagreement damages trust and may affect ongoing care. Patients denied exemption support may seek other providers willing to attest, creating attestation shopping that undermines program integrity while straining provider relationships.

Documentation of denial also raises questions. Should providers document that they evaluated and declined to support exemption? Such documentation might prejudice subsequent applications or state reviews. Should providers simply not respond to requests they cannot support? Silence creates uncertainty for patients who need to pursue alternative pathways. The administrative infrastructure for handling denial is as underdeveloped as infrastructure for handling approval.

The liability dimension adds complexity. Providers attesting to exemption qualification could face scrutiny if attestations appear inappropriate. Providers declining to attest could face claims of abandonment or discrimination if patients lose coverage and suffer harm. The legal framework for provider responsibility in exemption documentation remains undefined, creating uncertainty that may chill provider participation.

The Rural Dimension

Rural areas face compounded challenges that urban areas with greater provider density may avoid. Physician shortages in rural communities mean fewer providers available for exemption documentation. Travel distances to available providers create access barriers for populations without reliable transportation. Telehealth can address some documentation needs but requires technology access and comfort that rural populations may lack.

The rural primary care reality includes practices serving vast geographic areas with limited physician coverage. A solo practitioner serving a rural county cannot absorb hundreds of exemption documentation requests without sacrificing clinical capacity. The documentation bottleneck in rural areas may prove more severe than in urban areas, creating geographic disparities in exemption access that translate to geographic disparities in coverage outcomes.

Rural specialty access compounds the problem. Mental health exemptions require behavioral health provider attestation in many frameworks, but rural areas face severe behavioral health provider shortages. Physical disability exemptions may require specialist documentation that rural residents must travel hours to obtain. The exemption documentation system assumes provider availability that rural geography does not provide.

State policy can address rural disparities through several mechanisms. Expanded telehealth authorization allows documentation without in-person visits. Scope of practice expansions enable nurse practitioners and physician assistants to complete attestations independently. Mobile documentation units bring exemption support to remote communities. Simplified documentation requirements reduce provider time burden. Each approach has tradeoffs that states must navigate within their specific rural contexts.

The Safety-Net Pressure Point

Federally Qualified Health Centers and other safety-net providers face the most intense exemption documentation pressure because their patient populations have the highest Medicaid concentration and the highest prevalence of exemption-qualifying conditions.

FQHCs serve over 30 million patients annually, with 15 million covered by Medicaid or CHIP. These same centers report over 70 percent facing staffing shortages. Adding millions of exemption attestations to already-overwhelmed clinical operations threatens care quality and access for the populations most dependent on safety-net services.

The financial model of safety-net care compounds the challenge. FQHCs operate under prospective payment system rates that provide fixed reimbursement per encounter regardless of time spent. Exemption documentation within clinical encounters consumes time without additional reimbursement. Documentation outside encounters represents pure administrative cost with no offsetting revenue. The margin pressure that safety-net providers already face intensifies as exemption documentation demands grow.

Safety-net providers also serve populations with the greatest exemption documentation complexity. Patients with multiple chronic conditions require comprehensive functional assessment. Patients with limited English proficiency need translated materials and interpreter services during documentation encounters. Patients with unstable housing may lack reliable contact information for appointment scheduling and follow-up. The populations needing exemptions face the greatest barriers to obtaining them, and safety-net providers serve precisely these populations.

Strategic investment in safety-net exemption capacity could address these pressures. Dedicated exemption documentation staff separate from clinical providers. Enhanced reimbursement for exemption-related encounters. Template libraries and workflow tools reducing per-attestation time burden. Integration assistance enabling EHR connectivity with state systems. The investment

required is substantial, but the alternative is systematic exemption access failure for the populations most needing protection.

The Behavioral Health Bottleneck

Mental health and substance use disorder exemptions require behavioral health provider documentation in most frameworks. The behavioral health workforce shortage creates a specific bottleneck that affects exemption access for populations with conditions most clearly qualifying for protection.

Serious mental illness, including schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depressive disorder, represents clear exemption eligibility in most state frameworks. Substance use disorder treatment engagement similarly qualifies for exemption during active treatment. Both populations need behavioral health provider attestation. Both populations face behavioral health access barriers that predate work requirements and will intensify under exemption documentation demands.

The psychiatrist shortage is particularly acute. Many communities lack any practicing psychiatrist, forcing patients to travel hours for psychiatric care. Adding exemption documentation to psychiatric encounters competes with medication management and therapeutic intervention for limited appointment time. Wait times for new psychiatric patients often extend months, meaning someone needing exemption documentation may lose coverage before obtaining an appointment.

Alternative attestation pathways could reduce behavioral health bottlenecks. Primary care providers managing mental health conditions could document exemptions for stable patients they treat. Licensed clinical social workers and professional counselors could complete mental health attestations within their scope. Peer support specialists with appropriate supervision could facilitate documentation coordination if not direct attestation. These alternatives require state authorization and clear scope-of-practice guidance that few states have developed.

Substance use disorder treatment programs face distinct documentation challenges. Residential treatment programs may complete attestations for patients in their care. Outpatient treatment programs must coordinate documentation with treatment delivery. Medication-assisted treatment prescribers may not have infrastructure for exemption documentation beyond clinical care. The fragmented SUD treatment system creates fragmented exemption documentation pathways that patients must navigate during recovery when administrative capacity is lowest.

Building Provider Infrastructure

Physician practices preparing for work requirement implementation face infrastructure decisions that state policy uncertainty complicates. Practices cannot finalize workflows without knowing state documentation requirements. They cannot build technology integrations without knowing state system specifications. They cannot train staff without knowing exemption categories and attestation standards. The 14 months before December 2026 implementation provides inadequate time for infrastructure development that depends on policy decisions not yet made.

Despite uncertainty, practices can take preparatory steps. Identifying current Medicaid expansion patient panels establishes baseline documentation demand estimates. Assessing current administrative capacity reveals gaps that exemption documentation will stress. Evaluating EHR capabilities determines technology enhancement needs. Engaging with state Medicaid agencies

during rulemaking positions practices to influence documentation requirements toward practicability.

Template development offers practical preparation regardless of final state requirements. Functional assessment templates capturing work capacity across multiple domains. Episodic condition templates documenting pattern variation over time. Caregiver exemption templates describing care recipient needs and caregiver time requirements. Template libraries enable rapid adaptation once state specifications become clear.

Staff training requires investment even before final requirements emerge. Clinical support staff learning exemption category basics can begin patient education and application triage. Providers understanding functional versus diagnostic assessment approaches can begin shifting documentation practices. Administrative staff establishing tracking systems can manage exemption request flow once volume increases. The learning curve for exemption documentation is steep enough that early training investment pays dividends despite specification uncertainty.

Compensation advocacy represents a collective action opportunity for physician practices. Individual practices cannot secure exemption documentation reimbursement. Medical societies, state associations, and safety-net provider networks can advocate collectively for payment models recognizing exemption attestation as legitimate compensable work. The window for influencing payment policy closes as state implementation approaches.

Looking Ahead

The provider role in work requirement implementation extends beyond exemption documentation to broader questions about healthcare's function in a reciprocal social contract. When coverage depends on work participation, healthcare providers become not just healers but verifiers of the conditions that excuse non-participation. This represents a fundamental expansion of provider function that the healthcare system has not fully grappled with.

Article 9C examines hospital systems facing related but distinct challenges: emergency departments as coverage loss early warning systems, inpatient stays creating exemption documentation opportunities, discharge planning incorporating work requirement status, and health system community benefit obligations potentially including navigation support. The provider perspective expands from individual practices to institutional responsibilities.

For physician practices, the immediate challenge is operational: building infrastructure to handle documentation volume without sacrificing clinical care quality for the populations most needing both. The philosophical questions about clinical-administrative boundary maintenance matter but remain secondary to the practical reality that December 2026 arrives regardless of whether practices are ready. Those investing now in workflow development, template creation, staff training, and technology preparation will serve their patients better than those waiting for perfect policy clarity that will not arrive in time.

Next in series: Article 9C, "Hospital Systems as Work Requirement Infrastructure"

Previous in series: Article 9A, "ACO Implementation Challenges"

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

References

1. Medscape. "Physician Compensation Report 2023." Medscape.com, 2023. Reports physicians spend average 15.5 hours weekly on paperwork and administration, with primary care and internal medicine averaging 17-18 hours.
2. Commonwealth Fund. "Community Health Centers' Progress and Challenges in Meeting Patients' Essential Primary Care Needs: Findings from the Commonwealth Fund 2024 National Survey of Federally Qualified Health Centers." Commonwealth Fund, August 2024. https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2024/aug/community-health-centers-meeting-primary-care-needs-2024-FQHC-survey
3. American Medical Association. "Health Systems Help Doctors Bogged Down by Administrative Burdens." AMA, December 2024. https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/physician-health/health-systems-help-doctors-bogged-down-administrative-burdens
4. MACPAC. "Evaluating the Effects of Medicaid Payment Changes on Access to Physician Services." January 2025. https://www.macpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Evaluating-the-Effects-of-Medicaid-Payment-Changes-on-Access-to-Physician-Services.pdf
5. Health Resources and Services Administration. "Health Center Program Data." HRSA.gov, 2024. Documents FQHCs serve over 30 million patients annually, with 15 million covered by Medicaid or CHIP.
6. American Academy of Family Physicians. "How Much Scheduled 'Admin Time' vs. Patient-Facing Time Do Primary Care Physicians Need?" FPM, March 2025. https://www.aafp.org/pubs/fpm/blogs/inpractice/entry/scheduling-admin-time.html
7. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. "Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule." CMS.gov, January 2024. Establishes requirements for Medicaid managed care prior authorization processes.
8. KFF Health News. "Safety-Net Health Clinics Cut Services and Staff Amid Medicaid 'Unwinding.'" KFF Health News, May 2024. Documents FQHC financial pressures from Medicaid enrollment changes.
9. Sommers, Benjamin D., et al. "Medicaid Work Requirements in Arkansas: Two-Year Impacts on Coverage, Employment, and Affordability of Care." Health Affairs, vol. 39, no. 9, 2020, pp. 1522-1530.
10. National Association of Community Health Centers. "Community Health Centers: Providers, Partners and Employers of Choice - 2024 Chartbook." NACHC, 2024.
11. Becker's Hospital Review. "The Hours 23 Physician Specialties Spend on Paperwork, Administration." April 2023. https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/quality/hospital-physician-relationships/the-hours-23-physician-specialties-spend-on-paperwork-administration/

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

12. Rural Health Information Hub. "Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) and the Health Center Program Overview." RuralHealthInfo.org, 2024. https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/topics/federally-qualified-health-centers
13. Chartis Group. "Future of Community Health Centers Hangs in the Balance as Financial Uncertainty Abounds." Chartis.com, 2024. https://www.chartis.com/insights/future-community-health-centers-hangs-balance-financial-uncertainty-abounds
14. Georgetown University Health Policy Institute. "Medicaid Work Requirements: Implementation Lessons from Multiple States." Georgetown.edu, October 2025.
15. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. "Taking Away Medicaid for Not Meeting Work Requirements Harms People with Disabilities." CBPP.org, June 2018.

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