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Among its other provisions, the Affordable Care Act (the "ACA") broadened the population of persons eligible to enroll in Medicaid to include "individuals under the age of 65 with incomes below 133 percent of the federal poverty line," collectively referred to as the "expansion population." Under the ACA, states enjoy the freedom to choose whether or not to extend coverage to the expansion population. Kentucky is among the majority of states that has elected to participate in the expansion, which took effect on January 1, 2014.

As a result, nearly half a million Kentucky residents gained coverage based solely on their income. Section 1115 of the Social Security Act permits the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (the "HHS") to waive states' compliance with particular Medicaid requirements "to the extent and for the period" necessary for states to carry out "experimental, pilot, or demonstration project[s]." The waiver provision affords the Secretary considerable, though not absolute, deference to approve "those projects that 'in [his] judgment . . . [are] likely to assist in promoting the [Act's] objectives.'"

In 2016, Governor Matt Bevin applied for a Section 1115 waiver in a stated effort to "comprehensively transform Kentucky's Medicaid" program. The HHS, through its Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS") office, approved the five-year "KY HEALTH" project. The most controversial portion of the project, and the focus of this post, is an initiative entitled "Kentucky HEALTH.

The current version of Kentucky HEALTH establishes the following: a static community engagement or work requirement of eighty hours per month for all non-disabled enrollees, online monthly reporting requirements, a six-month lockout period for failure to reenroll within a set timeframe, mandatory monthly premiums varied by income, and more. By its own estimate, the state predicts that roughly ninety-five thousand individuals will lose their coverage over the course of the program.

In 2017, a class of Kentucky Medicaid enrollees successfully challenged HHS's approval of Kentucky HEALTH in federal court. Applying an arbitrary and capricious standard of review, the court vacated the Secretary's
approval because of his failure to consider whether Kentucky HEALTH would further one of Medicaid’s primary objectives of “furnishing medical assistance” to eligible individuals. The court emphasized its narrow holding by declining to discuss the permissible scope of state demonstration waivers. Ultimately, the court remanded the Kentucky HEALTH program back to HHS for reconsideration. Prior to its reapproval, HHS opened a new comment period and received over 8,500 public comments. Despite strong opposition, the HHS reapproved a slightly revised version of the plan. Another class of plaintiffs has since filed an amended complaint in the same court. Pending the outcome of the renewed litigation, most of the Kentucky HEALTH program is slated to begin on April 1, 2019. The Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services recently announced its decision to delay the enforcement of the community engagement requirements until at least June 1, 2019.

The primary critique among opponents of Kentucky HEALTH is that the program creates barriers to the continued receipt of coverage by adding more administrative hurdles for beneficiaries to overcome, which is contrary to the aim of Medicaid. Research indicates that complex Medicaid programs adversely affect enrollees’ retention of coverage. For instance, an inadvertent failure to report an insignificant change in income could result in a temporary loss in coverage. Even a temporary loss in coverage could prove disastrous for those individuals whose prompt and uninterrupted access to care is imperative to their well-being.

On the other hand, proponents of Kentucky HEALTH applaud the program’s objective of incentivizing self-sufficiency. Further, the CMS supports the program’s goals of improving health outcomes, reducing dependency on government assistance, decreasing the financial burden on the federal and state governments, and preparing individuals for the commercial health insurance market.

The potential outcome of the renewed litigation is tough to predict. In its reapproval, the HHS heeded the court’s criticism and offered a much more thorough analysis of its decision. Because of the highly deferential nature of the arbitrary and capricious standard of review for agency determinations, the court may elect to merely uphold the agency’s reapproval without reaching the merits of the waiver itself. Alternatively, the court may decide to issue a broader ruling and address the issues it chose to set aside in its initial opinion, including whether the Secretary exceeded his waiver authority in his reapproval of Kentucky HEALTH and in his letter to state Medicaid directors.

The decision will have major implications in light of other states’ attempts to follow in Kentucky’s footsteps. If the court blocks Kentucky HEALTH again, Governor Bevin may order the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services to terminate the state’s Medicaid expansion altogether once all appeals are exhausted.

Regardless of the outcome, Kentucky’s Medicaid battle is only one part of a much larger political discourse regarding the future of expanded Medicaid as a whole.
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