



**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES**  
**Health Care Financing Administration**

**Center for Medicaid and State Operations**  
**7500 Security Boulevard**  
**Baltimore, MD 2 1244-1850**

JUL 29 1998

Dear State Medicaid Director:

In the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Congress provided that "the Nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals." 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(8). Title II of the ADA further provides that "no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs or activities of a public entity, or be the subject of discrimination by any such entity." 42 U.S.C. § 12132. Department of Justice regulations implementing this provision require that "a public entity shall administer services, programs, and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities." 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(d).

We have summarized below three Medicaid cases related to the ADA to make you aware of recent trends involving Medicaid and the ADA.

In L.C. & E.W. v. Olmstead, patients in a State psychiatric hospital in Georgia challenged their placement in an institutional setting rather than in a community-based treatment program. The United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit held that placement in an institutional setting appeared to violate the ADA because it constituted a segregated setting, and remanded the case for a determination of whether community placements could be made without fundamentally altering the State's programs. The court emphasized that a community placement could be required as a "reasonable accommodation" to the needs of disabled individuals, and that denial of community placements could not be justified simply by the State's fiscal concerns. However, the court recognized that the ADA does not necessarily require a State to serve everyone in the community but that decisions regarding services and where they are to be provided must be made based on whether community-based placement is appropriate for a particular individual in addition to whether such placement would fundamentally alter the program.

In Helen L. v. DiDario, a Medicaid nursing home resident who was paralyzed from the waist down sought services from a State-funded attendant care program which would allow her to receive services in her own home where she could reside with her children. The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit held that the State's failure to provide services in the "most integrated

setting appropriate" to this individual who was paralyzed from the waist down violated the ADA, and found that provision of attendant care would not fundamentally alter any State program because it was already within the scope of an existing State program. The Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal in this matter; thus, the Court of Appeals decision is final.

In Easley v. Snider, a lawsuit, filed by representatives of persons with disabilities deemed to be incapable of controlling their own legal and financial affairs, challenged a requirement that beneficiaries of their State's attendant care program must be mentally alert. The Third Circuit found that, because the essential nature of the program was to foster independence for individuals limited only by physical disabilities, inclusion of individuals incapable of controlling their own legal and financial affairs in the program would constitute a fundamental alteration of the program and was not required by the ADA. This is a final decision.

While these decisions are only binding in the affected circuits, the Attorney General has indicated that under the ADA States have an obligation to provide services to people with disabilities in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs. Reasonable steps should be taken if the treating professional determines that an individual living in a facility could live in the community with the right mix of support services to enable them to do so. The Department of Justice recently reiterated that ADA's "most integrated setting" standard applies to States, including State Medicaid programs.

States were required to do a self-evaluation to ensure that their policies, practices and procedures promote, rather than hinder integration. This self-evaluation should have included consideration of the ADA's integration requirement. To the extent that any State Medicaid program has not fully completed its self-evaluation process, it should do so now, in conjunction with the disability community and its representatives to ensure that policies, practices and procedures meet the requirements of the ADA. We recognize that ADA issues are being clarified through administrative and judicial interpretations on a continual basis. We will provide you with additional guidance concerning ADA compliance as it becomes available.

I urge you also, in recognition of the anniversary of the ADA, to strive to meet its objectives by continuing to develop home and community-based service options for persons with disabilities to live in integrated settings.

If you have any questions concerning this letter or require technical assistance, please contact Mary Jean Duckett at (410) 786-3294.

Sincerely,

Sally K. Richardson  
Director

cc All HCFA Regional Administrators

All HCFA Associate Regional Administrators  
for Medicaid and State Operations

Page 3 .State Medicaid Director

Lee Partridge  
American Public Human Services Association

Joy Wilson  
National Conference of State Legislatures

Jennifer Baxendell  
National Governors' Association