

## Employee Benefits & Executive Compensation ADVISORY

June 14, 2011

### Court Decision Clears the Air (Somewhat) for Wellness Programs

Employer wellness programs face a number of potential compliance issues under a variety of federal (e.g., HIPAA, GINA, Affordable Care Act) and state law provisions. Recently, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and private litigants have challenged employer-sponsored wellness programs that offer incentives for providing biometric and other health-related information under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). (The EEOC is the federal agency charged with enforcing the ADA.)

The ADA generally prohibits employers from requiring employees to undergo a medical examination or answer medical inquiries (the “ADA Prohibition”). An important exception exists for wellness programs that are considered to be voluntary under ADA guidance. Based on current informal guidance from the EEOC, a wellness program will only be considered to be voluntary if it neither requires participation nor penalizes employees who do not participate. This raises concern with respect to the vast number of employers implementing wellness programs with a financial reward (or surcharge) for participation (or non-participation) (e.g., does a participation incentive of a 20 percent medical premium discount essentially *force* employees to participate in the wellness program?). Nonetheless, such financial components are almost universally included as part of employer-sponsored wellness programs. Earlier this spring, a federal district court in Florida handed down a ruling that, if followed by other courts, provides employers with some breathing room under the ADA. In this advisory, we summarize the court’s ruling and briefly discuss its potential impact on the design of employer-sponsored wellness programs.

#### *Seff v. Broward County*<sup>1</sup>

In 2009, Florida’s Broward County adopted a wellness program as part of its consumer-driven health plan’s open enrollment process. Just like countless other employer plans around the country, Broward County’s wellness program consisted of a confidential health risk assessment questionnaire and confidential biometric screening for glucose and cholesterol levels. Employees who completed the program and were identified as having one of five disease states—asthma, hypertension, diabetes, congestive heart failure or kidney disease—were given the option to participate in a disease management coaching program, after which the employee was eligible to receive relevant medications at no additional cost.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Case No. 10-61437-CIV-Moore/Simonton.

Participation in the wellness program was not required for coverage under Broward County's group health plan, and Broward County (as employer/plan sponsor) received only de-identified aggregate data that it might consider in creating future benefit plans. In mid-2010, a financial incentive component was added so that those who declined to participate in the program incurred a \$20 charge on each of their bi-weekly paychecks. Just a few months later, Broward County found itself the defendant in a class action lawsuit claiming that it violated the ADA Prohibition.<sup>2</sup>

Ruling in favor of Broward County, the court stated that the county's wellness program did not violate the ADA Prohibition because the program comes under ADA's "safe harbor" exception to the ADA Prohibition. In other words, the court did not even need to address whether the financial incentive rendered participation in the arrangement "involuntary."

### The Safe-Harbor Exception

The safe-harbor exception<sup>3</sup> protects employers and plan administrators (and other covered entities under the ADA) from "establishing, sponsoring, observing or administering" a wellness program if the program is:

- i) part of "the terms of a bona fide benefit plan";
- ii) "based on underwriting risks, classifying risks or administering such risks"; and
- iii) "based on or not inconsistent with State law" and is not used "as a subterfuge to evade the purposes" of the ADA Prohibition.

Applying these requirements to the Broward County wellness program, the court ruled that Broward County's wellness program was part of the county's group health plan and therefore met requirement (i) above because the insurer under the plan pays for and administers the program under its healthcare contract with the county, only those enrolled in the county's health plan may participate in the wellness program and the county included a description of the wellness program in its benefits plan handout. The court also found that there was a "strong argument" that the wellness program itself is a bona fide benefit plan because it offers benefits—disease coaching and medication cost waivers—for certain participants.

The court found that the purpose of the second requirement is to permit the development and administration of benefit plans in accordance with accepted principles of risk assessment. Thus, requirement (ii) was met because the program's ultimate goal is to sponsor insurance plans that maintain or lower its participants' premiums. More specifically, the court stated that Broward County's wellness program renders aggregate data that the county may analyze when developing future benefit plans and uses to classify various risks on a macroscopic level so it may form economically sound benefits plans for the future.

---

<sup>2</sup> The ADA Prohibition reads, "A covered entity shall not require a medical examination and shall not make inquiries of an employee as to whether such employee is an individual with a disability or as to the nature or severity of the disability, unless such examination or inquiry is shown to be job-related and consistent with business necessity." 42 U.S.C. § 12112(d)(4)(A).

<sup>3</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 12201(c).

Finally, the court stated that requirement (iii) was met because there is no Florida law that is inconsistent with the wellness program and the plaintiffs did not allege any sort of subterfuge to avoid the purposes of the ADA. Further, the court stated that it was hard to see how the wellness program relates to discrimination in any way and, rather, is “enormously beneficial” to all employers of the county.

### **Is the Voluntary/Involuntary Analysis Still Relevant?**

Only one other court has applied the approach adopted in *Seff v. Broward County*, and that decision was under a fully insured program. It is unclear whether the EEOC, as the ADA enforcement agency, will follow this ruling. We are aware of several EEOC challenges where the EEOC has disputed the validity of employer wellness programs that offered financial incentives based on the “voluntariness” of the arrangement. Nonetheless, *Seff v. Broward County* provides employers some breathing room, and an alternate approach to support the validity of their wellness programs.

*This advisory was written by John Hickman, Carolyn Smith and Johann Lee.*

If you would like to receive future *Employee Benefits and Executive Compensation Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information including e-mail address to [employeebenefits.advisory@alston.com](mailto:employeebenefits.advisory@alston.com). Be sure to put “**subscribe**” in the subject line.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any one of the following:

## Members of Alston & Bird's Employee Benefits & Executive Compensation Group

Robert A. Bauman  
202.239.3366  
[bob.bauman@alston.com](mailto:bob.bauman@alston.com)

David C. Kaleda  
202.239.3329  
[david.kaleda@alston.com](mailto:david.kaleda@alston.com)

John B. Shannon  
404.881.7466  
[john.shannon@alston.com](mailto:john.shannon@alston.com)

Saul Ben-Meyer  
212.210.9545  
[saul.ben-meyer@alston.com](mailto:saul.ben-meyer@alston.com)

Laurie Kirkwood  
404.881.7832  
[laurie.kirkwood@alston.com](mailto:laurie.kirkwood@alston.com)

Richard S. Siegel  
202.239.3696  
[richard.siegel@alston.com](mailto:richard.siegel@alston.com)

Sarah Burke  
404.881.7272  
[sarah.burke@alston.com](mailto:sarah.burke@alston.com)

Johann Lee  
202.239.3574  
[johann.lee@alston.com](mailto:johann.lee@alston.com)

Carolyn E. Smith  
202.239.3566  
[carolyn.smith@alston.com](mailto:carolyn.smith@alston.com)

Emily Seymour Costin  
202.239.3695  
[emily.costin@alston.com](mailto:emily.costin@alston.com)

Blake Calvin MacKay  
404.881.4982  
[blake.mackay@alston.com](mailto:blake.mackay@alston.com)

Michael L. Stevens  
404.881.7970  
[mike.stevens@alston.com](mailto:mike.stevens@alston.com)

Patrick C. DiCarlo  
404.881.4512  
[pat.dicarlo@alston.com](mailto:pat.dicarlo@alston.com)

Emily W. Mao  
202.239.3374  
[emily.mao@alston.com](mailto:emily.mao@alston.com)

Jahnisa P. Tate  
404.881.7582  
[jahnisa.tate@alston.com](mailto:jahnisa.tate@alston.com)

Ashley Gillihan  
404.881.7390  
[ashley.gillihan@alston.com](mailto:ashley.gillihan@alston.com)

Sean K. McMahan  
404.881.4250  
[sean.mcmahan@alston.com](mailto:sean.mcmahan@alston.com)

Laura G. Thatcher  
404.881.7546  
[laura.thatcher@alston.com](mailto:laura.thatcher@alston.com)

David R. Godofsky  
202.239.3392  
[david.godofsky@alston.com](mailto:david.godofsky@alston.com)

Craig R. Pett  
404.881.7469  
[craig.pett@alston.com](mailto:craig.pett@alston.com)

Elizabeth Vaughan  
404.881.4965  
[beth.vaughan@alston.com](mailto:beth.vaughan@alston.com)

John R. Hickman  
404.881.7885  
[john.hickman@alston.com](mailto:john.hickman@alston.com)

Jonathan G. Rose  
202.239.3693  
[jonathan.rose@alston.com](mailto:jonathan.rose@alston.com)

Kerry T. Wenzel  
404.881.4983  
[kerry.wenzel@alston.com](mailto:kerry.wenzel@alston.com)

H. Douglas Hinson  
404.881.7590  
[doug.hinson@alston.com](mailto:doug.hinson@alston.com)

Thomas G. Schendt  
202.239.3330  
[thomas.schendt@alston.com](mailto:thomas.schendt@alston.com)

Kyle R. Woods  
404.881.7525  
[kyle.woods@alston.com](mailto:kyle.woods@alston.com)

James S. Hutchinson  
212.210.9552  
[jamie.hutchinson@alston.com](mailto:jamie.hutchinson@alston.com)

### ATLANTA

One Atlantic Center  
1201 West Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3424  
404.881.7000

### CHARLOTTE

Bank of America Plaza  
Suite 4000  
101 South Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
704.444.1000

### DALLAS

Chase Tower  
Suite 3601  
2200 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, TX 75201  
214.922.3400

### LOS ANGELES

333 South Hope Street  
16th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3004  
213.576.1000

### NEW YORK

90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016-1387  
212.210.9400

### RESEARCH TRIANGLE

4721 Emperor Blvd.  
Suite 400  
Durham, NC 27703-8580  
919.862.2200

### SILICON VALLEY

275 Middlefield Road  
Suite 200  
Menlo Park, CA 94025-4004  
650.838.2000

### VENTURA COUNTY

Suite 215  
2801 Townsgate Road  
Westlake Village, CA 91361  
805.497.9474

### WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Atlantic Building  
950 F Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1404  
202.239.3300

**[www.alston.com](http://www.alston.com)**

© Alston & Bird LLP 2011