## Key State Insurance Statutes That Protect Individual Market Consumers with Preexisting Conditions



Last updated October 29, 2020

State	<b>Guaranteed issue</b>	Adjusted community rating	Prohibition on preexisting condition exclusions	Essential health benefit requirements
Alabama	No	No	No	No
Alaska	No	No	No	No
Arizona	No <sup>1</sup>	No	No <sup>1</sup>	No
Arkansas	No	No	No	No
California	No*	Yes	No*	No*
Colorado	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
Connecticut	No*	No	Yes	Yes
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District of Columbia	No*	No*	No*	No*
lorida	Yes <sup>3</sup>	No	Yes <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>5</sup>
Georgia	No	No	No	No
Hawaii	No	No	Yes	No
daho	No	No	No	No
llinois**	No	No	Yes	No
ndiana	No	No	Yes	No
owa	No	No	No	No
Kansas	No	No	No	No
Kentucky	No	No	No	No
ouisiana	No	N0 <sup>6</sup>	Yes <sup>7</sup>	Yes <sup>6</sup>
laine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
laryland		Yes <sup>8</sup>		
lassachusetts	Yes		Yes	Yes
/ichigan	Yes	Yes	No	No
linnesota	No*	No <sup>9</sup>	Yes	Yes
/ississippi	No	No	No	No
lissouri	No	No	No	No
Iontana	No	No	No	No
lebraska	No	No	No	No
levada	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
lew Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
lew Jersey	Yes	Yes <sup>10</sup>	Yes	Yes
lew Mexico	Yes	No <sup>11</sup>	Yes	Yes
lew York	Yes	Yes <sup>12</sup>	Yes	Yes
lorth Carolina	No	No	No	No
lorth Dakota	No	No	No	No
Dhio	No	No	No	No
Oklahoma	No	No	No	No
Dregon	Yes	Yes <sup>13</sup>	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	No	No	No	No
Rhode Island	No	No	Yes	No
South Carolina	No	No	No	No
South Dakota**	No	No	No	No
ennessee	No	No	No	No
exas	No	No	No	No
Jtah	No	No	No	No
/ermont	Yes	No <sup>14</sup>	Yes	No
/irginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vashington	Yes	No <sup>15</sup>	Yes	Yes
Vest Virginia	No	No	No	No
Visconsin	No	No	No	No
Vyoming	No	No	No	No

## Notes

General notes: Some states have laws that require insurers to comply with 1) federal law or with the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in general; or 2) specific provisions of the ACA, by incorporating such federal protections into state law by reference. (For example, a state may require insurers to meet the community rating requirements "established under the ACA.") The enforceability of such provisions may be vulnerable to challenge in the event the ACA is found invalid. Accordingly, unless such a state has codified additional requirements, described below, it is marked as "no." A state is marked as "yes" only if: it has adopted a specific statutory protection regarding guaranteed issue, adjusted community rating, preexisting condition exclusions, or essential health benefit requirements for all non-Medicareeligible residents, regardless of age, that is equivalent to, or more protective than, the ACA; and the operation of that protection does not appear to depend on the continued validity of the corresponding federal law provision.

- \* State statute incorporates protection by reference to the ACA or includes a provision that renders the statute void in the event that the ACA is repealed or declared unconstitutional.
- \*\* Some states like Illinois and South Dakota have promulgated regulations that incorporate some or all of the four ACA consumer protections in question. For the purposes of this table, a state is marked as "yes" only if the given protection is in statute.
- Arizona's guaranteed issue and prohibition on preexisting condition exclusion provisions only apply to plans issued to "eligible individuals," and while the state does not explicitly define this term, it likely refers to the term as defined by HIPAA, which means the protections only apply to a very narrow subset of the population.
- 2. Colorado's tobacco rating restriction is stricter than the requirement under the ACA.
- 3. Florida requires each carrier to guarantee issue of at least one major medical policy to all residents but carriers are allowed to adjust premiums based on health status.

- 4. Florida requires each carrier to offer at least one policy without preexisting condition exclusions but other policies offered by the same carrier may include such exclusions.
- 5. Florida essential health benefit (EHB) requirements are significantly narrower than the EHB requirements under the ACA.
- 6. Louisiana allows age rating of up to 5:1 and insurance regulators have the authority to grant insurers "transitional" relief from rating restrictions.
- 7. This protection goes into effect in Louisiana if the ACA is overturned.
- 8. Massachusetts has an age-rating standard that is more restrictive than that under the ACA.
- 9. In the event that the ACA is overturned, Minnesota law may permit an insurer to implement wider age- and tobacco-related bands than those currently allowed under the ACA.
- New Jersey statutory law allows premiums to vary up to 3.5:1 and state regulations are more restrictive.
- 11. In the event that the ACA is overturned, New Mexico law may permit an insurer to implement wider age- and tobacco-rating bands than those currently allowed under the ACA.
- 12. New York has a pure community rating, which is a more restrictive rating standard than the ACA, and prohibits rating factors such as age and tobacco.
- 13. In the event that the ACA is overturned, Oregon law may permit an insurer to implement wider age- and tobacco-related bands than those currently allowed under the ACA.
- 14. Vermont prohibits the use of age or geographic location as a rating factor, but it allows carriers to vary premiums on the basis of adherence to wellness programs.
- 15. Washington allows carriers to vary premiums on the basis of adherence to wellness programs and allows age rating variation up to 3.75:1.