

All information contained herein was provided by the member company whose territory relates to the statute and represents the view/practice of that member company and does not constitute legal advice.

| 5/9/2018 Is the Participating Dentist is Limited to the Approved Fee | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| State | Age Limitation denial | No payment on procedure due to patient and/or family maximum reached or frequency denials | Service rendered on a tooth that is not eligible (Ex - sealants) | Member's plan does not include coverage for this service | Eligibility denial | Waiting Period denial | Alternate Benefit provided (Ex - composite filling submitted and an alternate benefit of an amalgam is provided) | Service denied due to clinical review | When you implemented the non-covered services policy, was it based on the claim's date of service or the processing date? | Effective Date of non-covered services law |
| AK | No; if a service is not covered under the contract, AK does not hold dentists to their filed fees. | Yes; it does not make a difference if AK paid part or nothing. | If the service is not covered under the contract, then AK does not hold the dentist to the MPA/filed fee. If the service is covered and only being denied for frequency or maximum, then AK does hold the dentist to their filed fee. | No | No | Yes | Yes | | Processing date | 9/13/2010 |
| AL | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | |
| AR | No for age limitations. Yes for time limitations | Yes - It does not make a difference. | No | No | No | No | Yes - Including composites to amalgams eff 9/9/15 | No | N/A due to no change in current processing | 3/22/2011 |
| AZ | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Processing date | 1/1/2011 |
| CA | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | 1/1/2011 |
| CO | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Date of service | |
| CT | Yes, where the CT law (PA 11-58, Section 19) does not apply. The CT law does NOT apply to self-funded contracts or to insured coverage contracts that are incorporated in or derived from a collective bargaining agreement. | Yes | Yes, where the CT law (PA 11-58, Section 19) does not apply. The CT law does NOT apply to self-funded contracts or to insured coverage contracts that are incorporated in or derived from a collective bargaining agreement. | Yes, where the CT law (PA 11-58, Section 19) does not apply. The CT law does NOT apply to self-funded contracts or to insured coverage contracts that are incorporated in or derived from a collective bargaining agreement. | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | As of processing date 01/01/2012: CT law (PA 11-58, Section 19) does not allow holding DDS to maximum approved fee for non-covered services. The CT law does NOT apply to self-funded contracts or to insured coverage contracts that are incorporated in or derived from a collective bargaining agreement. | 1/1/2012 |
| DC | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | |
| DE | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | |

| State | Age Limitation denial | No payment on procedure due to patient and/or family maximum reached or frequency denials | Service rendered on a tooth that is not eligible (Ex - sealants) | Member's plan does not include coverage for this service | Eligibility denial | Waiting Period denial | Alternate Benefit provided (Ex - composite filling submitted and an alternate benefit of an amalgam is provided) | Service denied due to clinical review | When you implemented the non-covered services policy, was it based on the claim's date of service or the processing date? | Effective Date of non-covered services law |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| FL | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 7/1/2014 |
| GA | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 7/1/2011 |
| HI | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | | | |
| IA | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Processing date | 7/1/2010 |
| ID | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | | Effective 1/1/13 | 1/1/2013 |
| IL | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Only if the original submitted code is included in the group's benefit plan. If not, we do not hold | | Claims processed for an IL dentist cannot hold that dentist to the MPA for a service not included in the group benefit plan | 1/1/2013 |
| IN | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | | Date of service | |
| KS | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | 7/1/2010 |
| KY | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | | Legislation prohibiting dental insurers from holding providers to allowed fees for non-covered services KRS 304.17C-085 | 7/1/2012 |
| LA* | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | 1/1/2011 |
| MA | Yes, but not for orthodontic services if it has a specific age limit | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | We are in process of implementation until pending legislation in MA is finalized. | pending |
| MD | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 10/1/2011 |
| ME | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | | Date of service | |
| MI | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | |
| MN | No | Yes, payment makes no difference | No | No | No | No | No | | Processing date | 8/1/2011 |
| MO | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | | 8/28/2013 |
| MS* | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 7/1/2012 |
| MT | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Processing date | 7/2/2013 |
| NC | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date pf servoce | 7/21/2010 |
| ND | No | Yes, payment makes no difference | No | No | No | No | No | | Processing Date | 8/1/2011 |
| NE | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | | Date of service | 7/15/2010 |
| NH | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | | N/A due to no change in current processing. | |

| State | Age Limitation denial | No payment on procedure due to patient and/or family maximum reached or frequency denials | Service rendered on a tooth that is not eligible (Ex - sealants) | Member's plan does not include coverage for this service | Eligibility denial | Waiting Period denial | Alternate Benefit provided (Ex - composite filling submitted and an alternate benefit of an amalgam is provided) | Service denied due to clinical review | When you implemented the non-covered services policy, was it based on the claim's date of service or the processing date? | Effective Date of non-covered services law |
|-------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| NJ | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Effective for contracts issued or renewed on 11-28-14 or thereafter. It is unclear as to whether "contracts" refers to participation agreements or coverage contracts. DDNJ intends to automatically apply the law to all dentists and to all fully insured contracts for dates of service 7-1-15 and thereafter | 11/28/2014 |
| NM | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 4/7/2011 |
| NV | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | |
| NY | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of service | |
| OH | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | | Date of service. | |
| OK | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | | Date of service | 11/1/2010 |
| OR | No | Yes | If the service is not covered under the contract, then OR does not hold the dentist to the MPA/ filed fee. If the service is covered and only being denied for frequency or maximum, then OR does hold the dentist to their filed fee. | No | No | Yes | Yes | | Date of Service | 3/18/2010 |
| PA | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | 12/24/2012 |
| PR | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | | N/A | |
| RI | No | No, unless \$1 or more paid | No | No | No | Yes | No | | N/A | 6/18/2009 |
| SC | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | | N/A | |
| SD | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | | Date of Service | 7/1/2010 |
| TN | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | | Date of Service | 5/23/2011 |
| TX | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | 9/1/2011 |
| UT | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | |

| State | Age Limitation denial | No payment on procedure due to patient and/or family maximum reached or frequency denials | Service rendered on a tooth that is not eligible (Ex - sealants) | Member's plan does not include coverage for this service | Eligibility denial | Waiting Period denial | Alternate Benefit provided (Ex - composite filling submitted and an alternate benefit of an amalgam is provided) | Service denied due to clinical review | When you implemented the non-covered services policy, was it based on the claim's date of service or the processing date? | Effective Date of non-covered services law |
|-------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| VA | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | VA's contracts have been written to pay this way all along; nothing will be changing. | 7/1/2010 |
| VT | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | | Date of service | |
| WA | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | We cannot implement per WA state Substitute House Bill 2686 | 6/10/2010 |
| WI | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Processing date | 1/1/2014 |
| WV | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Date of Service | |
| WY | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | | Date of service | 7/1/2011 |