



Health Law Diagnosis

Monitoring the Pulse of Health Care and Life Sciences

June 13, 2023

The Robinson+Cole Health Law Group is committed to examining and reporting on issues important to the health care and life sciences industries. For more updates on news and developments for the health care and life sciences industries, we invite you to [subscribe to our Health Law Diagnosis blog](#).

[Connecticut Health Care Bill Revises Provider-Payor Contracting Requirements to Address Competitive Concerns](#)

Authored by: [Nathaniel T. Arden](#), [Conor O. Duffy](#), and [Michael G. Lisitano](#)

On June 7, 2023, the Connecticut Legislature passed [HB6669](#), “An Act Protecting Patients and Prohibiting Unnecessary Health Care Costs” (“the Act”), which includes a prohibition on certain contractual clauses in agreements between health care providers and insurance companies. The Act implements previously-[announced](#) legislative initiatives that are the product of collaboration between Connecticut Governor Ned Lamont and the Connecticut Hospital Association, as well as other health care stakeholders. Governor Lamont is expected to sign the Act but has not done so as of this publication.

Among other things, the Act: (i) prohibits so-called all-or-nothing, anti-steering, anti-tiering, and gag clauses in network agreements between health insurance payors and providers; (ii) establishes new required contract provisions related to tiered networks; and (iii) clarifies notice requirements related to provider-payor contract terminations. Each of these changes is outlined in more detail below.

Prohibitions on Certain Contract Clauses (Effective July 1, 2024)

The Act newly prohibits and renders null and void the following contract clauses in agreements between health care providers and (i) health carriers, (ii) plan administrators, or (iii) plan sponsors (i.e., health insurers and other payors) or any of their respective agents: “all-or-nothing clauses,” “anti-steering clauses,” “anti-tiering clauses,” and “gag clauses.” This prohibition applies to payor contracts that are offered, solicited, entered into, renewed, or amended on or after July 1, 2024. Importantly, the Act also prohibits such clauses in “written policies” and “written procedures” of payors, but does not define either such term. The inclusion of these terms suggests that the Act prohibits payors from unilaterally modifying their policies in a manner that would have a similar effect as inclusion of one of the prohibited clauses in a payor contract.

The Act defines each of the prohibited clauses. We summarize the definition of each term below but note that interpretation of specific clauses will require analysis of the exact statutory definitions in the Act:

- An “all-or-nothing clause” generally means any provision in a payor agreement that requires the payor to either (a) include all members of a health care provider (e.g., an entire physician practice) in a certain insurance network plan; or (b) enter into an additional contract with the health care provider’s affiliate as a condition to entering into a contract with such health care provider.
- An “anti-steering clause” generally means any provision in a payor agreement that restricts the ability of the payor to encourage an enrollee to obtain a health care service from a competitor of a hospital or health system, including offering incentives to encourage enrollees to utilize specific providers;
- An “anti-tiering clause” generally means any provision in a payor agreement that either: (a) restricts the payor from modifying a tiered network plan or assigning providers into tiers, including tiering providers by cost or quality; or (b) requires the payor to place all members of a provider in the same tier of a tiered network plan;
- A “gag clause” generally means any provision in a payor agreement that restricts the ability of a provider or payor to: (a) disclose price or quality information (including the allowed amount, negotiated rates or discounts, fees for services, or any other claim-related financial obligations) to any governmental entity or such government entity’s contractors or agents, enrollee, treating provider of an enrollee, plan sponsor, or

Tiered Network Contract Requirements (Effective July 1, 2024)

Existing Connecticut law permits tiered networks, by which payors may identify and group certain health care providers and facilities into specific tiers to which different reimbursement, cost-sharing, or participating provider access requirements apply for the same health care services.

The Act requires all contracts between health care providers and health insurers involving a tiered network entered into, renewed, or amended on or after July 1, 2024, to include a provision requiring the health insurer, upon request, to provide the provider's calculated score, related data, and a description of the standards used for tiering. Additionally, the Act requires health insurers to establish a grievance process for providers to appeal tiering decisions and performance measurements. Health insurers are required to provide at least the following information related to their tiering standards:

- Definitions of measures related to quality, cost, efficiency, satisfaction, and any other factors used to measure performance;
- A defined time period of not less than one year to measure performance;
- A summary of the grievance process to appeal tiering decisions and performance measurements, which process must also be posted on the insurer's website.

The Act requires that the tiering standards remain in place for at least one year and that health insurers provide at least 90 days' written notice to providers before changes are made to such tiering standards.

Updated Network Termination Notice Requirements (Effective Upon Passage)

Finally, the Act makes various clarifications to existing Connecticut law regarding termination or nonrenewal of network participation agreements between health insurers and health care providers. These issues have historically been the source of disputes between health insurers and health care providers, and confusion for enrollees affected by such disputes. The Act revises the notice requirements to provide that:

- Health insurers and health care providers must each provide the other with at least 90 days' written notice of intent to terminate or not renew an agreement (measured from the proposed date of termination or nonrenewal, as applicable).
- In the case of termination of a participating provider's network agreement with a health insurer and health care provider, the Act revises the patient notice requirement, providing that health insurers are required to make a good faith effort to give at least 30 days' written notice of termination or nonrenewal to all covered patients being treated on a regular basis by or at the participating provider prior to the contract end or termination date. However, the Act adds a new provision indicating that this notice requirement is not applicable where the health insurer and the participating provider agree in writing on an extension of the agreement for up to one year.
- The Act clarifies that the current continuity of care requirement that obligates health insurers and participating providers that are hospitals (or parent corporations of hospitals) to continue to abide by the terms of a participation agreement, including its reimbursement terms, for a period of 60 days post-termination or nonrenewal, applies to (i) intermediaries of hospitals as well as hospitals and their parents, and (ii) to the reimbursement terms for all health services and provisions under the applicable contract.

In addition to [changes](#) affecting the certificate of need process and the above changes affecting payor-provider contracting, the Act includes other changes to Connecticut health care laws. Those changes will be discussed in future *Health Law Diagnosis* posts.

[Connecticut Legislature Passes Law Limiting Physician, PA and APRN Non-Compete Agreements](#)

Authored by: [Stephen W. Aronson](#), [Conor O. Duffy](#), and [Erin C. Howard](#)

On June 5, 2023, the Connecticut Legislature passed Public Act [No. 23-97](#), "An Act Concerning Health and Wellness for Connecticut Residents" ("the Act"). Sections 13 through 15 of the Act make important changes to Connecticut law governing physician, physician assistant (PA), and advanced practice registered nurse (APRN) non-compete agreements. These changes are summarized below and scheduled to take effect July 1, 2023. Governor Lamont is expected to sign the Act but has not done so as of the date of this publication.

Physician Non-Compete Agreements

Existing Connecticut law requires physician non-compete agreements to meet certain requirements in order to be enforceable. Physician non-competes may not have a duration of more than one year, and must be (i) limited to a 15-mile radius from the physician's primary practice site, (ii) separately and individually signed by the physician, (iii) necessary to protect a legitimate business interest, (iv) reasonably limited in time, geographic scope, and practice restrictions as necessary to protect such business interest, and (v) otherwise consistent with law and public policy. (See Connecticut General Statutes § 20-14p).

The Act first changes the definition of “primary practice site” (which currently is based on where the physician generates a majority of professional revenue) to instead require the primary practice site to be a single location, mutually agreed upon by the parties, and expressly defined in the non-compete agreement.

The Act also newly provides that physician non-compete agreements entered into, amended, extended, or renewed on or after October 1, 2023, are generally unenforceable if (i) the physician does not agree to a proposed material change to the compensation terms of employment before the agreement is extended or renewed and (ii) the agreement expires or is terminated by the employer, other than a termination for cause. Notably, this new directive related to material compensation changes does not apply to a non-compete agreement between a physician and a group practice of 35 physicians or less if the physicians own a majority of the practice.

APRN and PA Non-Compete Agreements

Connecticut previously did not place statutory limitations on APRN or PA non-compete agreements. The Act implements new limitations on APRN and PA non-compete agreements similar to the limitations on physician non-compete agreements. The Act applies to APRN and PA non-compete agreements entered into, amended, extended, or renewed on or after October 1, 2023. Such APRN and PA non-compete agreements may not have a duration longer than one year and must be limited to a 15-mile radius from the primary site where the APRN or PA practices. The definition of primary site for APRNs and PAs matches the definition of primary site for physicians (i.e., it must be a single location agreed upon in writing between the parties to the agreement). Additionally, under the Act, as with physician non-competes, an APRN or PA covenant not to compete is valid and enforceable only if it is (i) necessary to protect a legitimate business interest, (ii) reasonably limited in time, geographic scope, and practice restrictions as needed to protect that interest, (iii) separately and individually signed by the APRN or the PA, and (iv) otherwise consistent with law and public policy.

The Act also establishes exceptions to the enforceability of APRN and PA non-compete agreements consistent with those applicable to physician non-compete agreements. For example, APRN and PA non-compete agreements are unenforceable when an employer terminates the employment relationship without cause, or when the employment agreement was not made in anticipation of a partnership or ownership agreement and the agreement expires or is not renewed, unless before such expiration or non-renewal the employer made a bona fide offer to renew the agreement on the same or similar terms. The Act additionally deems APRN and PA non-compete agreements unenforceable when the APRN or PA does not agree to a proposed material compensation change in connection with a renewal or extension of an agreement, and the agreement is not renewed by the employer or is terminated by the employer (other than for cause). However, the PA and APRN non-compete provisions of the Act notably do not contain the exception described above concerning enforceability of a physician non-compete regardless of a material compensation change by a group practice of 35 physicians or less that is a majority physician-owned.

Effective Date & Additional Changes in the Act

*The Sections of the Act described above will take effect on **July 1, 2023**, absent an unexpected veto of the Act by the Governor, but as noted above the material statutory changes will apply to non-compete agreements entered into, amended, extended, or renewed on or after October 1, 2023.*

The Act also makes various changes to Connecticut health care laws in other areas, including licensure, hospital privileges, medical records requests, and the opioid prescribing process. These changes will be discussed in detail in future *Health Law Diagnosis* posts.

If you have any questions, please contact any member of Robinson+Cole's [Health Law Group](#).

[Lisa M. Boyle \(Chair\)](#) | [Nathaniel T. Arden](#) | [Conor O. Duffy](#) | [Kathleen G. Healy](#) | [Leslie J. Levinson](#)

[Danielle H. Tangorre](#) | [Melissa \(Lisa\) Thompson](#) | [Theodore J. Tucci](#) | [Patricia D. Weitzman](#)

[Yelena Greenberg](#) | [Erin C. Howard](#) | [Michael G. Lisitano](#) | [Peter H. Struzzi](#)

Visit Our Blog



Health Law **Diagnosis**

Above is a post from our [Health Law Diagnosis](#) blog, where we post on fraud and abuse, government enforcement, Medicare and Medicaid, reimbursement, hospitals and health systems, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and other areas of interest.

For more updates on news and developments for the health care and life sciences industries, we invite you to [subscribe](#).



© 2023 Robinson & Cole LLP. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission. This document should not be considered legal advice and does not create an attorney-client relationship between Robinson+Cole and you. Consult your attorney before acting on anything contained herein. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Robinson+Cole or any other individual attorney of Robinson+Cole. The contents of this communication may contain ATTORNEY ADVERTISING under the laws of various states. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.