

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
55 FARMINGTON AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06105-3725

██████████ 2016
Signature Confirmation

Client ID # ██████████
Request #735864

NOTICE OF DECISION
PARTY

██████████
██████████
██████████

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On ██████████ 2015, BeneCare Dental Plans (“BeneCare”) sent ██████████ ██████████ (the “Appellant”) a notice of action denying a request for prior authorization of orthodontia services. The notice indicated that the severity of the Appellant’s malocclusion did not meet the requirements in state law to approve the proposed treatment.

On ██████████ 2015, the Appellant requested an administrative hearing to contest the Department’s denial of prior authorization of orthodontia.

On ██████████ ██████████ 2015, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) issued a notice scheduling the administrative hearing for ██████████, 2015.

On ██████████ 2015, in accordance with sections 17b-60, 17b-61 and 4-176e to 4-189, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, OLCRAH held an administrative hearing.

The following individuals were present at the hearing:

██████████, the Appellant
Luz Quinones, BeneCare’s Representative
Dr. Greg Johnson, Benecare’s Dental Consultant, by phone
Scott Zuckerman, Hearing Officer

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The issue is whether BeneCare's denial of prior authorization through the Medicaid program for [REDACTED] orthodontic services was in accordance with state law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Appellant (D.O.B. [REDACTED]/97) is a participant in the Medicaid program, as administered by the Department of Social Services (the "Department"). (Hearing Record)
2. Benecare is the Department's contractor for reviewing dental providers' requests for prior authorization of orthodontic treatment. (Hearing Record)
3. Bridgeport Orthodontics is the Appellant's treating orthodontist (the "treating orthodontist"). (Hearing Summary, Exhibit 1: Orthodontia Services Claim Form)
4. On [REDACTED], 2015, the treating orthodontist requested prior authorization to complete orthodontic services for the Appellant. (Hearing Summary, Ex. 1: Claim form)
5. On [REDACTED] 2015, the treating orthodontist submitted to Benecare, a Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record with a score of 22 points, dental models and panorex films of the Appellant's mouth. (Ex. 2: Malocclusion Assessment Record, [REDACTED]/15)
6. On [REDACTED] 2015, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, BeneCare's orthodontic dental consultant, independently reviewed the Appellant's models and panoramic radiographs, and arrived at a score of 13 points on a completed Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record. Dr. Monastersky also found no presence of severe deviations affecting the mouth and underlying structures. (Ex.3: Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record, [REDACTED]/15)
7. On [REDACTED] 2015, BeneCare denied the treating orthodontist's request for prior authorization for orthodontic services because the Appellant's score was less than 26 points on the Malocclusion Assessment Record, his teeth were not crooked enough to qualify for braces and the teeth currently posed no threat to the jawbone or the attached soft tissue. (Ex.4A: Notice of Action for Denied Services or Goods, [REDACTED]/15)
8. On [REDACTED] 2015, Dr. Geoffrey Drawbridge, DDS, Benecare's dental consultant, reviewed the Appellant's models and panoramic radiographs and arrived at a score of 15 points on a completed Preliminary Handicapping

Malocclusion Assessment Record. Dr. Drawbridge also found no presence of severe deviations affecting the mouth and underlying structures.(Ex. 6: Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record, █████/15)

9. On █████ 2015, BeneCare notified the Appellant that orthodontic treatment was not medically necessary. (Ex.7: Letter Regarding Orthodontic Services, █████/15)
- 10.The Appellant has some problems chewing food. (Appellant's Testimony)
- 11.The Appellant does not have problems swallowing food. (Appellant's Testimony)
- 12.The Appellant has no pain or infection of the mouth. (Appellant's Testimony)
- 13.The Appellant is not being treated by a qualified psychiatrist or psychologist for related mental emotional or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions. (Appellant's testimony)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. State statute provides that the Department may make such regulations as are necessary to administer the medical assistance program. [Conn. Gen. Stat. §17b-262]
2. State regulations provide that orthodontic services for services provided for individuals less than 21 years of age will be paid for when provided by a qualified dentist and deemed medically necessary as described in these regulations. [Conn. Agencies Regs. §17-134d-35(a)]
3. State regulation provides(a) For purposes of the administration of the medical assistance programs by the Department of Social Services, "medically necessary" and "medical necessity" mean those health services required to prevent, identify, diagnose, treat, rehabilitate or ameliorate an individual's medical condition, including mental illness, or its effects, in order to attain or maintain the individual's achievable health and independent functioning provided such services are: (1) Consistent with generally-accepted standards of medical practice that are defined as standards that are based on (A) credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature that is generally recognized by the relevant medical community, (B) recommendations of a physician-specialty society, (C) the views of physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas, and (D) any other relevant factors; (2) clinically appropriate in terms of type, frequency, timing, site, extent and duration and considered effective for the individual's illness, injury or disease; (3) not primarily for

- the convenience of the individual, the individual's health care provider or other health care providers; (4) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the individual's illness, injury or disease; and (5) based on an assessment of the individual and his or her medical condition. [Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-259b]
4. Public Act 15-5 (June Sp. Session, Section 390) provides, in relevant part, as follows: “ The Department of Social Services shall cover orthodontic services for a Medicaid recipient under twenty-one years of age when the Salzmann Handicapping Malocclusion Index indicates a correctly scored assessment for the recipient of twenty-six points or greater, subject to prior authorization requirements. If a recipient’s score on the Salzmann Handicapping Malocclusion Index is less than twenty-six points, the Department of Social Services shall consider additional substantive information when determining the need for orthodontic services, including (1) documentation of the presence of other severe deviations affecting the oral facial structures; and (2) the presence of severe mental, emotional or behavioral problems or disturbances, as defined in the most current edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, published by the American Psychiatric Association, that affects the individuals daily functioning.”
 5. State regulations provide that the study models submitted for prior authorization must clearly show the occlusal deviations and support the total point score of the preliminary assessment. [Conn. Agencies Regs. §17-134d-35(f)]
 6. In the Appellants case, the study models submitted for prior authorization do not show occlusal deviations and do not meet the requirement of a 26 point score on the preliminary assessment.
 7. In the Appellant’s case, a licensed psychiatrist or licensed psychologist who has limited his or her practice to child psychiatry or child psychology has not recommended that she receive orthodontic treatment to significantly ameliorate her mental, emotional, and or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions.
 8. BeneCare was correct to deny prior authorization because the orthodontic services, are not medically necessary for the Appellant, in accordance with state statutes and regulations.

DECISION

The Appellant's appeal is **DENIED**.



Scott Zuckerman
Hearing Officer

Pc: Diane D'Ambrosio, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership
Rita LaRosa, Connecticut Dental Health Partnership

RIGHT TO REQUEST RECONSIDERATION

The appellant has the right to file a written reconsideration request within **15** days of the mailing date of the decision on the grounds there was an error of fact or law, new evidence has been discovered or other good cause exists. If the request for reconsideration is granted, the appellant will be notified within 25 days of the request date. No response within **25** days means that the request for reconsideration has been denied. The right to request a reconsideration is based on §4-181a(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Reconsideration requests should include specific grounds for the request: for example, indicate what error of fact or law, what new evidence, or what other good cause exists.

Reconsideration requests should be sent to: Department of Social Services, Director, Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings, 55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105.

RIGHT TO APPEAL

The appellant has the right to appeal this decision to Superior Court within 45 days of the mailing of this decision, or 45 days after the agency denies a petition for reconsideration of this decision, provided that the petition for reconsideration was filed timely with the Department. The right to appeal is based on §4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes. To appeal, a petition must be filed at Superior Court. A copy of the petition must be served upon the Office of the Attorney General, 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106 or the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, 55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105. A copy of the petition must also be served on all parties to the hearing.

The **45** day appeal period may be extended in certain instances if there is good cause. The extension request must be filed with the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services in writing no later than **90** days from the mailing of the decision. Good cause circumstances are evaluated by the Commissioner or his designee in accordance with §17b-61 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Agency's decision to grant an extension is final and is not subject to review or appeal.

The appeal should be filed with the clerk of the Superior Court in the Judicial District of New Britain or the Judicial District in which the appellant resides.

