

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 # 772944

NOTICE OF DECISION

PARTY

██████████
Re: ██████████
██████████
██████████

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On ██████ ██████ 2016, BeneCare Dental Health Plans (“BeneCare”), administered by the Connecticut Dental Health Partnership (“CTDHP”), sent ██████████, (the “Appellant”) a Notice of Action (“NOA”) denying a request for prior authorization of orthodontia for ██████████, her minor child. The NOA stated that the severity of ██████ malocclusion did not meet the criteria set in state regulations to approve the proposed treatment.

On ██████ 2016, the Appellant requested an administrative hearing to contest the Department’s denial of prior authorization of orthodontia.

On ██████ 2016, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) issued a notice scheduling the administrative hearing for ██████ 2016.

On ██████ 2016, in accordance with sections 17b-60, 17-61, and 4-176e to 4-189 inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, OLCRAH held an administrative hearing via telephone conference call. The following individuals were present at the hearing:

██████████, the Appellant
██████ ██████ the minor child

Kate Nadeau, CTDHP Grievance & Appeals Representative
Christina Boisvert, CTDHP Grievance & Appeals Representative in training
Khalat Nerwai, translator
Dr. Julius Gold, CTDHP Dental Consultant
Maureen Foley-Roy, Hearing Officer

The hearing officer held the hearing record open for the submission of additional evidence. On [REDACTED] 2016, the record closed.

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The issue is whether BeneCare's denial of prior authorization for [REDACTED] orthodontic services through the Medicaid program was correct.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Appellant is the mother of the minor child, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] whose date of birth is [REDACTED] 2002. (Hearing record and Exhibit 1: Dental Claim form)
2. [REDACTED] is a participant in the Medicaid program, as administered by the Department. (Hearing Record)
3. [REDACTED] is fourteen years old and the dental records submitted show that he still has some baby teeth. (Exhibit 2b: Letter from Dr. Kiss and Exhibit 3: Dr. Monastersky's Scoring Assesment sheet)
4. [REDACTED] primary dentist pulled the baby teeth after the records were submitted. Two new teeth are coming in on [REDACTED] right side but nothing on the left. (Appellant's testimony)
5. The Connecticut Dental Health Partnership, ("CTDHP") also known as BeneCare Dental Plans, is the Department's contractor for reviewing dental provider's requests for prior authorization of orthodontic treatment. (Hearing Record)
6. On [REDACTED] 2016, BeneCare received a prior authorization request from Dr. Lance Kiss for orthodontics (braces) for [REDACTED] (Exhibit 1)
7. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, BeneCare received a Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record with a score of 28 points, dental models X-rays and photographs of [REDACTED] mouth from Dr. Kiss. (Exhibit. 2: Malocclusion Assessment Record signed [REDACTED] 2016)
8. Dr. Kiss commented that [REDACTED] teeth were severely crowded, that he had still had primary teeth and a posterior cross bite. (Exhibit 2b: Letter from Dr. Kiss)

9. On [REDACTED] 2016, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, BeneCare's orthodontic consultant, reviewed the X Rays and records submitted by the treating orthodontist and determined that [REDACTED] scored 17 points on the Malocclusion Assessment Record. Dr. Monastersky noted that there were no severe deviations affecting [REDACTED] mouth and underlying structures. He commented that [REDACTED] showed a delayed eruption pattern but the bicuspids would erupt on their own. (Exhibit. 3: Dr. Monastersky's Malocclusion Assessment Record)
10. On [REDACTED] 2016, BeneCare issued a notice denying the request for braces for [REDACTED] (Exhibit 4: Notice of Action for Denied Services)
11. On [REDACTED] 2016, the Appellant submitted her hearing request form which included comments from [REDACTED] regular general dentist. The dentist stated that teeth numbered 7 and 10 were in crossbite which caused those teeth to fracture. [REDACTED] dentist also stated that he may eventually need root canal therapy and have periodontal problems.(Exhibit 5: Hearing Request Form)
12. On [REDACTED] 2016, Dr. Geoffrey Drawbridge, DDS, consultant for BeneCare, reviewed [REDACTED] records and arrived at a score of 16 points on the Malocclusion Assessment Record. Dr. Drawbridge noted that there were no severe deviations affecting [REDACTED] mouth and underlying structures. (Exhibit 8: Dr. Drawbridge's Malocclusion Assessment Record)
13. On [REDACTED] 2016, BeneCare issued a letter to the Appellant notifying her that the dentist's request for approval of braces for [REDACTED] was denied for the following reasons: his score of 16 points was less than the 26 points needed for coverage; there was no presence found of any deviations affecting the mouth or underlying structures; there was no evidence presented of any treatment by a licensed psychiatrist or psychologist related to the conditions of his teeth. (Exhibit 7: BeneCare determination letter)
14. [REDACTED] chews his food with his front teeth because it is painful to chew with his back teeth. (Appellant's testimony)
15. [REDACTED] experiences a lot of discomfort with his teeth and such discomfort keeps him awake. (Appellant's testimony)
16. On [REDACTED] 2016, Dr. Nadia Mirza ([REDACTED] regular dentist) submitted X rays and a letter stating that [REDACTED] has severe crowding and that two of his teeth are in crossbite. Dr. Mirza stated that two of [REDACTED] teeth were fractured but that no restoration could be done. Dr. Mirza's letter also stated that she had reviewed the orthodontist scoring sheets but she did not comment on them. Dr. Mirza did not state how orthodontia was medically necessary for [REDACTED] Appellant's Exhibit A: letter from Dr. Mirza)

17. On [REDACTED] 2016, Dr. Monastersky reviewed the submissions of Dr. Mirza. Dr. Monastersky commented that two of [REDACTED] teeth were in cross bite and that they appeared to be worn down. Dr. Monastersky stated that the teeth were stable and did not have to be restored. (Exhibit 10: [REDACTED] 2016 E-mail from Dr. Monastersky)
18. There was no evidence in the record that [REDACTED] experiences severe emotional, mental or behavioral issues due to the condition of his teeth.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Section 17b-2(8) of the Connecticut General Statutes states that the Department of Social Services is designated as the state agency for the administration of the Medicaid program pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act.
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. For the purposes of the administration of the medical assistance programs by the Department, "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 (a)]

4. The Department of Social Services shall cover orthodontic services for a Medicaid recipient under twenty-one years of age when the Salzman 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 Salzman 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 individual's daily functioning. [Sec. 17b-282e of the Supplement to the General Statutes]
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. BeneCare correctly found that ██████ malocclusion did not meet the criteria for severity, or 26 points, as established in state regulations.
7. BeneCare correctly determined that ██████ did not have a deviation of such severity that it would cause irreversible damage to the teeth and underlying structures if left untreated.
8. BeneCare correctly determined that there was no evidence of emotional issues directly related to ██████ teeth.
9. BeneCare correctly determined that ██████ medical conditions do not render braces medically necessary for him at this time as per the regulations.

DISCUSSION

Testimony at the hearing indicated that there had been changes since the records had initially been presented. The Appellant testified that ██████ regular dentist had removed his baby teeth and had referred to fractures of ██████ teeth in the hearing request. The Appellant had requested that the hearing record remain open so ██████ regular dentist could review the CTDHP dental consultant's scoring sheets and comment. Dr. Mirza (██████ dentist) submitted X-Rays but did not comment on the assessments. She did not state that orthodontia was medically necessary for ██████ nor explain how it would improve

the condition of his teeth and mouth. Both Dr. Mirza and the CTDHP dental consultant who reviewed the post hearing submissions stated that there was no restoration to be done for [REDACTED] teeth. While there are issues with [REDACTED] teeth, there was no evidence from any of the dentists who reviewed his records that orthodontia could correct those issues and was medically necessary. CTDHP was correct when it denied braces for [REDACTED]

DECISION

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

Maureen Foley-Roy
Maureen Foley-Roy
Hearing Officer

CC: Diane D'Ambrosio, CTDHP
Rita LaRosa, CTDHP

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 Administrative Hearings and Appeals, 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 the Commissioner's 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.