

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

██████████ 2020  
SIGNATURE CONFIRMATION

██████████  
Request # 151896

NOTICE OF DECISION

PARTY

██████████  
██████████  
██████████

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On ██████████, 2020, CT Dental Health Partnership (“CTDHP”), the Dental Administrator for the Department of Social Services (the “Department”) sent ██████████ (“the child”), a Notice of Action (“NOA”) denying a request for prior authorization for orthodontic treatment indicating it was not medically necessary.

On ██████████, 2020, ██████████ (the “Appellant”), requested an administrative hearing to contest the Department’s denial of the prior authorization request for orthodontia.

On ██████████ 2020, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) issued a notice scheduling the administrative hearing for ██████████ 2020.

On ██████████ 2020, 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. The following individuals were present at the hearing:

██████████, Appellant  
Kate Nadeau, CTDHP Representative  
Dr. Greg Johnson, Dental Consultant for CTDHP via telephone  
Carla Hardy, Hearing Officer

The hearing record remained open for a third review of new evidence provided by the Appellant. The hearing record closed on [REDACTED] 2020.

### **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE**

The issue to be decided is whether CTDHP's denial of a prior authorization request for the child's orthodontia as not medically necessary was correct and in accordance with state statutes and regulations.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Appellant is the child's mother. (Hearing Record)
2. The child is 11 years old (DOB [REDACTED]08). (Exhibit 1: Prior Authorization Claim Form)
3. CTDHP is the Department's contractor for reviewing dental provider's requests for prior authorization of orthodontic treatment. (Hearing Record)
4. [REDACTED] (the "treating orthodontist") is the child's treating orthodontist. (Exhibit 1, Hearing Summary)
5. On [REDACTED] 2020, CTDHP received a prior authorization request for braces for the child. (Exhibit 1; Hearing Summary)
6. The prior authorization request included a Malocclusion Severity Assessment. The treating orthodontist assigned the child a score of thirty (30) points. Also included were models and x-rays of the child's teeth. The treating orthodontist noted there is no presence of other severe deviations affecting the child's mouth and underlying structures. (Exhibit 2: the treating orthodontist's Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record; Hearing Summary)
7. On [REDACTED] 2020, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, an Orthodontic Consultant for CTDHP reviewed the dental records and evidence provided by the child's treating orthodontist and assigned her a score of nineteen (19) points on the Malocclusion Severity Assessment. He noted that there is no presence of other severe deviations affecting the child's mouth and underlying structures. He did not approve the request for braces. (Exhibit 3: Dr. Monastersky's Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record; Hearing Summary)
8. On [REDACTED] 2020, CTDHP sent an NOA to the child advising her that the prior authorization request received from her provider for braces (orthodontics) was denied as not medically necessary, because (1) her score of nineteen (19) points on the Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record is less than the required twenty-six (26) points; 2) "There is no additional substantial information about the presence of severe deviations affecting the mouth and underlying structures which, if left untreated, would

cause irreversible damage to the teeth or underlying structures and; 3) There is no evidence that a diagnostic evaluation has been completed by a licensed child psychologist or a licensed child psychiatrist indicating that her dental condition is related to the presence of severe mental, emotional, and/or behavior problems, disturbances or dysfunctions as defined in the current edition of the Diagnostic Statistical Manual and that orthodontic treatment will significantly improve such problems, disturbances or dysfunctions.” (Exhibit 4: NOA, [REDACTED]/20)

9. On [REDACTED], 2020, the Department received the Appellant’s request for an expedited appeal/hearing. (Exhibit 5: Request for appeal and administrative hearing; Hearing Summary)
10. On [REDACTED] 2020, CTDHP sent to the Appellant a denial letter for the requested expedited appeal/hearing. The child’s life was not at risk in waiting for a regular decision. She therefore did not meet the expedited criteria. (Exhibit 6: Denial letter for an expedited appeal/hearing; Hearing Summary)
11. On [REDACTED] 2020, pursuant to the Appellant’s appeal filed on [REDACTED] 2020, Dr. Vincent Fazzino, DMD, a Dental Consultant for CTDHP conducted an appeal review of the child’s dental records. He assigned the child’s malocclusion a score of twenty (20) points. He noted that there is no presence of other severe deviations affecting the child’s mouth and underlying structures. Dr. Fazzino did not approve the request for braces. (Exhibit 7: Dr. Fazzino’s Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record)
12. On [REDACTED] 2020, CTDHP sent a letter to the Appellant advising her that the child’s score of twenty (20) points was less than the twenty-six points (26) needed to receive coverage for braces. There was no presence of any deviations found affecting the mouth or underlying structures or presence of related mental, emotional and/or behavior problems, disturbances, or dysfunctions. CTDHP upheld the previous denial for braces. (Exhibit 8: Determination Letter, [REDACTED]/20)
13. On the date of this hearing, the Appellant submitted a letter from her treating orthodontist that included photographs of the child’s teeth. The letter indicated that the orthodontist recently completed a orthodontic consultation for the child and listed the following clinical findings: Class I; no midline deviation; maxillary spacing; no mandibular arch length discrepancy; moderate overjet ~ 3mm; deep overbite; buccal crossbite at # UR4-5; diastema; and possible impaction of 3<sup>rd</sup> molars. (Appellant’s Exhibit A: Letter with Photos from the Treating Orthodontist dated [REDACTED]20)
14. On the date of this hearing, the Appellant’s evidence was submitted to CTDHP for a third review. (Hearing Record)
15. The child is not receiving psychiatric or psychological treatment due to the condition of her mouth. (Appellant’s Testimony)

16. On [REDACTED] 2020, Dr. Benson Monastersky, DMD, a Dental Consultant for CTDHP reviewed the Appellant's new evidence. The evidence submitted did not change the CTDHP's original determination to deny the braces. (Exhibit 10: Email from CTDHP, [REDACTED] 20)
17. The issuance of this decision is timely under Connecticut General Statutes 17b-61(a), which requires that a decision be issued within 90 days of the request for an administrative hearing. The Appellant requested an administrative hearing on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2020. Therefore, this decision is due not later than [REDACTED], 2020. However, the close of the hearing record, which had been anticipated to close on [REDACTED] 2020, did not close for the admission of evidence until [REDACTED] 2020 at the Appellant's request in order for her to submit additional evidence and have it reviewed. Because this 4-day delay in the close of the hearing record arose from the Appellant's request, this final decision was not due until [REDACTED] 2020, and is therefore timely. (Hearing Record)


### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Connecticut General Statutes §17b-262 provides that the Department may make such regulations as are necessary to administer the medical assistance program.
2. 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(a)]
3. 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. [Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(d)]

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 individuals daily functioning. . . ." [Conn. Gen. Stat § 17b-282e]
5. "The study models submitted for prior authorization must clearly show the occlusal deviations and support the total point score of the preliminary assessment. . . ." [Regs., Conn. State Agencies § 17-134d-35(f)(1)(D)].
6. Because the child's two CTDHP Malocclusion Severity Assessments were less than 26 points and there was no substantial evidence presented about the presence of severe deviations affecting her mouth and underlying structures, orthodontic services are not determined medically necessary.
7. Because the Appellant did not provide evidence from a licensed child psychologist or licensed child psychiatrist indicating the child suffered from the presence of severe mental, emotional, and/or behavioral problems, disturbances or dysfunctions caused by her dental deformity, orthodontic services are not determined medically necessary.
8. The child's malocclusion severity does not meet the requirements for medical necessity for approval of the prior authorization request for orthodontic treatment.
9. CTDHP correctly denied the request for orthodontic treatment for the child as it is not medically necessary.

**DECISION**

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carla Hardy  
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 Administrative Hearings and Appeals, 55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105-3725.

### 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 06105-3725. 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.