

### Part C – Decision Under Appeal

The decision under appeal is the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction (the “Ministry”) Reconsideration Decision, dated June 5, 2025 in which the Ministry determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a dental supplement in respect of the following items:

- Removal of Inlays/Onlays/Crown Veneers (Fee Code 29301) for two of the appellant’s teeth (35 and 46);
- Restoration, Tooth Coloured, Bonded, Core, in Conjunction with Crown (Fee Code 23602) for the same two teeth;
- A porcelain, ceramic/polymer glass crown (Fee Code 27211) for tooth number 35; and
- Commercial lab fees (Fee Code 99111).

The Ministry determined that:

- the Appellant was not eligible for a supplement in respect of Fee Codes 29301 and 99111 because there is no provision for coverage of these items under the Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disability Regulation as these fee codes do not appear in either Schedule of Fee Allowances- Dentist (the “Basic Schedule”) or the Schedule of Fee Allowances- Emergency Dental – Dentist (the “Emergency Schedule”); and
- the Appellant was not eligible for a supplement in respect of Fee Codes 23602 and 27211 because the Appellant had not satisfied the requirements for bridgework coverage that are set out in section 4.1(2) of Schedule C to the Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disability Regulation or coverage as an emergency dental service because the Appellant had not demonstrated that the bridgework was necessary for the immediate relief of pain or the need to immediately control infection or bleeding.

The Ministry also determined that the Appellant was not eligible for coverage of any of these items as a life threatening need or as a crisis supplement under Section 69 and Section 57(3) of the Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disability Regulation.

**Part D – Relevant Legislation**

*Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c.41 (the “Act”)- section 25

Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation, B.C. Reg. 265/2002 (the “Regulation”)- sections 57, 63, 63.1, 64, and 69, Schedule C- sections 1, 4, 4.1, and 5

## Part E – Summary of Facts

The hearing proceeded as a videoconference hearing on August 20, 2025. In attendance, all by videoconference, were the Appellant, the Appellant's advocate, and a representative of the Ministry.

### *Information before the Ministry at the time of the Reconsideration Decision*

The information before the Ministry at the time of the Reconsideration Decision included the following:

- the Appellant's Request for Reconsideration, May 29, 2025, to which were attached a number of documents, including:
  - e-mails from the Appellant to an advocacy society;
  - e-mails between the Appellant's dental provider and the Ministry;
  - an undated letter from the Appellant's dentist (the "Dentist"), confirming that a crown was placed at tooth 35 without prior authorization from the Ministry due to pain and a risk of further deterioration;
  - a summary of the claims submitted by the dental provider;
  - an invoice from the dental provider, dated November 22, 2024, in the amount of \$322.00 in respect of the "Rmvl, Inly/Only/Crwn/Vnr" (Fee Code 29301) and "resin core in conj with crown or fixed bridge" (Fee Code 23602) for tooth 35;
  - an invoice from the dental provider, dated November 25, 2024, in the amount of \$1,678.00 in respect of the "Rmvl, Inly/Only/Crwn/Vnr" (Fee Code 29301) and "resin core in conj with crown or fixed bridge" (Fee Code 23602), both for tooth 46, "Commercial Lab Fees (Fee Code 99111), and "Porcelain/Ceramic Jacket-Crown" (Fee Code 27201 in respect of tooth 35;
  - an e-mail from the Appellant to the Ministry reconsideration team setting out the history of her claims and describing her various health conditions, including Crohn's Disease and Irritable Bowel Disease;
  - further e-mails between the Ministry and the Appellant's dental provider; and
  - the summary of the decision to be reconsidered; and
  - a handwritten note from the Appellant, requesting an extension to complete her reconsideration request; and
- a letter, dated May 28, 2025, from an advocacy society to the Ministry, setting out the Appellant's position on the reconsideration of the Ministry denial of a dental supplement.

The Appellant filed her Notice of Appeal on June 26, 2025 and included a types noted, setting out the reasons for the appeal, as follows:

- she needed dental work done and was unsure about coverage;
- her dentist had advised her that a pre-determination was in;
- two Ministry workers had told her that the services were covered; and
- the Ministry's dental insurer does provide coverage for crowns in specific circumstances.

*Information Submitted Prior to the Hearing of the Appeal*

Prior to the hearing of the appeal, the Appellant submitted the following (the Appellant's Submission"):

- a written argument, prepared by the Appellant's advocate;
- a questionnaire completed by the Dentist, which noted the following:
  - because of the decay under the Appellant's existing crown, a filling or other restorative service was not an option and that a new crown was the only option;
  - it was preferable to retain the tooth than to extract it and replace it with a removeable prosthetic;
  - a removeable prosthetic could not replace a real tooth in terms of function;
  - a removeable prosthetic could not replace the function of a real tooth, would offer less strong chewing ability, and, most importantly, in the case of the Appellant, was more prone to causing impaction and discomfort, and carried an increased risk of inflammation and infections; and
  - a letter from the Appellant's rheumatologist (the "Rheumatologist"), dated September 5, 2025, setting out that it would be reasonable to worry about her ability to insert and remove a prosthetic as it may be too painful for her.

At the outset of the hearing, the Ministry advised that it did not oppose the inclusion of the Appellant's Submission, which is not determinative to the issue of admissibility.

*The Hearing*The Appellant

The Appellant stated that she is suffering from both Crohn's Disease and Fibromyalgia. Both of these conditions cause her considerable pain. She noted that tooth decay is particularly problematic. She described having constant pain in her mouth as a result.

The Appellant addressed the potential of a removable denture, noting that the pain around her teeth and gums would make a removable prosthetic especially painful for her. She conceded that this had not been an option discussed with her dentist. She did advise that her dentist had confirmed that her dental issues could not be resolved through restorative services.

The Appellant stated that she already had existing crowns on teeth 35 and 46, which precluded restoration and made a filling insufficient.

The Appellant stated that a removable prosthetic increased the risk of infection and inflammation to her mouth, making a removable prosthetic unsafe.

The Appellant did concede that it was not physically impossible for her to place a removable prosthetic dental device but that doing so would likely cause her to have considerably increased pain, as per the advice of her Rheumatologist. She also expressed concerns about how a removable prosthetic would affect the bone structure in her mouth. She noted further that the Rheumatologist confirmed that the placement of the For these reasons, the Appellant stated that it was her position that the use of a removable prosthetic was precluded in the case of her dental issues.

The Appellant confirmed that she is not taking issue with the denial of a supplement in respect of Fee Codes 29301 (the removal of the existing crowns), Fee Code 99111 (lab fees), or Fee Code 23602 (restoration of crowns) but, instead, is only taking issue with the denial of coverage for the crown (Fee Code 27211).

Ministry

At the hearing of the Appeal, the Ministry went through the history of the Appellant's request, pointing out the communications between the Ministry and the dental provider. September 27, 2024.

The Ministry noted that the medical information provided with the Appellant's Submission was not included with the original application which, from the Ministry's standpoint, did not provide enough information to satisfy the legislative requirements for a bridgework supplement.

*Admissibility of New Information*

Having regard to the fact that, aside from the argument prepared by the Appellant's advocate, the Appellant's Submission included evidence about the Appellant's ability to tolerate a removable prosthetic and the reasons why restorative services were not an option for the Appellant, the panel admits the Appellant's Submission as information that was not before the Ministry at the time of the Reconsideration Decision but which is reasonably necessary for a full and fair hearing on all of the matters related to the Reconsideration Decision, pursuant to section 22(4) of the *Employment and Assistance Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c. 40 (the "Act").

Likewise, other than the legal arguments advanced by the Appellant's advocate at the hearing, the Appellant's oral evidence addressed the same issues and is also admitted by the panel under section 22(4) of the Act.

## Part F – Reasons for Panel Decision

### *Issue on Appeal*

The issue in this appeal is whether the Ministry was reasonable in its determination that the Appellant was not eligible for a dental supplement or a crown and bridgework supplement in respect of the services which were requested because:

- the services requested are not provided for in either the Basic Schedule or the Emergency Schedule as required under Section(s) 63 and 64 of the Regulation and Section(s) 1, 4 and 5 of Schedule C to the Regulation;
- the Appellant had not established that she is unable to use a removeable prosthetic, as required by section 4.1(2) of Schedule C to the Regulation; and
- the Appellant was not eligible for a dental supplement, emergency dental supplement, or a crown and bridgework supplement as a life-threatening need or as a crisis supplement under Section(s) 69 and 57(3) to the Regulation.

### *Positions of the Parties*

#### Appellant

The Appellant's position is that her doctor and dental provider confirmed both the need for a crown at her number 35 tooth and that a removable prosthetic is precluded in the Appellant's case.

#### Ministry

The Ministry's position is that the services requested by the Appellant were not eligible for coverage under the Basic Schedule or the Emergency Schedule and that the Appellant had not met the requirements for a crown or bridgework supplement, as set out in section 4.1(2) of Schedule C to the Regulation. The Ministry agreed that that the information contained with the Appellant Submission, however, warranted another look at the Appellant's eligibility.

### *Panel Decision*

Section 25 of the *Act* authorizes the Ministry to delegate its authority under the *Act*. In the case of the provision of dental benefits, the Ministry has delegated its authority to its

insurers who sets out what services may be provided under the Dental Schedule, the Emergency Dental Schedule, and the Crown Schedule and at what rates.

Basic eligibility for a dental supplement or an emergency dental supplement is governed by sections 63 and 64 of the Regulation. The Appellant meets the basic eligibility criteria in both of those sections.

#### Basic Dental Supplement

Basic dental services, as contemplated in section 4 of Schedule C to the Regulation, however, are defined in section 1 of Schedule C to the Regulation as those services that have fee codes in the Basic Schedule. The Basic Schedule does not provide for coverage in respect of the restorations that were sought by the Appellant (Fee Code 23602) nor for the removal of crowns (Fee Code 29301) as the fee codes for those services do not appear anywhere in the Dental Schedule. Likewise, the Fee Codes for lab fees (99111) and for a crown itself (Fee Code 27211) are also not in the Basic Schedule. In view of this, the Ministry simply does not have the legislative authority to provide a supplement in respect of those treatments as a basic dental service and the panel finds that the Ministry was reasonable in its determination that the Appellant was not eligible for coverage of any of the requested services as a basic dental service.

#### Emergency Dental Supplement

Likewise, emergency dental services, as contemplated in section 5 of Schedule C to the Regulation, are defined in section 1 of Schedule C to the Regulation as those services that have fee codes in the Emergency Schedule. The Emergency Schedule also does not provide for coverage in respect of any of the services for which the Appellant sought a supplement. The result of this is, again, that the Ministry simply does not have the legislative authority to provide a supplement in respect of those treatments as an emergency dental service and the panel finds that the Ministry was reasonable in its determination that the Appellant was not eligible for coverage of any of the requested services as an emergency dental service.

#### Crown and Bridgework Supplement

Basic eligibility for a crown and bridgework supplement is governed by section 63.1 of the Regulation and the Appellant meets the basic eligibility criteria by virtue of being in receipt of disability assistance. However, the Appellant must also satisfy the criteria under section 4.1 of Schedule C to the Regulation and, more specifically, subsection (2) which requires



that a restorative device be precluded and the existence of one of the following circumstances under Section 4.1(2)(b) of Schedule C of the Regulation:

- (i) a dental condition that precludes the use of a removable prosthetic;
- (ii) a physical impairment that makes it impossible for him or her to place a removable prosthetic;
- (iii) an allergic reaction or other intolerance to the composition or materials used in a removable prosthetic; or
- (iv) a mental condition that makes it impossible for him or her to assume responsibility for a removable prosthetic.

In this case, the Dentist clearly determined that, because the Appellant already had an existing crown at tooth 35, restoration was not an option, satisfying the first of the two requirements in section 4.1(2) of Schedule C to the Regulation.

The Appellant is not taking the position that she has a mental condition that makes it impossible for her to assume responsibility for a removable prosthetic. Likewise, she did not provide any evidence that she suffers an allergic reaction to any of the materials that would make up a removable prosthetic.

Instead, the Appellant indicated that her physical pain from fibromyalgia would make it very difficult for her to place a removable prosthetic and that the pain in her mouth would likely make it difficult to tolerate a removable prosthetic. The panel notes that the evidence of both the Dentist and the Rheumatologist support a finding that the Appellant would very likely have increased pain with the placement of a removable prosthetic. However, the eligibility for a crown and bridgework supplement under section 4.1(2)(b)(ii) of Schedule C requires that the Appellant have a physical impairment that makes it *impossible* for him or her to place a removable prosthetic. In this case, the evidence does not go so far as to indicate that it would be impossible for the Appellant to place a removable prosthetic and, as such, the panel finds that the Ministry reasonably determined that the Appellant had not satisfied the requirement of section 4.1(2)(b)(ii) of Schedule C to the Regulation.

Finally, the Appellant also submits that the evidence establishes that she is precluded, because of a dental condition, from the use of a removable prosthetic, which would satisfy section 4.1(2)(b)(i) of Schedule C to the Regulation. The panel finds that there is evidence to support this position.

The evidence of the Dentist is that a removeable prosthetic would increase the risk of inflammation and infection in the Appellant's mouth. In the Appellant's case, the evidence is that she is already at an increased risk of infection because of her Crohn's Disease and while Crohn's Disease, is not in itself a dental condition, there is evidence that the inflammation caused by her Crohn's Disease is causing the infection and tooth decay that has led to her needing the dental work that is the subject of this appeal.

Given that a removeable prosthetic carries with it an increased risk of inflammation and infection for the Appellant, who is already prone to inflammation in her mouth and gums as a result of her Crohn's Disease, the panel finds that the Ministry was not reasonable in its determination that the Appellant had not satisfied it that the Appellant is precluded from using a removeable prosthetic by her dental condition.

In view of all of the above, the panel finds that the Ministry's determination that the Appellant had not satisfied the requirements of section 4.1(2)(b)(i) of Schedule C to the Regulation is not reasonable.

#### Crisis Supplement

While section 57 of the Regulation permits the Ministry to issue a crisis supplement to eligible recipients of disability assistance, section 57(3), expressly precludes the Ministry from providing a crisis supplement in respect of any of the items described in Schedule C to the Regulation and "any other health care goods or services." All dental supplements that the Ministry is authorized to provide are described in Schedule C. As a result, the Ministry also has no legislative authority to provide coverage for the restorations and the crowns as a crisis supplement. As a result, the panel finds that the Ministry reasonably determined that it was not able to provide a supplement for those items to the Appellant under section 57 of the Regulation.

#### Life Threatening Health Need

Likewise, section 69 of the Regulation permits the Ministry to provide a health supplement to persons facing an imminent and life-threatening health need. However, the items for which such a supplement can be provided are limited to those described in sections 2(1)(a), 2(1)(f), and 3 through 3.12, but not section 3(1), of Schedule C of the Regulation. None of those sections deal with dental items. Section 2(1)(a)(f) of Schedule C of the Regulation refers to surgical supplies, Section 2(1)(f) refers to medical transportation, and section 3 through 3.12 of Schedule C of the Regulation refer to a variety of medical items including canes, crutches, and walkers, wheelchairs, wheelchair seating systems, scooters,

toileting, transfers and positioning aids, hospital beds, pressure relief mattresses, floor or ceiling lift devices, breathing devices, orthoses, hearing instruments, and non-conventional glucose meters. As none of the items that are referred to in section 69 of the Regulation apply, the panel finds that the Ministry was reasonable in its determination that the Appellant is not eligible for a supplement for restorations and crowns under this section of the Regulation.

### *Conclusion*

The panel has found that the Ministry was unreasonable in its determination as to the Appellant's eligibility in respect of a supplement for a crown, insofar as section 4.1(2)(b)(i) of Schedule C to the Regulation is concerned. As such, the panel rescinds that part of the Reconsideration Decision. In all other respects, the panel confirms the Ministry's decision that the Appellant is not eligible for a supplement in respect of the removal of crowns, restorative services, or lab fees. The Appellant is successful in this appeal to the extent noted above.

## Relevant Legislation

### *Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act*

#### **Delegation of minister's powers and duties**

- 25** (1) Subject to the regulations, the minister may delegate to any person or category of persons any or all of the minister's powers, duties or functions under this Act except
- (a) the power to prescribe forms, and
  - (b) the power to enter into an agreement under section 21 (2) or (2.1), unless section 21 (2.2) applies in relation to the agreement.
- (2) A delegation of the powers, duties or functions of the minister must be in writing and may include any limits or conditions the minister considers advisable.

### *Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation*

#### Crisis supplement

- 57** (1) The minister may provide a crisis supplement to or for a family unit that is eligible for disability assistance or hardship assistance if
- (a) the family unit or a person in the family unit requires the supplement to meet an unexpected expense or obtain an item unexpectedly needed and is unable to meet the expense or obtain the item because there are no resources available to the family unit, and
  - (b) the minister considers that failure to meet the expense or obtain the item will result in
    - (i) imminent danger to the physical health of any person in the family unit, or
    - (ii) removal of a child under the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*.
- (2) A crisis supplement may be provided only for the calendar month in which the application or request for the supplement is made.
- (3) A crisis supplement may not be provided for the purpose of obtaining
- (a) a supplement described in Schedule C, or
  - (b) any other health care goods or services.

(4) A crisis supplement provided for food, shelter or clothing is subject to the following limitations:

- (a) if for food, the maximum amount that may be provided in a calendar month is \$50 for each person in the family unit;
- (b) if for shelter, the maximum amount that may be provided in a calendar month is the smaller of
  - (i) the family unit's actual shelter cost, and
  - (ii) the sum of
    - (A) the maximum set out in section 2 of Schedule A, the maximum set out in section 4 of Schedule A and any supplements provided under section 54.3 [*pre-natal shelter supplement*] or Division 7 [*Housing Stability Supplement*] of Part 5 of this regulation, or
    - (B) the maximum set out in Table 1 of Schedule D, the maximum set out in Table 2 of Schedule D and any supplements provided under section 54.3 or Division 7 of Part 5 of this regulation,
- as applicable, for a family unit that matches the family unit;
- (c) if for clothing, the maximum amount that may be provided in the 12 calendar month period preceding the date of application for the crisis supplement is \$110 for each person in the family unit.

(5) and (6) Repealed. [B.C. Reg. 248/2018, App. 2, s. 2.]

(7) Despite subsection (4) (b), a crisis supplement may be provided to or for a family unit for the following:

- (a) fuel for heating;
- (b) fuel for cooking meals;
- (c) water;
- (d) hydro.

### **Dental supplements**

**63** The minister may provide any health supplement set out in section 4 [*dental supplements*] of Schedule C to or for

- (a) a family unit in receipt of disability assistance,

- (b) a family unit in receipt of hardship assistance, if the health supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who is under 19 years of age, or
- (c) a family unit, if the health supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who is a continued person.

### **Crown and bridgework supplement**

**63.1** The minister may provide a crown and bridgework supplement under section 4.1 of Schedule C to or for

- (a) a family unit in receipt of disability assistance, if the supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who is a person with disabilities, or
- (b) a family unit, if the supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who
  - (i) is a continued person, and
  - (ii) was, on the person's continuation date, a person with disabilities.

### **Emergency dental and denture supplement**

**64** The minister may provide any health supplement set out in section 5 [*emergency dental supplements*] of Schedule C to or for

- (a) a family unit in receipt of disability assistance,
- (b) a family unit in receipt of hardship assistance, or
- (c) a family unit, if the health supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who is a continued person.

### **Health supplement for persons facing direct and imminent life threatening health need**

**69** (1) The minister may provide to a family unit any health supplement set out in sections 2 (1) (a) and (f) [*general health supplements*] and 3 [*medical equipment and devices*] of Schedule C, if the health supplement is provided to or for a person in the family unit who is otherwise not eligible for the health supplement under this regulation, and if the minister is satisfied that

- (a) the person faces a direct and imminent life threatening need and there are no resources available to the person's family unit with which to meet that need,
- (b) the health supplement is necessary to meet that need,

(c) the adjusted net income of any person in the family unit, other than a dependent child, does not exceed the amount set out in section 11 (3) of the Medical and Health Care Services Regulation, and

(d) the requirements specified in the following provisions of Schedule C, as applicable, are met:

(i) paragraph (a) or (f) of section (2) (1);

(ii) sections 3 to 3.12, other than paragraph (a) of section 3 (1).

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1) (c),

(a) "**adjusted net income**" has the same meaning as in section 7.6 of the Medical and Health Care Services Regulation, and

(b) a reference in section 7.6 of the Medical and Health Care Services Regulation to an "eligible person" is to be read as a reference to a person in the family unit, other than a dependent child.

*Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation, Schedule C*

**Definitions**

**1** In this Schedule:

...

**"basic dental service"** means a dental service that

(a) if provided by a dentist,

(i) is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Dentist that is effective September 1, 2017 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister, and

(ii) is provided at the rate set out in that Schedule for the service and the category of person receiving the service,

(b) if provided by a denturist,

(i) is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Denturist that is effective September 1, 2017 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister, and

(ii) is provided at the rate set out in that Schedule for the service and the category of person receiving the service, and

(c) if provided by a dental hygienist,

- (i) is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Dental Hygienist that is effective September 1, 2017 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister, and
- (ii) is provided at the rate set out in that Schedule for the service and the category of person receiving the service;

...

**"emergency dental service"** means a dental service necessary for the immediate relief of pain that,

- (a) if provided by a dentist,
  - (i) is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Emergency Dental — Dentist, that is effective September 1, 2017 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister, and
  - (ii) is provided at the rate set out in that Schedule for the service and the category of the person receiving the service, and
- (b) if provided by a denturist,
  - (i) is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Emergency Dental — Denturist, that is effective September 1, 2017 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister, and
  - (ii) is provided at the rate set out in that Schedule for the service and the category of the person receiving the service;

## Dental supplements

**4 (1)** In this section, **"period"** means

- (a) in respect of a person under 19 years of age, a 2 year period beginning on January 1, 2017, and on each subsequent January 1 in an odd numbered year, and
- (b) in respect of a person not referred to in paragraph (a), a 2 year period beginning on January 1, 2003 and on each subsequent January 1 in an odd numbered year.

(1.1) The health supplements that may be paid under section 63 [*dental supplements*] of this regulation are basic dental services to a maximum of

- (a) \$2 000 each period, if provided to a person under 19 years of age, and
- (b) \$1 000 each period, if provided to a person not referred to in paragraph (a).



(c) Repealed. [B.C. Reg. 163/2005, s. (b).]

(2) Dentures may be provided as a basic dental service only to a person

(a) who has never worn dentures, or

(b) whose dentures are more than 5 years old.

(3) The limits under subsection (1.1) may be exceeded by an amount necessary to provide dentures, taking into account the amount remaining to the person under those limits at the time the dentures are to be provided, if

(a) a person requires a full upper denture, a full lower denture or both because of extractions made in the previous 6 months to relieve pain,

(b) a person requires a partial denture to replace at least 3 contiguous missing teeth on the same arch, at least one of which was extracted in the previous 6 months to relieve pain, or

(c) a person who has been a recipient of disability assistance or income assistance for at least 2 years or a dependant of that person requires replacement dentures.

(4) Subsection (2) (b) does not apply with respect to a person described in subsection (3) (a) who has previously had a partial denture.

(5) The dental supplements that may be provided to a person described in subsection (3) (b), or to a person described in subsection (3) (c) who requires a partial denture, are limited to services under

(a) fee numbers 52101 to 52402 in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Dentist referred to in paragraph (a) of the definition "basic dental service" in section 1 of this Schedule, or

(b) fee numbers 41610, 41612, 41620 and 41622 in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Denturist referred to in paragraph (b) of the definition "basic dental service" in section 1 of this Schedule.

(6) The dental supplements that may be provided to a person described in subsection (3) (c) who requires the replacement of a full upper, a full lower denture or both are limited to services under

(a) fee numbers 51101 and 51102 in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Dentist referred to in paragraph (a) of the definition "basic dental service" in section 1 of this Schedule, or

(b) fee numbers 31310, 31320 or 31330 in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Denturist referred to in paragraph (b) of the definition "basic dental service" in section 1 of this Schedule.

(7) A reline or a rebase of dentures may be provided as a basic dental service only to a person who has not had a reline or rebase of dentures for at least 2 years.

### **Crown and bridgework supplement**

**4.1** (1) In this section, "**crown and bridgework**" means a dental service

- (a) that is provided by a dentist,
- (b) that is set out in the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Crown and Bridgework, that is effective April 1, 2010 and is published on the website of the ministry of the minister,
- (c) that is provided at the rate set out for the service in that Schedule, and
- (d) for which a person has received the pre-authorization of the minister.

(2) A health supplement may be paid under section 63.1 of this regulation for crown and bridgework but only if the minister is of the opinion that the person has a dental condition that cannot be corrected through the provision of basic dental services because

- (a) the dental condition precludes the provision of the restorative services set out under the Restorative Services section of the Schedule of Fee Allowances — Dentist, and
- (b) one of the following circumstances exists:
  - (i) the dental condition precludes the use of a removable prosthetic;
  - (ii) the person has a physical impairment that makes it impossible for the person to place a removable prosthetic;
  - (iii) the person has an allergic reaction or other intolerance to the composition or materials used in a removable prosthetic;
  - (iv) the person has a mental condition that makes it impossible for the person to assume responsibility for a removable prosthetic.

(3) The minister must also be satisfied that a health supplement for crown and bridgework will be adequate to correct the dental condition.

(4) A health supplement for crown and bridgework may not be provided in respect of the same tooth more than once in any period of 60 calendar months.

### **Emergency dental supplements**

**5** The health supplements that may be paid for under section 64 [*emergency dental and denture supplements*] of this regulation are emergency dental services.

2025-0222

### Part G – Order

The panel decision is: (Check one)     ☒ Unanimous     ☐ By Majority

The Panel     ☐ Confirms the Ministry Decision     ☒ Rescinds the Ministry Decision

If the ministry decision is rescinded, is the panel decision referred  
back to the Minister for a decision as to amount?    Yes ☐    No ☒

#### Legislative Authority for the Decision:

*Employment and Assistance Act*

Section 24(1)(a) ☐    or Section 24(1)(b) ☐  
Section 24(2)(a) ☐    or Section 24(2)(b) ☒

### Part H – Signatures

Print Name  
Adam Shee

Signature of Chair

Date (Year/Month/Day)  
2025/September/20

Print Name  
Kamal Gill

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)  
2025/September/23

Print Name  
Kim Louie

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)  
2025/September/22