Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-03-8788-01
TRINITY MEDICAL CENTER PO BOX 809053 DALLAS TX 75380	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:
TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 54	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* states: "Carrier remitted to the provider $911.80 as reimbursement for outpatient services rendered to the claimant, however the carrier failed to provide chrarges [sic] of other providers supporting the reimbursement remitted to this provider as fair and reasonable . Provider hereby submits an EOB issued by HNC software who made a recommendation for 80% reimbursement of the total charges for the same type of diagnosis as in this instant, and HNC deemed its reimbursement as fair and reasonable. Therefore, this provider seeks an order from the Commission for, the carrier to, pay an additional $11,759.52."

Amount in Dispute: $11,759.52

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The requestor did not produce any of this kind of evidence in its billing or appeals to the Carrier (only a resubmission of the original billing) indicating the Carrier's reimbursement failed to achieve the standards for payment set by §413.011, Tex. Labor Code or supporting medical records demonstrating the requester provided a substandard quality of care as a result of the Carrier's reimbursement. Nor did the requester produce evidence of established fees and negotiated contract rates for the same or similar services as the services in dispute. Managed care contracts, especially, evidence the amount of money the requester itself charges and accepts for a variety of services, including the very service provided to the worker in the instant case. Such contracts are direct evidence of the amount of money the requester can and does receive voluntarily in an attempt to provide both cost containment and qualify medical services. On the contrary, the requester has failed to produce information in its appeal to the Carrier rationally demonstrating that $15,839.15 is fair and reasonable reimbursement for this procedure performed as an outpatient."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
11/6/02	M	Outpatient Surgical Fees	$11,759.52	$0.00
			Total Due:	$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on July 21, 2003. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on July 25, 2003 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
   - M-Reduction was made on outpatient bill
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the

provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."

3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.

4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)… relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of each explanation of benefits for the disputed services. Neither has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B).

5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid." Review of the submitted documentation finds no documentation of the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed services should be paid. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii).

6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).

7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

   - The requestor did not submit a position statement for consideration in this dispute.
   - The requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* states that "Carrier remitted to the provider $911.80 as reimbursement for outpatient services rendered to the claimant, however the carrier failed to provide chrarges [sic] of other providers supporting the reimbursement remitted to this provider as fair and reasonable . Provider hereby submits an EOB issued by HNC software who made a recommendation for 80% reimbursement of the total charges for the same type of diagnosis as in this instant, and HNC deemed its reimbursement as fair and reasonable. Therefore, this provider seeks an order from the Commission for, the carrier to, pay an additional $11,759.52."
   - In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted redacted EOBs that the requestor asserts are for similar medical services performed in the same locality and geographical area. However, the requestor did not discuss or explain how the sample EOBs support the requestor's position that additional payment is due. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not establish that the sample EOBs are for services that are substantially similar to the services in dispute. The redacted EOBs indicate that payment was reduced based on the insurance carriers' fair and reasonable reimbursement methodology; however, the carriers' fair and reasonable reimbursement methodologies are not described on the EOBs. Nor did the requestor explain or discuss the sample carriers' methodologies or how the payment amount was determined for each sample EOB. The requestor did not discuss whether such payment was typical for such services or for the services in dispute.
   - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of 80% reimbursement would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
   - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
   - The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
   - The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

8. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is $0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

		10/22/2010
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date
		10/22/2010
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed $2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds $2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.