



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645
512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name

VISTA HEALTHCARE INC

Respondent Name

TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-04-3009-01

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 54

MFDR Date Received

October 30, 2003

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Vista Healthcare charges the above-referenced services at a fair and reasonable rate. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other Carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services. The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Vista Healthcare is at a minimum of 70% of billed charges. This is supported by a managed care contract with 'Focus' . . . This managed care contract supports Vista Healthcare's argument that the usual and customary charges are fair and reasonable and at the very minimum, 70% of the usual and customary charges is fair and reasonable."

Amount in Dispute: \$1,535.72

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The requester appears to have billed for the myelogram facility charges twice. Additionally, the requester did NOT submit a proper request for reconsideration for the billed amount of \$3,274.44. . . . it is this carrier's position the request was reimbursed for the myelogram and post myelogram CT when this carrier reimbursed \$517 . . . This carrier's payment is compliant with TWCC Rule 133.304, Medical Payments and Denials."

Response Submitted by: Texas Mutual Insurance Company, PO Box 12029, Austin, Texas 78711-2029

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
November 7, 2002	CT Scan and Facility Services	\$1,535.72	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 sets forth general provisions related to use of the fee guidelines.
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.

4. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - M – No MAR
 - YM – THE REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE SERVICE RENDERED HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO BE FAIR AND REASONABLE BASED ON BILLING AND PAYMENT RESEARCH AND IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH LABOR CODE 413.01 (D).
 - T2 – REDUCTION WAS MADE ON OUTPATIENT BILL
 - O – Denial after reconsideration
 - YO – REIMBURSEMENT WAS REDUCED OR DENIED AFTER RECONSIDERATION OF TREATMENT/SERVICE BILLED.
 - C – Negotiated contract price
 - YC – REIMBURSED PER NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WITH HEALTH NET PLUS (FORMERLY EOS) MANAGED CARE SERVICES, INC. FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING CONTRACT RATES, CONTACT INQUIRES DEPT AT 1-800-342-5888 EXT. 5889.
 - D – Duplicate bill
 - 60 – THE PROVIDER HAS BILLED FOR THE EXACT SERVICES ON A PREVIOUS BILL.

Issues

1. Are the disputed services subject to a contractual agreement between the parties to this dispute?
2. Did the requestor submit medical documentation to support the services in dispute?
3. What is the applicable rule for determining reimbursement for the disputed services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

1. The insurance carrier reduced or denied disputed services with payment exception codes C – "Negotiated contract price"; and YC – "REIMBURSED PER NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WITH HEALTH NET PLUS (FORMERLY EOS) MANAGED CARE SERVICES, INC. FOR QUESTIONS REGARDING CONTRACT RATES, CONTACT INQUIRES DEPT AT 1-800-342-5888 EXT. 5889." Review of the submitted information found no documentation to support that the disputed services were subject to a contractual agreement between the parties to this dispute. The above denial/reduction reason is not supported. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed for payment in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, requires the requestor to send "a copy of any pertinent medical records." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided copies of medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(B).
3. This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(c), effective May 16, 2002, 27 *Texas Register* 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."

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. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 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's position statement asserts that "Vista Healthcare charges the above-referenced services at a fair and reasonable rate. Specifically, these rates are based upon a comparison of charges to other Carriers and the amount of reimbursement received for these same or similar services."
 - The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
 - Documentation of the comparison of charges to other carriers was not presented for review.

- The Division has previously found, as stated in the adoption preamble to the former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors” (22 *Texas Register* 6271). The Division further considered alternative methods of reimbursement that use hospital charges as their basis; such methods were rejected because they “allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges” (22 *Texas Register* 6268-6269). Therefore, the use of a hospital’s “usual and customary” charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- In the alternative, the requestor asks to be reimbursed a minimum of 70% of billed charges, in support of which the requestor states that “The amount of reimbursement deemed to be fair and reasonable by Vista Healthcare is at a minimum of 70% of billed charges. This is supported by a managed care contract with ‘Focus’ . . . This managed care contract supports Vista Healthcare’s argument that the usual and customary charges are fair and reasonable and at the very minimum, 70% of the usual and customary charges is fair and reasonable. . . .the managed care contract shows numerous Insurance Carrier’s willingness to provide 70% reimbursement for Ambulatory Surgical Centers medical services.”
- The requestor has provided select exhibit pages from the alleged managed care contract referenced above; however, a copy of the contract referenced in the position statement was not presented for review with this dispute.
- Review of the exhibit pages submitted by the requestor finds a schedule of charges, labeled exhibit “A”, dated 04/23/92, which states that “OUTPATIENT SERVICES: 101/401 PAY 70% OF BILLED CHARGES.”
- The requestor submitted a letter of clarification dated July 30, 1992 indicating a change in reimbursement to the above referenced contract, stating in part that “services rendered to eligible Beneficiaries will be considered at 80% of the usual and reasonable charge which is equal to the lesser of the actual charges billed by HCP; OR the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research Database.”
- The requestor submitted a fee schedule page, labeled exhibit A, dated effective August 1, 1992 which states, in part, that the provider shall receive “an amount equal to eighty percent (80%) of the Usual and Reasonable Charge for those Covered Services. For all purposes hereunder, the Usual and Reasonable Charge for such services shall be equal to the lesser of: (i) the actual charges billed by HCP for such services; or (ii) the eightieth (80th) percentile for charges for such services as set forth in the current Medical Data Research database.”
- No data or information was submitted from the Medical Data Research database to support the requested reimbursement.
- No documentation was presented by the requestor to support that the referenced contract was in effect at the time of the disputed services.
- The requestor’s position statement further asserts that “amounts paid to healthcare providers by third party payers are relevant to determining fair and reasonable workers’ compensation reimbursement. Further, TWCC stated specifically that managed care contracts are fulfill the requirements of Texas Labor Code Section 413.011 as they are ‘relevant to what fair and reasonable reimbursement is,’ they are relevant to achieving cost control,’ they are relevant to ensuring access to quality care,’ and they are ‘highly reliable.’ See 22 Tex. Reg. 6272. Finally, managed care contracts were determined by the TWCC to be the best indication of a market price voluntarily negotiated for medical services.”
- While managed care contracts are relevant to determining a fair and reasonable reimbursement, the Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, which states at 22 *Texas Register* 6276 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.

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted redacted explanations of benefits, and selected portions of EOBs, from various sample insurance carriers. 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 carriers' 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 did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not support that the requested alternative reimbursement methodology would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the submitted documentation 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.

Conclusion

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. After thorough review and consideration of 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 requestor has failed to establish that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

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 entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

<p>Signature</p>	<p>Grayson Richardson Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer</p>	<p>August 29, 2014 Date</p>
------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **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. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

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