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 #: M4-05-3449-01
LAW OFFICE OF CASS BURTON PO BOX 684749 AUSTIN TX 78768-4749	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:
CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO Box #: 47	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Enclosed are copies of EOB's from other carrier's, which show a higher rate of reimbursement, consistent to our usual and customary. We are requesting that Continental Casualty Company pay our claims at the usual and customary."

Amount in Dispute: $5,590.00

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "Carrier contends that said payment is a fair and reasonable amount and complies with Texas Labor Code Section 413.011. Carrier's payment is sufficient and leads to effective cost control of medical expenses. This is especially true when compared with Rule 134.401 'Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guidelines'. In Rule 134.401 a one day standard per diem rate is $870.00 medical and $1118.00 surgical with pharmaceuticals only reimbursable if more than $250.00 per dose."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
8/13/2004	M, 850-054	Outpatient Surgery	$5,590.00	$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 January 13, 2005. 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 January 20, 2010 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

1. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.,* in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the Claim Adjudication Process as to the WC Receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 Trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Cass Burton, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.

2. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
   - M-No MAR
   - 850-054-The recommended payments above reflect a fair, reasonable and consistent methodology or reimbursement pursuant to the criteria set forth in Section 413.011 (D) of the Texas Workers Compensation Act.
3. 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."
4. 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.
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(E), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that "Prior to submission, any documentation that contains confidential information regarding a person other than the injured employee for that claim or a party in the dispute must be redacted by the party submitting the documentation, to protect the confidential information and the privacy of the individual. Un-redacted information or evidence shall not be considered in resolving the medical fee dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has submitted an EOB containing confidential information regarding a person other than the injured employee or a party in the dispute that has not been redacted. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(E). This document will not be considered in this review.
6. 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's position summary states: "Enclosed are copies of EOB's from other carrier's, which show a higher rate of reimbursement, consistent to our usual and customary. We are requesting that Continental Casualty Company pay our claims at the usual and customary."
   - The requestor does not discuss or demonstrate how payment at the usual and customary would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement. The Division has previously found 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," as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, 22* TexReg 6276 (July 4, 1997). It further states that "Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered… and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges…" 22 TexReg 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.
   - The request for reconsideration letter to the insurance carrier states that the requestor "…relies upon a portion of the Adopted Medical Fee Guidelines 1996…" within the former Division rule at 28 TAC §134.201, commonly referred to as the *1996 Medical Fee Guideline*. However, the 1996 Medical Fee Guideline is not applicable to the services in dispute, as indicated in former Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(4), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which states that "Ambulatory/outpatient surgical care is not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific types of reimbursements."
   - 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 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 requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

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.

7. 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 rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D) and §133.307(g)(3)(E). 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:

Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	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.