



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 | F: (512) 804-4811 | (800) 252-7031 | TDI.texas.gov | @TexasTDI

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name

VISTA HOSPITAL OF DALLAS

Respondent Name

CLARENDON NATIONAL INSURANCE CO

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-05-8959

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 19

MFDR Date Received

MAY 24, 2005

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "The Carrier is allowed to deduct any personal items and may only deduct non documented services and items and services, which are not related to the compensable injury...if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the 'Stop-Loss Reimbursement Factor' (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the 'entire admission.'"

Amount in Dispute: \$35,109.27

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The Requestor asserts it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$37,345.27, which is 75% of the total charges. Requestor has not shown entitlement to this alternative, exceptional method of calculating reimbursement and has not otherwise properly calculated the audited charges."

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary dated February 9, 2016: "Based upon Respondent's initial and all supplemental responses, and in accordance with the Division's obligation to adjudicate Requestor's claim of entitlement to additional payment, Requestor failed to sustain its burden of proving entitlement to the stop loss exception. The Division's original findings and decision applied the proper legal criteria for stop loss, and committed no error identified in the Third Court of Appeals Mandate that requires correction. The Division's original conclusion that Requestor is not entitled to additional payment should be acknowledged, and the Requestor be given the opportunity to request a referral to SOAH."

Responses Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
July 13, 2004 through July 15, 2004	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$35,109.27	\$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

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304(c), 17 *Texas Register* 1105, effective February 20, 1992, sets out the provisions for insurance carrier's to dispute and audit medical bills.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6246, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
- The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
 - 523-Reduced per administrative rules.
 - M-No MAR.
 - See attached itemization for a list of items found not to be reasonable or customary. Due to U&C adjustment bill does not meet stoploss threshold. Payment recommended per diem. Inpatient stay 7/13/04-7/15/04.
- Dispute M4-05-8959 History
 - The division originally issued a decision on August 23, 2005.
 - The dispute decision was appealed to the District Court.
 - The 345th Judicial District remanded the dispute to the division pursuant to an agreed order of remand D-1-GN-05-003443 dated July 10, 2015.
 - As a result of the remand order, the dispute was re-docketed at the division's medical fee dispute resolution section.
 - M4-05-8959-02 is hereby reviewed.

Issues

- Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
- Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
- Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
- Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 *Texas Register* 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges

exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this dispute were given an opportunity to supplement the original MDR submissions after the 3rd Court of Appeals Decision. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. Only the respondent submitted a supplemental position as noted above. Documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date is considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that “Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold...” In that same opinion, the Third Court of Appeals states that the stop loss exception “...was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases.” 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states, “to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold.” Furthermore, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v) states that “Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed.” Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the respondent finds that the carrier did deduct \$44.10 in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$49,749.59. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.00.
2. The requestor in its original position statement asserts that “if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the ‘Stop-Loss Reimbursement Factor’ (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the ‘entire admission.’” As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) rendered judgment to the contrary. The requestor’s position fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the particulars of the services in dispute are not discussed, nor does the requestor demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For the reasons stated, the division finds that the requestor failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually extensive.
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that “Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.” The requestor asserts that because the **billed charges** exceed the stop-loss threshold, the admission in this case is unusually costly. The Division notes that audited charges are addressed as a separate and distinct factor described in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i). Billed charges for services do not represent the cost of providing those services, and no such relation has been established in the instant case. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the **costs** associated with the services in dispute are unusual when compared to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For that reason, the division rejects the requestor’s position that the admission is unusually costly based on the mere fact that the billed or audited charges “substantially” exceed \$40,000.
4. For the reasons stated above, the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) subtitled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) subtitled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

- Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission...” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the length of stay for this admission was two (2) surgical days; therefore, the standard per diem amounts of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the 2 days result in a total allowable amount of \$2,236.00.

The division concludes that the total allowable for the disputed inpatient hospitalization is \$2,236.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$2,236.00; therefore, additional reimbursement is not recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

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 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

08/16/2016

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 MFDR 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 this *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.