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-A210-01
DOLLY VINSANT MEMORIAL HOSPITAL 302 KINGS HWY SUITE 112 BROWNSVILLE TX 78521	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 Position Summary: "TWCC Rule 134.401(a)(4) specifically states that Ambulatory/Outpatient surgical care, is not covered by the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guidelines. It further states that such fees shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific types of reimbursement. In MDR: M4-04-1813-01, the Division ruled that evidence of redacted copies of payments made by the other carriers for similar treatment in the same geographical area was a proper method to determine the fair and reasonable rates." "As Newton Healthcare Network LLC was acquired by Rockport Healthcare Group in 1998, Newton Healthcare Network was required to obtain written consent from Dolly Vinsant to transfer and assign agreement to Rockport. Since this did not occur, Dolly Vinsant has no contract with Rockport in connection with this claim."

Amount in Dispute: $4,255.00

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "…this carrier has made additional reimbursement in the amount of $516.59 for total reimbursement of $941.59, and no further reimbursement is due." "As supported above, it is this carrier's position that the amount billed, $4,680.00 is not fair and reasonable."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
10/05/2004	CAC-W1, CAC-W4, 891, 217, 793, CAC-143, CAC-150, CAC-24, 198, 420, 920, 426, 891	Outpatient Surgery	$4,255.00	$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 July 7, 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 July 15, 2005 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 codes:
   - CAC- W1-Workers Compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
   - CAC-143-Portion of payment deferred.
   - CAC-150-Payment adjusted because the payer deems the information submitted does not support this level of service.
   - CAC-24-Payment for charges adjusted. Charges are covered under a capitation agreement/managed care plan.

- CAC-W4-No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.
- 198-Allowance was reduced as per contractual agreement.
- 426-Reimbursed to fair and reasonable.
- 217-The value of this procedure is included in the value of another procedure performed on this date.
- 891-The insurance company is reducing or denying payment after reconsideration.
- 793-Reduction due to PPO contract.
- 420-Supplemental payment.
- 920-Reimbursement is being allowed based upon a dispute.

2. The Respondent raised the issue of a PPO contract; however, a review of the submitted EOBs does not support a PPO reduction was taken. The requestor submitted a copy of a contractual agreement with Newton Healthcare network, LLC. The requestor states in position summary that "As Newton Healthcare Network LLC was acquired by Rockport Healthcare Group in 1998, Newton Healthcare Network was required to obtain written consent from Dolly Vinsant to transfer and assign agreement to Rockport. Since this did not occur, Dolly Vinsant has no contract with Rockport in connection with this claim." The respondent did not submit documentation to support a contractual agreement between the parties to this dispute. Therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
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)(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).
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 asks to be reimbursed the full amount of the billed charges in support of which the requestor states "TWCC Rule 134.401(a)(4) specifically states that <u>Ambulatory/Outpatient surgical care, is not covered</u> by the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guidelines. It further states that such fees shall be reimbursed at a <u>fair and reasonable rate</u> until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific types of reimbursement."
   - The requestor does not discuss or explain how additional payment of $4,255.00 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
   - In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted redacted EOBs for services that are similar to the services in dispute. However, the requestor did not discuss or explain how the sample EOBs support the requestor's position that additional payment is due. The reimbursement methodology is 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 or provide documentation to support whether such payment, as reflected in the sample EOBs, was typical for the services in dispute.
   - 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 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.

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 rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §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:

Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	**12/8/2010** 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.