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 and Address

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL
P O BOX 11586
HOUSTON TX 77293

Carrier's Austin Representative Box
#15

MFDR Date Received
AUGUST 8, 2005

Respondent Name
PACIFIC EMPLOYERS INSURANCE CO

MFDR Tracking Number
M4-05-B221-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Taken From The *Table Of Disputed Services*: "Carrier did not pay claim at usual & customary Carrier did not apply TWCC Stop-Loss."

Amount in Dispute: $50,057.48

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated August 15, 2005: "Medical Fee Guideline Dispute."

Response Submitted by: ACE USA

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
October 1, 2004 through October 2, 2004	Inpatient Hospital Services	$50,057.48	$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 §133.305 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.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 27 *Texas Register* 4047, effective May 16, 2002, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee

guideline.

4. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

   Explanation of Benefits
   - F – REDUCTION ACCORDING TO MEDICAL FEE GUIDELINE
   - U – UNNECESSARY MEDICAL TREATMENT GUIDELINES. Based upon a review of billed charges this appears to be an overcharge and/or excessive amount for services rendered.
   - 3N– NO ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT ALLOWED AFTER REVIEW OF APPEAL/RECONSIDERATION. Based upon a review of billed charges this appears to be an overcharge and/or excessive amount for services.
   - Previous recommendation(s) will stand as they were defined and no additional recommendation is due based on TWCC medical fee guidelines/rules.
5. 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 workers' compensation 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 Burton & Hyde, PLLC, 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.

Issues

1. Does an unresolved medical necessity issue exist in this dispute?
2. Did the audited charges exceed $40,000.00?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
4. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
5. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

The requestor billed the disputed services on an outpatient hospital bill.

28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(1)(B) states "Inpatient Services – Health care, as defined by the Texas Labor Code §401.011(19), provided by an acute care hospital and rendered to a person who is admitted to an acute care hospital and whose length of stay exceeds 23 hours in any unit of the acute care hospital."

The Division finds that the requestor noted on the Nurse's Observation notes that claimant was admitted on October 1, 2004 at 0715 hours. The records indicate the claimant received Cardiopulmonary Services on October 2, 2004 at 1115 hours.

The Division concludes that the documentation supports that claimant's admission exceeded 23 hours; therefore, the disputed services are inpatient surgical services.

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 case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be 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 as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection…" 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. According to the explanation of benefits, the respondent denied reimbursement for supplies, code 99070, based upon reason code "U." The respondent further defined this denial on the original and reconsideration explanation of benefits stating "Based upon a review of billed charges this appears to be an overcharge and/or excessive amount for services." The submitted documentation finds that payment of $4,924.00 was issued for the disputed services. The Division finds that the respondent did not maintain the denial of the disputed services based upon medical necessity in the response to the request for medical fee dispute resolution; therefore, the medical necessity issue is not supported.
2. 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, (A) (v) of that same section states "…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 carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal $54,981.48. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed $40,000.

   In its position statement, the requestor asserts that "Carrier did not pay claim at usual & customary Carrier did not apply TWCC Stop-Loss." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that "This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission." The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion states 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." The requestor's position statement failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that may constitute unusually extensive services. The division concludes that the requestor failed to meet the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds $40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. 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 thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which 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 failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitutes unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
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) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *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.
   - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of $1,118.00 per day applies. 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…" The length of stay was one day. The surgical per diem rate of $1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of one day results in an allowable amount 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)."
   - A review of the submitted medical bill indicates that the requestor billed revenue code 278 for Implants at $12,700.00.

- The medical documentation provided finds that although the requestor submitted purchase orders to support what the requestor was charged by the supplier for the IMP Pain Buster/Mngmnt 27 and IMP Screw Fixation Temp, there was no documentation found to support the amounts that the requestor paid for these implantables. The division finds that the cost to the hospital for the IMP Pain Buster/Mngmnt 27 and IMP Screw Fixation Temp, billed under revenue code 278 cannot be established; therefore, no reimbursement can be recommended for these items.
- The Division finds the total allowable for the implants billed under revenue code 278 is:

Description of Implant per Itemized Statement	QTY.	Cost Per Unit	Cost + 10%
IMP Plate Cervl 2-Level	1	$1,280.00	$1,408.00
IMP Putty Allograft 10cc	1	$1,050.00	$1,155.00
IMP Screw Fixation Temp	1	No support for cost/invoice	$0.00
IMP Pain Buster/Mngmnt 27	1	No support for cost/invoice	$0.00
IMP Screw Self Drill 4.0 x	4	No support for cost/invoice	$0.00
TOTAL	8		$2,563.00

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than $250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed $250.00/unit for Thrombinar 10,000 units. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these pharmaceuticals. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is $3,681.00. The respondent paid $4,924.00. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be 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 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

		05/24/2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date
		05/24/2013
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

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.