



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

PHI AIR MEDICAL

Respondent Name

NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE COMPANY

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-13-1562

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 19

MFDR Date Received

February 21, 2013

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "The Texas Department of Insurance Division of Workers' Compensation does not have a 'fee schedule' for air ambulance services. . . . It is PHI Air Medical's contention that an MAR would not apply to air transportation. Therefore reimbursement should have been made subject to PHI Air Medical's usual and customary charge. . . . PHI Air Medical Charges are fair and reasonable and consistent with the Department of Labor's definition of usual and customary. . . . PHI Air Medical is extensively regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration under the Federal Aviations Act. That act was amended by the Airline Deregulation Act 49 U.S.C. Section 41713 (the 'ADA') in 1978 in order to impose a single federal regulatory scheme on air carrier thereby precluding state regulation of rates and routes."

Requestor's Position Summary dated June 6, 2014: "if the Division continues to apply the Texas statute in contravention of the ADA, both statute and rules require application of the 'fair and reasonable' standard. . . . The Airline Deregulation Act ("ADA") imposes a single federal regulatory scheme on air carriers that precludes state regulation of rates and certain other issues"

Requestor's Position Summary dated July 8, 2014: "The air ambulance providers have submitted documentation demonstrating that their market-driven charges represent the cost of doing business, plus a very modest profit margin . . . The Statute and Rules Do Not Allow for Default-to-Medicare Reimbursement"

Amount in Dispute: \$25,823.42

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: The insurance carrier did not submit a response for consideration in this review.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table with 4 columns: Dates of Service, Disputed Services, Amount In Dispute, Amount Due. Row 1: August 19, 2012, Air Ambulance Services, \$25,823.42, \$25,823.42

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and applicable 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 out general provisions regarding medical reimbursement.
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets out general provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
4. Texas Labor Code §413.031 sets out provisions regarding medical dispute resolution.
5. The Division placed a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution request in the insurance carrier's Austin representative box, which was acknowledged as received on March 1, 2013. Per 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(1), "The response will be deemed timely if received by the division via mail service, personal delivery, or facsimile within 14 calendar days after the date the respondent received the copy of the requestor's dispute. If the division does not receive the response information within 14 calendar days of the dispute notification, then the division may base its decision on the available information." The insurance carrier did not submit any response for consideration in this dispute. Accordingly, this decision is based on the information available at the time of review.
6. The insurance carrier reduced payment for the disputed services with the following claim adjustment codes:
  - 217 – BASED ON PAYER REASONABLE AND CUSTOMARY FEES. NO MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DEFINED BY LEGISLATED FEE ARRANGEMENT. (NOTE: TO BE USED FOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ONLY)
  - 193 – ORIGINAL PAYMENT DECISION IS BEING MAINTAINED. UPON REVIEW, IT WAS DETERMINED THAT THIS CLAIM WAS PROCESSED PROPERLY.

## **Issues**

1. Does the Federal Aviation Act preempt the authority of the Texas Labor Code to regulate air ambulance fees?
2. What is the applicable rule for determining reimbursement of the disputed services?
3. Has the requestor justified that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement?
4. Has the respondent justified that the payment made is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement?
5. Is additional reimbursement due?

## **Findings**

1. The requestor maintains that the Federal Aviation Act, as amended by the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, 49 U.S.C. §41713, preempts the authority of the Texas Labor Code to apply the Division's medical fee guidelines to air ambulance services. This threshold legal issue was considered by the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) in *PHI Air Medical v. Texas Mutual Insurance Company, et al.*, Docket number 454-12-7770.M4, which held that "the Airline Deregulation Act does not preempt state worker's compensation rules and guidelines that establish the reimbursement allowed for the air ambulance services . . . rendered to injured workers (claimants)." In particular, SOAH found that:

the McCarran-Ferguson Act explicitly reserves the regulation of insurance to the states and provides that any federal law that infringes upon that regulation is preempted by the state insurance laws, unless the federal law specifically relates to the business of insurance. In this case, there is little doubt that the worker's compensation system adopted in Texas is directly related to the business of insurance . . .

The Division agrees. The Division concludes that its jurisdiction to consider the medical fee issues in this dispute is not preempted by the Federal Aviation Act, or the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, based upon SOAH's threshold issue discussion and the information provided by the parties in this medical fee dispute. The disputed services will therefore be decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and applicable rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

2. The services in dispute are air ambulance transportation services for which the Division has not established a medical fee guideline. No documentation was found to support a negotiated contract or that the services were provided through a workers' compensation health care network. Payment is therefore subject to the general medical reimbursement provisions of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(e), which requires that in the absence of an applicable fee guideline or a negotiated contract, medical reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with a fair and reasonable reimbursement amount as specified in §134.1(f).

3. In the following analysis, the Division examines the positions of both parties and the evidence presented to date in support of, or to refute, each party's determination of a fair and reasonable payment amount, in order to establish which party presents the best evidence of an amount that will achieve a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the disputed services. The requestor has the burden of proof. The standard of proof required is by a preponderance of the evidence.

28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(f) requires that:

Fair and reasonable reimbursement shall:

- (1) be consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011;
- (2) ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and
- (3) be based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and/or values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available.

The Texas Supreme Court has summarized the statutory standards and criteria applicable to "fair and reasonable" fee determinations as requiring "methodologies that determine fair and reasonable medical fees, ensure quality medical care to injured workers, and achieve effective cost control." *Texas Workers' Compensation Commission v. Patient Advocates of Texas*, 136 South Western Reporter Third 656 (Texas 2004).

Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has held, in *All Saints Health System v. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission*, 125 South Western Reporter Third 104 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2003, petition for review denied), that "each . . . reimbursement should be evaluated according to [Texas Labor Code] section 413.011(d)'s definition of 'fair and reasonable' fee guidelines as implemented by Rule 134.1 for case-by-case determinations."

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. The commissioner shall consider the increased security of payment afforded by this subtitle in establishing the fee guidelines.

28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(O), 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 in accordance with §134.1 . . . when the dispute involves health care for which the division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR) or reimbursement rate, as applicable."

Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

- The requestor asserts that: "reimbursement should have been made subject to PHI Air Medical's usual and customary charge."
- 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). While an air ambulance company is not a hospital, the above principle is of similar concern in the present case. A health care provider's usual and customary charges are not evidence of a fair and reasonable rate or of what insurance companies are paying for the same or similar services. Payment of a provider's "usual and customary" charge is not acceptable when it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the health care provider—which would ignore the 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. Therefore, the use of a health care provider's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered unless other data or documentation is submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- In the present dispute, however, the requestor has submitted additional documentation and data to support that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in this dispute.

- The requestor asserts that the amount requested is designed to ensure the quality of medical care:  
The Division has long construed this inquiry as one of patient access . . . To ensure patient access to emergency helicopter service, it is essential that air ambulance providers are reimbursed a sufficient amount to cover the costs of providing the service to patients. This amount is reflected in their usual and customary market rates.
- In support of the quality of medical care, the requestor submitted documentation of a study as described in an article of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, volume 249, number 22 (1983), "The Impact of a Rotorcraft Aeromedical Emergency Care Service on Trauma Mortality," by William G. Baxt, and Peggy Moody, which reported a "52% reduction in predicted mortality of the aeromedical group" in reviewing populations of trauma patients transported to a trauma center by standard land prehospital care services as compared to the same trauma center by a rotorcraft aeromedical service.
- Additionally the requestor submitted documentation of a study as described in an article of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, volume 307, number 15 (2012), "Association Between Helicopter vs. Ground Emergency Medical Services and Survival for Adults With Major Trauma," by Samuel M. Galvagno, Jr., DO, PhD; et al., which the requestor asserts "indicate that helicopter EMS transport is independently associated with improved odds of survival for seriously injured adults."
- The requestor's July 8th position statement asserts that the amount requested achieves medical cost control: "Providers cannot and do not arbitrarily raise their rates to achieve higher profit margins, as evidenced by CMS data reflecting minimal variation in provider's billed charges in both statewide and national figures."
- The requestor further states:  
Providers' Financial Data and the CMS Study Prove that the Billed Charges are Constrained by Market Forces . . . the air ambulance charge model achieves effective cost control because it does not reflect the type of high historical profit margins that would indicate a provider's ability to raise rates to an unfair or unsustainable level. . . . The air ambulance provider's market-driven price inflexibility is further strengthened by the national study published by CMS . . . CMS published provider charge data from every Texas provider and reported the average billed charges, along with the 25th percentile, 75th percentile, maximum submitted charge amounts and minimum submitted charges. Not only are the air ambulance charges similar across the Texas, they are also relatively consistent across the country. While variations volume and payor mix in different parts of the state and country necessitate slight disparities in charges, the lack of wide fluctuations in pricing prove that providers cannot and do not deviate from their usual and customary, market-driven charges.
- Review of the health care provider's billed charges finds that the submitted charges for the services in this dispute are consistent with the submitted national aggregate charge range data compiled by CMS as found in the requestor's Exhibit 11.
- The requestor asserts that the amount requested does 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, stating "these providers apply usual and customary charges to all patients regardless of payor-type or standard of living, and expect payment in full except where prohibited by federal law."
- The requestor submitted documentation of the provider's revenue, expenses, and profit margins after estimated income tax for calendar years 2010 through 2013 respectively. The data supports that their profit margins were lower than 1% for 2011, and lower than 6% for all years; except for 2012, for which their margin was lower than 12%.
- The requestor states that "This proves that the air ambulance charge model achieves effective cost control because it does not reflect the type of high historical profit margins that would indicate a provider's ability to raise rates to an unfair or unsustainable level."
- The requestor states:  
Unlike hospitals, air ambulance providers (1) rarely, if ever, enter into discounted contracts with private insurance companies; (2) have not artificially inflated their billed charges to enable them to offer discounts to the insurance companies while maintaining the ability to recover their costs; and (3) routinely seek to balance bill the patient who is left with the remainder of the usual and customary charges that are not paid in full by a third-party payor.

- The requestor asserts that the amount requested accounts for the increased security of Workers' Compensation payment, stating "In the air ambulance context, limiting collections to any artificially-reduced rate is unreasonable because these providers consistently rely on collecting 100 percent of their billed charges from all patients except where prohibited by federal law."
- The requestor further asserts that the amount requested ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement:
  - air ambulance providers charge the same rates for all patients, regardless of payor-type or economic status. . . . the Division clearly noted when it reasoned, 'the objectives of the 1996 MFG were to move Texas MFG reimbursements toward a median position in comparison with other states, away from a charge-based structure [as applied by hospitals], and more toward a market-based system.' An air ambulance provider's usual and customary market rates are the only charges that achieve this result.
- The requestor asserts that the amount requested is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and/or values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, presenting documentation of the aggregated national and statewide charge data by HCPCS code, as compiled by CMS, to support that the requestor's billed charges are consistent with national averages.
- The requestor has explained and supported that the requested reimbursement methodology would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is supported. After thorough review of all the information submitted for consideration by the parties in this dispute, the Division concludes that the requestor has discussed, demonstrated, and justified, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the disputed services.

4. Because the requestor has met its burden to prove that the amount it is seeking is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement, the Division now reviews the information presented by the respondent to support whether the amount it has paid is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute.

28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(E)(v), effective May 31, 2012, 37 *Texas Register* 3833, requires the respondent to provide:

documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount the respondent paid is a fair and reasonable reimbursement in accordance with Labor Code §413.011 and §134.1 or §134.503 of this title if the dispute involves health care for which the division has not established a MAR or reimbursement rate, as applicable.

Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

- As stated above, the insurance carrier did not submit a response for consideration in this review.
- The submitted explanations of benefits do not indicate what method was used to calculate the fee for the disputed services.
- No documentation was submitted to explain or support the insurance carrier's calculation of the payment for the services in this dispute.
- Per the explanation of benefits, the insurance carrier reduced payment with explanation code 217 – "BASED ON PAYER REASONABLE AND CUSTOMARY FEES. NO MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DEFINED BY LEGISLATED FEE ARRANGEMENT."
- The respondent did not submit any documentation to explain or support how it arrived at its determination of "payer reasonable and customary fees."
- Review of the submitted information finds no documentation to support that the insurance carrier has consistently applied fair and reasonable reimbursement amounts and maintained, in reproducible format, documentation of the insurance carrier's methodology(ies) establishing fair and reasonable reimbursement amounts in accordance with the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(g).
- The respondent did not support that the amount paid satisfies the requirements of §134.1(f).
- The respondent did not support that the amount paid represents a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Thorough review of the submitted documentation finds that the respondent has not demonstrated or justified that the amount paid is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the respondent has not met the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(E)(v).

5. The Division finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the documentation submitted in support of the reimbursement amount proposed by the requestor is the best evidence of an amount that will achieve a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in this dispute. Reimbursement is calculated as follows: review of the submitted medical bill finds that the total charge for the disputed services is \$35,359.00. The Division finds this amount to be a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in this dispute. The amount previously paid by the insurance carrier is \$9,535.58. Accordingly, the additional payment amount recommended is \$25,823.42.

### **Conclusion**

In resolving disputes regarding the amount of payment due for health care, the role of the Division is to adjudicate the payment, given the relevant statutory provisions and Division rules. The Division would like to emphasize that the outcome of this medical fee dispute relied upon the evidence presented by the requestor and the respondent. Even though all the evidence was not discussed, it was considered.

The requestor has established by a preponderance of the evidence that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$25,823.42.

### ***ORDER***

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code Sections 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute. The Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor the amount of \$25,823.42 plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this Order.

### **Authorized Signature**

_____	<u>Grayson Richardson</u>	<u>June 26, 2015</u>
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

_____	<u>Martha Luévano</u>	<u>June 26, 2015</u>
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

### ***YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL***

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to seek review of this decision in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, 37 *Texas Register* 3833, applicable to disputes filed on or after June 1, 2012.

A party seeking review must submit a **Request to Schedule a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision** (form **DWC045M**) in accordance with the instructions on the form. The request must be received by the Division within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the Division using the contact information listed on the form or to the field office handling the claim.

The party seeking review of the MFDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request 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 §141.1(d).

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