



# 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](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

### MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

#### GENERAL INFORMATION

**Requestor Name**

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL

**Respondent Name**

LM INSURANCE CORP

**MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-04-1206-02

**Carrier's Austin Representative**

Box Number 01

**MFDR Date Received**

SEPTEMBER 29, 2003

#### REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are below \$40,000, the Carrier may reimburse at a 'per diem' rate for the hospital services. However, 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'."

**Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated July 30, 2014:** "Please allow this letter to serve as a supplemental statement to Vista Medical Center Hospital's (VMCH) originally submitted request for dispute resolution in consideration of the Texas Third Court of Appeals' Final Judgment."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$92,300.00

#### RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Respondent's Position Summary Dated October 10, 2003:** "We have received the medical dispute filed by Vista Medical Center Hospital for services rendered to [Claimant] for dates of service 10/4/02-10/20/02. We have re-reviewed the billing and documentation submitted with the medical dispute and our position remains the same...Liberty Mutual does not believe that Vista Medical Center Hospital is due any further reimbursement."

**Response Submitted by:** Liberty Mutual Insurance

**Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated August 1, 2014:** "Because Requestor has failed to meet its burden of demonstrating the existence of both unusually extensive *and* unusually costly services, and the documentation adduced thus far fails to provide any rationale which might justify the Requestor's qualification for payment under the Stop-Loss Exception, Respondent's payment was appropriate. No additional monies are due."

**Responses Submitted by:** Hanna & Plaut L.L.P.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
October 14, 2002 through October 20, 2002	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$92,300.00	\$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 §133.304, sets out the procedures for medical payments and denials.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 provides for fair and reasonable reimbursement of health care in the absence of an applicable fee guideline.
5. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines
6. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - F-Reduction according to fee guidelines.
  - Z695-The charges for this hospitalization have been reduced based on the fee schedule allowance.
  - Z560-The charge for this procedure exceeds the fee schedule or usual and customary values as established by Ingenix.
  - X394-Our position remains the same; if you disagree with our decision please contact the TWCC Medical Dispute Resolution.
7. Dispute M4-04-1206 History
  - Dispute was originally decided on April 8, 2005.
  - The original dispute decision was appealed to District Court.
  - District Court remanded the dispute to the Division pursuant to an agreed order of remand, cause number D-1-GN-08-000989, dated January 30, 2012.
  - Because of the remand order, the dispute was re-docketed at the Division's medical fee dispute resolution section.
  - M4-04-1206-02 is hereby reviewed

### **Issues**

1. Did the respondent provide sufficient explanation for denial of the disputed services?
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**

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. The requestor in its position statement asserts that “Texas Administrative Code Section 133.304 specifically provides the ‘explanation of benefits **shall include the correct payment exception codes...**’” 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304(c), 17 Texas Register 1105, effective February 20, 1992, applicable to dates of service in dispute, states, in pertinent part, that “At the time an insurance carrier makes payment or denies payment on a medical bill, the insurance carrier shall send, in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, the explanation of benefits to the appropriate parties. The explanation of benefits shall include the correct payment exception codes required by the Commission's instructions, and shall provide sufficient explanation to allow the sender to understand the reason(s) for the insurance carrier's action(s). A generic statement that simply states a conclusion such as ‘not sufficiently documented’ or other similar phrases with no further description of the reason for the reduction or denial of payment does not satisfy the requirements of this section.”

The payment exception codes and descriptions listed above in the background section support an explanation for the reduction of reimbursement based on former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, and were provided using the appropriate division-approved form TWCC 62. These reasons support a reduction of the reimbursement amount from the requested stop-loss exception payment reimbursement methodology to the standard per diem methodology amount and provided sufficient explanation to allow the provider to understand the reason(s) for the insurance carrier's action(s). The division therefore concludes that the insurance carrier has substantially met the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304(c).

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 \$253,568.98. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
3. 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 original assertion is not supported.

In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts’ final judgment and opined on both rule requirements. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, 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 extensive services. Rule §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 requestor’s supplemental position statement asserts that:

The medical records on file with MDR show this admission to be a complex lumbar fusion. This complex spine surgery is unusually extensive for at least the following reasons:

- This type of surgery is unusually extensive when compared to all surgeries performed on workers’ compensation patients in that only 19% of such surgeries involved operations on the spine;
- This type of surgery required a physician for neuromonitoring, a cell saver, additional, trained nursing staff and specialized equipment thereby making the hospital services unusually extensive;
- This type of surgery has the risks of bleeding, nerve root damage, blood clots in the region causing pulmonary embolism, a spinal headache requiring additional treatment in the hospital and the possibility that a drain will be needed to prevent blood from building at the site and,
- Medicare length of stay for this DRG is 3.7 days and the median length of stay for workers’ compensation inpatient admission is three days, whereas the length of stay for this admission of 6 days exceeds both the Medicare LOS and the median LOS for workers’ compensation.

The requestor's categorization of spinal surgeries presupposes that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive for the specified reasons. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the reasons asserted, nor did the requestor point to any sources for the information presented. The reasons stated are therefore not demonstrated. Additionally, the requestor's position that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive does not satisfy §134.401(c)(2)(C) which requires application of the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion affirmed this, stating "The rule further states that independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception will be 'allowed on a case-by-case basis.' *Id.* §134.401(c)(2)(C). This language suggests that the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases." The requestor's position that this type of surgery was unusually extensive fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the requestor does not demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgeries, services or admissions. For the reasons stated, the division finds that the requestor failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually extensive.

4. 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's supplemental position statement asserts that:

The medical and billing records on file with MDR also show that this admission was unusually costly for the following reasons:

- The median charge for all workers' compensation inpatient surgeries is \$23,187; the median charge for workers' compensation surgeries of this type is \$39,000; therefore, the audited billed charges for this surgery substantially exceed not only the median charges, but also the \$40,000 stop-loss threshold;
- As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in order for this surgery to be performed, specialized equipment such as large bore TV's and an arterial line and specially trained, extra nursing staff were required, thereby adding substantially to the cost of the surgery in comparison to other types of surgeries;
- And, it was necessary to purchase expensive implants for use in the surgery.

Therefore, additional reimbursement should be ordered under the stop-loss exception.

The requestor asserts that because the **billed charges** exceed the stop-loss threshold, the admission in this case is unusually costly. The requestor overlooks the fact that within the Texas Labor Code, total billed charges are not a valid indicator of cost as explained in the preamble to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 Texas Register 6246, effective August 1, 1997. 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 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). 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. The requestor additionally asserts that certain resources that are used for the types of surgeries associated with the admission in dispute (i.e. specialized equipment and specially-trained, extra nursing staff) added substantially to the cost of the admission. The requestor in this case does not list or quantify the costs associated with these resources in relation to the disputed services, nor does the requestor provide documentation make a reasonable comparison between the resources required for this admission and those required for similar spinal surgeries, services or admissions. Therefore, the requestor fails to demonstrate that the resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly when compared to similar spinal surgeries, services or admissions.

5. 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

six days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of six days results in an allowable amount of \$6,708.00.

- 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 \$173,288.00.
- Review of the medical documentation provided finds that although the requestor billed items under revenue code 278, no invoices were found to support the cost of the implantables billed. For that reason, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.
- 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 \$289.00/unit for Dilaudid PCA 100ml, and \$265.35 for Thrombin 10,000 unit. 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 \$6,708.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$97,876.74. 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 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

**Authorized Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Martha Luevano  
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.**