

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL,	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
Petitioner	§	
	§	
V.	§	OF
	§	
	§	
ZENITH INSURANCE COMPANY,	§	
Respondent	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
	§	

DECISION AND ORDER

Vista Medical Center Hospital (Provider) requested a hearing on a decision by the Medical Review Division (MRD) of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (Division)¹ denying additional reimbursement for a hospital stay provided to Claimant, an injured worker. Provider argued that reimbursement for this admission should be based on the Stop-Loss Exception to the per diem reimbursement methodology contained in the 1997 Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline (1997 ACIHFG).² The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds the Stop-Loss Exception should be followed in this proceeding. Accordingly, Zenith Insurance Company (Carrier) is ordered to pay additional reimbursement in the amount of \$53,224.33, plus any applicable interest.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY, NOTICE AND JURISDICTION

The MRD issued its decision on May 4, 2005. Provider filed a timely and sufficient request for hearing. Notice of the hearing was appropriately issued to the parties.

¹ Effective September 1, 2005, the legislature dissolved the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission (Commission) and created the Division of Workers' Compensation within the Texas Department of Insurance. Act of June 1, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 265, § 8.001, 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 469, 607. This Decision and Order refers to the Commission and its successor collectively as the Division.

² The 1997 ACIHFG established a general reimbursement scheme for all inpatient services provided by an acute care hospital for medical and/or surgical admissions using a service-related standard per diem amount. 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 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE (TAC) § 134.401(c). This independent reimbursement mechanism, the Stop-Loss Method or Stop-Loss Methodology, is sometimes referred to as the Stop-Loss Exception or the Stop-Loss Rule.

The hearing convened and concluded on February 28, 2008.³

II. DISCUSSION

A. Factual Overview

The basic facts were uncontested. Claimant sustained a compensable injury and was admitted to Provider, where Claimant underwent treatment. After Claimant was discharged from the hospital, Provider submitted a bill to Carrier in the amount of \$84,566.31 based on Provider's usual and customary charges for the inpatient stay and surgical procedure. To date, Carrier has paid \$10,200.40.

B. Issues

1. Summary of Positions and ALJ's Decision

In summary, the parties' positions and ALJ's findings are as follows:

³ Beginning in 2003, the Division began referring a significant number of ACIHFG cases to SOAH. Between 2003 and August 31, 2005, approximately 885 ACIHFG cases were referred to SOAH for contested case hearings on issues including the Stop-Loss Exception, audits, and the reimbursement of implantables. In order to efficiently and economically manage this growing number of cases, SOAH in late 2004 and early 2005 began to join the cases into a Stop-Loss Docket, and the cases were abated. By the close of the 2005 regular legislative session, SOAH realized a finite, but still unknown; number of Stop-Loss cases would be referred to SOAH by the Division through August 31, 2005.

	MRD	Provider	Carrier	ALJ
Charges	\$84,566.31	\$84,566.31	\$84,566.31	\$84,566.31
Reimbursement Methodology	per diem ⁴	x 75%	per diem	x 75%
Reimbursement Amount	\$10,200.40	\$63,424.73 ⁵	\$10,200.40 ⁶	\$63,424.73⁷
Less Payment	(\$10,200.40)	(\$10,200.40)	(\$10,200.40)	(\$10,200.40)
Balance Due Provider	\$0.00	\$53,224.33	\$0.00	\$53,224.33

2. Background

When a hospital's total audited bill is greater than \$40,000, the Division's Stop-Loss Exception applies, and the hospital is reimbursed at 75% of its total audited bill. The purpose of the Stop-Loss Methodology is "to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually

⁴ MRD determined that the Stop-Loss Exception did not apply based on Carrier's demonstration of improper billing, including duplicate billing, unbundling, and usual-and-customary charge issues. Provider's only response, that the charges were its usual and customary charges, was deemed inadequate. These reductions brought Carrier's charges below the \$40,000.00 Stop-Loss Threshold. MRD also found the Stop-Loss Exception did not apply because the admission did not involve "unusually extensive services." Although MRD noted that Carrier said some treatments were medically unnecessary, it did not address that issue, by requesting an independent review organization determination, because its conclusion that the Stop-Loss Exception did not apply rendered the issue moot. Considering Carrier's payment, MRD found that no additional reimbursement is owed.

⁵ Provider contended it is entitled to reimbursement according to the Stop-Loss Methodology at 75 percent of total audited charges.

⁶ Carrier reimbursed according to the per-diem methodology for a three-day hospital stay at \$1,118.00 per day for a total of \$3,354.00 and paid an additional \$6,846.00 for implantables for a total payment of \$10,200.40. Carrier also cited a peer review which said a \$1,500.00 charge for anesthesia equipment was a duplicate because it should be part of the overall anesthesia charge. Finally, Carrier asserted that Provider is limited by its amount-in-dispute statement of \$53,167.33 contained in its table of disputed services.

⁷ The ALJ rules as follows: (1) In its explanation of benefits (EOB), Carrier used denial-codes "F" (payment based on the 1997 ACIHFG per-diem amount), "G" (payment for the service included in the per-diem amount), and "M" (the amount charged exceeds the maximum usual and customary fee for the same services in the geographical area). Carrier's Ex. 1 at 18. Each reason is contrary to the En Banc Panel ruling, which requires payment under the Stop-Loss Methodology, not at the per-diem amount or in accordance with usual and customary charges in a geographic area, but at 75 percent of a provider's total audited charges determined in accordance with its own usual and customary charges. (2) Carrier's use of denial code "V" for a lack of medical necessity in its EOB for "cardiology general c" at \$1,149.50 and "radiology diagnostic" at \$342.50 was unpersuasive because the medical necessity of a three-day hospital stay and surgery was preauthorized. Carrier's Ex. 1 at 26. It is not obvious that these procedures are not included within the preauthorized stay and procedure and Carrier did not state they were not. (3) The ALJ was not persuaded by Carrier's assertion that the anesthesia charge should be reduced as a duplicate charge because that was not a reason asserted as a ground for denial in Carrier's EOB as required by 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §§ 133.304(c) and 133.307(j)(2), in effect at the time of the denial. (4) Carrier's assertion that Provider's reimbursement should be limited to the amount it stated in its table of disputed services was not persuasive because Carrier adequately identified the reimbursement it was requesting in its letter accompanying its request for medical dispute resolution. Provider's Ex. 1 at 29. (5) Based on the above-stated considerations, the ALJ agrees with Provider that it should be reimbursed 75 percent of its \$84,566.31 charge.

costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker.”⁸ The following legal issues in this case were decided by a SOAH En Banc Panel⁹ (En Banc Panel), and those determinations are incorporated herein. Legal arguments related to these issues will not be addressed, other than in the Conclusions of Law.

1. The ALJs conclude that a hospital’s post-audit usual and customary charges for items listed in 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(4) are the audited charges used to calculate whether the Stop-Loss Threshold has been met for a workers’ compensation admission. The ALJs decline to adopt the Carriers’ argument to use the carve-out reimbursement amounts in § 134.401(c)(4) as audited charges, and they decline to adopt the Division’s argument to use a fair-and-reasonable amount as determined by a carrier in its bill review as audited charges.
2. The ALJs find that when the Stop-Loss Methodology applies to a workers’ compensation hospitalization, all eligible items, including items listed in § 134.401(c)(4), are reimbursed at 75% of their post-audit amount. Items listed in § 134.401(c)(4) are not reimbursed at the carve out amounts provided in that section when the Stop-Loss Methodology is applied.
3. The ALJs conclude that any reasons for denial of a claim or defenses not asserted by a Carrier before a request for medical dispute resolution may not be considered, whether or not they arise out of an audit. The ALJs also conclude that Carriers’ audit rights are not limited by § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(v) when the Stop-Loss Methodology applies. In such cases, carriers may audit in accordance with § 134.401(b)(2)(c).
4. The ALJs find that a hospital establishes eligibility for applying the Stop-Loss Methodology under § 134.401(c)(4) when total eligible amounts exceed the Stop-Loss Threshold of \$40,000. There is no additional requirement for a hospital to establish that any or all of the services were unusually costly or unusually extensive.¹⁰

Finally, in reply to a request for clarification, the En Banc Panel found that when referring to a hospital’s usual and customary charges, the rules are referring to the hospital’s own usual and customary charges and not to charges that are an average or median of other hospitals’ charges.¹¹ Provider charged its usual and customary charges for the items and services provided.

⁸ 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(6).

⁹ En Banc Panel Order in Consolidated Stop-Loss Legal Issues Docket, SOAH Docket No. 453-03-1487.M4 (Lead Docket), issued January 12, 2007.

¹⁰ Because of a typographical error, the En Banc Panel’s decision incorrectly cites § 134.401(c)(4) rather than § 134.401(c)(6) as the applicable rule.

¹¹ Letter from ALJ Catherine C. Egan dated February 23, 2007.

In summary, the ALJ concludes that the Stop-Loss Threshold was met in this case and that the amounts in dispute should be calculated accordingly.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant sustained a compensable injury in the course and scope of her employment; the employer had coverage with Zenith Insurance Company (Carrier).
2. Vista Medical Center Hospital (Provider) provided medical treatment to Claimant for the compensable injury.
3. Provider submitted itemized billing totaling \$84,566.31 for services provided to Claimant.
4. The \$84,566.31 billed was Provider's usual and customary charges for these items and treatments.
5. Carrier issued payments of \$10,200.40 to Provider for the services in question.
6. Carrier denied further reimbursement to Provider.
7. Provider requested Dispute Resolution Services from the Medical Review Division (MRD) of the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission (Commission).
8. Effective September 1, 2005, the legislature dissolved the Commission and created the Division of Workers' Compensation within the Texas Department of Insurance. The Commission and its successor are collectively referred to as the Division.
9. MRD issued its Findings and Decision holding that no additional reimbursement was owed Provider.
10. Provider timely filed a request for a contested case hearing on the MRD's decision.
11. All parties were provided not less than 10-days notice of hearing and of their rights under the applicable rules and statutes.
12. On February 26, 2008, Administrative Law Judge James W. Norman convened a hearing on the merits at the hearing facilities of the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) in Austin, Texas. Carrier and Provider were present and represented by counsel. The Division did not participate in the hearing. The hearing concluded that day and the record closed on February 26, 2008.
13. Provider's total audited charges under § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(v) are \$84,566.31, which allows Provider to obtain reimbursement under the Division's Stop-Loss Methodology.
14. Under the Stop-Loss Methodology, Provider is entitled to total reimbursement of \$63,424.73. After deduction of Carrier's prior payment of \$10,200.40, Provider is entitled to additional reimbursement of \$53,224.33, plus any applicable interest, under the Stop-Loss Methodology.

IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The State Office of Administrative Hearings has jurisdiction over matters related to the hearing in this proceeding, including the authority to issue a decision and order, pursuant to TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. §§ 402.073 and 413.031(k) and TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. ch. 2003.
2. Provider timely requested a hearing, as specified in 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE (TAC) § 148.3.
3. Proper and timely notice of the hearing was provided to the parties in accordance with TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. §§ 2001.051 and 2001.052.
4. Provider had the burden of proof in this proceeding pursuant to 28 TAC § 148.21(h) and (i).
5. All eligible items, including the items listed in 28 TAC § 131.401(c)(4), are included in the calculation of the \$40,000 Stop-Loss Threshold.
6. In calculating whether the Stop-Loss Threshold has been met, all eligible items are included at the hospital's usual and customary charges in the absence of an applicable MARS or a specific contract.
7. The carve-out reimbursement amounts contained in 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(4) are not used to calculate whether the Stop-Loss Threshold has been met.
8. When the Stop-Loss Methodology applies to a workers' compensation admission, all eligible items, including items listed in 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(4), are reimbursed at 75% of their post-audit amount.
9. Under the Stop-Loss Methodology, items listed in 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(4) are not reimbursed at the carve-out amounts provided in that section when the Stop-Loss Methodology applies.
10. Carriers' audit rights are not limited by 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(6)(A)(v) when the Stop-Loss Methodology applies. In such cases, carriers may audit in accordance with 28 TAC § 134.401(b)(2)(C).
11. Pursuant to 28 TAC § 133.307(j)(2), any defense or reason for denial of a claim not asserted by a carrier before a request for medical dispute resolution may not be considered at the hearing before SOAH, whether or not it arises out of an audit.
12. A hospital, Provider in this case, establishes eligibility for applying the Stop-Loss Methodology under 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(4) when total eligible charges exceed the Stop-Loss Threshold of \$40,000. There is no additional requirement for a hospital to separately establish that any or all of the services were unusually costly or unusually extensive.
13. The Stop-Loss Methodology applies to this case.

14. The February 17, 2005 Staff Report (Staff Report) by MRD Director Allen C. McDonald, Jr., is not consistent with the Stop-Loss Rule, 28 TAC § 134.401(c)(6), and is not consistent with the Division's prior interpretation of the rule that the \$40,000 Stop-Loss Threshold alone triggered the application of the Stop-Loss Methodology.
15. The Staff Report is not consistent with the Stop-Loss Rule, the preambles to the Stop-Loss Rule published in the *Texas Register*, or MRD decisions issued prior to February 17, 2005.
16. The Staff Report has no legal effect in this case.
17. Applying the Stop-Loss Methodology in this case, Provider is entitled to total reimbursement of \$63,424.73.
18. As specified in the above Findings of Fact, Carrier has already reimbursed Provider \$10,200.40 of this amount.
19. Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, Carrier owes Provider an additional reimbursement of \$53,224.33, plus any applicable interest.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Zenith Insurance Company reimburse Vista Medical Center Hospital the additional sum of \$53,224.33, plus any applicable interest, for services provided to Claimant. Any requested relief not expressly granted herein is denied.

SIGNED April 24, 2008.

**JAMES W. NORMAN
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**