# MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
Type of Requestor: (X) HCP () IE () IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> (X) Yes () No
Requestor's Name and Address	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-0646-01
The San Antonio Orthopaedic Surgery	TWCC No.:
400 Concord Plaza, Suite 200	Injured Employee's Name:
San Antonio, TX 78216	
Respondent's Name and Address	Date of Injury:
Parker & Associates for Virginia Surety Company Inc. P.O. Box 684769	Employer's Name: Roman Catho. Archdiocese of San Antonio
Austin, TX 78768-4769	Insurance Carrier's No.:
Rep. Box: 29	Virginia Surety Company Inc.

#### PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То	CIT Couc(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
04/19/04	04/19/04	29881 – Arthroscopy with meniscectomy	\$6658.00 \$226.00		
			Total Amount Due:	\$226.00	

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

The Carrier has not provided the proper payment exception code in this instance, which is in violation of the Texas Administrative Code. Carrier did not make "fair and reasonable" reimbursement and did not make consistent reimbursements.

#### PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

The Carrier reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate, the equivalent of a one-day surgical inpatient stay under the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guidelines. The requestor billed at almost 600% more than the same procedure in an in-patient setting.

## PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to services provided in an Ambulatory Surgical Center that are not covered under a fee guideline for this date of service. Accordingly, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as directed by Commission Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it appears that neither party has provided convincing documentation that sufficiently discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that their purported amount is a fair and reasonable reimbursement (Rule 133.307). After reviewing the services, the charges, and both parties' positions, it is clearly evident that some other amount represents the fair and reasonable reimbursement.

During the rule development process for facility guidelines, the Commission had contracted with Ingenix, a professional firm specializing in actuarial and health care information services, in order to secure data and information on reimbursement ranges for these types of services. The results of this analysis resulted in a recommended range for reimbursement for workers' compensation services provided in these facilities. In addition, we received information from both ASCs and insurance carriers in the recent rule revision process. While not controlling, we considered this information in order to find data related to commercial market payments for these services. This information provides a very good benchmark for determining the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement amount for the services in dispute.

To determine the amount due for this particular dispute, staff compared the procedures in this case to the amounts that would be within the reimbursement range recommended by the Ingenix study (from 213.3% - 290% of Medicare for 2004). Staff considered the other information submitted by the parties and the issues related to the specific procedures performed in this dispute. Based on this review and considering the similarity of the various procedures involved in this surgery, staff selected a reimbursement amount in the lower end of the Ingenix range. The total amount was then presented to a staff team with health care provider billing and insurance adjusting experience. This team considered the recommended amount, discussed the facts of the individual case, and selected the appropriate "fair and reasonable" amount to be ordered in the final decision.

Based on the facts of this situation, the parties' positions, the Ingenix range for applicable procedures, and the consensus of other

	total of \$1,118.00 for these services, the health care			
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND O	ORDER			
Based upon the review of the disputed he entitled to additional reimbursement in the	ealthcare services, the Medical Review Division he amount of \$226.00. The Division hereby <b>O</b> st due at the time of payment to the Requestor version of the time of payment to the Requestor version.	RDERS the insurance carrier to		
		07/13/05		
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order		
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A	HEARING			
Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request. The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.  Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.				
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVERY CERTIFICATION				
I hereby verify that I received a copy of the Signature of Insurance Carrier:	this Decision and Order in the Austin Represer	ntative's box.  Date:		