MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
Type of Requestor: ☐ HCP ☐ IE ☐ IC	Response Timely Filed? Yes No
Requestor's Name and Address HCA Healthcare 6000 NW Parkway San Antonio, TX 78249	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-1058-01
	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address AMERICAN CASUALTY CO OF READING PA	Date of Injury:
BURNS ANDERSON JURY & BRENNER PO BOX 26300 AUSTIN TX 78755-0300 Austin Commission Representative Box 47	Employer's Name: MMI Products Inc.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 90000008

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of	of Service	CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	То	CIT Couc(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	
12/01/03	12/05/03	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$36,797.20	\$573.60

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Per TWCC contract total charges exceeding \$40,000 are reimbursed @ 75%. Audited charges are patient convenience items and non-covered charges.

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Reimbursement in this case should be pursuant to the standard per diem reimbursement method. The stop-loss method for outlier cases does not apply as the services provided to the claimant were not unusually extensive and costly. This case does not involve an unusually lengthy stay, unusually extensive services by Provider, or services that were unusually costly to Provider. In other words, it is not the type of outlier case for which the Commission developed the stop-loss reimbursement method. Rather, this case involves a routine hospital stay in which Provider performed routine services for a routine operation. The Provider has not justified the use of the stop-loss method in this case by demonstrating that the admission required unusually extensive services. Therefore, the standard per diem reimbursement method should be applied. However, even if the stop-loss exception were otherwise applicable to this case, surgical implants are excepted from stop-loss and, when medically necessary, are reimbursed at cost plus 10%. There is no justification for reimbursement of implants at 75% of Provider's grossly inflated charges. Reimbursement for implants at cost plus ten percent provides reimbursement that is consistent with the Act's statutory standards. Finally, even if the stop-loss exception were otherwise applicable to this case, the stop-loss provisions of the guideline are invalid for the reasons stated.

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

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the per diem plus carve-out methodology described in the same rule.

The total length of stay for this admission was 4 days (consisting of 0 days in an intensive care unit and 4 days for surgical).

Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$4,472 (0 times \$1,560 plus 4 times \$1,118). In addition, the hospital is entitled to additional reimbursement for (implantables/MRIs/CAT Scans/pharmaceuticals) as follows:				
Requestor provided documentation for implant	tables in the amount of \$8,938.20 (\$7,643.20 ar	nd \$1,295.00). Cost plus 10% = \$9.832.02.		
	90 and received payments totaling \$5,768.50. Envisions of Rule 134.401(c), we find that the held to \$573.60.			
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND OF	RDER			
Based upon the review of the disputed hea entitled to additional reimbursement in the	althcare services, the Medical Review Divise amount of \$573.60. The Division hereby due at the time of payment to the Requestor	ORDERS the insurance carrier to		
	Gail A. Anderson	04/08/05		
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order		
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A H	EARING			
for a hearing must be in writing and it mu (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision care provider and placed in the Austin Repudays after it was mailed and the first workin Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or for the contraction of the contraction	sagree with all or part of the Decision and hast be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk on (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3) resentatives box on This is going day after the date the Decision was place a request for a hearing should be sent to: Chefaxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision was placed to (512) 804-4011.	of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20. This Decision was mailed to the health Decision is deemed received by you five d in the Austin Representative's box (28 ief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, ecision should be attached to the request.		
The party appealing the Division's Decisi involved in the dispute.	on shall deliver a copy of their written req	uest for a hearing to the opposing party		
Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.				
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVE	RY CERTIFICATION			
I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision and Order in the Austin Representative's box.				
Signature of Insurance Carrier:		Date:		