MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Type of Requestor: (x) HCP ( ) IE ( ) IC	**Response Timely Filed?** (x) Yes () No
Requestor's Name and Address Tenet Healthcare/RHD Center 2401 Internet Blvd., Suite 110 Frisco, Texas 75034	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-1268-01 TWCC No.: Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address Continental Casualty Company C/O Burns Anderson Jury & Brenner P O Box 26300 Westlake Station Austin, Texas 78755-0300 Box 47	Date of Injury: Employer's Name: Waste Management, Inc. Insurance Carrier's No.: 64524177K3

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
12/29/03	**11/03/03**	**Hospital Admission**	**$35,040.03**	**$0.00**

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

"On behalf of Provider, we have reviewed the claim and payment for the above hospital admission. Our findings reveal this claim has not been paid according to the hospital fee guideline published by the Texas Workers Compensation Commission (TWCC). This claim in the amount of $65,982.94 is an inpatient surgical claim in which charges exceed $40,000, the stoploss threshold amount, however payment is not based on this methodology and we request you to review this for Medical Dispute Resolution as a Fee Dispute."

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

"On October 29, 2003, Claimant was admitted to Provider's facility at Provider's Hospital for elective surgery consisting of a lumbar fusion performed by MD. The claimant was discharged five days later on November 3, 2003. Provider charged Carrier $65,982.94 for the 5-day admission. See UB-92 with Invoices, attached as Exhibit 1. Carrier paid Provider a total of $14,483.83. This amount represents payment of $2,236 for two pre-authorized days under the standard per diem reimbursement method of the ACIHFG, plus additional reimbursement for implants of $12,207.80, at cost plus ten percent."

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 additional 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 information 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 methodology described in the same rule. The carrier indicates in their letter indicating that this was a lumbar fusion. The requestor did not submit an operative report.

The carrier reimbursed the provider for only 2-day surgical stay indicating that only 2 days were preauthorized. The provider did not refute this in their position statement.

The carrier made reimbursement based on per diem for the 2-day preauthorized stay $2,236.00(2 x $1,118 = $2,236.00 per diem). The

carrier also reimbursed the requestor an additional amount of $12,207.80 for the implantables, the provider billed $23,191.55. The provider submitted invoices totaling $11,098.00 in billed amount, so using the billed amount at cost plus ten percent $12,207.80 ($11,098.00 x 10% = $12,207.80). The total amount of per diem and cost plus ten percent is $14,443.80 and the carrier reimbursed the provider $14,443.80, therefore, no additional reimbursement is recommended.

Therefore, based on the facts of this situation, the parties' positions, and the application of the provisions of Rule 134.401(c), we find that the health care provider is not entitled to additional reimbursement.

PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION

Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor **is not** entitled to additional reimbursement.

Ordered by:

	Michael Bucklin	05/10/05
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 this Decision and Order in the Austin Representative's box.

Signature of Insurance Carrier: ____ Date: ________________________