

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. Vista Medical Center Hospital 4301 Vista Rd. Pasadena, TX 77504		MDR Tracking No.:	M4-05-2510-01
		TWCC No.:	
		Injured Employee's Name:	
Respondent's Name and Address Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co. Box 42 P.O. Box 162443 Austin, TX 78716		Date of Injury:	
		Employer's Name:	Crane Plumbing LLC
		Insurance Carrier's No.:	023050000215940001

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
04/07/04	04/12/04	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$35,743.49	\$0.00

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

TWCC Rule 134.401 provides the rules regarding reimbursement for Acute Care In-patient Hospital Fee services. Specifically, reimbursement consists of 75% of remaining charges for the entire admission, after a Carrier audits a bill... This figure is presumptively considered to be "fair and reasonable" in accordance with the preamble of TWCC Rule 134... Further, the TWCC stated that the stop-loss threshold increased hospital reimbursement and will ensure fair and reasonable rates for hospitals and ensure access to quality health care for injured workers...

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

While the Requestor did bill over \$40,000 for its services, it has not shown the procedure to be either unusually costly or extensive. As such, it has failed to meet the two-pronged Stop-Loss criteria and merits no additional monies.

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." The patient underwent an L3-4 and L4-5 laminectomy and microdiscectomy. The claimant had been told that he had borderline diabetes and during the hospital stay his diabetes became apparent. The claimant was subsequently put on Glucotrol XL 2.5 mg which controlled his blood sugar well. With the spine surgery the tolerated this well. On the second hospital day the claimant was transitioned over to oral medications that give the claimant nausea, and was put back on the PCA pump for another 24 hours. During the first couple of days, the T-max temperature was 100.6. Subsequent to that, the temperature never went above 100.6, nor did the claimant need to have any type of antipyretics. 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 4 days for surgical). Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$4,472.00 (4 times \$1,118). In addition, the hospital is entitled to additional reimbursement for (implantables/MRIs/CAT Scans/pharmaceuticals) as follows: Implantables were not used in the surgical procedure.

The insurance carrier paid a total of \$5,590.00. 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 AND ORDER

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

Findings & Decision by:

Marguerite Foster

May 12, 2005

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 en 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: _____