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 Twelve Oaks Medical Center	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-4296-01				
C/o Hollaway & Gumbert	TWCC No.:				
3701 Kirby Drive, Suite 1288 Houston, TX 77098-3926	Injured Employee's Name:				
Respondent's Name and Address North American Specialty Ins./Rep. Box #: 22	Date of Injury:				
C/o Flahive, Ogden & Latson 505 West 12 th Street	Employer's Name: Allco Inc.				
Austin, TX 78701	Insurance Carrier's No.: North American Specialty Ins.				

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То		Amount in Dispute	Amount Duc	
2-13-04	2-19-04	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$6,905.39	\$00.00	

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position statement of March 11, 2005 states in part "... To date, a total of \$27,200.87 has been paid in connection with this claim. It is our position that reimbursement was improperly determined pursuant to the acute care inpatient hospital fee guidelines... Specifically on the dates February 13, 2004 through February 19, 2004, _____ received treatment at our client's facility relating to postop wound infection. Because _____ admission was inpatient, this claim would be reimbursed pursuant to TWCC Rule 134.401..."

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position statement of March 4, 2005 states in part "This is a medical fee dispute arising from an inpatient hospital surgical admission, dates of service 02/13/2004 to 02/18/2004... To qualify for stop loss, the services provided by the hospital must be unusually costly to the hospital as opposed to unusually priced to the carrier... There is no evidence submitted by the hospital demonstrating that the services provided by the hospital were unusually extensive. There is no evidence of "complications, infections, or multiple surgeries" requiring additional services by the hospital... Secondly, there is no evidence that the services provided by the hospital were unusually costly to the hospital..."

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 operative report dated February 14, 2004 indicates the "Preoperative Diagnoses: Deep wound infection, lumbar wound and the surgeon performed a Lumbar wound debridement to bone, lumbar wound." 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 6 days (consisting of 6 days for surgical). Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$6,708.00 (6 times \$1,118). The Respondent paid \$21,029.51 for private room and board and later paid \$6,171.36 for private room and board for a total of \$27,200.87.

Considering the reimbursement amount calculated in accordance with the provisions of rule 134.401(c) compared with the amount previously paid by the insurance carrier, we find that no additional reimbursement is due for these services.

PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION

Based upon the review	of the disputed healthcare	services, the Medica	l Review Division has	determined that the	e requestor is
not entitled to addition	al reimbursement.				

Findings and Decision by:

Roy Lewis	4-19-05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Decision

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, 7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite # 100, 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 in the Austin Representative's box.

Signature of Insurance Carrier:

Date: