MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL	L INFORMATION					
Type of Requestor:	(X) HCP () IE	() IC	Response Timely	y Filed? (X) Yes () No		
Requestor Surgical and Diagnostic Center, LP			MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-9380-01			
729 Bedford Euless Road West, Ste. 100			TWCC No.:			
Hurst, TX 76053			Injured Employee's Name:			
Respondent Fidelity & Guaranty Insurance Co.			Date of Injury:			
Rep. Box # 19			Employer's Name: Cracker Barrel Old Country Store			
			Insurance Carrier's No.: 000537005313WC01			
PART II: SUMMAI	RY OF DISPUTE AN	D FINDINGS				
Dates of Service CPT Code(s) or 1		Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due		
From	То					
6-29-04	8-17-04	Caudal therapeutic epidural steroid injection billed with procedure code 03.92 (X3)		\$5595.14	\$2130.00	
		Insurance carrier's payment (subtracted)			<\$1382.43>	
		Additional reimbursen recommended	nent		\$747.57	
PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY						
Carrier did not pay at fair and reasonable according to the ACT and TWCC Rules.						
PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY						
The billing in dispute has been paid at a fair and reasonable rate in accordance with TWCC guidelines, policies and rules, and the Texas Labor Code.						
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.

On 6-29-04, 7-20-04 and 8-17-04, claimant underwent caudal therapeutic epidural steroid injection.

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% to 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 experienced staff members in Medical Review, we find that the fair and reasonable reimbursement amount for these services is \$2130.00. Since the insurance carrier paid a total of \$1382.43 for these services, the health care provider is entitled to an additional reimbursement in the amount of \$747.57.

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 entitled to additional reimbursement in the amount of \$747.57. The Division hereby **ORDERS** the insurance carrier to remit this amount plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the Requestor within 20-days of receipt of this Order.

Ordered by:

	Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA	August 16, 2005				
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order				
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING						
for a hearing must be in writing and (twenty) days of your receipt of this of care provider and placed in the Austin days after it was mailed and the first y Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(c	it must be received by the TWCC Chief lecision (28 Texas Administrative Code § n Representatives box on	n and has a right to request a hearing. A request Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health . This Decision is deemed received by you five as placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk,				

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: