



MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Type of Requestor: (x) Health Care Provider () Injured Employee () Insurance Carrier	
Requestor's Name and Address: Surgical and Diagnostic Center, LP 729 Bedford Eules Road West, Ste. 100 Hurst, TX 76053	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-9986-01
	Claim No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name: Assoc. Casualty Insurance Co. Rep. Box # 53	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Northwest ISD
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 033427

PART II: REQUESTOR'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary as listed on the Table of Disputed Services: "Carrier did not pay at fair and reasonable according to the ACT and TWCC Rules."

Principle Documentation: 1. DWC 60 package
 2. UB-92
 3. Explanation of Benefits (EOBs)
 4. Medical Reports

PART III: RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary states in part, "The provider was reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate."

Principle Documentation: 1. Response to DWC 60

PART IV: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code	CPT Code(s) or Description	Part V Reference	Additional Amount Due (if any)
7-12-04	M, G, F	ASC charges for hardware injection from T12 through L2 with c-arm verification billed with procedure code 83.98, 80048, 85025, 82947, 36415, 93005 and 93010	1	\$0.00
TOTAL DUE				\$0.00

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

1. 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 Division Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

Claimant underwent hardware injection from T12 through L2 with c-arm verification.

The insurance carrier paid \$1415.80.

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 Division 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. Based on this review, the original reimbursement on these services exceeds the higher end of the Ingenix range. The decision for no additional reimbursement was then presented to a staff team with health care provider billing and insurance adjusting experience. This team considered the decision and discussed the facts of the individual case.

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 Dispute Resolution we find that no additional reimbursement is due for these services.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES IMPACTING DECISION

Texas Labor Code 413.011(a-d)
28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. §134.1

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement.

Decision by:

Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA

January 5, 2007

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Decision

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST JUDICIAL REVIEW

Appeals of medical dispute resolution decisions and orders are procedurally made directly to a district court in Travis County [see Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031(k), as amended and effective Sept. 1, 2005]. An appeal to District Court must be filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the decision that is the subject of the appeal is final and appealable. The Division is not considered a party to the appeal.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.