

# Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

## MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

| PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Type of Requestor:</b> (x) Health Care Provider ( ) Injured Employee | ( ) Insurance Carrier                  |
| Requestor's Name and Address:<br>Vista Medical Center Hospital          | MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-A226-01        |
| 4301 Vista  | Claim No.:                             |
| Pasadena, Texas 77504   | Injured Employee's Name:               |
| Respondent's Name and Address:<br>Texas Mutual Insurance Company        | Date of Injury:                        |
| 6210 East Highway 290<br>Austin, Texas 78723-1098<br>Box 54             | Employer's Name: Indoor Air, Inc.      |
|   | Insurance Carrier's No.: 99D0000345198 |

### PART II: REQUESTOR'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor submitted operative report, discharge summary and a position statement. The requestor indicates in their position statement that, "As discussed in this decision, there is no evidence or denials presented by the Carrier that the prices billed were not Provider's usual and customary charges (which the Hospital must bill under Commission's rules), that the price markup was not consistent with the geographical or other hospital billing practices, or that the final price was not fair and reasonable."

#### PART III: RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

Carrier submitted a position statement that supports their reason for no additional reimbursement. "This requester charged \$43,053.15 a day for services that were NOT unusually extensive or costly. This carrier reimbursed the requester one day surgical per diem based on the TWCC Acute Care In-Patient Fee Guideline. The requester has not argued that the services were unusually costly or extensive, just that they billed over \$40,000, as you can see in the requester's TWCC 60 packet."

#### PART IV: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

| Date(s) of Service | CPT Code(s) or Description | Part V<br>Reference | Additional Amount<br>Due (if any) |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 07/15/04-07/16/04  | Surgical Admission         |                     |                                   |
|                    |                            |                     |                                   |
|                    |                            |                     |                                   |
|                    |                            |                     |                                   |

### 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 the provider, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." The provider submitted an operative report indicating that a bilateral L4-5, L5-S1 partial laminectomy, foraminotomy was performed, the patient was taken to the recovery room in good condition and no complications were noted. 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.

Requestor billed \$43,053.15 for the one day-stay.

The carrier made reimbursement for the 1-day stay in the amount of \$1,118.00.

Therefore, reimbursement based on per diem is \$1,118.00(1 x \$1,118.00), leaving no additional reimbursement recommended.

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: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES IMPACTING DECISION

28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. 134.401 (c)(6).

#### PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND ORDER

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.

Ordered by:

Michael Bucklin

09/09/05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Order

### 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.