

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Bill Review
P.O. Box 138006
Sacramento, CA 95813-8006
Fax: (916) 605-4280



INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

March 25, 2015

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

IBR Case Number:	CB14-0001954	Date of Injury:	08/27/1994
Claim Number:	[Redacted]	Application Received:	12/19/2014
Claims Administrator:	[Redacted]	Assignment Date:	01/21/2015
Provider Name:	[Redacted]		
Employee Name:	[Redacted]		
Disputed Codes:	82145, 83925, 83925-59,83992, 83840, 82520, 80154, 82205, 82145-59, 82055 & 82570		

Dear [Redacted]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Bill Review (“IBR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IBR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

Final Determination: OVERTURN. MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is reversed and the Claim Administrator owes the Provider additional reimbursement of \$250.00 for the review cost and \$124.35 in additional reimbursement for a total of \$374.35. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The Claim Administrator is required to reimburse the Provider a total of \$374.35 within 45 days of the date on this letter per section 4603.2 (2a) of the California Labor Code. The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its expert reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties. In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 20 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4603.6(f).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, M.D., M.P.H.
Medical Director

cc: [Redacted]
[Redacted]

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Pertinent documents reviewed to reach the determination:

- The Independent Bill Review Application
- The original billing itemization
- Supporting documents submitted with the original billing
- Explanation of Review in response to the original bill
- Request for Second Bill Review and documentation
- Supporting documents submitted with the request for second review
- The final explanation of the second review
- PPO Contract: 85%
- AMA CPT 2014

HOW THE IBR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services Chief Coding Specialist reviewed the case file and researched pertinent coding and billing standards to reach a determination. In some cases a physician reviewer was employed to review the clinical aspects of the care to help make a determination. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services.

ANALYSIS AND FINDING

Based on review of the case file the following is noted:

- **ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Provider seeking remuneration for Laboratory CPT Services; 82145, 83925, 83925-59, 83992, 83840, 82520, 80154, 82205, 82145-59, 82055 & 82570 for date of service 05/29/2014.**
- Pursuant to Labor Code section 5307.1(g)(2), the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation orders that the pathology and clinical laboratory fee schedule portion of the Official Medical Fee Schedule (OMFS) contained in title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 9789.50, has been adjusted to conform to the changes to the Medicare payment system that were adopted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) for calendar year 2013. Effective for services rendered on or after January 1, 2013, the maximum reasonable fees for pathology and laboratory services shall not exceed 120% of the applicable California fees set forth in the calendar year 2012 Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule. Based on the adoption of the CMS payment system, CMS coding guidelines and fee schedule were referenced during the review of this Independent Bill Review (IBR) case.
- EOR reflects CPT Codes denied by the Claims Administrator with the following rationale: "The documentation submitted does not support the rationale for 3 or more drug tests performed in a 6 month consecutive time period as this exceeds the recommended standard time frame. Diagnosis code indicates severe injury."
- The CPT Codes in question will be defined utilizing the American Medical Association Current Procedural Code Book, 2014:

CPT 82145: AMPHETAMINE/METHAMPHETAMINE

CPT 82520: COCAINE/METABOLITE

CPT 80154: QUANTITATIVE BENZODIAZEPINES

CPT 82055: BARBITURATES, NOT ELSEWERE SPECIFIED

CPT 83840: METHADONE

CPT 83992: PHENCYCLIDINE

CPT 83925: OPIATE(S) DRUG AND METABOLITES EACH PROCEDURE: Opiate(s),

CPT 82055: ALCOHOL ANY SPECIMEN EXCEPT BREATH

CPT 82570: CREATININE OTHER SOURCE

MODIFIER -59: Distinct Procedural Service

- CMS 1500 form reflects four diagnosis codes. The third diagnosis codes, V58.69 Long-term use meds supports the billing of drug testing.
- To best support the procedure performed, it is recommend the Provider code to the highest specificity and place V58.69 in the primary (first) position.
- Authorization 05/19/2014 indicates the following: “Partial certification 10 panel random urine drug screen for qualitative analysis (either through point of care testing or laboratory testing) with confirmatory laboratory testing only performed on inconstant results), x 1
- Date of service is 05/29/2014. No documentation of history of lab results received from Provider or Claims Administrator. As such, IBR unable to ascertain whether 05/29/2014 is the “x 1” or more authorized urine drug test.
- No response to the contrary from Claims Administrator; 05/29/2014 will be considered as the certified ‘x1.’
- The Provider states the “medical office holds a Clinical Laboratory License as a high complexity laboratory (effective 06/28/10).” The analyzer utilized to perform the assays is an “Olympus AU400 and AU640.” According to the manufacturer, this dual analyzer is classified as a “**high complexity**” unit.
- Moderate v. High complexity as defined by Centers for Disease Control Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA), “Clinical laboratory test systems are assigned a moderate or high complexity category on the basis of seven criteria given in the CLIA regulations. For commercially available FDA-cleared or approved tests, the test complexity is determined by the FDA during the pre-market approval process. For tests developed by the laboratory or that have been modified from the approved manufacturer’s instructions, the complexity category defaults to high complexity per the CLIA regulations, See 42 CFR 493.17.
- A similar code historically assigned for CPT Codes 882145, 83925, 83925-59, 83992, 83840, 82520, 80154, 82205, & 82145-59 is G0431, “multiple drug classes by high complexity test method.”
- US Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), HCPCS G0431 is defined as follows: G0431 (Drug screen, qualitative; multiple drug classes by **high complexity test method** (e.g., immunoassay, enzyme assay), per patient encounter) will be used to report more complex testing methods, such as multi-channel chemistry analyzers, where a more complex instrumented device is required to perform some or all of the screening tests for the patient. Note that the descriptor has been revised for CY 2011. This code may only be reported if the drug screen test(s) is classified as CLIA high complexity test(s) with the following restrictions:

