

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

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



INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

September 11, 2015

██████████
██
██

IBR Case Number:	CB15-0001267	Date of Injury:	07/22/2014
Claim Number:	██████████	Application Received:	08/05/2015
Assignment Date:	09/03/2015		
Claims Administrator:	██████████		
Date(s) of service:	05/26/2015 – 06/01/2015		
Provider Name:	██		
Employee Name:	██		
Disputed Codes:	99499-86		

Dear ██████████

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 \$195.00 for the review cost and \$3,360.00 in additional reimbursement for a total of \$3,555.00. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The Claim Administrator is required to reimburse the Provider a total of **\$3,555.00** 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: ██████████
██

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
- OMFS

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 Functional Restoration Evaluation services, billed as Unlisted Evaluation and Management Procedure Code 99499-86, for date of service 05/26/2015, 05/27/2015 & 06/01/2015.**
- SBR by Claims Administrator resulted in “duplicate claim” with upheld recommended allowance of “\$0.00,”
- Initial EOR indicated “documentation” required for reimbursement.
- **Modifier -86:** OMFS Modifier is used when prior authorization was received for services that exceed OMFS ground rules.
- Contractual Agreement not available for IBR.
- Authorization reviewed; “ x 22 days” FRP “Approved by Physician Advisor,” meeting the requirements for Modifier – 86.
- Usual and Customary Fee indicated on (undated/addressed) correspondence as \$1,120.00 per day; Claims ID & Injured Worker noted on communication.
- Opportunity to Dispute communicated to Claims Administrator on 08/18/2015; response not yet received.
- OMFS allows for Unlisted Procedure Codes to be reimbursed by “By Report.” § 9789.12.4 (c) “In determining the value of a By Report procedure, consideration may be given to the value assigned to a **comparable** procedure or analogous code. The comparable procedure or analogous code should reflect similar amount of resources, such as practice expense, time, complexity, expertise, etc. as required for the procedure performed.”

- There is no allowance or comparable code listed under the OMFS for service billed with procedure code 99499 or, more specifically, a Functional Restoration Program; a CPT Code has yet to be formulated for this comprehensive program. As such, a contractual agreement or the OMFS will dictate the level of reimbursement.
- Contractual Agreement not available for IBR; signed Authorization by Claims Administrator does not indicate a “By Report” or PPO Reduction. As such, in absence of the actual contractual agreement, the signed authorization and the OMFS dictate reimbursement.
- **Based on the aforementioned documentation and guidelines, reimbursement is indicated for 99499 – 86.**

The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: 99499 - 86

Date of Service: 05/26/2015, 05/27/2015, & 06/01/2015							
Physician Services							
Service Code	Provider Billed	Plan Allowed	Dispute Amount	Assist Surgeon	Units	Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.	Notes
99499 - 86	\$1,120.00	\$0.00	\$3,600.00	N/A	3	\$3,360.00	Refer to Analysis

Copy to:

██████████
 ██████████
 ██████████

Copy to:

██
 ██
 ██