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Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs

Tuesday, May 18, 1999

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Government Management,
Information, and Technology,
Committee on Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Stephen Horn (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Horn and Biggert.

Staff present: J. Russell George, staff director and chief counsel; Matthew Ebert, policy advisor; Bonnie Heald, director of communications/professional staff member; Mason Alinger, clerk; Faith Weiss, minority counsel; and Earley Green, minority staff assistant.

Mr. Horn. The Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology will come to order. We are here today to learn how well the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs at the Department of Labor is treating Federal workers who are injured on the job.

The Federal Employees Compensation Act authorizes Federal agencies to compensate Federal employees when their injuries are sustained on the job. The act was intended to develop a nonadversarial arrangement whereby Federal employees would be compensated in a fair and equitable way while reducing the Federal Government’s exposure to tort liability.

Concerned by allegations that the process is unfair and structurally flawed, the subcommittee held a hearing in Long Beach, CA, on July 6 of last year to evaluate and discuss these issues. The complaints involved delays in medical authorizations, payments for medical treatment and the lack of judicial recourse. Some of these delays were so serious that one injured worker testified that the waiting period left him financially devastated and nearly cost him his life.

What was especially evident in all of the testimony were concerns with the customer service issues at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (OWCP). It was alleged that it is very difficult for a claimant to make contact with the office and that the response rate is very poor. Testimony suggested that when a claims examiner has been reached, the Federal worker receives little or no
guidance. It has been suggested time and time again that Federal
workers have to turn to lawyers, unions, and congressional offices
to assist them in getting a simple response.

Union members, congressional offices, lawyers and individuals
who are entrenched in the claims process continue to contact the
subcommittee about their negative experiences with the Office of
Workers' Compensation Programs, the agency responsible for ad-
ministering claims for injured workers. Some of these people will
not be able to testify today, but will submit statements for the
record.

Senator Slade Gorton of Washington has expressed his frustra-
tion in assisting constituents who are struggling with their work-
ers' compensation claims.

Mr. Gorton will be submitting a statement for the record, as will
Mr. John D. McLellan, Jr., a former Director of the Federal Em-
ployees' Compensation Programs, a division of the Office of Work-
ers' Compensation Programs. After retiring in 1985, Mr. McClellan,
a lawyer, attempted for 8 years to assist Federal injured workers
through the FECA appeals process. His testimony is especially re-
vealing, because of his close contacts with the OWCP and frustra-
tions in attempting to guide Federal injured workers through the
process. Mr. McClellan's statement will also be submitted for the
record.

Today, the subcommittee will examine whether the Office of
Workers' Compensation Programs is performing its mission of ad-
ministering the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in a fair,
timely, and efficient manner. The subcommittee will also examine
how well the agency is doing in developing top-of-the-line customer
service. In addition, we will examine the effectiveness and accuracy
of the agency's customer service survey.

The first panel will include former Federal employees who have
been injured on the job. These witnesses will describe the nature
of their experiences throughout the claims process and the obsta-
cles they have confronted.

The second panel of witnesses consists of professionals who have
dealt with the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs while
treating, representing or assisting Federal injured workers through
the appeals process. These witnesses represent a medical clinic, a
Federal union, a law firm and a congressional office.

Panel III will include representatives of the Office of Workers'
Compensation Programs, who will discuss improvements in cus-
tomer service at the agency, and a representative of the Office of
Inspector General of the Department of Labor, who will discuss its
recommendations for improving the medical authorization process
and the agency's customer service survey.

I welcome our witnesses today, and I look forward to their testi-
mony.

[The prepared statements of Hon. Stephen Horn and Hon. Jim
Turner follow:]
“Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs”

Statement by Congressman Stephen Horn (R-CA)
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology

May 18, 1999

A quorum being present, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology will come to order. We are here today to learn how well the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs at the Department of Labor is treating Federal workers who are injured on the job.

The Federal Employees’ Compensation Act authorizes Federal agencies to compensate Federal employees when their injuries are sustained on the job. The Act was intended to develop a non-adversarial arrangement whereby Federal employees would be compensated in a fair and equitable way while reducing the Federal Government’s exposure to tort liability.

Concerned by allegations that the process is unfair and structurally flawed, the subcommittee held a hearing in Long Beach, California on July 6th of last year to evaluate and discuss these issues. The complaints involved delays in medical authorizations, payments for medical treatment and the lack of judicial recourse. Some of these delays were so serious that one injured worker testified that the waiting period left him financially devastated and nearly cost him his life.

What was especially evident in all of the testimony were concerns with the customer service issues at the Office of Workers’ Compensation (OWCP). It was alleged that it is very difficult for a claimant to make contact with the office and that the response rate is poor. Testimony suggested that when a claims examiner has been reached, the Federal worker receives little or no guidance. It has been suggested time and time again that Federal workers have to turn to lawyers, unions, and congressional offices to assist them in getting a simple response.

Union members, congressional offices, lawyers and individuals who are entrenched in the claims process continue to contact the subcommittee about their negative experiences with the Office of Workers’ Compensation Program – the agency responsible for administering claims for injured Federal workers. Some of these people will not be able to testify today, but will submit statements for the record. Senatorcalc Gorton has expressed his frustrations in assisting constituents who are struggling with their workers’ compensation claims.

Mr. Gorton will be submitting a statement for the record, as will Mr. John D. McLellan Jr., a former director of the Federal Employees’ Compensation Program, a division of the Office of Workers’ Compensation
Program. After retiring in 1983, Mr. McLellan, a lawyer-sentenced for eight years to assist Federal injured workers through the FECA appeals process. His testimony is especially revealing, because of his close contacts with the OWCP and his personal experiences in guiding Federal injured workers through the process. Mr. McLellan's statement will also be submitted for the record.

Today, the subcommittee will examine whether the Office of Workers' Compensation Program is performing its mission of administering the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in a fair, timely, and efficient manner. The subcommittee will also examine how well the agency is doing in developing top-of-the-line customer service. In addition, we will examine the effectiveness and accuracy of the agency's customer service survey.

The first panel will include former Federal employees who have been injured on the job. These witnesses will describe the nature of their experiences throughout the claims process, and the obstacles they have confronted.

The second panel of witnesses consists of professionals who have dealt with the Office of Workers' Compensation Program while treating, representing, or assisting Federal injured workers through the appeals process. These witnesses represent a medical clinic, a Federal union, a law firm, and a Congressional Office.

Panel three will include representatives of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs who will discuss improvements in customer service at the agency, and a representative of the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Labor who will discuss its recommendations for improving the medical-authorization process and the agency's customer service survey.

I welcome our witnesses today, and look forward to their testimony.
Statement of the Honorable Jim Turner
GMIT: "Oversight of Customer Service
at the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs"
May 17, 1999

I would like to thank Chairman Horn for holding this hearing. Today, we will look at the customer service aspect of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs. While we will be provided with some of the details of one good experience with the agency, we will focus primarily on problem areas. It is important that we hear from those who are having difficulty with any federal program, especially those who have been injured in the course of their federal employment and are in need of care and treatment.

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs administers the federal workers' compensation program, which was created by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). The FECA passed in 1916 to assure that injured federal workers receive appropriate medical treatment and benefits. Since that time, the goal of the program has been to provide those who are injured with the resources to return to their jobs and fair compensation for those who cannot.

Today, we will hear from one federal employee who will soon return to work about his experience with the program. I would like to welcome a fellow Texan, Special Agent Matthew Fairbanks, who is in Washington D.C. to receive the highest honor his agency can bestow for the bravery he exhibited during a helicopter crash that tragically took the life of his instructor. While here in D.C., he also will attend an award ceremony recognizing the superior efforts of his nurse, Sue Maraglino, who oversaw his rehabilitation.
I would like to welcome our other witnesses as well. We will also hear from some former federal workers whose experiences with the workers' compensation program have been unsatisfactory. Their complaints are important, because they will help us in our troubleshooting efforts to identify the problems and focus on a solution. These injured federal workers have had difficulty obtaining answers to their questions about their respective cases and have not experienced prompt and courteous treatment. Documentation that they have a right to receive has not been forthcoming, and in at least one situation, requested medical records, which clearly should remain confidential, were sent to the wrong person.

Many of the complaints that we will hear about today appear to be more common than they should be for individuals contacting the workers' compensation program. This is inexcusable, and there should be measures within the program to assure that all of its staff are as competent, courteous, and professional as Nurse Maraglino.

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs has solicited the opinions of injured federal workers on customer services, and only 56% of those surveyed indicated satisfaction with their treatment—revealing that there is room for substantial improvement at this agency. The agency collects some information on customer service, but, as the Inspector General notes, it may not use this information effectively. If resource constraints are causing these customer service problems, I would hope that the agency is looking creatively at ways to maximize their resources and to find the money to ensure better service.
This hearing will provide us with an understanding of some of the most prevalent concerns regarding customer service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Program. My hope is that this hearing can help the agency focus on the areas that need the most improvement. The Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs should develop targeted responses to these customer service complaints and track their progress.
Mr. HORN. Let me explain how we will go about this. Since this is an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform, all of our witnesses are sworn prior to their testimony, and we will begin with panel I this morning. I see they are in their chairs.

Mr. Thomas Chamberlin, former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Welcome, Mr. Chamberlin. Dianne McGuinness, former employee of the Social Security Administration. Welcome. And Matthew Fairbanks, special agent/pilot, Drug Enforcement Agency. We welcome you also.

So if you will stand and raise your right hands.

[Witnesses affirmed.]

Mr. HORN. The clerk will note all three witnesses affirmed.

We will begin with this panel; and if we have time before 12:15, we will begin with part of panel II, Beth Balen in particular. She has come the longest distance, namely Anchorage, AK; and we want to accommodate her. We will try to go all through panel I and begin panel II, and at 12:15 we will take a break until 2 p.m., when the hearing will pick up again.

So, Mr. Chamberlin, why don’t you tell us in your own words, because we have all read the documents, which are very detailed and very helpful to us, but summarize for us, if you would, because we would like to enter into a dialog on this in terms of questions and answers. So don’t feel you have to read everything.

We are going to give you at least 10 minutes here to get through your statement; and then we will go to the next person, Ms. McGuinness, Mr. Fairbanks; and then we will have questions.

So please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF THOMAS CHAMBERLIN, FORMER AGENT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION; DIANNE MCGUINNES, FORMER EMPLOYEE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION; AND MATTHEW FAIRBANKS, SPECIAL AGENT/PILOT, DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for providing me the opportunity to present the barriers I have encountered in the process of filing a workers’ compensation claim with the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs with the intent to provide a synopsis of DOL–OWCP’s action for analysis to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I previously submitted a statement for the hearing today. Therefore, I will briefly summarize the barriers I have encountered.

I had approximately 25 years of Federal service when I filed my claim. I had proudly served with the United States Marine Corps in Vietnam. Following that, I had a brief construction service, and then I began my law enforcement career with the Washington, DC, police, metropolitan DC. Then I followed over as a special agent with the Drug Enforcement Agency, and I concluded my career as a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In 1993, after having been identified as a whistle-blower for reporting improper Title III wiretap matters, the FBI targeted me for a character assassination. This is where the problems erupted. Subsequently, I was removed from the rolls of the FBI in 1994.
On October 17, 1995, I filed a claim at the Department of Labor’s Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, a claim which has yet to be finalized. The three barriers I encountered are incompetency, inaction and an adversarial position. The exhibits I will present will overlap in these three areas.

I encountered these barriers first during the initial filings of my claim. In summary, it took 10 months, six mailings, unlimited calls, and action of the Secretary of Labor to initiate the filing of the claim.

The first exhibit I present is from Chris Brandstrip, supervisory claims examiner, Department of Labor; and it is dated April 26th; and it is to the FBI requesting compliance.

Mr. HORN. Without objection, this letter will be put in the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]
April 26, 1996

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment Standards Administration
Office of Workers' Compensation Programs
Division of Federal Employees' Compensation

(904) 232-2821/2

RE: Thomas M. Chamberlin

U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
ATTN: Walter R. Wilson
Supervisory Special Agent
Employee Benefits Unit
Washington, D.C. 20535

Dear Mr. Wilson:

This letter is in response to correspondence received from Mr. Chamberlin concerning his occupational disease claim. As per the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 20 - Employees' Benefits, chapter 10.102 Report of injury by the official superior, "as soon as possible but no later than 10 working days after receipt of written notice of injury from the employee, the official superior shall submit to the Office a written report of every injury or occupational disease... portions of forms CA-1 or CA-2 are provided for this purpose.

We have a copy of claim form CA-2 completed by Mr. Chamberlin and dated on October 18, 1995. As of this date our office has not received his original claim form for due process.

Please investigate why his claim has not been sent to our office for processing.

Sincerely,

Chris Brandstrom
Supervisory Claims Examiner
Liaison to Department of Justice

CC: Mr. Thomas M. Chamberlin
4310 Old Chapel Hill-Hillsborough Rd
Hillsborough, N.C. 27278

Working for America's Workforce
ATTENTION

OUR OFFICE HAS NO RECORD OF THIS INDIVIDUAL. IT APPEARS THAT THIS PERSON IS NOT A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE. WE ONLY HANDLES CLAIMS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE SUSTAINED JOB RELATED INJURY OR ILLNESS AND WE CANNOT HELP YOU WITH THIS MATTER.

WE ARE RETURNING THE MATERIALS YOU HAVE SUBMITTED FOR YOUR DISPOSITION.

Working for America's Workforce
Memorandum

To: JAMES R. PEREZ
   EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY OFFICER

From: SA KAREN Z. MEDERNACH

Subject: THOMAS N. CHAMBERLIN
   COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION
   FILE NUMBER: F-93-4459-0

Re telephone call from SA MEDERNACH, Milwaukee, to SSA RONALD DAVIS, FBINQ, on July 15, 1993.

During the course of conducting the captioned investigation, a number of Agents expressed their concern that SA CHAMBERLIN may be emotionally and/or mentally unstable. Several Agents believe he may be a danger to others, as well as to himself. The Agents requested anonymity.

The purpose of this memorandum is to make these concerns a matter of record for the Bureau and the Detroit Division.

280A/HQ1126337-22

- Mr. Perez
1 - SAC Heltzhoff (Personal Attention)
1 - SSA RONALD DAVIS
1 - Administrative Services Division
   Employee Assistance Program

BARRIER 2+3
August 5, 1998

Honorable David Price
Member of Congress
Suite 202
1777 Fordham Blvd.
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dear Congressman Price:

Your letter dated July 10, 1998, with enclosures, concerning the Freedom of Information-Privacy Acts (FOIPA) request of your constituent, Mr. Thomas M. Chamberlin, has been referred to me for response.

As a result of another search, we located an additional Medernach to Perez memorandum dated July 19, 1993, which is responsive to Mr. Chamberlin's request. He was furnished an unexcised copy of this memorandum on July 29, 1998.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in this FOIPA matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

J. Kevin O'Brien, Chief
Freedom of Information-Privacy Acts Section
Office of Public and Congressional Affairs
November 5, 1998

Mike Chamberlin
2606 Percussion Drive
Hillsborough, NC 27278

Dear Mr. Chamberlin:

We have reviewed your letter of June 2, 1998 with attachments requesting reconsideration of the decision of June 5, 1997.

After a limited review was conducted of this information, it has been determined that this information is not sufficient to warrant review as it is repetitive of information previously submitted or irrelevant in establishing your claim. As noted in the attached Memorandum to the Director, it has been determined that the information submitted is insufficient to warrant review the June 5, 1997 decision.

If you disagree with this decision, you have the right to appeal to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board for review of this decision. A request for review by the Appeals Board should be made within 90 days from the date of this decision. No new evidence may be submitted to the Board. Your request should be addressed to Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., N.W., R-2609, Washington, DC 20210. For good cause the Board may waive failure to file within 90 days if application is made within one year from the date of the decision being appealed.

Sincerely,

Marilyn M. Freunt
Hearing Representative

CC: FBI
Mr. HORN. Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. It is dated in April, and it states that DOL-OWCP had a copy of the claim completed by Mr. Chamberlin dated on October 18th and that they request why the FBI hasn’t began processing it.

The next memo was a memo from Department of Labor, and it indicates here, this is approximately 1 year later, my entire package from my file was returned to me. And it states, “This person is not a Federal employee. We are returning the materials you have submitted for your disposition.” The memo is not signed, does not bear a name. It just returned the entire package.

That was what I had encountered in trying to file the claim.

Following that, the second segment was and is going to review process.

After having filed the claim, I had inquired with William Israel, the claims examiner, to see if he had received my package. There had been a total of six mailings, all registered return receipt. This is exhibit 3. And on that the exhibits are signed bearing a similar signature from a DOL-OWCP employee, and the dates range from September 1996 up to and including March 1998.

Of significance is the one on November 25, 1996. This is the reconsideration I had submitted to Mr. Israel, and Mr. Israel had stated he had not received the package. However, it is the same signature that the other five bear.

Following this is what I have labeled as the notorious Karen Mendernach homicidal-suicidal memo. After having been targeted as a whistle-blower, on July 19, 1993, Special Agent Mendernach prepared a confidential memo to FBI headquarters and FBI management in Detroit stating, “Chamberlin may be emotionally or mentally unstable. Several agents believe he may be a danger to himself as well as to others. The agents requested anonymity.”

This report I have been unable to obtain for quite a period of time. My attorneys, my treating doctors had requested it, and I had pleaded with the Department of Labor, Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, to obtain the document, but to no avail. However, it was released on August 5, 1998, through a congressional inquiry from Honorable David Price. And that is the fifth exhibit.

The final exhibit is a memo from Marilyn Preuit, a hearing representative, and this is the denial of my last reconsideration. And in that she specifically states, “If you disagree with this decision, you have the right to appeal before the Employees’ Compensation Appeals Board.”

Additionally, I had talked with Stephanie Stone as well as Deputy Director Sheila Williams in regards to do I have the right to appeal for a reconsideration. Ms. Williams specifically told me that she did not have that answer and that she would have to do the research to find out if I had the right for reconsideration.

Concluding, the DOL-OWCP also maintains the position it is a security matter. I challenge this, for during the Merit Systems Protection Board in December 1994, Administrative Law Judge Nina Puglia had informed my attorney that it was an open court matter and that it was open to the public. Additionally, OWCP claims security, while the FBI has only produced approximately 20 pages,
while the claimant has submitted over 1,000 pages of FBI documents, all of which are unclassified.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I would again like to personally thank you for allowing me to participate in this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Chamberlin follows:]
Statement of Thomas Mike Chastelier before the
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology of the
House Committee on Government Reform
Presented on Tuesday May 18, 1999 during the Hearing on
"Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of
Workers' Compensation Programs"

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for providing me the
opportunity to present the barriers I have encountered in the process of filing a worker's compensation
claim with the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs with the intent to provide a synopsis of DOL-
OWCP's action for analysis to improve "effectiveness and efficiency".

BACKGROUND

Upon graduation from high school I joined the United States Marine Corps. I proudly served a tour in
Viet Nam and was involved in several skirmishes, the most notable was the attempted siege of Khe Sanh
in 1968. I was honorably discharged in September 1968 and received several medals and commendations one
of which was a Purple Heart for shrapnel wounds sustained to the arms and legs.

Following my military career, I began working construction in my hometown area of Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania. After a few years of wandering, I met my lovely wife (nee), Terry Bruno. We began to
focus on a family and a career.

I began my law enforcement career in February 1972 with the Metropolitan Police Department,
Washington, DC. We were married in May 1972. Our family and careers began to evolve. I remained
with the MPDC until December 1979 at which time I received an appointment as a Special Agent with the
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). In March 1984, I received an appointment as a Special Agent
to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the believed to be "premier law enforcement agency".

I had a distinguished law enforcement career until September 1999: I reported FBI wrongdoing to the
Chief Judge of the United States Federal Court, Eastern District of Michigan involving improper actions
surrounding Title III matters (wiretaps). The FBI conducted its own internal investigation. My law
enforcement career began a downward spiral.

In the summer of 1997, another individual brought forth similar allegations of FBI wrongdoing. During
this period, FBI personnel including management began to attack my character. Several agents reported I
was homicidal-suicidal, however, they requested confidentiality. I have been unable to identify these
agents. Via a congressional inquiry last summer, 1998, I did receive the notorious "Karen Mondromack
Memorial-Suicidal Meme" documenting such unsubstantiated allegations.

Additionally, agents reported I was paranoid, claiming black heritage and not trustworthy. More
significant, five agents reported I assaulted one of them with a firearm. Interestingly, those five agents
reported the alleged action twenty-two (22) months after the alleged assault. The FBI began their focus on
terminating my law enforcement career. I was removed from the "rolls of the FBI" in September 1994 for
failure to cooperate on an internal investigation I initiated.

It should be noted when I began my law enforcement career I also began higher educational pursuits.
During my 23 years while working as a full time law enforcement officer I earned the following degrees:
AA & BA in Law Enforcement, Masters of Forensic Science, Masters of Public Administration and
completed all coursework towards a Ph.D. This final pursuit was placed in a moratorium due to the FBI's
actions.
OWCP CLAIM

Barrier One - Filing a Claim

The actions of the FBI plagued interminable stress on me. Subsequently, I filed an OWCP claim on October 17, 1995 with the appropriate paperwork forwarded to my former employer, the FBI for their action. A claim which has yet to be finalized. All correspondence followed by the claimant to either the DOL-OWCP and/or the FBI was sent certified return receipt with the appropriate documentation maintained. Additionally, numerous telephone calls occurred between the claimant and the respective parties during this entire process.

On January 8, 1996, DOL-OWCP Supervisor Stephanie Foster returned my file stating DOL-OWCP did not have a case file, therefore, the file being returned.

On January 16, 1996, I submitted the file for a second time to DOL-OWCP following telephonic conversation with OWCP personnel with the appropriate paperwork forwarded to the FBI requesting action for the second time.

On March 3, 1996, I submitted a follow-up letter to both DOL-OWCP and the FBI to determine the claim status. I also had several additional telephonic conversations with DOL-OWCP but to no avail.

On April 3, 1996, DOL-OWCP Technical Advisor Kevin Finn returned my file stating he needed my employer’s (FBI) completed paperwork before he could begin the process.

On April 26, 1996, DOL-OWCP Supervisor Chris Brandrup submitted a letter to FBIHQ “requesting FBI compliance”.

On July 19, 1996. I submitted a complete file to Honorable Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor, requesting assistance. I also stated DOL-OWCP had a complete file in their possession.

On July 29, 1996, Lee Haywood of DOL-OWCP left a message on my answering machine my file would be forwarded to Supervisor Stephanie Foster.

On August 1, 1996, DOL-OWCP returned my entire file with a note enclosed stating, "... THIS PERSON IS NOT A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE." The DOL-OWCP document did not contain the name of any individual. It just stated, "WE ARE RETURNING THE MATERIALS YOU HAVE SUBMITTED FOR YOUR DISPOSITION."

On August 8, 1996, Claims Examiner William Israell accepted Chamberlin's DOL-OWCP claim for review.

In summary it took more than 10 months, over 6 mailings, unlimited calls and action by the Secretary of Labor to sustain the filing of the claim.

Barrier One could have been overcome by DOL-OWCP having competent employees and a SOP (standard operating procedure) in place with monitoring to ensure compliance.
Barrier Two - Employer's (FBI) deceptive actions: OOL-OWCP's inaction

I pleaded from the onset of the filing of the claim for the FBI to produce the notorious "Mendernach Homicidal-Suicidal Memo" and all FBI documentation surrounding the FBI's character assassination. I stated it was my belief the FBI is and would continue to withhold the documentation. Subsequently, I pleaded for assistance from OOL-OWCP in obtaining the documents.

My position was the documents would establish one of two things, the claimant's mental health problems or the employer's action (character assassinations) caused severe stress resulting in depression.

1. FBI personnel including management according to FBI documentation found the claimant to be suffering from a mental illness while in the performance of his FBI Special Agent duties. The claimant was of sound mind at the time he received his FBI appointment and routinely passed his annual physicals as well as his required updated top secret security clearances. Therefore, the mental illness evolved while in his performance of duty. It would be in the employer's own documentation.

A specific example of this is on two occasions, 9/17/93 and 10/12/93, FBI management in the Detroit Division requested authorization from FBIHQ to order the claimant to "undergo psychiatric evaluations." The FBI refuses to produce all relevant documents surrounding the psychiatric requests. OOL-OWCP refuses to assist the claimant in obtaining the documents. The claimant was never ordered to undergo a psychiatric evaluation by the FBI.

2. The FBI's calculated actions in the ploy to destroy my character, i.e. character assassination, placed unreasonable stress on me resulting in a state of chronic depression. I decided I was a hostile, normal individual in the summer of 1993. I was performing fully successful as a Special Agent with the FBI per my two latest performance reports dated 4/01/93 and 9/10/93. I was nearing completion of my Ph.D. coursework at Michigan State University and serving as an adjunct professor at the University of Detroit-Mercy. Additionally, I was active in volunteer community action such as youth baseball and soccer coach, on the Board of Directors Community Drug Program, juvenile mentor via local courts, religious instructor at church and co-chairperson for a future project for the year 2020 involving six police departments.

I was fulfilling my dreams, i.e. a happy family (loving, beautiful wife, 2 great daughters, one in college and one starting in September '93, a nine year son who was perfect and a true friend), a fulfilling career and in a position to serve society in professional and volunteer basis.

My contention was the allegations the FBI was making attacking my character were false. Furthermore, the FBI was withholding said documents but was continuing to pursue my demise. For example, in the fall of 1993, the "burnout" pursued criminal prosecution by presenting unsubstantiated acts to the United States federal prosecutor. Eventually, all potential criminal charges were ignored by the US Attorney's Office in Detroit, Michigan as well as the US Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

The false allegations, beginning in July 1993 with the notorious "Mendernach Homicidal-Suicidal Memo," resulted in undue stress and chronic depression, due to the lack of organizational integrity. The institution was more important than the individual; integrity was identified as a sign of ineptness.
I counsel I was a healthy individual. The character assassination brought on by my employer, the FBI, was false. However, these false allegations would destroy anyone.

Barrier Two should have been handled by DOL-OWCW personnel, i.e. retrieval of relevant employer documents. However, it was obvious the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs had joined allegiance with the employer. The FBI. From their declarations it was clear they did not want to review my case file in its entirety nor would they require the FBI to produce any documents I vehemently pleaded for.

The FBI had provided DOL-OWCW with approximately 20 pages excluding my application and various standard forms. I provided DOL-OWCW with an exceed of 1,000 pages of FBI documentation prepared by FBI personnel and relating to my character. Said document were retrieved via various legal channels. However, I was unable to retrieve several specific documents such as the notorious “Mendelscham Homicidal-Suicidal Memo” and the paperwork surrounding the order for FBI psychiatric evaluations. The FBI refused to produce the documents in previous legal arenas and continued to ignore my request via the DOL-OWCW claim.

Gloria McCray Watson, Supervisory Claims Examiner, clearly presented DOL-OWCW’s position in her letter to the claimant on 5/2/98. I had previously inquired as to any FBI documents in the DOL-OWCW file, which I had yet to receive. Specifically, I was inquiring about the aforementioned FBI documents. Ms. Watson stated “we have reviewed your file and have determined that there are no records of this kind in your file (emphasis added).” She further stated, “We have not sent the FBI had reason to correspond since August of 1996.”

Ms. Watson made it clear DOL-OWCW had no interest in the “Mendelscham Homicidal-Suicidal Memo” nor any other FBI management documentation regarding the claimant’s psychiatric condition be it TRUE or FALSE. Note, the file was first accepted for review by DOL-OWCW in August 1996.

Barrier two is a serious organizational deficiency and DOL-OWCW upper management should be held accountable for this “incompetency and ineffectiveness.” Barrier two must be addressed via congressional action.

Barrier Three DOL-OWCW’s adversarial position in the decision making process.

DOL-OWCW’s position was clearly established from the onset of accepting the claim, i.e. either dismiss the claim or get it removed to the Employee’s Compensation Appeals Board (ECAB). Mr. Israel’s first correspondence, dated August 8, 1996, provided a detailed list of questions, many of which had already been addressed in my initial package in filing the claim. He concluded by stating a reasonable response time is 30 days. He then stated, “If we have not received the requested information, an indication that it is forthcoming, or evidence that the information is not necessary to decide your claim, we will be requested to render a decision on your claim based on the evidence in file.”

On August 29, 1996, I responded to Mr. Israel’s request. I submitted a ten-page response to his questions along with over 30 pages of FBI documentation relating to my character. My mental health be it positive or negative.

On September 5, 1996, Mr. Israel responded by stating “Your employer provided full and complete documentation with your application for worker’s compensation benefits.” He further stated “…” your (Chassidic) August 29, 1996 exhibits failed to fully respond to our letter.” He concluded that if I failed to provide a complete response within 30 days, the claim would be adjudicated based on the evidence of record. Note, the FBI reportedly “… provided full and complete documentation…” even though the “Burns” did not provide the homicidal-suicidal memo or any documents relating to the order for psychiatric evaluations.
On September 29, 1996, I submitted a response to Honorable Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor, Shelby Hallmark, Director, ESA-OWCP, and Mr. Israel. The response included 28 exhibits and in excess of 100 pages all relating to the claimant’s condition.

On October 17, 1996, I submitted a follow-up letter to the aforementioned parties stating my three doctors had submitted medical requests to my former employer, FBI, and the FBI refused to comply with any of the three doctors’ requests. I pleaded for assistance from DOL-OWCP.

On October 10, 1996 DOL-OWCP disallowed my claim. The memorandum stated, “As of this date, evidence sufficient to support that the claimant sustained an injury has not been received.” Note the DOL-OWCP refused to assist the claimant in obtaining the relevant employer documentation requested by the claimant’s three treating doctors.

On November 30, 1996 I submitted my first request for reconsideration. Said letter was sent certified return receipt requested. A DOL-OWCP employee who had signed for several of my previous letters received the letter.

On February 1, 1997, approximately 3 months later, I telephonically contacted Mr. Israel to determine the status of my reconsideration. Mr. Israel informed me he had never received the reconsideration. He was unable to account for the DOL-OWCP employee acknowledging receipt of it on November 25, 1996.

Numerous forms of communication followed between DOL-OWCP and the claimant for the next 4 months via telephone, fax and US mail.

On July 15, 1998, DOL-OWCP denied the claimant’s first reconsideration.

Within the next 2 years, the claimant submitted 3 additional requests for reconsideration. I had in excess of 50 occasions to communicate with DOL-OWCP personnel in various formats (phone, fax and mail) pleading for their assistance in obtaining the relevant employer documentation and to review the file in a fair and equitable manner.

The claimant had submitted 2 DOL-OWCP and 4 different doctors’ reports, some of which were required to submit follow-up requests to DOL-OWCP. Additionally, one of the doctor’s deposition which was taken by the FBI was submitted. The claimant also submitted hundreds of pages of FBI documentation attacking the character of the claimant and/or documenting the claimant’s mental problems. However, the FBI refused to produce certain documents and DOL-OWCP refused to assist the claimant in obtaining the relevant documents.

Congressman David Pison successfully obtained the notorious “Homicidal-Homicidal Suicide Memo” in August 1998 after 5 years of requests by the employer, treating doctors, attorneys and insurers. The FBI continues to withhold several other relevant documents.

The DOL-OWCP ignored the “Homicidal-Homicidal Suicide Memo” in their denial for the third request for reconsideration. In the memorandum to the Director outlining the decision it did not address the memo. Note this is a memo prepared by the employer stating the employee is “homicidal-suicidal”. The FBI withheld it from the employee for 5 years. DOL-OWCP receives it and ignores it in their decision-making process.

On January 11, 1999 I submitted my fourth request for reconsideration. Said request contained the notorious “Homicidal-Homicidal Suicide Memo” along with a report from one of my treating physicians, a rheumatologist.
The DOL-OWCP states its reviews are conducted within a 90-day period. As of Friday May 14, 1999, 123 days have elapsed and I await the ‘decision’

A final yet as significant issue regarding DOL-OWCP adversarial position is their desire to expeditiously remove the claim from within OWCP and refer it to the Employee’s Compensation Appeals Board (ECAB). The claimant has three appeal processes: reconsideration, oral hearing or ECAB. DOL-OWCP chooses to refer the claimant as soon as possible to ECAB without concern of the claimant. ECAB is the claimant’s final appeal. Therefore, denying him/her other viable appeals such as if one was to pursue a reconsideration. By placing the claim before ECAB it removes the claim from DOL-OWCP’s responsibility for ECAB is a separate entity within the Department of Labor but apart from OWCP.

DOL-OWCP’s adversarial position and deceptive action is clearly set forth in Marilyn Prentis’s (DOL-OWCP Hearing Representative) letter dated 11/05/98. Said letter is the denial of claimant’s third reconsideration. This denial completely ignored the “Mendez v. Henrico County School Board” Ms. Prentis states “If you disagree with this decision, you have the right to appeal to the Employee’s Compensation Appeals Board for review of the decision.”

Subsequently, I contacted Claimant Examiner Stephanie Stone as directed by Director Thomas Markley to determine if I had the right to file another “reconsideration”. Ms. Stone evasively responded to follow my appeals rights in the letter but did not acknowledge the reconsideration issues.

On November 11, 1998, I faxed the specific question - “Do I have the right to file a reconsideration...?” along with the appropriate legal citation to Director Markley/Assistant Director Sheila Williams. I followed up the fax with a telephone call to Ms. Williams. The Assistant Director, Sheila Williams, advised me, “she would have to do research regarding the right to file for reconsideration.” She added she would be traveling the week of November 16, 1998 and would get back with me in a few weeks.” She never returned the call.

Barrier three is also a serious organizational deficiency and DOL-OWCP upper management is responsible for this major organizational flaw, an adversarial position greatly diminishing the professional standards of the organization. Barrier three must be addressed via Congressional action.

In conclusion, my greatest loss was as a result of my employer’s actions. DOL-OWCP’s inaction has helped to exacerbate my personal, physical/mental, and financial condition. Since September 1994 I have had four jobs and currently unemployed. Additionally, I have changed residences on four occasions due to financial restraints. Submitted several hundred job applications including over 20 State applications in North Carolina; all of no avail. My personal health continues to deteriorate. My medical condition includes diabetes and amputee plus vascular problems all related to and as a result of depression.

I would again like to personally thank, you Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee for allowing me to participate in this hearing with the intent to improve governmental operations.

Documentation to substantiate my statement is available upon request.
Mr. Horn. Let me just pick up one question to clarify the exhibits. You mention the July 19, 1993, memorandum from Karen Z. Mendernach to James R. Perez, Equal Employment Opportunity officer. You note that throughout your testimony and call it notorious, and you say they are documenting such an unsubstantiated allegation. Did this individual, Karen Mendernach, ever talk to you, ever examine you in any way?

Mr. Chamberlin. No, she didn’t. I had requested this memo; and, as of August 1993, I had never been able to retrieve it and the FBI was in denial of the actual document.

Mr. Horn. How large is this document? Is it just this one-page memo? Are there attachments to it? Or what have you found out?

Mr. Chamberlin. Sir, through various avenues of litigation, I have determined that there are several other documents surrounding it. I have seen ASAC Stapleton had referred to this; and during interviews in regard to these agents I have been unable to obtain any of those documents.

Mr. Horn. So, you feel those documents do exist. People have based judgments on them, and yet you cannot get a copy of that, even though it concerns you. And, you would think if they are going to give a psychiatric exam, you would remember it?

Mr. Chamberlin. Yes, sir.

Mr. Horn. And they didn’t give a psychiatric exam.

Mr. Chamberlin. Correct. On two occasions, I believe it was September 17th and October 6, 1993, FBI management in Detroit had requested a psychiatric exam, unbeknownst to me. And I don’t know what documents evolved from that, and I was never required to submit for a psychiatric exam, and they refused to present any of the documents. And my doctors have made over 20 requests, as well as the attorneys, to obtain documents relevant to it; and the FBI refused to comply.

Additionally, I have pleaded with the Department of Labor, Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, for assistance. And claims examiner—I believe it was Gloria Watson had informed me that she had obtained sufficient documents, and that would be roughly these 20 pages from the FBI, and that they were not going to require them.

Mr. Horn. Do you know if Karen Mendernach is an M.D.?

Mr. Chamberlin. No, she is an FBI agent with a Bachelor’s degree.

Mr. Horn. So she doesn’t have a medical degree.

Mr. Chamberlin. Correct.

Mr. Horn. She is not a registered, board-certified psychiatrist; is that correct?

Mr. Chamberlin. Correct.

Mr. Horn. And yet she is making these judgments.

Mr. Chamberlin. Correct.

Mr. Horn. Do you know if she ever interviewed people that worked around you and have a list of those interviews somewhere?

Mr. Chamberlin. To my knowledge, she did interview, just referring to the memo. But they requested anonymity. And I addressed Rita Harrington, the Employees’ Assistance Coordinator, pleading for these while I was an agent, stating that the FBI was letting me
carry a loaded weapon around the office with these allegations, but they all refused.

Mr. HORN. I would think it is a little difficult for agents to request anonymity if they can simply libel a fellow worker, and I can't believe that kind of stuff would go on. I am surprised the FBI would permit that.

If they want to go to board-certified psychiatrists or psychologists, that's one thing, but just to have particular views of fellow workers and think you should give that any credence boggles the mind.

So, you don't know about any more attachments to that. Presumably, those would be where they say several agents believe he may be a danger to others as well as to himself. The agents requested anonymity. Well, you are saying there's probably a file there somewhere and you have never been allowed to counter that file; is that correct?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Correct, sir. During my dismissal with the Merit Systems Protection Board we were able to obtain documents where the ASAC had referred to interviewing a number of agents and various documentations, as well as to request for the two psychiatric evaluations. However, the FBI has refused all of our requests.

Mr. HORN. Now, you say on page 3 of your testimony the claimant was never ordered to undergo a psychiatric evaluation by the FBI. Did they ever ask you to undertake such an evaluation?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Never, sir.

Mr. HORN. You note that Congressman David Price, one of our most esteemed Members here, successfully obtained the notorious memo to which we have referred here; and in August 1998, after 5 years of requests by the employee, treating doctors, attorneys, and Senators, the FBI continues to withhold several other relevant documents. Such as what? What do you surmise they still have?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Such as the interviews in regards to these agents. Such as all the documentation—when FBI management in a division requests a psychiatric evaluation, they must submit written documents to support their request for the psychiatric evaluation and, in turn, FBI headquarters will respond back to them in a written document.

And so, therefore, there were two requests, and I have been unable to obtain the documents pertaining to the two requests, the documents that would support the two requests, as well as FBI headquarters documents that would either support the request or deny the request.

Mr. HORN. Well, thank you.

Mr. HORN. We will now move to Ms. Dianne McGuinness, former employee of the Social Security Administration. Ms. McGuinness. Ms. MCGUINNESS. Thank you. I wish to thank you for the honor of being here today. I am here to tell you about my frustrations with customer service at the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs. There are a few concerns I wish to discuss today, and while these are only two or three concerns, the magnitude is far greater.

Mr. Kenneth Hamlett, Regional Director of the New York Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, threatened to deny my claim over and over if I went to my Congressmen. He told this to Miriam
Madden, Director of Senator Alphonse D’Amato’s office, on September 18, 1996; and she called me to tell me so. I submitted a copy of her statement for the record.

Title 5 U.S.C. 7211, Employee’s Right to Petition Congress, states, “The right of employees, individually or collectively, to petition Congress or a Member of Congress, or to a committee or member thereof, may not be interfered with or denied.”

There are times when I needed congressional assistance and assistance from my union representatives. These times arose when I could not get through on the telephones at the OWCP because they were either busy, the mailbox was full, or nobody returned my calls or answered my letters.

I had problems getting copies of my file. Every few months I would ask for the current part of my file that I did not have. My informal requests were ignored, and my formal requests under the Privacy Act were ignored. I was even referred to as a liar by a claims examiner when my union explained the need for my file so that I may address my pretermination appeal.

When I finally did get a copy of my file, there were 97 pages of someone else’s doctors’ reports, memorandums, personal letters, etc., in my file. I contacted the other Federal injured worker, in another State, 1,500 miles away and in a different region, to tell him what I had found. I also contacted his Congressman, and we both contacted Congressman Horn’s office to complain. Someone may have parts of my file in their file. I also found a job résumé and several pages from a third person’s file. This leads me to believe that my file wasn’t worked. If my file was worked, the claims examiner would have found these documents.

I was told that the unit supervisors do the filing. I called Jonathan Lawrence, District Director of the New York office, and I explained how difficult it was to get through on the telephones. Often I would get told from Customer Service they would take a message and a claims examiner would call me back within 3 days. Mr. Lawrence told me in this conversation that if people can travel and go here and there and do everything else, there is a possibility that they are not totally disabled. They can travel and do certain other things but they can’t work, and that doesn’t make sense to me. If a doctor says a person is unable to work, then they should be unable to leave their homes, he said.

I submitted a tape recording of this conversation to the subcommittee and wish it to be made part of the record.

Mr. Horn. Without objection, it will be put in the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]
Taped conversation between Dianne McGuinness and John Lawrence, director of the NY District Office of Workers Compensation Programs.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Hello.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Hello Mr. LAWRENCE: I was wondering if you, tell me why the doors for your office are closed? Um-- I noticed a sign up on the door that you have to make an appointment a week in advance.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Correct.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Why is that?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Because we have been threatened with our lives.

Ms. McGUINNESS: You have been threatened with your lives?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Yes, we had a man arrested that wears a band around his wrist at all times so we can be alerted when he is in our area and, basically, we are Federal employees we don’t want to be shot at.

Ms. McGUINNESS: You don’t what to be shot at but don’t they have metal detectors? When you come in, I mean, you know, I can’t see how somebody can get in with a gun.

Mr. LAWRENCE: They don’t require federal employees to go through metal detectors all you have to do is show identification to get into this building.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Ah, that terrible.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We can’t afford to risk an incident here.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Oh-- I just wanted to ask you--The claimants don’t know and we travel long distance to see you and, we hadn’t been notified. I understand this has been the practice for, like six months.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We, don’t have the capacity of doing a mass mailing to everyone of clients, That’s 76,000 people, which would be something to do that.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Just in the New York Office?

Mr. LAWRENCE: That’s right.

Ms. McGUINNESS: 76,000 people.
Mr. LAWRENCE: 76,000 claims, active claims.

Ms. McGUIINNESS: Ok, because you know that people who come to see you are generally handicapped and incapacitated and it is hard for them to travel and then when you don't know... This is what happened in my case. If you don't know when you get there-- you know, it is very discouraging. I feel for you, I understand what you are going through, but on the other hand I don't think that the office should be closed to the rest of us.

Mr. L: Safety of my employees comes first.

Ms. McGUIINNESS: Oh, I understand that the safety comes first, but isn't there something can't you get help from higher up, plate glass windows, or plexi glass windows or something of that--

Mr. LAWRENCE: Normally if I would like to visit someone, I would call. If I had a business appointment I would call, I wouldn't just come down here.

Ms. McGUIINNESS: Yes, but it can be very hard,-- no that's not the case sometimes you just can't get through you can leave messages and people will say they will get back to you in forty eight hours and they don't. You know, you stay home and you wait by the phone and you believe that someone is going to call you and they don't call.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We--

Ms. McGUIINNESS: I am sorry what was that? I can't hear you.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We would think that if someone was unable to work that they wouldn't have anywhere to be but by the phone. Why would I be anywhere else?

Ms. McGUIINNESS: I am sorry. I don't understand the question. Why would they be anywhere else?

Mr. LAWRENCE: With the exception of their doctors, that if someone is unable to work they shouldn't be anywhere but in their home. It just seems to me that people can travel, go here and there, then there is a possibility they are not totally disabled.

Ms. McGUIINNESS: That's not true. People can be injured without being confined to their homes, when they can't work.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Totally can't work? What type of work can they be employed by?

Ms. McGUIINNESS: Yeah, so.
Mr. LAWRENCE: Totally disabled-- but they can shop, they can travel, they do certain other things, but they can't quote, unquote--"work." That doesn't make sense to me.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Well then that is up to the doctor then really, I would think.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Who am I specking with?

Ms. McGUINNESS: Umm,-- I just want to ask you something. If your office is open, see I just don't understand your thinking, well maybe you can explain it to me. The office is supposed to be--

Mr. LAWRENCE: Why don't you tell me who you are?

Ms. McGUINNESS: I don't think that is necessary.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Well, I am sorry. I am going to have to end the conversation, because I don't know who I am talking to.

Ms. McGUINNESS: Thank you, Mr. Lawrence.
Ms. McGuinness. I was also sent to an OWCP doctor for a neurological examination. I had my shoes on, all my clothes on, and the doctor told me he was in a rush. He did not touch my upper extremities or lower extremities during his examination. He did not perform any clinical tests to determine injuries to my upper extremities except for me to have him squeeze his hand. His bill for this examination was $285. The examination was less than 4 minutes, and it seemed that his charge was—he was being paid $75 a minute for this service. His examination resulted in a conflict of medical opinion.

I submitted a tape recording to the subcommittee of this examination, and I wish it to be made part of the record.

Last, it was Mr. Kenneth Hamlett, Regional Director of the New York office’s treatment of me when I went to the office with my union president for a prescheduled appointment. The Regional Director told me that he was denying my physical therapy, sending me back to work very soon, sending me for a referee examination, ignoring my pretermination appeal, refusing me the right to participate in the selection process of an impartial physician, and denied me the right to see my file in person.

I needed that file. I had a few more days left before I could complete my appeal, and I believe that he denied me the right to see my file so that my appeal would not be as complete as I would have liked it to be.

He also threatened to have me removed by guards if he ever found me on the 7th floor without an appointment. I feel that Mr. Hamlett, in his capacity of Regional Director, was practicing medicine when he denied me my physical therapy; and, based on Mr. Kenneth Hamlett’s statements, I assert that the outcome of my claim was predetermined so that I couldn’t collect my legitimate benefits. He violated my rights, and the processing of my claim was at the direction of Mr. Hamlett.

I defer any further testimony to Mr. John Riordan, then union president of AFGE 3369, who was present during my encounters with Mr. Hamlett.

And I would like to add one thing: this statement took longer than Dr. Bloom’s examination. I thank you and I welcome your questions.

Mr. Horn. Well, thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McGuinness follows:]
STATEMENT OF DIANNE MCGUINNESS
BEFORE THE
HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY
SUBCOMMITTEE
MAY 18, 1999

My name is Dianne McGuinness. I wish to thank you for the honor of being here today to tell you about my frustrations with Customer Service at the Office of Workers Compensation Programs.

As background, I sustained work-related injuries while employed with the Social Security Administration. Historically, as per my evaluations, I was a highly motivated, dedicated employee. I had 23 years of Federal service and received Excellent and Outstanding reviews and many cash awards.

Several months after my claim had been accepted, I contacted the New York District Office concerning wage loss compensation. I was not able to get an answer and called Mr. Kenneth Hamlet, Regional Director. Mr. Hamlet stated that I would receive a check in about a week, but I must now decide to return to work or retire.

Not receiving my check as promised, I called Mr. Hamlet to follow-up. He stated that steps were being taken to get me back to work. I had not yet completed a prescribed course of physical therapy, when Mr. Hamlet said he was sending me back to work. He said he would have the claims examiner call me back because he did not have my case file.

I received a letter of entitlement telling me how much my first check would be and in the same letter, I was told I would be sent for a Second Opinion examination.

Upon learning about the upcoming Second Opinion examination, I requested the "Statement of Accepted Facts, Issues to be resolved, and Questions to be asked. I did not receive a response. My union requested same, and did not receive a response. I then contacted my Congressman. Mr. Kenneth Hamlet, Regional Director, responded to the Congressman that I would not be sent the issues to be resolved, and questions to be asked, until after the examination in order to preserve the integrity of the examination.

Yet, the law provides that I am entitled to these if I ask for them.
I submitted a copy of Mr. Hamlet's letter to the subcommittee and wish it to remain part of the record.

I then attended the Second Opinion Neurologist Examination. Dr. William H. Bloom was the examining physician and he spent less than 4 minutes with me. I was fully dressed and had my shoes on. My injuries were to my neck, lower back, and upper extremities. There was not touching by the doctor to my upper extremities and I was not asked to perform any maneuvers with my upper extremities. Yet, his examination constituted the "Weight of Evidence" and I was sent a Pre-termination letter. Notes from the file show that my agency had been calling OWCP for the results of the Second Opinion Examination. OWCP informed my agency that it would be a few more days. Incidentally, I have a Memorandum from my agency that indicates that they can call for Second Opinion Examinations. Dr. Bloom's bill for the "less than 4 minute Exam" was $285.00.

I submitted a tape recording of the examination to my claims examiner. I also submitted a tape recording and Dr. Bloom's bill to the subcommittee.

I mentioned to Mrs. Miriam Madden, Executive Director, Senator Alphonse D'Amato's office that I had to get my argument to the Proposed Termination to the Office. She made an appointment for me with Ms. Johnston of the New York Office.

Upon arriving at the Office's door with Mr. John Riordan, Union President, AFGE 3369 we heard someone shouting at us from down the hall. It was Mr. Kenneth Hamlet, Regional Director. He was shouting at us, as though we had committed a crime. I will defer testimony regarding what took place on our visit to the Dept of Labor to Mr. Riordan who will testify today. I have submitted copies of Affidavits by Mr. Riordan to the subcommittee and wish the affidavits to be made part of the record.

Two days later, I met with Mr. Riordan in the Union Office. Mr. Hamlet called me at the Union office. I will once again defer testimony about the details of this conversation to Mr. Riordan.

I would like to mention that Mr. Hamlet stated he would ignore my argument to the proposed termination and arrange a Referee exam and he added "And it will be very soon, Mrs. McGuinness." I received an overnight letter directing me to go to a Referee exam by a physician who
Mr. Hamlet picked without any input from me. Yet, another claimant was permitted to participate in the selection process of the Referee.

After the meeting, and phone call with Mr. Hamlet, I receive a phone call from Miriam Madden of Senator Damato's office. She tells me that Mr. Hamlet threatened to deny my claim over and over if I went to my congressionals. I feel the environment is such that the outcome of my claims was pre-decided. I have submitted Mrs. Maddens statement to the subcommittee as part of the record.

Title 5 USC 7211, Employees Right to Petition Congress states, "The right of employees, individually or collectively, to petition Congress or a member of Congress, or to a committee or member thereof, may not be interfered with or denied.

Most months my checks were not sent out timely and I had to contact the office multiple times to get my checks.

Requests for current copies of my file were ignored after about 10 months of letter writing and I received an incomplete copy only after I was terminated. Upon review of my file, I discovered 97 pages of Doctors Reports and other related documents belonging to an injured worker that resides out of state and in another Region. I contacted this injured worker and his congressional. He stated that his congressional did not want me to have his file because of the privacy issue, but that my having it did not concern him. What concerned me was that OWCP misplaced parts of his file. What concerns me is that someone may have parts of my file with my doctors reports. I made a photocopy of the 97 pages and sent them to this injured worker. The worker informed me that he contacted the subcommittee to express his concern. I provided the subcommittee with a copy of the letter I sent along with the 97 pages of doctors reports, etc. for the record.

In a telephone conversation with Mr. Jonathan Lawrence, District Director of the New York Office, Mr. Lawrence stated to me, that if people can travel and go here and there and do everything else, there is a possibility that they are not totally disabled, but they can travel and do certain other things, but they can't work. That doesn't make sense to me. If the doctor says a person is unable to work then they should be unable to leave their homes. I submitted a tape of this conversation to the subcommittee and wish it to be made part of the record.
The rudeness when I appeared for a pre-scheduled meeting, failure to pay me on time each month, threats to cut off my medical treatment, threats to deny my claim because I engaged the help of my congressmen, failure to provide me with a copy of my file under the privacy act, failure to return my phone calls, ignoring my appeals, is very very poor customer service. I was an employee of the Social Security Administration and I provided Excellent Service to the customers. I expect to be treated with courtesy and I expect Excellent service from OWCP.

While these are just a few complaints, the magnitude must be greater. I have additional concerns and additional tapes that I wish to share with the subcommittee in the future. These tapes contain conversations of myself and OWCP examining physicians and claims examiners. One in particular contains statements made by OWCP examining physicians that the claims examiner ordered duplicative, invasive, expensive, diagnostic testing. And that the claims examiner discussed this over the telephone with the examining physicians. I feel that it is highly improper for a claims examiner to hold ex parte telephone conversations with an impartial examiner and instruct the impartial examiner to perform diagnostic procedures. When I asked the examiners the medical necessity for these tests, the examiners informed me that Mr. Eric Beluja and Mr. Kevin Kates ordered the tests and that everything was done by telephone. The doctors told me that the tests were ordered before the appointments were made. One would think that it would be a physicians decision to order any testing based on clinical findings and medical necessity and not prescribed by, or ordered by a claims examiner or any other employee. Mr. Eric Beluja, claims examiner did not think it was excessive for taxpayers to foot eight thousand dollars for duplicative testing.
Mr. HORN. We now move to Mr. Fairbanks, Matthew Fairbanks, Special Agent/Pilot, Drug Enforcement Agency.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Chairman Horn and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the topic “Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs.”

My name is Matt Fairbanks, and I am currently employed as a special agent with the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration. Although I am an employee of DEA, I am appearing today as a private citizen, not as a Department of Justice employee or a DEA employee.

My current duties are that of aviation specialist. I’m a pilot for the DEA. The job requirements in this position have taken me all over the United States and into Central and South America.

On September 25, 1998, I was involved in a training flight accident. The flight was a beginning to transition myself into the helicopters. During the flight, my flight instructor demonstrated a very aggressive maneuver. As the terrain rushed up toward our OH 6 helicopter, I knew we were in serious trouble. With a loud crash, my instructor was killed; and I found myself trying to escape the burning wreckage. I wanted to get my instructor out also, but the flames finally drove me out of the inferno.

I was life-flighted to Parkland Hospital, where I remained for 2 weeks, for which I have little or no memory. Upon arrival at the hospital, my blood pressure was dropping; and I was severely burned over 56 percent of my body. The emergency room physicians discovered that my spleen had been lacerated beyond repair and had to remove it in order to save me from bleeding to death.

I then spent 4 weeks in the Burn Intensive Care Unit. While in the BICU, I had four operations in which viable skin was painfully harvested from unburned areas of my left arm and chest. This was accomplished via a high-tech cheese grater and a press. The tissue is now in place on my right arm and legs, and it continues on its 18-month journey to mature as grafted skin.

After 6 weeks in Parkland Memorial Hospital, I was able to return to my home. My wounds were still open, and my care necessitated a daily nurse visit for IV antibiotics and wound cleaning. All of this was arranged by my workers’ compensation case worker, Ms. Sue Maraglino. Additionally, I was required to make a 50-mile round trip to the hospital on a daily basis for therapy and wound care. Once again, all the arrangements, down to the transportation, were taken care of by my caseworker, Ms. Maraglino.

As a nurse, Ms. Maraglino was able to answer all of my family’s questions and address all of our concerns; and, as a caseworker, she was also attended to the important doctors’ appointments which I had. To this day my recovery has not been hampered due to lack of funding, and I have been carefully informed about what to expect in the future and future surgeries.

Over the months of my recovery, I have had numerous occasions to reflect upon my experiences as a DEA Special Agent. I recall my mission to the Oklahoma City bombing site. I was there as part of my duties as a Special Agent. However, others were there volunteering, volunteering their time trying to help in a hopeless situa-
Various church groups and workers set up dinner banquets on a daily basis at our base of operations, with no charge. A construction worker, seeing my DEA jacket, approached me just to shake my hand and thank me for helping them take care of their own. Schoolchildren made signs and posters which were hanging everywhere. There was one in our bathroom hanging over the mirror which read, “You are looking at a hero.” A man stood at the entrance to the work area with little bags of cookies. He told us, “My daughter made these for you. Please take a bag of cookies. It is her contribution.” Even country singer Garth Brooks made a personal phone call to the son of DEA Special Agent Kenny McCoullough, who was killed in the blast. This phone call brightened the day of a little boy during a very dark time.

These seemingly small acts provided me with great strength and drive while I was standing on that mountain of rubble, formerly known as the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. I could lift the next stone and clear the next level of the building in a continuing search. I did not find anyone alive, but I did find that the great spirit of America was not dead. I previously thought it was.

The same experience which helped me deal with the broken remains of the Federal building laid a groundwork for me in dealing with the shattering conditions of my own life. I’m grateful to a caseworker who provided me with every means at her disposal to help me pick up the broken remains of my life and prepare to go on.

While I lay there in my hospital bed, I recall hearing the news that another teenager in Plano, TX, had lost their life due to an overdose of heroin. It made me think about an event years earlier when I was a Dallas, TX, police officer on the streets of Dallas. I had arrested a poor disoriented junkie. As I checked for weapons, I came across a paper on which he had written the following:

My name is cocaine, call me Crack for short
I entered this country without a passport
Ever since then, I’ve made scum from the rich
Some have been murdered and found in a ditch
I’m more valued than diamonds, more treasured than gold
Use me just once and you too will be sold
I’ll make a school boy forget all his books
I’ll make a beauty queen forget her good looks
I’ll take a renowned speaker and make him a bore
I’ll take your own mother and make her a whore
I’ll make a school teacher forget how to teach
And I’ll make a preacher not want to preach
I’ll take your rent money and get you evicted
I’ll murder your babies, or they’ll be born addicted
I’ll make you rob, and steal and kill
When you’re under my power, you’ll have no will
Remember my friend, my name is “Big C”
If you try me one time, you may never be free
I’ve destroyed politicians, actors and heroes
I’ve reduced bank accounts from millions to zeros
I’ll make shooting and stabbing a common affair
Once I take charge, you won’t have a prayer
Now that you know me, what will you do?
You’ll have to decide, it’s all up to you
The decision is one to sit in my saddle,
It is one that no one can straddle
Listen to me, and please listen well
When you ride with cocaine, you ride straight into hell.
My life, my job, my responsibility to you collectively is about removing these soul-destructive elements from our society. Ms. Sue Maraglino's job is to get me back to health so that I can perform that task. She did her job, and as of Tuesday of last week, I am back to do mine.

I'm familiar with the bureaucracy, and I've seen my share of government workers that are professionally “less than anxious.” Although others could have had an experience different than mine, I can say that if all caseworkers were as prompt and professional and courteous as mine, nothing more could be expected. Thank you.

Mr. HORN. Thank you very much. That is a very moving statement and quite a poem, I must say.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fairbanks follows:]
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Chairman Horn and Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the topic of "Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of Worker's Compensation Programs". My name is Matt Fairbanks, and I am currently employed as a Special Agent with the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). Although I am an employee of the DEA, I am appearing today as a private citizen, not as a Department of Justice or DEA employee. My current duties are that of Aviation specialist, and I am a pilot for the DEA. The job requirements in this position have taken me all over the United States, and into Central and South America.

On September 25, 1998, I was involved in a training flight to begin the transition to helicopters. During the flight, my flight instructor demonstrated a very aggressive maneuver. As the terrain rushed up towards our OH 6 helicopter, I knew that we were in trouble. With a loud crash, my instructor was killed, and I found myself trying to escape the burning wreckage. I wanted to get my instructor out also, but the flames finally drove me out of the inferno.

I was LIFE FLIGHTED to Parkland Memorial Hospital, where I remained for two weeks for which I have little to no memory. Upon arrival at the hospital, my blood pressure was dropping and I was severely burned over 56% of my body. The Emergency Room physicians discovered that my spleen had been lacerated beyond repair, and had to remove it in order to save me from bleeding to death.

I then spent four weeks in the Burn Intensive Care Unit (BICU). While in the BICU, I had four operations in which viable skin was painfully harvested from unburned areas of my left arm and chest. This was accomplished via a high tech cheese grater and a press. The tissue is now in place on my right arm and leg, and it continues on its 18 month journey to mature as grafted skin.

After six weeks in Parkland Memorial Hospital, I was able to return to my home. My wounds were still open, and my care necessitated a daily nurse visit for IV antibiotics and wound cleaning. All of this was arranged by my Worker’s Compensation case worker, Ms. Sae Maraglino. Additionally, I was required to make a 50 mile round trip to the hospital on a daily basis for therapy and wound care. Once again, all of the arrangements, down to the transportation, was taken care of by my case worker, Ms. Maraglino. As a nurse, Ms. Maraglino was able to answer all of my family’s questions and address our concerns, and as a case worker, she also attended all of the important doctor’s appointments. To this day, my recovery has not been hampered due to lack of funding, and I have been carefully informed about what to expect in future surgeries.
Over the months of my recovery, I have had numerous occasions to reflect upon my experiences as a DEA Special Agent. I recall the day I was at the Oklahoma City bombing site. I was there as part of my duties as a Special Agent. However, others were there volunteering their time trying to help in a hopeless situation.

1. Various church groups set up dinner banquets daily at our base of operations.
2. A construction worker, seeing my DEA jacket, approached me just to shake my hand and thank me for helping them "take care of their own".
3. School children made signs and posters which were hanging everywhere. There was one in our bathroom hanging over the mirror which read, "You are looking at a hero".
4. A man stood at the entrance to the work area with little bags of cookies. He told us "My daughter made these for you", "Please take a bag of cookies, it is her contribution".
5. Country singer Garth Brooks made a personal phone call to the son of DEA Special Agent Kenny McCullough, who was killed in the blast. He brightened the day of a little boy during a dark time.

These seemingly small acts provided me with great strength and drive while I was standing on that mountain of rubble. I could lift the next stone, and clear the next level of the building in a continuing search. I did not find anyone alive, but I found that the great spirit of America was not dead. I had previously thought that it was.

This same experience, which helped me deal with the broken remains of the Murrah Federal Building, laid a groundwork for me in dealing with the shattered condition of my own life. I am grateful to a case worker who provided me with every means at her disposal to help me pick up the broken remains of my life, and prepare to go on.

While I lay there in my hospital bed, I recall hearing the news that another teenager had lost his life due to an overdose of heroin. It made me think about an event years earlier when I was a Police Officer on the streets of Dallas, Texas. I had arrested a poor disoriented junkie. As I checked for weapons, I came across a paper on which he had written the following:

My Name is Cocaine

My job, my life, my responsibility to you collectively, is about removing these soul destructive substances from our society. Mr. Sue Marjoline's job is to get me back to health so I can perform that task. She did her job, and as of Tuesday last week, I am back to do mine.

Now, I am familiar with bureaucracy, and I have seen my share of government workers that are professionally, "less than anxious". Although, others could have had an experience different than mine, I can say that if all case workers were as prompt and professional as mine, nothing more could be expected.
My Name is Cocaine

My name is Cocaine, call me Crack for short
I entered this country without a passport

Ever since then I’ve made scum from the rich
Some have been murdered and found in a ditch

I am more valued than diamonds, more treasured than gold
Use me just once and you too will be sold

I’ll make a school boy forget all his books
I’ll make a beauty queen forget her good looks

I’ll take a renowned speaker and make him a bore
I’ll take your own mother and make her a whore

I’ll make a school teacher forget how to teach,
and I’ll make a preacher not want to preach

I’ll take your rent money and get you evicted
I’ll murder your babies, or they’ll be born addicted

I’ll make you rob, and steal and kill
When you are under my power, you will have no will

Remember my friend, my name is “Big C”
If you try me once time, you may never be free

I have destroyed politicians, actors, and heroes
I’ve decreased bank accounts from millions to zeros

I’ll make shooting and stabbing a common affair
Once I take charge you won’t have a prayer

Now that you know me what will you do?
You’ll have to decide, it’s all up to you

The day you decide to sit in my saddle,
the decision is one that no one can straddle

Listen to me, and please listen well
When you ride with cocaine, you ride straight into Hell
Mr. HORN. The gentlewoman from Illinois, the vice chairman of the subcommittee, will start the questioning.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Fairbanks, about how long did it take you to resolve your case, then?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Everything was resolved on an ongoing, an as-needed basis, and there was never any—I had constant contact with my caseworker throughout each operation and each new phase, and so there was never anything that was unresolved.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Was it in a reasonable amount of time, then, as you moved along? I'm wondering if it was before anything started. Did you have to wait a long time?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. No, no, there were no waits. And during a large percentage of the time I was helpless and drugged up and incapacitated in the hospital. But, nevertheless, everything was always taken care of immediately; and there were no worries that my family or friends or the other agents that were helping me had.

Mrs. BIGGERT. And, Ms. McGuinness, did you find the same prompt service?

Ms. MCGUINNESS. No, ma'am, I did not. There were always delays. I couldn't get materials that I needed. If I needed assistance or I had a question, if I needed a copy of my file, it was denied all the way through.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Do you know other people that felt the same way?

Ms. MCGUINNESS. Yes. Yes, I do. A lot of people.

Mrs. BIGGERT. And Mr. Chamberlin?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. It took 10 months to get the file just accepted for review, and it was a letter to the Secretary of Labor. And then, following that, it has been approximately 5 years; and the case remains pending.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Was there a problem with having correct forms in your package? Was that a part of the delay, that you didn't fill out the forms correctly or the right forms?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. No, it appeared that OWCP personnel just did not review the entire package. And, additionally, I had a number of doctors as well as the accompanying FBI documents that I was able to obtain submitted. However, the OWCP personnel would continuously almost misinterpret, be it intentionally or inadvertently, what the doctors were saying.

The reports were there, and I would continue to submit it. And on one occasion, Mr. Israel, the claims examiner, had indicated that he was going to speak to Gloria Watson in regards to the fact he felt the entire facts were submitted for the case and the claim should be accepted, but nothing came to it.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So did the FBI fulfill their end of the bargain and did they complete the forms properly that had to go for the workers' comp?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Absolutely not.

Mrs. BIGGERT. And do you know why?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. No, I'm unable to provide an explanation.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So did the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs ever ask the FBI for these forms?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. They did back in August of, I believe it was 1996; and said they submitted the minimum amount of documents. I have been attempting to obtain, as I indicated previously, 5 years
to obtain the documents in regards to the allegations of me being homicidal, suicidal, and all the documentation surrounding it, and the FBI refuses to produce it.

Mrs. Biggert. Was this the Mendernach homicidal-suicide memo?

Mr. Chamberlin. That is one of the documents, yes.

Mrs. Biggert. So the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, were they willing to pursue these documents from the FBI?

Mr. Chamberlin. No. In a FOIA request to OWCP, I had asked if they had any additional documents, other than the ones I had received from the FBI; and OWCP’s position was, we have not communicated with the FBI nor do we intend to nor is there a need.

Mrs. Biggert. And you got help from a Congressman?

Mr. Chamberlin. Yes, Congressman Price.

Mrs. Biggert. And so he helped you obtain that document.

Mr. Chamberlin. Yes. He had submitted several inquiries on it and asking for specifically that document. And on their first release, they had provided a document to Congressman Price that was nonrelated, but it was written by Karen Mendernach on that same date, and that was just an action of their intentional deceit.

Mrs. Biggert. What then was the reaction of the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs to supplying the document for the case file?

Mr. Chamberlin. Following the submission of the——

Mrs. Biggert. Yes.

Mr. Chamberlin. The first time I had submitted it, which was last August and September, the report from OWCP completely ignored it. They did not address it and did not acknowledge receiving it. I had sent it to them, I had faxed it to them, and they had acknowledged receiving the fax. And I followed it up within the next 5 weeks with communications asking that it be forwarded to the appropriate claims examiner to ensure that they had it.

On the decision by Ms. Preuit, they just did not address it. It is currently before them right now, and it is 128 days pending the reconsideration.

Mrs. Biggert. But they have acknowledged the memo?

Mr. Chamberlin. They have acknowledged receipt of the memo at the time I faxed it. They have not acknowledged the memo in their memorandum to the Director on the denial of the reconsideration.

Mrs. Biggert. And you mentioned in your testimony that you are on your fourth reconsideration now?

Mr. Chamberlin. Yes.

Mrs. Biggert. And how long have you been waiting for a response to that?

Mr. Chamberlin. 128 days.

Mrs. Biggert. Did the workers’ comp group issue a date in which they stated the decision on your claim would be provided?

Mr. Chamberlin. They have indicated that it would be in 90 days.

Mrs. Biggert. You also stated in your testimony that you struggled to confirm your appeal right from OWCP. Why was this difficult to do?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Well, I had received the last, and now Ms. Preuit’s letter specifically stated to take it to ECAB. Following that, I had inquired if I had the right to file a reconsideration. Specifically, I did not want to go to ECAB without the homicidal-suicidal memo as part of the package. Included in the letter was for me to contact, if I had any questions, a Ms. Stone in Washington, DC, with OWCP. Her response was to just follow the appeals rights. She would not address if I did have the right to file a reconsideration.

Following that, I talked with Sheila Williams. She informed me that was an interesting question and she would have to do research to find out if I would have the right for a reconsideration. She informed me that she would be traveling the week of, I believe it was November 16th, and that she would get back with me, and she had never followed up a return call.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So she just thought that was an interesting question and that is as far as it went?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Yeah. She did not have the answer if I had the right to file a reconsideration.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So, has this process been financially draining to you?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Well, at the time I was dismissed from the FBI I lost my house. My wife had a stroke. We’ve had four different residences since. We have been moving around. We’ve lived in two abandoned farmhouses and just fixed them up.

I have applied for several hundred jobs, over 60 in the State of North Carolina. I have two master’s degrees, course work completed for a Ph.D., and 25 years of government experience and applying for a job of $22,000 and up, and I have been unable to obtain full-time, permanent employment.

Mrs. BIGGERT. So do you have a source of income?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I have retirement now from the OPM.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HORN. Well, thank you.

Mrs. Williams was mentioned, and you said she did not get back to you. Was she cooperative when she talked on the telephone?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Sir, I guess it could be—I wouldn’t want to make a biased statement to say that she was uncooperative or she was passive. She just felt it was an interesting question; she would have to do the research.

And then I still had not had the answer, and I had checked with Congressman Price’s office and she was very concerned, Ms. Gay Eddy, of whether I should file—she was emphasizing to file with ECAB because of the 90-day restriction for ECAB. And then I had submitted it within the 90-day period, and if that wouldn’t suffice I was going to go to ECAB.

When I submitted it, I followed it up with a phone call. And Ms. Williams stated, well, we have it; I guess it will go. She did not elaborate.

Mr. HORN. Do you remember what her position was in the Department of Labor?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I believe she is the Deputy Director, or was the Deputy Director.
Mr. HORN. For the region or a district or what?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I was under the impression for the entire OWCP.
Mr. HORN. I see. So she is in Washington, not in the field?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Correct.
Mr. HORN. What was the region that you dealt with on most of your activity and claims?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. When I initiated the claim, I was told to file with Jacksonville, FL; and I began to make the filings with Jacksonville, FL. And, unbeknownst to me, as the time progressed, this is where they had sent the files to the FBI and had returned the packages on two occasions saying they were not processing the claim.

Following that, I submitted the letter to the Secretary of Labor, Honorable Robert Reich. And as a result of submitting it to him, I'm making the assumption he had forwarded it to the Washington, DC office. I believe it was the security office, OL 9. So OL 9 actually processed the claim.

Mr. HORN. So you were working with the Florida region, I assume?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Initially, yes.
Mr. HORN. But also with the national headquarters?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Yes. Somehow, in other words, in trying to get the claim filed initially with OWCP, it was with the Jacksonville, FL, office. And then, as a result of the Secretary of Labor's actions, it was submitted to Washington, DC.

Mr. HORN. Did the OWCP pursue the missing documents from the FBI?
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. They were not of any assistance at all. They specifically told me that they had sufficient documents from the FBI and that they had no need to further communicate with the FBI nor did the FBI have a need to communicate with them.

Mr. HORN. So they had seen or had held the documents. It is just you that didn't see them.
Mr. CHAMBERLIN. No, they said they never received—or they had no acknowledgment. The documents that they had provided me under the FOIA, of the documents that were submitted to OWCP by the FBI, were very limited, approximately 20 pages.

Mr. HORN. Ms. McGuinness, what region was it primarily with whom you dealt?
Ms. MCGUINNESS. New York region.
Mr. HORN. The New York.

How about you, Mr. Fairbanks? What was your region that was helping you on the case?
Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Dallas, TX, region.
Mr. HORN. Dallas, TX, region.

Well, thank you. Are there any other points you would like to make?

I think you have a very full record here. And we, I might say, out of the three of you, we have hundreds of files that have been sent to us over the last few months; and some of them are just very tragic and similar to some of your cases in terms of the lack of, shall we say, proper handling in the sense, I don't want to use the word handling particularly, but just that people on the government
payroll ought to realize that they are there to serve the people; the
people are not there to serve them. And it comes up again and
again in office after office that we have real problems with in that
area.

I'm glad to hear Mr. Fairbanks had a very positive experience.
That hasn't been the tenor of a lot of the files that have come in
from all over the country, and that's what started me on this in
Long Beach about 3 years ago when I had 60 people under the Fed-
eral injured workers situation. And I just went right down the line
and I said, tell me your story; and I came back filled with 60 sto-
ries, most of which either the government agency or this program
had been less than helpful, to put it charitably.

So I thank you for getting this on the record, and we appreciate
it, and thank you very much for coming.

We will now start with panel II, if they will come forward.

Beth Balen, administrator of the Anchorage Fracture and Ortho-
pedic Clinic; John Riordan is first vice-president, Council 220 of the
American Federation of Government Employees; James Linehan is
an attorney; and Tina Maggio is field representative for the Office
of Representative Michael F. Doyle.

If you would stand and raise your right hands, please.

[Witnesses affirmed.]

Mr. HORN. The clerk will note all four witnesses have affirmed
the oath.

We will begin with Beth Balen. Thank you for coming all that
distance, Ms. Balen.

STATEMENTS OF BETH BALEN, ADMINISTRATOR, ANCHORAGE
FRACTURE AND ORTHOPEDIC CLINIC; JOHN RIORDAN,
FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, COUNCIL 220, AMERICAN FEDERA-
TION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES; JAMES LINEHAN, LAW-
YER, JAMES R. LINEHAN, P.C.; AND TINA MAGGIO, FIELD
REPRESENTATIVE, OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL
F. DOYLE

Ms. BALEN. Thank you. My name is Beth Balen, and I'm the ad-
ministrator of the Anchorage Fracture and Orthopedic Clinic,
which is an eight-physician orthopedic group in Anchorage, AK. I
would like to, I guess, apologize for the length of my statement that
I submitted. Unfortunately, most of it is numbers, so there's a lot
of backup documentation there.

Federal workers' compensation claims, paid through the U.S. De-
partment of Labor, have been a long-term problem for our clinic
and other Alaska providers in general, and these difficulties have
led many offices in the State to refuse to accept USDOL patients.

Our physicians want to be able to treat sick and injured patients,
but it's difficult to deal with all the USDOL guidelines which, real-
ly, the government relationship or the government regulations are
interfering with the doctor-patient relationship. They're sort of get-
ing right smack in the middle of it.

In the past 3 years, our office as well has pretty much stopped
accepting appointments from USDOL patients due to the low reim-
bursement rates and the amount of staff time involved to obtain
payment. We will see the patient, but frequently we make them
self-pay, particularly if a case number has not been issued yet, be-
cause we don’t have time to deal with the headaches of billing the USDOL.

And I would like to stress that this doesn’t apply if the patient comes to us from the emergency room when we are on trauma call for the city, in which case we take any and all patients and whatever insurance coverage they may or may not have.

The problems that we experience with U.S. Department of Labor patients include, No. 1, the low fee schedule. I have included a number of examples in my statement which show the actual patient bills for some of our recent USDOL patients, starting on page 3 in my statement. I have shown you our charge, the amount Alaska Workers’ Compensation would have paid if it had been State workers’ comp, and the amount the USDOL actually paid.

For example, a carpal tunnel release that we charge $1,428 for, Alaska Workers’ Comp actually allows more than we charge. They allow $1,733, but the USDOL paid $691. For a laminotomy, back surgery, we charge $5,227. Alaska Workers’ Comp pays $4,608. USDOL paid $2,107. Frequently, it’s less than 50 percent of the charge. We end up writing off considerably more than we get paid.

The second major issue that we have a problem with are the forms. The forms that a USDOL patient comes in with are lengthy, they are time consuming, and in the amount of time it takes a physician to complete his part of the form he could have seen another patient. The forms are also redundant, because the information that they request is standard in medical office visit dictation, which is always attached to the claim anyway.

From 1988 through 1991, our office didn’t see any USDOL patients, which was following a sting operation engineered by the U.S. Department of Labor which targeted Alaska physician offices. In 1991, we started seeing these patients again, after we worked out an arrangement with the USDOL in Seattle that we would bill with our chart notes and our standard forms and not use the lengthy forms, which we continue to do today, but we’re constantly hounded by the patients and their employers that the form has to be filled out.

Another problem is the delay that we have as the patient obtains their case numbers. Our experience has shown it takes at least 30 to 45 days for a claim number to be issued by the USDOL, and there is absolutely no way in the meantime to bill a claim to the USDOL without a case number on the bill. It’s returned immediately to our office saying there’s no case number on file.

It doesn’t appear that there’s any way for the USDOL to enter the claim in their computer and wait for a claim number to be issued, and it also doesn’t appear that they are willing or able, one of the two, to put in a patient’s name and look and see if there’s a case number on file. They won’t look it up.

Many times we have a claim number, we have it written on the bill, and the claim still gets rejected for no claim number. It looks to us, although we have no way to prove this, that it’s possible for a claim number to exist in one part of the USDOL’s computer but not in another part, namely the claim payment portion.

Frequently, claim numbers are issued without the proper medical condition attached to them, then the claim gets denied, saying that the billed services are not related to the accepted condition.
claim gets rebilled three or four times with no changes made to it, eventually it gets paid because something gets updated in the computer. So rebillings are just a constant—it is almost a given with the U.S. Department of Labor. You do not get paid the first time you submit the bill. You have to do it several times.

There seems to be very poor communication between Federal employers and the USDOL, and I question whether this is because the employers are not properly instructed in the process or whether the process is just so complicated that nobody could possibly follow it. And I have given you an example of this attached, which almost seems like it belonged in the testimony for the first panel, where this employer authorized the claim and the USDOL issued paperwork but it took more than 8 months from the date of this patient's surgery plus hours of staff time to get the claim paid.

The automated telephone system presents a problem. It's not possible to call and speak to a person if you are having problems with the claim. You punch numbers, you leave a message, the message process that you have to follow to get information or leave a message is very long, and you never know if you are going to get a call back or not. Although I must say that recently we did get a call back on a claim. I don't know if that's a fluke or a sign of improvement.

The time involved to work these accounts in order to receive payments has become a serious issue to us, and typically the amounts of reimbursement we get is not worth the effort.

The Federal Government is the largest employer in Alaska. Many of our friends and relatives work for them. My husband works for them. Our doctors want to be able to treat all of the sick and injured patients that need it and come to us, but the USDOL rules make it virtually impossible to do so. The combination of low reimbursement rates, the difficulties we have had in obtaining payment, and the past history we’ve had in dealing with USDOL just doesn't make treating USDOL patients good business sense. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Balen follows:]
RE: Office of Worker's Compensation Programs

Beth A. Bales, CMPE
Administrator
Anchorage Fracture and Orthopedic Clinic
3260 Providence Drive, Suite 200
Anchorage, AK 99508
907-261-7135

May 18, 1999
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Re: Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs

Introduction

Federal Worker’s Compensation claims, paid through the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), have been a long-term problem for Alaska medical providers. The difficulties encountered when dealing with this patient population have led many offices to refuse to accept USDOL patients, except under very specific circumstances. These difficulties include delays in payment, frequent re-billings, low reimbursement rates, inability to get telephone assistance, and multiple lengthy and redundant forms. Physicians want to be able to treat sick and injured patients, and they have become increasingly dissatisfied with the Federal Worker’s Compensation guidelines, which have made caring for these injured workers so very difficult.

Injured Federal workers are given a variety of forms and instructed to have their physicians complete them. These forms are time-consuming for the physician to fill out, and most of the information requested from the physician is already found in the standard medical office dictation that describes a worker’s compensation patient visit. Examples of these forms may be found at the back of this document, pages A-1 through A-14. One of the best ways to control health care costs in a physician’s office is to keep the physician productive. In the time required to complete one of these Federal Forms, the physician could have seen an additional patient.

In 1991 Anchorage Fracture & Orthopedic Clinic (AFOC) worked out an arrangement with Dr. Robert Reynolds, at the USDOL office in Seattle, whereby we would see USDOL patients, but not complete their lengthy forms. We would use our standard billing forms and work releases, submitted with our chart notes, which answer all the questions in their forms. This arrangement was part of a larger agreement for AFOC to agree to a 90-day trial of seeing Federal Worker’s Compensation patients. If we were the first physicians to examine the patient, we would complete the Form CA-16 (example on page A-1), which is the report of initial injury. (Correspondence from and regarding Dr. Reynolds is included on Page B-1 and B-2.) Our office continues to complete Form CA-16 today, although we still do not fill out the other forms.
At the time the 90-day trial was set up, there were no orthopedic surgeons in the Anchorage area who were willing to see USD patients, due to the cumbersome paperwork, and an undercover sting operation by the U.S. Department of Labor in the Fall of 1987 through the Spring of 1988. In this sting operation two agents were sent to various physician offices posing as postal worker employees with work-related injuries, with the intent of tricking the doctors into granting unnecessary time off from work. The agents wore wire and recorded the office visits. A news article from the Washington State Orthopedic Society newsletter from Spring, 1989 is included on pages B-3 and B-4, and gives the complete story on this sting operation. It should be noted that the Anchorage orthopedist featured in the story was a member of our group at the time. Following the sting operation our clinic, as well as most orthopedists in Anchorage, refused to see any USD patients until the 90-day trial was attempted in 1991. USD patients needing care had to be sent to Seattle.

In the past three years the low reimbursement rates and amount of staff time involved to obtain payment for services have led our clinic to again stop accepting appointments from USD patients, scheduling them on a self-pay basis only. We are happy to see the patient, but we do not want to take on the headaches associated with billing USD and the process of returning the patient back to work. Our doctors may individually choose to accept a patient with their USD coverage if they are contacted directly by another physician.

The only exception to this rule is when we are the assigned orthopedic trauma call physicians for the city, covering the hospital emergency rooms. In this situation we accept any and all patients, along with whatever insurance coverage they have, if they are either seen by our physicians in the emergency room, or referred to our office for follow-up after treatment in the E.R. by any E.R. physician.

Details of Problems Experienced with USD Patients

1. Low Fee Schedules

The fee schedule from which the USD pays is extremely low, as shown in the examples, which follow. Details of these actual patient charges and payments are found in the appendix, as referenced by page number below. Detailed is the Surgical CPT code, a brief description of the procedure, our charge for that particular code, USD’s actual payment, and the amount written off. As demonstrated, the amount written off is frequently higher than the amount actually paid for the service. Also included are the maximum allowed amounts for each procedure per the State of Alaska Worker’s Compensation fee schedule, and the average commercial insurance allowable for the area, based on the Medicare Fee Analyzer for our specific area (this schedule also shows the average charge for our geographic locale).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>AFOC Charge</th>
<th>Alaska WC Allowed</th>
<th>Commercial Indemnity Allowable</th>
<th>USDL Paid</th>
<th>Write-off</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60024</td>
<td>Laminectomy</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60030-20</td>
<td>Laminectomy (5%)</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60030-80</td>
<td>Laminectomy Ant. Surgeon (25%)</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22554</td>
<td>Nuchal Dislocation</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60075-1</td>
<td>Discectomy (50%)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20916</td>
<td>Autograft for Spine Surgery</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63047</td>
<td>Laminectomy, Single Segment, L3</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63048</td>
<td>Laminectomy, Adj. Segment, L4</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22612-51</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, Post/Post-Int., L-5</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22614</td>
<td>Arthrodesis, Post/Post-Int., L-5-50</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20975-1</td>
<td>Electrical Bone Stimulator</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26055</td>
<td>Tenodesis, Finger</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22420</td>
<td>Repair, Shoulder Cuff Avulsion</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26620</td>
<td>Codas Fracture</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73110</td>
<td>Wrist X-Rays</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>C-9, D-3, E-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Delays in obtaining Case Numbers

Past experience and the information available to us lead us to conclude that it takes at least 30 to 45 days for a Case Number to be issued to an injured Federal worker. Since a claim cannot be submitted without a Case Number, there is a delay in the billing if the patient has either not yet received a number, or not given it to the physician. Once the number has been given to the patient, they may not think to call the physician and provide them with that information, perhaps because they are not informed of what a critical piece of information it is.

There is no way to bill a claim to the USDl without a Case Number. Billings sent without a Case Number are returned immediately with a denial stating there is no valid claim number on file. The provider of service has no way of knowing if there is actually no Case Number on file, or if the provider just does not have the information. The USDl payment office is either unable or unwilling to do a name search to determine if there is a Case Number in existence for that patient.

3. Rebilling of claims

Rebilling of medical claims is time-consuming and is frequently necessary before payment can be obtained from USDl. As mentioned above, the claim may be returned for no Case Number. However, many times we have had a Case Number and had it written on the bill, only to have the claim rejected for no claim number! It appears that it is possible for a claim number to exist in one part of the USDl computer without being cross-referenced to the claim payment system.

Denials are also received due to the diagnosis on the medical billing not matching the diagnosis attached to the Case Number (see page F-19). Denials are frequently received which say "Billed services not related to the accepted conditions in this claim." If the claim is rebilled three to four times, without any changes, it will eventually get paid, as the claim number finally gets updated with the correct medical information. An example of this is described in the situation detailed below.

There seems to be poor communication between Federal employers and employees and the USDls. I question whether this is due to employers and employees not being properly instructed in the entire process, or whether the process itself is so complicated that it is difficult for even the most diligent, well-trained person to complete it correctly.

An example of this is the medical claim beginning on page F-1. In this claim the employer authorized the work-related condition (see page F-6), and the USDl issued paperwork with a claim number, but it still took eight months from the date of surgery, plus hours of staff time, for our office to receive payment for the surgery charges. This patient, who is an FBI
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employee, was injured on April 13, 1996, and was seen in the emergency room in Fort Smith, Arkansas. He consulted in our office on August 5, 1996, but did not indicate that this was a work-related condition. The patient completed the appropriate USDL forms on August 12, 1996 (see page F-3), and notified our office on August 13, 1996 that this was a work-related condition, and that we were to send the bills directly to his employer at the FBI office in Anchorage. With our knowledge of the difficulties in dealing with the USDL, this seemed like an effective alternative for handling the billing. We received notification from USDL dated September 23, 1996 that the claim had been accepted, and a case number assigned (page F-5).

Meanwhile the patient had required surgery for his back, which was performed on August 27. Although authorization for surgery had not yet been received from USDL, the patient's employer assured us that, as long as our physician felt the surgery was medically necessary and needed to be done without delay, we should proceed, and authorization could be obtained retroactively. This began a series of denials and rejections. We were working with the local FBI office, who was assuring us that this was a valid claim and would be paid, but all the while we were receiving denials and rejections on the surgery claim from the USDL. Although they were paying the physical therapy and doctor visits for the patient's back condition, they were denying the patient's back surgery because it was not related to the condition accepted for his claim (see denial notice on page F-19).

Complete documentation of this situation is found on pages F-1 through F-21. These types of machinations are not unusual when working with USDL, and demonstrate the amount of staff and physician time required in resolving an unpaid claim. It always appears that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing at the USDL, and in this particular example resulted in the major part of our charges not being paid until April 21, 1997, eight months after the services were performed. We received the check on April 29. Payment on a $4,100 charge was only $2,102, 48.6% of the Alaska Worker's Comp allowable, and 49.3% of the commercial indemnity allowable for our area.

4. Automated telephone system

When calling the USDL it is not possible to call and speak to a person. The caller punches numbers and leaves a message. The message process that must be followed to get information or leave a message for a call back is very long, and there is no way to bypass the message (such as pushing “0” for an operator) and reach a person. Recent experience has shown an improvement in the timeliness of call-backs, but the process is frustrating, particularly when a doctor is waiting for information, or a patient is in the office, waiting for help.

At one point we had a contact in the USDL office who we could reach directly, and who was very helpful, but she no longer works there.
Conclusion

In conclusion, in order to adequately assist injured federal workers, while making it a worthwhile business decision to treat them, we need the following:

1. Higher fee schedules, which should have geographic adjustments to account for different price ranges in various parts of the country (similar to Medicare’s GPCI), and which match, or nearly match, the state Worker’s Compensation fee schedules.

2. Easier access to the claim payment office.

3. Less paperwork for the patient, employer and physician to complete, which would speed up the entire process and make it less prone to error.

4. Overall simplification of the process, by reducing the length and number of forms, the authorization process whereby a condition is accepted as work-related, and improvement in access to the claims office. There may be states with Worker’s Compensation systems which work well, and might be used as a model.

Approximately 20% of the patients in our clinic are Worker’s Compensation (mostly state of Alaska worker’s comp), 17% are Medicare, 5% are Medicaid, and about 5% are self-pay. Obviously we are accustomed to State and Federal regulations and compliance issues, and are also willing to treat patients who may not have top-notch insurance benefits. Our physicians want to be able to treat sick and injured patients, but the USDL rules make it virtually impossible to do so. The Federal Government is the largest employer in Alaska (see page G-1 and G-2), and many of our friends and relatives work for them. However, due to the combination of low reimbursement rates, the past history in dealing with the OWC, and the difficulties in receiving payment, treating USDL patients makes poor business and medical sense.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Balen, CMPE
Administrator
Anchorage Fracture & Orthopedic Clinic
907-261-7135
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### PHYSICIAN'S REPORT

#### PART B - AT

14. **Employee's name (last, first, middle)**

15. **Medical History or Disability Under Employee's Guide?**

16. **History of injury or disability or employee's guide?**

17. **Describe the nature or injury or disability or employee's guide?**

18. **What is your diagnosis?**

19. **Do you believe the condition found was caused or aggravated by the employee's activity?**

20. **If yes, disease described**

21. **If injury related to employment?**

22. **Date of discharge (mm, dd, yyyy)**

23. **Surgery (if any, describe type)**

24. **What current type of treatment did you provide?**

25. **Case of discharge from treatment (mm, dd, yyyy)**

26. **What type of follow-up do you anticipate?**

27. **Is employee able to resume work?**

28. **If yes, date of return to work (mm, dd, yyyy)**

29. **If employee is able to resume work, what restrictions would be necessary?**

30. **If employee is able to resume work, what restrictions would be necessary?**

31. **Has employee been advised of restrictions?**

32. **If yes, state specialty**

33. **Signature of physician**

34. **Address No., Street, City, State, ZIP Code**

35. **Date of report**

---

**MEDICAL BILL** Charges for your services should be presented in the AM/AAMA standard "Health Insurance Claim Form" (AMA/AAMA, CHPA-19805, or HCFA-15000). Services shall be categorized by Current Procedures Terminology Code (CPT-4) and the form must be signed.

---

Form Date: 1/1/2000


---

Form No. 14907

---

Form Date: 1/1/2000
INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL FOR COMPLETION OF PART A

SELECTION OF PHYSICIAN

- A federal employee injured by accident while in the performance of duty has the initial right to select a physician of his/her choice to provide necessary treatment. The supervisor shall immediately authorize examination and appropriate medical care by use of Form CA-16 issued to either a United States medical officer/hospital or any duly qualified physician/hospital of the employee's choice.

- If the employee selects to be treated by a private physician, a copy of the American Medical Association standards listing forms SSA-545, SSA-546, SSA-547, and SSA-548 should be submitted along with Form CA-16.

- A physician who is retained from the FECA program as prescribed at 22 CFR 10.490-497 may not be authorized to examine or treat an injured federal employee. Generally, 25 miles from the place of injury, employing agency, or the employee's home is a reasonable distance to travel for medical care; however, other pertinent factors must also be considered.

PERIOD OF AUTHORIZATION

- Form CA-16 is valid for up to sixty days from date of issuance and may be terminated sever upon written notice from OWCP to the provider. It should not be used to authorize a change of physicians after the initial choice is exercised by the employee.

FEDERAL MEDICAL FACILITIES

- U.S. medical facilities include Public Health Service hospitals or VA hospitals. Federal health service facilities (health units established under 5 USC 7901) are not U.S. medical facilities as used herein (see 22 CFR 10.490).

DEFINITION OF INJURY

- The term "injury" includes damage to or destruction of medical, dental, or other treatment devices. Eyepieces and hearing aids are included only if the damages were incident to a personal injury for which medical services are rendered for injury or disease. Treatment for injury or disease should not be authorized unless damage is first obtained from OWCP.

DEFINITION OF PHYSICIAN

- The term "physician" includes doctors of medicine (M.D.), surgeons, podiatrists, dentists, clinical psychologists, optometrists, chiropractors, and osteopathic physicians within the scope of their practice as defined by State law. The term "physician" also includes any persons authorized by statute to practice medicine, receive apprenticeship training and be able to diagnose, treat, and perform surgical manipulation of the same to correct a disability demonstrated by a X-ray.

FORM COMPLETION

- Form CA-16 must be completed in full by the authorizing official. The authorization is not valid unless the name and address of the physician or medical institution is shown in item 1 and the signature of the authorizing official appears in item 8. Check item 9 if item 8 is not signed or is incorrect. In case of illness or disease, only Box 9B may be checked.

- Show the address of the proper OWCP office in item 12. Send original and one copy of Form CA-16 to the medical officer or physician. If issued for illness or disease, a copy must also be sent to OWCP.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION


Information for Physician is on Reverse Side
INFORMATION FOR PHYSICIAN

YOUR AUTHORIZATION

○ Please read Part A of Form CA-16. You are authorized to examine and provide treatment for the injury or disease described in item 3. for a period of no more than 60 days from the date of injury, subject to the conditions in item 5. A physician who is distant from the FECA program as provided in 26 CFR 50.6584-1 may not be authorized to examine or treat an injured Federal employee. Authorization may be terminated earlier upon written notice from OWCP. For extension of the authorization to treat beyond the 60 day period, apply to the officer shown in Part A, item 12.

USE OF CONSULTANTS AND HOSPITALS

○ You may utilize consultans, laboratories and local hospitals, if needed. Authorize and authorize the hospital unless otherwise indicated. Present emergencies may provide for a hospital as necessary.

REPORTS

○ After examination, complete items 14 through 36 of Part B. and send your report, together with any additional information or explanatory materials, to the address cited in Part A, item 12. If the employee sustained a traumatic injury and is disabled for work, report on Form CA-17, "Employee's Status Report" may be used by the employing agency during the first 45 days of disability. If disability continues beyond 45 days, monthly reports should be submitted. Reports from all consultants are also required. Delay in submitting medical reports may delay payment of benefits.

RELEASE OF RECORDS

○ Injury reports are the official records of OWCP. They shall not be released to anyone nor may any other use be made of them without the approval of OWCP.

BILLING FOR SERVICES

○ OWCP requires that charges be itemized using the AHA standard "Health Insurance Claim Form" (AMA OP 407460408, WCF-100, or HCFA-1500). Each procedure must be identified, in Column 24 C of the form, by the applicable Current Procedural Terminology (4th edition) Code CPT 4). A copy of the form may be submitted by the employee at the time treatment is sought.

○ Payments for chiropractic services is limited to charges for physical examination, routine laboratory tests, and x-rays to diagnose and substantiate the injury and treatment consisting of manual manipulation of the spine or correct a subluxation demonstrated by x-ray.

TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

○ The provider's Tax Identification Number (TIN) is an important identifier in the OWCP system. To speed processing and reduce inaccuracy of payment, the provider's TIN (Employee Identification Number or SIN) should be shown on all reports and bills submitted to OWCP. If possible, providers should decide on a single TIN - either corporate or personal - which is used consistently on OWCP claims.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

○ Contact the OWCP shown in item 12 of Part A.

Please remove these instructions before submitting your report.
## Attending Physician's Supplemental Report

**U.S. Department of Labor**  
**Office of Workers' Compensation Programs**

For instructions see reverse side.

**Date of Injury:**

**Place of Injury:**

**Name of Employer:**

**Address of Employer:**

**Name of Employee:**

**Address of Employee:**

**Relationship of Employee to Employer:**

**Date of Death:**

**Place of Death:**

### 13. What percent of income is employee earning and how much is (given)?

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

### 14. Describe any concurrent disability employee has which is work-related.

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

### 15. Can employee return to work within 20 days or longer?

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

### 16. What if any permanent effects, if any, are anticipated?

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

### 17. What if any future medical treatment is required?

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

### 18. Address for future correspondence

- Employee is currently working.
- Employee is unemployed.
- Employee is deceased.

---

We estimate that it will take all the time of 50 minutes to complete this section.

1. If you have any comments or questions, please contact the Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N9601, 200 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20210. (202) 693-7199.

2. This report is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the collection of information, please contact the Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N9601, 200 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20210. (202) 693-7199.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Date of injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social Security number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cause of injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Date of injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Date of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Date of claim filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Date of award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Date of settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Amount of compensation awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Date of death of dependents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Date of death of beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Date of death of insured employee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The above fields are placeholders and do not represent actual data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Name:</th>
<th>Date of Injury:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ per</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Leave:**
- [ ] Type A: Leave
- [ ] Type B: Leave
- [ ] Type C: Leave
- [ ] Type D: Leave
- [ ] Type E: Leave
- [ ] Type F: Leave

**Employee Information:**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Supervisor's Signature:**
- [ ] Name
- [ ] Date

**Agency:**
- [ ] Office Phone

**Date of Injury:**
- [ ] 6-10

**Form CA-7**
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM CA-7

If the employee does not qualify for continuation of pay (for 45 days), the term should be completed and filed with the OPM as soon as possible. The term should also be submitted when the employee reaches retirement, other employment, and causes a schedule award. If the employee is receiving continuation of pay and will continue to be so paid for 45 days, the term should be filed with OPM 30 working days prior to the end of the 45-day period.

EMPLOYEE (For person acting on the employee's behalf, please complete items 1 through 30 and submit the form to the employee's supervisor.)

SUPERVISOR (For person acting on the employee's behalf, please complete items 1 through 30 and promptly forward the form to OPM.)

ITEM EXPLANATIONS - Some of the items on the form which may require further explanation are explained below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Period of Wage Loss for which Compensation is Claimed</td>
<td>Enter inclusive cases covering the period for which you are claiming compensation. If intermittent periods are covered, use a separate sheet to list each period individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is This a Claim for a Schedule Award?</td>
<td>Schedule awards are paid for permanent impairment to a member or function of the body. A claim for a schedule award should not be made on the same form as a claim for compensation for wage loss; rather, a separate CA-7 should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Has Any Pay Been Received for Period Shown in Item 4?</td>
<td>This question includes leave pay and OOP received from the Federal act or in which you were injured, and pay for work actually performed, wherever it is the Federal act or for which you were injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If Yes, Amounts</td>
<td>Give the amounts of pay received and the period for which it was paid. If there is more than one period, or more than one source of pay, explain fully on a separate sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Was Claim Made Against 3rd Party?</td>
<td>A third party is an individual or organization (other than the injured employee or the Federal government) who is liable for the injury. For instance, the driver of a vehicle causing an accident in which an employee is injured, or the owner of a building where unsafe conditions cause an employee to fall, and a manufacturer who gave improper instructions for the use of a chemical to which an employee is exposed, could be considered third parties to the injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>List Your Dependents</td>
<td>Your wife or husband is a dependent if he or she is living with you. A child is a dependent if he or she either lives with you or receives support payments from you, and he or she: 1) is under 18 or 2) is between 18 and 23 and is a full-time student; or 3) is incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>If Employee Received Additonal Pay, Specify Type and Show Amount</td>
<td>“Additional Pay” includes any different, Sunday premium, holiday premium, and any other non-wage pay (such as hazardous duty or “dirty work” pay) regularly received by the employee, but does not include pay for overtime. If the amount of such paid varies from pay period to pay period (as in the case of holiday premium or a rotating shift), then the total amount of such pay earned during the year immediately prior to the date of injury or the date the employee stopped work (whichever is greater) should be reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Type and Inclusive Cases of Employee Resumed Leave for Any Part of Period Since Stopping Work</td>
<td>Enter inclusive cases covering each period of leave. If leave was used for more than one inclusive case, continue on a separate sheet. If leave was used for part of each day during a period, state how many hours were used per day; if the number of hours used per day varies, use a separate sheet to list each day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dates of Pay Continuation (OOP) During Period of Disability</td>
<td>Enter the period of Continuation of Pay (see form CA-1 for a full explanation). If the injury was not a continuing injury reported on Form CA-1, this space does not apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Date All Pay Stopped</td>
<td>Compensation is payable for temporary total disability until the employee enters a temporary job; thereon, 20% of the weekly pay is payable for the first three days of disability after the end of any OOP unless the disability exceeds 14 calendar days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Burden Statement

The estimated average burden for completing this form is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering necessary data, and completing and reviewing the SF-1 form. This statement is an estimate, and it is not intended to indicate the number of responses that must be submitted. The response time will depend upon the user's ability to complete the SF-1 form. If you have any comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing burden, please send them to the Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Room 5-5225, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE SHOWN ABOVE. Please do not respond to this collection of information unless it is a mandate of compensation under a federal law that requires that a quarterly form be filed.
IMPORTANT: A MEDICAL REPORT IS REQUIRED BY THE OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS BEFORE PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF WAGES OR PERMANENT DISABILITY CAN BE MADE TO THE EMPLOYED. THIS INFORMATION IS REQUIRED TO OBTAIN OR RETAIN A BENEFIT (5 USC 2101 et seq).

IF YOU HAVE SUBMITTED A NARRATIVE MEDICAL REPORT OR A FORM CA-15 TO OWS IN THE PAST 10 DAYS, YOU NEED NOT SUBMIT THIS FORM CA-20.

OWS Requires that Medical Bills Other Than Hospital Bills Be Submitted On The American Medical Association Health Insurance Claim Form, HCFA 1500/0040-4006.

INSTRUCTIONS TO PHYSICIAN FOR COMPLETING ATTENDING PHYSICIAN'S REPORT

1. COMPLETE THE ENTRIES 1-18 ON THE FORM AND
2. IF DISABILITY HAS NOT TERMINATED, INDICATE IN ITEM 17; AND
3. SEND THE FORM AND YOUR BILL TO:

[Image of a form]

OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

PUBLIC NOTICE STATEMENT

We estimate that it will take an average of 5 minutes to complete this collection of information, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any comments regarding these estimates or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, send them to the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S-2525, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

[Signature]

JT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THIS OFFICE

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402
FORM CA-20, PHYSICIAN'S REPORT

Compensation for wage loss cannot be paid unless medical evidence has been submitted supporting disability for work during the period involved. For claims based on acute injury and reported on Form CA-1, the employee should bring a copy of the report to the physician. For claims based on chronic injury and reported on Form CA-20, complete parts 1-3 on the form, and send the OOWP district office address on the reverse. The form should be properly dated and signed by the attending physician or employee. If the claim is for occupational disease, part 4 of Form CA-20 should be completed. The basic information as necessary for form is required in each case. The employee may have a claim, the claim should be properly dated and signed by the physician. In addition to Form CA-20, the physician should provide a complete medical report, in addition to Form CA-20, to adequately explain and support the relationship of the disability to the employment.

For payment of a schedule award, the claimant must have a permanent loss or loss of function of one of the members or the body or organs enumerated in the regulations (20 C.F.R. 10.304). The examining physician must affirm that maximum medical improvement of the disability has been reached and should document the functional loss and the necessary treatment in accordance with the American Medical Association Guidelines to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment.

PRIVACY ACT

In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law No. 93-579, 5 U.S.C. 552a) and the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988 (Public Law No. 100-503), you are hereby notified that: (1) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 8111), is carried out by the Office of Compensation Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor, in accordance with this section, the Office reserves the right to disclose information concerning the individual's employment, and other information collected in connection with the investigation, or by other means authorized under the Act. (2) The information collected by this form or other information collected in connection with the investigation, or by other means authorized under the Act, may be used by federal, state, and local agencies for law enforcement purposes. (3) Failure to submit all requested information may delay the process of determining eligibility or result in an unfavorable decision or a reduced level of benefits. (4) Dissemination of a social security number (SSN) is required by 5 C.F.R. 155.500(3) to satisfy the provisions of this Act. The information collected by you using your SSN may be used for studies, statistics, and computer matching to benefits and payment rates. This notice should be retained for your information.

(Please sign)

A-14
April 1991

Dear Doctor:

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) maintains a roster of physicians who are willing to do second opinion and medical referee examinations of Federal employees with traumatic injuries or occupational diseases. These medical evaluations are needed as a complement to existing evidence or to act as a referee examination in cases where there is a conflict of medical opinion.

Both types of evaluations involve the physical examination of the worker, the review of the medical records (for second opinion examination), a review of our entire case file (for referee examinations), and the submission of a written medical report answering specific questions posed by the OWCP claims examiner. In the report you will be asked to give your opinion on issues such as the etiology of the condition and its medical relationship to the workplace, recommendations for treatment, prognosis, and the assessment of any resulting physical impairment.

We pay full fees and promptly if you use the special billing form which we supply. We rotate among those willing to do our examinations and now have an automated computer program to give all interested persons equal opportunity to give this much needed advice to our claim development.

We would like to hear from you. If you would be interested in being on our roster, please complete the simple attached form and mail it to me using the envelope provided. If you have done this type of work for us previously, please excuse this duplication, however we would like to update our records. If we do not receive a response we will assume that you chose not to perform second opinion or referee examinations for OWCP.

If you or your staff have any questions, please call me at 206-553-8120.

Sincerely,

PD Reynolds MD
Robert Reynolds, M.D.
District Medical Director

Enclosure
MEMO TO: PHYSICIANS AND STAFF OF A.F.C.C.
FROM: BETH (ARC Administrator Beth Schrock)
DATE: June 20, 1991
RE: 90 DAY TRIAL OF SEEING FEDERAL WORKER’S COMPENSATION PATIENTS

I have notified Dr. Reynolds of USDL workers comp division that we have agreed to a 90 day trial of seeing limited types of Federal Workers Comp patients.

He has been informed that the type of cases which we will see are new trauma, and acute cases. We will NOT be seeing chronic backs, second opinions, or IMEs. Information is being sent to Federal agencies in Alaska, but it will be up to us to screen the types of patients that we will and will not see.

I have also been told by Dr. Reynolds that we will NOT need to fill out ANY of the special federal forms. He said that if we send our chart notes and work releases along with our standard billing forms that this will suffice.

We will need to preauthorize all non-emergency surgery with Dr. Reynolds in Seattle. His direct phone number is (206)553-0120
His fax number is (206)553-4629.

Dr. Reynolds has agreed to be our contact person to resolve any problems which may occur. This includes billing and timely reimbursement issues. If anyone has problems with the USDL systems during the next 90 days PLEASE let me know.
The chart said the new patient, a postal worker at Alaska's central mail sorting center, had strained her shoulder lifting mailbags. The orthopedist grimaced. Federal worker's comp cases were hardly worth taking anymore — the paperwork was horrendous and it took months to get paid. But, he reminded himself, he had gone into medicine to take care of patients, and there was one waiting for him in the exam room.

He had no way of knowing that the "patient" was an investigator hired by the U.S. Dept. of Labor to manipulate him into making a mistake. He had no way of knowing that she was wearing a wire, or that slow payment and paperwork would soon be the least of his worries over the case.

He was about to be stung.

The Anchorage orthopedist was one of 16 Alaskan physicians fingered in an undercover sting operation by the U.S. Dept. of Labor. Two agents, a man and a woman, were sent into doctors' offices posing as postal workers with related injuries. Once inside the exam room, they changed their stories. The trick was to see whether the doctor could be lured into authorizing new or off work even after the patient admitted to faking the injury.

How couldn't? But that wasn't enough to redeem him in the eyes of the government. They had been targeted for a sting — therefore, they had to be guilty of something. It simply wouldn't do have an undercover investigation where the end result was a finding that the targeted doctors were honest.

The bogus office visits, all preserved on tape, occurred between the fall of 1987 and spring of 1988. The state medical association knew nothing about it until July 15, 1988, when it hit the front page of the newspapers, explained Ray Schlaw, AMA's executive director. "The threat of the story was that physicians and postal workers were scamming the government out of thousands of dollars. Reputations were destroyed that day."

Schlaw demanded a meeting with the federal prosecutor assigned to the case. He took along the medical association's attorneys, the executive director of the Medical Disciplinary Board, and the investigator for the State Department of Occupational Licensing. "The government came on like gangbusters at that meeting," Schlaw recalls. "They said they had targeted the small group of physicians with the heaviest caseload of postal worker patients. Out of an initial group of 20, 16 went on to examine the patient after being told they weren't really testified. Seven cases were before the grand jury, and six doctors were indicted. The government's attorney told us that they could have gotten indictments on all seven but decided that five was enough."

As for the other nine physicians who had examined the patients, the attorney wouldn't concede that their conduct had been improper — only that there had been insufficient evidence to take their case before a grand jury.

"Sometimes later, our attorney got his hands on a tape of one of the office visits," Schlaw continued. "It was pretty bad. The prosecutor led us to believe that all the tapes were equally damning."

"What had in fact happened was that the government allowed only the worst tape to be looked at. The other cases were entirely different. Only one of the 16 — the one whose tape we had heard — was convicted of fraud. One other physician pled guilty to a misdemeanor. In 14 out of the 16 cases, the government either didn't have enough on the doctor to take it to the jury, or the jury wouldn't buy their argument."

The doctors insist that the reason their cases went nowhere was because they had done nothing wrong in the first place.

"When I got into the exam room, the patient told me that there was nothing wrong with her shoulder, but that she wanted time off to visit her boyfriend in Hawaii," says one orthopedist. "I told her right off the bat that I wouldn't authorize time off. The next thing she did was turn into tears and tell me that she'd lose her job if the postal service found out what she had done."

"Out of compassion, I said I would go ahead and fill out a duty status report, confirming that she had come to me complaining of shoulder pain. That was the truth. I billed for an office visit. The Department can't deny that I examined the patient — they've got that on tape."

But early this year, he and the 16 other physicians who were not indicted got letters from the regional director of the Dept. of Labor, informing them that they were being "excluded from payment and participation as a provider of..."
2 medical services to injured federal workers under the Federal Workers' Compensation Act."

"What they contend is that knowingly give false statements in connection with a request for payments is the cornerstone. I guess if someone comes into my office under phone pressure, push the stuff, in the expense of taking a claim, takes me twice the time, whole other patient was, then claims the whole thing a scam. I'm not supposed to put it in, if I hold for my time and documentation, that's misrepresentation.

"The truth cost me $50,000 in direct costs and at least $200,000 in indirect costs. The emotional cost is truly immeasurable. Most importantly, the time and energy which I had to devote to these misguided proceedings was taken away from the people who needed my services, the most—my patients."

The government was looking under rocks for problems, on the assumption that the doctors had to be doing something wrong. They dragged us through hell on the timeline of charges. When they couldn't find anything solid or concrete, they accused us of misrepresenting facts. "What really galls me is that these people have no personal liability for what they said. They can wreck lives and careers and just walk away."

The Department came down especially hard on one of the five physicians. He was told, he took the jury only 20 minutes to exonerate him. Later, he got a letter from the government telling him that even though a jury had judged him innocent, he was being excluded from the workers' comp program.

"This man is an absolute prince, and what's been done to him is unconscionable," says Schall. "He specializes in sports medicine, and he is on the U.S. Olympic Committee. Every year, he gives 500 exams to high school athletes and teams every year the school system turns over to the schools to fund their sports programs. He's a tremendous asset to the community and the state, and an outstanding person. He's not out to kick anybody.

And he's been devastated by the sting. "The sting cost me $50,000 in direct costs and at least $200,000 in indirect costs," he writes. "The emotional cost to me, my family and my staff was truly immeasurable. Most importantly, the time and energy which I had to devote to these misguided proceedings was taken away from the people who needed my services, the most—my patients.

"During my trial, the federal undercover agents admitted all they had lied to the grand jury, and that their perjury was the basis for my indictment. Nevertheless, the Dept. of Labor now states in an administrative action that they find me guilty of those same charges. They propose to punish me because I was not the federal employee under the workers' comp program.

"The licence in all that," says Schall, "is that if the government can't trick the doctors into doing something wrong, they'd find a way to punish them anyway."

"These guys weren't out to defraud the government. Physicians are impacted from the very beginning to the very end. That's all they were doing. Their conscience told them, 'I'm going to help the basis of our medical care system.'"

"During my trial, the federal undercover agents admitted all they had lied to the grand jury, and that their perjury was the basis for my indictment. Nevertheless, the Dept. of Labor now states in an administrative action that they find me guilty of those same charges. This stuff... it's going to make anyone more less willing to be a doctor for the government."

"We're losing physicians in Alaska already," explains the orthopedist. "And many of our 12 orthopedic surgeons are subspecialists who generally treat three patients a year. The sting targeted directly the few general orthopedic and family physicians who would agree to treat postal workers. Now most of us are excluded from the program. And those who aren't excluded aren't particularly impressed with the way the Dept. of Labor does business. This sting certainly isn't going to make anyone more anxious to take care of patients for the government."

"These 15 doctors, most of them orthopedics, have been put through hell. But they're not the only ones who have been wronged. This is as much to the whole profession, and to society. It's not how I want my tax dollars spent."

It may also run out to be an expensive sting for the government. Physicians say it will cost the Department thousands of tens of dollars extra in year to secure waivers for injured workers, many of whom will now need to be flown to Seattle.
## Statement of Account

For the period 02/27/97 thru 04/27/97

ARCH FRACTURE & ORTHO CLINIC
3260 PROVIDENCE DR., SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508
907-563-3145

Statement date: 05/06/99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/27/97 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>CONC.</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE SCHED.</td>
<td>737.00-</td>
<td>737.00-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/98 35</td>
<td>OH DEAN</td>
<td>64711</td>
<td>CARPAL TUNNEL RELEASE</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>1428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/27/97 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>691.00-</td>
<td>691.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $0.00

Claim # 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/05/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $0.00

Claim # 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/05/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>L3908</td>
<td>CORK-UP WRIST SPLINT</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>20.80-</td>
<td>20.80-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $0.00

Claim # 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/19/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $0.00

Claim # 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/02/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>64711</td>
<td>CARPAL TUNNEL RELEASE</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>1428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>CONC.</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE SCHED.</td>
<td>737.00-</td>
<td>737.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $5.00

Claim # 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/20/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>99080</td>
<td>SPECIAL REPORTS OR FORMS</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>25.00-</td>
<td>25.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** $0.00

Claim # 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. PL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/24/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>99080</td>
<td>LETTER</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/98 35</td>
<td>DEAN</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>25.00-</td>
<td>25.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS***** (C1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Number</th>
<th>Check Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5678-9012</td>
<td>1234.56</td>
<td>02-20-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This payment is for the TICA bill 00-123456789. Please ensure it covers the correct amount and date. If there are any issues, please contact the agency at the number listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/09/98</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE SCHEDULE</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/12/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>DO RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISIT 72210</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE SCHEDULE</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/16/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>DO RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PRE-OP VISIT: ONE DAY PRI 72210</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/23/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>DO RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/29/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>CH RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>5227.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>CH RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>LUMBAR XERAS (3V)</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/98</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>CH RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>2162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>RAYMOND</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE SCHEDULE</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>3273.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/07/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>DO RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/04/97</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>DO RAYMOND</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Prov Hld</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ICCA</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/28/99</td>
<td>DO MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Patient Office Visit</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>197.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Out of State Fee Schedule</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/99</td>
<td>DO MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-op Visit - One Day Fri</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/99</td>
<td>CH MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laminotomy</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>4182.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>2075.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Out of State Fee Schedule</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>2107.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/99</td>
<td>CH MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Peterson</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>5045.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>415.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/99</td>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Out of State Fee Schedule</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>630.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/99</td>
<td>DO MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postoperative Follow Up</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/99</td>
<td>DO MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postoperative Follow Up</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/99</td>
<td>DO MARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Established Patient Visit</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Claim Trans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Date Paid</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338-109310</td>
<td>338-109310</td>
<td>010798</td>
<td>2038-12</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>This payment is for the following amounts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>ANCHORAGE FRAC AND ORTHOPEDIC CLINIC</td>
<td>LKY20039318A8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>111 3rd AVE SUITE 200</td>
<td>SEATTLE, WA. 98101-3211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>PHILADELPHIA, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>19103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>2058-34255651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Number</td>
<td>943490.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>07-23-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS PAYMENT IS FOR COCA BILLS FOLLOWING IS THE CASE NUMBER:**

CASE NUMBER: 0114900723

**INVOICE NUMBER OR Date:**

ALC 16-15-2001

**AMOUNT BILLED:**

142333818 %

**AMOUNT PAID:**

867/2.88/2.88/3.88

**AMOUNT UNPAID:**

7-335.98 7-208.98 7-219.88

**AGENCY:**

C-8

**PLEASE DIRECT ANY INQUIRIES CONCERNING THIS PAYMENT TO THE AGENCY AT THE ABOVE FAX PHONE NUMBER AND E-MAIL ADDRESS:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov F.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Adjusted Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/31/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>CONC OUT OF STATE PER SCHEDULE</td>
<td>992003</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 7220</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>I. P.</td>
<td>NECK SPINE FUSION 7222</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>4935.00</td>
<td>4935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>I. P.</td>
<td>DISCECTOMY 7222</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>3217.50</td>
<td>3217.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>AUTOGRAFT FOR SPINE SURG 7222</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>568.00</td>
<td>568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>CONC OUT OF STATE PER SCHEDULE</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>1940.50</td>
<td>1940.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>DQ. Paul</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 7220</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>DQ. Paul</td>
<td>SPINE XRAY 7220</td>
<td>722020</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>CONC OUT OF STATE PER SCHEDULE</td>
<td>992024</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>SPINE XRAY 7220</td>
<td>722020</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim #</td>
<td>PL NAME</td>
<td>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DO FREDERICK</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISIT</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHED</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DO FREDERICK</td>
<td>PRE-OP VISIT, ONE DAY PRI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IN FREDERICK</td>
<td>TREATMENT OF BONE STIMUL (</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>1752.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IN FREDERICK</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF SPINAL LAMINA</td>
<td>1266.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREDERICK</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>1483.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td>1270.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents a statement of account for a patient named Frederick, detailing various medical procedures and their associated costs for the period 09/27/98 to 09/30/98. The claim numbers range from 3 to 6, with each claim listing the provider name, service description, and the amount charged.
### Account: CBL33924

**Provider Information:**
- Name: Alaska St. Mary's Hospital
- Tel: 907-638-2145
- Address: WASILLA, AK 99654

**Claim Details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/95</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>9203</td>
<td>New Patient Office Visit 92321</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/95</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Thumb Spica Splint 92321</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/95</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>71101</td>
<td>Cubital Tunnel X-Rays (Y) 92321</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/95</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>72401</td>
<td>Finger X-Rays 92321</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp 2665.50</td>
<td>USDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/98</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>CAAHC Alaska W/C Fee Schedule 46.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/06/96</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>99212</td>
<td>Established Patient Visit 3540</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp 42.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/98</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>CAAHC Alaska W/C Fee Schedule 10.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/04/96</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>99212</td>
<td>Established Patient Visit 72703</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp 42.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/98</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>CAAHC Alaska W/C Fee Schedule 10.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/15/96</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>99212</td>
<td>Established Patient Visit 72703</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp 41.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>CAAHC Out-of-State Fee Schedule 13.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim 5:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/27/97</td>
<td>DO MARC</td>
<td>99023</td>
<td>Pre-op Visit One Day Fri 72703</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim 6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prov PL Name</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/97</td>
<td>CH MARC</td>
<td>26055</td>
<td>Tenovaginotomy, Finger 72703</td>
<td>793.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/97</td>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Payment by Workers' Comp 455.00</td>
<td>USDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS *****</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT**

FOR THE PERIOD 12/09/96 - THRU 03/04/99
ANCHE FRACTURE & ORTHO CLINIC
1240 PROVIDENCE DR., SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508
907-563-3145

**TO:**

GARY L.

ANCHORAGE, AK 99514

**Statement Date:** 05/06/99

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/28/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>11000-</td>
<td>11.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/25/97</td>
<td>DO GARY</td>
<td>CONFIRMATORY CONSULTATION</td>
<td>7220</td>
<td>99274</td>
<td>235.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>99999-</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>11000-</td>
<td>60.00-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/09/97</td>
<td>DO GARY</td>
<td>PRE-OP VISIT: ONE DAY PRI 7261</td>
<td>99223</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/12/97</td>
<td>DO GARY</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 7261</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>99000-</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/06/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>REPAIR, SHOULDER CUFF AV 8404</td>
<td>23420</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>3264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>99999-</td>
<td>2099.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>11000-</td>
<td>1165.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/02/97</td>
<td>DO GARY</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 7261</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>99000-</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim # 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV. FL. NAME</th>
<th>SERV.</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/29/97</td>
<td>DO GARY</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISIT</td>
<td>99213</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>99999-</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/97</td>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>11000-</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

C-17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SHOP</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IDVA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/11/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>NEW PATIENT OFFICE VISIT</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USED</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>243.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>特种报告或形式</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>1758.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>GLOVE- XRAY (3V)</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USED</td>
<td>1237.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>920057</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>73110</td>
<td>Wrist Xray (3V)</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>73110</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USED</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>73110</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE PAY SCHEDULE</td>
<td>81341</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/97</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>99080</td>
<td>SPECIAL REPORTS OR FORMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/97</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>99080</td>
<td>PAYMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>USED</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The Alaska Division of Workers’ Compensation (ADWC) is pleased to announce the implementation of the Official Alaska Workers’ Compensation Medical Fee Schedule, which provides the maximum reimbursement rates for practitioner and non-practitioner services. All fees contained in this schedule are effective for dates of service beginning on September 16, 1996.

Pursuant to Alaska Administrative Code 4 AAC 45.28010(d), the usual, customary, and reasonable fees were determined based on the 90th percentile of charges for similar services reported to Medicaid. This schedule shall be used by insurance carriers, self-insurers, bill review organizations, and other payer organizations as a guide for approving and paying medical charges of physicians and surgeons and other health care providers for services rendered under the Alaska Administrative Code.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FEE SCHEDULE

The Official Alaska Workers’ Compensation Medical Fee Schedule is comprised of two parts: Practitioner Services and Facilities Services combined as one schedule, and an additional inpatient hospital schedule. The Practitioner and Outpatient Facility schedules are divided into the following sections: Evaluation and Management (EM), Anesthesia, Surgery, Radiology, Pathology and Laboratory, Medicine, HCFCS (EME), and Pharmacy. Each of these sections is preceded by general guidelines pertinent to it. The schedule is divided into these sections for structural purposes only.

Providers are to use the section(s) that contain the procedure(s) they perform or the service(s) they render. This schedule utilizes Physicians’ Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes. This schedule of fees represents the maximum level of medical and surgical reimbursement for the treatment of workplace-related injuries and/or illnesses, which the Alaska Workers’ Compensation Board deems to be reasonable and necessary. Providers should bill their normal charges for services, not values listed within this schedule.

Familiarity with these general rules within the guidelines section as well as general guidelines within each section is necessary for all who use the schedule. It is extremely important that these be read before the schedule is used.

COLUMN HEADINGS AND INTERPRETING THE FEE SCHEDULE

The two-part data portion of the Official Alaska Workers’ Compensation Medical Fee Schedule is arranged under easy-to-use column headings, which are explained below.

Practitioner (Provider) Schedule

For the purposes of this schedule, two categories are included within each section of the fee schedule: the Practitioner section and the Outpatient Facility section. Most healthcare services and procedures can be divided into two types of billing: the professional or physician services, and the services performed in an...
The amounts in the Facility Schedule represent the technical portion or component of a service or procedure. Typically, the technical component requires the use of specialized instrumentation or equipment but not necessarily the presence of a physician. Most facilities will be billing for the technical portion of a service only. Billings received on the UB-92 for an outpatient service are assumed to be for the technical portion only of the procedure. The reimbursement is listed in the Outpatient Facility schedule for the technical portion of a procedure. If the facility bills for the total component of a procedure (i.e., both the professional and technical components), the professional dollar amount from the Practitioner Schedule should be added to the Outpatient Facility dollar amount to reimburse the total component for the procedure. Hospitals must identify the services as the total component for correct reimbursement.

Implementation of the outpatient facility schedule

A revenue code is defined by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) as a code which identifies a specific accommodation, ancillary service or billing calculation. Revenue codes are used by outpatient facilities to specify the type and place of service being billed and to reflect charges for items and services provided. A substantial number of outpatient facilities use both CPT codes and revenue codes to bill private payers for outpatient facility services. The Outpatient Facility file schedule is driven by CPT code rather than revenue code. Common revenue codes are listed for components of the comprehensive surgical outpatient facility charge, as well as pathology and laboratory services, radiology services, and medicine services. This information is a guideline for producing a total surgical charge by bundling revenue code charges into one surgical CPT code.

Recommended Implementation Methodology

Many outpatient surgical facility bills consist of charges associated with both CPT and revenue codes. The reimbursement amounts included in the Outpatient Facility file schedule are listed for CPT codes only, they are organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>CPT Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical</td>
<td>10000-19999 (excluding 36400, 36405, 36406, 36415 (G0001), 36600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-surgical  36400, 36405, 36426, 36415, 36600, 70010-99999

Use the following methodology to combine the charges billed in conjunction with revenue center codes billed on a UB-92 and determine the appropriate CPT code:

1. Select non-surgical CPT codes (as defined above) on a line item basis.

2. For a single surgical procedure, combine all remaining charges associated with any of the following revenue center codes into the charge associated with the single surgical CPT code:

Surgical Procedures
250-252, 257-258  39X  76X
26X  45X  79X
270-272.276  49X
360-361  70X
370  71X
38X  75X

Notes: Revenue code 76X (treatment or observation room) may appear on an outpatient facility UB-92 for an outpatient stay of up to 24 hours. The total fee includes up to 3 hours of observation services. Observation services over 3 hours may be billed and reimbursed in addition.

3. If multiple surgical procedures are billed, bundle all charges as described in step 2. Allow 100% of the billed charge or fee allowance (whichever is lowest) for the highest relative valued procedure.

Subsequent surgical procedures are allowed at 50% of the fee allowance or billed charge (whichever is lowest)

Outpatient Facility Surgical Revenue Code Matrix
REV CODE DESCRIPTION COMBINE
12D Pharmacy Yes
128 IV Solution Yes
12X Medical/Surgical Supplies Yes
130 Laboratory ***
131 Pathology ***
132 Radiology ***
1338 (360-363) Operating Room Services Yes
137X (370) Anesthesia Yes
138X (381) Blood Yes
39X (390) Blood Storage and Processing Yes
41X (410) Respiratory Services ***
49X (490) Ambulatory Surgery Yes
71X (710) Recovery Room Yes
75X (750) Ogn-instrumental Services Yes
76X (760) Treatment or Observation Room Yes

*** Radiology CPT codes (72010-79999), Laboratory and Pathology CPT codes (80001-85999), and Medicine Services (99300-99999) are not combined.

Determine fee allowance on a code-by-code basis for these CPT codes.

Implementation Methodology Examples
Example 1
64153 PSA
64650 Zinc

Each of these non-surgical CPT codes should be reviewed individually to determine the outpatient facility fee allowance.

Example 2
93510 Left heart catheterization
36415 Routine venipuncture
38025 Blood count, CBC

All three CPT codes are reviewed individually to determine the outpatient fee allowance.

Example 3
258 IV solutions
370 Anesthesia
42520 Tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy

Combine revenue codes 158 and 370 into the charge for surgical CPT code 43820. Use 43820 to determine the outpatient facility fee allowance.

Example 4
258 IV solutions
272 Sterile supplies
381 Blood/FPD red
e 27844 Open treatment of proximal ilium
36415 Routine venipuncture
Introduction

Combine revenue codes 258, 272, 370, and 381 into the charge for surgical CPT code 27784. Use both CPT codes 262385 and 36415 to determine outpatient facility fee allowances.

Example 5

80006  Automated multichannel test
31000  Urinalysis
99205  Inpatient hernia repair

In this example, use three CPT codes to determine outpatient facility fee allowances.

Procedures Not Performed in an Outpatient Facility

Many procedures (specifically surgical procedures) are not performed in an outpatient setting, accounting for approximately 25 percent of all surgical procedures. These procedures are identified with a subcode of NF (Not Outpatient Facility procedure) in the relative value table.

Surgical Services

Outpatient facility services directly related to the procedure on the day of an outpatient surgery comprise the comprehensive, or all-inclusive, surgical outpatient facility charge. The comprehensive outpatient surgical facility charge usually includes the following services:

- Anesthesia administration materials and supplies
- Blood, blood plasma, platelets, etc.
- Drugs and biologicals
- Equipment, devices, appliances, and supplies
- Use of the outpatient facility
- Nursing and related technical personnel services
- Surgical dressings, splinting, and casting materials

An outpatient is defined as a person who presents to a medical facility for services and is released on the same day. Observation patients are considered outpatients because they are not admitted to the hospital.

Drugs and Biologicals

Drugs and biologicals are considered an integral portion of the comprehensive surgical outpatient fee allowance. This category includes drugs administered immediately prior to or during an outpatient facility procedure and administered in the recovery room or other designated area of the outpatient facility.

Example

Intravenous (IV) solutions, Narcotics, Antibiotics and Steroids

Revenue Center 235: Pharmacy

Revenue Code  Standard Abbreviation
250  Pharmacy (general classification)
251  Drugs/parenteral
252  Drugs/intravenous
257  Drugs/notprescript
258  IV solutions
259  Drugs/other

Drugs and biologicals for take-home use (self-administration) by the patient are not included in the outpatient facility fee allowance, use the pharmacy section in the Alaska Fee Schedule.

Equipment, Devices, Appliances, and Supplies

All equipment, devices, appliances, and general supplies commonly furnished by an outpatient facility for a surgical procedure are incorporated into the comprehensive outpatient facility fee allowance.

Example

Syringe for drug administration
Patient gown
IV pump

Revenue Center 275: Medical/Surgical Supplies

Revenue Code  Standard Abbreviation
270  Med-supplies
272  Sterile supplies

Specialty and Limited-Supply Items

Particular surgical techniques or procedures performed in an outpatient facility require certain specialty and limited-supply items that may or may not be included in the comprehensive outpatient facility fee allowance. This is because the billing patterns vary for different outpatient facilities.

These items should be supported by an invoice from the supplier showing the actual cost incurred by the
outpatient facility for the purchase of the supply item or device.

**Durable Medical Equipment (DME)**
The sale, lease, or rental of durable medical equipment for use in a patient’s home is not included in the comprehensive surgical outpatient facility fee allowance.

**Example**
Unna boot for a postoperative podiatry patient. Cottons for a patient with a fracturedibia.

**Use of Outpatient Facility and Ancillary Services**
The comprehensive surgical outpatient facility fee allowance includes outpatient facility patient preparation areas, the operating room, recovery room, and any ancillary areas of the outpatient facility such as a waiting room or other area used for patient care. Specialized treatment areas such as a GI (gastrointestinal) lab, Cath (cardiac catheterization) lab, cast room, free-standing clinic, treatment or observation room, or other facility areas used for outpatient care are also included. Other outpatient facility and ancillary service areas included as an integral portion of the comprehensive surgical outpatient facility fee allowance are all general administrative functions necessary to run and maintain the outpatient facility. These functions include but are not limited to administration and record keeping, security, housekeeping, and plant operations.

**Nursing and Related Technical Personnel Services**
Patient care provided by nurses and other related technical personnel is included in the comprehensive surgical outpatient facility fee allowance. This category includes services performed by licensed nurses, nurses’ aides, certified, technologists, and other related technical personnel employed by the outpatient facility.

**Surgical Dressings, Splinting, and Casting Materials**
Certain outpatient facility procedures involve the application of a surgical dressing, splint, or cast in the operating room or similar area by the physician. The types of surgical dressings, splinting, and casting materials commonly furnished by an outpatient facility are considered part of the comprehensive surgical outpatient facility fee allowance.

**FORMAT OF THE FEE SCHEDULE**
The fee schedule columns are different in each of the sections. Listed below are the column titles that you will find throughout the fee schedule.

**Code**
This first column is the American Medical Association’s Physicians’ Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) five-digit code numbers, 1996 edition. New codes in CPT 1996 are designated by a symbol, and codes with changed descriptive nomenclature are identified by the symbol. CPT codes changed or altered for use in this schedule are identified with an @.

**Starred Procedures**
Starred (*) procedures, indicating that the usual “package” concept does not apply and that associated pre- and postoperative services are not included in the code as described, are indicated by a * in this column. Refer to the complete description in CPT 1996, page 57, for a comprehensive explanation of starred procedures or the surgery section within this fee schedule.

**Description (Nomenclature)**
The Official Alaska Workers’ Compensation Medical Fee Schedule uses actual CPT 1996 descriptions that have been abbreviated to 48 characters. If you have any questions regarding the descriptions as they appear, please consult the 1996 Physician’s Current Procedural Terminology.

**Total Fee**
This column lists the total fee assigned to each procedure. These are, however, procedures with no fee assigned to them. When this is the case, one of the following designations will appear in the total fee column:

**BR** Indicates a “By Report” procedure, which is typically one that is too variable to accept a set relative value.

**NC** Indicates codes that are considered non-covered procedures by the ADWC under Alaska workers’ compensation law.

**NF** Indicates services or procedures not usually performed in an outpatient surgical facility.
| PS | Indicates a professional service or procedure and refers you to the Provider Schedule.

| TF | Indicates procedures that are not normally billed as a total component by a physician but usually billed by a facility. This field is informational only.

| Total Fee | This manual lists the total reimbursable as a monetary amount. There are, however, procedures too variable to accept a set value — these are "By Report" procedures and are noted SR.

| PC Fee | Where there is an identifiable physician and technical component, the person considered to be the physician component (PC) is listed. The physician component gives the total reimbursable as a monetary amount; use modifier -26 to report these services.

| FUD | "Global" Period
This column lists the follow-up dates, sometimes referred to as the "global period" of a service or procedure. In Alaska, it includes the day of the surgery through termination of the postoperative period.

| ASST | This column indicates whether or not a surgical procedure is commonly expected to require the services of an assistant surgeon.

| OUTPT FEE | This manual lists the total reimbursable as a monetary amount for outpatient facility services. There are, however, procedures too variable to accept a set value — these are "By Report" procedures and are noted SR.
Adjustment Factors for Services Outside of Alaska

The State of Alaska requires that reimbursement be specific to the area in which the service was performed. Listed below are Geographic Adjustment Factors (GAF) designed to convert the Alaska Allowables to allowables for 86 additional areas nationwide. Multiply the GAF corresponding to the geographical area where the service(s) were performed to obtain the area-specific allowable.

Alabama ........................................ 0.757
Arizona ......................................... 0.900
Arizona ......................................... 0.935
Arkansas ......................................... 0.724
California ....................................... 0.887
California ....................................... Los Angeles-Anaheim
Santa Ana-Riverside-San Bernardino-Los Angeles
Oxnard-Ventura ................................ 1.073
California ....................................... Sacramento ........................................ 0.900
California ....................................... San Diego ........................................ 0.943
California ....................................... San Francisco-Oakland
San Jose-Santa Cruz
Santa Rosa-Peninsula
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa ........................ 1.013
Colorado ......................................... 0.780
Colorado ......................................... Denver-Boulder
Longmont ...................................... 0.881
Connecticut .................................... 1.035
Connecticut .................................... Hartford-New Britain
Middlesex-Branford ................................ 1.033
Connecticut .................................... Wilton ........................................ 1.048
District of Columbia ........................... 1.002
Florida ........................................... 0.816
Florida ........................................... Miami-Miami Beach-Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood
Pompano Beach ................................ 0.838
Florida ........................................... Orlando ..................................... 0.873
Florida ........................................... Tampa-St. Petersburg
Clearwater .................................... 0.821
Georgia .......................................... 0.826
Georgia .......................................... Atlanta ....................................... 0.868
Hawaii ........................................... 0.940
Idaho ............................................. 0.785
Illinois .......................................... 0.773
Illinois .......................................... Chicago-Lake County
Aurora-Elliot Park ............................. 0.942
Indiana .......................................... 0.726
Indiana .......................................... Indianapolis ................................ 0.792
Indiana .......................................... Gary-Hammond ................................ 0.942
Iowa ............................................. 0.720
Kansas .......................................... 0.703
Kansas .......................................... Kansas City .................................. 0.787
Kentucky ....................................... 0.746
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>FLUID</th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>CHOPIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22602</td>
<td>BONE GFT ANY CONIOR AREA: MAJOR/MAJOR</td>
<td>1101.76</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22610</td>
<td>CARTRIDGE GFT: DIAM. CORNEAL</td>
<td>1071.14</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22612</td>
<td>CARTRIDGE GFT: NASAL SEPTUM</td>
<td>1199.35</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22620</td>
<td>FASCIA LATA GFT: BY STEPPING</td>
<td>799.96</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22622</td>
<td>FASCIA LATA GFT: INC &amp; AREA EXPOSURE COMPLEX</td>
<td>1099.85</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22624</td>
<td>TENDON GFT FROM A DISTANCE</td>
<td>763.60</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22625</td>
<td>TISS GFT OTHER</td>
<td>732.74</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22630</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY: ASSESSABLE</td>
<td>418.16</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22631</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY: STRUCTURAL</td>
<td>510.07</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22632</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY: LOCAL, THORACIC</td>
<td>530.91</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22637</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY: ASSESSABLE</td>
<td>1022.11</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22638</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY: STRUCTURAL-THORACIC</td>
<td>1380.76</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22650</td>
<td>MONITOR INTERSTITIAL PRESSURE DETECT INJURY</td>
<td>354.33</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22655</td>
<td>BONE GFT: VASCULAR AND BLOOD VESSELS</td>
<td>5454.00</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22660</td>
<td>BONE GFT: VASCULAR AND BLOOD VESSELS</td>
<td>5454.00</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22662</td>
<td>BONE GFT: VASCULAR AND BLOOD VESSELS</td>
<td>6363.35</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22669</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOCUT FLAP: NOT CALCIFIABLE</td>
<td>7727.40</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22670</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOCUT FLAP: CALCIFIABLE</td>
<td>7727.40</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22671</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOCUT FLAP: NONCALCIFIABLE</td>
<td>7727.40</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22672</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOCUT FLAP: CALCIFIABLE</td>
<td>7727.40</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22673</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOCUT FLAP: NONCALCIFIABLE</td>
<td>7727.40</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22674</td>
<td>ELECTROMY INJ. BONE, HEALING, NONASSISTIVE</td>
<td>9093.59</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22675</td>
<td>ELECTROMY INJ. BONE, HEALING, INASSISTIVE</td>
<td>1454.46</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22999</td>
<td>UNLISTED PROC: SPH. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23020</td>
<td>RADICAL REN TUMOR/DRUG MEDICATION</td>
<td>3312.23</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23025</td>
<td>EXC BONE MANDIB</td>
<td>2329.04</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23026</td>
<td>EXC BONE FACIAL BONE</td>
<td>2485.46</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23028</td>
<td>REMOV BY CONTINUOUS TUMOR FACIAL BONE</td>
<td>2794.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23030</td>
<td>EXC BONE TUMOR/DRUG MEDICATION</td>
<td>1363.78</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23031</td>
<td>EXC BONE MANDIB. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>588.90</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23032</td>
<td>EXC BONE FACIAL BONE</td>
<td>331.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23034</td>
<td>EXC BONE TUMOR/DRUG MEDICATION</td>
<td>2794.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23040</td>
<td>EXC BONE MANDIB. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>765.30</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23041</td>
<td>EXC BONE MANDIB. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>1303.51</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23044</td>
<td>EXC BONE TUMOR/DRUG MEDICATION</td>
<td>2761.56</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23045</td>
<td>EXC BONE TUMOR/DRUG MEDICATION</td>
<td>4990.00</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23050</td>
<td>CONDECTOMY TEMPORAL MANDIB FINESECT #2</td>
<td>3962.64</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23060</td>
<td>MENINGECTOMY PARTIALLY-#2 SPH. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>4491.72</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23070</td>
<td>CONDECTOMY SPH. TUBES GEN</td>
<td>3293.31</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23076</td>
<td>IMPLANTATION, INSERTION, ETC.</td>
<td>2561.94</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPT codes, descriptions, and 2-digit numeric modifiers only are Copyright © 1997, American Medical Association. Copyright © 1996, Mediquest, Inc., All rights reserved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FEE</th>
<th>PC FEE</th>
<th>FLUD</th>
<th>ASST</th>
<th>O/L PER FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21120</td>
<td>CLO TH STERNAL FX</td>
<td>481.23</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>151.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21125</td>
<td>OPEN TH STERNAL FX W/O MEDIA SKEL/TISS</td>
<td>792.89</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>141.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21189</td>
<td>UNATTEND PROC NEC/THORAC</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21920</td>
<td>BX SOFT TISS BACK/BLANK: SUPERF</td>
<td>239.86</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>139.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21925</td>
<td>BX SOFT TISS BACK/BLANK: DEEP</td>
<td>923.95</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3016.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21930</td>
<td>E/S TUMOR SOFT TISS BACK/BLANK</td>
<td>5463.92</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3016.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21955</td>
<td>RADICALRECT TUMOR SOFT TISS BACK/BLANK</td>
<td>3273.32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4213.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22100</td>
<td>PART ÈXC POST VERT AL/PER P/SEGMENT: CERV</td>
<td>1732.45</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22105</td>
<td>PART ÈXC POST VERT AL/PER P/SEGMENT: THOR</td>
<td>1732.45</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22110</td>
<td>PART ÈXC POST VERT AL/PER P/SEGMENT: LUMB</td>
<td>1732.45</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22115</td>
<td>PART ÈXC POST VERT AL/PER P/SEGMENT: EA+ADD SEG A</td>
<td>857.86</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4213.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22210</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE POST/SCO/NEAR APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: CERV</td>
<td>604.12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22215</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE POST/SCO/NEAR APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: THOR</td>
<td>604.12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22220</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE POST/SCO/NEAR APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: LUMB</td>
<td>604.12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22225</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE WIDESP/ANT APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: CERV</td>
<td>7199.13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22230</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE WIDESP/ANT APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: THOR</td>
<td>7199.13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22235</td>
<td>OSTOT SPINE WIDESP/ANT APPROXIM 1 SEGMENT: LUMB</td>
<td>7199.13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2602.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPT codes, descriptions, and 2-digit numeric modifiers only are Copyright © 1995, American Medical Association. Copyright 1994 Medisys Inc. All rights reserved.
### Surgery

#### 10040 - 69979

**Medical Fee Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FE</th>
<th>PER FE</th>
<th>FUD</th>
<th>ASHT</th>
<th>CHUTE FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2101</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY WITH INTERVENTION: GLANDULAR, IRT</td>
<td>2988.01</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4824.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY WITH INTERVENTION, STEMOCIRCULAR, IRT</td>
<td>1996.51</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4824.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY, GLOMUS, IRT. W/ HEMATOMA REMOV</td>
<td>2192.35</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5433.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>CLAVICLECTOMY: PART</td>
<td>1643.93</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4634.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105</td>
<td>CLAVICLECTOMY: TOT</td>
<td>2642.21</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>KNEEOPHATHERMOPHOTODYNAMIC TREAT.</td>
<td>1602.99</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7244.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY F/SUGAR CLAVICULA</td>
<td>1013.62</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4233.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2145</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY CLAVICULA W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>1547.45</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4633.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2146</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY CLAVICULA W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>1371.12</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4634.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY PROX NUMBERS</td>
<td>1996.69</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4233.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2155</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY PROX NUMBERS, W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>2495.81</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6031.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2156</td>
<td>EXCURRT BONE CYSTOMY PROX NUMBERS, W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>2163.07</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4634.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2170</td>
<td>SEQUESTRECTOMY: CAL</td>
<td>1497.51</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4634.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2172</td>
<td>SEQUESTRECTOMY: SCAPULA</td>
<td>1996.64</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4634.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2174</td>
<td>SEQUESTRECTOMY HUMERUS: HEAD TO ELB W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4634.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2180</td>
<td>PART. EXC. BONE: CAL</td>
<td>1364.40</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4634.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2181</td>
<td>PART. EXC. BONE: SCAPULA</td>
<td>1321.12</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4633.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2184</td>
<td>PART. EXC. BONE: PROX NUMBERS</td>
<td>1996.68</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4634.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>CORRECTSCY SCAPULA</td>
<td>1081.54</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6031.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2315</td>
<td>RESECT. HUMERUS, HEAD</td>
<td>2582.24</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6031.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>RADICAL RESECT. TUMOR: CAL</td>
<td>1996.68</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2323</td>
<td>RADICAL TUMOR: SCAPULA</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>RADICAL TUMOR: PROX NUMBERS</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2330</td>
<td>RECEPT. TUMOR: PROX NUMBERS, W/OUT CFT</td>
<td>3993.36</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2332</td>
<td>RADICAL TUMOR: PROX NUMBERS, W/OUT W/STH REPLAC</td>
<td>3993.36</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2332</td>
<td>RECEPT. SHOULDER: ELB</td>
<td>1996.68</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2411.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2334</td>
<td>RECEPT. SHOULDER: DEEP</td>
<td>998.34</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4233.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2336</td>
<td>REM. SHOULDER: COMPLE INCL., TOT. SHOULDER</td>
<td>3640.58</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2335</td>
<td>INJ. PROC. SHOULDER ARTHROSCOPY</td>
<td>1463.39</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>251.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2335</td>
<td>MUSCLE TRANSF. ANY TYPE, SHOULDER, PER AERIAL, SING</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2337</td>
<td>MUSCLE TRANSF. ANY TYPE, SHOULDER, PER AERIAL, MUL</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2340</td>
<td>SCAPULOPSY</td>
<td>3327.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2346</td>
<td>TENOSYMPHONIOTOMY: AEA, SING</td>
<td>1669.59</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2346</td>
<td>TENOSYMPHONIOTOMY: AEA, MUL W/ SAME INC</td>
<td>2163.07</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REPAIR MUSCULOTENDONOSUS: CUFF-ACUTE</td>
<td>2537.49</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REPAIR MUSCULOTENDONOSUS: CUFF-CHRONIC</td>
<td>2995.02</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6033.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>CORACOACROMIAL LC INJURY: ANAV ACROMIOPLASTY</td>
<td>1730.46</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REPAIR CUFF SHOULDER: CUFF-MUSCULUM, CHRONIC</td>
<td>3820.57</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7465.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REPAIR CUFF SHOULDER: CUFF-MUSCULUM, ACUTE</td>
<td>2261.91</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1403.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2344</td>
<td>REPAIR CUFF SHOULDER: CUFF-MUSCULUM, CHRONIC</td>
<td>3128.13</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6033.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPT codes, descriptions, and 2-digit numeric modifiers on File are Copyright 1994, MediCode, Inc. All rights reserved
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[DIA]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>FUD</th>
<th>HST</th>
<th>OUTFTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25620</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>814.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2143.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25621</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1773.35</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2439.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25622</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>814.80</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2143.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25623</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>3695.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25624</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2398.46</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3540.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25625</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>517.12</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1236.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25626</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>760.97</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2132.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25627</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1773.35</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25628</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>6196.95</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1336.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25629</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1121.21</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2413.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25630</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2364.82</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25631</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2988.19</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5430.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25632</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>3335.19</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1819.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25633</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>846.75</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2143.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25634</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1637.89</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4239.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25635</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1725.44</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4239.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25636</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>393.13</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1336.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25637</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>760.87</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2132.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25638</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1615.56</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25639</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>487.28</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1336.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25640</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>708.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2413.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25641</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1120.26</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25642</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>702.87</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1336.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25643</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>798.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2413.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25644</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1357.85</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25645</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>659.06</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1819.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25646</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1378.13</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4126.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25647</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1134.32</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3120.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25648</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2372.80</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4526.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25649</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>958.08</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2143.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25650</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1949.13</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4526.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25651</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1981.09</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6335.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25652</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2396.49</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7240.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25653</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2747.96</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7240.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25654</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2300.62</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6335.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25655</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2313.79</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7240.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25656</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2506.73</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7240.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25657</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1877.18</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25658</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1661.55</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25659</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>2743.92</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4526.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25660</td>
<td>OPEN TRAUMA SHRD FT X LMIA/WRIS/ELBOW</td>
<td>1917.16</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TOTAL FEE</td>
<td>HC FEE</td>
<td>FUD</td>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>GNEPT FEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25915</td>
<td>KIDNEYS INJURY</td>
<td>19106.00</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25920</td>
<td>DISART THRU WKS - SECONDARY C/SCAR REV</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25924</td>
<td>DISART THRU WKS - RE AMPLA</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25927</td>
<td>TRANSFIXATION AMPUTA</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25929</td>
<td>TRANSFIXATION AMPUTA - SECONDARY C/SCAR REV</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25931</td>
<td>TRANSFIXATION AMPUTA - RE AMPLA</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25999</td>
<td>UNELECTED PROC FOREARM</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26010</td>
<td>DRAINAGE FINGER ABSCESS, SMALL</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26011</td>
<td>DRAINAGE FINGER ABSCESS, COMPL.</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26020</td>
<td>DRAINAGE TENDON SHEATH, O/S &amp; FOR PALM</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26022</td>
<td>DRAINAGE PALMAR BURSA, SINGLE, ULNAR/RADIAL</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26026</td>
<td>DRAINAGE PALMAR BURSA, MACUL/COMPL.</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26034</td>
<td>INJ. DEEP W/KEN BONE CORRECT HAND &amp; FINGER</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26035</td>
<td>DECOMP FINGERS &amp; HAND INJURY</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26037</td>
<td>DECOMP FASCOTOMY HAND</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26040</td>
<td>FASCOTOMY PALMAR DUPPL/REV X CONTRACT, REL CID</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26045</td>
<td>FASCOTOMY PALMAR DUPPL/REV's CONTRACT, OPEN PART</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26075</td>
<td>TENDON SHEATH INC</td>
<td>1907.10</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>09C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Surgery

### 10040 - 69979

#### Medical Fee Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FEE</th>
<th>PC FEE</th>
<th>FUD</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>OBT TP FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6305</td>
<td>LAMINECT WIDCOMP 1-2 VERT: LUMBAR SYMPHYSIS</td>
<td>4906.34</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63071</td>
<td>LAMINECT WIDCOMP 1-2 VERT: LUMBAR SYMPHYSIS</td>
<td>4978.39</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63012</td>
<td>LAMINECT WIDCOMP Vert: LUMBAR SYMPHYSIS</td>
<td>4879.75</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63013</td>
<td>LAMINECT WIDCOMP Vert: LUMBAR SYMPHYSIS</td>
<td>5180.81</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63014</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP A2-2 VERTICAL SEGMENT CERV</td>
<td>5217.38</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP A2-2 VERTICAL SEGMENT LUMBAR</td>
<td>5180.81</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63032</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP NERV ROOT 1 INTERFACE CERV</td>
<td>5174.32</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63291</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP NERV ROOT 1 INTERFACE LUMBAR</td>
<td>5174.32</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63355</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>1326.65</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63356</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>1310.65</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63357</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5391.65</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63358</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63359</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63367</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFaCET CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63368</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFaCET CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63369</td>
<td>LAMINECTY WIDCOMP EA ADD INTERFaCET CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63377</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>6174.81</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63378</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5672.75</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63379</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63380</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63381</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63382</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63383</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63384</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63385</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63386</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63387</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63388</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63389</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63390</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63391</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63392</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63393</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63394</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63395</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63396</td>
<td>TRANSVERSE SPINE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>5272.59</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- CPT codes, descriptors, and 2-digit numeric modifiers are not included.
- Copyright © 2019, American Medical Association.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FEE</th>
<th>PC FEE</th>
<th>FUD</th>
<th>ASST</th>
<th>OUTPT FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64518</td>
<td>IN/OUT AGENT. STENTLATE CANCERON</td>
<td>545.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>844.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64520</td>
<td>IN/OUT AGENT. LUMBAR MYELOSCIS</td>
<td>305.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1366.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64550</td>
<td>IN/OUT AGENT. CELIAC PLEXUS AVOID RADIO MONITOR</td>
<td>641.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1047.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64553</td>
<td>PROCEDURE NEUROSTIMULATION</td>
<td>135.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1213.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64555</td>
<td>PROCEDURE NEUROSTIMULATION PERIPHERAL</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>271.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64560</td>
<td>PROCEDURE NEUROSTIMULATION AUTONOMIC</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>281.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64565</td>
<td>PROCEDURE NEUROSTIMULATION NEUROMUSCULAR</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>281.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64573</td>
<td>INCISION NEUROSTIMULATION CRANIAL NERV</td>
<td>380.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>331.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64575</td>
<td>INCISION NEUROSTIMULATION PERIPHERAL</td>
<td>466.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>622.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64577</td>
<td>INCISION NEUROSTIMULATION AUTONOMIC</td>
<td>466.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>622.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64580</td>
<td>INCISION NEUROSTIMULATION NEUROMUSCULAR</td>
<td>466.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>422.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64585</td>
<td>REVISION OF PERIPHERAL NEUROSTIMULATION ELECTRODE</td>
<td>466.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>422.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64590</td>
<td>INCISION PERIPHERAL NEUROSTIMULATION CIRC</td>
<td>535.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>422.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64595</td>
<td>REVISION OF PERIPHERAL NEUROSTIMULATION CIRC</td>
<td>535.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>422.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64600</td>
<td>DISTRICT TRIGEMINAL SUPRACHRISTAL/INFRAFACIAL</td>
<td>395.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>319.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64603</td>
<td>DISTRICT TRIGEMINAL 2ND &amp; 3RD DIV OR ORAL OVAL</td>
<td>363.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>318.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64610</td>
<td>DISTRICT TRIGEMINAL 2ND &amp; 3RD DIV W/NEUROSIC</td>
<td>465.63</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>318.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64612</td>
<td>DISTRICT MAXILLARY ENERGIZED BY FACIAL NERV</td>
<td>640.51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>325.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64613</td>
<td>DISTRICT BY NEUROLYSIS &amp; GEL OR PAIN CONTROL</td>
<td>640.51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>325.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64620</td>
<td>DISTRICT BY NEUROLYSIS &amp; INTERCOSTAL NERV</td>
<td>325.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>290.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64622</td>
<td>DISTRICT PERIPHERAL NERV LUMBAR &amp; LOCAL LEVEL</td>
<td>508.64</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>480.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64630</td>
<td>DISTRICT FACET NERV LUMBAR &amp; LOCAL LEVEL</td>
<td>295.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>263.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64630</td>
<td>DISTRICT BY NEUROLYSIS &amp; PSEUDOSYMPOTOMAL NERV</td>
<td>508.64</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>480.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64640</td>
<td>DISTRICT OTHER PERIPHERAL NERV BRANCH</td>
<td>239.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>216.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64680</td>
<td>DISTRICT CERVICAL PLEXUS INFERIOR AND MONITOR</td>
<td>451.82</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>422.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64702</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY DIGITAL STUMP&amp;SHAVE DIGIT</td>
<td>1130.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1668.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64704</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV HAND</td>
<td>1356.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1668.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64707</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV PERIPHERAL NERV ARM LEG TRT IMP SPEC</td>
<td>2266.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64712</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV PERIPHERAL NERV ARM LEG TRT</td>
<td>2837.39</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64713</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV PERIPHERAL NERV BRACHIAL PLEXUS</td>
<td>2788.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64714</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV PERIPHERAL NERV BRACHIAL PLEXUS</td>
<td>2788.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64716</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV TRANSPOSITION LUMBAR NERV &amp; W/ SURG</td>
<td>2449.09</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64718</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV TRANSPOSITION LUMBAR NERV &amp; W/ SURG</td>
<td>2449.09</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64720</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV TRANSPOSITION LUMBAR NERV &amp; W/ SURG</td>
<td>2449.09</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3377.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64721</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY NERV TRANS SDN &amp; GASTRAL TUNNEL</td>
<td>773.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2522.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64722</td>
<td>GROIN LAXITY PROLAPSE SPECIFIC</td>
<td>1723.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2522.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64726</td>
<td>GROIN VENTRAL PROLAPSE GROIN</td>
<td>773.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2522.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64727</td>
<td>NEUROLYSIS REQUIREMENT OF SURG &amp; USE OF MICRO</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64732</td>
<td>TRANSITION KNEUROLYSIS SUPRACHRISTAL NERV</td>
<td>1130.33</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2332.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64734</td>
<td>TRANSITION KNEUROLYSIS SUPRACHRISTAL NERV</td>
<td>1130.33</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2332.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64734</td>
<td>TRANSITION KNEUROLYSIS SUPRACHRISTAL NERV</td>
<td>1130.33</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2332.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72204</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: THORACIC COMPLETE W/VIDEO MINI 4</td>
<td>124.24</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>221.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72205</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: THORACOLUMBAR AP &amp; LAT</td>
<td>147.67</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>215.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72206</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: SAGITTAL STUDY W/SPINE &amp; ERECT</td>
<td>124.85</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>221.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72207</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: LUMBAROCRAL AP &amp; LAT</td>
<td>133.32</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>183.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72210</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: LUMBAROCRAL CONCIP VIEWS</td>
<td>174.89</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td>242.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72214</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SPINE: LUMBAROCRAL COMPLETE &amp; BENDING</td>
<td>246.13</td>
<td>108.54</td>
<td>334.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72215</td>
<td>CAT CT EXAM: SPINE W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>881.67</td>
<td>250.50</td>
<td>1034.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72216</td>
<td>CAT CT EXAM: SPINE W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>981.20</td>
<td>264.92</td>
<td>1316.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72222</td>
<td>CAT CT EXAM: SPINE: W/CONTRAST THEN W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1179.22</td>
<td>294.81</td>
<td>1707.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72228</td>
<td>CAT THORACIC CT: W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>881.67</td>
<td>250.50</td>
<td>1034.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72229</td>
<td>CAT THORACIC CT: W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>981.20</td>
<td>264.92</td>
<td>1316.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72230</td>
<td>CAT THORACIC CT: W/NO CONTRAST THEN W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>1179.22</td>
<td>294.81</td>
<td>1707.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72231</td>
<td>CAT LUMBAR CT: W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>881.67</td>
<td>250.50</td>
<td>1034.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72232</td>
<td>CAT LUMBAR CT: W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>981.20</td>
<td>264.92</td>
<td>1316.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72233</td>
<td>CAT LUMBAR CT: W/NO CONTRAST THEN W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>1179.22</td>
<td>294.81</td>
<td>1707.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72241</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS CERVICAL W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1471.85</td>
<td>294.36</td>
<td>1766.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72243</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS LUMBAR W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1824.44</td>
<td>364.29</td>
<td>2198.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72246</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS THORACIC W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1665.60</td>
<td>321.12</td>
<td>1986.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72247</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS THORACIC, W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1706.11</td>
<td>353.23</td>
<td>2059.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72248</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS LUMBAR W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1724.97</td>
<td>348.99</td>
<td>2073.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72249</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS LUMBAR W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>1724.97</td>
<td>348.99</td>
<td>2073.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72256</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY W/NO CONTRAST CERVICAL</td>
<td>2132.97</td>
<td>420.39</td>
<td>2553.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72258</td>
<td>MRI SPINAL CAVITY W/NO CONTRAST LUMBAR</td>
<td>2817.22</td>
<td>543.64</td>
<td>3360.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72259</td>
<td>MRI ANGIO SPINAL CAVITY &amp; CONTENTS W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1806.13</td>
<td>373.64</td>
<td>2179.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72270</td>
<td>RAD EXAM PELVIS: ANTEROPosterior ONLY</td>
<td>101.66</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>147.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72290</td>
<td>&quot; RAD EXAM PELVIS: COMPLET MINI 4 VIEWS</td>
<td>135.43</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>193.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72292</td>
<td>&quot; CAT PELVIS: W/O CONTRAST</td>
<td>272.74</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>333.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72303</td>
<td>CAT PELVIS: W/NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>820.04</td>
<td>221.57</td>
<td>1041.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72310</td>
<td>CAT PELVIS: W/NO CONTRAST THEN W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>1195.95</td>
<td>247.98</td>
<td>1523.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72507</td>
<td>MRI PELVIS</td>
<td>1286.70</td>
<td>350.14</td>
<td>1636.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72508</td>
<td>MRI ANGIO PELVIS: W/NO CONTRAST MAT</td>
<td>1864.44</td>
<td>366.97</td>
<td>2231.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72520</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SACCULARIT: LESS THAN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>107.04</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>150.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72521</td>
<td>&quot; SPINE SACCULARIT: THORACIC VIEWS</td>
<td>112.68</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>153.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72522</td>
<td>&quot; SPINE SACCULARIT: COCYX MINI 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>100.95</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>144.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72525</td>
<td>MYEOGRAPHY CERVICAL &amp; LUMBAR S &amp; I</td>
<td>513.63</td>
<td>186.87</td>
<td>690.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72526</td>
<td>MYEOGRAPHY THORACIC &amp; ABD &amp; S &amp; I</td>
<td>580.18</td>
<td>190.66</td>
<td>770.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72527</td>
<td>MYEOGRAPHY LUMBOSACRAL &amp; S &amp; I</td>
<td>727.85</td>
<td>235.90</td>
<td>963.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72528</td>
<td>MYEOGRAPHY LUMBOSACRAL &amp; S &amp; I</td>
<td>897.35</td>
<td>295.07</td>
<td>992.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72531</td>
<td>MYEOGRAPHY LUMBOSACRAL &amp; S &amp; I</td>
<td>947.90</td>
<td>230.59</td>
<td>1178.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D-19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CPT</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>OL/HCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71000</td>
<td>RAD EXAM: CLAVICULAR COMP.</td>
<td>127.97</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>136.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71010</td>
<td>RAD EXAM: ACROMIOL. COMP.</td>
<td>134.16</td>
<td>53.66</td>
<td>142.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71020</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SHOULDER, 1 VIEW</td>
<td>113.22</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>120.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71030</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SHOULDER, COMPL. 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>144.48</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>153.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71040</td>
<td>RAD EXAM SHOULDER ARTHROGRAPHS: R&amp;L</td>
<td>385.97</td>
<td>150.09</td>
<td>435.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71050</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ACROMIAL/JJT BL 1 ANG W/ CT D 1CTOR</td>
<td>127.97</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>136.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71060</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HUMERUS MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>115.71</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>127.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71070</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ELBOW, ANTEROP. &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>107.32</td>
<td>42.83</td>
<td>114.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71080</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ELBOW, COMPL. MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>114.71</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>127.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71095</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ELBOW, ARTHROGRAPHS: R&amp;L</td>
<td>376.78</td>
<td>132.93</td>
<td>439.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71100</td>
<td>RAD EXAM FOREARM, ANT. &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>100.20</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>108.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71110</td>
<td>RAD EXAM UPPER EXTREM. MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>105.39</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>111.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71120</td>
<td>RAD EXAM WRIST, ANT. &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>107.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71130</td>
<td>RAD EXAM WRIST, COMPL. MIN 1 VIEW</td>
<td>107.18</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>112.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71140</td>
<td>RAD EXAM WRIST, ARTHROGRAPHS R &amp; L</td>
<td>272.45</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>316.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71150</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HAND, 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>135.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71160</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HAND, MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>107.33</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>114.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71170</td>
<td>RAD EXAM FINGERS MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>96.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71200</td>
<td>C/ CAT UP. EXT: NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>803.85</td>
<td>320.16</td>
<td>1065.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71210</td>
<td>CAT UP. EXT: W/ CONTRAST</td>
<td>945.44</td>
<td>362.55</td>
<td>1308.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71220</td>
<td>CAT UP. EXT: W/ CONTRAST THEN W/CONTRAST</td>
<td>1047.63</td>
<td>386.06</td>
<td>1433.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71230</td>
<td>MRI UP. EXT: OTHER THAN KET</td>
<td>1744.08</td>
<td>668.82</td>
<td>2412.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71240</td>
<td>MRI ANY FT UP. EXTREM.</td>
<td>1700.24</td>
<td>649.13</td>
<td>2349.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71250</td>
<td>MRI ANGIO UP. EXTREM NO CONTRAST</td>
<td>1033.92</td>
<td>340.80</td>
<td>1374.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71300</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HIP, MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>99.65</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>109.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71310</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HIP, COMPL. MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>122.72</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>134.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71320</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HIPS BLANK 2 VIEWS W/ VIEW PELVIS</td>
<td>158.48</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>181.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71330</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HIP ARTHROGRAPHS R &amp; L</td>
<td>375.45</td>
<td>129.06</td>
<td>459.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71340</td>
<td>RAD EXAM HIP PULSING OF PROCE</td>
<td>166.42</td>
<td>65.77</td>
<td>185.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71350</td>
<td>RAD EXAM PELVIS &amp; HIP ANT. CHILD MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>134.71</td>
<td>58.81</td>
<td>193.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71360</td>
<td>RAD EXAM FEMUR ANT. &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>113.66</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>131.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71370</td>
<td>RAD EXAM KNEE, ANT. &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>108.96</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>114.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71380</td>
<td>RAD EXAM KNEE, AP &amp; LAT ANG W/ CT DCTOR</td>
<td>108.77</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>114.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71390</td>
<td>RAD EXAM KNEE, OSS SCI. AP &amp; TUNNEL SKEPTIC</td>
<td>108.66</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>114.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71400</td>
<td>RAD EXAM KNEE, BOTH KNEES STANDING AP</td>
<td>108.96</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>114.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71410</td>
<td>RAD EXAM KNEE, ARTHROGRAPHS R &amp; L</td>
<td>438.78</td>
<td>139.92</td>
<td>578.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71420</td>
<td>RAD EXAM TIB &amp; FIB AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>118.66</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>130.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71430</td>
<td>RAD EXAM THIGH, MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>118.66</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>130.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71440</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ANKLE, ARTHROGRAPHS R &amp; L</td>
<td>118.97</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>130.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71450</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ANKLE, COMPL. MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>114.50</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>119.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71460</td>
<td>RAD EXAM ANKLE, ARTHROGRAPHS R &amp; L</td>
<td>345.50</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td>423.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>PPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99201</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM NEW SELF LIMIT/ MINOR 10 M</td>
<td>79.11</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99202</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM NEW LOW MOD SEVERITY 30 M</td>
<td>94.60</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99203</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM NEW MODERATE SEVERITY 30 M</td>
<td>128.41</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99204</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM NEW MOD SEVERITY 45 M</td>
<td>183.44</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99205</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM NEW MOD/H SEVERITY 60 M</td>
<td>247.64</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99211</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM ELESTAR NO PHYS PRE 1 M</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99212</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM ELESTAR SELF LIMIT/ MINOR 10 M</td>
<td>94.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99213</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM EST HISH LOW/MOD SEVERITY 15 M</td>
<td>85.28</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99214</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM EST LOW MOD MEDIUM SEVERITY 25 M</td>
<td>123.60</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99215</td>
<td>OFFICE/CLINIC VISIT EAM EST MEDIUM SEVERITY 30 M</td>
<td>167.76</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99216</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM LOW SEVERITY</td>
<td>131.16</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99217</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM MOD SEVERITY</td>
<td>163.95</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99218</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>222.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99219</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM HIGH SEVERITY</td>
<td>273.51</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99220</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM MODERATE SEVERITY</td>
<td>183.12</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99221</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>245.93</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99222</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA EAM HIGH SEVERITY</td>
<td>301.67</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99223</td>
<td>SUBROT HOSP CARE DA EAM MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>94.18</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99224</td>
<td>SUBROT HOSP CARE DA EAM MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>141.16</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99225</td>
<td>SUBROT HOSP CARE DA EAM MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>193.46</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99226</td>
<td>SUBROT HOSP CARE DA MEDIUM SEVERITY</td>
<td>113.67</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99227</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA MEDIUM MORE THAN 20 M</td>
<td>142.69</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99228</td>
<td>HOSP CARE DA MEDIUM MORE THAN 30 M</td>
<td>124.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99241</td>
<td>OFFICE CONS NEW/ESTAR LOW SEVERITY 15 M</td>
<td>124.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99242</td>
<td>OFFICE CONS NEW/ESTAR LOW SEVERITY 20 M</td>
<td>158.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99243</td>
<td>OFFICE CONS NEW/ESTAR MODERATE SEVERITY 40 M</td>
<td>202.61</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99244</td>
<td>OFFICE CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD SEVERITY 50 M</td>
<td>246.95</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99245</td>
<td>OFFICE CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY 60 M</td>
<td>336.50</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99250</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS NEW/ESTAR LOW SEVERITY 20 M</td>
<td>147.54</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99251</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS NEW/ESTAR MODERATE SEVERITY 40 M</td>
<td>185.10</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99252</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD SEVERITY 50 M</td>
<td>232.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99253</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY 60 M</td>
<td>266.95</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99254</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY 70 M</td>
<td>335.73</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99261</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 10 M</td>
<td>74.96</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99262</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 20 M</td>
<td>124.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99263</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 30 M</td>
<td>189.79</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99264</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 40 M</td>
<td>244.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99265</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 50 M</td>
<td>303.18</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99266</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 60 M</td>
<td>364.42</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99267</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 70 M</td>
<td>426.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99268</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 80 M</td>
<td>492.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99269</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 90 M</td>
<td>562.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99270</td>
<td>INT HOSP CONS STABILIZE/RECOVER 100 M</td>
<td>637.74</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99271</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR LOW SEVERITY</td>
<td>158.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99272</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MODERATE SEVERITY</td>
<td>223.61</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99273</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD SEVERITY</td>
<td>294.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99274</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>364.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99275</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>334.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99276</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>244.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99277</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>158.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99278</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>223.61</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99279</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>294.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99280</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>364.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99281</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>334.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99282</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>244.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99283</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>158.97</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99284</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>223.61</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99285</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>294.68</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99286</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>364.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99287</td>
<td>CONFIRM CONS NEW/ESTAR MOD/H SEVERITY</td>
<td>334.56</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Medico welcomes you as a Customized Fee Analyzer client. The following pages describe the data we have compiled and various ways to use it. Medico offers this data solely as a tool to help you evaluate your fees. You should not simply select a given percentile and assume that column will translate into an appropriate fee schedule. For example, if the financial and marketing goals of your practice call for mid-range fees, compare your current fee schedule to the area's 50th percentile. You may find several charges that fall well below the area's 50th percentile requiring gradual adjustment up to a more acceptable level. However, other fees may exceed the 75th percentile and require adjustment downward. The resulting fee schedule diminishes your patient's out-of-pocket expenses while placing your new charges in the "safety zone" for acceptance and payment by most commercial and managed care payers.

In addition to the fee and relative value data, each Customized Fee Analyzer includes a table of professional (PC) and technical (TC) component splits, and a table of commercial payer follow-up days, anesthesia unit values, and the necessity of surgical assists for all CPT codes. This data has been developed by the Medico team of clinicians, coders, and payer representatives.

If you have questions about how to use this product, please call the Medico Helpline at 800-705-6818. For those occasions when a code you want falls outside the ranges found in your Analyzer, your purchase price includes one phone call to receive additional fee information for a maximum of 10 codes. Please have your codes ready when you place your call.
Customized Fee Analyzer Applications
This new edition of the Analyzer provides in-depth information to help evaluate your fee schedule. Useful applications include:

- A comparison of your current charges to those of other physicians in your area, now at three percentiles — 50th, 75th, and 95th.
- A comparison of your charges to a range of estimated national allowables paid by indemnity carriers.
- Identification of allowable charge errors on explanations of benefits from third-party payers.
- Development of fees for new or seldom-performed procedures.
- Modification of current fees that are either too high or too low, with relative values.
- Identification of new CPT procedure codes of interest to your specialty or changes to descriptions from previous editions.

Using the Analyzer Format
The Analyzer cross-references CPT codes to Medicode's relative value study, to three percentiles (50th, 75th, 95th) of the specified area's prevailing fees, and to average national allowables paid by indemnity carriers. Reading across the top from left to right, the specific information provided in this product is as follows:

CPT Code — This column lists procedural codes from the 1998 edition of the American Medical Association's CPT (copyright 1997).

TOS — The Customized Fee Analyzer lists global fees for services in your specialty or for all services when the all specialty Fee Analyzer is purchased, including those that can be split into technical (TC) and professional (26) components. The global fee and component splits are listed on separate lines with a G, TC, or 26 in the TOS field. If the service is 100 percent technical, the global service line shows the total amount, the technical component line shows the same total amount, and the professional component line shows zeroes. If the service is 100 percent professional, the global service and professional component lines show the same total amount, and the technical component line shows zeroes.

Sub — The Sub column indicates the status of the code with:
- * Starred procedure, as defined in CPT
- C Change in procedure description from the previous edition
- N New code in CPT 1998
- D Deleted code in CPT 1998
Description — The procedure code descriptions are 48-character abbreviations of the current CPT code descriptions.

MRVS — The fifth column contains the Medicode Relative Value Study. This copyright scale is a mix of historical charge-based and resource-based methodologies and has been in wide use throughout the industry since 1988. The study is updated in monthly meetings with coding, clinical, and statistical experts.

The relative value units (RVUs) for listed professional and technical component splits are the same as the global service RVU. Medicode creates its fee information for the component splits by changing the conversion factor, not by splitting the RVU by a percentage. You will find a table beginning on page 11 with Medicode’s recommended PC/TC split percentages. This information allows you to determine how technical and professional amounts for your geographic area would be determined if the calculation was based on the PC/TC split percentage multiplied by the global fee.

Est Indem Allow — The Analyzer’s sixth column (Estimated Indem Allowable) is a mathematic derivative of Medicode’s provider charges databases. The proprietary formula used to derive this information was developed by Medicode in conjunction with insurance actuarial consultants. The resulting data is validated by comparing it to the allowable amounts used by some of our payer clients.

Area 50th — Percentiles are frequently misunderstood. A fee at the 50th percentile is not necessarily 50 percent of the highest charge. If your fee for a given service is at the 50th percentile, 50 percent of the submitted charges for that service are higher than your fee. If your fee is at the 75th percentile, 25 percent of the charges are higher than yours.

The 50th and the following 75th percentile columns represent the “highest frequency of charge range” for physician offices. Within this fee range you can expect to satisfy the payer industry’s loose definition of usual, customary, and reasonable (UCR is often defined as “nondiscounted fee-for-service”).

Area 75th — This column is the 75th percentile of our database for your geographic area.

Area 90th — This column is the 90th percentile of our database for your geographic area. This figure is included so that physicians can see as complete a picture as possible, but it is often inadvisable to bill at this level. In the current political atmosphere of cost containment, consistent high-level billing can be harmful to the financial well-being of your practice. As managed care networks become more prevalent, high-priced physicians may find themselves without an invitation to be involved with emerging alliances. Or, equally painful, find themselves losing patients who are increasingly unable or unwilling to tolerate high out-of-pocket expenses.
Comparing your charges to Medicode's data provides a 'snapshot' of how your fee schedule stands in relation to other physicians in your area, and helps you see where you need to position your fees for successful negotiation of managed care contracts.

The relative value and fee data columns in Customized Fee Analyzer present a blend of two different methodologies. The IRS weighs medical procedures relative to one another on a scale linked to difficulty, work, risk, and the material costs of the procedure. The second ingredient can be characterized as simple statistical profiling of charges in the geographic areas.

While profiling alone has the benefit of reporting actual charges, the method presupposes coding accuracy, and the required data volume is very high. The accuracy of the analysis is strictly limited to the quality and quantity of the data set and does not address the question of whether the charges are reasonable. Since 80 percent of procedures billed are represented by less than 5 percent of codes, many statistical holes develop where the quantity of data is insufficient for confident analysis. Furthermore, studies show that up to 20 percent of all medical bills are coded inaccurately—a further compromise to good data analysis.

Medicode feels this method of combining the approaches merges the benefits of a relative value scale with the better features of actual charge data. This combination is further enhanced by our tremendous number of charges (now approximately 560 million), which allows us to array the data confidently by zip-code areas.

Please note that while thousands of payers and physician practices contribute to the data used in this product, no individual physician, clinic, or payer schedules appear in the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Index Allowable</th>
<th>Area 50th</th>
<th>Area 75th</th>
<th>Area 95th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64580</td>
<td>DISTRICT CARPAL TUNNEL</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>450-642</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64700</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; DIGITAL V-sect SAME</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1008-1105</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64704</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; NERV. FLEXT.</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1209-1328</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64708</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; PERIPHERAL NERV. SPECIFIC</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>2015-2210</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64721</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; PERIPHERAL NERV. SCALAN</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>2151-2179</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>2584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64713</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; PENICILLIN FLDG.</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>2485-2758</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64714</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; PERIPHERAL LUMB LERN.</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1847-2028</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64716</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY/TRANSPOST; CRANIAL NERV</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>2182-2394</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64718</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; ELM NERV @ ELBOW</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>2182-2394</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>2381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64719</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY; ELM NERV @ WRIST</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>1469-1502</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64721</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, MIDDLE &amp; CARPAL TUNNEL</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1546-1604</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64722</td>
<td>DECOMP: UNSPECIFIED NERV (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1546-1604</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64726</td>
<td>DECOMP; PLANTAR DIGITAL NERV</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>672-737</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64727</td>
<td>INT. NEUROLYSIS W/USE OR MICRO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64732</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION SUPRA/INFR ORBIT. NERV</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1008-1105</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64734</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION INFRORBITAL NERV</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1008-1105</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64738</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION MENTAL NERV</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>1208-1328</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64738</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION SUPERIOR AL. NERV</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1478-1621</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64740</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION LINGUAL NERV</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1847-2028</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64742</td>
<td>TRANSFECT ORAL/NERV GTHERMIVRMP.</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1847-2028</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64744</td>
<td>TRANSFECT/AVL.SION GROSS &amp; OCCIP. NERV</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1175-1328</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MSR</th>
<th>Est Median Allowable</th>
<th>Area 50th</th>
<th>Area 75th</th>
<th>Area 95th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64702</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, DIGITAL 1/2/SAME</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>989-1186</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64704</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, NERV HANDeft</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1690-1428</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64709</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY PERIPHERAL NERV, NOT SPECI</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>1999-2372</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64712</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY PERIPHERAL NERV, SCATC</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>2332-2787</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>3121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64713</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY PERIPHERAL, BRACHIAL PLEX</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>2465-2925</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2925</td>
<td>3310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64714</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY PERIPHERAL, LUMBAR PLEXUS</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1832-2174</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64716</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY TRANSPONDT CRANIAL NERV</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>2160-2569</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>2908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64718</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, LUMBAR NERV @ ELBOW</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>2160-2569</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>2908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64719</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, LUMBAR NERV @ WRIST</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>1449-1719</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64720</td>
<td>NEUROPLASTY, MEDIAN @ CARPAL TUNNEL</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1532-1818</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64722</td>
<td>DECOMP, UNSPECIFIED NERV (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1532-1818</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>2058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64725</td>
<td>DECOMP, PLANTAR DIGITAL NERV</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>590-781</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64727</td>
<td>INT NEUROLYSIS W/PIPE OR MICRO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64722</td>
<td>TRANSECT/VULSION SUPRACHRICAL NERV</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>999-1185</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64724</td>
<td>TRANSECT/VULSION INFRAORBITAL NERV</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>999-1185</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64726</td>
<td>TRANSSECTION/VULSION MENTAL NERV</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>999-1185</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64728</td>
<td>TRANSCT INFERIOR ALVEOLAR NERV</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1486-1739</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64740</td>
<td>TRANSCT/VULSION LINGUAL NERV</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1832-2174</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64742</td>
<td>TRANSCT FACIAL NERV DIFF/COMPL</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1832-2174</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64744</td>
<td>TRANSCT/VULSION OCCR DC/P NERV</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>1166-1383</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64746</td>
<td>TRANSCT/VULSION PHARYNCG NERV</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>832-968</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Medicode Physician Fee Analyzer Plus

**ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY**  
**SPECIALTY: 20**  
**U.S. ZIP: 995xx**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRVS</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>90th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99217</td>
<td>MED TESTIMONY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99218</td>
<td>PHYS EDUCAT SERV RENDERED IN GRP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99219</td>
<td>SPEC REPORT &gt;3HR IN USUAL MEDIUM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99220</td>
<td>UNEVENTFUL TRAVEL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99221</td>
<td>ANALYSIS INFORM DATA STORED-COMPUTERS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99231</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM NEW MIDR 15MIN</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>63-74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99232</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM NEW LOW-MOD 20MIN</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>78-92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99233</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM NEW MOD SEVERE</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>103-120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99234</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM NEW MOD-HI 45 MIN</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>147-171</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99235</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM NEW MOD-HI 60 MIN</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>199-231</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99236</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM ESTAB 5 MIN</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>39-45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99237</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM ESTAB SEVERE 10MIN</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>59-64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99238</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM ESTAB LOW-MOD 15MIN</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>71-81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99239</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM ESTAB MOD-HI 25MIN</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>103-110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99240</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT EAM ESTAB MOD-HI 40MIN</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>168-189</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99241</td>
<td>OBST/OBST/AC/DC/OA NGMT</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>90-110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99242</td>
<td>INRT OBST/AC/DA EAM LOW SEVERITY</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>118-147</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99243</td>
<td>INRT OBST/AC/DA EAM MOD SEVERITY</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>180-201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99244</td>
<td>INRT OBST/AC/DA EAM HI SEVERITY</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>201-222</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99245</td>
<td>INRT HOSP/AC/DA EAM LOW SEVERITY 30MIN</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>131-144</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99246</td>
<td>INRT HOSP/AC/DA EAM MOD SEVERITY 30MIN</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>177-221</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPT's codes and descriptions only are copyright © 1999 American Medical Association.  
Data copyright © 1999 Guidebooks, Inc. Reprint License Agreement, all rights reserved.
### Orthopedic Surgery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>TDS Sub</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Actual</th>
<th>Avg Actual</th>
<th>Area 92%</th>
<th>Area 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63011</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR 1-2 SEGNT, SACRAL</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>2967-4366</td>
<td>3939</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63012</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR ABN. FACETS-LUMBAR</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>4179-4382</td>
<td>4146</td>
<td>4249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63015</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGNT, CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4489-4903</td>
<td>4457</td>
<td>4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63016</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGNT, THORAC</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>4688-4917</td>
<td>4685</td>
<td>4780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGNT, LUMBAR</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4489-4903</td>
<td>4457</td>
<td>4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63020</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/DECOMP. 1 INTERSPACE CERV</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>4123-4308</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>4196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63030</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT W/DECOMP. 1 INTERSPACE LUMB</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>3999-4094</td>
<td>3965</td>
<td>4063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63035</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT: EA ADD INTERSPACE CERV/LUMB</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1209-1333</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63043</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY RE-EXPLOR, CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4489-4903</td>
<td>4457</td>
<td>4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY RE-EXPLOR, LUMBAR</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>4672-4790</td>
<td>4639</td>
<td>4753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63045</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY 1 VERTEB. SEGMT, CERV</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>4959-5065</td>
<td>4924</td>
<td>5043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63046</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY 1 VERTE SEGMT, THORACIC</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>4628-4961</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>4912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63047</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY 1 VERTE SEGMT, LUMBAR</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>4628-4961</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>4912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63048</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMINECT 1 SEGMT. EA ADD CERV/LUMB</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1586-1606</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63055</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSVERSOSILLAR ENG, SEGMT, THORACIC</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>5390-5446</td>
<td>5312</td>
<td>5444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63056</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSVERSOSILLAR ENG, SEGMT, LUMBAR</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>4906-5031</td>
<td>4972</td>
<td>4992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63057</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSVERSOSILLAR ENG, SHA ADD, SEGMT, CERV</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>1778-1825</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63064</td>
<td></td>
<td>COSTOTIVERTEB. THORACIC: ENG, SEGMT</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4489-4903</td>
<td>4467</td>
<td>4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63068</td>
<td></td>
<td>COSTOTIVERTEB. THORACIC: EA ADD SEGMT</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>1488-1526</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63075</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISSECT ANT. CERV ENG, INTERSPACE</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>4123-4308</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>4196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63076</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISSECT ANT. CERV EA ADD INTERSPACE</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>1383-1418</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Medcode Customized Fee Analyzer Plus

**ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY**

**SPECIALTY: 20**

**U.S. ZIP: 995xx**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>E/M Codes</th>
<th>Area Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69001</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M NEW MINOR 10MIN</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>69-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69002</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M LOW-MOD 20MIN</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>85-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69003</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M MOD SEVERE 30MIN</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>111-127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69004</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M MOD-HI 45MIN</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>130-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69005</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M MOD-HI 60MIN</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>210-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99211</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M ESTAB 5 MIN</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>43-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99212</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M ESTAB MINOR 10MIN</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>57-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99213</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M ESTAB LOW-MOD 15MIN</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>73-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99214</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M ESTAB MOD-HI 25MIN</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>110-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99215</td>
<td>OFFICE/OUTPT E&amp;M ESTAB MOD-HI 40MIN</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>181-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99217</td>
<td>OBSERV CARE D/C DA MGMT</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>124-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99218</td>
<td>INIT OBSERV CARE-DA E&amp;M LOW SEVERITY</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>150-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99219</td>
<td>INIT OBSERV CARE-DA E&amp;M MOD SEVERITY</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>210-243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99220</td>
<td>INIT OBSERV CARE-DA E&amp;M HI SEVERITY</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>294-325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99221</td>
<td>INIT HOSP-DA E&amp;M LOW SEVERITY 30MIN</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>172-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99222</td>
<td>INIT HOSP-DA E&amp;M MOD SEVERITY 50MIN</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>220-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99223</td>
<td>INIT HOSP-DA E&amp;M HI SEVERITY 75MIN</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>285-329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99224</td>
<td>SUBGROP HOSP-DA E&amp;M STABLE 15MIN</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>91-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99225</td>
<td>SUBGROP HOSP-DA E&amp;M MNR COMPL 25MIN</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>124-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99226</td>
<td>SUBGROP HOSP-DA E&amp;M SIG COMPL 35MIN</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>182-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99227</td>
<td>OBSERVANT HOSP CARE &amp; E&amp;M LOW SEVER</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>170-197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**E-11**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Min/Max (Allowable)</th>
<th>Annu. 50th</th>
<th>Annu. 75th</th>
<th>Annu. 90th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63012</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIRENOC ABNL FACS-LUMBAR</td>
<td>193.00 4026-4978</td>
<td>4468 4879</td>
<td>5535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63015</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIREPLOR + 2 SEGMT: CERV</td>
<td>172.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63016</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIREPLOR + 2 SEGMT: THORAC</td>
<td>193.00 5095-5598</td>
<td>5001 5489</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIREPLOR + 2 SEGMT: LUMBAR</td>
<td>172.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63020</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIRECOMP: 1 INTERSPACE CERV</td>
<td>193.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63030</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT WIRECOMP: 1 INTERSPACE LUMB</td>
<td>193.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63032</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT: EA ADD INTERSPACE CERV/LUMB</td>
<td>65.50 1448-1555</td>
<td>1389 1525</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>LAMINOISTORY RE-EXPLOR. CERV</td>
<td>172.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63044</td>
<td>LAMINOISTORY RE-EXPLOR. LUMBUR</td>
<td>193.00 5095-5598</td>
<td>5001 5489</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63046</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT 1 VERT SEGMT-UNIV/BL: CERV</td>
<td>193.00 5095-5598</td>
<td>5001 5489</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63047</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT 1 VERT SEGMT-UNIV/BL: THORAC</td>
<td>193.00 5095-5598</td>
<td>5001 5489</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63048</td>
<td>LAMNIEXT 1 VERT SEGMT-UNIV/BL: EA ADD.</td>
<td>193.00 5095-5598</td>
<td>5001 5489</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63055</td>
<td>TRANSPECULAR SNGL SEGMT: THORACIC</td>
<td>205.00 5123-6576</td>
<td>5696 6251</td>
<td>7063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63058</td>
<td>TRANSPECULAR SNGL SEGMT: LUMBUR</td>
<td>193.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63057</td>
<td>TRANSPECULAR SNGL SEGMT: EA ADD.</td>
<td>193.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63064</td>
<td>COSTOVERTEBRAL THORACIC SNGL SEGMT</td>
<td>172.00 4975-8350</td>
<td>4779 5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63066</td>
<td>COSTOVERTEBRAL THORACIC EA ADD SEGMT</td>
<td>57.00 1649-1773</td>
<td>1584 1738</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63075</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT. CERV thin INTERSPACE</td>
<td>150.00 4339-4665</td>
<td>4168 4574</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63076</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT. CERV EA ADD INTERSPACE</td>
<td>65.50 1448-1555</td>
<td>1389 1525</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63077</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT. THORACIC 1 INTERSPACE</td>
<td>150.00 4339-4665</td>
<td>4168 4574</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>TOS Sub</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MRRS</td>
<td>Allowable</td>
<td>Area 009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22315</td>
<td>OLV TX VERT FIX/SLG/C+WCAST-MANIP</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1189-1221</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22325</td>
<td>OPEN TX VERT FIX/SLG-POST-1: LUMB</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>3429-3628</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>3475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22335</td>
<td>OPEN TX VERT FIX/SLG-POST-1: CERV</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>3727-4159</td>
<td>3713</td>
<td>3777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22337</td>
<td>OPEN TX VERT FIX/SLG-POST-1: THOR</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>3579-3993</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>3626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22345</td>
<td>OP TX VERT FIX/SLG-POST: EA ADD</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1075-1198</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22505</td>
<td>MANIP SPINE REQU IR ANES ANY REGION</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>342-383</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22548</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-C1 C2-W/WO EXC OCCIPITD</td>
<td>147.50</td>
<td>4534-4818</td>
<td>4591</td>
<td>4792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22554</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS W/WMIN DISECT: C3-C7</td>
<td>142.50</td>
<td>4381-4555</td>
<td>4399</td>
<td>4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22558</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS W/WMIN DISECT, THOR</td>
<td>157.50</td>
<td>4842-5145</td>
<td>4796</td>
<td>5117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22585</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS W/WMIN DISECT, LUMB</td>
<td>142.50</td>
<td>4381-4555</td>
<td>4399</td>
<td>4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22588</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS W/WMIN DISECT, EA ADD</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>1316-1396</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22590</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST TECH, CRANIOCERV</td>
<td>162.50</td>
<td>4995-5306</td>
<td>4948</td>
<td>5380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22595</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST TECH, ATLAS-AXIS</td>
<td>169.50</td>
<td>5088-5426</td>
<td>5039</td>
<td>5377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22600</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST/POSTLAT-1: C3-C7</td>
<td>142.50</td>
<td>4381-4555</td>
<td>4399</td>
<td>4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22610</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST/POSTLAT-1: THOR</td>
<td>132.50</td>
<td>4073-4328</td>
<td>4014</td>
<td>4395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22612</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST/POSTLAT-1: LUMB</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>3986-4214</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>4191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22614</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POSTLAT, EA ADD SEGMT</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>1220-1405</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22630</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST INTERBODY-1: LUMB</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>3549-3903</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>3661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22632</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST INTERBODY, EA ADD</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>1276-1355</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22660</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST: SSL/LESS VENT SEGMT</td>
<td>172.50</td>
<td>5509-5935</td>
<td>5522</td>
<td>5905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22682</td>
<td>ARTHRIDEISIS-POST, 7-12 VERTES SEGMT</td>
<td>207.00</td>
<td>4533-4782</td>
<td>5303</td>
<td>6726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CPT codes and descriptions are copyright © 2011 American Medical Association.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MFS</th>
<th>Est. Index Allowable</th>
<th>Area 50%</th>
<th>Area 75%</th>
<th>Area 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63012</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/REMOV ARM. FACETS-LUMBAR</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>4629-4674</td>
<td>4446</td>
<td>4879</td>
<td>5536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63013</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGMT, CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4675-5250</td>
<td>4775</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63016</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGMT, THORACIC</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>5206-5588</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>6229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63017</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOR &gt; 2 SEGMT, LUMBAR</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4675-5250</td>
<td>4775</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63029</td>
<td>LAMINOT MYEOCOMP 1 INTERSPACE CERV</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>4570-4914</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4818</td>
<td>5467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63033</td>
<td>LAMINOT MYEOCOMP 1 INTERSPACE LUMBAR</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>4580-4799</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63055</td>
<td>LAMINOT, EA ADD INTERSPACE CERV/LUMBAR</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1146-1555</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63040</td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY RE-EXPLOR, CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4675-5300</td>
<td>4779</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63042</td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY RE-EXPLOR, LUMBAR</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>5177-5567</td>
<td>4974</td>
<td>5458</td>
<td>6184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63045</td>
<td>LAMINECT 1 VERT SEGMT-LUM/BIL, CERV</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td>5496-5950</td>
<td>5279</td>
<td>5794</td>
<td>6574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63046</td>
<td>LAMINECT 1 VERT SEGMT-LUM/BIL, THOR</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>5321-5734</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>5564</td>
<td>6401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63047</td>
<td>LAMINECT 1 VERT SEGMT-LUM/BIL, LUMB</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>5321-5734</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>5564</td>
<td>6401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63048</td>
<td>LAMINECT 1 SEGMT-LUM/BIL, EA ADD, L</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>1735-1806</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63055</td>
<td>TRANSPEC. SGL SGMT. SEGMT, THORACIC</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>5829-6375</td>
<td>5696</td>
<td>6251</td>
<td>7093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63056</td>
<td>TRANSPEC. SGL SGMT. SEGMT, LUMBAR</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>5438-5847</td>
<td>5234</td>
<td>5733</td>
<td>6505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63057</td>
<td>TRANSPEC. SGL SGMT. SEGMT, EA ADD</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1967-2115</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63064</td>
<td>COSTOVERTEBRAL THORACIC, SGMT SEGMT</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4675-5300</td>
<td>4779</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>5951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63066</td>
<td>COSTOVERTEBR THORACIC, EA ADD SEGMT</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>1649-1773</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63075</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT, CERV SGMT. INTERSPACE</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>4679-4914</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>4918</td>
<td>5467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63076</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT, CERV EA ADD INTERSPACE</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>1523-1648</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63077</td>
<td>DISKECT ANT, THORACIC 1 INTERSPACE</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>4329-4665</td>
<td>4198</td>
<td>4574</td>
<td>5190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MRVS</td>
<td>Est Income Allowable</td>
<td>Area 50th</td>
<td>Area 75th</td>
<td>Area 90th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20900</td>
<td>BONE GIFT ANY DONOR AREA, MINOR/SM</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>628-723</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20902</td>
<td>BONE GIFT ANY DONOR AREA, MAJOR/LG</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1259-1485</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20910</td>
<td>CARTILAGE GIFT, COSTOCHONDRAL</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>925-1080</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20912</td>
<td>CARTILAGE GIFT, NASAL, SEPTUM</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>1080-1273</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20920</td>
<td>FASCI A LATA GIFT, BY STRIPPER</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>727-848</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20922</td>
<td>FASCI A LATA GIFT, INC &amp; AREA EXPOSU</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>981-1157</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20924</td>
<td>TENDON GIFT FROM A DISTANCE</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>694-810</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20926</td>
<td>TISS GIFT OTHER</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>669-771</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20930</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY, MORSELIZED</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>390-440</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20931</td>
<td>ALLOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY, STRUCTURAL</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>462-540</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20928</td>
<td>AUTOGRAFT SPINE SURG, LOCAL, GRAFT INDIC</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>578-675</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20937</td>
<td>AUTOGRAFT SPINE SURG ONLY, MORSELIZED</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>1007-1176</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20938</td>
<td>AUTOGRAFT SPINE SURG, STRUC/INJ-CERT</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>1255-1485</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20950</td>
<td>MONITOR PRESS-Detect Muscll Compartment</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>231-270</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20955</td>
<td>BONE GIFT W/MIKROVASC ANASTOMS, FIBUL</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>3718-4339</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>5167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20955</td>
<td>BONE GIFT W/MIKROVASC ANASTOMS, K.IAC</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>3718-4339</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>5167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20957</td>
<td>BONE GIFT W/MIKROVASC ANAS, METATARSIC</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>3718-4339</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>5167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20962</td>
<td>BONE GIFT W/MIKROVASC ANASTOMS, OTHER</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>3718-4339</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>5167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20969</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOTOMY FLAP, NOT K.IAC CREST</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>4954-5785</td>
<td>4778</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>6890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20970</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOTOMY FLAP, K.IAC CREST</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>4954-5785</td>
<td>4778</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>6890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20972</td>
<td>FREE OSTEOTOMY FLAP, METATARSIC</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>4954-5785</td>
<td>4778</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>6890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>AVG Allowed</td>
<td>AVG Allowed</td>
<td>AVG Allowed</td>
<td>AVG Allowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62040</td>
<td>Laminotomy SC/EC/CS: CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4338-4796</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>4021</td>
<td>5436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62043</td>
<td>Laminotomy SC/EC/CS: LUMBAR</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>4484-4792</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>5730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62045</td>
<td>Laminectomy 1 VERTEbral SEGMENT: CERV</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>4760-5190</td>
<td>4355</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>8073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62044</td>
<td>Laminectomy 1 VERTebral SEGMENT: THORACIC</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>4614-5159</td>
<td>6340</td>
<td>6075</td>
<td>5913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62047</td>
<td>Laminectomy 1 VERTebral SEGMENT: LUMBAR</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>6028-6519</td>
<td>4840</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>5151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62044</td>
<td>Laminectomy 1 SEGMENT: LA ADD CERV/LUMB</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>1533-1873</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62051</td>
<td>TRANSpedicular ING. SEGMENT: THORACIC</td>
<td>395.00</td>
<td>1215-5717</td>
<td>4918</td>
<td>6408</td>
<td>6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62052</td>
<td>TRANSpedicular ING. SEGMENT: LUMBAR</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>4710-5343</td>
<td>4349</td>
<td>5191</td>
<td>6007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62077</td>
<td>TRANSpedicular ING. SEGMENT: ES ADD</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>1701-1896</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62064</td>
<td>CONTRavertebral THORACIC, ING. SEGMENT</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4389-4796</td>
<td>3942</td>
<td>4825</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62064</td>
<td>CONTRavertebral THORACIC, LA ADD SEGMENT</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>1428-1570</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62075</td>
<td>DISCETomy ANT. CERV ECC INTErrFACE</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>1058-4406</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>4245</td>
<td>5964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62074</td>
<td>DISCETomy ANT. CERV ES ADD INTErrFACE</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1128-1478</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62077</td>
<td>DISCETomy ANT. THORACIC 1 INTErrFACE</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>1058-4406</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>4245</td>
<td>5964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62078</td>
<td>DISCETomy THORACIC LA ADD INTErrFACE</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1283-1394</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62861</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: CERV 1 SEGMENT</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>4766-5228</td>
<td>4255</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>6901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62862</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: CERV 2 AD SEGMENT</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>1578-1757</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62863</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: THORACIC 1 SEGMENT</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>4760-5388</td>
<td>4205</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>6901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62864</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: THORACIC 2 AD SEGMENT</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>1578-1757</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62887</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: LUMBAR 1</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>4559-5875</td>
<td>4171</td>
<td>4690</td>
<td>5813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62888</td>
<td>VERTebral CONVEXTomy: LUMBAR 2 ES ADD</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>1528-1785</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>AVG Allowable</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>75th</td>
<td>90th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>CLD VX VERT FUS 40 MANIP-M/C</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>713-910</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>CLD VX VERT FUS/DELOC W/CART-WASH</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1037-1234</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>TOP VX VERT FUS/DELOC-POST-1 CMND</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>2581-2900</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>3225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>TOP VX VERT FUS/CORE-POST-1 CERV</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>2248-4129</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>TOP VX VERT FUS/CORE-POST-1 THOR</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>2114-2372</td>
<td>2246</td>
<td>2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>OLF VX VERT FUS/DELOC-POST-1 EA ADD</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>933-1252</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>MANIP SPINE EQUIUS AILS ANY REGION</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>298-381</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY C1+2+3+4 EXC ORBITOID</td>
<td>152.50</td>
<td>1893-2467</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY NW/NW D/SRECT: CI-C</td>
<td>167.50</td>
<td>2663-2716</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY NW/NW D/SRECT: THOR</td>
<td>162.50</td>
<td>472-5210</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY NW/NW D/SRECT: LUMB</td>
<td>147.50</td>
<td>2823-4716</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY NW/NW D/SRECT: EA ADD</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>1125-2231</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST TECH. TRANSVERSE</td>
<td>187.50</td>
<td>4542-5278</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST TECH. AR/AXIS</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>4290-5314</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST/POSTLAT-1: CI-C</td>
<td>162.50</td>
<td>1698-2678</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST/POSTLAT-1: THOR</td>
<td>132.50</td>
<td>1435-2625</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST/POSTLAT-1: LUMB</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>1344-1842</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST/POSTLAT: EA ADD AND SPINE</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>1125-1381</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY LAT VERT-FIXA LUMBAR</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>4836-4977</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST INTERBODY-1: LUMB</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>3208-4548</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22120</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>ARTHROSCOPY POST INTERBODY: EA ADD</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>1078-1313</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CPT codes and descriptions only are copyright © AMIA American Medical Informatics Association. Data copyright © AHA HealthCare Systems, Inc. All rights reserved.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Dues</th>
<th>Vanilla</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>90th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21060</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: CPT</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21100</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21150</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21250</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21300</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21350</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21400</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21450</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21500</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21550</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21600</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21650</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21700</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21750</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21800</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21850</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21900</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21950</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC FEE ANALYSIS: OTHER</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPT Code and descriptions only as copyright © 2006 America's Medical Association. Data reprinted with permission from America's Medical Association, All rights reserved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Ins/Out</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28010</td>
<td>DRAINAGE FINGER ABSCES, SIMPL</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>112-120</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28011</td>
<td>DRAINAGE FINGER ABSCES, COMPLIC</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>425-496</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28020</td>
<td>DRAIN TENDON SHEATH 1 DIGIT/PALM</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28025</td>
<td>DRAIN PALMAR BURSA, ENL. ULNAR/RADIAL</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28030</td>
<td>DRAIN PALMAR BURSA, MIX/COMPLIC</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>1946-2268</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28034</td>
<td>INCISION DEEP WOUND BONE CORTEX HAND</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>908-1097</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28035</td>
<td>DECOMP FINGERS &amp; OR HAND INJURY</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>1946-2268</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28037</td>
<td>DECOMP FASCIOCTOMY HAND</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28040</td>
<td>C FASCIOCTOMY PALMAR, PERCUT</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>999-999</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20045</td>
<td>FASCIOCTOMY PALMAR, OPEN PART</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28055</td>
<td>TENDON SHEATH INCS</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>722-942</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28060</td>
<td>C TENOTOMY PERCUT ENL. EA DIGIT</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>389-421</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28070</td>
<td>C ARTHROTOMY WIDOPEN, CARPO/METACARP JT</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28075</td>
<td>C ARTHROTOMY WIDOPEN, MCP JT</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>651-972</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28080</td>
<td>C ARTHROTOMY WIDOPEN, IP JT EA</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>661-776</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28100</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY WSYNOVL, BICEPS, CM JT</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>851-972</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28105</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY WSYNOVL, BICEPS, MCP JT</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>708-910</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28110</td>
<td>ARTHROTOMY WSYNOVL, BICEPS, IP JT EA</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>588-680</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28115</td>
<td>EXC TUMOR HAND/FINGER, SURG</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>567-646</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28116</td>
<td>EXC TUMOR HAND/FINGER, DEEP/FINE</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>999-1037</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28117</td>
<td>RAD RESECT TUMOR TISS HAND/FINGER</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>2979-3042</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>3270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>MRVS</td>
<td>Average Allowable</td>
<td>Area 10th Percentile</td>
<td>Area 75th Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23322</td>
<td>RAD RESECT TUM PROX HUMER; W/IB/DISF</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>5689-5885</td>
<td>6420</td>
<td>7602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23320</td>
<td>REMOV FB SHOULDER; SUBS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>178-184</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23321</td>
<td>REMOV FB SHOULDER; DEEP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>97-101</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23332</td>
<td>REMOV FB SHOULDER; COMPLIC- TOT SHOUL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1988-2278</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23400</td>
<td>INJ PROG SHOULDER ANGIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>145-154</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22386</td>
<td>MUSC TRANSF SHOULDER UP ARM; SNGL</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>2957-3071</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22387</td>
<td>MUSC TRANSF SHOULDER UP ARM; NK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22400</td>
<td>SCAPULOPEXY</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>2957-3071</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22405</td>
<td>TENDOMYOTOMY SHOULDER AREA; SNGL</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1454-1536</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22406</td>
<td>TENDOMYOTOMY SHOULDER; NKS SAME INCS</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>1986-1998</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22410</td>
<td>REP RPT MUSC/L TENDIN CUR P; ACUTE</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>2158-2318</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>2204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22411</td>
<td>REP RPT MUSC/L TENDIN CUR; CHRON</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>2916-2764</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22419</td>
<td>CORACOACROM LIG REL, W/ACROMIOPLA</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>1510-1597</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22439</td>
<td>REP RPT COMPLET SHOUL CUR; APL SHOUL</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>3043-3250</td>
<td>3238</td>
<td>3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22430</td>
<td>TENDOESS LONG TENDON BICEPS</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>1977-2088</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22440</td>
<td>RESECT/TRANS PL LONG TENDON BICEPS</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>1744-1842</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22450</td>
<td>CAPSULORRAPHY ANT; PUTOH-PLAT TYP</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>2173-2987</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22455</td>
<td>CAPSULORRAPHY ANT; BANKART TYPE</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>3062-3224</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>3394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22460</td>
<td>CAPSULORRAPHY ANT; W/ZONE BLOCK</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>2957-3571</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22462</td>
<td>CAPSULORRAPHY ANT; W/CORACOID TINS</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>2957-3571</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Avg Income Allowable</td>
<td>Area 50th</td>
<td>Area 75th</td>
<td>Area 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25545</td>
<td>OPEN TX ULLNAR SHAFT FX W/O RFXA</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>1489-1605</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25580</td>
<td>CLO TX RAD &amp; ULLNAR SHAFT FX W/O MAIN</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>527-579</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25585</td>
<td>CLO TX RAD &amp; ULLNAR SHAFT FX W/MAIN</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>1000-1099</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25574</td>
<td>OPEN TX RAD &amp; ULLNAR FX, RADIUS/ULLN</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>1961-2141</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25575</td>
<td>OPEN TX RAD &amp; ULLNAR RAD &amp; ULLN</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>2130-2343</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25560</td>
<td>CLO TX DIST RAD FX, W/O MAIN</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>485-509</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25565</td>
<td>CLO TX DIST RAD FX, W/MAIN</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>689-747</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25811</td>
<td>PERCUIT FX DISLT RAD FX W/MAIN</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>1187-1322</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25825</td>
<td>OPEN TX DIST RAD FX W/O RFXA</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>1434-1552</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25822</td>
<td>CLO TX CARPAL SCAPHOID FX, W/O MAIN</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>488-635</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25824</td>
<td>CLO TX CARPAL SCAPHOID FX, W/MAIN</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>620-694</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25828</td>
<td>OPEN TX CARPAL SCAPHOID FX, W/O RFX</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>1571-1604</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25830</td>
<td>CLO TX CARPAL BONE FX, W/O MAIN/EA</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>402-441</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25836</td>
<td>CLO TX CARPAL BONE FX, W/MAIN/EA</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>509-723</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25845</td>
<td>OPEN TX CARPAL BONE FX, EA BONE</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>999-1085</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25860</td>
<td>CLO TX ULLNAR STYLOID FX</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>580-638</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25860</td>
<td>CLO TX RADIOCARPAL DISLOC W/MAIN</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>659-723</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25870</td>
<td>OPEN TX RADIOCARPAL DISLOC 1/MORE</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1319-1448</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25875</td>
<td>CLO TX RADIOULNAR DISLOC W/MAIN</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>527-579</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25876</td>
<td>OPEN TX RADIUS/ULN DISLOC ACUTE/CHRONIC</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1055-1157</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25880</td>
<td>CLO TX TRANS-SCAPHOID/ULNAR W/MAIN</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>930-1027</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Avg Indem</td>
<td>Area 50th</td>
<td>Area 75th</td>
<td>Area 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72080</td>
<td>RADI EXAM; HUMERUS MIN 2 VIEWS</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>38-44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72070</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72070</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>51-59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72070</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>56-110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72080</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW; COMPL MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>57-96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72080</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW; COMPL MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>38-44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72086</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW ARTHROGRAPHY- I &amp; II</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>300-348</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72085</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW ARTHROGRAPHY- I &amp; II</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>186-230</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72085</td>
<td>RADI EXAM ELBOW ARTHROGRAPHY- I &amp; II</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>180-122</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72090</td>
<td>RADI EXAM FOREARM AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>59-96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72090</td>
<td>RADI EXAM FOREARM AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>60-67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72090</td>
<td>RADI EXAM FOREARM AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72052</td>
<td>RADI EXAM UPPER EXTREM INFANT MIN 2</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>87-100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72052</td>
<td>RADI EXAM UPPER EXTREM INFANT MIN 2</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>52-60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72052</td>
<td>RADI EXAM UPPER EXTREM INFANT MIN 2</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>28-36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71010</td>
<td>RADI EXAM WRIST; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>70-90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71010</td>
<td>RADI EXAM WRIST; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>45-62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71010</td>
<td>RADI EXAM WRIST; AP &amp; LAT VIEWS</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>30-55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73110</td>
<td>RADI EXAM WRIST; COMPL MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>60-90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73110</td>
<td>RADI EXAM WRIST; COMPL MIN 3 VIEWS</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>51-59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Medicode Physician Fee Analyzer Plus

### Orthopedic Surgery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Allowable</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>95th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61250</td>
<td>INJ SUBSTANCE EPIDURAL (SEP FRA)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>452-500</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61250</td>
<td>INJ/INFUS EPIDURAL CAT: NO ANESTH</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>1418-1599</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>2864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61251</td>
<td>INJ/INFUS EPIDURAL CAT: W/ANESTH</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>3092-3174</td>
<td>2982</td>
<td>3314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61255</td>
<td>REMOV PREY INF/INFUS EPIDURAL CAT</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1109-1338</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61260</td>
<td>INJ/INFUS PLAC DEVIC EPIDURAL: DEFERRED</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1337-1489</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61261</td>
<td>INJ/INFUS PLAC DEVIC EPIDURAL: NONPROG</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>1227-1399</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61262</td>
<td>INJ/INFUS PLAC DEVIC EPIDURAL: PROGRE</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>1329-1470</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61263</td>
<td>REMOV PREY INF/INFUS SURG DEVICES/PUMP</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>780-882</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61267</td>
<td>ELEC ANALYSIS PROGM PUMP: NO REFRES</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61268</td>
<td>ELEC ANALYSIS PROGM PUMP: W/REFRES</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61291</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD 1-2 VERTER: CERV</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>3587-3904</td>
<td>3209</td>
<td>3762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61294</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD 1-2 VERTER: THORAX</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>6098-6448</td>
<td>6067</td>
<td>6339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61295</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD: LUMBAR EX SPOND</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>3382-3765</td>
<td>3094</td>
<td>3427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61296</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD 1-2 SECON: CERVAL</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>3898-4229</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>4104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61297</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/REMVR ABNL FACETS-LUMBAR</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>3898-4229</td>
<td>3667</td>
<td>4209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61299</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD &gt; 2 SECON: CERV</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>4308-4796</td>
<td>3943</td>
<td>4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61316</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD &gt; 2 SECON: THORAC</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>4568-5519</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>4686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61317</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD &gt; 2 SECON: LUMBAR</td>
<td>173.00</td>
<td>4308-4796</td>
<td>3943</td>
<td>4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61320</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD: 1 INTERSPACE CERV</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>7559-8406</td>
<td>7221</td>
<td>8246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61321</td>
<td>LAMINECT W/EXPLOD: 1 INTERSPACE LUMB</td>
<td>153.00</td>
<td>2932-3627</td>
<td>2879</td>
<td>3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61325</td>
<td>LAMINECT: EX ADD INTERSPACE CERV/LUMB</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1322-1394</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr. ______ had back pain, left hip pain, and pain in the right thigh for about 1 to 2 months. It has gotten worse over the last month and needs to have radiated somewhat from the knee upwards to the left hip area. Initially it started with just back pain and then pain in the right leg which got better, then pain in the left sacroiliac and hip area started. He has a history of previous mild backaches in the past which have resolved spontaneously. No history of sciatica or history of back surgery. He denies any bowel or bladder problems and denies any muscle weakness. He says he is very stiff in the morning. He gets a little better as the day goes on.

He was seen in the emergency room in Fort Smith, Arkansas and was given a muscle relaxant. The injury occurred the weekend of April 13, 1996.

On exam the patient walks around the room well. Heel and toe walking are normal. Straight leg raising is positive at about 30° with left hip and posterior thigh pain. Right leg straight leg raising is positive at about 40° with back pain but not any left leg sciatica. He has no sensory deficits. Knee and Achilles reflexes are intact. He is able to bend forward with difficulty so that his hands come within a foot of the ground.

X-rays show some minor osteochondritic changes at L5 and L5-S1 otherwise these are pretty much normal for age.

Assessment: Possible herniated disc versus bulging disc.

Recommendation: MRI scan, physical therapy, and Relafen 500 mg 2 tablets q.d. I explained the gastrointestinal complications of Relafen and told him to stop it if he starts getting heartburn.

Plan: We will check him back again after the MRI is done and go from there.

Richard D. McEvoy, MD/hj
### ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Physician's Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dr. William C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>101 East Sixth Ave, Anchorage, AK 99501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Injury</td>
<td>06.07.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Report</td>
<td>07.19.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Injury**

- Strain limited upper back
- Medical history: 1979 - Back injury - Back limited upper back

**Nature of Injury**

- Medical treatment: Pain in back, leg, and foot

**Examination**

- Physical examination: Normal

**Conclusion**

- Permanent disability: 25%

---

**Physician's Notes**

See attached notes from 06.07.96.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee's Notice of Traumatic Injury and Claim for Continuation of Pay/Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of employee (Last, First, Middle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Security Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Date of birth (Day, Month, Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex [ ] Male [ ] Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Home address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE RIVER, ALASKA 99577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Date and State ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee's home mailing address (Include city, state, and zip code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Residential Agency, 2nd Floor, 200 Garrison Avenue, Fort Smith, Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dependents [ ] Wife [ ] Children under 18 years [ ] Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Place where injury occurred (e.g. 2nd floor, near Fox Office Bldg, 13th &amp; Pine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Resident Agency, 2nd Floor, 200 Garrison Avenue, Fort Smith, Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Date injury occurred (MM/DD/YY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Time of injury (AM or PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Employee's occupation (MM/dd/yyyy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cause of injury (Describe what happened and what was injured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While on duty at the FBI, I was in the process of packing boxes containing files, books, etc., for shipment for my next duty station in Anchorage, AK. A total of 22 boxes were packed and prepared for shipping. Each box weighed 25 to 30 pounds. While opening the boxes, I bent over and injured my lower back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Nature of injury (Describe how the injury occurred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower back injury due to lifting box and turning the box. I injured my lower back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Employee signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Witness Statement (Describe what you saw, heard, or know about the injury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed by SSA William C, Jr. on 4/15/96 that he had injured his back while packing in the Resident Agency at FBI, Smith, Arkansas. He stated at that time he did not intend to go to a doctor. On Thursday, 4/18/96, SSA advised the muscle spasms in his back had grown worse and that he could not see the treating physician due to his appointment with an orthopedic specialist. My supervisor diagnosed the injury as a soft tissue injury to the lower back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Witness's Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C. Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Witness's Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Witness's Phone Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S. Department of Labor**

**Employment Standards Administration**

**Office of Workers' Compensation Programs**
PREROOPERATIVE DIAGNOSIS: Herniated intervertebral disk, L4-5.

POSTOPERATIVE DIAGNOSIS: Herniated intervertebral disk, L4-5.

PROCEDURE: Partial laminectomy and disk excision, L4-5, left.

SURGEON: Richard D. McEvoy, MD

ASSISTANT SURGEON: Not given.

ANESTHESIOLOGIST: Michael Norman, MD

ANESTHESIA: General.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURE: The patient was first given a general anesthetic and given Atropin prior to the start of the case. He was placed prone on the Andrews frame. Knees were padded, knees were also placed in TEDs and SCDS. Elbows were padded. Make sure that there was not undue pressure on the ulnar nerves, etc. The hands were beneath the groin area. Chase roll was placed. Neck was in good position and we made sure there was no pressure on the eyes or nose and he was prepped with Betadine soap and solution and draped in the usual fashion.

Straight incision was made, infiltrated with Marcaine with epinephrine and then soft tissues were taken off the L4-5 interspace area. This was identified with a spinal needle and x-ray. The bone was then removed to form a partial laminectomy between L4-5 on the left. Using a Midas-Rex and combination of rongeurs, partial laminectomy was accomplished.

We then took off the ligamentum flavum and identified the large disk herniation. This the removed in pinrow fashion with several large pieces of disk and many small pieces. We then irrigated out the space and then retrieved some more disk fragments. Continued to do this until there were no more disk fragments left that we could find in the space. We checked the nerve root and dura with the bulb tipped dissector and it was seen to be well decompressed. Wound was then irrigated and the graft was then placed over the area of the dura and the nerve root.
September 23, 1996

WILLIAM C. JR
EAGLE RIVER, AK. 99577

Dear Mr.:

I am writing in reference to your claim for the injury of 04/14/1996, which you sustained while employed by the agency identified below. Your claim is accepted for:

If your injury results in disability for work or the need for medical treatment, you may be eligible to receive continuation of pay (COP) until you recover or return to light duty, up to a maximum of 43 calendar days. If wage loss continues after the expiration of COP, you are eligible to claim disability compensation on Form CA-7. Necessary medical expenses related to the injury will be processed for payment by this office following proper submission of charges.

Enclosed is a pamphlet entitled “How That Your Claim Has Been Accepted…” which provides information concerning payment of bills, claims for compensation, and other matters pertinent to your claim.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Claims Examiner

US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
CFD: JOB AND COMPTON
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS
FBI: PERSONNEL COMPENSATION
9TH AN FERNSTEDTNA AVE NV
WASHINGTON, DC 20535

CA1008-0896

TOTAL P. 02
NOTEPAK AND SYSTEM MESSAGES  
ANCH FRACTURE & ORTHO CLINIC  

Account... 113922  
Name... WILIAM C  

Message text:  

2  
61  0  N  0  08/13/96  
MR. CALLED. SAID HIS INJURY IS WORK COMP. HE SAID WE SHOULD SEND THE BILLS TO THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS AND CHRISS MCCOMMILLANS, 101 E 5TH AVE., APO 99601. HE DOES NOT HAVE A DEL 3AM & YET, BUT SAID CHRIS SAID TO SEND THE BILLS TO HER AND SHE WILL PROCEED THEM.  

3  
87  01  0  N  0  08/13/96  
ATTEN: CHANCE. OLD I. HEN C  
OLD P411111012 NEW 1411111012  

Message:  

5  
81  0  N  0  08/21/96  
PER CHRIS MCCOMILLANS (P.H.OFFICE) HANDLING THE W/C CASES. AS LONG AS DR. MCBRYCE FEEL THAT INJURY ON 0872794 (CAN NOT WAIT DUE TO RISK OF FURTHER INJURY AND HANDSHIELD), AS LONG AS THIS DETERMINATION HAS BEEN WELL DOCUMENTED (HANDSHIELD IN OUR OFFICE TOLD CHRIS THAT IF THE BILLS SHE RECEIVED WERE NOT SUFFICIENT ENOUGH, SHE SHOULD WRITE A LETTER TO DR. MCBRYCE REQUESTING FURTHER DOCUMENTATION). W/C DOES APPROVE THE SURGERY.  

9  
01  0  N  0  09/16/96  
PER CHRISS AT PB., THEY SHOULD HEAR LATER THIS WEEK IF W/C IS GOING TO ACCEPT MR. BOWT'S Claim. IF NOT, HIS PRIVATE (KJF, 169, 169).  

15  
01  0  N  0  10/29/96  
I RECEIVED A DENIAL FROM DEBIL NOW ON THE BU. THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN DONE. I CALLED AND SPOKE WITH DEBIL AND SHE IF DONE. I CALLED AND SPOKE WITH DEBIL AND CHRISTIAN AT PE. AND SHE IS DONE. I CALLED THE CLARKE ADJUSTMENT OFFICE AND PROMISES HER.  

16  
01  0  N  0  10/29/96  
WELL, WHAT OF MY CALL HAS BEEN CONSIDERED WITH THIS SEND ISSUE HERE  
ANNAND... I JUST RECEIVED A CALL FROM CHRISTIAN AT PB AND SHE JUST DROPPED OFF THE PHONE WITH DEBIL. CONTRARY TO ALL OF OUR RELIANCE. DEBIL IS NOW SAYING THAT THEY NEVER AUTHORIZED THE SURGERY. THEY WILL, HOWEVER, CONSIDER IT IF DR. MCBRYCE DICTATES A LETTER AS TO WHY THE SURGERY WAS DONE AND WHAT LED HIM TO THIS CONCLUSION. OF COURSE, WE HAVE NOTHING IN WRITING PERTAINING TO THAT. SUPPOSEDLY THEY ARE GOING TO BE SENDING THE PATIENT CHARGE REQUEST, BUT NOT THE DR. INGEL ALSO DENIES HAVING ANY DOCUMENTATION FROM OUR OFFICE OR CHRISTIAN ET AL. 

IN THE SAME BREATH, CONRAD TO CHRISTIAN ABOUT ALL OF THE PAPERS BE SENDING WITH OUR STATUS.
I HAVE CALLED DOG 08/24/96 TO USDL. I RECEIVED A DENIAL FROM THEM STATING THAT WE NEVER SENT OFF NOTES. WHATEVER.

WELL. WELL. WELL. THIS HAS BEEN QUITE THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE. I SPOKE WITH BARBARA MC DONALD AT USDL YESTERDAY AND HERE'S WHAT SHE HAD TO SAY. MR. EE WAS AUTHORIZED THRU CRIS JST FEB 97. MW THE AUTHORIZATION ACTUALLY REMOVED TO COME FROM USDL. BARB WAS GUIDED TO MAKE SURE THAT MR. EE'S MEDICAL BILL WOULD BE REIMBURSED BY ONE OF THE USDL DDS AND GET BACK TO ME WITHIN THE NEXT WEEK WITH A DEFINITE ANSWER. HOWEVER AT THIS POINT IT IS STILL DENIED. I ALSO HAVE A CALL INTO CRIS AT FBI TO CALL ME ON THIS. I GUESS AT THIS POINT I WILL WAIT FOR A DEFINITE FROM USDL AND IF IT IS STILL

DENIED I WILL PUT THE BALANCE DUE AS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FBI SINCE THEY AUTHORIZED THE EX. AND IF THEY DON'T AGREE TO THAT I WILL NEED TO CONTACT MR. EE AND MAKE THIS HIS RESPONSIBILITY SINCE HIS PRIVATE DON'T TOUCH IT. LESSON LEARNED: NEVER SEND W/C BILLING TO ANY FEDERAL AGENCY, ONLY SEND TO USDL AND WILL DEAL DEAL WITH THEM DIRECTLY.

KRIS FROM FBI CALLED TO SAY THAT MR. EE CAME INTO WORK WITH A LETTER DATED 02/25/97 STATING THAT USDL HAS AUTHORIZED THE EX AND THAT WE SHOULD BE EXPECTING PAYMENT SOON.

I SPOKE WITH CRIS AT FBI TODAY AND SHE SAID THAT THE HOSPITAL WAS JUST PAID ON 03/10/97 AND THAT SHE WOULD CHECK WITH THEM AND THAT WE S/A RECEIVING PAYMENT SOON.
NOTEPAD AND SYSTEM MESSAGES

Account... 132852
Name..... BOUNDS, WILLIAM C.

msg# ty mb days dcl pl stmc claim action date. date entered pass cd
message text

31 I 01 0 N 0 04/07/97 SF
I CALLED AND LEFT A MSG FOR BARBARA McCOULD AT 10:30 PM RE S. B. BAL.

NOTEPAD AND SYSTEM MESSAGES

Account... 132852
Name..... BOUNDS, WILLIAM C.

msg# ty mb days dcl pl stmc claim action date. date entered pass cd
message text

32 I 01 0 N 0 04/09/97 SF
I SPOKE WITH BARBARA McCOULD AT UHDL TODAY AND SHE SAID SHE REMEMBERS GETTING OUR 2X CHARGES, HOWEVER SHE FOLDS THAT C/B PAYING THIS CLAIM WOULD EITHER BE DEBBIE CORNELI OR ROD PARKER AND SHE WAS GOING TO GET WITH THEM TODAY TO FIND OUT WHAT THE HOLD UP IS AND HAVE ONE OF THEM CALL ME.

NOTEPAD AND SYSTEM MESSAGES

Account... 132852
Name..... BOUNDS, WILLIAM C.

msg# ty mb days dcl pl stmc claim action date. date entered pass cd
message text

33 I 01 0 N 0 04/09/97 SF
I HAVE RECEIVED A CALL FROM RODNEY BARKER AT UHDL. HE SAID HE DID HAVE THE 2X CHARGES AND THAT HE WOULD SEND THEM IN FOR PROCESSING AND THAT WE SHOULD RECEIVE PAYMENT IN LESS THAN A MONTH. LET'S HOPES NO.

NOTEPAD AND SYSTEM MESSAGES

Account... 132852
Name..... BOUNDS, WILLIAM C.

msg# ty mb days dcl pl stmc claim action date. date entered pass cd
message text

34 I 01 0 N 0 04/11/97 SF
CHRIS FROM FBI ASKED ME TO CALL HER IF WE DO NOT RECEIVE 2X CHARGE IN THE NEXT 30 DAYS.
# Statement of Account

For the period 08/08/96 thru 08/30/97

ANCH FRACTURE & ORTHO CLINIC
3440 PROVIDENCE DR., SUITE 210
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508
907-563-3145

Statement date: 05/05/99

TO: BOUNDS, WILLIAM C.
20194 CONSTITUTION DR
EAGLE RIVER, AK 99577

Account #: 132852  Insprov#: 132852  Proov#: IRIS# 92-039318
Tel: 907-696-7770  Chm#: 132852  Birth: 06/07/46 SS#: 429-88-6343

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV EL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/08/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>NEW PATIENT OFFICE VISIT  7242</td>
<td>99203</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>LUMBAR X-RAYS (3V)</td>
<td>7244</td>
<td>106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ELEVATED BY WORKERS' COMP  (Pa. &amp; Pay)</td>
<td>97035</td>
<td>163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/97</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE Schedul</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV EL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/14/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISI  72210</td>
<td>99213</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ELEVATED BY WORKERS' COMP (Pa. &amp; Pay)</td>
<td>97035</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE Schedul</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV EL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/14/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ULTRASOUND THERAPY (15 M 7242</td>
<td>97035</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISI  72210</td>
<td>99213</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ULTRASOUND THERAPY (15 M 7242</td>
<td>97035</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MYOFASCIAL RELEASE</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/97</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEE Schedul</td>
<td>7245</td>
<td>101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV EL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/19/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISI  72210</td>
<td>99212</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV EL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/19/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ULTRASOUND THERAPY (15 M 7242</td>
<td>97035</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/96</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MYOFASCIAL RELEASE</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PROV PL NAME</td>
<td>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>ICDA</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/96 1000 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>97014</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL STIM, UNATTEND</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/96 1000 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>97025</td>
<td>ULTRASOUND THERAPY (15 M) 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/96 1000 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>97250</td>
<td>MYOFASCIAL RELEASE 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/96 1000 WILLIAM</td>
<td>90850</td>
<td>TREATMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96 1000 WILLIAM</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHEDULE</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00

Claim # 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/26/96 55 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>99021</td>
<td>PRE-OP VISIT, ONE DAY PRI 72210</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00

Claim # 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/96 55 IN WILLIAM</td>
<td>61030</td>
<td>LAMINOTOMY 72210</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>4100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/97 55 WILLIAM</td>
<td>90850</td>
<td>TREATMENT BY WORKERS' COMP</td>
<td>2202.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/97 55 WILLIAM</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHEDULE</td>
<td>1998.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00

Claim # 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/04/96 55 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>99024</td>
<td>POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210</td>
<td>72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00

Claim # 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/09/96 1000 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>97110</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15) 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/96 1000 WILLIAM</td>
<td>97110</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15) 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96 1000 WILLIAM</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE FEES SCHEDULE</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00

Claim # 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAME</th>
<th>SERV SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ICDA</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/13/96 2000 DO WILLIAM</td>
<td>97110</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15) 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/96 2000 WILLIAM</td>
<td>97110</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15) 7242</td>
<td>7242</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS ***** $0.00
**STATEDMENT OF ACCOUNT**

For the period 08/01/96 thru 05/30/97

ANCHI PRACUER & ORTHO CLINIC
320 PROVIDENCE DR., SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508
907-563-3145

Statement date: 05/05/99

TO: BOODH, WILLIAM C.
20134 CONSTITUTION DR
EAGLE RIVER, AK 99577

Account# 132852 Ins prov# Provs
Tel: 907-898-7770 Cnt# 132852 Birth: 09/07/46 SS#: 423-86-8343

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROV PL NAMB</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>SERVICE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>HCRC</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>2200 William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE Fee SChedUL</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/96</td>
<td>55 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>POSTOP FOLLOW UP 72210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/96</td>
<td>2000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15 7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>2000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>ULTRASOUND THERAPY (15 N 7242</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/96</td>
<td>2000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>NEUROMUSCULAR RE-EDUCATI 7242</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/96</td>
<td>2000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15 7242</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>2000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE Fee SChedUL</td>
<td>174.00</td>
<td>174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/96</td>
<td>1000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15 7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>1000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE Fee SChedUL</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim # 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/96</td>
<td>4000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>THERAPEUTIC EXERCISE (15 7242</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/96</td>
<td>4000 DO William</td>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE Fee SChedUL</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT

For the period 08/05/96 Thru 08/30/96

ARCH FRACTURE & ORTHO CLINIC
1260 PROVIDENCE DR., SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508
307-631-345

Statement Date: 05/05/99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/17/96 4220</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>OUT OF STATE Fee SCHEDULE</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS-----

$20.00

Claim # 16

10/05/96 1000 DO WILLIAM 97110 THEATRICAL EXERCISE (15 7242) | 45.00 |
11/14/96 1000 WILLIAM PAC COMPLIANCE BY WORKERS' COMP (370-40) | 35.00 |
12/17/96 1000 WILLIAM COMC OUT OF STATE Fee SCHEDULE | 10.00 |

-----TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS-----

$50.00

Claim # 17

10/14/96 55 DO WILLIAM 99024 POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210 | .00 |

-----TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS-----

$0.00

Claim # 18

12/18/96 55 DO WILLIAM 99024 POSTOPERATIVE FOLLOW UP 72210 | .00 |

-----TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS-----

$0.00

Claim # 19

03/26/97 55 DO WILLIAM 99213 ESTABLISHED PATIENT VISI 72210 | 73.00 |
05/19/97 55 WILLIAM PAC GATHERED BY WORKERS' COMP (370-40) | 65.00 |
05/30/97 55 WILLIAM COMC OUT OF STATE Fee SCHEDULE | 8.00 |

-----TOTAL OF CLAIM TRANS-----

$146.00
FISCAL OFFICER
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
1111 THIRD AVENUE-SUITE 650
SEATTLE WA 98101-3211

10/09/1996
CASE #: 140316026
CLAIMANT: BOUNDS, WILLIAM C. JR

ANCHORAGE FRACTURE AND ORTHOPEDIC CLINIC
3260 PROVIDENCE DRIVE SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, AK 99508

PAYER TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 920039918

THE FOLLOWING EXPLANATION IS PROVIDED FOR BENEFITS CLAIMED UNDER THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT:

INVOICE #: 122852100
RECEIVED 10/07/1996
BILL ID: 6206599001
BILL TOTAL: $4,100.00
PROCESSED: 10/09/1996

SERVICE DATES
FROM - TO:
08/27/1996-08/27/1996

PROCEDURE CODE UNITS CHARGE EOB MESSAGES
63030 001 $4,100.00 704
704 BILLED SERVICE(S) NOT RELATED TO THE ACCEPTED CONDITION(S) IN THIS CLAIM.

A COPY OF THIS NOTICE SHOULD BE PLACED ON TOP OF ANY MATERIALS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS NOTICE.

QUESTIONS ON THIS NOTICE OR RESUBMITTED BILLINGS MAY BE SENT WITHIN 30 DAYS TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

IF YOU DISAGREE WITH THE DENIALS IN THIS NOTICE, RESUBMIT A BILL FOR THE UNPAID CHARGES, AND A FULL, DETAILED EXPLANATION AS TO WHY THE BILL SHOULD BE PAID.

PAYMENTS ARE MADE UNDER SEPARATE COVER AND ARE ACCOMPANIED BY AN EXPLANATION.

PAGE 1 OF 1
12023-0099
November 4, 1996

Ms. Lillie Hayden, Claims Representative
Employment Standards Administration
Office of Workers' Compensation Programs
1111 Third Avenue, Suite 650
Seattle, WA. 98101-3211

RE: William
OUR FILE: CA-132512
EMP: FBI
INJ: 4-14-96
YOUR FILE: 14-016826

Dear Sir or Madame:

Mr. [redacted] underwent a laminectomy and disc excision for a herniated intervertebral disc at the L4-L5 level on the level on the left on August 27, 1996. This surgery was necessary because the disc was impinging on the spinal canal and pinching a nerve causing him severe pain, decreased sensation, and loss of ankle reflex as well as muscle weakness of the extensor hallucis longus and extensor digitorum communis on the left foot. Surgery is the most common solution for this problem.

The patient's problem began while packing, wrapping, and lifting boxes at his resident agency in Ft. Smith, Arkansas in preparation for transfer to Anchorage, Alaska.

Sincerely,

Richard D. McEwey, MD
February 25, 1997

WILLIAM C WEIR
EAGLE RIVER, AK 99577

Dear Mr. Weir,

This is a letter to update your accepted condition for your work injury of April 16, 1996, to herniated disc L4-5. Laminectomy and disc excision surgery performed August 27, 1996 is authorized after the fact.

Please see the enclosed Publication CA 11 dated April 1996 for additional information about your injury.

Sincerely,

LILLIE HAYDEN
Claims Examiner

Enclosure(s)
The Trends 100: ALASKA'S LARGEST PRIVATE EMPLOYERS 1997
BY NEAL FRIED AND BRIGITTA WINDISCH

After its explosive growth of the early to mid-1990s, the retail industry apparently is taking a breather. Nevertheless, in 1997, Alaska's retailers still employed nearly 30 percent of all Trends 100 workers, providing the single largest piece of this employment pie.

Retail Employment Dominates Among Trends 100 Group

- Retail 22.2%
- Oil & Gas 13.6%
- Government 13.4%
- Manufacturing 14.4%
- Other, including Food, Freight, Wholesale Trade, and Construction 12.8%
- Services 23.3%
- Finance 4.6%

Inside:
- Alaska's Economy Heats Up
Employment in all of the airlines grew

Alaska Airlines was one of seven airlines that made 1997's list of 100 largest employers. All of the Trends 100 airlines added employment in 1997, as a majority of them also moved up the list. This result is not surprising, given the present dynamics of this industry.

The financial group loses one

For the first time since 1989, financial institutions on the Trends 100 list changed. Key Bank's downsizing dropped it off the list entirely. Two banks and one credit union, National Bank of Alaska, First National Bank of Anchorage and Alaska USA Federal Credit Union, still remain on the list of the state's largest employers.

Trends 100 employers are ubiquitous in Alaska

Even though nearly two-thirds of the Trends 100 employers have their largest work site or headquarters in Anchorage, fewer than 15 operate exclusively in the state's largest city. For example, National Bank of Alaska is headquartered in Anchorage but has branches in 38 other communities around the state. Alaska's largest employers can be found in all regions and sizes of communities. Some of the 12 fish processors, nor either of the two timber firms, is based in Anchorage.

Alaska's Top 10 Employers Including the Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Headquarters or Largest Worksites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>17,339</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State of Alaska</td>
<td>15,791</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anchorage School District</td>
<td>5,548</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Municipality of Anchorage</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Carr Gudetin Foods</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Providence Alaska Medical Center</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fred Meyer</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fairbanks North Star School Dist.</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ARCO Alaska</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis Section.

Top 10 changes when including the public sector

When the public sector is included, the list of the state's largest employers changes dramatically (See Exhibit 11). With this change, only four private sector employers rank in the Top Ten: Carr Gudetin Foods, Providence Alaska Medical Center, Fred Meyer and ARCO Alaska. This result should not be surprising, since 37 percent of the state's workforce is employed in the public sector, and public sector organizations tend to be large. Therefore, the public sector, including the federal government, state government, the university, the Anchorage School District and the Municipality of Anchorage, heads this list. As the public sector's share of the workforce continues to decline, however, private sector employers are becoming a stronger force in Alaska's economy.
Mr. HORN. Let me just question you on one point. I want to make sure I understand on the chart, the write-off. Is that essentially your agency’s write-off on it?

Ms. BALEN. That’s the amount that we have to write off, because you cannot bill Federal worker for the difference in what the USDOL pays and what our charges are. So, yes.

Mr. HORN. That mounts up to quite a bit. Of these particular operations you note here, was there ever any attempt to get the agency to change the fee, particularly based on the cost of living in Alaska, which is probably the highest in the United States, isn’t it?

Ms. BALEN. Pretty close.

Mr. HORN. If not the State of Washington. The two of them usually have been the highest cost of living.

So have they ever adjusted their fees based on concerns from you?

Ms. BALEN. They have never adjusted the fees, to my knowledge. We have tried appealing, and in fact we appeal to commercial insurances periodically using some of the documentation that I have attached in my statement. An appeal to the USDOL is typically a waste of time, though. The only response we get is that’s their fee schedules and that’s it.

Mr. HORN. Well, I thank you. That’s a very helpful document and series.

And we will now move to Mr. John Riordan, first vice president, Council 220, American Federation of Government Employees.

Mr. RIORDAN. Mr. Chairman and members of subcommittee.

Thank you for this opportunity to address the topic of customer service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs by the Department of Labor.

My name is John Riordan. I am first vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, Council 220 which represents approximately 25,000 Social Security employees in field offices throughout the country. I have been employed by the Social Security Administration for over 25 years. And as a union official, I have represented many SSA employees that have been injured on the job and who have applied for workers’ compensation.

I am currently representing four employees. None of these employees are receiving compensation benefits at present, although they applied for benefits many months ago. I encounter difficulties contacting agents because of the voice mail system. You are no longer able to speak with an agent. Instead I have to leave voice recorded messages. When I receive no response, I have to write to them even though I work in the same building, 201 Varick Street, New York City, where they are located.

They imposed a policy restricting visitors to their offices a couple of years ago. I want to recount briefly an incident which occurred on September 16, 1996, when I accompanied a customer who wanted to deliver some documents to the OWCP office at 201 Varick Street. The customer who I accompanied is Dianne McGuinness who testified earlier before the subcommittee.

Ms. Diane McGuinness came to my office and reviewed some of the documents she wanted to submit to OWCP. Ms. McGuinness wanted to deliver her appeal of the denial of the continuation of her workers’ compensation benefits. I was, at that time, president
of AFG Local 3369 which represents Social Security field office employees in New York City, Long Island, and Westchester County. We took the elevator from the 11th floor to the 7th floor where OWCP is located. The door to the office was locked and there was no mail slot.

While searching for a place to deliver the appeal, a man appeared at the end of a long corridor and started shouting. I tried to ignore him, but Ms. McGuinness said to me that he was shouting at us. As the man approached he was still shouting, indeed it was directed toward us.

We attempted to explain to him why we were there, but he didn’t stop talking so he could hear our response. He told us to leave the building immediately. He said we had to have an appointment to be there. I told him that I had called to make an appointment earlier, but no one responded to our calls. Ms. McGuinness and I told him that we were Federal employees. The man responded that he didn’t care whether or not we were Federal employees and that he would call the security guards to remove us if we did not leave.

Ms. McGuinness had made an appointment through the Senator’s office to deliver the appeal, but she was not able to tell the man this because he would not let her talk. The man was visibly upset and disturbed by our presence. Ms. McGuinness asked him if he were Mr. Kenneth Hamlett, the New York Regional Director OWCP, and he said he was. Ms. McGuinness introduced herself to him and Mr. Hamlett replied, “Oh, Ms. McGuinness, we’re going to get you back to work real soon.”

I introduced myself to Mr. Hamlett. I told him that I worked in the building and was not told that the 7th floor was restricted. We asked Mr. Hamlett to accept the appeal and he took it. When Ms. McGuinness asked him to sign a receipt, he did. I was shocked to learn that the man shouting at us was the OWCP Regional Director.

Two days later, September 18, 1996, Mr. Hamlett called me at my office to hold a conference call with Ms. McGuinness. Mr. Hamlett told us that Jonathan Lawrence, District Director, Kevin Kates, senior claims examiner, and another claims examiner were on the call with him. However, only Mr. Hamlett spoke during the conversation. Mr. Hamlett angrily stated that his staff was presently engaged in responding to Congressman Ackerman and others concerning Diane McGuinness. He accused Ms. McGuinness of calling all over the country. He said he had heard from his head office about her calls.

Ms. McGuinness asked him if she could see her file and Mr. Hamlett responded that he would furnish her the part of the file she does not have already via mail. However, Mr. Hamlett said she would not be permitted to visit the office to review her file by going to room 740. Mr. Hamlett said that Ms. McGuinness would be referred to a referee for a decision on her disability. He said he came to his decision without the use of the appeal Ms. McGuinness had presented to him September 16. He said that Ms. McGuinness’ appeal was not right.

Ms. McGuinness asked him about her physical therapy being disallowed, and Mr. Hamlett said he made the decision based on medical evidence. I asked him to continue the physical therapy at least
until OWCP makes a decision on her pending disability and he said no. I did not understand his reasoning to stop the physical therapy prior to the decision of the referee. Even the second opinion doctors had recommended that she be provided with physical therapy for at least 12 weeks.

Mr. Hamlett replied that she was injured too long ago to benefit from physical therapy. It was only effective early in the injury, he contended. I said that his decision was inconsistent with the medical evidence and that the physical therapy should be supported until there is a decision on the disability. Mr. Hamlett said no.

Ms. McGuinness asked if she could participate in the selection process of the referee. Mr. Hamlett said he selected the referee and that Ms. McGuinness can have no participation in the selection process. Ms. McGuinness protested stating that regulations permit her to participate in the selection process. Mr. Hamlett said, no, they don’t.

Mr. Hamlett stated that he had alerted the building management that anyone found on the 7th floor without an appointment with his office would be escorted out of the building.

During the entire conversation, Mr. Hamlett spoke in an angry and loud tone of voice. Ms. McGuinness asked him not to shout. Mr. Hamlett maintained his angry and loud tone throughout our conversation.

Mr. Hamlett concluded the call by stating that he would send Ms. McGuinness her file from June 21, 1996, to the present, that is the part of the file she did not already have.

I also want to make a comment on two other issues that are serious drawbacks in dealing with the OWCP for employees I have represented. The first is that it takes too long to receive payment after filing a claim after having submitted complete and necessary medical evidence.

The earliest case which I have handled as representative was paid in about 3 months. But the norm for the cases I have handled is at least 6 months or even much longer. Employees encounter severe hardship waiting to be placed in payment status. Often there are delays because the wrong forms or obsolete forms were completed or because employees were not given the correct forms in the first place by their agency.

For example, I have had many problems with the Social Security Administration personnel office who take an inordinate amount of time to process and to send the employee’s workers’ compensation claim to OWCP.

The second issue which I mentioned earlier is the inability to reach anyone at OWCP. The voice mail system is frustrating and often does not work. More often than not there is no call back after leaving a message. There is insufficient staff to process the workload, and employees seem to have become numb by the backlog of cases they are not able to get to.

I strongly recommend that you support funding the agency for more personnel to improve customer service and to clear the backlog of cases.

I just want to mention the status of three cases that I am currently handling. Case A is an employee with carpal tunnel syndrome injury. He filed a claim for his injury, and it was approved.
He later returned to work and asked for some accommodation so that he could perform the job without incurring injury.

Social Security Administration denied him the requested accommodation. He had to stop working again due to the pain of the carpal tunnel and tendonitis injuries. He filed for compensation November 17, 1998. He has submitted all required medical evidence, but he is still awaiting approval of his claim and payment.

Case B is an employee who had stress-related injury, and she left work in September 1997. She returned to work in June 1998 and continues to work on the job. Her claim was approved by OWCP, but she still is awaiting payment for that period.

Case C is an employee who was receiving compensation for an injury she received in a fall while working. OWCP pressured her to return to work 1 day a week. She did so, but, due to pain, was unable to show up for the 1-day a week on most occasions. She again filed for full compensation and OWCP not only denied that, they decided to deny her entire compensation. Because the employee could not return to work, she filed for disability retirement under Office of Personnel Management.

I represented her before the Merit Systems Protection Board and it was settled with her claim approved. We appealed her denial to workers' compensation and was recently reversed on appeal and awarded retroactively. This award covers the part-time claim, not the full-time claim she filed. She is still awaiting a payment. She continues to receive disability retirement benefits while awaiting workers' compensation.

Mr. Horn. That's very helpful and we're going to pursue some of the questions you've raised with the administration when they testify. Thank you for bringing those points out.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Riordan follows:]
Statement of John Riordan
before the
Committee on Government Reform’s
Subcommittee on Government Management,
Information and Technology

May 18, 1999

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to address the topic of Customer Service at the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs by the Department of Labor.

My name is John Riordan. I am First Vice President of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, Council 220 which represents approximately 25,000 Social Security Administration employees in field offices throughout the country. I have been employed by the Social Security Administration for over 25 years and as a union representative, I have represented many SSA employees who have been injured on the job and who have applied for workers' compensation. I am currently representing four employees. None of these employees are receiving compensation benefits at present although they applied for benefits many months ago. I encounter difficulties contacting agents because of the voice mail system. You are no longer able to speak with an agent. Instead, I have to leave voice recorded messages. When I receive no response, I have to write to them even though I work in the same building (201 Varick St., New York City) where they are located. They imposed a strict policy restricting visitors to their offices a couple of years ago. I want to recount briefly an incident which occurred on Sept. 16, 1998 when I accompanied a customer who wanted to deliver some documents to OWCP office at 201 Varick St. The customer who I accompanied is Dianne McGuinness who testified earlier before the Subcommittee.

Ms. Dianne McGuinness came to my office and we reviewed some of the documents she wanted to submit to OWCP. Ms. McGuinness wanted to deliver her appeal of the denial of the continuation of her Workers' Compensation. I was at that time President of AFGE Local 3369 which represents SSA FO employees in New York City, Long Island and Westchester County. We took the elevator from the 11th Floor to the 7th Floor where OWCP is located. The door to the office was locked and there was no mail slot. While searching for a place to
deliver the appeal, a man appeared at the end of the long corridor and started shouting. I tried to ignore him but Ms. McGuinness said to me that he was shouting at us. As the man approached he was still shouting and indeed it was directed towards us. We attempted to explain to him why we were there but he didn't stop talking to us so he could hear our response. He told us to leave the building immediately. He said we had to have an appointment to be there. I told him that I had called to make an appointment earlier but no one responded to our calls. Ms. McGuinness and I told him that we were federal employees. The man responded that he didn't care whether or not we were federal employees and that he would call the security guards to remove us if we did not leave. Ms. McGuinness had made an appointment through the Senator's office to deliver the appeal, but she was not allowed to tell the man this because he would not let her talk. The man was visibly upset and disturbed by our presence. Ms. McGuinness asked him if he was Mr. Kenneth Hamlett (the NY Regional Director OWCP) and he said he was. Ms. McGuinness introduced herself to him and Mr. Hamlett replied, "Oh, Ms. McGuinness, we're going to get you back to work real soon." I introduced myself to Mr. Hamlett. I told him that I worked in the building and was not told that the 7th Floor was restricted. We asked Mr. Hamlett to accept the appeal and he took it. But Ms. McGuinness asked him to sign a receipt. He did. I was shocked to learn that the man shouting at us was the OWCP Regional Director.

Two days later, Sept. 18, 1998, Mr. Hamlett called me in my office to hold a conference call with Ms. McGuinness. Mr. Hamlett told us that Jonathan Lawrence, District Director, and Kevin Kates, Senior Claims Examiner and another claims examiner were on the call with him. However, only Mr. Hamlett spoke during the conversation. Mr. Hamlett angrily stated that his staff was presently engaged in responding to Congressman Ackerman and others concerning Diane McGuinness. He accused Ms. McGuinness of calling all over the country. Mr. Hamlett said he had heard from his head office about her calls. Ms. McGuinness asked him if she could see her file and Mr. Hamlett responded that he would furnish her the part of the file she does not already have via mail. However, Mr. Hamlett said she would not be permitted to visit the office to review her file by going to Room 740. Mr. Hamlett said that Ms. McGuinness would be referred to a referee for a decision on her disability. He said he made his decision without the use of the appeal Ms McGuinness had presented to him Sept. 16. He said that Ms McGuinness's appeal was not ripe.

Ms McGuinness asked him about her physical therapy being disallowed and Mr. Hamlett said he made the decision based on medical evidence. I asked him to
continue the physical therapy at least until OWCP makes a decision on her pending disability and he said no. I did not understand his reasoning to stop the physical therapy prior to the decision of the referee. Even the second-opinion doctors had recommended that she be provided with physical therapy for at least 12 weeks. Mr. Hamlett replied that she was injured too long ago to benefit from physical therapy. It was only effective early in the injury, he contended. I said that his decision was inconsistent with the medical evidence and that physical therapy should be supported until there is a decision on the disability. Mr. Hamlett said no.

Ms McGuinness asked if she could participate in the selection process of the referee. Mr. Hamlett said that he selected the referee and that Ms McGuinness can have no participation in the selection process. Ms McGuinness protested stating that regulations permit her to participate in the selection process. Mr. Hamlett said no they don't. Mr. Hamlett stated that he had alerted the building management that anyone found on the 7th floor without an appointment with his office would be escorted out of the building.

During the entire conversation, Mr. Hamlett spoke in an angry and loud tone of voice. Ms. McGuinness asked him not to shout. Mr. Hamlett maintained his angry and loud tone throughout our conversation. Mr. Hamlett concluded the call by stating that he would send Ms McGuinness her file from June 21, 1996 to the present, i.e., the part of the file she did not already have.

I also want to comment on two other issues that are serious drawbacks in dealing with OWCP for employees I have represented. The first is that it takes too long to receive payment after filing a claim after having submitted complete and necessary medical evidence. The earliest case which I have handled as representative was paid in about three months. But the norm for the most cases I have handled is at least six months or even much longer. Employees encounter severe hardship waiting to be placed in payment status.

Often there are delays because the wrong forms or obsolete forms were completed or because employees were not given the correct forms in the first place by their agency. For example, I have had many problems with the SSA personnel office who take an inordinate amount of time to process and to send the employee's workers' compensation claim to OWCP. The second issue, which I mentioned earlier, is the inability to reach anyone at OWCP. The voice mail system is frustrating and often does not work right. More often than not, there is no call back after leaving a message. There is insufficient staff to process the
workload and employees seem to have become numb by the backlog of cases they are not able to get to. I strongly recommend that you support funding the agency for more personnel to improve customer service and to clear the backlog of cases.

Status of three of the cases I am currently handling.

Case A is an employee with a carpal tunnel syndrome injury. He filed a claim for his injury and it was approved. He later returned to work and asked for some accommodations so he could perform the job without incurring injury. SSA denied him the requested accommodation. He had to stop working again due to the pain of his carpal tunnel and tendonitis injuries. He filed for compensation 11/17/98. He has submitted all required medical evidence, but he is still awaiting approval of his claim and payment.

Case B is an employee who had a stress-related injury and she left work in Sept. '97. She returned to work June '98 and continues to work on the job. Her claim was approved by OWCP, but she is still waiting for payment.

Case C is an employee who was receiving compensation for an injury she received in a fall while working. OWCP pressured her to return to work one day a week. She did so but due to pain was unable to show up for the one day a week on most occasions. She again filed for full compensation and OWCP not only denied that, they decided to deny her entire compensation. Because the employee could not return to work, she filed for disability retirement under OPM. I represented her before the MSPB and it was settled with her claim approved. We appealed her denial of Worker's Compensation, and it was recently reversed on appeal and awarded retroactively. This award covers the part-time claim not the full-time claim she filed. She is awaiting payment. She continues to receive disability retirement benefits while awaiting Worker's Compensation.
Mr. Horn. James Linehan is an attorney. And please identify where. And proceed with your testimony.

Mr. Linehan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to be here. My name is James Linehan, Jim Linehan out of Oklahoma City area. I am an attorney, solo practitioner. I represent disabled claimants before FECA, OWCP, Merit Systems Protection Board, Social Security Administration, and Federal courts.

Basically I have submitted a statement. The statement is out there. I'm not going to read through it, but I will break it down for you. I find it rather incredible that in this current city I have never been here before but I understand this to be a city of attorneys. There is 1 1/2 million attorneys in the United States, I know of three or four, including myself, who will be willing to take on these claims, these OWCP claims. I find it incredible that out of all of this city you have to find an attorney in Oklahoma to come up and speak on these claims. I think that speaks loudly for itself.

I also find it not unusual with the testimony that's just been entered about the medical treatment status. Presently in Oklahoma, I know of only one to three neurosurgeons, orthopedic surgeons, et cetera, who will treat or take on Federal workers' compensation cases. That's a couple of weeks ago. I do not think they will take them on anymore.

That leaves no physicians I know of in the State of Oklahoma who will take on these claims. I know of no attorney in the State of Oklahoma beside myself who will represent these claims. The reason why, other than these are bureaucratic nightmares, I have broken down further. There's two general issues. In my opinion, the main issue is nonaccountability. The OWCP, in my opinion, is a self-regulating, self-governing agency that answers by law to no court of law. It has, thus, no incentive to answer to anyone. It has no incentive to handle these cases in the claimant's best interest. I have broken this down in the statement, but in general the nonaccountability of Fed Comp OWCP is what leads to no attorney representation. Essentially there's nothing for an attorney to do. And how do I handle claims? Basically—and attorneys tell me never to tell this, but I tell it all the time any way—people pay me money to tell a government bureaucrat to do what they're supposed to do in the first place. That's what it boils down to.

As a result of nonaccountability, there's a distinct lack of medical treatment. In my opinion, as a result of this nonaccountability and its effect on medical treatment there's millions upon millions of dollars being diverted from OWCP to private sector insurers to cover them.

How does this work? In a typical back case that I see, $150,000 is spent for operative physical therapy because of the bureaucratic nightmare the claimants and doctors have to go through. They have to wait months on end to get medical treatment authorized, yet the claimant needs the surgery now. Their doctor says they cannot wait months. The claimant and I need something. There is no response from OWCP.

Very easy. The claimant and doctor turn it over to private insurance. Private insurance carries it. They never know it's Fed Comp. I see this 20, 30, 40, 50 times a year. Multiply it out, $100,000 per claim, it's very easy math. This is in Oklahoma alone.
I get calls from Hawaii to New York to Florida to Alaska to handle these claims. I see this constantly. Can I prove how much money is being diverted? No. You would have to go to the medical establishment. I just say this is what I see.

The nonaccountability of the OWCP basically results from the fact that it answers to no court of law. What does this mean? This means the OWCP—and I'm always referring to OWCP—can knowingly and freely act in any manner it wants to with the claimants. This is what you're hearing testimony before about. This is what you're hearing testimony today about. There is no incentive for the OWCP to respond to a claimant. There is nothing the claimant can do in response. The OWCP can act as it wants.

In the typical OWCP claim, the claimant is under guidelines to respond, submit forms this, forms that, within 30 days, 10 days here, et cetera, if you don't, Mr. Claimant, your job will be terminated. You will lose benefits, et cetera.

These are real life happenings. They lose benefits, they lose their home, they lose their car, they can't feed kids. In return, the OWCP is under absolutely no guidelines whatsoever to respond in any timely manner. The claimant has to respond. The OWCP never has to respond. That's why you see comment after comment, no return phone calls, no response to filings, et cetera.

The other thing in addition to nonaccountability I have outlined is unilateral control. As a result of unilateral control that the OWCP has over these claims, I gave two examples. One is the attending physician rule. Federal courts across this country, the Social Security Administration, et cetera, all recognize the attending physician rule. Basically, what this means is that the claimant's qualified medical attending physician prevails over the reports of a hired, paid consultant of the agency. Speaks common sense. The qualified medical practitioner for the claimant knows him, has treated him for years, et cetera.

The agency is a paid doctor, may not ever examine the claimant, may only look briefly at reports, if at all, or may examine the claimant, from what I see and as testimony this morning reflected, 5 to 10 minutes. That's normal.

In OWCP land, the attending physician rule is the exact opposite. If there's a contest between medical reports, the paid non-examining, barely examining report of the OWCP doctor prevails over the attending physician. Thus another incentive for medical practitioners not to take these claims. They can't get treatment authorized. They are subversive to whoever OWCP can shop around and find, $250 to pay for a report to say what they want. This is how it works in real life. I see this daily.

The other example of unilateral control that I see—and this is a killer clause I call it, Section 8128(a)(1) of the OWCP. This is a simple clause and it's a quite deadly clause for Federal employees. This basically means that the Secretary of Labor—under this clause if a Federal employee can succeed in gaining benefits on his or her claim, can gain a scheduled award, whatever she or he gets, under Section 8128 the killer clause, the Secretary of Labor or his or her designee, anybody down the road, down to the claims examiner level, can on own motion, without notice, without hearing,
anything, simply take the award, take the benefits back, demand repayment. There is no time limit on this. There is—it's—I just simply call it the killer clause.

If a claimant is successful, if they didn't tick the OWCP off enough, they may get to keep their claim. However, in they're successful, and they tick the OWCP off, and 8128 can come back in and say simply hand the money back. That's it. There is no right of review.

As a result of this what I see daily in these claims, I have one recommendation that will solve a lot of problems. These are not second-class citizens. This Congress looked at VA claims back in 1998. It was the same setup. VA acted unilaterally without control over veterans benefits for years. Couldn't get attorney representation. I think the old law was $25 for an attorney.

In 1988, this Congress came in and said enough of this. Veterans needs to be recognized as full citizens with full rights. They created the Court of Veterans Appeals. Veterans now get the right to have Federal court review their claims. They have attorneys now.

The lower administration, the Veterans Administration can no longer deny claims randomly, can no longer deny due process. They have to give hearings. They have to provide reports in a timely manner. They have to act according to Federal court rules.

This is what needs to be done for the OWCP. These people are not second-class citizens. They need the right, they deserve the right to have Federal court review.

Whether or not they should have their own Federal court, I leave this up to Congress. I know you're going to get into the budget, et cetera, I'm not concerned with that. My concern is only that somehow there be Federal court review. We could use the present system.

You don't need the ECAB system anymore. If you're saving money, take it away. It's a useless appeal. It goes nowhere. They can have their administrative hearing at the lower level, file the claim, the administrative hearing, much as in Social Security, if it's denied there, file a claim in Federal court. It's very simple.

If the Federal court then sees that the OWCP is not following due process rules regarding notice, production of documents, everything else you hear constantly in these claims, it's very simple: Sanctions. A Federal court will start stomping on the toes that need to be stomped on. That's what it boils down to. Until then, in my frank opinion, nothing will change. This will go on. That is my recommendation.

I'm open for questions at any time.

Mr. Horn. I never thought I would hear a lawyer's statement that I agreed with, so I'm glad you came, because you're the exception to my rule. I mean, that's a brilliant statement and I really appreciate it.

Mr. Linehan. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Linehan follows:]
June 1, 1999

Honorable Stephen Horn, Chairman
Subcommittee on Government Management,
Information, and Technology
Rayburn House Office Building, Room B-373
Washington D.C. 20515-6143

RE: OVERSIGHT OF CUSTOMER SERVICE AT THE OWCP

Honorable Chairman:

Pursuant to your invitation of May 5th, 1999, the following statement is respectfully submitted as a synopsis of expected testimony to be presented via appearance of the undersigned witness. Said voluntary appearance has been requested before this Subcommittee on Tuesday, May 18th, 1999 at 10:00 a.m.

GENERAL

A. Expected Purpose

The expected purpose of this Subcommittee hearing is to gather information on the processes, methods, and workings of the United States Department of Labor Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (“OWCP”). The response of the OWCP to claims by federal civilian employees or their survivors who are or have been injured, disabled, or killed on the job in and out of the course of their federal employment will be the specific subject of inquiry. In addition to federal employee testimony, additional testimony is expected from “professionals”: e.g. medical and legal personnel who are involved in the claims processes of OWCP on behalf of federal civilian employees.

B. The OWCP

Federal employees who are injured, disabled, or killed on the job as a federal employee are required to apply to the OWCP in the Department of Labor for workers’ compensation benefits. Statutory authority is contained in Title 5 U.S.C. §8101 et. seq. The OWCP is a self-governed, self-regulating, exclusive rights agency. The unilateral responses and actions of the OWCP in claims decisions are final and conclusive for all purposes with respect to all questions of law and fact and are not subject to review by another official of the United States or by a court by mandamus or otherwise. 5 U.S.C. §8129(b).

Thus for all practical effect and purpose, for those federal civilian employees injured, disabled or killed on the job, their exclusive remedy for relief is to resort to the OWCP system with no right of appeal to any court of law in the United States.

C. The Claimants

There are, to the undersigned’s estimation, between 2.5 and 3 million federal civilian employees in
the United States, Federal employees covered under the OWCP include a range of employees such as postal workers, Peace Corps and Volunteers of America workers, student-employees. Generally, any officer or employee of any branch of the government or any individual rendering personal service to the United States falls within the parameters of OWCP. 5 U.S.C. §8101 et seq.

D. Legal Representation

There are, to the undersigned's current estimation, more than 1 million practicing attorneys in the United States. Presently, the undersigned knows of only three (3) to four (4) other attorneys in the entire United States willing to represent federal civilian employees in OWCP claims. The undersigned knows of no (0) other attorneys in his State of Oklahoma who will represent federal civilian employees in these claims.

E. Medical Treatment

Presently, the undersigned knows of only one (1) to three (3) qualified medical physicians in the State of Oklahoma who are willing to medical treat federal civilian employees who are proceeding with a federal workers' compensation claim under the OWCP. The undersigned is not aware of the status of medical treatment availability for the remainder of the United States. However, based on weekly telephone calls received from federal civilian employees across the United States, the rarity or non-existence of medical providers for injured federal employees is common.

SPECIFIC PROBLEM AREAS

A. Nonaccountability

If there can be described one overall riding concern common to the OWCP claims handling process, the concern would be the gross total nonaccountability of the OWCP to any overseer. As noted above, the OWCP is essentially, and for all practical purposes a self-governing, self-regulating federal agency that answers to no court of law. This nonaccountability of a federal agency leads to an obvious and common sense concept: a federal agency that is not required to answer or account for its actions need not concern itself with its actions (or lack of action).

Specifically and most practically, why should the OWCP concern itself with its responses and decisions on federal workers' compensation claims? There is nothing "legally" that the injured federal employee can do in response to the OWCP. There is no incentive, legally or economically, for the OWCP to act in the "best interest" of the federal employee. In reality, quite the opposite occurs. The OWCP can freely act to delay, stall or deny claims as desired. A federal employee meeting such delays in the face of mounting bills will grow increasingly frustrated with the OWCP claims process. The federal employee will either forego further action on her claim or will drop or refuse to file her claim. Thus, it is in the "best interest" of the OWCP to delay, stall or deny claims as such non-action saves the OWCP from claims payments. The OWCP will not have to pay out compensation benefits to a now thoroughly devastated federal employee. Additionally, the never filed injury claim allows the federal employee to claim that the federal employee's workplace injury rate is artificially lower since fewer claims are filed. Both the OWCP and federal employer gain whereas the employee and her family continually lose.

Effects of Nonaccountability of OWCP on the Medical Treatment of Federal Workers

The effect of nonaccountability of the OWCP in its claims handling and decisions directly leads to the rapidly growing refusal of qualified medical practitioners across the United States to medically treat injured or diseased federal civilian employees. The nonaccountability of the OWCP, also leads to the diversion of due payment of millions of dollars per year in compensation benefits to the private sector.
Annually, millions of dollars of benefits actually due as federal compensation are, in the underinsurer's opinion, being wrongfully diverted to private insurers for payment in return of OWCP's nonaccountability. For example: an on the job back injury resulting in a herniated disc followed by surgery and physical therapy will average more than $150,000.00 in immediate medical costs. These medical costs are due and payable by the OWCP. However, with nonaccountability, the OWCP can simply, and knowingly, stall and delay authorization of medical treatment on the workers compensation claim for months on end. (The OWCP is under no statutory guideline or regulation requiring its timely response - or any response for that matter - to any federal employee's workers' compensation claim. The OWCP mandates that it must pre-approve and authorize medical treatment, however, the OWCP is under no timeline requiring it to issue such approval and authorization for medical treatment.) The injured federal worker who needs immediate medical treatment must first find a physician who will treat her. The physician is highly reluctant to even accept the case as the physician is well aware that she may not be paid for months, or years, if at all, by the OWCP. But, needing medical treatment, and needing to be paid for medical services, both the employee and the physician avoid OWCP and its indeterminable delays. The federal employee and her physician simply file her claim and medical bills with the employee's private insurer. The private insurer, in turn, unknowingly pays for medical services that are in reality the total responsibility of OWCP. Thus, with nonaccountability, the OWCP has every incentive not to act in the best interest of the injured employee. By not taking action through nonaccountability the OWCP can, and does, divert millions of dollars per year onto the backs (literally) of the private sector. In turn, the OWCP and federal employer can claim artificially reduced injury rates, reduced compensation claims paid, etc. In reality, the private insurers and American citizens are bearing the increased burden of nonaccountability: private insurance premium rates continue to rise to cover the nonaction of the OWCP.

Nonaccountability of the OWCP also leads directly to increasing refusals of federal employees to either initially file their claim or to later prematurely drop their workers' compensation claims. It is in the best interest of the OWCP not to take action on the employee's claim. By not acting on a claim, OWCP avoids payment of compensation benefits to the employee if the employee never files or when the employee subsequently drops his claim. No claim means no payment. A very simple means of denial of benefits payments by OWCP.

Nonaccountability of the OWCP also leads directly to increasing refusals of medical practitioners to treat injured or disabled federal employees. It is in the best interest of the OWCP not to authorize medical treatment. By not acting on a request for medical treatment authorization, OWCP avoids payment of medical treatment costs to the physician and the physician subsequently bills the private insurer. No authorization means no payment. Again, a very simple means of denial of benefits payments by OWCP.

Effects of Nonaccountability on Legal Representation of Federal Workers

As stated above, there are less than a handful of practicing attorneys across the United States who will represent federal civilian employees in their workers' compensation claims. The reason for this rarity of legal representation is quite simple: the express nonaccountability of the OWCP, its actions or nonactions, to any court review provides no legal peg on which an attorney can hang his hat in support of the federal employee. No review means no payment. Again, a very simple means of denial of benefits payments by OWCP.

With no accountability to any court of law, the OWCP knowingly is free to act in any manner it so desires toward an injured federal civilian employee. The OWCP knowingly is free to refuse to respond to claimant's telephone calls; to knowingly refuse to acknowledge receipt of correspondence, medical records, etc. from the claimant or his physician; to knowingly delay or knowingly and wrongly deny due compensation benefits to the claimant; to knowingly refuse to provide OWCP file records upon request to the claimant; etc.
The OWCP's express nonaccountability to any court of law for its actions and nonactions on a federal workers' compensation claim leads to a most common sense observation. The OWCP is free to do what it wants, when it wants, how it wants, and why it wants on any federal workers' compensation claim. Frankly, the undersigned knows of no other better example of the "fox left guarding the henhouse."

B. Unilateral Control

As can be seen, allowed nonaccountability, the OWCP can, and does, assert full and final unilateral control over the claimant and all issues involving a claim for workers’ compensation benefits. 5 U.S.C. §8128(b). This issue of unilateral control can be readily illustrated by the following two examples.

The Attending Physician Rule

Under most circumstances in courts of law or otherwise, the attending physician rule prevails. This rule is quite simple. In a contest between the injured claimant's qualified attending medical physician and an agency's non-attending consultative examiner regarding medical treatment, the qualified medical recommendations and reports of the attending physician prevail and take precedence over the paid consultant. The United States Federal Court of Appeals and the United States Social Security Administration recognize that "The "Attending Physician Rule" was developed because such an opinion " reflects an expert judgment based on a continuing observation of the patient's condition over a prolonged period of time." * Fesser v. Miskel, 783 F.2d 1125, 1130 (4th Cir.1986) (quoting > Mitchell v. Schweiker, 699 F.2d 183, 187 (4th Cir.1983)).

The exact opposite holds true in OWCP claims. 5 U.S.C. §8123 states that when there is a conflict in medical evidence of equal weight, the opinion of the hired medical consultant of the OWCP prevails over that of the claimant's attending physician. The detailed medical treatment report of a federal employee's attending physician are considered less qualified than the medical report of a non-examining physician retained and paid by OWCP. This occurs despite the fact that the employee's attending physician's expert judgment reflects the continuing observation of the patient's condition over a prolonged period of time. With total unilateral control by the OWCP over the medical treatment of the federal employee, it is in the best interest of OWCP agg to recognize the attending physician rule. The OWCP, with unilateral control over its choice of the prevailing medical report needs only to "shop around" for a paid consultant to state any medical diagnosis the OWCP so desires. With such unilateral control over the claimant's own attending physician, the OWCP has no incentive to act in the best interest of the federal employee.

Section 8128(a)(1)

This section of OWCP regulations is quite simple and quite deadly for federal employees. This small and often unnoticed clause permits the Secretary of Labor (or any designee) to review for any reason—at any time—any claim—for federal workers' compensation.

Section 8128 allows the OWCP to unilaterally end, decrease or increase any award of compensation benefits paid to the claimant.

No pre-notice of such loss of compensation is required to be given to the claimant.

No due process hearing on such loss of compensation is required to be given to the claimant.

Subsequently, as explained above, Section 8128(b) then states that such a unilateral review of an award and its results is not reviewable in any court of law and is final.
In quite simple terms, this clause is the trump card of all cards for OWCP. In the event a claimant should ever prevail on her federal workers’ compensation claim, the award given can always be taken back by OWCP. Regardless of when the claimant was awarded benefits (there is no time limiting review by the OWCP), regardless of the appropriateness of the claimant’s award; regardless of the claimant’s the OWCP can and will at any time, now or in the distant future, on its own motion, without any right of review, and to decrease the claimant’s compensation benefit.

Without any prejudice and without any right of hearing, a federal employee’s previously awarded compensation benefits can be taken back by OWCP and demand for reimbursement made upon the employee at any time by the OWCP.

The Sword of Damocles never hung so precariously over a head as does Section 8128(a)(1) hung over the head of an injured or diseased federal employee and her family. Should she fight so hard to eventually win her due benefits, and thus be finally able to feed and house her family again, at any time—now or in the distant future—without warning and with no chance to avoid, the sword of Section 8128(a)(1) can and will slash down with a fury upon the federal employee and her family.

Section 8128(a)(1) is a prime example of unilateral regulatory control risen to an ultimate and final extreme without regard to its effect on federal employees.

RECOMMENDATION

The present federal workers’ compensation under OWCP is a federal system without accountability to any court of law; a federal system that costs the private insurance sector millions of dollars annually; and a federal system of unilateral control with no incentive to assure that the effects of its actions are in the best interest of the federal employee. The OWCP is essentially a federal agency that has and continues to answer to no one.

The Veterans’ Administration was a similarly situated federal system. For decades the VA remained unaccountable for its actions and was the cause of veterans seeking disability compensation for their service connected injuries. For decades, veterans were left without legal representation in their claims for disability. In 1988, this Congress recognized that after decades of nonaccountability of the VA to veterans and after years of virtual unilateral control by the VA over veterans disability claims, veterans’ law and regulations needed a vast but simple and effective overhaul. This Congress properly decided that the laws for veteran’s seeking compensation for their service connected disability claims should be changed to serve the best interest of the veterans rather than the best interest of the VA. In 1988, this Congress enacted legislation creating a federal court system of review for veteran’s disability claims. VA disability claims, after VA administrative review, were made subject to federal court appellate review. The VA now affords veterans due process in the processing of their claims. Veterans are permitted to seek and retain legal representation with fees for same to be reimbursed by the VA should the veteran be the prevailing party on her claim. Veterans can rest assured that if their claims are wrongly decided at the administrative level, they will be at least granted right of federal court review. Faced with such federal court review, the VA must necessarily act promptly and in the best interest of the veteran in the handling and processing of veterans’ disability claims.

The undersigned recommends that this Congress also act in the best interest of the thousands of injured, diseased or killed federal employees seeking federal workers’ compensation for themselves and their families. The undersigned recommends that the most simple and effective means of insuring that the OWCP acts in the best interest of the federal employee (rather than the OWCP) is to allow the federal employee a basic right of federal court review of her federal workers’ compensation claim. With the prospect of federal court review overweighing its actions (or nonaction), the OWCP will have every incentive to act in the best interest of the injured federal employee rather than the best interest of OWCP. Federal court review of OWCP claims will require that the OWCP respond in a prompt timely
manner to federal employee’s request for information and action on their claim. Federal court review will insure that the OWCP responds in a prompt timely manner to federal employee’s and their physicians request for authorization of necessary medical treatment. Federal court review will insure that medical costs being presently diverted to private insurers for payment are correctly processed and accounted for by OWCP in a timely manner thus assuring the federal employee of the availability of medical treatment. Federal court review of OWCP claims will also assure that claimant that in case of appeal she will have greater opportunity to be represented by legal counsel.

In summary, by simply allowing federal civilian employees to appeal their OWCP claims to a federal court of review; the above noted problems of nonaccountability and unilateral control of the OWCP disappear. Without such court oversight, federal employees seeking compensation for their on the job injuries remain subject to the whims and will of an essentially nonregulated agency.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James R. Linheau, P.C.
Attorney at Law
Mr. HORN. Our last one on this panel is Tina Maggio, and she is the field representative for a respected Member of this body, Representative Michael F. Doyle.

Ms. MAGGIO. Thank you Chairman Horn—Horn. Sorry. I’m nervous. Thank you, Chairman Horn for allowing me this opportunity.

I have been working for Representative Mike Doyle’s district office as field representative for 3 years. As part of my responsibilities, I assist constituents with problems with OWCP as well as the Social Security Administration, the U.S. Postal Service, Medicare, and the Office of Personnel Management.

For OWCP cases, a majority of my contact is with the Philadelphia District Office. In looking over the history of my case work, I have handled approximately 30 to 35 cases.

Since each individual case is different and varies in complexity, I do not believe it would be fair for me to make a generalized statement regarding the responsiveness of OWCP to congressional calls or correspondence.

Therefore, I would like to discuss my constituent casework in which I deal with the Philadelphia District Office. In my written statement, I outline three case examples in detail which provide a broader understanding of my correspondence with the OWCP.

The first example is—I first spoke with this individual on March 8, 1999. He has an approved medical claim through OWCP and has been waiting for a prescription reimbursement since May 1998. He was referred to seek assistance from Representative Doyle by his injury compensation specialist at the Postal Service because neither she, the drugstore, nor this constituent could get a response from the claims examiner.

The constituent told me that he was reducing the amount of his medication because he could no longer afford to pay for the prescription without getting reimbursed. On March 8, 10, and 16, I contacted the Philadelphia District Office and left a message for his claims examiner. On March 17, I faxed a letter to the District Director’s office regarding this matter. On March 25, I called the Philadelphia District Office and spoke with the assistant in the District Director’s office. I told her that I had left numerous messages for the claims examiner to call me back, but I had not yet heard from him. She told me that all congressional calls are supposed to be answered within 1 day.

This was 3 weeks from when I had initially contacted OWCP.

The next case I would like to discuss is outlined in my written statement pertaining to the determination of benefits.
I would like to submit the following pertinent documentation for
the record: First, a letter that the individual received from the Dis-
trict Director dated October 29, 1998, in which the District Director
states that all phone and written inquiries received from Congress-
man Doyle’s office are promptly answered.
[The information referred to follows:]
October 29, 1998

Charles T. Blystone
1101 Preston Drive
N. Versailles, PA 15137

Dear Mr. Blystone:

I am writing in response to your letter dated October 14, 1998 to Mr. T. Michael Kerr, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Washington, D.C. You had contacted Mr. Kerr for assistance with Case #A6-599895. He has referred your correspondence to my attention for reply.

As you've mentioned, you've requested a hearing by the Branch of Hearings and Review on the denial decision rendered in Case A6-599895. Your case file was transferred by the Philadelphia District Office to the Branch of Hearings and Review on October 8, 1998. That appellate body now has temporary jurisdiction over this case until a decision is rendered by the Hearing Representative.

In your October 14, 1998 letter, you cite the non-responsiveness of the Philadelphia District Office to Congressman Doyle's phone calls and letters regarding your case. Records indicate that the following responses were, in fact, made to Congressman Doyle's inquiries:

Phone calls

June 24, 1998, Phone contact between Supervisory Claims Examiner, Ann Bazik, and Congressional Aide, Tina Maggio

June 26, 1998, Phone contact between Supervisory Claims Examiner, Ann Bazik, and Congressional Aide, Tina Maggio

August 3, 1998, Phone contact between Senior Claims Examiner, Toby Rubenstein, and Congressional Aide, Tina Maggio
October 1, 1998, Phone contact between District Director, William Staarman, and Congressional Aide, Tina Maggio

Written Responses

August 19, 1998, Written reply to Congressman Doyle’s Office by District Director, William Staarman

September 24, 1998, Written reply to Congressman Doyle’s Office by District Director, William Staarman

I can assure you that ALL phone and written inquiries received from Congressman Doyle’s Office have been promptly answered by the Philadelphia District Office. Note, too, that the September 10, 1998 inquiry from Congressman Doyle’s Office, which you included with your October 14, 1998 letter to Mr. Kerr, was responded to by the Philadelphia District Office on September 24, 1998.

In addition to keeping Congressman Doyle’s Office fully apprised as to the status of your case, the Philadelphia District Office also responded to your own phone and written inquiries, as follows:

Phonecalls

June 15, 1998, Phone contact between Claims Examiner, Claudia Harris, and yourself

June 23, 1998, Phone contact between Supervisor Claims Examiner, Ann Bazik, and yourself

September 22, 1998, Phone contact between Supervisor Claims Examiner, Ann Bazik, and yourself

Written Responses

July 22, 1998, Written reply to your inquiry by the Regional Director, R. David Lotz

Attached to your letter to Mr. Kerr was a copy of a letter, dated October 13, 1998, from you to R. David Lotz, Regional Director, in Phila., PA. Please note, as mentioned above, that Case #86-50989 was physically transferred to the Branch of Hearings and Review in Washington, D.C. on October 8, 1998. That appellate body has now assumed temporary jurisdiction over your case. Therefore, at this point in time, you should address any inquiries regarding Case #86-50989 to the Branch of Hearings and Review in Washington, D.C., where your case is now located, rather than to the Phila. District Office. Any mail which the Phila. District Office has received on your case since its transfer would have been forwarded to the Branch of Hearings and Review.
It’s clear from your October 14, 1998 letter to Mr. Kerr that you disagree with the Philadelphia District Office’s unfavorable decision rendered on Case #A6-509895. You have chosen to pursue the matter by requesting a hearing. Any additional factual and/or medical evidence which you may have to support your claim should be addressed to the Branch of Hearings and Review. I can assure you that any such additional evidence submitted will be fully reviewed and considered by the Hearing Representative. This would include any arguments that you may have regarding your claim.

Let me take this opportunity to update you regarding the current status of Case #A3-226839, a case which the Philadelphia District Office is currently handling. An appointment has been scheduled for you to be examined by the Board-Certified Industrial Specialist, Dr. Laing, on November 16, 1998. The purpose of this refree exam is to resolve the conflict in medical opinion within the case file as to the possible connection between your current right knee problems and the April 21, 1997 work injury. Any decision regarding halogen shoe and surgery must await the District Office’s receipt and review of Dr. Laing’s report following his exam. (These were issues which you’d raised in your October 13, 1998 letter to Mr. Lutz, attached to your letter to Mr. Kerr.)

To summarize, the Philadelphia District Office has been fully responsive to inquiries from both you and Congressman Doyle’s Office. Any additional evidence which you may have to support Case #A6-509895, including written arguments, should be addressed to the Branch of Hearings and Review in Washington, D.C. for their consideration, not to the Philadelphia District Office. Regarding Case #A3-226839, a final decision will be rendered after the Industrial Specialist’s report is received and reviewed following your November 16, 1998 exam.

Cases are adjudicated and managed in the program’s district offices. Therefore, the best source of information about a case is usually the staff of the district office. If you need further case-specific information about Case #A3-226839, please write to: U.S. Department of Labor; Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs; District Office, Room 11006; 5335 Market Street; Philadelphia, PA 19104. Or, you may telephone the district office at (215) 596-1457. If you need further case-specific information about Case #A6-509895, please write to: Branch of Hearings and Review; P.O. Box 37717; Washington, D.C. 20013. Or, you may call the Branch of Hearings and Review at (202) 219-6155.

Sincerely,

William J. Stedman
District Director
Ms. MAGGIO. However, what this letter does not state is the number of phone messages that were left before my phone calls were actually returned, nor does it state that the written responses did not address the issues clearly specified in Representative Doyle’s letters.

In addition, I would also like to submit the letter sent to the District Director dated August 4, 1998; the response from the District Director dated August 25, 1998; the letter sent to the District Director dated September 29—or September 9, 1998; and the questions faxed to the District Director on September 29, 1998, after the individual’s benefits were terminated.

[The information referred to follows:]
Mr. William J. Staarman  
District Director GWCP  
Department of Labor  
Gateway Building  
Room 13100  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear Mr. Staarman:

I am writing on behalf of a constituent of mine, Charles T. Blystone. Claim Numbers A6509895 and A3226839, who my office has been assisting regarding his work-related injuries with the United States Postal Service.

Although Mr. Blystone has already submitted his point-by-point appeal of your decision to terminate his benefits on Claim A6509895 and deny his request for a scheduled award, I am writing to reiterate many of the arguments he makes regarding the inaccurate facts stated in the “Memorandum to the Director” by Toby Rubenstein, Claims Examiner.

First, Mr. Blystone clearly makes his arguments regarding the misinformation that both Mr. Rubenstein and Dr. Tauberg state in their decisions and opinions. I have enclosed a copy of Mr. Blystone’s appeal for your review. All of the information that Mr. Blystone presents in his argument is supported by the evidence that I have also enclosed.

It is very troubling to me that this case has not been properly processed and resolved. It seems quite evident to me that Mr. Blystone was going through the process of getting a scheduled award by the documentation that was submitted while he was employed by the Postal Service in Pompano Beach, Florida. Now, ever since my office has inquired about this scheduled award, Mr. Blystone has gone from having “permanent medical restrictions” according to Claudia Harris, Claims Examiner, to being terminated from receiving any medical benefit at all.

I am also concerned at the way in which he was examined by both Dr. Lauro and Dr. Tauberg. According to Mr. Blystone, neither doctor used any measuring devices to determine the extent of his injury, yet they were able to make the determination that he could go back to work without any medical restrictions.
It concerns me that the Office of Workers' Compensation would determine that "the weight of the evidence rests with the opinion of Dr. Tauberg" when he examined Mr. Blystone for a total of 15 minutes. According to Mr. Blystone, Dr. Tauberg spent more time examining his knee when this appointment was supposedly a second opinion appointment for his ankle. In addition, Mr. Blystone also claims that Dr. Tauberg sent him to get an x-ray for the wrong ankle and leg. When Mr. Blystone's wife asked him to change the prescription, he disputed the fact of which ankle and which leg were injured. Only after she showed him the medical documentation did he make the change. It concerns me that the weight of the evidence comes from a doctor who spends minutes with the claimant rather than the doctor who spends years treating the injury.

Mr. Blystone's entire case is a result of mistakes made by both the Office of Workers' Compensation and the United States Postal Service. OWCP is supposed to do the follow-up work with the attending physician according to the Federal Employees' Compensation manual. This was not done, and Mr. Blystone's scheduled award fell through the cracks. The Postal Service was supposed to adhere to his medical restrictions and place him into a rehabilitation job, but that too fell through the cracks when he transferred to New Kensington.

Instead of resolving those mistakes, the Office of Workers' Compensation is terminating Mr. Blystone's medical benefits and taking him off of his restrictions. Mr. Blystone cannot work beyond those medical restrictions. He tried to when he first transferred from Pompano Beach, Florida, to the New Kensington Post Office because management was not adhering to his restrictions. The end result of that was another work-related injury. Mr. Blystone will now be forced to work beyond his limitations. When he cannot accomplish his tasks as a walking mail carrier, he will be terminated due to his inability to perform work-related duties.

I would appreciate it if you will take all the evidence into consideration when making a final determination on his request for a scheduled award as well as his continuing medical benefits for Claim Number A605099895. In addition, please look at the enclosed documentation from Mr. Blystone's supervisor, Amy Barricklow. On the "Official Supervisor's Report of Occupational Disease," dated November 8, 1997, she writes, "he was hired as a mail processor and never had the ability to perform this clerk function." However, in a letter dated January 25, 1998, addressed to the U.S. Department of Labor, she writes, "Mr. Blystone transferred....as a mail processor. He began working this position and even worked overtime. He did an exceptional job as a mail processor and had no difficulty performing and completing his assignment." These two statements contradict each other which could and possibly may have affected his limited duty position.

As this is a complicated case, I would also appreciate it if you could set up a meeting in which Mr. Blystone and Tina Maggio of my staff could present all of the documentation regarding this case to the appropriate claims examiner so that all of the information can be taken into consideration when making the final determination.
William Staetan
August 4, 1999
page 3

Please keep my office up-to-date regarding this status of this case and my request. There are
often times when phone messages are not returned to my staff, so I would appreciate your
assistance in ensuring that my office will be communicated with regarding the progress of this
case. If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call at (412) 241-5055. Thank you
for your time and attention to this very urgent matter.

Sincerely,

Mike Doyle
Member of Congress

MD:tm
CC: Chuck Blystone
August 19, 1998

The Honorable Mike Doyle
Member, United States
House of Representatives
133 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Doyle:

I am writing to you in regards to the compensation claim of Charles T. Blystone, Case #A6-509895 and Case #A3-226839. Specifically, I'm writing in response to your letter dated August 4, 1998, received on August 11, 1998, concerning both cases.

Last week, the Senior Claims Examiner who'd been handling Mr. Blystone's cases, Ms. Toby Rubenstein, was unexpectedly detailed to Washington, DC for at least a six month period. We are now in the process of re-assigning her caseload to other Claims staff. As of this date, we are re-assigning Mr. Blystone's cases to a different Senior Claims Examiner, Ms. Barbara Williams.

Regarding Case #A6-509895, you may be assured that Ms. Williams will thoroughly review all of the evidence submitted in response to the "Notice of Proposed Termination of Medical Benefits", dated July 21, 1998. Thereafter, a determination will be made as to whether the "Proposal" should be made final. A decision will also be made regarding Mr. Blystone's possible entitlement to a Schedule Award on this claim. In the event that the decision(s) would be unfavorable, Mr. Blystone would be provided with his full appeal rights. If favorable one(s) were issued instead, then all appropriate benefits will be expedited to the claimant.

Regarding Case #A3-226839, Ms. Williams must review the Second Opinion Specialist, Dr. Laura's, report, as well as his supplemental report, in addition to the entire evidence of record. Mr. Blystone will then be further apprised concerning this claim.

You may be assured that Mr. Blystone will receive every FECA benefit to which he's entitled by law. All case actions will be performed as expeditiously as possible.
I trust that this is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William J. Staunton
District Director
Chuck Blystone

I. Benefits terminated for A6-509895

OWCP - "all the medical evidence submitted by the claimant was already a part of the file except for an office note from Dr. Girdany dated 5/8/98 which states, 'His knee is bothering him more. His foot was not helped much by therapy. There is nothing more to do other than hyaluronic acid injections for the knee and perhaps a knee replacement. I injected his left foot in the area of the sinus tarsi, the site of removal of the ganglion, with Marcaine and Celestone. Hopefully, this will help him. He will return as needed.' Dr. Girdany does not discuss whether there is a relationship of the current foot condition to the 1991 work injury."

Blystone - Both Mr. Blystone and I submitted a letter from Dr. Girdany dated August 5, 1998 which does discuss his current foot condition in relation to the 1991 work injury. "I told him that some of his foot pain and his ganglion was likely related to his minor work injury and his resulting post-traumatic arthritis."

II. Evidence overlooked in Notice of Termination of Benefits from Toby Rubensien

1. OWCP - Memorandum to the Director - States that Dr. Bacon made no reference to valgus deformity.

   Blystone - Dr. Bacon's clinical records, dated 10/20/93 thru 4/5/94 he made reference to valgus deformity. "He has mild varus deformity of the foot bilaterally."

2. OWCP - States OWCP attempted to assist Dr. Bacon by sending him a form designed to elicit information in conformity with AMA Guides to Permanent Impairment but he did not respond.

   Blystone - Dr. Bacon completed form 1303-06 on 4/5/94. Reading his clinical notes that day indicated that Mr. Blystone reached Maximal Medical Improvement and has Permanent Partial Impairment considered 15% of the left lower extremity as regards his foot. There is also a billing number for completion of this form, # C72-025. Also, if Dr. Bacon supposedly did not respond, it is the claims examiner's responsibility to follow up on the case according to the FECA Manual. Also, why would OWCP send him this form, if Mr. Blystone was not being processed for a scheduled award.

3. OWCP - reference to a 1978 left foot fracture in Memorandum to the Director.

   Blystone - 1978 was injury to the right foot; 1983 injury to left foot was a sprain with no mention of a fracture in the Brownsville General Hospital records, 015452. "Bony Structures are intact without evidence of fracture or dislocation."

4. OWCP - Dr. Langa and Dr. Taubner performed thorough examinations

   Blystone - Both conducted examinations without medical measuring devices. Both were less than 15 minutes exams. Dr. Taubner had his injuries on different legs and thought Mr. Blystone was someone else.
5. **OWCP** - Weight of evidence is on Dr. Taurberg

Blystone - Dr. Taurberg and Dr. Bacon have the same credentials. Dr. Bacon was Mr. Blystone's attending physician for 4 years. His credentials were never challenged by the claims examiners in Florida when he stated Mr. Blystone reached Maximal Medical Improvement on 4/5/94. Mr. Blystone was never challenged on this claim even after he moved to Pittsburgh and changed physicians to Dr. Girdancy.

6. **OWCP** - Mr. Blystone went from permanent medical restrictions and approved claims for physical therapy to termination of benefits once our office asked about scheduled award.

Blystone - letter from Claudia Harris indicates that Mr. Blystone has permanent medical restrictions to ankle injury.

7. **OWCP** - Dr. Bacon had placed medial restrictions on Mr. Blystone - no prolonged walking.

Blystone - 20 days after working beyond his restrictions in New Kensington, he had to receive pain therapy for left foot - injection.

8. **OWCP** - Memorandum to Director - Dr. Bacon prepared a very brief report about Mr. Blystone's permanent work restrictions.

Blystone - Claims examiner Dobyns from Florida was preparing a permanent limited duty job description within his limitations. She obviously had no doubt about Dr. Bacon's medical records and reports.

9. **OWCP** - Contradictory Statement by Amy Barricklow, supervisor at postal service at Greensburg Mail Processing Center in forms to OWCP

Blystone - 1/18/97 - "He was hired as a mail processor and never had the ability to perform this clerk function."

1/25/98 - "He began working this position (mail processor) and even worked overtime."

---

**III. Questions still not answered by OWCP**

1. Why did Mr. Blystone go from having "permanent medical restrictions" on claim # A6509895 to receiving a "Notice of Proposed Termination of Medical Benefits" on that same claim? As soon as this office inquired about a scheduled award for Mr. Blystone, he was sent to see a second opinion doctor.

2. Why did it take only one month to make a decision on Claim # A6509895 after he saw the second opinion doctor, Dr. Taurberg? He still has not received a decision on Claim Number A3226829 when he saw that second opinion doctor in April and the report came back indeterminate?

3. Why was Mr. Blystone not informed that Dr. Taurberg, the second doctor for Claim # A6509895, would also be examining his knee injury, Claim # A3226839? According to the information that my office received, Mr. Blystone was there for an exam of his ankle and not his knee. I was told that he was definitely not there for his knee - even though Dr. Taurberg took an x-ray on his knee and examined his knee.
4. How can the weight of the evidence be placed on Dr. Tadberg when he only examined Mr. Blystone for 15 minutes, did not use any measuring devices, confused which leg had what injury, and spent most of that time examining his knee?

5. Why has the decision of Dr. Lauro, second opinion doctor for Claim # A32268539, not been used to make a final determination on Claim # A32268539. According to the report that Dr. Lauro submitted to OWCP, he stated that it is indeterminate as to when the aggravation of Mr. Blystone's work-related injury ceased. Mr. Blystone has been waiting since April 1998 to receive treatment on his knee and is still waiting for a decision to be made to seek further treatment.
Dear Mr. Staaran:

Thank you for your recent response to my inquiry on behalf of Charles T. Blystone. Claim Numbers A6509895 and A3226839. However, it is not responsive to the issues I addressed in my last letter.

The following questions have yet to be answered regarding Mr. Blystone’s case:

1) Why did Mr. Blystone go from having “permanent medical restrictions” on Claim Number A6509895 to receiving a “Notice of Proposed Termination of Medical Benefits” on that same claim? As soon as my office inquired about Mr. Blystone receiving a scheduled award for that claim, he was sent to see a second opinion doctor.

2) Why did it take only one month to make a decision on Claim Number A6509895 after he saw the second opinion doctor, Dr. Tauberg? He still has yet to receive a decision on Claim Number A3226839 when he saw a second opinion doctor in April.

3) Why was Mr. Blystone not informed that Dr. Tauberg, the second opinion doctor for Claim Number A6509895, would also be examining his knee injury. Claim Number A3226839? According to the information that my office received, Mr. Blystone was there for an exam of his ankle and not his knee.

4) How can the weight of the evidence be placed on Dr. Tauberg when he only examined Mr. Blystone for 15 minutes. Did not use any measuring devices, confused which leg had what injury, and spent most of that time examining his knee?

5) Why has the decision of Dr. Lauro, second opinion doctor for Claim Number A3226839, not been used to make a final determination on Claim Number A3226839. According to the report that Dr. Lauro submitted to OWCP, he stated that it is indeterminate as to when the aggravation of Mr. Blystone’s work-related injury ceased. Mr. Blystone has been waiting since April 1998 to receive treatment on his knee and is still waiting for a decision to be made to seek further treatment.

I would appreciate it if you would respond to the above questions. If my office can be of any assistance, please contact Tim Maggio at (412) 241-6055. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mike Doyle
Member of Congress

MD-13

CC: Charles Blystone
Ms. MAGGIO. These documentations will demonstrate and provide insight into the attempts made to supply OWCP with the correct and factual information.

From these examples, I hope I have clearly demonstrated some of the problems I experienced in assisting constituents with their claims. To summarize, I often have problems getting my phone calls returned for constituent matters that are urgent. In addition, the response letters that I receive usually do not answer the specific questions and issues addressed in Representative Doyle's correspondence.

During my 3 years working for Representative Doyle, I have come to realize that most people go to their Congressman for assistance when they have exhausted all avenues on their own in trying to resolve their problems. When they come to the office, they are frustrated because they cannot get a response from their claims examiner regarding their specific questions.

Congressional casework entails getting those answers for those constituents. I feel that I am, at times, inhibited in this duty because of the lack of responsiveness and cooperation from OWCP. Most constituents want their Congressman's assistance in guaranteeing that they are getting a fair and equitable determination as well as getting the benefits for which they are entitled.

When I contact the district office, this is exactly what I'm trying to ensure. As a congressional caseworker, I'm here to help people either resolve their problems or answer their questions regarding OWCP. However, I am only one half of the whole in assisting a constituent. To do my job effectively, I need to be able to communicate with the responsive agency to ensure that the constituent is being treated in a fair manner.

Again, thank you for allowing me this opportunity, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Maggio follows:]
Statement of Tina Maggio
before the
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology

"Oversight of Customer Service at the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs"

Thank you Chairman Horn and Honorable Members of Congress for affording me this opportunity to submit a statement regarding my experiences in attempting to assist constituents with the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) as a congressional caseworker.

I have been working in Representative Mike Doyle's district office as a field representative for three years this month. As part of my responsibilities, I assist constituents who approach the office with problems with OWCP. I also handle issues dealing with the Social Security Administration, the United States Postal Service, Medicare, and the Office of Personnel Management.

For OWCP cases, a majority of my contact is with the Philadelphia District Office. Occasionally, I will write or call the Office of Hearings and Reviews Board in Washington, D.C. for an update on the status of a case, but most of my work deals with issues handled by the district office.

The Philadelphia District Office has a congressional phone number which is sometimes answered by an individual in the District Director's office. More often than not, a voice mail message is activated when I call. The message indicates that all congressional calls should leave a message with the constituent's name and his or her claim number.

In looking over the history of my casework, I have handled approximately 30-35 OWCP cases. These cases have varied in complexity. Some constituents simply request that I look into the status of their claim or their appeal. However, a majority of the OWCP cases on which I have worked are much more complicated. These cases deal with individuals not being reimbursed for pharmaceutical and medical expenses on approved claims, individuals having difficulty in obtaining approval for medical treatments, and individuals whose benefits have been terminated.

Since each individual case is different, I do not believe that it would be fair for me to make a generalized statement regarding the responsiveness of OWCP to congressional calls or correspondence. Therefore, I would like to provide a few examples of my constituent casework.
in which I dealt with the claims examiner, the senior claims examiner, the supervisory claims examiner and the district director in the Philadelphia District Office. These examples cover problems regarding prescription reimbursement, compensation pay, and termination of benefits.

Example 1 - Prescription Reimbursement:

This individual is an employee with the United States Postal Service in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He was injured on the job in an automobile accident which left him paralyzed. He has an approved medical claim through OWCP. I first spoke with this individual on March 8, 1999. He had been waiting for prescription reimbursements from OWCP since May 1998.

As a result of a paperwork mistake, his reimbursement checks were sent to the drug store in the drug store’s name. He claimed that the drug store and his injury compensation specialist at the Postal Service tried to resolve this problem on many occasions by calling the Philadelphia District Office; however, their phone calls were not returned.

He was referred to seek assistance from Representative Doyle by the injury compensation specialist because neither she, the drug store, nor this constituent could get a response from the claims examiner at OWCP.

This individual explained to me that the medication he needed to be reimbursed for was to curb the shakles and shimmers he experiences as a result of the car accident. He told me that he was reducing the amount of his medication because he could no longer afford to pay for the prescription without getting reimbursed.

—On March 8, 1999, I contacted the Philadelphia District Office and left a message for his claims examiner to call me back on the main voice mail.

—On March 10, 1999, I contacted the Philadelphia District Office and left a message on his claims examiner’s voice mail.

—On March 16, 1999, I contacted the Philadelphia District Office and left a message for his claims examiner to call me back on the main voice mail.

—On March 17, 1999, I faxed a letter to the District Director’s office regarding this matter.

—On March 25, 1999, I called the congressional line and spoke with the assistant in the District Director’s office. I told her that I had left numerous messages for the claims examiner to call me back over the past two weeks, but he had not yet called me back. She told me that all congressional calls are supposed to be answered within one day. She put me through to the supervisory claims examiner’s voice mail and told me to call her back if I did not get a call within a day. I left a message for the supervisory claims examiner to call me back.
On March 26, 1999, I called and left another message on the main voice mail for either the claims examiner or the supervisory claims examiner to call me back.

On March 29, 1999, I finally received a call from the constituent's claim examiner. This was three weeks from when I initially contacted OWCP. At this point, I asked him if he had received any of my messages. He told me that the only message he received was from the supervisory claims examiner to give me a call. I told him how many messages I left, however, he claimed that he did not receive any of them.

Once the claims examiner did call me back, he explained what this individual needed to do to resolve his prescription reimbursement problem.

**Example 2. Back Compensation Pay**

This individual contacted Representative Doyle's office on March 8, 1999, for assistance regarding a mistake made in her compensation pay. For a four-week period in which she was entitled to compensation, she only received an amount equal to two weeks. In addition, she was owed compensation for the period from 12/6/97 to 12/25/97.

She addressed the problem of incorrect compensation payment in numerous letters to OWCP dated May 26, 1998; August 14, 1998; November 16, 1998; and January 11, 1999. She did not receive a response from OWCP regarding the compensation owed her. It was suggested to her to contact her congressman by the injury compensation specialist at the United States Postal Service because neither one of them could get a response from OWCP regarding this matter.

A letter dated March 8, 1999, was sent to the District Director from Representative Doyle regarding this matter.

In a letter dated March 26, 1999, but not received until April 13, 1999, the District Director stated that a compensation payment was made to the constituent for the time period from 12/6/97 to 12/25/97. In addition, he claimed that an adjustment check was sent to her on May 8, 1998. If she did not receive it, then she should file for a non-receipt.

On April 13, 1999, the constituent called me to let me know that she finally received the payment for the back compensation owed her.

**Example 3. Termination of Benefits**

I have been working with this individual since September 1997. This individual has two work related injuries with the United States Postal Service.

His first injury occurred to his left ankle while employed in Pompano Beach, Florida. It was an approved claim in which his medical restrictions were also approved by OWCP. He was being
assigned to a rehabilitation job in Pompano Beach before his transfer to Pittsburgh. After his transfer to Pittsburgh, he was informed by his claims examiner in writing that the ankle injury and restrictions were permanent according to OWCP.

When he transferred to Pittsburgh, he was assigned to walk a six-hour mail route. When he informed his supervisor that it was beyond his work restrictions for his work-related injury, he was told to complete the mail route because management was not aware of his limitations when the transfer was approved. While on the mail route, he fell through a set of wooden steps and injured his right knee. Since this second injury, there have been many complications with this individual’s claims.

This individual first came to Representative Doyle’s office when he realized that he was due a schedule award for his ankle injury sustained in Pompano Beach. When reading through the Federal Employees Compensation manual, he realized that the OWCP district office in Pompano Beach was processing the paperwork for a schedule award for his ankle injury. His doctor was requested by OWCP to fill out the proper paperwork, Form CA-1503, which determines permanent partial impairment and maximum medical improvement. Therefore, he asked me to find out if he was entitled to a schedule award. He was also awaiting a decision on his right knee injury for which he had already seen a second opinion doctor.

--A letter was submitted to the District Director from Representative Doyle regarding this individual’s schedule award. In a letter dated June 9, 1998, this individual was informed that he would have to go to an OWCP doctor for a second opinion examination to see if there were any residuals from his ankle injury and if he was still entitled to benefits.

--I called OWCP on June 16, 1998, and left a message for his claims examiner to call me back regarding this appointment.

The individual saw the OWCP doctor on June 22, 1998. He contacted me soon after to inform me that the OWCP doctor, who was supposed to be examining his ankle, spent more time examining his knee, the other work-related injury. He also claimed that this doctor was not at first examining the wrong ankle and the wrong knee. The doctor sent him x-rays for the wrong side of the body. This individual asked me to call OWCP to find out why this doctor was examining his knee.

--I called OWCP on June 22, 1998, and left another message for his claims examiner to call me back regarding this appointment.

--I called OWCP on June 23, 1998, and left another message for his claims examiner and a message for the supervisory claims examiner to call me back regarding this appointment.
On June 24, 1998, the supervisory claims examiner called me back and informed me that this appointment was for a second opinion examination for his ankle injury. She also told me she was assigning both cases to a senior claims examiner because of the complexity of this individual's cases.

On June 26, 1998, I contacted the supervisory claims examiner again. I asked her about the second opinion doctor examining the constituent's knee and she told me that the exam was for a second opinion on his ankle injury only and it had nothing to do with his knee injury. I asked her why the doctor was examining the knee then? She told me that we would all have to wait until the doctor's opinion came in before we could dispute anything.

In the doctor's opinion to OWCP dated June 26, 1998, he makes determinating statements regarding this individual's knee injury in addition to his ankle injury.

On June 29, 1998, I called and left a message for the senior claims examiner to discuss the schedule award and the second opinion doctor exam.

The individual received a Notice of Proposed Termination of Medical Benefits dated July 21, 1998, for his claim for the ankle injury.

On July 27, 1998, I left a message for the senior claims examiner to call me back.

A letter dated August 4, 1998, was sent to the District Director from Representative Doyle addressing the misinformation and facts that were incorrect in the Notice of Proposed Termination of Medical Benefits and Memorandum to the Director. Medical evidence and documentation were provided to support the statements made in the letter. In addition, a meeting was requested with the District Director for the constituent and myself.

On August 20, 1998, the same letter that was submitted to District Director on August 4, 1998, was also sent to the Regional Director.

On August 25, 1998, I received a letter from the District Director which stated that this constituent's case was reassigned to another senior claims examiner who would thoroughly review all the evidence. None of the questions addressed in the August 4, 1998, letter were answered.

On August 31, 1998, I left a message for the senior claims examiner to call me back.

On September 3, 1998, received a letter from the Regional Director stating the same information as was in the District Director's August 25, 1998, letter.
On September 10, 1998, another letter was sent to the District Director from Representative Doyle outlining the five specific issues and questions that had not yet been answered by his office. It was stated in the letter that the District Director's past correspondence was not responsive to the issues previously addressed.

In a letter dated September 16, 1998, this individual's benefits were terminated.

On September 29, 1998, I faxed a list of unanswered questions to the District Director's office. When I contacted him to go over them point by point, I spoke with his assistant who told me that the District Director would call me back once he had the chance to review the information.

In a conversation with the District Director on October 1, 1998, I was told that his senior claims examiner is very thorough and he puts his complete trust in her decision. I attempted to explain to him the incorrect facts she stated in her termination of benefits as well as point out the evidence that was overlooked in making the determination. I had supporting documentation for every statement. This documentation had been sent to the senior claims examiner prior to the final determination being made. He told me that there was no point in discussing it because the constituent can appeal the decision and bring it up then. I told him that all of this was submitted before the final termination decision was issued and should have been considered then. I asked if he would review the individual's file to gain a greater understanding of our concerns in how this claim was handled. He said that he would not do that.

This individual received a response from the District Director dated October 29, 1998, which detailed the responsiveness of OWCP to both the individual and Representative Doyle. The District Director states that all phone and written inquiries received from Congressman Doyle's Office have been promptly answered by the Philadelphia District Office.

The constituent appealed for a hearing with the Bureau of Hearings and Reviews. Before his case even made it to the hearing, the hearing representative reversed the decision of the district office and remanded the case back for a referee doctor in a decision letter dated January 19, 1999. The hearing representative stated that the office did not meet its burden to justify the termination of compensation benefits, and the medical benefits must be reinstated retroactive to their termination.

This case is still pending an appointment with a referee doctor. This has been delayed because OWCP first scheduled this individual for a referee appointment with a doctor who performs fitness for duty exams for the United States Postal Service. According to the FECA manual, a doctor who performs fitness for duty exams for the employing agency cannot perform the referee examination.
Since this individual is scheduled for knee replacement surgery due to his other injury, I sent a letter on April 21, 1999, to the individual's claims examiner requesting that his appointment with the referee doctor be scheduled before his knee replacement surgery at the beginning of May 1999.

On April 27, 1999, I left a message for his claims examiner to call me back on the main voice mail regarding the scheduling of the referee examination.

On April 28, 1999, I left a message for his claims examiner to call me back on the main voice mail regarding the scheduling of the referee examination.

On April 29, 1999, I left a message for his claims examiner to call me back on the main voice mail regarding the scheduling of the referee examination.

In a letter dated May 7, 1999 from his claims examiner, this individual was denied his request for the schedule award for his ankle injury even though he has not yet gone through the referee examination.

As of May 14, 1999, I have not received a returned phone call from his claims examiner.

On May 14, 1999, a letter was sent to the District Director from Representative Doyle requesting a justification of the denial of the schedule award before the medical report from the referee doctor was received and reviewed by OWC. Under the orders of the hearing representative, the referee doctor will provide a clarification of the conflicting medical reports from the individual's doctor and the second opinion doctor.

From these few examples, I hope I have clearly demonstrated some of the problems I experience in assisting constituents with their claims with OWC. To summarize, I often have problems receiving a returned response by phone for constituent matters that are urgent. When I have addressed this fact with the District Director in the past, he has responded that according to his records, all of my phone calls are returned. In addition, the response letters that I receive usually do not answer the specific questions and issues that have been addressed in Representative Doyle's correspondence to OWC.

During my three years working for Representative Doyle, I have come to realize that most people approach their congressmen for assistance when they have exhausted all avenues on their own in trying to resolve their problems. When they come to the office, they are frustrated because they cannot get a response from their claims examiner regarding their specific questions. Congressional casework entails getting those answers for the constituents. I feel that I am sometimes inhibited in this duty because of the lack of responsiveness and cooperation from OWC.
When it comes to OWCP, most constituents are not looking for their congressman to influence a decision in their favor. A majority of individuals want their congressman's assistance in guaranteeing that they are getting a fair and equitable determination based on the merits of their case as well as getting the benefits for which they are entitled.

When I contact the OWCP district office on behalf of a constituent, I am trying to ensure that each individual is getting exactly what is outlined in the Federal Employees Compensation manual.

Per the policy and procedures of Representative Doyle, we cannot pick and choose the constituents who need assistance, nor do we pick and choose those we do help. Every constituent in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania has the right to call upon Representative Doyle in assisting with a problem with a federal agency, and every constituent can count on whatever assistance we are able to provide to their situation. It is up to us, congressional caseworkers as a whole, to act as liaisons in requesting information and status reports or requesting prompt consideration of a matter based on the merits of the case.

As a congressional caseworker, I am here to help people either resolve their problems or understand the benefits for which they are entitled. However, I am only one half of the whole in assisting a constituent. To do my job effectively, I need to be able to communicate with a responsive agency to ensure that the constituent is being treated in a fair and equitable manner.

Again, thank you for allowing me this opportunity.

Lisa Maggio
Field Representative
U.S. Representative Mike Doyle (PA-18)
11 Duff Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235
(412) 241-6055
lmaggio@mail.house.gov
Mr. HORN. Let me just ask one here. You handle other than cases such as this. You probably have Social Security cases, Medicare cases, Internal Revenue cases, Immigration cases.

Ms. MAGGIO. Right.

Mr. HORN. As you look at all of those agencies with which you connect on behalf of Representative Doyle, which is the most responsive and which is the least responsive?

Ms. MAGGIO. The most responsive is Social Security Administration. They have a congressional office in Baltimore that is very responsive. The least responsive is OWCP in Philadelphia.

Mr. HORN. I thought that would be your answer. Without question, I served on the Senate staff in the early 1960’s. Then and now, I think most of us say the best run organization in the U.S. Government is the Social Security Administration.

I had an interesting experience when I came back from a long day of committee hearings about a month ago, I saw a fax from an attorney in Long Beach, CA, where Social Security hadn’t come through on the check that they admitted he knew. So, even good agencies make their mistakes.

So, I wrote out a fax to the Commissioner in Baltimore and within 18 hours he had a response back to me. The check was out there, and he apologized on the behalf of the agency for the stupidity of one of his members. That’s a very responsive operation.

So thank you for adding that to our record.

I’m now going to have the vice chairman do the questioning, Mrs. Biggert of Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Balen, you talked about the time it takes to get a case number. Is it—what does it entail to get a case number? Isn’t it just an assignment of a number?

Ms. BALEN. I don’t know. We’re really not in on that part of the process. All we know is either the patient comes to us with a new injury that is—they say is workers’ comp, and they work for the Federal Government and we know they have these forms. There’s one particular form that we do fill out, I think it’s the CA–16 that, according to my information, is the form that is required to initiate the process for getting a case number.

What has to happen beyond that point, I really don’t know. I just know it kind of takes a long time. Eventually the patient is issued—we’ve had them come in with a little card with their case number on it. If we have treated the patient without a case number and we’re waiting, holding the bill, sometimes the patients don’t realize that as soon as they get that little card with the case number, that they need to give it to us. I don’t know if it’s not stressed to them, that you need to go give that to everybody who has helped you with this. I don’t know what process they’re having to go through.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Linehan said that many times since they can’t get a response from OWCP that they have gone to the private insurance. Do you find that happening?

Ms. BALEN. We typically have not done that because what we find, at least in my office, all insurances want to know how the injury happened and where you were. And as soon as you say it hap-
pened at work, they won't touch it. I think that's a good idea if it would work. We haven't found that it really works.

Typically what we've done if we have a patient who is like the one in my example in my statement, we usually just go ahead and do the surgery and try to get the authorization later which means the patient ends up getting helped, but we end up holding the bag.

Mrs. Biggert. Since you've had to—the amount of money is so much lower than other—is it lower than what was paid out in the State for workers' comp?

Ms. Balen. Oh, far lower. Yes, I've got that in my statement. Typically the State Worker's Comp allows more than what we charge, which is kind of backward. But, yes, the USDOL typically pays less than half of our charge, and the State Worker's Comp allows more than we charge. So it's a considerable difference.

Mrs. Biggert. So you just have to write that off.

Ms. Balen. Yes.

Mrs. Biggert. OK. Mr. Riordan, do you find problems with the numbers also?

Mr. Riordan. Well, the number is assigned once a case worker looks at a case. I mean, there is a delay. And if you call before you're assigned a case number, they can't help you, they won't help you. You have to have the case number. So you just have to sit and wait until it's looked at.

Mrs. Biggert. Do you find that some people will go through private insurance rather than the workers' comp, or do you find the same thing that Ms. Balen said?

Mr. Riordan. Yeah, I don't think they're covered by—if they're injured at work, they have to file for workers' comp.

Mrs. Biggert. OK. Mr. Linehan, why is it that there's so few lawyers that are willing—I'm a lawyer also and I've never done a workers' comp case, but why are there so few that are willing to take these cases?

Mr. Linehan. A carpenter needs tools to work. An attorney needs a court to work in. There's no court. There is nothing really for an attorney to work with.

Basically, I push the claim. I help—claimants come into me after they have grown so frustrated with the system, they basically come in to me, throw a file down on my desk that averages a foot thick and say, "Take it and run with it. We don't want to mess with it. We'll pay you whatever it takes to handle this. Just do something to get this moving."

That's where I enter the picture. I don't enter the picture at the beginning of the claim. The claimant is hurt and they come to me rarely, if ever.

Mrs. Biggert. Are there States that you know of that have some access to the courts from workers' comp cases?

Mr. Horn. Can we move the mic a little closer to each of you. It's a little difficult to hear.

Mr. Linehan. I don't understand your—you mean State comp?

Mrs. Biggert. Well, since there's no Federal process to get into court, are there State courts that take appeals from workers' comp?

Mr. Linehan. Federal OWCP?

Mrs. Biggert. No, from State.

Mr. Linehan. Oh, every State.
Mrs. Biggert. Every State?
Mr. Linehan. Yeah. Oklahoma, you have the Oklahoma OWCP system, it’s appealable to the State Supreme Court up through the circuit courts, et cetera.

Mrs. Biggert. Do you know of any reason why this hasn’t happened on the Federal level?
Mr. Linehan. I’m not going to comment, but yeah. It’s just—you’ve got a system that works as it is now for the system. It doesn’t work for the claimants. From what I see, claimants who come in are scared to death. They don’t want to buck the system. They don’t want it to be known that they’re bucking the system.

So the system continues, it grows on itself. And that’s what’s happened here. Nobody is bucking the system. They’re scared. Maybe that’s why I’m here. But something needs to change. And the only change I could see that needs to be done that will really work—that will end a lot of these problems overnight—is allowance for Federal court review.

And I don’t know of any reason why these civilians should be treated any differently from any other injured, diseased or killed civilian in America. But they are. They are. They have no rights. Zero.

Why is that? That is a question that goes back to the Congress.

Mrs. Biggert. Thank you.

Ms. Maggio, have you had complaints about second opinions or doctors? Is that—

Ms. Maggio. Yes. I have a long, involved case. It’s actually the case example, the termination of benefits in my written statement. His second opinion exam was about 15 minutes long. The doctor was supposed to be examining his left ankle, I believe it was his left. He was examining the right ankle.

And he was also examining another injury that he had—another work-related injury that he wasn’t supposed to be examining. And he sent him for x-rays for the wrong ankle, the wrong knee. And the OWCP based terminating his benefits on it—they put the weight of the evidence in that doctor’s assessment.

Mrs. Biggert. Fortunately they weren’t doing surgery.

Ms. Maggio. Right. Right.

Mrs. Biggert. In a second opinion, is it usually the same doctor over and over again in the area that would be giving the second opinion?

Ms. Maggio. You mean many constituents going to the same second opinion?

Mrs. Biggert. Yes.

Ms. Maggio. I have seen a couple of the same doctors’ names popping up with different constituents who come to the office. I don’t know how often—I was told that it’s a revolving process where it’s kind of they draw a name and they send the constituent to that doctor.

But I’m not sure how often they go to the same one.

Mrs. Biggert. Do you sense, then, that their decisions are predetermined?

Ms. Maggio. Yes, I get that feeling. And I believe that—I have one constituent who knows the FECA manual front and back, and luckily—because he knows what his rights are. But I think that at
times OWCP tries to send these individuals to doctors, especially for a referee exam, you cannot go to a fitness-for-duty doctor for the employing agency.

And I think a lot of claimants are going to doctors who are also working for their employing agency, which is a problem. There is a conflict of interest there.

Mrs. Biggert. I know that in so many States the second opinion is the choice of the injured worker and there has been some movement to change that; to have the employers have the opportunity to choose the second doctor. So you don’t think that would be a good idea on the Federal level?

Ms. Maggio. No. No.

In my opinion, I deal a lot with postal workers who are injured. And I think there’s a rush to get people back to work. And I think that if the employer was able to choose the doctor, the second opinion doctor, that might have some influence on the decision of the doctor. It’s just my opinion, but I think it would be best if it was an outside source.

Mrs. Biggert. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Horn. Thank you very much.

Is there any additional point you feel has not been made that you would like to make? This is the last call on that.

Ms. Balen.

Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Riordan. Well, one earlier question Congresswoman Biggert asked was why is there a delay in processing, asked one of the earlier people that testified, why is there a delay.

Well, one of the reasons is the agency has an interest in keeping the employee off workers’ comp because the agency has to cover the position for a full year. So they want the employee back to work because that position is open. And their statistics count against that employee for production purposes. So they want to pressure the employee to come back to work.

That’s why the personnel offices have delays, you know, delays in processing and filling out the forms and completing them and sending them to OWCP. That’s part of it, any way.

Mr. Horn. Mr. Linehan, anything else you want to say?

Mr. Linehan. No. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. And if you have any further questions of me, I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Horn. Well, if something comes to mind, if you don’t mind we’ll do what we do with every other hearing, send you the question and at this point in the record, we’ll give the question and your answer.

[The information referred to follows:]
Thomas Chamberlin/Shelina Williams Conversation

You invited me to provide information concerning the testimony of Thomas Chamberlin and his conversation with Acting FEC Director Shelina Williams. Mr. Chamberlin called the OWCP national office, in follow-up to his faxed message, to determine what appeal options were available to him following a decision of the Office on November 5, 1998. Having no direct knowledge of the case or the recent decision, Ms. Williams explained to Mr. Chamberlin that she was on her way out of town but would ensure that he got a response to his question. She referred the faxed inquiry to the responsible Claims Examiner handling his case in the district office. Unfortunately, no response to Mr. Chamberlin was in fact provided at that time by the district office.

Following these events, Mr. Chamberlin in fact requested and received a review of his case file under 5 USC 8128, which was the appeal opportunity he had been seeking. A decision on the appeal (reconsideration) was issued on July 21, 1999, and his further appeal right to the Employees’ Compensation Board is described in the decision letter. Acting Director Williams wrote separately on July 22 to Mr. Chamberlin apologizing for the initial failure to respond and the resulting delay. After the situation was brought to their attention, the district office made specific improvements to ensure that future written requests would be handled timely.

Ms. Williams and I greatly regret that Mr. Chamberlin did not receive the information he sought from us. I can assure you again, as I did on May 18, that it is not characteristic of Ms. Williams, who has served OWCP with distinction as Deputy Director of the FECA program since 1990 and as Acting Director since March 1999. In addition to her excellent management of this complex program, she is personally extraordinarily accessible and responsive to claimants, often going to extraordinary lengths to ensure that a payment is expedited or a question answered.
Report on New York Regional Office Allegations

Chairman Horn requested that Deputy Director Hallmark investigate the allegations of Ms. McGuinness and Mr. Riordan to the effect that OWCP New York Regional Director Kenneth Hamlett behaved improperly or abusively in dealing with Ms. McGuinness and her FECA claim. Mr. Hallmark and members of his staff have reviewed available records in this regard, and discussed the matter in some detail with Mr. Hamlett and members of his staff who witnessed some of the exchanges.

Mr. Hamlett provides a different description of the September 16, 1996, hallway encounter complained about by Mr. Riordan and Ms. McGuinness. Mr. Riordan’s statement suggests that he and Ms. McGuinness were outside the FECA office attempting to deliver a package of papers which constituted an appeal of her claim. He acknowledged that Mr. Hamlett ultimately accepted (and signed a receipt for) these documents, but describes Mr. Hamlett as shouting, visibly upset, disturbed, and unwilling to listen to their responses.

The office had earlier during that year instituted a new security policy to address serious threats of violence against office employees by disgruntled claimants. The policy was precipitated by the arrest of a disturbed claimant who had made numerous threats against the New York OWCP staff and whose psychiatrist had reported to the FBI that the threats were credible. The policy was also intended to provide assurance that OWCP staff would be protected from other risks: during late 1995 both a murder and an armed robbery which resulted in a stabbing occurred in the building. While not all FECA offices have instituted such a controlled approach to walk-in visitors, all have installed security protections and strictly limit public access, for similar reasons. The circumstances in the New York office, especially given the presence of an INS detention center in the same building, justified the additional precautions.

Mr. Hamlett states that he observed two people attempting to gain entry into the FECA office, through a locked door clearly marked "staff only". Concerned about a potential security breach, he spoke to them loudly enough to be heard down the hall as he walked quickly towards them to determine what they were doing. Mr. Hamlett reports that once the parties had identified themselves the conversation was civil on all sides, and Ms. McGuinness’s desire to deliver a package of documents was accomplished, as Mr. Hamlett accepted the papers and had them associated with the case file. But he did deny access to the office, and explain that Ms. McGuinness would have to return another time when she had an appointment, in accordance with the office’s policy. Although Mr. Riordan expressed “shock” that the Regional Director would intervene in this way, in fact his actions appear to have been appropriate, especially when he determined who Ms. McGuinness was. (He knew that a claimant by that name had been advised by an office representative that she could not have an appointment for that day, because the responsible claims examiner was not there to meet with her.) It is regrettable that Mr. Riordan and Ms. McGuinness were unhappy at being informed of OWCP’s policy and at having the restrictions on visiting the office enforced, but it also appears that Ms. McGuinness was attempting to circumvent the procedures for obtaining an appointment.
that had been explained to her earlier. The circumstances in this instance were quite unusual, but Mr. Hamlett's conduct was hardly "shocking," and his intervention appears to have been in keeping with the situation as he understood it.

Mr. Riordan and Ms. McGuinness also cite a telephone conference call with Mr. Hamlett and others in the New York office that occurred two days later, as a further example of their disappointment with Mr. Hamlett's customer service. Although both witnesses expressed objections to the specific claims processing actions Mr. Hamlett attempted to explain during that call (e.g., the method of selecting a medical referee to resolve the medical disputes regarding her continuing claim of disability), the central concern appears to be the tone and aggressiveness of OWCP's communication in this instance.

Mr. Hamlett and the three other OWCP employees present acknowledge that the communication in this instance was heated at times. Mr. Hamlett denies that he spoke "in an angry and loud tone", although it is clear that the call became contentious and that at times he and Ms. McGuinness talked over one another. Mr. Hamlett reports that the reason for the conference call was at least in part to attempt to resolve a growing difficulty in communicating with Ms. McGuinness. He had been advised that she had called several different staff members repeating the same questions and complaints; there was a confusion as to who her designated representative was (an individual other than Mr. Riordan had been acting in that capacity and she had not clearly stated which was currently authorized), and Ms. McGuinness had written many letters to different officials, seeking redress for her concerns. Mr. Hamlett hoped to use the conference call to see that a clear understanding of the current actions being taken on her case was shared by all, and to attempt to streamline communications in the future such that she or her representative contacted the responsible examiner in a one-to-one fashion to avoid further confusion and duplicative efforts.

Clearly, the call did not accomplish those goals. Mr. Riordan states that he did not understand the reasoning for various claims decisions, and the claimant continued to be extremely unhappy with the handling of her case. In hindsight, Mr. Hamlett's attempt to clear the air in this instance was unsuccessful, and he might have chosen some other communication vehicle. The participation of the Regional Director, the District Director and two claims examiners indicates that OWCP's intent was to use this call to resolve problems, not to ignore them. The office made a continuing effort to effectively communicate with Ms. McGuinness throughout the handling of her case, including responses to more than 40 Congressional letters and other priority inquiries made on her behalf between 1995-1998.

OWCP seeks to achieve satisfaction with our services for all our customers, but in some instances the law, regulations and procedures we must apply result in actions that are either unfavorable to the claim or are viewed as undesirable by the claimant. Some individuals continually press their arguments notwithstanding having been provided a thorough description of the actions being taken, their rationale, and the opportunities for due process that will be afforded should they disagree. The circumstances and claims actions are sometimes complex. They can involve multiple injuries, non-work-related or
disputed medical conditions, conflicts over job suitability in light of the injury, disagreements over the coverage of alternative medical treatment options, and a myriad of other issues. These difficulties and disagreements can arise even while OWCP is providing ongoing compensation for the claimant's wage loss and medical costs -- as was the case for Ms. McGuinness before, during, and for several months after the confrontations under discussion here.

It is regrettable when our efforts to communicate fully yield disappointment and verbal conflict. Our staff are trained to avoid expressions of impatience or frustration insofar as humanly possible in these instances, and we expect them to bring such conversations to a polite close when it appears that they can no longer be fruitful. It would appear that this conference call was an example of this difficult type of interaction, and clearly Mr. Riordan and Ms. McGuinness were not at all satisfied with either its substance or its tone. Just as clearly, the New York office made extensive and intensive efforts to address Ms. McGuinness' inquiries and requests. Mr. Hamlett, like all OWCP employees, will nevertheless continue to work to improve the efficacy of our communication techniques.

Finally, it is noted that during the hearing we were asked to review and respond to a tape recording or transcript which Ms. McGuinness was to submit regarding a separate telephone conversation, ostensibly between her and Mr. Jonathan Lawrence, the New York FECA District Director. We have not been provided a copy of this document, and while Mr. Lawrence recalls several conversations with Ms. McGuinness, he is not sure he recalls the specific conversation she describes in her written statement. He does recall a conversation with a woman who did not identify herself, in which a complaint was lodged about the policy denying access for walk-in meetings without an appointment. If that is the call which Ms. McGuinness taped, the issues discussed above regarding Mr. Hamlett's halfway discussion would likely be applicable to this conversation as well.
Alaska Medical Fee Schedule

Ms. Beth Balen raised concerns about OWCP's fee schedule for certain medical services, indicating that we pay less than the Alaska workers' compensation program allows for the same services.

Background

In 1986, The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) published regulations (March 10, 1986, 51 FR 8276-82) that established a fee schedule for the reimbursement of charges for medical services incurred during the treatment of injuries covered under the FECA. This schedule, which was based on the relative unit value system developed by the Division of Labor and Industry, State of Washington, the Physician Procedural terminology (CPT-4) coding scheme, and internally developed conversion factors, was national in scope, and allowed for regional variations in medical costs through a geographic index. Development of the fee schedule was prompted by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) recommendation that OWCP institute corrective actions to prevent suspected billing abuse by physicians.

OWCP used this initial version of the fee schedule for four (4) years. However, in 1992, the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) implemented a fee schedule to regulate payments for professional medical services provided under the Medicare Program, and two years later OWCP adopted HCFA's model by regulation (February 23, 1994, 59 FR 8529-30). The revised schedule, which is still in effect, retains the CPT coding scheme, and the internal conversion factors, but uses the resource based relative value units (RBRVUs) and the geographic adjustment factors developed by HCFA for the Medicare program. All elements are updated every year. The CPT codes, RBRVUs and geographic adjustment factors are obtained from HCFA, while the conversion factors updates are based on the Medicare medical economic index and our own internal medical payment data.

Nationally, the OWCP fee schedule reduces about 22% of the total amount billed for professional medical services. When compared to the 35 state workers' compensation medical fee schedules in effect at this time, the OWCP reimbursement level is approximately at the 50th percentile. That is, there are as many states that have lower reimbursement rates as there are states that have higher payment levels. Additionally, a number of states, among them Texas, Pennsylvania and California, have used the OWCP schedule as a reference when updating their own schedules. (It is important to note that the OWCP payment levels which were cited as too low during the hearing are in fact substantially higher than the amount Medicare pays for the same service, utilizing the HCFA fee schedule. This is in part because workers' compensation services entail additional requirements including report writing, and because Medicare utilizes a patient co-pay system whereas FECA and typical workers' compensation systems pay the total cost.)

ATTACHMENT D
Current Status

We have studied our FY 1998 medical payments in Alaska. Charges for services amounted to $1.96 million, and $1.40 million, or 72%, was paid to health care providers. Clearly, this reimbursement level is lower than our national average. Moreover, while payments for office visits amounted to 80% of the total billed, for other services, particularly surgery and radiology, the reductions exceed 28%.

Each year HCFA makes adjustments to its fee schedule components, and OWCP uses those adjustments to update our own system. The 1999 fee schedule update we have recently implemented addresses some of the issues raised by Ms. Balen, and similar concerns expressed to OWCP's Medical Director during a meeting of the Alaska Medical Association she attended last May. Based on a review of 1998 nationwide payment data, all OWCP conversion factors have been increased by 2.3% (the medical economic index), while the surgery and radiology conversion factors have been increased by 14% and 9% respectively. When these changes are combined with the HCFA's 1999 RBRVS and geographic adjustment factor updates, it is calculated that payments for surgery and radiology will generally increase by approximately 13%. Payment for other services (e.g., office visits), will increase by considerably less.

Changes in reimbursement rates in specific geographically areas can only result from changes to the geographic adjustment factors, which we incorporate in our system wholly on the basis of the HCFA-developed structure. For this reason, we discussed the Alaska factors with HCFA's Division of Practitioner and Ambulatory Care. Because the methodology and the data used for the calculation of the adjustment factors is set by law, they do not foresee any change in the geographic adjustment factors until 2001, when they will complete their next scheduled review. Short of jettisoning entirely the HCFA structure (and their system is based on far more extensive and reliable cost data than OWCP could hope to generate), OWCP is unable to substitute its judgement for the geographical adjustment factors derived from that system.

However, HCFA does have permission to add a 10% bonus for Medicare payments in areas designated as "Health Professional Shortage Areas" (HPSAs), and most of Alaska is included in this category. HCFA has formally recommended the adoption of such a bonus to other federal users of the HCFA schedule, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, CHAMPUS, and the Department of Defense (DOD), who have reported reimbursement problems in Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico. OWCP will consider the addition of this differential to our payments in Alaska and other professional shortage areas as identified by HCFA.

Summary

OWCP (1) met with the Alaska Medical Association on May 25, 1999 and reviewed their concerns about its payment structure; (2) reviewed our fee structure in light of those issues and made FY 1999 adjustments that will increase reimbursement for key service types that Ms. Balen and other Alaska medical providers feel have been undervalued; (3)
approached HCFA regarding the complaints we have heard from Alaska that the geographic cost factors for that region are too low, and have been advised that HCFA is aware of this concern and is evaluating a long-term fix; and (4) is considering application of an interim "bonus" adjustment which HCFA has implemented as a means of addressing relative cost issues in areas where provider shortages are prevalent.
The Honorable Jim Turner
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on Government
Management, Information, and Technology
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Turner:

This is in response to your letter of July 19, 1999, requesting that OWCP clarify its rules regarding federal employees' benefit claims under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). The following responses to your questions are submitted for inclusion in the record of the hearing held before the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology on May 18, 1999.

(I) Does the Department of Labor, under § 8128 of the FECA, have the authority to review OWCP decisions to end, decrease, or increase any award of compensation benefits paid to a beneficiary?

OWCP cannot unilaterally revise an award of compensation benefits without possibility of review. Section 10.610 of the regulations implements § 8128(a) of the FECA and provides the following:

The FECA specifies that an award for or against payment of compensation may be reviewed at any time on the Director's own motion. Such review may be made without regard to whether there is new evidence or information. If the Director determines that a review of the award is warranted (including, but not limited to circumstances indicating a mistake of fact or law or changed conditions), the Director (at any time and on the basis of existing evidence) may modify, rescind, decrease or increase compensation previously awarded, or award compensation previously denied. A review on the Director's own motion is not subject to a request or petition and none shall be entertained.
The decision whether or not to review an award under this section is solely within the discretion of the Director. The Director's exercise of this discretion is not subject to review by the ICAB, nor can it be the subject of a reconsideration or hearing request.

(b) When the Director reviews an award on his or her own motion, any resulting decision is subject as appropriate to reconsideration, a hearing, and/or appeal to the ICAB. Jurisdiction on review or on appeal to ICAB is limited to a review of the merit of the resulting decision. The Director's determination to review the award is not reviewable.

As noted in subsection (b) above, any decision issued as a result of the Director exercising his discretionary authority under § 8128(a) would be accompanied by appropriate appeal rights, as are any other decisions of the OWCP.

(2) What type of notice is the OWCP required to give a FECA beneficiary prior to a reduction or termination of compensation?

OWCP's regulations require that a FECA beneficiary be given advance notice of the intention to terminate or reduce his or her compensation. Section 10.540 of the regulations directs that "whenever the evidence establishes that compensation should be either reduced or terminated, OWCP will provide the beneficiary with written notice of the proposed action and give him or her 30 days to submit relevant evidence or argument to support entitlement to continued payment of compensation," provided that the beneficiary has a "reasonable basis to expect that payment of compensation will continue" and compensation is not being terminated, suspended or forfeited due to a penalty provision of the FECA or the implementing regulations. These notices include "a description of the reasons for the proposed action and a copy of the specific evidence upon which OWCP is basing its determination." Payment of compensation continues "until any evidence or argument submitted has been reviewed and an appropriate decision has been issued, or until 30 days have elapsed if no additional evidence or argument is submitted."

(3) Is a FECA beneficiary entitled to any "due process" rights when the beneficiary's compensation is reduced?
Yes. In addition to the answer in number two above, a FECA beneficiary whose compensation is reduced has additional ways in which to obtain review of that decision. Following a decision that either reduces or terminates a beneficiary’s entitlement to compensation, he or she may request an oral or written review of such decision by an OWCP hearing representative. That the request must be made within 30 days of the decision reducing or terminating entitlement and before any request for reconsideration by the district office of OWCP (whether or not the request for reconsideration is granted). Claimants injured on or after July 4, 1966, have the right, under § 8124(b)(1) of the FECA, to request an informal hearing with respect to an entitlement decision “before a representative of the Secretary.” While these hearings are held after the OWCP issues its decision reducing or terminating entitlement, they nonetheless meet the flexible standards of procedural due process set out in Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

Sections 10.615 through 10.622 of the current regulations describe the hearing process under the FECA. In particular, § 10.617 concerns oral hearings and states the following:

(a) The hearing representative retains complete discretion to set the time and place of the hearing, including the amount of time allotted for the hearing, considering the issues to be resolved.¹

(b) Unless otherwise directed in writing by the claimant, the hearing representative will mail a notice of the time and place of the oral hearing to the claimant and any representative at least 30 days before the scheduled date. The employer will also be mailed a notice at least 30 days before the scheduled date.

(c) The hearing is an informal process, and the hearing representative is not bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence, by technical or formal rules of procedure or by section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act, but the hearing representative may conduct the hearing in such manner as to best ascertain the rights of the claimant. During the hearing process, the claimant may state his or her arguments and present new written evidence in support of the claim.

¹ The Department of Labor has 27 hearing representatives who make approximately 220 trips a year to upwards of 500 cities a year based on the volume of incoming hearing requests. OWCP schedules approximately 6,750 hearings per year. Every effort is made to schedule a hearing within 300 days of the claimant’s request at a location no more than one hundred miles from the claimant’s home.
(c) Testimony at oral hearings is recorded, then transcribed and placed in the record. Oral testimony shall be made under oath.

(e) OWCP will furnish a transcript of the oral hearing to the claimant and the employer, who have 20 days from the date it is sent to comment. Any comments received from the employer shall be sent to the claimant, who will be given an additional 20 days to comment from the date OWCP sends any agency comments.

(f) The hearing remains open for the submission of additional evidence until 30 days after the hearing is held, unless the hearing representative, in his or her sole discretion, grants an extension. Only one such extension may be granted. A copy of the decision will be mailed to the claimant's last known address, to any representative, and to the employer.

(g) The hearing representative determines the conduct of the oral hearing and may terminate the hearing at any time he or she determines that all relevant evidence has been obtained, or because of misbehavior on the part of the claimant and/or representative at or near the place of the oral presentation.

(4) What are a beneficiary's "due process" rights if the OWCP determines that the beneficiary was overpaid and the OWCP makes a demand for reimbursement?

Before demanding reimbursement of an overpayment compensation benefit from a FICA beneficiary, OWCP provides both preliminary notice and an opportunity for a hearing. Consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in Califano v. Koncas, 442 U.S. 682 (1979), the OWCP's current regulations at §§ 10.430 through 10.441 provide for both preliminary notice and a "right of hearing" before any "demand for reimbursement" is made for an overpayment of compensation. In particular, § 10.431 states that:

Before seeking to recover an overpayment or adjust benefits, OWCP will advise the beneficiary in writing that:

(a) The overpayment exists, and the amount of overpayment;
(b) A preliminary finding shows either that the individual was or was not at fault in the creation of the overpayment;

(c) He or she has the right to inspect and copy Government records relating to the overpayment; and

(d) He or she has the right to present evidence which challenges the fact or amount of the overpayment, and/or challenges the preliminary finding that he or she was at fault in the creation of the overpayment. He or she may also request that recovery of the overpayment be waived.

Once the OWCP has issued the preliminary notice of an overpayment and finding of fault, § 10.432 provides that the beneficiary may "present evidence to OWCP in response to a preliminary notice of an overpayment," either "in writing or at a pre-recoupment hearing," as long as the evidence is "presented or the hearings requested within 30 days of the date of the written notice of overpayment."

(5) What are the OWCP's guidelines with regard to deferring to the view of a treating physician? What weight does OWCP give to the physician's view? Is the weight given by OWCP to the treating physician's views consistent with the weight used by other federal agencies when determining eligibility for or level of benefits?

The policy followed by OWCP and the ECAB in weighing the opinion of a treating physician is consistent with the approach taken by administrators of other benefit programs such as the Social Security Administration (SSA). The "attending [or treating] physician rule" is nothing more than a jurisprudential principle regarding the weight to be given to particular medical evidence. While the rule is, in fact, based in part upon the treating physician's "continuing observation of the patient's condition over a prolonged period of time," the SSA, by regulation, gives controlling weight to the opinion of a treating physician only if it is "well-supported by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques and is not inconsistent with the other substantial evidence in the record." 20 C.F.R. § 404.1527(d)(2). See Winford v. Chater, 917 F. Supp. 398 (E.D. Va. 1996); Shrewsbury v. Chater, 1995 WL 592236 (4th Cir. 1995 (unpublished); Schild v. Sullivan, 3 F.3d 563 (2d Cir. 1993).

The SSA regulations provide that if a treating physician's opinion is not given controlling weight, a number of factors should be applied in determining the weight to give the opinion. In this context, the "rule" is simply guidance to be used by a fact-finder in weighing the evidence before him or her. See, for example, Ross v. Callahan, 168 F.3d 72,78
(2d Cir. 1999) ("The opinion of a treating physician is given controlling weight if it is well supported by medical findings and not inconsistent with other substantial evidence."); Walters v. Commissioner of Social Security, 127 F.3d 525, 530 (6th Cir. 1997) (where treating physician’s opinion is not conclusive as to the critical issue and is contrary to substantial evidence in the contrary in the record, the fact finder "is not bound by the treating physician’s opinions"); Bookz v. Chater, 91 F. 3d 972, 979 (7th Cir. 1996) (in the end, "it is up to the ALJ to decide which doctor to believe – the treating physician who has experience and knowledge of the case, but may be biased, or . . . the consulting physician, who may bring expertise and knowledge of similar cases – subject only to the requirement that the ALJ’s decision be supported by substantial evidence."); Wilson v. Apfel, 172 F.3d 539, 542 (8th Cir. 1999) ("Although a treating physician’s opinion is generally entitled to substantial weight, such opinion does not automatically control, since the record must be evaluated as a whole."); Morgan v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, 169 F. 3d 595, 600-01 (9th Cir. 1999); Reid v. Chater, 71 F. 3d 372, 374 (10th Cir. 1995).

Even before the promulgation of the Social Security regulation, the opinion of a treating physician was not afforded controlling weight where the record demonstrated "good cause" for rejecting it. Schilder v. Heckler, 787 F. 2d 16, 85 (2d Cir. 1986) ("a treating physician’s opinion on the subject of medical disability is binding on the factfinder unless contradicted by substantial evidence."); Schner v. Bowen, 816 F.2d 578, 581-582 (11th Cir. 1987) (factfinder "properly discounted [treating physician’s] opinion that Schner was totally disabled because it was not supported by objective medical evidence and was merely conclusory"); Floyd v. Bowen, 833 F. 2d 529, 531 (5th Cir. 1987) ("unless good cause can be shown to the contrary, a treating physician’s opinion is entitled to considerable weight."). The "treating physician rule" has similarly varied effect in proceedings under state worker’s compensation statutes. See, for example, Goodman v. Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, 605 A. 2d 945, 949 (PA. 1997). EBORION Group v. Blythe, 957 P. 2d 1134, 1136 (MN. 1998) ("a treating physician’s opinion is not conclusive. To presume otherwise would quash the rule of the fact finder in questions of an alleged injury."). Rent v. Remediation Services of Louisiana, et al., 714 So. 2d 218, 223 (LA. 1998) (despite the general jurisprudential rule that a treating physician’s opinion is entitled to added weight, "the trier of fact is not bound to accept the testimony of an expert whose testimony is presumptively given more weight if he finds the opinion is less credible than that of other experts.")
The BCAB, in adjudicating FECA cases, has recognized that while the opinion of a treating physician might be accorded greater weight, it must still be evaluated and if it is not sufficiently explained, and is contrary to evidence that withstands similar scrutiny, will not be controlling. Jack B. Schaff, 1989 WL 222410 (E.C.A.B.). See also Timothy E. Murray, 1987 WL 91035 (E.C.A.B.) (treating physician report "of little probative value" where doctor did not describe method of calculation of impairment, did not mention A.M.A. Guides, and is indefinite and speculative in nature.). OWCP’s practice under the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act (FECA) also is fully consistent with the foregoing precedent. In all cases, a medical report is required from a claimant’s attending physician (20 C.F.R. 10.330), and in most cases, benefits are paid on the basis of such reports. When OWCP determines that a second opinion is warranted, or where additional medical reports are submitted by hospital or emergency facilities, all the medical evidence must be considered in adjudicating the claim. In weighing medical reports, OWCP claim examiners must consider a number of issues relevant to the probative value of the evidence. FECA Proc. Manual Part 2-0810-4.

OWCP recognizes that the attending physician is the primary source of medical evidence in most cases and usually sees the claimant soon after the injury or onset of symptoms. The attending physician may also be familiar with the claimant’s medical history and know of preexisting conditions that should be considered. These factors do not outweigh the need for detailed information and a rationalized opinion, however, nor can familiarity with the claimant replace medical expertise. All such factors are properly considered in weighing the evidence with respect to a claim. OWCP’s Procedure Manual indicates that a “second opinion” physician’s opinion that differs from that of the attending physician with respect to critical issues will take precedence, but only where all other factors are equal and the attending physician is a general practitioner but the “second opinion” is provided by a Board-certified specialist in the appropriate specialty. This result is merely an application of the principle recognized in all the cases cited above – that where the fact finder has appropriate grounds for crediting one report over another, that finding should not be disturbed on appeal.

Nor is the special weight afforded the opinion of an impartial referee inconsistent with this principle. First, an impartial referee’s opinion is given additional weight because the examination by such a referee is required by the statute where there is a conflict in medical evidence of equal weight. 5 U.S.C. §8123(a); 20 C.F.R. §10.502. A referee’s opinion is afforded this special weight, however, only if there is, in fact,
a conflict in the evidence (See Jordan M. Carter, 32 ECAB 850), and only if the referee's "conclusion is not vague, speculative or equivocal and is supported by substantial medical reasoning" (James P. Roberts, 31 ECAB 1010). See, FECA Procedure Manual (Part 2-0810-11(c)(2)). Under these circumstances, affording some greater weight to an impartial referee's opinion, which is required by statute, which supports evidence already in the file and already determined to be equal to the weight of conflicting evidence, and which must be inherently definitive, well-rationalized, and supported by substantial reasoning, can hardly be said to be contrary to the "treating physician rule."

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional information on this program which provides such important benefits to injured Federal workers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Shelby Hallman
Deputy Director

cc: The Honorable Stephen Horn
Mr. HORN. So Ms. Maggio, what would you like to add?

Ms. MAGGIO. I want to state that a lot of the other agencies have congressional offices that have a staff who handle congressional calls only.

And OWCP in Philadelphia, they have a congressional phone line to the District Director’s office, but it’s the claimant. There’s not a special congressional staff to help. And I know that the claimant—or the claims examiners, they have a lot—you know, their workload is backed up. And for them to stop and explain something to us, just delays their work even further. So maybe as a possible suggestion for the congressional point, if there was a staff that we could communicate with, it might be more effective.

Mr. HORN. That’s a good suggestion, I think for any agency, frankly.

We are now finished with this panel. And I think I will try to bring panel III forward, if they’re present. Patricia Dalton, the Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Labor, will be accompanied by Amy Friedlander, Evaluations and Inspections.

And the second witness will be Shelby Hallmark, Deputy Director, Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, Department of Labor. And Shelby Hallmark will be accompanied by Sharon Tyler, District Director, San Francisco Regional Office.

Mr. HALLMARK. Chairman Horn, let the record show it’s Mr., not Ms. here. My name does go both ways.

Mr. HORN. I left it open. Thank you. If there’s any staff behind you that are also going to advise you, we can save a lot of time if they stand up too and you take the oath, even if you aren’t going to do it. But it will save us from interrupting the hearing to give oaths every 5 minutes.

OK. Would you stand, raise your right hands, and those behind you.

Do you affirm that the testimony you’re about to give this subcommittee is the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth.

[Witnesses affirmed.]

Mr. HORN. OK. I saw seven members, four at the table and three in the audience.

So let us start with Patricia Dalton, the Deputy Inspector General.

STATEMENTS OF PATRICIA DALTON, DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY AMY FRIEDLANDER, EVALUATIONS; AND SHELBY HALLMARK, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY SHARON TYLER, DISTRICT DIRECTOR, SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL OFFICE

Ms. DALTON. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for inviting the Office of the Inspector General to discuss customer service issues within the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs at the Department of Labor.

Over the past two decades, the OIG has devoted significant resources to detecting and preventing fraud and abuse within the FECA program through our audits, investigations, and evaluations.
The OIG has conducted two recent evaluations of customer service-related issues within the FECA program.

The first evaluation examined two timeliness issues that arose during the July 1998 hearing held by this subcommittee.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Dalton follows:]
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Year 2000 Computer Compliance at the
U.S. Department of Labor

Witness appearing before the
House Committee on Education and the Workforce
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
U.S. House of Representatives

Patricia A. Dalton
Deputy Inspector General
Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for inviting the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to discuss customer service issues within the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (OWCP) at the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). I am here in my capacity as Deputy Inspector General to present the views of the OIG, which may not necessarily be representative of those of the Department of Labor.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Labor administers several programs and statutes designed to provide and protect the benefits of workers and retirees, including the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act (FECA) Program, the Longshore and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Program, the Unemployment Insurance Program, and key provisions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. FECA is a major Federal benefit program that affects the budgets of all Federal agencies. This year, FECA costs are expected to total about $2 billion.
FECA is a comprehensive workers' compensation law for Federal employees that is designed to provide coverage for work-related injuries or deaths to some 3 million Federal employees and postal workers. Benefits are paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund, which is administered by OWCP and principally funded through chargebacks to the employing agencies.

Over the last two decades, the OIG has devoted significant resources to detecting and preventing fraud and abuse within the FECA program through the OIG's program of audits, investigations, and evaluations. To date, the OIG's work has disclosed vulnerabilities that can often lead to inefficiencies and loss of Federal funds.

Most recently, the OIG has conducted two evaluations of customer service-related issues with the FECA program. The first examined two specific issues that arose during a July 1998 hearing held by this Subcommittee. The second OIG evaluation examined OWCP customer service surveys from 1995 through 1998.

**MEDICAL REIMBURSEMENTS AND SURGICAL AUTHORIZATIONS**

Mr. Chairman, last summer, this Subcommittee held a hearing to investigate whether injured Federal employees receive timely and equitable adjudication of their compensation claims. At that hearing a number of witnesses testified about their concerns with the compensation claims process. Following the hearing, the OIG analyzed the hearing transcript and the allegations made by the claimants at the hearing. We also reviewed a relevant General Accounting Office (GAO) report. Based on this analysis, we examined two outstanding issues regarding whether OWCP was timely in responding to claimant requests for reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses, and requests for surgical authorizations.

In examining the issue of claimant reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses, we reviewed existing OWCP data, which revealed that reimbursements to claimants represent only 3 percent of all medical bills. The remaining 97 percent of the claims are submitted by medical providers and health plans.

In addition, we reviewed the reimbursement standards that OWCP has established. These standards for claimant reimbursement have been established at the 28-day level and the 60-day level. OWCP's own data showed that the agency falls slightly short of meeting its 90 percent standard for the 28 day period, paying 82.1 percent of all claimant-submitted bills within the 28 days. At the 60-day standard, OWCP has paid 99.9 percent of all claimant-submitted bills. In addition, OWCP has recently
implemented an automated bill review system. Prior to the new system, OWCP had to manually review each bill. OWCP has indicated to the OIG that it expects this new system will shorten the processing time for bills and, therefore, increase the percentage of claimant-submitted bills paid within the time frames.

![Payment of Claimant-Submitted Bills](image)

Pharmacy bills are the single largest cost category of claimant-submitted reimbursements. Our review found that OWCP was able to pay 97 percent of claimant-submitted pharmacy bills within 55 days, and 83 percent of these claims were paid within 28 days. This past July, OWCP implemented an electronic billing system that enables pharmacies to bill OWCP directly, eliminating the need for claimant out-of-pocket expenses. OWCP records indicate that after only four months, the new system has reduced claimant-submitted pharmacy bills by 10 percentage points.

The second issue that arose from the July 6, 1998, hearing was concerns about the timeliness of surgical authorizations. In this area, OWCP deals with two different types of surgeries: emergency and non-emergency. If an employee suffers a traumatic injury at work and requires emergency surgery, the employing agency is responsible for authorizing the medical treatment within four hours of injury. Our review examined OWCP's handling of requests for non-emergency surgery.

While OWCP has no automated system to track the time between requests for non-emergency surgery and authorizations by OWCP, some OWCP district offices
attempt to manually track this information. For example, the New York District Office has dedicated a fax line to receive medical authorization requests. The goal is to respond to claimants within one week, whenever possible. Although OWCP indicates that claims examiners are working to expeditiously process surgical authorizations, we could not identify a standard within OWCP, or within the industry, to benchmark performance.

We contacted many different sources, including the Workers' Compensation Research Institute and State Workers' Compensation Programs, but could not find a standard to measure OWCP's performance. Although the overall range for processing authorization requests was 0 to 354 days, ninety-three percent of the cases fell within the range of 0 to 85 days. Leaving the five atypical cases (354, 328, 225, 124, and 102 days) out of our calculations, we found that on average, OWCP processed surgical requests in 26 days, with the median (mid-point) being 17 days and the mode (most frequent value), which occurred 5 times, 7 days. The range shows what program officials told us -- that the time it takes OWCP to process a surgical request varies greatly depending on the case. Although we did not find a pattern of delays in the case files we examined, our report recommends that OWCP establish a performance standard for responding to requests for surgical authorizations in order to reduce claimant uncertainty about the process.

**OWCP CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEYS**

Mr. Chairman, our second evaluation reviewed OWCP's customer service surveys from 1995 through 1998. We conducted this review in order to determine whether OWCP's surveys are a useful tool in providing information about customer service.

Earlier OIG and GAO reports found no evidence of anti-claimant bias on the part of OWCP. However, our first review of reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses and requests for surgical authorizations, alerted us to possible problems with OWCP customer service. A preliminary review of OWCP's customer service surveys and interviews with agency officials indicated methodological deficiencies that raised concerns about the surveys' ability to provide useful information to the agency.

Because OWCP has conducted customer service surveys of claimants covered under FECA since 1995, we reviewed their last four survey reports and questionnaires and interviewed OWCP officials to analyze the methodology of the survey questionnaires. Our review identified deficiencies in the methodology used to measure customer service, as well as deficiencies in sampling, survey design, response rate, and survey operations. Although OWCP has made efforts to improve the surveys each year, our analysis revealed the existence of methodological flaws that cast doubt on the
accuracy of the information obtained from them. Our review identified the following problems:

- In terms of the survey design, we found that the 27-question, 4-page survey is too long, which may encourage respondents to rush or skip items. In addition, the changing formats within the questionnaire increased the difficulty in responding to questions.

- With regard to measuring customer service, we believe that to accurately report on a broad, multi-faceted topic across five different subgroups requires using more than just one questionnaire. We have recommended that OWCP consider other methods of measuring customer service, including using focus groups with representatives of different claimant groups and using existing agency data sources, such as telephone logs or correspondence tracking. Focus groups are particularly useful for exploring issues and can contribute a clear understanding of customer needs.

- In terms of the sampling methodology, we found that some of the five sample groups are over-sampled, while others are under-sampled. For example, approximately equal samples were drawn from dissimilarly-sized groups. One group was comprised of 154,000 claimants who had not lost time from work, and a second group with only 24,000 claimants who had been denied a claim. Sampling an equal number from these two sub-groups (and the three others) does not ensure that all claimants have an equal chance of selection in the overall sample. Consequently, this may potentially skew OWCP's sample.

- In one year's survey, we found that the questions asked in the questionnaire did not specifically pertain to the sample that OWCP drew. Consequently, many respondents may have believed that the survey did not apply to them.

- Our review also found that OWCP does not retain any data from the surveys. Because of potentially incomplete records, the data and research conducted cannot be verified. Moreover, valuable information, as well as the opportunity for subsequent research with the data sets, is lost.

- Although the response rate is improving, it remains considerably below the OMB standard of 80%. However, in 1998, OWCP did conduct a telephone survey to identify the characteristics of non-respondents to verify the quality of the responses they obtained.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the many problems associated with the research methodology make it very difficult to assess the adequacy of the annual survey.
Ultimately, OWCP is unable to fully discern whether Federal injured workers are being adequately served by the process intended to help them. In order to make the survey accurate and useful, and to better understand the concerns of injured workers, our recommendations have been crafted to ensure that OWCP will be able to collect high-quality data for performance planning and managing customer service to Federal claimants. OWCP generally concurred with our findings and management has indicated that they will be using most of our recommendations to improve future customer service surveys.

CONCLUSION

Since the Subcommittee reviewed these issues last July, the issue of customer satisfaction within OWCP has been reviewed in a number of different ways. Despite the problems associated with the way OWCP surveys its customers, the OIG believes that OWCP has the ability to make the necessary corrections to allow for a more useful survey. These changes, if implemented, will enable OWCP to have a better strategic planning process, and -- more importantly -- help them obtain a better gauge of the concerns that injured Federal workers have with the current process. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you or the other Subcommittee Members may have.
Ms. DALTON. The second evaluation examined OWCP customer-service surveys from 1995 through 1998.

Following this subcommittee's field hearing last summer, the OIG reviewed the hearing transcript and the allegations made by a number of claimants.

Specifically, we focused on two outstanding issues. The first issue is the timeliness of OWCP in responding to claimant requests for reimbursement of their out-of-pocket medical expenses.

In examining the issue of claimant reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses, we found that reimbursements to claimants represent only 3 percent of all medical bills. OWCP has established standards for claimant reimbursements at the 28-day level and the 60-day level.

At 82 percent, OWCP's own data shows that the agency fails short of meeting its 90 percent standard for the 28-day period.

However, it does exceed it's 60-day standard of 95 percent by paying 96.9 percent of all claimant's submitted bills within 60 days. Recently OWCP implemented an automated bill-review system which they expect will further shorten the bill processing time.

The second issue that arose from the July 1998 hearing concerns were concerns about the timeliness of surgical authorizations. Our review focused on OWCP's handling of requests for nonemergency surgery since emergency surgery is authorized by the employing agency.

Our review disclosed that OWCP has now an automated system to track the time between requests for nonemergency surgery and authorizations by OWCP. Although some OWCP district offices are attempting to manually track this information.

While OWCP indicates the claims examiners are working to expeditiously process surgical authorizations, we could not identify an OWCP or industry standard that is used to benchmark performance. To help improve the system, our report recommends that a performance standard be established for responding to non-emergency surgical requests. We believe that this would help to reduce claimant uncertainty about the process.

We conducted a second evaluation where we examined OWCP's customer-satisfaction surveys from 1995 through 1998 to determine whether those surveys are useful tools in assessing customer satisfaction.

Our review of the four survey reports identified a number of problems. We found that the 27-question 4-page survey was too long and difficult to complete. We recommended that OWCP supplement the survey with focus group data which can contribute to a more detailed understanding of customer service and concerns.

We found that some of the five sample groups were over sampled while others were undersampled. Sampling of a virtually equal number from these groups does not reflect the proportional difference in the national claimant population.

We found that the questions asked in 1-year surveys—survey did not specifically pertain to the sample that OWCP drew. Consequently, many respondents may not have returned the surveys assuming that it did not apply to them.
Finally, we also found that OWCP does not retain any data from the surveys, thereby precluding its verification and the opportunity for subsequent research.

As a result of the problems with the survey methodology, OWCP is unable to fully discern whether Federal injured workers are being adequately served by the process intended to help them. In order for the survey to be useful to OWCP and better understand the concerns of injured workers, we made a number of recommendations to help OWCP in the collection of high quality data for performance planning and managing customer service to Federal claimants.

Despite the problems associated with the way OWCP surveys its customers, the OIG believes that OWCP has the ability to make the necessary corrections to allow for a more useful customer satisfaction survey. These changes, if implemented, will enable OWCP to have a better strategic planning process and, more importantly, help the agency to better gauge and address the concerns that injured Federal workers have with the current process.

OWCP has indicated in their response to the evaluation—to our evaluation report the intent to make a number of changes in their survey process.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. HORN. We'll hear from the administration then if you can stay with us, we'll have a dialog here.

Mr. Shelby Hallmark is the Deputy Director for the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs and the Employment Standards Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Welcome. A number of people, I think, over you were either out of town or something is what I'm told. So you're holding the whole burden. Please proceed.

Mr. HALLMARK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to come in to discuss the administration of the FECA program here today.

As you say, I'm the Deputy Director of OWCP which is the oversight, the umbrella organization, one of our programs is the FECA program.

I have with me today Ms. Sharon Tyler who is the District Director in our San Francisco Regional Office and the largest of the FECA offices. She's currently acting as the Acting Deputy Director for FECA here in the National office.

I believe it would be helpful to review how OWCP's strategic plan and Government Performance and Results Act goals relate to this whole issue of customer service that we've been hearing about today and will undoubtedly continue to discuss. I think that provides a framework for what the organization is trying to do. And I would like to talk a little bit about that this morning.

Obviously my written testimony is longer, and I would refer folks to that for more detail.

Mr. HORN. Well, take your time. I want to give fairness to the administration. So take your time. We're in no hurry.

Mr. HALLMARK. I appreciate that.

Just a general word about the volume of our work. I think that's an important context to consider. I believe one of the previous wit-
nesses indicated the degree to which claims examiners are hard-working and, oftentimes, the issues that are raised in this kind of context are difficult.

OWCP gets roughly 8 million telephone calls and pieces of mail each year. With our 950 employees, that factors out to almost 9,000 contacts per each and every individual in this program.

We serve roughly 250,000 injured workers, injured Federal workers—

Mr. HORN. Let me ask at that point just to make sure the record is clear, you’re saying they have 8 or 9,000 calls per employee?

Mr. HALLMARK. Per year.

Mr. HORN. Per year. Now, is that based on the voice mail where somebody might have called 10 times trying to reach a human being? What kind of data——

Mr. HALLMARK. The 8 million figure represents roughly 2½ million telephone calls, which is our estimation.

We don’t have an exact number. It’s an approximation based on our telephone systems that provide reports in some cases. We try to delete from that duplicates of the kind that you’re suggesting. The other 5½ million items are pieces of mail, medical bills, and so on.

Mr. HORN. Let me ask the Inspector General, have you ever checked the telephone numbers?

Ms. DALTON. No, we haven’t, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HORN. Would you take a look at it, and let us know. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Hallmark.

Mr. HALLMARK. Yes, sir.

We serve, as I was saying, about 250,000 injured Federal workers in any given year. We pay roughly $2 billion in benefits each year and 96 percent of the cost of this program is delivered to injured workers and their medical providers which makes the FECA program perhaps the leanest compensation system in the country in terms of administrative costs.

Most of the injuries of that 250,000 that I’m describing are minor ones. And OWCP basically is involved only in making medical payments for those individuals.

The major source of difficulty, some of which we’ve heard about this morning, in those cases—and there are roughly 150,000 of them each year—comes into play when the Federal agency, the employing agency, fails to send the notice of injury to OWCP timely. If we have no official notice, we cannot make a payment. The individual who is from a doctor’s facility was reflecting the difficulties that occur when that happens.

When we do have a case established, we make payments on medical bills. And, as I say, we receive millions of them, and about 90 percent of the time, we pay within 28 days. Roughly 95 percent of the time, as Ms. Dalton was indicating, within 60 days.

About 50,000 workers are on long-term monthly wage-loss replacement benefits from OWCP. For them, we have a much more intense involvement. We serve as their payroll office as well as dealing with medical issues and other assistive services.

A smaller group of individuals receive wage-loss benefits from us on a part-time basis or interim basis during the year, and then, in
most cases, return to work. And a smaller group still each year, approximately 18,000 cases, are denied. And, obviously, in those cases many of the difficulties that some of the previous panels have talked about can occur where there are obvious differences of opinion regarding the nature of the case.

A little history would be helpful, I think, in evaluating the FECA program. We fell behind dramatically in the 1970’s in this program in handling the basic workload, getting cases adjudicated and making payments. During the 1980’s, we instituted a number of initiatives to get a handle on that workload.

We established numerous performance measures and standards to provide a target, and we held our staff accountable for accomplishing those timeframes. As a result of that, since the mid-to late 1980’s, we have been able to adjudicate our cases as they come in the door relatively promptly, and we believe the great majority of cases are, in fact, expeditiously handled.

Roughly 90 percent of all cases coming in the door are approved. When the GAO and the OIG have audited our programs, they have uniformly found that our processes are basically fair and reasonable.

However, we recognized at the close of the 1980’s that there were a number of continuing problems in this program. And the strategic plan that I’m about to describe to you which has evolved as now being a part of the Government Performance and Results Act effort, basically was developed to address how this program can transform itself to address the major issues that we saw.

And those issues really were three major components. One, customers were frustrated with our ability to communicate with them effectively; two, we found that the individuals on our long-term rolls were often staying on the long-term rolls even when it appeared that their injury was not totally disabling; and, three, the costs of the program were escalating.

Analyzing those issues, as I said, we chose to try to transform this program, and our strategic plan basically amounts to a transformation plan.

The plan basically has four elements. One is return to work, making injured workers whole by aiding them in getting back to the work place. We have found that throughout the world the benefit and importance to society, to the individual, to the family, of individuals being a productive member of society is key.

Two, improving overall customer service. Clearly that’s the topic of our conversation most directly today.

Three, enhancing fiscal integrity.

And, four, enhancing agency and union partnerships throughout the Federal Government to accomplish all of the above goals.

That strategic plan was, by the way, established as the partnership activity within our own Department of Labor family.

We believe we’ve made important strides. And my written testimony addresses the accomplishments of the organization in terms of those specific measures that are identified in our GPRA plan including return-to-work measures, cost-containment measures, and customer-service measures.

But clearly the customer-service component of our plan is the most challenging aspect for this program to achieve. We have made
progress. All three of the measures that we report on for customer service are showing steady improvement, but we're not satisfied with those improvements. And clearly we will continue to make enhanced efforts.

Customer service is, by definition, a labor intensive and very expensive undertaking. And shifting our staff's central concern or view of what they do in their job from being an adjudication and paper-processing operation to being an interactive, dynamic, service-providing operation is a long-term undertaking. We believe it will take time, it will take improved tools, and it will take training. We know we have a long way to go, and we're working hard to get there.

I cite a few examples of what we're doing. Let me just give you a few of the things that are in my written testimony. First, we've gotten more staff. In 1999, we received a 10 percent increase in staff which had been sought for a number of years. It takes more people to be more responsive in a program like this. And even with that 10 percent increase, OWCP has among the highest per FTE caseloads of any program of this kind.

I mentioned earlier that we get about 8,000, 9,000 calls and letters per person. A 10 percent increase in staff amounts to an 800 or 900 per person per year reduction, and that's not small.

That will have a major impact on the ability of this program to meet the needs of the individuals we heard today and all the other individuals who come to us seeking services.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hallmark follows:]
Statement of Shelby Hallmark, Deputy Director
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Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am pleased to be here today and appreciate this opportunity to discuss the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) by the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), and to address some of the important issues and concerns people have about this program.

The Federal Employees' Compensation (FEC) program covers nearly three million Federal employees in 72 different agencies, providing benefits to any of them who sustains an injury or illness in the performance of duty anywhere in the world. Because of the extreme importance of this protection to Federal workers, OWCP tries to provide those benefits when they are due as quickly as possible, and OWCP offers the full range of medical and rehabilitation services to return injured employees to productive work at the earliest date possible. For the 170,000 injury notices filed annually, we maintain high standards of decision timelines and prompt payment of wage loss claims and medical bills, and are especially proud of the high number of workers successfully returned to work. At the same time we recognize our fiduciary responsibility to Federal employers and taxpayers. Since 1993 our periodic roll management project and other cost containment efforts have saved hundreds of millions of dollars and reduced the overall cost of the program measured in constant dollars.

OWCP's record of timely adjudication, well-controlled inventories, and timely payment has been consistent since the mid-eighties, when, after an intensive effort including ongoing automation initiatives, the program slowly gained control of a dramatically increased workload which overwhelmed our administrative resources in the late 1970's. Beginning in 1992, and well before the Government Performance and Results Act made strategic planning a requirement, OWCP turned its attention to achieving positive outcomes for employers and employees through careful deployment of its limited resources. Our administrative expenditures have remained extremely low compared to most comparable state compensation programs, about 4 percent of total costs. Nevertheless, in the last several years we have been able to target and achieve better outcomes for employees, in the form of early and safe return to work, in addition to prompt provision of benefits when due; and for employers, in terms of better control of disability and medical costs.

OWCP has taken the mandates of the Government Performance and Results Act extremely seriously, and we believe that the goals and measures we have established in carrying out the GPRA will help us achieve increasingly positive outcomes in the future. The key measures we are holding ourselves accountable for this year and through FY 2002 under our current strategic plan are identified in Appendix A. As that document shows, OWCP is meeting or on schedule to
meet all of our FY 1999 goals for the FEC program, and we believe that record reflects the
genuine progress -- and improvements in real-world results -- for our customers and
stakeholders.

Our strategic goal number one is to return injured employees to work as soon as medically
appropriate. The measure of our success in this area is a reduction of lost production days due to
work-related injuries. OWCP has achieved more than a 9 percent reduction in this measure
through the first half of FY 1999.

Our second goal is improved service to injured workers. The three GPRA measures for this goal
-- customer satisfaction, employing agency timeliness of claims submission, and quality of case
work -- have all improved steadily since we began our measurements. These improvements are
in addition to the continuing strong performance of the program in terms of timely adjudication
and payment of wage-loss and medical benefits, which is the fundamental aspect of good
customer service in a benefit program. In addition, we have accomplished improved timeliness
in response to telephone and written inquiries.

The third goal is fiscal integrity, and all three measures -- savings via the Periodic Roll
Management project, savings in the medical bill payment arena, and implementation of
electronic ("paperless") processes -- are being met or will be met by the end of the year.

The final strategic goal is to enhance our relationships with customers and stakeholders --
including especially the employing agencies and employee unions. While this goal does not lend
itself as readily to quantiative measurement, we are pursuing cooperative efforts on a wide range
of issues with our partners, and we believe these efforts will pay continuing dividends in terms of
improved overall service to the ultimate beneficiaries of the program -- injured Federal workers.

Despite this strong evidence of real performance improvement in the FEC program, we are aware
that much remains to be done. The results just described are hard-won, given the limitations on
our administrative budget, the unreleenting volume of the work, and its inherent complexity.
Although all of our goals are challenging, providing first class customer service and achieving
broad customer satisfaction are perhaps the most difficult. We recognize that many injured
workers and others who are engaged by this program have serious concerns, and as we indicated
at the hearing in July 1998 in Long Beach, we appreciate the Subcommittee's raising some of
these issues to our attention.

Any discussion about customer service in the context of the FEC program must take into account
the distinguishing characteristics of the program, and should consider the entire (voluminous)
population of injured workers and others whose needs must be addressed.
FECA's Characteristics

One distinguishing feature of this program is its legal focus. Entitlement to benefits does not flow just from the status of the individual claiming benefits, as it may when a veteran claims a service-connected disability, nor from time in service, as it may when a Federal employee applies for retirement benefits.

Rather, entitlement to workers' compensation benefits rests on a host of factors defined in the law and the regulations, including whether the claim was filed within the time limitations required by law, whether the person claiming benefits is in fact a Federal employee, and whether the employee was performing his or her official duties when the injury occurred. The first two of these determinations are usually straightforward, but the third can become very complicated, especially in claims for occupational illness.

A second distinguishing feature of this program is its basis in initial and continuing medical evaluation. Initially, medical evidence is used to determine whether a condition is in fact work-related. In complex and long-term cases, OWCP needs to re-evaluate the medical evidence from time to time to ensure that benefits continue to be paid at the correct level. While not unique to workers' compensation claims, this differs from the evaluation process in other programs, where a one-time medical assessment may be all that is needed to support payment of benefits at a constant level for a very long time.

This dual emphasis on legal decision-making and on the need for continuing medical evaluation informs many aspects of our program, and it helps to explain why the program often seems complicated to outside observers. This complexity makes the job of serving our customers all the more difficult as Americans have come to expect a greater degree of information about products they buy and services they receive. Meanwhile, OWCP has juggled increasing requirements for customer responsiveness with a large and unrelenting workload.

FECA Program's Workload

The program covers about three million civilian Federal employees, as well as members of a number of ancillary groups such as the Peace Corps, the ROTC, and non-Federal law enforcement officers. The program does not, however, cover active-duty members of the U.S. Armed Services. A review of some basic figures may help to convey the size of the program and its challenges.

In FY 1998 the program's 12 district offices received and processed 165,814 new injury or illness cases. Another 18,560 claimants filed new claims for wage loss.

The offices also maintained another 50,105 ongoing claims on the periodic roll for continuing partial or total disability. For these individuals, OWCP serves as a payroll operation, handling all manner of issues such as health benefit coverage, group life insurance and optional life
insurance, and open season changes, as well as continuing medical, rehabilitation and related services and support. In the first half of FY 1999 the program's offices processed 924,730 medical bills.

Each year, the program as a whole receives approximately 5.5 million pieces of mail; the offices receive almost 106,000 pieces of mail per week. Each year, the program as a whole also receives more than 2.6 million phone calls. On a weekly basis, over 40,000 calls are received and responded to program-wide. The offices receive and respond to more than 21,000 phone calls and letters from Congressional offices each year.

With less than a thousand employees to do the job, handling this massive, unrelenting workload is a daunting task, and our claims staff deserves recognition for the hard work they do every day in support of their fellow Federal employees. Largely because of the dedication of its staff, OWCP accomplishes its mission on an administrative budget that is extremely low as a percentage of the total cost of the program. On a per FTE basis, FEC employees are responsible for a significantly higher number of covered employees, number of claims, and benefit dollar outlays than their counterparts in comparable state workers' compensation programs.

The Definition of "Customer Service" in the FECA Context

The service that OWCP provides to claimants should be viewed in the context of the agency's role in administering the FECA. OWCP's role is to be the neutral adjudicator of claims against the various Federal agencies in their capacity as employers. OWCP must make a legal entitlement decision based on facts and medical evidence, as an adjudicating body, as well as acting in the role of an insurance company, as payer of benefits and provider of other services. The program's customer service goals are to render fair and accurate decisions on benefits, including treatment authorizations, and explain the decisions clearly and tactfully, to provide full appeal rights and assist people in obtaining these rights, and to give people full, accurate and timely information on their claims.

Customer Service Initiatives

The Subcommittee has indicated special interest in customer service, the area covered by the FECA program's second and fourth strategic goals. Although the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General has recently provided us with a study citing the need for improvements in our customer survey methodology, OWCP believes that survey provides some useful information about customer attitudes, which comports with our experience in general regarding the claimant population. With the assistance of the OIG we anticipate obtaining more accurate information via this or alternative instruments in the future. The information available to date shows improvement over the past several years, but the general level of satisfaction reported (56 percent in the FY 1998 survey) is far from satisfactory.
Given the nature of our customer relationships, we know not everyone is going to be pleased with our services. But OWCP is committed to identifying and correcting service deficiencies, and we have been pursuing a wide range of initiatives in that regard. In addition to the strategies identified in our strategic plan, these include:

Additional staff. In FY 1999, the FEC program received nearly a 10 percent increase in staff, a much needed infusion of human resources which are absolutely critical to achieving quality customer service.

Extensive computer improvements. OWCP is making sweeping enhancements to its already sophisticated computer systems, which will increasingly allow electronic rather than paper communications, speeding transactions and improving our ability to track and control the information needed to process these cases. By FY 2000 all new cases will be scanned and processed as electronic documents, and by FY 2001 we expect to be in a fully paperless environment. We have already instituted a secure Internet system that provides employing agency staff with real-time access to virtually all the information they need to assist us in assuring the smooth operation of the system, and we are close to instituting electronic submission of claim forms from the agencies. Interactive Voice Response (IVR) telephone systems allow automated access to FECA payment status data for claimants and medical providers. Finally, we are completely redesigning the A2P support system that claims staff use to process cases, and the new system -- targeted for FY 2001 -- will greatly improve their ability to respond efficiently and effectively to the particular cases that need action on any given day.

Training. OWCP’s FY 2000 budget request includes funding for the first nationwide training program for all FEC staff. This will address program fundamentals and familiarization with the major automation improvements just discussed, and is necessary to the success of the automation and imaging projects. It will also provide techniques for providing quality telephone and written communication, dealing with difficult customers, and developing other customer service skills.

Improved agency timeliness of claims submission. OWCP has worked with Federal agencies to significantly improve the speed of initial claims timeliness, a key element in ensuring that medical bills filed soon after the injury are paid timely and without the need for resubmission by the provider. Electronic submission and other efforts to speed this process will have an important effect in getting the vast majority of claims off to a good start.

Improved casework quality. FEC is focused on getting decisions right in the first instance, so as to avoid over burdening the appeals process with cases where appeals should not have been necessary.

Maintenance of basic claims processing and payment timeliness. No amount of responsiveness will improve satisfaction if adjudication and payment actions are not completed as promptly as possible.
Actions Since the July 1998 Subcommittee Hearing

In addition to the ongoing initiatives just discussed, OWCP has taken several measures that address the customer service and related concerns that were identified by Chairman Horn during the July 1998 hearing in Long Beach.

Hearings and Review

Of particular concern at that hearing was the delay experienced by injured workers who request an oral hearing appeal before the FEC Branch of Hearings and Review. Several improvements have been targeted in that area, including the speeding of the "front-end" review process that determines whether the case is in posture for a hearing or if it should be returned to the district office for action. This process has been expedited, and all such reviews are now completed within 30 days of the case arriving at the Branch.

More generally, the overall time from receipt of the appeal to delivery of a decision following a hearing has been reduced, from 312 days in September 1998, to 251 days in April 1999, and the number of cases awaiting a decision in the Branch has been reduced from 4,805 in July 1998 to 4,169 in April 1999, a 13 percent reduction. While we hope to make still further improvements, these data reflect significant progress in delivering timely decisions. Goals for improvement in both of these areas have been incorporated in the performance agreement for the Director of the FEC program.

Medical Authorizations

In October of 1998, national program managers began requiring each Regional Director to establish a method of identifying, tracking and measuring requests for medical authorizations received by telephone. This step was taken to ensure that employees and medical providers receive prompt, substantive responses to such requests. The methods vary by region, but many district offices use a report based on automated records of telephone calls, which have a category for medical authorization.

The tracking methodology was in place by January 31, and the first reports on the percentages of requests answered substantively have been received.

--- While these reports are still being analyzed, preliminary results show that most offices are providing over 90 percent of their responses within three days or less.

--- We are now going to look into the quality of subsequent responses, to ensure that cases where additional work is required to adjudicate the request are handled promptly and substantively as well, and to evaluate whether the most complicated requests need to be tracked separately. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have sufficient information to determine
whether a new performance standard is needed in this regard, and what the standard should be, in 
conformance with OPRA principles.

Through management reviews and accountability reviews, all offices are reviewing this issue as 
it relates to timeliness and quality of decisions.

For example, the New York District Office has a dedicated fax line to receive medical 
authorizations. The availability of the fax line is publicized through its Telephone Bank voice 
mail message system. When employees, medical providers or agencies contact any district office 
staff, they are advised to use this fax number to request authorizations for surgery and other 
medical requests. If a second opinion must be obtained to act on a surgery request, the 
examination is scheduled on a priority basis.

Second Opinion and Referee Specialists

At the last hearing, Congressman Davis noted the concerns of certain claimants who had 
attended a second opinion and referee medical examination at the direction of OWCP. These 
employees believed that the physicians did not grant them the time and attention necessary to 
obtain a true picture of their respective conditions, and contended that as a result the medical 
reports of these evaluations were seriously flawed.

As I noted in the beginning of this statement, the program depends on thorough and professional 
medical evaluations. We have procedures in place to review the performance of second opinion 
and IME physicians to assure that quality work is obtained. Following last year’s hearing, we 
have required each regional director to ensure that this review mechanism explicitly includes 
identification and follow up on employee complaints of this kind.

Following Up with Employing Agencies

Many injured workers express concern about their Federal employers’ handling of their FECA 
claims. These problems include untimely submission of forms and information to OWCP, non-
availability of light-duty positions, lack of technical information about the claims process, in 
addition to underlying employee/employer disputes. As in the area of second opinion 
evaluations, the Regional Directors’ performance agreements were modified to require that they 
establish systems to capture information about agency activities that may violate FECA 
regulations, procedures, or sound case management, and to provide effective feedback to 
agencies about the need to correct such practices.

Partnering with employing agencies and employee unions to enhance the overall delivery of 
FECA services is our fourth major strategic goal. To that end, OWCP has a multi-focused 
program to work with agencies to manage their overall workers’ compensation programs, 
implemented through discussions at the program head level with agency heads, national and local 
technical assistance meetings, seminars and workshops, and our various publications. During FY
1999 we have redoubled our efforts in this regard. Beginning this year, OWCP and OSHA will jointly pursue a government-wide "Federal Worker 2000" program which requires agencies to:

- Reduce the injury case rates for most Federal agencies by 3 percent per year, while at the same time increasing the timeliness of reporting new injuries and illnesses to OWCP for each agency by 5 percent per year.

- Reduce the lost time injury case rates for those worksites with the highest Federal lost time case rates by 10 percent per year.

- Following establishment of a baseline in FY 1999 or 2000, reduce the lost production days rate (lost days due to injury or illness per 100 employees) by 2 percent per year.

As part of this program, OWCP will measure all lost time, including the Continuation of Pay (COP) days paid by each agency in traumatic injury cases, and not merely wage loss periods. This will require that we find ways to assist return to work much earlier in the history of the injury, which studies have shown is more effective in preventing long-term disability.

For the last two years, OWCP has made the timeliness with which agencies submit injury notices and claim forms a central concern, using whatever forum is available to tell agencies that good case management and program management begin with this simple step. Agency performance, including establishment or bureau level data, is tracked and posted on OWCP's internet website.

Overall agency performance in this area has improved since we have been emphasizing it, but we have a long way to go. In this and other areas, OWCP has directed special attention to several large agencies, including the VA, Treasury, USPS and DOD, to address particular problems. Injury Compensation Specialists are being trained in the program's new regulations, and in many offices, Senior Claims Examiners (CEs) and Supervisory CEs have been matched with employing agencies to address problems arising with individual claims and to improve coordination between OWCP and the agencies.

New Regulations

OWCP recently revised in their entirety the regulations which govern administration of the FECA. These regulations became effective January 4, 1999. They are written in a question-and-answer format in a manner that is much more accessible for the lay person, which will allow them to be more readily used by injured workers and their representatives as a handbook for pursuing their claims. OWCP made a number of substantive changes to the regulations, among them the simplification of the process used to approve attorney fee applications. Before the revision, claims examiners were required to review each fee application for a number of factors, including time, cost, reasonableness and impact of the services on the outcome of the claim. Under the new regulations, if the claimant does not disagree with the attorney's fee request, as properly presented to OWCP, it can be approved immediately.
Recent ADP Improvements

The program continues to modify and enhance its ADP operations to address customer issues.

-- The program's new regulations, effective January 4, 1999, included a provision for electronic payment of prescription bills, which will reduce the burden of injured workers by reducing the need for them to seek reimbursement for out of pocket expenses (since more and more pharmacies will bill OWCP directly given the electronic mode);

-- The Interactive Voice Response (IVR) System has been updated, so that authorized persons can find out if a medical bill has been paid;

-- The program's Internet site has been upgraded to make additional claims forms available to employees and employers.

What Remains To Be Done

OWCP continues to develop new strategies to tackle the issues we've been discussing today. As I've noted, improving customer service in a program like FECA is an expensive, labor-intensive undertaking, and most strategies for the future will require additional staff as well as equipment. Here are some of the approaches we are planning for the future.

The program's ability to respond to the millions of telephone calls we receive would be enhanced if we can improve our telephone equipment base and the link between our phone systems in each office and the FEC database. A fairly rudimentary system is in place now -- the IVR arrangement which permits a claimant or medical provider to key in identifiers and obtain automated payment information over the phone. We hope to expand on that capability, but to do so will require the installation of modern telephone switching devices in each office. We are investigating how best to address this need, in coordination with the Department of Labor's overall administrative arm.

OWCP has identified the potential benefit of installing a nationwide 800 number that injured workers, providers, and others could use to obtain quick information about the program, and possibly to speed the process of medical authorization. This would provide the public with an avenue for reaching a "live person" without diverting district office staff from their claims processing and management work. Competing demands on our scarce staffing resources, as well as limitations on our data systems, have made this approach impractical to date. However, we plan to move to a fully electronic system by FY 2001, which would permit nurses stationed at a central location to instantly access all medical reports on file for a case and make consistent and informed authorization decisions. The feasibility of this approach will be reconsidered in that context, again in conjunction with Department-wide initiatives.
OWCP is working with the OIG to improve its ability to measure customer satisfaction and identify means of improving service. Since a large part of the current frustration centers around our telephone responsiveness, we are considering whether a new design for assessing customer satisfaction with individual calls may be needed. In addition, a FECA partnership team is currently evaluating the performance standards and workload expectations of claims staff. This team has identified measurement of communications timeliness and quality -- a performance standard for claims staff in every office -- as an area for reinvention.

As noted above, OWCP has requested FY 2000 funds for intensive training of its claims staff. In that context we hope to develop a comprehensive "Communications Redesign" to help both claims and support staff meet their responsibilities, both on the phone and (for claims staff) in writing. Depending upon the availability of resources, such an initiative could involve some or all of the following steps:

--Identify the specific demands placed on contact reps and claims staff, and train accordingly. People call and write for a variety of reasons. The program hasn’t had a standardized protocol for dealing with different kinds of issues, either by phone or in writing, nor have we had a uniform process for handling troubled or irate callers. While every office has evolved processes for elevating complaints about service, these channels are not formalized and are not always adequately understood by staff or made clear to customers.

--Identify the skills needed to handle inquiries. These include interpreting questions, knowing the answers, explaining matters clearly, staying calm in the face of adversity, identifying and avoiding extraneous issues, and avoiding legal and medical jargon. In written responses, it is important to know when to quit, and on the phone, it is important to know when to refer a problem call to someone else.

--Train both support and examining staff. Basic training in communication and conflict management would be combined with inculcation of the protocols and complaint referral procedures discussed above. We hope to include this as a component of the training to be funded in FY 2000.

--Devise a way to monitor performance and measure results, again in conformance with GPRA principles. We would need to make sure that responses made are made well and politely, and identify where responses are left unmade. Also, we would need to ensure that responses are timely, and monitor such issues as voice mail boxes filling up.

--Finally, this initiative would also involve a reexamination of the program’s systems for generating form letters -- in conjunction with the ADP redesign project which will provide much fuller support for claims examiners in terms of automatically generated correspondence triggered by specific events or milestones.

I again want to thank the Subcommittee for inviting OWCP to address these matters today.
Mr. HORN. If I might point out, just to get it in the record, because it is sort of relevant and I was going to ask it anyhow. You mentioned the 10 percent increase. We are now in fiscal year 1999, and we are considering fiscal year 2000. Has your office, program within Labor, and you personally asked for the appropriate resources in the last 2 years or did you ask even earlier, like 1993–1994? After our hearing in Long Beach, I would hope that somebody got the message and said, gee, let’s solve some of these problems. Have you asked for those resources at your program level?

Mr. HALLMARK. I believe the record will show that OWCP has been seeking substantial additional staff resources at least, probably before this but certainly starting with the 1992 budget. A small number of staff were approved—additional staff were approved in 1992. We renewed those requests. A small additional increment was added in 1995. Unfortunately, in 1996, our resources were cut; and we were obliged to conduct a reduction in force.

Mr. HORN. Let me ask—

Mr. HALLMARK. So there is a long history of trying to accomplish that.

Mr. HORN. So your program reports to the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, essentially?

Mr. HALLMARK. Correct.

Mr. HORN. He or she, in turn, reports to a Deputy Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Labor. Did they approve your recommendations for more funding to help get at the backlog that Mr. Riordan mentioned? Where did it go up the line? How far did it go positively, let’s say, from your standpoint? Did you have the support of the Assistant Secretary and the Deputy Secretary and the Secretary?

Mr. HALLMARK. I’m casting my memory back over the number of years that we are talking about here which, unfortunately, now is 7 or 8. My recollection is that, in most of those years, the requests made by OWCP were, in fact, at least in part passed forward through the system. I can’t say with certainty that they appeared as part of the President’s budget in every case, but in most cases, yes, they did, at least in part.

Mr. HORN. So the Office of Management and Budget, then, made a decision one way or the other. And then comes the question, did the Secretary appeal the decision to the President, if it was a cut; and what eventually happened?

I don’t expect you to carry all those figures in your head right now. What I want to do is make a little matrix of that and put it in the record at this point, without objection. Then I would like to know if the President did make a recommendation and agreed with your recommendations. What did the Congress do in 1993, 1994, which was a Democratic Congress, and after that in Republican Congresses? Did they cut you? Did they add to it? Was there a difference between the Senate and the House?

If you could just get your fiscal people to give us that type of chart. And staff here will work with you. They will know what I’m after here. It is sort of my usual management routine of, did you get it or didn’t you and who sat on it so we can pin a little responsibility.
If it is Congress’ problem, fine, we will deal with them, the Authorization Committee and Appropriations Subcommittee. If it is the administration’s problem, fine, we will deal with them. But I would just like to have that—to the degree to which people asked for the resources they need and justified it.

[The information referred to follows:]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1998</th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONG. House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWCP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FECA)</td>
<td>61,169</td>
<td>77,758</td>
<td>77,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SHP)</td>
<td>5,537</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>8,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,611</td>
<td>26,844</td>
<td>26,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Backlund)</td>
<td>25,651</td>
<td>25,851</td>
<td>25,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LSTF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONG. Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT C**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>COND.</th>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
<th>Appropri.</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWCP</td>
<td>82,937</td>
<td>70,893</td>
<td>72,604</td>
<td>73,736</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>(151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECRA</td>
<td>74,407</td>
<td>42,254</td>
<td>60,241</td>
<td>68,961</td>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>(124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>8,482</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>8,086</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWCP</td>
<td>30,008</td>
<td>28,737</td>
<td>29,371</td>
<td>29,067</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>(187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frac Comp)</td>
<td>28,530</td>
<td>28,193</td>
<td>28,323</td>
<td>27,252</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTI</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWCF</td>
<td>81,057</td>
<td>79,034</td>
<td>76,425</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>76,603</td>
<td>76,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTECA</td>
<td>75,099</td>
<td>72,549</td>
<td>63,141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,676</td>
<td>67,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.04-M</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>8,518</td>
<td>8,474</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>8,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWCF</td>
<td>29,565</td>
<td>29,101</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>28,505</td>
<td>28,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Block 12)</td>
<td>28,505</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>27,548</td>
<td>27,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Excess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1993</td>
<td>OWCP</td>
<td>72,387</td>
<td>70,298</td>
<td>71,306</td>
<td>70,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1994</td>
<td>NREAG</td>
<td>64,584</td>
<td>61,081</td>
<td>62,955</td>
<td>62,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1995</td>
<td>LSWRA</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1996</td>
<td>OWCP</td>
<td>30,410</td>
<td>30,410</td>
<td>30,410</td>
<td>30,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1997</td>
<td>Black Lung</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1998</td>
<td>LSWRA</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted this review in response to testimony presented at a July 6, 1998, Congressional hearing of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, Government Information and Technology Subcommittee that was critical of the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (OWCP) administration of the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act (FECA). After analyzing the hearing transcript, OWCP’s written response to allegations made by the 19 claimants during that hearing, and relevant OIG and General Accounting Office (GAO) reports, we decided to examine two issues that remained unaddressed -- timeliness of claimant reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses and requests for surgical authorizations.

We found that reimbursement of claimants’ out-of-pocket expenses is not a substantial issue. OWCP data show that reimbursement of claimants represents only 3 percent of all medical bills paid by OWCP. OWCP surpasses the 95 percent 60-day performance standard by paying 96.9 percent of all claimant-submitted bills in 60 days, although it falls somewhat short of the 90 percent standard in 28 days by paying 82.1 percent of claimant-submitted bills within 28 days. However, OWCP told us that in January 1999, they implemented an automated bill review system. They expect this new system to increase the percentage of claimant-submitted bills paid in 28 days.

Pharmacy bills are the largest category of claimant reimbursements. OWCP has implemented an electronic billing system that allows pharmacies to bill OWCP directly, eliminating the need for claimant out-of-pocket expenses. OWCP records show that after only four months, the new system has reduced claimant-submitted pharmacy bills by 10 percentage points.
OWCP deals with two different types of surgeries—emergency and non-emergency. If an employee suffers a traumatic injury at work and requires emergency surgery, the employing agency is responsible for authorizing the medical treatment within four hours of injury. Our review examined OWCP's handling of requests for non-emergency surgery.

OWCP has not set a performance standard in this area. Although we contacted many different sources such as the Workers' Compensation Research Institute and State Workers' Compensation Programs, we did not find a standard with which to measure OWCP's performance. We did not find a pattern of delays in the case files we examined. In addition, OIG complaint letters contain few complaints regarding delays in reimbursement and surgical authorizations.

We recommend that OWCP set a performance standard for responding to surgical requests to reduce claimant uncertainty about the process. OWCP's response might be in the form of a request for additional information, an appointment to see a physician for a second opinion exam or an approval for surgery. Four of OWCP's twelve district offices already track surgical requests and have set performance standards. The performance standards range from 7 to 10 days.

The following report contains our analysis, findings and recommendation regarding OWCP's response to claimants' requests for reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses and surgical authorizations. We provided a draft of this report to OWCP. The agency's response is found in the body of the report and in its entirety in Appendix D. OWCP did not agree to set a performance standard at this time. We will consider our recommendation resolved once OWCP sets a performance standard for responding to surgical requests.
I. Purpose

This review assesses the timeliness of OWCP's response to claimants' requests for out-of-pocket expenses and surgical authorizations. On July 6, 1998, Congressman Stephen Horn of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, Government Management Information and Technology Subcommittee held a hearing in Long Beach, California on OWCP's service to injured employees under the FECA. The purpose of Congressman Horn's hearing was to find ways to improve the federal employees' compensation system. Nineteen claimants testified, either on a panel or from the audience. The claimants expressed a wide variety of complaints that pointed to possible anti-claimant bias on the part of OWCP, including difficulties with adjudication of claims, problems communicating with district offices, disputes with employing agencies and delays in reimbursement of claimant out-of-pocket medical expenses and surgical authorizations.

In a July 31, 1998 letter to Chairman Horn, OWCP addressed the agency's handling of each of the 19 cases. According to OWCP, only two involved delays with surgical authorizations and none related to delays in reimbursing claimant out-of-pocket medical expenses. Of the remaining 17 cases, seven involved delays on the part of OWCP unrelated to reimbursement of claimants and surgical authorizations. The other 10 involved lack of medical evidence, claimant confusion over the process and other issues which were the responsibility of the employing agencies.

Earlier OIG and GAO reports found no evidence of anti-claimant bias in OWCP's selection and payment of second-opinion physicians or handling of claims. In 1998, the OIG study, Review of FECA Program Administration, examined the OWCP's acceptance of initial claims for benefits, the termination of benefits and the appeals process administered by the Branch of Hearings and Review. OIG did not find a systemic anti-claimant bias but, to the contrary, found OWCP commitment to improving the quality of service to claimants and ensuring cost-effective administration of the program.

In 1994 the GAO report, Federal Employees' Compensation Act - Non Evidence That Labor's Physician Selection Processes Biased Claimants' Decisions, investigated allegations that OWCP (1) "shopped" for physicians to conduct second-opinion exams and independent medical examinations who would be predisposed against claimants and (2) took longer to reimburse claimants' physicians than to reimburse physicians selected by OWCP. GAO found no evidence to support either allegation. OWCP's process for selecting physicians...
provided a reasonable level of certainty that the physicians were selected in an unbiased manner. While GAO did not distinguish between payments made directly to providers and reimbursements to claimants, GAO found that OWCP was meeting its overall bill payment performance standards.

After analyzing the hearing transcript, OWCP's written response to allegations made by the 19 claimants during that hearing, and the OIG and GAO reports, we identified two issues that remained unaddressed—timeliness of claimant reimbursement for out-of-pocket medical expenses and requests for surgical authorizations.

Accordingly, the objective of this review was to determine whether OWCP was responding in a timely manner to claimants' requests for:

- Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses and
- Surgical authorizations.

Our review was conducted in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspections published by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.
II. Findings

1. Reimbursement of Claimant Out-of-Pocket Medical Expenses

As Figure 1 shows, claimant-submitted bills are only 3 percent of the 2,817,021 bills OWCP paid in fiscal year 1998.

![Figure 1: Provider-Submitted vs Claimant-Submitted Bills](chart)

We found that OWCP surpasses the 95 percent 60-day performance standard by paying 96.9 percent of all claimant-submitted bills in 60 days, but falls somewhat short of the 90 percent standard for 28 days by paying 82.1 percent of claimant-submitted bills within 28 days. However, OWCP told us that in January 1999,

\[\text{[At the time of this report, the agency was unable to retrieve dollar amounts to correspond with these percentages.}\]
they implemented an automated bill review system. Prior to this new system, OWCP had to manually review each bill. OWCP expects this new system to shorten the time for processing bills and therefore increase the percentage of claimant-submitted bills paid in 28 days. Furthermore, an electronic billing system OWCP has put in place is expected to reduce the overall percentage of claimant-submitted bills.

As Figure 2 illustrates, pharmacy bills are 88 percent of all claimant-submitted bills, physician bills are 10 percent and outpatient bills are less than 1 percent.

Figure 2: Categories of Claimant-Submitted Bills

We found that for July 1, 1997, through July 14, 1998, OWCP exceeded the 60 day standard by paying 97 percent claimant-submitted pharmacy bills in 60 days and came very close to the 28 day standard by paying 83 percent in 28 days. In fiscal year 1998, OWCP did not meet performance standards in either claimant-submitted physician bills or claimant-submitted outpatient bills. Although
pharmacy bills are by far the largest category of claimant-submitted bills that OWCP reimburses, they represent only 2 percent of all medical services paid for by OWCP. The remaining two categories -- claimant-submitted physician bills and claimant-submitted outpatient bills -- are only .2 percent and .02 percent respectively of all medical services paid for by OWCP.

In an effort to reduce claimant-submitted bills, OWCP implemented an electronic billing system for pharmacy bills -- the bulk of all claimant-submitted bills -- in July, 1998. The system allows participating pharmacies to bill OWCP directly, thus eliminating the need for claimants to pay pharmacy bills out-of-pocket and request reimbursement from OWCP.

The year before the electronic billing system was implemented, claimant-submitted bills were 22 percent of the total pharmacy bills. Four months after the electronic billing system was in place, the percentage dropped to 12 percent. OWCP provides lists of participating pharmacies to district offices and posts them on the internet. OWCP’s efforts to reduce claimant-submitted bills appear to be on the right track and are showing early success.

Also, in August 1997, OWCP introduced a Claimant Medical Reimbursement Form. This form tells claimants what documentation OWCP requires to reimburse out-of-pocket medical expenses. By completing the form, a claimant greatly reduces the possibility of OWCP returning their bill to request additional information, thus reducing delays in claimant reimbursement.

OWCP is working on several other technological innovations to further streamline the bill payment process. OWCP plans to have the new computer system in place by July 2001. Where feasible, the new system will use imaging and electronic capture of data, instead of manual data entry. This will allow OWCP to establish more electronic billing programs like the one currently in place for pharmacies.

OWCP is also in the process of imaging all its case files and medical bill batches. Bill batch imaging gives claims examiners quicker access to specific bills. Instead of searching for the paper copy, the staff will be able to quickly access an electronic copy. OWCP expects this innovation to improve the timeliness of their responses to claimants’ needs.
2. **OWCP’s Timeliness in Processing Surgical Authorizations**

OWCP has not set a performance standard in this area. We contacted a wide range of sources such as the Workers’ Compensation Research Institute and State Workers’ Compensation Offices; however, we found no standard against which to benchmark OWCP’s performance.

Some OWCP district offices attempt to track the time between request and authorization manually. For example, the New York district office has dedicated a fax line to receiving medical authorization requests. Their goal is to respond in one week whenever possible. In Cleveland, each claims examiner maintains a log of incoming correspondence that includes surgical authorization requests. The claims examiners try to respond to the request within 10 working days of its receipt. Tracking systems are left to the discretion of the district offices because OWCP’s current computer system is not capable of tracking this information. However, OWCP’s national management told us that they have directed each district office to develop a way to track telephone medical authorization requests, which includes requests for surgical authorizations. OWCP states that all district offices are currently conducting tracking of telephone requests for medical authorizations and are reporting on a quarterly basis to the national OWCP office.

In order to get an idea of OWCP’s timeliness in processing surgical authorizations, we measured the elapsed time between OWCP’s receipt of a request for surgical authorization and OWCP’s approval in 69 Philadelphia case files. We also noted the number of Congressional inquiries in an effort to determine whether there were patterns of delays in responding to these inquiries. In addition we reviewed OWCP claimant complaint letters received by the OIG.

**Elapsed Time**

Our random sample of 69 cases drawn from the Philadelphia case files included three high frequency surgical procedures: (1) arthroscopic knee surgery, (2) rotator cuff repair and (3) herniated disk repair. We measured the elapsed time between the surgical authorization request and OWCP’s authorization.

Although the overall range for processing surgical authorization requests was 0 to 354 days, ninety-three percent of the cases fell within the range of 0 to 85

---

*OWCP does not keep a record of the number of surgical authorizations denied.*
days. Leaving the five atypical cases (354, 326, 225, 124, and 102 days) out of our calculations, we found that on average, OWCP processed surgical requests in 26 days, with the median (mid-point) being 17 days and the mode (most frequent value), which occurred 5 times, 7 days. The range shows what program officials told us -- that the time it takes OWCP to process a surgical request varies greatly depending on the case.

Congressional Inquiries
Our sample from the 85 Philadelphia case files included three files containing Congressional correspondence. Each case was unique and did not appear to be part of a pattern of delays on the part of OWCP.

1. On May 6, 1996, the Philadelphia District Office received a fax from Congressman Joseph M. McDade's office inquiring about the status of a claim. Congressman McDade was particularly concerned about delays in authorizing surgery and reimbursing pharmacy bills. The District Office responded to the fax with a May 20th letter from the District Director. The Director stated that the office had received the claims for reimbursement and the claimant should expect payment in approximately two weeks. The office never received a request for authorization of surgery.

Based on the case file, it appears that the claimant's doctor sent the letter requesting surgery to the claimant's employer, the U.S. Postal Service, on April 23. The Postal Service received the letter on April 29, but failed to forward it to the OWCP District office. After the District Office received the surgery request on June 9, it authorized the surgery on June 15.

2. On May 11, 1996, the Philadelphia District Office received a letter from Congressman Bud Shuster inquiring about the status of a claim. OWCP replied in a May 21 letter stating that the claim had been approved and the claimant had been informed of this by letter. OWCP received the claimant's request for authorization on March 27, 1998. A letter to the claimant appears in the file. The letter is not dated, but its placement in the file suggests that it was sent prior to the May 11th Congressional inquiry.

3. On April 8, 1997, the Philadelphia District Office received a letter from Congressman Bud Shuster requesting information about a claim. The claimant injured his knee on July 9, 1996. The claimant waited for approval, but OWCP did not receive his claim until January 18, 1997.
The District Office responded to Congressman Shuster in a letter dated April 18, 1997. The letter explained that on January 30, 1997, OWCP sent the claimant a letter informing him that the information accompanying his claim was not sufficient for OWCP to determine eligibility for FECA benefits. The claimant sent additional information on February 26, 1997. OWCP approved the claim and surgery on April 11, 1997, and sent a letter informing the claimant.

**OIG Data**
Currently, claimant complaints regarding delays in reimbursement and surgical authorizations are infrequent. Our analysis of fiscal year 1998 OIG complaint letters shows 64 letters concerning OWCP. Of the 64 letters, 7 involved complaints about reimbursements and/or surgical authorizations. The 7 letters contained 4 complaints about medical reimbursements and 5 about delays in processing surgical authorizations.
III. Conclusions

We found that the timeliness of OWCP's reimbursement to claimants for out-of-pocket medical expenses is not a substantial issue. OWCP data show that claimant-submitted bills are only 3 percent of the total number of medical services paid for by OWCP. Overall, bills are paid in a timely manner and, furthermore, OWCP has implemented an electronic billing system for pharmacy bills, which in only four months has reduced the number of claimant-submitted bills by 10 percentage points.

OWCP has not set a performance standard for responding to requests for surgical authorizations. Although our review of 69 Philadelphia case files did not reveal a pattern of delay and claimant letters received by the OIG indicate that claimant complaints regarding delays in surgical authorizations are infrequent, we recommend that OWCP set a performance standard for responding to requests for surgical authorizations.
IV. Recommendation

We recommend that OWCP set a performance standard for responding to surgical requests. OWCP’s response might be in the form of a request for additional information, an appointment to see a physician for a second opinion exam or an approval for surgery. Four of OWCP’s twelve district offices already track surgical requests and have set performance standards. The performance standards range from 7 to 10 days.

During the hearings claimants expressed confusion over OWCP’s processing of claims and surgical requests. Setting a performance standard for responding to surgical authorizations would not only enable OWCP to determine district offices’ timeliness in this area, but may also eliminate a great deal of claimant uncertainty.

OWCP Response

"OWCP plans to review its practices in responding to surgery requests given the recommendation of your study and your emphasis on identifying more precisely where and how to focus our efforts at improving customer service. However, there are several reasons that we cannot establish a performance standard at this time."

OIG Conclusion

On the basis of this response, we do not consider this recommendation resolved.

Major Contributors to this Report:

Amy C. Friedlander, Director, Division of Evaluations and Inspections
Teserach Ketema, Team Leader
Mary Elizabeth McNeill, Project Leader
George T. Fitzelle, Program Analyst
Appendix A

Background

The FECA (5 USC 8103(a)) requires that any civilian employee of the United States who is injured while in the performance of duty, be provided with the medical services and supplies needed to treat the injury. The rules governing reimbursements, surgical authorizations, and timeliness follow.

Reimbursements

OWCP recognizes two types of reimbursements: provider-submitted and claimant-submitted. Medical providers can directly bill OWCP for their services (provider-submitted) or a claimant can pay for medical services out of his own pocket and request reimbursement from OWCP (claimant-submitted). This study focuses on claimant-submitted reimbursements. Claimant-submitted bills fall into three categories: outpatient, physician and pharmacy.

To be reimbursed, a claimant must submit (1) a copy of an itemized standard billing form (HCFA-1500, UB-92 or for pharmacies, the Universal Billing Form) which provides the tax identification number of the vendor as well as each line item paid and (2) a copy of a canceled check or proof of payment.

Surgical Authorizations

The FECA procedures manual states that in order to ensure payment, a claimant must obtain prior authorization for surgery whenever possible. A physician must request the surgery and provide medical evidence to show its necessity. However, if an employee suffers a traumatic injury at work and requires emergency surgery, the employing agency is responsible for authorizing the medical treatment within four hours of injury by issuing a CA-16 form. The CA-16 guarantees the payment of medical treatment up to 30 days after the injury unless OWCP withdraws authorization in writing.

The time OWCP takes to authorize non-emergency cases varies depending on the complexity of the condition. For example, before OWCP will authorize back surgery, the claimant must obtain a second opinion or a consultant's review of the medical evidence. The FECA procedures manual states that an in-house review by a consultant should occur within 21 days of receipt of the request for surgery, and any second opinion examination required should be accomplished within 40 days. On
the other hand, OWCP does not require second opinion exams or a consultant's review for injuries such as carpal tunnel surgery. A claims examiner may be able to authorize the surgery based on the information already contained in the case file.

According to OWCP officials, many of the factors contributing to the length of processing time are beyond OWCP's control. For example, OWCP may need additional medical information from the physician or a claimant may postpone an appointment for a second opinion. The claims examiner may request additional information regarding how the injury occurred to ascertain that the surgery is necessary and concerns a work-related injury.

Timeliness

The OWCP Operational Plan includes a Timeliness Performance Measure for processing (paying or denying) medical bills—90 percent are to be processed in 28 days and 95 percent in 60 days. However, OWCP does not have a timeliness standard for processing requests for surgical authorizations. OWCP officials told us that it is difficult to set a performance standard for processing surgical authorizations because the time it takes to authorize a procedure varies depending on the type of case. We contacted multiple sources such as the Workers' Compensation Research Institute and State Workers' Compensation Programs, but did not find a standard with which to measure OWCP's performance.
Appendix B

Methodology

To gather background information, we examined two pertinent previous studies—OIG’s 1998 study, *Review of FECA Program Administration* and the 1994 GAO report, *Federal Employees’ Compensation Act - Non Evidence That Labor’s Physician Selection Processes Biased Claimants’ Decisions*. We then began our current review. We started with the examination of OWCP’s performance in reimbursing claimants. Subsequently, we reviewed agency performance in processing surgical authorization requests. Table 1 of Appendix C lists the data sources we reviewed.

To determine OWCP’s performance in reimbursing claimants for out-of-pocket medical expenses, we conducted interviews with OWCP senior management and obtained OWCP bill payment data. We did not verify the statistical data obtained from OWCP’s bill payment system. According to an OWCP official, OWCP defines a bill as a service or prescription and most claimant reimbursement requests involve a single bill. Outpatient and physician bill data include outpatient and physician bills paid from October 1, 1997 to September 30, 1998. Pharmacy bill data include pharmacy bills paid from July 1, 1997 to July 14, 1998. The three-month difference in reporting periods is so small as to not be material to our review. The two sets of data give an informative picture of OWCP’s bill payment performance. In addition, we analyzed complaint letters regarding delays in reimbursement and authorization for surgery sent to the OIG in fiscal year 1996 (October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998).

To study OWCP’s performance in processing surgical authorizations, OWCP furnished summaries of administrative practices in district offices. To gain further insight into the details of processing surgical authorizations, we visited the Philadelphia district office and examined a random sample of case files. We selected the Philadelphia District Office because OWCP data showed its performance was in the average range among OWCP district offices.

To develop the random sample, we first reviewed a list of surgical procedures commonly billed under FECA. OWCP created a list of frequently billed Physician’ Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes by extrapolating from bills paid for the last quarter of fiscal year 1998. Using the CPT codes billed, we were able to identify
the procedures represented by the codes and determined the most frequently billed procedures.

Two of the most frequent codes were carpal tunnel surgery and epidurals. However, we decided not to look at carpal tunnel and epidurals because neither procedure always requires a specific authorization. We chose shoulder, knee and back surgery as these procedures always require authorizations, are common and less likely to be an emergency procedure necessitating an emergency authorization. Specifically, we looked at rotator cuff repair (CPT # 23420), knee arthroscopy (CPT # 29881) and herniated disk repair (CPT # 63030). We included herniated disk repair because it represented a case that required a second-opinion exam before authorization. This requirement indicates that OWCP would take longer to authorize this procedure. We determined that these codes would provide an adequate sample to measure the number of days it takes OWCP to authorize a requested surgery.

After determining which codes we would review, we used a stratified random sampling for attributes method to select cases allocated proportionally among the three codes. This sampling method yielded 74 cases for review.

During our visit to Philadelphia we reviewed 60 case files and gathered information on selected variables including those related to identified time-frames. Five of the 74 cases we selected were not at the Philadelphia office at the time of our review. More specifically, the variables we recorded included the type of procedure and number of days between the date of request and the date of authorization.
Appendix C

Table 1
Data Sources Reviewed

Transcript of Proceedings held before Chairman Home, July 6, 1998 in California. Reported by Bill Warren for York Stenographic Services, York, PA.

July 31, 1998 OWCP's Response to Claimant Testimony

OWCP Bill Payment Data

- Pharmacy bills (7/1/97 - 12/15/98)
- Physician bills (Fiscal Year 1998)
- Outpatient bills (Fiscal Year 1998)

OIG Complaint Letters (Fiscal Year 1998 - January Fiscal Year 1999)

Philadelphia District Office Case Records
May 17, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR: AMY FRIEDLANDER
OIG

FROM: SHELBY HALLMARK
OWCP

SUBJECT: OIG Report No. 2E-04-431-0001

You requested our review of the draft report dated May 14 and whether OWCP is prepared to implement your recommendation for a performance standard on surgical requests. OWCP plans to review its practices in responding to surgery requests given the recommendation of your study and our emphasis on identifying more precisely where and how to focus our efforts at improving customer service. However, there are several reasons that we cannot establish a performance standard at this time.

OWCP has set numerous performance standards over the years, and has an excellent track record of managing performance to ensure that these exacting standards are met. Following the tenets of the GPRA, we believe that goals and measures should be established for those aspects of our work which are critical to our mission and which relate to areas needing real improvement.

We agree that it is essential that surgical requests be handled timely. In fact, your report indicates that it did not find a pattern of delay in the handling of these requests. Performance standards are currently in place for responses to telephone and written inquiries. Sampling in these areas, as well as automated telephone tracking systems, reveal that we are meeting these standards. To determine whether or in what areas there may be problems which warrant a new standard, in early 1999, the office began tracking telephone requests for medical authorizations and percentage of responses within three days. Once this information has been collected for a period of time, we will analyze the data and consider the need for an additional standard.

Secondly, your report notes the varied appropriate actions that can be taken on a surgical request. Depending on the specific surgery request, appropriate response can be immediate. Infrequently, it may take several months while additional examinations are being requested and performed. A standard set at a low number of days does not acknowledge those cases that appropriately require several additional actions before a decision. A standard set at a high number of days does not adequately serve those with surgeries that do not require additional review or information. A standard set at the median minimizes both situations.
Finally, it must be noted that tracking such information to the degree of precision required for a standard would be very difficult in our current ADP system. For this reason, the tracking of authorizations we recently mandated is being accomplished on a mainly manual basis. While we may determine that a standard should be set for some (or all) medical procedure requests, it may be very difficult to track performance against such a standard until our system redesign is completed in FY 2001. Simply setting a performance standard in this area may serve to alleviate claimant confusion, but OWCP has found that accurate and reliable measurement is essential to genuine performance improvement.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reviewed the Office of Workers' Compensation (OWCP) 1995 - 1998 customer service surveys, which were conducted by the Division of Federal Employees' Compensation (FEC). We analyzed the surveys' methodology in order to determine their accuracy and usefulness in providing sound information about customer service. Although OWCP has made efforts to improve the surveys each year, our analysis revealed the existence of methodological flaws in several areas, including survey design, measurement of customer service, sampling, response rate, and survey operations.

We make the following recommendations to enhance the accuracy of the data by improving the survey methodology and thus help OWCP judge and improve the quality of customer service provided by FEC.

Survey Design
1. Revise the questionnaire to shorten it, improve formatting of questions, and eliminate duplicate questions.
2. Reformat the questions to reduce the burden on claimants.
3. Conduct a pilot test for any future survey to increase clarity and relevance.

Measurement of Customer Service
Supplement reporting on customer service with focus group data.

Sampling
1. Draw a sample weighted to reflect the differences in sizes among the five claimant subgroups.
2. Analyze the sample to identify and eliminate overlap in sample selection from each subgroup.
3. Focus analysis of the survey data on only the key questions for which the research is being conducted.
4. Include additional analysis of samples, including: a comparison of the sample to the national claimant universe, using demographic variables and estimation of sampling error.

Response Rate
1. Establish higher standards for the response rate.
2. Include a cover letter on the contractor or DOL letterhead explaining at a minimum the importance of the survey, that participation is voluntary, a promise of confidentiality, and contact information for any questions.
3. Review follow-up procedures to ensure that nonrespondents who do not return the survey after the first postcard receive a new copy of the survey with a different cover letter stating the urgency of the project.

Survey Operations
1. Keep a record of the surveys returned in the mail as undeliverable and identify the reason why they were returned.
2. Ensure that the claimants sampled have the necessary experience with agency services to be able to answer the questions that are asked.
3. Keep a copy of the final data set as a permanent agency record.

The following report contains our analysis, findings, and recommendations regarding the methodology of the FEC customer service surveys. We provided a draft of this report to OWCP. The agency response is found in the body of the report and in its entirety in Appendix III. OWCP agreed to implement most of our recommendations if they conduct another survey and we consider those recommendations OWCP agreed with resolved. We are awaiting written confirmation of OWCP’s corrective actions so that we can close the recommendations.
I. PURPOSE

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted a review of the Office of Workers' Compensation's (OWCP) 1994-1998 customer service surveys of claimants covered under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). Because we believe that OWCP’s ability to effectively measure customer satisfaction with FECA service is critical toward improving customer service, we analyzed the methodology of the surveys in order to determine whether they provide accurate and useful information.

Earlier OIG and U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reports found no evidence of anti-claimant bias on the part of OWCP. However, while conducting research that resulted in our Review of Medical Reimbursements and Authorization of Surgical Requests for the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (1998), we requested a copy of the OWCP customer service survey report. Upon examination, we found methodological flaws in the questionnaire, casting doubt on the surveys’ ability to provide accurate and useful information to the agency on customer service.

To assess the surveys’ ability to provide useful information on customer service, we analyzed OWCP’s customer service survey methodology in the following areas:

- Survey design,
- Measurement of customer service,
- Sampling,
- Response rate, and
- Survey operations

We conducted our review according to the Quality Standards for Inspections published by the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

---

II. BACKGROUND, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

1. Background

OWCP has conducted an annual customer service survey of claimants covered under FECA since 1995. The purpose of this survey, which focuses on customer service process issues and not on adjudication, is to measure agency performance to monitor customer service and for planning purposes. The agency samples five groups of claimants: periodic roll payment recipients (who were in receipt of payments released every 28 days for wage loss); daily roll payment recipients (claimants who receive intermittent payments for wage loss); employees injured but with no salary loss; employees whose claims for injury or disease have been denied; and employees who filed claims for occupational disease. Management uses this information for monitoring customer service and planning.

The first round of customer service surveys was conducted in-house. The agency sent the surveys to respondents in June, 1994 and reported on its findings in 1995. Since then, OWCP has hired a contractor to conduct the surveys. Customarily, OWCP mails the surveys in March and the contractor records and analyzes the data and submits a formal report on the findings by August of the same fiscal year. A contractor report has been submitted to the agency each year the survey has been conducted.

OWCP contracted out the second round of surveys to Market Research Bureau, Inc. of Washington, D.C. The contractor conducted the survey in September of 1995 and issued a report in January of 1996. The sampling for this survey appears to have used the previously determined claimant subgroups. According to the report, the agency mailed an equal number of questionnaires (800) to the five client categories for a total of 4,000. The returned questionnaires were sent to DOL and then forwarded to the contractor for analysis. Six hundred and thirty-five were returned for a response rate of 21%. The questionnaire included both open-ended and closed-ended questions and covered a range of customer service related issues. This survey also allowed respondents to provide verbatim comments that were not consistently analyzed from year to year.

Contractor D. M. Saunders was awarded the contract for the 1996 survey. To increase the response rate in this round, OWCP made some changes: it increased the sample size by 500 and mailed follow-up postcards to nonrespondents. Data collection was completed in February 1997 and the report was issued in May of 1997. OWCP reported the response rate for this survey to be 29%.

The original contractor, Market Research, Inc., was awarded the contract for the 1998 survey. The number of followup postcards was increased to two and respondents were
given a deadline for returning the survey. The report based on data collected for this survey was issued in 1998. In this survey the total response rate was 44%. To gather information on nonrespondents, a telephone interview supplemented this survey.

2. Scope

OIG reviewed customer service surveys conducted annually from 1994-1998 by OWCP. Our analysis focused on survey methodology in the following areas: survey design, measurement of customer service, sampling, response rate, and survey operations. The following issues were outside the scope of our review: efforts that may be occurring at the district level to measure customer service; initiatives that OWCP may have taken to improve customer service in response to survey information; performance planning that may have been conducted using the data obtained from the surveys; and contracting issues with regard to procurement of the survey.

3. Methodology

To analyze the methodological issues within the scope of our review, we inspected customer service survey questionnaires and reports and written agency documentation, policies, and procedures on how the survey was conducted; and held interviews with OWCP officials.
III. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on all the information reviewed, OIG identified specific research methodology deficiencies that detract from the ability to make inferences about the claimant population from the sample. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that high quality data are available for the agency’s management of customer service.

In order to make our recommendations immediately useful, we chose to only report on the most salient issues that need attention. The following sections list our findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding (1) survey design, (2) measurement of customer service, (3) sampling, (4) response rate, and (5) survey operations.

1. Survey Design

Our review found problems and deficiencies with regard to the length, construction, and testing of the survey instrument. Specifically, we found that the questionnaire is too long; the number of answer formats, as well as the sequencing of questions, is problematic; and the questionnaire was never pilot tested. Appendix II contains copies of the questionnaires for the 1996, 1997, and 1998 reports.

Questionnaire length. The survey is four pages long, which is excessive for the goals of the annual customer service survey. The length of the questionnaire may encourage respondents to rush or skip items, reducing the quality of the response. By making the following revisions the questionnaire could be shortened to two pages. The first four paragraphs of the survey should be moved to a cover letter, any duplicate questions should be eliminated, and the questions could be reformatted to save space. Research shows that shorter, focused questionnaires have a higher probability of yielding reliable responses and higher response rates.

Questionnaire construction. The questionnaire construction is deficient. The questionnaire uses nine types of formats interspersed throughout. For example, question formats 1, 2a, 3, 4a, 4b, 5b, 5c, 6, and 7 in the 1996 survey are all different response formats (see Appendix II). Using many answer formats makes it difficult for the respondent to answer. The number of answer formats should be reduced to no more than four, and questions should be grouped by the answer format used. Screening questions should be located early in the questionnaire. For example, question 6 is a screening question and should be asked early in the questionnaire (see Appendix II). Placing screening questions early in the questionnaire has two advantages: it (1) prevents claimants from wasting their time when they do not have the experience necessary to answer and (2) strengthens survey findings. Improving the formatting will decrease the amount of time needed for completion and improve the probability of response. Claimants who lack the necessary experience will be screened out early and will not be burdened with completing the entire questionnaire.
Pilot test. No pilot test was conducted. The questionnaires were not tested with a small group of claimants before they were used with thousands of claimants over the last 3 years. Testing a questionnaire before it is mailed to the entire sample can help the agency learn whether the questionnaire is long and confusing to respondents and gauge whether it is asking relevant questions.

Recommendations

1. Revise the questionnaire to shorten it, improve formatting of questions, and eliminate duplicate questions.

OWCP Response
"We agree with #1 that the questionnaire could benefit from being revised to shorten its length, improve the formatting and eliminate duplicate questions."

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving a printed copy of the revised questionnaire that is sent out to respondents.

2. Reformat the questions to reduce the burden on claimants.

OWCP Response
"We agree with Recommendation #2 regarding the formatting of questions to put the like questions together. We would note, however, that OWCP/FEC has received no complaints from claimants through the past three years that there is undue 'burden' in completion of the questionnaires, as your report suggests."

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, the issue of reformatting of questions is resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving a copy of the 1999 questionnaire as mailed to respondents. Although OWCP has received no adverse comments on the surveys, our assessment is that the low response rates may be claimant reaction to the "burden" created by a poorly-designed questionnaire. Research in this area shows that response rates go down when questionnaires are too long.
3. Conduct a pilot test for any future survey to increase clarity and relevance.

**OWCP Response**
"We agree with Recommendation #3 that a pilot test may be useful should we substantially revise the survey in the future."

**OIG Conclusion**
On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved.
To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving a copy of the pilot test methodology and results.


The use of a single questionnaire can result in unreliable reporting. It is advisable that the agency measure customer service through a variety of data sources instead of relying solely on one survey.

**Reporting on customer service.** Even if a survey is conducted perfectly, it cannot capture all the dimensions of a multifaceted topic such as customer service. Focus groups are particularly useful for exploring issues and can contribute a clear understanding of customer service². In addition, programmatic areas that require improvement are more likely to be identified, making it possible to correct customer service problems before they escalate.

**Recommendation**

Supplement reporting on customer service with focus group data.

**OWCP Response**
"We will review this suggestion, to supplement the use of a survey on customer satisfaction by using focus groups, depending on the availability of funding."

**OIG Conclusion**
On the basis of OWCP's response, we do not consider this recommendation resolved. As stated in our report, we believe that, to have valid and useful information, the agency needs to collect information from more than one source.

3. Sampling

Examination of the sample revealed that it was not proportional to the different subgroups comprising the entire group of claimants. Further, our review disclosed that (1) the categories of claimant groups were not mutually exclusive, thereby raising the potential for overlap; (2) District Office comparisons were not statistically valid for the 1997 and 1998 surveys; and, (3) no analysis was conducted by the agency to ensure the sample approximated the entire group’s characteristics.

The sample. The sample drawn was not proportional to the different subgroups comprising the entire group of claimants. The different subgroups of claimants vary in size. Some of the five groups are over-sampled while others are under-sampled. The five claimant subgroups, the number of claimants in each subgroup, and the number of questionnaires sent to each group can be found below in Table 1.

Table 1
Identification of 1998 FEC Claimant Subgroups and their Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimant Subgroup at the time Sample Was Drawn</th>
<th>Number Of Claimants</th>
<th>Questionnaires Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Periodic Roll Payment Recipients</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Claimants who were in receipt of payments released every 28 days for wage loss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Daily Roll Payment Recipients</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Claimants who received intermittent payments for wage loss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Injured Employees with No Wage Loss</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employees Whose Claims for Injury/Disease Have Been Denied</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employees Who Filed Claims For Occupational Disease</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, there are 154,000 claimants with no lost time from work and only 24,000 claimants who have been denied a claim. Sampling a virtually equal number from these two groups and the three others does not reflect the proportional differences in the national population. To report on the national
population of claimants, weighting of the sample needs to be considered. Because the sample drawn was not proportional to the different subgroups, it likely does not represent the national universe of claimants. This means that analytical results reported on the data gathered probably do not represent the national claimant population when responses of all subgroups are added to form an aggregate measure.

Categories of claimants. The categories of claimant groups are not mutually exclusive, thereby raising the potential for overlap. This means that a claimant may be included in more than one subgroup. The samples from 1994-1998 could have been contaminated by sampling the same claimant more than once. Analyzing the sample by running a cross reference of case file numbers to identify repeated cases will protect it against including respondents in more than one category. In addition, the analytical findings of the data can be accepted with greater confidence.

Comparison of District Office performance. Comparison of District Offices was not statistically valid for the 1997 or 1998 surveys, because (1) the sample sizes for comparison were not large enough and (2) comparing District Office performance was not one of the key research questions listed in the agency's documentation. Analysis of survey data should be focused on the key questions for which the research is being conducted to avoid findings that are not statistically valid. Otherwise, District Offices may receive invalid feedback on their performance. Research is enhanced by ensuring consistency and a focused analyses in each part of the survey.

Relationship between sample and claimant population. No analysis was conducted to ensure that the sample used approximated the characteristics of the entire group and to estimate the sampling error. We did not find that any comparison of the sample to the population was done using demographic variables such as age and gender. Conducting this analysis would indicate whether the samples drawn match the target FEC claimant population on such characteristics as age and gender.

Another analysis that is standard practice includes estimating sampling error. Sampling error is expressed by stating the confidence level and the confidence interval. In national opinion polling, the confidence interval is often expressed as ±4%. A given percentage (or probability that the sample represents the population of interest). Without such comparison, there is no assurance that the sample is representative of the population. Conducting analysis to determine the sample quality will ensure that the sample is representative of claimants nationwide.

---

Recommendations

1. Draw a sample weighted to reflect the differences in sizes among the five claimant subgroups for reporting national aggregated data.

**OWCP Response**
"We agree with Recommendation #1, regarding weighting the sample. It should be noted, however, that OWCP's original design sought to determine satisfaction among each of the different types of claimants. We continue to need that level of specific information to guide our efforts."

**OIG Conclusion**
Based on OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving written evidence that the sample was weighted to reflect the differences in sizes among the five claimant subgroups.

2. Analyze the sample to identify and eliminate overlap in sample selection from each subgroup.

**OWCP Response**
"We agree to analyze the sample to identify and eliminate any overlap in sample selection from each subgroup."

**OIG Conclusion**
Based on OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving written evidence that OWCP has analyzed the sample to identify and eliminate overlap in sample selection from each subgroup.
3. Focus analysis of the survey data on only the key questions for which the research is being conducted.

OWCP Response
“We agree in general with #3 that focusing the analysis of the survey data on the key questions may improve the contractor’s report. However, the program believes that discussion of district office level data, while not necessarily statistically valid, can be useful in guiding individual offices’ communication plans.”

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP’s response, this recommendation is not resolved. We believe that feedback using data that may not be valid can be misleading rather than helpful. In this case, we do not know who the respondents are.

4. Conduct additional analysis of samples, including a comparison of the sample to the national claimant universe, using demographic variables and estimation of sampling error.

OWCP Response
“We agree to conduct additional analysis of samples, including a comparison of the sample to the national claimant universe, using demographic variables and estimation of sampling error.”

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP’s response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving written evidence that OWCP has conducted additional analysis of samples, including a comparison of the sample to the national claimant universe, using demographic variables and estimation of sampling error.

4. Response Rate

The questionnaire response rate is considerably below the OMB standard of 80%. In addition, the agency needs to (1) reinstate the use of a cover letter to minimize claimant confusion and improve response rates, and (2) improve follow-up methods.
OMB standard. The response rate on the questionnaires is low. OMB has a response rate standard of 80% for all surveys, a standard that is supported by many research experts. The response rates on the surveys we analyzed were 21% in 1995, 23% in 1997, and 44% in 1998. Although the response rate is improving, it remains below standard. A low response rate means that the responses received may not be representative of the population of claimants, resulting in response bias. Setting a higher standard will improve the probability of a higher response rate, which will improve the accuracy of descriptions about the population.

Cover letter. After the first year, no cover letter was attached to the questionnaire that was sent to claimants. Using a cover letter has been found to improve the response rate. Sending the survey form by itself weakens communication on critical topics that impact the response rate. The cover letter included in the mailing with the questionnaire explains, at a minimum, the survey's importance and protections of anonymity or confidentiality, and offers a point of contact for additional information. The cover letter also provides a place for an explanation of technical terms such as "anonymous" or "confidential." The cover letter minimizes claimant confusion and highlights the importance of the survey. Claimants also understand their rights for participation or refusal.

Addressing nonresponse. Follow-up methods to address nonresponse have been inadequate. Specifically, follow-up methods were not substantially updated in response to inadequate response rates. Although OWCP has tried to increase the response rate through the use of postcards and telephone follow-up, the response rate remains low. One option for improving follow-up is to ensure that nonrespondents who do not return the survey after the first postcard receive a new copy of the survey with a different cover letter, stating the urgency of the project. By changing follow-up methods, the response rate can be improved, OWCP can learn what particular methods are most effective, and the data can be protected against response bias.

---

4Zikmund, p. 175, and Babbie, p. 242.
6A response bias occurs when nonrespondents self-select or respondents and tend to answer in a certain pattern, thus skewing the direction of responses.
Recommendations

1. Establish higher standards for the response rate.

OWCP Response
"We agree with Recommendation #1 that we seek to hold the contractor to a higher standard for response rates. We will include this in future work statements. However, we anticipate that the cost of requiring such a response rate may be substantially higher. Even using a fixed price contract with a mandated response rate, the OMB goal of 80% may not be attainable. OWCP also notes that it required the 1998 contractor to conduct a telephone survey which measured non-respondents' attitudes. This was not aimed at increasing response rates; this data set was used to determine whether or not the non-respondent population held views similar to those measured for the respondents. As reported in that survey, the two groups had comparable scores, providing increased confidence in the reported statistics."

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, we do not consider this recommendation resolved. The agency's goal expectation falls short of OMB's 80% response standard. We do not concur with OWCP's position regarding funding constraints. The recommendations we are making are standard professional practices and the contractor should conduct them for no additional charge. Implementing the recommendations can be expected to increase the response rate and allow savings through a decreased sample size. In addition, valid information will provide the organization with a valuable management tool that can help save resources by making the organization more productive.

2. Include a cover letter on the contractor or DOL letterhead explaining at a minimum the importance of the survey, that participation is voluntary, a promise of confidentiality, and contact information for any questions.

OWCP Response
"We agree with Recommendation #2, to add a cover letter from the FEC program to explain the importance of the survey."

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving a copy of the 1999 questionnaire with the cover letter.
3. Review follow-up procedures to ensure that nonrespondents who do not return the survey after the first postcard receive a new copy of the survey with a different cover letter stating the urgency of the project.

**OWCP Response**

"We do not agree with Recommendation #3 that an additional copy of the survey itself should be mailed, since the survey is anonymous and there is no record of who are the "non-respondents". To implement this would allow for duplicate submission of the survey by a given respondent (see Recommendation #2 regarding sampling, requiring that we avoid duplicate replies). OWCP has scrupulously maintained the anonymity of the survey respondents, and coding the surveys to allow identification of responses could undermine confidence in that process."

**OIG Conclusion**

On the basis of OWCP’s response, we do not consider this recommendation resolved. OWCP may want to consider ensuring confidentiality, rather than anonymity (as is the practice in most customer surveys), to make it easier to implement this recommendation.

5. Survey Operations

We found problems/deficiencies with regard to the survey process, i.e., returned surveys, sample-questions relationship and record-keeping. Specifically, we found that no records are kept or analyses conducted of surveys returned in the mail as undeliverable; the sample drawn in 1998 did not support the questions asked in the questionnaire; and, no final data sets are kept on file by the agency after completion of analysis and reporting.

**Returned surveys.** No records are kept or analysis is conducted with surveys that are returned in the mail without ever having reached the addressee. Returned surveys were set aside without inquiry into why they were returned. As a result, follow-up postcards and questionnaires may have been sent to the original wrong addresses. Analyzing returned surveys enables the agency to correct potential mailing problems so that they do not reoccur each year.

**Relationship between sample and questions.** The sample drawn in 1998 did not support the questions asked in the questionnaire. The sample was pulled to include individuals who had some contact with the agency between October 1, 1996, and September 30, 1997. However, the questionnaire was not sent until the second week of March 1998. The questionnaire stated in eight places that respondents were to answer the questions based on their last 12 months of experiences with agency
services. However, many of the claimants included in the sample did not have experience with the agency within the last 12 months specified. As a result, many claimants may have believed the questionnaire did not apply to them. Since a high proportion of respondents did not have contact or experience with the office in the previous year, they had no basis to respond to questions relating to their satisfaction. When the sample supports the questions asked, the probability of a higher response rate increases and claimants who do not have the necessary experience with agency services are not unduly burdened. Establishing consistency between the sample and the questionnaire improves the quality of the data collected.

Record-keeping. No final data sets are kept on file after completion of analysis and reporting. No data sets are available for the surveys for any of the years that they were conducted, as a hard copy document or on a statistical or spreadsheet software program. Because of incomplete records, the data and research conducted can not be verified. In addition, an opportunity for subsequent research with the data sets is missed. Thus, valuable information is lost. Records that include data collected can be used to verify the research conducted. The data can also be analyzed to answer additional questions to support management decisions.

**Recommendations**

1. Keep a record of the returned surveys and identify the reason why they were returned.

**OWCP Response**

"We agree to keep a record of the returned surveys and identify the reason why they were returned."

**OIG Conclusion**

On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved. To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving written evidence that OWCP has kept a record of the returned surveys and has identified the reason why they were returned.

2. Ensure that the claimants sampled have the necessary experience with agency services to be able to answer the questions that are asked.

**OWCP Response**

"We agree that the time period we use as the basis for drawing the sample should be coordinated with the time frame specified in the questionnaire, and that the questionnaires should be distributed as close as possible to that time frame."
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OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved.
To close this recommendation, we would appreciate receiving written evidence that claimants sampled in the next survey had experience with the office in the previous 12 months.

3. Keep a copy of the final data set as a permanent agency record.

OWCP Response
“We agree with Recommendation #3 that the full data sets derived from the questionnaire by the contract be provided back to FEC as one of the project deliverables.”

OIG Conclusion
On the basis of OWCP's response, we consider this recommendation resolved.
To close this recommendation, we would appreciate the opportunity to inspect the data sets received by OWCP.

Major Contributors
Amy C. Friedlander, Director, Division of Evaluations and Inspections
Teserach Ketema, Team Leader
George T. Fitzelle, Project Leader
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Appendix II

Agency Response
MEMORANDUM FOR: AAY FRIEDLANDER
OIG

FROM: SHELBY HALLMARK
OWCP

SUBJECT: OIG Report No. 2E-04-431-0002

You requested our review of the draft report dated May 14 and what recommendations from that report OWCP is prepared to implement. OWCP plans to reevaluate its approach to measuring customer satisfaction, given the recommendations of your study and our own evolving thoughts about identifying more precisely where and how to focus our efforts at improving customer service. Since we have utilized the global satisfaction data from the current survey as a simple GPRA measure of our customer service goal, we may determine that this survey needs to be continued in some form for that purpose, but we are also considering taking other approaches entirely, for example, surveys that would get at satisfaction with a specific service response at the individual district office level. If we determine that a general survey of the current type should be continued, we will incorporate the recommendations cited below in any enhancement of that survey, and we hope that your office would work with us in that effort.

FEC developed the use of the customer survey as a result of the Executive Order in 1994 on customer service, to evaluate its customers and implement plans to improve service to customers. FEC's Strategic Plan, developed in 1995, recognizes that improving customer service (and hence satisfaction) is a critical issue for this program, and makes customer service improvement one of its key goals and measures. Although the survey we have conducted addresses several different components of service, when the program built its GPRA goals structure, the single overall measure of satisfaction statistic was selected as a simple and concise measure against which to track progress. Nevertheless, the program has continued to utilize the full reports of survey results — including data on telephone and written communications responsiveness and quality — to inform its district office staff about areas requiring more attention.

We also utilize other measures of service, such as timeliness of decision-making, bill payment, correspondence and telephone responses, as well as quality measures and informal assessments of complaints received, to evaluate the level of service in the various offices. While we acknowledge that many of the technical and statistical improvements cited in your report would better support this survey and make it more useful, we believe that the data we have derived from our survey are consistent with our
general observations of customer attitudes, and that the moderate improvements it shows over the past three years are generally reflective of our improved service.

You shared several concerns about the procedures used in past FEC customer surveys, including documentation of sampling methods, more focused questions to the customers, pilot testing of the questionnaire itself prior to its redesign, and a more formal statement of work regarding requirements to the contractor. All of these recommendations will be looked at closely. If FEC determines that it will proceed with a customer survey, the recommendations below will be incorporated:

**Recommendations on "Survey Design"**

We agree with Recommendation #1 that the questionnaire could benefit from being revised to shorten its length, improve the formatting and eliminate duplicate questions.

We agree with Recommendation #2 regarding the formatting of questions to put the like questions together. We would note, however, that OWCP/FEC has received no complaints from claimants through the past three years that there is undue burden in completion of the questionnaires, as your report suggests.

We agree with Recommendation #3 that a pilot test may be useful should we substantially revise the survey in the future.

**Recommendation on "Customer Service"**

We will review this suggestion, to supplement the use of a survey on customer satisfaction by using focus groups, depending on the availability of funding.

**Recommendations on "Sampling"**

We agree with Recommendation #1, regarding weighting the sample. It should be noted, however, that OWCP's original design sought to determine satisfaction among each of the different types of claimants. We continue to need that level of specific information to guide our efforts.

We agree with Recommendation #2 to analyze the sample to identify and eliminate any overlap in sample selection from each subgroup.

We agree in general with Recommendation #3 that focusing the analysis of the survey data on the key questions may improve the contractor's report. However, the program believes that analysis of district office level data, while not necessarily statistically valid, may be useful in guiding individual offices' communications plans.

We agree with Recommendation #4 to conduct additional analysis of samples, including: a comparison of the sample to the national claimant universe, using demographic variables and estimation of sampling error.
Recommendations on "Response Rate"

We agree with Recommendation #1 that we seek to hold the contractor to a higher standard for response rates. We will include this in future work statements. However, we anticipate that the cost of requiring such a response rate may be substantially higher. Even using a fixed price contract with a mandated response rate, the OMB goal of 80% may not be attainable. OWCP also notes that it required the 1998 contractor to conduct a telephone survey which measured non-respondents' attitudes. This was not aimed at increasing response rates; this data set was used to determine whether or not the non-respondent population held views similar to those measured for the respondents. As reported in that survey, the two groups had comparable scores, providing increased confidence in the reported statistics.

We agree with Recommendation #2, to add a cover letter from the FEC program to explain the importance of the survey.

We do not agree with Recommendation #3 that an additional copy of the survey itself should be mailed, since the survey is anonymous and there is no record of who are the "non-respondents". To implement this would allow for duplicate submission of the survey by a given respondent (see Recommendation #2 regarding sampling, requiring that we avoid duplicate replies). OWCP has scrupulously maintained the anonymity of the survey respondents, and coding the surveys to allow identification of responses could undermine confidence in that process.

Recommendations on "Survey Operations"

We agree with Recommendation #1 to keep a record of the returned surveys and identify the reason they were returned.

We agree with Recommendation #2 that the time period we use as the basis for drawing the sample should be coordinated with the time frame specified in the questionnaire, and that the questionnaires should be distributed as close as possible to that time frame.

We agree with Recommendation #3 that the full data sets derived from the questionnaire by the contractor be provided back to FEC as one of the project deliverables.
Appendix III

Claimant

Dear Workers' Compensation Claimant:

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs oversees the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. Claims are reported directly to FECA district offices located in the major cities in the United States and decisions made on eligibility in those district offices. Now how this system works affects individuals like yourself. The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs needs to know how well this system is working in fulfilling its mission.

You are one of a small number of injured workers being asked to give their opinions on these matters. You were drawn from a random sample from injured workers subject to the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. If the results are to truly represent the thinking of all injured workers covered by this program, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Neither your name nor the name of your employer will ever be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this study will be used to determine how well the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is serving you, the customer.

We appreciate your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Markey
Director for Federal Employees' Compensation
Denial Claims (For identification purposes; not to be placed on survey questionnaire)

DIVISION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION
CUSTOMER SURVEY

Submission of this information is entirely voluntary and will not be utilized by other government agencies. The primary use of this information will be by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs to determine how well our customers are being served. The responses provided will have no effect on your entitlement to benefits.

1. Were you treated in a professional and courteous manner by the Department of Labor's FECA district office staff?
   ___ Always ___ Usually ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ Never ___ Does not apply

2. Did the FECA district office employee who assisted you address all the concerns you raised? ___ All ___ Some ___ Neutral ___ Few ___ None ___ Does not apply

3. Did you receive accurate information when you telephoned the FECA district office? ___ Very Accurate ___ Accurate ___ Neutral ___ Inaccurate ___ Very Inaccurate ___ Does not apply

4. Was the written correspondence that you received from the FECA district office clear and understandable? ___ Very Clear ___ Clear ___ Neutral ___ Unclear ___ Very Unclear ___ Does not apply

5. When you called the FECA district office, was it easy for you to speak directly with a person or leave a voice mail message? ___ Very Easy ___ Easy ___ Neutral ___ Difficult ___ Very Difficult ___ Does not apply

6. If you left a voice mail message, was your call returned promptly?
   ___ Very Promptly ___ Promptly ___ Neutral ___ Not promptly ___ Had to Call Again ___ Does not apply

7. Did the formal denial notice that you received from the FECA district office clearly explain why your claim was rejected?
   ___ Very Clear ___ Clear ___ Neutral ___ Unclear ___ Very Unclear ___ Does not apply
8. Did the FECA district office provide an explanation of your appeal rights along with your denial notice?  __ Yes  __ No

9. Were the forms required for benefits understandable?
   __ Very Understandable  __ Understandable  __ Neutral
   __ Not Understandable  __ Very Difficult To Understand
   __ Does not apply

10. Were you able to complete the forms easily?  __ Very Easily
    __ Easily  __ Neutral  __ Not Easily  __ Very Difficult To Complete
    __ Does not apply

11. Did you receive a timely response, either by mail or phone, to any letter you may have sent to the FECA district office?
    __ Very Timely  __ Timely  __ Neutral  __ Untimely
    __ Very Untimely  __ Does not apply

12. How many times have you called/contacted the FECA district office in regard to your claim?  __ 1  __ 2-4  __ 5-10
    __ Over 10  __ Does not apply

13. How long ago was your last contact with the FECA district office?  Less than 1 week  2-4 weeks  5-10 weeks
    __ 10-24 weeks  __ Over 6 months  __ Does not apply

14. Please provide any additional comments concerning the service you received in connection with the processing of your claim, including any specific changes you think would improve the process.

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

We estimate that it will take an average of 15 minutes per respondent to complete this survey. If you have any comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of the survey, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, send them to the Office of IRM Policy, Department of Labor, Room N-1101, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210 and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, (1225-0058), Washington, D.C. 20503. DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO EITHER OF THESE ADDRESSES.
Customer Service Evaluation

In an effort to improve the service we provide to our customers, the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is conducting this survey. You have been selected at random from a list of individuals who have filed claims with OWCP in the past year. Your response to this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and will be used only by OWCP and no other government agencies. You can remain entirely anonymous in any case. Your participation or responses will have no effect on your entitlement to benefits.

We encourage you to participate so that we can learn how we currently are doing in our relationships with our customers. The OWCP has contracted with a professional research company, the Market Research Bureau, to collect and analyze the surveys.

If you have any questions about this survey, please call Maria Ivancin at the Market Research Bureau at 202-335-4245. Thank you for your cooperation.

1a. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the service that you received from the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation?

☐ ] Very satisfied
☐ ] Somewhat satisfied
☐ ] Not very satisfied
☐ ] Not at all satisfied

1b. Why do you say that? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

________________________________________________________

2a. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly positive? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

________________________________________________________

2b. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly negative? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

________________________________________________________

3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following regarding the service that you received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not at All Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The ease of understanding the application instructions</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Answers to questions you had</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Any written correspondence you may have gotten</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Communications over the telephone</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The case worker's knowledge of your specific case</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The case worker's knowledge of rules and regulations</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
<td>☐ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4a. Did you call the FECA district office about your claim?

[ ] Yes - CONTINUE  [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 5

4b. How many times did you call the FECA office? Indicate # of times you called

4c. How long did it take the FECA office to return your phone calls? (If you made more than one phone call, please indicate how long it took for each call.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Call</th>
<th>Second Call</th>
<th>Third Call</th>
<th>Fourth Call</th>
<th>Fifth Call</th>
<th>Sixth Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not have to leave message/spoke with someone when you called</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same day</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next day</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 days later</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 days later</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 days</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never returned the call</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4d. How satisfied were you with how quickly your phone calls were returned?

[ ] Very satisfied
[ ] Somewhat satisfied
[ ] Not very satisfied
[ ] Not at all satisfied

5a. Did you send any written correspondence to the FECA district office?

[ ] Yes - CONTINUE  [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 6

5b. How many times did you write to the FECA office? Indicate # of times you wrote

5c. Was the response you received from the FECA office by phone, mail, fax or other means? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

[ ] Phone  [ ] Mail  [ ] Fax  [ ] Other PLEASE SPECIFY

5d. How quickly did you get a response to your written correspondence? (If you sent written correspondence more than once, please indicate how long it took to get a response each time you sent something.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Time</th>
<th>Second Time</th>
<th>Third Time</th>
<th>Fourth Time</th>
<th>Fifth Time</th>
<th>Sixth Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within a week</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 weeks</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 weeks</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never received a response</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5e. How satisfied were you with the timeliness of the response to your written correspondence?

[ ] Very satisfied
[ ] Somewhat satisfied
[ ] Not very satisfied
[ ] Not at all satisfied
5f. How satisfied were you with the thoroughness and clarity of the response to your written correspondence? (That is, was the response that you received easy to understand, did it answer the questions or concerns that you had, etc.)

- [ ] Very satisfied
- [ ] Somewhat satisfied
- [ ] Not very satisfied
- [ ] Not at all satisfied

6. When was the last time that you had any contact with the FECA district office?

- [ ] Within the last week
- [ ] 1-2 weeks ago
- [ ] 3-4 weeks ago
- [ ] 5-6 weeks ago
- [ ] 6-12 months ago
- [ ] More than a year ago

7a. Did you find anything confusing or difficult to understand about the process you had to go through in filing your claim?

- [ ] Yes - CONTINUE
- [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 8

7b. What was confusing or difficult to understand? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC.

8. How helpful were the people who processed your claim at your employing agency in putting you in contact with the FECA district office?

- [ ] Very helpful
- [ ] Somewhat helpful
- [ ] Not very helpful
- [ ] Not at all helpful

9. The following questions are about the people that you dealt with at the FECA district office. Please rate the people you dealt with at the FECA district office on each of the following using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- a. How helpful were the people you dealt with at the FECA district office?
- b. How pleasant and courteous were the people at the FECA district office?
- c. How knowledgeable about the claims process (i.e., rules and regulations) were the people at the FECA district office?
- d. How knowledgeable about your specific case were the people at the FECA district office?
- e. How successful were the people at the FECA district office? (That is, were they easy to reach, did they return your phone calls, etc.)
10a. Have you received notification of a formal decision about your claim?
   [ ] Yes - CONTINUE  [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

10b. Did you understand your rights as they were explained to you when you were notified about the decision?
   [ ] Did not understand rights - CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 10c
   [ ] Understood rights as explained - SKIP TO QUESTION 11
   [ ] Do not remember that rights were explained - SKIP TO QUESTION 11

10c. What did you find difficult to understand about your rights as explained in the notification?
    PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

11a. Have you received any payments as a result of your claim?
    [ ] Yes - CONTINUE  [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

11b. Has payment of your benefits been prompt?
    [ ] Yes  [ ] No

11c. Have any payments been missed?
    [ ] Yes - CONTINUE  [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

11d. Were the missed payments replaced in a timely manner?
    [ ] Yes  [ ] No

12. What, if anything, would you change about the service that you got from the OWCP or the FECA district office? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

13. Do you have any additional comments?

The following information will help us in our analysis of the data.

14. Are you:  [ ] Male  [ ] Female

15. What is your age? _________

Thank you for your time and your comments. Please return the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided.
Customer Service Evaluation

In an effort to improve the service we provide to our customers, the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) is conducting this survey. This survey is to be based only on your direct experiences with the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) in the last 12 months. It is not to be based on your experience with the organization you work for or any previous work experience. Not should it be based on any experiences with OWCP more than 12 months ago.

You have been selected at random from a list of individuals who have filed claims with OWCP in the past 12 months. Your response to this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and will be used only by OWCP and no other government agencies. You can remain entirely anonymous in any case. Your participation or response will have no effect on your entitlement to benefits.

We encourage you to participate so that we can learn how we currently are doing in our relationships with our customers. The OWCP has contracted with a professional research company, the Market Research Bureau, to collect and analyze the surveys. Please complete and return your survey before Monday, April 15, 1996. Thank you for your cooperation.

Public Review Statement: We estimate that it will take an average of 15 minutes to complete this collection of information, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any questions regarding these amounts or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, send them to the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S-3229, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210. DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THIS OFFICE.

1. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the service that you received from the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation within the last 12 months?

- [ ] Very satisfied
- [ ] Somewhat satisfied
- [ ] Not very satisfied
- [ ] Not at all satisfied

2a. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly positive? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

2b. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly negative? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following regarding the service that you received within the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not at All Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The claim has been processed and held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The examiner's knowledge of your specific case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Any written correspondence you may have received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The administration has been helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The claim examiner's knowledge of your specific case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The claim examiner's knowledge of the claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4a. Did you call the OWCP district office about your claim within the last 12 months?

[ ] Yes - CONTINUE
[ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 5a

4b. How many times did you call the OWCP office within the last 12 months? _____ INDICATE # OF TIMES YOU CALLED

4c. How long did it take the OWCP district office to return your phone calls? (If you made more than one phone call, please indicate about how long it took for each call.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not have to leave message / spoke
with someone when you called
[ ] 1
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] More than 6
[ ] Never returned the call

4d. How satisfied were you with how quickly the phone calls were returned?

[ ] Very satisfied
[ ] Somewhat satisfied
[ ] Not very satisfied
[ ] Not at all satisfied

5a. Did you send any written correspondence to the OWCP district office within the last 12 months?

[ ] Yes - CONTINUE
[ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 6

5b. How many times did you write to the OWCP district office within the last 12 months? _____ INDICATE # OF TIMES YOU WROTE

5c. Was the response you received from the OWCP office by phone, mail, fax or other means? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

[ ] Phone
[ ] Mail
[ ] Fax
[ ] Other PLEASE SPECIFY _________
56. How quickly did you get a response to your written correspondence? (If you sent written correspondence more than once, please indicate how long it took to get a response for each time you sent something.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within a week</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 weeks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 weeks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never received a response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How satisfied were you with the timeliness of the response to your written correspondence?

4 - Very satisfied
3 - Somewhat satisfied
2 - Not very satisfied
1 - Not at all satisfied

f. How satisfied were you with the thoroughness and clarity of the response to your written correspondence? (That is, was the response that you received easy to understand, did it answer the questions or concerns that you had, etc.)

4 - Very satisfied
3 - Somewhat satisfied
2 - Not very satisfied
1 - Not at all satisfied

When was the last time that you had any contact with the OWCP district office?

| Within the last week | 12 |
| 1-2 weeks ago | 12 |
| 3-4 weeks ago | 12 |
| 5-6 months ago | 12 |
| 7-12 months ago | 12 |
| More than a year ago | 12 |

7. Did you find anything confusing or difficult to understand about the process you had to go through in filing your claim?

1 - Yes
2 - No

8. How helpful were the people who processed your claim at your employing agency in putting you in contact with the OWCP district office?

4 - Very helpful
3 - Somewhat helpful
2 - Not very helpful
1 - Not at all helpful
9. The following questions are about the people that you dealt with at the OWCP district office within the last 12 months. Please rate the people you dealt with at the OWCP district office on each of the following using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How helpful were the people you dealt with at the OWCP district office?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How cooperative and courteous were the people at the OWCP district office?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How knowledgeable about the claims process (i.e., rules and regulations) were the people at the OWCP district office?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. How involved were you and your appropriate representative with the people at the OWCP district office?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. How accessible were the people at the OWCP district office? (That is, were they easy to reach; did they return your phone calls, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10a. Have you received notification of a formal decision about your claim?

1  Yes - CONTINUE  2  No - SKIP TO QUESTION 11

10b. Did you understand your rights as they were explained to you when you were notified about the decision?

1  Did not understand the rights  2  Understood rights as explained  3  Do not remember that rights were explained

11. Do you have any additional comments regarding the customer service provided to you by telephone or written correspondence in the last 12 months?

__________________________________________________________

The following information will help us in our analysis of the data.

12. Are you:

1  Male  2  Female

13. What is your age? __________

Thank you for your time and comments. Please return the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided.
Customer Service Evaluation

In an effort to improve the service we provide to our customers, the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) is conducting this survey. This survey is to be based only on your direct experience with the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) in the past 12 months. It is not to be based on your experience with the organization you work for or have previously worked for. Nor should it be based on any experience with OWCP more than 12 months ago.

You have been selected at random from a list of individuals who have filed claims with OWCP in the past 12 months. Your response to this questionnaire is entirely voluntary and will be used only by OWCP and no other government agencies. Your name will not be used in any way that will identify you, and your responses will be kept confidential.

We encourage you to participate so that we can learn how we currently are doing in our relationships with our customers. The OWCP has contracted with a professional research company, the Market Research Bureau, to collect and analyze the surveys. Please complete and return your survey before April 15, 1998. Thank you for your cooperation.

Public Service Statement: We estimate that it will take an average of 15 minutes to complete this collection of information, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any questions regarding this estimation or any other aspect of the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, mail them to the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, Room S-2317, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210. DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THIS OFFICE.

1. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the service that you received from the Department of Labor's Office of Workers' Compensation in the past 12 months?

   - [ ] Very satisfied
   - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
   - [ ] Not very satisfied
   - [ ] Not at all satisfied

2a. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly positive? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

   ________________________________________________________________

2b. What, if anything, about the service did you find particularly negative? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC

   ________________________________________________________________

3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following regarding the service that you received within the last 12 months.

   a. The ease of understanding the application instructions.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied

   b. The adequacy of telephone contact.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied

   c. The adequacy of written correspondence.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied

   d. The overall quality of the process.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied

   e. The claim examiner's knowledge of your specific case.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied

   f. The claim examiner's knowledge of rules and regulations.

      - [ ] Very satisfied
      - [ ] Somewhat satisfied
      - [ ] Not very satisfied
      - [ ] Not at all satisfied
4a. Did you call the OWCP district office about your claim within the last 12 months?

1 = Yes - CONTINUE
2 = No - SKIP TO QUESTION 5b

4b. How many times did you call the OWCP office within the last 12 months? ___ INDICATE # OF TIMES YOU CALLED

4c. How long did it take the OWCP district office to return your phone calls? (If you made more than one phone call, please indicate how long it took for each call.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not have to leave message / spoke with someone when you called</th>
<th>First Call</th>
<th>Second Call</th>
<th>Third Call</th>
<th>Fourth Call</th>
<th>Fifth Call</th>
<th>Sixth Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The next day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 days later</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 days later</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 days later</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never returned the call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4d. How satisfied were you with how quickly the phone calls were returned?

1 = Very satisfied
2 = Somewhat satisfied
3 = Not very satisfied
4 = Not at all satisfied

5a. Did you send any written correspondence to the OWCP district office within the last 12 months?

1 = Yes - CONTINUE
2 = No - SKIP TO QUESTION 6

5b. How many times did you write to the OWCP district office within the last 12 months? ___ INDICATE # OF TIMES YOU WROTE

5c. Was the response you received from the OWCP office by phone, mail, fax or other means? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

1 = Phone
2 = Mail
3 = Fax
4 = Other - PLEASE SPECIFY ________________

5d. How quickly did you get a response to your written correspondence? (If you sent written correspondence more than once, please indicate how long it took to get a response for each time you sent something.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>First Call</th>
<th>Second Call</th>
<th>Third Call</th>
<th>Fourth Call</th>
<th>Fifth Call</th>
<th>Sixth Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never received a response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5c. How satisfied were you with the timeliness of the response to your written correspondence?

4 Very satisfied
3 Somewhat satisfied
2 Not very satisfied
1 Not at all satisfied

5d. How satisfied were you with the thoroughness and clarity of the response to your written correspondence? (That is, was the response that you received easy to understand, did it answer the questions or concerns that you had, etc.)

4 Very satisfied
3 Somewhat satisfied
2 Not very satisfied
1 Not at all satisfied

6. When was the last time that you had any contact with the OWCP district office?

1 Within the last week
2 1-2 weeks ago
3 3-4 weeks ago
4 1-3 months ago
5 4-6 months ago
6 7-12 months ago
7 more than a year ago

7. Did you find anything confusing or difficult to understand about the process you had to go through in filing your claim?

1 Yes
2 No

8. How helpful were the people who processed your claim at your employing agency in putting you in contact with the OWCP district office?

4 Very helpful
3 Somewhat helpful
2 Not very helpful
1 Not at all helpful

9. The following questions are about the people that you dealt with at the OWCP district office within the last 12 months. Please rate the people you dealt with at the OWCP district office on each of the following using the scale below.

Very Somewhat Not very Not at all

a. How helpful were the people you dealt with at the OWCP district office?

b. How pleasant and courteous were the people you dealt with at the OWCP district office?

c. How knowledgeable about the claims process (i.e., rules and regulations) were the people at the OWCP district office?

d. How knowledgeable about your specific case were the people at the OWCP district office?

e. How accessible were the people at the OWCP district office? (That is, were they easy to reach, did they return your phone calls, etc.)
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10a. Have you received notification of a formal decision about your claim?
   [ ] Yes - CONTINUE
   [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

10b. Did you understand your rights as they were explained to you when you were notified about the decision?
   [ ] Did not understand the rights
   [ ] Understood rights as explained
   [ ] Do not remember that rights were explained

11a. Have you received any payments as a result of your claim?
   [ ] Yes - CONTINUE
   [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

11b. Has payment of your benefits been prompt?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

11c. Have any payments been missed?
   [ ] Yes - CONTINUE
   [ ] No - SKIP TO QUESTION 12

11d. Were the missed payments replaced in a timely manner?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

12. Do you have any additional comments regarding the customer service provided to you by telephone or written correspondence in the last 12 months?

The following information will help us in our analysis of the data.

13. Are you:
   [ ] Male
   [ ] Female

14. What is your age? _______

Thank you for your time and comments. Please return the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope provided.
Mr. HORN. Now, in this strategic plan, which was new to all of the executive branch and was asked for it 5 years before they had to do it—and I want to go through that now with the Inspector General. I hope you have a copy of that, do you, of their strategic plan?

Ms. DALTON. I don't have it with me.

Mr. HORN. Can we give Ms. Dalton a copy of that? I think the staff here has it.

What I want to do is just go through those charts that you have in your appendix, and I would like the Inspector General to take a look at those and see what they could provide. Because you are doing the right thing in the sense of looking at the goals you should achieve in a matter of time and dealing with the cases and so forth.

The gripe I have heard from hundreds of Federal injured workers is that, too often, they don't get approval to get the medical therapy that they need if they are going to get back to work and that, I think, we have just got to focus on, who sits on those appeals and who lets them go. I think that is one of the things we need to deal with.

Here on the Department of Labor’s Strategic Goal 2, A Secure Workforce; and your Outcome Goal, Protect Worker Benefits. Now, you say fiscal year 1999 funding, not known. Cost accounting for discreet GPRA, which is the Government Performance and Results Act, which we take very seriously up here—I think we have to take a look at these in terms of the Inspector General for Labor as a whole and say: Is there something else that can be done here? Does what you want to do in your strategic goals really relate to what your fiscal plan is when you send it over to OMB and the President as to the resources you need?

So I just think we need a little analysis of that. Is this just talk and hokum or is the money there? As they say, where’s the money? And we need to know that. And we need to know if the money was given. Some agencies never put it on computers, they put it on people. Others put it only on computers and don't put it on people. So some of what I would like to do is just have your two offices work it out, put it in the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]
APPENDIX

OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW
(FISCAL QUARTERS 1/99 AND 2/99)

Performance Overview

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs mitigates the financial burden on certain workers, or their dependents or survivors, resulting from work-related injury, disease, or death, through the provision of wage replacement and cash benefits, medical treatment, vocational rehabilitation, and other benefits. OWCP will provide individuals who experience work-related injuries the best and most cost-effective assistance and services possible. As the country's largest self-insured employer, the Federal government is uniquely situated to find the best ways to take care of people affected by workplace injuries, and OWCP can be a laboratory for excellence in the field of workers' compensation.

The Government Performance and Results Act is being implemented in a thoughtful and organic way in OWCP. Building upon OWCP's long performance measurement history, a FECA union-management partnership team identified strategic goals consistent with the OWCP mission and which would increase program impact. Multiple process reengineering, programmatic, and high technology initiatives, begun in the early 1990s, were organized in support of the strategic goals. GPRA goals were aligned with performance objectives in OWCP's program operational plans and incorporated into the performance agreements of national office, regional and field managers. GPRA performance evaluations, based on evolving data systems, are conducted at frequent intervals alongside OWCP's regular Quarterly Review and Analysis and Accountability and Management Review processes.

Midway through FY 1999, OWCP is meeting or exceeding the three performance goals included in the DOL Annual Performance Plan. We are also meeting or exceeding the five additional performance goals included in the ESA Annual Performance Plan, where measurements are available.

The most indicative, critical goal for OWCP is the reduction of the number of days workers are away from their jobs due to work injury-related disabilities. This goal is a key measure of the impact of work-related injuries and central to OWCP's return-to-work emphasis. FECA's Quality Case Management program to intervene early in new injury cases has reduced lost production days (LPD) to an average 177 days for cases measured in FY 1999. This represents a reduction of 18 days since the fourth quarter of 1996, when first measurements were taken.

Since FY 1994, OWCP has surveyed Federal civilian employees, who were/were disabled by on-the-job injury or illness. In response to the survey results, the program developed a Customer Service Plan. The program has also developed corrective action plans to deal with customers service shortcomings. Customer satisfaction survey scores have improved.
Customer service improvement, in the form of processing timeliness and decision quality, is a second strategic emphasis in FECA. Decision quality is emphasized in the Accountability Review process, where each district office is given a Quality Index score. Our work with the Federal employing agencies has resulted in more timely filing of new injury reports and is opening the way to providing assistance much sooner following occurrence of injury.

Fiscal integrity, a third strategic emphasis in FECA, is being addressed with a battery of cost-containment and fiscal controls. Medical fee schedules, computer software assisted bill review, and strengthened disability case review are improving results in this area.

Fee schedules on outpatient and physician services saved $93.7 million against amounts billed in FY 1998. New fee schedules, effective January 1999, are expected to save 5% of inpatient hospital and pharmacy billings in FY 1999. Also in FY 1999, OWCP is developing a medical bill review process to catch improper billings before they are paid. This automation-assisted process will detect improperly coded bills, (such as bills “unbundled” into component services to enhance revenue), duplication, overuse or inappropriate use of services to treat given conditions, and other abuses.

Performance measurement has been refined since the team’s initial efforts. Initial GPRA performance objectives focused on program priorities and strategic direction. OWCP is working to include more of its core activities in result-based measurement. OWCP is also working to make improvements whenever we have established preliminary or interim baselines, where industry benchmarks are suitable, or where goals and supporting data are not sufficiently comprehensive. For example, in FY 2000 OWCP will redefine the baseline, goal and method of measurement for time lost during the Continuation of Pay (COP) period, to accomplish the goal of Federal Worker 2000 to reduce overall lost production days for all injuries. For this, we will begin to collect data on COP usage from Federal agencies.
## DOL Strategic Goal 2: A Secure Workforce

### DOL Outcome Goal (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits

**Performance Goal (2.2E):** Return Federal employees to work following an injury as early as appropriate, indicated by a 6% reduction from the baseline in production days lost due to disability for cases in the Quality Case Management (QCM).

**Indicator:** Average number of days lost due to disability for cases in QCM.

**Baseline:** Interim baseline for Quality Case Management cases only: FY 1997 actual – 189 workdays.

**Rationale for Selecting Measure:**

- Production days lost due to disability is a key indicator of the degree of impact of work-related injuries on injured workers.
- The primary focus of FECA strategic planning is to lessen the impact of injuries.
- Average LPD measures the outcome of FECA’s early case management and vocational rehabilitation programs to speed recovery from injury and return to work.

**FY 1999 Funding:** Not known. (Cost accounting for discrete GPRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

### FY 1999 Status

**Progress:**

We are currently meeting the goal. Average LPD was 177 days for QCM cases measured in Quarters 1 and 2, slightly better than the goal of 178 days.

**Comments/Issues:**

- The 12-day reduction from the FY 1997 LPD baseline represents a compensation benefit savings of over $3.3 million for those cases measured in FY 1999.
- Through FY 2000, the interim baseline and measurement focuses on the average number of production days lost for cases in only QCM cases. Beginning in FY 2000, a baseline for all injuries will be established.
- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
APPENDIX

OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW
(FISCAL QUARTERS 1/99 AND 2/99)

Performance Overview

The Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs mitigates the financial burden on certain workers, or their dependents or survivors, resulting from work-related injury, disease, or death, through the provision of wage replacement and cash benefits, medical treatment, vocational rehabilitation, and other benefits. OWCP will provide individuals who experience work-related injuries the best and most cost-effective assistance and services possible. As the country’s largest self-insured employer, the Federal government is uniquely situated to find the best ways to take care of people affected by workplace injuries, and OWCP can be a laboratory for excellence in the field of workers’ compensation.

The Government Performance and Results Act is being implemented in a thoughtful and organic way in OWCP. Building upon OWCP’s long performance measurement history, a FSCA union-management partnership team identified strategic goals consistent with the OWCP mission and which would increase program impact. Multiple process reengineering, programmatic, and high technology initiatives, begun in the early 1990s, were organized in support of the strategic goals. GPRA goals were aligned with performance objectives in OWCP’s program operational plans and incorporated into the performance agreements of national office, regional and field managers. GPRA performance evaluations, based on evolving data systems, are conducted at frequent intervals alongside OWCP’s regular Quarterly Review and Analysis and Accountability and Management Review processes.

Midway through FY 1999, OWCP is meeting or exceeding the three performance goals included in the DOL Annual Performance Plan. We are also meeting or exceeding the five additional performance goals included in the FSCA Annual Performance Plan, where measurements are available.

The most indicative, critical goal for OWCP is the reduction of the number of days workers are away from their jobs due to work injury-related disabilities. This goal is a key measure of the impact of work-related injuries and critical to OWCP’s return-to-work emphasis. FSCA’s Quality Case Management program to intervene early in new injury cases has reduced lost production days (LPDs) to an average 177 days for cases measured in FY 1999. This represents a reduction of 14 days since the fourth quarter of 1998, when first measurements were taken.

Since FY 1994, OWCP has surveyed Federal civilian employees, who are/were disabled by on-the-job injury or illness. In response to the survey results, the program developed a Customer Service Plan. The program has also developed corrective action plans to deal with customer service shortcomings. Customer satisfaction survey scores have improved.
Customer service improvement, in the form of processing timeliness and decision quality, is a second strategic emphasis in FECA. Decision quality is emphasized in the Accountability Review process, where each distress call is given a Quality Index score. Our work with the Federal employing agencies has resulted in more timely filing of new injury reports and is opening the way to providing assistance much sooner following occurrence of injury.

Fiscal integrity, a third strategic emphasis in FECA, is being addressed with a battery of cost-containment and fiscal controls. Medical fee schedules, computer software assisted bill review, and strengthened disability case review are improving results in this area.

Fee schedules on outpatient and physician services saved $93.7 million against amounts billed in FY 1998. New fee schedules, effective January 1999, are expected to save 5% of inpatient hospital and pharmacy billings in FY 1999. Also in FY 1999, OWCP is developing a medical bill review process to catch improper billings before they are paid. This automation-assisted process will detect improperly coded bills, (such as bills "unscheduled" into component services to enhance revenue), duplication, overuse or inappropriate use of services to treat given conditions, and other abuses.

Performance measurement has been refined since the team's initial efforts. Initial CFRM performance objectives focused on program priorities and strategic direction. OWCP is working to include more of its core activities in cost-based measurement. OWCP is also working to make improvements wherever we have established preliminary or interim baselines, where industry benchmarks are suitable, or where goals and supporting data are not sufficiently comprehensive. For example, in FY 2000 OWCP will redefine the baseline, goal and method of measurement for time lost during the Continuation of Pay (COP) period, to accomplish the goal of Federal Worker 2000 to reduce overall lost production days for all injuries. For this, we will begin to collect data on COP usage from Federal agencies.
DOL STRATEGIC GOAL 2: A Safe Workforce
DOL OUTCOME GOAL (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits

**PERFORMANCE GOAL (2.2.E):** Return Federal employees to work following an injury as early as appropriable, indicated by a 6% reduction from the baseline in production days lost due to disability for cases in the Quality Case Management (QCM).

**INDICATOR:** Average number of days lost due to disability for cases in QCM.

**BASELINE:** Interim baseline for Quality Case Management cases only: FY 1997 actual = 189 workdays.

**RATIONALE FOR SELECTING MEASURE:**
- Production days lost due to disability is a key indicator of the degree of impact of work-related injuries on injured workers.
- The primary focus of FECA strategic planning is to lessen the impact of injuries.
- Average LFDP measures the outcome of FECA’s early case management and vocational rehabilitation programs to speed recovery from injury and return to work.

**FY 1999 FUNDING:** Not known. (Cost accounting for discrete GPRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

**FQ 2.99 STATUS**

**PROCESS:**
We are currently meeting the goal. Average LFDP was 177 days for QCM cases measured in Quarters 1 and 2, slightly better than the goal of 178 days.

**COMMENTS/ISSUES:**
- The 12-day reduction from the FY 1997 LFDP baseline represents a compensation benefit savings of over $3.3 million for those cases measured in FY 1999.
- Through FY 2000, the interim baseline and measurement focuses on the average number of production days lost for cases in only QCM cases. Beginning in FY 2001, a baseline for all injuries will be established.
- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
Performance Goal 2.2E

*Reduce Federal Employees' Lost Production Days*

1/ Average Calendar Days nationwide measured within the first year from the date wage loss compensation began in Quality Case Management cases only.
Departmental Annual Performance Plan: Status of Performance Measures

DOL Strategic Goal 2: A Secure Workforce

**DOL Outcome Goal (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE GOAL (2.2.1): Produce $1.7 million in savings in the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act (FECA) Program by expanding the Periodic Roll Management project that reviews the continued eligibility of long-term beneficiaries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR: The amount of compensation benefit savings from resolved long-term (PRM) disability cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE: Savings produced in base year prior to PRM project start-up in each office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for Selecting Measure:**

- Long-term disability (periodic roll) cases represent the majority of FECA compensation costs and management of these cases is highly cost-effective.
- PRM case reviews identify workers whose disability has lessened and who may benefit from the program's return-to-work assistance.
- PRM case reviews determine continued benefit entitlement and ensure proper levels of benefit payments. This supports the fiscal integrity of the FECA Special Benefits Fund.
- Dollar savings resulting from PRM decisions indicate the production and efficiency levels of the case review activity.

**FY 1999 Funding:** Not known. (Cost accounting for discrete OFSA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

**FQ 2/99 Status**

**Progress:**

The goal has been exceeded. Benefit savings for FY 1999 from PRM case review actions made between October 1, 1998 and March 31, 1999 are $13.9 million. This is more than double the savings goal for the full fiscal year.

As discussed in the FY 1999 and FY 2000 Annual Performance Plans, Periodic Roll Management was expanded to all district offices in FY 1999 and made a permanent program activity. The PRM savings calculation method has been revised to more accurately account for this change.

**Comments/Issues:**

- PRM savings were previously calculated by comparing total savings from benefit adjustments and terminations on all cases, both PRM and non-PRM, in each district office, to total savings produced in the year prior to PRM start-up in that office. With PRM expansion, PRM savings are now calculated by comparing total savings from both QCM and PRM case actions to non-PRM case action savings in FY 1998 (the baseline year prior to PRM expansion).
- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
Performance Goal 2.2F

*Increase FECA Periodic Roll Management Savings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation benefit savings in millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Target* ■ *Actual*

1/ The performance calculation has been revised to more accurately account for the expansion of PRM case review to a permanent FECA activity. Baseline is reestablished as actual FY 1998 benefit reductions in non-PRM cases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOL STRATEGIC GOAL: A Secure Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOL OUTCOME GOAL (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Goal (2.12):** In the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) Program, save 5% versus amounts billed for pharmacy and inpatient hospital services and 3% versus amounts billed for physician and other professional medical services through review of bills prior to payment to identify improper use by the medical provider.

**Indicator:** Amounts paid versus amounts billed for hospital inpatient services, drugs, and physician/professional services.

**Baseline:** Amounts billed for hospital in-patient, pharmacy, and physician/professional services in FY 1999. (Baseline is the amount billed in the measurement year.)

**Rationale for Selecting Measure:**
This goal supports fiscal management and the integrity of the FECA Special Fund by gauging the effectiveness of two new medical cost control initiatives: a fee schedule for pharmacy services and for inpatient hospital services, and by identifying and correcting for abusive billing practices.

**FY 1999 Funding:** Not known. (Cost accounting for these OGRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

**FY 1999 Status**

**Progress:**
The goal is on target to be met or exceeded by the end of FY 1999. In January 1999 new regulations extended Fee Schedules to inpatient hospital and pharmacy services. These services accounted for $51.4 million and $41.2 million, respectively, of the total $476 million paid for medical benefits in FY 1998. Preliminary results through March 1999 show that inpatient hospital billed amounts were reduced by 23% under the fee schedule, and pharmacy billings by 12%.

For its new automated bill review Quality Assurance program, FECA is currently adapting medical bill editing software designed to identify medical providers' duplicative and abusive billing practices. FECA is also in the process of hiring specialized staff who will evaluate questionable bills identified by the system and resolve them before authorizing payment. Additionally, FECA is developing a Quality Assurance Program to ensure a high level of accuracy in the resolution of complex bills. Implementation in all district offices is scheduled by the end of the fiscal year.

**Comments/Issues:**
- Even though the medical bill review process will not be implemented until late in FY 1999, the savings generated by the new fee schedules will far exceed the total savings projected for both initiatives.
- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
Performance Goal 2.1G

Increase FECA Medical Cost Reduction Savings

1/ FY 1998 target: Reduce 10% of amounts billed for Inpatient Hospital (IP) and Pharmacy services.

2/ FY 1999 target: Reduce 5% of amounts billed for IP and Pharmacy services through fee schedules and 3% of amounts billed for physician services through medical bill review.

3/ Implementing regulations for the IP and Pharmacy fee schedules were originally planned for FY 1998 but did not go into effect until January 1999.

4/ Testing of bill review software and new staff hiring has delayed implementation of the Medical Bill Review (Quality Assurance) program until the latter part of FY 1999.

5/ Actual savings did not begin until January 4, 1999; despite implementation delays, the program expects to meet its annual target by the end of the fiscal year.
**DOL Strategic Goal 2: A Secure Workforce**

**DOL Outcome Goal (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE GOAL (P.6):</th>
<th>Increase customer satisfaction with the OWCP Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) Program by 4 percentage points.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR:</td>
<td>Customer survey results indicating satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASELINE:</td>
<td>FY 1997: 54% Overall satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE FOR SELECTING MEASURE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - FECA is a service-delivery program and improvement of claims filing assistance, communication responsiveness, processing timeliness, and other customer services are important strategies in lessening the impact of work-related injuries.  
  - Customer satisfaction surveys are useful in identifying service deficiencies. |

**FY 1999 FUNDING:** Not known. (Cost accounting for discrete GPRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

**FQ 2/99 STATUS**

**PROGRESS:**

Data is not yet available for FY 1999. The customer survey of FY 1998 reported a 56% overall satisfaction with FECA services. FECA expects to select a contractor and issue the FY 1999 survey by May 1. Results will be available by September 30, 1999.

**COMMENTS/ISSUES:**

- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
ESA Performance Goal P.5

*Increase FECA Customer Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999 Q1-Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ FY 1999 customer survey results will not be available until September, 1999.
DOL STRATEGIC GOAL 2: A Secure Workforce
DOL OUTCOME GOAL (2.2): Protect Worker Benefits

**PERFORMANCE GOAL (P.9):** Increase the timeliness of notice of injury submission by employing Federal agencies under the FECA by 10 percentage points.

**INDICATOR:** Average time between agency supervisors’ authorization and receipt of claim forms by FECA.

**BASELINE:** FY 1997 average: 41%.

**RATIONALE FOR SELECTING MEASURE:**

- Agencies’ prompt injury reporting supports FECA program goals to intervene earlier in new injury cases to speed recovery and return to work and, overall, to provide better services to injured workers.
- A major FECA program strategy is to promote improvement of the Federal employing agencies’ role in administering the FECA, assisting workers, and containing costs.
- This measure targets the improvement of new injury processing timeliness by the employers.

**FY 1999 FUNDING:** Not known. (Cost accounting for discrete GFRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)

**FQ 2/99 STATUS**

**PROGRESS:**
The goal is currently being met. Overall average filing time of Notice of Injury reports improved in the first two quarters of FY 1999 to 51.3 percent within 14 days, or 10.3 percentage points above the baseline.

**COMMENTS/ISSUES:**
- OWCP had hoped to initiate electronic transmission of claims from at least 2 or 3 major agencies, thereby increasing timeliness. To date, however, no agency has completed the work needed on their systems to send claims electronically.
- Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.
ESA Performance Goal P.9

*Increase Federal Employers' Notice of Injury Timeliness*

![Bar Chart]

1/ Average percentage of Notice of Injury reports received within 14 calendar days from all Federal employing agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE GOAL (P.10):</th>
<th>Improve the quality of FECA claims adjudication by 2%.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR:</td>
<td>Nationwide average of Quality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATIONALE FOR SELECTING MEASURE:</td>
<td>This indicator measures the accuracy of claims decisions affecting basic entitlement to benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The goal strengthens program integrity and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1999 FUNDING:</td>
<td>Not known. (Cost accounting for discreet GPRA activities is not currently available in DOL.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2/99 STATUS</th>
<th>PROGRESS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The goal is currently being exceeded. The Quality Index average through the 2nd Quarter is 76.4 and above the FY 1999 target of 74.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS/ISSUES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Quality Index score consists of the average of twelve individual district office index scores from accountability reviews conducted over a two-year period: six scores from the fiscal year prior to, and six scores within, the reporting year (e.g. 1998 - 1999). The score through the 2nd Quarter, 1999 consists of seven of the twelve scores planned for the FY 1999 performance period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance for this goal is illustrated in attached graph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESA Performance Goal P.10

Increase FECA Adjudication Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Index scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Target
- Actual

1/ FY '97-'98 baseline consists of average of twelve individual district office QI scores. Six different offices are scored in each fiscal year.

2/ FY '98-'99 result consists of seven district offices scored to date.
Mr. HORN. I think the question raised by Beth Balen, administrator of the Anchorage Fracture and Orthopedic Clinic, is a very good one. To what degree is the power there for the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs to adjust based on cost of living? San Francisco is a pretty high living place. Seattle, we know is; certainly Alaska is.

Do you have the authority to adapt those to the point, Ms. Balen, made in terms of things they just have to write off because it isn't reasonable in terms of their own economy?

Mr. HALLMARK. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The OWCP fee schedule is, in the case for the Anchorage institution, is a relative value fee schedule which we adopted based on—originally based on the Washington State Workers' Compensation Program System and subsequently modified to follow that used for the Medicare program as established by the Health Care Financing Administration. It is geographically based. That is to say, there is a component of the system that takes into account cost of living, cost of business, cost of real estate, etc., in the different geographical regions.

We are aware that some States have higher fee schedules than the OWCP schedule; others have lower. Our schedule, at least at the last review we did, fell almost exactly in the middle. I think there are 23 States below and 26 or 27 States higher. So we have attempted to be—to address geographical issues.

Obviously, in the case of Alaska, what we are hearing today is that, from the perspective of at least this provider, set of providers, our schedule is too low for that State. It is something that is a part of our regulatory structure. We can look at it to determine whether there is a need for adjustment in that regard, and we will do that.

Mr. HORN. Another point Ms. Balen made, which makes sense to me, is easier access to claim payment office. What are we doing on that front?

Mr. HALLMARK. If by that she is referring to the issue of telephone calls and of calling in to address ways of resolving problems, we have a whole series of things we are trying to do to accomplish exactly that.

I didn't quite get through my statement, but it addresses some of the issues that we are trying to work on now in terms of improved communication systems, improved technology. We're moving to a fully electronic world which we believe will have a tremendous impact on customer service.

One of the problems, and cited by some of the panel members this morning, has been that keeping track of millions of pages of paper is a very difficult task. We believe that an imaging system, which we are currently building and expect to implement in 19— I'm sorry, fiscal year 2000 will greatly improve our ability to handle a wide range of these issues and especially medical bills.

All of our offices have communication plans. All are trying to work on improving the access to telephones. We have, I believe, in almost every office, if not every office, ways for individuals to call and receive an individual response. Sometimes, as we have seen today, that doesn't work. We're obviously working hard to improve it.

Mr. HORN. One of the questions that came up was the difficulty of tracking a case if you did not have the case number. Isn't there
a way to solve that with a master index by name and the last four digits in the Social Security number or something like that?

Mr. HALLMARK. Mr. Chairman, we have that. I think in the vast majority of cases, the problems that Ms. Balen was referring to, the Federal agency hasn’t sent us the claim. If they haven’t sent us the claim, there’s nothing for us to interface with. We don’t have an electronic connection to the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service to find out information about an individual who has been injured. It is only when the notice of injury comes to us that we can create that electronic record with the name, with the case number, with other identifiers.

Mr. HORN. On that point, suppose an agency doesn’t give them the forms? We had testimony to that effect. And certainly, when I met with a number of Federal injured workers, and it has been mentioned already this morning, a lot of them are U.S. Postal Service employees, they couldn’t even get the form out of their personnel office. Can’t they apply to your agency and get the forms if we have got the post office in parts of the country refusing to recognize there’s a problem here?

Mr. HALLMARK. Well, we are certainly aware of the legal requirement that Federal agencies have to do this work and to do it with speed, and where we see—where we have evidence that is presented to us that, in fact, agencies are knowingly restricting or obstructing this program, we take action, and we take it right to the top of the agency to try to get it attention and get the problem solved. In fact, our IG conducted several years ago a joint study with the Inspection Service of the Postal Service to address and try to pinpoint exactly that kind of problem. So we are anxious to address that kind of issue, and we do.

I would note, however, that oftentimes we do go back to the agency, and we heard one individual replying today who had trouble, apparently, getting information from the agency about the fact that he was an employee. We can only do so much. We can go to the agency and ask them. We are not an enforcement agency. We cannot force a Federal agency to hand us materials which they don’t do.

Obviously, at a certain point we can move to a U.S. attorney and seek to achieve some sort of prosecution, but our U.S. attorneys are also busy individuals, and it is difficult to make that kind of case.

Mr. HORN. Other points that Ms. Balen made, which certainly are those that we have had, less paperwork for the patient, employer and physician to complete, which would speed up the entire process, make it less prone to error; and she elaborates, overall simplification of the process by reducing the length and number of forms; the authorization process, whereby a condition is accepted as work-related; and improvement in access to the claims office.

There may be States with workers’ compensation systems, such as the State of Washington, just south of Alaska, which would work well and might be used as a model. Has the agency looked at some of the State systems and how they have speeded this up so the worker is not dangling out there not knowing whether they are going to be covered or not covered or the medical bills are going to be paid? What are we doing to just help the average citizen that is a Federal worker?
Mr. Hallmark. We have looked at the information that is available for a number of State systems. There is something of a paucity of actual performance information about how the different States work. Some of that information is proprietary because the systems are private, insurance-driven systems.

We have a number of initiatives in place to do many of the things that Ms. Balen was referring to.

We have just recently moved to automated receipt and payment of pharmacy bills. That started in July 1998. We believe that will—as the IG report indicates, we believe that will significantly improve service to claimants who will no longer be required to make out-of-pocket payments because the pharmacy can readily and quickly send the bill to us electronically and receive payment directly from us.

We are likewise working on electronic billing processes for physicians and for hospitals, and we are looking at electronic transmission. We are working with the Postal Service, VA and DOD right now to ensure that we can get the electronic claim in the first place.

All of these things will not only speed up the process, they will cut down the amount of confusion with respect to submitting forms and other paper. It is understandable that a doctor in Alaska, who may not deal with OWCP that much, knows the laws and the procedures in Alaska but the OWCP Federal process is different. So we want to try to smooth that.

I would also note that where we receive the information from a doctor with regard to the medical evidence that we need, if we receive it in the form of notes or other materials, if it is the information we need, we are not going to send that back and say, no, no, it must be on this form and you must fill out box 3. We have to have the claim in the first place, but once we have the claim, we do our best to try to use the information that we can, in fact, procure.

Mr. Horn. Mr. Linehan noted in his recommendations that we just allow the Federal employees to have a basic right of Federal Court review of the workers’ compensation claim and the due process. Has the administration thought of recommending that?

Mr. Hallmark. I can’t speak for the administration as a whole. Mr. Horn. Well, let’s say the administration of the agency and then move it to the administration of the Department and on up.

Mr. Hallmark. It is OWCP’s view that the FECA program is structured along the lines of the model workers’ compensation programs as they were created in the early part of this century. The intent of workers’ compensation was to be a no-fault nonadversarial program. The intent was to ensure that benefits could be delivered quickly to injured workers without the attendant difficulties that had been experienced in the tort system.

Now, many State systems have moved back in the direction of litigation and the kind of lawyerly process that Mr. Linehan suggested. We don’t believe that’s necessarily the best policy approach. The reason why OWCP delivers 96 percent of its $2 billion benefits to the injured workers and their medical providers is because we have a straightforward, nonadversarial process.
Now, obviously, we want to make it work better; and we are anxious to make it work better.

Mr. HORN. I guess I would ask, is it really nonadversarial? It sounds like it is the clientele versus bureaucracy and it is fairly adversarial.

Forget the applause, please.

It just seems to me that the job of the agency must, overall, be fairness. You don’t have to save the pot of money, and I hope that isn’t the way you are judged. What you have to do is make sure that if people have an injury that is work related that they can be processed and have the benefits that the law provides. And as an administrative agency, it seems to me, if I were the head of it, I would be saying, hey, folks, there has to be a turnaround here in attitude.

It is exactly the same problem that Commissioner Rossotti faces in the Internal Revenue Service when we had long rows of witnesses from all over America before the Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance that said, hey, we have been treated like dirt. We have a problem here. Who is going to do anything about it? Well, Congress did do something about it. They put an advisory board in.

Of course, the President hasn’t submitted one name yet, and he fought us tooth and nail on doing anything to change the bureaucracy, but he signed the bill. And it could be that we need to do that to a number of agencies, maybe yours included, with an outside board that could look at and be available for complaints when people aren’t served.

Now, I realize there are a lot of people that don’t deserve the benefits. I had that under workers’ comp. I understand that. And there’s a lot of people that think the government owes them a living, and when they retire they decide to figure out some injury to get additional benefits. I know all of that, and I have been through it as an employer, as head of a university.

It was very simple. We just told our lawyers, if we are going to have this nonsense and they are fraudulent claims, let’s make them know that they’re in for a battle. And once you do that, usually that type of person that thinks they can get a few bucks when they aren’t injured, or faking an injury, that type of person usually is going to go somewhere else and not take on the people.

But, again, that becomes an adversarial process. Sometimes it has to be, and you will let a neutral, such as a judge, decide what was right here and what was wrong. All I am saying, and I think all Congress would say is, look, if people who are Federal employees have injuries, we want to treat them fairly. And your administration here of the agency, we have got to deal fairly. And if it means firing a few Regional Directors and firing a few caseworkers, I realize that’s hard with the Civil Service, but maybe the whole thing should be privatized. I don’t know, but you have got to get responsiveness out of the bureaucracy.

I have found that usually, when you set the goals, the people will respond if they are fair and want to do the right thing. But there are always some in every organization, I don’t know about this one, yours, anyone down the street, that people just don’t get the message that the clients aren’t out there just so they can have a job.
They have a job so they can help people, and that’s what we need to focus on here.

I guess I would ask you this: Do you make your Federal Employees’ Compensation Procedure Manual available to injured Federal workers to help assist them through the appeals process? What is the policy of the agency on that?

Mr. HALLMARK. Well, we have the Federal procedure on the Internet. It is available. We have recently updated our regulations to make them in a question-answer format to make them more usable for injured workers and their representatives as a means for pursuing their claims straightforwardly.

And I need to take a little issue with Mr. Linehan’s position that there are no rights for individuals and that no one is looking over OWCP’s shoulder. We have well-established and multiple avenues for appeal within the agency and outside the agency to the Employees’ Compensation Appeals Board. It does provide an objective review, and as do the reconsiderations and oral hearings that are provided within the agency.

In addition to that, an individual who can show or allege that a violation of their constitutional rights has been effectuated by OWCP can take their case to the District Court, and some do. So it is not the case that we are without any oversight. In fact, we have, as I said, I believe a reasonable process.

Mr. HORN. Well, you have two appeal processes, don’t you?

Mr. HALLMARK. Actually, three.

Mr. HORN. Three? Because I think there is a confusion out there as to whether these are real appeals. And maybe I’m all wrong on that, but one does the same thing the other does, and is it really an outside appeal?

Mr. HALLMARK. The three processes are first, reconsiderations, which are done within the district office. When a reconsideration is done, it is done by a claims examiner who has had no involvement in the case previously; who looks at it with fresh eyes.

I don’t have the data right now, but I think that something over 35 percent of reconsiderations, possibly higher than that, result in the original decision being overturned. So we have good reason to believe there are fresh eyes being applied.

Second, the oral hearing is done by staff located here in the national office who travel to the site and do a complete review, including presentation of evidence. Something in the neighborhood of 30 plus percent of those cases are overturned and sent back for further processing because they have found that an error was made.

Third, the ECAB, likewise, is an independent organization which reviews the entire case file as it is presented, and I believe something less than 30 percent of those cases are overturned.

So the process from our perspective, appears to work. Obviously, we continually monitor it, and we look at the quality of our cases. We have an elaborate accountability review process, and one of our customer service measures is to ensure that our decisions that we are making in the first instance are correct or according to procedure. We measure that very closely, and we report that as part of our GPRA plan.

Mr. HORN. Let me continue on this appeal process. You were probably in the room when the Sheila Williams case was men-
tioned. She is Acting Director, and Mr. Chamberlin phoned and said, could you explain the appeal process to me? Now, all I can say is if it is so simple why would she have to do research to answer Mr. Chamberlin’s question?

Mr. HALLMARK. Well, I can’t speak to the exact circumstances, obviously, in that particular case. Every single case is different. The response that one needs to make in a given case may have to do with the particular appeal rights that were issued by the previous decider. And, in this case, it is possible that the appeal rights that were issued by the decider were incorrect.

Ms. Williams happens to be in the room here this morning, so I don’t know whether she can speak, and we are governed by the Privacy Act in discussing individual case issues, so I don’t want to go too far down the line of suggesting specifics.

Mr. HORN. We would be glad to have a letter and put it at this point in the record if she feels she has been misquoted, et cetera.

Mr. HALLMARK. And if I could just beg your indulgence, I would say that Ms. Williams, who is our Deputy Director for FECA and is Acting Director right now, in the regular course of her work talks with hundreds of claimants, their representatives, congressional staff and so on on a regular basis. And she is—I believe we could find many, many individuals who would tell you that she is not only gracious and helpful but that she goes out of her way on every single day to provide the kind of services that I think you would want if you were an injured worker. I think that is true of Ms. Williams, who is an extraordinary person; also true of the vast majority of our staff who are working very hard.

Mr. HORN. Well, as I remember the testimony, it wasn’t that she wasn’t helpful, it was that she said I’m going to have to do research on this and never got back to the individual. So we need to straighten that out with a letter.

Mr. HALLMARK. We will certainly reply for the record.

Mr. HORN. All right. Now, I guess I would ask Mr. Hallmark, the testimony regarding Regional Director Hamlett, and that has been confirmed by two witnesses, does the agency plan to have a little—I guess in China it would be Mao, putting people in the fields to get right with what they ought to be doing as opposed to what they are doing. So did that shock you, that the Director would come screaming down the hall and all that?

Mr. HALLMARK. I had been informed by Mr. Hamlett that this event occurred. He had advised me somewhat differently about the circumstances. We will certainly investigate.

Now, having heard in some detail what we heard this morning, we will certainly investigate to determine what actually happened, both in the event that occurred in the hallway and on the conference call that was also described at some length in Mr. Riordan’s testimony.

Clearly, our folks try to be as courteous and sympathetic as they possibly can be. There are occasions where emotions run high. If we are discourteous in ways that are inappropriate, we need to take remedial action. Whether it is a reeducation process, as you suggest, we will have to determine.

Mr. HORN. With Ms. McGuinness’ testimony there was also the testimony about District Director John Lawrence, and that has
been submitted for the record. It will be transcribed and we will
send you a copy of it, and you can ask us, or please file if you think
further comment is necessary on that to clarify it one way or the
other from the agency’s standpoint.

Mr. HALLMARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HORN. Now let me go to what I regard as a very serious as-
pact, and that is the subcommittee has learned of adverse per-
sonnel actions that were initiated against Joseph Perez, a former
hearing representative for the Office of Workers’ Compensation
Programs. We hope there has not been any negative recourse taken
against Mr. Perez for his whistle-blowing activity or his testimony
before the subcommittee last year. The timing of this has us con-
cerned. Do you know anything about it?

Mr. HALLMARK. As it happens, I do. I’m part of the process that
has been involved in the particular instance you talk about.

Again, under the Privacy Act I don’t know that it is appropriate
for me to get into specific discussions with regard to personnel ac-
tions. I certainly would be willing and eager to provide information
for the record, but I certainly don’t want to violate the Privacy Act
in this hearing.

Mr. HORN. Well, we will be glad to insert your comments in the
record at this point without objection.

I will tell you that when congressional witnesses are sanctioned
by agencies when they are telling the truth, it makes us very un-
happy up here; and that happiness or unhappiness only goes away
when we cut about half the administration’s office budget and see
how they like that for a while.

But I have told one Cabinet officer if he fires that Inspector Gen-
eral he will be up here quite often under subpoena. Inspector Gen-
erals are there to do their duty, and they have done a great job
over the last 20 years, and all I can say is I would not punish a
witness before a congressional committee. That upsets people. And
I don’t care how they cover it up, it looks that way.

And I would just say if you have got an answer for it, great, we
will file it for the record, we will take a look at it, but we don’t
think that’s the way you treat people. We have had that problem
in the Pentagon in spades over the years. So that doesn’t make us
too happy.

Let’s see. We have about one more item, and then I think we can
call it a day. Some of them we will send down to you because it
will take staff work to give us an answer.

The Inspector General’s report on the medical authorizations,
Ms. Dalton. The subcommittee has heard many complaints from in-
jured Federal workers, as I have noted earlier, that it takes an un-
reasonably long time to receive authorization for a surgery, that
sometimes their immediate injury gets worse during the waiting
period. Does the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs set
standards to measure how quickly and efficiently it is making deci-
sions?

Now, Ms. Friedlander, I think you are supposed to be the expert
on evaluations for the Inspector General. What can you do to edu-
cate us on how do they measure their performance and do you feel
the claimants are well informed through the process?
Ms. FRIEDLANDER. Mr. Chairman, it appears to us that claimants are confused at times, and we make this recommendation with the hope that if claimants get a prompt response, they at least know that the agency has heard them.

We heard today information confirming that suspicion that we have, and we think that this first step, if we tried it, and then we measure the results of that, would tell us whether we need to take any further steps or whether this is enough.

Mr. HORN. Any comments to add to that, Ms. Dalton?

Ms. DALTON. No, I think I would just concur with what Ms. Friedlander had to say. As we looked at the data we did not find serious problems. We had looked at 69 cases out of the Philadelphia region and, on average, an authorization was provided within 26 days. However, there were a number of outliers in that group.

Mr. HORN. On the survey in general, I guess I would ask, as you looked at the customer service at the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs, do you find their customer service survey a useful tool for providing information about customer service? I mean, how many questions do you need? I’m familiar with this with faculty evaluations by students, and I have found that really about one or two questions is all you need to find out what’s really going on in the classroom. How about you? What’s the situation here?

Ms. DALTON. We found the survey, as I said in my testimony, to be too long, too complex, and that it certainly could use significant improvements. And we made a number of suggestions to the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs on how to go about that as well as to improve the way that they are drawing their sample to get more reliable information. The way it is being done right now we did not feel it was a good measure of customer satisfaction, and certainly there is room for improvement.

Mr. HORN. Well, I would agree with you on that, and we have had submitted to us from people all over the country a lot of different surveys, and we will put an exhibit in the record on those surveys and what they show us one way or the other. So we thank you for going over that.

[The information referred to follows:]
CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

1. Rate telephone responses by the OWCP __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Non-Existent.
2. Rate Correspondence responses by the OWCP __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Non-Existent
3. Rate Claims Examiner responses to questions asked __ Knowledgeable __ Informative __ False
4. Rate Claims Examiner demeanor __ Rule __ Unprofessional __ Acceptable __ Professional
5. How many times did you contact OWCP and never get a response __ 1-5 __ 6-10 __ 11-20 __ 21 or more.
6. How long did it take you to get a response __ 1-5 days __ 6-10 days __ 1 month __ 2 months __ 3 months __ 6 months __ 1 year or longer __ still trying.
7. Rate the maintenance of your file __ sloppy __ Other peoples things in file __ duplicated and unreadable in file.
8. Rate the amount of time it takes to get a copy of your file __ 1-3 months __ 3-6 months __ 6-12 months __ 1 year or longer __ still trying.
9. For those who got a schedule award, was your award __ reduced __ delayed __ paid as you requested and were entitled.
10. Rate physicians selected by OWCP __ Professional __ Unprofessional __ Made false claims __ Overpaid.
11. How many examinations have you been to __ 1-4 __ 5-10 __ 11-20 __ more, how many __________.
12. Rate your experience with these physicians __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Bad
13. Rate reimbursement of expenses by OWCP __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Not reimbursed yet
14. Rate your experience with OWCP nurse __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Bad
15. Rate your experience with OWCP Voc. Rehab. __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Bad
16. If you had Voc. Rehab. __ Actually working __ Comp cut for job I don’t have __ Comp Cut for more money than earning __ Got training __ Got a job __ Forced to work a job I cannot do.
17. Rate OWCP Rehab Program __ Bad experience __ Good counselors __ Bad counselors __ Training satisfactory
18. Rate your employers involvement in claims experience __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Bad
19. Rate your employers evidence __ False __ in Error __ Accurate __ Timely __ Relevant. __ Meant to delay or deny
20. Rate your employers willingness in filing papers __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Non-existent
21. Was medical treatment __ Delayed __ denied __ approved promptly __ hard to get __ as requested by physician.
22. Was diagnostic testing __ Delayed __ denied __ approved promptly __ hard to get __ as requested by physician.
23. Were surgery requests __ Delayed __ denied __ approved promptly __ hard to get __ as requested by physician.
24. As a result of delays or denial __ suffered permanent condition __ suffered long term pain __ have not been able to work
25. Rate OWCP handling of medical statement __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Poor
26. Were you ever denied __ physical therapy __ medicine __ standards __ appliances __ testing __ change of physician
27. Rate your experience with hearings representatives __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Poor
28. Rate the decision by the hearings representatives __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Poor
29. Rate the material used to make the decision __ Accurate __ False __ Did not address issues __ Employer biased
30. How long did it take to get a hearing and decision __ 1-4 months __ 5-12 months __ 1 to 2 years __ longer
31. Rate OWCP reconsideration process __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Very Poor
32. Was the decision __ Fair __ Unfair __ Poorly rationalized __ Well Rationalized
33. Do you feel that __ You had a fair chance __ No chance at all __ Some chance at all __ Never will have a chance
34. Rate your overall feelings of the OWCP appeal process __ Favors OWCP __ Favors Claimants __ Is fair __ is not fair
35. Rate your right to find representation in appeals __ Excellent __ Good __ Fair __ Poor __ Non-existent
36. Due to your injury, the OWCP delays, did you suffer __ Bankruptcy __ Raised or poor Credit __ Divorce __ Loss of home __ Loss of self worth __ Loss of dignity

I won't sign my name because __________ Name (optional)
If you sign your name, please __________ Address (optional)
If you sign your name, please __________ Phone No. (optional)

You may check more than one box per line if you need to. Please send your filled out survey to The Honorable Steve Horn; Chairman Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology; Room B-373 Rayburn BOB; Washington, DC 20515. Please do not send case files or requests for personal assistance with cases. Mr. Horn cannot help any individuals but those from his district with their cases. If you wish to make additional comments about the OWCP and their service, please use a clean piece of paper and keep it as short as possible.
## CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

1. Rate telephone responses by the OWCP: Good, Poor, No Existence.
2. Rate Correspondence responses by the OWCP: Good, Fair, Poor, No Existence.
3. Rate Claims Examiner responses to questions asked: Knowledgeable, Informed, Uninformed, Misleading.
4. Rate Claims Examiner demeanor: Professional, Unprofessional, Acceptable, Professional.
5. How many times did you contact OWCP and never get a response: 1-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20 or more.
6. How long did it take you to get a response: 1-5 days, 6-10 days, 1 month, 2 months, never got a response.
7. Rate the maintenance of your file (compy) other people things in file (c) duplicates and unreadable in file.
8. How long did it take to get a copy of your file: 1-3 months, 3-6 months, 1 year or longer, still waiting.
9. For those who got a schedule award, was your award: reduced, delayed, paid as you requested and were entitled.
10. Rate physicians selected by OWCP: Professional, Poor, Unprofessional, Made false claims, Overpaid.
11. How many examinations have you been sent to: 1-5, 5-10, 10-20, more, how many.
12. Rate your experience with three physicians: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Bad.
13. Rate reimbursement of expenses by OWCP: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Not reimbursed yet.
14. Rate your experience with OWCP nurses: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Bad.
15. Rate your experience with OWCP Voc. Rehab: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Bad.
16. If you had Voc. Rehab, actually working: Comp out for job I don't have, Comp can for more money than earning.
17. Rate OWCP Rehab Program: Bad experience, Good counseling, Bad counselors, Training satisfactory, Training unsatisfactory, no training, rehab ended with nothing but waste of time.
18. Rate your employer's involvement in claims experience: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Bad.
19. Rate your employer's evidence: False, In Error, Accurate, Timely, Relevant, Relevant, Mean to delay or deny.
20. Rate your employer's treatment of filling papers: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Bad.
21. Was medical treatment delayed: Denied, approved promptly, not allowed to get, as requested by physician.
22. Was diagnostic testing delayed: Denied, approved promptly, hard to get, as requested by physician.
23. Were surgery requests delayed: Denied, approved promptly, hard to get, as requested by physician.
24. As a result of delays or denials, suffered permanent condition: Suffer long term pain, have not been able to work.
25. Rate OWCP handling of medical conditions: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor.
26. Which health care provider did you use: Physical therapy, medicine, dentist, audiologist, chiropractor.
27. Rate your experience with hearing representatives: Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor.
28. Rate the decision by the hearings representatives: Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor.
29. Rate the manner used to make the decision: Accurate, False, Did not address issues, Employer biased.
30. How long did it take to get a hearing and decision: 1-12 months, 12 months, 2 years.
31. Rate the decision process: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor.
32. Was the decision fair: Fair, Unfair, Poorly rationalized, Well Rationalized.
33. How are you feeling: You had a fair chance, No chance at all, Some chance at all, Never will have a chance.
34. Rate your overall feelings of the OWCP appeal process: Favorable, Unfavorable, Claimant's appeal, Fair, Unfair.
35. Rate your right to appeal: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, No existence.
36. Due to your injury, the OWCP delays, did you suffer: Bankruptcy, Ruined or poor Credit, Divorce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (optional)</th>
<th>Address (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

You may check more than one box per line if you need to. Please send your filled out survey to The Honourable Steve Horn, Chairman, Senate, On Government Management, Information, and Technology, Room B-373 Rayburn House Washington, DC 20515. Please do not send case files or requests for personal assistance with cases. Mr. Horn cannot help any individuals but those from his district with their cases. If you wish to make additional comments about the OWCP and their service, please use a clean piece of paper and keep it as short as possible.
### CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

1. Rate telephone responses by the OWCP:  
   - Good:  
   - Fair:  
   - Poor:  
   - Non-existent:  

2. Rate Correspondence responses by the OWCP:  
   - Good:  
   - Fair:  
   - Poor:  
   - Non-existent:  

3. Rate Claims Examiners demeanor:  
   - Friendly:  
   - Unprofessional:  
   - Acceptable:  
   - Professional:  

4. Rate how many times did you contact OWCP and never get a response:  
   - 1-5:  
   - 6-10:  
   - 11-20:  
   - 20 or more:  

5. Rate how long did it take you to get a response:  
   - 5 days:  
   - 6-10 days:  
   - 1 month:  
   - 3 months:  
   - 1 year or longer:  

6. Rate the maintenance of your file:  
   - Satisfactory:  
   - Sloppy:  
   - Other people's things in file:  
   - Irregularities and unattainable in file:  

7. Rate the service you received:  
   - Excellent:  
   - Good:  
   - Fair:  
   - Poor:  
   - Very Poor:  

8. Rate how many examinations have you been sent to:  
   - 1-5:  
   - 6-10:  
   - 11-20:  
   - More than 20:  

9. Rate your experience with the participating physicians:  
   - Excellent:  
   - Good:  
   - Fair:  
   - Poor:  
   - Very Poor:  

10. Rate the reimbursement of expenses by OWCP:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Not reimbursed:  

11. Rate your experience with OWCP nurses:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

12. Rate your experience with OWCP Voc. Rehab.  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

13. If you had Voc. Rehab.  
    - Actually working:  
    - Comp cut for job:  
    - Don't have job:  
    - Comp cut for more money than earning:  
      - Got training:  
      - Got a job:  
      - Forced to work a job I couldn't do:  

14. Rate OWCP Rec. Program:  
    - Good counsel:  
    - Good counselors:  
    - Bad counselors:  
    - Training satisfactory:  
      - Training unsatisfactory:  
      - No training:  
      - Trained on other veterans' money:  

15. Rate your employers involvement in claims experience:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

16. Rate your employers' evidence:  
    - False:  
    - In Error:  
    - Accurate:  
    - Timely:  
    - Relevant:  
    - Maintains to delay or deny:  

17. Rate how long it took to complete treatment:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

18. Rate medical treatment:  
    - Delayed:  
    - Denied:  
    - Approved promptly:  
    - hard to get:  
    - as requested by physician:  

19. Rate diagnostic testing:  
    - Delayed:  
    - Denied:  
    - Approved promptly:  
    - hard to get:  
    - as requested by physician:  

20. Rate surgery:  
    - Delayed:  
    - Denied:  
    - Approved promptly:  
    - hard to get:  
    - as requested by physician:  

21. As a result of delays or denial,  
    - suffered permanent condition:  
    - suffered long term pain:  
    - have not been able to work:  

22. Rate OWCP handles:  
    - Medical treatment:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

23. Were you ever denied:  
    - physical therapy:  
    - medication:  
    - attendants:  
    - appliances:  
    - toast:  
    - change of physician:  

24. Rate your experience with hearing representatives:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

25. Rate the decision by hearing representatives:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

26. Rate the material used to make the decision:  
    - Accurate:  
    - False:  
    - Did not address issues:  
    - Employer biased:  

27. Rate the hearing decision:  
    - 1-5 months:  
    - 6-12 months:  
    - 1 year or longer:  
    - Ambiguous:  

28. Rate the process of the hearing:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

29. Rate the medical review:  
    - No chance:  
    - Some chance at all:  
    - Never will have a chance:  

30. Rate how well the OWCP appointment process:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

31. Rate how well the OWCP handles appeals:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Non-existent:  

32. Rate your overall service:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Very Poor:  

33. Rate your right to represent or appeal:  
    - Excellent:  
    - Good:  
    - Fair:  
    - Poor:  
    - Non-existent:  

34. If you have any questions or comments about the OWCP, please contact:  
    - Bankruptcy:  
    - Ruined or poor credit:  
    - Divorce:  
    - Loss of home:  
    - Loss of self worth:  
    - Loss of dignity:  

---

Name (optional)

Address (optional)

Phone No (optional)

You may check more than one box per line if you need to. Please send your filled out survey to  The Honorable Steve Horn; Chairman Subcom. On Government Management, Information, and Technology; Room B-373 Rayburn HOB; Washington, DC 20515. Please do not send case files or requests for personal assistance with cases. Mr. Horn cannot help any individual but those from his district with their cases. If you wish to make additional comments about the OWCP and their service, please use a clean piece of paper and keep it as short as possible.
Mr. Horn. Mr. Hallmark, is there anything you would like to sum up on? Feel free. We will keep the record open, obviously.

Mr. Hallmark. I wanted to speak for a moment about the medical authorization issue. We appreciate the work that the IG has done in this area. Prior to this, we had established in each Regional Director’s performance agreement a requirement that they begin this year to capture data with respect to the whole range of medical authorization, following in part on the issues that were raised last summer in Long Beach.

We intend to look at that data closely and determine what areas, if any, we think need to have a performance standard and what that would look like. It is a complex issue because some things can be done very quickly, other things require a second opinion. If it is a back surgery and a complex issue, we don’t want to establish a standard that would, in effect, not fit the circumstance where our most significant problems are. So that is the tack that we have taken within OWCP, and we expect to address it.

Again, I would say, in summary, that I think we are aware of the need to provide much better customer service. We have projects in place to try to do that.

One of the issues that I believe you mentioned yourself, Mr. Chairman, about the attitude of workers in this program, is something that we have been working on and are continuing to work on. As I say, this is an effort on our part to transform ourselves to become a dynamic service entity; that is, to view ourselves as service providers rather than gatekeepers. We are going to get there, and we are working very hard to do that.

There are some cases where denials occur, where disputes, often-times long-standing disputes, between the employee and their employing agency are intense. They get transferred to the OWCP environment when a denial occurs or information doesn’t change hands, and we end up with the difficulty of trying to address those cases. It is a very hard thing for us to do.

I think our folks struggle very manfully—and womanfully—to try to accomplish it, and we are going to continue to try to make that performance better.

Mr. Horn. Very good. At this time I would like to place in the record a statement from John D. McLellan, Jr., a former Director of the FECA Program. The statement outlines his thoughts concerning the administration of FECA at the OWCP.

[The information referred to follows:]
Hon. Stephen Horn, Chairman
Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology
Committee on Government Reform
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington DC 20515-6143

June 16, 1999

Dear Mr. Horn:

By your letter of June 1, 1999 you have asked me to submit a statement concerning the administration of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA) by the Department of Labor’s Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (OWCP). As was noted in the letter — as a former Director of FECP Program and subsequently an attorney assisting Federal injured workers with their attempts to get FECA benefits to which they were entitled under the FECA — your subcommittee would like to get:

1. my views on whether the FECA program is being run in a fair and efficient manner
2. my experiences in assisting injured Federal workers through the FECA process
3. findings or recommendations I may have regarding the structure of OWCP and its administration of FECA

I will start with my experience in representing FECA claimants before OWCP. This was the period from late 1987 to the end of 1995. Following my retirement from OWCP in August 1985, I decided to set up a solo practice of law in my home — partly to see if I could assist FECA claimants in getting the benefits to which they were entitled. I wanted to know if it indeed was so difficult, as I had heard many times, for an injured Federal employee to successfully get through the OWCP process to get FECA benefits. I terminated this activity at the end of calendar year 1995 totally frustrated in my efforts in dealing with the OWCP-FECA process. My letters and phone calls to determine the specific issue in a case or the specific status of cases were seldom answered. When OWCP decisions adverse to the claimant were reached and the claimant wished to go to a hearing, there was at least a one year wait to get a hearing and a decision. Appealing to the Appeals Board again was a one year plus process to a decision.

It should be understood that the cases I received were the more difficult ones generally involving occupational disease or illness. Traumatic injury cases, the large majority of FECA cases, normally are handled very well by the OWCP-FECP system — a disabled claimant has his pay continued for 45 days after which compensation kicks in. Decisions on issues are more prompt. There is little need for the claimant to get an attorney in these traumatic injury cases.

In occupational illness or disease cases, on the other hand, the claimant must prove his or her case medically before OWCP may accept the case for payment. No compensation may be paid until OWCP makes a decision accepting the claim. There is no continuation of pay as there is for traumatic injuries. It is often very difficult for a claimant to obtain the detailed reasoned medical documentation from a medical specialist to support the claim that something in the work environment to which the claimant was exposed...
over a number of days caused the disability claimed. The claimant often must go without pay or 
compensation for months or years in such a case before a decision is issued and the hearing and appeal 
process successfully used.

These claimants waiting months and years to get the compensation and medical care to which they are 
entitled, and who are often unable to get case status information from OWCP (during 
this wait), get frustrated, seek assistance from their Congress person, union, attorney, anyone who will 
help. And some claimants are sure that there is some conspiracy in place to intentionally deny them FECA 
benefits.

My experience both in administering OWCP-FECA and assisting claimants with claims being processed 
through OWCP is that the system gets bogged down at the Claims Examiners level. All claims in the 
system go to a Claims Examiner who is to get all the necessary facts (work exposure to the alleged 
harmful substances, etc.), medical documentation, etc. and then prepare a statement of accepted facts 
upon which to base the Claims Examiner’s OWCP decision. In occupational disease cases this is a long 
and often difficult chore. At the same time the Claims Examiner is aware that his or her performance 
requirements expect that the examiner will produce decisions on a specified number of cases a week or 
month. Many Claims Examiners are soon aware that the caseload is larger than she or he can reasonable 
handle. Under this pressure many examiners will often take the easier cases first and put off “till 
tomorrow” the cases that are much more difficult and time consuming. The result is the system is not 
producing adjudications on occupational disease in a timely manner.

The most important point is it is true that there are not enough claims examiners to handle the work load. 
The per examiner caseload is much too high for an effective and efficient operation. The examiners handle 
as best they can the work load given. This load is too much. They see they can’t do everything. So they 
take short cuts (handle the easier cases first, do occupational cases later, don’t return phone calls, etc.) And 
everything bogs down.

I had no problem in dealing with Mr. Markey (FECA Director) and his staff. On specific case problems I 
might discuss the matter with Mr. Markey or his staff but for resolution the matter would be referred back 
to the Claims Examiner, where often the case would sit for months with no action.

My views on whether the FEC program is being run in a fair and efficient manner. 
It is my opinion the OWCP officials have made and continue to make great efforts to establish and run a 
fair and efficient work injury compensation program. The Claims Procedure Manual and other OWCP-
FECA Procedure Manuals are updated constantly and it is clear to me that the product is intended to assure 
basic due process and fairness in claims actions concerning the injured worker. The high quality of the 
written procedures shows the effort that is going into this process of making the FECA system fair and 
equitable.

The great and continuing computer assisted claims processing, developed by OWCP, is also noteworthy 
and again demonstrates OWCP management’s determination to improve the FECA claims process.

While I am convinced that OWCP management has a high level of administrative skills and is exercising 
these to the advantage of the program, it can not be denied that the begging down of the FECA claims at 
the Claims Examiner level because of the disappointment of case load to staffing ultimately makes the 
process unfair to the long suffering claimants, especially those with occupational disease claims.
Findings or recommendations I have regarding the structure of OWCP and its administration of FECA

1. I do not recommend reorganizing or restructuring OWCP to improve performance. It is my experience in 30 years in the government that reorganizing an organization that is not producing as expected does not solve the problem. You have to get to the cause of the trouble. In my opinion the cause of the trouble is shortage of staff in the Claims Examiner area. Congress and the Administration would have to make some type of long term commitment to adequately staff the FECA claims operation. This has not been done in the 40+ years I have been connected with the FECA operation. If the members of Congress and the Administration do want to see Federal employees disabled due to job injuries get the timely benefits to which they are entitled by law, they will have to make such commitment.

2. I do not see any evidence to indicate that there is any conspiracy within OWCP to deny claims of FECA claimants as alleged by some understandably frustrated FECA claimants.

3. The FECA hearing staff in OWCP needs to be increased to the extent necessary to be able to provide timely hearings and decisions to FECA claimants. Likewise the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board needs to have its staff increased so that appeals may be decided timely.

4. Serious consideration needs to be given to instituting a FECA appeal process to the Federal Court system as has been done for US Veterans in the Veterans' Judicial Review Act of 1988. That law provides for Federal Court review of VA benefit decisions. A similar U.S. Court review for FECA cases would eventually give more credibility to the FECA adjudication process.

I trust this provides the information you requested. You or your staff may contact me if you need more.

Sincerely,

John D. McLellan Jr.

Enclosed: 1) Background on John McLellan
        2) Completed "truth in testimony" rule form
Mr. McLellan, Associate Director of the Department of Labor's Office of Workers Compensation Programs, was in charge of and directed the Federal Employees' Compensation Program from 1978 until his retirement from the federal government in 1985.

He is a 1955 graduate of the Boston University Law School and has over 40 years experience in management and adjudication systems, especially those concerning workers' compensation, both in the public and private sectors, with a notable record of accomplishing cost savings and at the same time providing better service and support to injured workers.

His service in the Federal workers' compensation programs began in 1955 when he was hired by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) to begin training for an executive position in the federal workers' compensation programs. He subsequently served as national director of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Program (1962-66), Deputy Commissioner in charge of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' and Federal Employees' Compensation Programs in the New York Region (1966-78) and national director of the Federal Employees Compensation (FEC) Program, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), Employment Standards Administration (ESA), U.S. Department of Labor (1978-1985). In the national Longshore and FEC positions he was responsible for the written policy and procedures issued and the general administration of the programs.

From 1985-1995 he was Workers' Compensation Coordinator for G.M. Smith Associates, Inc. (GMSA) Bethesda, MD (a small national company assisting large and small employers with employee health and workers' compensation issues), and consultant on workers' compensation matters to various organizations including the Occupational Health Foundation (AFL-CIO). With Will L. Massey & Associates (Dallas, TX) he has assisted in case reviews/audits of workers' compensation cases (Longshore Act) for Alexander & Alexander's Alexis (a major third-party workers' compensation claim administrator) in Austin TX and (FECA cases) for the U.S. Postal Service in Dallas. While with GMSA he assisted the Naval Research Laboratory with its FECA cases.

Mr. McLellan served on the Technical Resources Group of the National Conference of State Legislatures, served on the Workers' Compensation Committees of the Federal, District of Columbia and American Bar Associations (ABA), and also served as the Vice-Chair of ABA's General Practice Section's Worker's Compensation Committee. In addition he is a member of the Bar of the U.S. Supreme Court and Associate member of the Virginia Bar. His extensive pro bono activities in his solo law practice (1986-1995) include assistance to U.S. civilian ex-prisoners of war and others seeking to obtain from the federal government the benefits to which they are entitled. Besides his
extensive knowledge of the FBC, he also is an authority on the Longshore Act, the War Claims Act, the War Hazards Act, Defense Base Act, Missing Person's Act, Hostage Relief Act and related laws.

Because of his extensive knowledge of federal disability systems he was asked to contribute a chapter on that subject to a book on disability. That book entitled *Disability Evaluations* was published the Spring of 1996 by the American Medical Association and Mosby and the editors Doctors Stephen Demeter, Gunnar Anderson and George Smith. Chapter 4 comprises Mr. McLellan's paper *Overview of Various Disability Systems in the United States*.

Mr. McLellan is a native of New Jersey - born (1930), raised and graduated high school in Glen Ridge and then attended Drew University in Madison, New Jersey where he graduated in 1952 with a BA degree. He then went on to get his JD from Boston University Law School. He now resides in Alexandria, Virginia.
Mr. HORN. I would also like to read into the record the people that helped develop this hearing besides the Federal injured workers that we heard from from all over the country, which were very helpful.

J. Russell George, the staff director, chief counsel, who is not here right now, and that's for the Government Management, Information, and Technology Subcommittee.

On my left, your right, is the gentleman that prepared most of the work on this hearing, Matthew Ebert, an excellent senior policy adviser to the committee.

And Bonnie Heald, director of communications, is back here; and next to her is Mason Alinger, our clerk for putting this all together. Faith Weiss, minority counsel, is over here; and Earley Green, minority staff assistant.

We had two court reporters today, Julia Thomas and Pam Garland; and we had two sign language interpreters, Jan Nishimura and Earl Fleetwood.

We thank you all for your help; and, with that, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:38 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional information submitted for the hearing record follows:]
January 26, 2000

FROM: John Victor Shepherd Sr.
230 West Delano Street
Elverta, California 95626-9215
916.991.7089 fax 916.991.7089
email tvs@inreach.com

Thank you for your January 19, 2000 acknowledgment. I do appreciate your offer of having my written testimony as part of the Congressional record. As you are aware that I could "go on for hours" on the subject of the Office of Worker's Compensation and the problems encountered, I will confine myself to the calendar years of 1999 and 2000. As this time period is a classic example of OWCP's abuse of power and their complete disregard for federal employees as well as federal laws.


In 1988, bladder cancer was discovered and surgery was performed to remove tumors, again in 1989 with more surgery and again January of 1991. On the advice of McClellan AFB Civilian Personnel, I also filed claims for compensation for Tinitus and carpal Tunnel syndrome as well as the cancer. It was determined that my exposure to the chemical environment of aircraft maintenance might be the cause of the cancer and I was placed on worker's compensation in August of 1992 for recurrent bladder cancer.

April 1999: I received a OWCP letter, dated April 21, 1999, requiring a "periodic medical report from your treating physician" with the Standard Form OWCP-5c attached. I presented it to my Urologist, who once again balked at filling out the Form OWCP-5c. The Urologist has always stated that the Form OWCP-5c, titled Work Capacity Evaluation - Musculoskeletal Conditions, was not appropriate for a urologic condition, but in the past he had filled out the Part 3 and signed it. I wrote to OWCP requesting clarification on the use of this form ( Is Musculoskeletal Conditions form correct for bladder/cancer/chemical toxicity? ) and after receiving no response I requested that my doctor go ahead with his report. The Urologist wrote his medical report (May 25, 1999), very much as he had in the past, and returned it to me with a blank and unsigned Form OWCP-5c. I submitted these to OWCP!

July 1999: I received the OWCP letter, dated July 22, 1999, NOTICE OF PROPOSED TERMINATION OF COMPENSATION and immediately hand-carried it to the Urologist, who, in a telephone call, stated that he did not agree with the findings of OWCP of "no longer suffering from bladder cancer", but if I needed more I should contact the Occupational Medicine Department. I hand-carried a request to Kaiser's Occupational Medicine Chief of Staff requesting that he review the OWCP findings, the urologist's report and if he felt that OWCP was in error, to write a medical narrative with the Form OWCP-5c filled out for submission to OWCP. I received his August 12, 1999 letter (without the Form OWCP-5c) and forwarded it on to OWCP.

October 1999: I received the October 5, 1999 letter that terminated my compensation and upon reviewing this letter and the attached supporting documents "Memo To The Director", dated July 27, 1999 and September 29, 1999. I found that I had quite a few questions concerning this termination of compensation and I wrote to OWCP letter dated October 17, 1999, requesting that my questions be reviewed and answered so that I could file an appeal with the Employer's Compensation Appeals Board (ECAB). Knowing that OWCP Claim Examiner (based on 10 years of experience) would not respond to my questions, I sent a copy of this letter on October 18, 1999 to the Office of the Regional Director requesting an informal review of the findings outlined in the October 5th letter.
On October 26, 1999, I received a telephone call from a Donna F. (I asked for the spelling of her last name and was told to just refer to her as “Donna F” as everyone did know who she was), stating that the Regional Director had given her my letter and that she had been told to get it handled. She informed me that they (OWCP) could not respond to my letter informally, she asked that I fax her a letter request for reconsideration, and she would see to it that my questions were answered.

On December 1, 1999, I fixed another letter to Donna F., requesting status of that reconsideration process; I never received a reply.

After the 1st of the year, I began calling Donna F. at both the OWCP Regional Office and the PECO District Office, I have yet to get her last name, but she was identified as the Regional Claims Manager. I finally received a telephone call from a Miss Lee, on January 14, 2000, stating that she did in fact have my reconsideration on her desk, but she hadn’t gotten to it yet.

**Opinion:** My family has been without OWCP compensation, medical/health benefits and life insurance since October 5th of last year, a total of 101 days (Oct 5th thru Jan. 14th) and I am still waiting to have my questions answered! This “reconsideration” process is not based on any new medical evidence, but only on points of federal law.

1. **Did two OWCP Claims Examiners overstep their authority and make medical decisions?**
   The July 27, 1999 Memo to Director (dated five days after the July 22, 1999 letter) states that “latest and most recent report indicates Mr. Shepherd does not show any tumor growth and is free of bladder cancer.” Reading the May 25th medical report is does state that I do not show any tumor growth, but the cancer-free statement just isn’t there. The September 29, 1999 Memo to Director contains a handwritten statement signed by a Senior Claims Examiner stating that “No evidence that these conditions are disabling from the performance of his normal job duties,” is this Senior Claims Examiner qualified to make a medical statement such as this?

   It is apparent that this Senior Claims Examiner has never read the job description for an WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician.

   - Tinnitus/indicating loss - medically restricted from any noise environment
   - Carpal Tunnel - medically restricted from lifting and repetitive hand motions
   - Cancer - medically restricted from chemical environments

2. **Did OWCP disregard The Code of Federal Regulations in this termination order?**
C.F.R Title 5, Volume 1 Part 353 Section 353.101 Scope states who is covered under this section.

C.F.R Title 5, Volume 1 Part 353, Section 353.102 Definitions states that “Fully recovered means compensation payments have been terminated on the basis that the employee is able to perform all of the duties of the position he or she left or an equivalent one” means no medical restrictions! Section 353.102 (2) (i) states “There is a medical reason to restrict the individual from some or all essential duties because of possible incapacitation (for example, a seizure) or because of health impairments (such as further exposure to a toxic substance for an individual who has already shown the effects of such exposure).”

**Conclusion:** I do firmly believe that this illegal termination of compensation is based on only one factor! The mandate from Employment Standards Administration as outlined in their FY2000 Annual Performance Plan and the Office of Worker’s Compensation Programs Strategic Plan.

I thank you for your time and for your assistance in having it posted as part of the record of the Government Management, Information and Technology Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

John V. Shepherd Sr.
April 21, 1999

John V. Shepherd
230 W Delano Street
Elverta, CA 95626

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

The Office of Workers' Compensation Programs requires periodic medical reports from your treating physician regardless of the severity of your condition, length of time you have been receiving benefits, or your age. These periodic reports are necessary even if your condition is such that no improvement seems likely or possible.

Please have your physician submit the following information in a detailed narrative report within 60 days:

1. A description of the current objective findings and diagnoses.
2. An opinion, with medical reasons for the opinion, regarding causal relationship of your condition to the accepted work injury or disease.
3. A completed Work Restriction Evaluation Form and an indication when you will be able to return to work or participate in vocational rehabilitation.

IMPORTANT: Present this letter to your physician so that he/she is made aware of the required detailed narrative report to be included with the completed Work Restriction Evaluation Form. The physician may submit an itemized bill on Form HCFA-1500 with the report.

Sincerely,

RON KOSTER
Casino Examiner

Enclosure: Work Restriction Evaluation Form, OWCP
May 25, 1999

John V. Sheperd, Sr
230 West Delano Street
Elverta, California 95626

MR# 05165865

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that I saw Mr. John Victor Sheperd the Senior last week for a routine cystoscopy to follow up on the status of his bladder cancer. Mr. Sheperd had his first bladder tumor in August of 1989, followed by recurrences in June of 1989, and again in January of 1991. Cystoscopy since then have revealed no evidence of recurrent tumor growth.

His most recent cystoscopy again revealed no clinical recurrences.

Mr. Sheperd is scheduled for continued surveillance cystoscopy on an annual basis.

If there are any further questions regarding Mr. Sheperd's urologic status, please feel free to call or write.

Sincerely,

DEEPAK CHABRA, M.D.
Department of Urology

cc: Dr. Chabra
DC/Irl
July 22, 1999

John V. Shepherd
230 W Delano Street
Riviera, CA 95656

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

NOTICE OF PROPOSED TERMINATION OF COMPENSATION

This is to advise you that we propose to terminate your compensation for wage loss on account of the injury identified above for the following reason:

You are no longer suffering from bladder cancer.

The medical reports on which this decision is based are enclosed. If you disagree with the proposed action, you may submit additional evidence or argument relevant to the issues described in the preceding paragraph. Such evidence or argument must be submitted to this Office within thirty days of the date of this letter. Your compensation will not be terminated during this thirty-day period. If no response is received within thirty days, we shall proceed with the termination of your compensation.

Under Office of Personnel Management Regulations, an employee who recovers from a compensable injury within one year is entitled to mandatory job restoration, and is expected to apply for reemployment within 30 days of the cessation of compensation. Further information concerning restoration rights may be obtained from your agency or any OPM area office. You may also wish to contact your former employing agency or OPM for advice on continuing any health insurance and/or life insurance coverage.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Barbara Kennedy
Senior Claims Examiner

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
SACRAMENTO AIR LOGISTICS CNTR.
77 SPTG-OPEB
3411 O'LEARY STREET SUITE 2
MCLELLAN AFB, CA 95652
MEMO TO THE DIRECTOR

Case Number: 130914770
Claimant Name: John Shepherd

Date: 07/27/1999

ISSUE:
The issue is whether Mr. Shepherd's occupational disease continues, thus entitling Mr. Shepherd to further compensation for wage loss.

REQUIREMENTS OF ENTITLEMENT:
For Mr. Shepherd to be entitled to continued compensation payments, the medical evidence must establish that Mr. Shepherd continues to be disabled due to his occupational disease (bladder cancer).

BACKGROUND:
The department of the Air Force, McClellan Air Force Base, California employed Mr. Shepherd as an aircraft electrical systems installer/repairer. While performing duties associated with the position of aircraft electrical systems installer/repairer Mr. Shepherd came in contact with a number of know carcinogens. Ultimately, in 1988, Mr. Shepherd was diagnosed with bladder cancer. Mr. Shepherd filed timely notice with this Office and bladder cancer was accepted as an occupational disease. Mr. Shepherd had surgery to remove tumors in 1998 and again in 1999 and 2001 when tumors returned. Mr. Shepherd worked intermittently during this period until 08/04/1992 when Mr. Shepherd began receiving regularly scheduled compensation payments. Mr. Shepherd continues to receive compensation payment through the present time.

DISCUSSION OF EVIDENCE:
Mr. Shepherd's most recent medical report, submitted by Dr. Deepak Chandra, Department of Urology, Kaiser Permanente, Sacramento, CA, states that Mr. Shepherd shows no evidence of recurrent tumor growth, and has not since his last surgery in 1991.

BASIS FOR DECISION:
The latest and most recent report indicates that Mr. Shepherd does not show any tumor growth and is free of bladder cancer.

CONCLUSION:
It is recommended that compensation be terminated because Mr. Shepherd is no longer suffering from bladder cancer, Mr. Shepherd's accepted occupational disease.

Ron Keser
Claims Examiner
August 12, 1999

U.S. Department of Labor
Employee Standards Administration
Office of Workers Compensation Programs
P.O. Box 19457
San Francisco, CA 94119
ATTN: Ron Koster, Claims Examiner

RE: SHEPHERD, JOHN
Mbf: 516 58 65
OWCF: 95626-13-0914270
DIT: 07/25/88

Dear Mr. Koster:

I am in receipt of your letter to Mr. Shepherd dated April 21, 1999, wherein you asked for an update of the patient’s current medical problems.

As you have received a report from Dr. Chabas on May 25, 1999, where there is no sign of any clinical recurrence of his bladder cancer, there was a response from Barbara Kennedy, Senior Claims Examiner in your office on July 22, 1999 that compensation be terminated because he was no longer suffering from bladder cancer. Therefore, your letter, as well as Ms. Kennedy’s letter, were both forwarded to me for clarification.

I had seen Mr. Shepherd in the early 1990’s, and had given him a permanent restriction as of June 4, 1991 from any significant exposure to Turko JP-4 or other paraffin-containing solvents, as these chemicals have been noted to be carcinogenic to the bladder. Even though he has not had a recurrence of his bladder cancer, one would not discontinue this restriction, much like one would not encourage a patient recovering from lung cancer to restart his smoking. The fact that Mr. Shepherd is not suffering from bladder cancer at this time is a reflection of probably the modifications of the various multifactorial risk factors for bladder cancer, one of which would be exposure to the solvents named above.
With regard to his tinnitus, the patient's restrictions are that he should not exceed the general acceptable maximum noise level as established by OSHA standards.

Finally, with regards to his carpal tunnel syndrome, Dr. Powers had restricted Mr. Shepherd's repetitive hand motions to an occasional basis for an indefinite period of time as well.

I am not aware of any change in any of the restrictions, especially the first one regarding his exposure to the paraffin and other solvents noted above.

I hope this report helps you in your evaluation of Mr. Shepherd's case. Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Peter W. Yip, M.D.
Occupational Medicine

cc: Occ Med Shadow File
    Peter Yip, M.D.
    Clinic Chart (Roseville)
    John Shepherd (230 West Delano Street, Elvera, CA 9526-9215)
MEMO TO THE DIRECTOR

RE: JOHN SHEPHERD

FILE # 13-0914270

08/28/1999

ISSUE:
Whether to finalize termination of Workers' Compensation benefits to Mr. Shepherd.

BACKGROUND:
On 07/22/1999 a Notice of Proposed Termination was sent to Mr. Shepherd indicating this Office was proposing to terminate Workers' Compensation Benefits because Mr. Shepherd was no longer suffering from bladder cancer.

In response to this notice, Mr. Shepherd contacted Kaiser Permanente to have additional medical evidence submitted to this Office for consideration. Dr. Yip submitted a letter dated 08/12/1999, discussing Mr. Shepherd's condition(s).

DISCUSSION:
Dr. Yip's letter addressed not only Mr. Shepherd's claim for bladder cancer (File # 13-0914270), but also Mr. Shepherd's claims with this Office for lumbosacral (File # 13-1081960) and carpal tunnel syndromes (File # 13-0998202).

Mr. Shepherd has been free of bladder cancer since the removal of tumors in 1991. Dr. Deepak Chandra in a report dated 05/29/1999 indicated Mr. Shepherd remains cancer-free. Dr. Yip acknowledged Dr. Chandra's report. However, Dr. Yip noted he had placed Mr. Shepherd on "permanent restriction" from any significant exposure to certain chemical solvents noted to be carcinogenic to the bladder. Dr. Yip noted that these restrictions should remain in effect to prevent the possible recurrence of Mr. Shepherd's bladder cancer.

Dr. Yip's point is noted. However, in regard to terminating Mr. Shepherd's benefits, the issue is whether or not Mr. Shepherd is suffering from bladder cancer, and not if it will recur. In addition, the Employee's Compensation Appeals Board has held that fear of a new injury or recurrence is not the basis for the payment of compensation.

Patricia A. Keller, 43ECAR_... (Docket No. 93-1091, issued on December 30, 1993)

Mr. Shepherd's case file for lumbosacral (File # 13-1081960) is a separate condition and is not related to the issue at hand. It should also be noted that the claim for lumbosacral is currently listed as being in C-5 status. Mr. Shepherd's case file for carpal tunnel (File # 13-0998202) is likewise a separated condition and is also currently listed as being in C-5 status. If Mr. Shepherd feels he has any residuals and/or recurrence of these conditions and wishes to pursue either claim, it would be a separate issue. Since these cases are not at issue in this action, no further discussion is needed.

CONCLUSION:
It is established that Mr. Shepherd is no longer suffering from bladder cancer.

ECAR findings state that fear of recurrence is not the basis for payment of compensation.

The claims for lumbosacral and carpal tunnel are separate from the claim for bladder cancer and are not relevant in determining whether or not Mr. Shepherd continues to have bladder cancer.

RECOMMENDATION:
Terminate Mr. Shepherd's compensation for wage loss as proposed.
October 8, 1999

File Number: 9658-13-0914270
Date of Injury: 07/25/1981
Employee: John Shepherd

Dear Mr. Shepherd:

Your claim for compensation benefits has been disallowed for the reason stated in the enclosed copy of the Compensation Order. The decision was based on all the evidence of record, and on the assumption that all available evidence has been submitted. If you disagree with the decision, you may follow any one of the courses of action outlined on the attachment of this letter.

Under Office of Personnel Management regulations, an employee who recovers from a compensable injury within one year is entitled to mandatory job restoration, and is expected to apply for reemployment with the employing Federal agency immediately upon recovery. Employees who take longer than one year to recover are entitled to priority consideration, provided they apply for reemployment within thirty days of the cessation of compensation. Further information concerning restoration rights may be obtained from your agency or any OPM area office. You should also contact your former employing agency or OPM for advice on continuing any health insurance and/or life insurance coverage.

IN ALL DISABILITY CASES, FURTHER MEDICAL TREATMENT IS NOT AUTHORIZED AND PRIOR AUTHORIZATION, IF ANY, IS HEREBY TERMINATED.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kris Koster
Claims Examiner

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
SACRAMENTO AIR LOGISTICS CNTR
00-AALC-FPCE
6053 ELM LANE
HILL AFB, UT 84056

Enclosure: Compensation Order w/appeal rights
Memorandum to the Director
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

In the matter of the claim for compensation:
Under the Federal Employees' Compensation
Act (5 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.) of

JOHN V. SHEPHERD
Claimant

COMPENSATION ORDER
REJECTION OF CLAIM
CASE FILE NO. 130914270

Employed by: Department of the Air Force
McClellan Air Force Base, CA 95652

Such investigation in respect to the above-entitled claim having been made as is considered necessary, and after due
consideration of such claims and reports of record, the Office makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Timely notice of injury and claim for compensation were respectively given and filed by the
Claimant, a Federal employee, for an injury of bladder cancer sustained in the
performance of duty.

2. The claim was approved for bladder cancer

3. The Memoranda to the Director dated 07/21/1999 and 09/26/1999 are made
a part hereof by reference.

4. The evidence of file establishes that the claimant is no longer disabled for work due to the
effects of the accepted injury/condition.

Upon the foregoing findings of fact, it is ORDERED that entitlement to continuing compensation for wage loss be,
and the same hereby is, TERMINATED effective 10/01/1999 for the reason that Mr. Shepherd no longer has bladder
cancer.

Given under my hand at
San Francisco, California,
this fourth day of October,
for the Director of Workers' Compensation Programs.

[Signature]

By: Barbara Koonsley
Senior Claims Examiner
October 17, 1999

TO: Office of Worker’s Compensation
Post Office Box 193769
San Francisco, California 94119

ATTN: Mr. Ron Koster, Claims Examiner

FROM: John Victor Shepherd Sr.
230 West Delano Street
Elverta, California 95626-9215
(916) 991-9309 fax (916) 991-7089
email tsw@inreach.com

RE: October 5, 1999 letter of termination

Dear Mr. Koster,

I am addressing this letter to you as the signor of the October 5th letter. I have questions regarding this October 5, 1999 action that I would appreciate having answered before deciding as to whether to appeal this action with ECAB.

It has always been my understanding that medical personnel (attending physicians - August 17, 1992) would make the determination as to when I could return to work. I have read both Dr. Chahna’s and Dr. Yip’s reports and find no mention of returning to the position of WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician. In fact Dr. Yip does state that my medical restrictions are exactly the same as they were in 1992 when I was first placed on compensation.

Dr. Jacqueline R. Jayne, M.D. McClellan AFB, Dr. Alton G. Wills, M.D., McClellan AFB, Dr. Clyde M. Gaffney M.D. OWCP 2nd Opinion, all concurred with both Dr. Chahna and Dr. Yip that the risk of occupational/environment exposure to chemicals was the cause of the bladder cancer and that continued exposure to these chemicals would be a 50 to 70 percent likelihood of recurrence.

Question:
Was I not originally placed on compensation in August of 1992 for the “recurrence” of bladder cancer with the OPM Standard Form 2824D stating that NO accommodations were available at McClellan AFB?

Who was or is the Medical Doctor that reviewed this September 29, 1999 decision and made the determination that I can return to a toxic environment?

On the subject of “return to work”: I have searched the Internet, the USC, the code of Federal Regulations, the FECA for a definition of “return to work” and the only reference found is under Restoration Rights and states “When compensation is terminated on the basis of medical evidence that the employee no longer has residual limitations from the injury and can return to the former job without limitations” (OPM pamphlet dated July 31, 1998). In the Memo to the Director dated September 29, 1999 you refer to “permanent restrictions”. In short, these medical restrictions prohibit exposure to any paraffin-containing chemicals!!

Question:
How can OWCP determine that I can return to the duties of a WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician and stay within these medical restrictions?

What is the official OWCP definition of “return to work”?

Does CFR Title 5, Chapter 1 Subpart A, Section 353.102 apply?

Physically disqualified means that:

(1)(i) For medical reasons the employee is unable to perform the duties of the position formerly held or an
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equivalent one, or (ii) There is a medical reason to restrict the individual from some or all essential duties because of possible incapacitation (for example, a seizure) or because of risk of health impairment (such as further exposure to a toxic substance for an individual who has already shown the effects of such exposure).

(2) The condition is considered permanent with little likelihood for improvement or recovery.

A WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician position description ( OPM web site dated October 19, 1998 ) requires the following for performance of normal job duties:

Factor 3. Physical Effort

Employee frequently climbs up and down ladders, check stands, work platforms, scaffolding, and aircraft structures while making repairs or installations. The work requires long periods of standing and considerable kneeling, bending, stooping, and stretching. The work frequently requires individuals to make repairs or installations in hard-to-reach places requiring awkward and strained positions. In addition, the work requires lifting and carrying aircraft electrical items weighing up to 20 pounds unassisted and occasionally up to 30 pounds with assistance of lifting devices or other workers.

Factor 4. Working Conditions

Employee works in hangars and on flight lines. Workers are subject to drafts, noise, and varying temperatures in hangars and weather, temperature, and noise extremes on flight lines. Workers are exposed to dust, dirt, grease, oil, fumes, solvents and other aircraft fluids while working on aircraft in various stages of repair or modification. Workers at this level are exposed to the possibility of abrasions, cuts, burns, electrical shock, skin and eye irritation, and falls from elevated work areas e.g., check stands and aircraft structures. In addition, some workers on flight lines are exposed to potential injury from turning rotors or jet blast during engines run ups.

The hand-written statement on the September 29, 1999 Memo to the Director states "No evidence that these conditions disable from the performance of his normal job duties". Yet each of these conditions have in effect medical restrictions that do prevent me from carrying out the normal job requirements for a WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician. Case # 13-0996242 - Carpal Tunnel - December 1, 1992, Dr. William Powers placed medical restrictions of occasional repetitive hand motion and no lifting or carrying over 10 pounds. Case # 13-1081560 - High-frequency hearing loss, tinnitus, vertigo - September 11, 1995, Dr. William Johnson, OWCP 2nd Opinion, placed medical restrictions of avoidance of all forms of noise as well as the 1991 medical restrictions of the permanent restrictions from paraffin-containing chemicals!

In 1995, I was placed in the OWCP Vocational Rehabilitation Program and the outcome of this was the September 18, 1996 termination of the vocational rehabilitation effort due to "not able to benefit from vocational rehabilitation services. The rational for this counselor's decisions is based on the fact that Mr. Shepherd does have multiple injuries and the restrictions placed on him by each of these injuries would indicate that Mr. Shepherd is not able to return to employment".

I have contacted the "employing Federal agency" as directed by your October 5, 1999 cover letter. McClellan AFB is undergoing base closure and referred me to Hill AFB. Neither Federal agency has any use for a WG-2892-10 Aircraft Electrician on medical restrictions.
October 18, 1999

TO: Ms. Donna H. Onodera, Regional Director
71 Stevenson Street, Suite 1705
San Francisco, California 94105

FROM: John Victor Shepherd Sr.
230 West Delano Street
Elvera, California 92526-9215
(916) 991-9309 fax (916) 991-7089
email jvs@irreach.com

RE: Termination of Worker's Compensation - A13-0914270

Dear Ms. Onodera,

As you can see from the enclosed documents my compensation has been terminated with OWCP.

I am requesting a informal review by someone above the Central Valley Team Section to insure that this action is correct.

It has always been my understanding that benefits could not be terminated as long as I was medical restricted from returning to my former position or the completion of vocational rehabilitation into another career field.

I thank you for your time and you assistance.

Sincerely,

John V. Shepherd Sr.
October 26, 1999

TO:    Ms. Donna H. Onodera, Regional Director
       71 Stevenson Street, Suite 1705
       San Francisco, California  94105

ATTN:  Donna "F"  1-415-975-4257

FROM: John Victor Shepherd Sr.
       230 West Delano Street
       Elverta, California  95626-9215
       (916) 991-9309  fax (916) 991-7089
       email  jv@imreach.com

RE:    Termination of Worker's Compensation - A13-0914270
       Request for Reconsideration

Dear Ms. Onodera,

As per your (Donna "F") October 26th telephone conversation, I am requesting reconsideration of
the October 5, 1999 decision (termination of compensation). Please refer to my October 17, 1999
letter as to why I feel this termination was incorrect.

Again I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

John V. Shepherd Sr.