DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

James Ravindran
Quality Reimbursement Services, Inc.
150 N. Santa Anita Ave., Suite 570A
Arcadia, CA 91006

Cecile Huggins
Palmetto GBA
Internal Mail Code 380
P.O. Box 100307
Camden, SC 29202-3307

RE: ***Jurisdictional Decision***
Unicoi County Memorial Hospital, Inc. (44-0001)
FYE: 6/30/2011
PRRB Case: 13-3439

Dear Mr. Ravindran and Ms. Huggins,

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the jurisdictional documents in the above referenced appeal and finds that it does not have jurisdiction over the DSH/SSI – Provider Specific issue because it is the same as the DSH/SSI - Systemic Errors issue that was transferred to PRRB Case No. 14-3310G. The jurisdictional decision of the Board is set forth below.

Pertinent Facts:

On August 28, 2013, the Board received Provider's Individual Appeal Request appealing their February 28, 2013 Notice of Program Reimbursement ("NPR") for fiscal year ending June 30, 2011. The initial appeal contained eight (8) issues and, as indicated in the cover letter to Provider's Final Position Paper, only one issue has not been withdrawn or transferred to a group appeal. One of the issues transferred to a group appeal (PRRB Case Number 14-3310G) was "DSH/SSI - Systemic Errors."[1] The only issue remaining in the appeal is the DSH/SSI Provider Specific issue.

Provider summarizes its DSH/SSI – Provider Specific issue as follows:

> The provider contends that its SSI percentage published by [CMS] was incorrectly computed because CMS failed to include all patients that were entitled to SSI benefits in their calculation.
>
> . . .
>
> The Provider is seeking SSI data from CMS in order to reconcile its records with CMS data and identify records that CMS failed to include in their determination of the SSI percentage. The Provider also hereby preserves its right to request under separate cover that CMS recalculate the SSI percentage based upon the Provider's cost reporting period.[2]

[1] Model Form D – Request to Transfer Issue to a Group Appeal (Apr. 23, 2014).
[2] Individual Appeal Request, Tab 3, Issue 1 (Aug. 28, 2013).

Provider described its DSH/SSI – Systemic Errors issue, which has been transferred to a group appeal, as "[w]hether the Secretary properly calculated the Provider's [DSH]/[SSI] percentage." More specifically, Provider lists the following reasons for challenging its SSI percentage:

1. The Secretary improperly included "exhausted benefit" and "Medicare Secondary Payor" days in the numerator and denominator of the SSI Fraction;
2. The Secretary improperly included Medicare Advantage (MA) / Medicare Part C days in the numerator and denominator of the SSI Fraction;
3. The Secretary used an improper matching methodology in computing the SSI Fractions; and
4. The Secretary failed to adhere to required notice and comment rulemaking procedures in adopting its policy on MA, EB, and Medicare Advantage / Medicare Part C days.[3]

On August 25, 2014, the Board received a jurisdictional challenge filed on behalf of the Medicare Contractor which argued that the Board lacks jurisdiction over the DSH/SSI Provider Specific issue because no adjustment was made to the SSI percentage. They also argue that the decision to realign a hospital's SSI percentage with its fiscal year end is a hospital election, not an appealable Medicare Contractor determination, and since the Provider did not request an SSI realignment, appealing this issue is premature since there was no final determination.[4]

Provider filed a response on September 19, 2014, in which they argue that they are "not only addressing a realignment of the SSI percentage, but also addressing various errors of omission and commission that do not fit into the 'systemic errors' category."[5]

Board Decision

Based upon review of the two DSH/SSI issue statements, Provider is challenging the same underlying SSI data in both of the issues and they do not appear to be different in any significant way. Pursuant to Board Rule 4.6, a provider may not appeal an issue from a final determination in more than one appeal. Therefore, the Board finds that Provider's two DSH/SSI issues are the same and, because Provider transferred its DSH/SSI - Systemic Errors issue to a group appeal, dismisses their DSH/SSI Provider Specific issue from the instant appeal.

In addition, with respect to Provider's statement that it "hereby preserves its right to request under separate cover that CMS recalculate the SSI percentage based upon the Provider's cost reporting period[,]" the Board notes that such request is a provider election that must be submitted in writing to the Medicare Contractor and is not an appealable issue before the Board. Indeed, without the Medicare Contractor rendering a determination of the realignment issue, the Provider would not have exhausted its available remedy of requesting CMS to recalculate the SSI ratio using the Provider's fiscal year under 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(3).

Since the Provider Specific issue was the last issue in this case, the Board hereby closes Case No. 13-3439 and removes the appeal from its docket.

---

[3] *Id.* at Issue 2.
[4] Jurisdictional Challenge of a Medicare Administrative Contractor at 1-2 (Aug. 25, 2014).
[5] Jurisdictional Response at 1 (Sept. 19, 2014).

Review of this determination may be available under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f) and 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.1875 and 405.1877.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/3/2020

X Gregory H. Ziegler

Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Board Member
Signed by: Gregory H. Ziegler -S

cc: Wilson C. Leong, Esq., Federal Specialized Services

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Maureen O'Brien Griffin, Esq.
Hall, Render, Killian, Heath & Lyman
500 North Meridian St. Ste. 400
Indianapolis, IN 46204

RE: ***EJR Determination Hall Render DSH Dual Eligible SSI Patient Days Groups***
15-2000GC Community Health Network 2011 SSI Ratio Dual Eligible Days Group
15-0234GC McLaren Health Care 2012 DSH SSI Ratio Dual Eligible Days Group
16-1417GC Franciscan Alliance 2012 DSH SSI Ratio Dual Eligible Days Group
16-2301GC Franciscan Alliance 2013 DSH SSI Ratio Dual Eligible Days Group
17-0050GC McLaren Health Care 2014 DSH SSI Ratio Dual Eligible Days Group

Dear Ms. Griffin:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Providers' January 7, 2020 request for expedited judicial review ("EJR") (received January 8, 2020) in the above-referenced appeals. The Board's decision with respect EJR is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute

The issue for which the Board is considering EJR is:

> [W]hether the Providers' Medicare DSH [disproportionate share hospital] reimbursement calculations were understated due to the Centers for Medicare [&] Medicaid Services ("CMS" or "Agency") and the Medicare Administrative Contractors' ("MACs'") failure to include all patient days for patients who were enrolled in and eligible for in the SSI [Supplement Security Income] program but did not received an SSI cash payment for the month in which they received services from the Providers ("SSI Eligible Days"), in the numerator of the Medicare Fraction of the DSH percentage, as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).[1]

[1] Providers' EJR Requests at 2.

Medicare Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payment Background

The Medicare program pays inpatient hospital services based on predetermined, standardized amounts subject to certain payment adjustments under Medicare's inpatient prospective payment system ("IPPS").[2] One of these adjustments, the Medicare DSH adjustment, provides additional payments to certain qualifying hospitals that treat a disproportionate share of low income patients.[3] The Medicare DSH adjustment is calculated using two fractions known as the Medicare fraction (also referred to as the "SSI fraction" or "SSI ratio") and the Medicaid fraction. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), the Medicare fraction is calculated by using: (a) in the numerator, the "number of such hospital's patient days…which were made up of patients who (for such days) were entitled to benefits under part A of the subchapter and were entitled to supplementary security income benefits…under subchapter XVI of this chapter…"; and (b) in the denominator, the number of days of care that are furnished to patients who were entitled to Medicare Part A. The Secretary incorporated this statutory provision into the regulations at 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) which states:

> (2) *First computation: Federal fiscal year.* For each month of the Federal fiscal year in which the hospital's cost reporting period begins, CMS –
> (i) Determines the number of patient days that –
> (A) Are associated with discharges occurring during each month; and
> (B) Are furnished to patients who during that month were **entitled to** both Medicare Part A (including Medicare Advantage (Part C)) and **SSI**, excluding those patients who received only State supplementation;
> (ii) Adds the results for the whole period; and
> (iii) Divides the number determined under paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section by the total number of days that –
> (A) Are associated with discharges that occur during that period; and
> (B) Are furnished to patients entitled to Medicare Part A (including Medicare Advantage (Part C)).[4]

The dispute in these appeals involves CMS' determination of which patients are "entitled to" both Medicare Part A and SSI benefits for purposes of the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

The SSI program is a federal cash assistance program for low-income individuals who are aged, blind, or disabled,[5] administered by the Social Security Administration ("SSA"). The statutory

[2] 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[3] 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I).
[4] (Bold emphasis added and italics emphasis in original.)
[5] 42 U.S.C. § 1382.

provisions governing SSI, generally, do not use the term "entitled" to SSI benefits. Rather, the SSI statutory provisions typically refer to whether an individual is "eligible for benefits."[6] In order to be "eligible" for SSI benefits, a person must be: (1) 65 years of age or older, blind or disabled; (2) a lawful resident of the United States; (3) have limited income and resources; (4) not be fleeing to avoid prosecution for a crime or violating a condition of parole; and (5) file an application for benefits.[7]

In contrast, the Medicare program is an insurance program where an individual is automatically "entitled" to Medicare Part A when the person reaches age 65 and is entitled to Social Security benefits or becomes disabled and had been entitled to disability benefits for 24 calendar months.[8] In addition, the Medicare program provides that certain qualifying individuals with end stage renal disease are entitled to Medicare Part A.[9]

Unlike entitlement for Medicare Part A benefits, an individual who is currently eligible for SSI benefits may later become *in*eligible for SSI benefits. In this regard, SSA conducts periodic redeterminations to ensure continued eligibility[10] and may terminate,[11] suspend[12] or stop payments to individuals who are either temporarily or permanently ineligible for payment of SSI benefits.[13] In particular, SSI eligibility may be lost if a person no longer meets the basic requirements. For example, an individual may lose SSI eligibility if the individual is no longer disabled or the individual meets one of the following reasons set forth in §§ 416.207-416.216:

1. The individual fails to give the SSA permission to contact financial institutions;[14]
2. The individual fails to apply for other benefits to which the individual may be entitled;[15]
3. The individual fails to participate in drug or alcohol addiction treatment;[16]
4. The individuals is absent from the United States for more than 30 days;[17] or
5. The individual becomes a resident of a public institutions or prison.[18]

In addition, under certain circumstances, SSA may not pay benefits for administrative reasons, such as removal of a representative payee, an unknown address for the beneficiary, or because of income from a previous month.[19]

---

[6] 42 U.S.C. §§ 1381a, 1382(a) (emphasis added).
[7] 20 C.F.R. § 416.202.
[8] 42 U.S.C. § 426.
[9] 42 U.S.C. § 426-1.
[10] 20 C.F.R. § 416.204.
[11] 20 C.F.R. §§ 416.1331-1335.
[12] 20 C.F.R. §§ 416.1320-1330.
[13] 20 C.F.R. § 1320.
[14] 20 C.F.R. § 416.207.
[15] 20 C.F.R. § 416.210.
[16] 20 C.F.R. § 416.214.
[17] 20 C.F.R. § 416.215.
[18] 20 C.F.R. § 416.211.
[19] *See* SSA Program Operations Manual ("POMS") § SI 02301.201 (describing certain SSI post-eligibility events on the internet at https://secure.ssa.gov/apps10/poms.nsf/lnx/0502301201).

After the Medicare DSH statutory provisions were enacted in 1984, CMS (then known as the Health Care Financing Administration ("HCFA")) announced that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, rather than hospitals, would be solely responsible for computation of the Medicare fraction because the data necessary to calculate the Medicare fraction is voluminous and much of this data needed to be obtained from another agency, SSA.[20] CMS noted that, as of 1986, the data sources for the computation of the Medicare fraction included approximately 11 million billing records from the Medicare inpatient discharge file and over 5 million records from the SSI file compiled by SSA.[21] To compute the Medicare fraction, CMS had to match individual Medicare billing records to individual SSI records.[22] Considering the administrative burdens and complexity of the data matching process, CMS concluded that the Secretary would be responsible for the data matching process, which she would conduct retrospectively for every eligible Medicare hospital on a "federal fiscal year" basis—that is, based on discharges occurring in the federal fiscal year.[23] CMS notifies Medicare contractors of the SSI ratios after they are calculated. CMS currently makes this notification by posting the resulting SSI percentages on its website. Medicare contractors then use the posted SSI ratios to calculate the Medicare DSH percentage to determine each qualifying hospital's Medicare DSH payment adjustment.[24]

The Medicare DSH payment adjustment has been the subject of much litigation and, from that litigation, the following case is of particular relevance to this appeal: *Baystate v. Leavitt*, 545 F. Supp. 2d 20 *as amended* 587 F. Supp. 2d 37, 44 (D.D.C. 2008) ("*Baystate*"). In *Baystate*, the plaintiff alleged that the Secretary's process to identify and gather the data necessary to calculate each hospital's SSI ratio was deficient and the Court remanded the case to the Administrator for further action. The Board notes that this case discusses the Secretary's historical practice of basing "entitled to . . . SSI" under 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2) on actual payment of SSI cash benefits.[25]

---

[20] 51 Fed. Reg. 31454, 31459 (Sept. 3, 1986).
[21] *Id.*
[22] *Id.*
[23] *Id.* at 31459–31460; 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b).
[24] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(5); 42 C.F.R. § 405.1803.
[25] *Baystate* began with a hearing before the Board. *See Baystate Med. Ctr. v. Mutual of Omaha Ins. Co.*, PRRB Dec. No. 2006-D20 (Mar. 17, 2006), *modified by*, CMS Adm'r Dec. (May 11, 2006). The Board heard extensive testimony on the Secretary's then-existing data match process. This included testimony from several SSA employees on the data tapes historically sent from SSA to CMS that included "42 monthly indicators (ones and zeros) denoting the payment or non-payment of Federal SSI cash benefits during the period covered by the SSA tape." *Id.* at 11 (citations omitted). Further, this testimony established that SSA's program would "assign a '1' to a month if the CMPH field shows one of two payment codes, C01 (current pay status) or M01 (manual or forced pay), and the FAM field reflects an amount due for the month" and that "[o]therwise, the program assigns a '0' to that month." *Id.* The provider in *Baystate* contested among other things: (1) "the omission of SSI records relating to individuals who received a forced payment from an SSA filed office; (2) "the omission of SSI days associated with individuals whose SSI benefits were temporarily on hold or in suspense when SSA ran each year's SSI tape;" (3) "the omission of SSI days associated with individuals whose benefits were restored or retroactively after SSA ran each year's tape;" and (4) "the omission of individuals who were entitled to non-cash Federal SSI benefits." *Id.* at 23. The Board's discussion of these contentions confirms SSI days were counted when there was actual SSI cash benefits. *See id.* at 26-30. The CMS Administrator's decision and the ensuing decision of the D.C. District Court

On April 28, 2010, the Secretary through CMS acted on the *Baystate* remand order and published CMS Ruling CMS-1498-R ("Ruling 1498-R"). Specifically, the Ruling stated that CMS had implemented the *Baystate* remand order by recalculating the plaintiff's SSI fractions and Medicare DSH payment adjustments using a revised data matching process that used "updated and refined SSI eligibility data and Medicare records, and by matching individuals' records with reference to Social Security numbers (SSNs) as well as HICANs and Title II numbers."[26] The Ruling also stated that "in the FY 2011 proposed rule, CMS is proposing to adopt the same revised data matching process" for use with all hospitals and that "[i]n the forthcoming FY 2011 IPPS final rule, CMS expects to respond to public comments filed on the proposed new data matching process, make any changes to such matching process that seem appropriate, and adopt finally a new data matching process."[27] Finally, CMS stated that it would "use that new data matching process in calculating SSI fractions and DSH payments for specific claims that are found to qualify for relief under this Ruling."[28]

Consistent with Ruling 1498-R, the Secretary published the new data matching process in the FY 2011 IPPS proposed rule published on May 4, 2010.[29] The proposed rule includes references to the Secretary's historical practice of basing "entitled to . . . SSI" under 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2) on actual payment of SSI cash benefits.[30]

The Secretary finalized that data matching process in the FY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 16, 2010 ("FY 2011 IPPS Final Rule").[31] Significantly, in the preamble to the FY 2011 IPPS Final Rule, CMS acknowledged a public comment that: (1) requested that "CMS include both paid and unpaid days for both SSI entitlement and Medicare entitlement such that there would be consistency between the numerator and denominator of the SSI fraction"; and (2) provided examples of "several SSI codes that represent individuals who were eligible for SSI but not eligible for SSI payments, that should be included as SSI-entitled for purposes of the data match process."[32] CMS responded in detail to this comment and explained that CMS interprets SSI entitlement to correspond with any month for which an individual *receives* payment of SSI benefits. In this regard, CMS stated that the three SSI codes denoted as C01, M01, and M02 "accurately captures all SSI-entitled individuals during the month(s) they are entitled to receive

---

also contain references to the Secretary's policy. *See, e.g.*, Adm'r Dec. at 5, 16, 39, 41, 48-49; 545 F. Supp. 2d at 28-29 n.13 & n.17, 36-39.

[26] CMS-1498-R at 5.

[27] *Id.*

[28] *Id.* at 5-6.

[29] 85 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24002-24007 (May 4, 2010).

[30] *See, e.g.*, 75 Fed. Reg. at 24003 (discussing SSI cash payment issues discussed in the *Baystate* decision), 24003-24004 (discussing the proposed matching process where "[t]he SSI eligibility file serves as the system of record for whether or not SSA made a payment of SSI benefits to an individual who applied for SSI"), 24004-06 (discussing the time of the matching process including how "it is important to find an appropriate balance between administrative finality (that is, the final settlement of a hospital's cost report) and the inclusion of retroactive SSI eligibility determinations and the lifting of SSI payment suspensions by using the best and latest available SSI eligibility data at the time of cost report settlement benefits").

[31] 75 Fed. Reg. 50041, 50280-50281. (Aug. 16, 2010).

[32] *Id.* at 50280.

SSI benefits."[33] CMS explicitly rejected the inclusion of other SSA codes because "SSI entitlement can change from time to time" and none of these codes "would be used to describe an individual who was entitled to receive SSI benefits during the month that one of these codes was used."[34] Finally, in the preamble, CMS confirms that "[t]he same data matching process [used for FY 2011 and beyond] will be used to calculate SSI fractions for cost reporting periods covered under the Ruling [1498-R]."[35]

While the new data matching process established in the preamble to the FY 2011 IPPS Final Rule was effective October 1, 2010 (*i.e.*, for FY 2011 and forward), Ruling 1498-R directed that the Medicare contractors apply "the same, unitary relief" consisting of SSI fractions that the Secretary had calculated using the new "suitably revised" data matching process to: (1) any Medicare cost report that had not been settled; and (2) all properly pending Medicare DSH appeals of the SSI fraction data matching process issue.[36] The Ruling noted that hospitals dissatisfied with the initial or revised NPR issued using the new SSI ratios in the Medicare DSH adjustment calculation could seek administrative and judicial review provided they met the jurisdictional and procedural requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo, the Medicare regulations, and other agency rules and guidelines.[37] In the FY 211 IPPS Final Rule, the Secretary explicitly recognized that "[t]he data matching process provisions of the Ruling would apply to . . . open cost reports for cost reporting periods beginning prior to October 1, 2010 (that is those preceding the effective date of the FY 2011 IPPS final rule)."[38]

Finally, on April 22, 2015, CMS published Ruling 1498-R2 modifying and amending Ruling 1498-R by allowing hospitals to elect whether to use new Medicare SSI fractions calculated on the basis of "total days" or "covered days" for cost reports involving patient discharges *prior* to October 1, 2004.[39]

As a result of the Rulings, new regulation and data match process, CMS calculated new and recalculated existing SSI percentages for the Hospitals for all of fiscal years at issue in these appeals.[40] The Hospitals have appealed original NPRs a based on the methodology articulated in the preamble, *i.e.*, use only the three SSI codes to denote SSI eligibility.

---

[33] *Id.* at 50280-50281.
[34] *Id.* This include all codes with the "S" prefix indicating a suspension of payment; codes beginning with "N" for nonpayment; code "E01" indicating that the individual had countable income which eliminated the SSI payment; and code "E02" indicating that the patient was not entitled to SSI benefits during that month but became entitled during a subsequent month.
[35] *Id.* at 50285.
[36] CMS-1498-R at 6-7, 31.
[37] *Id.* at 28, 31.
[38] 75 Fed. Reg. at 24006.
[39] CMS-1498-R2 at 2, 6.
[40] The SSI ratios for FYs 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 were published in June 2013, June 2014, May 2015, and July 2016, respectively. *See* https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Medicare-Fee-for-Service-Payment/InpatientRehabFacPPS/SSIData.

Providers' Request for EJR

The Providers assert that under the rules of statutory construction, the Secretary is compelled to interpret "entitled to SSI" benefits to include all inpatients who were enrolled in the SSI program at the time of their hospitalization. The Providers point out that, overtime, the Secretary has expanded the definition of entitled to benefits, but the expanded definition did not address the rift between Medicare Part A beneficiaries and SSI beneficiaries who are described in the DSH statute as "entitled to benefits." The Providers explain that the Secretary continues to construe "entitled to [SSI] benefits" narrowly. In order to be counted in the Medicare fraction numerator of the DSH calculation, an SSI enrollee must actually have received a cash payment from the Social Security Administration (SSA) for the month in question. The Providers contend that this action excludes SSI enrollees otherwise qualified for and receiving non-cash benefits under the SSI program.[41]

The Providers note that in administering the SSI program, SSA assigns each beneficiary a Patient Status Code (PSC). The codes are made up of two elements: a single letter code reflecting payment status and a numeric code indicating the reason for the payment status. Of the 77 PSC codes used by SSA, the Secretary announced in the Federal Register that only three PSC codes, C01, M01 and M02, are counted as "entitlement" for purposes of the DSH statute.[42] Thus, the Providers allege the other 74 codes used by SSA to determine payment status result in a significant number of SSI enrollees being excluded from the numerator of the Medicare fraction for reasons that have no bearing on their eligibility for or entitlement to SSI benefits. The Providers believe that the SSI enrollees remain entitled to SSI regardless of whether cash payment is received in the month of hospitalization.

Further, the Providers assert in their request for EJR that CMS should provide the Providers with a listing of those SSI enrollees for the relevant hospitalizations so that they can ensure that their DSH adjustments were calculated in accordance with the Medicare statute. The Providers state that they are seeking a ruling that CMS has failed to furnish the Providers with adequate information to allow them to check and meaningfully challenge CMS' DPP calculations which they are entitled to under Section 951 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act, P.L. 108-173.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

[41] 75 Fed. Reg. at 50,275-286.
[42] *Id.* at 50,281.

Jurisdictional Determination

The participants that comprise the group appeals within this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2011-2014.

Jurisdiction

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008 the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hospital Association v. Bowen.*[43] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[44]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[45] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hospital v. Burwell (Banner).*[46] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[47]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable.

---

[43] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[44] *Bethesda at 1258-59.*
[45] 73 Fed. Reg. 30,190, 30,240 (May 23, 2008).
[46] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[47] *Banner* at 142.

However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest. The Board finds that the "entitled to benefits" question is governed by 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B), which is a regulation that left the Medicare Contractors without the authority to make the payment in the manner sought by the Providers in these cases. Consequently, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the Providers in these cases.

The Board has determined that the participants involved with the instant EJR request are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal.[48] The appeals were timely filed. Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the above-captioned appeals and the underlying, Providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case. Finally, the Board notes that e of these group appeals covered by the EJR request is a CIRP group and the Group Representative has certified that the mandatory group is complete for the relevant year consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837(b)(1).

Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

As noted above, the Secretary revised the SSI data match process in light of the *Baystate* decision through notice and comment in the form of an uncodified regulation. First, the Secretary issued Ruling 1498-R on April 28, 2010 to authorize remands of pending appeals of the SSI data match issue in order to recalculate the associated SSI fractions based on a revised data match process.[49] The Secretary also stated in the Ruling that, for those hospitals whose cost reports had not been settled, the Secretary would recalculate the SSI fraction for those cost reports using the revised data match process to be published through rulemaking.[50] Contemporaneous with Ruling 1498-R[51] the Secretary published a proposed IPPS rule[52] to adopt a revised data process for cost reports covered by Ruling 1498-R ***and*** for cost reports beginning on or after October 1, 2010. The Secretary adopted this proposed rule as part of the FY 2011 Final IPPS Final Rule in which the Secretary explained:

> . . .we used a revised data matching process . . . that comports with the court's decision [in *Baystate* to recalculate the hospitals SSI fractions]. As the revised data matching process was completed using SSI eligibility data compiled between 13 and 16 years beyond the fiscal years at issue in the *Baystate* case, we believe any issues associated with retroactive determinations of SSI eligibility and the lifting of payment suspensions had been long since resolved. Furthermore, because we believe that the revised match process used to implement the *Baystate* decision addressed all of the concerns found by the court,

[48] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[49] CMS Ruling 1498-R at 27.
[50] *Id.* at 31.
[51] *Id.* at 5.
[52] 75 Fed. Reg. 23,852, 24,002-07.

> in the FY 2011 IPPS/LTCH PPS proposed rule we proposed to use the same revised data matching process for calculating hospitals' SSI fractions for FY 2011 and subsequent fiscal years.[53]

Then she further announced:

> We have adopted the proposed data matching process for FY 2011 and beyond as final. The only modification we are making to the proposed matching process is adopting a policy to exclude a record from the data matching process if we find a HICAN in the MedPAR file that we are not able to locate in the EDB[54]which is an extremely unlikely situation as noted in the prior discussion in this final rule. We are adopting this additional step in our validation process to respond to public comment and provide even more assurances that our data matching process will yield accurate SSI fractions and capture all Medicare beneficiaries who were entitled to SSI at the time of their inpatient hospital stay. The same data matching process will be used to calculate SSI fractions for cost reporting periods covered under the ruling.[55]

While the Secretary did not incorporate the above new policy involving the revised data match process directly into the Code of Federal Regulations, it is clear from the language in the preamble to the FY 2011 IPPS Final Rule, as set forth above, that the Secretary intended to bind the regulated parties and establish a binding data match process to be used by CMS in calculating (or recalculating) the SSI fractions for all hospitals pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2).

Accordingly, the Board finds that the Secretary intended this policy change to be a binding but uncodified regulation and will refer to the above policy as "Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation." Indeed, this finding is consistent with the Secretary's obligations under 42 U.S.C. § 1395hh(a)(2) to promulgate any "substantive legal standard governing . . . the payment of services" as a regulation."[56] Moreover, it is clear that the Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation specifies which PSC codes determine SSI entitlement for purposes of calculating SSI fractions under 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2).

Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1867, the Board is bound to apply the statutory and regulatory provisions governing the Medicare program. Consequently, the Board finds that it is bound by the Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation the published in the FY 2011 Final Rule and the Board does not have the authority to grant the relief sought by the Providers, namely invalidating the Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation which they allege fails to include all of

---

[53] 75 Fed. Reg. at 50,277.
[54] (Medicare) Enrollment Database.fu
[55] 75 Fed. Reg. at 50,285.
[56] 42 U.S.C. § 1395hh(a)(2) states "[n]o rule, requirement, or other statement of policy . . . that establishes or changes a substantive legal standard governing . . . the payment of services . . . shall take effect unless it is promulgated by the Secretary by regulation . . . ."

the PSC codes used by SSA to determine SSI eligibility.[57] As a result, the Board finds that EJR is appropriate for the issue for the calendar years under appeal in these cases.

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding FY 2011 Final IPPS Rule there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without authority to decide the legal question of whether the Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation as adopted in the preamble to the FY 2011 Final IPPS Rule is valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of the Uncodified SSI Data Match Regulation as adopted in the preamble to the FY 2011 Final IPPS Rule properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' request for EJR for the issue and the subject years. The Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute, the Board hereby closes these cases.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/4/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosures: Schedules of Providers

cc: Byron Lamprecht, Wisconsin Physician Services, GBA
Danene Hartley, NGS
Wilson Leong, FSS

[57] The Board notes that all of the group cases involve fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 2010 and, as such, Ruling 1498-R is not applicable or relevant to the group cases.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

J.C. Ravindran
Quality Reimbursement Services, Inc.
150 N. Santa Anita Ave., Suite 570A
Arcadia, CA 91006

RE: ***Motion for Reinstatement***
Denver Health Medical Center (Prov. No. 06-0011)
FYE 12/31/2012
Case No. 16-1713

Dear Mr. Ravindran,

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the letters requesting reinstatement ("Motion for Reinstatement") that the Provider Representative submitted on behalf of Denver Health Medical Center ("Provider") on November 12, 2019 and January 13, 2020. The decision of the Board is set forth below.

Pertinent Facts:

The Provider filed an Individual Appeal Request on May 26, 2016 from a Notice of Program Reimbursement ("NPR") dated November 25, 2015, for fiscal year ending December 31, 2012. The original appeal contained three issues, including DSH/Medicaid Eligible Days, DSH/SSI (Provider Specific), and DSH/SSI (Systemic Errors). The Provider filed a Notice of Withdrawal of Appeal dated August 7, 2018 stating that: (1) its DSH/SSI (Systemic Errors) issue had been transferred to a group appeal; (2) it was withdrawing its DSH/SSI (Provider Specific) issue as duplicative of the DSH/SSI (Systemic Errors) issue; and (3) it was withdrawing its DSH/Medicaid Eligible Days issue subject to Board Rule 46 in order to facilitate a reopening with the Medicare Contractor. The Provider stated that it would seek a reinstatement of the DSH/Medicaid Eligible Days issue if it was not resolved through the reopening. Since the Provider either transferred or withdrew ***all*** of the issues, the Board closed the case on August 8, 2018.

On November 12, 2019, Provider filed a Request for Reinstatement of the DSH/Medicaid Eligible Days issue[1] because the Medicare Contractor did not reopen the cost report. However, the Provider did not attach its request to the Medicare Contractor to reopen the cost report, or the Medicare Contractor's agreement to reopen (or notice of reopening).

Statutory and Regulatory Background

A Medicare Contractor may reopen a cost report within three years of the date of the NPR.[2] A provider may withdraw an issue in an appeal for which the Medicare Contractor has agreed to reopen the final

[1] A renewed request was received by the Board on January 13, 2020.
[2] 42 C.F.R. § 405.1885.

determination (*i.e.*, the cost report).[3] Following such a withdrawal, the provider may file a motion for reinstatement within three years of withdrawing the issue.[4] Pursuant to Board Rule 47.1, the motion must be in writing and must include "*a copy of its reopening request* ***and*** *the correspondence from the Medicare contractor where the Medicare contractor agreed to reopen the final determination for that issue(s).*"[5]

Board's Decision:

The Provider's Representative has filed for reinstatement of the Provider's issue within three years of withdrawal as required by Board Rule 47.1. However, the only documentation that the Provider Representative attached to the Request for Reinstatement is the letter from the Provider to the Board withdrawing the issue in the first instance to pursue a reopening. The Provider's Representative failed to include, as required by Board Rule 47.2.2, the Provider's request to the Medicare Contractor to reopen the cost report and the agreement from the Medicare Contractor to do so. Based on the foregoing, the Board hereby denies Provider's Request for Reinstatement.

Review of this determination may be available under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f) and 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.1875 and 405.1877.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/7/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Wilson C. Leong, Esq., Federal Specialized Services
Justin Lattimore, Novitas Solutions, Inc.

[3] Board Rule 46.
[4] Board Rule 47.1.
[5] Board Rule 47.2.2.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

John Roberts
Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
311 South Wacker Drive, Suite 4300
Chicago, IL 60606-6622

Danene Hartley
National Government Services, Inc.
MP: INA 101-AF42
Indianapolis, IN 46206

RE: ***Untimely Filing – Reinstatement Request Denied***
Iroquois Memorial Hospital (Prov. No. 14-0167)
FYE 2019
Case No. 19-1165

Dear Mr. Roberts and Ms. Hartley:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the above-referenced appeal in response to your December 17, 201, request for reinstatement ("Reinstatement Request") of Case No. 19-1165 for Iroquois Memorial Hospital ("Iroquois" or "Provider"). As set forth below, the Board denies your request for reinstatement of this case.

Pertinent Facts:

On January 16, 2019, Iroquois filed an Individual Appeal Request for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009 ("FY 2009"). In its appeal, Iroquois included a request to appeal from its Quality Reporting Payment Reduction for FY 2019.[1]

On February 14, 2019, the Board issued the Case Acknowledgement and Critical Due Dates Letter that included instructions for the provider to submit the preliminary position paper ("PPP") by September 13, 2019. The Board sent this letter to Michelle Fox via email, who at the time of the issuance was the designated Representative for Iroquois.[2] However, Iroquois failed to file its PPP by this deadline. Accordingly, on October 22, 2019, the Board dismissed the appeal due to Iroquois' failure to timely file its PPP.

On November 29, 2019, John Roberts, of Faegre Baker Daniels LLP filed a Request for Reinstatement, on behalf of Iroquois. However, at that time, the Board had no correspondence from Iroquois appointing such party as the Designated Representative on its behalf.[3] Accordingly, on December 11, 2019, the Board notified Iroquois it could not consider the request as Mr. Robers was not an authorized Representative.

---

[1] Provider's Request for Hearing (Jan. 16, 2019).
[2] On December 9, 2019, Ms. Fox was still listed as the Designated Representative of Iroquois Memorial Hospital.
[3] *See* Provider's Request for Reinstatement (Nov. 29, 2019).

On December 17, 2019, Iroquois filed a Notice of Change of Representative, designating Mr. Roberts as the new representative.[4] Simultaneously, Mr. Roberts refiled the Reconsideration Request for Reinstatement of Appeal on behalf of Iroquois.

The Reconsideration Request notes that this past summer, Iroquois' management team, including Ms. Fox, the previous designated representative, was replaced by a new management team who learned of this appeal when the Board sent a letter to Iroquois in late October 2019 advising it that the Board was dismissing Iroquois' appeal because it failed to submit its PPP by September 13, 2019.[5] Iroquois apologized for missing the submission deadline due to an internal administrative error and respectfully asks the Board to reverse its October 22, 2019, dismissal decision and reinstate Iroquois' appeal.[6]

Board's Determination

The updated Board Rules, effective August 29, 2018, and superseding all previous rules and instructions, included an updated version of Board Rule 23. Board Rule 23 states that with the implementation of OH CDMS:

> [P]arties are now required to file the complete preliminary position paper with the narrative, listing of exhibits, and all exhibits. As the Board will now obtain a full copy of the preliminary position paper, which is required to have the fully developed position and identification of the controlling authority needed to support each issue in the appeal, final position papers will be optional for new appeals filed on or after the effective date of the rules. Final position papers are still mandatory for all appeals that were filed prior to that date.[7]

In concert with Rule 23, Board Rule 23.4 states that if the provider's PPP is not filed by the due date, *the case will be dismissed*.[8] To this end, the February 14, 2019 Acknowledgement and Critical Due Dates Notice issued by the Board set out the September 13, 2019 due date for the PPP and specified that "[i]f the Provider misses any of its due dates, the Board will dismiss the appeal."

Further, the Board issued an alert to all external users and stakeholders regarding the change in the Board rules, both by email blast as well as an alert posted on the "Current Alerts" section of the PRRB website. This alerted highlighted specific important changes including the requirement that a full PPP be filed: *"[r]equire the filing of the full preliminary position paper to*

---

[4] *See* Provider's Notice of Change of Representative (Dec. 17, 2019).
[5] Provider's Reconsideration Request for Reinstatement (Dec. 17, 2019).
[6] *Id*. at 1.
[7] Board Rule 23 (Aug. 29, 2018).
[8] Board Rule 23.4.

both the opposing party and the Board (currently the preliminary position paper is only filed on the opposing party with only a cover letter to the Board)."[9]

Board Rule 25.1 specifies that the following content be included in PPPs:

> A. Identify any issues that were raised in the appeal but are already resolved (whether by administrative resolution, agreement to reopen, transfer, withdrawal, dismissal, etc.) and require no further documentation to be submitted.
>
> B. For each issue that has not been fully resolved, state the material facts that support the provider's claim.
>
> C. Identify the controlling authority (e.g., statutes, regulations, policy, or case law) supporting the provider's position.
>
> D. Provide a conclusion applying the material facts to the controlling authorities.[10]

Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1868(b) and Board Rule 27, if a provider fails to meet a filing deadline or other requirement established by the Board in a rule or order, the Board may dismiss the appeal with prejudice. Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1801(a) and Board Rule 3, the date of filing is the date of receipt by the Board, or the date of delivery by a nationally-recognized next-day courier.

The Board previously found that the Provider did not comply with the Board rules regarding filing its PPP and, accordingly, dismissed the appeal on October 22, 2019. In this regard, the Board notes that Iroquois should have been well aware that the Board would dismiss the appeal if Iroquois failed to timely file its PPP in compliance with Board Rules and the instructions in the Case Acknowledgement and Critical Due Dates Letter dated February 14, 2019.

Board Rule 47 addresses reinstatements and specifies in Board Rule 47.1 that a provider may file a written motion for reinstatement within three years of from the date of the Board's decision to dismiss the issue(s)/case. Board Rule 47.1 further explains that the motion must include the reasons for reinstatement and sets forth the general rule that the Board will not reinstate a case if the provider was "at fault."

Additional guidance pertinent to this case is located in Board Rule 47.3. This Rule addresses reinstatement requests involving dismissals for failure to comply with Board procedures and specifies that "[g]enerally, administrative oversight, settlement negotiations, or a change in representative will not be considered good cause to reinstate." This Rule further states that "[i]f the dismissal was for failure to file with the Board a required position paper . . ., the motion for

---

[9] *ALERT 15: Revised PRRB Rules (August 29, 2018)*, Current Alerts, PRRB Review (last visited Jan. 17, 2019), https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Review-Boards/PRRBReview/PRRB-Alerts.html.
[10] Board Rule 25.1

reinstatement *must*, ***as a prerequisite***, *include the required filing* before the Board will consider the motion."[11]

Again, Iroquois should have been well aware that the Board would dismiss the appeal if Iroquois failed to timely file its PPP in compliance with Board Rules and the instructions in the Case Acknowledgement and Critical Due Dates Letter dated February 14, 2019. Further, the finds that the Provider has failed to establish good cause for failing to timely file its PPP because Board Rule 47.3 is clear that the Board will not consider administrative error and change in representative (such as occurred here) as good cause to reinstate. Finally, Iroquois failed to meet the prerequisite in Board Rule 47.3 for Board consideration of its reinstatement request because it failed to correct its error by filing or otherwise including the required PPP with its Request for Reinstatement. Accordingly, the Board hereby denies the reinstatement request and the case remains closed.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/12/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Wilson Leong, Federal Specialized Services

[11] (Emphasis added.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Corinna Goron
Healthcare Reimbursement Servs., Inc.
17101 Preston Rd, Ste. 220
Dallas, TX 75248

RE: ***EJR Determination***
13-2382GC HRS Prime Health 2008 DSH Medicare Part A Exhausted Day Group
14-1807G HRS 2010 SSI Dual Eligible Days Group
14-1808G HRS 2010 Medicaid Fraction Dual Eligible Days Group
14-3239G HRS 2011 DSH SSI Dual Eligible Days Group
14-3236G HRS 2011 Medicaid Fraction Dual Eligible Days Group

Dear Ms. Goron:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Providers' September January 17, 2020 request for expedited judicial review ("EJR") for the appeals referenced above. The Board's determination regarding EJR is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute:

The issue in these appeals is:

> Whether the MAC [Medicare Administrative Contractor] should have excluded from the Medicare fraction non-covered patient days, *i.e.*, days attributable to patients who were enrolled in Medicare and entitled to SSI [Supplemental Security Income], but for whom Medicare did not make a payment for their hospital stay, either because that patient's Medicare benefit days were exhausted, or because a third party made payment for that patient's hospital stay.[1]

[1] Providers' EJR request at 2.

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the inpatient prospective payment system ("IPPS").[2] Under IPPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[3]

The statutory provisions governing IPPS contain a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[4] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased IPPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[5]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[6] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[7] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[8] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[9]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[10]

---

[2] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[3] *Id.*
[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[9] (Emphasis added.)
[10] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[11]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[12]

Dual Eligible Days

In the preamble to FY 2004 IPPS proposed rule published on May 19, 2003, the Secretary, reiterated that the DSH patient percentage is equal to the sum of the percentage of Medicare inpatient days attributable to patients entitled to both Medicare Part A and SSI benefits, and the percentage of total inpatient days attributable to patients eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A benefits.[13] The Secretary explained that, if a patient is a Medicare beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid, the patient is considered dual eligible. Dual eligible patient days are included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage, but not the Medicaid fraction. The Secretary maintained that this treatment was consistent with the language of 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), which specified that patients entitled to benefits under Part A are excluded from the Medicaid fraction.[14]

At the time the proposed rule was published, the policy above applied even after the patient's Medicare coverage was exhausted. More specifically, under this policy, "if a dual-eligible patient was admitted without any Medicare Part A coverage remaining, or the patient exhausted Medicare Part A coverage while an inpatient, his or her patient days were counted in the Medicare fraction before and after Medicare coverage is exhausted."[15] The Secretary maintained that this was consistent with the inclusion of Medicaid patient days even after the patient's Medicaid coverage is exhausted.[16] The Secretary then summarized its policy by stating that "our current policy regarding dual-eligible patient days is that they are counted in the Medicare fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction, even if the patient's Medicare Part A coverage has been exhausted."[17]

The Secretary stated that he believed that the current policy regarding dual eligible patients, counting them in the Medicare fraction and excluding them from the Medicaid fraction, even if the patient's Medicare Part A coverage had been exhausted, was consistent with 42 U.S.C

[11] (Emphasis added.)
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[13] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27207 (May 19, 2003).
[14] *Id.*
[15] *Id.*
[16] *Id.*
[17] *Id.* at 27207-27208.

§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II).[18] Notwithstanding, the Secretary recognized that there were other plausible interpretations and acknowledged, on a practical level, it was often difficult for Medicare contractor`s[19] to differentiate the days for dual eligible patients who Part A coverage had been exhausted. The Secretary explained that the degree of difficulty in differentiating the days varied from State to State depending on the manner in which States identify dual eligible beneficiaries in their list of Medicaid patient days provided to hospitals or required the MACs or hospitals undertake the identification. Underlying the Secretary's concern was the fact that there were hospitals located in States in which the beneficiaries exhausted the Medicare Part A coverage and no Part A bill may be submitted for the patients. Consequently, the relevant MACs had no data by which to verify any adjustment for these cases in the Medicaid data furnished by the hospital.[20]

In light of these concerns and to facilitate consistent handling of these days across all hospitals, the Secretary proposed in the FY 2004 IPPS proposed rule to change this policy and begin to count the patient days of dual-eligible Medicare beneficiaries whose Medicare coverage was expired in the Medicaid fraction of the DSH patient percentage.[21] Specifically, the Secretary proposed that the days of patients who have exhausted their Medicare Part A coverage would no longer be included in the Medicare fraction and, instead, would be included in the Medicaid fraction of the DSH calculation.[22] The Secretary noted that not all SSI recipients are Medicaid eligible and, therefore, it would not be automatic that the patient days of SSI recipients would be counted in the Medicaid fraction when their Part A coverage ended. [23] Under the proposed change, before a hospital could count patient days attributable to dual eligible beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction, the hospital would be required to submit documentation to the MAC that justified including the days in the Medicaid fraction after Medicare Part A benefits have been exhausted.[24]

When the Secretary published the FY 2004 IPPS final rule on August 1, 2003, the Secretary did not adopt and finalize the proposed policy changes regarding dual eligible days.[25] Rather, he stated that "[d]ue to the number and nature of the comments we received on our proposed policies, we are addressing the public comments in a separate document."[26]

On May 18, 2004, the Secretary provided an update. Specifically, in the preamble to the FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule published on that date, the Secretary stated that the Secretary planned to address the proposed policy changes regarding dual eligible days in the forthcoming FY 2005 IPPS final rule.[27]

---

[18] *Id.* at 27207-08.
[19] MACs were formerly known as fiscal intermediaries or intermediaries.
[20] 68 Fed. Reg. at 27208.
[21] *Id.*
[22] *Id.*
[23] *Id.*
[24] *Id.*
[25] 68 Fed. Reg. 45346, 45421 (Aug. 1, 2003).
[26] *Id.*
[27] 68 Fed. Reg. 28196, 28286 (May 18, 2004).

In the preamble to the FY 2005 IPPS final rule published on August 11, 2004, the Secretary addressed the previously proposed policy changes and stated:

> It has come to our attention that we inadvertently misstated our ***current*** policy with regard to the treatment of certain inpatient days for dual-eligibles in the proposed rule of May 19, 2003 . . . . In that proposed rule, we indicated that a dual-eligible beneficiary is included in the Medicare fraction even after the patient's Medicare Part A hospital coverage is exhausted. That is, we stated that if a dual-eligible patient is admitted without any Medicare Part A hospital coverage remaining, or the patient exhausts Medicare Part A hospital coverage while an inpatient, the non-covered patient days are counted in the Medicare fraction. This statement was not accurate. ***Our policy has been*** that only ***covered*** patient days are included in the Medicare fraction (§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)). A notice to this effect was posted on CMS's Web site (*http://www.cms.hhs.gov/providers/hipps/dual.asp*) on July 9, 2004.[28]
>
> ****
>
> . . . [W]e have decided ***not*** to finalize our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include dual-eligible beneficiaries who have exhausted their Part A hospital coverage in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, ***we are adopting a policy*** *to include the days associated with dual-eligible beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction, whether or not the beneficiary has exhausted Medicare Part A hospital coverage.* If the patient is entitled to Medicare Part A and SSI, the patient days will be included in both the numerator and denominator of the Medicare fraction. This policy will be effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2004. *We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with dual eligible beneficiaries* ***in the Medicare fraction*** *of the DSH calculation.*[29]

Accordingly, the Secretary adopted a new policy to "include the days associated with dual-eligible beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction, whether or not the beneficiary has exhausted Medicare Part A hospital coverage."[30] In order to effectuate this policy change, the FY 2005 IPPS final rule revised 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) by deleting the word "covered."[31] Prior to this revision, § 412.106(b)(2) (2004) had stated:

> (2) First computation: Federal fiscal year. For each month of the Federal fiscal year in which the hospital's cost reporting period begins, CMS—

[28] 69 Fed. Reg.48916, 49098 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[29] *Id*. at 49099 (emphasis added).
[30] *Id*.
[31] *See id.* at 49099, 49246.

> (i) *Determines the number of* ***covered*** *patient days that—*
>
> (A) Are associated with discharges occurring during each month; and
>
> (B) Are furnished to patients who during that month were entitled to both Medicare Part A and SSI, excluding those patients who received only State supplementation . . .

As a result of the revision made by the FY 2005 IPPS final rule, § 412.105(b)(2)(i) (2005) now states:

> (2) First computation: Federal fiscal year. For each month of the Federal fiscal year in which the hospital's cost reporting period begins, CMS—
>
> (i) *determines the number of patient days that--*
>
> (A) Are associated with discharges occurring during each month; and
>
> (B) Are furnished to patients who during that month were entitled to both Medicare Part A and SSI, excluding those patients who received only State supplementation . . .

Again, the effect of this change was to adopt "a policy to include the days associated with dual-eligible beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction, whether or not the beneficiary has exhausted Medicare Part A hospital coverage."[32]

The Board notes that two courts have reviewed and upheld the FY 2005 change to 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i). In the first case, *Stringfellow Mem'l Hosp. v. Azar* ("*Stringfellow*"),[33] the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ("D.C. District Court") considered whether the FY 2005 IPPS final rule violated the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") because the rule is procedurally defective and arbitrary and capricious.[34] The D.C. District Court concluded that the Secretary promulgated FY 2005 IPPS final rule with adequate notice and comment procedures and that the rule is not procedurally defective.[35] Further, the D.C. District Court found that the 2005 Final Rule was procedurally sound and the product of reasoned decision making.[36] The *Stringfellow* decision was appealed to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals; however, it was later dismissed.[37]

---

[32] *Id.*
[33] 317 F. Supp. 3d 168 (D.D.C. 2018).
[34] *Id.* at 172.
[35] *Id.* at 190.
[36] *Id.* at 194.
[37] *See* 2019 WL 668282.

In the second case, *Empire Health Found. v. Price* ("*Empire*"),[38] the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington ("Washington District Court") reviewed the question of "the validity" of the Secretary's FY 2005 IPPS final rule with regard to the Secretary's interpretation of the phrase "entitled to benefits under [Medicare Part A] in 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww."[39] In *Empire*, the hospital had alleged that the FY 2005 IPPS final rule amending 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2) was substantively and procedurally invalid.[40] The Washington District Court noted that the Secretary misstated the then-existing policy until approximately three days before the close of the comment period for the FY 2005 IPPS proposed rule and that the inaccuracy of the policy statement necessarily distorted the context of the proposed rule. The Washington District Court determined that, without an accurate contest in which to view the Secretary's proposed rule, interested parties cannot know what to expect and have no basis on which to make comments. Further, the Washington District Court pointed out that interested parties could not have reasonably anticipated the Secretary's rulemaking contained a misstatement. Consequently, the Washington District Court found that the Secretary's notice failed to satisfy the procedural rulemaking requirements of the APA[41] and that the regulation is procedurally invalid.[42] The *Empire* decision is currently pending on appeal in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.[43]

As of the date of this decision, the Secretary's position with respect to the validity of the regulation has not changed.

Providers' Request for EJR

The Providers contend that the non-covered patient, *i.e*., days attributable to patients who were enrolled in Medicare and entitled to SSI, but for whom Medicare did not make payment for their hospital stays because the patient's Medicare patient days were exhausted or because a third party made payment, should be excluded from the Medicare fraction of the DSH fraction. The Providers believe that these non-covered patient days should be treated consistently: (1) they should be included in both the top and bottom of the SSI fraction; or (2) excluded from the top and bottom of the SSI fraction and then be recognized in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction.[44]

The Providers explain that the applicable regulations require that non-covered patient days be included in the Medicare fraction, even though the change made to the regulations effective October 1, 2004. This was accomplished by the deletion of the word "covered" where it had previously appeared in the definition of the Medicare fraction in 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i). As a result of this change, the regulation now requires the inclusion in the Medicare fraction of both exhausted benefit and Medicare secondary payment days associated with patient discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2004.

[38] 334 F. Supp. 3d 1134 (E.D. Wash. 2018)
[39] *Id.* at 1141.
[40] *Id.*
[41] *Id. at 1162.*
[42] *Id. at 1163*
[43] PACER: https://ecf.ca9.uscourts.gov/n/beam/servlet/TransportRoom. (last visited 02/05/2020).
[44] Providers' EJR Request at 2.

The Providers assert that the Secretary improperly promulgated the revision to § 412.106(b)(2)(i) as part of the FY 2005 IPP final rule and that this revision should be vacated. In support of its position, the Providers note that, in *Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius* ("*Allina*"), the D.C. Circuit recently invalidated a different regulatory revision made in the same rulemaking.[45] In *Allina*, the D.C. Circuit vacated the Secretary's regulation requiring Part C days be included in the Medicare fraction where the Secretary's policy prior to October 1, 2004 was to exclude Part C days from the Medicare fraction. The Court concluded that the Part C days regulation was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed regulation and that the proposed rule was merely an indication that the Secretary was considering a clarification of existing policy rather a reversal of the existing policy.

The Providers argue that the dual eligible days proposed rule as published in the FY 2004 IPPS proposed rule was equally misleading with respect to the Secretary's policy. As with the Secretary's Part C days policy, the Secretary adopted a policy with regard to dual eligible days that was the reverse of the proposed regulation and erroneously described the policy with respected to dual eligible days in the FY 2004 IPPS proposed rule. The Provider's contend that the convoluted nature of this rulemaking in which the Secretary both got her facts mixed up while at the same time shifting positions could only create among the public the type of hopeless confusion which the D.C. Circuit found in *Allina.*[46]

The Providers maintain that the Secretary denied the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations. There was nothing in the proposed regulations that suggested the possibility of anything other than the inclusion of non-covered days in the Medicare fraction or inclusion of non-covered days in the Medicaid fraction. As a result, the Providers maintain, the public was deprived of a meaningful opportunity to comment.

The Providers point out that there are no factual matters to be resolved with respect to the issue in these cases and the Board has jurisdiction over the appeals. The Providers maintain that EJR is appropriate since the Board is without the authority to grant the relief sought, namely a finding that as a matter of law 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i), as revised by the FY 2005 IPPS final rule for the purpose of mandating the inclusion of non-covered days in the Medicare fraction, is not valid.

[45] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014)
[46] *Id.* at 1107.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants that comprise the group appeals within this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2008, 2010 and 2011.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen* ("*Bethesda*").[47] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[48]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[49] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required, for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hosp. v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[50] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[51]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator

[47] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[48] *Bethesda*, 108 S. Ct. at 1258-59.
[49] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[50] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016).
[51] *Id.* at 142.

implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016. Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

For any participant that files an appeal from a revised NPR issued after August 21, 2008, the Board only has jurisdiction to hear that participant's appeal of matters that the Medicare contractor specifically revised within the revised NPR.[52] The Board notes that all participant revised NPR appeals included within this EJR request were issued after August 21, 2008.

Jurisdiction and EJR

The Board has determined that the participants involved with the instant EJR request are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R as the Providers are challenging the validity of a regulation. Further, the Providers which appealed from a revised NPR had an adjustment to the SSI fraction as required for Board jurisdiction. Finally, the appeals were timely filed and the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal.[53] Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the above-captioned appeals and the underlying, remaining providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

The Board finds that it lacks the authority to grant the relief sought by the Providers, namely a finding that 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i), as revised by the FY 2005 IPPS final rule for the purpose of mandating the inclusion of non-covered days in the Medicare fraction, is not valid. Consequently, the Board finds that EJR is appropriate.

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

[52] See 42 C.F.R. § 405.1889(b)(1) (2008).
[53] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) codifying the Medicare dual eligible days policy adopted in the FY 2005 IPPS final rule is valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) (2005) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' request for EJR for the issue and the subject years. The Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in these cases, the Board hereby closes the cases.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/14/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosures: Schedules of Providers

cc: Lorraine Frewert, Noridian Healthcare Services
Wilson Leong, FSS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

John R. Jacobs, Esq.
Akin Gump Straus Hauer & Feld LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20026

RE: ***Expedited Judicial Review Determination***

14-1292GC	Liberty HealthCare LLC FY 2006 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-1293GC	Liberty HealthCare LLC FY 2006 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-3413GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2007 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-3414GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2007 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-4040GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2008 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group
14-4041GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2008 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-4042GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2009 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Grp
14-4043GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2009 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp
15-1767GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2010 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp
15-1769GC	Liberty HealthCare, LLC FY 2010 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Grp

Dear Mr. Jacobs:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Providers' January 23, 2020 request for expedited judicial review ("EJR") (received January 24, 2020) for the appeals referenced above. The Board's determination regarding EJR is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute:

The issue in these appeals is:

> Whether Medicare Part C patients are 'entitled to benefits' under Part A, such that they should be counted in the Medicare Part A/SSI[1] fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator or vise-versa.[2]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the

[1] "SSI" is the acronym for "Supplemental Security Income."
[2] Providers' EJR Request at 4.

prospective payment system ("PPS").[3] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[4]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[5] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[6]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[7] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[8] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[9] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[10]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[11]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical

[3] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[4] *Id.*
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[10] (Emphasis added.)
[11] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

> assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[12]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[13]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[14] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[15]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[16]

---

[12] (Emphasis added.)
[13] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[14] of Health and Human Services.
[15] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[16] *Id.*

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[17] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [18]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[19]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[20] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A*. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . .* if the beneficiary

[17] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.
[18] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[19] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[20] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[21]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[22] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[23] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[24]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[25] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[26] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[27] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[28] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the

---

[21] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[22] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[23] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[24] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[26] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[27] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[28] *Id.* at 943.

Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[29] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Providers' Request for EJR

The issue under appeal in this case involves the question of whether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A, thereby requiring them to be counted in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator.

Prior to 2004, the Secretary treated Part C patients as not entitled to benefits under Part A. From 1986-2004, the Secretary interpreted the term "entitled to benefits under Part A" to mean covered or paid by Medicare Part A. In the final rule for the FFY 2005, the Secretary reversed course and announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective October 1, 2004.[30]

In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule."[31] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the 2004 regulation requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In this case, the Providers contend that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Providers seek a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the 2004 rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Providers maintain that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

[29] *Id.* at 943-945.
[30] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.
[31] *Allina* at 1109.

Jurisdiction

The participants that comprise the group appeals within this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2006-2010.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen* ("*Bethesda*").[32] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[33]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[34] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hosp. v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[35] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[36]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

---

[32] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[33] *Bethesda at 1258-59.*
[34] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[35] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[36] *Banner* at 142.

The Board has determined that the participants involved with the instant EJR request are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R since they are challenging the validity of a regulation. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal.[37] The appeals were timely filed. Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the above-captioned appeals and the underlying, providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in this EJR request involve the cost reporting periods 2006-2010 Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[38] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[39]

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

[37] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[38] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[39] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' request for EJR for the issue and the subject years. The Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in these cases, the Board hereby closes the cases.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/18/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosure: Schedules of Providers

cc: Bruce Snyder, Novitas Solutions
Wilson Leong, FSS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

John Jacob
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP
2001 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

RE: ***Part C Days Medicaid and Medicare Proxy – EJR Determination***

13-1019	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2006
13-1299	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2007
14-0514	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2008
14-1994	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2009
15-1770	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2010
16-0413	United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2012

Dear Mr. Jacob:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("PRRB" or "Board") has reviewed the Provider's January 24, 2020, Requests for Expedited Judicial Review ("EJR") (received January 27, 2020) for the above referenced appeals involving fiscal years 2006 to 2010 and 2012. The Board's jurisdictional determination and decision regarding the EJR requests is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute:

The issues for which the Board is considering its own motion EJR are:

> DSH Adjustment: Treatment Of Medicare Advantage Days – The Provider contends that all of the Medicaid eligible Medicare Part C days at issue must be counted in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction and that part C days must be excluded in their entirety from the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction.[1]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[2] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[3]

[1] Request for Expedited Judicial Review, at 1 (Jan. 27, 2019), Case No. 13-1019, *et al.*
[2] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[3] *Id.*

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[4] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[5]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[6] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[7] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[8] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> [T]he fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[9]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[10]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> [T]he fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter*, and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[11]

---

[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[9] Emphasis added.
[10] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).
[11] Emphasis added.

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[12]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[13] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[14]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[15]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[16] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their

[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[13] of Health and Human Services.
[14] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[15] *Id.*
[16] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in

care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004.[17]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[18]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[19] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . . if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated*

Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.

[17] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).

[18] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).

[19] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> *with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.*[20]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004, Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007, when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[21] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[22] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[23]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[24] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[25] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision.

More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[26] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[27] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[28] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

---

[20] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[21] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[22] *Id*. at 47411.
[23] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[24] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] *Id*. at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[26] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[27] *Id.* at 943.
[28] *Id.* at 943-945.

Provider's Request for EJR

In the FFY 2005 Final Rule, the Secretary announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective for discharges on or after October 1, 2004.[29] In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule [for FFY 2005] was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule [for FFY 2005]."[30] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as later set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In these cases, the Provider contends that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Provider seeks a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Provider maintains that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants addressed in this EJR determination have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2006 through 2012.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen* ("*Bethesda*").[31] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in

[29] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[30] *Allina* at 1109.
[31] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).

full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[32]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[33] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hosp. v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[34] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda,* the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[35]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

A. Jurisdictional Determination On Certain Specific Individual Participants

At the outset, the Board notes that a Board finding of jurisdiction is a prerequisite to any review of an EJR request pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1842 and the Board has the authority request "[a]ll of the information and documents found necessary by the Board for issuing a[n EJR] decision,"[36] including documentation relating to jurisdiction. Similarly, the regulations governing appeals specify that jurisdiction "may be raised at any time."[37]

---

[32] *Bethesda,* 108 S. Ct. at 1258-59.
[33] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[34] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[35] *Id.* at 142.
[36] 42 C.F.R. § 405.1842(e)(2)(ii) (referencing to the decision in subsection (f) which included a decision on both jurisdiction and the EJR request).
[37] 42 C.F.R. 405.1837(e)(2) states: "*The Board may make jurisdictional findings* under § 405.1840 ***at any time***, including, but not limited to, following a request by the providers for the jurisdictional findings. The providers may request jurisdictional findings by notifying the Board in writing that the group appeal is fully formed, or that the providers believe they have satisfied all of the requirements for a group appeal hearing request, and the Board may proceed to make jurisdictional findings."

1. PRRB Case No. 14-0514 – United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2008

On September 22, 2015, the MAC challenged the Board's jurisdiction to hear the Medicare Part C Days issue because it asserts no final determination/no adjustment was made by MAC; Further, the MAC asserts that the Provider failed to include the issue as a protested item on the as-filed cost report.[38]

The Provider has not filed a response to this Jurisdictional Challenge.

Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

In this regard, Ruling 1727 sets out a five-step analysis for the Board to undertake to determine whether a provider is entitled to a Board hearing for an item that the provider appealed but did not include on its cost report. In short, a provider has a right to a Board hearing for such an item if it excluded the item based upon "a good faith belief that the item was subject to a payment regulation or other policy that gave the Medicare contractor no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner the provider sought."[39]

The first step of analysis under Ruling 1727 involves the appeal's filing date and cost reporting period. The appeal must have been pending or filed after the Ruling was issued on April 23, 2018. In the instant case, the Board received the Provider's request for hearing on November 4, 2013. Thus, it satisfies the appeal pending date requirement. Additionally, the Ruling applies to appeals of cost reporting periods that ended on or after December 31, 2008 and began before January 1, 2016. These appeals involve fiscal year end 2008 cost reports. Thus, the appealed cost reporting period falls within the required time frame.

Second, the Board must determine whether the appealed item "was subject to a regulation or other payment policy that bound the [Medicare] contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider."[40]

Under §§ 1815(a) and 1833(e) of the Social Security Act, no Medicare payments are made to a provider unless the provider has furnished information requested by the Secretary so that the

[38] MAC's Jurisdictional Challenge, at 2 (Sep. 22, 2015), PRRB Case No. 14-0514.
[39] Ruling 1727 at unnumbered page 2.
[40] Ruling 1727 at 6.

Secretary may determine the amount of payment due. With respect to a hospital's Medicare DSH payment—comprised of the Medicare and Medicaid DSH fractions—part of the Secretary's regulations mandate that a DSH-eligible hospital "has the burden of furnishing data adequate to prove eligibility for each Medicaid patient day claimed…and of verifying with the State that a patient was eligible for Medicaid during each claimed patient hospital day."[41]

In the instant appeal, the Provider questions whether the inclusion of Medicare Choice/Medicare Advantage Days in the SSI/Medicare Fraction of the Provider's DSH calculation was correct. And that, to the extent these same days are Medicaid eligible, the days should be included in the Medicaid Fraction of the DSH calculation.

As the published SSI ratios for this time period include all Part C days in the SSI fraction, and the providers were barred from also including them in their Medicaid percentage (assuming the patients were dually eligible for Medicaid and Medicare Part C). In other words, this issue meets the second requirement or step of Ruling 1727.

The third, fourth and fifth steps of analysis under Ruling 1727 involve the Board's assessment of whether a provider's appeal has met the jurisdictional requirements set out in the applicable regulation.[42] As the Providers' appeals were timely filed and the estimated amount in controversy is over $10,000, the first two Board jurisdictional requirements have been met. With respect to the "dissatisfaction" requirement, Ruling 1727 sets out three different scenarios—in steps three, four and five—for the Board to consider.

The Board looks to step three if it is reviewing an appealed item which was, in fact, within the payment authority or discretion of the Medicare contractor, *i.e.*, an "allowable" item. In the instant appeal, the Dually eligible Part C/Medicaid Eligible Days sought are *not* within the payment authority or discretion of the Medicare Contractor because they are required to use the CMS issued SSI fractions per 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2) and per that regulations the SSI fraction must include Part C Days.[43]

Under step four of Ruling 1727, the Board does not apply the self-disallowance jurisdiction regulation (in § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) or § 405.1811(a)(1)(ii), as applicable) if a determination has been made that the item under appeal was subject to a regulation or other policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment as sought. As discussed in step two above, these Dually Eligible Medicaid Eligible/Part C Days are "non-allowable" costs because the Medicare Contractor was bound by 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2) and per that regulations the SSI fraction must include Part C Days.

Under step five of Ruling 1727, the Board is directed to consider the circumstances surrounding a provider's self-disallowance claim. In the instant appeals, however, the Provider did not self-

[41] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4)(iii) (2010).
[42] 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a) (2010).
[43] *See* 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B), 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B).

disallow the DSH Part C/Medicaid Eligible Days issue, thus this step is not applicable to this appeal.

The Board finds that the Provider's Part C Days issue is within the Board's jurisdiction, based upon the *Bethesda* rationale and Ruling 1727-R, as it would have been futile to present the dually eligible Part C/Medicaid Eligible Days to the Medicare Contractor as they are already included in their respective SSI fraction. The Provider did not have to protest the Part C issue as the Medicare Contractor had no authority to include the days in the Medicaid fraction as CMS had already included them in their respective Medicare fraction.

The Board concludes that it has jurisdiction over the Provider for Medicare Advantage Part C days in the DSH adjustment issue in the case.

2. *PRRB Case No. 14-1994 – United Health Services Hospitals, Inc. (33-0394) FYE 12/31/2009*

On February 9, 2015, the MAC challenged the Board's jurisdiction to hear the Medicare Part C Days issue because it asserts no final determination/no adjustment was made by MAC; Further, the MAC asserts that the Provider failed to include the issue as a protested item on the as-filed cost report.[44]

The Provider filed a brief in reply, commenting that the MAC made specific audit adjustments to the precise parts of the DSH adjustment calculation at issue, thus the Board has jurisdiction.[45]

Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

Relying on the same analysis as above, the Board finds that the Provider's appeal is governed by the decision in *Bethesda* and CMS-1727R. The Provider filed its appeal for FYE 2009 from an original NPR which adjusted Part C Days as required by 42 C.F.R. § 405.1889 for Board jurisdiction. In addition, the Provider's documentation shows that the appeal was timely filed.

The Board concludes that it has jurisdiction over the Provider for Medicare Advantage Part C days in the DSH adjustment issue in the case.

---

[44] MAC's Jurisdictional Challenge, at 2 (Feb. 9, 2015), PRRB Case No. 14-1994.
[45] Provider's Jurisdictional Response Brief, at 2 (Mar. 9, 2015), PRRB Case No. 14-1994.

B. Jurisdictional Determination for Remaining Participants

The Board has determined that the remaining participant's appeals involved with the instant EJR requests are governed by the decision in *Bethesda* and CMS-1727R. These Providers appealed from original NPRs in FYEs 2006-2012 and are challenging the validity of a regulation. In addition, the remaining participant's documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, as required for an individual appeal[46] and that the appeals were timely filed. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Accordingly, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the referenced appeals and the participants.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in these cases involve the 2006 through 2012 cost reporting periods. Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[47] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[48]

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in the individual appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

[46] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[47] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[48] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the EJR for the issue and the subject years. The participants have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Each of these appeals contain no further issues under dispute, therefore the cases are closed.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/19/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Wilson Leong, Federal Specialized Services
Bruce Snyder, Novitas Solutions, Inc.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Christopher Fraley
FirstHealth of the Carolinas, Inc.
155 Memorial Drive
PO Box 3000
Pinehurst, NC 28374

RE: ***Motion for Reinstatement***
FirstHealth Moore Regional Hospital (Prov. No. 34-0115)
FYE 9/30/2011
Case No. 16-0399

Dear Mr. Fraley,

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the letter requesting reinstatement ("Motion for Reinstatement") submitted by FirstHealth Moore Regional Hospital ("Provider") on August 19, 2019. The decision of the Board is set forth below.

Pertinent Facts:

The Provider filed an Individual Appeal Request on December 1, 2015 from a Notice of Program Reimbursement ("NPR") for fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, challenging the Medicare Contractor's disallowance of their reimbursable bad debts. On August 30, 2016 the Provider withdrew their Individual Appeal because the Medicare Contractor agreed to reopen the cost report at issue, but reserved the right to request reinstatement pursuant to Board Rule 46.1 (July 1, 2015) if the matter was not resolved through the reopening process. On August 19, 2019, Provider filed a Motion for Reinstatement because, while a revised NPR ("RNPR") was issued on September 27, 2017, the Provider asserts the adjustments only partially accounted for the issues outlined in the request for reopening. Attached to this motion was the Medicare Contractor's August 26, 2016 Notice of Reopening.

On September 13, 2019, the Medicare Contractor filed an Objection to Provider's Motion for Reinstatement. The Medicare Contractor argues that they did, in fact, re-examine all issues as noted in the Notice of Reopening and issue a RNPR, but that in many instances came to the same conclusions that were initially determined in the audit. The Medicare Contractor also argues that the Provider did not timely submit the documentation necessary to overturn the initial findings, and as such any fault associated with failing to receive the relief requested rests with the Provider.

Statutory and Regulatory Background

A Medicare Contractor may reopen a cost report within three years of the date of the NPR.[1] A provider may withdraw an issue in an appeal for which the Medicare Contractor has agreed to reopen the final determination (*i.e.*, the cost report).[2] Following such a withdrawal, the provider may file a motion for

[1] 42 C.F.R. § 405.1885.
[2] Board Rule 46.

reinstatement within three years of withdrawing the issue.[3] The motion must be in writing and include copies of the provider's reopening request and the Medicare Contractor's agreement to reopen the final determination.[4] The Board is required to grant the motion for reinstatement of the withdrawn issue/case if the Medicare Contractor fails to reopen the cost report and issue a revised NPR for that issue "as agreed."[5]

Board's Decision:

On August 29, 2016, the Provider filed its request to withdraw pursuant to Board Rule 46 and represented that "[t]his withdrawal ¡s conditioned upon the lntermediary's action through reopening of the September 30, 2011 cost report" for the following six Medicare bad debt issues:

1. Lack of documentation to support secondary payors;
2. The bad debt account was not on the detailed PS&R;
3. The financial assistance application is not signed by the patient;
4. Lack of documentation to support the probate court was formally contacted;
5. Lack of documentation to support income verification;
6. Lack of documentation to support the charity determination

However, contrary to the recommendation in Board Rule 46, the Provider did not "attach a copy of the correspondence from the Medicare contractor where the Medicare contractor agrees to that reopening."

On August 13, 2019, the Provider filed for reinstatement and it was within three years of withdrawal as required by Board Rule 47.1. In support of its reinstatement, the Provider states that, while the Medicare Contractor did reopen and issue a new RNPR, the Medicare Contractor "only partially accounted for the [6 Medicare bad debt] issues outlined in case no. 16-0039."

One of the requirements for granting reinstatement is that the reopening and issuing a revised NPR not occur "as agreed." Here, contrary to the instructions in Board Rule 47.2.2, the Provider has provided neither a copy of the Medicare Contractor agreement to reopen and issue an RNPR nor any explanation or documentation that otherwise explains why the reopening and RNPR (which was in fact done) otherwise violates that agreement. Moreover, the Provider acknowledges but fails to even include a copy of either the notice of reopening or the RNPR issued as a result of that reopening.

The Medicare Contractor opposes the reinstatement and did include copies of the notice of reopening dated August 26, 2016, the RNPR issued on September 27, 2017 as a result that reopening, and certain workpapers associated with the RNPR. The notice of reopening stated the one of the purposes of the reopening was "[t]o reexamine conclusion reached based on the documentation provided during the course of the field audit engagement relating to" verbatim the above listed six Medicare bad debt issues. The workpapers also support that the six issues were in fact reviewed. Accordingly, since it is clear that the

[3] Board Rule 47.1.
[4] Board Rule 47.2.2.
[5] *Id.* ("Upon written motion, the Board *will* also grant reinstatement . . .") (emphasis added).

Medicare Contractor, in fact, issued a RNPR consistent with the agreed withdrawal, the Provider's right to reinstatement was extinguished when the Medicare Contractor issued a new determination ***on September 27, 2017***[6] that specifically dealt with the issues for which the Provider is seeking reinstatement.[7] As such, the Board hereby denies the request to reinstate Case No. 16-0399.

Review of this determination may be available under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f) and 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.1875 and 405.1877.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/19/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Wilson C. Leong, Esq., Federal Specialized Services
Laurie Polson, Palmetto GBA c/o National Government Services, Inc.

[6] It is unclear why the provider waited *almost two years* to request reinstatement. If the Provider failed to obtain the relief it believed it was due in the RNPR, the Provider should have appealed the RNPR to the extent it had appeal rights to do so.
[7] Board Rule 47.2.2 states "Upon written motion, the Board will also grant reinstatement of an issue(s)/case if a provider requested to withdraw an issue(s) from its case because the Medicare contractor agreed to reopen/revise the cost report for that issue(s) but failed to reopen the co t report and issue a new final determination (e.g., Revised NPR) for that issue(s) ***as agreed***." (Emphasis added.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

John R. Jacobs, Esq.
Akin Gump Straus Hauer & Feld LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20026

RE: ***Expedited Judicial Review Determination***

14-1295GC	Barnabas Health FY 2006 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days
14-1296GC	Barnabas Health FY 2006 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days
14-3415GC	Barnabas Health FY 2007 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group
14-3416GC	Barnabas Health FY 2007 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Group
14-4188GC	Barnabas Health FY 2008 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group
14-4189GC	Barnabas Health FY 2008 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Group
15-0968GC	Barnabas Health FY 2009 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Group
15-1060GC	Barnabas Health FY 2009 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group
15-3268GC	Barnabas Health FY 2012 DSH Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Group
15-3269GC	Barnabas Health FY 2012 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group
16-2478GC	Barnabas Health FY 2013 DSH Pre-10/1/2013 Medicaid Fraction Part C Days Grp

Dear Mr. Jacobs:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Providers' January 23, 2020 request for expedited judicial review (EJR) (received January 24, 2020) for the appeals referenced above.[1] The Board's determination regarding EJR is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute:

The issue in these appeals is:

> Whether Medicare Part C patients are 'entitled to benefits' under Part A, such that they should be counted in the Medicare Part A/SSI[2] fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator or vise-versa.[3]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the

[1] This request for EJR also included case number 16-2477GC, Barnabas Health 2013 DSH SSI Fraction Part C Days Group for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2013. That appeal is being addressed under separate cover.
[2] "SSI" is the acronym for "Supplemental Security Income."
[3] Providers' EJR Request at 4.

prospective payment system ("PPS").[4] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[5]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[6] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[7]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[8] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[9] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[10] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[11]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[12]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the

[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[5] *Id.*
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[10] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[11] (Emphasis added.)
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

> Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter*, and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[13]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[14]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[15] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[16]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[17]

---

[13] (Emphasis added.)
[14] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[15] of Health and Human Services.
[16] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[17] *Id.*

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[18] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [19]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[20]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[21] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A*. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . .* if the beneficiary

[18] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.
[19] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[20] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[21] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[22]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[23] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[24] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[25]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[26] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[27] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[28] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[29] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the

---

[22] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[23] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[24] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[25] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[26] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[27] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[28] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[29] *Id.* at 943.

Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[30] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Providers' Request for EJR

The issue under appeal in this case involves the question of whether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A, thereby requiring them to be counted in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator.

Prior to 2004, the Secretary treated Part C patients as not entitled to benefits under Part A. From 1986-2004, the Secretary interpreted the term "entitled to benefits under Part A" to mean covered or paid by Medicare Part A. In the final rule for the FFY 2005, the Secretary reversed course and announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective October 1, 2004.[31]

In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule."[32] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the 2004 regulation requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In this case, the Providers contend that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Providers seek a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the 2004 rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Providers maintain that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants that comprise the group appeals within this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2006-2013.

---

[30] *Id.* at 943-945.
[31] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[32] *Allina* at 1109.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hospital Association v. Bowen.*[33] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[34]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[35] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hospital v. Burwell (Banner).*[36] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[37]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

---

[33] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[34] *Bethesda at 1258-59.*
[35] 73 Fed. Reg. 30,190, 30,240 (May 23, 2008).
[36] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[37] *Banner* at 142.

The Board has determined that the participants involved with the instant EJR request are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal.[38] The appeals were timely filed. Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the above-captioned appeals and the underlying, providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in this EJR request involve the cost reporting periods 2006-2013. Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[39] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[40]

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' request for EJR for the issue and the subject years. The

[38] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[39] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[40] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in these cases, the Board hereby closes the cases.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/20/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosure: Schedules of Providers

cc: Bruce Snyder, Novitas Solutions
Wilson Leong, FSS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

James Flynn
Bricker & Eckler, LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

RE: Jurisdictional Decision
Doctors Hospital (36-0152)
FYE: 6/30/2009
PRRB Case: 14-0014

Dear Mr. Flynn,

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the jurisdictional documents in the above referenced appeal and finds that it does not have jurisdiction over the DSH/SSI Ratio Realignment issue because there is no final determination from which the Provider is appealing. The jurisdictional decision of the Board is set forth below.

Pertinent Facts:

Doctors Hospital ("Provider") filed an Individual Appeal Request on October 17, 2013. The original appeal contained just one issue[1] from a Notice of Program Reimbursement dated April 10, 2013. The Provider sought "to preserve its rights to obtain a shift in the calculation period of the DSH percentage from federal fiscal year to the provider's cost report year, should such a shift be found to desirable [sic] for the provider." The Provider states that it has not received the information needed to evaluate whether an SSI realignment pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(3) would be beneficial. The Provider filed the appeal to preserve its right to a realignment in the event that it did not receive the information within the three year time frame for the Medicare Contractor to effectuate the reopening. A hearing has been set for June 18, 2020.

Board Decision

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(a) and 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.1835-405.1840, a provider has a right to a hearing before the Board with respect to costs claimed on a timely filed cost report if it is dissatisfied with the final determination of the intermediary, the amount in controversy is $10,000 or more (or $50,000 for a group), and the request for a hearing is filed within 180 days of the date of receipt of the final determination.

The Board concludes that it does not have jurisdiction over the SSI Realignment issue in the appeal because there is no final determination from which the Provider is appealing, and dismiss the issue from the appeal. Under 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(3) a hospital can, if it prefers, use its cost reporting period data instead of the federal fiscal year data in determining the DSH Medicare fraction. The decision to use its own cost reporting period is the hospital's alone, which then must submit a written request to the

[1] A second issue – Dual Eligible Days – was added and simultaneously transferred on December 6, 2013.

MAC. Without this request it is not possible for the Medicare Contractor to have issued a final determination from which the Provider could appeal.

Since this is the sole remaining issue, the case is being closed and removed from the Board's docket.

Review of this determination may be available under the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f) and 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.1875 and 405.1877.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/20/2020

X Gregory H. Ziegler

Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Board Member
Signed by: Gregory H. Ziegler -S

cc:

Wilson C. Leong, Esq., Federal Specialized Services
Judith Cummings, CGS Administrators

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Leslie Demaree Goldsmith, Esq.
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz
100 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: ***Part C Days Medicaid and Medicare Proxy – Board Own Motion EJR***

08-2682 Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital, Prov. No. 34-9901, FYE 9/30/2005
10-0782 Greenville Memorial Hospital, Prov. No. 42-0078, FYE 9/30/2006
13-1660 AnMed Health d/b/a Anderson Area Med. Ctr., Prov. No. 42-0027, FYE 9/30/2007
14-1250 AnMed Health d/b/a Anderson Area Med. Ctr., Prov. No. 42-0027, FYE 9/30/2008

Dear Ms. Goldsmith:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the records in the above-referenced appeals and, on December 31, 2019, as required by 42 C.F.R. § 405.1842(c), notified the Provider that it was considering, on its own motion, whether Expedited Judicial Review ("EJR") was appropriate for the above referenced cases. The Providers, as well as, Federal Specialized Services (FFS), on behalf of the Medicare Contractors,[1] have submitted comments as to regarding the proposed own motion EJR.

The Board is considering whether it is without the authority to decide the following legal questions:

> Case No. 08-2682:
>
> Disproportionate share hospital (DSH)/failure to include the Provider's dual eligible Medicare Part C and Medicare Advantage (collectively M+C) days in the numerator of the Medicaid Proxy, rather than in the Medicare Proxy [of the DSH fraction].
>
> Case Nos. 10-0782, 13-1660 and 14-1250:
>
> Medicare Part C Days-Whether the Intermediary[2] failed to include the Provider's Dual Eligible days that were Medicaid eligible and Medicare managed care days (M+C/Medicare HMO/Medicare Advantage) in the numerator of the Medicaid Proxy of the [DSH] calculation.[3]

[1] The Providers' comments were received on February 4, 2020. FSS's comments were received on January 27 and 30, 2020.
[2] Intermediaries are now known as Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) or Contractors.
[3] Request for Hearing, Issue Statement in each appeal at Ex. 3.

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[4] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[5]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[6] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[7]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[8] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[9] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[10] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[11]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[12]

---

[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[5] *Id.*
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[10] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[11] Emphasis added.
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> [T]he fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[13]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[14]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[15] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been

[13] Emphasis added.
[14] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[15] of Health and Human Services.

> including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[16]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[17]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[18] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004.[19]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[20]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[21] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A. We agree with the commenter that these*

---

[16] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[17] *Id.*
[18] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.
[19] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[20] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[21] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> *days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . . if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.*[22]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004, Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007, when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[23] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[24] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[25]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[26] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[27] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision.

---

[22] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[23] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[24] *Id*. at 47411.
[25] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[26] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[27] *Id*. at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").

More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[28] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[29] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[30] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Board's Consideration for Own Motion EJR

In the FFY 2005 Final Rule, the Secretary announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective for discharges on or after October 1, 2004.[31] In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule [for FFY 2005] was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule [for FFY 2005]."[32] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as later set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In these cases, the Providers contend that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Provider seeks a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Providers maintain that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants addressed in this own-motion EJR determination have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008.

[28] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[29] *Id.* at 943.
[30] *Id.* at 943-945.
[31] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[32] *Allina* at 1109.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen* ("*Bethesda*").[33] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[34]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[35] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hosp. v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[36] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda,* the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[37]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

The Board has determined that the participants' appeals involved with the instant own-motion EJR are governed by the decision in *Bethesda* and CMS-1727-R as the Providers are challenging a regulation. The Providers appealed from original NPRs. In addition, the participants' documentation, in each case, shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $10,000,

---

[33] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[34] *Bethesda*, 108 S. Ct. at 1258-59.
[35] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[36] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[37] *Id*. at 142.

as required for an individual appeal[38] and that the appeals were timely filed. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case. Accordingly, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the referenced appeals and the participants.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in this EJR request involve fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time period at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[39] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Providers would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[40] Based on the above, the Board must conclude that it is otherwise bound by the regulation for purposes of this EJR.

Board's Decision Regarding the Own Motion EJR

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in the individual appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants its Own Motion EJR for the issue and the subject years. The Providers have 60

[38] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[39] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[40] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in this Case Nos. 08-2682, 10-0782, and 13-1660, the Board hereby closes these three (3) cases. Case No. 14-1250 remains open as there are additional issues under appeal in that case.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Laurie Polson, Palmetto GBA c/o NGS
Wilson Leong, Federal Specialized Services

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Thomas Koons, Esq.
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz
100 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: ***Part C Days Medicaid & Medicare Proxy Grps – Board Own Motion EJR***
09-2292G Ober Kaler post 10/1/2004-2005 Medicare Mngd. Care Medicaid Eligible Days Grp
10-1141G Ober Kaler 2006 DSH Medicare Manage Care Days Group

Dear Mr. Koons:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the records in the above-referenced group appeals and, on December 31, 2019, as required by 42 C.F.R. § 405.1842(c), notified the Providers that it was considering, on its own motion, whether expedited judicial review ("EJR") was appropriate for the above referenced cases. The Providers and the Medicare Contractor have also submitted comments with regard to the proposed own motion EJR.[1]

The Board is considering whether it is without the authority to decide the following legal question:

> Whether the Intermediary[2] failed to include all of the Provider's Medicare Part C days in the numerator of the Medicaid Proxy used to calculated the Provider's allowable Medicare disproportionate share hospital payment.[3]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[4] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[5]

[1] The Providers' comments were received on January 29, 2020. Federal Specialized Services, on behalf of the Medicare Contractor, submitted its comments on January 30, 2020.
[2] Intermediaries are known as Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs) or Contractors.
[3] Providers' Request for Hearing, Issue Statement, Ex. 2 (PRRB Case No. 09-2292G and PRRB Case No. 10-1141G)
[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[5] *Id.*

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[6] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[7]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[8] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[9] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[10] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[11]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[12]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under*

[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[10] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[11] (Emphasis added.)
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

> *part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[13]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[14]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[15] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[16]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[17]

---

[13] (Emphasis added.)
[14] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[15] of Health and Human Services.
[16] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[17] *Id.*

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[18] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [19]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[20]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[21] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A*. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . .* if the beneficiary

[18] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.
[19] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[20] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[21] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[22]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[23] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[24] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[25]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[26] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[27] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[28] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[29] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the

---

[22] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[23] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[24] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[25] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[26] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[27] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[28] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[29] *Id.* at 943.

Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[30] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Board's Consideration for Own Motion EJR

In the FFY 2005 Final Rule, the Secretary announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective for discharges on or after October 1, 2004.[31] In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule [for FFY 2005] was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule [for FFY 2005]."[32] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as later set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In these cases, the Providers contend that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Providers seek a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Providers maintain that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants addressed in this own-motion EJR determination have filed appeals involving fiscal year reporting periods 10/1/2004-2005 and 2006.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v.*

[30] *Id.* at 943-945.
[31] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[32] *Allina* at 1109.

Bowen ("*Bethesda*").[33] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[34]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[35] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hospital v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[36] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda,* the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[37]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

The Board has determined that the participants' appeals involved with the instant own-motion EJR are governed by the decision in *Bethesda*. Each Provider appealed from an original NPRs. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal[38] and that the appeals were timely filed. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case. Accordingly, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the referenced appeals and the participants.

---

[33] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[34] *Bethesda*, 108 S. Ct. at 1258-59.
[35] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[36] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[37] *Id*. at 142.
[38] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in these EJR requests involve the fiscal years 10/1/2004-2005 and 2006 cost reporting periods. Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time period at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[39] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Providers would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[40] Based on the above, the Board must conclude that it is otherwise bound by the regulation for purposes of this EJR.

Board's Decision Regarding the Own Motion EJR

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants its Own Motion EJR for the issue and the subject years. The participants have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in these cases, the Board hereby closes those cases.

[39] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[40] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosures: Schedules of Providers

cc: Pam VanArsdale, NGS
Wilson Leong, Federal Specialized Services

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Electronic Delivery

Leslie Demaree Goldsmith, Esq.
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz
100 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: ***Expedited Judicial Review Determination***
Pinnacle Health Hospitals (Prov. No. 39-0067)
FYE 6/30/2007
Case No. 13-0956

Dear Ms. Goldsmith:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Provider's February 3, 2020 request for expedited judicial review ("EJR") (received February 4, 2020). The Board's determination with respect to the EJR is set forth below.

The issue in this appeal is:

> [W]hether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A such that they should be counted in the Medicare Part A/Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") fraction [of the disproportionate share hospital adjustment] and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator or vice-versa.[1]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[2] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[3]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[4] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[5]

---

[1] Provider's EJR Request at 1.
[2] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[3] *Id.*
[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[6] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[7] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[8] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[9]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[10]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter*, and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[11]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[12]

---

[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[9] (Emphasis added.)
[10] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).
[11] (Emphasis added.)
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[13] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[14]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[15]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[16] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C

[13] of Health and Human Services.
[14] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[15] *Id.*
[16] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.

days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [17]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[18]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[19] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A*. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction* . . . . if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[20]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until

[17] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[18] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[19] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.
[20] *Id.* (emphasis added).

August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[21] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[22] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[23]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[24] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[25] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[26] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[27] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[28] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Provider's Request for EJR

The Provider contends that the 2004 Rule is unlawful as it is contrary to 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi) and, the Provider believes, was promulgated in violation of the Medicare statute and the Administrative Procedure Act. The Provider seeks to have the 2004 Rule set aside based on the decision in *Allina I*, however, since the Secretary not acquiesced to the decision, the Board remains bound by the 2004 rule on the treatment of Part C Day found in the regulations at sought invalidating 42 C.F.R. §§ 405.412.106(b)(2)(i) and (b)(2)(ii).

---

[21] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[22] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[23] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[24] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[26] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[27] *Id.* at 943.
[28] *Id.* at 943-945.

The Provider believes the Board must grant the request for EJR because it has jurisdiction over the appeals, but lacks the authority to decide the validity of 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participant in this individual appeal in this EJR request has filed an appeal involving fiscal year 2007. For any participant that files an appeal from a revised NPR issued after August 21, 2008, the Board only has jurisdiction to hear that participant's appeal of matters that the Medicare contractor specifically revised within the revised Notice of Program Reimbursement (NPR).[29] The Board notes that this providers RNPR was issued after August 21, 2008.

In the current appeal, the Provider's SSI percentage was adjusted, which included Part C Days in the SSI percentage. Therefore, the Board finds that the issue was adjusted in the RNPR under appeal.

EJR

The Board has determined that participant involved with the instant EJR request, which appealed a revised Notice of Program Reimbursement had an adjustment to the Part C issue as required for Board jurisdiction under 42 C.F.R. § 405.1889. In addition, the participant's documentation shows that that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, as required for an individual appeal[30] and the appeal was timely filed. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeal in this EJR request involve fiscal year 2007. Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus

[29] See 42 C.F.R. § 405.1889(b)(1) (2008).
[30] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835.

nationwide).[31] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[32]

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in the individual appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Provider's request for EJR for the issue and the subject year. The Provider has 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since there are no other issues under appeal in this case, the case is hereby closed.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Bruce Snyder, Novitas
Wilson Leong, FSS

[31] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[32] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Electronic Delivery

Leslie Demaree Goldsmith, Esq.
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz
100 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: ***Expedited Judicial Review Determination***
13-3428 Greenville Hospital Center, Provider No. 42-0078, FYE 9/30/2007
14-1201 Greenville Hospital Center, Provider No. 42-0078, FYE 9/30/2008
14-2039 AnMed Health Medical Center, Provider No. 42-0027, FYE 9/30/2009

Dear Ms. Goldsmith:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the Providers' February 3, 2020 requests for expedited judicial review ("EJR") (received February 4, 2020). The Board's determination with respect to the EJRs is set forth below.

The issue in these appeals is:

> [W]hether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A such that they should be counted in the Medicare Part A/Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") fraction [of the disproportionate share hospital adjustment] and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator or vice-versa.[1]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[2] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[3]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[4] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[5]

[1] Providers' EJR Requests at 1.
[2] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[3] *Id.*
[4] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[6] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[7] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[8] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[9]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[10]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[11]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[12]

---

[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[9] (Emphasis added.)
[10] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).
[11] (Emphasis added.)
[12] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[13] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[14]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[15]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[16] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C

---

[13] of Health and Human Services.
[14] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[15] *Id.*
[16] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.

days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [17]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[18]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[19] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> . . . *We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A*. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . .* if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[20]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until

[17] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[18] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[19] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.
[20] *Id.* (emphasis added).

August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[21] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[22] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[23]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[24] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[25] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[26] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[27] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[28] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Provider's Request for EJR

The Providers contend that the 2004 Rule is unlawful as it is contrary to 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi) and, the Providers believe, was promulgated in violation of the Medicare statute and the Administrative Procedure Act. The Providers seek to have the 2004 Rule set aside based on the decision in *Allina I*, however, since the Secretary not acquiesced to the decision, the Board remains bound by the 2004 rule and without the authority to grant the relief sought.

---

[21] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[22] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[23] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[24] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[26] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[27] *Id.* at 943.
[28] *Id.* at 943-945.

The Providers believe the Board must grant the request for EJR because it has jurisdiction over the appeals, but lacks the authority to decide the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants in these individual appeals in this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen*.[29] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[30]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[31] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hosp. v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[32] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda,* the 2008 self-disallowance

[29] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[30] *Bethesda at 1258-59.*
[31] 73 Fed. Reg. 30,190, 30,240 (May 23, 2008).
[32] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)

regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[33]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

Jurisdiction and EJR

The Board has determined that the participants involved with the instant EJR requests are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R as the Providers are challenging a regulation. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy for each individual appeal exceeds $10,000, as required.[34] The appeals were timely filed. Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the above-captioned appeals and the underlying providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in these EJR requests involve fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009, Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[35] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[36]

[33] *Banner* at 142.
[34] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835.
[35] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[36] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in the individual appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' requests for EJR for the issue and the subject years. The Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since there are other issues under appeal in these cases, the cases will remain open.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Laurie Polson, Palmetto GBA c/o NGS
Wilson Leong, FSS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Manie Campbell
CampbellWilson, LLP
15770 N. Dallas Pkwy., Ste. 500
Dallas, TX 75248

RE: ***Part C Days Medicaid and Medicare Proxy – Board Own Motion EJR***
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (Prov. No. 45-0044)
FYE 08/31/2009
Case No. 14-0829

Dear Mr. Campbell:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") has reviewed the records in the above-referenced appeal and, on October 4, 2019, as required by 42 C.F.R. § 405.1842(c), notified the Provider that it was considering, on its own motion, whether Expedited Judicial Review ("EJR") was appropriate for the above referenced case. The Provider, as well as, Federal Specialized Services (FFS), on behalf of the Medicare Contractor, has submitted comments as to whether the Board is without the authority to decide the following legal question[1]:

> SSI- Medicare Advantage Part C – Whether the Intermediary's audit adjustment related to Disproportionate Share Hospital ("DSH") Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") is proper.[2]

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[3] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[4]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[5] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[6]

---

[1] FSS's comments were received on October 24, 2019; Provider's comments were received on October 25, 2019.
[2] Request for Hearing, Issue Statement, at Ex. 3 (Nov. 18, 2013), 14-0829.
[3] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[4] *Id.*
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[7] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[8] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[9] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[10]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[11]

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> [T]he fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter*, and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[12]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[13]

---

[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[10] Emphasis added.
[11] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).
[12] Emphasis added.
[13] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[14] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[15]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[16]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[17] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their

[14] of Health and Human Services.
[15] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[16] *Id.*
[17] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.

care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004.[18]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[19]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[20] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

> *. . . We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A. We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . . if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.*[21]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

---

[18] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[19] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[20] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.
[21] *Id.* (emphasis added).

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004, Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007, when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[22] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[23] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[24]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[25] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[26] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision.

More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[27] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[28] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[29] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Board's Consideration for Own Motion EJR

In the FFY 2005 Final Rule, the Secretary announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid

[22] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[23] *Id*. at 47411.
[24] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[26] *Id*. at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[27] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[28] *Id*. at 943.
[29] *Id*. at 943-945.

fraction effective for discharges on or after October 1, 2004.[30] In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule [for FFY 2005] was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule [for FFY 2005]."[31] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as later set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In this case, the Provider contends that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Provider seeks a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the regulation announced in the FFY 2005 Final Rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Provider maintains that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

The Provider has identified four other commonly owned providers in the University of Texas Health System: 1) University of Texas Harris County Psychiatric Center, 2) University of Texas Health Center at Tyler, 3) University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, and 4) University of Texas Zale Lipshy Hospital. The Provider attests in a letter dated January 21, 2020, that none of these other commonly owned providers are participating in any other group appeals for this appealed issue, nor do they have the issue pending before the Board in any other individual appeal. The Provider further attests there are no other commonly owned providers with the appealed issue for fiscal year end 08/31/2009 which would require the Provider to set up a CIRP Group appeal to pursue this fiscal year 2009 Part C days issue.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participant addressed in this own-motion EJR determination has filed an appeal involving fiscal year 2009.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-

[30] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[31] *Allina* at 1109.

disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hosp. Ass'n v. Bowen* ("*Bethesda*").[32] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[33]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[34] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hospital v. Burwell* ("*Banner*").[35] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[36]

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to largely apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

The Board has determined that the participant's appeal involved with the instant own-motion EJR is governed by the decision in *Bethesda* and CMS-1727R as the Provider is challenging a regulation. The Provider appealed from an original NPR. In addition, the participant's documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy exceeds $10,000, as required for an individual appeal[37] and that the appeal was timely filed. The estimated amount in controversy

[32] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[33] *Bethesda*, 108 S. Ct. at 1258-59.
[34] 73 Fed. Reg. 30190, 30240 (May 23, 2008).
[35] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[36] *Id.* at 142.
[37] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.

is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case. Accordingly, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction for the referenced appeal and the participant.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeal in this EJR request involves the fiscal year 2009 cost reporting period. Thus, the appealed cost reporting period falls squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time period at issue in this request, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[38] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[39] Based on the above, the Board must conclude that it is otherwise bound by the regulation for purposes of this EJR.

Board's Decision Regarding the Own Motion EJR

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject years and that the participants in the individual appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2008) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants its Own Motion EJR for the issue and the subject years. The participant has 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in this case, the Board hereby closes this case.

---

[38] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[39] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

For the Board:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

cc: Wilson Leong, Federal Specialized Services
Bruce Snyder, Novitas Solutions, Inc.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Provider Reimbursement Review Board
1508 Woodlawn Drive, Suite 100
Baltimore, MD 21207
410-786-2671

Via Electronic Delivery

Leslie Demaree Goldsmith, Esq.
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz
100 Light Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

RE: ***Expedited Judicial Review Determination***

16-1580G	Baker 2013 DSH Medicare Part C Days-Medicare Proxy Optional Group
16-1583G	Baker 2013 DSH Medicare Part C Days-Medicaid Proxy Optional Group
16-0141GC	Virtua Health 2013 DSH/Medicare Part C Days-Medicare Proxy Group
16-0142GC	Virtua Health 2013 DSH/Medicare Part C Days-Medicaid Proxy Group
17-0158GC	Capital Health 2013 DSH/Medicare Part C Days-Medicare Proxy Group
17-0160GC	Capital Health 2013 DSH/Medicare Part C Days-Medicaid Proxy Group

Dear Ms. Goldsmith:

The Provider Reimbursement Review Board (Board) has reviewed the Providers' February 3, 2020 request for expedited judicial review (EJR) (received February 4, 2020) for the appeals referenced above covering periods prior to October 1, 2013.[1] The Board's determination regarding EJR is set forth below.

Issue in Dispute:

The issue in these appeals is:

> [W]hether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A such that they should be counted in the Medicare Part A/Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") fraction [of the disproportionate share hospital adjustment] and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator or vice-versa.[2]

[1] The Schedule of Providers in Case Nos. 16-1580G and 16-1583G contains a notation that "[t]hese are revised calculations that reflect only the period through September 30, 2013, as the Providers are not pursuing appeal[s] of this issue for the October 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013." In Case Nos. 16-0141GC, 16-0142GC, 17-0158GC and 17-0160GC, the Group Representative submitted correspondence dated February 14, 2020 stating that the Providers were on appealing the period through 10/1/2013.

[2] Providers' EJR Request at 4.

Statutory and Regulatory Background: Medicare DSH Payment

Part A of the Medicare Act covers "inpatient hospital services." Since 1983, the Medicare program has paid most hospitals for the operating costs of inpatient hospital services under the prospective payment system ("PPS").[3] Under PPS, Medicare pays predetermined, standardized amounts per discharge, subject to certain payment adjustments.[4]

The PPS statute contains a number of provisions that adjust reimbursement based on hospital-specific factors.[5] These cases involve the hospital-specific DSH adjustment, which requires the Secretary to provide increased PPS payments to hospitals that serve a significantly disproportionate number of low-income patients.[6]

A hospital may qualify for a DSH adjustment based on its disproportionate patient percentage ("DPP").[7] As a proxy for utilization by low-income patients, the DPP determines a hospital's qualification as a DSH, and it also determines the amount of the DSH payment to a qualifying hospital.[8] The DPP is defined as the sum of two fractions expressed as percentages.[9] Those two fractions are referred to as the "Medicare/SSI" fraction and the "Medicaid" fraction. Both of these fractions consider whether a patient was "entitled to benefits under part A."

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(I), defines the Medicare/SSI fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter and were entitled to supplemental security income benefits (excluding any State supplementation) under subchapter XVI of this chapter, and the denominator of which is the number of such hospital's patient days for such fiscal year which were made up of patients who (for such days) were *entitled to benefits under part A* of this subchapter . . . .[10]

The Medicare/SSI fraction is computed annually by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services ("CMS"), and the Medicare contractors use CMS' calculation to compute a hospital's DSH payment adjustment.[11]

---

[3] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(l)-(5); 42 C.F.R. Part 412.
[4] *Id.*
[5] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5).
[6] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106.
[7] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(i)(I) and (d)(5)(F)(v); 42 C.F.R. § 412.l06(c)(l).
[8] *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(iv) and (vii)-(xiii); 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(d).
[9] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi).
[10] (Emphasis added.)
[11] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)-(3).

The statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)(II), defines the Medicaid fraction as:

> the fraction (expressed as a percentage), the numerator of which is the number of the hospital's patient days for such period which consist of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under subchapter XIX [the Medicaid program], but who were *not entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter,* and the denominator of which is the total number of the hospital's patient days for such period.[12]

The Medicare contractor determines the number of the hospital's patient days of service for which patients were eligible for Medicaid but not entitled to Medicare Part A, and divides that number by the total number of patient days in the same period.[13]

Medicare Advantage Program

The Medicare program permits its beneficiaries to receive services from managed care entities. The managed care statute implementing payments to health maintenance organizations ("HMOs") and competitive medical plans ("CMPs") is found at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm. The statute at 42 U.S.C. § 1395mm(a)(5) provides for "payment to the eligible organization under this section for individuals enrolled under this section with the organization and entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter and enrolled under part B of this subchapter . . ." Inpatient hospital days for Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in HMOs and CMPs prior to 1999 are referred to as Medicare HMO patient care days.

In the September 4, 1990 Federal Register, the Secretary[14] stated that:

> Based on the language of section 1886(d)(5)(F)(vi) of the Act [42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(F)(vi)], which states that the disproportionate share adjustment computation should include "patients who were entitled to benefits under Part A," we believe it is appropriate to include the days associated with Medicare patients who receive care at a qualified HMO. Prior to December 1, 1987, we were not able to isolate the days of care associated with Medicare patients in HMOs, and therefore, were unable to fold this number into the calculation [of the DSH adjustment]. However, as of December 1, 1987, a field was included on the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MEDPAR) file that allows us to isolate those HMO days that were associated with Medicare patients. Therefore, since that time we have been

[12] (Emphasis added.)
[13] 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(4).
[14] of Health and Human Services.

> including HMO days in the SSI/Medicare percentage [of the DSH adjustment].[15]

At that time Medicare Part A paid for HMO services and patients continued to be eligible for Part A.[16]

With the creation of Medicare Part C in 1997,[17] Medicare beneficiaries who opted for managed care coverage under Medicare Part C were no longer entitled to have payment made for their care under Part A. Consistent with the statutory change, CMS did not include Medicare Part C days in the SSI ratios used by the Medicare contractors to calculate DSH payments for the fiscal year 2001-2004. [18]

No further guidance regarding the treatment of Part C days in the DSH calculation was provided until the 2004 Inpatient Prospective Payment System ("IPPS") proposed rules were published in the Federal Register. In that notice the Secretary stated that:

> . . . once a beneficiary has elected to join an M+C plan, that beneficiary's benefits are no longer administered under Part A . . . . *once a beneficiary elects Medicare Part C, those patient days attributable to the beneficiary should not be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH patient percentage. These patient days should be included in the count of total patient days in the Medicaid fraction (the denominator), and the patient's days for the M+C beneficiary who is also eligible for Medicaid would be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction . . . .*[19]

The Secretary purportedly changed her position in the Federal fiscal year ("FFY") 2005 IPPS final rule, by noting she was "revising our regulations at [42 C.F.R.] § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with [Part C] beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation."[20] In response to a comment regarding this change, the Secretary explained that:

---

[15] 55 Fed. Reg. 35990, 39994 (Sept. 4, 1990).
[16] *Id.*
[17] The Medicare Part C program did not begin operating until January 1, 1999. *See* P.L. 105-33, 1997 HR 2015, *codified as* 42 U.S.C. § 1394w-21 Note (c) "Enrollment Transition Rule.- An individual who is enrolled [in Medicare] on December 31 1998, with an eligible organization under . . . [42 U.S.C. 1395mm] shall be considered to be enrolled with that organization on January 1, 1999, under part C of Title XVIII . . . if that organization as a contract under that part for providing services on January 1, 1999 . . . ." This was also known as Medicare+Choice. The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (Pub.L. 108-173), enacted on December 8, 2003, replaced the Medicare+Choice program with the new Medicare Advantage program under Part C of Title XVIII.
[18] 69 Fed. Reg. 48918, 49099 (Aug. 11, 2004).
[19] 68 Fed. Reg. 27154, 27208 (May 19, 2003) (emphasis added).
[20] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49099.

> *. . . We do agree that once Medicare beneficiaries elect Medicare Part C coverage, they are still, in some sense, entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A.* We agree with the commenter that these days should be included in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation. Therefore, we are *not adopting as final our proposal stated in the May 19, 2003 proposed rule to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicaid fraction. Instead, we are adopting a policy to include the patient days for M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction . . . .* if the beneficiary is also an SSI recipient, the patient days will be included in the numerator of the Medicare fraction. We are revising our regulations at § 412.106(b)(2)(i) to include the days associated with M+C beneficiaries in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.[21]

This statement would require inclusion of Medicare Part C inpatient days in the Medicare fraction of the DSH calculation.

Although the change in DSH policy regarding 42 C.F.R. § 412.106(b)(2)(i) was included in the August 11, 2004 Federal Register, no change to the regulatory language was published until August 22, 2007 when the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule was issued.[22] In that publication the Secretary noted that no regulatory change had in fact occurred, and announced that she had made "technical corrections" to the regulatory language consistent with the change adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule. These "technical corrections" are reflected at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).[23] As a result of these rulemakings, Part C days were required to be included in the Medicare fraction as of October 1, 2004 (the "Part C DSH policy"). Subsequently, as part of the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule published on August 15, 2010, CMS made a minor revision to §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) "to clarify" the Part C DSH policy by replacing the word "or" with "including."[24]

The U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia in *Allina Healthcare Services v. Sebelius* ("*Allina I*"),[25] vacated both the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule adopting the Part C DSH policy and the subsequent regulations issued in the FFY 2008 IPPS final rule codifying the Part C DSH policy

---

[21] *Id.* (emphasis added).
[22] 72 Fed. Reg. 47130, 47384 (Aug. 22, 2007).
[23] 72 Fed. Reg. at 47411.
[24] 75 Fed. Reg. 50042, 50285-50286, 50414 (Aug. 16, 2010). *See also* 75 Fed. Reg. 23852, 24006-24007 (May 4, 2010) (preamble to proposed rulemaking stating: "We are aware that there might be some confusion about our policy to include MA days in the SSI fraction. . . . In order to further clarify our policy that patient days associated with MA beneficiaries are to be included in the SSI fraction because they are still entitled to benefits under Medicare Part A, we are proposing to replace the word 'or' with the word 'including' in § 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and § 412.106(b)(2)(iii)(B)."); *Allina Healthcare Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 82 n.5, 95 (2012), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part*, 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).
[25] 746 F. 3d 1102 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

adopted in FFY 2005 IPPS rule.[26] However, the Secretary has not acquiesced to that decision. More recently, in *Allina Health Services v. Price* ("*Allina II*"),[27] the D.C. Circuit confirmed that the Secretary's 2004 attempt to change the standard to include Part C days in the Medicare fraction had been vacated in *Allina I*.[28] The D.C. Circuit further found in *Allina II* that the Secretary failed to provide proper notice and comment before including Part C days in the Medicare fractions published for FY 2012.[29] Once again, the Secretary has not acquiesced to this decision.

Providers' Request for EJR

The issue under appeal in this case involves the question of whether Medicare Part C patients are "entitled to benefits" under Part A, thereby requiring them to be counted in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and excluded from the Medicaid fraction numerator.

Prior to 2004, the Secretary treated Part C patients as not entitled to benefits under Part A. From 1986-2004, the Secretary interpreted the term "entitled to benefits under Part A" to mean covered or paid by Medicare Part A. In the final rule for the FFY 2005, the Secretary reversed course and announced a policy change. This policy was to include Part C days in the Medicare Part A/SSI fraction and exclude them from the Medicaid fraction effective October 1, 2004.[30]

In *Allina I*, the Court affirmed the district court's decision "that the Secretary's final rule was not a logical outgrowth of the proposed rule."[31] The Providers point out that because the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision, the 2004 regulation requiring Part C days be included in the Part A/SSI fraction and removed from the Medicaid fraction remains in effect as set forth in 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B).

In this case, the Providers contend that all Part C days should be excluded from the Part A/SSI fraction and the Medicaid-eligible Part C days should be included in the numerator of the Medicaid fraction. To obtain relief, the Providers seek a ruling on the procedural and substantive validity of the 2004 rule that the Board lacks the authority to grant. The Providers maintain that since the Secretary has not acquiesced to the decision in *Allina I*, the Board remains bound by the regulation. Hence, EJR is appropriate.

---

[26] 746 F.3d at 1106 n.3, 1111 (affirming portion of the district court decision vacating the FFY 2005 IPPS rule). *See also Allina Health Servs. v. Sebelius*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The Court concludes that the Secretary's interpretation of the fractions in the DSH calculation, announced in 2004 and not added to the Code of Federal Regulations until the summer of 2007, was not a "logical outgrowth" of the 2003 NPRM.").
[27] 863 F.3d 937 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[28] *Id.* at 943.
[29] *Id.* at 943-945.
[30] 69 Fed. Reg. at 49,099.
[31] *Allina* at 1109.

Decision of the Board

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and the regulations at 42 C.F.R.§ 405.1842(f)(1) (2017), the Board is required to grant an EJR request if it determines that: (i) the Board has jurisdiction to conduct a hearing on the specific matter at issue; and (ii) the Board lacks the authority to decide a specific legal question relevant to the specific matter at issue because the legal question is a challenge either to the constitutionality of a provision of a statute or to the substantive or procedural validity of a regulation or CMS Ruling.

Jurisdiction

The participants that comprise the group appeals within this EJR request have filed appeals involving fiscal year January 1, 2013 - September 30, 2013.

For purposes of Board jurisdiction over a participant's appeals for cost report periods ending prior to December 31, 2008, the participant may demonstrate dissatisfaction with the amount of Medicare reimbursement for the appealed issue by claiming the SSI/Part C issue as a "self-disallowed cost," pursuant to the Supreme Court's reasoning set out in *Bethesda Hospital Association v. Bowen.*[32] In that case, the Supreme Court concluded that a cost report submitted in full compliance with the Secretary's rules and regulations, does not bar a provider from claiming dissatisfaction with the amount of reimbursement allowed by the regulations. Further, no statute or regulation expressly mandated that a challenge to the validity of a regulation be submitted first to the Medicare Contractor where the contractor is without the power to award reimbursement.[33]

On August 21, 2008, new regulations governing the Board were effective.[34] Among the new regulations implemented in Federal Register notice was 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) which required for cost report periods ending on or after December 31, 2008, providers who were self-disallowing specific items had to do so by following the procedures for filing a cost report under protest. This regulatory requirement was litigated in *Banner Heart Hospital v. Burwell (Banner).*[35] In *Banner*, the provider filed its cost report in accordance with the applicable outlier regulations and did not protest the additional outlier payment it was seeking. The provider's request for EJR was denied because the Board found that it lacked jurisdiction over the issue. The District Court concluded that, under *Bethesda*, the 2008 self-disallowance regulation could not be applied to appeals raising a legal challenge to a regulation or other policy that the Medicare Contractor could not address.[36]

---

[32] 108 S. Ct. 1255 (1988). *See also* CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R (in self-disallowing an item, the provider submits a cost report that complies with the Medicare payment policy for the item and then appeals the item to the Board. The Medicare Contractor's NPR would not include any disallowance for the item. The provider effectively self-disallowed the item.).
[33] *Bethesda at 1258-59.*
[34] 73 Fed. Reg. 30,190, 30,240 (May 23, 2008).
[35] 201 F. Supp. 3d 131 (D.D.C. 2016)
[36] *Banner* at 142.

The Secretary did not appeal the decision in *Banner* and decided to apply the holding to certain similar administrative appeals. Effective April 23, 2018, the CMS Administrator implemented CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R which involves dissatisfaction with the Medicare Contractor determinations for cost report periods ending on December 31, 2008 and which began before January 1, 2016, Under this ruling, where the Board determines that the specific item under appeal was subject to a regulation or payment policy that bound the Medicare Contractor and left it with no authority or discretion to make payment in the manner sought by the provider on appeal, the protest requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(a)(1)(ii) were no longer applicable. However, a provider could elect to self-disallow a specific item deemed non-allowable by filing the matter under protest.

Non-issuance of an NPR

Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(c) a provider has the right to a hearing where:

> (1) A final contractor determination for the provider's cost reporting period is not issued (through no fault of the provider) within 12 months after the date of receipt by the contractor of the provider's perfected cost report or amended cost report (as specified in § 413.24(f) of this chapter). The date of receipt by the contractor of the provider's perfected cost report or amended cost report is presumed to be the date the contractor stamped "Received" on such cost report unless it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the contractor received the cost report on an earlier date.
>
> (2) Unless the provider qualifies for a good cause extension under § 405.1836, the date of receipt by the Board of the provider's hearing request is no later than 180 days after the expiration of the 12 month period for issuance of the final contractor determination . . .

Jurisdiction and EJR

The Board has determined that the ng participants involved with the instant EJR request and which filed from NPRs are governed by CMS Ruling CMS-1727-R. The Providers which file their appeals pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1835(c) filed their appeals within 180 days after the expiration of the 12 month period for issuing a Notice of Program Reimbursement. In addition, the participants' documentation shows that the estimated amount in controversy for each group appeal exceeds $50,000, as required for a group appeal.[37] The appeals were timely filed. Based on the above, the Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the above-captioned appeals and the underlying providers. The estimated amount in controversy is subject to recalculation by the Medicare contractor for the actual final amount in each case.

Board's Analysis Regarding the Appealed Issue

The appeals in this EJR request involve the cost reporting period January 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013.[38] Thus, the appealed cost reporting periods fall squarely within the time frame applicable to the Secretary's Part C DSH policy being challenged which was adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule and later codified at 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) as part of the FY 2008 IPPS final rule (with a minor revision published in the FFY 2011 IPPS final rule). The Board recognizes that, for the time periods at issue in these requests, the D.C. Circuit in *Allina I* vacated this regulation. However, the Secretary has not formally acquiesced to that *vacatur* and, in this regard, has not published any guidance on how the *vacatur* is being implemented (*e.g.*, only circuit-wide versus nationwide).[39] Moreover, the D.C. Circuit is the only circuit to date that has vacated the regulation and, if the Board were to grant EJR, the Provider would have the right to bring suit in either the D.C. Circuit *or* the circuit within which they are located.[40]

Board's Decision Regarding the EJR Request

The Board finds that:

1) It has jurisdiction over the matter for the subject year[41] and that the participants in these group appeals are entitled to a hearing before the Board;

2) Based upon the participants' assertions regarding 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B), there are no findings of fact for resolution by the Board;

---

[37] *See* 42 C.F.R. § 405.1837.
[38] *See supra* note 1.
[39] *See generally Grant Med. Ctr. v. Burwell*, 204 F. Supp. 3d 68, 77-82 (D.D.C. 2016), *aff'd*, 875 F.3d 701 (D.C. Cir. 2017).
[40] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1).
[41] *See supra* note 1.

3) It is bound by the applicable existing Medicare law and regulation (42 C.F.R. § 405.1867); and

4) It is without the authority to decide the legal question of whether 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) codifying the Medicare Part C DSH policy adopted in the FFY 2005 IPPS final rule are valid.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the question of the validity of 42 C.F.R. §§ 412.106(b)(2)(i)(B) and (b)(2)(iii)(B) (2011) properly falls within the provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 1395oo(f)(1) and hereby grants the Providers' requests for EJR for the issue and the subject year. The Providers have 60 days from the receipt of this decision to institute the appropriate action for judicial review. Since this is the only issue under dispute in these cases, the Board hereby closes the cases.

Board Members Participating:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Charlotte F. Benson, CPA
Gregory H. Ziegler, CPA, CPC-A
Robert A. Evarts, Esq.
Susan A. Turner, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

2/21/2020

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: Clayton J. Nix -A

Enclosure: Schedules of Providers

cc: Bruce Snyder, Novitas Solutions
Wilson Leong, FSS