PROVIDER REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW BOARD DECISION

2017-D2

PROVIDER -

The Park Associates, Inc.

Provider Nos.: See Appendix A

VS.

MEDICARE CONTRACTOR -

National Government Services, Inc.

DATE OF HEARING – May 1, 2015

Cost Reporting Period Ended – December 31, 1998

CASE NO.: 03-1599G

INDEX

·	ge No.
Issue Statement	2
Decision	2
Introduction	2
Statement of Facts	3
Discussion, Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law	4
Decision	5
Appendix A	6

Page 2 Case No. 03-1599G

ISSUE STATEMENT

Whether the Medicare Contractor's methodology allocating Park Associates pooled home office costs improperly denied reimbursement to the Providers?¹

DECISION

After considering the Medicare law and regulations, the parties' contentions, and the evidence submitted, the Provider Reimbursement Review Board ("Board") finds that the Medicare Contractor properly allocated pooled home office costs to the Providers for fiscal year ending December 31, 1998 ("FY 1998").

INTRODUCTION

Located in East Aurora, New York, Park Associates, Inc. ("Park Associates") is a "home office" providing clinical and financial services to 118 nursing facilities (13 New York, 15 Indiana, 32 Illinois and 58 Texas nursing facilities) during portions of its cost reporting period ending December 31, 1998. This appeal involves eleven of these nursing facilities as delineated in the Schedule of Providers at Appendix A (collectively referred to as the "Providers").²

On February 6, 1998, Park Associates sold 89 of its nursing facilities including all of the Illinois nursing facilities and all but one Texas nursing facility to an unrelated third party.³ The Medicare contractor⁴ designated for the Indiana, Illinois and Texas nursing facilities was Wisconsin Physicians Service ("WPS").⁵ The Medicare contractor designated for the New York nursing facilities was National Government Services ("NGS").⁶ The Board will refer to WPS and NGS collectively as the "Medicare Contractor."

Park Associates and the Medicare Contractor disagreed about how to allocate pooled costs of the home office between the sold nursing facilities and those that remained with Park Associates. The Medicare Contractor calculated facility-specific allocations for those nursing facilities that were sold and these allocations were generally lower than those calculated for the "non-sold" nursing facilities. This difference resulted in a reduced reimbursement for the Providers (*i.e.*, eleven nursing facilities participating in this appeal).⁷

The Providers timely appealed their Notices of Program Reimbursement ("NPR") and met the jurisdictional requirements for a hearing. The Board conducted a live hearing on May

¹ Hearing Transcript ("Tr.") at 5-6.

² Only eleven of Park Associates' nursing facilities remain in the subject appeal after the Board issued jurisdictional decisions. *See* Appendix A for the Schedule of Providers.

³ Tr. at 35, 121. The majority of the testimony suggests that the New York and Indiana nursing facilities only remained part of Park Associates. However, one Texas facility did in fact remain part of Park Associates.

⁴ The term "Medicare contractor" includes fiscal intermediaries and Medicare administrative contractors.

⁵ Formerly Mutual of Omaha.

⁶ Formerly Empire Medical Services.

⁷ Medicare Contractor's Post Hearing Memorandum at 3.

Page 3 Case No. 03-1599G

1, 2015. The Providers were represented by Joseph F. Widmer, of The Park Associates, Inc. The Medicare Contractor was represented by Arthur E. Peabody, Jr., Esq., of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Park Associates filed its Home Office Cost Statement ("HOCS") in a paper format, splitting its pooled administrative costs into two separate six month periods and using a combination of actual and imputed days to allocate the segmented pooled costs when reporting the amounts on Schedule G.⁸ Park then used these allocations from the "asfiled" paper HOCS to complete the cost reports filed by all 118 of its sold and remaining nursing facilities for cost reimbursement determinations. Park Associates made the decision not to use the electronic cost statement software because the sold nursing facilities received home office services for only approximately six months of the fiscal year. ⁹

Park Associates contends that the Medicare Contractor erred in using the same number of patient days as reported on Schedule G, when entering these patient days into the standard CMS-approved electronic HOCS software which automatically allocated the home office costs based on the proportion of inpatient days for each nursing facility to the total inpatient days of all of the nursing facilities in the chain. Because the inpatient days were not the actual incurred days for each of the affiliated nursing facilities, but a combination of six-months weighted days for the Texas and Illinois nursing facilities and twelve months of actual incurred days for the New York and Indiana nursing facilities, the methodology generally allocated lower home office costs to the "non-sold" nursing facilities which resulted in reimbursement reductions for the remaining nursing facilities participating in this appeal. 12

Park Associates claims that, by dividing the year into two 6 month periods and using "imputed" days for the sold nursing facilities for the first six month period, patient days for the closed nursing facilities were more accurately and equitably allocated between the sold and the remaining owned nursing facilities.¹³ This method, Park Associates argues, results in a more accurate allocation of costs since home office services for the sold nursing facilities did not cease on February 6, 1998, the day of the sale. Park Associates notes that the home office had to finalize general ledgers and close-out cost reports so there was no substantial change in the home office services provided to the sold nursing facilities for the first six months of 1998.¹⁴

⁸ Tr. at 13-15, 41-50, 91-97; Providers' Post Hearing Brief at 5.

⁹ Tr. at 12, 15.

¹⁰ Medicare Contractor's Post Hearing Memorandum at 7-8; Tr. 90. *See also* Medicare Contractor Exhibit I-9.

¹¹ Providers' Post-Hearing Brief, at 5.

¹² Medicare Contractor's Post Hearing Memorandum at 3.

¹³ Providers' Post Hearing Brief at 8.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 5.

Page 4 Case No. 03-1599G

The Medicare Contractor defends its methodology, maintaining that it simply used the data that Park Associates reported on Schedule G to determine the allocation of the pooled costs and using the electronic cost statement software as required by federal regulations. The Medicare Contractor argues that, if Park Associates had a more accurate and sophisticated methodology, CMS manual guidance in the Provider Reimbursement Manual, CMS Pub. 15-1 ("PRM 15-1"), § 2150.3(D)(2)(b) would have allowed Park Associates to use its alternate methodology only if it could demonstrate that its methodology would provide: (1) a more precise allocation of pooled home office costs; and (2) it had sought written permission from the Medicare Contractor no later than 120 days after the beginning of the home office accounting period to which the change is to apply.¹⁵ In the alternative, Park Associates could have requested that its cost reports be reopened to recalculate the number of patient days after the fiscal year had ended.¹⁶ However, it did not do so.

DISCUSSION, FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

CMS guidance at PRM 15-1 § 2150.3(D)(2)(a) requires that pooled home office costs be allocated on the basis of inpatient days when the entire chain consists solely of comparable inpatient health care facilities. Notwithstanding, § 2150.3(D)(2)(b) permits the use of a more precise allocation method for pooled home office costs if the affected provider(s) seek "the approval of the Medicare Contractor no later than 120 days after the beginning of the home office accounting period."¹⁷

Park Associates believes that its recommended allocation using split cost and split imputed/weighted days is a more sophisticated, accurate methodology to allocate the pooled costs. However, the Board finds no clear and convincing evidence in the record to adequately support this assertion and no evidence that Park Associates ever sought and was in any manner granted approval to use a non - standard allocation basis.¹⁸

Although the Board does not dispute that Park Associates faced unusual circumstances with the sale of 89 of its 118 nursing facilities, the burden of proof still falls on Park Associates to submit evidence to indicate that the use of its recommended split allocation method would result in a more sophisticated and precise allocation of pooled home office costs to the chain components. ¹⁹ The Board finds that Park Associates failed to present sufficient clear and convincing evidence at the hearing or in the record that its allocation method is more accurate or equitable. In fact, the record is void with respect to how costs were split and, at the hearing, the Medicare Contractor made the uncontroverted assertion that it had yet to obtain "documentation to support the split of costs between the first six months and the second six months of the year." ²⁰

¹⁵ Tr. at 100-101.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 102.

¹⁷ See Medicare Contractor Exhibit I-17.

¹⁸ Tr. at 89.

¹⁹ PRM 15-1 § 2150.3(D)(2)(b).

²⁰ Tr. at 68, 101, 108.

Page 5 Case No. 03-1599G

The Board notes Park Associates' concern that cost reports for the sold nursing facilities were not adjusted to reflect the increase in their share of the home office costs resulting from the revised HOCS allocations. However, the Board points out that the sold Providers could have requested reopening of their individual cost reports in order to have the home office cost allocation revised, but they failed to do so.²¹ Had those nursing facilities requested reopening, the additional costs allocated to those nursing facilities on the finalized HOCS could have been included on their terminating cost reports.

Finally, Park Associates requests that the Board instruct the Medicare Contractor to disregard the reported imputed days and direct the Medicare Contractor to use actually incurred patient days to allocate the pooled costs. During the hearing, the Medicare Contractor discussed the audit of the days reported on the Park Associates' HOCS and noted that Park Associates, itself, had requested that imputed days be used for the Texas and Illinois nursing facilities to more accurately reflect what they considered additional costs to those nursing facilities. The record further shows the Medicare Contractor accepted Park Associates' reported days including the imputed days for the sold nursing facilities in order to reflect additional costs after the sale. Accordingly, the Board cannot find that the Medicare Contractor's decision to accept reported imputed days was an abuse of discretion or that the Medicare Contractor's decision should be reversed.

DECISION

After considering the Medicare law and regulations, the parties' contentions, and the evidence submitted, the Board finds that the Medicare Contractor properly allocated pooled home office costs to the Providers in the subject appeal.

BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATING:

Michael W. Harty Clayton J. Nix, Esq. L. Sue Andersen, Esq. Charlotte F. Benson, CPA Jack Ahern, M.B.A.

FOR THE BOARD:

/s/ Michael W. Harty Chairman

DATE: January 11, 2017

²¹ Tr. at 74-76.

²² Providers' Post Hearing Brief at 9.

²³ Tr. at 105-106.

Page 6 Case No. 03-1599G

APPENDIX A LIST OF PROVIDERS

up Name: The Park Associates, inc. presentative: J h F. Widmer se Numba Group Lopsal # 03-1599G ue: HOME OFFICE ADJUSTMENT (FILED SEPTEMBER 5, 2003)

·	PECEIVED	D 8 7014	107	2000	מא																									
G Date(s) Of Add/Trensfer	PECE	NA DEC D		NA A		10/27/04		06/20/04	2000		W.	and the second of the second of the second	AN		Ā		Ϋ́		10/27/04		1 2	C.	42		NA NA		414		10/27/04	-
F Prior Case No.		NA - Rev NPR Issued by FI		NA - Rev NPR Issued by FI		e z		04.0064	04040	NA - Rev NPR	iz ka penesi	NA - Rev NPR	Issued by FI		NA - Rev NPR		NA - Rev NPR Issued by FI				NA - Rev NPR	I de consei	NA - Rev NPR		NA - Rev NPR		NA - Rev NPR	L Ag poposi	2004-27	
E Amount in Controversx		4,300	П	7,800	opal,	0		12 131			0,400	1	3,200	peal,	8,200		2.900		6.100	П	1 600	1	.008	1	1400	1	000	1	4.800	
Audit Adi. No. C	•	-	d for initial Group App		d for initial Group App	ΨN		•	appeal of a later dete.	,	d for initial Group App		1	d for minal Group Ap	,	d for initial Group App	_	d for Initial Group App	4	d for initial Group App		d for initial Group Api		d for Initial Group App		d for Initial Group Api		d for Initial Group Apr		appeal at a later date.
No. of Days		185	stment, Direct Ado	1) 165	stment, Direct Ado	Ą		92,	ferred to Group A	405	lustment, Direct Art		36	sment, Direct Ad	1) 150	stment, Direct Add	(1) 185	stment, Direct Adi	¥	stment, Direct Ad	307	stment, Direct Ad	186	stment, Direct Ad	148	stment, Direct Ad	400	stment. Direct Ad	180	ferred to Group A
B Hearing Request Date		09/06/03	Home Office Adju	09/05/03 (1)	Home Office Adju	¥	br this provider,	Ady British	Omehe, then frem	i solation	Home Office Adia	-	09/06/03 (1)	Home Office Adju	09/05/03 (1)	Home Office Adju	09/90/03	Home Office Adju	¥	Home Office Adju	(A) SOLECTION	Home Office Adju	09/05/03 (1)	Home Office Att/u	00,05,03 (4)	Home Office Adlu	CAN POSTOR CAN	Home Office Adlu	03/08/04	Omeha, then fram
A Date of Final Determination		03/24/03 R	lypesi Filed Before 8/21/2003 - Cost Report Revised Solely for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appesi.	03/24/03 R	ppeal Filed Bafora 8/21/2008 - Cost Report Revised Solely for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appeal.	02/04/02	stment so there is no issue for this provider	09/11/03	Appeal Fliet Before & 21/2008 - Fl Appeal flied First with Mutuel of Omena than transferred to Group Appeal at a later date.	D SOLLOW	Abbesi Filed Before 872/1006 Cost Report Ravised Solely for the Home Office Achiefment. Direct dot for this Group Abbesi.		07/31/03 R	Appear fred bench extrave - Cost Nebolt Nevised Solety for the nome Office Adjustment, bifect Add for findin Group Appear.	04/08/03 R	Appeal Filed Before \$22/2008 - Cost Report Revised Solely for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appeal.	03/24/03 R	Appeal Filed Before \$21/2006 - Cost Report Revised Solety for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appeal	03/15/06	Appeal Piled Before 8/21/2006 - Cost Report Revised Solely for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Broup Appeal	a survey	123 Plan Institute Company (2008 - 2018) Order (2018) Ord	03/24/03 B	Appeal Flied Before 8/21/2008 - Cost Report Revised Solety for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appeal.	G SOLATOR	Appeal First Institute (27/17008 - Cost Record Revised Science Forms Office Adjustment, Direct Add for Initial Group Appeal.	G 507707	Anne I instrument Control of Control Revised Solovior I. Anne I illed Before & 21/2008 - Cost Report Revised Solovior II. Anne I illed Before & 21/2008 - Cost Report Revised Solovior II.	09/10/03 R	Appeal Filed Before 8/21/2006 - Fl Appeal filed First with Mutual of Omaha , then transferred to Group Appeal at a later date.
Flacal	0 0 0	Mutual of Omaha Insurance Company	efore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha Insurance Company	store 8/21/2005 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha — 12/01/98 Insurance Company	를	Mutual of Omaha	sfore 8/21/2008 - Fi Appea	Mutual of Omaha	afore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha	Insurance Company	8/2// CM9 - COST VE	Multual of Omana Insurance Company	efore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha	efore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutuel of Omeha Insurance Company	efore 8/21/2006 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omana	efore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaina	afore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omana	afore 8/21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha	afore \$21/2008 - Cost Re	Mutual of Omaha	efore 8/21/2008 - FI Appe
EXE		M 12/31/98 In	Appeal Filed B	12/31/98 In	Appeal Filed B	// 12/04/08 In	Fl never adjust	A dolated	Appeal Filed B	N of the state of	Appeal Filed B	N	12/31/98 //	Appeal Filed B	/ // // // // // // // // // // // // //	Appeal Filed B	A 12/31/98 Jr	Appeal Filed B	1		A contact	Appeal Filed B	A ADVITOR	Appeal Filed B	A soltact	Appeal Filed B	A 400 400 4	Appeal Filed B	12/31/08 //	Appeal Filed B
Provider Provider Name Number (City, County, State)	LTHCARE CENTERS OF INDIANA, L.L.C d/b/a/:	Chateau Care Center	Muncle, Delaware, IN	Chesterton HCC	Chesterton, Porter, IN	Siffy Falls 1189 *	Madison, Jefferson, IN	* 001	Covinction, Fountain, IN	The state of the s	Dillehoro Dearborn IN	All Property of the Common of	Dreyerhaus HCC		Forest Del Health & Rehab	Princeton, Gibson, IN	Herifade House - Greencestle	Greencastle, Pulnam, IN	***************************************	Martinsville, Morgan, IN		Huntingburg Dubols, IN	Out provide O	New Castle, Henry, IN	order Contact	Bisha Sim Oho IN	To Colon Books & Bokes	Indianapolis Madon IN	Vorkfown HCC	Yorktown, Delaware, IN
Províder Number	CENTERS OF	15-5443		15-5246		6.5208		45 8000	0.0880		15-5260		15-5233		16-5216		16.4900	-	45 2402			15-521/		10-0004	unia ar	10-0463	20,000	15-5409	4E K998	10-20-01
erence	LTHCARE	-		2				,			0		9		+							10	;			77	!	13	;	*

(1) - Refer to Tab 1B for the Hearing Request for all 10 of these Indiana Providers.

Impacts were parciculated by entering all soulst adjustments into the MCR cost report softwere so that both Part A and B settlements agree to the latest issued NPR. Worksheets are attached for each facility.

* Dismissed by PRRB by letter dated April 7, 2015.

		×										ਕਾ	<u>م</u> ا	г		
t	Date(s) Of Add/Transfer	08/05/03	09/05/03 (2)	09/05/03 (2)	08/02/03 (2)	08/02/03 (2)	09/06/03 (2)	10/27/04	10/27/04	09/06/03 (2)	09/05/03 (2)	09/05/03 (2)	09/05/03 (2) coriginal NPRs.		08/04/04	×
	Prior Case No.	F1#010282	FI#010344	FI#010281	FI#010289 PRRB,	FI#010288	FI#010283	PRRB#011429	N/A 27/2004.	F1#010343 o PRRB.	FI#010345 o PRRB.	FI#010280 to PRRB.	N/A nd been issued their		NA - Rev NPR	shed for each facilit
1 1	Amount in	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse Services, Syracuse 08/34/00 02/16/01 169 9.8.10 10,700 FI#010282	Employ Modificato Services, Syracuse 1804199- New York 2012,000 (22,20)01 180 2 7,100 Fils Appeal Filed Bahow 821,2008 - Fi Appeal filed First with Employ Medicane Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employ Medicane Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employ Medicane Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employ Medicane Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employ Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial appeal filed First with Employee Medicane Services and the services are serviced to Group Appeal on Initial	Empire Medicare Services, Synaciase 09/12/00 02/13/01 154 3.8.4 3.4.00 Fits Anneal Films Before 22/12/00 17/12/01 154 3.8.4 3.4.00 Fits Anneal Films Before 22/12/00 17/14/10 Films Infrared to Group Appeal on Initial speel inter to PRRB.	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse CAUGHNB- New York Services, Syracuse Appeal Filed Baren & Strizoge - H Appeal final First with Empire Medicare Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal either to PRRs.	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse 08/30/00 02/06/01 162 2 1,200 File Association Behavior 2 1,200 File Association Behavior 801/2001 El Appeal filed Files Perior Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Hilbs leapes in fetrat to PRPR.	Cappeal in the Medicare Services, Syracuse 08/14/00 02/08/01 178 18 & 17 1/200 FileO10283 08/14/00 02/08/01 170 08/01/14/00 FileO10283 08/01/01 170 06/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/01/	4,100	Emplore Medicare Services, Syracuse Oslog/00 NA 180 9.5.10 500 B New York and the Leading twee fixed the way fixed final mount, eithough it was edded in with the other NY facilities on 1027/2004.	Trip proving from the Medicare Services, Syracuse Coloration (178 2 2.500 Fib010343 Appeal fined First With Empire Medicare Services, then transferred to Group Appeal on Initial appeal since to PRRB.	Empire Madicare Services, Syracuse 12291789 Nav York Anneal Flee Before \$21,000 Fleet To FREE.	09/09/00 02/05/01 180 6.8.7 3,400 FI#010280 el mittal appeal letter to PRRB.	Empire Medicure Services, Syracuse Services, Syracuse 08/14/00 N/A 180 6 & 7 46 N/A 09/05/03 This provider never appealed their adjustment since it was ineignificant in amount, although it was added in with all other IV facilities that had been issued their original INPRs.	43,146	5,359 roup Appeal.	Total 122,936 Total Transfer Request for all 9 New York previous F1 Appeals. In the PRRB Group Transfer Request for all 9 New York previous F1 Appeals. Itening all aucit adjustments into the MCR cost report software so that both Part A and B settlements agree to the latest issued NPR. Worksheels are attached for each facility.
	Audit Adl. No.	9 & 10	2 d to Group Appeal o	3 & 4 d to Group Appeal o	9 & 10 d to Group Appeal o	2 d to Group Appeal	18 & 17 Id to Group Appeal	1 10/27/2004.	9 & 10 added in with the o	2 ad to Group Appeal	2 ed to Group Appeal	6 & 7 ed to Group Appeal	6 & 7 added in with all of		1 t Add for existing G	Total
	No. of Days	169	180 In transferre	154 an transferre	177 en transferre	182 en transferre	178	184 up Appeal or	180 Tough it was	178 en transferre	154 an transfarm	180 Ion transferr	180 hough it was		181 tment, Direct	agree to the
	B Hearing Reguest Date	02/16/01	02/20/01 Redicare Services , the	02/13/01 Medicare Services , the	02/02/01 Nedicare Services , th	02/08/01 Medicare Services . th	02/08/01	Appear from Services Best Account of Frings Control of Services Se	N/A Mineant in emount, eld	03/08/01 Medicare Services , th	02/20/01 Medicare Services, th	02/05/01 Medicare Services , th	N/A nificant in amount, alt		Muzua of Omeria Origing Insurance Company 2/5/2004 R 8/4/2004 - 181 1 Appeal Files Before &2/2004 - Coas Report Revised Solety for the Home Office Adjustment, Direct Add for extering Group Appeal	t A and B settlements
	Date of Final	08/31/00	08/24/00	09/12/00 First with Empire	08/09/00 First with Empire I	09/30/00 First with Empire	08/14/00 Electrolity Emples	08/25/00 First with PRRB.	08/09/00	09/09/00 First with Empire	09/19/00 First with Empire	08/09/00 First with Empire	08/14/00 tsince it was insig		2/5/2004 R devised Solely for	ious FI Appeals. e so that both Par
*	Dat	100	Appeal filed	Appeal filed	Appeal filed	Day Image		Appeal filed	Telli sili	Appeal filed	Appeal filed	Appeal filed	r adjustmen		ost Report F	w York prev port softwar
	Fiscal Intermediary	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York Before \$2217008 - FL	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York Before 8/21/2008 - FL	mpire Medicare ervices, Syracuse lew York efore 8/21/2008 - FI.	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse Vew York 3efore 8/21/2008 - FI	Empire Medicere Services, Syracuse 19/31/108 New York Appeel Filed Before 8/21/2005 - FI Appe	Empire Medicare Services, Syracuse New York never appealed the		Mutual of Omaha Insurance Company Before 8/21/2008 - C	the PRRB Group Transfer Request for all 9 New York previous FI Appeals, ering all audit adjustments into the MCR cost report software so that both Pr
SEPTEMBER 5, 2003)	ži	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	12/3/198 - Appeal Filed B	5 5 400est Filed B	2 5 42/34/98• A Appel Filed B	12/01/98	12/2/198	12/2/198	12/188	Appeal Flied	42/31/98 Anneel Filted	Appeal Fited	12/84/98- This provider	100 September 10	07/31/98 Appeal Filed	B Group Transfer Prudit adjustments in
ss, Inc. ENT (FILED	Provider Name [City, County, State]	Aurem Park HCG ING. *	Orehard Park LICE INC. *	1 11	Park Shoro HCC ING. ** Durkirk Chaulaunta NY	Arbor Park HCC ING. *	River Park HCC INC. *	Sulliven Park HGC INC. *	Three Rivers HCC ING. **	Village Park HOG ING. **	Woodland Park HGG NG. *	HIII Park HCC/NC. * Syracuse. Onondage. NY	College Park HCC INC. ** Houghton, Allegany, NY		Andrews Healthcare Center	copy o
Nams: The Park Associate entative: ph F. Widmer umbe Group Appeal # 03-1699G HOME OFFICE ADJUSTIM	ice Provider sr Number IRK FACILITIES:	16 30 5281	16 99 5597	17 09-6088	18 23 6606	10 33 5607	0185-55 0Z	21 09-6371	23-69-60	23 23-5535	\$4-99 - 5594	- 25 03-5181	26 33-5641		27 45-5947	(3