PROVIDER REIMBURSEMENT REVIEW BOARD
DECISION
On the Record

2024-D15

PROVIDER-
Fallbrook District Hospital

Provider No.: 05-0435

vs.

MEDICARE CONTRACTOR –
WPS Government Health Administrators

RECORD HEARING DATE –
February 2, 2024

Cost Reporting Period Ended –
6/30/2015

CASE NO. – 19-0124

INDEX

ISSUE STATEMENT

Whether Fallbrook District Hospital (the "Provider") is entitled to a volume decrease adjustment ("VDA") for the significant decrease in inpatient discharges that occurred in its cost reporting period ending June 30, 2015 ("FY 2015").[1]

DECISION

After considering the Medicare law and regulations, the arguments presented, and the evidence admitted, the Provider Reimbursement Review Board (the "Board") finds that the Provider is eligible for a VDA calculation for FY 2015. As the VDA determination appealed did not include a VDA calculation, the Board remands this appeal to the Medicare Contractor to perform a VDA calculation for FY 2015 consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3).[2]

INTRODUCTION

The Provider is located in Fallbrook, California and was designated as a sole community hospital ("SCH") during the fiscal year at issue.[3] The Medicare contractor[4] assigned to the Provider for this appeal is WPS Government Health Administrators ("Medicare Contractor").[5]

The Provider filed a timely request for VDA payment for FY 2015.[6] On May 14, 2018, the Medicare Contractor denied the request because it concluded that "[w]e do not believe the provider has clearly established the decline in discharges is due to unusual circumstances beyond the providers [sic] control."[7] On June 29, 2018, the Provider filed a Request for Reconsideration. According to the Provider, they have yet to receive a response to the Request for Reconsideration and there is none in the Board's record.[8] Significantly, the May 14, 2018 determination does *not* include, reference or make a VDA payment calculation.

On October 25, 2018, the Provider filed its appeal request with the Board and appealed the May 14, 2018 VDA denial. Specifically, the Provider appealed the Medicare Contractor's finding that the Provider failed to establish that the decline in discharges was due to circumstances beyond the Provider's control.

---

[1] Provider's Optional Responsive Brief at 2 (June 22, 2023); Medicare Contractor's Final Position Paper ("Medicare Contractor's FPP") at 5 (May 30, 2023).
[2] All citations to the regulations in this decision are as of June 30, 2015 unless otherwise specified.
[3] Record Hearing Request and Stipulation of Facts (hereinafter "Stipulations") at ¶ 1 (Jan. 19, 2024).
[4] CMS' payment and audit functions under the Medicare program were historically contracted to organizations known as fiscal intermediaries ("FIs") and these functions are now contracted with organizations known as Medicare administrative contractors ("MACs"). The term "Medicare contractor" refers to both FIs and MACs, as appropriate.
[5] Stipulations at ¶ 4.
[6] *Id*. at ¶ 5.
[7] VDA Denial Letter at 1, Exhibit ("Ex.") P-2. The Board notes that Stipulations at ¶ 6 *incorrectly* state that, as part of the May 14, 2018 VDA denial letter, the MAC "concluded that the Provider's inpatient prospective payment system (IPPS) payments for its operating costs exceeded the Provider's allowable inpatient fixed and semi-fixed operating costs." The copy of the May 14, 2018 VDA denial included in the record as an attachment to the Provider's appeal request (as well as Ex. P-2 as attached to the Provider's Final Position Paper) does ***not*** include this finding.
[8] Provider's Final Position Paper ("Provider's FPP") at 2 (Apr. 27, 2023).

The Provider's appeal of the May 14, 2018 VDA denial was timely and met all jurisdictional requirements for a hearing before the Board. On February 2, 2024, the Board approved a record hearing. The stipulations agreed to by the parties to facilitate the hearing on the record memorialize that: (1) the Medicare Contractor ***now*** agrees the Provider met the criteria for a greater-than-5-percent decrease in discharges beyond its control; and (2) the parties agree a VDA payment calculation for FY 2015 should be made but disagree on the methodology to make that calculation.[9]

The Provider was represented by Ronald K. Rybar of The Rybar Group, Inc. The Medicare Contractor was represented by Scott Berends, Esq. of Federal Specialized Services.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND RELEVANT LAW

The Medicare program pays certain hospitals a predetermined, standardized amount per discharge under the inpatient prospective payment system ("IPPS") based on the diagnosis-related group ("DRG") assigned to the patient. These DRG payments are also subject to certain payment adjustments. One of these payment adjustments is referred to as a VDA payment. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(D)(ii), VDA payments are designed "to fully compensate the hospital for the fixed costs it incurs in the period in providing inpatient hospital services, including the reasonable cost of maintaining necessary core staff and services."

The implementing regulations, located at 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e), reflect these statutory requirements. Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e), a VDA adjustment is available to SCHs if, "due to circumstances beyond their control," they incur a decrease in their total number of inpatient discharges of more than five percent (5%) from one cost reporting year to the next:

> (e) *Additional payments to sole community hospitals experiencing a significant volume decrease*. (1) For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 1983, the intermediary provides for a payment adjustment for a sole community hospital for any cost reporting period during which the hospital experiences, **due to circumstances as described in paragraph (e)(2) of this section a more than five percent decrease in its total discharges of inpatients as compared to its immediately preceding cost reporting period**. . . .
>
> (2) To qualify for a payment adjustment on the basis of a decrease in discharges, a sole community hospital must submit its request no later than 180 days after the date on the intermediary's Notice of Amount of Program Reimbursement—
>
> (i) Submit to the intermediary documentation demonstrating the size of the decrease in discharges, and the resulting effect on per discharge costs; and

[9] Stipulations at ¶ 3, 8 and 11.

> (ii) Show that the decrease is due to circumstances beyond the hospital's control.
>
> (3) **The intermediary determines a lump sum adjustment amount** not to exceed the difference between the hospital's Medicare inpatient operating costs and the hospital's total DRG revenue for inpatient operating costs based on DRG-adjusted prospective payment rates for inpatient operating costs (including outlier payments for inpatient operating costs determined under subpart F of this part and additional payments made for inpatient operating costs for hospitals that serve a disproportionate share of low-income patients as determined under § 412.106 and for indirect medical education costs as determined under § 412.105).
>
> (i) **In determining the adjustment amount, the intermediary considers**—
>
> (A) **The individual hospital's needs and circumstances**, including the reasonable cost of maintaining necessary core staff and services in view of minimum staffing requirements imposed by State agencies;
>
> (B) The hospital's fixed (and semifixed) costs, other than those costs paid on a reasonable cost basis under part 413 of this chapter; and
>
> (C) The length of time the hospital has experienced a decrease in utilization.
>
> (ii) The intermediary makes its determination within 180 days from the date it receives the hospital's request and all other necessary information.
>
> (iii) **The intermediary determination is subject to review under subpart R of part 405 of this chapter**.[10]

Significantly, 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) makes clear that, when calculating a VDA payment, the Medicare Contactor must take into account multiple factors including but not limited to "[t]he individual hospital's needs and circumstances."

The Medicare Contractor denied the Provider's original VDA request for a VDA payment in the amount of $562,800,[11] noting that the Provider failed to establish that the decline in discharges

[10] (Bold and underline emphasis added.)
[11] Ex. P-1 at 22 (copy of the VDA request).

was due to an unusual event or occurrence beyond its control. *Significantly, the original May 14, 2018 determination* that was appealed to the Board *did not include a VDA calculation*.

More than five (5) years after the Provider filed its appeal of the original May 14, 2018 determination, the Provider submitted a request for a record hearing and, with that request, included stipulations agreed to by the Parties wherein the Medicare Contractor ***now*** recognizes that the "Provider met the criteria in 42 C.F.R. §412.92(e) for the fiscal year at issue…"[12], "[t]he Provider experienced a decrease in discharges of more than five percent…"[13] and "[t]he remaining issue to be determined is the correct VDA payment calculation."[14]

Following the parties' stipulation that the Provider ***now*** qualifies to have a VDA payment calculation performed for FY 2015, the parties then determined that they dispute the appropriate application of the statute and regulation governing VDAs for purposes of calculating the FY 2015 VDA payment.[15]

DISCUSSION, FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Pursuant to 42. C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3)(iii), a Medicare contractor's VDA "***determination*** is subject to [Board] review under subpart R of part 405 of this chapter."[16] Accordingly, the Board finds it has jurisdiction in this case as a result of the original May 14, 2018 VDA denial that was appealed to the Board. This *determination* contends that the Provider did not meet the greater than five percent (5%) decrease in discharges between years due to an unusual event or occurrence beyond its control. However, the original May 14, 2018 VDA determination that the Provider appealed did *not* include a formal Medicare Contractor determination of the amount the Provider would be due (if any) under 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) if it were eligible for a VDA adjustment for FY 2015. Similarly, the appeal request filed by the Provider does not raise the *methodology* for the VDA calculation as a disputed item for appeal, presumably because the Medicare Contactor had not yet issued a determination on a VDA calculation since it had determined that the Provider did not qualify for a VDA adjustment calculation in the first instance. Indeed, in this regard, the Board notes that its review is limited to "the intermediary determination" per 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) and the determination appealed to the Board (the May 14, 2018 VDA denial) did not address or make any determination on a VDA payment or a methodology for that payment. Therefore, the issue properly before the Board in this case is limited to the May 14, 2018 VDA denial for FY 2015 and whether, for FY 2015, the Provider "experience[d], due to circumstances as described in paragraph (e)(2) of this section, a more than five percent decrease in its total discharges of inpatients as compared to its immediately preceding cost reporting period."[17]

Consistent with 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(D)(ii) *and* based upon the Board's finding of jurisdiction, the parties' stipulations, the parties' agreement to conduct a hearing on the record, and the record before the Board, the Board:

---

[12] Stipulations at ¶ 3.
[13] *Id*. at ¶ 5.
[14] *Id*. at ¶ 7.
[15] Provider's FPP at 10-11; Medicare Contractor's FPP at 23-25.
[16] (Emphasis added.)
[17] 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(1).

1. Accepts the parties' agreement in the Stipulations at ¶¶ 3 and 5 that, for FY 2015, "the Provider met the criteria in 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)"[18] specifying that, in order to be eligible for a VDA payment calculation for FY 2015, it must experience, due to circumstances beyond is control, a decrease in discharges of more than five percent (5%) for FY 2015 in comparison to FY 2014; and

2. Finds that the Provider is ***now*** *eligible* to have a VDA calculation completed by the Medicare Contractor for FY 2015.

However, the record before the Board shows that the Medicare Contractor did *not* make and issue, pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3)(i)-(ii), a determination on the VDA calculation ***in the May 14, 2018 determination that is on appeal to the Board in the instant case***.[19] This regulation specifies that, when making a VDA calculation, the Medicare Contactor must take into account multiple factors, including but not limited to "the individual hospital's needs and circumstances."[20] As 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3)(iii) limits Board review to the determination on appeal, and the May 14, 2018 determination appealed to the Board did not address or make a VDA calculation for FY 2015, the Board finds that remand to the Medicare Contractor is appropriate. Accordingly, pursuant to its authority under 42 C.F.R. § 405.1845(h), the Board hereby remands this appeal to the Medicare Contractor with direction to perform a VDA calculation consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) and, if indicated by the calculation, to make an additional VDA payment for FY 2015. The Board's remand in this case is consistent with its remand in other cases with similar circumstances[21]

DECISION

After considering the Medicare law and regulations, the arguments presented, and the evidence admitted, the Board finds that the Provider is eligible for a VDA calculation for FY 2015. As the VDA determination appealed did not include a VDA calculation, the Board remands this appeal to the Medicare Contractor to perform a VDA calculation for FY 2015 consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3).

---

[18] Stipulations at ¶ 3.

[19] Provider has included with their Final Position Paper a copy (Ex. P-10) of revised cost report worksheets showing the Provider's calculation of revised inpatient operating costs.

[20] 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3)(i)(A).

[21] Examples of recent VDA cases where the Board has remanded back to the Medicare contractor include: *Methodist Hosp. South fka South Texas Reg'l Med. Ctr. v. WPS – Gov. Health Adm'rs,* PRRB Dec. 2022-D36 (Sept. 26, 2022); *Skiff Med. Ctr. v. Wisconsin Physicians Serv.*, PRRB Dec. 2022-D19 (April 27, 2022); *Grinnell Reg'l Med. Ctr. v. Wisconsin Physicians Serv*., PRRB Dec. 2016-D03 (Dec. 1, 2015); *Alta Vista Reg'l Hosp. v. Wisconsin Physicians Serv.*, PRRB Dec. 2015-D9 (May 12, 2015); *Porter Hosp. Middlebury, Vt. v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield Ass'n*, PRRB Dec. 2013-D34 (Aug. 29, 2013); *Rice Mem'l Hosp. v. National Gov. Servs.*, PRRB Dec. 2018-D51 (Sept. 28, 2018); *St. Mary's Reg'l Hosp. v. National Gov. Servs.*, PRRB Dec. 2018-D52 (Sept. 28, 2018).

BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATING:

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Kevin D. Smith, CPA
Ratina Kelly, CPA
Nicole E. Musgrave, Esq.

FOR THE BOARD:

5/17/2024

X Clayton J. Nix

Clayton J. Nix, Esq.
Chair
Signed by: PIV