

## CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES

### In the case of:

**Oswego Hospital**

**Provider**

**vs.**

**National Government Services, Inc.**

**Medicare Contractor**

### Claim for:

**Cost Reporting Period Ending:  
December 31, 2011**

**Review of:  
PRRB Dec. No. 2021-D26  
Dated: July 29,2021**

This case is before the Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), for review of the decision of the Provider Reimbursement Review Board (Board). The review is during the 60-day period in §1878(f) (1) of the Social Security Act (Act), as amended (42 USC 1395oo (f)). The parties were notified of the Administrator’s intention to review the Board’s decision. The Center for Medicare (CM) and the Medicare Administrative Contractor both submitted comments requesting that the Administrator reverse the Board’s decision with respect to the Volume Decrease Adjustment (VDA). The Provider submitted comments with respect to the VDA calculation requesting that the CMS Administrator affirm the Board’s decision. However, the Provider stated that, in the alternative, if the Administrator seeks to review the Board’s decision, the CMS Administrator should modify the Board’s decision and it should be limited to reinstating the MAC’s original determination and reject the MAC’s revised calculation. Accordingly, this case is now before the Administrator for final agency review.

### ISSUE AND BOARD DECISION

The issue is whether the Medicare Contractor properly calculated the volume decrease adjustment (“VDA”) owed to the Provider for the significant decrease in inpatient discharges that occurred in its cost reporting period ending December 31, 2011 (“FY 2011”) and whether the MAC properly reopened the original VDA approval

The Board held that the MAC had the authority to reopened the original VDA approval pursuant to 42 C.F.R. § 405.1885(a) and 42 C.F.R. § 405.1885(b)(1). The Board found that the MAC acted in keeping with the applicable statute and regulations and had the authority to reopen and revise the VDA determination. Furthermore, the Board determined that the fact that the MAC may have previously calculated the VDA differently does not mean that the MAC departed from Medicare policy; nor does it mean that because a MAC has historically used the wrong calculation method that the method is considered CMS policy. The Board rejected the Provider’s APA and recent

Supreme court arguments that CMS departed from its established VDA calculation methodology noting that this case is not consistent with the facts of *Azar v. Allina*<sup>1</sup> and that CMS is allowed to adopt new policy via case-by-case adjudication.

The Board held that the MAC's improperly calculated the Provider's VDA payment for FY 2011. In reaching this determination, the Board concluded that the methodology used by the MAC did not fully compensate the Provider for its fixed cost since the MAC's calculation compared fixed costs to total Medicare payments. In the Board's view the Provider's fixed costs should have been compared to the portion of the IPPS payment that represented payment for fixed costs and not total IPPS payment as computed by the MAC. Therefore, since the Board did not have access to the IPPS actuarial data to determine the split between fixed and variable cost related to a DRG payment the Board opted to use the MAC's fixed/variable cost percentage as a proxy.

In this case, the MAC had determined that the Provider's fixed costs were 91.30 percent of its Medicare costs for FY 2011. Applying this rationale, the Board concluded that the Provider's VDA payment for FY 2011 should be \$2,306,489. Since the Provider had already received a VDA payment in the amount of \$1,162,276 the Provider should receive an additional VDA payment in the amount of \$1,144,213 for FY 2011.

#### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

The MAC and CM submitted comments, requesting that the Administrator affirm the Board's determination with respect to the reopening issue. With respect to the reopening, the MAC and CM did not challenge the Board's decision as the Board correctly found that the reopening was proper.

The MAC and CM submitted comments, requesting that the Administrator reverse the Board's decision with respect to the VDA calculation and uphold the determination and methodology utilized by the MAC. They contend that the methodology used by the Board to calculate the Provider's VDA payment is not in accord with CMS policy, court decisions, and past Administrator decisions. They argue that the Board's methodology requires modification to existing law to survive a statutory challenge, and those modifications are prospective only and not relevant to the fiscal year at hand.

The Provider submitted comments, requesting that the CMS Administrator affirm the Board's decision. However, in the alternative, if the Administrator seeks to review the Board's decision, the CMS Administrator should modify the Board's decision. Such modification should be limited to reinstating the MAC's original VDA approval and rejecting the MAC's revised VDA approval.

#### BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The entire record, which was furnished by the Board, has been examined, including all correspondence, position papers, and exhibits.

---

<sup>1</sup> 139 S. Ct. 1804 (2020)(holding that CMS could not adopt substantive legal changes without proper promulgation).

The Provider is an acute care hospital located in Oswego, New York. For the fiscal period in dispute, the Provider experienced a decrease in discharges greater than 5 percent, due to circumstances beyond its control, and as a result, was eligible to have the VDA calculation performed. As such, the Provider requested a VDA payment in the amount of \$2,271,866. On February 25, 2013, the MAC originally calculated the Provider's VDA payment to be \$2,956,089. However, the MAC notified the Provider on February 5, 2016 that it was reopening the original VDA determination. By letter dated July 22, 2016 the MAC issued a revised VDA approval in the amount of \$1,162,276, requiring a repayment by the Provider in the amount of \$1,793,813. The Provider, timely appealed and met all jurisdictional requirements for a hearing before the Board.

The Administrator notes the procedural difference in this case varies from other VDA cases, particularly regarding the MAC's reopening of the original VDA adjustment amount to remove variable costs from the calculation. However, the Administrator agrees with the Board's finding that the MAC had the authority to reopen and revise the VDA determination. The Board properly pointed to the MAC's authority under 42 C.F.R. 405.1885(a) to revise a final determination. Additionally, the Board was also correct to find that a MAC's historical method of calculations does not create CMS policy. The Administrator finds that Allina is not invoked as the MAC's revised payment calculation methodology is the result of the application of the statutory language and the properly promulgated regulation.

Section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii) of the Act, defines a SCH as any hospital:

- (I) that the Secretary determines is located more than 35 road miles from another hospital,
- (II) that, by reason of factors such as the time required for an individual to travel to the nearest alternative source of appropriate inpatient care (in accordance with standards promulgated by the Secretary), location, weather conditions, travel conditions, or absence of other like hospitals (as determined by the Secretary), is the sole source of inpatient hospital services reasonably available to individuals in a geographic area who are entitled to benefits under part A of this subchapter, or
- (III) that is located in a rural area and designated by the Secretary as an essential access community hospital under section 1820(v)(i) of this title as in effect on September 30, 1997.

Section 1886(d)(5)(D)(ii) of the Act authorizes the Secretary to adjust the payment of SCHs that incur a decrease in discharges of more than 5 percent from one cost reporting year to the next, if the circumstances leading to the decline in discharges were beyond its control. It stating:

In the case of a sole community hospital that experiences, in a cost reporting period compared to the previous cost reporting period, a decrease of more than 5 percent in its total number of inpatient cases due to circumstances beyond its control, ...as may be necessary 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 core staff and services.

The regulations implementing this statutory adjustment are located at 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e). In particular, subsection (e)(1) specifies the following regarding low volume adjustment:

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 [beyond the hospital’s control] a more than five percent decrease in its total discharges of inpatients as compared to its immediately preceding cost reporting period.

Once an SCH demonstrates that it has suffered a qualifying decrease in total inpatient discharges, the MAC must determine the appropriate amount, if any, due to the provider as an adjustment. The regulation at 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) specifies the following regarding the determination of low volume adjustment amount:

(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 ....

- (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 semi-fixed) 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.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the controlling regulation, CMS has provided further interpretive guidelines in the Provider Reimbursement Manual, (PRM 15-1). The Manual is intended to ensure that Medicare reimbursement standards “are uniformly applied nationally without regard to where covered services are furnished.”<sup>3</sup> Section 2810.1(A)(1) of the PRM defines “circumstances beyond the hospital’s control” as:

1. Circumstances Beyond the Hospital’s Control. – In order for an SCH to qualify for additional payment, the decrease in volume must result from an

---

<sup>2</sup> As reflected in the foregoing regulation and in the notice and comment rulemaking history, and as noted by CM, even if section 1871 of the Act required the VDA calculation methodology to be established through rulemaking, the agency satisfied that obligation by utilizing notice and comment rulemaking to promulgate, revise, and clarify the implementing regulation, and describing in regulation and preamble how the VDA is to be calculated. See, e.g., 49 *Fed. Reg.* 234, 270-271 (Jan. 3, 1984) (Final rule, responding to comments); 48 *Fed. Reg.* 39,752, 39,781-82 (Sept. 1, 1983) (Interim final rule with comment period); 42 C.F.R. § 405.476(d) (1984). See 52 *Fed. Reg.* 33,034, 33,049 (Sept. 1, 1987) (final rule); 52 *Fed. Reg.* 22,080, 22,090-91 (June 10, 1987) (proposed rule); 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) (1987). And, finally, in 2017, CMS issued a notice of proposed rulemaking and then a final rule which explicitly stated (and amended the regulation’s text to provide) the longstanding, then-current VDA calculation methodology (under which the VDA=Fixed Costs-DRG payments) would continue to govern earlier periods such as those at issue here. See, e.g., 82 *Fed. Reg.* 37,990, 38,179-83, 38,511 (Aug. 14, 2017) (final rule); 82 *Fed. Reg.* 19,796, 19,933-35 (Apr. 28, 2017) (proposed rule); 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) (2018).

<sup>3</sup> See CMS Pub. 15-1, Foreword.

unusual situation or occurrence externally imposed on the hospital and beyond its control. These situations may include strikes, floods, inability to recruit essential physician staff, unusual prolonged severe weather conditions, serious and prolonged economic recessions that have a direct impact on admissions, or similar occurrences with substantial cost effects.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, § 2810.1 provides guidance to assist MACs in the calculation of VDAs for sole community hospitals (SCHs). Specifically, § 2810.1(B) of the PRM states the following regarding the amount of a low volume adjustment:

B. Amount of Payment Adjustment. Additional payment is made to an eligible SCH for fixed costs it incurs in the period in providing inpatient hospital services including the reasonable cost of maintaining necessary core staff and services, not to exceed the difference between the hospital's Medicare inpatient operating cost and the hospital's total DRG revenue.

Fixed costs are those costs over which management has no control. Most truly fixed costs, such as rent, interest, and depreciation, are capital-related costs and are paid on a reasonable cost basis, regardless of volume. Variable costs, on the other hand, are those costs for items and services that vary directly with utilization such as food and laundry costs.

In a hospital setting, however, many costs are neither perfectly fixed nor perfectly variable, but are semi-fixed. Semi-fixed costs are those costs for items and services that are essential for the hospital to maintain operation but also vary somewhat with volume. For purposes of this adjustment, many semi-fixed costs, such as personnel-related costs, may be considered as fixed on a case-by-case basis.

In evaluating semi-fixed costs, the MAC considers the length of time the hospital has experienced a decrease in utilization. For a short period of time, most semi-fixed costs are considered fixed. As the period of decreased utilization continues, we expect that a cost-effective hospital would take action to reduce unnecessary expenses. Therefore, if a hospital did not take such action, some of the semifixed costs may not be included in determining the amount of the payment adjustment.

The adjustment amount includes the reasonable cost of maintaining necessary core staff and services. The intermediary reviews the determination of core staff and services based on an individual hospital's needs and circumstances; e.g., minimum staffing requirements imposed by State agencies. (Emphasis added.)

With respect to determining core staffing, § 2810.1(C)(6)(a)<sup>5</sup> states that:

6. Core Staff and Services.

---

<sup>4</sup> See, PRM 15-1, § 2810.1(A)(1).

<sup>5</sup> Rev. 479.

a. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2007, and prior to October 1, 2017, a comparison, by cost center, of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees and salaries in both cost reporting periods must be submitted. The requesting hospital must identify core staff and services in each center and the cost of these staff and services. The request must include justification of the selection of core staff and services including minimum staffing requirements imposed by an external source. The contractor's analysis of core staff is limited to those cost centers (general service, inpatient, ancillary, etc.) where costs are components of Medicare inpatient operating cost.

Core nursing staff is determined by comparing FTE staffing in the Adults and Pediatrics and Intensive Care Unit cost centers to FTE staffing in the prior year and FTE staffing in peer hospitals. Peer hospital information is obtained from data on nursing hours per patient day using the results of the occupational mix survey or the AHA Annual Survey for hospitals of the same size, geographic area (Census Division), and period of time. Acceptable core nursing staff for a year in which a hospital had a volume decline is the lesser of actual staffing in the prior fiscal year or core staff for the prior fiscal year as determined from the occupational mix survey or the AHA Annual Survey data from peer hospitals. When determining core staff hours for other than a full year, the standard hours worked must be multiplied by the actual number of weeks in the cost reporting period. For example, a hospital with a standard work week of 37.5 hours requesting a VDA for a cost reporting period of January 1, 2008, through June 30, 2008, has a paid hours per year of 975 (26 weeks x 37.5 hours per week).

In the discussion included in the preamble to the August 18, 2006 final rule<sup>6</sup>, it was noted:

The process for determining the amount of the volume decrease adjustment can be found in section 2810.1 of the Provider Reimbursement Manual. Fiscal intermediaries are responsible for establishing whether an SCH or MDH is eligible for a volume decrease adjustment and, if so, the amount of the adjustment. To qualify for this adjustment, the SCH or MDH must demonstrate that: (a) A 5 percent or more decrease of total discharges has occurred; and (b) the circumstance that caused the decrease in discharges was beyond the control of the hospital. Once the fiscal intermediary has established that the SCH or MDH satisfies these two requirements, it will calculate the adjustment. The adjustment amount is determined by subtracting the second year's DRG payment from the lesser of: (a) The second year's costs minus any adjustment for excess staff; or (b) the previous year's costs multiplied by the appropriate IPPS update factor minus any adjustment for excess staff. The SCH or MDH receives the difference in a lump-sum payment.

In the 2018 Final IPPS Rule, CMS changed the method of calculating the VDA, effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2017. In discussing this change, CMS again explained the method that is at issue in this case:

---

<sup>6</sup> 71 *Fed. Reg.*, 47,870, 48,056 (Aug. 18, 2006).

As we have noted in Section 2810.1 of the Provider Reimbursement Manual, Part 1 (PRM-1) and in adjudications rendered by the PRRB and the CMS Administrator, under the current methodology, the MAC determines a volume decrease adjustment amount not to exceed a cap calculated as the difference between the lesser of (1) the hospital's current year's Medicare inpatient operating costs or (2) its prior year's Medicare inpatient operating costs multiplied by the appropriate IPPS update factor, and the hospital's total MS-DRG revenue for inpatient operating costs (including outlier payments, DSH payments, and IME payments). In determining the volume decrease adjustment amount, the MAC considers 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; the hospital's fixed costs (including whether any semi-fixed costs are to be considered fixed) other than those costs paid on a reasonable cost basis; and the length of time the hospital has experienced a decrease in utilization.<sup>7</sup>

CMS noted that the VDA has been the subject of a series of adjudications, rendered by the PRRB and the CMS Administrator,<sup>8</sup> and that in those adjudications, the PRRB and the CMS Administrator have recognized that: "(1) The volume decrease adjustment is intended to compensate qualifying SCHs for their fixed costs only, and that variable costs are to be excluded from the adjustment; and (2) an SCH's volume decrease adjustment should be reduced to reflect the compensation of fixed costs that has already been made through MS-DRG payments."<sup>9</sup> CMS explained that it was making the change in how the VDA is calculated because:

As the above referenced Administrator decisions illustrate and explain, under the current calculation methodology, the MACs calculate the volume decrease adjustment by subtracting the entirety of the hospital's total MS-DRG revenue for inpatient operating costs, including outlier payments and IME and DSH payments in the cost reporting period in which the volume decrease occurred, from fixed costs in the cost reporting period in which the volume decrease occurred, minus any adjustment for excess staff. If the result of that calculation is greater than zero and less than the cap, the hospital receives that amount in a lump sum payment. If the result of that calculation is zero or less than zero, the hospital does not receive a volume decrease payment adjustment.

---

<sup>7</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. 37,990, 38,179 (Aug. 14, 2017).

<sup>8</sup> *Greenwood County Hospital Eureka, Kansas, v. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association/Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas*, 2006 WL 3050893 (PRRB August 29, 2006); *Unity Healthcare Muscatine, Iowa v. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association/ Wisconsin Physicians Service*, 2014 WL 5450066 (CMS Administrator September 4, 2014); *Lakes Regional Healthcare Spirit Lake, Iowa v. Blue Cross Blue Shield Association/Wisconsin Physicians Service*, 2014 WL 5450078 (CMS Administrator September 4, 2014); *Fairbanks Memorial Hospital v. Wisconsin Physician Services/BlueCross BlueShield Association*, 2015 WL 5852432 (CMS Administrator, August 5, 2015); *St. Anthony Regional Hospital v. Wisconsin Physicians Service*, 2016 WL 7744992 (CMS Administrator October 3, 2016); and *Trinity Regional Medical Center v. Wisconsin Physician Services*, 2017 WL 2403399 (CMS Administrator February 9, 2017).

<sup>9</sup> 82 Fed. Reg. at 38,180.

Under the IPPS, MS–DRG payments are not based on an individual hospital’s actual costs in a given cost reporting period. However, the main issue raised by the PRRB and individual hospitals is that, under the current calculation methodology, if the hospital’s total MS–DRG revenue for treating Medicare beneficiaries for which it incurs inpatient operating costs (consisting of fixed, semi-fixed, and variable costs) exceeds the hospital’s fixed costs, the calculation by the MACs results in no volume decrease adjustment for the hospital. In some recent decisions, the PRRB has indicated that it believes it would be more appropriate for the MACs to adjust the hospital’s total MS–DRG revenue from Medicare by looking at the ratio of a hospital’s fixed costs to its total costs (as determined by the MAC) and applying that ratio as a proxy for the share of the hospital’s MS–DRG payments that it assumes are attributable (or allocable) to fixed costs, and then comparing that estimate of the fixed portion of MS–DRG payments to the hospital’s fixed costs. In this way, the calculation would compare estimated Medicare revenue for fixed costs to the hospital’s fixed costs when determining the volume decrease adjustment.<sup>10</sup>

However, CMS pointed out that despite the change, the previous method was still reasonable and consistent with the statute. CMS stated:

We continue to believe that our current approach in calculating volume decrease adjustments is reasonable and consistent with the statute. The relevant statutory provisions, at sections 1886(d)(5)(D)(ii) and 1886(d)(5)(G)(iii) of the Act, are silent about and thus delegate to the Secretary the responsibility of determining which costs are to be deemed “fixed” and what level of adjustment to IPPS payments may be necessary to ensure that total Medicare payments have fully compensated an SCH or MDH for its “fixed costs.” These provisions suggest that the volume decrease adjustment amount should be reduced (or eliminated as the case may be) to the extent that some or all of an SCH’s or MDH’s fixed costs have already been compensated through other Medicare subsection (d) payments. The Secretary’s current approach is also consistent with the regulations and the PRM–1. Like the statute, the relevant regulations do not address variable costs, and the regulations and the PRM– 1 (along with the Secretary’s preambles to issued rules (48 FR 39781 through 39782 and 55 FR 15156) and adjudications) all make it clear that the volume decrease adjustment is intended to compensate qualifying SCHs and MDHs for their fixed costs, not for their variable costs, and that variable costs are to be excluded from the volume decrease adjustment calculation. Nevertheless, we understand why hospitals might take the view that CMS should make an effort, in some way, to ascertain whether a portion of MS–DRG payments can be allocated or attributed to fixed costs in order to fulfill the statutory mandate to “fully compensate” a qualifying SCH for its fixed costs.<sup>11</sup>

CMS revised the regulations at 42 C.F.R. § 412.92(e)(3) to reflect the change in the MAC’s calculation of the volume decrease adjustment that would apply prospectively to cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2017, and to reflect that the language requiring that the

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*



volume decrease adjustment amount not exceed the difference between the hospital's Medicare inpatient operating costs and the hospital's total DRG revenue for inpatient operating costs would only apply to cost reporting periods beginning before October 1, 2017, but not to subsequent cost reporting periods. While some commenters suggested that the new method should be applied retroactively, CMS noted:

We also do not agree that we should apply our proposed methodology retroactively. The IPPS is a prospective system and, absent legislation, a judicial decision, or other compelling considerations to the contrary, we generally make changes to IPPS regulations effective prospectively based on the date of discharge or the start of a cost reporting period within a certain Federal fiscal year. We believe following our usual approach and applying the new methodology for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2017 would allow for the most equitable application of this methodology among all IPPS providers seeking to qualify for volume decrease adjustments. For these reasons, we are finalizing that our proposed changes to the volume decrease adjustment methodology will apply prospectively for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2017.<sup>12</sup>

The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the methodology used by CMS, noting:

The Secretary's interpretation is a reasonable interpretation of the plain language of the statute. The precise language at issue says that the VDA should be given "as may be necessary to fully compensate" a qualified hospital "for the fixed costs it incurs . . . in providing inpatient hospital services." 42 U.S.C. § 1395ww(d)(5)(D)(ii). The Secretary's interpretation ensures that the total amount of a hospital's fixed costs in a given cost year are paid out through a combination of DRG payments and the VDA. As the Secretary points out, the prospective nature of DRG payments makes it difficult to determine how best to allocate those payments against the actual fixed costs a hospital incurs. Given the lack of guidance in the statute and the substantial deference we afford to the agency in this case, the Secretary's decision reasonably complied with the mandate to provide full compensation.<sup>13</sup>

The Eighth Circuit found that, just because CMS prospectively adopted a new interpretation, that it was not a sufficient reason to find that the Secretary's prior interpretation was arbitrary or capricious.<sup>14</sup> The Eighth Circuit pointed out that the main argument that the Secretary's prior interpretation was arbitrary and capricious relied on the premise that the PRM's sample

---

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 38,182.

<sup>13</sup> *Unity HealthCare v. Azar*, 918 F.3d 571, 577 (8th Cir. 2019).

<sup>14</sup> The Eighth Circuit cited, "An initial agency interpretation is not instantly carved in stone. On the contrary, the agency . . . must consider varying interpretations and the wisdom of its policy on a continuing basis." *Nat'l Cable & Telecommunications Ass'n v. Brand X Internet Servs.*, 545 U.S. 967, 981 (2005) (quoting *Chevron*, 467 U.S. at 863–64); see also *LaRouche v. FEC*, 28 F.3d 137, 141 (D.C. Cir. 1994) ("The mere fact that regulations were modified, without more, is simply not enough to demonstrate that the prior regulations were invalid."). The Court also noted, "A statute can have more than one reasonable interpretation, as in this case. See *Smiley v. Citibank (S.D.), N.A.*, 517 U.S. 735, 744–45 (1996) (stating that "the question before us is not whether [an agency interpretation] represents the best interpretation of the statute, but whether it represents a reasonable one")."

calculations conflict with the Secretary's interpretation and that the Secretary is bound by the PRM. As the Eighth Circuit pointed out, though:

However, the examples are not presented in isolation. The same section of the Manual reiterates that the volume-decrease adjustment is "not to exceed the difference between the hospital's Medicare inpatient operating cost and the hospital's total DRG revenue." In a decision interpreting § 2810.1(B) immediately following the Secretary's guidance, the Board found "that the examples are intended to demonstrate how to calculate the adjustment limit as opposed to determining which costs should be included in the adjustment." See *Greenwood Cty. Hosp. v. BlueCross BlueShield Ass'n*, No. 2006-D43, 2006 WL 3050893, at \*9 n.19 (P.R.R.B. Aug. 29, 2006). That decision was not reviewed by the Secretary and therefore became a final agency action. The agency's conclusion that the examples are meant to display the ceiling for a VDA, rather than its total amount, is a reasonable interpretation of the regulation's use of "not to exceed," rather than "equal to," when describing the formula. We conclude that the Secretary's interpretation was not arbitrary or capricious and was consistent with the regulation.<sup>15</sup>

This case centers on the application of the statute and regulation to the proper classification and treatment of costs and the proper calculation of the amount for the low volume adjustment. The Administrator's examination of the governing statute and implementing regulation and guidance clearly recognize three categories of costs, i.e., fixed, semi-fixed and variable. The guidance only considers fixed and semi-fixed costs within the calculation of the volume adjustment but not variable costs.

Regarding the methodology and proper calculation of the Provider's payment adjustment, the Administrator finds that the Board improperly calculated the Provider's adjustment. The VDA calculation methodology used by the Board is in direct contradiction to the statute and CMS' regulations and guidance. The Board found the VDA in this case should be calculated as follows:

Step 1: Calculation of the CAP

2010 Medicare Inpatient Operating Costs	\$16384,752
Multiplied by the 2011 IPPS update factor	<u>1.0235</u>
2010 Updated Costs (Max allowed)	\$16,769,794
2011 Medicare Inpatient Operating Costs	\$15,682,265
Lower of 2010 Updated Costs or 2011 Costs	\$15,682,265
Less 2011 IPPS payment	<u>\$13,155,990</u>
2011 Payment Cap	<u>\$2,526,275</u>

Step 2: Calculation of VDA

---

<sup>15</sup> *Unity* at 578.

2011 Medicare Inpatient Fixed Operating Cost –	
Fixed portion (91.30 percent)	\$14,317,908
Less 2011 IPPS amount – fixed portion (91.30 percent)	<u>\$12,011,419</u>
Payment adjustment amount (subject to CAP)_	<u>\$2,306,489<sup>16</sup></u>

As shown above, the Board determined that, as the payment adjustment amount of \$2,306,489 is less than the CAP of \$2,526,275, the Provider's VDA payment for FY 2011 should be \$2,306,489. Therefore, since the Provider had already received a VDA payment in the amount of \$1,162,276, the Provider should receive an additional VDA payment in the amount of \$1,144,213.

The Administrator disagrees with the Board's determination. The Administrator finds that the MAC properly calculated the correct payment adjustment, by following the controlling statute, regulations and various Administrative and Court decisions as reflected in Greenwood and Unity, cited supra, is as follows:

#### Calculation of VDA

2011 Medicare Inpatient Operating Cost –	\$15,682,268
Provider's Fixed Costs (\$15,682,268 x .9130)	\$14,318,266 <sup>17</sup>
Less Greater of DRG or SCH Payment	<u>\$13,155,990</u>
Payment adjustment amount (subject to CAP)	<u>\$1,162,276<sup>18</sup></u>

Therefore, the Administrator reverses the Board's decision on the calculation of the VDA using a proportional method.

In sum, the Administrator finds that the Board's decision with respect the calculation of the Provider's VDA payment was improper. Accordingly, the Administrator reverses the Board's decision as it specifically relates to the calculation of the Provider's VDA payment.

<sup>16</sup> See, *Oswego Hospital*, PRRB Dec. No. 2021-D26 at 14-15.

<sup>17</sup> Exhibit C-3 at 2/14. The MAC calculated this amount by multiplying the Current Year Operating costs of \$15,682,265 by 0.913022845 to arrive at the Current Year operating costs – fixed of \$14,318,266.

<sup>18</sup> See, Exhibit C-2 at 8/11 and Exhibit C-3 at 2/14. Because the Provider had received a previous Interim VDA Payments of \$2,956,08, the MAC determined a total overpayment of \$1,793,813.

DECISION

The decision of the Board decision is reversed in accordance with the foregoing opinion.

THIS CONSTITUTES THE FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION OF THE  
SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Date: September 17, 2021

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan Blum  
Principal Deputy Administrator  
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services