

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Baltimore City, MD		
Carroll, MD		
Harford, MD		
Howard, MD		
Queen Anne's, MD		
0733 Bangor, ME	0.9791	0.9856
Penobscot, ME		
0743 Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA	1.3127	1.2048
Barnstable, MA		
0760 Baton Rouge, LA	0.8388	0.8866
Ascension, LA		
East Baton Rouge, LA		
Livingston, LA		
West Baton Rouge, LA		
0840 Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	0.8389	0.8867
Hardin, TX		
Jefferson, TX		
Orange, TX		
0860 Bellingham, WA	1.2407	1.1592
Whatcom, WA		
0870 Benton Harbor, MI	0.9072	0.9355
Berrien, MI		
0875 ¹ Bergen-Passaic, NJ	1.2100	1.1394
Bergen, NJ		
Passaic, NJ		
0880 Billings, MT	0.9114	0.9384
Yellowstone, MT		
0920 Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS	0.8830	0.9183
Hancock, MS		
Harrison, MS		
Jackson, MS		
0960 ² Binghamton, NY	0.8633	0.9042
Broome, NY		
Tioga, NY		
1000 Birmingham, AL	0.9301	0.9516
Blount, AL		
Jefferson, AL		
St. Clair, AL		
Shelby, AL		
1010 Bismarck, ND	0.7881	0.8495
Burleigh, ND		
Morton, ND		
1020 Bloomington, IN	0.8997	0.9302
Monroe, IN		
1040 Bloomington-Normal, IL	0.9202	0.9446
McLean, IL		
1080 Boise City, ID	0.9403	0.9587
Ada, ID		
Canyon, ID		
1123 ¹ Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH	1.1304	1.0876
Bristol, MA		
Essex, MA		
Middlesex, MA		
Norfolk, MA		
Plymouth, MA		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Suffolk, MA		
Worcester, MA		
Hillsborough, NH		
Merrimack, NH		
Rockingham, NH		
Strafford, NH		
1125 Boulder-Longmont, CO	0.9688	0.9785
Boulder, CO		
1145 Brazoria, TX	0.8617	0.9031
Brazoria, TX		
1150 Bremerton, WA	1.1056	1.0712
Kitsap, WA		
1240 Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX	0.8992	0.9298
Cameron, TX		
1260 Bryan-College Station, TX	0.8410	0.8882
Brazos, TX		
1280 ¹ Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	0.9464	0.9630
Erie, NY		
Niagara, NY		
1303 Burlington, VT ...	1.0176	1.0120
Chittenden, VT		
Franklin, VT		
Grand Isle, VT		
1310 Caguas, PR	0.4453	0.5746
Caguas, PR		
Cayey, PR		
Cidra, PR		
Gurabo, PR		
San Lorenzo, PR		
1320 Canton-Massillon, OH	0.9026	0.9322
Carroll, OH		
Stark, OH		
1350 Casper, WY	0.9788	0.9854
Natrona, WY		
1360 Cedar Rapids, IA	0.9149	0.9409
Linn, IA		
1400 Champaign-Urbana, IL	0.9983	0.9988
Champaign, IL		
1440 ² Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.8607	0.9024
Berkeley, SC		
Charleston, SC		
Dorchester, SC		
1480 Charleston, WV	0.8765	0.9137
Kanawha, WV		
Putnam, WV		
1520 ¹ Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	0.9839	0.9889
Cabarrus, NC		
Gaston, NC		
Lincoln, NC		
Mecklenburg, NC		
Rowan, NC		
Stanly, NC		
Union, NC		
York, SC		
1540 Charlottesville, VA	1.0583	1.0396
Albemarle, VA		
Charlottesville City, VA		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Fluvanna, VA		
Greene, VA		
1560 Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.9069	0.9353
Catoosa, GA		
Dade, GA		
Walker, GA		
Hamilton, TN		
Marion, TN		
1580 ² Cheyenne, WY	0.8890	0.9226
Laramie, WY		
1600 ¹ Chicago, IL	1.1088	1.0733
Cook, IL		
DeKalb, IL		
DuPage, IL		
Grundy, IL		
Kane, IL		
Kendall, IL		
Lake, IL		
McHenry, IL		
Will, IL		
1620 ² Chico-Paradise, CA	0.9934	0.9955
Butte, CA		
1640 ¹ Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	0.9354	0.9553
Dearborn, IN		
Ohio, IN		
Boone, KY		
Campbell, KY		
Gallatin, KY		
Grant, KY		
Kenton, KY		
Pendleton, KY		
Brown, OH		
Clermont, OH		
Hamilton, OH		
Warren, OH		
1660 Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	0.8386	0.8864
Christian, KY		
Montgomery, TN		
1680 ¹ Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	0.9295	0.9512
Ashtabula, OH		
Cuyahoga, OH		
Geauga, OH		
Lake, OH		
Lorain, OH		
Medina, OH		
1720 Colorado Springs, CO	0.9968	0.9978
El Paso, CO		
1740 Columbia, MO ...	0.8737	0.9117
Boone, MO		
1760 Columbia, SC	0.8990	0.9297
Lexington, SC		
Richland, SC		
1800 Columbus, GA-AL	0.8450	0.8911
Russell, AL		
Chattahoochee, GA		
Harris, GA		
Muscogee, GA		
1840 ¹ Columbus, OH	0.9705	0.9797
Delaware, OH		
Fairfield, OH		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Franklin, OH		
Licking, OH		
Madison, OH		
Pickaway, OH		
1880 Corpus Christi, TX	0.8154	0.8696
Nueces, TX		
San Patricio, TX		
1890 Corvallis, OR	1.1569	1.1050
Benton, OR		
1900 ² Cumberland, MD-WV (MD Hospitals)	0.8855	0.9201
Allegany, MD		
Mineral, WV		
1900 ² Cumberland, MD-WV (WV Hospitals)	0.8053	0.8622
Allegany, MD		
Mineral, WV		
1920 ¹ Dallas, TX	0.9831	0.9884
Collin, TX		
Dallas, TX		
Denton, TX		
Ellis, TX		
Henderson, TX		
Hunt, TX		
Kaufman, TX		
Rockwall, TX		
1950 Danville, VA	0.8785	0.9151
Danville City, VA		
Pittsylvania, VA		
1960 Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL		
Scott, IA		
Henry, IL		
Rock Island, IL		
2000 Dayton-Springfield, OH	0.9378	0.9570
Clark, OH		
Greene, OH		
Miami, OH		
Montgomery, OH		
2020 Daytona Beach, FL	0.9133	0.9398
Flagler, FL		
Volusia, FL		
2030 Decatur, AL	0.9066	0.9351
Lawrence, AL		
Morgan, AL		
2040 ² Decatur, IL	0.8301	0.8803
Macon, IL		
2080 ¹ Denver, CO	1.0401	1.0273
Adams, CO		
Arapahoe, CO		
Denver, CO		
Douglas, CO		
Jefferson, CO		
2120 Des Moines, IA	0.8908	0.9239
Dallas, IA		
Polk, IA		
Warren, IA		
2160 ¹ Detroit, MI	1.0506	1.0344
Lapeer, MI		
Macomb, MI		
Monroe, MI		
Oakland, MI		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
St. Clair, MI		
Wayne, MI		
2180 Dothan, AL	0.8028	0.8603
Dale, AL		
Houston, AL		
2190 Dover, DE	0.9452	0.9621
Kent, DE		
2200 Dubuque, IA	0.8801	0.9163
Dubuque, IA		
2240 Duluth-Superior, MN-WI	1.0462	1.0314
St. Louis, MN		
Douglas, WI		
2281 Dutchess County, NY	1.0793	1.0536
Dutchess, NY		
2290 ² Eau Claire, WI	0.9229	0.9465
Chippewa, WI		
Eau Claire, WI		
2320 El Paso, TX	0.9137	0.9401
El Paso, TX		
2330 Elkhart-Goshen, IN	0.9851	0.9898
Elkhart, IN		
2335 ² Elmira, NY	0.8633	0.9042
Chemung, NY		
2340 Enid, OK	0.8387	0.8865
Garfield, OK		
2360 Erie, PA	0.9016	0.9315
Erie, PA		
2400 Eugene-Springfield, OR	1.1077	1.0726
Lane, OR		
2440 ² Evansville-Henderson, IN-KY (IN Hospitals)	0.8796	0.9159
Posey, IN		
Vanderburgh, IN		
Warrick, IN		
Henderson, KY		
2440 Evansville-Henderson, IN-KY (KY Hospitals)	0.8254	0.8769
Posey, IN		
Vanderburgh, IN		
Warrick, IN		
Henderson, KY		
2520 Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN	0.9783	0.9851
Clay, MN		
Cass, ND		
2560 Fayetteville, NC	0.9055	0.9343
Cumberland, NC		
2580 Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	0.8182	0.8716
Benton, AR		
Washington, AR		
2620 Flagstaff, AZ-UT	1.0791	1.0535
Coconino, AZ		
Kane, UT		
2640 Flint, MI	1.1233	1.0829
Genesee, MI		
2650 Florence, AL	0.7960	0.8554
Colbert, AL		
Lauderdale, AL		
2655 Florence, SC	0.8869	0.9211

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Florence, SC		
2670 Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	0.9923	0.9947
Larimer, CO		
2680 ¹ Ft. Lauderdale, FL	1.0792	1.0536
Broward, FL		
2700 Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	0.9456	0.9624
Lee, FL		
2710 Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL	0.9959	0.9972
Martin, FL		
St. Lucie, FL		
2720 Fort Smith, AR-OK	0.7811	0.8444
Crawford, AR		
Sebastian, AR		
Sequoyah, OK		
2750 Fort Walton Beach, FL	0.9651	0.9760
Okaloosa, FL		
2760 Fort Wayne, IN ..	0.9499	0.9654
Adams, IN		
Allen, IN		
De Kalb, IN		
Huntington, IN		
Wells, IN		
Whitley, IN		
2800 ¹ Forth Worth-Arlington, TX	0.9620	0.9738
Hood, TX		
Johnson, TX		
Parker, TX		
Tarrant, TX		
2840 Fresno, CA	1.0340	1.0232
Fresno, CA		
Madera, CA		
2880 Gadsden, AL	0.8684	0.9079
Etowah, AL		
2900 Gainesville, FL ..	0.9730	0.9814
Alachua, FL		
2920 Galveston-Texas City, TX	0.9603	0.9726
Galveston, TX		
2960 Gary, IN	0.9676	0.9777
Lake, IN		
Porter, IN		
2975 ² Glens Falls, NY	0.8633	0.9042
Warren, NY		
Washington, NY		
2980 Goldsboro, NC ..	0.8982	0.9291
Wayne, NC		
2985 Grand Forks, ND-MN	0.9338	0.9542
Polk, MN		
Grand Forks, ND		
2995 Grand Junction, CO	0.9824	0.9879
Mesa, CO		
3000 ¹ Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	0.9664	0.9769
Allegan, MI		
Kent, MI		
Muskegon, MI		
Ottawa, MI		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
3040 Great Falls, MT Cascade, MT	0.9057	0.9344
3060 Greeley, CO	0.9219	0.9458
3080 Green Bay, WI .. Brown, WI	0.9599	0.9724
3120 ¹ Greensboro- Winston-Salem-High Point, NC	0.9270	0.9494
Alamance, NC Davidson, NC Davie, NC Forsyth, NC Guilford, NC Randolph, NC Stokes, NC Yadkin, NC		
3150 Greenville, NC ... Pitt, NC	0.9257	0.9485
3160 Greenville- Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	0.9177	0.9429
Anderson, SC Cherokee, SC Greenville, SC Pickens, SC Spartanburg, SC		
3180 Hagerstown, MD Washington, MD	0.9362	0.9559
3200 Hamilton-Middle- town, OH	0.9484	0.9644
Butler, OH		
3240 Harrisburg-Leb- anon-Carlisle, PA	0.9315	0.9526
Cumberland, PA Dauphin, PA Lebanon, PA Perry, PA		
3283 ^{1 2} Hartford, CT .. Hartford, CT Litchfield, CT Middlesex, CT Tolland, CT	1.2520	1.1664
3285 ² Hattiesburg, MS	0.7759	0.8405
Forrest, MS Lamar, MS		
3290 Hickory-Mor- ganton-Lenoir, NC	0.8958	0.9274
Alexander, NC Burke, NC Caldwell, NC Catawba, NC		
3320 Honolulu, HI	1.1121	1.0755
Honolulu, HI		
3350 Houma, LA	0.8470	0.8925
Lafourche, LA Terrebonne, LA		
3360 ¹ Houston, TX Chambers, TX Fort Bend, TX Harris, TX Liberty, TX Montgomery, TX Waller, TX	0.9746	0.9825
3400 Huntington-Ash- land, WV-KY-OH	0.9744	0.9824

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Boyd, KY Carter, KY Greenup, KY Lawrence, OH Cabell, WV Wayne, WV		
3440 Huntsville, AL Limestone, AL Madison, AL	0.8901	0.9234
3480 ¹ Indianapolis, IN Boone, IN Hamilton, IN Hancock, IN Hendricks, IN Johnson, IN Madison, IN Marion, IN Morgan, IN Shelby, IN	0.9828	0.9882
3500 Iowa City, IA	1.0025	1.0017
Johnson, IA		
3520 Jackson, MI	0.9591	0.9718
Jackson, MI		
3560 Jackson, MS Hinds, MS Madison, MS Rankin, MS	0.8713	0.9100
3580 Jackson, TN	0.9370	0.9564
Madison, TN Chester, TN		
3600 ¹ Jacksonville, FL	0.9341	0.9544
Clay, FL Duval, FL Nassau, FL St. Johns, FL		
3605 ² Jacksonville, NC	0.8714	0.9100
Onslow, NC		
3610 ² Jamestown, NY Chautauqua, NY	0.8633	0.9042
3620 Janesville-Beloit, WI	0.9696	0.9791
Rock, WI		
3640 Jersey City, NJ .. Hudson, NJ	1.1200	1.0807
3660 Johnson City- Kingsport-Bristol, TN- VA (TN Hospitals)	0.8384	0.8863
Carter, TN Hawkins, TN Sullivan, TN Unicoi, TN Washington, TN Bristol City, VA Scott, VA Washington, VA		
3660 ² Johnson City- Kingsport-Bristol, TN- VA (VA Hospitals)	0.8494	0.8942
Carter, TN Hawkins, TN Sullivan, TN Unicoi, TN Washington, TN Bristol City, VA Scott, VA		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Washington, VA		
3680 ² Johnstown, PA Cambria, PA Somerset, PA	0.8525	0.8965
3700 Jonesboro, AR .. Craighead, AR	0.7906	0.8514
3710 Joplin, MO	0.8700	0.9090
Jasper, MO Newton, MO		
3720 Kalamazoo- Battlecreek, MI	1.0689	1.0467
Calhoun, MI Kalamazoo, MI Van Buren, MI		
3740 Kankakee, IL Kankakee, IL	0.9591	0.9718
3760 ¹ Kansas City, KS-MO	0.9809	0.9869
Johnson, KS Leavenworth, KS Miami, KS Wyandotte, KS Cass, MO Clay, MO Clinton, MO Jackson, MO Lafayette, MO Platte, MO Ray, MO		
3800 Kenosha, WI Kenosha, WI	0.9741	0.9822
3810 Killeen-Temple, TX	0.8447	0.8909
Bell, TX Coryell, TX		
3840 Knoxville, TN Anderson, TN Blount, TN Knox, TN Loudon, TN Sevier, TN Union, TN	0.9090	0.9368
3850 Kokomo, IN	0.9031	0.9326
Howard, IN Tipton, IN		
3870 ² La Crosse, WI- MN (WI Hospitals)	0.9229	0.9465
Houston, MN La Crosse, WI		
3870 ² La Crosse, WI- MN (MN Hospitals) ...	0.9249	0.9479
Houston, MN La Crosse, WI		
3880 Lafayette, LA Acadia, LA Lafayette, LA St. Landry, LA St. Martin, LA	0.8550	0.8983
3920 Lafayette, IN	0.9515	0.9665
Clinton, IN Tippecanoe, IN		
3960 Lake Charles, LA	0.8030	0.8605
Calcasieu, LA		
3980 Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	0.9170	0.9424
Polk, FL		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
4000 Lancaster, PA ... Lancaster, PA	0.9171	0.9425
4040 Lansing-East Lansing, MI	0.9827	0.9881
Clinton, MI Eaton, MI Ingham, MI		
4080 Laredo, TX	0.8504	0.8950
Webb, TX		
4100 Las Cruces, NM Dona Ana, NM	0.8888	0.9224
4120 ¹ Las Vegas, NV- AZ	1.1018	1.0686
Mohave, AZ Clark, NV Nye, NV		
4150 Lawrence, KS Douglas, KS	0.7964	0.8556
4200 Lawton, OK	0.8251	0.8766
Comanche, OK		
4243 Lewiston-Au- burn, ME	0.9249	0.9479
Androscoggin, ME		
4280 Lexington, KY Bourbon, KY Clark, KY Fayette, KY Jessamine, KY Madison, KY Scott, KY Woodford, KY	0.8629	0.9040
4320 Lima, OH	0.9515	0.9665
Allen, OH Auglaize, OH		
4360 Lincoln, NE	0.9133	0.9398
Lancaster, NE		
4400 Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	0.9045	0.9336
Faulkner, AR Lonoke, AR Pulaski, AR Saline, AR		
4420 Longview-Mar- shall, TX	0.8588	0.9010
Gregg, TX Harrison, TX Upshur, TX		
4480 ¹ Los Angeles- Long Beach, CA	1.2044	1.1358
Los Angeles, CA		
4520 ¹ Louisville, KY- IN	0.9517	0.9667
Clark, IN Floyd, IN Harrison, IN Scott, IN Bullitt, KY Jefferson, KY Oldham, KY		
4600 Lubbock, TX	0.7809	0.8442
Lubbock, TX		
4640 Lynchburg, VA .. Amherst, VA Bedford, VA Bedford City, VA Campbell, VA Lynchburg City, VA	0.9311	0.9523

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
4680 Macon, GA	0.9296	0.9512
Bibb, GA Houston, GA Jones, GA Peach, GA Twiggs, GA		
4720 Madison, WI	1.0188	1.0128
Dane, WI		
4800 Mansfield, OH ... Crawford, OH Richland, OH	0.8989	0.9296
4840 Mayaguez, PR .. Anasco, PR Cabo Rojo, PR Hormigueros, PR Mayaguez, PR Sabana Grande, PR San German, PR	0.4921	0.6153
4880 McAllen-Edin- burg-Mission, TX	0.8419	0.8888
Hidalgo, TX		
4890 Medford-Ash- land, OR	1.0605	1.0410
Jackson, OR		
4900 Melbourne- Titusville-Palm Bay, FL	1.0782	1.0529
Brevard, FL		
4920 ¹ Memphis, TN- AR-MS	0.8839	0.9190
Crittenden, AR DeSoto, MS Fayette, TN Shelby, TN Tipton, TN		
4940 Merced, CA	0.9937	0.9957
Merced, CA		
5000 ¹ Miami, FL	0.9878	0.9916
Dade, FL		
5015 ¹ Middlesex- Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	1.1454	1.0974
Hunterdon, NJ Middlesex, NJ Somerset, NJ		
5080 ¹ Milwaukee- Waukesha, WI	0.9901	0.9932
Milwaukee, WI Ozaukee, WI Washington, WI Waukesha, WI		
5120 ¹ Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	1.0969	1.0654
Anoka, MN Carver, MN Chisago, MN Dakota, MN Hennepin, MN Isanti, MN Ramsey, MN Scott, MN Sherburne, MN Washington, MN Wright, MN Pierce, WI St. Croix, WI		
5140 Missoula, MT	0.9250	0.9480

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Missoula, MT		
5160 Mobile, AL	0.8181	0.8715
Baldwin, AL Mobile, AL		
5170 Modesto, CA	1.0606	1.0411
Stanislaus, CA		
5190 ¹ Monmouth- Ocean, NJ	1.1290	1.0866
Monmouth, NJ Ocean, NJ		
5200 Monroe, LA	0.8191	0.8723
Ouachita, LA		
5240 ² Montgomery, AL	0.7853	0.8475
Autauga, AL Elmore, AL Montgomery, AL		
5280 Muncie, IN	0.9150	0.9410
Delaware, IN		
5330 Myrtle Beach, SC	0.9141	0.9403
Horry, SC		
5345 Naples, FL	0.9803	0.9865
Collier, FL		
5360 ¹ Nashville, TN .. Cheatham, TN Davidson, TN Dickson, TN Robertson, TN Rutherford TN Sumner, TN Williamson, TN Wilson, TN	0.9456	0.9624
5380 ¹ Nassau-Suffolk, NY	1.3441	1.2245
Nassau, NY Suffolk, NY		
5483 ^{1,2} New Haven- Bridgeport-Stamford- Waterbury-Danbury, CT	1.2520	1.1664
Fairfield, CT New Haven, CT		
5523 ² New London- Norwich, CT	1.2520	1.1664
New London, CT		
5560 ¹ New Orleans, LA	0.9050	0.9339
Jefferson, LA Orleans, LA Plaquemines, LA St. Bernard, LA St. Charles, LA St. James, LA St. John The Baptist, LA St. Tammany, LA		
5600 ¹ New York, NY Bronx, NY Kings, NY New York, NY Putnam, NY Queens, NY Richmond, NY Rockland, NY Westchester, NY	1.4069	1.2634

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
5640 ¹ Newark, NJ Essex, NJ Morris, NJ Sussex, NJ Union, NJ Warren, NJ	1.1546	1.1035
5660 Newburgh, NY-PA Orange, NY Pike, PA	1.1434	1.0961
5720 ¹ Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC Currituck, NC Chesapeake City, VA Gloucester, VA Hampton City, VA Isle of Wight, VA James City, VA Mathews, VA Newport News City, VA Norfolk City, VA Poquoson City, VA Portsmouth City, VA Suffolk City, VA Virginia Beach City VA Williamsburg City, VA York, VA	0.8553	0.8985
5775 ¹ Oakland, CA ... Alameda, CA Contra Costa, CA	1.5324	1.3395
5790 Ocala, FL Marion, FL	0.9526	0.9673
5800 Odessa-Midland, TX Ector, TX Midland, TX	0.9233	0.9468
5880 ¹ Oklahoma City, OK Canadian, OK Cleveland, OK Logan, OK McClain, OK Oklahoma, OK Pottawatomie, OK	0.8997	0.9302
5910 Olympia, WA Thurston, WA	1.1071	1.0722
5920 Omaha, NE-IA ... Pottawattamie, IA Cass, NE Douglas, NE Sarpy, NE Washington, NE	1.0089	1.0061
5945 ¹ Orange County, CA Orange, CA	1.1726	1.1152
5960 ¹ Orlando, FL Lake, FL Orange, FL Osceola, FL Seminole, FL	0.9537	0.9681
5990 Owensboro, KY Davies, KY	0.8283	0.8790
6015 Panama City, FL	0.8926	0.9251

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Bay, FL 6020 Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH (WV Hospitals) Washington, OH Wood, WV	0.8210	0.8737
6020 ² Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH (OH Hospitals) Washington, OH Wood, WV	0.8675	0.9072
6080 ² Pensacola, FL Escambia, FL Santa Rosa, FL	0.8907	0.9238
6120 Peoria-Pekin, IL Peoria, IL Tazewell, IL Woodford, IL	0.8854	0.9200
6160 ¹ Philadelphia, PA-NJ Burlington, NJ Camden, NJ Gloucester, NJ Salem, NJ Bucks, PA Chester, PA Delaware, PA Montgomery, PA Philadelphia, PA	1.0675	1.0457
6200 ¹ Phoenix-Mesa, AZ Maricopa, AZ Pinal, AZ	0.9562	0.9698
6240 Pine Bluff, AR ... Jefferson, AR	0.7866	0.8484
6280 ¹ Pittsburgh, PA Allegheny, PA Beaver, PA Butler, PA Fayette, PA Washington, PA Westmoreland, PA	0.9403	0.9587
6323 ² Pittsfield, MA ... Berkshire, MA	1.1257	1.0845
6340 Pocatello, ID Bannock, ID	0.9013	0.9313
6360 Ponce, PR Guayanilla, PR Juana Diaz, PR Penuelas, PR Ponce, PR Villalba, PR Yauco, PR	0.5221	0.6408
6403 Portland, ME Cumberland, ME Sagadahoc, ME York, ME	0.9932	0.9953
6440 ¹ Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA Clackamas, OR Columbia, OR Multnomah, OR Washington, OR Yamhill, OR Clark, WA	1.0792	1.0536
6483 ¹ Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI	1.0558	1.0379

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Bristol, RI Kent, RI Newport, RI Providence, RI Washington, RI		
6520 Provo-Orem, UT Utah, UT	1.0190	1.0130
6560 ² Pueblo, CO Pueblo, CO	0.9104	0.9377
6580 ² Punta Gorda, FL Charlotte, FL	0.8907	0.9238
6600 Racine, WI Racine, WI	0.9413	0.9594
6640 ¹ Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC Chatham, NC Durham, NC Franklin, NC Johnston, NC Orange, NC Wake, NC	1.0083	1.0057
6660 Rapid City, SD .. Pennington, SD	0.8936	0.9259
6680 Reading, PA Berks, PA	0.9308	0.9521
6690 Redding, CA Shasta, CA	1.1249	1.0839
6720 Reno, NV Washoe, NV	1.0664	1.0450
6740 Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA Benton, WA Franklin, WA	1.1608	1.1075
6760 Richmond-Petersburg, VA Charles City County, VA Chesterfield, VA Colonial Heights City, VA Dinwiddie, VA Goochland, VA Hanover, VA Henrico, VA Hopewell City, VA New Kent, VA Petersburg City, VA Powhatan, VA Prince George, VA Richmond City, VA	0.9735	0.9818
6780 ¹ Riverside-San Bernardino, CA Riverside, CA San Bernardino, CA	1.1251	1.0841
6800 Roanoke, VA Botetourt, VA Roanoke, VA Roanoke City, VA Salem City, VA	0.8703	0.9093
6820 Rochester, MN .. Olmsted, MN	1.2263	1.1499
6840 ¹ Rochester, NY Genesee, NY Livingston, NY Monroe, NY	0.9133	0.9398

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Ontario, NY		
Orleans, NY		
Wayne, NY		
6880 Rockford, IL	0.9456	0.9624
Boone, IL		
Ogle, IL		
Winnebago, IL		
6895 Rocky Mount, NC	0.9322	0.9531
Edgecombe, NC		
Nash, NC		
6920 ¹ Sacramento, CA	1.1636	1.1093
El Dorado, CA		
Placer, CA		
Sacramento, CA		
6960 Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	0.9709	0.9800
Bay, MI		
Midland, MI		
Saginaw, MI		
6980 St. Cloud, MN ...	0.9858	0.9903
Benton, MN		
Stearns, MN		
7000 ² St. Joseph, MO	0.8099	0.8656
Andrew, MO		
Buchanan, MO		
7040 ¹ St. Louis, MO-IL	0.8907	0.9238
Clinton, IL		
Jersey, IL		
Madison, IL		
Monroe, IL		
St. Clair, IL		
Franklin, MO		
Jefferson, MO		
Lincoln, MO		
St. Charles, MO		
St. Louis, MO		
St. Louis City, MO		
Warren, MO		
7080 Salem, OR	1.0473	1.0322
Marion, OR		
Polk, OR		
7120 Salinas, CA	1.4772	1.3063
Monterey, CA		
7160 ¹ Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	1.0035	1.0024
Davis, UT		
Salt Lake, UT		
Weber, UT		
7200 San Angelo, TX	0.7956	0.8551
Tom Green, TX		
7240 ¹ San Antonio, TX	0.8649	0.9054
Bexar, TX		
Comal, TX		
Guadalupe, TX		
Wilson, TX		
7320 ¹ San Diego, CA	1.1247	1.0838
San Diego, CA		
7360 ¹ San Francisco, CA	1.4288	1.2768
Marin, CA		
San Francisco, CA		
San Mateo, CA		
7400 ¹ San Jose, CA ..	1.4162	1.2691

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Santa Clara, CA		
7440 ¹ San Juan-Bayamon, PR	0.4706	0.5968
Aguas Buenas, PR		
Barceloneta, PR		
Bayamon, PR		
Canovanas, PR		
Carolina, PR		
Catano, PR		
Ceiba, PR		
Comerio, PR		
Corozal, PR		
Dorado, PR		
Fajardo, PR		
Florida, PR		
Guaynabo, PR		
Humacao, PR		
Juncos, PR		
Los Piedras, PR		
Loiza, PR		
Luguillo, PR		
Manati, PR		
Morovis, PR		
Naguabo, PR		
Naranjito, PR		
Rio Grande, PR		
San Juan, PR		
Toa Alta, PR		
Toa Baja, PR		
Trujillo Alto, PR		
Vega Alta, PR		
Vega Baja, PR		
Yabucoa, PR		
7460 San Luis Obispo-Atascadero-Paso Robles, CA	1.1386	1.0930
San Luis Obispo, CA		
7480 Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA	1.0588	1.0399
Santa Barbara, CA		
7485 Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	1.3630	1.2362
Santa Cruz, CA		
7490 Santa Fe, NM	1.0822	1.0556
Los Alamos, NM		
Santa Fe, NM		
7500 Santa Rosa, CA	1.3179	1.2081
Sonoma, CA		
7510 Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	0.9367	0.9562
Manatee, FL		
Sarasota, FL		
7520 Savannah, GA ...	0.9961	0.9973
Bryan, GA		
Chatham, GA		
Effingham, GA		
7560 ² Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	0.8525	0.8965
Columbia, PA		
Lackawanna, PA		
Luzerne, PA		
Wyoming, PA		
7600 ¹ Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	1.1571	1.1051
Island, WA		

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
King, WA		
Snohomish, WA		
7610 ² Sharon, PA	0.8525	0.8965
Mercer, PA		
7620 ² Sheboygan, WI	0.9229	0.9465
Sheboygan, WI		
7640 Sherman-Denison, TX	0.9334	0.9539
Grayson, TX		
7680 Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	0.8813	0.9171
Bossier, LA		
Caddo, LA		
Webster, LA		
7720 Sioux City, IA-NE	0.9138	0.9401
Woodbury, IA		
Dakota, NE		
7760 Sioux Falls, SD	0.9098	0.9373
Lincoln, SD		
Minnehaha, SD		
7800 South Bend, IN	0.9902	0.9933
St. Joseph, IN		
7840 Spokane, WA	1.0961	1.0649
Spokane, WA		
7880 Springfield, IL	0.8654	0.9057
Menard, IL		
Sangamon, IL		
7920 Springfield, MO	0.8510	0.8954
Christian, MO		
Greene, MO		
Webster, MO		
8003 ² Springfield, MA	1.1257	1.0845
Hampden, MA		
Hampshire, MA		
8050 State College, PA	0.9032	0.9327
Centre, PA		
8080 Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV	0.8893	0.9228
Jefferson, OH		
Brooke, WV		
Hancock, WV		
8120 Stockton-Lodi, CA	1.0630	1.0427
San Joaquin, CA		
8140 ² Sumter, SC	0.8607	0.9024
Sumter, SC		
8160 Syracuse, NY	0.9519	0.9668
Cayuga, NY		
Madison, NY		
Onondaga, NY		
Oswego, NY		
8200 Tacoma, WA	1.1052	1.0709
Pierce, WA		
8240 ² Tallahassee, FL	0.8907	0.9238
Gadsden, FL		
Leon, FL		
8280 ¹ Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	0.9238	0.9472
Hernando, FL		
Hillsborough, FL		
Pasco, FL		
Pinellas, FL		
8320 ² Terre Haute, IN	0.8796	0.9159

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Clay, IN	0.8193	0.8724
Vermillion, IN		
Vigo, IN		
8360 Texarkana, AR-Texarkana, TX	0.9863	0.9906
Miller, AR		
Bowie, TX	0.8952	0.9270
8400 Toledo, OH		
Fulton, OH		
Lucas, OH		
Wood, OH	1.0710	1.0481
8440 Topeka, KS		
Shawnee, KS	0.8993	0.9299
8480 Trenton, NJ		
Mercer, NJ	0.8398	0.8873
8520 Tucson, AZ		
Pima, AZ		
8560 Tulsa, OK		
Creek, OK	0.8303	0.8804
Osage, OK		
Rogers, OK		
Tulsa, OK		
Wagoner, OK	0.9650	0.9759
8600 Tuscaloosa, AL		
Tuscaloosa, AL	0.8633	0.9042
8640 Tyler, TX		
Smith, TX	1.3544	1.2309
8680 ² Utica-Rome, NY		
Herkimer, NY		
Oneida, NY	1.1209	1.0813
8720 Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA		
Napa, CA		
Solano, CA	0.8814	0.9172
8735 Ventura, CA		
Ventura, CA	1.0296	1.0202
8750 Victoria, TX		
Victoria, TX	0.9934	0.9955
8760 Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ		
Cumberland, NJ		
8780 ² Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA	0.8802	0.9163
Tulare, CA		
8800 Waco, TX	1.0852	1.0576
McLennan, TX		
8840 ¹ Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	0.9140	0.9403
District of Columbia, DC		
Calvert, MD	0.9485	0.9644
Charles, MD		
Frederick, MD	1.0310	1.0211
Montgomery, MD		
Prince Georges, MD	0.8677	0.9074
Alexandria City, VA		
Arlington, VA	0.9485	0.9644
Clarke, VA		
Culpeper, VA	1.0676	1.0458
Fairfax, VA		
Fairfax City, VA	0.9934	0.9955
Falls Church City, VA		
Fauquier, VA	0.9140	0.9403
Fredericksburg City, VA		
King George, VA	0.9485	0.9644

TABLE 4A.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
Loudoun, VA	0.8970	0.9283
Manassas City, VA		
Manassas Park City, VA	0.9882	0.9919
Prince William, VA		
Spotsylvania, VA	0.9929	0.9951
Stafford, VA		
Warren, VA	0.8053	0.8622
Berkeley, WV		
Jefferson, WV	0.8675	0.9072
8920 Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA		
Black Hawk, IA	0.9571	0.9704
8940 Wausau, WI		
Marathon, WI	0.8023	0.8600
8960 ¹ West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL		
Palm Beach, FL	0.8624	0.9036
9000 ² Wheeling, WV-OH (WV Hospitals) ...		
Belmont, OH	1.1287	1.0864
Marshall, WV		
Ohio, WV	0.9471	0.9635
9000 ² Wheeling, WV-OH (OH Hospitals) ...		
Belmont, OH	1.0676	1.0458
Marshall, WV		
Ohio, WV	0.9934	0.9955
9040 Wichita, KS		
Butler, KS	0.9140	0.9403
Harvey, KS		
Sedgwick, KS	0.9485	0.9644
9080 Wichita Falls, TX		
Archer, TX	1.0310	1.0211
Wichita, TX		
9140 Williamsport, PA	0.8677	0.9074
Lycoming, PA		
9160 Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD	0.9485	0.9644
New Castle, DE		
Cecil, MD	1.0676	1.0458
9200 Wilmington, NC		
New Hanover, NC	0.9934	0.9955
Brunswick, NC		
9260 Yakima, WA	0.9140	0.9403
Yakima, WA		
9270 ² Yolo, CA	0.9485	0.9644
Yolo, CA		
9280 York, PA	1.0310	1.0211
York, PA		
9320 Youngstown-Warren, OH	0.8677	0.9074
Columbiana, OH		
Mahoning, OH	0.9485	0.9644
Trumbull, OH		
9340 Yuba City, CA	1.0676	1.0458
Sutter, CA		
Yuba, CA	0.9934	0.9955
9360 Yuma, AZ		
Yuma, AZ	0.9140	0.9403

¹ Large Urban Area
² Hospitals geographically located in the area are assigned the statewide rural wage index for FY 2003.

TABLE 4B.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR RURAL AREAS

Nonurban area	Wage index	GAF
Alabama	0.7853	0.8475
Alaska	1.2323	1.1538
Arizona	0.8483	0.8935
Arkansas	0.7670	0.8339
California	0.9934	0.9988
Colorado	0.9104	0.9377
Connecticut	1.2520	1.1664
Delaware	0.9126	0.9393
Florida	0.8907	0.9238
Georgia	0.8254	0.8769
Hawaii	1.0342	1.0233
Idaho	0.8799	0.9161
Illinois	0.8301	0.8803
Indiana	0.8796	0.9159
Iowa	0.8395	0.8871
Kansas	0.7964	0.8556
Kentucky	0.8079	0.8641
Louisiana	0.7719	0.8375
Maine	0.8754	0.9129
Maryland	0.8855	0.9201
Massachusetts	1.1257	1.0845
Michigan	0.8961	0.9276
Minnesota	0.9249	0.9479
Mississippi	0.7759	0.8405
Missouri	0.8099	0.8656
Montana	0.8567	0.8995
Nebraska	0.8283	0.8790
Nevada	0.9519	0.9668
New Hampshire	0.9882	0.9919
New Jersey ¹
New Mexico	0.8645	0.9051
New York	0.8633	0.9042
North Carolina	0.8714	0.9100
North Dakota	0.7830	0.8458
Ohio	0.8675	0.9072
Oklahoma	0.7664	0.8334
Oregon	1.0408	1.0278
Pennsylvania	0.8525	0.8965
Puerto Rico	0.4400	0.5699
Rhode Island ¹
South Carolina	0.8607	0.9024
South Dakota	0.7895	0.8506
Tennessee	0.7873	0.8489
Texas	0.7759	0.8405
Utah	0.9426	0.9603
Vermont	0.9402	0.9587
Virginia	0.8494	0.8942
Washington	1.0274	1.0187
West Virginia	0.8053	0.8622
Wisconsin	0.9229	0.9465
Wyoming	0.8890	0.9226

¹ All counties within the State are classified as urban.

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED

Area	Wage index	GAF
Abilene, TX	0.8534	0.8971
Akron, OH	0.9685	0.9783
Albany, GA	1.0658	1.0446
Albuquerque, NM	0.9372	0.9566
Alexandria, LA	0.7929	0.8531

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA	0.9833	0.9885
Altoona, PA	0.9300	0.9515
Amarillo, TX	0.8900	0.9233
Anchorage, AK	1.2610	1.1721
Ann Arbor, MI	1.1217	1.0818
Anniston, AL	0.7983	0.8570
Asheville, NC	0.9448	0.9619
Athens, GA	1.0161	1.0110
Atlanta, GA	0.9985	0.9990
Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC	0.9981	0.9987
Austin-San Marcos, TX	0.9529	0.9675
Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA	1.2894	1.1901
Baton Rouge, LA	0.8281	0.8788
Bellingham, WA	1.2139	1.1420
Benton Harbor, MI	0.9072	0.9355
Bergen-Passaic, NJ	1.2100	1.1394
Billings, MT	0.9114	0.9384
Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS	0.8417	0.8887
Binghamton, NY	0.8525	0.8965
Birmingham, AL	0.9301	0.9516
Bismarck, ND	0.7881	0.8495
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH	1.1304	1.0876
Burlington, VT	0.9667	0.9771
Caguas, PR	0.4453	0.5746
Casper, WY	0.9655	0.9762
Champaign-Urbana, IL	0.9334	0.9539
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.8607	0.9024
Charleston, WV	0.8602	0.9020
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	0.9839	0.9889
Charlottesville, VA	1.0252	1.0172
Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.8878	0.9217
Chicago, IL	1.0953	1.0643
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	0.9354	0.9553
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	0.8239	0.8758
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	0.9295	0.9512
Columbia, MO	0.8737	0.9117
Columbia, SC	0.8990	0.9297
Columbus, GA-AL (GA Hospitals)	0.8254	0.8769
Columbus, GA-AL (AL Hospitals)	0.8041	0.8613
Columbus, OH	0.9521	0.9669
Corpus Christi, TX	0.8154	0.8696
Dallas, TX	0.9831	0.9884
Danville, VA	0.8530	0.8968
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	0.8872	0.9213
Dayton-Springfield, OH	0.9378	0.9570
Denver, CO	1.0401	1.0273
Des Moines, IA	0.8908	0.9239
Detroit, MI	1.0506	1.0344
Dothan, AL	0.8028	0.8603
Dover, DE	0.9274	0.9497
Duluth-Superior, MN-WI	1.0462	1.0314
Eau Claire, WI	0.9229	0.9465
Elkhart-Goshen, IN	0.9484	0.9643
Erie, PA	0.8850	0.9197

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Eugene-Springfield, OR	1.1077	1.0726
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN	0.9564	0.9699
Fayetteville, NC	0.9055	0.9343
Flagstaff, AZ-UT	1.0234	1.0160
Flint, MI	1.1041	1.0702
Florence, AL	0.7960	0.8554
Florence, SC	0.8869	0.9211
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	0.9923	0.9947
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	1.0792	1.0536
Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL	0.9959	0.9972
Fort Smith, AR-OK	0.7681	0.8347
Fort Walton Beach, FL	0.9365	0.9561
Forth Worth-Arlington, TX	0.9620	0.9738
Gadsden, AL	0.8684	0.9079
Grand Forks, ND-MN	0.9338	0.9542
Grand Junction, CO	0.9824	0.9879
Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	0.9664	0.9769
Great Falls, MT	0.9057	0.9344
Greeley, CO	0.9219	0.9458
Green Bay, WI	0.9347	0.9548
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC	0.9131	0.9396
Greenville, NC	0.9257	0.9485
Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA	0.9315	0.9526
Hartford, CT	1.1550	1.1037
Hattiesburg, MS	0.7759	0.8405
Hickory-Morgantown-Lenoir, NC	0.8958	0.9274
Houston, TX	0.9746	0.9825
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	0.9251	0.9481
Huntsville, AL	0.8901	0.9234
Indianapolis, IN	0.9828	0.9882
Iowa City, IA	0.9828	0.9882
Jackson, MS	0.8587	0.9009
Jackson, TN	0.9032	0.9327
Jacksonville, FL	0.9225	0.9463
Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA (VA Hospitals)	0.8494	0.8942
Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA (KY Hospitals)	0.8384	0.8863
Jonesboro, AR (AR Hospitals)	0.7906	0.8514
Jonesboro, AR (MO Hospitals)	0.8099	0.8656
Joplin, MO	0.8700	0.9090
Kalamazoo-Battlecreek, MI	1.0490	1.0333
Kansas City, KS-MO	0.9809	0.9869
Knoxville, TN	0.9090	0.9368
Kokomo, IN	0.9031	0.9326
Lafayette, LA	0.8392	0.8869
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	0.9170	0.9424
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	1.1018	1.0686
Lawton, OK	0.8073	0.8636
Lexington, KY	0.8629	0.9040
Lima, OH	0.9515	0.9665

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Lincoln, NE	0.9133	0.9398
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	0.8926	0.9251
Longview-Marshall, TX	0.8588	0.9010
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	1.2044	1.1358
Louisville, KY-IN	0.9382	0.9573
Lubbock, TX	0.7809	0.8442
Lynchburg, VA	0.9114	0.9384
Macon, GA	0.9296	0.9512
Madison, WI	1.0188	1.0128
Mansfield, OH	0.8989	0.9296
Medford-Ashland, OR	1.0408	1.0278
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	0.8667	0.9067
Miami, FL	0.9878	0.9916
Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI	0.9901	0.9932
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	1.0969	1.0654
Missoula, MT	0.9139	0.9402
Mobile, AL	0.8181	0.8715
Modesto, CA	1.0606	1.0411
Monmouth-Ocean, NJ	1.1290	1.0866
Monroe, LA	0.8191	0.8723
Montgomery, AL	0.7853	0.8475
Nashville, TN	0.9283	0.9503
New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT	1.2520	1.1664
New London-Norwich, CT	1.1683	1.1124
New Orleans, LA	0.9050	0.9339
New York, NY	1.3936	1.2552
Newark, NJ	1.1546	1.1035
Newburgh, NY-PA	1.0820	1.0555
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newsport News, VA-NC	0.8714	0.9100
Oakland, CA	1.5324	1.3395
Ocala, FL	0.9343	0.9545
Odessa-Midland, TX	0.8910	0.9240
Oklahoma City, OK	0.8997	0.9302
Omaha, NE-IA	1.0089	1.0061
Orange County, CA	1.1726	1.1152
Orlando, FL	0.9537	0.9681
Peoria-Pekin, IL	0.8854	0.9200
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	1.0675	1.0457
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	0.9562	0.9698
Pine Bluff, AR	0.7760	0.8406
Pittsburgh, PA	0.9268	0.9493
Pittsfield, MA	0.9869	0.9910
Pocatello, ID	0.9013	0.9313
Portland, ME	0.9698	0.9792
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	1.0792	1.0536
Provo-Orem, UT	1.0088	1.0060
Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	0.9978	0.9985
Rapid City, SD	0.8936	0.9259
Reading, PA	0.9126	0.9393
Redding, CA	1.1249	1.0839
Reno, NV	1.0445	1.0303
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	1.1209	1.0813
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	0.9735	0.9818

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Roanoke, VA	0.8703	0.9093
Rochester, MN	1.2263	1.1499
Rockford, IL	0.9456	0.9624
Sacramento, CA	1.1636	1.1093
Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	0.9709	0.9800
St. Cloud, MN	0.9858	0.9903
St. Joseph, MO	0.8300	0.8802
St. Louis, MO-IL	0.8907	0.9238
Salinas, CA	1.4772	1.3063
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	1.0035	1.0024
San Antonio, TX	0.8649	0.9054
San Diego, CA	1.1247	1.0838
Santa Fe, NM	0.9927	0.9950
Santa Rosa, CA	1.2891	1.1899
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	0.9367	0.9562
Savannah, GA	0.9841	0.9891
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	1.1571	1.1051
Sherman-Denison, TX ..	0.9090	0.9368
Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	0.8813	0.9171
Sioux City, IA-NE	0.8736	0.9116
Sioux Falls, SD	0.8950	0.9268
South Bend, IN	0.9902	0.9933
Spokane, WA	1.0770	1.0521

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Springfield, IL	0.8654	0.9057
Springfield, MO	0.8236	0.8756
Stockton-Lodi, CA	1.0630	1.0427
Syracuse, NY	0.9519	0.9668
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	0.9238	0.9472
Texarkana,AR-Texas, TX	0.8193	0.8724
Toledo, OH	0.9863	0.9906
Topeka, KS	0.8840	0.9190
Tucson, AZ	0.8993	0.9299
Tulsa, OK	0.8398	0.8873
Tuscaloosa, AL	0.8303	0.8804
Tyler, TX	0.9249	0.9479
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA	1.3544	1.2309
Victoria, TX	0.8668	0.9067
Waco, TX	0.8671	0.9070
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	1.0852	1.0576
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	0.8970	0.9283
Wausau, WI	0.9710	0.9800
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL	0.9929	0.9951
Wichita, KS	0.9235	0.9470
Wichita Falls, TX	0.7918	0.8523

TABLE 4C.—WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF) FOR HOSPITALS THAT ARE RECLASSIFIED—Continued

Area	Wage index	GAF
Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD	1.0973	1.0657
Wilmington, NC	0.9336	0.9540
York, PA	0.9140	0.9403
Youngstown-Warren, OH	0.9485	0.9644
Rural Alabama	0.7853	0.8475
Rural Florida	0.8907	0.9238
Rural Illinois (IA Hospitals)	0.8395	0.8871
Rural Illinois (MO Hospitals)	0.8301	0.8803
Rural Kentucky	0.8079	0.8641
Rural Louisiana	0.7719	0.8375
Rural Massachusetts	1.0417	1.0284
Rural Michigan	0.8961	0.9276
Rural Minnesota	0.9249	0.9479
Rural Mississippi	0.7759	0.8405
Rural Missouri	0.8099	0.8656
Rural Montana	0.8567	0.8995
Rural Nebraska	0.8283	0.8790
Rural Nevada	0.9097	0.9372
Rural Texas	0.7759	0.8405
Rural Washington	1.0274	1.0187
Rural Wyoming	0.8890	0.9226

TABLE 4F.—PUERTO RICO WAGE INDEX AND CAPITAL GEOGRAPHIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (GAF)

Area	Wage index	GAF	Wage index—reclass. hospitals	GAF—reclass. hospitals
Aguadilla, PR	0.9781	0.9850
¹ Arecibo, PR	0.9289	0.9507
Caguas, PR	0.9400	0.9585	0.9400	0.9585
Mayaguez, PR	1.0388	1.0264
Ponce, PR	1.1021	1.0688
San Juan-Bayamon, PR	0.9935	0.9955
Rural Puerto Rico	0.9289	0.9507

¹ Hospitals geographically located in the area are assigned the Rural Puerto Rico wage index for FY 2003.

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
0040 Abilene, TX	0.9268
Taylor, TX
0060 Aguadilla, PR	0.4634
Aguada, PR
Aguadilla, PR
Moca, PR
0080 Akron, OH	0.9685
Portage, OH
Summit, OH
0120 Albany, GA	1.0835
Dougherty, GA
Lee, GA
0160 Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	0.8633
Albany, NY

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Montgomery, NY
Rensselaer, NY
Saratoga, NY
Schenectady, NY
Schoharie, NY
0200 Albuquerque, NM	0.9279
Bernalillo, NM
Sandoval, NM
Valencia, NM
0220 Alexandria, LA	0.7903
Rapides, LA
0240 Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA	0.9833
Carbon, PA
Lehigh, PA

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Northampton, PA
0280 Altoona, PA	0.9300
Blair, PA
0320 Amarillo, TX	0.9051
Potter, TX
Randall, TX
0380 Anchorage, AK	1.2477
Anchorage, AK
0440 Ann Arbor, MI	1.1217
Lenawee, MI
Livingston, MI
Washtenaw, MI
0450 Anniston, AL	0.8126
Calhoun, AL

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
0460 Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	0.9229
Calumet, WI	
Outagamie, WI	
Winnebago, WI	
0470 Arecibo, PR	0.4400
Arecibo, PR	
Camuy, PR	
Hatillo, PR	
0480 Asheville, NC	0.9682
Buncombe, NC	
Madison, NC	
0500 Athens, GA	1.0308
Clarke, GA	
Madison, GA	
Oconee, GA	
0520 Atlanta, GA	1.0091
Barrow, GA	
Bartow, GA	
Carroll, GA	
Cherokee, GA	
Clayton, GA	
Cobb, GA	
Coweta, GA	
DeKalb, GA	
Douglas, GA	
Fayette, GA	
Forsyth, GA	
Fulton, GA	
Gwinnett, GA	
Henry, GA	
Newton, GA	
Paulding, GA	
Pickens, GA	
Rockdale, GA	
Spalding, GA	
Walton, GA	
0560 Atlantic-Cape May, NJ	1.1058
Atlantic, NJ	
Cape May, NJ	
0580 Auburn-Opelika, AL	0.8306
Lee, AL	
0600 Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC	1.0364
Columbia, GA	
McDuffie, GA	
Richmond, GA	
Aiken, SC	
Edgefield, SC	
0640 Austin-San Marcos, TX	0.9529
Bastrop, TX	
Caldwell, TX	
Hays, TX	
Travis, TX	
Williamson, TX	
0680 Bakersfield, CA	1.0186
Kern, CA	
0720 Baltimore, MD	0.9757
Anne Arundel, MD	
Baltimore, MD	
Baltimore City, MD	
Carroll, MD	
Harford, MD	
Howard, MD	
Queen Anne's, MD	
0733 Bangor, ME	0.9791
Penobscot, ME	
0743 Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA ...	1.3127
Barnstable, MA	
0760 Baton Rouge, LA	0.8388
Ascension, LA	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
East Baton Rouge, LA	
Livingston, LA	
West Baton Rouge, LA	
0840 Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX ..	0.8389
Hardin, TX	
Jefferson, TX	
Orange, TX	
0860 Bellingham, WA	1.2407
Whatcom, WA	
0870 Benton Harbor, MI	0.8992
Berrien, MI	
0875 Bergen-Passaic, NJ	1.2100
Bergen, NJ	
Passaic, NJ	
0880 Billings, MT	0.9114
Yellowstone, MT	
0920 Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS	0.8830
Hancock, MS	
Harrison, MS	
Jackson, MS	
0960 Binghamton, NY	0.8633
Broome, NY	
Tioga, NY	
1000 Birmingham, AL	0.9301
Blount, AL	
Jefferson, AL	
St. Clair, AL	
Shelby, AL	
1010 Bismarck, ND	0.7848
Burleigh, ND	
Morton, ND	
1020 Bloomington, IN	0.8997
Monroe, IN	
1040 Bloomington-Normal, IL	0.9202
McLean, IL	
1080 Boise City, ID	0.9403
Ada, ID	
Canyon, ID	
1123 Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH (NH Hospitals)	1.1304
Bristol, MA	
Essex, MA	
Middlesex, MA	
Norfolk, MA	
Plymouth, MA	
Suffolk, MA	
Worcester, MA	
Hillsborough, NH	
Merrimack, NH	
Rockingham, NH	
Strafford, NH	
1125 Boulder-Longmont, CO	0.9688
Boulder, CO	
1145 Brazoria, TX	0.8617
Brazoria, TX	
1150 Bremerton, WA	1.1056
Kitsap, WA	
1240 Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX	0.8992
Cameron, TX	
1260 Bryan-College Station, TX ..	0.8410
Brazos, TX	
1280 Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY ...	0.9464
Erie, NY	
Niagara, NY	
1303 Burlington, VT	1.0176
Chittenden, VT	
Franklin, VT	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Grand Isle, VT	
1310 Caguas, PR	0.4415
Caguas, PR	
Cayey, PR	
Cidra, PR	
Gurabo, PR	
San Lorenzo, PR	
1320 Canton-Massillon, OH	0.9026
Carroll, OH	
Stark, OH	
1350 Casper, WY	0.9788
Natrona, WY	
1360 Cedar Rapids, IA	0.9149
Linn, IA	
1400 Champaign-Urbana, IL	0.9983
Champaign, IL	
1440 Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.8607
Berkeley, SC	
Charleston, SC	
Dorchester, SC	
1480 Charleston, WV	0.8765
Kanawha, WV	
Putnam, WV	
1520 Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	0.9839
Cabarrus, NC	
Gaston, NC	
Lincoln, NC	
Mecklenburg, NC	
Rowan, NC	
Stanly, NC	
Union, NC	
York, SC	
1540 Charlottesville, VA	1.0583
Albemarle, VA	
Charlottesville City, VA	
Fluvanna, VA	
Greene, VA	
1560 Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.9069
Catoosa, GA	
Dade, GA	
Walker, GA	
Hamilton, TN	
Marion, TN	
1580 Cheyenne, WY	0.8890
Laramie, WY	
1600 Chicago, IL	1.1088
Cook, IL	
DeKalb, IL	
DuPage, IL	
Grundy, IL	
Kane, IL	
Kendall, IL	
Lake, IL	
McHenry, IL	
Will, IL	
1620 Chico-Paradise, CA	0.9934
Butte, CA	
1640 Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	0.9323
Dearborn, IN	
Ohio, IN	
Boone, KY	
Campbell, KY	
Gallatin, KY	
Grant, KY	
Kenton, KY	
Pendleton, KY	
Brown, OH	
Clermont, OH	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Hamilton, OH Warren, OH	
1660 Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	0.8386
Christian, KY Montgomery, TN	
1680 Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	0.9295
Ashtabula, OH Cuyahoga, OH Geauga, OH Lake, OH Lorain, OH Medina, OH	
1720 Colorado Springs, CO	0.9968
El Paso, CO	
1740 Columbia, MO	0.8737
Boone, MO	
1760 Columbia, SC	0.8990
Lexington, SC Richland, SC	
1800 Columbus, GA-AL	0.8450
Russell, AL Chattahoochee, GA Harris, GA Muscogee, GA	
1840 Columbus, OH	0.9705
Delaware, OH Fairfield, OH Franklin, OH Licking, OH Madison, OH Pickaway, OH	
1880 Corpus Christi, TX	0.8154
Nueces, TX San Patricio, TX	
1890 Corvallis, OR	1.1569
Benton, OR	
1900 Cumberland, MD-WV (WV Hospital)	0.8053
Allegany, MD Mineral, WV	
1920 Dallas, TX	0.9831
Collin, TX Dallas, TX Denton, TX Ellis, TX Henderson, TX Hunt, TX Kaufman, TX Rockwall, TX	
1950 Danville, VA	0.8785
Danville City, VA Pittsylvania, VA	
1960 Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	0.8872
Scott, IA Henry, IL Rock Island, IL	
2000 Dayton-Springfield, OH	0.9378
Clark, OH Greene, OH Miami, OH Montgomery, OH	
2020 Daytona Beach, FL	0.9133
Flagler, FL Volusia, FL	
2030 Decatur, AL	0.9066
Lawrence, AL Morgan, AL	
2040 Decatur, IL	0.8301

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Macon, IL	
2080 Denver, CO	1.0401
Adams, CO Arapahoe, CO Denver, CO Douglas, CO Jefferson, CO	
2120 Des Moines, IA	0.8867
Dallas, IA Polk, IA Warren, IA	
2160 Detroit, MI	1.0506
Lapeer, MI Macomb, MI Monroe, MI Oakland, MI St. Clair, MI Wayne, MI	
2180 Dothan, AL	0.7990
Dale, AL Houston, AL	
2190 Dover, DE	0.9452
Kent, DE	
2200 Dubuque, IA	0.8801
Dubuque, IA	
2240 Duluth-Superior, MN-WI	1.0462
St. Louis, MN Douglas, WI	
2281 Dutchess County, NY	1.0793
Dutchess, NY	
2290 Eau Claire, WI	0.9229
Chippewa, WI Eau Claire, WI	
2320 El Paso, TX	0.9137
El Paso, TX	
2330 Elkhart-Goshen, IN	0.9851
Elkhart, IN	
2335 Elmira, NY	0.8633
Chemung, NY	
2340 Enid, OK	0.8387
Garfield, OK	
2360 Erie, PA	0.9016
Erie, PA	
2400 Eugene-Springfield, OR	1.1077
Lane, OR	
2440 Evansville-Henderson, IN-KY (IN Hospitals)	0.8796
Posey, IN Vanderburgh, IN Warrick, IN Henderson, KY	
2520 Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN ...	0.9783
Clay, MN Cass, ND	
2560 Fayetteville, NC	0.8980
Cumberland, NC	
2580 Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR	0.8182
Benton, AR Washington, AR	
2620 Flagstaff, AZ-UT	1.0791
Coconino, AZ Kane, UT	
2640 Flint, MI	1.1233
Genesee, MI	
2650 Florence, AL	0.7927
Colbert, AL Lauderdale, AL	
2655 Florence, SC	0.8869
Florence, SC	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
2670 Fort Collins-Loveland, CO ..	0.9923
Larimer, CO	
2680 Ft. Lauderdale, FL	1.0368
Broward, FL	
2700 Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	0.9456
Lee, FL	
2710 Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL	0.9802
Martin, FL St. Lucie, FL	
2720 Fort Smith, AR-OK	0.7811
Crawford, AR Sebastian, AR Sequoyah, OK	
2750 Fort Walton Beach, FL	0.9651
Okaloosa, FL	
2760 Fort Wayne, IN	0.9499
Adams, IN Allen, IN De Kalb, IN Huntington, IN Wells, IN Whitley, IN	
2800 Forth Worth-Arlington, TX ...	0.9620
Hood, TX Johnson, TX Parker, TX Tarrant, TX	
2840 Fresno, CA	1.0340
Fresno, CA Madera, CA	
2880 Gadsden, AL	0.8580
Etowah, AL	
2900 Gainesville, FL	0.9730
Alachua, FL	
2920 Galveston-Texas City, TX ...	0.9603
Galveston, TX	
2960 Gary, IN	0.9676
Lake, IN Porter, IN	
2975 Glens Falls, NY	0.8633
Warren, NY Washington, NY	
2980 Goldsboro, NC	0.8982
Wayne, NC	
2985 Grand Forks, ND-MN	0.8988
Polk, MN Grand Forks, ND	
2995 Grand Junction, CO	0.9615
Mesa, CO	
3000 Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	0.9645
Allegan, MI Kent, MI Muskegon, MI Ottawa, MI	
3040 Great Falls, MT	0.9042
Cascade, MT	
3060 Greeley, CO	0.9104
Weld, CO	
3080 Green Bay, WI	0.9599
Brown, WI	
3120 Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC	0.9270
Alamance, NC Davidson, NC Davie, NC Forsyth, NC Guilford, NC Randolph, NC	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Stokes, NC Yadkin, NC	
3150 Greenville, NC	0.9177
Pitt, NC	
3160 Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	0.9177
Anderson, SC Cherokee, SC Greenville, SC Pickens, SC Spartanburg, SC	
3180 Hagerstown, MD	0.9362
Washington, MD	
3200 Hamilton-Middletown, OH ...	0.9484
Butler, OH	
3240 Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA	0.9315
Cumberland, PA Dauphin, PA Lebanon, PA Perry, PA	
3283 Hartford, CT	1.2520
Hartford, CT Litchfield, CT Middlesex, CT Tolland, CT	
3285 ² Hattiesburg, MS	0.7746
Forrest, MS Lamar, MS	
3290 Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	0.8958
Alexander, NC Burke, NC Caldwell, NC Catawba, NC	
3320 Honolulu, HI	1.1121
Honolulu, HI	
3350 Houma, LA	0.8470
Lafourche, LA Terrebonne, LA	
3360 Houston, TX	0.9746
Chambers, TX Fort Bend, TX Harris, TX Liberty, TX Montgomery, TX Waller, TX	
3400 Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	0.9744
Boyd, KY Carter, KY Greenup, KY Lawrence, OH Cabell, WV Wayne, WV	
3440 Huntsville, AL	0.8901
Limestone, AL Madison, AL	
3480 Indianapolis, IN	0.9828
Boone, IN Hamilton, IN Hancock, IN Hendricks, IN Johnson, IN Madison, IN Marion, IN Morgan, IN Shelby, IN	
3500 Iowa City, IA	1.0025
Johnson, IA	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
3520 Jackson, MI	0.9591
Jackson, MI	
3560 Jackson, MS	0.8713
Hinds, MS Madison, MS Rankin, MS	
3580 Jackson, TN	0.9370
Madison, TN Chester, TN	
3600 Jacksonville, FL	0.9341
Clay, FL Duval, FL Nassau, FL St. Johns, FL	
3605 Jacksonville, NC	0.8714
Onslow, NC	
3610 Jamestown, NY	0.8633
Chautauqua, NY	
3620 Janesville-Beloit, WI	0.9696
Rock, WI	
3640 Jersey City, NJ	1.1200
Hudson, NJ	
3660 Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA	0.8307
Carter, TN Hawkins, TN Sullivan, TN Unicoi, TN Washington, TN Bristol City, VA Scott, VA Washington, VA	
3680 Johnstown, PA	0.8525
Cambria, PA Somerset, PA	
3700 Jonesboro, AR	0.7828
Craighead, AR	
3710 Joplin, MO	0.8700
Jasper, MO Newton, MO	
3720 Kalamazoo-Battlecreek, MI	1.0689
Calhoun, MI Kalamazoo, MI Van Buren, MI	
3740 Kankakee, IL	0.9591
Kankakee, IL	
3760 Kansas City, KS-MO	0.9809
Johnson, KS Leavenworth, KS Miami, KS Wyandotte, KS Cass, MO Clay, MO Clinton, MO Jackson, MO Lafayette, MO Platte, MO Ray, MO	
3800 Kenosha, WI	0.9741
Kenosha, WI	
3810 Killeen-Temple, TX	0.8447
Bell, TX Coryell, TX	
3840 Knoxville, TN	0.9090
Anderson, TN Blount, TN Knox, TN Loudon, TN Sevier, TN Union, TN	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
3850 Kokomo, IN	0.8950
Howard, IN Tipton, IN	
3870 La Crosse, WI-MN	0.9229
Houston, MN La Crosse, WI	
3880 Lafayette, LA	0.8550
Acadia, LA Lafayette, LA St. Landry, LA St. Martin, LA	
3920 Lafayette, IN	0.9515
Clinton, IN Tippecanoe, IN	
3960 Lake Charles, LA	0.8030
Calcasieu, LA	
3980 Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	0.9162
Polk, FL	
4000 Lancaster, PA	0.9171
Lancaster, PA	
4040 Lansing-East Lansing, MI ...	0.9827
Clinton, MI Eaton, MI Ingham, MI	
4080 Laredo, TX	0.8504
Webb, TX	
4100 Las Cruces, NM	0.8888
Dona Ana, NM	
4120 Las Vegas, NV-AZ	1.1018
Mohave, AZ Clark, NV Nye, NV	
4150 Lawrence, KS	0.7964
Douglas, KS	
4200 Lawton, OK	0.8251
Comanche, OK	
4243 Lewiston-Auburn, ME	0.9249
Androscoggin, ME	
4280 Lexington, KY	0.8629
Bourbon, KY Clark, KY Fayette, KY Jessamine, KY Madison, KY Scott, KY Woodford, KY	
4320 Lima, OH	0.9515
Allen, OH Auglaize, OH	
4360 Lincoln, NE	0.8928
Lancaster, NE	
4400 Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	0.9045
Faulkner, AR Lonoke, AR Pulaski, AR Saline, AR	
4420 Longview-Marshall, TX	0.8588
Gregg, TX Harrison, TX Upshur, TX	
4480 Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	1.2027
Los Angeles, CA	
4520 ¹ Louisville, KY-IN	0.9517
Clark, IN Floyd, IN Harrison, IN Scott, IN Bullitt, KY	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Jefferson, KY	
Oldham, KY	
4600 Lubbock, TX	0.7752
Lubbock, TX	
4640 Lynchburg, VA	0.9311
Amherst, VA	
Bedford, VA	
Bedford City, VA	
Campbell, VA	
Lynchburg City, VA	
4680 Macon, GA	0.9259
Bibb, GA	
Houston, GA	
Jones, GA	
Peach, GA	
Twiggs, GA	
4720 Madison, WI	1.0188
Dane, WI	
4800 Mansfield, OH	0.8989
Crawford, OH	
Richland, OH	
4840 Mayaguez, PR	0.4921
Anasco, PR	
Cabo Rojo, PR	
Hormigueros, PR	
Mayaguez, PR	
Sabana Grande, PR	
San German, PR	
4880 McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	0.8419
Hidalgo, TX	
4890 Medford-Ashland, OR	1.0605
Jackson, OR	
4900 Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL	1.0782
Brevard, FL	
4920 Memphis, TN-AR-MS	0.8839
Crittenden, AR	
DeSoto, MS	
Fayette, TN	
Shelby, TN	
Tipton, TN	
4940 Merced, CA	0.9937
Merced, CA	
5000 Miami, FL	0.9864
Dade, FL	
5015 Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	1.1454
Hunterdon, NJ	
Middlesex, NJ	
Somerset, NJ	
5080 Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI ..	0.9901
Milwaukee, WI	
Ozaukee, WI	
Washington, WI	
Waukesha, WI	
5120 Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	1.0969
Anoka, MN	
Carver, MN	
Chisago, MN	
Dakota, MN	
Hennepin, MN	
Isanti, MN	
Ramsey, MN	
Scott, MN	
Sherburne, MN	
Washington, MN	
Wright, MN	
Pierce, WI	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
St. Croix, WI	
5140 Missoula, MT	0.9250
Missoula, MT	
5160 Mobile, AL	0.8179
Baldwin, AL	
Mobile, AL	
5170 Modesto, CA	1.0606
Stanislaus, CA	
5190 Monmouth-Ocean, NJ	1.1270
Monmouth, NJ	
Ocean, NJ	
5200 Monroe, LA	0.8191
Ouachita, LA	
5240 Montgomery, AL	0.7786
Autauga, AL	
Elmore, AL	
Montgomery, AL	
5280 Muncie, IN	0.9150
Delaware, IN	
5330 Myrtle Beach, SC	0.9141
Horry, SC	
5345 Naples, FL	0.9803
Collier, FL	
5360 Nashville, TN	0.9456
Cheatham, TN	
Davidson, TN	
Dickson, TN	
Robertson, TN	
Rutherford TN	
Sumner, TN	
Williamson, TN	
Wilson, TN	
5380 Nassau-Suffolk, NY	1.3441
Nassau, NY	
Suffolk, NY	
5483 New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT	1.2520
Fairfield, CT	
New Haven, CT	
5523 New London-Norwich, CT ...	1.2520
New London, CT	
5560 New Orleans, LA	0.9050
Jefferson, LA	
Orleans, LA	
Plaquemines, LA	
St. Bernard, LA	
St. Charles, LA	
St. James, LA	
St. John The Baptist, LA	
St. Tammany, LA	
5600 New York, NY	1.4069
Bronx, NY	
Kings, NY	
New York, NY	
Putnam, NY	
Queens, NY	
Richmond, NY	
Rockland, NY	
Westchester, NY	
5640 Newark, NJ	1.1504
Essex, NJ	
Morris, NJ	
Sussex, NJ	
Union, NJ	
Warren, NJ	
5660 Newburgh, NY-PA	1.1434
Orange, NY	
Pike, PA	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
5720 Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC	0.8553
Currituck, NC	
Chesapeake City, VA	
Gloucester, VA	
Hampton City, VA	
Isle of Wight, VA	
James City, VA	
Mathews, VA	
Newport News City, VA	
Norfolk City, VA	
Poquoson City, VA	
Portsmouth City, VA	
Suffolk City, VA	
Virginia Beach City VA	
Williamsburg City, VA	
York, VA	
5775 Oakland, CA	1.5222
Alameda, CA	
Contra Costa, CA	
5790 Ocala, FL	0.9526
Marion, FL	
5800 Odessa-Midland, TX	0.9233
Ector, TX	
Midland, TX	
5880 Oklahoma City, OK	0.8997
Canadian, OK	
Cleveland, OK	
Logan, OK	
McClain, OK	
Oklahoma, OK	
Pottawatomie, OK	
5910 Olympia, WA	1.1071
Thurston, WA	
5920 Omaha, NE-IA	1.0089
Pottawattamie, IA	
Cass, NE	
Douglas, NE	
Sarpy, NE	
Washington, NE	
5945 Orange County, CA	1.1604
Orange, CA	
5960 Orlando, FL	0.9537
Lake, FL	
Orange, FL	
Osceola, FL	
Seminole, FL	
5990 Owensboro, KY	0.8283
Daviess, KY	
6015 Panama City, FL	0.8926
Bay, FL	
6020 Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	0.8210
Washington, OH	
Wood, WV	
6080 Pensacola, FL	0.8907
Escambia, FL	
Santa Rosa, FL	
6120 Peoria-Pekin, IL	0.8854
Peoria, IL	
Tazewell, IL	
Woodford, IL	
6160 Philadelphia, PA-NJ	1.0675
Burlington, NJ	
Camden, NJ	
Gloucester, NJ	
Salem, NJ	
Bucks, PA	
Chester, PA	
Delaware, PA	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Montgomery, PA Philadelphia, PA	
6200 Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	0.9562
Maricopa, AZ Pinal, AZ	
6240 Pine Bluff, AR	0.7866
Jefferson, AR	
6280 Pittsburgh, PA	0.9403
Allegheny, PA Beaver, PA Butler, PA Fayette, PA Washington, PA Westmoreland, PA	
6323 Pittsfield, MA	1.1257
Berkshire, MA	
6340 Pocatello, ID	0.8799
Bannock, ID	
6360 Ponce, PR	0.5221
Guayanilla, PR Juana Diaz, PR Penuelas, PR Ponce, PR Villalba, PR Yauco, PR	
6403 Portland, ME	0.9932
Cumberland, ME Sagadahoc, ME York, ME	
6440 Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	1.0774
Clackamas, OR Columbia, OR Multnomah, OR Washington, OR Yamhill, OR Clark, WA	
6483 Providence-Warwick-Paw- tucket, RI	1.0558
Bristol, RI Kent, RI Newport, RI Providence, RI Washington, RI	
6520 Provo-Orem, UT	1.0190
Utah, UT	
6560 Pueblo, CO	0.9104
Pueblo, CO	
6580 Punta Gorda, FL	0.8907
Charlotte, FL	
6600 Racine, WI	0.9413
Racine, WI	
6640 Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	1.0083
Chatham, NC Durham, NC Franklin, NC Johnston, NC Orange, NC Wake, NC	
6660 Rapid City, SD	0.8936
Pennington, SD	
6680 Reading, PA	0.9308
Berks, PA	
6690 Redding, CA	1.1249
Shasta, CA	
6720 Reno, NV	1.0664
Washoe, NV	
6740 Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	1.1608

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Benton, WA Franklin, WA	
6760 Richmond-Petersburg, VA ..	0.9735
Charles City County, VA Chesterfield, VA Colonial Heights City, VA Dinwiddie, VA Goochland, VA Hanover, VA Henrico, VA Hopewell City, VA New Kent, VA Petersburg City, VA Powhatan, VA Prince George, VA Richmond City, VA	
6780 Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	1.1251
Riverside, CA San Bernardino, CA	
6800 Roanoke, VA	0.8703
Botetourt, VA Roanoke, VA Roanoke City, VA Salem City, VA	
6820 Rochester, MN	1.2263
Olmsted, MN	
6840 Rochester, NY	0.9133
Genesee, NY Livingston, NY Monroe, NY Ontario, NY Orleans, NY Wayne, NY	
6880 Rockford, IL	0.9456
Boone, IL Ogle, IL Winnebago, IL	
6895 Rocky Mount, NC	0.9322
Edgecombe, NC Nash, NC	
6920 Sacramento, CA	1.1622
El Dorado, CA Placer, CA Sacramento, CA	
6960 Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	0.9709
Bay, MI Midland, MI Saginaw, MI	
6980 St. Cloud, MN	0.9757
Benton, MN Stearns, MN	
7000 St. Joseph, MO	0.8093
Andrew, MO Buchanan, MO	
7040 St. Louis, MO-IL	0.8907
Clinton, IL Jersey, IL Madison, IL Monroe, IL St. Clair, IL Franklin, MO Jefferson, MO Lincoln, MO St. Charles, MO St. Louis, MO St. Louis City, MO Warren, MO	
7080 Salem, OR	1.0473

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Marion, OR Polk, OR	
7120 Salinas, CA	1.4772
Monterey, CA	
7160 Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT ...	1.0035
Davis, UT Salt Lake, UT Weber, UT	
7200 San Angelo, TX	0.7956
Tom Green, TX	
7240 San Antonio, TX	0.8649
Bexar, TX Comal, TX Guadalupe, TX Wilson, TX	
7320 San Diego, CA	1.1243
San Diego, CA	
7360 San Francisco, CA	1.4288
Marin, CA San Francisco, CA San Mateo, CA	
7400 San Jose, CA	1.4162
Santa Clara, CA	
7440 San Juan-Bayamon, PR	0.4706
Aguas Buenas, PR Barceloneta, PR Bayamon, PR Canovanas, PR Carolina, PR Catano, PR Ceiba, PR Comerio, PR Corozal, PR Dorado, PR Fajardo, PR Florida, PR Guaynabo, PR Humacao, PR Juncos, PR Los Piedras, PR Loiza, PR Luguillo, PR Manati, PR Morovis, PR Naguabo, PR Naranjito, PR Rio Grande, PR San Juan, PR Toa Alta, PR Toa Baja, PR Trujillo Alto, PR Vega Alta, PR Vega Baja, PR Yabucoa, PR	
7460 San Luis Obispo- Atascadero-Paso Robles, CA	1.1386
San Luis Obispo, CA	
7480 Santa Barbara-Santa Maria- Lompoc, CA	1.0588
Santa Barbara, CA	
7485 Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	1.3630
Santa Cruz, CA	
7490 Santa Fe, NM	1.0822
Los Alamos, NM Santa Fe, NM	
7500 Santa Rosa, CA	1.3179
Sonoma, CA	
7510 Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	0.9339
Manatee, FL Sarasota, FL	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
7520 Savannah, GA	0.9961
Bryan, GA	
Chatham, GA	
Effingham, GA	
7560 Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	0.8525
Columbia, PA	
Lackawanna, PA	
Luzerne, PA	
Wyoming, PA	
7600 Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA	1.1571
Island, WA	
King, WA	
Snohomish, WA	
7610 Sharon, PA	0.8525
Mercer, PA	
7620 Sheboygan, WI	0.9229
Sheboygan, WI	
7640 Sherman-Denison, TX	0.9334
Grayson, TX	
7680 Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	0.8813
Bossier, LA	
Caddo, LA	
Webster, LA	
7720 Sioux City, IA-NE	0.9138
Woodbury, IA	
Dakota, NE	
7760 Sioux Falls, SD	0.9098
Lincoln, SD	
Minnehaha, SD	
7800 South Bend, IN	0.9902
St. Joseph, IN	
7840 Spokane, WA	1.0961
Spokane, WA	
7880 Springfield, IL	0.8654
Menard, IL	
Sangamon, IL	
7920 Springfield, MO	0.8510
Christian, MO	
Greene, MO	
Webster, MO	
8003 Springfield, MA	1.1257
Hampden, MA	
Hampshire, MA	
8050 State College, PA	0.9032
Centre, PA	
8080 Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV (WV Hospitals)	0.8893
Jefferson, OH	
Brooke, WV	
Hancock, WV	
8120 Stockton-Lodi, CA	1.0445
San Joaquin, CA	
8140 Sumter, SC	0.8607
Sumter, SC	
8160 Syracuse, NY	0.9519
Cayuga, NY	
Madison, NY	
Onondaga, NY	
Oswego, NY	
8200 Tacoma, WA	1.1052
Pierce, WA	
8240 Tallahassee, FL	0.8907
Gadsden, FL	
Leon, FL	
8280 Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	0.9127
Hernando, FL	
Hillsborough, FL	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Pasco, FL	
Pinellas, FL	
8320 Terre Haute, IN	0.8796
Clay, IN	
Vermillion, IN	
Vigo, IN	
8360 Texarkana,AR-Texarkana, TX	0.8150
Miller, AR	
Bowie, TX	
8400 Toledo, OH	0.9863
Fulton, OH	
Lucas, OH	
Wood, OH	
8440 Topeka, KS	0.8952
Shawnee, KS	
8480 Trenton, NJ	1.0710
Mercer, NJ	
8520 Tucson, AZ	0.8993
Pima, AZ	
8560 Tulsa, OK	0.8398
Creek, OK	
Osage, OK	
Rogers, OK	
Tulsa, OK	
Wagoner, OK	
8600 Tuscaloosa, AL	0.8221
Tuscaloosa, AL	
8640 Tyler, TX	0.9650
Smith, TX	
8680 Utica-Rome, NY	0.8633
Herkimer, NY	
Oneida, NY	
8720 Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA ..	1.3472
Napa, CA	
Solano, CA	
8735 Ventura, CA	1.1209
Ventura, CA	
8750 Victoria, TX	0.8814
Victoria, TX	
8760 Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	1.0296
Cumberland, NJ	
8780 Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA	0.9934
Tulare, CA	
8800 Waco, TX	0.8802
McLennan, TX	
8840 Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	1.0852
District of Columbia, DC	
Calvert, MD	
Charles, MD	
Frederick, MD	
Montgomery, MD	
Prince Georges, MD	
Alexandria City, VA	
Arlington, VA	
Clarke, VA	
Culpeper, VA	
Fairfax, VA	
Fairfax City, VA	
Falls Church City, VA	
Fauquier, VA	
Fredericksburg City, VA	
King George, VA	
Loudoun, VA	
Manassas City, VA	
Manassas Park City, VA	
Prince William, VA	

TABLE 4G.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index
Spotsylvania, VA	
Stafford, VA	
Warren, VA	
Berkeley, WV	
Jefferson, WV	
8920 Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	0.8395
Black Hawk, IA	
8940 Wausau, WI	0.9882
Marathon, WI	
8960 West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL	0.9929
Palm Beach, FL	
9000 Wheeling, WV-OH	0.8053
Belmont, OH	
Marshall, WV	
Ohio, WV	
9040 Wichita, KS	0.9571
Butler, KS	
Harvey, KS	
Sedgwick, KS	
9080 Wichita Falls, TX	0.8023
Archer, TX	
Wichita, TX	
9140 Williamsport, PA	0.8624
Lycoming, PA	
9160 Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD	
New Castle, DE	
Cecil, MD	
9200 Wilmington, NC	0.9471
New Hanover, NC	
Brunswick, NC	
9260 Yakima, WA	1.0676
Yakima, WA	
9270 Yolo, CA	0.9934
Yolo, CA	
9280 York, PA	0.9140
York, PA	
9320 Youngstown-Warren, OH	0.9485
Columbiana, OH	
Mahoning, OH	
Trumbull, OH	
9340 Yuba City, CA	1.0310
Sutter, CA	
Yuba, CA	
9360 Yuma, AZ	0.8677
Yuma, AZ	

TABLE 4H.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS

Nonurban area	Wage index
Alabama	0.7786
Alaska	1.2323
Arizona	0.8483
Arkansas	0.7670
California	0.9934
Colorado	0.9104
Connecticut	1.2520
Delaware	0.9126
Florida	0.8907
Georgia	0.8254
Hawaii	1.0342
Idaho	0.8799
Illinois	0.8301
Indiana	0.8796
Iowa	0.8395
Kansas	0.7964

TABLE 4H.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS—Continued

Nonurban area	Wage index
Kentucky	0.8079
Louisiana	0.7637
Maine	0.8754
Maryland	0.8855
Massachusetts	1.1257
Michigan	0.8944
Minnesota	0.9249
Mississippi	0.7746
Missouri	0.8093
Montana	0.8567
Nebraska	0.8283
Nevada	0.9519
New Hampshire	0.9882

TABLE 4H.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS—Continued

Nonurban area	Wage index
New Jersey ¹
New Mexico	0.8645
New York	0.8633
North Carolina	0.8714
North Dakota	0.7830
Ohio	0.8675
Oklahoma	0.7664
Oregon	1.0408
Pennsylvania	0.8525
Puerto Rico	0.4400
Rhode Island ¹
South Carolina	0.8607
South Dakota	0.7895

TABLE 4H.—PRE-RECLASSIFIED WAGE INDEX FOR RURAL AREAS—Continued

Nonurban area	Wage index
Tennessee	0.7873
Texas	0.7752
Utah	0.9426
Vermont	0.9402
Virginia	0.8494
Washington	1.0274
West Virginia	0.8053
Wisconsin	0.9229
Wyoming	0.8890

¹ All counties within the State are classified as urban.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
1	01	SURG	CRANIOTOMY AGE >17 W CC	3.7174	8.1	11.2
2	01	SURG	CRANIOTOMY AGE >17 W/O CC	1.9613	4.0	5.2
3	01	SURG	*CRANIOTOMY AGE 0-17	1.9441	12.7	12.7
4	01	SURG	SPINAL PROCEDURES	2.2960	4.5	7.2
5	01	SURG	EXTRACRANIAL VASCULAR PROCEDURES	1.3846	2.1	3.1
6	01	SURG	CARPAL TUNNEL RELEASE8237	2.1	2.9
7	01	SURG	PERIPH & CRANIAL NERVE & OTHER NERV SYST PROC W CC	2.5718	6.5	9.8
8	01	SURG	PERIPH & CRANIAL NERVE & OTHER NERV SYST PROC W/O CC	1.4925	1.9	2.8
9	01	MED	SPINAL DISORDERS & INJURIES	1.3592	4.6	6.6
10	01	MED	NERVOUS SYSTEM NEOPLASMS W CC	1.2507	4.9	6.6
11	01	MED	NERVOUS SYSTEM NEOPLASMS W/O CC8629	3.0	4.0
12	01	MED	DEGENERATIVE NERVOUS SYSTEM DISORDERS8881	4.4	5.9
13	01	MED	MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS & CEREBELLAR ATAXIA7928	4.1	5.0
14	01	MED	INTRACRANIAL HEMORRHAGE & STROKE W INFARCT	1.2742	4.8	6.2
15	01	MED	NONSPECIFIC CVA & PRECEREBRAL OCCLUSION W/O INFARCT9844	4.0	5.0
16	01	MED	NONSPECIFIC CEREBROVASCULAR DISORDERS W CC	1.2389	4.7	6.2
17	01	MED	NONSPECIFIC CEREBROVASCULAR DISORDERS W/O CC6651	2.5	3.1
18	01	MED	CRANIAL & PERIPHERAL NERVE DISORDERS W CC9712	4.2	5.4
19	01	MED	CRANIAL & PERIPHERAL NERVE DISORDERS W/O CC6939	2.8	3.5
20	01	MED	NERVOUS SYSTEM INFECTION EXCEPT VIRAL MENINGITIS	2.7921	8.0	10.8
21	01	MED	VIRAL MENINGITIS	1.5323	5.0	6.6
22	01	MED	HYPERTENSIVE ENCEPHALOPATHY	1.0334	3.9	5.0
23	01	MED	NONTRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA8214	3.1	4.3
24	01	MED	SEIZURE & HEADACHE AGE >17 W CC9953	3.6	4.9
25	01	MED	SEIZURE & HEADACHE AGE >17 W/O CC6061	2.5	3.2
26	01	MED	SEIZURE & HEADACHE AGE 0-177854	2.5	4.7
27	01	MED	TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA >1 HR	1.3045	3.2	5.0
28	01	MED	TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE >17 W CC	1.3318	4.5	6.3
29	01	MED	TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE >17 W/O CC7069	2.7	3.6
30	01	MED	*TRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA, COMA <1 HR AGE 0-173288	2.0	2.0
31	01	MED	CONCUSSION AGE >17 W CC8787	3.0	4.1
32	01	MED	CONCUSSION AGE >17 W/O CC5318	1.9	2.4
33	01	MED	*CONCUSSION AGE 0-172066	1.6	1.6
34	01	MED	OTHER DISORDERS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM W CC9962	3.7	5.1
35	01	MED	OTHER DISORDERS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM W/O CC6353	2.5	3.2
36	02	SURG	RETINAL PROCEDURES6814	1.2	1.5
37	02	SURG	ORBITAL PROCEDURES	1.0534	2.6	3.8
38	02	SURG	PRIMARY IRIS PROCEDURES5412	1.9	2.5
39	02	SURG	LENS PROCEDURES WITH OR WITHOUT VITRECTOMY5924	1.5	1.9
40	02	SURG	EXTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT ORBIT AGE >178647	2.5	3.6
41	02	SURG	*EXTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT ORBIT AGE 0-173348	1.6	1.6
42	02	SURG	INTRAOCULAR PROCEDURES EXCEPT RETINA, IRIS & LENS6552	1.7	2.4
43	02	MED	HYPHEMA4951	2.4	3.0
44	02	MED	ACUTE MAJOR EYE INFECTIONS6374	4.1	5.1
45	02	MED	NEUROLOGICAL EYE DISORDERS7064	2.6	3.2

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.
 ** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.
 GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.
 ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.
 NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
46	02	MED	OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE >17 W CC	.7810	3.4	4.6
47	02	MED	OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE >17 W/O CC	.5193	2.5	3.2
48	02	MED	* OTHER DISORDERS OF THE EYE AGE 0-17	.2949	2.9	2.9
49	03	SURG	MAJOR HEAD & NECK PROCEDURES	1.7706	3.3	4.6
50	03	SURG	SIALOADENECTOMY	.8318	1.5	1.8
51	03	SURG	SALIVARY GLAND PROCEDURES EXCEPT SIALOADENECTOMY	.9325	1.9	3.1
52	03	SURG	CLEFT LIP & PALATE REPAIR	.8003	1.5	1.9
53	03	SURG	SINUS & MASTOID PROCEDURES AGE >17	1.1968	2.1	3.4
54	03	SURG	* SINUS & MASTOID PROCEDURES AGE 0-17	.4779	3.2	3.2
55	03	SURG	MISCELLANEOUS EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT PROCEDURES	.9492	1.9	3.0
56	03	SURG	RHINOPLASTY	.9678	2.0	3.0
57	03	SURG	T&A PROC, EXCEPT TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE >17.	.9849	2.4	3.7
58	03	SURG	* T&A PROC, EXCEPT TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE 0-17.	.2714	1.5	1.5
59	03	SURG	TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE >17	.7530	1.8	2.6
60	03	SURG	* TONSILLECTOMY &/OR ADENOIDECTOMY ONLY, AGE 0-17	.2067	1.5	1.5
61	03	SURG	MYRINGOTOMY W TUBE INSERTION AGE >17	1.3030	2.9	4.8
62	03	SURG	* MYRINGOTOMY W TUBE INSERTION AGE 0-17	.2927	1.3	1.3
63	03	SURG	OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT O.R. PROCEDURES	1.4279	3.0	4.5
64	03	MED	EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT MALIGNANCY	1.3100	4.4	6.6
65	03	MED	DYSEQUILIBRIUM	.5487	2.3	2.8
66	03	MED	EPISTAXIS	.5626	2.4	3.1
67	03	MED	EPIGLOTTITIS	.7763	2.8	3.6
68	03	MED	OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE >17 W CC	.6690	3.1	3.8
69	03	MED	OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE >17 W/O CC	.5033	2.4	3.0
70	03	MED	OTITIS MEDIA & URI AGE 0-17	.4570	2.8	3.5
71	03	MED	LARYNGOTRACHEITIS	.6933	2.8	3.4
72	03	MED	NASAL TRAUMA & DEFORMITY	.7159	2.6	3.6
73	03	MED	OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT DIAGNOSES AGE >17	.7961	3.2	4.4
74	03	MED	* OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT DIAGNOSES AGE 0-17	.3326	2.1	2.1
75	04	SURG	MAJOR CHEST PROCEDURES	3.0978	7.7	10.1
76	04	SURG	OTHER RESP SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W CC	2.8553	8.5	11.4
77	04	SURG	OTHER RESP SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.2070	3.5	4.9
78	04	MED	PULMONARY EMBOLISM	1.2980	5.7	6.7
79	04	MED	RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE >17 W CC	1.6199	6.7	8.5
80	04	MED	RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE >17 W/O CC	.8747	4.4	5.5
81	04	MED	* RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS AGE 0-17	1.5059	6.1	6.1
82	04	MED	RESPIRATORY NEOPLASMS	1.3926	5.2	7.0
83	04	MED	MAJOR CHEST TRAUMA W CC	.9653	4.3	5.5
84	04	MED	MAJOR CHEST TRAUMA W/O CC	.5109	2.6	3.2
85	04	MED	PLEURAL EFFUSION W CC	1.2119	4.8	6.4
86	04	MED	PLEURAL EFFUSION W/O CC	.6963	2.9	3.8
87	04	MED	PULMONARY EDEMA & RESPIRATORY FAILURE	1.3625	4.8	6.3
88	04	MED	CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE	.9039	4.1	5.1
89	04	MED	SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE >17 W CC	1.0431	4.8	5.9
90	04	MED	SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE >17 W/O CC	.6270	3.4	4.0
91	04	MED	SIMPLE PNEUMONIA & PLEURISY AGE 0-17	.6854	3.2	4.0
92	04	MED	INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE W CC	1.2255	5.0	6.4
93	04	MED	INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE W/O CC	.7331	3.3	4.1
94	04	MED	PNEUMOTHORAX W CC	1.1575	4.7	6.4
95	04	MED	PNEUMOTHORAX W/O CC	.5895	2.9	3.7
96	04	MED	BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE >17 W CC	.7541	3.7	4.6
97	04	MED	BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE >17 W/O CC	.5602	2.9	3.5
98	04	MED	BRONCHITIS & ASTHMA AGE 0-17	.9319	3.7	5.1
99	04	MED	RESPIRATORY SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W CC	.7022	2.4	3.2
100	04	MED	RESPIRATORY SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W/O CC	.5347	1.7	2.1
101	04	MED	OTHER RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W CC	.8567	3.3	4.4
102	04	MED	OTHER RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W/O CC	.5447	2.0	2.6
103	PRE	SURG	HEART TRANSPLANT	19.5361	29.7	49.4
104	05	SURG	CARDIAC VALVE & OTH MAJOR CARDIOTHORACIC PROC W CARD CATH.	7.9615	12.3	14.4
105	05	SURG	CARDIAC VALVE & OTH MAJOR CARDIOTHORACIC PROC W/O CARD CATH.	5.7856	8.3	10.0
106	05	SURG	CORONARY BYPASS W PTCA	7.4493	9.6	11.4
107	05	SURG	CORONARY BYPASS W CARDIAC CATH	5.3894	9.2	10.5

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
108	05	SURG	OTHER CARDIOTHORACIC PROCEDURES	5.4585	7.8	10.3
109	05	SURG	CORONARY BYPASS W/O PTCA OR CARDIAC CATH	3.9756	6.8	7.7
110	05	SURG	MAJOR CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W CC	4.0985	6.5	9.1
111	05	SURG	MAJOR CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W/O CC	2.4445	3.5	4.4
112	05	SURG	NO LONGER VALID0000	.0	.0
113	05	SURG	AMPUTATION FOR CIRC SYSTEM DISORDERS EXCEPT UPPER LIMB & TOE.	2.9028	10.4	13.4
114	05	SURG	UPPER LIMB & TOE AMPUTATION FOR CIRC SYSTEM DISORDERS	1.6530	6.2	8.5
115	05	SURG	PRM CARD PACEM IMPL W AMI,HRT FAIL OR SHK,OR AICD LEAD OR GN.	3.4452	5.9	8.3
116	05	SURG	OTHER PERMANENT CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPLANT	2.3075	3.2	4.5
117	05	SURG	CARDIAC PACEMAKER REVISION EXCEPT DEVICE REPLACEMENT	1.3312	2.6	4.2
118	05	SURG	CARDIAC PACEMAKER DEVICE REPLACEMENT	1.5696	1.9	2.9
119	05	SURG	VEIN LIGATION & STRIPPING	1.3027	3.0	5.1
120	05	SURG	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES	2.2337	5.3	8.8
121	05	MED	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI & MAJOR COMP, DISCHARGED ALIVE.	1.5813	5.3	6.6
122	05	MED	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI W/O MAJOR COMP, DISCHARGED ALIVE.	1.0393	3.0	3.8
123	05	MED	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS W AMI, EXPIRED	1.5526	2.8	4.7
124	05	MED	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS EXCEPT AMI, W CARD CATH & COMPLEX DIAG.	1.4301	3.3	4.4
125	05	MED	CIRCULATORY DISORDERS EXCEPT AMI, W CARD CATH W/O COMPLEX DIAG.	1.0846	2.1	2.7
126	05	MED	ACUTE & SUBACUTE ENDOCARDITIS	2.6971	9.5	12.2
127	05	MED	HEART FAILURE & SHOCK	1.0027	4.1	5.3
128	05	MED	DEEP VEIN THROMBOPHLEBITIS7241	4.7	5.5
129	05	MED	CARDIAC ARREST, UNEXPLAINED	1.0803	1.8	2.8
130	05	MED	PERIPHERAL VASCULAR DISORDERS W CC9384	4.5	5.7
131	05	MED	PERIPHERAL VASCULAR DISORDERS W/O CC5683	3.3	4.1
132	05	MED	ATHEROSCLEROSIS W CC6540	2.3	3.0
133	05	MED	ATHEROSCLEROSIS W/O CC5359	1.8	2.3
134	05	MED	HYPERTENSION5884	2.5	3.2
135	05	MED	CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC	.8961	3.3	4.5
136	05	MED	CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC.	.5709	2.1	2.6
137	05	MED	* CARDIAC CONGENITAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS AGE 0-178113	3.3	3.3
138	05	MED	CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIA & CONDUCTION DISORDERS W CC8249	3.1	4.0
139	05	MED	CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIA & CONDUCTION DISORDERS W/O CC5128	2.0	2.5
140	05	MED	ANGINA PECTORIS5384	2.1	2.6
141	05	MED	SYNCOPE & COLLAPSE W CC7284	2.8	3.6
142	05	MED	SYNCOPE & COLLAPSE W/O CC5605	2.1	2.6
143	05	MED	CHEST PAIN5394	1.7	2.1
144	05	MED	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W CC	1.1931	3.8	5.5
145	05	MED	OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES W/O CC5881	2.1	2.7
146	06	SURG	RECTAL RESECTION W CC	2.7193	8.8	10.2
147	06	SURG	RECTAL RESECTION W/O CC	1.5566	5.8	6.4
148	06	SURG	MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W CC	3.4444	10.2	12.3
149	06	SURG	MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.5247	5.9	6.5
150	06	SURG	PERITONEAL ADHESIOLYSIS W CC	2.8477	9.1	11.2
151	06	SURG	PERITONEAL ADHESIOLYSIS W/O CC	1.3334	4.5	5.7
152	06	SURG	MINOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W CC	1.9467	6.9	8.3
153	06	SURG	MINOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1736	4.8	5.4
154	06	SURG	STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES AGE >17 W CC.	4.1397	9.8	13.2
155	06	SURG	STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES AGE >17 W/O CC.	1.3054	3.0	4.0
156	06	SURG	* STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES AGE 0-17	.8355	6.0	6.0
157	06	SURG	ANAL & STOMAL PROCEDURES W CC	1.2618	3.9	5.6
158	06	SURG	ANAL & STOMAL PROCEDURES W/O CC6504	2.0	2.5
159	06	SURG	HERNIA PROCEDURES EXCEPT INGUINAL & FEMORAL AGE >17 W CC.	1.3593	3.7	5.1
160	06	SURG	HERNIA PROCEDURES EXCEPT INGUINAL & FEMORAL AGE >17 W/O CC.	.8070	2.2	2.7
161	06	SURG	INGUINAL & FEMORAL HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE >17 W CC	1.1278	2.8	4.2
162	06	SURG	INGUINAL & FEMORAL HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE >17 W/O CC6337	1.6	1.9

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.
 ** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.
 GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.
 ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.
 NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
163	06	SURG	* HERNIA PROCEDURES AGE 0-17	.6855	2.1	2.1
164	06	SURG	APPENDECTOMY W COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W CC	2.2964	7.0	8.3
165	06	SURG	APPENDECTOMY W COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W/O CC	1.2622	4.0	4.7
166	06	SURG	APPENDECTOMY W/O COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W CC	1.4680	3.7	4.9
167	06	SURG	APPENDECTOMY W/O COMPLICATED PRINCIPAL DIAG W/O CC	.9104	2.1	2.5
168	03	SURG	MOUTH PROCEDURES W CC	1.2974	3.3	4.9
169	03	SURG	MOUTH PROCEDURES W/O CC	.7397	1.8	2.3
170	06	SURG	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W CC	2.8017	7.4	11.0
171	06	SURG	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1651	3.1	4.3
172	06	MED	DIGESTIVE MALIGNANCY W CC	1.3567	5.1	7.0
173	06	MED	DIGESTIVE MALIGNANCY W/O CC	.7531	2.7	3.8
174	06	MED	G.I. HEMORRHAGE W CC	.9937	3.9	4.8
175	06	MED	G.I. HEMORRHAGE W/O CC	.5553	2.5	2.9
176	06	MED	COMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER	1.0832	4.1	5.3
177	06	MED	UNCOMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER W CC	.9193	3.7	4.5
178	06	MED	UNCOMPLICATED PEPTIC ULCER W/O CC	.6843	2.6	3.1
179	06	MED	INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE	1.0778	4.6	6.0
180	06	MED	G.I. OBSTRUCTION W CC	.9429	4.2	5.4
181	06	MED	G.I. OBSTRUCTION W/O CC	.5322	2.8	3.4
182	06	MED	ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC.	.7982	3.3	4.4
183	06	MED	ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC.	.5722	2.3	2.9
184	06	MED	ESOPHAGITIS, GASTROENT & MISC DIGEST DISORDERS AGE 0-17	.4806	2.3	2.8
185	03	MED	DENTAL & ORAL DIS EXCEPT EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS, AGE >17.	.8998	3.3	4.7
186	03	MED	* DENTAL & ORAL DIS EXCEPT EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS, AGE 0-17.	.3185	2.9	2.9
187	03	MED	DENTAL EXTRACTIONS & RESTORATIONS	.8564	3.0	4.1
188	06	MED	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W CC	1.0955	4.1	5.6
189	06	MED	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W/O CC	.5821	2.4	3.1
190	06	MED	OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES AGE 0-17	.6986	3.3	4.8
191	07	SURG	PANCREAS, LIVER & SHUNT PROCEDURES W CC	4.2962	9.8	13.8
192	07	SURG	PANCREAS, LIVER & SHUNT PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.6932	4.7	6.1
193	07	SURG	BILIARY TRACT PROC EXCEPT ONLY CHOLECYST W OR W/O C.D.E. W CC.	3.4015	10.4	12.8
194	07	SURG	BILIARY TRACT PROC EXCEPT ONLY CHOLECYST W OR W/O C.D.E. W/O CC.	1.6023	5.5	6.9
195	07	SURG	CHOLECYSTECTOMY W C.D.E. W CC	3.0046	8.6	10.4
196	07	SURG	CHOLECYSTECTOMY W C.D.E. W/O CC	1.6036	4.6	5.4
197	07	SURG	CHOLECYSTECTOMY EXCEPT BY LAPAROSCOPE W/O C.D.E. W CC.	2.4858	7.3	9.0
198	07	SURG	CHOLECYSTECTOMY EXCEPT BY LAPAROSCOPE W/O C.D.E. W/O CC.	1.2276	3.8	4.4
199	07	SURG	HEPATOBIILIARY DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURE FOR MALIGNANCY	2.4260	7.0	9.9
200	07	SURG	HEPATOBIILIARY DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURE FOR NON-MALIGNANCY.	2.9570	6.5	10.5
201	07	SURG	OTHER HEPATOBIILIARY OR PANCREAS O.R. PROCEDURES	3.7421	10.3	14.5
202	07	MED	CIRRHOSIS & ALCOHOLIC HEPATITIS	1.2879	4.8	6.4
203	07	MED	MALIGNANCY OF HEPATOBIILIARY SYSTEM OR PANCREAS	1.3499	5.0	6.8
204	07	MED	DISORDERS OF PANCREAS EXCEPT MALIGNANCY	1.1826	4.4	5.8
205	07	MED	DISORDERS OF LIVER EXCEPT MALIG,CIRR,ALC HEPA W CC	1.1933	4.6	6.2
206	07	MED	DISORDERS OF LIVER EXCEPT MALIG,CIRR,ALC HEPA W/O CC	.7038	3.0	3.9
207	07	MED	DISORDERS OF THE BILIARY TRACT W CC	1.1338	4.0	5.3
208	07	MED	DISORDERS OF THE BILIARY TRACT W/O CC	.6526	2.3	2.9
209	08	SURG	MAJOR JOINT & LIMB REATTACHMENT PROCEDURES OF LOWER EXTREMITY.	2.0531	4.5	5.0
210	08	SURG	HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE >17 W CC.	1.8289	6.1	7.0
211	08	SURG	HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE >17 W/O CC.	1.2715	4.6	5.0
212	08	SURG	* HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT AGE 0-17	.8391	11.1	11.1
213	08	SURG	AMPUTATION FOR MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONN TISSUE DISORDERS.	1.8664	6.6	9.2
214	08	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
215	08	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
216	08	SURG	BIOPSIES OF MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE.	2.2151	6.6	9.6
217	08	SURG	WND DEBRID & SKN GRFT EXCEPT HAND, FOR MUSCULOSKELET & CONN TISS DIS.	3.0062	9.1	13.4
218	08	SURG	LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP, FOOT, FEMUR AGE >17 W CC.	1.5404	4.3	5.4
219	08	SURG	LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP, FOOT, FEMUR AGE >17 W/O CC.	1.0244	2.7	3.2
220	08	SURG	*LOWER EXTREM & HUMER PROC EXCEPT HIP, FOOT, FEMUR AGE 0-17.	.5789	5.3	5.3
221	08	SURG	NO LONGER VALID0000	.0	.0
222	08	SURG	NO LONGER VALID0000	.0	.0
223	08	SURG	MAJOR SHOULDER/ELBOW PROC, OR OTHER UPPER EXTREMITY PROC W CC.	1.0248	2.1	2.9
224	08	SURG	SHOULDER, ELBOW OR FOREARM PROC, EXC MAJOR JOINT PROC, W/O CC.	.7868	1.6	1.9
225	08	SURG	FOOT PROCEDURES	1.1460	3.4	5.0
226	08	SURG	SOFT TISSUE PROCEDURES W CC	1.5663	4.6	6.7
227	08	SURG	SOFT TISSUE PROCEDURES W/O CC8129	2.1	2.7
228	08	SURG	MAJOR THUMB OR JOINT PROC, OR OTH HAND OR WRIST PROC W CC.	1.1339	2.6	4.1
229	08	SURG	HAND OR WRIST PROC, EXCEPT MAJOR JOINT PROC, W/O CC6984	1.7	2.2
230	08	SURG	LOCAL EXCISION & REMOVAL OF INT FIX DEVICES OF HIP & FEMUR.	1.2657	3.3	5.1
231	08	SURG	LOCAL EXCISION & REMOVAL OF INT FIX DEVICES EXCEPT HIP & FEMUR.	1.3977	3.1	4.9
232	08	SURG	ARTHROSCOPY	1.0021	1.8	2.7
233	08	SURG	OTHER MUSCULOSKELET SYS & CONN TISS O.R. PROC W CC	1.9862	4.8	7.2
234	08	SURG	OTHER MUSCULOSKELET SYS & CONN TISS O.R. PROC W/O CC ..	1.2329	2.3	3.2
235	08	MED	FRACTURES OF FEMUR7648	3.8	5.1
236	08	MED	FRACTURES OF HIP & PELVIS7233	4.0	4.9
237	08	MED	SPRAINS, STRAINS, & DISLOCATIONS OF HIP, PELVIS & THIGH5797	2.9	3.6
238	08	MED	OSTEOMYELITIS	1.3934	6.6	8.9
239	08	MED	PATHOLOGICAL FRACTURES & MUSCULOSKELETAL & CONN TISS MALIGNANCY.	1.0031	4.9	6.3
240	08	MED	CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISORDERS W CC	1.3301	5.0	6.7
241	08	MED	CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISORDERS W/O CC6493	3.1	3.9
242	08	MED	SEPTIC ARTHRITIS	1.1093	5.1	6.7
243	08	MED	MEDICAL BACK PROBLEMS7407	3.7	4.7
244	08	MED	BONE DISEASES & SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES W CC7056	3.7	4.7
245	08	MED	BONE DISEASES & SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES W/O CC4686	2.7	3.4
246	08	MED	NON-SPECIFIC ARTHROPATHIES5658	2.9	3.8
247	08	MED	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS OF MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONN TISSUE.	.5725	2.6	3.4
248	08	MED	TENDONITIS, MYOSITIS & BURSITIS8317	3.8	4.9
249	08	MED	AFTERCARE, MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE.	.6895	2.5	3.7
250	08	MED	FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE >17 W CC.	.6886	3.3	4.2
251	08	MED	FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE >17 W/O CC.	.4624	2.2	2.8
252	08	MED	*FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF FOREARM, HAND, FOOT AGE 0-172513	1.8	1.8
253	08	MED	FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM, LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE >17 W CC.	.7384	3.7	4.7
254	08	MED	FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM, LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE >17 W/O CC.	.4433	2.6	3.1
255	08	MED	*FX, SPRN, STRN & DISL OF UPARM, LOWLEG EX FOOT AGE 0-172928	2.9	2.9
256	08	MED	OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE DIAGNOSES.	.8038	3.8	5.1
257	09	SURG	TOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W CC8995	2.1	2.7
258	09	SURG	TOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W/O CC7107	1.6	1.8
259	09	SURG	SUBTOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W CC9130	1.7	2.7
260	09	SURG	SUBTOTAL MASTECTOMY FOR MALIGNANCY W/O CC6821	1.2	1.4
261	09	SURG	BREAST PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY EXCEPT BIOPSY & LOCAL EXCISION.	.9773	1.6	2.2
262	09	SURG	BREAST BIOPSY & LOCAL EXCISION FOR NON-MALIGNANCY9324	2.9	4.3

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.
 ** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.
 GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.
 ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.
 NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
263	09	SURG	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID FOR SKN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W CC	2.2113	9.3	12.5
264	09	SURG	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID FOR SKN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W/O CC.	1.1350	5.5	7.1
265	09	SURG	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID EXCEPT FOR SKIN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W CC.	1.5906	4.2	6.7
266	09	SURG	SKIN GRAFT &/OR DEBRID EXCEPT FOR SKIN ULCER OR CELLULITIS W/O CC.	.8540	2.2	3.1
267	09	SURG	PERIANAL & PILONIDAL PROCEDURES9343	2.5	4.3
268	09	SURG	SKIN, SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE & BREAST PLASTIC PROCEDURES	1.1068	2.4	3.6
269	09	SURG	OTHER SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST PROC W CC	1.6798	5.7	8.2
270	09	SURG	OTHER SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST PROC W/O CC7495	2.3	3.3
271	09	MED	SKIN ULCERS	1.0266	5.6	7.3
272	09	MED	MAJOR SKIN DISORDERS W CC	1.0013	4.6	6.1
273	09	MED	MAJOR SKIN DISORDERS W/O CC5578	3.0	3.9
274	09	MED	MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS W CC	1.1936	4.8	6.8
275	09	MED	MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS W/O CC5469	2.2	3.0
276	09	MED	NON-MALIGANT BREAST DISORDERS6781	3.5	4.5
277	09	MED	CELLULITIS AGE >17 W CC8580	4.7	5.8
278	09	MED	CELLULITIS AGE >17 W/O CC5497	3.6	4.3
279	09	MED	* CELLULITIS AGE 0-176580	4.2	4.2
280	09	MED	TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE >17 W CC6972	3.2	4.2
281	09	MED	TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE >17 W/O CC	.4634	2.3	2.9
282	09	MED	* TRAUMA TO THE SKIN, SUBCUT TISS & BREAST AGE 0-172545	2.2	2.2
283	09	MED	MINOR SKIN DISORDERS W CC7211	3.5	4.7
284	09	MED	MINOR SKIN DISORDERS W/O CC4300	2.4	3.1
285	10	SURG	AMPUTAT OF LOWER LIMB FOR ENDOCRINE,NUTRIT,& METABOL DISORDERS.	2.0391	8.0	10.6
286	10	SURG	ADRENAL & PITUITARY PROCEDURES	2.0831	4.5	5.9
287	10	SURG	SKIN GRAFTS & WOUND DEBRID FOR ENDOC, NUTRIT & METAB DISORDERS.	1.8701	7.7	10.6
288	10	SURG	O.R. PROCEDURES FOR OBESITY	2.2124	4.3	5.4
289	10	SURG	PARATHYROID PROCEDURES9697	1.8	2.8
290	10	SURG	THYROID PROCEDURES8955	1.7	2.2
291	10	SURG	THYROGLOSSAL PROCEDURES6333	1.4	1.6
292	10	SURG	OTHER ENDOCRINE, NUTRIT & METAB O.R. PROC W CC	2.4623	6.8	10.0
293	10	SURG	OTHER ENDOCRINE, NUTRIT & METAB O.R. PROC W/O CC	1.2998	3.3	4.9
294	10	MED	DIABETES AGE >357573	3.4	4.5
295	10	MED	DIABETES AGE 0-357854	3.0	4.0
296	10	MED	NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE >17 W CC8469	3.9	5.1
297	10	MED	NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE >17 W/O CC ..	.5046	2.7	3.4
298	10	MED	NUTRITIONAL & MISC METABOLIC DISORDERS AGE 0-175879	2.9	4.4
299	10	MED	INBORN ERRORS OF METABOLISM9367	3.8	5.4
300	10	MED	ENDOCRINE DISORDERS W CC	1.0930	4.7	6.2
301	10	MED	ENDOCRINE DISORDERS W/O CC6308	2.8	3.7
302	11	SURG	KIDNEY TRANSPLANT	3.2671	7.4	8.7
303	11	SURG	KIDNEY,URETER & MAJOR BLADDER PROCEDURES FOR NEO-PLASM.	2.4195	6.7	8.3
304	11	SURG	KIDNEY,URETER & MAJOR BLADDER PROC FOR NON-NEOPL W CC.	2.3243	6.2	8.7
305	11	SURG	KIDNEY,URETER & MAJOR BLADDER PROC FOR NON-NEOPL W/O CC.	1.1946	2.9	3.6
306	11	SURG	PROSTATECTOMY W CC	1.2725	3.6	5.5
307	11	SURG	PROSTATECTOMY W/O CC6329	1.8	2.2
308	11	SURG	MINOR BLADDER PROCEDURES W CC	1.6399	4.0	6.3
309	11	SURG	MINOR BLADDER PROCEDURES W/O CC8980	1.7	2.2
310	11	SURG	TRANSURETHRAL PROCEDURES W CC	1.1281	2.9	4.3
311	11	SURG	TRANSURETHRAL PROCEDURES W/O CC6270	1.5	1.8
312	11	SURG	URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE >17 W CC	1.0583	3.0	4.5
313	11	SURG	URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE >17 W/O CC6693	1.7	2.1
314	11	SURG	* URETHRAL PROCEDURES, AGE 0-174905	2.3	2.3
315	11	SURG	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT O.R. PROCEDURES	2.0954	3.8	7.2
316	11	MED	RENAL FAILURE	1.3241	4.9	6.6
317	11	MED	ADMIT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS6603	2.0	3.1
318	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT NEOPLASMS W CC	1.1819	4.4	6.1
319	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT NEOPLASMS W/O CC6051	2.1	2.9
320	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE >17 W CC8555	4.3	5.3

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
321	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE >17 W/O CC5645	3.1	3.8
322	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS AGE 0-174769	3.1	3.7
323	11	MED	URINARY STONES W CC, &/OR ESW LITHOTRIPSY8049	2.4	3.1
324	11	MED	URINARY STONES W/O CC4643	1.5	1.8
325	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE >17 W CC6508	2.9	3.8
326	11	MED	KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE >17 W/O CC4441	2.2	2.7
327	11	MED	*KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT SIGNS & SYMPTOMS AGE 0-173668	3.1	3.1
328	11	MED	URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE >17 W CC7339	2.8	3.8
329	11	MED	URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE >17 W/O CC4891	1.7	2.2
330	11	MED	*URETHRAL STRICTURE AGE 0-173160	1.6	1.6
331	11	MED	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W CC	1.0553	4.2	5.6
332	11	MED	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE >17 W/O CC5998	2.4	3.2
333	11	MED	OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES AGE 0-177662	3.3	4.7
334	12	SURG	MAJOR MALE PELVIC PROCEDURES W CC	1.5217	4.0	4.8
335	12	SURG	MAJOR MALE PELVIC PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.1249	2.9	3.2
336	12	SURG	TRANSURETHRAL PROSTATECTOMY W CC8721	2.6	3.4
337	12	SURG	TRANSURETHRAL PROSTATECTOMY W/O CC6046	1.8	2.1
338	12	SURG	TESTES PROCEDURES, FOR MALIGNANCY	1.2297	3.5	5.6
339	12	SURG	TESTES PROCEDURES, NON-MALIGNANCY AGE >17	1.1006	2.9	4.6
340	12	SURG	*TESTES PROCEDURES, NON-MALIGNANCY AGE 0-172808	2.4	2.4
341	12	SURG	PENIS PROCEDURES	1.2148	1.9	3.1
342	12	SURG	CIRCUMCISION AGE >177897	2.3	3.1
343	12	SURG	*CIRCUMCISION AGE 0-171526	1.7	1.7
344	12	SURG	OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES FOR MALIGNANCY.	1.2631	1.6	2.4
345	12	SURG	OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROC EXCEPT FOR MALIGNANCY.	1.1839	2.9	4.8
346	12	MED	MALIGNANCY, MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM, W CC	1.0453	4.5	6.0
347	12	MED	MALIGNANCY, MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM, W/O CC5654	2.0	2.7
348	12	MED	BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERTROPHY W CC7111	3.2	4.2
349	12	MED	BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERTROPHY W/O CC3943	1.9	2.5
350	12	MED	INFLAMMATION OF THE MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM7192	3.6	4.5
351	12	MED	*STERILIZATION, MALE2342	1.3	1.3
352	12	MED	OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES7227	2.8	4.0
353	13	SURG	PELVIC EVISCERATION, RADICAL HYSTERECTOMY & RADICAL VULVECTOMY.	1.8746	5.0	6.5
354	13	SURG	UTERINE, ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-OVARIAN/ADNEXAL MALIG W CC.	1.5439	4.8	5.8
355	13	SURG	UTERINE, ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-OVARIAN/ADNEXAL MALIG W/O CC.	.9119	3.0	3.2
356	13	SURG	FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTIVE PROCEDURES.	.7675	1.9	2.2
357	13	SURG	UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR OVARIAN OR ADNEXAL MALIGNANCY.	2.3212	6.7	8.4
358	13	SURG	UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY W CC	1.2295	3.5	4.3
359	13	SURG	UTERINE & ADNEXA PROC FOR NON-MALIGNANCY W/O CC8356	2.4	2.6
360	13	SURG	VAGINA, CERVIX & VULVA PROCEDURES8857	2.3	2.8
361	13	SURG	LAPAROSCOPY & INCISIONAL TUBAL INTERRUPTION	1.1215	2.3	3.7
362	13	SURG	*ENDOSCOPIC TUBAL INTERRUPTION2993	1.4	1.4
363	13	SURG	D&C, CONIZATION & RADIO-IMPLANT, FOR MALIGNANCY8801	2.6	3.6
364	13	SURG	D&C, CONIZATION EXCEPT FOR MALIGNANCY8399	2.7	3.9
365	13	SURG	OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM O.R. PROCEDURES	1.9401	5.2	7.7
366	13	MED	MALIGNANCY, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM W CC	1.2804	4.9	6.9
367	13	MED	MALIGNANCY, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM W/O CC5388	2.3	3.0
368	13	MED	INFECTIONS, FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM	1.2019	5.2	6.7
369	13	MED	MENSTRUAL & OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DISORDERS.	.5941	2.4	3.2
370	14	SURG	CESAREAN SECTION W CC9721	4.4	5.7
371	14	SURG	CESAREAN SECTION W/O CC6742	3.3	3.6
372	14	MED	VAGINAL DELIVERY W COMPLICATING DIAGNOSES6053	2.6	3.7
373	14	MED	VAGINAL DELIVERY W/O COMPLICATING DIAGNOSES3931	2.0	2.3
374	14	SURG	VAGINAL DELIVERY W STERILIZATION &/OR D&C7855	2.5	2.9
375	14	SURG	*VAGINAL DELIVERY W O.R. PROC EXCEPT STERIL &/OR D&C5714	4.4	4.4
376	14	MED	POSTPARTUM & POST ABORTION DIAGNOSES W/O O.R. PROCEDURE.	.4827	2.6	3.5

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
377	14	SURG	POSTPARTUM & POST ABORTION DIAGNOSES W O.R. PROCEDURE.	1.4673	3.2	4.4
378	14	MED	ECTOPIC PREGNANCY8385	2.0	2.5
379	14	MED	THREATENED ABORTION3944	2.1	3.0
380	14	MED	ABORTION W/O D&C3662	1.6	2.0
381	14	SURG	ABORTION W D&C, ASPIRATION CURETTAGE OR HYSTEROTOMY	.5859	1.6	2.1
382	14	MED	FALSE LABOR1588	1.2	1.4
383	14	MED	OTHER ANTEPARTUM DIAGNOSES W MEDICAL COMPLICATIONS ..	.5475	2.7	4.0
384	14	MED	OTHER ANTEPARTUM DIAGNOSES W/O MEDICAL COMPLICATIONS.	.4188	1.8	2.7
385	15	MED	*NEONATES, DIED OR TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER ACUTE CARE FACILITY.	1.3636	1.8	1.8
386	15	MED	*EXTREME IMMATUREITY	4.4966	17.9	17.9
387	15	MED	*PREMATURITY W MAJOR PROBLEMS	3.0711	13.3	13.3
388	15	MED	*PREMATURITY W/O MAJOR PROBLEMS	1.8531	8.6	8.6
389	15	MED	*FULL TERM NEONATE W MAJOR PROBLEMS	3.1546	4.7	4.7
390	15	MED	*NEONATE W OTHER SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS	1.1165	3.4	3.4
391	15	MED	*NORMAL NEWBORN1512	3.1	3.1
392	16	SURG	SPLENECTOMY AGE >17	3.1530	6.9	9.5
393	16	SURG	*SPLENECTOMY AGE 0-17	1.3357	9.1	9.1
394	16	SURG	OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES OF THE BLOOD AND BLOOD FORMING ORGANS.	1.7961	4.3	7.0
395	16	MED	RED BLOOD CELL DISORDERS AGE >178141	3.2	4.4
396	16	MED	RED BLOOD CELL DISORDERS AGE 0-176515	2.4	3.8
397	16	MED	COAGULATION DISORDERS	1.2348	3.7	5.2
398	16	MED	RETICULOENDOTHELIAL & IMMUNITY DISORDERS W CC	1.2646	4.6	5.9
399	16	MED	RETICULOENDOTHELIAL & IMMUNITY DISORDERS W/O CC6883	2.8	3.6
400	17	SURG	LYMPHOMA & LEUKEMIA W MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE	2.6627	5.5	9.0
401	17	SURG	LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W OTHER O.R. PROC W CC	2.7815	8.0	11.3
402	17	SURG	LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W OTHER O.R. PROC W/O CC.	1.1184	2.7	3.9
403	17	MED	LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W CC	1.7630	5.7	8.0
404	17	MED	LYMPHOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O CC8543	3.0	4.2
405	17	MED	*ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE AGE 0-17	1.8937	4.9	4.9
406	17	SURG	MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W MAJ O.R.PROC W CC.	2.7896	6.9	9.7
407	17	SURG	MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W MAJ O.R.PROC W/O CC.	1.2754	3.3	4.1
408	17	SURG	MYELOPROLIF DISORD OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL W OTHER O.R.PROC.	2.0472	4.7	7.9
409	17	MED	RADIOTHERAPY	1.2026	4.5	6.1
410	17	MED	CHEMOTHERAPY W/O ACUTE LEUKEMIA AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS.	1.0423	3.1	4.0
411	17	MED	HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY W/O ENDOSCOPY3885	2.2	2.9
412	17	MED	HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY W ENDOSCOPY2791	1.6	2.0
413	17	MED	OTHER MYELOPROLIF DIS OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL DIAG W CC ...	1.3594	5.3	7.3
414	17	MED	OTHER MYELOPROLIF DIS OR POORLY DIFF NEOPL DIAG W/O CC	.6897	3.0	4.0
415	18	SURG	O.R. PROCEDURE FOR INFECTIOUS & PARASITIC DISEASES	3.6521	10.4	14.5
416	18	MED	SEPTICEMIA AGE >17	1.5936	5.6	7.5
417	18	MED	SEPTICEMIA AGE 0-17	1.1657	4.5	6.1
418	18	MED	POSTOPERATIVE & POST-TRAUMATIC INFECTIONS	1.0377	4.8	6.2
419	18	MED	FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE >17 W CC8636	3.6	4.7
420	18	MED	FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE >17 W/O CC5907	2.8	3.4
421	18	MED	VIRAL ILLNESS AGE >177028	2.9	3.8
422	18	MED	VIRAL ILLNESS & FEVER OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AGE 0-174351	2.3	2.9
423	18	MED	OTHER INFECTIOUS & PARASITIC DISEASES DIAGNOSES	1.7883	5.9	8.3
424	19	SURG	O.R. PROCEDURE W PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSES OF MENTAL ILLNESS	2.2964	8.1	13.0
425	19	MED	ACUTE ADJUSTMENT REACTION & PSYCHOSOCIAL DYSFUNCTION.	.6796	2.9	3.9
426	19	MED	DEPRESSIVE NEUROSES5177	3.2	4.5
427	19	MED	NEUROSES EXCEPT DEPRESSIVE5199	3.1	4.4
428	19	MED	DISORDERS OF PERSONALITY & IMPULSE CONTROL7376	4.4	7.4
429	19	MED	ORGANIC DISTURBANCES & MENTAL RETARDATION8268	4.7	6.3
430	19	MED	PSYCHOSES7128	5.7	8.0
431	19	MED	CHILDHOOD MENTAL DISORDERS5925	4.2	5.9
432	19	MED	OTHER MENTAL DISORDER DIAGNOSES6333	2.9	4.6

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
433	20	MED	ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE, LEFT AMA	.2752	2.2	3.0
434	20	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
435	20	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
436	20	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
437	20	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
438	20	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
439	21	SURG	SKIN GRAFTS FOR INJURIES	1.6840	5.4	8.5
440	21	SURG	WOUND DEBRIDEMENTS FOR INJURIES	1.9031	5.7	9.0
441	21	SURG	HAND PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES	.9231	2.1	3.1
442	21	SURG	OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES W CC	2.4078	5.6	8.6
443	21	SURG	OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR INJURIES W/O CC	1.0670	2.6	3.5
444	21	MED	TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE >17 W CC	.7577	3.2	4.3
445	21	MED	TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE >17 W/O CC	.4857	2.3	2.9
446	21	MED	* TRAUMATIC INJURY AGE 0-17	.2936	2.4	2.4
447	21	MED	ALLERGIC REACTIONS AGE >17	.5000	1.8	2.4
448	21	MED	* ALLERGIC REACTIONS AGE 0-17	.0965	2.9	2.9
449	21	MED	POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE >17 W CC	.8233	2.6	3.7
450	21	MED	POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE >17 W/O CC	.4272	1.6	2.0
451	21	MED	* POISONING & TOXIC EFFECTS OF DRUGS AGE 0-17	.2607	2.1	2.1
452	21	MED	COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT W CC	1.0378	3.5	5.0
453	21	MED	COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT W/O CC	.5133	2.1	2.8
454	21	MED	OTHER INJURY, POISONING & TOXIC EFFECT DIAG W CC	.8272	3.0	4.4
455	21	MED	OTHER INJURY, POISONING & TOXIC EFFECT DIAG W/O CC	.4542	1.8	2.4
456	22	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
457	22	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
458	22	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
459	22	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
460	22	MED	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
461	23	SURG	O.R. PROC W DIAGNOSES OF OTHER CONTACT W HEALTH SERVICES.	1.1927	2.2	4.1
462	23	MED	REHABILITATION	1.1251	9.3	11.5
463	23	MED	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W CC	.6930	3.2	4.2
464	23	MED	SIGNS & SYMPTOMS W/O CC	.4957	2.4	3.0
465	23	MED	AFTERCARE W HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS.	.6785	1.8	2.9
466	23	MED	AFTERCARE W/O HISTORY OF MALIGNANCY AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS.	.7305	2.1	3.9
467	23	MED	OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING HEALTH STATUS	.6095	2.1	8.4
468			EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS.	3.6658	9.2	13.0
469			** PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS INVALID AS DISCHARGE DIAGNOSIS	.0000	.0	.0
470			** UNGROUPABLE	.0000	.0	.0
471	08	SURG	BILATERAL OR MULTIPLE MAJOR JOINT PROCS OF LOWER EXTREMITY.	3.0990	4.8	5.5
472	22	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
473	17	SURG	ACUTE LEUKEMIA W/O MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURE AGE >17	3.5075	7.3	12.6
474	04	SURG	NO LONGER VALID	.0000	.0	.0
475	04	MED	RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSIS WITH VENTILATOR SUPPORT	3.6408	8.0	11.3
476		SURG	PROSTATIC O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS.	2.2587	8.0	11.3
477		SURG	NON-EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS.	1.8605	5.3	8.2
478	05	SURG	OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES W CC	2.3660	4.9	7.4
479	05	SURG	OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES W/O CC	1.4314	2.5	3.3
480	PRE	SURG	LIVER TRANSPLANT	10.1911	15.7	21.5
481	PRE	SURG	BONE MARROW TRANSPLANT	6.9570	19.3	22.0
482	PRE	SURG	TRACHEOSTOMY FOR FACE, MOUTH & NECK DIAGNOSES	3.4938	9.7	12.5
483	PRE	SURG	TRACHEOSTOMY/MECH VENT 96+HRS EXCEPT FACE, MOUTH & NECK DIAGNOSES.	16.2670	34.6	42.0
484	24	SURG	CRANIOTOMY FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	5.5512	8.9	13.2
485	24	SURG	LIMB REATTACHMENT, HIP AND FEMUR PROC FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRA.	2.9897	7.6	9.5
486	24	SURG	OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	4.8066	8.4	12.4
487	24	MED	OTHER MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	1.9538	5.5	7.8
488	25	SURG	HIV W EXTENSIVE O.R. PROCEDURE	4.6394	11.5	16.9
489	25	MED	HIV W MAJOR RELATED CONDITION	1.7885	6.0	8.6

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 5.—LIST OF DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS), RELATIVE WEIGHTING FACTORS, GEOMETRIC AND ARITHMETIC MEAN LENGTH OF STAY—Continued

DRG	MDC	Type	DRG Title	Relative weights	Geometric mean LOS	Arithmetic mean LOS
490	25	MED	HIV W OR W/O OTHER RELATED CONDITION	1.0200	3.7	5.3
491	08	SURG	MAJOR JOINT & LIMB REATTACHMENT PROCEDURES OF UPPER EXTREMITY.	1.7021	2.9	3.5
492	17	MED	CHEMOTHERAPY W ACUTE LEUKEMIA AS SECONDARY DIAGNOSIS.	3.9117	9.2	15.0
493	07	SURG	LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY W/O C.D.E. W CC	1.8188	4.3	5.9
494	07	SURG	LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY W/O C.D.E. W/O CC	1.0128	1.9	2.5
495	PRE	SURG	LUNG TRANSPLANT	8.9713	14.3	17.2
496	08	SURG	COMBINED ANTERIOR/POSTERIOR SPINAL FUSION	5.7699	7.1	9.5
497	08	SURG	SPINAL FUSION EXCEPT CERVICAL W CC	3.3834	5.4	6.5
498	08	SURG	SPINAL FUSION EXCEPT CERVICAL W/O CC	2.4714	3.7	4.1
499	08	SURG	BACK & NECK PROCEDURES EXCEPT SPINAL FUSION W CC	1.4381	3.4	4.6
500	08	SURG	BACK & NECK PROCEDURES EXCEPT SPINAL FUSION W/O CC9487	2.0	2.5
501	08	SURG	KNEE PROCEDURES W PDX OF INFECTION W CC	2.5940	8.4	10.7
502	08	SURG	KNEE PROCEDURES W PDX OF INFECTION W/O CC	1.5391	5.3	6.4
503	08	SURG	KNEE PROCEDURES W/O PDX OF INFECTION	1.2111	2.9	3.9
504	22	SURG	EXTENSIVE 3RD DEGREE BURNS W SKIN GRAFT	14.4707	26.9	35.1
505	22	MED	EXTENSIVE 3RD DEGREE BURNS W/O SKIN GRAFT	1.9872	2.2	3.7
506	22	SURG	FULL THICKNESS BURN W SKIN GRAFT OR INHAL INJ W CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	4.6264	12.7	17.3
507	22	SURG	FULL THICKNESS BURN W SKIN GRFT OR INHAL INJ W/O CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	1.7118	6.5	9.0
508	22	MED	FULL THICKNESS BURN W/O SKIN GRFT OR INHAL INJ W CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	1.4160	5.8	8.4
509	22	MED	FULL THICKNESS BURN W/O SKIN GRFT OR INH INJ W/O CC OR SIG TRAUMA.	.9410	4.1	5.5
510	22	MED	NON-EXTENSIVE BURNS W CC OR SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA	1.2161	4.6	6.7
511	22	MED	NON-EXTENSIVE BURNS W/O CC OR SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA6968	3.0	4.4
512	PRE	SURG	SIMULTANEOUS PANCREAS/KIDNEY TRANSPLANT	5.7000	11.7	14.2
513	PRE	SURG	PANCREAS TRANSPLANT	6.1951	9.4	10.7
514	05	SURG	CARDIAC DEFIBRILLATOR IMPLANT W CARDIAC CATH	6.3288	5.0	7.3
515	05	SURG	CARDIAC DEFIBRILLATOR IMPLANT W/O CARDIAC CATH	5.0380	3.3	5.5
516	05	SURG	PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASC PROC W AMI	2.7295	3.7	4.7
517	05	SURG	PERC CARDIO PROC W CORONARY ARTERY STENT W/O AMI	2.1793	1.9	2.6
518	05	SURG	PERC CARDIO PROC W/O CORONARY ARTERY STENT OR AMI	1.7267	2.3	3.4
519	08	SURG	CERVICAL SPINAL FUSION W CC	2.3467	3.2	5.2
520	08	SURG	CERVICAL SPINAL FUSION W/O CC	1.5390	1.7	2.1
521	20	MED	ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE W CC7267	4.3	5.8
522	20	MED	ALC/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPEND W REHABILITATION THERAPY W/O CC.	.5829	7.5	9.5
523	20	MED	ALC/DRUG ABUSE OR DEPEND W/O REHABILITATION THERAPY W/O CC.	.4007	3.3	4.1
524	01	MED	TRANSIENT ISCHEMIA7236	2.7	3.4
525	05	SURG	HEART ASSIST SYSTEM IMPLANT	11.3787	9.3	16.2

* MEDICARE DATA HAVE BEEN SUPPLEMENTED BY DATA FROM 19 STATES FOR LOW VOLUME DRGS.

** DRGS 469 AND 470 CONTAIN CASES WHICH COULD NOT BE ASSIGNED TO VALID DRGS.

GEOMETRIC MEAN IS USED ONLY TO DETERMINE PAYMENT FOR TRANSFER CASES.

ARITHMETIC MEAN IS PRESENTED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

NOTE: RELATIVE WEIGHTS ARE BASED ON MEDICARE PATIENT DATA AND MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR OTHER PATIENTS.

TABLE 6A.—NEW DIAGNOSIS CODES

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
040.82	Toxic shock syndrome	Y	18	423
066.4	West Nile fever	N	18	421, 422
277.02	Cystic fibrosis with pulmonary manifestations	Y	4	79, 80, 81
277.03	Cystic fibrosis with gastrointestinal manifestations	Y	6	188, 189, 190
277.09	Cystic fibrosis with other manifestations	Y	10	296, 297, 298
357.81	Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuritis	N	1	18, 19
357.82	Critical illness polyneuropathy	N	1	18, 19
357.89	Other inflammatory and toxic neuropathy	N	1	18, 19
359.81	Critical illness myopathy	N	1	34, 35
359.89	Other myopathies	N	1	34, 35
365.83	Aqueous misdirection	N	2	46, 47, 48
414.06	Coronary atherosclerosis of coronary artery of transplanted heart	N	5	132, 133

TABLE 6A.—NEW DIAGNOSIS CODES—Continued

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
414.12	Dissection of coronary artery	N	5	121, 144, 145
428.20	Unspecified systolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.21	Acute systolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.22	Chronic systolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.23	Acute on chronic systolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.30	Unspecified diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.31	Acute diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.32	Chronic diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.33	Acute on chronic diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.40	Unspecified combined systolic and diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.41	Acute combined systolic and diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.42	Chronic combined systolic and diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
428.43	Acute on chronic combined systolic and diastolic heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
438.6	Alterations of sensations	N	1	12
438.7	Disturbances of vision	N	1	12
438.83	Facial weakness	N	1	12
438.84	Ataxia	N	1	12
438.85	Vertigo	N	1	12
443.21	Dissection of carotid artery	N	5	130, 131
443.22	Dissection of iliac artery	N	5	130, 131
443.23	Dissection of renal artery	N	11	331, 332, 333
443.24	Dissection of vertebral artery	N	5	130, 131
443.29	Dissection of other artery	N	5	130, 131
445.01	Atheroembolism, upper extremity	Y	5	130, 131
445.02	Atheroembolism, lower extremity	Y	5	130, 131
445.81	Atheroembolism, kidney	Y	11	331, 332, 333
445.89	Atheroembolism, other site	Y	5	130, 131
454.8	Varicose veins of the lower extremities, with other complications	N	5	130, 131
459.10	Postphlebotic syndrome without complications	N	5	130, 131
459.11	Postphlebotic syndrome with ulcer	N	5	130, 131
459.12	Postphlebotic syndrome with inflammation	N	5	130, 131
459.13	Postphlebotic syndrome with ulcer and inflammation	N	5	130, 131
459.19	Postphlebotic syndrome with other complication	N	5	130, 131
459.30	Chronic venous hypertension without complications	N	5	130, 131
459.31	Chronic venous hypertension with ulcer	N	5	130, 131
459.32	Chronic venous hypertension with inflammation	N	5	130, 131
459.33	Chronic venous hypertension with ulcer and inflammation	N	5	130, 131
459.39	Chronic venous hypertension with other complication	N	5	130, 131
537.84	Dieulafoy lesion (hemorrhagic) of stomach and duodenum	Y	6	174, 175
569.86	Dieulafoy lesion (hemorrhagic) of intestine	Y	6	188, 189, 190
633.00	Abdominal pregnancy without intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.01	Abdominal pregnancy with intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.10	Tubal pregnancy without intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.11	Tubal pregnancy with intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.20	Ovarian pregnancy without intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.21	Ovarian pregnancy with intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.80	Other ectopic pregnancy without intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.81	Other ectopic pregnancy with intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.90	Unspecified ectopic pregnancy without intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
633.91	Unspecified ectopic pregnancy with intrauterine pregnancy	N	14	378
747.83	Persistent fetal circulation	N	15	387, 389
765.20	Unspecified weeks of gestation	N	15	391
765.21	Less than 24 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	386
765.22	24 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	386
765.23	25-26 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	386
765.24	27-28 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	387, 388
765.25	29-30 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	387, 388
765.26	31-32 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	387, 388
765.27	33-34 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	387, 388
765.28	35-36 completed weeks of gestation	N	15	387, 388
765.29	37 or more completed weeks of gestation	N	15	391
770.81	Primary apnea of newborn	N	15	390
770.82	Other apnea of newborn	N	15	390
770.83	Cyanotic attacks of newborn	N	15	390
770.84	Respiratory failure of newborn	Y	15	387, 389
770.89	Other respiratory problems after birth	N	15	390
771.81	Septicemia [sepsis] of newborn	Y	15	387, 389
771.82	Urinary tract infection of newborn	N	15	387, 389
771.83	Bacteremia of newborn	Y	15	387, 389
771.89	Other infections specific to the perinatal period	N	15	387, 389
779.81	Neonatal bradycardia	N	15	390

TABLE 6A.—NEW DIAGNOSIS CODES—Continued

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
779.82	Neonatal tachycardia	N	15	390
779.89	Other specified conditions originating in the perinatal period	N	15	390
780.91	Fussy infant (baby)	N	23	463,464
780.92	Excessive crying of infant (baby)	N	23	463,464
780.99	Other general symptoms	N	23	463,464
781.93	Ocular torticollis	N	8	243
795.00	Nonspecific abnormal Papanicolaou smear of cervix, unspecified	N	13	358, 359, 369
795.01	Atypical squamous cell changes of undetermined significance favor benign (ASCUS favor benign)	N	13	358, 359, 369
795.02	Atypical squamous cell changes of undetermined significance favor dysplasia (ASCUS favor dysplasia)	N	13	358, 359, 369
795.09	Other nonspecific abnormal Papanicolaou smear of cervix	N	13	358, 359, 369
795.31	Nonspecific positive findings for anthrax	N	18	423
795.39	Other nonspecific positive culture findings	N	18	423
813.45	Torus fracture of radius	N	8	250, 251, 252
			24	487
823.40	Torus fracture, tibia alone	N	8	253, 254, 255
			24	487
823.41	Torus fracture, fibula alone	N	8	253, 254, 255
			24	487
823.42	Torus fracture, fibula with tibia	N	8	253, 254, 255
			24	487
995.90	Systemic inflammatory response syndrome, unspecified	Y	18	416, 417
995.91	Systemic inflammatory response syndrome due to infectious process without organ dysfunction	Y	18	416, 417
995.92	Systemic inflammatory response syndrome due to infectious process with organ dysfunction	Y	18	416, 417
995.93	Systemic inflammatory response syndrome due to non-infectious process without organ dysfunction	Y	18	416, 417
995.94	Systemic inflammatory response syndrome due to non-infectious process with organ dysfunction	Y	18	416, 417
998.31	Disruption of internal operation wound	Y	21	452, 453
998.32	Disruption of external operation wound	Y	21	452, 453
V01.81	Contact with or exposure to communicable diseases, anthrax	N	15	391 ¹
			23	467
V01.89	Contact with or exposure to communicable diseases, other communicable diseases	N	15	391 ¹
			23	467
V13.21	Personal history of pre-term labor	N	23	467
V13.29	Personal history of other genital system and obstetric disorders	N	23	467
V23.41	Pregnancy with history of pre-term labor	N	14	469
V23.49	Pregnancy with other poor obstetric history	N	14	469
V46.2	Other dependence on machines, supplemental oxygen	N	23	467
V54.10	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of arm, unspecified	N	8	249
V54.11	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of upper arm	N	8	249
V54.12	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of lower arm	N	8	249
V54.13	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of hip	N	8	249
V54.14	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of leg, unspecified	N	8	249
V54.15	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of upper leg	N	8	249
V54.16	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of lower leg	N	8	249
V54.17	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of vertebrae	N	8	249
V54.19	Aftercare for healing traumatic fracture of other bone	N	8	249
V54.20	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of arm, unspecified	N	8	249
V54.21	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of upper arm	N	8	249
V54.22	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of lower arm	N	8	249
V54.23	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of hip	N	8	249
V54.24	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of leg, unspecified	N	8	249
V54.25	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of upper leg	N	8	249
V54.26	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of lower leg	N	8	249
V54.27	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of vertebrae	N	8	249
V54.29	Aftercare for healing pathologic fracture of other bone	N	8	249
V54.81	Aftercare following joint replacement	N	8	249
V54.89	Other orthopedic aftercare	N	8	249
V58.42	Aftercare following surgery for neoplasm	N	23	465,466
V58.43	Aftercare following surgery for injury and trauma	N	23	465,466
V58.71	Aftercare following surgery of the sense organs, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.72	Aftercare following surgery of the nervous system, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.73	Aftercare following surgery of the circulatory system, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.74	Aftercare following surgery of the respiratory system, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.75	Aftercare following surgery of the teeth, oral cavity and digestive system, NEC	N	23	465,466

TABLE 6A.—NEW DIAGNOSIS CODES—Continued

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
V58.76	Aftercare following surgery of the genitourinary system, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.77	Aftercare following surgery of the skin and subcutaneous tissue, NEC	N	23	465,466
V58.78	Aftercare following surgery of the musculoskeletal system, NEC	N	23	465,466
V71.82	Observation and evaluation for suspected exposure to anthrax	N	23	467
V71.83	Observation and evaluation for suspected exposure to other biological agent ...	N	23	467
V83.81	Cystic fibrosis gene carrier	N	23	467
V83.89	Other genetic carrier status	N	23	467

¹ Classified as an “only secondary diagnosis” in this DRG.

TABLE 6B.—NEW PROCEDURE CODES

Procedure code	Description	OR	MDC	DRG
00.01	Therapeutic ultrasound of vessels of head and neck	N		
00.02	Therapeutic ultrasound of heart	N		
00.03	Therapeutic ultrasound of peripheral vascular vessels	N		
00.09	Other therapeutic ultrasound	N		
00.10	Implantation of chemotherapeutic agent	N		
00.11	Infusion of drotrecogin alfa (activated)	N		
00.12	Administration of inhaled nitric oxide	N		
00.13	Injection or infusion of nesiritide	N		
00.14	Injection or infusion of oxazolidinone class of antibiotics	N		
00.50	Implantation of cardiac resynchronization pacemaker without mention of defibrillation, total system [CRT-P]	Y	5	115 ¹ , 116 ¹
00.51	Implantation of cardiac resynchronization defibrillator, total system [CRT-D]	Y	5	514 ¹ , 515 ¹
00.52	Implantation or replacement of transvenous lead (electrode) into left ventricular coronary venous system	Y	5	115 ² , 116 ³ , 514 ⁴ , 515 ⁴
00.53	Implantation or replacement of cardiac resynchronization pacemaker pulse generator only [CRT-P]	Y	5	115 ² , 116 ³ , 118
00.54	Implantation or replacement of cardiac resynchronization defibrillator pulse generator only [CRT-D]	Y	5	115 ¹ , 514 ⁴ , 515 ⁴
00.55	Insertion of drug-eluting noncoronary artery stent(s)	N		
36.07	Insertion of drug-eluting coronary artery stents(s)	N*	5	517
39.72	Endovascular repair or occlusion of head and neck vessels	Y	1	1,2,3
			5	110, 111
			11	315
			21	442, 443
			24	486
49.75	Implantation or revision of artificial anal sphincter	Y	6	157, 158
			9	267
			21	442, 443
			24	486
49.76	Removal of artificial anal sphincter	Y	6	157, 158
			9	267
			21	442, 443
			24	486
81.61	360 degree spinal fusion, single incision approach	Y	1	4
			8	496
			21	442, 443
			24	486
84.51	Insertion of interbody spinal fusion device	N		
84.52	Insertion of recombinant bone morphogenetic protein	N		
88.96	Other intraoperative magnetic resonance imaging	N		
99.76	Extracorporeal immunoadsorption	N		
99.77	Application or administration of an adhesion barrier substance	N		

*Non-operating room procedure, but affects DRG.

¹ Classified under “operating room procedures”.

² Classified under “operating room procedure” and under “as any of the following procedure combinations” as 00.52 and 00.53.

³ Classified under “any of the following procedure combinations” as 00.52 and 00.53.

⁴ Classified under “any of the following procedure combinations” as 00.52 and 00.54.

TABLE 6C.—INVALID DIAGNOSIS CODES

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
357.8	Other inflammatory and toxic neuropathy	N	1	18, 19
359.8	Other myopathies	N	1	34, 35

TABLE 6C.—INVALID DIAGNOSIS CODES—Continued

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
459.1	Postphlebotic syndrome	N	5	130, 131
633.0	Abdominal pregnancy	N	14	378
633.1	Tubal pregnancy	N	14	378
633.2	Ovarian pregnancy	N	14	378
633.8	Other ectopic pregnancy	N	14	378
633.9	Unspecified ectopic pregnancy	N	14	378
770.8	Other respiratory problems after birth	N	15	387, 389
771.8	Other infections specific to the perinatal period	Y	15	387, 389
779.8	Other specified conditions originating in the perinatal period	N	15	390
780.9	Other general symptoms	N	23	463, 464
795.0	Nonspecific abnormal Papanicolaou smear of cervix	N	13	358, 359, 369
795.3	Nonspecific positive culture findings	N	18	423
998.3	Disruption of operation wound	Y	21	452, 453
V01.8	Other communicable diseases	N	23	467
V13.2	Other genital system and obstetric disorders	N	23	467
V23.4	Pregnancy with other poor obstetric history	N	14	469
V54.8	Other orthopedic aftercare	N	8	249

TABLE 6D.—INVALID PROCEDURE CODES

Note: There are no invalid procedure codes for FY 2003.

TABLE 6E.—REVISED DIAGNOSIS CODE TITLES

Diagnosis code	Description	CC	MDC	DRG
402.00	Hypertensive heart disease, malignant, without heart failure	Y	5	134
402.01	Hypertensive heart disease, malignant, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
402.10	Hypertensive heart disease, benign, without heart failure	N	5	134
402.11	Hypertensive heart disease, benign, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
402.90	Hypertensive heart disease, unspecified, without heart failure	N	5	134
402.91	Hypertensive heart disease, unspecified, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.00	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, malignant, without mention of heart failure or renal failure	Y	5	134
404.01	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, malignant, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.03	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, malignant, with heart failure and renal failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.10	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, benign, without mention of heart failure or renal failure	N	5	134
404.11	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, benign, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.13	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, benign, with heart failure and renal failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.90	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, unspecified, without mention of heart failure or renal failure	N	5	134
404.91	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, unspecified, with heart failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
404.93	Hypertensive heart and renal disease, unspecified, with heart failure and renal failure	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
414.10	Aneurysm of heart	N	5	121, 144, 145
414.11	Aneurysm of coronary vessels	N	5	121, 144, 145
414.19	Other aneurysm of heart	N	5	121, 144, 145
428.0	Congestive heart failure, unspecified	Y	5	115, 121, 124, 127
454.9	Asymptomatic varicose veins	N	5	130, 131
627.2	Symptomatic menopausal or female climacteric states	N	13	358, 359, 369
627.4	Symptomatic states associated with artificial menopause	N	13	358, 359, 369
V49.81	Asymptomatic postmenopausal status (age-related) (natural)	N	23	467

TABLE 6F.—REVISED PROCEDURE CODE TITLES

Procedure code	Description	OR	MDC	DRG
36.06	Insertion of nondrug-eluting coronary artery stents(s)	N*	5	517
39.79	Other endovascular repair of aneurysm of other vessels	Y	1	1, 2, 3
			5	110, 111
			11	315
			21	442, 443

TABLE 6F.—REVISED PROCEDURE CODE TITLES—Continued

Procedure code	Description	OR	MDC	DRG
39.90	Insertion of nondrug-eluting, noncoronary artery stent(s)	N	24	486

*Nonoperating room procedure, but affects DRG.

TABLE 6G.—ADDITIONS TO THE CC EXCLUSIONS LIST

[CCs that are added to the list are in Table 6G-Additions to the CC Exclusions List. Each of the principal diagnoses is shown with an asterisk, and the revisions to the CC Exclusions List are provided in an indented column immediately following the affected principal diagnosis.]

*0031	99591	6829	99591	99593	44501	42821	4280
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	44502	42822	4281
99591	99593	99591	99593	*04186	44581	42823	42820
99592	99594	99592	99594	99590	44589	42830	42821
99593	*03843	99593	*0412	99591	*25090	42831	42822
99594	99590	99594	99590	99592	44501	42832	42823
*0202	99591	*04089	99591	99593	44502	42833	42830
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	44581	42840	42831
99591	99593	99591	99593	*04189	44589	42841	42832
99592	99594	99592	99594	99590	*25091	42842	42833
99593	*03844	99593	*0413	99591	44501	42843	42840
99594	99590	99594	99590	99592	44502	*40211	42841
*0362	99591	*04100	99591	99593	44581	42820	42842
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	44589	42821	42843
99591	99593	99591	99593	*0419	*25092	42822	4289
99592	99594	99592	99594	99590	44501	42823	5184
99593	*03849	99593	*0414	99591	44502	42830	*42821
99594	99590	99594	99590	99592	44581	42831	39891
*0380	99591	*04101	99591	99593	44589	42832	40201
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	*25093	42833	40211
99591	99593	99591	99593	*0545	44501	42840	40291
99592	99594	99592	99594	99590	44502	42841	4280
99593	*0388	99593	*0415	99591	44581	42842	4281
99594	99590	99594	99590	99592	44589	42843	42820
*03810	99591	*04102	99591	99593	*2515	*40291	42821
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	53784	42820	42822
99591	99593	99591	99593	*1398	56986	42821	42823
99592	99594	99592	99594	99590	*27700	42822	42830
99593	*0389	99593	*0416	99591	27702	42823	42831
99594	99590	99594	99590	99592	27703	42830	42832
*03811	99591	*04103	99591	99593	27709	42831	42833
99590	99592	99590	99592	99594	*27701	42832	42840
99591	99593	99591	99593	*25070	27702	42833	42841
99592	99594	99592	99594	44501	27703	42840	42842
99593	*04082	99593	*0417	44502	27709	42841	42843
99594	0380	99594	99590	44581	*27702	42842	4289
*03819	03810	*04104	99591	44589	27700	42843	5184
99590	03811	99590	99592	*25071	27701	*4280	*42822
99591	03819	99591	99593	44501	27702	42820	39891
99592	0382	99592	99594	44502	27703	42821	40201
99593	0383	99593	*04181	44581	27709	42822	40211
99594	03840	99594	99590	44589	*27703	42823	40291
*0382	03841	*04105	99591	*25072	27700	42830	4280
99590	03842	99590	99592	44501	27701	42831	4281
99591	03843	99591	99593	44502	27702	42832	42820
99592	03844	99592	99594	44581	27703	42833	42821
99593	03849	99593	*04182	44589	27709	42840	42822
99594	0388	99594	99590	*25073	*27709	42841	42823
*0383	0389	*04109	99591	44501	27700	42842	42830
99590	04082	99590	99592	44502	27701	42843	42831
99591	6800	99591	99593	44581	27702	*4281	42832
99592	6801	99592	99594	44589	27703	42820	42833
99593	6802	99593	*04183	*25080	27709	42821	42840
99594	6803	99594	99590	44501	*39891	42822	42841
*03840	6804	*04110	99591	44502	42820	42823	42842
99590	6805	99590	99592	44581	42821	42830	42843
99591	6806	99591	99593	44589	42822	42831	4289
99592	6807	99592	99594	*25081	42823	42832	5184
99593	6808	99593	*04184	44501	42830	42833	*42823
99594	6809	99594	99590	44502	42831	42840	39891
*03841	6820	*04111	99591	44581	42832	42841	40201
99590	6821	99590	99592	44589	42833	42842	40211
99591	6822	99591	99593	*25082	42840	42843	40291
99592	6823	99592	99594	44501	42841	*42820	4280
99593	6825	99593	*04185	44502	42842	39891	4281
99594	6826	99594	99590	44581	42843	40201	42820
*03842	6827	*04119	99591	44589	*40201	40211	42821
99590	6828	99590	99592	*25083	42820	40291	42822

TABLE 6G.—ADDITIONS TO THE CC EXCLUSIONS LIST—Continued

[CCs that are added to the list are in Table 6G-Additions to the CC Exclusions List. Each of the principal diagnoses is shown with an asterisk, and the revisions to the CC Exclusions List are provided in an indented column immediately following the affected principal diagnosis.]

42823	5184	42822	42831	56986	*53270	53784	*56202
42830	*42833	42823	42832	*53140	53784	56986	53784
42831	39891	42830	42833	53784	56986	*53411	56986
42832	40201	42831	42840	56986	*53271	53784	*56203
42833	40211	42832	42841	*53141	53784	56986	53784
42840	40291	42833	42842	53784	56986	*53420	56986
42841	4280	42840	42843	56986	*53290	53784	*56212
42842	4281	42841	44501	*53150	53784	56986	53784
42843	42820	42842	44502	53784	56986	*53421	56986
4289	42821	42843	44581	56986	*53291	53784	*56213
5184	42822	4289	44589	*53151	53784	56986	53784
*42830	42823	5184	*4599	53784	56986	*53430	56986
39891	42830	*42843	42820	56986	*53300	53784	*5693
40201	42831	39891	42821	*53160	53784	56986	53784
40211	42832	40201	42822	53784	56986	*53431	56986
40291	42833	40211	42823	56986	*53301	53784	*56985
4280	42840	40291	42830	*53161	53784	56986	53784
4281	42841	4280	42831	53784	56986	*53440	56986
42820	42842	4281	42832	56986	*53310	53784	*56986
42821	42843	42820	42833	*53170	53784	56986	56986
42822	4289	42821	42840	53784	56986	*53441	*5780
42823	5184	42822	42841	56986	*53311	53784	53784
42830	*42840	42823	42842	*53171	53784	56986	56986
42831	39891	42830	42843	53784	56986	*53450	*5781
42832	40201	42831	44501	56986	*53320	53784	53784
42833	40211	42832	44502	*53190	53784	56986	56986
42840	40291	42833	44581	53784	56986	*53451	*5789
42841	4280	42840	44589	56986	*53321	53784	53784
42842	4281	42841	*5184	*53191	53784	56986	56986
42843	42820	42842	42820	53784	56986	*53460	*74783
4289	42821	42843	42821	56986	*53330	53784	42971
5184	42822	4289	42822	*53200	53784	56986	42979
*42831	42823	5184	42823	53784	56986	*53461	7450
39891	42830	*4289	42830	56986	*53331	53784	74510
40201	42831	42820	42831	*53201	53784	56986	74511
40211	42832	42821	42832	53784	56986	*53470	74512
40291	42833	42822	42833	56986	*53340	53784	74519
4280	42840	42823	42840	*53210	53784	56986	7452
4281	42841	42830	42841	53784	56986	*53471	7453
42820	42842	42831	42842	56986	*53341	53784	7454
42821	42843	42832	42843	*53211	53784	56986	74560
42822	4289	42833	*5302	53784	56986	*53490	74569
42823	5184	42840	53784	56986	*53350	53784	7457
42830	*42841	42841	56986	*53220	53784	56986	74601
42831	39891	42842	*5307	53784	56986	*53491	74602
42832	40201	42843	53784	56986	*53351	53784	7461
42833	40211	*44489	56986	*53221	53784	56986	7462
42840	40291	44501	*53082	53784	56986	*53501	7463
42841	4280	44502	53784	56986	*53360	53784	7464
42842	4281	44581	56986	*53230	53784	56986	7465
42843	42820	44589	*53100	53784	56986	*53511	7466
4289	42821	*4449	53784	56986	*53361	53784	7467
5184	42822	44501	56986	*53231	53784	56986	74681
*42832	42823	44502	*53101	53784	56986	*53521	74682
39891	42830	44581	53784	56986	*53370	53784	74683
40201	42831	44589	56986	*53240	53784	56986	74684
40211	42832	*44501	*53110	53784	56986	*53531	74686
40291	42833	44501	53784	56986	*53371	53784	74711
4280	42840	*44502	56986	*53241	53784	56986	74722
4281	42841	44502	*53111	53784	56986	*53541	*76520
42820	42842	*44581	53784	56986	*53390	53784	76501
42821	42843	44581	56986	*53250	53784	56986	76502
42822	4289	*44589	*53120	53784	56986	*53551	76503
42823	5184	44589	53784	56986	*53391	53784	76504
42830	*42842	*4560	56986	*53251	53784	56986	76505
42831	39891	53784	*53121	53784	56986	*53561	76506
42832	40201	56986	53784	56986	*53400	53784	76507
42833	40211	*45989	56986	*53260	53784	56986	76508
42840	40291	42820	*53130	53784	56986	*53783	*76521
42841	4280	42821	53784	56986	*53401	53784	76501
42842	4281	42822	56986	*53261	53784	56986	76502
42843	42820	42823	*53131	53784	56986	*53784	76503
4289	42821	42830	53784	56986	*53410	53784	76504

TABLE 6G.—ADDITIONS TO THE CC EXCLUSIONS LIST—Continued

[CCs that are added to the list are in Table 6G-Additions to the CC Exclusions List. Each of the principal diagnoses is shown with an asterisk, and the revisions to the CC Exclusions List are provided in an indented column immediately following the affected principal diagnosis.]

76505	76506	769	76508	7703	7713	78039	03811
76506	76507	7700	7670	7704	77181	7817	03819
76507	76508	7701	7685	7705	77183	7854	0382
76508	*7685	7702	769	7707	77210	78550	0383
*76522	77084	7703	7700	77084	77211	78551	03840
76501	*7686	7704	7701	7710	77212	78559	03841
76502	77084	7705	7702	7711	77213	7863	03842
76503	*7689	7707	7703	7713	77214	78820	03843
76504	77084	77084	7704	77181	7722	78829	03844
76505	*769	*7709	7705	77183	7724	7895	03849
76506	77084	77084	7707	77210	7725	7907	0388
76507	*7700	*7714	77084	77211	7730	7911	0389
76508	77084	77181	7710	77212	7731	7913	0545
*76523	*7701	77183	7711	77213	7732	7991	99590
76501	77084	*7715	7713	77214	7733	7994	99591
76502	*7702	77181	77181	7722	7734	*78099	99592
76503	77084	77183	77183	7724	7740	04082	99593
76504	*7703	*7716	77210	7725	7741	44024	99594
76505	77084	77181	77211	7730	7742	78001	*99592
76506	*7704	77183	77212	7731	77430	78003	0362
76507	77084	*7717	77213	7732	77431	7801	0380
76508	*7705	77181	77214	7733	77439	78031	03810
*76524	77084	77183	7722	7734	7744	78039	03811
76501	*7706	*77181	7724	7740	7745	7817	03819
76502	77084	77181	7725	7741	7747	7854	0382
76503	*7707	77183	7730	7742	7751	78550	0383
76504	77084	*77182	7731	77430	7752	78551	03840
76505	*77081	77181	7732	77431	7753	78559	03841
76506	7685	77183	7733	77439	7754	7863	03842
76507	769	*77183	7734	7744	7755	78820	03843
76508	7700	77181	7740	7745	7756	78829	03844
*76525	7701	77183	7741	7747	7757	7895	03849
76501	7702	*77189	7742	7751	7760	7907	0388
76502	7703	77181	77430	7752	7761	7911	0389
76503	7704	77183	77431	7753	7762	7913	0545
76504	7705	*7760	77439	7754	7763	7991	99590
76505	7707	77181	7744	7755	7771	7994	99591
76506	77084	77183	7745	7756	7772	*78550	99592
76507	*77082	*7761	7747	7757	7775	04082	99593
76508	7685	77181	7751	7760	7776	*78551	99594
*76526	769	77183	7752	7761	7780	04082	*99593
76501	7700	*7762	7753	7762	7790	*78559	0362
76502	7701	77181	7754	7763	7791	04082	0380
76503	7702	77183	7755	7771	7797	*7859	03810
76504	7703	*7763	7756	7772	*78091	04082	03811
76505	7704	77181	7757	7775	04082	*7998	03819
76506	7705	77183	7760	7776	44024	04082	0382
76507	7707	*7764	7761	7780	78001	*99590	0383
76508	77084	77181	7762	7790	78003	0362	03840
*76527	*77083	77183	7763	7791	7801	0380	03841
76501	7685	*7765	7771	7797	78031	03810	03842
76502	769	77181	7772	*77989	78039	03811	03843
76503	7700	77183	7775	76501	7817	03819	03844
76504	7701	*7766	7776	76502	7854	0382	03849
76505	7702	77181	7780	76503	78550	0383	0388
76506	7703	77183	7790	76504	78551	03840	0389
76507	7704	*7767	7791	76505	78559	03841	0545
76508	7705	77181	7797	76506	7863	03842	99590
*76528	7707	77183	*77982	76507	78820	03843	99591
76501	77084	*7768	76501	76508	78829	03844	99592
76502	*77084	77181	76502	7670	7895	03849	99593
76503	7685	77183	76503	7685	7907	0388	99594
76504	769	*7769	76504	769	7911	0389	*99594
76505	7700	77181	76505	7700	7913	0545	0362
76506	7701	77183	76506	7701	7991	99590	0380
76507	7702	*77981	76507	7702	7994	99591	03810
76508	7703	76501	76508	7703	*78092	99592	03811
*76529	7704	76502	7670	7704	04082	99593	03819
76501	7705	76503	7685	7705	44024	99594	0382
76502	7707	76504	769	7707	78001	*99591	0383
76503	77084	76505	7700	77084	78003	0362	03840
76504	*77089	76506	7701	7710	7801	0380	03841
76505	7685	76507	7702	7711	78031	03810	03842

TABLE 6G.—ADDITIONS TO THE CC EXCLUSIONS LIST—Continued

[CCs that are added to the list are in Table 6G-Additions to the CC Exclusions List. Each of the principal diagnoses is shown with an asterisk, and the revisions to the CC Exclusions List are provided in an indented column immediately following the affected principal diagnosis.]

03843	99591
03844	99592
03849	99593
0388	99594
0389	*V096
0545	99590
99590	99591
99591	99592
99592	99593
99593	99594
99594	*V0970
*99791	99590
99831	99591
99832	99592
*99799	99593
99831	99594
99832	*V0971
*99831	99590
99831	99591
99832	99592
*99832	99593
99831	99594
99832	*V0980
*99881	99590
99831	99591
99832	99592
*99883	99593
99831	99594
99832	*V0981
*99889	99590
99831	99591
99832	99592
*9989	99593
99831	99594
99832	*V0990
*V090	99590
99590	99591
99591	99592
99592	99593
99593	99594
99594	*V0991
*V091	99590
99590	99591
99591	99592
99592	99593
99593	99594
99594	*V2341
*V092	V237
99590	V2381
99591	V2382
99592	V2383
99593	V2384
99594	V2389
*V093	V239
99590	*V2349
99591	V237
99592	V2381
99593	V2382
99594	V2383
*V094	V2384
99590	V2389
99591	V239
99592	*V462
99593	V461
99594	
*V0950	
99590	
99591	
99592	
99593	
99594	
*V0951	
99590	

TABLE 6H.—DELETIONS TO THE CC EXCLUSIONS LIST

[CCs that are deleted from the list are in Table 6H-Deletions to the CC Exclusions List. Each of the principal diagnoses is shown with an asterisk, and the revisions to the CC Exclusions List are provided in an indented column immediately following the affected principal diagnosis.]

*7708	7722	9983
7685	7724	*9989
769	7725	9983
7700	7730	*V234
7701	7731	V237
7702	7732	V2381
7703	7733	V2382
7704	7734	V2383
7705	7740	V2384
7707	7741	V2389
*7714	7742	V239
7718	77430	
*7715	77431	
7718	77439	
*7716	7744	
7718	7745	
*7717	7747	
7718	7751	
*7718	7752	
7718	7753	
*7760	7754	
7718	7755	
*7761	7756	
7718	7757	
*7762	7760	
7718	7761	
*7763	7762	
7718	7763	
*7764	7771	
7718	7772	
*7765	7775	
7718	7776	
*7766	7780	
7718	7790	
*7767	7791	
7718	7797	
*7768	*7809	
7718	44024	
*7769	78001	
7718	78003	
*7798	7801	
76501	78031	
76502	78039	
76503	7817	
76504	7854	
76505	78550	
76506	78551	
76507	78559	
76508	7863	
7670	78820	
7685	78829	
769	7895	
7700	7907	
7701	7911	
7702	7913	
7703	7991	
7704	7994	
7705	*99791	
7707	9983	
7710	*99799	
7711	9983	
7713	*9983	
7718	9983	
77210	*99881	
77211	9983	
77212	*99883	
77213	9983	
77214	*99889	

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
1	34667	8.9765	2	3	6	12	19
2	7122	9.9083	3	5	8	13	20
3	7	7.4286	1	1	3	4	10
4	6414	7.1743	1	2	5	9	16
5	93169	3.0674	1	1	2	3	7
6	398	2.9196	1	1	2	4	6
7	14187	9.7565	1	4	7	12	20
8	4350	2.7572	1	1	1	3	6
9	1738	6.4689	1	3	5	8	13
10	18019	6.5224	2	3	5	8	13
11	3400	4.0044	1	2	3	5	8
12	49655	5.8699	2	3	4	7	11
13	6646	5.0141	2	3	4	6	9
14	320358	5.8150	2	3	5	7	11
15	152285	3.4737	1	2	3	4	6
16	11455	6.0111	2	3	5	7	12
17	3729	3.2773	1	2	3	4	6
18	28016	5.4234	2	3	4	7	10
19	8679	3.5369	1	2	3	5	7
20	5618	10.4676	3	5	8	13	20
21	1429	6.5850	2	3	5	8	13
22	2723	5.0165	2	2	4	6	10
23	11192	4.2429	1	2	3	5	8
24	55364	4.8878	1	2	4	6	10
25	27208	3.2250	1	2	3	4	6
26	34	4.6765	1	1	2	4	6
27	3839	5.0253	1	1	3	6	11
28	12344	6.2286	1	3	5	8	13
29	4930	3.5613	1	2	3	5	7
31	3815	4.0765	1	2	3	5	8
32	1893	2.4464	1	1	2	3	5
34	21788	5.0453	1	2	4	6	9
35	6839	3.2388	1	1	3	4	6
36	2493	1.4705	1	1	1	1	2
37	1419	3.8182	1	1	2	4	9
38	93	2.4946	1	1	1	3	6
39	667	1.9340	1	1	1	2	4
40	1524	3.6037	1	1	2	5	8
42	1938	2.3710	1	1	1	3	5
43	110	3.0455	1	1	2	4	6
44	1295	5.0347	2	3	4	6	9
45	2600	3.2423	1	2	3	4	6
46	3374	4.5871	1	2	4	6	9
47	1350	3.1719	1	1	3	4	6
48	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
49	2335	4.6188	1	2	3	5	9
50	2483	1.8212	1	1	1	2	3
51	251	3.1195	1	1	1	3	7
52	239	1.9205	1	1	1	2	3
53	2516	3.3792	1	1	2	4	8
54	1	4.0000	4	4	4	4	4
55	1566	3.0556	1	1	1	3	6
56	528	2.9848	1	1	2	3	6
57	692	3.6893	1	1	2	4	8
59	128	2.6641	1	1	1	3	6
60	6	3.3333	1	1	2	5	5
61	243	4.8354	1	1	3	7	10
62	3	1.6667	1	1	1	3	3
63	2887	4.4891	1	1	3	6	9
64	3132	6.6028	1	2	4	8	14
65	39024	2.7977	1	1	2	3	5
66	7671	3.1068	1	1	2	4	6
67	440	3.5955	1	2	3	4	6
68	8648	3.8274	1	2	3	5	7
69	2973	3.0054	1	2	2	4	6
70	25	3.4800	1	2	3	4	8
71	87	3.4368	1	2	3	4	6
72	926	3.5659	1	1	3	4	7
73	7073	4.3867	1	2	3	6	9
75	39878	10.0489	3	5	7	12	20

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
76	41691	11.4166	3	5	9	14	22
77	2445	4.8634	1	2	4	7	10
78	35316	6.6636	3	4	6	8	11
79	166404	8.5040	3	4	7	11	16
80	8320	5.4954	2	3	5	7	10
81	2	8.0000	3	3	13	13	13
82	63426	6.9938	2	3	6	9	14
83	6394	5.4759	2	3	4	7	10
84	1559	3.2290	1	2	3	4	6
85	21268	6.3168	2	3	5	8	12
86	2180	3.8138	1	2	3	5	8
87	59482	6.3070	1	3	5	8	12
88	396842	5.1059	2	3	4	6	9
89	502709	5.8920	2	3	5	7	11
90	46817	4.0322	2	2	3	5	7
91	57	4.0000	2	2	3	5	8
92	14816	6.3579	2	3	5	8	12
93	1710	4.1076	1	2	3	5	8
94	12574	6.3304	2	3	5	8	13
95	1679	3.7123	1	2	3	5	7
96	53729	4.5526	2	2	4	6	8
97	28601	3.5208	1	2	3	4	6
98	15	5.0000	1	2	3	4	13
99	21279	3.1677	1	1	2	4	6
100	8950	2.1349	1	1	2	3	4
101	21127	4.3832	1	2	3	6	9
102	5559	2.5690	1	1	2	3	5
103	428	49.2103	9	14	26	61	116
104	19836	14.4245	6	8	12	17	25
105	27462	9.9935	5	6	8	11	18
106	3308	11.3987	5	7	10	14	20
107	85791	10.4560	5	7	9	12	17
108	6205	10.2743	3	5	8	13	20
109	59572	7.7288	4	5	6	9	13
110	53172	9.0340	2	4	7	11	18
111	9394	4.4159	1	2	4	6	8
113	41424	12.4557	4	6	9	15	24
114	8852	8.5204	2	4	7	11	17
115	15271	8.2839	1	4	7	11	16
116	109277	4.4721	1	2	3	6	9
117	4177	4.1611	1	1	2	5	9
118	8112	2.8930	1	1	1	3	7
119	1316	5.1117	1	1	3	6	12
120	37220	8.7981	1	2	6	12	20
121	167308	6.3297	2	3	5	8	12
122	81710	3.6163	1	2	3	5	7
123	41163	4.7016	1	1	3	6	11
124	137232	4.3524	1	2	3	5	8
125	91133	2.7831	1	1	2	4	5
126	5016	11.8909	4	6	9	15	22
127	682134	5.2700	2	3	4	7	10
128	8254	5.4723	2	3	5	7	9
129	4105	2.8378	1	1	1	3	6
130	88700	5.6615	2	3	5	7	10
131	27798	4.0539	1	2	4	5	7
132	152312	2.9301	1	1	2	4	5
133	8929	2.2655	1	1	2	3	4
134	39623	3.1770	1	2	2	4	6
135	7554	4.4298	1	2	3	5	8
136	1237	2.5594	1	1	2	3	5
138	203378	3.9834	1	2	3	5	8
139	90000	2.4829	1	1	2	3	5
140	66435	2.5585	1	1	2	3	5
141	102391	3.5917	1	2	3	4	7
142	51719	2.5539	1	1	2	3	5
143	250133	2.0827	1	1	2	3	4
144	88510	5.4530	1	2	4	7	11
145	7598	2.6481	1	1	2	3	5
146	10799	10.2146	5	7	8	12	17
147	2798	6.4010	3	5	6	8	10

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
148	129350	12.2861	5	7	10	15	22
149	19313	6.4669	4	5	6	8	10
150	20328	11.2319	4	7	10	14	20
151	4963	5.6756	1	3	5	8	10
152	4425	8.3250	3	5	7	10	14
153	2014	5.3803	3	4	5	7	8
154	29001	13.2057	3	7	10	16	26
155	7262	3.9898	1	2	3	6	8
156	3	15.0000	11	11	13	21	21
157	8154	5.5581	1	2	4	7	11
158	4562	2.5184	1	1	2	3	5
159	17114	5.0598	1	2	4	6	10
160	12169	2.6492	1	1	2	3	5
161	11152	4.1588	1	1	3	5	9
162	7288	1.9175	1	1	1	2	4
163	3	3.0000	1	1	3	5	5
164	5118	8.2651	3	5	7	10	14
165	2185	4.6499	2	3	4	6	8
166	3903	4.8737	1	2	4	6	9
167	3800	2.5132	1	1	2	3	4
168	1279	5.0023	1	2	3	6	11
169	827	2.2866	1	1	2	3	5
170	12108	10.9853	2	4	8	14	22
171	1355	4.3107	1	2	3	6	9
172	30622	6.9624	2	3	5	9	14
173	2711	3.7444	1	1	3	5	8
174	247222	4.8059	2	3	4	6	9
175	35165	2.9201	1	2	3	4	5
176	15219	5.2481	2	3	4	6	10
177	9429	4.5038	2	2	4	6	8
178	3758	3.0780	1	2	3	4	6
179	12541	5.9632	2	3	5	7	11
180	88300	5.3709	2	3	4	7	10
181	27097	3.3767	1	2	3	4	6
182	248889	4.4042	1	2	3	5	8
183	87342	2.8973	1	1	2	4	5
184	90	2.9000	1	1	2	4	6
185	5021	4.7104	1	2	3	6	9
186	3	4.6667	2	2	3	9	9
187	446	4.3565	1	2	3	6	8
188	79403	5.5558	1	2	4	7	11
189	13113	3.0563	1	1	2	4	6
190	74	4.7838	1	2	3	5	9
191	9222	13.7304	3	6	10	17	28
192	1257	6.0963	1	3	5	8	11
193	4865	12.7394	5	7	10	16	23
194	733	6.8759	2	4	6	8	12
195	4157	10.3560	4	6	9	12	18
196	1051	5.4186	2	3	5	7	9
197	18569	8.9827	3	5	7	11	16
198	5672	4.4381	2	3	4	6	8
199	1644	9.9179	2	4	7	13	21
200	1042	10.4539	1	3	7	14	22
201	1466	14.4734	3	6	11	18	29
202	26156	6.3731	2	3	5	8	13
203	29310	6.7403	2	3	5	9	13
204	61544	5.8119	2	3	4	7	11
205	24459	6.1537	2	3	5	8	12
206	2049	3.9204	1	2	3	5	8
207	32107	5.1834	1	2	4	7	10
208	10745	2.8598	1	1	2	4	5
209	371105	4.9903	3	3	4	6	8
210	121541	6.8894	3	4	6	8	11
211	32567	4.9284	3	4	5	6	7
212	7	3.2857	1	2	2	2	4
213	9878	9.1432	2	4	7	11	18
216	6916	9.5448	2	4	7	12	19
217	17029	13.4060	3	5	9	16	28
218	22745	5.4427	2	3	4	7	10
219	20867	3.2086	1	2	3	4	5

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
[FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
220	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
223	13667	2.8776	1	1	2	3	6
224	12467	1.8627	1	1	1	2	3
225	6124	5.0144	1	2	3	7	11
226	5702	6.6733	1	3	5	8	14
227	4923	2.6669	1	1	2	3	5
228	2481	4.0806	1	1	2	5	9
229	1176	2.2168	1	1	2	3	4
230	2407	5.0586	1	2	3	6	11
231	13540	4.8875	1	1	3	6	10
232	882	2.7426	1	1	1	3	7
233	7199	7.2148	1	3	5	9	15
234	4623	3.1573	1	1	2	4	7
235	5091	5.0304	1	2	4	6	9
236	39785	4.7450	1	3	4	6	9
237	1744	3.5740	1	2	3	4	7
238	8625	8.8420	3	4	7	11	17
239	48235	6.2846	2	3	5	8	12
240	11808	6.7199	2	3	5	8	13
241	3223	3.8849	1	2	3	5	7
242	2516	6.5568	2	3	5	8	13
243	93807	4.6804	1	2	4	6	9
244	13584	4.7331	1	2	4	6	9
245	5733	3.3630	1	2	3	4	6
246	1347	3.7647	1	2	3	5	7
247	19620	3.3687	1	1	3	4	6
248	12067	4.8652	1	2	4	6	9
249	12912	3.6678	1	1	2	4	8
250	3795	4.1686	1	2	3	5	7
251	2489	2.7814	1	1	2	4	5
253	20861	4.6779	1	3	4	6	9
254	10809	3.1314	1	2	3	4	6
255	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
256	6422	5.1110	1	2	4	6	10
257	16706	2.6651	1	1	2	3	5
258	16972	1.8186	1	1	2	2	3
259	3813	2.6693	1	1	1	2	6
260	5087	1.3666	1	1	1	1	2
261	1889	2.1615	1	1	1	2	4
262	683	4.2958	1	1	3	5	10
263	24569	11.8050	3	5	8	14	23
264	3982	6.9006	2	3	5	8	14
265	4052	6.7347	1	2	4	8	14
266	2676	3.1371	1	1	2	4	6
267	267	4.2584	1	1	2	4	8
268	899	3.6274	1	1	2	4	8
269	9064	8.2177	2	3	6	10	17
270	2746	3.2618	1	1	2	4	7
271	19612	7.2767	2	4	6	9	13
272	5471	6.1349	2	3	5	7	12
273	1387	3.9250	1	2	3	5	7
274	2344	6.7675	1	3	5	8	14
275	247	3.0202	1	1	2	4	6
276	1315	4.5384	1	2	4	6	8
277	93957	5.7577	2	3	5	7	10
278	31764	4.2755	2	3	4	5	7
279	3	7.0000	3	3	8	10	10
280	17047	4.1686	1	2	3	5	8
281	7834	2.9183	1	1	2	4	5
283	5638	4.6568	1	2	4	6	9
284	1950	3.0569	1	1	2	4	6
285	6574	10.6492	3	5	8	13	20
286	2183	5.9464	2	3	4	7	11
287	6460	10.5718	3	5	8	12	20
288	3675	5.3897	2	3	4	6	8
289	6423	2.8026	1	1	1	3	6
290	9500	2.2281	1	1	1	2	4
291	78	1.6026	1	1	1	2	3
292	5423	9.9458	2	4	8	13	20
293	345	4.9246	1	2	3	7	10

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
294	95391	4.5356	1	2	3	6	9
295	3359	3.9690	1	2	3	5	7
296	250941	5.1144	1	2	4	6	10
297	47743	3.3559	1	2	3	4	6
298	103	4.3495	1	2	3	5	8
299	1218	5.3760	1	2	4	6	10
300	17546	6.1581	2	3	5	8	12
301	3644	3.6509	1	2	3	5	7
302	7896	8.6990	4	5	7	10	15
303	20694	8.2722	3	4	6	9	15
304	11944	8.6761	2	4	6	11	18
305	2972	3.5697	1	2	3	4	6
306	7213	5.4883	1	2	3	7	13
307	2168	2.2002	1	1	2	3	4
308	7359	6.3367	1	2	4	8	14
309	4375	2.1913	1	1	2	3	4
310	24597	4.3470	1	1	3	5	9
311	8323	1.8264	1	1	1	2	3
312	1547	4.4945	1	1	3	6	10
313	644	2.1289	1	1	1	2	4
314	1	5.0000	5	5	5	5	5
315	31230	6.8866	1	1	4	9	16
316	116645	6.6308	2	3	5	8	13
317	1890	3.0899	1	1	2	3	7
318	5739	6.0294	1	3	4	8	12
319	494	2.8543	1	1	2	4	6
320	193283	5.3020	2	3	4	7	10
321	30745	3.7500	1	2	3	5	7
322	64	3.6563	1	2	3	4	7
323	18622	3.1423	1	1	2	4	6
324	7455	1.8437	1	1	1	2	3
325	8938	3.7880	1	2	3	5	7
326	2803	2.6718	1	1	2	3	5
327	2	2.5000	1	1	4	4	4
328	685	3.7883	1	1	3	5	7
329	105	2.2000	1	1	1	2	5
331	49140	5.5819	1	3	4	7	11
332	5119	3.1686	1	1	2	4	6
333	311	4.6849	1	2	3	6	10
334	10271	4.7684	2	3	4	5	8
335	12383	3.1779	2	2	3	4	5
336	36334	3.4249	1	2	2	4	7
337	29524	2.0688	1	1	2	2	3
338	1055	5.5526	1	2	3	8	13
339	1505	4.6186	1	1	3	6	10
340	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
341	3670	3.0695	1	1	2	3	6
342	723	3.1355	1	1	2	4	6
343	1	5.0000	5	5	5	5	5
344	3810	2.2850	1	1	1	2	4
345	1180	3.8542	1	1	2	4	8
346	4562	6.0342	1	3	5	8	12
347	373	2.6971	1	1	2	3	6
348	3281	4.1591	1	2	3	5	8
349	597	2.4623	1	1	2	3	5
350	6497	4.5045	2	2	4	6	8
351	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
352	768	3.9557	1	2	3	5	8
353	2659	6.4772	2	3	5	7	12
354	7491	5.8265	3	3	4	7	10
355	5680	3.2347	2	2	3	4	5
356	25943	2.1725	1	1	2	3	4
357	5715	8.4126	3	4	6	10	16
358	20616	4.3038	2	3	3	5	7
359	31095	2.6372	1	2	3	3	4
360	15579	2.8185	1	2	2	3	5
361	369	3.6694	1	1	2	4	8
362	2	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
363	2684	3.6256	1	2	2	4	7
364	1632	3.8762	1	1	3	5	8

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
365	1770	7.3989	1	3	5	9	16
366	4436	6.8537	2	3	5	9	14
367	521	3.0115	1	1	2	4	6
368	3288	6.7318	2	3	5	8	13
369	3280	3.1976	1	1	2	4	6
370	1244	5.6937	3	3	4	5	9
371	1416	3.6031	2	3	3	4	5
372	919	3.6529	1	2	2	3	5
373	3878	2.2935	1	2	2	3	3
374	116	2.8793	1	2	2	3	5
375	8	5.2500	1	3	5	5	9
376	263	3.5095	1	2	2	4	6
377	29	4.3793	1	2	3	4	7
378	169	2.4615	1	1	2	3	4
379	408	3.0000	1	1	2	3	6
380	76	1.9605	1	1	1	2	4
381	181	2.0829	1	1	1	2	4
382	25	1.3600	1	1	1	1	3
383	1841	3.9620	1	1	3	4	8
384	149	2.7315	1	1	1	3	6
389	5	3.4000	1	1	2	4	8
390	8	2.7500	1	1	1	4	5
392	2247	9.5167	2	4	7	12	19
393	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
394	1959	6.2950	1	2	4	8	14
395	100668	4.3478	1	2	3	5	9
396	11	3.8182	1	1	2	4	6
397	17952	5.1683	1	2	4	7	10
398	17121	5.8897	2	3	5	7	11
399	1788	3.5520	1	2	3	5	7
400	6488	8.9578	1	3	6	11	20
401	5837	11.2479	2	5	9	15	23
402	1598	3.8899	1	1	3	5	8
403	32013	8.0033	2	3	6	10	17
404	4593	4.1916	1	2	3	5	9
406	2495	9.6970	2	4	7	12	20
407	702	4.1140	1	2	3	5	8
408	2122	7.8591	1	2	5	10	18
409	2517	6.1339	2	3	4	6	13
410	30770	4.0138	1	2	4	5	6
411	14	2.9286	1	1	2	4	6
412	18	2.0000	1	1	1	2	4
413	5767	7.2917	2	3	6	9	14
414	763	4.0170	1	2	3	5	8
415	39920	14.4391	4	6	11	18	29
416	181162	7.4625	2	4	6	9	14
417	37	6.1351	2	2	4	8	13
418	23410	6.1742	2	3	5	8	12
419	15730	4.6490	1	2	4	6	9
420	2958	3.4324	1	2	3	4	6
421	9274	3.7804	1	2	3	4	7
422	69	2.9130	1	1	2	3	6
423	7273	8.2391	2	3	6	10	17
424	1292	12.9690	2	5	9	16	26
425	16309	3.8956	1	2	3	5	8
426	4483	4.4716	1	2	3	5	9
427	1576	4.4143	1	2	3	5	9
428	745	7.3732	1	2	4	8	15
429	27035	6.1425	2	3	4	7	12
430	63072	7.9697	2	3	6	10	16
431	321	5.9470	1	2	4	7	13
432	411	4.5645	1	1	3	5	9
433	5523	2.9714	1	1	2	3	6
439	1457	8.5003	1	3	6	10	17
440	5440	9.0241	2	3	6	11	20
441	612	3.0735	1	1	2	4	7
442	16697	8.5604	1	3	6	10	18
443	3806	3.5365	1	1	3	4	7
444	5676	4.3175	1	2	3	5	8
445	2726	2.8995	1	1	2	4	5

TABLE 7A.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V19.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
447	6278	2.4462	1	1	2	3	5
448	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
449	30479	3.6797	1	1	3	4	8
450	7369	1.9900	1	1	1	2	4
451	5	1.6000	1	1	2	2	2
452	25229	5.0164	1	2	3	6	10
453	5648	2.7665	1	1	2	3	5
454	4624	4.3575	1	2	3	5	9
455	1098	2.3752	1	1	2	3	5
461	4563	4.0690	1	1	2	4	10
462	11994	11.3643	4	6	10	14	21
463	25215	4.1639	1	2	3	5	8
464	7115	3.0145	1	1	2	4	6
465	224	2.8973	1	1	1	3	5
466	1797	3.9321	1	1	2	4	7
467	1043	8.3931	1	1	2	3	6
468	57090	12.8803	3	6	10	16	25
471	12468	5.4931	3	3	4	6	9
473	8236	12.3409	1	3	7	17	32
475	104072	11.1941	2	5	9	15	22
476	3803	11.2611	2	5	10	15	21
477	25564	8.1456	1	3	6	11	17
478	108638	7.3817	1	3	5	9	16
479	24179	3.3012	1	1	3	4	7
480	622	21.5354	7	9	14	28	49
481	726	21.9353	13	17	20	25	33
482	5562	13.2251	4	7	10	16	25
483	43028	39.7169	15	22	33	49	71
484	317	13.0820	2	5	10	18	27
485	3029	9.4262	4	5	7	11	18
486	1867	12.3214	1	5	10	16	25
487	3536	7.6683	1	3	6	10	16
488	776	16.9162	3	6	13	22	35
489	13557	8.5376	2	3	6	10	18
490	5252	5.2582	1	2	4	6	10
491	13607	3.4664	1	2	3	4	6
492	2875	15.0104	2	5	7	25	34
493	58106	5.8777	1	3	5	7	11
494	30972	2.4751	1	1	2	3	5
495	211	17.1659	8	10	13	20	31
496	1842	9.4870	3	4	7	11	19
497	18414	6.5560	3	4	5	7	11
498	13584	4.1477	2	3	4	5	6
499	33300	4.6629	1	2	3	6	9
500	49827	2.4760	1	1	2	3	5
501	2356	10.6341	4	5	8	13	20
502	637	6.4066	2	4	5	8	11
503	5894	3.8884	1	2	3	5	7
504	123	34.9756	9	15	27	44	66
505	147	3.6667	1	1	1	5	9
506	937	17.2604	4	8	14	22	36
507	288	8.9549	2	4	7	12	18
508	667	8.2219	2	3	6	10	17
509	177	5.4350	1	2	4	7	10
510	1671	6.6092	1	3	5	8	13
511	616	4.3766	1	1	3	5	9
512	450	14.2244	6	8	11	15	24
513	142	10.7042	5	7	9	11	20
514	19261	7.2615	1	3	6	9	15
515	4570	5.4897	1	1	3	7	13
516	76256	4.7308	2	2	4	6	9
517	191586	2.6138	1	1	2	3	6
518	51638	3.3905	1	1	2	4	7
519	7316	5.1875	1	2	3	6	12
520	11118	2.1205	1	1	2	2	4
521	28568	5.7752	2	3	4	7	12
522	6141	9.4402	3	4	8	12	20
523	14812	4.0927	1	2	3	5	7
	11403341						

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
1	27708	11.1212	3	5	8	14	22
2	14081	5.2277	1	3	4	7	10
3	7	7.4286	1	1	3	4	10
4	6426	7.1748	1	2	5	9	16
5	93169	3.0674	1	1	2	3	7
6	398	2.9196	1	1	2	4	6
7	14187	9.7565	1	4	7	12	20
8	4350	2.7572	1	1	1	3	6
9	1737	6.4669	1	3	5	8	13
10	18019	6.5224	2	3	5	8	13
11	3400	4.0044	1	2	3	5	8
12	49655	5.8699	2	3	4	7	11
13	6646	5.0141	2	3	4	6	9
14	236067	6.0768	2	3	5	7	12
15	101726	4.9503	2	3	4	6	9
16	9257	6.1391	2	3	5	8	12
17	2871	3.1379	1	1	2	4	6
18	28016	5.4234	2	3	4	7	10
19	8679	3.5369	1	2	3	5	7
20	5618	10.4676	3	5	8	13	20
21	1429	6.5850	2	3	5	8	13
22	2723	5.0165	2	2	4	6	10
23	11192	4.2429	1	2	3	5	8
24	55364	4.8878	1	2	4	6	10
25	27208	3.2250	1	2	3	4	6
26	34	4.6765	1	1	2	4	6
27	3839	5.0253	1	1	3	6	11
28	12344	6.2286	1	3	5	8	13
29	4930	3.5613	1	2	3	5	7
31	3815	4.0765	1	2	3	5	8
32	1893	2.4464	1	1	2	3	5
34	22342	5.0412	1	2	4	6	9
35	7331	3.2195	1	1	3	4	6
36	2493	1.4705	1	1	1	1	2
37	1419	3.8182	1	1	2	4	9
38	93	2.4946	1	1	1	3	6
39	667	1.9340	1	1	1	2	4
40	1524	3.6037	1	1	2	5	8
42	1938	2.3710	1	1	1	3	5
43	110	3.0455	1	1	2	4	6
44	1295	5.0347	2	3	4	6	9
45	2600	3.2423	1	2	3	4	6
46	3374	4.5871	1	2	4	6	9
47	1350	3.1719	1	1	3	4	6
48	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
49	2337	4.6166	1	2	3	5	9
50	2483	1.8212	1	1	1	2	3
51	251	3.1195	1	1	1	3	7
52	239	1.9205	1	1	1	2	3
53	2518	3.3777	1	1	2	4	8
54	1	4.0000	4	4	4	4	4
55	1566	3.0556	1	1	1	3	6
56	528	2.9848	1	1	2	3	6
57	692	3.6893	1	1	2	4	8
59	128	2.6641	1	1	1	3	6
60	6	3.3333	1	1	2	5	5
61	243	4.8354	1	1	3	7	10
62	3	1.6667	1	1	1	3	3
63	2900	4.4831	1	1	3	6	9
64	3132	6.6028	1	2	4	8	14
65	39024	2.7977	1	1	2	3	5
66	7671	3.1068	1	1	2	4	6
67	440	3.5955	1	2	3	4	6
68	8754	3.8284	1	2	3	5	7
69	3035	2.9997	1	2	2	4	5
70	25	3.4800	1	2	3	4	8
71	87	3.4368	1	2	3	4	6
72	926	3.5659	1	1	3	4	7
73	7073	4.3867	1	2	3	6	9
75	39878	10.0489	3	5	7	12	20

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
76	41691	11.4166	3	5	9	14	22
77	2445	4.8634	1	2	4	7	10
78	35316	6.6636	3	4	6	8	11
79	166404	8.5040	3	4	7	11	16
80	8320	5.4954	2	3	5	7	10
81	2	8.0000	3	3	13	13	13
82	63426	6.9938	2	3	6	9	14
83	6394	5.4759	2	3	4	7	10
84	1559	3.2290	1	2	3	4	6
85	21268	6.3168	2	3	5	8	12
86	2180	3.8138	1	2	3	5	8
87	59482	6.3070	1	3	5	8	12
88	396842	5.1059	2	3	4	6	9
89	502709	5.8920	2	3	5	7	11
90	46817	4.0322	2	2	3	5	7
91	57	4.0000	2	2	3	5	8
92	14816	6.3579	2	3	5	8	12
93	1710	4.1076	1	2	3	5	8
94	12574	6.3304	2	3	5	8	13
95	1679	3.7123	1	2	3	5	7
96	53729	4.5526	2	2	4	6	8
97	28601	3.5208	1	2	3	4	6
98	15	5.0000	1	2	3	4	13
99	21279	3.1677	1	1	2	4	6
100	8950	2.1349	1	1	2	3	4
101	21127	4.3832	1	2	3	6	9
102	5559	2.5690	1	1	2	3	5
103	428	49.2103	9	14	26	61	116
104	19517	14.4041	6	8	12	17	25
105	27289	9.9529	5	6	8	11	18
106	3308	11.3987	5	7	10	14	20
107	85791	10.4560	5	7	9	12	17
108	6205	10.2743	3	5	8	13	20
109	59572	7.7288	4	5	6	9	13
110	53172	9.0340	2	4	7	11	18
111	9394	4.4159	1	2	4	6	8
113	41424	12.4557	4	6	9	15	24
114	8852	8.5204	2	4	7	11	17
115	15271	8.2839	1	4	7	11	16
116	109277	4.4721	1	2	3	6	9
117	4177	4.1611	1	1	2	5	9
118	8112	2.8930	1	1	1	3	7
119	1316	5.1117	1	1	3	6	12
120	37308	8.7872	1	2	6	12	20
121	167308	6.3297	2	3	5	8	12
122	81710	3.6163	1	2	3	5	7
123	41163	4.7016	1	1	3	6	11
124	138287	4.3673	1	2	3	6	8
125	90077	2.7417	1	1	2	4	5
126	5016	11.8909	4	6	9	15	22
127	682134	5.2700	2	3	4	7	10
128	8254	5.4723	2	3	5	7	9
129	4105	2.8378	1	1	1	3	6
130	88700	5.6615	2	3	5	7	10
131	27798	4.0539	1	2	4	5	7
132	152311	2.9301	1	1	2	4	5
133	8929	2.2655	1	1	2	3	4
134	39623	3.1770	1	2	2	4	6
135	7554	4.4298	1	2	3	5	8
136	1237	2.5594	1	1	2	3	5
138	203378	3.9834	1	2	3	5	8
139	90000	2.4829	1	1	2	3	5
140	66435	2.5585	1	1	2	3	5
141	102391	3.5917	1	2	3	4	7
142	51719	2.5539	1	1	2	3	5
143	250133	2.0827	1	1	2	3	4
144	88510	5.4530	1	2	4	7	11
145	7598	2.6481	1	1	2	3	5
146	10800	10.2147	5	7	8	12	17
147	2799	6.4012	3	5	6	8	10

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
148	129450	12.2855	5	7	10	15	22
149	19342	6.4670	4	5	6	8	10
150	20334	11.2329	4	7	10	14	20
151	4963	5.6756	1	3	5	8	10
152	4425	8.3250	3	5	7	10	14
153	2015	5.3782	3	4	5	7	8
154	29004	13.2062	3	7	10	16	26
155	7262	3.9898	1	2	3	6	8
156	3	15.0000	11	11	13	21	21
157	8155	5.5579	1	2	4	7	11
158	4564	2.5184	1	1	2	3	5
159	17115	5.0602	1	2	4	6	10
160	12172	2.6489	1	1	2	3	5
161	11155	4.1600	1	1	3	5	9
162	7290	1.9177	1	1	1	2	4
163	3	3.0000	1	1	3	5	5
164	5118	8.2651	3	5	7	10	14
165	2185	4.6499	2	3	4	6	8
166	3903	4.8737	1	2	4	6	9
167	3800	2.5132	1	1	2	3	4
168	1382	4.8705	1	2	3	6	10
169	869	2.2842	1	1	2	3	5
170	12156	10.9845	2	4	8	14	22
171	1359	4.3061	1	2	3	6	9
172	30622	6.9624	2	3	5	9	14
173	2711	3.7444	1	1	3	5	8
174	247222	4.8059	2	3	4	6	9
175	35165	2.9201	1	2	3	4	5
176	15219	5.2481	2	3	4	6	10
177	9429	4.5038	2	2	4	6	8
178	3758	3.0780	1	2	3	4	6
179	12541	5.9632	2	3	5	7	11
180	88300	5.3709	2	3	4	7	10
181	27097	3.3767	1	2	3	4	6
182	260686	4.3600	1	2	3	5	8
183	91243	2.8817	1	1	2	4	5
184	93	2.8387	1	1	2	4	6
185	5070	4.6984	1	2	3	6	9
186	3	4.6667	2	2	3	9	9
187	668	4.1153	1	2	3	6	8
188	79403	5.5558	1	2	4	7	11
189	13113	3.0563	1	1	2	4	6
190	74	4.7838	1	2	3	5	9
191	9222	13.7304	3	6	10	17	28
192	1257	6.0963	1	3	5	8	11
193	4865	12.7394	5	7	10	16	23
194	733	6.8759	2	4	6	8	12
195	4157	10.3560	4	6	9	12	18
196	1051	5.4186	2	3	5	7	9
197	18569	8.9827	3	5	7	11	16
198	5672	4.4381	2	3	4	6	8
199	1644	9.9179	2	4	7	13	21
200	1042	10.4539	1	3	7	14	22
201	2013	14.4287	4	6	11	18	28
202	26156	6.3731	2	3	5	8	13
203	29310	6.7403	2	3	5	9	13
204	61544	5.8119	2	3	4	7	11
205	24459	6.1537	2	3	5	8	12
206	2049	3.9204	1	2	3	5	8
207	32107	5.1834	1	2	4	7	10
208	10745	2.8598	1	1	2	4	5
209	371105	4.9903	3	3	4	6	8
210	121541	6.8894	3	4	6	8	11
211	32567	4.9284	3	4	5	6	7
212	7	3.2857	1	2	2	2	4
213	9878	9.1432	2	4	7	11	18
216	6916	9.5448	2	4	7	12	19
217	17029	13.4060	3	5	9	16	28
218	22744	5.4422	2	3	4	7	10
219	20866	3.2085	1	2	3	4	5

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
220	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
223	13666	2.8724	1	1	2	3	6
224	12467	1.8627	1	1	1	2	3
225	6124	5.0144	1	2	3	7	11
226	5699	6.6699	1	3	5	8	14
227	4921	2.6651	1	1	2	3	5
228	2481	4.0806	1	1	2	5	9
229	1175	2.2179	1	1	2	3	4
230	2406	5.0590	1	2	3	6	11
231	12533	4.8810	1	1	3	6	11
232	882	2.7426	1	1	1	3	7
233	7179	7.2117	1	3	5	9	15
234	4607	3.1532	1	1	2	4	7
235	5091	5.0304	1	2	4	6	9
236	39785	4.7450	1	3	4	6	9
237	1744	3.5740	1	2	3	4	7
238	8625	8.8420	3	4	7	11	17
239	48230	6.2846	2	3	5	8	12
240	11807	6.7199	2	3	5	8	13
241	3223	3.8849	1	2	3	5	7
242	2516	6.5568	2	3	5	8	13
243	93654	4.6808	1	2	4	6	9
244	13584	4.7331	1	2	4	6	9
245	5732	3.3627	1	2	3	4	6
246	1346	3.7645	1	2	3	5	7
247	19620	3.3687	1	1	3	4	6
248	12067	4.8652	1	2	4	6	9
249	12651	3.6505	1	1	2	4	7
250	3795	4.1686	1	2	3	5	7
251	2489	2.7814	1	1	2	4	5
253	20861	4.6779	1	3	4	6	9
254	10809	3.1314	1	2	3	4	6
255	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
256	6404	5.1084	1	2	4	6	10
257	16706	2.6651	1	1	2	3	5
258	16974	1.8185	1	1	2	2	3
259	3813	2.6693	1	1	1	2	6
260	5087	1.3666	1	1	1	1	2
261	1893	2.1590	1	1	1	2	4
262	686	4.2886	1	1	3	5	10
263	24569	11.8050	3	5	8	14	23
264	3982	6.9006	2	3	5	8	14
265	4052	6.7347	1	2	4	8	14
266	2676	3.1371	1	1	2	4	6
267	267	4.2584	1	1	2	4	8
268	899	3.6274	1	1	2	4	8
269	9064	8.2177	2	3	6	10	17
270	2746	3.2618	1	1	2	4	7
271	19612	7.2767	2	4	6	9	13
272	5471	6.1349	2	3	5	7	12
273	1387	3.9250	1	2	3	5	7
274	2344	6.7675	1	3	5	8	14
275	247	3.0202	1	1	2	4	6
276	1326	4.5181	1	2	4	6	8
277	93957	5.7577	2	3	5	7	10
278	31764	4.2755	2	3	4	5	7
279	3	7.0000	3	3	8	10	10
280	17047	4.1686	1	2	3	5	8
281	7834	2.9183	1	1	2	4	5
283	5638	4.6568	1	2	4	6	9
284	1950	3.0569	1	1	2	4	6
285	6574	10.6492	3	5	8	13	20
286	2183	5.9464	2	3	4	7	11
287	6460	10.5718	3	5	8	12	20
288	3675	5.3897	2	3	4	6	8
289	6423	2.8026	1	1	1	3	6
290	9500	2.2281	1	1	1	2	4
291	78	1.6026	1	1	1	2	3
292	5423	9.9458	2	4	8	13	20
293	345	4.9246	1	2	3	7	10

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
294	95391	4.5356	1	2	3	6	9
295	3359	3.9690	1	2	3	5	7
296	250941	5.1144	1	2	4	6	10
297	47743	3.3559	1	2	3	4	6
298	103	4.3495	1	2	3	5	8
299	1218	5.3760	1	2	4	6	10
300	17546	6.1581	2	3	5	8	12
301	3643	3.6508	1	2	3	5	7
302	7896	8.6990	4	5	7	10	15
303	20709	8.2736	3	4	6	9	15
304	12044	8.6857	2	4	6	11	18
305	3008	3.6051	1	2	3	5	6
306	7213	5.4883	1	2	3	7	13
307	2168	2.2002	1	1	2	3	4
308	7245	6.2803	1	2	4	8	14
309	4338	2.1547	1	1	2	3	4
310	24597	4.3470	1	1	3	5	9
311	8323	1.8264	1	1	1	2	3
312	1547	4.4945	1	1	3	6	10
313	644	2.1289	1	1	1	2	4
314	1	5.0000	5	5	5	5	5
315	33711	7.1835	1	1	4	9	17
316	115329	6.5892	2	3	5	8	13
317	1890	3.0899	1	1	2	3	7
318	5739	6.0294	1	3	4	8	12
319	494	2.8543	1	1	2	4	6
320	193283	5.3020	2	3	4	7	10
321	30745	3.7500	1	2	3	5	7
322	64	3.6563	1	2	3	4	7
323	18622	3.1423	1	1	2	4	6
324	7455	1.8437	1	1	1	2	3
325	8938	3.7880	1	2	3	5	7
326	2803	2.6718	1	1	2	3	5
327	2	2.5000	1	1	4	4	4
328	685	3.7883	1	1	3	5	7
329	105	2.2000	1	1	1	2	5
331	49140	5.5819	1	3	4	7	11
332	5119	3.1686	1	1	2	4	6
333	311	4.6849	1	2	3	6	10
334	10271	4.7684	2	3	4	5	8
335	12383	3.1779	2	2	3	4	5
336	36334	3.4249	1	2	2	4	7
337	29524	2.0688	1	1	2	2	3
338	1055	5.5526	1	2	3	8	13
339	1505	4.6186	1	1	3	6	10
340	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
341	3670	3.0695	1	1	2	3	6
342	723	3.1355	1	1	2	4	6
343	1	5.0000	5	5	5	5	5
344	3840	2.3802	1	1	1	2	5
345	1336	4.7859	1	1	3	6	10
346	4562	6.0342	1	3	5	8	12
347	373	2.6971	1	1	2	3	6
348	3281	4.1591	1	2	3	5	8
349	597	2.4623	1	1	2	3	5
350	6497	4.5045	2	2	4	6	8
351	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
352	768	3.9557	1	2	3	5	8
353	2659	6.4772	2	3	5	7	12
354	7491	5.8265	3	3	4	7	10
355	5680	3.2347	2	2	3	4	5
356	25943	2.1725	1	1	2	3	4
357	5715	8.4126	3	4	6	10	16
358	20617	4.3038	2	3	3	5	7
359	31095	2.6372	1	2	3	3	4
360	15583	2.8183	1	2	2	3	5
361	369	3.6694	1	1	2	4	8
362	2	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
363	2683	3.6254	1	2	2	4	7
364	1631	3.8780	1	1	3	5	8

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
 [FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
365	1834	7.6930	2	3	5	10	17
366	4436	6.8537	2	3	5	9	14
367	521	3.0115	1	1	2	4	6
368	3288	6.7318	2	3	5	8	13
369	3281	3.1987	1	1	2	4	6
370	1244	5.6937	3	3	4	5	9
371	1416	3.6031	2	3	3	4	5
372	919	3.6529	1	2	2	3	5
373	3878	2.2935	1	2	2	3	3
374	116	2.8793	1	2	2	3	5
375	8	5.2500	1	3	5	5	9
376	263	3.5095	1	2	2	4	6
377	29	4.3793	1	2	3	4	7
378	169	2.4615	1	1	2	3	4
379	408	3.0000	1	1	2	3	6
380	76	1.9605	1	1	1	2	4
381	181	2.0829	1	1	1	2	4
382	25	1.3600	1	1	1	1	3
383	1841	3.9620	1	1	3	4	8
384	149	2.7315	1	1	1	3	6
389	5	3.4000	1	1	2	4	8
390	1	4.0000	4	4	4	4	4
392	2247	9.5167	2	4	7	12	19
393	1	2.0000	2	2	2	2	2
394	2329	7.0575	1	2	5	9	15
395	100668	4.3478	1	2	3	5	9
396	11	3.8182	1	1	2	4	6
397	17952	5.1683	1	2	4	7	10
398	17121	5.8897	2	3	5	7	11
399	1788	3.5520	1	2	3	5	7
400	6488	8.9578	1	3	6	11	20
401	5837	11.2479	2	5	9	15	23
402	1599	3.8899	1	1	3	5	8
403	32013	8.0033	2	3	6	10	17
404	4592	4.1916	1	2	3	5	9
406	2495	9.6970	2	4	7	12	20
407	702	4.1140	1	2	3	5	8
408	2122	7.8591	1	2	5	10	18
409	2517	6.1339	2	3	4	6	13
410	30770	4.0138	1	2	4	5	6
411	14	2.9286	1	1	2	4	6
412	18	2.0000	1	1	1	2	4
413	5767	7.2917	2	3	6	9	14
414	763	4.0170	1	2	3	5	8
415	39922	14.4392	4	6	11	18	29
416	181162	7.4625	2	4	6	9	14
417	37	6.1351	2	2	4	8	13
418	23408	6.1732	2	3	5	8	12
419	15730	4.6490	1	2	4	6	9
420	2958	3.4324	1	2	3	4	6
421	9274	3.7804	1	2	3	4	7
422	69	2.9130	1	1	2	3	6
423	7273	8.2391	2	3	6	10	17
424	1292	12.9690	2	5	9	16	26
425	16309	3.8956	1	2	3	5	8
426	4483	4.4716	1	2	3	5	9
427	1576	4.4143	1	2	3	5	9
428	745	7.3732	1	2	4	8	15
429	27035	6.1425	2	3	4	7	12
430	63072	7.9697	2	3	6	10	16
431	321	5.9470	1	2	4	7	13
432	411	4.5645	1	1	3	5	9
433	5523	2.9714	1	1	2	3	6
439	1457	8.5003	1	3	6	10	17
440	5440	9.0241	2	3	6	11	20
441	612	3.0735	1	1	2	4	7
442	16700	8.5598	1	3	6	10	18
443	3808	3.5355	1	1	3	4	7
444	5676	4.3175	1	2	3	5	8
445	2726	2.8995	1	1	2	4	5

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
[FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
447	6278	2.4462	1	1	2	3	5
448	1	1.0000	1	1	1	1	1
449	30478	3.6796	1	1	3	4	8
450	7369	1.9900	1	1	1	2	4
451	5	1.6000	1	1	2	2	2
452	25229	5.0164	1	2	3	6	10
453	5646	2.7669	1	1	2	3	5
454	4624	4.3575	1	2	3	5	9
455	1098	2.3752	1	1	2	3	5
461	4563	4.0690	1	1	2	4	10
462	11994	11.3643	4	6	10	14	21
463	25215	4.1639	1	2	3	5	8
464	7115	3.0145	1	1	2	4	6
465	224	2.8973	1	1	1	3	5
466	1797	3.9321	1	1	2	4	7
467	1043	8.3931	1	1	2	3	6
468	54726	12.9153	3	6	10	16	25
471	12468	5.4931	3	3	4	6	9
473	8236	12.3409	1	3	7	17	32
475	104072	11.1941	2	5	9	15	22
476	3814	11.2651	2	5	10	15	21
477	25602	8.1413	1	3	6	11	17
478	108638	7.3817	1	3	5	9	16
479	24179	3.3012	1	1	3	4	7
480	622	21.5354	7	9	14	28	49
481	726	21.9353	13	17	20	25	33
482	5300	12.4930	4	7	9	15	23
483	43301	39.6393	14	22	33	49	71
484	317	13.0820	2	5	10	18	27
485	3029	9.4262	4	5	7	11	18
486	1867	12.3214	1	5	10	16	25
487	3536	7.6683	1	3	6	10	16
488	776	16.9162	3	6	13	22	35
489	13557	8.5376	2	3	6	10	18
490	5252	5.2582	1	2	4	6	10
491	13607	3.4664	1	2	3	4	6
492	2875	15.0104	2	5	7	25	34
493	58106	5.8777	1	3	5	7	11
494	30972	2.4751	1	1	2	3	5
495	211	17.1659	8	10	13	20	31
496	1842	9.4870	3	4	7	11	19
497	19927	6.5368	3	4	5	7	11
498	14665	4.1305	2	3	4	5	6
499	32668	4.6299	1	2	3	6	9
500	49512	2.4657	1	1	2	3	5
501	2356	10.6341	4	5	8	13	20
502	637	6.4066	2	4	5	8	11
503	5894	3.8884	1	2	3	5	7
504	123	34.9756	9	15	27	44	66
505	147	3.6667	1	1	1	5	9
506	937	17.2604	4	8	14	22	36
507	288	8.9549	2	4	7	12	18
508	667	8.2219	2	3	6	10	17
509	177	5.4350	1	2	4	7	10
510	1671	6.6092	1	3	5	8	13
511	616	4.3766	1	1	3	5	9
512	450	14.2244	6	8	11	15	24
513	142	10.7042	5	7	9	11	20
514	19261	7.2615	1	3	6	9	15
515	4570	5.4897	1	1	3	7	13
516	76256	4.7308	2	2	4	6	9
517	191586	2.6138	1	1	2	3	6
518	51638	3.3905	1	1	2	4	7
519	7220	5.1497	1	2	3	6	12
520	11073	2.1137	1	1	2	2	4
521	28568	5.7752	2	3	4	7	12
522	6141	9.4402	3	4	8	12	20
523	14812	4.0927	1	2	3	5	7
524	136857	3.3964	1	2	3	4	6

TABLE 7B.—MEDICARE PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM SELECTED PERCENTILE LENGTHS OF STAY—Continued
[FY 2001 MEDPAR Update 12/01 Grouper V20.0]

DRG	Number discharges	Arithmetic mean LOS	10th percentile	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile	90th percentile
525	492	15.9309	2	5	9	18	35
	11420001						

TABLE 8A.—STATEWIDE AVERAGE OPERATING COST-TO-CHARGE RATIOS FOR URBAN AND RURAL HOSPITALS (CASE WEIGHTED) MARCH 2002

State	Urban	Rural
ALABAMA	0.337	0.394
ALASKA	0.407	0.675
ARIZONA	0.349	0.478
ARKANSAS	0.456	0.438
CALIFORNIA	0.335	0.419
COLORADO	0.463	0.538
CONNECTICUT	0.494	0.509
DELAWARE	0.516	0.484
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
FLORIDA	0.413	
GEORGIA	0.349	0.365
HAWAII	0.446	0.456
IDAHO	0.403	0.519
ILLINOIS	0.558	0.599
INDIANA	0.398	0.492
IOWA	0.522	0.529
KANSAS	0.484	0.594
KENTUCKY	0.380	0.591
LOUISIANA	0.478	0.490
MAINE	0.390	0.482
MARYLAND	0.585	0.523
MASSACHUSETTS	0.759	0.821
MICHIGAN	0.550	0.568
MINNESOTA	0.460	0.562
MISSISSIPPI	0.470	0.581
MISSOURI	0.444	0.434
MONTANA	0.399	0.473
NEBRASKA	0.504	0.544
NEVADA	0.428	0.550
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.284	0.473
NEW JERSEY	0.524	0.579
NEW MEXICO	0.393	
NEW YORK	0.471	0.516
NORTH CAROLINA	0.500	0.595
NORTH DAKOTA	0.511	0.465
OHIO	0.611	0.611
OKLAHOMA	0.492	0.568
OREGON	0.405	0.485
	0.545	0.579

TABLE 8A.—STATEWIDE AVERAGE OPERATING COST-TO-CHARGE RATIOS FOR URBAN AND RURAL HOSPITALS (CASE WEIGHTED) MARCH 2002—Continued

State	Urban	Rural
PENNSYLVANIA	0.376	0.500
PUERTO RICO	0.467	0.561
RHODE ISLAND	0.486	
SOUTH CAROLINA	0.438	0.455
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.498	0.546
TENNESSEE	0.432	0.457
TEXAS	0.380	0.484
UTAH	0.495	0.570
VERMONT	0.572	0.595
VIRGINIA	0.452	0.546
WASHINGTON	0.580	0.598
WEST VIRGINIA	0.563	0.534
WISCONSIN	0.524	0.599
WYOMING	0.524	0.707

TABLE 8B.—STATEWIDE AVERAGE CAPITAL COST-TO-CHARGE RATIOS (CASE WEIGHTED) MARCH 2002

State	Ratio
ALABAMA	0.041
ALASKA	0.053
ARIZONA	0.038
ARKANSAS	0.049
CALIFORNIA	0.033
COLORADO	0.045
CONNECTICUT	0.036
DELAWARE	0.048
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0.032
FLORIDA	0.043
GEORGIA	0.049
HAWAII	0.038
IDAHO	0.048
ILLINOIS	0.039
INDIANA	0.056

TABLE 8B.—STATEWIDE AVERAGE CAPITAL COST-TO-CHARGE RATIOS (CASE WEIGHTED) MARCH 2002—Continued

State	Ratio
IOWA	0.049
KANSAS	0.047
KENTUCKY	0.046
LOUISIANA	0.046
MAINE	0.038
MARYLAND	0.013
MASSACHUSETTS	0.050
MICHIGAN	0.044
MINNESOTA	0.043
MISSISSIPPI	0.043
MISSOURI	0.043
MONTANA	0.051
NEBRASKA	0.047
NEVADA	0.032
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.058
NEW JERSEY	0.035
NEW MEXICO	0.045
NEW YORK	0.049
NORTH CAROLINA	0.047
NORTH DAKOTA	0.073
OHIO	0.047
OKLAHOMA	0.045
OREGON	0.042
PENNSYLVANIA	0.037
PUERTO RICO	0.041
RHODE ISLAND	0.031
SOUTH CAROLINA	0.046
SOUTH DAKOTA	0.050
TENNESSEE	0.049
TEXAS	0.043
UTAH	0.045
VERMONT	0.049
VIRGINIA	0.057
WASHINGTON	0.068
WEST VIRGINIA	0.044
WISCONSIN	0.050
WYOMING	0.062

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
010005	01	3440	3440
010008	01	5240	
010010	01	3440	3440
010012	01	2880	
010022	01	2880	
010029	0580	1800	
010035	01	1000	
010036	01	2750	
010043	01	1000	1000
010044	01	25	
010072	01	0450	0450
010101	01	0450	0450

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
010118	01	5240	
010120	01	5160	
010121	01	5240	
010126	01	2180	
010150	01	5240	
010158	01	2650	
020008	02	0380	
030007	03	2620	
030012	03	6200	
030033	03	2620	
030043	03	8520	
040014	04	4400	
040017	04	7920	
040019	04	4920	
040020	3700	4920	
040026	04	4400	
040027	04	7920	
040041	04	4400	
040045	04	26	
040066	04	4400	
040069	04	4920	
040076	04	4400	
040078	04	4400	
040080	04	3700	
040088	04	7680	
040091	04	8360	
040107	04	8360	
040119	04	4400	
050042	05	6690	
050045	05		7320
050069	5945	4480	
050071	7400	5775	
050073	8720	5775	
050076	7360	5775	
050101	8720	5775	
050150	05	6920	
050174	7500	8720	
050192	2840	05	
050228	7360	5775	
050230	5945	4480	
050236	8735	4480	
050286	8780	05	
050296	05	7120	
050301	05	7500	
050325	05	5170	
050335	05	5170	
050419	05	6690	
050446	0680	05	
050457	7360	5775	
050464	5170	8120	
050469	6780	05	
050494	05	6920	
050510	7360	5775	
050528	4940	05	
050541	7360	5775	
050549	8735	4480	
050569	05	7500	
050594	5945	4480	
050609	5945	4480	
050686	6780	5945	
050701	6780	7320	
060003	1125	2080	2080
060013	06	0200	
060018	06	2995	
060023	2995	6520	
060027	1125	2080	2080
060044	06	2080	
060049	06	2670	
060075	06	2995	
060076	06	3060	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
060096	06	2080	
060103	1125	2080	2080
070006	5483	5600	
070018	5483	5600	
070033	5483	5600	
070034	5483	5600	
070036	3283	5483	
080002	08		0720
080004	2190	9160	
080006	08	2190	
080007	08	2190	
100022	5000	2680	
100023	10	5960	
100024	10	5000	
100045	2020	5960	
100048	6080	10	
100049	10	3980	
100098	10	8960	8960
100103	10	3600	3600
100105	10	2710	
100109	10	5960	
100118	2020	10	
100150	10	5000	
100157	3980	8280	
100176	8960	2710	
100211	8280	3980	
100217	10	2710	
100232	10	5790	2900
100239	8280	7510	
100249	10	8280	
100268	8960	2680	
110001	11	0520	
110002	11	0520	
110003	11	3600	
110016	11	1800	
110023	11	0520	
110025	11	3600	
110029	11	0520	
110038	11	10	
110040	11	0500	0500
110050	11	0520	
110054	11	0520	
110075	11	7520	
110100	11	0600	
110118	11	0120	
110122	11	10	
110150	11	4680	
110168	11	0520	
110187	11	0520	
110188	11	0520	
110189	11	0520	
110190	11	4680	
110205	11	0520	
120015	12	3320	
130002	13	29	
130003	13	50	
130011	13	50	
130018	13	6340	
130049	13	7840	
130060	13	1080	
140012	14	1600	
140015	14	7040	
140031	14	1400	
140032	14	7040	
140034	14	7040	
140040	14	6120	
140043	14	6880	
140046	14	7040	
140058	14	7880	
140064	14	6120	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
140086	14		7040
140093	14	1400	
140102	14	7880	7880
140110	14	6120	
140141	14	7040	7040
140143	14	6120	
140155	3740		1600
140160	14	6880	
140161	14	1600	
140164	14	7040	
140189	14	1400	
140199	14	7040	
140230	14		1400
140234	14	6120	
140245	14		7040
140271	14	7800	7800
150002	2960	1600	
150004	2960	1600	
150006	15	7800	
150008	2960	1600	
150011	15	3480	3480
150015	15	1600	
150027	15		3480
150030	15	3480	3480
150034	2960	1600	
150036	15	3850	
150048	15	2000	
150051	1020		3480
150062	15	3480	3480
150065	15	3480	
150067	15		3480
150069	15	1640	1640
150076	15	7800	
150090	2960	1600	
150096	15	2330	
150105	15	3480	3480
150112	15	3480	3480
150122	15	3480	
150125	2960	1600	1600
150126	2960	1600	1600
150132	2960	1600	
150133	15	2330	
150146	15	2330	
160001	16	2120	
160016	16	2120	
160026	16	2120	
160030	16	2120	
160037	16	24	
160057	16	3500	
160064	16	8920	
160080	16	1960	
160089	16	2120	
160094	16	8920	
160122	16	14	
160147	16	2120	
170001	17	9040	
170006	17	3710	
170010	17	8560	
170012	17	9040	
170013	17	9040	
170014	17	3760	
170020	17	9040	
170022	17	7000	
170023	17	9040	
170025	17	9040	
170033	17	9040	
170058	17	26	
170060	17	28	
170094	17	8440	
170120	17	3710	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
170131	17	8440
170137	4150	17
170142	17	8440
170145	17	8560
170166	17	0320
170175	17	9040
180005	18	3400
180011	18	4280
180012	18	4520
180013	18	5360
180016	18	4520
180018	18	4280
180027	18	1660
180028	18	3400
180029	18	3660
180044	18	3400
180048	18	4280
180054	18	1660
180065	18	1640
180066	18	5360
180069	18	3400
180078	18	3400
180102	18	1660
180104	18	1660
180116	18	1660
180124	18	5360
180127	18	4520
180132	18	4280
180139	18	4280
190001	19	5560	5560
190003	19	3880
190010	19	5560	5560
190014	19	3880
190015	19	5560
190018	19	3880
190025	19	3880
190048	3350	19
190054	19	3880
190083	19	5200
190086	19	5200
190099	19	3880
190106	19	3880
190110	3880	19
190131	19	5560
190218	19	0220
200020	6403	1123	1123
200024	4243	6403
200034	4243	6403
200039	20	6403
200040	6403	1123
200063	20	6403
220060	1123	0743
220077	8003	3283
230015	23	3720
230022	23	3720
230027	23	3000	3000
230030	23	6960
230036	23	6960
230037	23	0440
230040	23	3720	3720
230054	23	3080
230078	0870	23
230080	23	6960
230093	23	3000
230096	23	3720
230097	23	3000
230105	23	6960
230106	23	3000
230121	23	2640	2640
230188	23	6960	6960

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
230199	23	0870	0870
230235	23	6960	6960
230253	23	2160	
240008	24	6820	
240011	24	5120	
240014	24	5120	
240016	24	2520	
240018	24		5120
240023	24	5120	
240045	24	2240	
240064	24	2240	
240075	24	6980	
240088	24	6980	
240089	24	5120	
240100	24	2985	
240121	24	2240	
240139	24	5120	
240142	24	6980	
240152	24	5120	
250004	25	4920	
250009	25	3580	
250012	25	4920	
250025	25	1	
250030	25	3560	
250031	25	3560	
250034	25	4920	
250042	25	4920	
250058	25	3285	
250069	25	3560	
250078	3285	0920	
250079	25	3560	
250081	25	3560	
250082	25	6240	
250084	25	19	
250088	25	0760	
250094	3285	0920	
250097	25	0760	
250100	25	8600	
250101	25	3560	
250104	25	3560	
250122	25	19	
250126	25	4920	
260006	7000	26	
260009	26	3760	
260011	26	1740	
260015	26	3700	
260017	26	7040	
260022	26	1740	
260025	26	14	
260034	26	3760	
260047	26	1740	
260050	26	7000	
260064	26	1740	
260074	26	1740	
260078	26	7920	
260094	26	7920	
260110	26	7040	7040
260113	26	14	
260116	26	7040	
260119	26	3700	
260120	26	3700	
260127	26	7040	
260131	26	1740	
260183	26	7040	
260186	26	1740	
270002	27	0880	
270003	27	3040	
270011	27	3040	
270016	27	0880	
270017	27	5140	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
270051	27	5140	
270057	27	0880	
270083	27	5140	
280009	28	4360	
280023	28	4360	
280032	28	4360	
280054	28	4360	
280061	28	53	
280065	28	3060	
280077	28	5920	
280111	28	5920	
280125	28	7720	
290006	29	6720	
290019	29	6720	
300003	30	1123	
300005	30	1123	1123
300009	1123	30	
300019	30	22	
300024	30		1123
310001	0875	5600	
310002	5640	5600	
310003	3640	5600	
310015	5640	0875	
310021	8480	5190	
310031	6160	5190	
310038	5015	5600	
310039	5015	5190	
310045	0875	5600	
310048	5015	5640	
310049	3640		5640
310070	5015	5640	
310076	5640	5600	
310087	8760	6160	
310108	5015	5190	
310118	3640		0875
310119	5640	5600	
320005	32	0200	
320006	32	7490	
320011	32	7490	
320013	32	7490	
320063	32	5800	
320065	32	5800	
330001	5660	5600	
330004	33	5660	
330023	2281	5660	
330027	5380	5600	
330084	33	1303	
330085	33	8160	
330103	33		1280
330106	5380	5600	
330126	5660	5600	
330135	5660	5600	
330136	33	8160	
330157	33	8160	
330181	5380	5600	
330182	5380	5600	
330205	5660	5600	
330209	5660	5600	
330224	33	3283	
330235	8160		6840
330239	3610	2360	
330250	33	1303	
330264	5660	5600	
330307	33	8160	
330386	33	5660	
340003	34	3120	
340008	34	2560	
340013	34	1520	
340017	34	0480	
340021	34	1520	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
340023	34	0480	
340027	34	3150	
340039	34	1520	1520
340050	34	2560	
340051	34	3290	
340052	3120	1520	
340064	34	3120	
340068	34	9200	
340071	34	6640	6640
340084	34	1520	
340088	34	0480	
340097	34	3120	
340109	34	5720	5720
340115	34	6640	
340124	34	6640	6640
340126	34	6640	6640
340129	34	1520	
340131	34	3150	
340143	3290	1520	
340144	34	1520	
340147	6895	6640	
350005	35	2985	
350006	35	1010	
350009	35	2520	
350017	35	27	
350043	35	1010	
360002	36		1680
360008	36	3400	
360010	36	0080	
360011	36	1840	
360013	36	2000	
360014	36	1840	
360024	36	1680	1680
360025	36	1680	1680
360036	36	0080	
360037	1680	0080	
360039	36	1840	
360046	3200	1640	1640
360056	3200	1640	1640
360063	36	1680	1680
360065	36	1680	1680
360071	36	4320	4320
360076	3200	1640	1640
360078	0080		1680
360084	1320	0080	
360088	36	1840	
360089	36	8400	
360090	8400		2160
360092	36	1840	1840
360095	36	8400	
360101	1680	0080	
360107	36	8400	
360108	36	4800	
360109	36	1840	
360112	8400	0440	
360121	36	0440	
360132	3200	1640	1640
360142	36		1640
360144	1680	0080	
360159	36	1840	
360175	36	1840	1640
360197	36	1840	1840
360211	8080		6280
370004	37	3710	
370006	37	8560	
370014	37	7640	
370015	37	8560	
370018	37	8560	
370022	37	4200	
370023	37	4200	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
370025	37	8560	
370034	37	2720	
370047	37	7640	
370048	37	8360	
370049	37	5880	
370054	37	5880	
370084	37	2720	
370103	37	45	
370153	37	4200	
370200	37	5880	
380001	38	6440	
380002	38	4890	
380003	38	2400	
380006	38		6440
380027	38	2400	
380040	38	2400	
380047	38	2400	
380050	38	4890	
380051	7080		6440
380065	38	2400	
380070	38	6440	
380084	7080	38	
380090	38	2400	
390006	39	3240	
390008	39	6280	6280
390013	39	3240	
390016	39	6280	6280
390017	39	6280	6280
390030	39	0240	6680
390031	39	0240	6680
390048	39	3240	
390052	39	0280	
390065	39	8840	9280
390079	39	0960	
390091	39	6280	
390093	39	6280	
390110	3680	6280	
390113	39	9320	
390133	0240	6160	
390138	39	8840	
390150	39	6280	
390151	39	8840	
390181	39	6680	6680
390183	39	6680	6680
390189	39	3240	
390197	0240	6160	
390201	39	5660	5640
390263	0240	6160	
400018	40	1310	
410010	6483	1123	
410013	6483	5523	
420020	42	1440	
420036	42	1520	
420059	42	2655	
420062	42	1520	
420068	42	0600	
420070	8140	1760	
420071	42	0600	
420080	42	7520	
420085	5330	9200	
430008	43	24	
430012	43	7760	
430013	43	7760	
430014	43	2520	
430015	43	6660	
430047	43	28	
430048	43	53	
430089	43	7720	
440020	44	3440	
440024	44	1560	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
440050	44	0480	
440058	44	1560	
440059	44	5360	
440067	44	3840	
440068	44	1560	
440073	44	5360	
440083	44	3840	
440143	44	5360	
440148	44	5360	
440175	44	3440	
440180	44	3840	
440182	44	3580	
440185	44	1560	
440186	44	5360	
440187	44	18	
440192	44	5360	
440200	44	5360	
440203	44	1560	
450007	45	7240	
450014	45	8750	
450053	45	8750	
450072	1145	3360	
450080	45	4420	
450085	45	9080	
450098	45	4420	
450099	45	0320	
450113	45	1920	
450140	45	5800	
450144	45	5800	
450146	45	0320	
450155	45	0320	
450163	45	1880	
450178	45	5800	
450187	45	3360	
450192	45	1920	
450194	45	1920	
450196	45		1920
450211	45	3360	
450214	45	3360	
450224	45	8640	
450246	45	8750	
450347	45	3360	
450351	45	2800	
450353	45	1880	
450373	45	4420	
450395	45	3360	
450400	45	8800	
450438	45	0640	
450447	45	1920	
450451	45	2800	
450484	45	3360	
450508	45	8640	
450534	45	0320	
450587	45	40	
450591	1145	3360	
450623	45	1920	
450626	45	8750	
450653	45	5800	
450656	45	8640	
450694	45	3360	
450747	45	1920	
450755	45	4600	
450763	45	320	
460007	46	2620	
460011	46	6520	
460021	46	4120	
460027	46	6520	
460032	46	6520	
460036	46	6520	
460039	46	7160	

TABLE 9.—HOSPITAL RECLASSIFICATIONS AND REDESIGNATIONS BY INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL—FY—2003—Continued

Provider number	Actual MSA or rural area	Wage index MSA reclassification	Standardized amount MSA reclassification
470001	47	1303	
470003	1303	1123	
470011	47	1123	1123
470012	47	6323	
470018	47	1123	
490001	49	3660	
490004	49	1540	
490005	49	8840	
490013	49	1950	
490018	49	4640	
490038	49	3660	
490047	49	8840	
490060	49	3660	
490066	5720	6760	
490079	49	3120	
490126	49	6800	
500002	50	6740	
500003	50	7600	
500007	50	0860	
500016	50	7600	
500041	50	6440	
500059	50	7600	
500072	50	7600	
500079	8200		7600
510001	51	6280	
510002	51	6800	
510006	51	6280	
510024	51	6280	6280
510028	51	1480	
510046	51	1480	
510047	51	6280	
510048	51	3400	
510062	51	1480	
510070	51	1480	
510071	51	1480	
520002	52	8940	
520006	52	8940	
520011	52	2290	
520021	3800	1600	1600
520028	52	4720	
520037	52	8940	
520059	6600	5080	5080
520066	3620	4720	
520071	52	5080	5080
520076	52	5080	
520084	52	4720	
520088	52	5080	
520091	52	23	
520094	6600	5080	5080
520096	6600	5080	5080
520102	52	5080	5080
520107	52	3080	
520113	52	3080	
520116	52	5080	5080
520152	52	3080	
520173	52	2240	
520189	3800	1600	1600
530008	53	1350	
530009	53	1350	
530015	53	6340	
530025	53	2670	
530032	53	7160	

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
1	27,704	\$66,748
2	14,078	\$34,337
3	7	\$55,030
4	6,426	\$41,870
5	93,104	\$23,280
6	398	\$14,095
7	14,187	\$46,968
8	4,349	\$28,253
9	1,737	\$24,223
10	18,015	\$22,246
11	3,398	\$15,519
12	49,619	\$15,429
13	6,637	\$13,922
14	235,975	\$21,928
15	101,681	\$16,969
16	9,257	\$21,632
17	2,870	\$11,541
18	28,000	\$17,036
19	8,672	\$12,308
20	5,616	\$51,920
21	1,429	\$27,335
22	2,722	\$18,422
23	11,189	\$14,276
24	55,342	\$17,340
25	27,205	\$10,640
26	34	\$13,463
27	3,839	\$23,063
28	12,339	\$23,674
29	4,928	\$12,505
31	3,814	\$15,329
32	1,891	\$9,174
34	22,336	\$17,368
35	7,323	\$11,138
36	2,481	\$10,985
37	1,418	\$18,071
38	93	\$9,775
39	666	\$10,551
40	1,524	\$14,863
42	1,936	\$11,289
43	110	\$8,855
44	1,295	\$11,245
45	2,598	\$12,352
46	3,373	\$13,685
47	1,350	\$9,302
49	2,337	\$31,134
50	2,477	\$13,972
51	251	\$16,197
52	238	\$13,055
53	2,517	\$20,530
55	1,564	\$16,073
56	526	\$16,460
57	692	\$17,299
59	127	\$13,165
60	6	\$10,986
61	243	\$21,950
62	3	\$6,623
63	2,900	\$25,070
64	3,131	\$23,886
65	39,014	\$9,512
66	7,668	\$9,851
67	439	\$13,316
68	8,752	\$11,567
69	3,034	\$8,666
70	25	\$8,029
71	87	\$12,279
72	926	\$12,429
73	7,070	\$13,912
75	39,852	\$53,451

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
76	41,676	\$50,324
77	2,444	\$21,281
78	35,270	\$22,207
79	166,273	\$29,036
80	8,304	\$15,356
81	2	\$17,479
82	63,407	\$25,645
83	6,390	\$16,990
84	1,558	\$8,753
85	21,262	\$21,607
86	2,179	\$12,312
87	59,447	\$24,541
88	396,490	\$15,658
89	502,217	\$18,132
90	46,781	\$10,653
91	57	\$12,409
92	14,806	\$21,600
93	1,710	\$13,018
94	12,571	\$20,639
95	1,679	\$10,242
96	53,684	\$13,018
97	28,583	\$9,626
98	15	\$16,431
99	21,274	\$12,269
100	8,941	\$9,245
101	21,119	\$14,939
102	5,557	\$9,489
103	428	\$349,756
104	19,511	\$130,539
105	27,278	\$94,418
106	3,307	\$121,657
107	85,660	\$86,239
108	6,200	\$95,309
109	59,511	\$64,065
110	53,164	\$71,438
111	9,392	\$42,529
113	41,401	\$49,111
114	8,849	\$29,028
115	15,270	\$58,727
116	109,194	\$38,515
117	4,176	\$23,091
118	8,104	\$27,103
119	1,316	\$22,646
120	37,306	\$39,416
121	167,277	\$27,051
122	81,670	\$17,860
123	41,145	\$28,071
124	138,236	\$23,982
125	89,996	\$18,048
126	5,015	\$48,094
127	681,606	\$17,412
128	8,240	\$12,365
129	4,100	\$19,186
130	88,663	\$16,401
131	27,776	\$9,821
132	152,256	\$11,138
133	8,915	\$9,314
134	39,612	\$10,344
135	7,552	\$15,416
136	1,237	\$10,011
138	203,304	\$14,336
139	89,960	\$8,832
140	66,409	\$9,140
141	102,377	\$12,604
142	51,706	\$9,672
143	250,001	\$9,216
144	88,480	\$21,330
145	7,594	\$10,378

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
146	10,796	\$45,993
147	2,797	\$25,903
148	129,351	\$59,354
149	19,315	\$24,710
150	20,330	\$49,351
151	4,962	\$22,681
152	4,424	\$33,239
153	2,013	\$19,418
154	28,996	\$73,715
155	7,260	\$21,846
156	3	\$32,596
157	8,151	\$22,041
158	4,560	\$10,941
159	17,109	\$23,315
160	12,156	\$13,554
161	11,153	\$19,125
162	7,270	\$10,677
163	3	\$7,876
164	5,116	\$39,084
165	2,184	\$20,580
166	3,902	\$24,579
167	3,799	\$14,801
168	1,381	\$22,419
169	869	\$12,657
170	12,155	\$49,736
171	1,359	\$19,892
172	30,603	\$24,475
173	2,709	\$13,824
174	247,084	\$17,229
175	35,141	\$9,564
176	15,215	\$18,581
177	9,422	\$15,760
178	3,756	\$11,718
179	12,540	\$18,881
180	88,253	\$16,534
181	27,085	\$9,241
182	260,632	\$13,956
183	91,215	\$9,962
184	93	\$8,646
185	5,069	\$15,675
186	3	\$17,560
187	666	\$14,847
188	79,377	\$19,332
189	13,104	\$10,335
190	74	\$12,681
191	9,220	\$77,337
192	1,257	\$30,601
193	4,862	\$59,463
194	733	\$27,612
195	4,151	\$50,509
196	1,050	\$26,194
197	18,557	\$42,811
198	5,667	\$20,952
199	1,644	\$42,977
200	1,042	\$53,497
201	2,013	\$67,182
202	26,142	\$23,012
203	29,301	\$24,716
204	61,516	\$20,412
205	24,447	\$21,124
206	2,048	\$12,455
207	32,101	\$19,874
208	10,740	\$11,426
209	370,349	\$31,852
210	121,438	\$29,326
211	32,517	\$19,885
212	7	\$11,988
213	9,875	\$32,709

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
216	6,916	\$38,905
217	17,022	\$53,503
218	22,732	\$25,771
219	20,855	\$16,751
223	13,650	\$17,145
224	12,431	\$12,855
225	6,124	\$19,539
226	5,698	\$26,964
227	4,915	\$13,522
228	2,481	\$19,438
229	1,175	\$11,756
230	2,406	\$21,932
231	12,530	\$24,031
232	880	\$16,464
233	7,178	\$34,665
234	4,607	\$21,908
235	5,089	\$13,039
236	39,744	\$12,220
237	1,743	\$9,880
238	8,617	\$24,817
239	48,197	\$17,565
240	11,800	\$23,191
241	3,218	\$11,428
242	2,515	\$19,784
243	93,611	\$12,959
244	13,570	\$12,429
245	5,726	\$8,349
246	1,346	\$9,926
247	19,616	\$10,001
248	12,060	\$14,559
249	12,649	\$11,805
250	3,793	\$11,824
251	2,489	\$8,063
253	20,842	\$12,750
254	10,802	\$7,656
256	6,400	\$14,186
257	16,692	\$14,784
258	16,950	\$11,403
259	3,812	\$15,230
260	5,072	\$11,046
261	1,888	\$16,770
262	686	\$15,951
263	24,560	\$37,753
264	3,982	\$19,495
265	4,052	\$27,077
266	2,676	\$14,584
267	267	\$15,879
268	899	\$19,361
269	9,060	\$29,801
270	2,746	\$12,961
271	19,594	\$18,154
272	5,470	\$17,426
273	1,387	\$10,047
274	2,343	\$22,054
275	247	\$10,261
276	1,326	\$11,997
277	93,843	\$14,927
278	31,720	\$9,470
279	3	\$19,964
280	17,038	\$12,041
281	7,827	\$8,003
283	5,635	\$12,585
284	1,950	\$7,589
285	6,568	\$35,890
286	2,183	\$35,565
287	6,457	\$32,850
288	3,675	\$36,854
289	6,414	\$16,097

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
290	9,482	\$14,860
291	78	\$10,570
292	5,422	\$44,164
293	345	\$24,530
294	95,355	\$13,252
295	3,358	\$13,707
296	250,808	\$14,775
297	47,716	\$8,713
298	103	\$10,114
299	1,218	\$16,149
300	17,532	\$19,436
301	3,639	\$11,261
302	7,896	\$54,753
303	20,698	\$41,205
304	12,041	\$40,662
305	3,006	\$20,536
306	7,210	\$21,938
307	2,164	\$10,268
308	7,244	\$28,300
309	4,331	\$15,304
310	24,587	\$19,325
311	8,309	\$10,483
312	1,547	\$18,439
313	644	\$11,749
315	33,708	\$36,795
316	115,275	\$23,727
317	1,889	\$12,419
318	5,736	\$21,305
319	494	\$11,322
320	193,134	\$14,735
321	30,723	\$9,566
322	64	\$8,657
323	18,621	\$14,311
324	7,451	\$8,122
325	8,937	\$11,466
326	2,802	\$7,872
327	2	\$10,679
328	685	\$13,051
329	105	\$8,650
331	49,123	\$18,734
332	5,117	\$10,727
333	311	\$13,719
334	10,262	\$24,961
335	12,370	\$18,084
336	36,313	\$14,365
337	29,498	\$9,686
338	1,055	\$21,430
339	1,505	\$18,435
341	3,670	\$21,442
342	723	\$13,001
344	3,838	\$22,438
345	1,335	\$19,558
346	4,559	\$18,995
347	373	\$10,844
348	3,280	\$12,862
349	597	\$7,194
350	6,493	\$12,462
352	768	\$12,805
353	2,655	\$31,864
354	7,485	\$25,534
355	5,670	\$14,447
356	25,920	\$12,488
357	5,710	\$39,602
358	20,605	\$20,138
359	31,042	\$13,346
360	15,575	\$14,638
361	369	\$18,778
362	2	\$9,180

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
363	2,683	\$15,573
364	1,629	\$14,738
365	1,834	\$34,245
366	4,432	\$23,297
367	520	\$10,108
368	3,285	\$21,162
369	3,279	\$10,693
370	1,242	\$16,029
371	1,413	\$10,589
372	919	\$9,639
373	3,876	\$6,330
374	116	\$12,936
375	8	\$21,289
376	262	\$8,664
377	29	\$24,590
378	169	\$15,095
379	408	\$6,916
380	76	\$6,684
381	181	\$10,112
382	25	\$2,798
383	1,841	\$9,336
384	149	\$7,372
389	5	\$11,692
392	2,246	\$55,515
394	2,326	\$31,257
395	100,607	\$14,330
396	11	\$12,749
397	17,906	\$21,719
398	17,113	\$22,322
399	1,788	\$12,303
400	6,486	\$47,400
401	5,836	\$50,173
402	1,599	\$19,649
403	31,999	\$32,078
404	4,588	\$15,824
406	2,494	\$48,934
407	701	\$21,576
408	2,122	\$36,343
409	2,515	\$21,666
410	30,760	\$18,311
411	14	\$7,688
412	18	\$4,980
413	5,766	\$24,842
414	763	\$12,866
415	39,905	\$66,206
416	181,072	\$28,177
417	37	\$21,802
418	23,398	\$18,311
419	15,719	\$15,131
420	2,957	\$10,195
421	9,270	\$11,869
422	69	\$7,590
423	7,269	\$31,897
424	1,292	\$41,189
425	16,304	\$11,890
426	4,481	\$9,206
427	1,576	\$9,291
428	744	\$12,949
429	27,018	\$14,174
430	63,051	\$12,703
431	320	\$10,737
432	411	\$11,105
433	5,520	\$4,883
439	1,457	\$29,345
440	5,435	\$32,696
441	612	\$15,577
442	16,693	\$42,597
443	3,807	\$17,673

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
444	5,675	\$13,003
445	2,724	\$8,465
447	6,278	\$8,499
449	30,470	\$14,241
450	7,366	\$7,229
451	5	\$4,039
452	25,215	\$18,340
453	5,643	\$9,105
454	4,623	\$14,423
455	1,096	\$8,019
461	4,563	\$21,124
462	11,981	\$19,956
463	25,204	\$12,097
464	7,101	\$8,636
465	224	\$10,305
466	1,795	\$11,397
467	1,043	\$9,854
468	54,705	\$66,153
470	49	\$302,446
471	12,391	\$47,581
473	8,235	\$63,556
475	104,025	\$67,384
476	3,812	\$40,882
477	25,600	\$32,847
478	108,611	\$42,010
479	24,176	\$24,354

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
480	622	\$176,423
481	726	\$123,849
482	5,299	\$61,539
483	43,282	\$288,420
484	317	\$100,224
485	3,028	\$50,619
486	1,867	\$85,814
487	3,533	\$35,194
488	776	\$88,052
489	13,548	\$32,178
490	5,247	\$18,195
491	13,575	\$26,985
492	2,874	\$74,770
493	58,081	\$30,868
494	30,883	\$16,784
495	211	\$155,662
496	1,841	\$98,777
497	19,917	\$57,641
498	14,635	\$41,713
499	32,659	\$24,252
500	49,444	\$15,562
501	2,352	\$44,432
502	636	\$25,677
503	5,888	\$20,546
504	123	\$281,048
505	147	\$31,985

TABLE 10.—MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGs) ¹—Continued

DRG	Cases	Mean + 1 standard deviation
506	937	\$84,055
507	288	\$30,296
508	667	\$24,629
509	177	\$16,475
510	1,671	\$20,337
511	616	\$11,613
512	450	\$95,226
513	142	\$99,439
514	19,241	\$104,112
515	4,568	\$87,754
516	76,169	\$45,006
517	190,940	\$36,508
518	51,620	\$30,281
519	7,216	\$39,899
520	11,045	\$25,111
521	28,562	\$12,663
522	6,139	\$10,035
523	14,802	\$6,921
524	136,805	\$12,350
525	492	\$209,675

¹Cases are taken from the FY 2001 MedPAR file; DRGs are from GROUPER V20.0.

Appendix A—Regulatory Impact Analysis

I. Introduction

We have examined the impacts of this rule as required by Executive Order 12866 (September 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (September 19, 1980, Public Law 96–354), section 1102(b) of the Social Security Act, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4), and Executive Order 13132.

Executive Order 12866 directs agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). A regulatory impact analysis (RIA) must be prepared for major rules with economically significant effects (\$100 million or more in any 1 year). We have determined that this proposed rule is a major rule as defined in 5 U.S.C. 804(2). We estimate that the total impact of these changes for FY 2003 payments compared to FY 2002 payments to be approximately a \$0.3 billion increase.

The RFA requires agencies to analyze options for regulatory relief of small businesses. For purposes of the RFA, small entities include small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies. Most hospitals and most other providers and suppliers are small entities, either by nonprofit status or by having revenues of \$5 million to \$25 million in any 1 year. For purposes of the RFA, all hospitals and other providers and suppliers are considered to be small entities.

Individuals and States are not included in the definition of a small entity.

In addition, section 1102(b) of the Act requires us to prepare a regulatory impact analysis for any proposed rule that may have a significant impact on the operations of a substantial number of small rural hospitals. This analysis must conform to the provisions of section 603 of the RFA. With the exception of hospitals located in certain New England counties, for purposes of section 1102(b) of the Act, we define a small rural hospital as a hospital with fewer than 100 beds that is located outside of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or New England County Metropolitan Area (NECMA). Section 601(g) of the Social Security Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98–21) designated hospitals in certain New England counties as belonging to the adjacent NECMA. Thus, for purposes of

the hospital inpatient prospective payment systems, we classify these hospitals as urban hospitals.

It is clear that the changes being proposed in this document would affect both a substantial number of small rural hospitals as well as other classes of hospitals, and the effects on some may be significant. Therefore, the discussion below, in combination with the rest of this proposed rule, constitutes a combined regulatory impact analysis and regulatory flexibility analysis.

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–4) also requires that agencies assess anticipated costs and benefits before issuing any proposed rule (or a final rule that has been preceded by a proposed rule) that may result in an expenditure in any one year by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$110 million. This proposed rule would not mandate any requirements for State, local, or tribal governments.

Executive Order 13132 establishes certain requirements that an agency must meet when it promulgates a proposed rule (and subsequent final rule) that imposes substantial direct requirement costs on State and local governments, preempts State law, or otherwise has Federalism implications. We have reviewed this proposed rule in light of Executive Order 13132 and have determined that it will not have any negative impact on the rights, roles, and responsibilities of State, local, or tribal governments.

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12866, this proposed rule was reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

II. Objectives

The primary objective of the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system is to create incentives for hospitals to operate efficiently and minimize unnecessary costs while at the same time ensuring that payments are sufficient to adequately compensate hospitals for their legitimate costs. In addition, we share national goals of preserving the Medicare Trust Fund.

We believe the proposed changes would further each of these goals while maintaining the financial viability of the hospital industry and ensuring access to high quality health care for Medicare beneficiaries. We expect that these proposed changes would ensure that the outcomes of this payment system are reasonable and equitable while avoiding or minimizing unintended adverse consequences.

III. Limitations of Our Analysis

The following quantitative analysis presents the projected effects of our proposed policy changes, as well as statutory changes effective for FY 2003, on various hospital groups. We estimate the effects of individual policy changes by estimating payments per case while holding all other payment policies constant. We use the best data available, but we do not attempt to predict behavioral responses to our policy changes, and we do not make adjustments for future changes in such variables as admissions, lengths of stay, or case-mix. As we have done in previous proposed rules, we are soliciting comments and information about the anticipated effects of these changes on hospitals and our methodology for estimating them.

IV. Hospitals Included In and Excluded From the Acute Care Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System

The prospective payment systems for hospital inpatient operating and capital-related costs encompass nearly all general, short-term, acute care hospitals that participate in the Medicare program. There were 44 Indian Health Service hospitals in our database, which we excluded from the analysis due to the special characteristics of the prospective payment method for these hospitals. Among other short-term, acute care hospitals, only the 67 such hospitals in Maryland remain excluded from the hospital inpatient prospective payment system under the waiver at section 1814(b)(3) of the Act.

There are approximately 515 critical access hospitals (CAHs). These small, limited service hospitals are paid on the basis of reasonable costs rather than under the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system. The remaining 20 percent are specialty hospitals that are excluded from the acute-care, short-term prospective payment system. These hospitals include psychiatric hospitals and units, rehabilitation hospitals and units, long-term care hospitals, children's hospitals, and cancer hospitals. The impacts of our final policy changes on these hospitals are discussed below.

Thus, as of February 2002, we have included 4,301 hospitals in our analysis. This represents about 80 percent of all Medicare-participating hospitals. The majority of this impact analysis focuses on this set of hospitals.

V. Impact on Excluded Hospitals and Hospital Units

As of February 2002, there were 1,065 specialty hospitals excluded from the

acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system and instead paid on a reasonable cost basis subject to the rate-of-increase ceiling under § 413.40. Broken down by specialty, there were 493 psychiatric, 216 rehabilitation, 270 long-term care, 75 children's, and 11 cancer hospitals. In addition, there were 1,436 psychiatric units and 936 rehabilitation units in hospitals otherwise subject to the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system. Under § 413.40(a)(2)(i)(A), the rate-of-increase ceiling is not applicable to the 67 specialty hospitals and units in Maryland that are paid in accordance with the waiver at section 1814(b)(3) of the Act.

In the past, hospitals and units excluded from the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system have been paid based on their reasonable costs subject to limits as established by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA). Hospitals that continue to be paid based on their reasonable costs are subject to TEFRA limits for FY 2003. For these hospitals, the proposed update is the percentage increase in the excluded hospital market basket (currently estimated at 3.4 percent).

Inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs) are paid under the IRF prospective payment system for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2002. For cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003, the IRF prospective payment is based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal IRF prospective payment amount, updated annually (see the August 7, 2001 final rule (66 FR 41316 through 41430)). Therefore, these hospitals are not impacted by this proposed rule.

Effective for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003, we have proposed that long-term care hospitals would be paid under a long-term care hospital prospective payment system, where long-term care hospitals receive payment based on a 5-year transition period (see the March 22, 2002 proposed rule (67 FR 13416 through 13494)). However, under this proposed payment system, a long-term care hospital may also elect to be paid at 100 percent of the Federal prospective rate at the beginning of any of its cost reporting periods during the 5-year transition period. For purposes of the update factor, the portion of the proposed prospective payment system transition blend payment based on reasonable costs for inpatient operating services would be determined by updating the long-term care hospital's TEFRA limit by the proposed estimate

of the excluded hospital market basket (or 3.4 percent).

The impact on excluded hospitals and hospital units of the update in the rate-of-increase limit depends on the cumulative cost increases experienced by each excluded hospital or unit since its applicable base period. For excluded hospitals and units that have maintained their cost increases at a level below the rate-of-increase limits since their base period, the major effect will be on the level of incentive payments these hospitals and hospital units receive. Conversely, for excluded hospitals and hospital units with per-case cost increases above the cumulative update in their rate-of-increase limits, the major effect will be the amount of excess costs that would not be reimbursed.

We note that, under § 413.40(d)(3), an excluded hospital or unit whose costs exceed 110 percent of its rate-of-increase limit receives its rate-of-increase limit plus 50 percent of the difference between its reasonable costs and 110 percent of the limit, not to exceed 110 percent of its limit. In addition, under the various provisions set forth in § 413.40, certain excluded hospitals and hospital units can obtain payment adjustments for justifiable increases in operating costs that exceed the limit. At the same time, however, by generally limiting payment increases, we continue to provide an incentive for excluded hospitals and hospital units to restrain the growth in their spending for patient services.

VI. Quantitative Impact Analysis of the Proposed Policy Changes Under the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System for Operating Costs

A. Basis and Methodology of Estimates

In this proposed rule, we are announcing policy changes and payment rate updates for the hospital inpatient prospective payment systems for operating and capital-related costs. We estimate the total impact of these changes for FY 2003 payments compared to FY 2002 payments to be approximately a \$0.3 billion increase. We have prepared separate impact analyses of the proposed changes to each system. This section deals with changes to the operating prospective payment system.

The data used in developing the quantitative analyses presented below are taken from the FY 2001 MedPAR file and the most current provider-specific file that is used for payment purposes. Although the analyses of the changes to the operating prospective payment system do not incorporate cost data, the

most recently available hospital cost report data were used to categorize hospitals. Our analysis has several qualifications. First, we do not make adjustments for behavioral changes that hospitals may adopt in response to these proposed policy changes. Second, due to the interdependent nature of the hospital inpatient prospective payment system, it is very difficult to precisely quantify the impact associated with each proposed change. Third, we draw upon various sources for the data used to categorize hospitals in the tables. In some cases, particularly the number of beds, there is a fair degree of variation in the data from different sources. We have attempted to construct these variables with the best available source overall. For individual hospitals, however, some miscategorizations are possible.

Using cases in the FY 2001 MedPAR file, we simulated payments under the operating prospective payment system given various combinations of payment parameters. Any short-term, acute care hospitals not paid under the short-term acute-care hospital inpatient prospective payment systems (Indian Health Service hospitals and hospitals in Maryland) are excluded from the simulations. The impact of payments under the capital prospective payment system, or the impact of payments for costs other than inpatient operating costs, are not analyzed in this section. Estimated payment impacts of proposed FY 2003 changes to the capital prospective payment system are discussed in section IX. of this Appendix.

The proposed changes discussed separately below are the following:

- The effects of the proposed change to the labor portion of the standardized amounts from 71.1 percent to 72.5 percent.
- The effects of the proposed changes in hospitals' wage index values reflecting wage data from hospitals' cost reporting periods beginning during FY 1999, compared to the FY 1998 wage data, and the effects of removing from the wage data the costs and hours associated with graduate medical education (GME) and certified registered nurse anesthetists (CRNAs).
- The effects of the proposed annual reclassification of diagnoses and procedures and the recalibration of the diagnosis-related group (DRG) relative weights required by section 1886(d)(4)(C) of the Act.
- The effects of geographic reclassifications by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board (MGCRB) that will be effective in FY 2003.

- The total change in payments based on FY 2003 policies relative to payments based on FY 2002 policies.

To illustrate the impacts of the FY 2003 proposed changes, our analysis begins with a FY 2003 baseline simulation model using: the FY 2002 DRG GROUPER (version 19.0); the FY 2002 wage index; and no MGCRB reclassifications. Outlier payments are set at 5.1 percent of total DRG plus outlier payments.

Each proposed and statutory policy change is then added incrementally to this baseline model, finally arriving at an FY 2003 model incorporating all of the changes. This allows us to isolate the effects of each change.

Our final comparison illustrates the percent change in payments per case from FY 2002 to FY 2003. Six factors have significant impacts here. The first is the update to the standardized amounts. In accordance with section 1886(d)(3)(A)(iv) of the Act, as amended by section 301 of Public Law 106-554, we are proposing to update the large urban and the other areas average standardized amounts for FY 2003 using the most recently forecasted hospital market basket increase for FY 2003 of 3.3 percent minus 0.55 percentage points (for an update of 2.75 percent). Under section 1886(b)(3) of the Act, the updates to the hospital-specific amounts for sole community hospitals (SCHs) and for Medicare-dependent small rural hospitals (MDHs) is also equal to the market basket increase of 3.3 percent minus 0.55 percentage points (for an update of 2.75 percent).

A second significant factor that impacts changes in hospitals' payments per case from FY 2002 to FY 2003 is the change in MGCRB status from one year to the next. That is, hospitals reclassified in FY 2002 that are no longer reclassified in FY 2003 may have a negative payment impact going from FY 2002 to FY 2003; conversely, hospitals not reclassified in FY 2002 that are reclassified in FY 2003 may have a positive impact. In some cases, these impacts can be quite substantial, so if a relatively small number of hospitals in a particular category lose their reclassification status, the percentage change in payments for the category may be below the national mean. This effect is alleviated, however, by section 304(a) of Public Law 106-554, which provided that reclassifications for purposes of the wage index are for a 3-year period.

A third significant factor is that we currently estimate that actual outlier payments during FY 2002 will be 6.7 percent of total DRG payments. When the FY 2002 final rule was published,

we projected FY 2002 outlier payments would be 5.1 percent of total DRG plus outlier payments; the standardized amounts were offset correspondingly. The effects of the higher than expected outlier payments during FY 2002 (as discussed in the Addendum to this proposed rule) are reflected in the analyses below comparing our current estimates of FY 2002 payments per case to estimated FY 2003 payments per case.

Fourth, section 213 of Public Law 106-554 provided that all SCHs may receive payment on the basis of their costs per case during their cost reporting period that began during 1996. This option was to be phased in over 4 years. For FY 2003, the proportion of payments based on affected SCHs' FY 1996 hospital-specific amount increases from 50 percent to 75 percent.

Fifth, under section 1886(d)(5)(B)(ii) of the Act, the formula for indirect medical education (IME) is reduced beginning in FY 2003. The reduction is from approximately a 6.5 percent increase for every 10 percent increase in the resident-to-bed ratio during FY 2002 to approximately a 5.5 percent increase.

Sixth, the disproportionate share hospital (DSH) adjustment increases in FY 2003 compared with FY 2002. In accordance with section 1886(d)(5)(F)(ix) of the Act, during FY 2002, DSH payments that the hospital would otherwise receive were reduced by 3 percent. This reduction is no longer applicable beginning with FY 2003.

Table I demonstrates the results of our analysis. The table categorizes hospitals by various geographic and special payment consideration groups to illustrate the varying impacts on different types of hospitals. The top row of the table shows the overall impact on the 4,301 hospitals included in the analysis. This number is 494 fewer hospitals than were included in the impact analysis in the FY 2002 final rule (66 FR 40087). Of this number, 437 are now CAHs and are excluded from our analysis.

The next four rows of Table I contain hospitals categorized according to their geographic location: all urban, which is further divided into large urban and other urban; and rural. There are 2,613 hospitals located in urban areas (MSAs or NECMAs) included in our analysis. Among these, there are 1,511 hospitals located in large urban areas (populations over 1 million), and 1,102 hospitals in other urban areas (populations of 1 million or fewer). In addition, there are 1,688 hospitals in rural areas. The next two groupings are by bed-size categories, shown separately for urban and rural hospitals. The final

groupings by geographic location are by census divisions, also shown separately for urban and rural hospitals.

The second part of Table I shows hospital groups based on hospitals' FY 2003 payment classifications, including any reclassifications under section 1886(d)(10) of the Act. For example, the rows labeled urban, large urban, other urban, and rural show that the number of hospitals paid based on these categorizations after consideration of geographic reclassifications are 2,645, 1,570, 1,075, and 1,656, respectively.

The next three groupings examine the impacts of the proposed changes on hospitals grouped by whether or not they have GME residency programs (teaching hospitals that receive an IME adjustment) or receive DSH payments, or some combination of these two adjustments. There are 3,195 nonteaching hospitals in our analysis, 872 teaching hospitals with fewer than 100 residents, and 234 teaching hospitals with 100 or more residents.

In the DSH categories, hospitals are grouped according to their DSH payment status, and whether they are considered urban or rural after MGCRB reclassifications. Hospitals in the rural DSH categories, therefore, represent hospitals that were not reclassified for purposes of the standardized amount or for purposes of the DSH adjustment. (They may, however, have been reclassified for purposes of the wage index.)

The next category groups hospitals considered urban after geographic reclassification, in terms of whether they receive the IME adjustment, the DSH adjustment, both, or neither.

The next five rows examine the impacts of the proposed changes on rural hospitals by special payment groups (SCHs, rural referral centers (RRCs), and MDHs), as well as rural hospitals not receiving a special payment designation. The RRCs (159), SCHs (540), MDHs (216), and hospitals that are both SCH and RRC (75) shown here were not reclassified for purposes of the standardized amount. There are 4 RRCs and 1 SCH and RRC that will be reclassified as urban for the standardized amount in FY 2003 and, therefore, are not included in these rows.

The next two groupings are based on type of ownership and the hospital's Medicare utilization expressed as a percent of total patient days. These data are taken primarily from the FY 1999 Medicare cost report files, if available (otherwise FY 1998 data are used). Data needed to determine ownership status were unavailable for 213 hospitals. Similarly, the data needed to determine

Medicare utilization were unavailable for 109 hospitals.

The next series of groupings concern the geographic reclassification status of hospitals. The first grouping displays all

hospitals that were reclassified by the MGCRB for FY 2003. The next two groupings separate the hospitals in the first group by urban and rural status.

The final row in Table I contains hospitals located in rural counties but deemed to be urban under section 1886(d)(8)(B) of the Act.

TABLE I.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES FOR FY 2003 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM
[Percent changes in payments per case]

	Number of hosps. ¹ (0)	New labor share ² (1)	DRG changes. ³ (2)	New wage data ⁴ (3)	Remove GME & CRNA 80/20 ⁵ (4)	Remove GME & CRNA 100 percent ⁶ (5)	DRG & WI changes ⁷ (6)	MGCRB reclassification ⁸ (7)	All FY 2003 changes ⁹ (8)
By Geographic Location:									
All hospitals	4,301	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Urban hospitals	2,613	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.5	0.1
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,511	0.1	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-0.5	-0.3
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million or fewer)	1,102	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	-0.4	0.8
Rural hospitals	1,688	-0.2	-0.4	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	2.5	2.1
Bed Size (Urban):									
0-99 beds	647	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.3	-0.6	1.5
100-199 beds	904	0.0	-0.3	-0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	-0.5	1.0
200-299 beds	528	0.0	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.4	0.5
300-499 beds	387	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.4	0.1
500 or more beds	147	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.5	-1.1
Bed Size (Rural):									
0-49 beds	819	-0.2	-0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.5	2.6
50-99 beds	507	-0.2	-0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	1.0	2.4
100-149 beds	216	-0.2	-0.4	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.5	2.9	2.0
150-199 beds	78	-0.2	-0.4	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	4.8	1.9
200 or more beds	68	-0.2	-0.3	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.1	1.4
Urban by Region:									
New England	134	0.2	-0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	-0.2	0.0
Middle Atlantic	402	0.2	-0.1	-0.8	0.0	0.0	-0.8	-0.1	-1.8
South Atlantic	380	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.5	0.9
East North Central	431	0.0	-0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	-0.5	0.4
East South Central	158	-0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.7	0.9
West North Central	180	-0.1	-0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.6	-0.7	0.9
West South Central	334	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.7	0.4
Mountain	132	0.0	0.0	-0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.6	0.6
Pacific	416	0.2	-0.4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.5	0.7
Puerto Rico	46	-0.7	-0.4	-0.8	0.0	0.0	-0.7	-0.8	0.0
Rural by Region:									
New England	40	0.0	-0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.0
Middle Atlantic	68	-0.1	-0.4	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.3	2.5	1.6
South Atlantic	239	-0.2	-0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	3.0	1.9
East North Central	225	-0.1	-0.3	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	2.1	2.5
East South Central	243	-0.3	-0.6	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.8	2.4	2.0
West North Central	311	-0.2	-0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.5	2.4
West South Central	294	-0.3	-0.6	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	3.4	1.8
Mountain	151	-0.1	-0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.6	2.0
Pacific	112	0.0	-0.4	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.6	2.3	2.7
Puerto Rico	5	-0.7	-0.5	-4.9	0.1	0.1	-5.0	-0.5	-2.8
By Payment Classification:									
Urban hospitals	2,645	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.4	0.2
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,570	0.1	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-0.4	-0.2
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million or fewer)	1,075	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	-0.4	0.8
Rural areas	1,656	-0.2	-0.5	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	2.4	2.1
Teaching Status:									
Non-teaching	3,195	-0.1	-0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.5
Fewer than 100 Residents	872	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.3	0.5
100 or more Residents	234	0.1	-0.2	-0.3	0.0	0.0	-0.3	-0.3	-1.7
Urban DSH:									
Non-DSH	1,565	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.7
100 or more beds	1,354	0.0	-0.2	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.5	0.0
Less than 100 beds	295	0.0	-0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.3	1.5

TABLE I.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES FOR FY 2003 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM—Continued
 [Percent changes in payments per case]

	Number of hosps. ¹ (0)	New labor share ² (1)	DRG changes. ³ (2)	New wage data ⁴ (3)	Remove GME & CRNA 80/20 ⁵ (4)	Remove GME & CRNA 100 percent ⁶ (5)	DRG & WI changes ⁷ (6)	MCGRB reclassification ⁸ (7)	All FY 2003 changes ⁹ (8)
Rural DSH:									
Sole Community (SCH)	470	-0.1	-0.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.1	2.3
Referral Center (RRC) ...	156	-0.2	-0.4	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	5.1	1.6
Other Rural:									
100 or more beds	78	-0.3	-0.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	1.2	2.0
Less than 100 beds ...	383	-0.3	-0.6	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.8	2.5
Urban teaching and DSH:									
Both teaching and DSH	758	0.0	-0.2	-0.3	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-0.5	-0.6
Teaching and no DSH ...	278	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	-0.1	-0.1
No teaching and DSH ...	891	0.0	-0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.4	1.4
No teaching and no DSH	718	0.0	-0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	-0.4	1.0
Rural Hospital Types:									
Non special status hos-									
pitals	666	-0.3	-0.5	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.6	1.2	2.3
RRC	159	-0.3	-0.3	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	6.0	1.2
SCH	540	-0.1	-0.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.3	2.3
Medicare-dependent									
hospitals (MDH)	216	-0.2	-0.6	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	2.7
SCH and RRC	75	-0.1	-0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.8	2.5
Type of Ownership:									
Voluntary	2,473	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.4
Proprietary	705	0.0	-0.2	-0.2	0.1	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.3
Government	910	-0.1	-0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8
Unknown	213	-0.1	-0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.4	0.6
Medicare Utilization as a									
Percent of Inpatient Days:									
0-25	319	0.1	-0.4	-0.3	0.1	0.1	-0.4	-0.3	-0.7
25-50	1,650	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.3	0.0
50-65	1,706	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	1.1
Over 65	517	-0.1	-0.4	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.5	0.6
Unknown	109	0.2	0.1	-1.1	0.0	0.0	-0.8	-0.7	-0.4
Hospitals Reclassified by the									
Medicare Geographic Classi-									
fication Review Board: FY 2003									
Reclassifications:									
All Reclassified Hospitals	620	-0.1	-0.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.4	4.4	1.0
Standardized Amount									
Only	29	0.0	-0.4	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.3	1.6
Wage Index Only	527	-0.1	-0.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	4.5	0.8
Both	41	-0.2	-0.2	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.6	5.1	1.1
Nonreclassified Hospitals	3,666	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.7	0.3
All Reclassified Urban Hos-									
pitals	108	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.0	-0.4
Standardized Amount									
Only	1	0.0	-0.1	0.4	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	-0.9	1.6
Wage Index Only	95	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.1	0.6
Both	12	-0.1	-0.2	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.9	2.9	4.1
Urban Nonreclassified									
Hospitals	2,471	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.7	0.2
All Reclassified Rural Hos-									
pitals	512	-0.2	-0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.6	1.8
Standardized Amount									
Only	1	-0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.9	3.7
Wage Index Only	502	-0.2	-0.4	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.6	1.8
Both	9	-0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	4.7	0.7
Rural Nonreclassified Hos-									
pitals	1,175	-0.2	-0.6	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	-0.4	2.4
Other Reclassified Hospitals									
(Section 1886(D)(8)(B))	35	-0.1	-0.6	-0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-1.4	2.8

¹ Because data necessary to classify some hospitals by category were missing, the total number of hospitals in each category may not equal the national total. Discharge data are from FY 2001, and hospital cost report data are from reporting periods beginning in FY 1999 and FY 1998.

² This column displays impact of the proposed change to the labor share from 71.1 percent to 72.5 percent.

³ This column displays the payment impact of the recalibration of the DRG weights based on FY 2001 MedPAR data and the DRG reclassification changes, in accordance with section 1886(d)(4)(C) of the Act.

⁴ This column displays the impact of updating the wage index with wage data from hospitals' FY 1999 cost reports.

⁵ This column displays the impact of an 80/20 percent blend of removing the labor costs and hours associated with graduate medical education and for the Part A costs of certified registered nurse anesthetists.

⁶ This column displays the impact of completely removing the labor costs and hours associated with graduate medical education (GME) and for the Part A costs of certified registered nurse anesthetists (CRNAs).

⁷ This column displays the combined impact of the reclassification and recalibration of the DRGs, the updated and revised wage data used to calculate the wage index, the phase-out of GME and CRNA costs and hours, and the budget neutrality adjustment factor for DRG and wage index changes, in accordance with sections 1886(d)(4)(C)(iii) and 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Act. Thus, it represents the combined impacts shown in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5, and the FY 2003 budget neutrality factor of 1.001026.

⁸ Shown here are the effects of geographic reclassifications by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board (MGRB). The effects demonstrate the FY 2003 payment impact of going from no reclassifications to the reclassifications scheduled to be in effect for FY 2003. Reclassification for prior years has no bearing on the payment impacts shown here.

⁹ This column shows changes in payments from FY 2002 to FY 2003. It incorporates all of the changes displayed in columns 1, 6 and 7 (the changes displayed in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5 are included in column 6). It also displays the impact of the FY 2003 update, changes in hospitals' reclassification status in FY 2003 compared to FY 2002, and the difference in outlier payments from FY 2002 to FY 2003. It also reflects the gradual phase-in for some SCHs of the full 1996 hospital-specific rate. Finally, the impacts of the reduction in IME adjustment payments, and the increase in the DSH adjustment are shown in this column. The sum of these impacts may be different from the percentage changes shown here due to rounding and interactive effect.

B. Impact of the Proposed Changes to the Labor Share (Column 1)

In Column 1 of Table 1, we present the effects of our proposal to update the labor share from 71.10 percent to 72.49 percent. We estimate the impact of this change by calculating payments using payment rates updated to FY 2003, but using the FY 2002 DRG GROUPER and wage index. The change in this column represents the impact upon various hospital categories of the proposed change to the labor share. This proposed change negatively impacts hospitals with wage indexes less than 1.0, and positively affects those with wage indexes greater than 1.0.

This proposed change has no impact on overall hospital payments. However, there are redistributive impacts generally in the range of plus or minus 0.1 percent or 0.2 percent. The net redistributive impact from those positively and negatively affected is approximately \$65 million. Hospitals in large urban areas would experience an increase of 0.1 percent. Hospitals in both "other" urban and rural areas would experience -0.1 and -0.2 percent decreases, respectively.

Under the urban by region category, New England, Middle Atlantic and Pacific regions would experience a 0.2 percent increase. The urban East South Central and West South Central regions would experience -0.2 percent decreases. Puerto Rico has a projected decrease of -0.7 percent, due to the low wage indexes in the Puerto Rico MSAs.

All rural regions would experience a negative percent decrease except New England and Pacific regions (at 0.0 percent change). The South Atlantic and West North Central regions would experience a decrease of -0.2 percent. The East South Central and West South Central regions each would experience a -0.3 percent decrease, while Puerto Rico would experience a -0.7 percent decrease. Rural nonspecial status hospitals and RRCs would decline by -0.3. SCH and MDHs also would experience decreases of -0.1 and -0.2

percent, respectively. The relatively smaller negative impact for these hospitals is due to the fact that the hospital-specific rate is not adjusted by the wage index. Therefore, this proposed change would have no effect on hospitals paid on that basis (other than SCHs receiving a blended of their FY 1996 hospital-specific rate and the Federal rate).

C. Impact of the Proposed Changes to the DRG Reclassifications and Recalibration of Relative Weights (Column 3)

In column 3 of Table I, we present the combined effects of the DRG reclassifications and recalibration, as discussed in section II. of the preamble to this proposed rule. Section 1886(d)(4)(C)(i) of the Act requires us to annually make appropriate classification changes and to recalibrate the DRG weights in order to reflect changes in treatment patterns, technology, and any other factors that may change the relative use of hospital resources.

We compared aggregate payments using the FY 2002 DRG relative weights (GROUPER version 19.0) to aggregate payments using the proposed FY 2003 DRG relative weights (GROUPER version 20.0). Overall payments decrease -0.2 percent due to the DRG reclassification and recalibration. We note that, consistent with section 1886(d)(4)(C)(iii) of the Act, we have applied a budget neutrality factor to ensure that the overall payment impact of the DRG changes (combined with the wage index changes) is budget neutral. This budget neutrality factor of 1.001026 is applied to payments in Column 6. Because this is a combined DRG reclassification and recalibration and wage index budget neutrality factor, it is not applied to payments in this column.

The DRG changes we are proposing would result in 0.2 percent lower payments to hospitals overall. This is the reason the budget neutrality factor is

greater than 1.0. This change is largely related to the proposed changes we are making to DRGs 14 (proposed to be retitled, Intracranial Hemorrhage and Stroke with Infarction) and 15 (proposed to be retitled, Nonspecific Cerebrovascular and Precerebral Occlusion without Infarction), and new DRG 524 (Transient Ischemia). With the new configuration of these DRGs, over 80,000 cases that previously would have been assigned to DRG 14 (with a FY 2003 proposed relative weight of 1.2742) would now be assigned to DRG 15 (with a FY 2003 proposed relative weight of 0.9844).

This change is evident most dramatically in small and rural hospitals. Rural hospitals with fewer than 50 beds would experience a 0.6 percent decrease, and rural hospitals with between 50 and 99 beds would experience a 0.5 percent decrease. Among rural hospitals categorized by region, the East South Central and West South Central would experience a 0.6 percent decrease in payments. Among special rural hospital categories, SCHs and MDHs both would experience 0.6 percent decreases.

D. Impact of Wage Index Changes (Columns 3, 4, and 5)

Section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Act requires that, beginning October 1, 1993, we annually update the wage data used to calculate the wage index. In accordance with this requirement, the proposed wage index for FY 2003 is based on data submitted for hospital cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 1998 and before October 1, 1999. As with column 2, the impact of the new data on hospital payments is isolated in columns 3, 4 and 5 by holding the other payment parameters constant in the three simulations. That is, columns 3, 4, and 5 show the percentage changes in payments when going from a model using the FY 2002 wage index (based on FY 1997 wage data before geographic reclassifications to a model using the FY 2003 pre-

reclassification wage index based on FY 1998 wage data).

The wage data collected on the FY 1999 cost reports are similar to the data used in the calculation of the FY 2002 wage index. Also, as described in section III.B of this preamble, the proposed FY 2003 wage index is calculated by removing 100 percent of hospitals' GME and CRNA costs (and hours). The FY 2002 wage index was calculated by blending 60 percent of hospitals' average hourly wages, excluding GME and CRNA data, with 40 percent of average hourly wages including these data.

Column 3 shows the impacts of updating the wage data using FY 1999 cost reports. This column maintains the same 60/40 phase-out of GME and CRNA costs as the FY 2002 wage index, which is the baseline for comparison. Among regions, the largest impact of updating the wage data is seen in rural Puerto Rico (a 4.9 percent decrease). Rural hospitals in the East South Central region experience the next largest impact, a 1.0 percent increase. This is primarily due to a 6 percent increase in the rural Alabama wage index, and a little under a 3 percent increase in the rural Mississippi wage index. Among urban hospitals, the Middle Atlantic region would experience a 0.8 percent decrease, largely due to a 2.4 percent

decrease in the New York City wage index and a 2.3 percent decrease in the Philadelphia wage index.

The next two columns show the impacts of removing the GME and CRNA data from the wage index calculation. Under the 5-year phaseout of these data, FY 2003 would be the fourth year of the phaseout. This means that, under the phaseout, the FY 2003 wage index would be calculated with 20 percent of the GME and CRNA data included and 80 percent with these data removed, and FY 2004 would begin the calculation with 100 percent of these data removed. However, we are proposing to remove 100 percent of GME and CRNA costs from the FY 2003 wage index. To demonstrate the impacts of this proposal, we first show the impacts of moving to a wage index with 80 percent of these data removed (Column 4), then show a wage index with 100 percent of these data removed (Column 5). As expected, the impacts in the two columns are similar, with some differences due to rounding. Generally, no group of hospitals is impacted by more than 0.1 percent by this change. Even among the hospital group most likely to be negatively impacted by this change, teaching hospitals with 100 or more residents, the net effect of removing 100 percent of GME and

CRNA data is 0.0 percent change in payments.

We note that the wage data used for the proposed wage index are based upon the data available as of February 22, 2001 and, therefore, do not reflect revision requests received and processed by the fiscal intermediaries after that date. To the extent these requests are granted by hospitals' fiscal intermediaries, these revisions will be reflected in the final rule. In addition, we continue to verify the accuracy of the data for hospitals with extraordinary changes in their data from the prior year.

The following chart compares the shifts in wage index values for labor market areas for FY 2002 relative to FY 2003. This chart demonstrates the impact of the proposed changes for the FY 2003 wage index, including updating to FY 1999 wage data and removing 100 percent of GME and CRNA data. The majority of labor market areas (324) experience less than a 5 percent change. A total of 19 labor market areas experience an increase of more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent. One area experiences an increase greater than 10 percent. A total of 26 areas experience decreases of more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent. Finally, 2 areas experience declines of 10 percent or more.

Percentage change in area wage index values	Number of labor market areas	
	FY 2002	FY 2003
Increase more than 10 percent	2	1
Increase more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent	26	19
Increase or decrease less than 5 percent	335	320
Decrease more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent	10	26
Decrease more than 10 percent	1	2

Among urban hospitals, 24 would experience an increase of between 5 and 10 percent and 2 more than 10 percent. A total of 53 rural hospitals have increases greater than 5 percent, but none greater than 10 percent. On the

negative side, 75 urban hospitals have decreases in their wage index values of at least 5 percent but less than 10 percent. Six urban hospitals have decreases in their wage index values greater than 10 percent. There are 19

rural hospitals with decreases in their wage index values greater than 5 percent or with increases of more than 10 percent. The following chart shows the projected impact for urban and rural hospitals.

Percentage change in area wage index values	Number of hospitals	
	Urban	Rural
Increase more than 10 percent	2	0
Increase more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent	24	53
Increase or decrease less than 5 percent	2506	1616
Decrease more than 5 percent and less than 10 percent	75	19
Decrease more than 10 percent	6	0

E. Combined Impact of DRG and Wage Index Changes—Including Budget Neutrality Adjustment (Column 6)

The impact of DRG reclassifications and recalibration on aggregate payments is required by section 1886(d)(4)(C)(iii) of the Act to be budget neutral. In addition, section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Act specifies that any updates or adjustments to the wage index are to be budget neutral. As noted in the Addendum to this proposed rule, we compared simulated aggregate payments using the FY 2002 DRG relative weights and wage index to simulated aggregate payments using the proposed FY 2003 DRG relative weights and blended wage index. Based on this comparison, we computed a wage and recalibration budget neutrality factor of 1.001026. In Table I, the combined overall impacts of the effects of both the DRG reclassifications and recalibration and the updated wage index are shown in column 6. The 0.0 percent impact for all hospitals demonstrates that these changes, in combination with the budget neutrality factor, are budget neutral.

For the most part, the changes in this column are the sum of the changes in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5, plus approximately 0.1 percent attributable to the budget neutrality factor. In addition, section 4410 of Public Law 105–33 provides that, for discharges on or after October 1, 1997, the area wage index applicable to any hospital that is not located in a rural area may not be less than the area wage index applicable to hospitals located in rural areas in that State. This provision is required to be budget neutral. The impact of this provision, which is to increase overall payments by 0.1 percent, is not shown in columns 2, 3, 4, and 5. It is included in the impacts shown in column 6. There also may be some variation of plus or minus 0.1 percent due to rounding.

F. Impact of MGCRB Reclassifications (Column 7)

Our impact analysis to this point has assumed hospitals are paid on the basis of their actual geographic location (with the exception of ongoing policies that provide that certain hospitals receive payments on bases other than where they are geographically located, such as hospitals in rural counties that are deemed urban under section 1886(d)(8)(B) of the Act). The changes in column 6 reflect the per case payment impact of moving from this baseline to a simulation incorporating the MGCRB decisions for FY 2003. These decisions

affect hospitals' standardized amount and wage index area assignments.

By February 28 of each year, the MGCRB makes reclassification determinations that will be effective for the next fiscal year, which begins on October 1. The MGCRB may approve a hospital's reclassification request for the purpose of using another area's standardized amount, wage index value, or both.

The proposed FY 2003 wage index values incorporate all of the MGCRB's reclassification decisions for FY 2003. The wage index values also reflect any decisions made by the CMS Administrator through the appeals and review process for MGCRB decisions as of February 28, 2002. Additional changes that result from the Administrator's review of MGCRB decisions or a request by a hospital to withdraw its application will be reflected in the final rule for FY 2003.

The overall effect of geographic reclassification is required by section 1886(d)(8)(D) of the Act to be budget neutral. Therefore, we applied an adjustment of 0.990536 to ensure that the effects of reclassification are budget neutral. (See section II.A.4.b. of the Addendum to this proposed rule.)

As a group, rural hospitals benefit from geographic reclassification. Their payments rise 2.5 percent in column 6. Payments to urban hospitals decline 0.5 percent. Hospitals in other urban areas see a decrease in payments of 0.5 percent, while large urban hospitals lose 0.5 percent. Among urban hospital groups (that is, bed size, census division, and special payment status), payments generally decline.

A positive impact is evident among most of the rural hospital groups. The smallest increases among the rural census divisions are 1.5 and 1.6 percent for West North Central and Mountain regions, respectively. The largest increases are in rural South Atlantic and West South Central regions. These regions receive increases of 3.0 and 3.4 percent, respectively.

Among all the hospitals that were reclassified for FY 2003 (including hospitals that received wage index reclassification in a FY 2001 or FY 2002 that extend for 3-years), the MGCRB changes are estimated to provide a 4.4 percent increase in payments. Urban hospitals reclassified for FY 2003 are expected to receive an increase of 4.0 percent, while rural reclassified hospitals are expected to benefit from the MGCRB changes with a 4.6 percent increase in payments. Overall, among hospitals that were reclassified for purposes of the standardized amount only, a payment increase of 0.3 percent

is expected, while those reclassified for purposes of the wage index only show a 4.5 percent increase in payments. Payments to urban and rural hospitals that did not reclassify are expected to decrease slightly due to the MGCRB changes, decreasing by 0.7 for urban hospitals and 0.4 for rural hospitals. Those hospitals located in rural counties but deemed to be urban under section 1886(d)(8)(B) of the Act are expected to receive a decrease in payments of 1.4 percent.

The foregoing analysis was based on MGCRB and CMS Administrator decisions made by February 28, 2002. As previously noted, there may be changes to some MGCRB decisions through the appeals, review, and applicant withdrawal process. The outcome of these cases will be reflected in the analysis presented in the final rule.

G. All Changes (Column 8)

Column 8 compares our estimate of payments per case, incorporating all changes reflected in this proposed rule for FY 2003 (including statutory changes), to our estimate of payments per case in FY 2002. This column includes all of the policy changes to date, including the proposed new labor share shown in column 1, and the combined DRG and wage index changes from column 6. Because the reclassifications shown in column 7 do not reflect FY 2002 reclassifications, the impacts of FY 2003 reclassifications only affect the impacts from FY 2002 to FY 2003 if the reclassification impacts for any group of hospitals are different in FY 2003 compared to FY 2002.

It includes the effects of the 2.75 percent update to the standardized amounts and the hospital-specific rates for MDHs and SCHs. It also reflects the 1.7 percentage point difference between the projected outlier payments in FY 2002 (5.1 percent of total DRG payments) and the current estimate of the percentage of actual outlier payments in FY 2002 (6.8 percent), as described in the introduction to this Appendix and the Addendum to this proposed rule.

Section 213 of Public Law 106–554 provided that all SCHs may receive payment on the basis of their costs per case during their cost reporting period that began during 1996. For FY 2003, eligible SCHs that rebase receive a hospital-specific rate comprised of 25 percent of the higher of their FY 1982 or FY 1987 hospital-specific rate or their Federal rate, and 75 percent of their 1996 hospital-specific rate. The impact of this provision is modeled in column 8 as well.

Under section 1886(d)(5)(B)(ii) of the Act, the formula for IME is reduced beginning in FY 2003. The reduction is from approximately a 6.5 percent increase for every 10 percent increase in the resident-to-bed ratio during FY 2002 to approximately a 5.5 percent increase. We estimate the impact of this change to be a 0.9 percent reduction in hospitals' overall FY 2003 payments. The impact upon teaching hospitals would be larger.

Finally, the DSH adjustment increases in FY 2003 compared with FY 2002. In accordance with section 1886(d)(5)(F)(ix) of the Act, during FY 2002, DSH payments that the hospital would otherwise receive were reduced by 3 percent. This reduction is no longer applicable beginning with FY 2003. The estimated impact of this change is to increase overall hospital payments by 0.2 percent.

There might also be interactive effects among the various factors comprising the payment system that we are not able to isolate. For these reasons, the values in column 8 may not equal the sum of the changes in columns 6 and 7, plus the other impacts that we are able to identify.

The overall change in payments per case for hospitals in FY 2003 increases by 0.4 percent. This reflects the update of 2.75 percent, the 1.7 percent higher outlier payments in FY 2002 than projected for FY 2003, a 0.9 percent reduction in payments for IME, and a 0.2 percent increase in payments due to

higher DSH payments in FY 2003. Hospitals in urban areas experience a 0.1 percent increase in payments per case compared to FY 2002, although hospitals in large urban areas experience a 0.3 percent decline in payments, largely due to reduction in IME payments. The impact of the reduction in IME payments is most evident among teaching hospitals with 100 or more residents, who would experience a decrease in payments per case of 1.7 percent. Hospitals in rural areas, meanwhile, experience a 2.1 percent payment increase.

Among urban census divisions, the largest payment increase was 0.9 percent in South Atlantic, East South Central, and West North Central. Hospitals in urban Middle Atlantic would experience an overall decrease of 1.8 percent. This is primarily due to the combination of the negative impact on these hospitals of reducing IME and the lower outlier payments during FY 2003. The rural census division experiencing the smallest increase in payments were New England and the Middle Atlantic regions (1.0 and 1.6 percent, respectively). The only decreases by rural hospitals are in Puerto Rico, where payments appear to decrease by 2.8 percent, largely due to the updated wage data. In the Pacific, payments appear to increase by 2.7 percent. Rural East and West North Central regions also benefited, with 2.5 and 2.4 percent increases, respectively.

Among special categories of rural hospitals, those hospitals receiving payment under the hospital-specific methodology (SCHs, MDHs, and SCH/RRCs) experience payment increases of 2.3 percent, 2.7 percent, and 2.5 percent, respectively. This outcome is primarily related to the fact that, for hospitals receiving payments under the hospital-specific methodology, there are no outlier payments. Therefore, these hospitals do not experience negative payment impacts from the decline in outlier payments from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (from 6.8 percent of total DRG plus outlier payments to 5.1 percent) as do hospitals paid based on the national standardized amounts.

Among hospitals that were reclassified for FY 2003, hospitals overall are estimated to receive a 1.0 percent increase in payments. Urban hospitals reclassified for FY 2003 are anticipated to receive a decrease of -0.4 percent, while rural reclassified hospitals are expected to benefit from reclassification with a 1.8 percent increase in payments. Overall, among hospitals reclassified for purposes of the standardized amount, a payment increase of 1.6 percent is expected, while those hospitals reclassified for purposes of the wage index only show an expected 0.8 percent increase in payments. Those hospitals located in rural counties but deemed to be urban under section 1886(d)(8)(B) of the Act are expected to receive an increase in payments of 2.8 percent.

TABLE II.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES FOR FY 2003 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM
[Payments per Case]

	Number of hosps. (1)	Average FY 2002 payment per case ¹ (2)	Average FY 2003 payment per case ¹ (3)	All FY 2003 changes (4)
By Geographic Location:				
All hospitals	4,301	7,194	7,224	0.4
Urban hospitals	2,613	7,707	7,718	0.1
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,511	8,269	8,245	-0.3
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million of fewer)	1,102	6,977	7,034	0.8
Rural hospitals	1,688	5,108	5,213	2.1
Bed Size (Urban):				
0-99 beds	647	5,299	5,380	1.5
100-199 beds	904	6,436	6,498	1.0
200-299 beds	528	7,391	7,425	0.5
300-499 beds	387	8,276	8,280	0.1
500 or more beds	147	10,046	9,932	-1.1
Bed Size (Rural):				
0-49 beds	819	4,204	4,313	2.6
50-99 beds	507	4,754	4,866	2.4
100-149 beds	216	5,052	5,154	2.0
150-199 beds	78	5,494	5,600	1.9
200 or more beds	68	6,651	6,742	1.4
Urban by Region:				
New England	134	8,228	8,225	0.0
Middle Atlantic	402	8,832	8,675	-1.8
South Atlantic	380	7,287	7,353	0.9
East North Central	431	7,269	7,296	0.4

TABLE II.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES FOR FY 2003 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM—Continued
[Payments per Case]

	Number of hosps. (1)	Average FY 2002 pay- ment per case ¹ (2)	Average FY 2003 pay- ment per case ¹ (3)	All FY 2003 changes (4)
East South Central	158	6,919	6,984	0.9
West North Central	180	7,330	7,399	0.9
West South Central	334	7,089	7,121	0.4
Mountain	132	7,505	7,553	0.6
Pacific	416	9,319	9,383	0.7
Puerto Rico	46	3,310	3,311	0.0
Rural by Region:				
New England	40	6,227	6,290	1.0
Middle Atlantic	68	5,345	5,430	1.6
South Atlantic	239	5,221	5,319	1.9
East North Central	225	5,059	5,185	2.5
East South Central	243	4,723	4,819	2.0
West North Central	311	5,093	5,214	2.4
West South Central	294	4,547	4,627	1.8
Mountain	151	5,424	5,531	2.0
Pacific	112	6,592	6,772	2.7
Puerto Rico	5	2,754	2,677	-2.8
By Payment Classification:				
Urban hospitals	2,645	7,691	7,703	0.2
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,570	8,194	8,175	-0.2
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million of fewer)	1,075	7,003	7,057	0.8
Rural areas	1,656	5,094	5,199	2.1
Teaching Status:				
Non-teaching	3,195	5,866	5,952	1.5
Fewer than 100 Residents	872	7,479	7,515	0.5
100 or more Residents	234	11,431	11,239	-1.7
Urban DSH:				
Non-DSH	1,565	6,538	6,581	0.7
100 or more beds	1,354	8,299	8,299	0.0
Less than 100 beds	295	5,235	5,312	1.5
Rural DSH:	470	4,938	5,053	2.3
Sole Community (SCH).				
Referral Center (RRC)	156	5,906	6,001	1.6
Other Rural:				
100 or more beds	78	4,509	4,598	2.0
Less than 100 beds	383	4,076	4,179	2.5
Urban teaching and DSH:				
Both teaching and DSH	758	9,185	9,134	-0.6
Teaching and no DSH	278	7,724	7,717	-0.1
No teaching and DSH	891	6,510	6,600	1.4
No teaching and no DSH	718	6,066	6,124	1.0
Rural Hospital Types:				
Non special status hospitals	666	4,247	4,345	2.3
RRC	159	5,667	5,737	1.2
SCH	540	5,223	5,344	2.3
Medicare-dependent hospitals (MDH)	216	4,032	4,142	2.7
SCH and RRC	75	6,429	6,589	2.5
Type of Ownership:				
Voluntary	2,473	7,322	7,349	0.4
Proprietary	705	6,907	6,929	0.3
Government	910	6,764	6,815	0.8
Unknown	213	7,281	7,326	0.6
Medicare Utilization as a Percent of Inpatient Days:				
0-25	319	9,820	9,755	-0.7
25-50	1,650	8,252	8,252	0.0
50-65	1,706	6,225	6,293	1.1
Over 65	517	5,645	5,679	0.6
Unknown	109	8,871	8,832	-0.4
Hospitals Reclassified by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board:				
FY 2002 Reclassifications:				
All Reclassified Hospitals	620	6,513	6,579	1.0
Standardized Amount Only	29	5,918	6,016	1.6
Wage Index Only	527	6,678	6,728	0.8
Both	41	5,874	5,936	1.1
All Nonreclassified Hospitals	3,666	7,310	7,335	0.3
All Urban Reclassified Hospitals	108	8,752	8,720	-0.4

TABLE II.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF CHANGES FOR FY 2003 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM—Continued
[Payments per Case]

	Number of hosps. (1)	Average FY 2002 payment per case ¹ (2)	Average FY 2003 payment per case ¹ (3)	All FY 2003 changes (4)
Urban Nonreclassified Hospitals	1	5,484	5,569	1.6
Standardized Amount Only	95	9,003	8,951	-0.6
Wage Index Only	12	5,680	5,911	4.1
Both	2,471	7,672	7,685	0.2
All Reclassified Rural Hospitals	512	5,666	5,768	1.8
Standardized Amount Only	1	5,408	5,605	3.7
Wage Index Only	502	5,650	5,754	1.8
Both	9	6,370	6,415	0.7
Rural Nonreclassified Hospitals	1,175	4,478	4,585	2.4
Other Reclassified Hospitals (Section 1886(D)(8)(B))	35	4,892	5,031	2.8

¹ These payment amounts per case do not reflect any estimates of annual case-mix increase.

Table II presents the projected impact of the proposed changes for FY 2003 for urban and rural hospitals and for the different categories of hospitals shown in Table I. It compares the estimated payments per case for FY 2002 with the average estimated per case payments for FY 2003, as calculated under our models. Thus, this table presents, in terms of the average dollar amounts paid per discharge, the combined effects of the changes presented in Table I. The percentage changes shown in the last column of Table II equal the percentage changes in average payments from column 8 of Table I.

VII. Impact of Specific Proposed Policy Changes

A. Impact of Proposed Policy Changes Relating to Hospital Bed Counts

As discussed in section V.E.3. of the preamble of this proposed rule, we are proposing that if a hospital's reported bed count results in an occupancy rate below 35 percent, the applicable bed count for that hospital would be the number of beds that would result in an occupancy rate of 35 percent.

We have calculated an estimated impact on the Medicare program for FY 2003 as a result of this policy. We first identified urban hospitals receiving DSH with bed counts above 100, but with occupancy rates below 35 percent. Then, we determined the amount of DSH payments made to these hospitals in FY 1999. Next, we simulated what these hospitals' DSH payments would have been had their bed counts been less than 100. We compared the difference between actual DSH payments using 100 or more beds to simulated DSH payments using fewer than 100 beds, and determined that the reductions in DSH payments to these hospitals, inflated to FY 2003 using the

update to the average standardized amount, would be approximately \$38.9 million.

B. Impact of Proposed Changes Relating to EMTALA Provisions

In section V.J. of the preamble to this proposed rule, we discuss our proposed changes to our policies relating to the responsibilities of Medicare-participating hospitals under the patient antidumping statute (EMTALA) to medically screen all patients seeking emergency services and provide stabilizing medical treatment as necessary to patients whose conditions warrant it. In summary, to help promote consistent application of our regulations concerning EMTALA, we are proposing to clarify certain policies in areas where issues have arisen and at the same time address concerns about EMTALA raised by the Secretary's Regulatory Reform Task Force, including the following:

- We are proposing to change the requirements relating to emergency patients presenting at those off-campus outpatient clinics that do not routinely provide emergency services. We believe these changes would enhance the quality and promptness of emergency care by permitting individuals to be referred to appropriately equipped emergency facilities close to such clinics.

- We are proposing to clarify when EMTALA applies to both inpatients and outpatients. We believe these clarifications would enhance overall patient access to emergency services by helping to relieve administrative burdens on frequently overcrowded emergency departments.

- We are proposing to clarify the circumstances in which physicians, particularly specialty physicians, must serve on hospital medical staff "on-call" lists. We expect these clarifications

would help improve access to physician services for all hospital patients by permitting hospitals local flexibility to determine how best to maximize their available physician resources. We are currently aware of reports of physicians, particularly specialty physicians, severing their relationships with hospitals, especially when those physicians belong to more than one hospital medical staff. Physician attrition from these medical staffs could result in hospitals having no specialty physician service coverage for their patients. Our proposed clarification of the on-call list requirement would permit hospitals to continue to attract physicians to serve on their medical staffs and thereby continue to provide services to emergency room patients.

- We are proposing to clarify the responsibilities of hospital-owned ambulances so that these ambulances can be more fully integrated with citywide and local community EMS procedures for responding to medical emergencies and thus use these resources more efficiently for the benefit of these communities.

We believe it would be difficult to quantify the impact of these changes and are soliciting comments on these issues.

C. Impact of Proposed Policy Changes Relating to Provider-Based Entity

In section V.K. of the preamble of this proposed rule, we discuss our proposed Medicare payment policy changes relating to determinations of provider-based status for entities of main providers. These changes are intended to focus mainly on issues raised by the hospital industry surrounding the provider-based regulations and to allow for an orderly and uniform implementation strategy once the

grandfathering provision for these entities expires on September 30, 2002.

We believe it would be difficult to quantify the impact of these changes and are soliciting comments on these issues.

VIII. Impact of Proposed Policies Affecting Rural Hospitals

A. Raising the Threshold To Qualify for the CRNA Pass-Through Payments

In section V. of the preamble of this proposed rule, we are proposing to raise the maximum number of surgical procedures (including inpatient and outpatient procedures) requiring anesthesia services that a rural hospital may perform to qualify for pass-through payments for the costs of CRNAs to 800 from 500. Currently, we have identified 622 hospitals that qualify under this provision.

To measure the impact of this provision, we determined that approximately half of the hospitals that would appear to be eligible based on the current number of procedures appear to receive this adjustment. In order to be eligible, hospitals must employ the CRNA and the CRNA must agree not to bill for services under Part B. We estimate approximately 90 rural hospitals would qualify under the increased maximum volume threshold. If one-half of these hospitals then met the other criteria, 45 additional hospitals would be eligible for these pass-through payments under this proposed change.

B. Removal of Requirement for CAHs To Use State Resident Assessment Instrument

In section VII. of the preamble of this proposed rule, we are proposing to eliminate the requirement that CAHs use the State resident assessment instrument (RAI) to conduct patient assessments. There are approximately 600 CAHs. The overwhelming majority of CAHs, 95 percent, provide SNF level care. The elimination of the requirement to use the State RAI would greatly reduce the burden on CAHs because facilities would no longer be required to complete an RAI document for each SNF patient (which would involve approximately 12,000 admissions based on the most recent claims data). Facilities would have the flexibility to document the assessment data in the medical record in a manner appropriate for their facility. The elimination of the requirement for use of the State RAI would reduce the amount of time required to perform patient assessments and allow more time for direct patient care.

IX. Impact of Proposed Changes in the Capital Prospective Payment System

A. General Considerations

Fiscal year 2001 was the last year of the 10-year transition period established to phase in the prospective payment system for hospital capital-related costs. During the transition period, hospitals were paid under one of two payment methodologies: fully prospective or hold harmless. Under the fully prospective methodology, hospitals were paid a blend of the Federal rate and their hospital-specific rate (see § 412.340). Under the hold-harmless methodology, unless a hospital elected payment based on 100 percent of the Federal rate, hospitals were paid 85 percent of reasonable costs for old capital costs (100 percent for SCHs) plus an amount for new capital costs based on a proportion of the Federal rate (see § 412.344). As we state in section VI.A. of the preamble of this proposed rule, the end of the 10-year transition period ending with hospital cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2001 (FY 2002), capital prospective payment system payments for most hospitals are based solely on the Federal rate in FY 2003. Therefore, we no longer include information on obligated capital costs or projections of old capital costs and new capital costs, which were factors needed to calculate payments during the transition period, for our impact analysis.

In accordance with section § 412.312, the basic methodology for determining a capital prospective payment system payment is:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{Standard Federal Rate}) \times (\text{DRG weight}) \\ & \times (\text{Geographic Adjustment} \\ & \text{Factor (GAF)}) \times (\text{Large Urban Add-on,} \\ & \text{if applicable}) \times (\text{COLA adjustment for} \\ & \text{hospitals located in Alaska and} \\ & \text{Hawaii}) \times (1 + \text{Disproportionate Share} \\ & \text{(DSH) Adjustment Factor} + \text{Indirect} \\ & \text{Medical Education (IME) Adjustment} \\ & \text{Factor, if applicable}). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, hospitals may also receive outlier payments for those cases that qualify under the proposed threshold established for each fiscal year.

The data used in developing the impact analysis presented below are taken from the December 2001 update of the FY 2001 MedPAR file and the December 2001 update of the Provider Specific File that is used for payment purposes. Although the analyses of the changes to the capital prospective payment system do not incorporate cost data, we used the December 2001 update of the most recently available hospital cost report data (FY 1999) to

categorize hospitals. Our analysis has several qualifications. First, we do not make adjustments for behavioral changes that hospitals may adopt in response to policy changes. Second, due to the interdependent nature of the prospective payment system, it is very difficult to precisely quantify the impact associated with each proposed change. Third, we draw upon various sources for the data used to categorize hospitals in the tables. In some cases (for instance, the number of beds), there is a fair degree of variation in the data from different sources. We have attempted to construct these variables with the best available sources overall. However, for individual hospitals, some miscategorizations are possible.

Using cases from the December 2001 update of the FY 2001 MedPAR file, we simulated payments under the capital prospective payment system for FY 2002 and FY 2003 for a comparison of total payments per case. Any short-term, acute care hospitals not paid under the general hospital inpatient prospective payment systems (Indian Health Service Hospitals and hospitals in Maryland) are excluded from the simulations.

As we explain in section III.A.4. of the Addendum of this proposed rule, payments will no longer be made under the regular exceptions provision under §§ 412.348(b) through (e). Therefore, we are no longer using the actuarial capital cost model (described in Appendix B of August 1, 2001 final rule (66 FR 40099)). We modeled payments for each hospital by multiplying the Federal rate by the GAF and the hospital's case-mix. We then added estimated payments for indirect medical education, disproportionate share, large urban add-on, and outliers, if applicable. For purposes of this impact analysis, the model includes the following assumptions:

- We estimate that the Medicare case-mix index will increase by 0.99800 percent in FY 2002 and will increase by 1.01505 percent in FY 2003.
- We estimate that the Medicare discharges will be 13,398,000 in FY 2002 and 13,658,000 in FY 2003 for a 1.9 percent increase from FY 2002 to FY 2003.
- The Federal capital rate was updated beginning in FY 1996 by an analytical framework that considers changes in the prices associated with capital-related costs and adjustments to account for forecast error, changes in the case-mix index, allowable changes in intensity, and other factors. The proposed FY 2003 update is 1.1 percent (see section III.A.1.a. of the Addendum to this proposed rule).

- In addition to the proposed FY 2003 update factor, the proposed FY 2003 Federal rate was calculated based on a proposed GAF/DRG budget neutrality factor of 1.0224, a proposed outlier adjustment factor of 0.9460, a proposed exceptions adjustment factor of 0.9960, and a proposed special adjustment for FY 2003 of 1.0255 (see section III.A. of the Addendum of this proposed rule).

2. Results

In the past, in this impact section we presented the redistributive effects that were expected to occur between “hold-harmless” hospitals and “fully prospective” hospitals and a cross-sectional summary of hospital groupings by the capital prospective payment system transition period payment methodology. We are no longer including this information since all hospitals (except new hospitals under § 412.324(b) and under proposed § 412.32(c)(2)) are paid 100 percent of the Federal rate in FY 2003.

We used the actuarial model described above to estimate the potential impact of our proposed changes for FY 2003 on total capital payments per case, using a universe of 4,300 hospitals. As described above, the individual hospital payment parameters are taken from the best available data, including the December 2001 update of the MedPAR file, the December 2001 update to the Provider-Specific File, and the most recent cost report data. In Table III, we present a comparison of total payments per case for FY 2002 compared to FY 2003 based on proposed FY 2003 payment policies. Column 3 shows estimates of payments per case under our model for FY 2002. Column 4 shows estimates of payments per case under our model for FY 2003. Column 5 shows the total percentage change in payments from FY 2002 to FY

2003. The change represented in Column 5 includes the 1.1 percent increase in the Federal rate, a 1.01505 percent increase in case-mix, changes in the adjustments to the Federal rate (for example, the effect of the new hospital wage index on the geographic adjustment factor), and reclassifications by the MGCRB, as well as changes in special exception payments. The comparisons are provided by: (1) Geographic location; (2) region; and (3) payment classification.

The simulation results show that, on average, capital payments per case can be expected to increase 3.7 percent in FY 2003. Our comparison by geographic location shows an overall increase in payments to hospitals in all areas. This comparison also shows that urban and rural hospitals will experience slightly different rates of increase in capital payments per case (3.5 percent and 5.1 percent, respectively). This difference is due to a projection that urban hospitals will experience a larger decrease in outlier payments from FY 2002 to FY 2003 compared to rural hospitals.

All regions are estimated to receive an increase in total capital payments per case, partly due to the elimination of the 2.1 percent reduction to the Federal rate for FY 2003 (see section VI.D. of the preamble of this proposed rule). Changes by region vary from a minimum increase of 2.1 percent (Middle Atlantic urban region) to a maximum increase of 5.7 percent (West North Central rural region). Hospitals located in Puerto Rico are expected to experience an increase in total capital payments per case of 4.3 percent.

By type of ownership, government hospitals are projected to have the largest rate of increase of total payment changes (4.4 percent). Similarly, payments to voluntary hospitals will increase 3.9 percent, while payments to

proprietary hospitals will increase 2.0 percent.

Section 1886(d)(10) of the Act established the MGCRB. Hospitals may apply for reclassification for purposes of the standardized amount, wage index, or both. Although the Federal capital rate is not affected, a hospital’s geographic classification for purposes of the operating standardized amount does affect a hospital’s capital payments as a result of the large urban adjustment factor and the disproportionate share adjustment for urban hospitals with 100 or more beds. Reclassification for wage index purposes also affects the geographic adjustment factor, since that factor is constructed from the hospital wage index.

To present the effects of the hospitals being reclassified for FY 2003 compared to the effects of reclassification for FY 2002, we show the average payment percentage increase for hospitals reclassified in each fiscal year and in total. For FY 2003 reclassifications, we indicate those hospitals reclassified for standardized amount purposes only, for wage index purposes only, and for both purposes. The reclassified groups are compared to all other nonreclassified hospitals. These categories are further identified by urban and rural designation.

Hospitals reclassified for FY 2003 as a whole are projected to experience a 4.2 percent increase in payments. Payments to nonreclassified hospitals will increase slightly less (3.6 percent) than reclassified hospitals, overall. Hospitals reclassified during both FY 2002 and FY 2003 are projected to receive an increase in payments of 3.9 percent. Hospitals reclassified during FY 2003 only are projected to receive an increase in payments of 9.0 percent. This increase is primarily due to changes in the GAF (wage index).

TABLE III.—COMPARISON OF TOTAL PAYMENTS PER CASE
[FY 2002 Payments Compared To FY 2003 Payments]

	Number of hospitals	Average FY 2002 payments/case	Average FY 2003 payments/case	Change
By Geographic Location:				
All hospitals	4,300	667	692	3.7
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,511	773	798	3.1
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million of fewer)	1,102	652	678	4.0
Rural areas	1,687	448	471	5.1
Urban hospitals	2,613	721	746	3.5
0–99 beds	647	511	533	4.3
100–199 beds	904	611	634	3.7
200–299 beds	528	692	717	3.6
300–499 beds	387	762	790	3.7
500 or more beds	147	935	961	2.8
Rural hospitals	1,687	448	471	5.1
0–49 beds	818	370	393	6.0

TABLE III.—COMPARISON OF TOTAL PAYMENTS PER CASE—Continued
 [FY 2002 Payments Compared To FY 2003 Payments]

	Number of hospitals	Average FY 2002 payments/case	Average FY 2003 payments/case	Change
50–99 beds	507	412	435	5.6
100–149 beds	216	454	477	5.1
150–199 beds	78	493	517	4.9
200 or more beds	68	566	589	4.1
By Region:				
Urban by Region	2,613	721	746	3.5
New England	134	771	804	4.3
Middle Atlantic	402	817	834	2.1
South Atlantic	380	690	716	3.7
East North Central	431	687	718	4.5
East South Central	158	649	675	4.0
West North Central	180	703	735	4.6
West South Central	334	666	685	2.9
Mountain	132	695	724	4.2
Pacific	416	841	866	2.9
Puerto Rico	46	305	319	4.3
Rural by Region	1,687	448	471	5.1
New England	40	549	575	4.6
Middle Atlantic	68	472	497	5.4
South Atlantic	239	467	489	4.8
East North Central	225	456	481	5.5
East South Central	243	414	435	5.0
West North Central	311	440	465	5.7
West South Central	294	403	423	5.0
Mountain	150	460	483	5.0
Pacific	112	528	557	5.5
By Payment Classification:				
All hospitals	4,300	667	692	3.7
Large urban areas (populations over 1 million)	1,570	767	791	3.2
Other urban areas (populations of 1 million of fewer)	1,075	654	680	4.0
Rural areas	1,655	447	469	5.1
Teaching Status:				
Non-teaching	3,194	545	568	4.2
Fewer than 100 Residents	872	699	726	3.8
100 or more Residents	234	1,041	1,069	2.7
Urban DSH:				
100 or more beds	1,354	759	784	3.3
Less than 100 beds	295	492	512	4.2
Rural DSH:				
Sole Community (SCH/EACH)	469	392	414	5.6
Referral Center (RRC/EACH)	156	518	540	4.3
Other Rural:				
100 or more beds	78	418	439	5.0
Less than 100 beds	383	378	400	5.8
Urban teaching and DSH:				
Both teaching and DSH	758	838	864	3.1
Teaching and no DSH	278	746	776	4.0
No teaching and DSH	891	600	623	3.8
No teaching and no DSH	718	600	623	3.8
Rural Hospital Types:				
Non special status hospitals	666	398	420	5.5
RRC/EACH	159	526	548	4.2
SCH/EACH	539	415	438	5.5
Medicare-dependent hospitals (MDH)	216	368	391	6.3
SCH, RRC and EACH	75	503	530	5.3
Hospitals Reclassified by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board:				
Reclassification Status During FY2002 and FY2003:				
Reclassified During Both FY2002 and FY2003	567	588	611	3.9
Reclassified During FY2003 Only	53	516	563	9.0
Reclassified During FY2002 Only	77	623	651	4.4
FY2003 Reclassifications:				
All Reclassified Hospitals	620	583	607	4.2
All Nonreclassified Hospitals	3,645	683	708	3.6
All Urban Reclassified Hospitals	108	799	826	3.4
Urban Nonreclassified Hospitals	2,471	718	743	3.5
All Reclassified Rural Hospitals	512	500	524	4.7
Rural Nonreclassified Hospitals	1,174	389	411	5.7
Other Reclassified Hospitals (Section 1886(D)(8)(B))	35	454	484	6.4

TABLE III.—COMPARISON OF TOTAL PAYMENTS PER CASE—Continued
 [FY 2002 Payments Compared To FY 2003 Payments]

	Number of hospitals	Average FY 2002 payments/case	Average FY 2003 payments/case	Change
Type of Ownership:				
Voluntary	2,473	680	707	3.9
Proprietary	705	658	671	2.0
Government	909	600	627	4.4
Medicare Utilization as a Percent of Inpatient Days:				
0–25	318	859	885	3.0
25–50	1,650	767	792	3.3
50–65	1,706	582	606	4.2
Over 65	517	525	547	4.3

BILLING CODE 4120-01-P

Appendix B—Report to Congress



THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201

MAR 22 2002

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney
President of the Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. President:

I am pleased to submit to Congress this letter containing my recommendation for the applicable percentage increase in Medicare's hospital inpatient prospective payment system (IPPS) rates for Federal fiscal year (FY) 2003. Also included are my recommendations for updates to the payment limits for hospitals and hospital units excluded from IPPS, and for adjustments to the diagnosis-related group (DRG) weighting factors.

Section 1886(e)(3) of the Social Security Act (the Act) directs the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to report to the Congress his initial estimate of his recommendation (required by section 1886(e)(4) of the Act) of an appropriate payment update for inpatient hospital services for the upcoming FY. Consistent with current law, the President's FY 2003 budget includes an update to the standardized amounts (the base dollar amounts for IPPS payments) equal to the market basket (an index of inflation in goods and services used by hospitals) minus 0.55 percentage points. The President's FY 2003 budget estimated the IPPS market basket rate of increase for FY 2003 to be 2.8 percent. Based on this estimate, I am recommending an update to the standardized amounts for hospitals in both large urban and other areas of 2.25 percent. Payments to hospitals under IPPS are projected to increase by \$2.1 billion, from \$86.0 billion in FY 2002 to \$88.1 billion in FY 2003.

Although payments for most hospitals under the IPPS are made on the basis of the standardized amounts, some categories of hospitals are paid the higher of a hospital-specific rate based on their costs in a base year (the higher of either 1982, 1987, or 1996) or the IPPS rate based on the standardized amount. Consistent with current law and the President's FY 2003 budget, I am recommending an update equal to 2.25 percent to the hospital-specific rate for both sole community hospitals and Medicare-dependent, small rural hospitals.

I am also submitting, consistent with Section 1886(e)(3) of the Act, my recommendation for updating payments for hospitals and distinct-part hospital units that are excluded from IPPS.

The excluded hospital types are: psychiatric hospitals; rehabilitation hospitals; children's hospitals; long-term care hospitals; and cancer hospitals. The types of excluded distinct-part hospital units are psychiatric and rehabilitation. Hospitals and units excluded from the IPPS have in the past been paid based on their reasonable costs subject to limits as established by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA).

Page 2 — The Honorable Richard B. Cheney

Psychiatric hospitals and units, and children's and cancer hospitals continue to be paid based on their reasonable costs subject to TEFRA limits. For these hospitals, the President's FY 2003 budget incorporates an increase to the TEFRA limit using 2.8 percent for the excluded hospital market basket increase.

Inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRF) are paid under the IRF PPS for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2002. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, the IRF prospective payment is based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal IRF PPS amount, updated annually.

Effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, we are proposing that long-term care hospitals will be paid under a PPS based on a 5-year transition period (hospitals may elect to receive full PPS rather than transition payments.) For purposes of the update factor, the portion of the proposed PPS transition blend payment based on reasonable costs for inpatient operating services would be determined by updating the long term care hospital's TEFRA limit by 2.8 percent.

My recommendation for the updates is based on cost projections used in the President's FY 2003 budget. A final recommendation on the appropriate percentage increases for FY 2003 will be made nearer the beginning of the new Federal fiscal year based on the most current market basket projection available at that time. The final recommendation will incorporate our analysis of the latest estimates of all relevant factors, including recommendations by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC).

Section 1886(d)(4)(C)(iv) of the Act also requires that I include in my report recommendations with respect to adjustments to the diagnosis-related group (DRG) weighting factors. At this time I do not anticipate recommending any across-the-board adjustment to the DRG weighting factors for FY 2003.

I am pleased to provide this recommendation to you. I am also sending a copy of this letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tommy G. Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tommy G. Thompson



THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201

MAR 22 2002

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am pleased to submit to Congress this letter containing my recommendation for the applicable percentage increase in Medicare's hospital inpatient prospective payment system (IPPS) rates for Federal fiscal year (FY) 2003. Also included are my recommendations for updates to the payment limits for hospitals and hospital units excluded from IPPS, and for adjustments to the diagnosis-related group (DRG) weighting factors.

Section 1886(e)(3) of the Social Security Act (the Act) directs the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to report to the Congress his initial estimate of his recommendation (required by section 1886(e)(4) of the Act) of an appropriate payment update for inpatient hospital services for the upcoming FY. Consistent with current law, the President's FY 2003 budget includes an update to the standardized amounts (the base dollar amounts for IPPS payments) equal to the market basket (an index of inflation in goods and services used by hospitals) minus 0.55 percentage points. The President's FY 2003 budget estimated the IPPS market basket rate of increase for FY 2003 to be 2.8 percent. Based on this estimate, I am recommending an update to the standardized amounts for hospitals in both large urban and other areas of 2.25 percent. Payments to hospitals under IPPS are projected to increase by \$2.1 billion, from \$86.0 billion in FY 2002 to \$88.1 billion in FY 2003.

Although payments for most hospitals under the IPPS are made on the basis of the standardized amounts, some categories of hospitals are paid the higher of a hospital-specific rate based on their costs in a base year (the higher of either 1982, 1987, or 1996) or the IPPS rate based on the standardized amount. Consistent with current law and the President's FY 2003 budget, I am recommending an update equal to 2.25 percent to the hospital-specific rate for both sole community hospitals and Medicare-dependent, small rural hospitals.

I am also submitting, consistent with Section 1886(e)(3) of the Act, my recommendation for updating payments for hospitals and distinct-part hospital units that are excluded from IPPS.

The excluded hospital types are: psychiatric hospitals; rehabilitation hospitals; children's hospitals; long-term care hospitals; and cancer hospitals. The types of excluded distinct-part hospital units are psychiatric and rehabilitation. Hospitals and units excluded from the IPPS have in the past been paid based on their reasonable costs subject to limits as established by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA).

Page 2 — The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert

Psychiatric hospitals and units, and children's' and cancer hospitals continue to be paid based on their reasonable costs subject to TEFRA limits. For these hospitals, the President's FY 2003 budget incorporates an increase to the TEFRA limit using 2.8 percent for the excluded hospital market basket increase.

Inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRF) are paid under the IRF PPS for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2002. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, the IRF prospective payment is based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal IRF PPS amount, updated annually.

Effective for cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, we are proposing that long-term care hospitals will be paid under a PPS based on a 5-year transition period (hospitals may elect to receive full PPS rather than transition payments.) For purposes of the update factor, the portion of the proposed PPS transition blend payment based on reasonable costs for inpatient operating services would be determined by updating the long term care hospital's TEFRA limit by 2.8 percent.

My recommendation for the updates is based on cost projections used in the President's FY 2003 budget. A final recommendation on the appropriate percentage increases for FY 2003 will be made nearer the beginning of the new Federal fiscal year based on the most current market basket projection available at that time. The final recommendation will incorporate our analysis of the latest estimates of all relevant factors, including recommendations by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC).

Section 1886(d)(4)(C)(iv) of the Act also requires that I include in my report recommendations with respect to adjustments to the diagnosis-related group (DRG) weighting factors. At this time I do not anticipate recommending any across-the-board adjustment to the DRG weighting factors for FY 2003.

I am pleased to provide this recommendation to you. I am also sending a copy of this letter to the President of the Senate.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tommy G. Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tommy G. Thompson

ATTACHMENT

Discussion of Two Market Basket Estimates

Section 1886(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the Act defines the “market basket percentage increase” as “the percentage, estimated by the Secretary” by which the cost of goods and services comprising inpatient hospital services “will exceed the cost of such goods and services for the preceding period. The estimate is based on an index of appropriately weighted indicators of changes in wages and prices which are representative of the mix of goods and services included in such inpatient hospital services.”

With the implementation of the Inpatient Prospective Payment System in Fiscal Year 1984, the Office of the Actuary (OACT) developed the market basket methodology and determined the official input price index from which the update percentage is calculated. OACT also forecasts the percentage increases for all of the Medicare payment categories that are updated by health-specific market baskets and other price indexes, including skilled nursing facility PPS, home health care PPS, and noninpatient hospital PPSs (capital, outpatient, rehabilitation facility, and hospice). To help ensure consistency among the many economic and price factors comprising the market baskets and other indexes, OACT contracts with a well-known and widely-respected independent forecasting firm, Global Insights/*DRI-WEFA*, to assist in making their forecasts.

In addition, each year for the President’s Budget, the Office of Management and Budget forecasts the market basket by applying future assumptions of economy-wide wage and Consumer Price Index growth to the historical relationship between these factors and the market basket. This forecast does not attempt to capture the interrelationships among market basket factors that should be reflected in the actual update. OACT is in a stronger position to forecast the percentage increase in the market basket to be used in the actual update because they possess the detailed knowledge of the factors that affect the market basket, having developed these indexes for nearly two decades.

BILLING CODE 4120-01-C

Appendix C: Recommendation of Update Factors for Operating Cost Rates of Payment for Inpatient Hospital Services

I. Background

Section 1886(e)(4) of the Act requires that the Secretary, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), recommend update factors for inpatient hospital services for each fiscal year that take into account the amounts necessary for the efficient and effective delivery of medically appropriate and necessary care of high quality. Under section 1886(e)(5) of the Act, we are required to publish the update factors recommended under section 1886(e)(4) of the Act. Accordingly, this Appendix provides the recommendations of appropriate update factors and the analysis underlying our

recommendations. We also respond to MedPAC’s recommendations concerning the update factors.

Section 1886(b)(3)(B)(i)(XVIII) of the Act, as amended by Section 301 Public Law 106-554, sets the FY 2003 percentage increase in the operating cost standardized amounts equal to the rate of increase in the hospital market basket minus 0.55 percent for prospective payment hospitals in all areas. Section 1886(b)(3)(B)(iv) of the Act sets the FY 2003 percentage increase in the hospital-specific rates applicable to SCHs and MDHs equal to the rate set forth in section 1886(b)(3)(B)(i) of the Act, that is, the same update factor as all other hospitals subject to the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system, or the rate of increase in the market basket minus 0.55 percentage points. Under section 1886(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the Act, the FY 2003 percentage increase in the rate-of-increase limits for hospitals and hospital units excluded

from the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system is the market basket percentage increase.

In accordance with section 1886(d)(3)(A) of the Act, we are proposing to update the standardized amounts, the hospital-specific rates, and the rate-of-increase limits for hospitals and hospital units excluded from the prospective payment system as provided in section 1886(b)(3)(B) of the Act. Based on the proposed revised and rebased first quarter 2002 forecast of the FY 2003 market basket increase of 3.3 percent for hospitals subject to the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system, the proposed update to the standardized amounts is 2.75 percent (that is, the market basket rate of increase minus 0.55 percent percentage points) for hospitals in both large urban and other areas. The proposed update to the hospital-specific rate applicable to SCHs and MDHs is also 2.75 percent.

Consistent with section 1886(e)(3) of the Act, we are proposing a recommendation for updating payments for hospitals and distinct-part hospital units that are excluded from the hospital inpatient prospective payment system. Facilities excluded from the hospital inpatient prospective payment system include psychiatric hospitals and units, rehabilitation hospitals and units, long-term care hospitals, cancer hospitals, and children's hospitals.

In the past, hospitals and hospital units excluded from the hospital inpatient prospective payment system have been paid based on their reasonable costs subject to limits as established by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA). Hospitals that continue to be paid based on their reasonable costs are subject to TEFRA limits for FY 2003. For these hospitals, the proposed update is the percentage increase in the excluded hospital market basket (currently estimated at 3.4 percent).

Inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs) are paid under the IRF prospective payment system for cost reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2002. For cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003, the Federal prospective payment for IRFs is based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal IRF prospective payment amount, updated annually (see the August 7, 2001 final rule (66 FR 41316)).

Effective for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003, we are proposing that long-term care hospitals would be paid under a prospective payment system under which long-term care hospitals receive payment based on a 5-year transition period (see the March 22, 2002 proposed rule (67 FR 13416)). We are also proposing that long-term care hospitals may elect to be paid on 100 percent of the Federal prospective rate at the beginning of any of its cost reporting periods during the 5-year transition period. For purposes of the update factor, the portion of the proposed prospective payment system transition blend payment based on reasonable costs for inpatient operating services would be determined by updating the long-term care hospital's TEFRA limit by the current estimate of the excluded hospital market basket (or 3.4 percent).

In its March 1, 2002 Report to the Congress, MedPAC recommended that the base payment rates for Medicare covered services under the hospital inpatient prospective payment system be increased by the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percent for hospitals located in large urban areas, and by the full market basket

percentage increase for hospitals located in all other areas (page 66). MedPAC did not make a separate recommendation for the hospital-specific rate applicable to SCHs and MDHs. MedPAC also presented a new approach for updating the hospital inpatient prospective system payment rates, which assesses the adequacy of current payments and accounts for the increase in efficient providers' costs in the upcoming year. While this approach is not fundamentally different from what MedPAC has done in the past, it no longer produces a detailed update framework for direct comparison with the Secretary's framework. We discuss MedPAC's recommendations concerning the update factors and our responses to these recommendations in section III. of this Appendix C. Below we describe the basis of our FY 2003 update recommendation (as shown in Table 1).

II. Secretary's Recommendations

Under section 1886(e)(4) of the Act, we are recommending that an appropriate update factor for the standardized amounts is the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percentage points for hospitals located in large urban and other areas. We are also recommending an update factor of the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percentage points for the hospital-specific rate for SCHs and MDHs. We believe these recommended update factors for FY 2003 would ensure that Medicare acts as a prudent purchaser and provide incentives to hospitals for increased efficiency, thereby contributing to the solvency of the Medicare Part A Trust Fund.

Rehabilitation hospitals and units are now paid under the IRF prospective payment system. For cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2002, the IRF prospective payment is based on 100 percent of the adjusted Federal IRF prospective payment system amount updated annually.

Effective for cost reporting periods beginning during FY 2003, we have proposed that long-term care hospitals be paid under a prospective payment system (67 FR 13416). For purposes of the update factor, the portion of the proposed prospective payment system transition blend payment based on reasonable costs for inpatient operating services for FY 2003 would be determined by updating the TEFRA target amount for long-term care hospitals by the most recent available estimate of the increase in the excluded hospital operating market basket (or 3.4 percent).

We recommend that the remaining excluded hospitals and units (which are excluded from the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system and will continue to be paid on a reasonable cost basis in FY 2003) receive an update of 3.4 percent. The update for excluded hospitals and hospital units is equal to the most recent available estimate of the increase in the excluded hospital operating market basket. Based on the proposed revised and rebased first quarter 2002 forecast for FY 2003, the proposed market basket rate of increase for excluded hospitals and hospital units is 3.4 percent.

As required by section 1886(e)(4) of the Act, we have taken into consideration the recommendations of MedPAC in setting these recommended update factors. Our responses to the MedPAC recommendations concerning the update factors are discussed below. Consistent with current law, we are proposing an update recommendation of the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percentage points for the hospital inpatient prospective payment system operating cost standardized amounts for FY 2003. This proposed update recommendation is supported by the following analyses that measure changes in hospital productivity, scientific and technological advances, practice pattern changes, changes in case-mix, the effect of reclassification on recalibration, and forecast error correction.

A. Productivity

Service level labor productivity is defined as the ratio of total service output to full-time equivalent employees (FTEs). While we recognize that productivity is a function of many variables (for example, labor, nonlabor material, and capital inputs), we use the portion of productivity attributed to direct labor since this update framework applies to operating payment. To recognize that we are apportioning the short-run output changes to the labor input and not considering the nonlabor inputs, we weight our productivity measure by the share of direct labor services in the market basket to determine the expected effect on cost per case.

Our recommendation for the service productivity component is based on historical trends in productivity and total output for both the hospital industry and the general economy, and projected levels of future hospital service output. MedPAC's predecessor, the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission (ProPAC), estimated cumulative service productivity growth to be 4.9 percent from 1985 through

1989 or 1.2 percent annually. At the same time, ProPAC estimated total output growth at 3.4 percent annually, implying a ratio of service productivity growth to output growth of 0.35.

Absent a productivity measure specific to Medicare patients, we examined productivity (output per hour) and output (gross domestic product) for the economy. Depending on the exact time period, annual changes in productivity range from 0.3 to 0.35 percent of the change in output (that is, a 1.0 percent increase in output would be correlated with a 0.3 to 0.35 percent change in output per hour).

Under our framework, the recommended update is based in part on expected productivity—that is, projected service output during the year, multiplied by the historical ratio of service productivity to total service output, multiplied by the share of direct labor in total operating inputs, as calculated in the hospital market basket. This method estimates an expected productivity improvement in the same proportion to expected total service growth that has occurred in the past and assumes that, at a minimum, growth in FTEs changes proportionally to the growth in total service output. Thus, the recommendation allows for unit productivity to be smaller than the historical averages in years that output growth is relatively low and larger in years that output growth is higher than the historical averages. Based on the above estimates from both the hospital industry and the economy, we have chosen to employ the range of ratios of productivity change to output change of 0.30 to 0.35.

The expected change in total hospital service output is the product of projected growth in total admissions (adjusted for outpatient usage), projected real case-mix growth, expected quality-enhancing intensity growth, and net of expected decline in intensity due to reduction of cost-ineffective practice. Case-mix growth and intensity numbers for Medicare are used as proxies for those of the total hospital, since case-mix increases (used in the intensity measure as well) are unavailable for non-Medicare patients. Thus, expected FY 2003 hospital output growth is simply the sum of the expected change in intensity (1.0 percent), projected admissions change (1.9 percent), and projected real case-mix growth (1.0 percent), or 3.9 percent. The share of direct labor services in the market basket (consisting of wages, salaries, and employee benefits) is 61.7 percent (based on the proposed revised and rebased hospital market basket

discussed in section IV. of the preamble of this proposed rule).

Multiplying the expected change in total hospital service output (3.9 percent) by the ratio of historical service productivity change to total service growth of 0.30 to 0.35 and by the direct labor share percentage 61.6, provides our productivity standard of 0.9 to 0.7 percent. Because productivity gains hold down the rate of increase in hospitals' costs, this factor is applied as a negative offset to the market basket increase.

B. Intensity

We base our intensity standard on the combined effect of three separate factors: changes in the use of quality enhancing services, changes in the use of services due to shifts in within-DRG severity, and changes in the use of services due to reductions of cost-ineffective practices. For FY 2003, we recommend an adjustment of 1.0 percent. The basis of this recommendation is discussed below.

Following methods developed by CMS' Office of the Actuary for deriving hospital output estimates from total hospital charges, we have developed Medicare-specific intensity measures based on a 5-year average using FYs 1997 through 2001 MedPAR billing data. Case-mix constant intensity is calculated as the change in total Medicare charges per discharge adjusted for changes in the average charge per unit of service as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for hospital and related services and changes in real case-mix.¹ The 5-year average percentage change in charge per discharge was 6.3 percent, the 5-year average annual change in the CPI for hospital and related services was 4.5 percent, and the 5-year average annual change in case-mix was -0.3 percent. Dividing the change in charge per discharge by the product of the real case-mix index change and the CPI for hospital and related services yields a 5-year average annual change in intensity of 2.0 percent. To account for the proportions of the overall annual intensity increases due to ineffective practice patterns and to the combination of quality-enhancing new technologies and within-DRG complexity, we assume that one-half of the annual increase is due to each of these factors. Our

¹ In the past, we have considered the upper bound of real case mix to be from 1.0 to 1.4 percent annually, with any increase beyond this bound assumed to be due to changes in coding practices. Because none of the annual changes in observed case mix change during the 5-year period from FY 1997 through FY 2001 exceeded 1.0 percent, it is all assumed to be real case mix change.

recommended adjustment excludes the estimated amount of the overall intensity increase due to ineffective practice patterns. Thus, we are recommending an intensity adjustment for FY 2003 of 1.0 percent.

C. Change in Case-Mix

Our analysis takes into account projected changes in case-mix, adjusted for changes attributable to improved coding practices. For our FY 2003 update recommendation, we are projecting a 1.0 percent increase in the case-mix index. We define real case-mix change as actual changes in the mix (and resource requirements) of Medicare patients as opposed to changes in coding behavior that result in assignment of cases to higher weighted DRGs, but do not reflect greater resource requirements. We do not believe changes in coding behavior will impact the overall case-mix in FY 2003. As such, for FY 2003, we estimate that real case-mix is equal to projected change in case-mix. Thus, we are recommending a 0.0 percent adjustment for case-mix.

D. Effect of FY 2001 DRG Reclassification and Recalibration

We estimate that DRG reclassification and recalibration for FY 2001 resulted in a 0.3 percent change in the case-mix index when compared with the case-mix index that would have resulted if we had not made the reclassification and recalibration changes to the GROUPER. Therefore, we are recommending a -0.3 percent adjustment for the effect of FY 2001 DRG reclassification and recalibration.

E. Forecast Error Correction

We make a forecast error correction if the actual market basket changes differ from the forecasted market basket by 0.25 percentage points or more. There is a 2-year lag between the forecast and the measurement of forecast error. The estimated market basket percentage increase used to update the FY 2001 payment rates was 3.4 percent. Our most recent data indicates the actual FY 2001 increase was 4.1 percent. The resulting forecast error in the FY 2001 market basket rate of increase is 0.7 percentage points. This forecast error is a result of prices for wages, benefits, and utilities increasing more rapidly than expected. The effects of a labor shortage within the health services industry caused hospitals to increase wages greater than initially projected. Increases in actual benefits were faster than projected due to a greater than expected increase in health insurance premiums. Finally, market conditions for natural gas and electricity caused

prices for those products to increase more rapidly than expected.

The following is a summary of the update range supported by our analyses:

HHS's FY 2003 UPDATE RECOMMENDATION

Market basket	MB
Policy Adjustment Factors:	
Productivity	-0.9 to -0.7
Intensity	1.0
Subtotal	0.1 to 0.3
Case-Mix Adjustment Factors:	
Projected Case-Mix Change	1.0
Real Across DRG Change	-1.0
Subtotal	0.0
Effect of FY 2001 DRG Reclassification and Recalibration	-0.3
Forecast Error Correction	0.7
Total Recommendation Update	MB + 0.5 to MB + 0.7

While the above analysis would suggest an update between market basket plus 0.5 percentage points and the market basket plus 0.7 percentage points, the Secretary is recommending, consistent with current law, an update of the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percentage points (or 2.75 percent) for hospitals in all areas.

We believe that a 2.75 percent update factor for FY 2003 will appropriately reflect current trends in health care delivery, including the recent decreases in the use of hospital inpatient services and the corresponding increase in the use of hospital outpatient and postacute care services. Also, consistent with current law, we are recommending that the hospital-specific rates applicable to SCHs and MDHs be increased by the same update, 2.75 percentage points.

Since the inception of the acute care hospital inpatient prospective payment system, hospitals have received a full market basket update only once, in FY 2001. The stabilization of overall hospital margins in recent years suggests that the restrictions on market basket increases have not resulted in inadequate hospital payments. Modest limits below full market basket updates could be linked to continued careful review of Medicare hospital margin data to ensure that margins do not worsen among certain hospital types with negative and declining Medicare margins.

III. MedPAC Recommendations for Assessing Payment Adequacy and Updating Payments in Traditional Medicare

In its FY 2002 Report to Congress, MedPAC developed a new approach for updating fee-for-service payments that breaks the process into two basic parts: assessing the adequacy of current payments; and accounting for the increase in efficient providers' costs in the coming year. MedPAC points out

this new approach "is not fundamentally different from what the Commission has done in the past, but we expect formalizing the two parts of our process will lead to greater emphasis on the broad question of whether the amount of money in the system currently is right and less emphasis on the role of specific cost-influencing factors" (page 39).

In assessing payment adequacy, MedPAC reviews the relationship between costs and payments (conventionally expressed as a margin). On the payment side, MedPAC applied the annual payment updates specified in law through FY 2002 and then modeled the effects of other policy changes that have affected the level of payments. On the cost side, MedPAC estimated the increases in costs per unit of output over the same period using the change in cost per adjusted admission in the American Hospital Association's annual survey of hospitals for FY 2000, and the CMS projected increase in the FYs 2001 and 2002 market baskets (page 58). MedPAC estimated that the inpatient Medicare margin would be 10.8 percent in FY 2002 (with FY 2003 payment rules). This amount is down slightly from MedPAC's estimate of 11.9 percent in FY 1999. In addition to the inpatient Medicare margin, MedPAC measured the overall Medicare margin, incorporating almost all Medicare-related payments and costs to hospitals. This overall Medicare margin was estimated to be 3.8 percent. The report notes that "the Commission does not plan to specify a 'standard margin,' although we will take the need for a small positive margin into account as we assess the adequacy of various fee-for-service payments" (page 43).

In addition to considering the relationship between estimated payments and costs, MedPAC also considered the following three factors to

assess whether current payments are adequate (page 43):

- Changes in access to or quality of care;
- Changes in the volume of services or number of providers; and
- Changes in providers access to capital.

MedPAC found no evidence that the hospital cost base is inappropriate and concluded that Medicare payment is adequate and no payment adequacy adjustment is needed for FY 2003.

MedPAC recommends gradually eliminating the differential in the standardized amounts for hospitals in large urban and other areas. MedPAC's data on margins and its analysis of costs suggest that a different standardized amount (the large urban standardized amount is 1.6 percent higher than the amount for other areas) is unwarranted. MedPAC estimates the FY 2002 Medicare inpatient margins will range from 5 percent for rural hospitals to 14 percent for hospitals in large urban areas. Because much of this difference is due to the greater proportion of IME and DSH payments going to hospitals in large urban areas, MedPAC removed DSH payments and the portion of the IME payment above the measured cost relationship between IME and hospitals' costs, and found that hospitals in large urban areas still have Medicare margins that are about 4 percentage points higher than other urban and rural hospitals (page 64).

MedPAC believes that "(e)liminating the differential would improve payment equity across geographic areas and also help to simplify the payment system" (page 63). For example, eliminating the standardized amount differential would also eliminate the need for hospitals to reclassify for a higher standardized amount through the MGCRB. Therefore, MedPAC recommends holding the update for hospitals in large urban areas to the legislated level of the market

basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percent for FY 2003, while updating the other areas standardized amount by the full market basket percentage increase.

MedPAC accounts for providers' cost changes in the coming payment year primarily through a forecast of input price inflation, which estimates how much providers' costs would rise in the coming year if the quality and mix of inputs they use to furnish care and the types of patients they treat remain constant. MedPAC relies on CMS' market basket estimate to forecast input price inflation, but considers other factors that may affect providers' costs. These other factors are scientific and technological advances, changes in DRG case-mix complexity, site-of-service substitution, and other one-time factors.

In the past, MedPAC recommended specific adjustments to its update recommendation for each of these factors. In its March 2002 Report to Congress, MedPAC did not provide specific estimates for these factors, but stated "(a)fter considering all factors that might potentially affect the rate of growth in efficient providers' costs, we conclude that the appropriate adjustment for cost growth in fiscal year 2003 is the forecasted increase in the market basket, or 2.9 percent" (page 66). This market basket forecast was based on the December 2001 market basket

estimated by CMS' Office of the Actuary, and does not reflect the proposed revisions and rebasing discussed in section IV. of the preamble of this proposed rule.

MedPAC's second recommendation related to updating payments under the hospital inpatient prospective payment system is that the Congress should increase the base rate for inpatient services covered by Medicare's prospective payment system in FY 2003 by the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percent for hospitals in large urban areas and by the market basket percentage increase for hospitals in all other areas. MedPAC focused on the operating update only because it applies to 92 percent of hospitals' Medicare costs. The report noted that, in its March 2000 report to Congress, MedPAC recommended combining the operating and capital payment systems into a single prospective payment system.

Response: As described above, we continue to use our detailed update framework to develop our recommended update for FY 2003. However, we believe MedPAC's new approach will be useful to focusing the policy discussion more directly on the overall adequacy of hospital payments. We look forward to continuing to work with MedPAC to refine and utilize both

methodologies in an effort to produce analyses that provide the most helpful information for setting the annual updates.

We agree with MedPAC's recommendation that the current law update for FY 2003 of the market basket percentage increase minus 0.55 percentage points is appropriate for the operating system update. However, we are not recommending differential updates to gradually eliminate the higher standardized amount for hospitals in large urban areas, as recommended by MedPAC. We believe the stabilization of overall hospital margins in recent years suggests that modest limits below full market basket updates provide adequate payments. We agree, however, that certain hospital types that show clear evidence of negative and declining Medicare margins should be monitored closely.

Because the operating and capital prospective payment systems remain separate, CMS continues to use separate updates for operating and capital payments. The proposed update to the capital payment rate is discussed in section III. of the Addendum of this proposed rule.

[FR Doc. 02-11290 Filed 5-8-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120-01-P