



[We redact certain identifying information and certain potentially privileged, confidential, or proprietary information associated with the individual or entity, unless otherwise approved by the requestor.]

Issued: June 9, 2005

Posted: June 16, 2005

[name and address redacted]

Re: OIG Advisory Opinion No. 05-10

Dear [name redacted]:

We are writing in response to your request for an advisory opinion regarding a proposal by a municipal corporation that provides emergency medical services (“EMS”) through its fire department to treat revenue received from certain local taxes as payment of otherwise applicable cost-sharing amounts due from residents and nonresident taxpayers who receive EMS within the municipality (the “Proposed Arrangement”). Specifically, you have inquired whether the Proposed Arrangement would constitute grounds for the imposition of sanctions under the exclusion authority at section 1128(b)(7) of the Social Security Act (the “Act”) or the civil monetary penalty provision at section 1128A(a)(7) of the Act, as those sections relate to the commission of acts described in section 1128B(b) of the Act, or under the civil monetary penalties provision for illegal remuneration to beneficiaries, section 1128A(a)(5) of the Act.

You have certified that all of the information provided in your request, including all supplementary letters, is true and correct and constitutes a complete description of the relevant facts and agreements among the parties.

In issuing this opinion, we have relied solely on the facts and information presented to us. We have not undertaken an independent investigation of such information. This opinion is limited to the facts presented. If material facts have not been disclosed or have been misrepresented, this opinion is without force and effect.

Based on the facts certified in your request for an advisory opinion and supplemental submissions, we conclude that the Proposed Arrangement would not generate prohibited remuneration under the anti-kickback statute. Accordingly, the Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) would not impose administrative sanctions on the [name redacted] under sections 1128(b)(7) or 1128A(a)(7) of the Act (as those sections relate to the commission of acts described in section 1128B(b) of the Act) in connection with the Proposed Arrangement. In addition, the OIG would not impose administrative sanctions on the [name redacted] under section 1128A(a)(5) of the Act in connection with the Proposed Arrangement. This opinion is limited to the Proposed Arrangement and, therefore, we express no opinion about any ancillary agreements or arrangements disclosed or referenced in your request letter or supplemental submissions.

This opinion may not be relied on by any persons other than the [name redacted], the requestor of this opinion, and is further qualified as set out in Part IV below and in 42 C.F.R. Part 1008.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The [name redacted] (the “City”) is a municipal corporation that provides EMS through its fire department. The City is the exclusive provider of EMS within City boundaries and does not subcontract these services. The City provides emergency medical treatment and transport services 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The City does not provide routine transportation services.

Currently, the City funds EMS primarily through local tax revenues, including, for example, revenue from real estate, personal property, and hotel room taxes. The City is a major tourist destination and tourism is the City’s dominant industry and the primary reason for nonresidents’ presence in the City. Taxes paid by tourists generate a considerable share of the City’s budget and tourists use a significant portion of the City’s EMS services. The City proposes to begin billing residents and nonresidents (including tourists) who pay City taxes (“City Taxpayers”), or their insurers, including Federal health care programs, for the City’s EMS services only to the extent of their insurance coverage (*i.e.*, no out-of-pocket costs). The City proposes to treat the revenues received from local taxes as payment of any otherwise applicable cost-sharing amounts due from residents and City Taxpayers for EMS services provided within City limits (*i.e.*, “insurance only” billing).¹ For purposes of the

¹The City has disclosed that it may contract with an independent third party billing company to bill for EMS services on the City’s behalf. No opinion has been sought, and we express no opinion, regarding any such third party billing arrangement.

Proposed Arrangement, the City would effectively treat City Taxpayers the same as residents.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Law

The anti-kickback statute makes it a criminal offense knowingly and willfully to offer, pay, solicit, or receive any remuneration to induce or reward referrals of items or services reimbursable by a Federal health care program. See section 1128B(b) of the Act. Where remuneration is paid purposefully to induce or reward referrals of items or services payable by a Federal health care program, the anti-kickback statute is violated. By its terms, the statute ascribes criminal liability to parties on both sides of an impermissible “kickback” transaction. For purposes of the anti-kickback statute, “remuneration” includes the transfer of anything of value, directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, in cash or in kind.

The statute has been interpreted to cover any arrangement where one purpose of the remuneration was to obtain money for the referral of services or to induce further referrals. United States v. Kats, 871 F.2d 105 (9th Cir. 1989); United States v. Greber, 760 F.2d 68 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 988 (1985). Violation of the statute constitutes a felony punishable by a maximum fine of \$25,000, imprisonment up to five years, or both. Conviction will also lead to automatic exclusion from Federal health care programs, including Medicare and Medicaid. Where a party commits an act described in section 1128B(b) of the Act, the OIG may initiate administrative proceedings to impose civil monetary penalties on such party under section 1128A(a)(7) of the Act. The OIG may also initiate administrative proceedings to exclude such party from the Federal health care programs under section 1128(b)(7) of the Act.

B. Analysis

The “insurance only” billing under the Proposed Arrangement may implicate the anti-kickback statute to the extent that it constitutes a limited waiver of Medicare or other Federal health care program cost-sharing amounts. Our concern about potentially abusive waivers of Medicare cost-sharing amounts under the anti-kickback statute is longstanding. For example, we have previously stated that providers who routinely waive Medicare cost-sharing amounts for reasons unrelated to individualized, good faith assessments of financial hardship may be held liable under the anti-kickback statute. See, e.g., Special Fraud Alert, 59 Fed. Reg. 65374 (Dec. 19, 1994). Such waivers may constitute prohibited remuneration to induce referrals under the anti-kickback statute, as well as a violation of the civil monetary penalty prohibition on inducements to beneficiaries, section 1128A(a)(5) of the Act.

However, there is a special rule for providers and suppliers that are owned and operated by a state or a political subdivision of a state, such as a municipality or fire department. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (“CMS”) Medicare Benefit Policy Manual (“BPM”) Chap. 16, section 50.3 provides that:

a [state or local government] facility which reduces or waives its charges for patients unable to pay, or charges patients only to the extent of their Medicare and other health insurance coverage, is not viewed as furnishing free services and may therefore receive program payment.

Pub. 100-2 BPM Chap. 16, section 50.3 at:

http://www.cms.hhs.gov/manuals/102_policy/bp102index.asp (formerly Medicare Carrier Manual section 2309.4 and Medicare Intermediary Manual section 3153.3A).

Notwithstanding the use of the term “facility,” CMS has confirmed that this provision would apply to a state or municipal ambulance company that is a Medicare Part B supplier. CMS has also confirmed that this provision would apply to waivers of cost-sharing amounts for taxpaying nonresidents who need EMS within the City limits.

Accordingly, since Medicare would not require the City (a municipality) to collect cost-sharing amounts from residents, we would not impose sanctions under the anti-kickback statute where the cost-sharing waiver is implemented by the City categorically for *bona fide* residents of the City (including City Taxpayers receiving EMS services within City limits).² Nothing in this advisory opinion would apply to waivers of cost-sharing amounts based on criteria other than residency, as defined by the municipality.

We note that this provision of the CMS manual applies only to situations in which the governmental unit is the ambulance supplier; it does not apply to contracts with outside ambulance suppliers. For example, where a municipality contracts with an outside ambulance supplier for the provision of services to residents of its service area, the municipality cannot require the ambulance supplier to waive out-of-pocket cost-sharing amounts unless the municipality pays the cost-sharing amounts owed or otherwise makes provisions for the payment of such cost-sharing amounts. See, e.g., OIG Advisory Opinion No. 01-12 (July 20, 2001). There is an important difference between a municipally-owned ambulance company voluntarily waiving cost-sharing amounts for its own residents and a municipality requiring a private company to bill “insurance only” as a condition of getting the municipality’s EMS business, including Medicare business. Lump sum or periodic payments by the municipality, on behalf of residents or others, may be permitted if the payments are reasonably calculated to cover the expected uncollected cost-sharing amounts.

²We note that for the same reasons we would not impose sanctions under section 1128A(a)(5) of the Act.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the facts certified in your request for an advisory opinion and supplemental submissions, we conclude that the Proposed Arrangement would not generate prohibited remuneration under the anti-kickback statute. Accordingly, the OIG would not impose administrative sanctions on the [name redacted] under sections 1128(b)(7) or 1128A(a)(7) of the Act (as those sections relate to the commission of acts described in section 1128B(b) of the Act) in connection with the Proposed Arrangement. In addition, the OIG would not impose administrative sanctions on the [name redacted] under section 1128A(a)(5) of the Act in connection with the Proposed Arrangement. This opinion is limited to the Proposed Arrangement and, therefore, we express no opinion about any ancillary agreements or arrangements disclosed or referenced in your request letter or supplemental submissions.

IV. LIMITATIONS

The limitations applicable to this opinion include the following:

- This advisory opinion is issued only to the [name redacted], the requestor of this opinion. This advisory opinion has no application to, and cannot be relied upon by, any other individual or entity.
- This advisory opinion may not be introduced into evidence in any matter involving an entity or individual that is not a requestor of this opinion.
- This advisory opinion is applicable only to the statutory provisions specifically noted above. No opinion is expressed or implied herein with respect to the application of any other Federal, state, or local statute, rule, regulation, ordinance, or other law that may be applicable to the Proposed Arrangement, including, without limitation, the physician self-referral law, section 1877 of the Act.
- This advisory opinion will not bind or obligate any agency other than the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- This advisory opinion is limited in scope to the specific arrangement described in this letter and has no applicability to other arrangements, even those which appear similar in nature or scope.

- No opinion is expressed herein regarding the liability of any party under the False Claims Act or other legal authorities for any improper billing, claims submission, cost reporting, or related conduct.

This opinion is also subject to any additional limitations set forth at 42 C.F.R. Part 1008.

The OIG will not proceed against the City with respect to any action that is part of the Proposed Arrangement taken in good faith reliance upon this advisory opinion, as long as all of the material facts have been fully, completely, and accurately presented, and the Proposed Arrangement in practice comports with the information provided. The OIG reserves the right to reconsider the questions and issues raised in this advisory opinion and, where the public interest requires, to rescind, modify, or terminate this opinion. In the event that this advisory opinion is modified or terminated, the OIG will not proceed against the City with respect to any action taken in good faith reliance upon this advisory opinion, where all of the relevant facts were fully, completely, and accurately presented and where such action was promptly discontinued upon notification of the modification or termination of this advisory opinion. An advisory opinion may be rescinded only if the relevant and material facts have not been fully, completely, and accurately disclosed to the OIG.

Sincerely,

/s/

Lewis Morris
Chief Counsel to the Inspector General