

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Health Care Financing Administration**

**42 CFR Part 412**

[HCFA-1049-F]

RIN 0938-AJ26

**Medicare Program; Changes to the FY 1999 Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Wage Index and Standardized Amounts Resulting From Approved Requests for Wage Data Revisions**

**AGENCY:** Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), HHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule implements revised wage index values, geographic adjustment factors, operating standardized amounts, and capital Federal rates for hospitals subject to the inpatient prospective payment system. These changes result from requests made by hospitals in response to a final rule with comment period published in the **Federal Register** on November 19, 1998. These revisions will be implemented on a prospective basis.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* The provisions of this final rule are effective March 1, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Phillips, (410) 786-4531.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Availability of Copies and Electronic Access**

*Copies:* To order copies of the **Federal Register** containing this document, send your request to: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954. Specify the date of the issue requested and enclose a check or money order payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or enclose your Visa or Master Card number and expiration date. Credit card orders can also be placed by calling the order desk at (202) 512-1800 or by faxing to (202) 512-2250. The cost for each copy is \$8. As an alternative, you can view and photocopy the **Federal Register** document at most libraries designated as Federal Depository Libraries and at many other public and academic libraries throughout the country that receive the **Federal Register**.

This **Federal Register** document is also available from the **Federal Register** online database through GPO Access, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office. Free public access is available on a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via

asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is [http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara\\_docs/](http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara_docs/), by using local WAIS client software, or by telnet to [swais.access.gpo.gov](mailto:swais.access.gpo.gov), then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512-1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about GPO Access, contact the GPO Access User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to [help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov](mailto:help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov); by faxing to (202) 512-1262; or by calling (202) 512-1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. eastern standard time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays.

**I. Background**

Section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act (the Act) requires that, as part of the methodology for determining prospective payments to hospitals for inpatient operating costs, the Secretary must adjust standardized amounts "for area differences in hospital wage levels by a factor (established by the Secretary) reflecting the relative hospital wage level in the geographic area of the hospital compared to the national average hospital wage level." In addition, section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Act requires that the hospital wage index be updated annually and that updates or adjustments to the hospital wage index be budget neutral.

In the July 31, 1998 **Federal Register** (63 FR 40966), we published hospital inpatient prospective payment rates and policies for Federal fiscal year (FY) 1999, including the hospital wage index. The FY 1999 wage index is based on data from Medicare cost reports for cost reporting periods beginning in FY 1995. These cost report data are submitted by hospitals and certified by hospitals. Before the calculation of the FY 1999 hospital wage index was published on July 31, 1998, we provided opportunities to hospitals to request wage data revisions and to verify wage data in HCFA's files. We established deadlines for requesting wage data revisions.

Notwithstanding these deadlines, numerous hospitals contacted us to request revisions to the data reflected in the FY 1999 hospital wage index. Many of these requests related to issues arising from hospitals' failure to properly report costs in the first place and failure to request revisions, or from hospitals' failure to verify the final wage data. However, it came to our attention that certain aspects of the development of

the FY 1999 wage index may have led to some confusion among the hospital community.

In light of the totality of the circumstances, in the November 19, 1998 **Federal Register** (63 FR 64191), we provided hospitals with an additional opportunity to request limited types of revisions to the wage data used to calculate the FY 1999 hospital wage index.

**II. Provisions of the November 19, 1998 Final Rule With Comment Period**

*A. Criteria for Requesting Revisions and Explanation of the Types of Revisions*

We provided a window of opportunity, from November 19, 1998 until December 3, 1998, for hospitals to request revisions to their FY 1995 wage data, if they met one of the following criteria:

- The hospital's data on the May 1998 public use file is recorded as zero on Line 28 of Worksheet S-3, Part III (wage-related costs).
- The hospital's data on the May 1998 public use file is recorded as zero in either column 3 or 4 (but not both), with nonzero data in the other column, for Lines 2, 4, 6, or 33 of Worksheet S-3, Part III.
- The hospital properly requested a wage data revision by March 9, 1998, the fiscal intermediary approved a revision (as reflected in a revised Worksheet S-3), but the fiscal intermediary or HCFA made a data entry or tabulation error.

*B. Rationale for Accepting Limited Types of Revisions*

As we stated in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period (63 FR 64193), we provided for these limited revisions because of the totality of the circumstances, including—

- The number of hospitals contacting us about the same types of problems;
- The hardship that might result for a number of hospitals if we did not revise the wage data;
- The changes to the Medicare cost report, reflected for the first time in the FY 1999 wage index;
- The revised statutory timetable for publishing the proposed and final hospital inpatient prospective payment system rules, effective for the first time for FY 1999 (see section 4644 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997); and
- The revised timetable for finalizing wage data (including the revised timetable for releasing the final public use wage data file and the revised timetable for requesting corrections of data entry and tabulation errors), applied for the first time in developing the FY 1999 wage index.

None of these factors, by itself, would be sufficient grounds for making a mid-year revision. For example, we believe we should not make a wage index revision merely because a single individual hospital might receive significantly lower payments as a result of its failure to properly report costs or its failure to properly request revisions and verify data. In deciding which types of revisions we would allow, we considered the factors above not only in combination with each other, but also in light of the previous opportunities we provided to hospitals to verify data and request revisions.

We evaluated the totality of the circumstances and decided it was appropriate to make limited types of revisions. As indicated above, we believe most problems with wage data arise because hospitals fail to properly report costs on the cost report, fail to properly request revisions, or fail to verify the data that the intermediary and HCFA are using to calculate the wage index. We believed that it was only necessary or appropriate to consider requests for revisions to the FY 1995 wage data from hospitals who met certain criteria. We noted in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period that, if we permitted hospitals to request any and all revisions, it would take longer for hospitals to receive revised wage index values for FY 1999.

Also, we emphasize that this final rule should not be construed as an acknowledgment that the development of the FY 1999 wage index, as reflected in the July 31, 1998 **Federal Register**, was in any way unfair or unreasonable. Moreover, it should not be construed as an acknowledgment that mid-year corrections may be appropriate in other contexts or in other years. Many of our policies reflect balancing the competing considerations of finality, accuracy, and certainty, and many aspects of developing payment rates and policies require the use of the best data available *at the time*. As stated above, we provided for limited wage data revisions for FY 1999 because of the totality of the circumstances in this context.

In addition to the requests for wage data revisions, the November 19, 1998 document provided a 30-day period for public comment, which ended on December 21, 1998. We received 150 requests from hospitals for wage data revisions. We also received 12 comments. The actions we took with regard to these requests and a discussion of the comments we received follow.

### III. Provisions of the Final Rule

#### A. Implementation of Wage Index Revisions

We reviewed each of the wage data revision requests and the supporting documentation. If necessary, we contacted the hospital's fiscal intermediary for additional verification.

Of the 150 requests, we approved full wage data revisions for 101 hospitals. An additional seven hospitals were granted a partial revision. Requests from 35 hospitals did not meet the criteria for revision as stated in the November 19 final rule with comment period and, therefore, were denied. Of the remaining seven requests, we found that five of the requested wage data revisions were already reflected in the wage index published in the July 31, 1998 final rule. Two hospitals withdrew their requests; one determined there was no error in its data, and the other determined that it would not benefit from the requested revision.

For each hospital whose wage data were revised, we calculated a revised average hourly wage following the same methodology described in the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 40972). We also calculated a revised national average hourly wage of \$20.7771. (The national average hourly wage in the July 31, 1998 final rule was \$20.7325.) As we noted in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period (63 FR 64193), revising the wage data for some hospitals affects the wage index for all hospitals, including hospitals that did not request revisions. This is because the hospital wage index measures relative wage levels across geographic areas, and reflects the average hourly wage in each labor market area as well as the national average hourly wage. Thus, since the revised national average hourly wage is different from that published in the July 31, 1998 final rule, we must calculate revised wage index values for all labor market areas. The wage index values for each labor market area were recalculated by dividing the area's average hourly wage by the revised national average hourly wage of \$20.7771.

Payments to hospitals under the capital prospective payment system are adjusted for local cost variation based on the hospital wage index value that is applicable to the hospital (42 FR 413.316). The adjustment factor equals the hospital wage index applicable to the hospital raised to the .6848 power, and is applied to 100 percent of the Federal rate. Therefore, because hospitals' wage index values are revised as a result of this final rule, the capital

geographic adjustment factor (GAF) is also revised.

For hospitals that have received an adjustment to their wage data under this window of opportunity, the revised average hourly wages are set forth in Table 3C of this document. Tables 4A through 4C show the new wage index values and GAFs applicable for all hospitals effective for discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999. Table 4D and 4E show the revised Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) average hourly wages. Table 4F shows the revised Puerto Rico specific wage index values and GAFs.

#### B. Comments and Responses

We received 12 comments in response to our November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period. Several comments we received concerned the treatment of the wage data for specific hospitals. These comments were submitted on behalf of hospitals located in the same labor market area as a hospital that filed a revision request and supported that hospital's request for a wage data revision. Other commenters were critical of the policy set forth in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment.

*Comment:* Several commenters wrote to oppose our policy to apply the revisions to the wage indexes prospectively. These commenters believe that we are unfairly penalizing hospitals who qualified for a revision by not making the changes effective retroactively. The commenters referred to the negative financial impact upon affected hospitals from this prospective only policy.

*Response:* It has been our longstanding policy to make revisions to the wage index only on a prospective basis. (See, for example, 60 FR 45795 (September 1, 1995), 54 FR 36478 (September 1, 1989), 53 FR 38496 (September 30, 1988), and 49 FR 258 (January 1, 1984).) We believe it is consistent with the principles of the prospective payment system to implement these changes in such a way that they do not affect payments already made to hospitals. Applying changes to the wage index retroactively would violate the prospective nature of the system. We note that we could have decided not to permit mid-year revisions at all.

*Comment:* We received two comments requesting that we remove from the wage data file the wage data for two hospitals that are now closed. The commenters are concerned that because the hospitals are closed, they could not have requested wage data revisions during the usual wage index process.

*Response:* This comment does not address the provisions of the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period. Nevertheless, we note that we responded to a similar comment in the September 1, 1994 **Federal Register** (59 FR 45353). As we explained in that document, we believe it is appropriate to include the data of a hospital that has closed but was in operation during the data collection period, because the hospital's data reflects conditions occurring in the labor market area during the period. However, we do remove wage data for a closed hospital if the data appear to be aberrant based on our edits and we are not able to verify the accuracy of those data because the documentation is unavailable due to the hospital's closure. Regarding the two hospitals specifically addressed by the commenters, we did not remove their data from the FY 1999 wage index because the data did not appear to be aberrant.

*Comment:* One commenter, writing on behalf of a hospital, believes that we should add another category of revisions to the limited types of revisions permitted under the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period. Specifically, the commenter believes that we should allow its hospital and "all other similarly situated hospitals" to revise wage data "to include compensation costs for physicians under contract." The commenter argues that, because we previously excluded contract physician costs as well as physician compensation costs incurred by related medical schools, it was "futile for hospitals to report those costs on the S-3." The commenter also suggests that we failed to give hospitals "timely notice" that the cost data at issue were "relevant." The commenter further argues that there is "no rational basis" for distinguishing the commenter's situation from those addressed in the November 19 final rule with comment period, and that it would be arbitrary and capricious for us not to permit the revision it seeks. To support these conclusions, the commenter asserts that two of the reasons for providing mid-year revisions apply equally to this situation.

*Response:* We do not agree that we should expand our criteria to permit mid-year revisions to address situations in which hospitals failed to report contract physician part A costs or the costs of physicians employed by the home office or a related organization. The commenter's analysis reflects a fundamental misunderstanding about the wage data reporting process and about the considerations underlying our

decision to permit certain types of mid-year revisions.

The commenter argues that, because we did not include contract physician costs or physician compensation costs incurred by related medical schools in the wage index calculation for previous fiscal years, "it was futile for hospitals to report those costs on the S-3." Citing statements in the September 1, 1994 final rule concerning the wage index calculation, the commenter also states it would have been "fruitless" to report the costs at issue.

Contrary to the reasoning of the commenter, a hospital's obligation to properly report wage costs is not limited to those costs that the hospital believes will be included in the wage index for a given fiscal year. It is inappropriate for a hospital to engage in selective reporting; that is, it is inappropriate for a hospital to report some costs properly and other costs improperly depending on whether the hospital believes that a particular cost will or will not be included in the wage index. Hospitals are *always* required to properly report *all* costs.

It is important to distinguish between wage data reporting issues and wage index methodology issues. The Medicare statute requires annual updates to the hospital wage index. Hospitals know or should know that each year we might propose and implement changes to the categories of wage costs that we include in the wage index. Thus, proper reporting of all categories of wage data is always "relevant."

Significantly, the commenter acknowledged that the inclusion of contract physician part A costs reflects "good policy reasons." Thus, the commenter does not object to our policy of including the costs at issue in the wage index calculation; instead, the commenter complains because the hospital believed we would not implement this "better policy" and thus the hospital did not properly report the costs. To the extent the commenter had questions about how to report the costs at issue, we note (as we did in the July 31, 1998 final rule) that the cost report instructions at section 2806.3 of the Provider Reimbursement Manual, Part II, instruct hospitals to include the costs of physician part A services from related organizations or the home office on Line 33 of Worksheet S-3.

Thus, we believe that the commenter is wrong to the extent it argues that it is reasonable for a hospital not to properly report wage costs because we had previously excluded the costs from the wage index calculation or because the hospital believed that we would not

include the costs in the future. Similarly, the hospital is wrong to the extent it suggests that it did not have "timely notice" that the cost at issue would be "relevant." As the discussion above reflects, proper reporting of costs is always relevant and important, and hospitals are on notice that each year we might propose and implement changes to the wage index methodology. In fact, we have addressed the issue of contract physician costs in particular in several previous **Federal Register** documents, so hospitals were on notice that we might revise the wage index methodology to address these costs. Thus, we believe it was not reasonable for the hospital to improperly report the costs at issue.

Moreover, in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period, we emphasized that our decision to permit limited types of mid-year revisions reflected the "totality of the circumstances," and reflected a number of factors in combination with each other. With respect to the situation presented by the commenter, we believe that the totality of the circumstances and consideration of all the factors does not dictate adding another category of revisions.

The commenter argues, among other things, that adding this criterion is consistent with two of the factors underlying the final rule with comment period: the hardship that a number of hospitals will incur if data is not corrected and the changes to the Medicare cost report that were reflected for the first time in the FY 1999 wage index. The commenter does not mention another important factor that we cited: the number of hospitals contacting us about the same type of problem. At the time we developed the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period, we had no reason to believe that there might be widespread problems in the reporting of the costs at issue; even as of today, we have received very few complaints about this issue. The commenter asserts that omission of physician compensation data should have been "apparent" to both intermediaries and HCFA. However, something that might be "apparent" on close examination might not be apparent in the context of developing a wage index that takes place under extremely tight timelines and involves data for thousands of hospitals. Moreover, the absence of contract physician costs on a hospital's cost report, by itself, does not on its face necessarily indicate a problem with the data.

We decided to permit mid-year revisions because certain issues came to

our attention shortly after publication of the July 31 final rule. We considered the totality of the circumstances, and decided to permit certain types of mid-year revisions based on the information available *at the time we developed the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period*. We believe it would be inappropriate and impractical to add another category of revisions at this point. If we added another category now, we would have to provide another window of opportunity for all other similarly situated hospitals to submit requests and supporting documentation; we would then have to evaluate the requests, calculate revised wage indexes and, if necessary, calculate revised standardized amounts (which would affect payments to all hospitals). In light of all the factors, we believe that at this point in the fiscal year the interests of finality take precedence over any increased accuracy that might result from providing another window of opportunity for revisions. Therefore, we are not adopting the commenter's suggestion to add another category of revisions.

#### IV. Other Related Issues

##### A. Budget Neutrality and Adjustment to Standardized Amounts

Under section 1886(d)(3)(E) of the Act, "adjustments or updates" to the hospital wage index for a fiscal year "shall be made in a manner that assures that aggregate payments \* \* \* in the fiscal year are not greater than or less than those that would have been made in the year without such adjustment." Accordingly, to the extent that changes to the hospital wage index affect aggregate payments, we are revising the budget neutrality adjustments to the standardized amounts so that aggregate payments "are not greater than or less than those that would have been made in the year without adjustment." The budget neutrality factors and the adjustments to the standardized amounts described here are effective for discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999.

The budget neutrality factor for changes to the wage index and DRG reclassification and recalibration is revised from 0.999006 in the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 41007) to 0.998978. Because of the payment interaction between wage index changes and the diagnosis-related groups (DRGs), the budget neutrality factor applied to the Puerto Rico standardized amounts changes slightly, from 0.998912 to 0.998915.

Also, § 412.308(c)(4)(ii) requires that the Federal capital rate be adjusted so

that any changes resulting from the annual DRG reclassification and recalibration and changes in the GAF are budget neutral. As stated in the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 41014), the incremental change in the national GAF/DRG budget neutrality factor from FY 1998 to FY 1999 applied to the standard Federal capital payment rate was 1.0027. The cumulative change in the rate due to this adjustment was 1.0028. These factors are applicable for all discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1998 and before March 1, 1999. For discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999, the incremental change applicable to the national GAF/DRG budget neutrality factor is 1.0028, and the cumulative factor is 1.0029. The factors for Puerto Rico (incremental and cumulative) are unchanged, thus the Puerto Rico rate will remain unchanged. The hospital-specific rates will also not be affected by these changes since it is not based on the GAF/DRG budget neutrality adjustment.

The revised operating standardized amounts and capital rates are set forth in Tables 1A and 1C through 1F.

##### B. The Relationship Between Wage Revisions and the MGCRB Process

Under section 1886(d)(10) of the Act, the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board (MGCRB) considers applications by hospitals to be reclassified to another geographic area for purposes of the wage index. We stated in the November 19, 1998 final rule with comment period that, for purposes of evaluating a hospital's application for reclassification for FY 2000, the MGCRB will use hospitals' average hourly wages incorporating all of the revisions made at the time the MGCRB rules on the hospital's application.

##### V. Waiver of 30-Day Delay in the Effective Date

We ordinarily provide a delay of 30 days in the effective date of a final rule. However, if adherence to this procedure would be impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, we may waive the delay in the effective date. As discussed above, we provided this process for mid-year revisions because of the totality of the circumstances arising this year. These circumstances include the number of hospitals contacting us about the same types of wage data problems (reflecting apparent confusion about certain aspects of the development of the FY 1999 wage index) and the hardship that might result if we did not revise the wage data for these hospitals. If we delayed the implementation of the revised wage

index in order to comply with the 30-day delay requirement, we would diminish the extent to which we address the potential hardship that might result for certain hospitals. Therefore, we find good cause to waive the 30-day delay in the effective date. Thus, the changes set forth in this final rule will be effective for discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999. This is the earliest possible effective date given our need to revise and distribute the PRICER software reflecting these changes.

##### VI. Regulatory Impact Statement

We have examined the impacts of this final rule as required by Executive Order 12866 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (Public Law 96-354). Executive Order 12866 directs agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and equity). 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 or less annually. For purposes of the RFA, all hospitals are considered to be small entities.

Section 1102(b) of the Act requires us to prepare a regulatory impact analysis if a rule may have a significant impact on the operations of a substantial number of small rural hospitals. Such an analysis must conform to the provisions of section 604 of the RFA. For purposes of section 1102(b) of the Act, we define a small rural hospital as a hospital that is located outside of a MSA and has fewer than 50 beds.

In the November 19, 1998 **Federal Register**, we indicated that the final rule with comment period rule was major rule as defined in Title 5, United States Code, section 804(2). However, we stated that the actual impact of that rule could not be determined prior to reviewing the revision requests. Based upon our analysis of the redistributive impacts of the revision to the wage index values and GAFs described below, we have now determined this is not a major rule under that section. That is, the total impact of payments redistributed from hospitals whose payments increased to those whose payments decreased does not exceed \$100 million.

*A. Impact of This Final Rule*

As we noted above, we received a total of 150 requests for wage data revisions, of which 108 were approved. Table A displays the impacts of these changes on the MSAs for the hospitals receiving revisions. The first column displays the MSA number, the second the MSA name (or State name in the case of rural areas). The third column is the area wage index value published in the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 41052), that is effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1998 and before March 1, 1999. The fourth column is the wage index value from Table 4A of this final rule that is

effective for discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999. The fifth column is the percentage change in the area wage index value.

Despite the fact that these changes generally increased both the hospital's and its area's average hourly wage, several areas in which hospitals had data revisions will experience a decrease in their wage index value from that published in the July 31, 1998 final rule. This occurs because the resulting change in the area average hourly wage was less (in percentage terms) than the change in the national average hourly wage (which increased by 0.2 percent). In addition, one MSA, Beaumont-Port

Arthur, Texas, has a decrease in its wage index value because its average hourly wage decreased as a result of the revision to its wage data.

Nonetheless, most labor market areas in Table A have increases in their wage index values as a result of the wage data revisions. The largest increases are in Yolo, California (5.6 percent increase), and Mayaguez, Puerto Rico (5.1 percent increase). The actual increase in payments for hospitals in these areas will be slightly less because only the labor-related portion of the standardized amount is adjusted by the wage index (just over 71 percent of the standardized amount).

TABLE A.—WAGE INDEX FOR MSAS WITH REVISED AREA AVERAGE HOURLY WAGES

MSA No.	MSA name	Wage index		Percent change
		October 1, 1998	March 1, 1999	
01	RURAL ALABAMA	0.7338	0.7326	-0.16
05	RURAL CALIFORNIA	0.9959	0.9979	0.20
17	RURAL KANSAS	0.7330	0.7319	-0.15
32	RURAL NEW MEXICO	0.8136	0.8269	1.64
45	RURAL TEXAS	0.7441	0.7565	1.67
49	RURAL VIRGINIA	0.7863	0.7857	-0.08
0320	AMARILLO, TX	0.8509	0.8517	0.09
0640	AUSTIN-SAN MARCOS, TX	0.8442	0.8782	4.03
0680	BAKERSFIELD, CA	0.9959	0.9979	0.20
0840	BEAUMONT-PORT ARTHUR, TX	0.9071	0.8659	-4.54
1123	BOSTON-WORCESTER-LAWRENCE-LOWELL-BROCKTON, MA-NH	1.1307	1.1288	-0.17
1145	BRAZORIA, TX	0.8925	0.8928	0.03
1320	CANTON-MASSILLON, OH	0.8827	0.8813	-0.16
1520	CHARLOTTE-GASTONIA-ROCK HILL, NC-SC	0.9562	0.9686	1.30
1600	CHICAGO, IL	1.0469	1.0461	-0.08
1920	DALLAS, TX	0.9364	0.9348	-0.17
2000	DAYTON-SPRINGFIELD, OH	0.9584	0.9605	0.22
2080	DENVER, CO	1.0059	1.0334	2.73
2340	ENID, OK	0.7969	0.7983	0.18
2520	FARGO-MOORHEAD, ND-MN	0.9537	0.9520	-0.18
2670	FORT COLLINS-LOVELAND, CO	1.0319	1.0770	4.37
2700	FORT MYERS-CAPE CORAL, FL	0.8936	0.8942	0.07
2800	FORT WORTH-ARLINGTON, TX	0.9729	0.9727	-0.02
2840	FRESNO, CA	1.0409	1.0700	2.80
2920	GALVESTON-TEXAS CITY, TX	1.0848	1.0894	0.42
2995	GRAND JUNCTION, CO	0.9099	0.9116	0.19
3360	HOUSTON, TX	0.9904	0.9889	-0.15
4080	LAREDO, TX	0.7441	0.7565	1.67
4480	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH, CA	1.2070	1.2116	0.38
4680	MACON, GA	0.8629	0.8980	4.07
4840	MAYAGUEZ, PR	0.4188	0.4401	5.09
4880	MCALLEN-EDINBURG-MISSION, TX	0.8506	0.8893	4.55
4920	MEMPHIS, TN-AR-MS	0.8371	0.8361	-0.12
5080	MILWAUKEE-WAUKESHA, WI	0.9135	0.9356	2.42
5380	NASSAU-SUFFOLK, NY	1.3579	1.3593	0.10
5600	NEW YORK-NEWARK, NY-NJ-PA	1.4431	1.4461	0.21
5640	NEWARK, NJ	1.0895	1.0914	0.17
5720	NORFOLK-VIRGINIA BEACH-NEWPORT NEWS, VA-NC	0.8214	0.8275	0.74
5945	ORANGE COUNTY, CA	1.1472	1.1468	-0.04
6160	PHILADELPHIA, PA-NJ	1.1382	1.1370	-0.11
6780	RIVERSIDE-SAN BERNADINO, CA	1.0141	1.0585	4.38
6920	SACRAMENTO, CA	1.1864	1.1962	0.83
7160	SALT LAKE CITY-OGDEN, UT	0.9400	0.9420	0.21
7360	SAN FRANCISCO, CA	1.3507	1.3563	0.42
7460	SAN LUIS OBISPO-ATASCADERO-PASO ROBLES, CA	1.0739	1.1264	4.89
7490	SANTA FE, NM	0.9623	0.9652	0.30
7680	SHREVEPORT-BOSSIER CITY, LA	0.9400	0.9386	-0.15
8720	VALLEJO-FARIFIELD-NAPA, CA	1.2845	1.3311	3.63
8735	VENTURA, CA	1.0715	1.0764	0.46

TABLE A.—WAGE INDEX FOR MSAS WITH REVISED AREA AVERAGE HOURLY WAGES—Continued

MSA No.	MSA name	Wage index		Percent change
		October 1, 1998	March 1, 1999	
8840 .....	WASHINGTON, DC-MD-VA-WV .....	1.0812	1.0807	-0.05
9270 .....	YOLO, CA .....	1.0636	1.1233	5.61

All other labor market areas' wage index values decrease slightly. This is because, as noted above, the changes slightly increase the national average hourly wage from \$20.7325 to \$20.7771. Therefore, for areas in which no hospital's average hourly wage was revised, the area's wage index value decreases slightly because the area's unchanged average hourly wage is compared to the higher national average hourly wage. The revision to the wage index is applied only to the labor-related portion of the standardized amount.

Table B displays the payment impacts for all hospitals. Specifically, this table compares simulated payments for hospitals using the wage index and standardized amounts effective with discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1998 (see the July 31, 1998 final rule) to simulated payments using the wage index and standardized amounts published in this final rule. The hospital categories in the table are identical to those published in the July 31, 1998 final rule (63 FR 41106). Also, the simulation methodology here is

identical to the methodology described in that final rule. The overall impact is a 0.0 percent change in payments across all hospitals, even though the average payment per case changes slightly (\$1 per case decrease). Because a \$1 per case change in payments is less than 0.1 percent of total payments, this rounds to 0.0.

The percentage changes across hospital groups are minimal. For the most part, hospitals receiving revisions are not concentrated in any particular category; therefore, the impacts are not predictable. Approximately two-thirds of the wage data revisions approved were for urban hospitals. This is reflected in the fact that urban hospitals experience no payment change overall, while rural hospitals experience a 0.1 percent decrease. Examining urban and rural census divisions, most categories experience either no change or a 0.1 percent decrease in payments. For urban hospitals in the Pacific and Mountain census divisions, payments rise by 0.3 percent and 0.2 percent, respectively. The largest increase among all categories is for urban hospitals with

fewer than 100 beds that also receive the disproportionate share adjustment. Payments for this group increase by 0.4 percent.

Because the capital geographic adjustment factors are based upon the wage indexes, similar impacts will be experienced in capital payments. In addition, to the extent the Medicare payment methodologies for other provider types (for example, skilled nursing facilities, home health agencies, and ambulatory surgical centers) use the hospital wage index, their payments will likewise be affected. Impacts to these providers will not be experienced as soon as inpatient hospitals because these providers' payment rates are updated on different schedules than inpatient hospital prospective payment rates. Skilled nursing facilities' payments will be updated using the revised FY 1999 hospital wage index beginning July 1, 1999. Other provider types' will employ the revised FY 1999 hospital wage index wage index after the end of the current fiscal year.

TABLE B.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF WAGE DATA REVISIONS FOR FY 1999 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM (PAYMENTS PER CASE)

	Number of hospitals	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring before March 1, 1999)	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring after March 1, 1999)	All changes
	(1)	(2) <sup>1</sup>	(3) <sup>1</sup>	(4)
<b>(BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION):</b>				
ALL HOSPITALS .....	4,975	6,707	6,706	0.0
URBAN HOSPITALS .....	2,810	7,246	7,246	0.0
LARGE URBAN AREAS .....	1,611	7,758	7,761	0.0
OTHER URBAN AREAS .....	1,199	6,544	6,540	-0.1
RURAL AREAS .....	2,165	4,517	4,514	-0.1
<b>BED SIZE (URBAN):</b>				
0-99 BEDS .....	704	4,889	4,894	0.1
100-199 BEDS .....	937	6,056	6,057	0.0
200-299 BEDS .....	568	6,851	6,851	0.0
300-499 BEDS .....	449	7,738	7,737	0.0
500 OR MORE BEDS .....	152	9,592	9,592	0.0
<b>BED SIZE (RURAL):</b>				
0-49 BEDS .....	1,137	3,701	3,700	0.0
50-99 BEDS .....	634	4,207	4,205	-0.1
100-149 BEDS .....	229	4,662	4,658	-0.1
150-199 BEDS .....	91	4,894	4,890	-0.1
200 OR MORE BEDS .....	74	5,704	5,698	-0.1
<b>URBAN BY CENSUS DIVISION:</b>				

TABLE B.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF WAGE DATA REVISIONS FOR FY 1999 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM (PAYMENTS PER CASE)—Continued

	Number of hospitals	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring before March 1, 1999)	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring after March 1, 1999)	All changes
	(1)	(2) <sup>1</sup>	(3) <sup>1</sup>	(4)
NEW ENGLAND .....	152	7,682	7,673	-0.1
MIDDLE ATLANTIC .....	425	8,107	8,106	0.0
SOUTH ATLANTIC .....	414	6,948	6,946	0.0
EAST NORTH CENTRAL .....	476	6,873	6,871	0.0
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL .....	162	6,524	6,516	-0.1
WEST NORTH CENTRAL .....	189	6,996	6,986	-0.1
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL .....	354	6,720	6,719	0.0
MOUNTAIN .....	129	6,971	6,982	0.2
PACIFIC .....	461	8,245	8,267	0.3
PUERTO RICO .....	48	3,056	3,058	0.1
RURAL BY CENSUS DIVISION:				
NEW ENGLAND .....	53	5,287	5,282	-0.1
MIDDLE ATLANTIC .....	80	4,881	4,876	-0.1
SOUTH ATLANTIC .....	286	4,694	4,690	-0.1
EAST NORTH CENTRAL .....	285	4,553	4,548	-0.1
EAST SOUTH CENTRAL .....	269	4,235	4,230	-0.1
WEST NORTH CENTRAL .....	500	4,236	4,232	-0.1
WEST SOUTH CENTRAL .....	342	4,017	4,021	0.1
MOUNTAIN .....	204	4,779	4,778	0.0
PACIFIC .....	141	5,643	5,640	-0.1
PUERTO RICO .....	5	2,370	2,366	-0.2
(BY PAYMENT CATEGORIES):				
URBAN HOSPITALS .....	2,894	7,207	7,207	0.0
LARGE URBAN AREAS .....	1,698	7,670	7,673	0.0
OTHER URBAN AREAS .....	1,196	6,530	6,526	-0.1
RURAL AREAS .....	2,081	4,494	4,491	-0.1
TEACHING STATUS:				
NON-TEACHING .....	3,880	5,450	5,450	0.0
FEWER THAN 100 RESIDENTS .....	854	7,145	7,144	0.0
100 OR MORE RESIDENTS .....	241	10,755	10,753	0.0
DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITALS (DSH):				
NON-DSH .....	3,089	5,799	5,798	0.0
URBAN DSH:				
100 BEDS OR MORE .....	1,404	7,843	7,844	0.0
FEWER THAN 100 BEDS .....	88	5,007	5,028	0.4
RURAL DSH:				
SOLE COMMUNITY (SCH) .....	162	4,249	4,247	0.0
REFERRAL CENTERS (RRC) .....	53	5,428	5,422	-0.1
OTHER RURAL DSH HOSP:				
100 BEDS OR MORE .....	60	4,162	4,157	-0.1
FEWER THAN 100 BEDS .....	119	3,600	3,596	-0.1
URBAN TEACHING AND DSH:				
BOTH TEACHING AND DSH .....	709	8,828	8,827	0.0
TEACHING AND NO DSH .....	331	7,291	7,289	0.0
NO TEACHING AND DSH .....	783	6,271	6,275	0.1
NO TEACHING AND NO DSH .....	1,071	5,612	5,611	0.0
SPECIAL UPDATE HOSPITALS (UNDER SEC. 4401(b) OF PUBLIC LAW 105-33 .....	344	5,236	5,232	-0.1
RURAL HOSPITAL TYPES:				
NONSPECIAL STATUS HOSPITALS .....	888	3,947	3,944	-0.1
RRC .....	145	5,286	5,279	-0.1
SCH .....	637	4,501	4,501	0.0
MDH .....	352	3,753	3,751	0.0
SCH AND RRC .....	59	5,402	5,399	-0.1
TYPE OF OWNERSHIP:				
VOLUNTARY .....	2,858	6,884	6,883	0.0
PROPRIETARY .....	671	6,096	6,097	0.0
GOVERNMENT .....	1,331	6,209	6,209	0.0
UNKNOWN .....	115	7,811	7,819	0.1
MEDICARE UTILIZATION AS A PERCENT OF INPATIENT DAYS:				
0-25 .....	247	8,754	8,772	0.2
25-50 .....	1,264	8,127	8,130	0.0
50-65 .....	1,978	6,134	6,130	-0.1

TABLE B.—IMPACT ANALYSIS OF WAGE DATA REVISIONS FOR FY 1999 OPERATING PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM (PAYMENTS PER CASE)—Continued

	Number of hospitals	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring before March 1, 1999)	Average payment per case (for FY 1999 discharges occurring after March 1, 1999)	All changes
	(1)	(2) <sup>1</sup>	(3) <sup>1</sup>	(4)
OVER 65 .....	1,371	5,241	5,238	-0.1
UNKNOWN .....	115	7,811	7,819	0.1
HOSPITALS RECLASSIFIED BY THE MEDICARE GEOGRAPHIC REVIEW BOARD:				
RECLASSIFICATION STATUS DURING FY98 AND FY99:				
RECLASSIFIED DURING:				
BOTH FY98 AND FY99 .....				
BOTH FY98 AND FY99 .....	315	5,944	5,942	0.0
URBAN .....	72	7,302	7,306	0.0
RURAL .....	243	5,254	5,250	-0.1
RECLASSIFIED DURING:				
FY99 ONLY .....				
FY99 ONLY .....	170	5,427	5,422	-0.1
URBAN .....	15	8,207	8,203	0.0
RURAL .....	155	4,960	4,955	-0.1
RECLASSIFIED DURING:				
FY98 ONLY .....				
FY98 ONLY .....	126	6,084	6,079	-0.1
URBAN .....	53	7,011	7,005	-0.1
RURAL .....	73	4,188	4,186	-0.1
FY 99 RECLASSIFICATIONS:				
ALL RECLASSIFIED HOSP .....				
ALL RECLASSIFIED HOSP .....	485	5,763	5,760	-0.1
STAND. AMT. ONLY .....	94	5,899	5,893	-0.1
WAGE INDEX ONLY .....	281	5,935	5,935	0.0
BOTH .....	47	6,264	6,259	-0.1
NONRECLASS. ....	4,526	6,786	6,786	0.0
ALL URBAN RECLASSIFIED .....				
ALL URBAN RECLASSIFIED .....	87	7,472	7,474	0.0
STAND. AMT. ONLY .....	26	5,635	5,628	-0.1
WAGE INDEX ONLY .....	40	8,872	8,884	0.1
BOTH .....	21	6,725	6,718	-0.1
NONRECLASSIFIED .....	2,696	7,249	7,249	0.0
ALL RURAL RECLASSIFIED .....				
ALL RURAL RECLASSIFIED .....	398	5,134	5,129	-0.1
STAND. AMT. ONLY .....	55	4,494	4,491	-0.1
WAGE INDEX ONLY .....	314	5,194	5,188	-0.1
BOTH .....	29	5,231	5,230	0.0
NONRECLASSIFIED .....	1,767	4,127	4,124	-0.1
OTHER RECLASSIFIED HOSPITALS (SECTION 1886(d)(8)(B)) .....	27	4,714	4,716	0.0

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

**VII. Tables**

This section contains the tables referred to in the preamble to this final

rule. These tables, which apply to discharges occurring on or after March 1, 1999 replace or update those published in the July 31, 1998 final rule

that are effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1998 and before March 1, 1999.

TABLE 1A.—NATIONAL ADJUSTED OPERATING STANDARDIZED AMOUNTS, LABOR/NONLABOR

Large urban areas		other areas	
Labor-related	Nonlabor-related	Labor-related	Nonlabor-related
2,783.34	1,131.34	2,739.28	1,113.44

TABLE 1C.—ADJUSTED OPERATING STANDARDIZED AMOUNTS FOR PUERTO RICO, LABOR/NONLABOR

	Large urban areas		Other areas	
	Labor	Nonlabor	Labor	Nonlabor
National .....	2,759.94	1,121.83	2,759.94	1,121.83
Puerto Rico .....	1,327.81	534.48	1,306.79	526.02



TABLE 1D.—CAPITAL STANDARD FEDERAL PAYMENT RATE

	Rate
National .....	378.10
Puerto Rico .....	181.10

TABLE 1E.—NATIONAL ADJUSTED OPERATING STANDARDIZED AMOUNTS FOR “TEMPORARY RELIEF” HOSPITALS, LABOR/ NONLABOR

Large urban areas		Other areas	
Labor-related	Nonlabor-related	Labor-related	Nonlabor-related
2,791.65	1,134.72	2,747.46	1,116.76

TABLE 1F.—ADJUSTED OPERATING STANDARDIZED AMOUNTS FOR “TEMPORARY RELIEF” HOSPITALS, IN PUERTO RICO, LABOR/NONLABOR

	Large urban areas		Other areas	
	Labor	Nonlabor	Labor	Nonlabor
National .....	2,768.18	1,125.18	2,768.18	1,125.18
Puerto Rico .....	1,331.77	536.08	1,310.69	527.59

TABLE 3C.—HOSPITAL AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 1999: WAGE INDEX FOR HOSPITALS WITH WAGE DATA REVISIONS

Provider	Average hourly wage
010120 .....	16.27
050060 .....	21.10
050088 .....	25.57
050129 .....	15.62
050152 .....	28.62
050177 .....	20.30
050299 .....	23.85
050327 .....	22.33
050352 .....	23.58
050382 .....	28.37
050390 .....	19.91
050410 .....	15.01
050419 .....	19.93
050421 .....	25.00
050438 .....	21.35
050455 .....	20.80
050485 .....	23.81
050537 .....	22.00
050578 .....	30.66
050590 .....	24.48
050592 .....	21.53
050667 .....	28.01
050684 .....	20.34
050694 .....	20.81
060011 .....	22.10
060030 .....	22.48
060063 .....	14.88
100012 .....	16.74
100124 .....	18.02
110107 .....	18.54
140103 .....	15.98
140208 .....	24.68
170019 .....	16.42
170045 .....	16.16
170049 .....	18.45
190041 .....	20.28
220049 .....	21.15
250044 .....	15.41
310063 .....	21.57
320002 .....	19.62
320003 .....	15.94

TABLE 3C.—HOSPITAL AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 1999: WAGE INDEX FOR HOSPITALS WITH WAGE DATA REVISIONS—Continued

Provider	Average hourly wage
320004	17.43
320035	27.42
330043	26.81
330121	15.35
330158	26.25
330162	27.00
330221	29.07
330259	23.47
330270	31.95
330309	24.40
330316	28.86
330338	20.97
330395	33.45
340001	21.44
340068	16.62
350004	18.34
360051	23.40
360100	17.85
370026	16.66
390083	21.74
390136	15.10
400014	9.30
410009	23.51
440147	17.64
440183	20.71
440208	17.90
450055	14.45
450078	12.49
450085	16.22
450092	14.96
450096	16.91
450124	21.71
450128	15.63
450144	16.52
450148	22.61
450151	15.21
450155	17.86
450157	15.26
450176	16.13
450181	14.80
450190	27.69
450200	18.00
450236	14.92
450243	12.16
450246	20.36
450264	17.74
450369	14.48
450370	11.23
450399	13.77
450424	16.39
450475	16.42
450534	18.86
450654	12.84
450723	18.89
450807	12.89
460042	17.45
460047	19.91
490017	16.47
490019	16.46
490043	23.23
490079	16.03
500001	21.87
520102	20.07
520138	19.07
520140	19.69

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
0040 ..	Abilene, TX, Taylor, TX .....	0.8066	0.8631
0060 ..	Aguadilla, PR, Aguada, PR, Aguadilla, PR Moca, PR .....	0.4727	0.5986
0080 ..	Akron, OH, Portage, OH, Summit, OH .....	0.9933	0.9954
0120 ..	Albany, GA, Dougherty, GA, Lee, GA .....	0.7975	0.8565
0160 ..	Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY, Albany, NY, Montgomery, NY, Rensselaer, NY, Saratoga, NY, Schenectady, NY Schoharie, NY .....	0.8610	0.9026
0200 ..	Albuquerque, NM, Bernalillo, NM, Sandoval, NM, Valencia, NM .....	0.8613	0.9028
0220 ..	Alexandria, LA Rapides, LA .....	0.8526	0.8966
0240 ..	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA, Carbon, PA, Lehigh, PA, Northampton, PA .....	1.0204	1.0139
0280 ..	Altoona, PA, Blair, PA .....	0.9335	0.9540
0320 ..	Amarillo, TX, Potter, TX, Randall, TX .....	0.8517	0.8959
0380 ..	Anchorage, AK, Anchorage, AK .....	1.2979	1.1955
0440 ..	Ann Arbor, MI, Lenawee, MI, Livingston, MI, Washtenaw, MI .....	1.1033	1.0696
0450 ..	Anniston, AL, Calhoun, AL .....	0.8658	0.9060
0460 ..	Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI, Calumet, WI, Outagamie, WI, Winnebago, WI .....	0.8825	0.9180
0470 ..	Arecibo, PR, Arecibo, PR, Camuy, PR, Hatillo, PR .....	0.4867	0.6107
0480 ..	Asheville, NC, Buncombe, NC, Madison, NC .....	0.8940	0.9261
0500 ..	Athens, GA, Clarke, GA, Madison, GA, Oconee, GA .....	0.8673	0.9071
0520 ..	Atlanta, GA, <sup>1</sup> 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 .....	0.9915	0.9942
0560 ..	Atlantic-Cape May, NJ, Atlantic, NJ, Cape May, NJ .....	1.0355	1.0242
0600 ..	Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC, Columbia, GA, McDuffie, GA, Richmond, GA, Aiken, SC, Edgefield, SC .....	0.9233	0.9468
0640 ..	Austin-San Marcos, TX, <sup>1</sup> Bastrop, TX, Caldwell, TX, Hays, TX, Travis, TX, Williamson, TX .....	0.8782	0.9149
0680 ..	Bakersfield, <sup>2</sup> CA, Kern, CA .....	0.9979	0.9986
0720 ..	Baltimore, MD, <sup>1</sup> Anne Arundel, MD, Baltimore, MD, Baltimore City, MD, Carroll, MD, Harford, MD, Howard, MD, Queen Anne's, MD .....	0.9642	0.9753
0733 ..	Bangor, ME, Penobscot, ME .....	0.9474	0.9637
0743 ..	Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA, Barnstable, MA .....	1.5382	1.3430
0760 ..	Baton Rouge, LA, Ascension, LA, East Baton Rouge, LA, Livingston, LA, West Baton Rouge, LA .....	0.8872	0.9213
0840 ..	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX, Hardin, TX, Jefferson, TX, Orange, TX .....	0.8659	0.9061
0860 ..	Bellingham, WA, Whatcom, WA .....	1.1434	1.0961
0870 ..	Benton Harbor, MI, <sup>2</sup> Berrien, MI .....	0.8884	0.9222
0875 ..	Bergen-Passaic, NJ, <sup>1</sup> Bergen, NJ, Passaic, NJ .....	1.1749	1.1167
0880 ..	Billings, MT, Yellowstone, MT .....	0.9143	0.9405
0920 ..	Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS, Hancock, MS, Harrison, MS, Jackson, MS .....	0.8276	0.8785
0960 ..	Binghamton, NY, Broome, NY, Tioga, NY .....	0.9059	0.9346
1000 ..	Birmingham, AL, Blount, AL, Jefferson, AL, St. Clair, AL, Shelby, AL .....	0.9073	0.9356
1010 ..	Bismarck, ND, Burleigh, ND, Morton, ND .....	0.8025	0.8601
1020 ..	Bloomington, IN, Monroe, IN .....	0.8965	0.9279
1040 ..	Bloomington-Normal, IL, McLean, IL .....	0.8851	0.9198
1080 ..	Boise City, ID, Ada, ID, Canyon, ID .....	0.9190	0.9438
1123 ..	Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH, <sup>1</sup> Bristol, MA Essex, MA, Middlesex, MA, Norfolk, MA, Plymouth, MA, Suffolk, MA, Worcester, MA, Hillsborough, NH, Merrimack, NH, Rockingham, NH, Strafford, NH .....	1.1288	1.0865
1125 ..	Boulder-Longmont, CO, Boulder, CO .....	1.0038	1.0026
1145 ..	Brazoria, TX, Brazoria, TX .....	0.8928	0.9253
1150 ..	Bremerton, WA, Kitsap, WA .....	1.1055	1.0711
1240 ..	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX, Cameron, TX .....	0.8237	0.8756
1260 ..	Bryan-College Station, TX, Brazos, TX .....	0.8066	0.8631
1280 ..	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY, Erie, NY, <sup>1</sup> Niagara, NY .....	0.9587	0.9715
1303 ..	Burlington, VT, Chittenden, VT, Franklin, VT, Grand Isle, VT .....	0.9596	0.9722
1310 ..	Caguas, PR, Caguas, PR, Cayey, PR, Cidra, PR, Gurabo, PR, San Lorenzo, PR .....	0.4410	0.5708
1320 ..	Canton-Massillon, OH, Carroll, OH, Stark, OH .....	0.8813	0.9171
1350 ..	Casper, WY, Natrona, WY .....	0.9150	0.9410
1360 ..	Cedar Rapids, IA, Linn, IA .....	0.8814	0.9172
1400 ..	Champaign-Urbana, IL, Champaign, IL .....	0.8770	0.9140
1440 ..	Charleston-North Charleston, SC, Berkeley, SC, Charleston, SC, Dorchester, SC .....	0.9114	0.9384
1480 ..	Charleston, WV, Kanawha, WV, Putnam, WV .....	0.8990	0.9297
1520 ..	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC, <sup>1</sup> Cabarrus, NC, Gaston, NC, Lincoln, NC, Mecklenburg, NC, Rowan, NC, Stanly, NC, Union, NC, York, SC .....	0.9686	0.9784
1540 ..	Charlottesville, VA, Albemarle, VA, Charlottesville City, VA, Fluvanna, VA, Greene, VA .....	1.0272	1.0185
1560 ..	Chattanooga, TN-GA, Catoosa, GA, Dade, GA, Walker, GA, Hamilton, TN, Marion, TN .....	0.9074	0.9356
1580 ..	Cheyenne, WY, <sup>2</sup> Laramie, WY .....	0.8768	0.9139
1600 ..	Chicago, IL, <sup>1</sup> Cook, IL, DeKalb, IL, DuPage, IL, Grundy, IL, Kane, IL, Kendall, IL, Lake, IL, McHenry, IL, Will, IL .....	1.0461	1.0313
1620 ..	Chico-Paradise, CA, Butte, CA .....	1.0145	1.0099
1640 ..	Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN, <sup>1</sup> Dearborn, IN, Ohio, IN, Boone, KY, Campbell, KY, Gallatin, KY, Grant, KY, Kenton, KY, Pendleton, KY, Brown, OH, Clermont, OH, Hamilton, OH, Warren, OH .....	0.9595	0.9721
1660 ..	Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY, Christian, KY, Montgomery, TN .....	0.8213	0.8739
1680 ..	Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH, <sup>1</sup> Ashtabula, OH, Cuyahoga, OH, Geauga, OH, Lake, OH, Lorain, OH, Medina, OH .....	0.9886	0.9922
1720 ..	Colorado Springs, CO, El Paso, CO .....	0.9390	0.9578
1740 ..	Columbia, MO, Boone, MO .....	0.8942	0.9263

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas—Continued

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
1760 ..	Columbia, SC, Lexington, SC, Richland, SC .....	0.9290	0.9508
1800 ..	Columbus, GA-AL Russell, AL, Chattahoochee, GA, Harris, GA, Muscogee, GA .....	0.8511	0.8955
1840 ..	Columbus, OH, <sup>1</sup> Delaware, OH, Fairfield, OH, Franklin, OH, Licking, OH, Madison, OH, Pickaway, OH .....	0.9781	0.9850
1880 ..	Corpus Christi, TX, Nueces, TX, San Patricio, TX .....	0.8531	0.8969
1900 ..	Cumberland, MD-WV (Maryland Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Allegany, MD, Mineral, WV .....	0.8555	0.8986
1900 ..	Cumberland, MD-WV (West Virginia Hospital), Allegany, MD, Mineral, WV .....	0.8242	0.8760
1920 ..	Dallas, TX, <sup>1</sup> Collin, TX, Dallas, TX, Denton, TX, Ellis, TX, Henderson, TX, Hunt, TX, Kaufman, TX, Rockwall, TX ....	0.9348	0.9549
1950 ..	Danville, VA, Danville City, VA, Pittsylvania, VA .....	0.9045	0.9336
1960 ..	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL, Scott, IA, Henry, IL, Rock Island, IL .....	0.8413	0.8884
2000 ..	Dayton-Springfield, OH, Clark, OH, Greene, OH, Miami, OH, Montgomery, OH .....	0.9605	0.9728
2020 ..	Daytona Beach, FL, Flagler, FL, Volusia, FL .....	0.9134	0.9399
2030 ..	Decatur, AL, Lawrence, AL, Morgan, AL .....	0.8233	0.8753
2040 ..	Decatur, IL, Macon, IL .....	0.8035	0.8609
2080 ..	Denver, CO, <sup>1</sup> Adams, CO, Arapahoe, CO, Denver, CO, Douglas, CO, Jefferson, CO .....	1.0334	1.0228
2120 ..	Des Moines, IA, Dallas, IA, Polk, IA, Warren, IA .....	0.8475	0.8929
2160 ..	Detroit, MI, <sup>1</sup> Lapeer, MI, Macomb, MI, Monroe, MI, Oakland, MI, St. Clair, MI, Wayne, MI .....	1.0544	1.0369
2180 ..	Dothan, AL, Dale, AL, Houston, AL .....	0.7892	0.8503
2190 ..	Dover, DE, Kent, DE .....	0.9363	0.9559
2200 ..	Dubuque, IA, Dubuque, IA .....	0.8222	0.8745
2240 ..	Duluth-Superior, MN-WI, St. Louis, MN, Douglas, WI .....	1.0009	1.0006
2281 ..	Dutchess County, NY, Dutchess, NY .....	0.9883	0.9920
2290 ..	Eau Claire, WI, <sup>2</sup> Chippewa, WI, Eau Claire, WI .....	0.8711	0.9098
2320 ..	El Paso, TX, El Paso, TX .....	0.9215	0.9456
2330 ..	Elkhart-Goshen, IN, Elkhart, IN .....	0.9368	0.9563
2335 ..	Elmira, NY, <sup>2</sup> Chemung, NY .....	0.8588	0.9010
2340 ..	Enid, OK, Garfield, OK .....	0.7983	0.8570
2360 ..	Erie, PA, Erie, PA .....	0.9271	0.9495
2400 ..	Eugene-Springfield, OR, Lane, OR .....	1.1193	1.0802
2440 ..	Evansville-Henderson, IN-KY, Posey, IN, Vanderburgh, IN, Warrick, IN, Henderson, KY .....	0.8528	0.8967
2520 ..	Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN, Clay, MN, Cass, ND .....	0.9520	0.9669
2560 ..	Fayetteville, NC, Cumberland, NC .....	0.8389	0.8867
2580 ..	Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR, Benton, AR, Washington, AR .....	0.8614	0.9029
2620 ..	Flagstaff, AZ-UT, Coconino, AZ, Kane, UT .....	0.9523	0.9671
2640 ..	Flint, MI, Genesee, MI .....	1.1031	1.0695
2650 ..	Florence, AL, Colbert, AL, Lauderdale, AL .....	0.7676	0.8343
2655 ..	Florence, SC, Florence, SC .....	0.8501	0.8947
2670 ..	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO, Larimer, CO .....	1.0770	1.0521
2680 ..	Fort Lauderdale, FL, <sup>1</sup> Broward, FL .....	0.9845	0.9894
2700 ..	Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL, Lee, FL .....	0.8942	0.9263
2710 ..	Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL, Martin, FL, St. Lucie, FL .....	1.0241	1.0164
2720 ..	Fort Smith, AR-OK, Crawford, AR, Sebastian, AR, Sequoyah, OK .....	0.7623	0.8304
2750 ..	Fort Walton Beach, FL, <sup>2</sup> Okaloosa, FL .....	0.8877	0.9217
2760 ..	Fort Wayne, IN, Adams, IN, Allen, IN, De Kalb, IN, Huntington, IN, Wells, IN, Whitley, IN .....	0.9047	0.9337
2800 ..	Fort Worth-Arlington, TX, <sup>1</sup> Hood, TX, Johnson, TX, Parker, TX, Tarrant, TX .....	0.9727	0.9812
2840 ..	Fresno, CA, Fresno, CA, Madera, CA .....	1.0700	1.0474
2880 ..	Gadsden, AL, Etowah, AL .....	0.8780	0.9148
2900 ..	Gainesville, FL, Alachua, FL .....	0.9462	0.9628
2920 ..	Galveston-Texas City, TX, Galveston, TX .....	1.0894	1.0604
2960 ..	Gary, IN, Lake, IN, Porter, IN .....	0.9462	0.9628
2975 ..	Glens Falls, NY, <sup>2</sup> Warren, NY, Washington, NY .....	0.8588	0.9010
2980 ..	Goldsboro, NC, Wayne, NC .....	0.8530	0.8968
2985 ..	Grand Forks, ND-MN, Polk, MN, Grand Forks, ND .....	0.8899	0.9232
2995 ..	Grand Junction, CO, Mesa, CO .....	0.9116	0.9386
3000 ..	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI, <sup>1</sup> Allegan, MI, Kent, MI, Muskegon, MI, Ottawa, MI .....	0.9971	0.9980
3040 ..	Great Falls, MT, Cascade, MT .....	0.9284	0.9504
3060 ..	Greeley, CO, Weld, CO .....	0.9457	0.9625
3080 ..	Green Bay, WI, Brown, WI .....	0.9248	0.9479
3120 ..	Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC, <sup>1</sup> Alamance, NC, Davidson, NC, Davie, NC, Forsyth, NC Guilford, NC, Randolph, NC, Stokes, NC, Yadkin, NC.	0.9547	0.9688
3150 ..	Greenville, NC, Pitt, NC .....	0.9434	0.9609
3160 ..	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC, Anderson, SC, Cherokee, SC, Greenville, SC, Pickens, SC, Spartanburg, SC.	0.9222	0.9460
3180 ..	Hagerstown, MD, Washington, MD .....	1.0183	1.0125
3200 ..	Hamilton-Middletown, OH, Butler, OH .....	0.9233	0.9468
3240 ..	Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA, Cumberland, PA, Dauphin, PA, Lebanon, PA, Perry, PA .....	1.0060	1.0041
3283 ..	Hartford, CT, <sup>1,2</sup> Hartford, CT, Litchfield, CT, Middlesex, CT, Tolland, CT .....	1.2074	1.1378
3285 ..	Hattiesburg, MS, Forrest, <sup>2</sup> MS, Lamar, MS .....	0.7312	0.8070
3290 ..	Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC, Alexander, NC, Burke, NC, Caldwell, NC, Catawba, NC .....	0.8649	0.9054
3320 ..	Honolulu, HI, Honolulu, HI .....	1.1510	1.1011
3350 ..	Houma, LA, Lafourche, LA, Terrebonne, LA .....	0.8197	0.8727
3360 ..	Houston, TX, <sup>1</sup> Chambers, TX, Fort Bend, TX, Harris, TX, Liberty, TX, Montgomery, TX, Waller, TX .....	0.9889	0.9924

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas—Continued

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
3400 ..	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH, Boyd, KY, Carter, KY, Greenup, KY, Lawrence, OH, Cabell, WV, Wayne, WV .....	0.9647	0.9757
3440 ..	Huntsville, AL, Limestone, AL, Madison, AL .....	0.8385	0.8864
3480 ..	Indianapolis, IN, <sup>1</sup> Boone, IN, Hamilton, IN, Hancock, IN, Hendricks, IN, Johnson, IN, Madison, IN, Marion, IN, Morgan, IN, Shelby, IN.	0.9831	0.9884
3500 ..	Iowa City, IA, Johnson, IA .....	0.9481	0.9642
3520 ..	Jackson, MI, Jackson, MI .....	0.9224	0.9462
3560 ..	Jackson, MS, Hinds, MS, Madison, MS, Rankin, MS .....	0.8292	0.8796
3580 ..	Jackson, TN, Madison, TN, Chester, TN .....	0.8560	0.8990
3600 ..	Jacksonville, FL, <sup>1</sup> Clay, FL, Duval, FL, Nassau, FL, St. Johns, FL .....	0.8900	0.9233
3605 ..	Jacksonville, NC, <sup>2</sup> Onslow, NC .....	0.8112	0.8665
3610 ..	Jamestown, NY, <sup>2</sup> Chautauqua, NY .....	0.8588	0.9010
3620 ..	Janesville-Beloit, WI, Rock, WI .....	0.9051	0.9340
3640 ..	Jersey City, NJ, Hudson, NJ .....	1.1598	1.1069
3660 ..	Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA, Carter, TN, Hawkins, TN, Sullivan, TN, Unicoi, TN, Washington, TN, Bristol City, VA, Scott, VA, Washington, VA.	0.8773	0.9143
3680 ..	Johnstown, PA, <sup>2</sup> Cambria, PA, Somerset, PA .....	0.8664	0.9065
3700 ..	Jonesboro, AR, Craighead, AR .....	0.7579	0.8271
3710 ..	Joplin, MO, Jasper, MO, Newton, MO .....	0.7873	0.8489
3720 ..	Kalamazoo-Battlecreek, MI, Calhoun, MI, Kalamazoo, MI, Van Buren, MI .....	1.1331	1.0893
3740 ..	Kankakee, IL, Kankakee, IL .....	0.9418	0.9598
3760 ..	Kansas City, KS-MO, <sup>1</sup> Johnson, KS, Leavenworth, KS, Miami, KS, Wyandotte, KS, Cass, MO, Clay, MO, Clinton, MO, Jackson, MO, Lafayette, MO, Platte, MO, Ray, MO.	0.9645	0.9756
3800 ..	Kenosha, WI, Kenosha, WI .....	0.9129	0.9395
3810 ..	Killeen-Temple, TX, Bell, TX, Coryell, TX .....	1.0109	1.0075
3840 ..	Knoxville, TN, Anderson, TN, Blount, TN, Knox, TN, Loudon, TN, Sevier, TN, Union, TN .....	0.8918	0.9246
3850 ..	Kokomo, IN, Howard, IN, Tipton, IN .....	0.9275	0.9498
3870 ..	La Crosse, WI-MN, Houston, MN, La Crosse, WI .....	0.8913	0.9242
3880 ..	Lafayette, LA, Acadia, LA, Lafayette, LA, St. Landry, LA, St. Martin, LA .....	0.8293	0.8797
3920 ..	Lafayette, IN, Clinton, IN, Tippecanoe, IN .....	0.8909	0.9239
3960 ..	Lake Charles, LA, Calcasieu, LA .....	0.7674	0.8342
3980 ..	Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL, Polk, FL .....	0.8877	0.9217
4000 ..	Lancaster, PA, Lancaster, PA .....	0.9561	0.9697
4040 ..	Lansing-East Lansing, MI, Clinton, MI, Eaton, MI, Ingham, MI .....	1.0090	1.0062
4080 ..	Laredo, TX, <sup>2</sup> Webb, TX .....	0.7565	0.8261
4100 ..	Las Cruces, NM, Dona Ana, NM .....	0.8970	0.9283
4120 ..	Las Vegas, NV-AZ, <sup>1</sup> Mohave, AZ, Clark, NV, Nye, NV .....	1.1413	1.0947
4150 ..	Lawrence, KS, Douglas, KS .....	0.8655	0.9058
4200 ..	Lawton, OK, Comanche, OK .....	0.8697	0.9088
4243 ..	Lewiston-Auburn, ME, Androscoggin, ME .....	0.9149	0.9409
4280 ..	Lexington, KY, Bourbon, KY, Clark, KY, Fayette, KY, Jessamine, KY, Madison, KY, Scott, KY, Woodford, KY .....	0.8506	0.8951
4320 ..	Lima, OH, Allen, OH, Auglaize, OH .....	0.8949	0.9268
4360 ..	Lincoln, NE, Lancaster, NE .....	0.9303	0.9517
4400 ..	Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR, Faulkner, AR, Lonoke, AR, Pulaski, AR, Saline, AR .....	0.8534	0.8971
4420 ..	Longview-Marshall, TX, Gregg, TX, Harrison, TX, Upshur, TX .....	0.8698	0.9089
4480 ..	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA, <sup>1</sup> Los Angeles, CA .....	1.2116	1.1405
4520 ..	Louisville, KY-IN, Clark, IN, Floyd, IN, Harrison, IN, Scott, IN, Bullitt, KY, Jefferson, KY, Oldham, KY .....	0.9093	0.9370
4600 ..	Lubbock, TX, Lubbock, TX .....	0.8496	0.8944
4640 ..	Lynchburg, VA, Amherst, VA, Bedford, VA, Bedford City, VA, Campbell, VA, Lynchburg City, VA .....	0.8900	0.9233
4680 ..	Macon, GA, Bibb, GA, Houston, GA, Jones, GA, Peach, GA, Twiggs, GA .....	0.8980	0.9290
4720 ..	Madison, WI, Dane, WI .....	1.0018	1.0012
4800 ..	Mansfield, OH, Crawford, OH, Richland, OH .....	0.8534	0.8971
4840 ..	Mayaguez, PR, Anasco, PR, Cabo Rojo, PR, Hormigueros, PR, Mayaguez, PR, Sabana Grande, PR, San German, PR.	0.4401	0.5700
4880 ..	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX, Hidalgo, TX .....	0.8893	0.9228
4890 ..	Medford-Ashland, OR, Jackson, OR .....	1.0020	1.0014
4900 ..	Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL, Brevard, FL .....	0.9216	0.9456
4920 ..	Memphis, TN-AR-MS, <sup>1</sup> Crittenden, AR, DeSoto, MS, Fayette, TN, Shelby, TN, Tipton, TN .....	0.8361	0.8846
4940 ..	Merced, CA, Merced, CA .....	1.0218	1.0149
5000 ..	Miami, FL, <sup>1</sup> Dade, FL .....	1.0017	1.0012
5015 ..	Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ, <sup>1</sup> Hunterdon, NJ, Middlesex, NJ, Somerset, NJ .....	1.0762	1.0516
5080 ..	Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI, <sup>1</sup> Milwaukee, WI, Ozaukee, WI, Washington, WI, Waukesha, WI .....	0.9356	0.9554
5120 ..	Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI, <sup>1</sup> 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.	1.0854	1.0577
5140 ..	Missoula, MT, Missoula, MT .....	0.9189	0.9437
5160 ..	Mobile, AL, Baldwin, AL, Mobile, AL .....	0.8377	0.8858
5170 ..	Modesto, CA, Stanislaus, CA .....	1.0346	1.0236
5190 ..	Monmouth-Ocean, NJ, <sup>1</sup> Monmouth, NJ, Ocean, NJ .....	1.1317	1.0884
5200 ..	Monroe, LA, Quachita, LA .....	0.8219	0.8743
5240 ..	Montgomery, AL, Autauga, AL, Elmore, AL, Montgomery, AL .....	0.7860	0.8480
5280 ..	Muncie, IN, Delaware, IN .....	0.9414	0.9595
5330 ..	Myrtle Beach, SC, Horry, SC .....	0.8179	0.8714

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas—Continued

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
5345 ..	Naples, FL, Collier, FL .....	1.0177	1.0121
5360 ..	Nashville, TN, <sup>1</sup> Cheatham, TN, Davidson, TN, Dickson, TN, Robertson, TN, Rutherford, TN, Sumner, TN, Williamson, TN, Wilson, TN .....	0.9480	0.9641
5380 ..	Nassau-Suffolk, NY, <sup>1</sup> Nassau, NY, Suffolk, NY .....	1.3593	1.2339
5483 ..	New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT, <sup>1</sup> Fairfield, CT, New Haven, CT .....	1.2245	1.1488
5523 ..	New London-Norwich, CT, <sup>2</sup> New London, CT .....	1.2074	1.1378
5560 ..	New Orleans, LA, <sup>1</sup> Jefferson, LA, Orleans, LA, Plaquemines, LA, St. Bernard, LA, St. Charles, LA, St. James, LA, St. John The Baptist, LA, St. Tammany, LA .....	0.9310	0.9522
5600 ..	New York, NY, Bronx, NY, <sup>1</sup> Kings, NY, New York, NY, Putnam, NY, Queens, NY, Richmond, NY, Rockland, NY, Westchester, NY .....	1.4461	1.2874
5640 ..	Newark, NJ, <sup>1</sup> Essex, NJ, Morris, NJ, Sussex, NJ, Union, NJ, Warren, NJ .....	1.0914	1.0617
5660 ..	Newburgh, NY-PA, Orange, NY, Pike, PA .....	1.1223	1.0822
5720 ..	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC, <sup>1</sup> 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 .....	0.8275	0.8784
5775 ..	Oakland, CA, <sup>1</sup> Alameda, CA, Contra Costa, CA .....	1.5162	1.3298
5790 ..	Ocala, FL, Marion, FL .....	0.9152	0.9411
5800 ..	Odessa-Midland, TX, Ector, TX, Midland, TX .....	0.8664	0.9065
58801 ..	Oklahoma City, OK, <sup>1</sup> Canadian, OK, Cleveland, OK, Logan, OK, McClain, OK, Oklahoma, OK, Pottawatomie, OK ..	0.8708	0.9096
5910 ..	Olympia, WA, Thurston, WA .....	1.1522	1.1019
5920 ..	Omaha, NE-IA, Pottawattamie, IA, Cass, NE, Douglas, NE, Sarpy, NE, Washington, NE .....	0.9972	0.9981
5945 ..	Orange County, CA, <sup>1</sup> Orange, CA .....	1.1468	1.0983
5960 ..	Orlando, FL, <sup>1</sup> Lake, FL, Orange, FL, Osceola, FL, Seminole, FL .....	0.9813	0.9872
5990 ..	Owensboro, KY, <sup>2</sup> Daviess, KY .....	0.7844	0.8468
6015 ..	Panama City, FL, <sup>2</sup> Bay, FL .....	0.8877	0.9217
6020 ..	Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH (West Virginia Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Washington, OH, Wood, WV .....	0.8016	0.8595
6020 ..	Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH (Ohio Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Washington, OH, Wood, WV .....	0.8519	0.8960
6080 ..	Pensacola, FL, <sup>2</sup> Escambia, FL, Santa Rosa, FL .....	0.8877	0.9217
6120 ..	Peoria-Pekin, IL, Peoria, IL, Tazewell, IL, Woodford, IL .....	0.8063	0.8629
6160 ..	Philadelphia, PA-NJ, <sup>1</sup> Burlington, NJ, Camden, NJ, Gloucester, NJ, Salem, NJ, Bucks, PA, Chester, PA, Delaware, PA, Montgomery, PA, Philadelphia, PA .....	1.1370	1.0919
6200 ..	Phoenix-Mesa, AZ, <sup>1</sup> Maricopa, AZ, Pinal, AZ .....	0.9591	0.9718
6240 ..	Pine Bluff, AR, Jefferson, AR .....	0.7912	0.8518
6280 ..	Pittsburgh, PA, <sup>1</sup> Allegheny, PA, Beaver, PA, Butler, PA, Fayette, PA, Washington, PA, Westmoreland, PA .....	0.9789	0.9855
6323 ..	Pittsfield, MA, <sup>2</sup> Berkshire, MA .....	1.0834	1.0564
6340 ..	Pocatello, ID, Bannock, ID .....	0.8792	0.9156
6360 ..	Ponce, PR, Guayanilla, PR, Juana Diaz, PR, Penuelas, PR, Ponce, PR, Villalba, PR, Yauco, PR .....	0.4788	0.6039
6403 ..	Portland, ME, Cumberland, ME, Sagadahoc, ME, York, ME .....	0.9574	0.9706
6440 ..	Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA, <sup>1</sup> Clackamas, OR, Columbia, OR, Multnomah, OR, Washington, OR, Yamhill, OR, Clark, WA .....	1.1178	1.0792
6483 ..	Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI, <sup>1</sup> Bristol, RI, Kent, RI, Newport, RI, Providence, RI, Washington, RI .....	1.0801	1.0542
6520 ..	Provo-Orem, UT, Utah, UT .....	0.9885	0.9921
6560 ..	Pueblo, CO, Pueblo, CO .....	0.8712	0.9099
6580 ..	Punta Gorda, FL, Charlotte, FL .....	0.9031	0.9326
6600 ..	Racine, WI, Racine, WI .....	0.9130	0.9396
6640 ..	Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC, <sup>1</sup> Chatham, NC, Durham, NC, Franklin, NC, Johnston, NC, Orange, NC, Wake, NC .....	0.9812	0.9871
6660 ..	Rapid City, SD, Pennington, SD .....	0.8208	0.8735
6680 ..	Reading, PA, Berks, PA .....	0.9234	0.9469
6690 ..	Redding, CA, Shasta, CA .....	1.1858	1.1238
6720 ..	Reno, NV, Washoe, NV .....	1.1095	1.0738
6740 ..	Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, <sup>2</sup> WA, Benton, WA, Franklin, WA .....	1.0489	1.0332
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 .....	0.9211	0.9453
6780 ..	Riverside-San Bernardino, <sup>1</sup> CA, Riverside, CA, San Bernardino, CA .....	1.0585	1.0397
6800 ..	Roanoke, VA, Botetourt, VA, Roanoke, VA, Roanoke City, VA, Salem City, VA .....	0.8509	0.8953
6820 ..	Rochester, MN, Olmsted, MN .....	1.1698	1.1134
6840 ..	Rochester, NY, <sup>1</sup> Genesee, NY, Livingston, NY, Monroe, NY, Ontario, NY, Orleans, NY, Wayne, NY .....	0.9657	0.9764
6880 ..	Rockford, IL, Boone, IL, Ogle, IL, Winnebago, IL .....	0.8615	0.9029
6895 ..	Rocky Mount, NC, Edgecombe, NC, Nash, NC .....	0.9012	0.9312
6920 ..	Sacramento, CA, <sup>1</sup> El Dorado, CA, Placer, CA, Sacramento, CA .....	1.1962	1.1305
6960 ..	Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI, Bay, MI, Midland, MI, Saginaw, MI .....	0.9487	0.9646
6980 ..	St. Cloud, MN, Benton, MN, Stearns, MN .....	0.9586	0.9715
7000 ..	St. Joseph, MO, Andrew, MO, Buchanan, MO .....	0.9889	0.9924
7040 ..	St. Louis, MO-IL, <sup>1</sup> 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 .....	0.9151	0.9411
7080 ..	Salem, OR, <sup>2</sup> Marion, OR, Polk, OR .....	0.9912	0.9940
7120 ..	Salinas, CA, Monterey, CA .....	1.5142	1.3286
7160 ..	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT, <sup>1</sup> Davis, UT, Salt Lake, UT, Weber, UT .....	0.9420	0.9599
7200 ..	San Angelo, TX, Tom Green, TX .....	0.7646	0.8321

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas—Continued

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
7240 ..	San Antonio, TX, <sup>1</sup> Bexar, TX, Comal, TX, Guadalupe, TX, Wilson, TX .....	0.8100	0.8656
7320 ..	San Diego, CA, <sup>1</sup> San Diego, CA .....	1.2310	1.1529
7360 ..	San Francisco, CA, <sup>1</sup> Marin, CA, San Francisco, CA, San Mateo, CA .....	1.3563	1.2321
7400 ..	San Jose, CA, <sup>1</sup> Santa Clara, CA .....	1.3695	1.2403
7440 ..	San Juan-Bayamon, PR, <sup>1</sup> 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.	0.4623	0.5896
7460 ..	San Luis Obispo-Atascadero-Paso Robles, CA, San Luis Obispo, CA .....	1.1264	1.0849
7480 ..	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA, Santa Barbara, CA .....	1.1194	1.0803
7485 ..	Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA, Santa Cruz, CA .....	1.3981	1.2580
7490 ..	Santa Fe, NM, Los Alamos, NM, Santa Fe, NM .....	0.9652	0.9760
7500 ..	Santa Rosa, CA, Sonoma, CA .....	1.3071	1.2013
7510 ..	Sarasota-Bradenton, FL, Manatee, FL, Sarasota, FL .....	0.9532	0.9677
7520 ..	Savannah, GA, Bryan, GA, Chatham, GA, Effingham, GA .....	1.0060	1.0041
7560 ..	Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA, <sup>2</sup> Columbia, PA, Lackawanna, PA, Luzerne, PA, Wyoming, PA .....	0.8664	0.9065
7600 ..	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA, <sup>1</sup> Island, WA, King, WA, Snohomish, WA .....	1.1535	1.1027
7610 ..	Sharon, PA, Mercer, PA .....	0.8847	0.9195
7620 ..	Sheboygan, WI, <sup>2</sup> Sheboygan, WI .....	0.8711	0.9098
7640 ..	Sherman-Denison, TX, Grayson, TX .....	0.8570	0.8997
7680 ..	Shreveport-Bossier City, LA, Bossier, LA, Caddo, LA, Webster, LA .....	0.9386	0.9575
7720 ..	Sioux City, IA-NE, Woodbury, IA, Dakota, NE .....	0.8481	0.8933
7760 ..	Sioux Falls, SD, Lincoln, SD, Minnehaha, SD .....	0.8912	0.9242
7800 ..	South Bend, IN, St. Joseph, IN .....	0.9859	0.9903
7840 ..	Spokane, WA, Spokane, WA .....	1.0928	1.0627
7880 ..	Springfield, IL, Menard, IL, Sangamon, IL .....	0.8720	0.9105
7920 ..	Springfield, MO, Christian, MO, Greene, MO, Webster, MO .....	0.8071	0.8635
8003 ..	Springfield, MA, Hampden, MA, Hampshire, MA .....	1.0834	1.0564
8050 ..	State College, PA, Centre, PA .....	0.9449	0.9619
8080 ..	Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV (Ohio Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Jefferson, OH, Brooke, WV, Hancock, WV .....	0.8519	0.8960
8080 ..	Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV (West Virginia Hospitals), Jefferson, OH, Brooke, WV, Hancock, WV .....	0.8428	0.8895
8120 ..	Stockton-Lodi, CA, San Joaquin, CA .....	1.1075	1.0724
8140 ..	Sumter, SC, Sumter, SC .....	0.8127	0.8676
8160 ..	Syracuse, NY, Cayuga, NY, Madison, NY, Onondaga, NY, Oswego, NY .....	0.9400	0.9585
8200 ..	Tacoma, WA, <sup>2</sup> Pierce, WA .....	1.0489	1.0332
8240 ..	Tallahassee, FL, <sup>2</sup> Gadsden, FL, Leon, FL .....	0.8877	0.9217
8280 ..	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL, <sup>1</sup> Hernando, FL, Hillsborough, FL, Pasco, FL, Pinellas, FL .....	0.9183	0.9433
8320 ..	Terre Haute, IN, Clay, IN, Vermillion, IN, Vigo, IN .....	0.8991	0.9298
8360 ..	Texarkana, AR-Texarkana, TX, Miller, AR, Bowie, TX .....	0.8506	0.8951
8400 ..	Toledo, OH, Fulton, OH, Lucas, OH, Wood, OH .....	0.9991	0.9994
8440 ..	Topeka, KS, Shawnee, KS .....	0.9812	0.9871
8480 ..	Trenton, NJ, Mercer, NJ .....	1.0509	1.0346
8520 ..	Tucson, AZ, Pima, AZ .....	0.9028	0.9324
8560 ..	Tulsa, OK, Creek, OK, Osage, OK, Rogers, OK, Tulsa, OK, Wagoner, OK .....	0.8463	0.8920
8600 ..	Tuscaloosa, AL, Tuscaloosa, AL .....	0.7641	0.8317
8640 ..	Tyler, TX, Smith, TX .....	0.8818	0.9175
8680 ..	Utica-Rome, NY, <sup>2</sup> Herkimer, NY, Oneida, NY .....	0.8588	0.9010
8720 ..	Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA, Napa, CA, Solano, CA .....	1.3311	1.2164
8735 ..	Ventura, CA, Ventura, CA .....	1.0764	1.0517
8750 ..	Victoria, TX, Victoria, TX .....	0.8382	0.8862
8760 ..	Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ, Cumberland, NJ .....	1.0440	1.0299
8780 ..	Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA, Tulare, CA .....	1.0083	1.0057
8800 ..	Waco, TX, McLennan, TX .....	0.8371	0.8854
8840 ..	Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV, <sup>1</sup> 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, Spotsylvania, VA, Stafford, VA, Warren, VA, Berkeley, WV, Jefferson, WV.	1.0807	1.0546
8920 ..	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA, Black Hawk, IA .....	0.8332	0.8825
8940 ..	Wausau, WI, Marathon, WI .....	0.9733	0.9816
8960 ..	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL, <sup>1</sup> Palm Beach, FL .....	1.0181	1.0124
9000 ..	Wheeling, WV-OH (West Virginia Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Belmont, OH, Marshall, WV, Ohio, WV .....	0.7875	0.8491
9000 ..	Wheeling, WV-OH (Ohio Hospitals), <sup>2</sup> Belmont, OH, Marshall, WV, Ohio, WV .....	0.8519	0.8960
9040 ..	Wichita, KS, Butler, KS, Harvey, KS, Sedgwick, KS .....	0.8898	0.9232
9080 ..	Wichita Falls, TX, Archer, TX, Wichita, TX .....	0.7830	0.8458
9140 ..	Williamsport, PA, <sup>2</sup> Lycoming, PA .....	0.8664	0.9065
9160 ..	Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD, New Castle, DE, Cecil, MD .....	1.1868	1.1244
9200 ..	Wilmington, NC, New Hanover, NC, Brunswick, NC .....	0.9343	0.9545
9260 ..	Yakima, WA, <sup>2</sup> Yakima, WA .....	1.0489	1.0332
9270 ..	Yolo, CA, Yolo, CA .....	1.1233	1.0829

TABLE 4A.—Wage Index and Capital Geographic Adjustment Factor (GAF) for Urban Areas—Continued

	Urban area (constituent counties)	Wage index	GAF
9280 ..	York, PA, York, PA .....	0.9410	0.9592
9320 ..	Youngstown-Warren, OH, Columbiana, OH, Mahoning, OH, Trumbull, OH .....	0.9815	0.9873
9340 ..	Yuba City, CA, Sutter, CA, Yuba, CA .....	1.0865	1.0585
9360 ..	Yuma, AZ, Yuma, AZ .....	1.0058	1.0040

<sup>1</sup> Large Urban Area.

<sup>2</sup> Hospitals geographically located in the area are assigned the statewide rural wage index for FY 1999.

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

Nonurban area	Wage index	GAF
Alabama .....	0.7326	0.8081
Alaska .....	1.2430	1.1606
Arizona .....	0.7989	0.8575
Arkansas .....	0.7250	0.8023
California .....	0.9979	0.9986
Colorado .....	0.8436	0.8901
Connecticut .....	1.2074	1.1378
Delaware .....	0.8807	0.9167
Florida .....	0.8877	0.9217
Georgia .....	0.7888	0.8500
Hawaii .....	1.0910	1.0615
Idaho .....	0.8477	0.8930
Illinois .....	0.7925	0.8528
Indiana .....	0.8380	0.8860
Iowa .....	0.7777	0.8418
Kansas .....	0.7319	0.8076
Kentucky .....	0.7844	0.8468
Louisiana .....	0.7465	0.8186
Maine .....	0.8467	0.8923
Maryland .....	0.8555	0.8986
Massachusetts .....	1.0834	1.0564
Michigan .....	0.8884	0.9222
Minnesota .....	0.8595	0.9015
Mississippi .....	0.7312	0.8070
Missouri .....	0.7452	0.8176
Montana .....	0.8578	0.9003
Nebraska .....	0.7674	0.8342
Nevada .....	0.9256	0.9484
New Hampshire .....	1.0240	1.0164
New Jersey <sup>1</sup> .....	.....	.....
New Mexico .....	0.8269	0.8780
New York .....	0.8588	0.9010
North Carolina .....	0.8112	0.8665
North Dakota .....	0.7497	0.8210
Ohio .....	0.8519	0.8960
Oklahoma .....	0.7124	0.7928
Oregon .....	0.9912	0.9940
Pennsylvania .....	0.8664	0.9065
Puerto Rico .....	0.4080	0.5412
Rhode Island .....	.....	.....
South Carolina .....	0.8046	0.8617
South Dakota .....	0.7508	0.8218
Tennessee .....	0.7492	0.8206
Texas .....	0.7565	0.8261
Utah .....	0.8859	0.9204
Vermont .....	0.9416	0.9596
Virginia .....	0.7857	0.8478
Washington .....	1.0489	1.0332
West Virginia .....	0.7875	0.8491
Wisconsin .....	0.8711	0.9098
Wyoming .....	0.8768	0.9139

<sup>1</sup> 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 .....	0.8066	0.8631



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

Area	Wage index	GAF
Albany, GA	0.7888	0.8500
Albuquerque, NM	0.8613	0.9028
Alexandria, LA	0.8526	0.8966
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA	1.0204	1.0139
Amarillo, TX	0.8517	0.8959
Anchorage, AK	1.2979	1.1955
Asheville, NC	0.8940	0.9261
Atlanta, GA	0.9915	0.9942
Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC	0.9233	0.9468
Baltimore, MD	0.9642	0.9753
Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA	1.4427	1.2853
Baton Rouge, LA	0.8872	0.9213
Benton Harbor, MI	0.8884	0.9222
Bergen-Passaic, NJ	1.1749	1.1167
Billings, MT	0.9143	0.9405
Binghamton, NY	0.9059	0.9346
Birmingham, AL	0.9073	0.9356
Bismarck, ND	0.7846	0.8469
Boise City, ID	0.9190	0.9438
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH	1.1288	1.0865
Brazoria, TX	0.8928	0.9253
Bryan-College Station, TX	0.8066	0.8631
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	0.9587	0.9715
Burlington, VT	0.9596	0.9722
Caguas, PR	0.4410	0.5708
Canton-Massillon, OH	0.8813	0.9171
Casper, WY	0.9150	0.9410
Champaign-Urbana, IL	0.8770	0.9140
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	0.9114	0.9384
Charleston, WV	0.8763	0.9135
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	0.9686	0.9784
Charlottesville, VA	0.9733	0.9816
Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.8869	0.9211
Chicago, IL	1.0461	1.0313
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	0.9595	0.9721
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	0.8213	0.8739
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH	0.9886	0.9922
Columbia, MO	0.8798	0.9160
Columbus, GA-AL	0.8511	0.8955
Columbus, OH	0.9781	0.9850
Corpus Christi, TX	0.8531	0.8969
Dallas, TX	0.9348	0.9549
Danville, VA	0.8716	0.9102
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	0.8413	0.8884
Dayton-Springfield, OH	0.9605	0.9728
Denver, CO	1.0334	1.0228
Des Moines, IA	0.8475	0.8929
Duluth-Superior, MN-WI	1.0009	1.0006
Dutchess County, NY	0.9883	0.9920
Elkhart-Goshen, IN	0.9368	0.9563
Eugene-Springfield, OR	1.1048	1.0706
Evansville-Henderson, IN-KY	0.8415	0.8885
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN	0.9246	0.9477
Fayetteville, NC	0.8389	0.8867
Flagstaff, AZ-UT	0.9523	0.9671
Flint, MI	1.1031	1.0695
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	1.0770	1.0521
Fort Lauderdale, FL	0.9845	0.9894
Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL	1.0241	1.0164
Fort Smith, AR-OK	0.7519	0.8226
Fort Walton Beach, FL	0.8621	0.9034
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	0.9727	0.9812
Gadsden, AL	0.8780	0.9148
Gainesville, FL	0.9462	0.9628
Goldsboro, NC	0.8335	0.8827
Grand Forks, ND-MN	0.8899	0.9232
Grand Junction, CO	0.9116	0.9386
Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	0.9856	0.9901
Great Falls, MT	0.9284	0.9504
Greeley, CO	0.9356	0.9554
Green Bay, WI	0.9248	0.9479

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

Area	Wage index	GAF
Greenville, NC	0.9098	0.9373
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	0.9222	0.9460
Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA	1.0060	1.0041
Hartford, CT	1.1854	1.1235
Hattiesburg, MS	0.7312	0.8070
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC	0.8649	0.9054
Honolulu, HI	1.1510	1.1011
Houston, TX	0.9889	0.9924
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	0.9275	0.9498
Huntsville, AL	0.8223	0.8746
Indianapolis, IN	0.9727	0.9812
Iowa City, IA	0.9362	0.9559
Jackson, MS	0.8292	0.8796
Jackson, TN	0.8560	0.8990
Jacksonville, FL	0.8900	0.9233
Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA	0.8773	0.9143
Jonesboro, AR	0.7579	0.8271
Joplin, MO	0.7873	0.8489
Kalamazoo-Battlecreek, MI	1.1078	1.0726
Kansas City, KS-MO	0.9645	0.9756
Knoxville, TN	0.8918	0.9246
Lafayette, LA	0.8293	0.8797
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	0.9974	0.9982
Las Cruces, NM	0.8970	0.9283
Las Vegas, NV-AZ	1.1413	1.0947
Lexington, KY	0.8506	0.8951
Lima, OH	0.8768	0.9139
Lincoln, NE	0.9032	0.9327
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	0.8534	0.8971
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	1.2116	1.1405
Louisville, KY-IN	0.9093	0.9370
Macon, GA	0.8775	0.9144
Madison, WI	1.0018	1.0012
Mansfield, OH	0.8534	0.8971
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	0.8361	0.8846
Merced, CA	1.0218	1.0149
Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI	0.9356	0.9554
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	1.0854	1.0577
Modesto, CA	1.0346	1.0236
Monroe, LA	0.8080	0.8642
Montgomery, AL	0.7860	0.8480
Myrtle Beach, SC	0.8179	0.8714
Nashville, TN	0.9302	0.9517
New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT	1.2245	1.1488
New London-Norwich, CT	1.1640	1.1096
New Orleans, LA	0.9310	0.9522
New York, NY	1.4461	1.2874
Newburgh, NY-PA	1.1223	1.0822
Oakland, CA	1.5162	1.3298
Odessa-Midland, TX	0.8664	0.9065
Oklahoma City, OK	0.8708	0.9096
Omaha, NE-IA	0.9972	0.9981
Orange County, CA	1.1468	1.0983
Orlando, FL	0.9813	0.9872
Peoria-Pekin, IL	0.8063	0.8629
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	1.1370	1.0919
Pittsburgh, PA	0.9642	0.9753
Pocatello, ID (Idaho Hospital)	0.8654	0.9057
Pocatello, ID (Wyoming Hospitals)	0.8768	0.9139
Portland, ME	0.9574	0.9706
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	1.1178	1.0792
Provo-Orem, UT	0.9885	0.9921
Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	0.9812	0.9871
Rapid City, SD	0.8208	0.8735
Reno, NV	1.1095	1.0738
Rochester, MN	1.1698	1.1134
Rockford, IL	0.8615	0.9029
Sacramento, CA	1.1962	1.1305
Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	0.9487	0.9646
St. Cloud, MN	0.9586	0.9715
St. Louis, MO-IL	0.9151	0.9411

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

Area	Wage index	GAF
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT .....	0.9420	0.9599
San Diego, CA .....	1.2310	1.1529
Santa Fe, NM .....	0.9516	0.9666
Santa Rosa, CA .....	1.2907	1.1909
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA .....	1.1535	1.1027
Sharon, PA .....	0.8847	0.9195
Sherman-Denison, TX .....	0.8249	0.8765
Sioux City, IA-NE .....	0.8481	0.8933
Sioux Falls, SD .....	0.8809	0.9168
South Bend, IN .....	0.9859	0.9903
Spokane, WA .....	1.0729	1.0494
Springfield, IL .....	0.8720	0.9105
Springfield, MO .....	0.8071	0.8635
State College, PA .....	0.8793	0.9157
Syracuse, NY .....	0.9400	0.9585
Tallahassee, FL .....	0.8500	0.8947
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL .....	0.9183	0.9433
Texarkana, AR-Texarkana, TX .....	0.8506	0.8951
Toledo, OH .....	0.9991	0.9994
Topeka, KS .....	0.9588	0.9716
Tucson, AZ .....	0.9028	0.9324
Tulsa, OK .....	0.8359	0.8845
Tuscaloosa, AL .....	0.7641	0.8317
Tyler, TX .....	0.8818	0.9175
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA .....	1.3311	1.2164
Victoria, TX .....	0.8382	0.8862
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV .....	1.0807	1.0546
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA .....	0.8332	0.8825
Wausau, WI .....	0.9422	0.9600
Wichita, KS .....	0.8770	0.9140
Wichita Falls, TX .....	0.7830	0.8458
Rural Alabama .....	0.7326	0.8081
Rural Illinois .....	0.7925	0.8528
Rural Louisiana .....	0.7465	0.8186
Rural Massachusetts .....	1.0399	1.0272
Rural Michigan .....	0.8884	0.9222
Rural Minnesota .....	0.8595	0.9015
Rural Missouri .....	0.7452	0.8176
Rural Nevada .....	0.8832	0.9185
Rural New Mexico .....	0.8269	0.8780
Rural Oregon .....	0.9912	0.9940
Rural Washington .....	1.0489	1.0332
Rural Wyoming .....	0.8768	0.9139

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage	Urban area	Average hourly wage	Urban area	Average hourly wage
Abilene, TX .....	16.5825	Athens, GA .....	18.0203	Bismarck, ND .....	16.6736
Aguadilla, PR .....	9.8222	Atlanta, GA .....	20.6008	Bloomington, IN .....	18.6271
Akron, OH .....	20.5687	Atlantic-Cape May, NJ .....	23.9678	Bloomington-Normal, IL .....	18.3900
Albany, GA .....	16.5708	Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC .....	19.1829	Boise City, ID .....	19.0323
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY .....	17.8900	Austin-San Marcos, TX .....	18.2464	Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH .....	23.4143
Albuquerque, NM .....	17.8958	Bakersfield, CA .....	19.8019	Boulder-Longmont, CO .....	20.8550
Alexandria, LA .....	17.7146	Baltimore, MD .....	20.0332	Brazoria, TX .....	18.5041
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA .....	21.2002	Bangor, ME .....	19.6846	Bremerton, WA .....	22.9686
Altoona, PA .....	19.3951	Barnstable-Yarmouth, MA .....	31.9593	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX .....	17.1138
Amarillo, TX .....	17.6070	Baton Rouge, LA .....	18.4325	Bryan-College Station, TX .....	16.2473
Anchorage, AK .....	26.6324	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX .....	17.9913	Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY .....	19.9187
Ann Arbor, MI .....	22.9238	Bellingham, WA .....	23.7572	Burlington, VT .....	19.8983
Anniston, AL .....	17.9884	Benton Harbor, MI .....	17.7241	Caguas, PR .....	9.1414
Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI .....	18.3354	Bergen-Passaic, NJ .....	25.3184	Canton-Massillon, OH .....	18.3114
Arecibo, PR .....	10.1129	Billings, MT .....	18.9960	Casper, WY .....	18.0774
Asheville, NC .....	18.5755	Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS .....	17.1946	Cedar Rapids, IA .....	18.3134
		Binghamton, NY .....	18.8217	Champaign-Urbana, IL .....	18.1242
		Birmingham, AL .....	18.8506		

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Charleston-North Charleston, SC .....	18.9373
Charleston, WV .....	18.6776
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC .....	20.1245
Charlottesville, VA .....	21.3425
Chattanooga, TN-GA .....	18.8525
Cheyenne, WY .....	16.9321
Chicago, IL .....	21.7349
Chico-Paradise, CA .....	21.0787
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN .....	19.9348
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY .....	16.7045
Cleveland-Lorain-Elyria, OH .....	20.5401
Colorado Springs, CO .....	19.5098
Columbia, MO .....	18.5780
Columbia, SC .....	19.3016
Columbus, GA-AL .....	17.6831
Columbus, OH .....	20.3213
Corpus Christi, TX .....	17.6885
Cumberland, MD-WV .....	17.1237
Dallas, TX .....	19.4652
Danville, VA .....	18.7936
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL .....	17.4790
Dayton-Springfield, OH .....	19.9557
Daytona Beach, FL .....	18.9775
Decatur, AL .....	17.1056
Decatur, IL .....	16.6936
Denver, CO .....	21.4638
Des Moines, IA .....	17.5526
Detroit, MI .....	21.9074
Dothan, AL .....	16.3982
Dover, DE .....	19.4527
Dubuque, IA .....	17.0836
Duluth-Superior, MN-WI .....	20.6977
Dutchess County, NY .....	21.8781
Eau Claire, WI .....	17.8112
El Paso, TX .....	19.1468
Elkhart-Goshen, IN .....	19.3331
Elmira, NY .....	17.5367
Enid, OK .....	16.5863
Erie, PA .....	19.2614
Eugene-Springfield, OR .....	23.2566
Evansville, Henderson, IN-KY .....	17.7198
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN .....	19.7800
Fayetteville, NC .....	17.4302
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR .....	17.8965
Flagstaff, AZ-UT .....	19.7032
Flint, MI .....	22.9184
Florence, AL .....	15.9479
Florence, SC .....	17.6631
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO .....	22.3767
Fort Lauderdale, FL .....	20.3766
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL .....	18.5790
Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL .....	21.2784
Fort Smith, AR-OK .....	15.8375
Fort Walton Beach, FL .....	17.8995
Fort Wayne, IN .....	18.7962
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX .....	20.1926
Fresno, CA .....	22.2323
Gadsden, AL .....	18.2411
Gainesville, FL .....	19.6396
Galveston-Texas City, TX .....	22.6345
Gary, IN .....	19.6025
Glens Falls, NY .....	17.6404
Goldsboro, NC .....	17.7222
Grand Forks, ND-MN .....	18.3589

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Grand Junction, CO .....	17.2009
Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI .....	20.7161
Great Falls, MT .....	18.4336
Greeley, CO .....	19.6480
Green Bay, WI .....	19.0230
Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC .....	19.8355
Greenville, NC .....	19.6007
Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC .....	19.1612
Hagerstown, MD .....	21.1564
Hamilton-Middletown, OH .....	19.1833
Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA .....	20.9016
Hartford, CT .....	24.5817
Hattiesburg, MS .....	15.0868
Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC .....	18.4995
Honolulu, HI .....	23.9148
Houma, LA .....	17.0314
Houston, TX .....	20.5460
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH .....	20.0441
Huntsville, AL .....	17.4211
Indianapolis, IN .....	20.4258
Iowa City, IA .....	19.6992
Jackson, MI .....	19.1645
Jackson, MS .....	17.2283
Jackson, TN .....	17.7852
Jacksonville, FL .....	18.4915
Jacksonville, NC .....	15.6996
Jamestown, NY .....	15.9148
Janesville-Beloit, WI .....	18.8060
Jersey City, NJ .....	24.0964
Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol, TN-VA .....	18.2276
Johnstown, PA .....	17.9084
Jonesboro, AR .....	15.3904
Joplin, MO .....	16.3572
Kalamazoo-Battlecreek, MI .....	23.5418
Kankakee, IL .....	19.5674
Kansas City, KS-MO .....	20.0387
Kenosha, WI .....	18.9676
Killeen-Temple, TX .....	21.0041
Knoxville, TN .....	18.5294
Kokomo, IN .....	19.2700
La Crosse, WI-MN .....	18.5196
Lafayette, LA .....	17.1506
Lafayette, IN .....	18.3693
Lake Charles, LA .....	15.9437
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL .....	18.5726
Lancaster, PA .....	19.8644
Lansing-East Lansing, MI .....	20.9650
Laredo, TX .....	15.2556
Las Cruces, NM .....	18.4298
Las Vegas, NV-AZ .....	23.7139
Lawrence, KS .....	17.9827
Lawton, OK .....	18.0698
Lewiston-Auburn, ME .....	19.0090
Lexington, KY .....	17.6740
Lima, OH .....	18.5932
Lincoln, NE .....	19.3291
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR .....	17.6667
Longview-Marshall, TX .....	18.0723
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA .....	25.1088
Louisville, KY-IN .....	18.8926
Lubbock, TX .....	17.6523

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Lynchburg, VA .....	18.4907
Macon, GA .....	18.6578
Madison, WI .....	20.8155
Mansfield, OH .....	17.7305
Mayaguez, PR .....	9.1443
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX .....	18.4765
Medford-Ashland, OR .....	20.8190
Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL .....	19.1487
Memphis, TN-AR-MS .....	17.3726
Merced, CA .....	20.8449
Miami, FL .....	20.8119
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ .....	23.1702
Milwaukee-Waukesha, WI .....	19.4387
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI .....	22.5517
Missoula, MT .....	19.0914
Mobile, AL .....	17.4040
Modesto, CA .....	21.4951
Monmouth-Ocean, NJ .....	23.5125
Monroe, LA .....	17.0762
Montgomery, AL .....	16.2493
Muncie, IN .....	19.5589
Myrtle Beach, SC .....	16.9930
Naples, FL .....	21.1457
Nashville, TN .....	19.6966
Nassau-Suffolk, NY .....	28.2430
New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT .....	25.6149
New London-Norwich, CT .....	24.1351
New Orleans, LA .....	19.3440
New York, NY .....	30.0458
Newark, NJ .....	24.6548
Newburgh, NY-PA .....	23.1779
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA-NC .....	17.1926
Oakland, CA .....	31.1506
Ocala, FL .....	19.0159
Odessa-Midland, TX .....	17.9849
Oklahoma City, OK1 .....	8.0923
Olympia, WA .....	23.9389
Omaha, NE-IA .....	20.7181
Orange County, CA .....	23.9400
Orlando, FL .....	20.3876
Owensboro, KY .....	16.1460
Panama City, FL .....	17.6753
Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH .....	16.6559
Pensacola, FL .....	17.1334
Peoria-Pekin, IL .....	16.7415
Philadelphia, PA-NJ .....	23.6239
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ .....	19.9270
Pine Bluff, AR .....	16.4382
Pittsburgh, PA .....	20.3391
Pittsfield, MA .....	22.4781
Pocatello, ID .....	18.2669
Ponce, PR .....	9.9487
Portland, ME .....	19.8655
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA .....	23.2244
Providence-Warwick, RI .....	22.4422
Provo-Orem, UT .....	20.5384
Pueblo, CO .....	18.1010
Punta Gorda, FL .....	18.7634
Racine, WI .....	18.9687
Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC .....	20.3867
Rapid City, SD .....	17.0546
Reading, PA .....	19.1866

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Redding, CA .....	24.6374
Reno, NV .....	23.0512
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA .....	21.3732
Richmond-Petersburg, VA ....	19.1375
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA .....	22.3498
Roanoke, VA .....	17.6802
Rochester, MN .....	24.3054
Rochester, NY .....	20.0636
Rockford, IL .....	17.8998
Rocky Mount, NC .....	18.7242
Sacramento, CA .....	24.8541
Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI .....	19.7109
St. Cloud, MN .....	19.9167
St. Joseph, MO .....	20.5465
St. Louis, MO-IL .....	19.0136
Salem, OR .....	20.5776
Salinas, CA .....	31.4614
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT ....	19.5264
San Angelo, TX .....	15.8857
San Antonio, TX .....	16.8290
San Diego, CA .....	25.4828
San Francisco, CA .....	28.9989
San Jose, CA .....	28.7281
San Juan-Bayamon, PR .....	9.6051
San Luis Obispo-Atascadero-Paso Robles, CA .....	23.4029
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA .....	23.2580
Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA .....	29.0487

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Santa Fe, NM .....	20.0537
Santa Rosa, CA .....	28.2508
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL .....	19.8054
Savannah, GA .....	20.9009
Scranton-Wilkes Barre-Hazleton, PA .....	17.2431
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA .....	23.9482
Sharon, PA .....	18.3824
Sheboygan, WI .....	17.0899
Sherman-Denison, TX .....	17.8053
Shreveport-Bossier City, LA .....	19.5016
Sioux City, IA-NE .....	17.6215
Sioux Falls, SD .....	18.5158
South Bend, IN .....	20.4831
Spokane, WA .....	22.7055
Springfield, IL .....	18.1176
Springfield, MO .....	16.7688
Springfield, MA .....	22.8337
State College, PA .....	19.6319
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV .....	17.5119
Stockton-Lodi, CA .....	23.0115
Sumter, SC .....	16.8850
Syracuse, NY .....	19.5305
Tacoma, WA .....	21.5661
Tallahassee, FL .....	17.5545
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL .....	18.9348
Terre Haute, IN .....	18.6798
Texarkana, AR- Texarkana, TX .....	17.6740
Toledo, OH .....	20.7579

TABLE 4D.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR URBAN AREAS—Continued

Urban area	Average hourly wage
Topeka, KS .....	20.3862
Trenton, NJ .....	21.8355
Tucson, AZ .....	18.7576
Tulsa, OK .....	17.5841
Tuscaloosa, AL .....	15.8762
Tyler, TX .....	18.3215
Utica-Rome, NY .....	17.4892
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA ....	27.8686
Ventura, CA .....	22.8835
Victoria, TX .....	17.4131
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ .....	21.6923
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA .....	20.9493
Waco, TX .....	17.3923
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV .....	22.4534
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA .....	16.5347
Wausau, WI .....	20.2214
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL .....	21.2323
Wheeling, OH-WV .....	15.8460
Wichita, KS .....	18.4872
Wichita Falls, TX .....	16.2686
Williamsport, PA .....	17.7778
Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD .....	24.6591
Wilmington, NC .....	19.4129
Yakima, WA .....	21.4371
Yolo, CA .....	23.3394
York, PA .....	19.5520
Youngstown-Warren, OH .....	20.3921
Yuba City, CA .....	22.5751
Yuma, AZ .....	20.8977

TABLE 4E.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR RURAL AREAS

Nonurban area	Average hourly wage
Alabama .....	15.1554
Alaska .....	25.8250
Arizona .....	16.5996
Arkansas .....	15.0624
California .....	20.7330
Colorado .....	17.5278
Connecticut .....	25.0854
Delaware .....	18.2993
Florida .....	18.4445
Georgia .....	16.3888
Hawaii .....	22.6670
Idaho .....	17.6129
Illinois .....	16.4463
Indiana .....	17.4120
Iowa .....	16.1574
Kansas .....	15.2062
Kentucky .....	16.2977
Louisiana .....	15.4880
Maine .....	17.5914
Maryland .....	17.7750
Massachusetts .....	22.5095
Michigan .....	18.4407
Minnesota .....	17.8572
Mississippi .....	15.1920
Missouri .....	15.4837
Montana .....	17.4489
Nebraska .....	15.9437
Nevada .....	19.2311
New Hampshire .....	21.2761
New Jersey <sup>1</sup> .....	.....
New Mexico .....	17.1812
New York .....	17.8440

TABLE 4E.—AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE FOR RURAL AREAS—Continued

Nonurban area	Average hourly wage
North Carolina .....	16.8544
North Dakota .....	15.5776
Ohio .....	17.6991
Oklahoma .....	14.8012
Oregon .....	20.5901
Pennsylvania .....	18.0013
Puerto Rico .....	8.4766
Rhode Island <sup>1</sup> .....	.....
South Carolina .....	16.7176
South Dakota .....	15.5989
Tennessee .....	15.5660
Texas .....	15.7178
Utah .....	18.4060
Vermont .....	19.5637
Virginia .....	16.3242
Washington .....	21.7934
West Virginia .....	16.3620
Wisconsin .....	18.0980
Wyoming .....	18.2168

<sup>1</sup> All counties within the State are classified as urban.

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 .....	1.0295	1.0201	.....	.....
Arecibo, PR .....	1.0599	1.0406	.....	.....
Caguas, PR .....	0.9603	0.9726	0.9603	0.9726
Mayaguez, PR .....	0.9584	0.9713	.....	.....
Ponce, PR .....	1.0427	1.0290	.....	.....
San Juan-Bayamon, PR .....	1.0067	1.0046	.....	.....
Rural Puerto Rico .....	0.8884	0.9222	.....	.....

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.773, Medicare—Hospital Insurance; and Program No. 93.774,

Medicare—Supplementary Medical Insurance Program)

Dated: February 5, 1999.

**Nancy-Ann Min DeParle,**  
Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration.

Approved: February 10, 1999.

**Donna E. Shalala,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-4506 Filed 2-19-99; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 4120-01-P