DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
7500 Security Boulevard, Mail Stop S2-26-12
Baltimore, Maryland 21244-1850

June 25, 2026

Steven Ford, Director of the Virginia Department of Medical Assistance Services
600 East Broad Street,
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Steven Ford:

In accordance with 42 CFR 438.6(c), the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has reviewed and is approving Virginia's submission of a proposal for a state directed payment (SDP) under Medicaid managed care plan contract(s). The proposal was received by CMS on March 30, 2026, and a final revised preprint was received on April 14, 2026. The proposal has a control name of VA_VBP_NF_Renewal_20260701-20270630.

CMS has completed our review of the following Medicaid managed care SDP(s):

- Quality Payment/Pay for Performance (Category 2 APM, or similar) for nursing facility services for rating periods covering July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2027, incorporated in the capitation rates through a separate payment term amount up to $184,900,000.

This letter satisfies the regulatory requirement in 42 CFR 438.6(c)(2) for SDPs described in 42 CFR 438.6(c)(1). This letter pertains only to the actions identified above and does not apply to other actions currently under CMS's review. This letter does not constitute approval of any specific Medicaid financing mechanism used to support the non-federal share of expenditures associated with these actions. All relevant federal laws and regulations apply. CMS reserves its authority to enforce requirements in the Social Security Act and the applicable implementing regulations.

Based on CMS's preliminary determination, the SDP proposal with the control name of VA_VBP_NF_Renewal_20250701-20260630 likely qualified for the temporary grandfathering period in section 71116(b) of the Working Families Tax Cut (WFTC) legislation (Public Law 119-21). CMS acknowledges that this determination is preliminary in nature and policies will be finalized as part of notice and comment rulemaking. CMS will enforce all federal requirements, including section 71116, and CMS's assessment may be revised if further information is identified that alters the initial assessment.

Until the phase down required by section 71116 begins, the total dollar amount of $184,900,000 for the grandfathered SDP named VA_VBP_NF_Renewal_20250701-20260630 submitted on March 31, 2025 (as specified in item 4 of the applicable SDP preprint form) cannot increase and a state cannot increase this total dollar amount under any change or revision to the grandfathered SDP, including an amendment to the SDP, or subsequent renewal SDP for a future rating period. For rating periods beginning on or after January 1, 2028, grandfathered SDPs must comply with the specified phase down requirements.

The state is required to submit contract action(s) and related capitation rates that include all SDPs, including those that do not require written prior approval as specified in 42 CFR 438.6(c)(2)(i). Additionally, all SDPs must be addressed in the applicable rate certifications. CMS recommends that states share this letter and the preprint(s) with the certifying actuary. Documentation of all SDPs must be included in the initial rate certification as outlined in Section I, Item 4, Subsection D, of the Medicaid Managed Care Rate Development Guide. The state and its actuary must ensure all documentation outlined in the Medicaid Managed Care Rate Development Guide is included in the initial rate certification. Failure to provide all required documentation in the rate certification will cause delays in CMS review.

Approval of this SDP proposal for the applicable rating period does not preclude CMS from requesting additional materials from the state, revision to the SDP proposal design or any other modifications to the proposal for this rating period or future rating periods, if CMS determines that such modifications are required for the state to meet relevant federal requirements.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact StateDirectedPayment@cms.hhs.gov.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. GILES JR -S

Digitally signed by JOHN F. GILES JR -S
Date: 2026.06.25 13:46:23 -04'00'

John Giles
Director, Managed Care Group
Center for Medicaid and CHIP Services

Section 438.6(c) Preprint

42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c) provides States with the flexibility to implement delivery system and provider payment initiatives under MCO, PIHP, or PAHP Medicaid managed care contracts (i.e., state directed payments). 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1) describes types of payment arrangements that States may use to direct expenditures under the managed care contract. Under 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii), contract arrangements that direct an MCO's, PIHP's, or PAHP's expenditures under paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(ii) and (c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D) must have written approval from CMS prior to implementation and before approval of the corresponding managed care contract(s) and rate certification(s). This preprint implements the prior approval process and must be completed, submitted, and approved by CMS before implementing any of the specific payment arrangements described in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(ii) and (c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D). Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules using State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

Submit all state directed payment preprints for prior approval to: StateDirectedPayment@cms.hhs.gov.

SECTION I: DATE AND TIMING INFORMATION

1. Identify the State's managed care contract rating period(s) for which this payment arrangement will apply (for example, July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021):
   July 1, 2026 - June 30, 2027
2. Identify the State's requested start date for this payment arrangement (for example, January 1, 2021). *Note, this should be the start of the contract rating period unless this payment arrangement will begin during the rating period.* July 1, 2026
3. Identify the managed care program(s) to which this payment arrangement will apply:
   Cardinal Care: Virginia's Medicaid Program
4. Identify the estimated **total dollar amount** (federal and non-federal dollars) of this state directed payment: $184,900,000
   a. Identify the estimated federal share of this state directed payment: $98,338,454
   b. Identify the estimated non-federal share of this state directed payment: $86,561,546

   Please note, the estimated total dollar amount and the estimated federal share should be described for the rating period in Question 1. If the State is seeking a multi-year approval (which is only an option for VBP/DSR payment arrangements (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i)-(ii))), States should provide the estimates per rating period. For amendments, states should include the change from the total and federal share estimated in the previously approved preprint.

5. Is this the initial submission the State is seeking approval under 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c) for this state directed payment arrangement? ☐ Yes ☒ No

6. If this is not the initial submission for this state directed payment, please indicate if:

a. ☐ The State is seeking approval of an amendment to an already approved state directed payment.

b. ☒ The State is seeking approval for a renewal of a state directed payment for a new rating period.

i. If the State is seeking approval of a renewal, please indicate the rating periods for which previous approvals have been granted:
SFY26, SFY25, SFY24, SFY23

c. Please identify the types of changes in this state directed payment that differ from what was previously approved.

☐ Payment Type Change
☒ Provider Type Change
☐ Quality Metric(s) / Benchmark(s) Change
☒ Other; please describe:

DMAS is modifying the definition of maintenance as described in the response to question 11.

☐ No changes from previously approved preprint other than rating period(s).

7. ☒ Please use the checkbox to provide an assurance that, in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(F), the payment arrangement is not renewed automatically.

SECTION II: TYPE OF STATE DIRECTED PAYMENT

8. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(A), describe in detail how the payment arrangement is based on the utilization and delivery of services for enrollees covered under the contract. The State should specifically discuss what must occur in order for the provider to receive the payment (e.g., utilization of services by managed care enrollees, meet or exceed a performance benchmark on provider quality metrics).

In the fifth year of the program, the performance-based funding will center on how facilities perform against set thresholds and their effectiveness through the following: 1) Reducing the percentage of long-stay residents who develop pressure ulcers, 2) total nurse staffing hours per resident day, adjusted for the facility's population case mix, 3) CMS NF VBP total nurse staffing turnover measure, and 4) long-stay residents with one or more falls with major injury for similar reasons.

DMAS affirms that the payments required under this payment arrangement will only be made for Medicaid services on behalf of Medicaid beneficiaries covered under the Medicaid managed care contract for the rating period only and that the payments will not be made on behalf of individuals who are uninsured, covered for such services by another insurer (e.g. Medicare), nor Medicaid services provided through the state fee-for-service program.

a. ☒ Please use the checkbox to provide an assurance that CMS has approved the federal authority for the Medicaid services linked to the services associated with the SDP (i.e., Medicaid State plan, 1115(a) demonstration, 1915(c) waiver, etc.).

b. Please also provide a link to, or submit a copy of, the authority document(s) with initial submissions and at any time the authority document(s) has been renewed/revised/updated.
(Please paste the following updated link into your browser):

https://www.dmas.virginia.gov/media/jewcewcg/419d-s1-establishing-payment-rates-for-long-term-care-part-2.pdf

9. Please select the general type of state directed payment arrangement the State is seeking prior approval to implement. (Check all that apply and address the underlying questions for each category selected.)

a. ☒ **VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS / DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM:** In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i) and (ii), the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to implement value-based purchasing models for provider reimbursement, such as alternative payment models (APMs), pay for performance arrangements, bundled payments, or other service payment models intended to recognize value or outcomes over volume of services; or the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to participate in a multi-payer or Medicaid-specific delivery system reform or performance improvement initiative.

If checked, please answer all questions in Subsection IIA.

b. ☐ **FEE SCHEDULE REQUIREMENTS:** In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D), the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to adopt a minimum or maximum fee schedule for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract; or the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to provide a uniform dollar or percentage increase for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract. **[Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules using State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).]**

If checked, please answer all questions in Subsection IIB.

SUBSECTION IIA: VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS (VBP) / DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM (DSR):

This section must be completed for all state directed payments that are VBP or DSR. This section does not need to be completed for state directed payments that are fee schedule requirements.

10. Please check the type of VBP/DSR State directed payment the State is seeking prior approval for. *Check all that apply; if none are checked, proceed to Section III.*

- ☒ Quality Payment/Pay for Performance (Category 2 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Bundled Payment/Episode-Based Payment (Category 3 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Population-Based Payment/Accountable Care Organization (Category 4 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Multi-Payer Delivery System Reform
- ☐ Medicaid-Specific Delivery System Reform
- ☐ Performance Improvement Initiative
- ☐ Other Value-Based Purchasing Model

11. Provide a brief summary or description of the required payment arrangement selected above and describe how the payment arrangement intends to recognize value or outcomes over volume of services. If "other" was checked above, identify the payment model. The State should specifically discuss what must occur in order for the provider to receive the payment (e.g., meet or exceed a performance benchmark on provider quality metrics).

The NF VBP program calculates payments based on how facilities perform against set thresholds on four (4) performance measures. Per diem values are set based on three range thresholds – fair, better and b
DMAS updated the attainment payment methodology in SFY 2026 to ensure compliance with Federal regulations. Under this revised structure, only nursing facilities (NFs) that show maintenance or improvement in

As defined by DMAS in SFY 2026, "maintenance" indicates that an NF's performance does not drop more than one tier relative to the previous year. NFs maintaining their tier status will be eligible for the maximum p
To account for any tier threshold changes made year-to-year, DMAS is making the following modification to the definition of maintenance described above: a NF that has the same, or better, performance measure s

12. In Table 1 below, identify the measure(s), baseline statistics, and targets that the State will tie to provider performance under this payment arrangement (provider performance measures). Please complete all boxes in the row. To the extent practicable, CMS encourages states to utilize existing, validated, and outcomes-based performance measures to evaluate the payment arrangement, and recommends States use the CMS Adult and Child Core Set Measures when applicable. If the state needs more space, please use Addendum Table 1.A and check this box: ☒

TABLE 1: Payment Arrangement Provider Performance Measures

Measure Name and NQF # (if applicable)	**Measure Steward/ Developer**[1]	**Baseline**[2] **Year**	**Baseline**[2] **Statistic**	**Performance Measurement Period**[3]	**Performance Target**	**Notes**[4]
Example: Percent of High-Risk Residents with Pressure Ulcers – Long Stay	*CMS*	*CY 2018*	*9.23%*	*Year 2*	*8%*	*Example notes*
a. Please see Excel file as attachment VA_NF_VBP_20260701-20270630_Addendum Table 1.A						
b.						
c.						
d.						
e.						

1. Baseline data must be added after the first year of the payment arrangement
2. If state-developed, list State name for Steward/Developer.
3. If this is planned to be a multi-year payment arrangement, indicate which year(s) of the payment arrangement that performance on the measure will trigger payment.
4. If the State is using an established measure and will deviate from the measure steward's measure specifications, please describe here. Additionally, if a state-specific measure will be used, please define the numerator and denominator here.

13. For the measures listed in Table 1 above, please provide the following information:

a. Please describe the methodology used to set the performance targets for each measure.

For each measure, performance will fall into one of four tiers: "Best", "Better", "Fair" or "Below". The tiers determine the amount of a measure's per diem-based award available to NFs: 100% for Best, 75% for Better, and 50% for Fair. Performance targets (i.e., the floor of each of the award-paying tiers) for SFY27 are set as follows:

Total Nurse Staffing: performance tier levels were re-based in SFY26 following a CMS measure specification change that took place during FFY25. The Best, Better and Fair tiers were calculated by quartiling NFs into 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles based on the new measure specification. SFY27's tiers raise each tier's floor by approximately 5% to align the floor of the minimum award-paying tier (Fair) with a recent state statutory change that requires a minimum number of hours per resident day of Total Nurse Staffing for oversight functions applicable to Virginia's Department of Public Health.

Percentage of Long-Stay Residents with Pressure Ulcers: SFY27 tiers are the same as SFY26 tiers. Performance tiers were re-based in SFY26 following a CMS measure specification changes that took place during FFY25. The Best, Better and Fair tiers were calculated by quartiling NFs into 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles based on the new measure specification.

Staff Turnover/Percentage of Resident With Falls With Major Injuries: because both of these measures are new to the program for SFY27, Best, Better and Fair tiers were calculated by quartiling NFs into 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles based on historical FFY26 data.

b. If multiple provider performance measures are involved in the payment arrangement, discuss if the provider must meet the performance target on each measure to receive payment or can providers receive a portion of the payment if they meet the performance target on some but not all measures?

Providers can receive a portion of the payment if they meet the performance target on one or more measures.

c. For state-developed measures, please briefly describe how the measure was developed?

There are no state-developed measures in the program.

14. Is the State seeking a multi-year approval of the state directed payment arrangement?
☐ Yes ☒ No

a. If this payment arrangement is designed to be a multi-year effort, denote the State's managed care contract rating period(s) the State is seeking approval for.

b. If this payment arrangement is designed to be a multi-year effort and the State is **NOT** requesting a multi-year approval, describe how this application's payment arrangement fits into the larger multi-year effort and identify which year of the effort is addressed in this application.

15. Use the checkboxes below to make the following assurances:

a. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(A), the state directed payment arrangement makes participation in the value-based purchasing initiative, delivery system reform, or performance improvement initiative available, using the same terms of performance, to the class or classes of providers (identified below) providing services under the contract related to the reform or improvement initiative.

b. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(B), the payment arrangement makes use of a common set of performance measures across all of the payers and providers.

c. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(C), the payment arrangement does not set the amount or frequency of the expenditures.

d. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(D), the payment arrangement does not allow the State to recoup any unspent funds allocated for these arrangements from the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP.

SUBSECTION IIB: STATE DIRECTED FEE SCHEDULES:
This section must be completed for all state directed payments that are fee schedule requirements. This section does not need to be completed for state directed payments that are VBP or DSR.

16. Please check the type of state directed payment for which the State is seeking prior approval. *Check all that apply; if none are checked, proceed to Section III.*

a. ☐ Minimum Fee Schedule for providers that provide a particular service under the contract *using rates other than State plan approved rates* [1] (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(B))

b. ☐ Maximum Fee Schedule (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(D))

c. ☐ Uniform Dollar or Percentage Increase (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(C))

[1] Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules that use State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

17. If the State is seeking prior approval of a fee schedule (options a or b in Question 16):

a. Check the basis for the fee schedule selected above.

i. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on the **State-plan approved rates** as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a). [2]

ii. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on the **Medicare or Medicare-equivalent rate**.

iii. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on an **alternative fee schedule established by the State**.

1. If the State is proposing an alternative fee schedule, please describe the alternative fee schedule (e.g., 80% of Medicaid State-plan approved rate)

b. Explain how the state determined this fee schedule requirement to be reasonable and appropriate.

18. If using a maximum fee schedule (option b in Question 16), please answer the following additional questions:

a. ☐ Use the checkbox to provide the following assurance: In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(C), the State has determined that the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP has retained the ability to reasonably manage risk and has discretion in accomplishing the goals of the contract.

b. Describe the process for plans and providers to request an exemption if they are under contract obligations that result in the need to pay more than the maximum fee schedule.

c. Indicate the number of exemptions to the requirement:

i. Expected in this contract rating period (estimate)

ii. Granted in past years of this payment arrangement

d. Describe how such exemptions will be considered in rate development.

[2] Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules that use State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

19. If the State is seeking prior approval for a uniform dollar or percentage increase (option c in Question 16), please address the following questions:

a. Will the state require plans to pay a ☐ uniform dollar amount **or** a ☐ uniform percentage increase? (*Please select only one.*)

b. What is the magnitude of the increase (e.g., $4 per claim or 3% increase per claim?)

c. Describe how will the uniform increase be paid out by plans (e.g., upon processing the initial claim, a retroactive adjustment done one month after the end of quarter for those claims incurred during that quarter).

d. Describe how the increase was developed, including why the increase is reasonable and appropriate for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract

SECTION III: PROVIDER CLASS AND ASSESSMENT OF REASONABLENESS

20. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(B), identify the class or classes of providers that will participate in this payment arrangement by answering the following questions:

a. Please indicate which general class of providers would be affected by the state directed payment (check all that apply):

- ☐ inpatient hospital service
- ☐ outpatient hospital service
- ☐ professional services at an academic medical center
- ☐ primary care services
- ☐ specialty physician services
- ☒ nursing facility services
- ☐ HCBS/personal care services
- ☐ behavioral health inpatient services
- ☐ behavioral health outpatient services
- ☐ dental services
- ☐ Other:

b. Please define the provider class(es) (if further narrowed from the general classes indicated above).

The provider class eligible for program payments is defined as nursing facilities meeting the following criteria: are of Provider Type 010 (Skilled Nursing Homes) or 015 (Intermediate Care Nursing Homes); participate in managed care and/or previously received enhanced Nursing Facility per diems during the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency; do not have cost settlements; do not appear on CMS' list of Special Focus Facilities (SFFs) and SFF candidates at the end of the performance period.

c. Provide a justification for the provider class defined in Question 20b (e.g., the provider class is defined in the State Plan.) If the provider class is defined in the State Plan, please provide a link to or attach the applicable State Plan pages to the preprint submission. Provider classes cannot be defined to only include providers that provide intergovernmental transfers.

The provider class criteria are described in the publicly available methodology of the NF VBP program, which is incorporated by reference into the NF VBP State Plan Amendment.

(https://www.dmas.virginia.gov/media/6350/va-23-0017-approved.pdf).

21. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(B), describe how the payment arrangement directs expenditures equally, using the same terms of performance, for the class or classes of providers (identified above) providing the service under the contract.

Under this payment arrangement all eligible facilities will be assessed on the same performance measures. Measure-specific per diem payments are the same for all facilities, with total amounts earned depending on the number of Medicaid member days for a particular facility, as well as that facility's attainment threshold reached and whether it improved compared to the prior year.

22. For the services where payment is affected by the state directed payment, how will the state directed payment interact with the negotiated rate(s) between the plan and the provider? Will the state directed payment:

a. ☐ Replace the negotiated rate(s) between the plan(s) and provider(s).

b. ☐ Limit but not replace the negotiated rate(s) between the plans(s) and provider(s).

c. ☒ Require a payment be made in addition to the negotiated rate(s) between the plan(s) and provider(s).

23. For payment arrangements that are intended to require plans to make a payment in addition to the negotiated rates (as noted in option c in Question 22), please provide an analysis in Table 2 showing the impact of the state directed payment on payment levels for each provider class. This provider payment analysis should be completed distinctly for each service type (e.g., inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, etc.).

This should include an estimate of the base reimbursement rate the managed care plans pay to these providers as a percent of Medicare, or some other standardized measure, and the effect the increase from the state directed payment will have on total payment. *Ex: The average base payment level from plans to providers is 80% of Medicare and this SDP is expected to increase the total payment level from 80% to 100% of Medicare.*

If the state needs more space, please use Addendum 2.A and check this box: ☐

TABLE 2: Provider Payment Analysis

Provider Class(es)	Average Base Payment Level from Plans to Providers (absent the SDP)	Effect on Total Payment Level of State Directed Payment (SDP)	Effect on Total Payment Level of Other SDPs	Effect on Total Payment Level of Pass-Through Payments (PTPs)	Total Payment Level (after accounting for all SDPs and PTPs
Ex: Rural Inpatient Hospital Services	*80%*	*20%*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*100%*
a. Nursing Facility	69.3%	10.8%			80.1%
b.					
c.					
d.					
e.					
f.					
g.					

24. Please indicate if the data provided in Table 2 above is in terms of a percentage of:

- **a.** ☐ Medicare payment/cost
- **b.** ☐ State-plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a) *(Please note, this rate cannot include supplemental payments.)*
- **c.** ☒ Other; Please define: Average Commercial Rate; see file ACR_VA_VBP_NF_Renewal_20260701-20270603 Question 23 Table 2 Support

25. Does the State also require plans to pay any other state directed payments for providers eligible for the provider class described in Question 20b? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide information requested under the column "Other State Directed Payments" in Table 2.

26. Does the State also require plans to pay pass-through payments as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a) to any of the providers eligible for any of the provider class(es) described in Question 20b? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide information requested under the column "Pass-Through Payments" in Table 2.

27. Please describe the data sources and methodology used for the analysis provided in response to Question 23.

For the SFY26 rating period, the Commonwealth of Virginia utilized the public Genworth Cost of Long Term Care by State survey tool to source the Average Commercial Rate benchmark for this analysis. The survey tool was filtered on the State of "Virginia," "Daily" cost by period, and calendar year 2023 to most closely match the cost reporting period of the data provided. The Commonwealth applied the "Nursing Home Facility: Semi-Private Room" per diem value published as of the date of submission of the preprint, illustrated on the sheet in this workbook titled "Genworth Cost of Care Report." The SFY26 Average Commercial Rate was carried forward for this SFY27 benchmarking analysis.

For the SFY27 benchmarking analysis, the Commonwealth used an inflated Medicaid per diem and Medicaid bed days reported on Nursing Facility Medicaid cost report submissions to produce a weighted average statewide Medicaid per diem for comparison to the Average Commercial Rate. In coordination with Nursing Facility FFS fee schedule changes, the average Medicaid per diem from the cost report submissions was trended by 3.34% from SFY24 (cost report period used) to the SFY25 rating period, then 3.98% to the SFY26 rating period, and finally by 3.30% to the SFY27 rating period. The Average Commercial Rate was not trended. Both the Average Commercial Rate and Medicaid weighted average per diems were each multiplied by the statewide total VBP program-eligible days from the VBP program year corresponding to the cost report period used to source the average statewide Medicaid per diem. This produced the Benchmark and Medicaid total estimated dollars, respectively, to allow for the "Average Base Payment Level from Plans to Providers (absent the SDP)" ratio comparison of Medicaid to Benchmark total dollars provided. Budgeted VBP Directed Payment Total Medicaid Dollars were then divided by the total estimated commercial Benchmark dollars to produce the "Effect on Total Payment Level of State Directed Payment" percentage in the Provider Payment Analysis. Cost report data and VBP program bed days will be updated in coordination with the next rebenchmarking of the Average Commercial Rate.

28. Please describe the State's process for determining how the proposed state directed payment was appropriate and reasonable.

DMAS used the most recent comparable State-specific commercial NF payment available from a national source and compared it to the total payments (i.e., base and state-directed payments) under the NF VBP program. Recent national studies have indicated that Medicare payment rates may not be the optimal benchmark for assessing the adequacy of Medicaid payment rates for Medicaid-covered nursing facility residents due to differences in services covered and resident acuity. (MACPAC, Estimates of Medicaid Nursing Facility Payments Relative to Costs, January 2023). As these payments including NF VBP program funding were determined to be less than 100% of commercial payments, DMAS determined that payments under this program are appropriate and reasonable.

SECTION IV: INCORPORATION INTO MANAGED CARE CONTRACTS

29. States must adequately describe the contractual obligation for the state directed payment in the state's contract with the managed care plan(s) in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c). Has the state already submitted all contract action(s) to implement this state directed payment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

a. If yes:

i. What is/are the state-assigned identifier(s) of the contract actions provided to CMS?

ii. Please indicate where (page or section) the state directed payment is captured in the contract action(s).

b. If no, please estimate when the state will be submitting the contract actions for review.

Prior to June 30, 2026

SECTION V: INCORPORATION INTO THE ACTUARIAL RATE CERTIFICATION

Note: Provide responses to the questions below for the first rating period if seeking approval for multi-year approval.

30. Has/Have the actuarial rate certification(s) for the rating period for which this state directed payment applies been submitted to CMS? ☐ Yes ☒ No

a. If no, please estimate when the state will be submitting the actuarial rate certification(s) for review.

June 30, 2026

b. If yes, provide the following information in the table below for each of the actuarial rate certification review(s) that will include this state directed payment.

Table 3: Actuarial Rate Certification(s)

Control Name Provided by CMS (List each actuarial rate certification separately)	Date Submitted to CMS	Does the certification incorporate the SDP?	If so, indicate where the state directed payment is captured in the certification (page or section)
i.			
ii.			
iii.			
iv.			
v.			

Please note, states and actuaries should consult the most recent Medicaid Managed Care Rate Development Guide for how to document state directed payments in actuarial rate certification(s). The actuary's certification must contain all of the information outlined; if all required documentation is not included, review of the certification will likely be delayed.)

c. If not currently captured in the State's actuarial certification submitted to CMS, note that the regulations at 42 C.F.R. § 438.7(b)(6) requires that all state directed payments are documented in the State's actuarial rate certification(s). CMS will not be able to approve the related contract action(s) until the rate certification(s) has/have been amended to account for all state directed payments. Please provide an estimate of when the State plans to submit an amendment to capture this information.

31. Describe how the State will/has incorporated this state directed payment arrangement in the applicable actuarial rate certification(s) (please select one of the options below):

- **a.** ☐ An adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans.
- **b.** ☒ Separate payment term(s) which are captured in the applicable rate certification(s) but paid separately to the plans from the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans.
- **c.** ☐ Other, please describe:

32. States should incorporate state directed payment arrangements into actuarial rate certification(s) as an adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans as this approach is consistent with the rate development requirements described in 42 C.F.R. § 438.5 and consistent with the nature of risk-based managed care. For state directed payments that are incorporated in another manner, particularly through separate payment terms, provide additional justification as to why this is necessary and what precludes the state from incorporating as an adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to managed care plans.

The reimbursement levels for nursing facility services rendered by the provider classes reflects the importance of these providers to Virginia's Medicaid program and such reimbursement levels may exceed negotiated rates between the health plans and nursing facilities. Maintaining the separate payment term approach mitigates concerns that health plans will divert utilization for other purposes, supports network participation of these critical providers, and maximizes transparency in the payment process by ensuring payments are directed to these providers. While the State recognizes that CMS final rules will require incorporation of this SDP arrangement into capitation rates in the future, the State requires a transition period to do so during which the SDP payments will continue as separate payment terms.

33. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(i), the State assures that all expenditures for this payment arrangement under this section are developed in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.4, the standards specified in 42 C.F.R. § 438.5, and generally accepted actuarial principles and practices.

SECTION VI: FUNDING FOR THE NON-FEDERAL SHARE

34. Describe the source of the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. Check all that apply:

- **a.** ☒ State general revenue
- **b.** ☐ Intergovernmental transfers (IGTs) from a State or local government entity
- **c.** ☐ Health Care-Related Provider tax(es) / assessment(s)
- **d.** ☐ Provider donation(s)
- **e.** ☐ Other, specify:

35. For any payment funded by **IGTs (option b in Question 34)**,

- **a.** Provide the following (respond to each column for all entities transferring funds). If the state needs more space, please use Addendum Table 4.A and check this box: ☐

Table 4: IGT Transferring Entities

Name of Entities transferring funds (enter each on a separate line)	Operational nature of the Transferring Entity (State, County, City, Other)	Total Amounts Transferred by This Entity	Does the Transferring Entity have General Taxing Authority? (Yes or No)	Did the Transferring Entity receive appropriations? If not, put N/A. If yes, identify the level of appropriations	Is the Transferring Entity eligible for payment under this state directed payment? (Yes or No)
i.					
ii.					
iii.					
iv.					
v.					
vi.					
vii.					
viii.					
ix.					
x.					

b. ☐ Use the checkbox to provide an assurance that no state directed payments made under this payment arrangement funded by IGTs are dependent on any agreement or arrangement for providers or related entities to donate money or services to a governmental entity.

c. Provide information or documentation regarding any written agreements that exist between the State and healthcare providers or amongst healthcare providers and/or related entities relating to the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. This should include any written agreements that may exist with healthcare providers to support and finance the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. Submit a copy of any written agreements described above.

36. For any state directed payments funded by **provider taxes/assessments (option c in Question 34)**,

a. Provide the following (respond to each column for all entries). If there are more entries than space in the table, please provide an attachment with the information requested in the table.

Table 5: Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment(s)

Name of the Health Care-Related Provider Tax / Assessment (enter each on a separate line)	Identify the permissible class for this tax / assessment	Is the tax / assessment broad-based?	Is the tax / assessment uniform?	Is the tax / assessment under the 6% indirect hold harmless limit?	If not under the 6% indirect hold harmless limit, does it pass the "75/75" test?	Does it contain a hold harmless arrangement that guarantees to return all or any portion of the tax payment to the tax payer?
i.						
ii.						
iii.						
iv.						
v.						

b. If the state has any waiver(s) of the broad-based and/or uniform requirements for any of the health care-related provider taxes/assessments, list the waiver(s) and its current status:

Table 6: Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment Waivers

Name of the Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment Waiver (enter each on a separate line)	Submission Date	Current Status (Under Review, Approved)	Approval Date
i.			
ii.			
iii.			
iv.			
v.			

37. For any state directed payments funded by **provider donations (option d in Question 34)**, please answer the following questions:

a. Is the donation bona-fide? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Does it contain a hold harmless arrangement to return all or any part of the donation to the donating entity, a related entity, or other provider furnishing the same health care items or services as the donating entity within the class?
☐ Yes ☐ No

38. ☒ **For all state directed payment arrangements**, use the checkbox to provide an assurance that in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(E), the payment arrangement does not condition network provider participation on the network provider entering into or adhering to intergovernmental transfer agreements.

SECTION VII: QUALITY CRITERIA AND FRAMEWORK FOR ALL PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS

39. ☒ Use the checkbox below to make the following assurance, "In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(C), the State expects this payment arrangement to advance at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy required per 42 C.F.R. § 438.340."

40. Consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 438.340(d), States must post the final quality strategy online beginning July 1, 2018. Please provide:

- **a.** A hyperlink to State's most recent quality strategy: (Please paste the following updated link into your browser) https://www.dmas.virginia.gov/media/njopa
- **b.** The effective date of quality strategy. March 17, 2026

41. If the State is currently updating the quality strategy, please submit a draft version, and provide:

- **a.** A target date for submission of the revised quality strategy (month and year):
- **b.** Note any potential changes that might be made to the goals and objectives.

Note: The State should submit the final version to CMS as soon as it is finalized. To be in compliance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.340(c)(2) the quality strategy must be updated no less than once every 3-years.

42. To obtain written approval of this payment arrangement, a State must demonstrate that each state directed payment arrangement expects to advance at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy. In the Table 7 below, identify the goal(s) and objective(s), as they appear in the Quality Strategy (include page numbers), this payment arrangement is expected to advance. If additional rows are required, please attach.

Table 7: Payment Arrangement Quality Strategy Goals and Objectives

Goal(s)	Objective(s)	Quality strategy page
Example: Improve care coordination for enrollees with behavioral health conditions	*Example: Increase the number of managed care patients receiving follow-up behavior health counseling by 15%*	*5*
a. Please see Excel file * VA_NF_VBP_20260701-20270630 Addendum Table 7.1		
b.		
c.		
d.		

43. Describe how this payment arrangement is expected to advance the goal(s) and objective(s) identified in Table 7. If this is part of a multi-year effort, describe this both in terms of this year's payment arrangement and in terms of that of the multi-year payment arrangement.

The performance-based funding structure of Virginia's Nursing Facility VBP program will incentivize and sup

44. Please complete the following questions regarding having an evaluation plan to measure the degree to which the payment arrangement advances at least one of the goals and objectives of the State's quality strategy. To the extent practicable, CMS encourages States to utilize existing, validated, and outcomes-based performance measures to evaluate the payment arrangement, and recommends States use the CMS Adult and Child Core Set Measures, when applicable.

a. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(D), use the checkbox to assure the State has an evaluation plan which measures the degree to which the payment arrangement advances at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy required per 42 C.F.R. § 438.340, and that the evaluation conducted will be *specific* to this payment arrangement. *Note:* States have flexibility in how the evaluation is conducted and may leverage existing resources, such as their 1115 demonstration evaluation if this payment arrangement is tied to an 1115 demonstration or their External Quality Review validation activities, as long as those evaluation or validation activities are *specific* to this payment arrangement and its impacts on health care quality and outcomes.

b. Describe how and when the State will review progress on the advancement of the State's goal(s) and objective(s) in the quality strategy identified in Question 42. For each measure the State intends to use in the evaluation of this payment arrangement, provide in Table 8 below: 1) the baseline year, 2) the baseline statistics, and 3) the performance targets the State will use to track the impact of this payment arrangement on the State's goals and objectives. Please attach the State's evaluation plan for this payment arrangement.

TABLE 8: Evaluation Measures, Baseline and Performance Targets

Measure Name and NQF # (if applicable)	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Statistic**	**Performance Target**	**Notes[1]**
Example: Flu Vaccinations for Adults Ages 19 to 64 (FVA-AD); NQF # 0039	*CY 2019*	*34%*	*Increase the percentage of adults 18–64 years of age who report receiving an influenza vaccination by 1 percentage point per year*	*Example notes*
i. Increase % of NFs servicing Medicaid members that met the BEST tier of performance for at least half of the performance measures by 2% each year	FFY2021	11%	Increase the percent of NFs serving Medicaid members that met the Best tier of performance for at least half of the performance measures by 2% each year	
ii. % of prevalence of pressure ulcers among non-dual LTSS members	FFY2024	4.32%	Decrease prevalence of pressure ulcers among non-dual LTSS members by 0.25% each year	Due to a CMS change in this measure's specification that took place in FFY24, FFY24 serves as a new baseline for SFY26.
iii. Rate of hospital admissions for non-dual LTSS members residing in nursing facilities	FFY2021	35.59%	Decrease prevalence of hospitalization rates among non-dual LTSS members residing in nursing facilities by 0.25% each year	This rate used the numerator and denominator listed below. Numerator: Volume of admissions into a hospital from Medicaid nursing facility discharges Denominator: Medicaid nursing facility resident days used in the NF VBP program.
iv.				

1. If the State will deviate from the measure specification, please describe here. If a State-specific measure will be used, please define the numerator and denominator here. Additionally, describe any planned data or measure stratifications (for example, age, race, or ethnicity) that will be used to evaluate the payment arrangement.

c. If this is any year other than year 1 of a multi-year effort, describe (or attach) prior year(s) evaluation findings and the payment arrangement's impact on the goal(s) and objective(s) in the State's quality strategy. Evaluation findings must include 1) historical data; 2) prior year(s) results data; 3) a description of the evaluation methodology; and 4) baseline and performance target information from the prior year(s) preprint(s) where applicable. If full evaluation findings from prior year(s) are not available, provide partial year(s) findings and an anticipated date for when CMS may expect to receive the full evaluation findings.

Please see attached Word document in email: "Q 44c"

"Q44c"

Section 438.6(c) Preprint Addendum Tables

Overview

This addendum to the Section 438.6(c) preprint file allows States to add rows to the eight tables in the preprint: Please use this workbook if States need additional rows than what is provided in the preprint. States may also use the Workbook Tables 1.A. - 8.A. in lieu of completing Tables 1 - 8 in the preprint.

Directions

States should only submit the tables they populate to CMS; please do not submit the entire workbook unless the State inputs data into all addendum Tables 1.A - 8.A. For example, if the State only needs extra rows to complete Table 1.A, please delete Tabs 2.A - 8.A

CMS requests States submit the addendum tables with the preprint in this Excel format; please do not merge and re-PDF the preprint.

Addendum Table Organization

The addendum tables are organized by tab. Within the tables, States will find data elements with specific drop-downs that CMS has pre-selected to standardize data provided by States in the preprint.

Table 1.A	Payment Arrangement Provider Performance Measures
Table 2.A	Provider Payment Analyses
Table 3.A	Actuarial Rate Certification(s)
Table 4.A	IGT Transferring Entities
Table 5.A	Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment(s)
Table 6.A	Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment Waivers
Table 7.A	Payment Arrangement Quality Strategy Goals and Objectives
Table 8.A	Evaluation Measures, Baseline and Performance Targets

Identifying Information	Column1
State/Territory (Select from dropdown menu):	

PREPRINT SUBSECTION IIIA: VALUE-BASED PAYMENT/DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM
ADDENDUM TABLE 1.A: PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT PROVIDER PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Directions

1. In Table 1.A below, use the rows to add more measure(s) to Table 1 that the State will tie to provider performance under this value-based payment or delivery system reform arrangement (provider performance measures). States may also use Table 1.A in lieu of completing Table 1 in the preprint. Input data only in beige cells in columns B - H.

States should only submit the tables they populate to CMS; please do not submit the entire workbook unless the State inputs data into Tables 1.A - 8.A. For example, if the State only needs extra rows to complete Table 1 in the preprint, please delete Tabs 2.A - 8.A. CMS requests States submit the addendum tables with the preprint in this Excel format; please do not merge and re-PDF the preprint.

TABLE 1.A Payment Arrangement Provider Performance Measures

Column#	Measure Name and NQF # (if applicable)	Measure Steward/Developer	Baseline Year	Baseline Statistic	Performance Measurement Period	Performance Target	Notes
Data Format	Free text	Set values (select one)	Year (FY or CY YYYY)	Decimal (0.###)	Free text	Decimal (0.###)	Free text
			Baseline year must be added after the first year of the payment arrangement	Baseline percentage must be added after the first year of the payment arrangement	If this is planned to be a multi-year payment arrangement, indicate which year(s) of the payment arrangement that performance on the measure will trigger payment		If the State is using an established measure and will deviate from the measure steward's measure specifications, please describe here. Additionally, if a state-specific measure will be used, please define the numerator and denominator here
a.	Percentage of long-stay residents with pressure ulcers	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	FFY 2024	20th Percentile: 0.23 Median: 3.45 70th Percentile: 0.00	*Program Year 5*	Fair: 5.23-7.43 Better: 3.45-5.22 Best: 0–3.44	Due to CMS change to this measures's specifications and beginning SFY26, the measure's denominator includes members of all risk categories; the FFY24 result following this methodology (4.32%) will serve as the baseline for future program years.
b.	Total Nurse Staffing Hours per resident day (RN, LPN, CNA) – case-mix adjusted	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	CY 2020	20th Percentile: 3.09 Median: 3.44 70th Percentile: 3.84	*Program Year 5*	Fair: 3.09–3.43 Better: 3.44–3.83 Best: 3.84+	Due to CMS' change in case-mix calculations affecting this measure, thresholds were determined by quantiling nursing facilities based data available FFY24 data (i.e., FFY Quarters 2-4)
c.	Total Nurse Staffing Turnover (RN, LPN, Nurse aides)	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	CY 2027	20th Percentile: 46.61 Median: 40.31 70th Percentile: 0.00	*Program Year 5*	Fair: 46.61-58.86 Better: 40.31-46.60 Best: 0-40.30	
d.	Percentage of Long-Stay residents with one or more falls with major injury	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	CY 2027	20th Percentile: 3.30 Median: 2.04 70th Percentile: 0.00	*Program Year 5*	Fair: 3.30-4.66 Better: 2.04- 3.29 Best: 0.00-2.03	

PREPRINT SECTION VII: QUALITY CRITERIA AND FRAMEWORK FOR ALL PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS
ADDENDUM TABLE 7.A. PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT QUALITY STRATEGY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Directions

7. Use Table 7.A below to add any goal(s) and objective(s) this payment arrangement is expected to advance as they appear in the state Quality Strategy (include page numbers). States may also use Table 7.A in lieu of completing Table 7 in the preprint. Input data only in beige cells in the three columns.

States should only submit the tables they populate to CMS; please do not submit the entire workbook unless the State inputs data into Tables 1.A - 8.A. For example, if the state only needs extra rows to complete Table 7 in the preprint, please delete Tabs 1.A - 6.A and 8.A. CMS requests States submit the addendum tables with the preprint in this Excel format; please do not merge and re-PDF the preprint.

TABLE 7.A: Payment Arrangement Quality Strategy Goals and Objectives

Column1	Goal(s)	Objective(s)	Quality strategy page #
Data Format	**Free text**	**Free text**	**Free text**
Example:	Improve care coordination for enrollees with beahvioral health conditions	Increase the number of managed care patients receiving follow-up behavior health counseling by 15%	pp. 20-22
a.	*Goal 2 – Promote Access to Safe, Gold-Standard Patient Care: Measure Name: (2.2.1.1) Prevalence of Pressure Ulcers Among LTSS Members*	Decrease the prevalence percentage of LTSS members with pressure ulcers by a minimum of 1 percent over 2022 benchmark by 2025: • Long-Term Nursing Facility: • Short-Term Nursing Facility: • CCC Plus Waiver Members:	256
b.	*Goal 3 - Support Efficient and Value-Driven Care: Measure Name: (3.1.1.7) Total Nurse Staffing Hours per Resident Day (RN, LPN, C.N.A. – Case-Mix Adjusted)*	Increase by X% the number of days with total nurse staffing hours per resident day meeting minimum requirements. Best: 3.84+, Better: 3.46–3.83, Fair: 3.16–3.45	174
c.	*Goal 3 – Support Efficient and Value-Driven Care: Measure Name: (3.1.1.11) Percentage Long-Stay Resident with Pressure Ulcers*	Please refer to Measure Name: (2.2.1.1)Prevalence of Pressure Ulcers Among LTSS Members (above) NF VBP: Decrease by X% Long-Stay Residents with Pressure Ulcers. Best: 0–5.42, Better: 5.43–8.05, Fair: 8.06–10.92	175