STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL

ANNUAL MEETING

AGENDA

February 12, 2015
10:00 a.m.

90 Church Street
4th Floor, Room 4A & 4B
New York City

I. INTRODUCTION OF OBSERVERS

Jeffrey Kraut

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. Election of Vice Chairperson

B. Announce Committee Chairpersons and Vice Chairpersons and Committee Membership

- Committee on Codes, Regulations and Legislation
- Committee on Establishment and Project Review
- Committee on Health Planning
- Committee on Public Health
- Ad Hoc Committee to Lead the State Health Improvement Plan

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 4, 2015

Exhibit #1

IV. REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES

A. Report of the Department of Health

Howard A. Zucker, M.D., J.D., Acting Commissioner of Health

B. Report of the Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management Activities

Daniel Sheppard, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
C. **Report of the Office of Health Insurance Programs Activities**  
   Elizabeth Misa, Medicaid Deputy Director, Office of Health Insurance Programs

D. **Report of the Office of Quality and Patient Safety**  
   Patrick Roohan, Director, Office of Quality and Patient Safety

V. **PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES**  
   **Report on the Activities of the Committee on Public Health**  
   Jo Ivey Boufford, M.D., Chair of the Public Health Committee

VI. **REGULATION**  
   **Report of the Committee on Codes, Regulations and Legislation**  
   Exhibit #2  
   Angel Gutiérrez, M.D., Chair

   **For Emergency Adoption**  
   13-08 Amendment of Subpart 7-2 of Title 10 NYCRR - Children’s Camps

   **For Adoption**  
   11-02 Amendment of Section 415.3(h) of Title 10 NYCRR (Nursing Home Transfer and Discharge Rights)

VII. **PROJECT REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS AND ESTABLISHMENT ACTIONS**  
   **Report of the Committee on Establishment and Project Review**  
   Jeffrey Kraut, Chair of Establishment and Project Review Committee

   **A. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES**

   **CATEGORY 1:** Applications Recommended for Approval – No Issues or Recusals, Abstentions/Interests

   **CON Applications**  
   **Acute Care Services - Construction**  
   Exhibit #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142181 C</td>
<td>Orange Regional Medical Center (Orange County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ambulatory Surgery Centers - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142134 C</td>
<td>Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center (Montgomery County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 2:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Without Dissent by HSA
- Without Dissent by Establishment and Project Review Committee

### CON Applications

### Acute Care Services - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142081 C</td>
<td>Huntington Hospital (Suffolk County) Mr. Kraut - Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 142168 C</td>
<td>Westchester Medical Center (Westchester County) Dr. Berliner – Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 142083 C</td>
<td>Southside Hospital (Suffolk County) Mr. Kraut – Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 142185 C</td>
<td>New York Presbyterian Hospital – New York Weill Cornell Center (New York County) Dr. Brown – Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 142228 C</td>
<td>Strong Memorial Hospital (Monroe County) Ms. Hines – Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Health Care Facilities - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>132305 C Jewish Home of Rochester (Monroe County) Ms. Hines - Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 3:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- No PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendations by HSA

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 4:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendation by HSA

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 5:** Applications Recommended for Disapproval by OHSM or Establishment and Project Review Committee - with or without Recusals

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 6:** Applications for Individual Consideration/Discussion

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**B. APPLICATIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES**

**CATEGORY 1:** Applications Recommended for Approval – No Issues or Recusals, Abstentions/Interests

**CON Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>141253 E South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center (Kings County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diagnostic and Treatment Centers – Establish/Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142152 E</td>
<td>Odyssey Community Services, Inc. (New York County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Health Care Facility – Establish/Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142195 B</td>
<td>Delhi Rehabilitation &amp; Nursing Center (Delaware County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Certified Home Health Agencies – Establish/Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142193 E</td>
<td>Kindred Healthcare (Saratoga County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOME HEALTH AGENCY LICENSURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2276 L</td>
<td>1st Class Care Services, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2178 L</td>
<td>All Heart Homecare Agency, Inc. (New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2292 L</td>
<td>Angels of Mercy Counseling Center, Inc. (Nassau Suffolk Queens and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2272</td>
<td>A Plus Homecare Agency, Inc.</td>
<td>Queens, Bronx, New York, Kings, Richmond, and Nassau Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>Bright Home Care, Inc.</td>
<td>New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens and Westchester Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2266</td>
<td>Central Westchester Home Health Services, LLC</td>
<td>Westchester County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2268</td>
<td>Chinatown Home Health Care, Inc.</td>
<td>New York, Bronx, Kings, Queens, Richmond and Nassau Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395</td>
<td>Ciambella Home Care, Inc. d/b/a FirstLight Home Care of East Buffalo</td>
<td>Erie and Niagara Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2218</td>
<td>Comprehensive Elder Care, LLC</td>
<td>Bronx, Richmond, Kings, New York, Queens, and Nassau Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2285</td>
<td>Elite Home and Community Care Service, Inc.</td>
<td>Rockland, Putnam, Westchester, Orange and Bronx Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>Ellison Home Care Companion Agency, Inc.</td>
<td>Nassau, Westchester, Rockland, Queens, and Suffolk Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2247</td>
<td>Grupp KK, Inc. (Bronx, Richmond, New York, Queens, Kings, Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>Guiding Angels Home Care, LLC (Bronx, Kings, New York, Richmond, Queens and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>Home at Last Home Care Services, LLC (Kings, Bronx, Queens, Richmond, and New York Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2175</td>
<td>Human First Community Health Care, LLC (Nassau, Suffolk and Queens Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2215</td>
<td>La’Dorch Homecare, Inc. (Bronx, Richmond, Kings, New York, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2261</td>
<td>Marabi Homecare Agency, Inc. (New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2274</td>
<td>Masih Home Care Incorporated (Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York, Bronx, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202</td>
<td>MY Care Health Services, Inc. (Queens, New York, Bronx, Richmond, Kings, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line No.</td>
<td>Name and Address</td>
<td>Counties Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2244 L</td>
<td>New Hope Services, Inc. (Bronx, Richmond, New York, Queens, Kings and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2259 L</td>
<td>NMC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2176 L</td>
<td>Augusta Osinowo d/b/a Nightingale Care Services (Bronx, Queens, New York, Richmond, Kings, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2157 L</td>
<td>Passion for Seniors of NY, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2299 L</td>
<td>Premium Home Services, LLC (Queens, Kings, Bronx, New York, Richmond, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2279 L</td>
<td>Scope Healthcare Services, Inc. (Suffolk, Nassau and Queens Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163 L</td>
<td>Global Private Home Care LLC (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2461 L</td>
<td>Alice Hyde Medical Center (Franklin County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2295 L</td>
<td>Hyde Park Assisted Living Facility, Inc. d/b/a Hyde Park Licensed Home Care Agency (Dutchess County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2319 L  Acare HHC, Inc.  
d/b/a Four Seasons Home Care  (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, Nassau and New York Counties)  Contingent Approval

2281 L  Anchor Home Care LLC  (Allegany, Erie, Orleans, Cattaraugus, Genesee, Wyoming, Chautauqua and Niagara Counties)  Deferred at the Department’s Request

2389 L  Crown of Life Care NY, LLC  (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, Nassau and New York Counties)  Contingent Approval

2342 L  Elite HHC, LLC  (Bronx, Richmond, Kings, Westchester, New York and Queens Counties)  Contingent Approval

2401 L  Prestige LHCSA Management, Inc.  (Bronx, Richmond, Kings, Westchester, New York and Queens Counties)  Contingent Approval

2556 L  Quality Care – USA, Inc.  d/b/a Gentiva Health Services  (See exhibit for counties served)  Contingent Approval

CATEGORY 2:  Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Without Dissent by HSA
- Without Dissent by Establishment and Project Review Committee

CON Applications

Acute Care Services – Establish/Construct  Exhibit #12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142218 E</td>
<td>NYU Lutheran Medical Center (Kings County) Dr. Kalkut – Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CATEGORY 3: Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- No PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendations by or HSA

NO APPLICATIONS

CATEGORY 4: Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment an Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendation by HSA

CON Applications

Residential Health Care Facility – Establish/Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. (Erie County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Bhat – Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Martin – Abstained at EPRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATEGORY 5: Applications Recommended for Disapproval by OHSM or Establishment and Project Review Committee - with or without Recusals

NO APPLICATIONS

CATEGORY 6: Applications for Individual Consideration/Discussion

Dialysis Services – Establish/Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>E.P.R.C. Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC (Kings County)</td>
<td>No Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Bhat – Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Boufford - Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Martin – Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Yang - Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. **PROFESSIONAL**

Executive Session - Report of the Committee on Health Personnel and Interprofessional Relations

Dr. Jodumutt Bhat, Chair
One Case arising under PHL 2801-b

IX. **NEXT MEETING**

March 26, 2015 - ALBANY
April 16, 2015 – ALBANY

X. **ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting of the Public Health and Health Planning Council was held on Thursday, December 4, 2014, at the Century House 997 New Loudon Road (Route 9), Main Ball Room, Latham, New York. Council member Mr. Peter Robinson presided.

### COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Howard Berliner</th>
<th>Dr. Gary Kalkut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jodumatt Bhat</td>
<td>Dr. Arthur Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Christopher Booth</td>
<td>Dr. Glenn Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carla Bouton-Foster</td>
<td>Ms. Ellen Rautenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lawrence Brown</td>
<td>Dr. John Rugge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kathleen Carver-Cheney</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Fassler</td>
<td>Dr. Anderson Torres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kim Fine</td>
<td>Dr. Patsy Yang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Angel Gutierrez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vicky Hines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STAFF PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Charles Abel</th>
<th>Ms. Karen Madden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nancy Agard</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa McMurdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Udo Ammon</td>
<td>Ms. Joan Cleary Miron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anna Colello</td>
<td>Ms. Elizabeth Misa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Barbara DelCigliano</td>
<td>Ms. Lakia Rucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Christopher Delker</td>
<td>Ms. Linda Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Dering</td>
<td>Mr. Keith Servis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Alejandra Diaz</td>
<td>Mr. Michael Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Horan</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa Ullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Yvonne Lavoie</td>
<td>Ms. Diana Yang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Colleen Leonard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ruth Leslie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTRODUCTION

Mr. Robinson called the meeting to order and welcomed Council members, meeting participants and observers. He mentioned that Mr. Sheppard would provide the Report on the Department of Health Activities in Commissioner Zucker’s absence and that the Dr. Birkhead would provide an update on the Office of Public Health activities at the next meeting.
Mr. Robinson asked for a motion to approve the October 2, 2014 Minutes of the Public Health and Health Planning Council meeting. Dr. Gutierrez motioned for approval which was seconded by Dr. Berliner. The minutes were unanimously adopted. Please refer to page 34 of the attached transcript.

**REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES**

Mr. Robinson turned the floor over to Mr. Sheppard to give the Report on the Department of Health Activities.

**EBOLA**

Mr. Sheppard reported that New York had its first Ebola patient, Dr. Craig Spencer, in mid-October. Dr. Craig Spencer was working in Guinea for Doctors without Borders when he contracted the virus. Six days after his return he came down with Ebola symptoms and went to Bellevue Hospital Center where he was isolated and treated for three weeks. His discharge from Bellevue was a much celebrated event that demonstrated New York’s ability to successfully treat this disease. Since claiming its first victim last December, Ebola has effected more than 16,900 people in eight countries of which more than 6,000 people have died. The collective preparedness efforts by the health departments and hospitals kept others from getting sick, including the healthcare workers who took care of Dr. Spencer.

Mr. Sheppard advised that New York began preparing for an Ebola patient long before Dr. Spencer got sick. New York is a State with more than 19 million people and we are home to a city that is an international travel hub, with more than 8 million people. We have one of five major U.S. Airports, JFK New York City, which allows flights from countries where Ebola has become widespread. Since October, travelers from effected countries have gone through an initial health screening. They are then referred to state and local public health authorities for active monitoring of Ebola symptoms. The monitoring goes on for 21 days following their last day of potential exposure to Ebola. Since the program began, health officials have monitored over 3,000 travelers more than 30,000 times.

Mr. Sheppard stated that knowing the risk for having a patient with Ebola was high, New York was the first state in the nation to designate hospitals for the care of patients with Ebola. At the Governor’s request, 10 hospitals across the State agreed to serve as designated centers for treating people with confirmed cases of Ebola. He was pleased to announce that five of New York’s designated hospitals have been approved by the CDC for inclusion on a list of U.S. facilities that will serve as Ebola treatment centers. The five CDC approved hospitals are the North Shore System in Glen Cove, New York; New York City Montefiore Health System; New York Presbyterian Hospital, the Allen Pavilion; Bellevue Hospital Center and Mt. Sinai Hospital. These five centers are among 35 hospitals in the country designated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human services as having the capabilities, training, and resources to provide the complex and extensive treatment that an Ebola patient requires while minimizing the risk to healthcare workers. They have undergone an intensive assessment by the CDC’s Rapid Ebola Preparedness Team. The Department has requested the CDC to survey the other five hospitals in New York State so that they may also be added to the federal list. The remaining five hospitals are Erie County Medical Center in Buffalo, SUNY Stony Brook University Hospital on Long Island, SUNY Upstate Medical University in Syracuse, University
Mr. Sheppard noted that the Department continues to work with CDC and local health departments to ensure that these centers maintain the necessary state of readiness with respect to facilities, workforce, training, labs, and waste management, all of which are required to safely and effectively treat a patient with Ebola. The rapid Ebola response teams have assessed each facility on all infection control aspects of caring for a patient with Ebola from the use of personal protective equipment or PPE to details like how trash is removed from a patient’s room. They also ensure that staff involved in the caring for a patient with Ebola has been appropriately trained. That means that the staff involved have demonstrated that they know how to put on and take off PPE, they know the appropriate protocols for proper waste management, they know how to do infection control, they know how to safely transport lab specimens, and that these designated hospitals also have processes in place to support the physical and emotional wellbeing of the staff providing care for someone with Ebola. It’s important to note the hospital staff caring for patients with Ebola will not be providing care to other patients which will limit potential exposure to other patients.

Mr. Sheppard advised that at Governor Cuomo’s request, Dr. Zucker issued a Commissioner’s order on October 16, 2014, that outlined hospital preparation protocols. The order required hospitals to develop protocols, training, and drills, provide personal protective equipment and identify a care setting to ensure that early recognition safe handling a suspect Ebola patients is possible. The Commissioner’s order also required all hospitals and clinics in the State to be ready to evaluate, isolate, and transport a person suspected of having Ebola. Additionally, the Department has begun to do readiness assessments for nearly 1,000 clinics; meet with state EMS providers to review their protocols for safe transportation; spoken with community health centers and other providers to ensure they were also ready for an Ebola patient or suspect Ebola patient; amassed its own stockpile of PPE for hospitals who are unable to replenish their supplies in the midst of treatment; and done practice drills for early identification and isolation of suspect Ebola patients in an emergency department.

Mr. Sheppard mentioned that as of November 21, 2014, there have been eight cases in Mali, six of which have died. As a result, both the CDC and Department of Homeland Security have added Mali to the list of Ebola affected nations and they’re screening all travelers coming into the U.S. each day from Mali, as well as those from Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea. Although there are no direct flights between the U.S. and Mali, approximately 15 to 20 residents of Mali do arrive in the United States every day by way of other countries. Most of these people are U.S. citizens coming home to America. In light of this possibility, we started enhancing our screening for travelers who originated in Mali. They’ll be subject to the same 21 day monitoring and movement protocols now in effect for travelers from Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. That means twice daily temperature checks as well as check-ins with the state and local public health authorities.

**WORLD AIDS DAY**

Mr. Sheppard reported that the Department held its annual World Aids Day event on December 1, 2014, at the Empire State Plaza. It was an event that galvanized the AIDS community in our resolve to combat this disease and help us to remember those we have lost to it. New York is at a turning point where we can actually envision a future without AIDS. It has
been a long and difficult journey due to the fact that New York has been at the epicenter of this epidemic since it began in the 80s. In our darkest days the early 90s, New York had as many as 15,000 new diagnoses a year. Today we are down to 3,000 new diagnoses a year. Many factors played a role in what has happened: better prevention strategies such as free syringe distribution programs for the injectable drug users, more education and awareness such as our mandated offers of HIV testing, and improvements in healthcare including the newly approved use of antiretroviral medications for people who are HIV negative and want to stay that way. When we talk about the end of the epidemic, we are talking about bringing down the number of new infections to just 750. Last month, Governor Cuomo announced the creation of the ending the epidemic task force. To help us achieve our goals, this group will support his three point plan which includes identifying persons with HIV who remain undiagnosed and linking them to healthcare, linking and retaining persons diagnosed with HIV in healthcare to maximize virus suppression so they remain healthy and prevent further transmission, and providing access to pre-exposure prophylaxis or PREP for high-risk persons to keep them HIV negative. The plan will alter the future of AIDS in New York State. It will also demonstrate the power of public health and good healthcare and showcases what we’ve achieved in New York.

NY STATE OF HEALTH

Mr. Sheppard advised that the Council that New York State of Health, the marketplace healthcare exchange, is currently in its second year. To date, more than 960,000 New Yorkers were enrolled during the first enrollment period which puts the Department well-ahead of its one million people insured by 2016 goal. The enrollment process began November 15th and ends February 15, 2015. The premiums for the 2015 plans will continue to be more than 50 percent lower than they were before the marketplace was created. Nearly 75 percent of the people enrolled received financial assistance that helped further lower their monthly costs. The Exchange is also enhancing its outreach efforts by providing some of the informational materials in 10 languages including Arabic, Hindu and Yiddish. Additionally, the website has been enhanced and a new Spanish version was created. Consumers in many counties will have more health plan options to choose from in 2015. Many new features were added such as a compare guide that lets consumers see all available plans in their county before they begin their application. Consumers will also get a personalized premium quote without entering personal information and completing the application.

DISASTER PREPAREDNESS

In closing, Mr. Sheppard stated that Dr. Zucker wanted to express thanks to the people in Western New York and all those who assisted in recovery from the recent series of snow storms. These people worked hard to ensure the health and safety of people affected by the recent storms was protected. Dr. Zucker was personally there for several days and saw how hard people were working to keep communities safe from all the snow and subsequent potential for flooding.

Mr. Sheppard concluded the report. Mr. Robinson thanked him and inquired if members had questions or comments. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 34 through 50 of the attached transcript.
Report of the Office of Health Insurance Programs Activities

Next, Mr. Robinson introduced Ms. Misa to give Report of Activities of the Office of Health Insurance Programs.

DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM INCENTIVE PAYMENT PROGRAM

Ms. Misa reported that the Department is on track with its year one deliverables. There are currently 25 PPSs statewide. On October 1, 2014, the final DSRIP plan application was released, and on December 1, 2014, LEAD submitted their final partner lists within the network tool. Project plan applications must be completed and submitted by the PPS lead on December 22, 2014, and will be posted to the website on December 24, 2014. The public comment period will be held from December 24 to January 26, 2015. In early February, the independent assessor will make recommendations to the public. The DSRIP project approval and oversight team will begin public meetings in mid-February and will make their final recommendations to the state in March. DSRIP year one will begin on April 1, 2015. There is a lot of work to be accomplished within a very tight timeline, but the Department is on track. All information can be found on the Department’s DSRIP website.

Ms. Misa concluded the report. Mr. Robinson thanked her and inquired if members had questions or comments. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 50 through 55 of the attached transcript.

Report on the Office of Quality and Patient Safety Activities

Mr. Robinson introduced Mr. Roohan to give the report of Activities of the Office of Quality and Patient Safety.

Mr. Roohan advised that the Office of Quality and Patient Safety is made up of four core areas: quality improvement in patient safety, evaluation measurement reporting and transparency, data system enhancement and development, and healthcare transformation. Under quality improvement and patient safety, one of the projects is to improve sepsis care in New York State. Regulations have given the Department authority to review evidence-based protocols from hospitals, measure process measures of sepsis care, and develop a risk-adjusted mortality model to compare hospitals. Much of the project’s success is a combination of hospitals participation and an incredible workgroup of stakeholders. The first review of the evidence-based protocols were in by December 31, 2013, and have all been approved. Additionally, two quarters have been collected thus far and once the data is cleaned up, the stakeholder workgroup will develop a data dictionary. The goal is to continue to evaluate the data and eventually evaluate the impact on mortality. Staff will continue to work diligently on this project as sepsis mortality is a serious condition and the number one cause of inpatient mortality in New York State.

Mr. Roohan reported that staff have been the lead on quality measurement of health plan reporting for the Department for over 20 years. Staff have been collecting data on quality assurance reporting requirements (QARR) from various managed care plan types; measurement and alignment; collection reporting for health homes and proposed fully integrated duals (FIDA) program; DSRIP; HARP – the health and recovery plans, Medicaid behavioral health plans; managed long term care programs; and the cardiac data reporting system.
Mr. Roohan stated that staff are developing an all-payer database (APD) for processing claims throughout the state. The process will begin with what public payers, such as Medicaid, Child Health Plus and the New York State of Health. The data intake system which collects data for the public payers began this fall. Medicare data will be added in 2015 and commercial insurance data collection will begin in late 2015. Funds were made available in the 2014-2015 budget to create the APD. The procurement process has been initiated to procure a vendor to do data storage and analytics from the system. Staff anticipate the system to be cost approximately $1.1 to $1.5 billion for a billion rolls of data yearly. APD regulations are in development which will address the submission requirements and process, data access levels, and what information can and cannot be released. Additionally, revised regulations were issued last year regarding the state’s health planning and research cooperative systems (SPARCS). These revisions included clarification on how data is collected, a streamlined approval process, and a reduced waiting time for retrieving SPARCS data.

Mr. Roohan mentioned that his office has been heavily involved in healthcare transformation. One featured program is the State Health Innovation Plan which was submitted to the federal government last year which produced a four-year model grant for $10 million. Staff have been working very closely with Medicaid and all the measurement activities related to DSRIP including measures, specifications, reporting, and interaction with CMS. Additionally, staff have worked very closely with OHIP staff to include a lot of data on publicly available data, and DSRIP core metrics which are preventable, prevention quality indicators (PQIs) and potentially preventable readmissions (PPRs).

OFFICE BASED SURGERY

Dr. Gesten reported that an Ad Hoc Office Based Surgery Advisory Committee was created in August and briefly listed the names of its members. The major objectives of the Committee are to review adverse event data with a focus on office-based surgery related deaths to identify potential systemic and preventable issues, make recommendations to enhance data collection, and improve patient safety for those individuals who are having office-based surgery procedures. The committee held a conference call on September 30, 2014, and met on November 13, 2014, in New York City. More meetings have been scheduled for 2015. It is anticipated that the work of the group in terms of concluding its recommendations and report should take between six to ten months.

Dr. Gesten advised that the Committee had done an additional analysis of the office-based surgery adverse event data that was received from 2010 to 2013 which focused on deaths, particularly those involving vascular and GI procedures. The majority of the office-based surgery deaths involve end stage renal disease patients who are on dialysis and receiving various kinds of surgical interventions to correct shunt abnormalities and/or deal with shunt dysfunction.

Dr. Gesten stated that future plans include reviewing data on 2014 deaths and those going forward with external experts, matching the adverse event data to vital statistics death data, and examining the data collection protocols from the office-based surgery accrediting bodies. The Committee is also continuing to pursue electronic submissions as a method of reporting adverse events to try to decrease the barriers or the burden of making adverse events reports to the Department. The ultimate goal is to resubmit the amendments to OBS legislation that were supported and submitted by PHHPC last year.
Mr. Robinson thanked both Dr. Gesten and Mr. Roohan, and inquired if members had questions or comments. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 56 through 77 of the attached transcript.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Report of the Activities of the Committee on Public Health

Mr. Robinson introduced Ms. Rautenberg to give her Report of the Committee on Public Health.

Ms. Rautenberg reported that the Prevention Agenda is now two years old and the local planning activities are ending year one. Due to the decreased traction from the implementation cycle to the implementation cycle, members are now highly focused on the implementation of the local plans between local health departments, hospitals, and their community partners.

Ms. Rautenberg informed members that a work group was created to address health disparities which met in September. The discussion highlighted disparities within the five prevention goals and what the attendees respective organizations are doing to try to tackle the issue of health disparities. The Office of Minority Health and Health Disparities will be issuing a statutorily required report on health equity in the near future. The Committee offered to help them communicate the findings of the report throughout the state and make sure that the local partnerships are aware of and have access to data on health disparities.

Ms. Rautenberg mentioned that a meeting was held for localities that are working on promoting mental health and the prevention of substance abuse, the second most chosen priority within the Prevention Agenda. The New York State Health Department, along with the New York State Office of Mental Health, the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, and the New York State Association of County Health Officials, the Conference of Local Mental Health Agencies, and the New York Academy of Medicine hosted a one-day meeting to provide training and technical assistance to communities that selected this particular Prevention Agenda item as one of their top two. There were approximately 29 counties in attendance, along with their government counterparts, hospital partners, and community partners. The discussion focused on evidence-based interventions in areas around suicide prevention, prescription drug prevention, tobacco cessation for those with mental illness, and ESBERT. The meeting was an opportunity for communities to share what they were doing and learn from each other.

Ms. Rautenberg advised that department staff will be sending out surveys to the local health departments and hospitals to measure their progress on Prevention Agenda items since plan submissions in 2013. The workgroup plans to meet in early February to analyze the survey results and provide a summary at a future Council meeting.

Ms. Rautenberg concluded her report. Mr. Robinson thanked her and inquired if members had questions or comments. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 78 through 80 of the attached transcript.
HEALTH POLICY

Report on the Activities of the Committee on Health Planning

Mr. Robinson introduced Dr. Rugge to give the Report on the Activities of the Health Planning Committee.

Dr. Rugge reported that two sessions were held on development criteria for the approval of off-campus EDs, where there has been no ED previously. There is a mechanism in place for recognition of off-campus EDs when a hospital closes but the ED continues. Through committee discussion, the determination was to focus on both the distance from the nearest available existing emergency department and the size of the population. The Department is now working on a proposal to present to the full Council at a later date.

Dr. Rugge stated that the Committee discussed a proposal to designate Nicholas Noyes Memorial Hospital as a stroke center. There was a brief discussion on the specifics of the application, specifically its contingencies. Dr. Rugge then motioned to approve the designation of Nicholas Noyes Hospital as a stroke center pending fulfillment of the last contingency. The motion was seconded by Dr. Gutierrez; the motion was approved.

Dr. Rugge concluded his report. Mr. Robinson thanked him and inquired if members had questions or comments. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 81 through 80 of the attached transcript.

Report of the Committee on Codes, Regulation and Legislation

Mr. Robinson introduced Dr. Gutierrez to give his Report of the Committee on Codes, Regulations and Legislation.

For Adoption

12-03 - Section 710.1 of Title 10 NYCRR – Certificate of Need Requirements

Dr. Gutierrez described Amendment of Section 710.1 of Title 10 NYCRR (Certificate of Need Requirements) and motioned to adopt this regulation. Dr. Berliner seconded the motion. The adoption carried. Please see pages 83 through 84 of the attached transcript.

14-16 - Part 404 of Title 10 NYCRR – Integrated Outpatient Services

Dr. Gutierrez described Amendment of Part 404 of Title 10 NYCRR (Integrated Outpatient Services) and motioned to adopt this regulation. Mr. Fassler seconded the motion. The adoption carried. Please see pages 84 through 94 of the attached transcript.

For Information

11-02 - Sections 415.3 of Title 10 NYCRR – Nursing Home Transfers and Discharge Rights

Dr. Gutierrez described the proposed Amendment of Sections 415.3 of Title 10 NYCRR (Nursing Home Transfers and Discharge Rights) for discussion. Please see pages 94 to 95 of the attached transcript.
Dr. Gutierrez concluded his report. Mr. Robinson thanked him and moved to the next item on the agenda.

Report on the Activities of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Free-Standing Ambulatory Surgery Centers and Charity Care

Mr. Robinson thanked Mr. Delker for his work in staffing the Committee, and the members of the Council who have been participating. Mr. Robinson noted that he would not read the report due to time constraints but requested that it be put into the record for the minutes. He mentioned that the Committee made significant progress in working through the various criteria and would be drafting their own criteria soon.

Mr. Robinson concluded his report. To see the complete report and comments from members, please see pages 95 to 96 of the attached transcript.

PROJECT REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS AND ESTABLISHMENT ACTIONS

Report of the Committee on Establishment and Project Review

Christopher Booth, Vice Chair, Establishment and Project Review Committee

A. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

CATEGORY 1: Applications Recommended for Approval – No Issues or Recusals, Abstentions/Interests

NO APPLICATIONS

CATEGORY 2: Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Without Dissent by HSA
- Without Dissent by Establishment and Project Review Committee

CON Applications

Acute Care Services - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>United Memorial Medical Center North Street Campus</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Genesee County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Booth – Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Hines – Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Robinson – Recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth described application 142157C. He noted for the record that Ms. Hines and Mr. Robinson had both declared a conflict and left the meeting room. Mr. Booth motioned for approval, Dr. Gutierrez seconded. The motion to approve carried. Ms. Hines and Mr. Robinson returned to the meeting room. Please see pages 96 and 97 of the transcript.
Mr. Booth described application 142079C and motioned for approval. Dr. Berliner seconded and the motion to approve carried. Please see pages 97 and 98 of the transcript.

**CATEGORY 3:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- No PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendations by HSA

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 4:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendation by HSA

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 5:** Applications Recommended for Disapproval by OHSM or Establishment and Project Review Committee - with or without Recusals

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 6:** Applications for Individual Consideration/Discussion

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**B. APPLICATIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES**

**CATEGORY 1:** Applications Recommended for Approval – No Issues or Recusals, Abstentions/Interests

**CON Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142140 E</td>
<td>NYP Community Programs, Inc. (Westchester County) Dr. Boutin-Foster - Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Booth described application 142140E. He noted for the record that Dr. Boutin-Foster had declared a conflict and left the meeting room. Mr. Booth motioned for approval, Dr. Berliner seconded. The motion to approve carried. Dr. Boutin-Foster returned to the meeting room. Please see pages 98 and 99 of the transcript.

**Ambulatory Surgery Centers – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 132340 B</td>
<td>Richmond ASC, LLC d/b/a Richmond Pain Management (Richmond County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 142077 E</td>
<td>Island Digestive Health Center (Suffolk County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Health Care Facilities – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142056 E</td>
<td>Hope Center Operations, LLC d/b/a Hope Center For HIV and Nursing Care (Bronx County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 142090 E</td>
<td>L&amp;A Operations LLC d/b/a Adira at Riverside Rehabilitation (Westchester County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certified Home Health Agency – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142060 E</td>
<td>Dominican Sisters Family Health Service, Inc. (Nassau County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 142068 E</td>
<td>Royal Care Certified Home Health Care, LLC (Queens County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 142100 E</td>
<td>A &amp; T Certified Home Care, LLC (Rockland County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth described applications 132340B, 142077E, 142056E, 142090E, 142060E, 142068E and 142100E. Mr. Booth motioned for approval, Dr. Berliner seconded. The motion to approve carried. Please see pages 99 and 101 of the transcript.
Mr. Booth then called applications Fletcher Allen Partners, Inc.; The Debutante Cotillion and Christmas Ball, Inc.; and The Health Science Center Foundation at Syracuse, Inc. Mr. Booth motioned for approval, Dr. Gutierrez seconded. The motion to approve the applications carried. Please see pages 101 through 102 of the attached transcript.

**HOME HEALTH AGENCY LICENSURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2162L</td>
<td>24/7 Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2172L</td>
<td>Able Body Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (Bronx, Kings, New York, Richmond, Queens and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2191L</td>
<td>Agincare Homecare Services, Inc. (Bronx, New York, Kings, Richmond, Queens, and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2161L</td>
<td>Allied Partners Home Care, LLC (Nassau and Queens Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2236L</td>
<td>Anderson Care, LLC d/b/a Home Helpers/Direct Link (Albany and Schenectady Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2187L</td>
<td>Angel Home Care Agency, Inc.</td>
<td>(Kings, Richmond, New York, Queens, and Bronx Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2174L</td>
<td>Angel’s Touch Home Care, LLC</td>
<td>(Kings, Richmond, Queens, Bronx, New York and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2252L</td>
<td>Axzons Health System Corporation</td>
<td>(Nassau, Westchester, Suffolk and Queens Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207L</td>
<td>Blissful Healthcare, Inc. (Bronx, New York, Kings, Richmond and Queens Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060L</td>
<td>Compassionate Home Health Care, LLC</td>
<td>(New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2257L</td>
<td>Customize Care, LLC (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2164L</td>
<td>Eva Homecare Agency, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230L</td>
<td>First Baana Corp. (New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens and Westchester Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2232L Fun & Fit, LLC d/b/a Home Instead Senior Care (Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess and Bronx Counties) Contingent Approval

2189L Janette Homecare of NY, Inc. (New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens and Nassau Counties) Contingent Approval

2087L Long Beach Home Care Services, Inc. (Bronx, Richmond, New York, Nassau, Kings, and Queens Counties) Contingent Approval

2182L Safe and Prudent, LLC (New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens, and Nassau Counties) Contingent Approval

2201L SafeCare Home Care Agency, Inc. (Nassau, Suffolk and Queens Counties) Contingent Approval

2208L SHARE of New Square, Inc. (Rockland, Sullivan, Putnam, Westchester, Dutchess, Bronx, Orange and Ulster Counties) Contingent Approval

2159L Skilled Home Care Services of New York, LLC d/b/a Skilled Home Care Services of New York (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Westchester Counties) Contingent Approval

1728L Supreme Generation, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, New York and Richmond Counties) Contingent Approval

2183L The Heinlein Group, Inc. d/b/a Synergy HomeCare of Westchester (Westchester and Bronx Counties) Contingent Approval

2055L Golden Eagle Homecare Agency, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Nassau, New York, and Richmond Counties) Contingent Approval

2391L JS Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (Bronx, Richmond, Kings, Nassau, New York and Queens Counties) Contingent Approval

2127L Premier Home Health Care Services, Inc. (Kings, New York, Queens, Richmond, and Bronx Counties) Contingent Approval

2256L Premier Home Health Care Services, Inc. (Westchester, Putnam, Rockland, and Bronx Counties) Contingent Approval


**CATEGORY 2:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:
- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Without Dissent by HSA
- Without Dissent by Establishment and Project Review Committee

**CON Applications**

**Acute Care Services – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142108 E</td>
<td>Long Island Jewish Medical Center (Queens County) Br. Bhat – Interest Dr. Martin – Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Applicant/Facility</td>
<td>Council Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142039 E</td>
<td>North Country Orthopaedic Ambulatory Surgery Center, LLC (Jefferson County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Booth - Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142073 E</td>
<td>Buffalo Surgery Center, LLC (Erie County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Booth – Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dialysis Services – Establish/Construct**

Exhibit #14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141210 B</td>
<td>Peninsula Continuum Services, LLC d/b/a Cassena Care Dialysis at Peninsula (Queens County) Dr. Bhat – Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141280 E</td>
<td>Liverpool LD, LLC d/b/a FMS-Liverpool Dialysis Center (Onondaga County) Dr. Bhat – Interest Mr. Booth – Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth described applications 152108E, 142105E, 142039E, 142073E, 141210B, and 141280E. Mr. Booth made a motion to approve, Dr. Brown seconded. The motion to approve carried. Please refer to pages 103 to 105 of the transcript.

**Residential Health Care Facilities – Establish/Construct**

Exhibit #15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132128 B</td>
<td>DOJ Operations Associates, LLC d/b/a Triboro Center for Rehabilitation and Specialty Healthcare (Bronx County) Dr. Bhat - Recusal</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Booth called application 132128B. He advised that Dr. Bhat had a recusal and had left the room. Mr. Booth made a motion to approve which Mr. Fassler seconded. The motion to approve carried and Dr. Bhat returned to the room. Please refer to pages 105 to 106 of the transcript.

2. 141213E Comprehensive at Williamsville, LLC d/b/a Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Nursing Center at Williamsville (Erie County) Mr. Booth - Interest

Mr. Booth then called application 141213E and informed members that he had declared an interest. Mr. Booth made a motion to approve; Dr. Boutin-Foster seconded. The motion to approve carried. Please refer to pages 106 to 107 of the transcript.

HOME HEALTH AGENCY LICENSURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2226L</td>
<td>Beech Development Corp. d/b/a ComForcare Senior Services – Rochester East (Monroe, Livingston, Ontario and Wayne Counties) Mr. Booth – Interest Ms. Hines - Interest</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2241L</td>
<td>New York Congregational Licensed Home Care Services Agency, Inc. (Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2316L</td>
<td>Rehekah Rehab Licensed Home Care Services Agency, Inc. (Bronx County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2449L</td>
<td>The Gardens by Morningstar, LLC (Oswego, Onondaga and Cayuga Counties)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2211L  UCSL, LLC d/b/a focus Home Care of Central New York (Herkimer, Oswego, Lewis, Oneida, Madison, and Onondaga Counties)  Mr. Booth – Interest  Contingent Approval

2331 L  Shire Senior Living LLC (Monroe, Ontario, Schuyler, Yates, Chemung, Wayne, Seneca, Livingston, Genesee, and Steuben Counties)  Ms. Hines - Interest  Contingent Approval

Mr. Booth next called applications 2226L, 2241L, 2316L, 2449L, 2211, and 2331. Mr. Booth made a motion to approve, Dr. Torres seconded. The motion to approve carried. Please refer to pages 107 to 108 of the transcript.

**CATEGORY 3:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- No PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment and Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendations by or HAS

None

**CATEGORY 4:** Applications Recommended for Approval with the Following:

- PHHPC Member Recusals
- Establishment an Project Review Committee Dissent, or
- Contrary Recommendation by HSA

**CON Applications**

**Ambulatory Surgery Centers – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 141290 B</td>
<td>SOW Westside, LLC d/b/a Surgicare of Westside (New York County) Dr. Martin – Recusal Dr. Brown – Opposed at EPRC Dr. Torres – Opposed at EPRC</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth described application 141290B and noted that Drs. Martin and Kalkut both had declared conflicts and left the room. Mr. Booth made a motion to approve which was seconded by Dr. Gutierrez. The motion passed and Drs. Martin and Kalkut returned to the room. Please refer to pages 108 to 109 of the transcript.
**CATEGORY 5:** Applications Recommended for Disapproval by OHSM or Establishment and Project Review Committee - with or without Recusals

**NO APPLICATIONS**

**CATEGORY 6:** Applications for Individual Consideration/Discussion

**CON Applications**

**Ambulatory Surgery Centers – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142061 E</td>
<td>East Side Endoscopy (New York County) Dr. Brown – Abstained at EPRC Mr. Levin – Opposed at EPRC</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth called application 142061E and motioned to approve. Ms. Fine seconded; the motion to approve carried. Please refer to pages 109 to 110 of the transcript.

**Dialysis Services – Establish/Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Applicant/Facility</th>
<th>Council Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 142058 E</td>
<td>Massena Center, LLC d/b/a Massena Dialysis Center (St. Lawrence County)</td>
<td>Contingent Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Booth then called application 142058E and motioned to approve. Dr. Gutierrez seconded; the motion carried. Please refer to pages 110 to 111 of the transcript.

Mr. Booth concluded his report and Mr. Robinson thanked him.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Robinson reminded members of the dates and location of the next meeting cycle. He then made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Good morning. My name is Angel Gutierrez, I’m the chair of the Codes, Regulation, and Legislation Committee and I’m told that we do have a quorum. So we’re going to call the meeting to order.

There are three sets of regulations in the agenda today. For adoption we have an amendment of certificate of need requirements. The Department is proposing an amendment to section 710.1 of title 10 NYCRR regarding simplifying the Certificate of Need process for certain projects. And Chris Delker of the Department is here to present this proposal. Dr. Delker.

CHRIS DELKER: Thank you. These regulations were issued pursuant to legislation that passed in 2011 and took effect in January of 2012, almost three years ago now, and what that legislation did was eliminate requirements for limited review or other types of CON review for projects that were confined to non-clinical infrastructure in healthcare facilities, repair and maintenance and one for one equipment replacement, all regardless of cost. So, in place of the limited review of CON application the operator would have to submit only a notice to the Department describing the project and any construction or equipment purchases involved accompanied by any applicable architecture or engineering certification, and if applicable a patient safety plan during construction.
We received one comment on these regulations from Healthcare Association of New York State – HANYS – expressing concern that the statute as we administered it was being interpreted in a manner that for any project that might effect a clinical space, even though it involved non-clinical infrastructure, a CON review might be required. We have not generally administered the project that way but we think that the regulations that – we think that these regulations will clarify that and by emphasizing that the CON or limited review would apply only if an infrastructure project involved the modification or alteration of clinical space services or equipment, and that’s what the regulation says. So we think that that will make it possible for any infrastructure project that does not involve clinical space to be subject only to notice of submission, and indeed that had been the case throughout the almost three years we’ve been administering it. We have had a number of projects where, that involved an entire facility. For example, an HVAC replacement or an electrical system replacement that obviously effected clinical and non-clinical space but because those projects did not involve the alteration or modification of clinical space they were accepted as notice submissions. We think that specifying very clearly in regulation that only if modification or alteration of clinical space is involved would any limited review apply will prevent any possible misadministration if you will, of the law, and
perhaps in error requiring limited review where clinical space
is not effected, if that’s clear. Any questions?

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Thank you Mr. Delker. Questions from
the Committee? Questions from members of the Council? Are there
any members of the public who would like to comment on this
proposal? If not, we have a motion to approve this? Dr. Bhat.
Second? OK. Let’s vote. All in favor? Anybody opposed? Any
abstentions? The motion carries.

For adoption also is integrated services licensure. We
have this for adoption of proposed regulations on the
integration of primary care and behavioral health services. Ms.
Ullman from the Department is here to explain the regulations.

LISA ULLMAN: Thank you. The Department has worked
together with the Office of Mental Health and the Office of
Alcoholism and substance abuse services on these joint
regulations which are designed to facilitate the integration of
primary care and behavioral healthcare services, and the idea is
that they would apply to providers that have already had dual
licensure at one site which will allow them to get expedited
approval to add services at a second site. So, for example that
means for an article 28 facility that has multiple sites that
are licensed by the Department of Health and they have approval,
for example, from OMH to provide mental health services at one
site, if they want to add mental health services at a second
site they ordinarily would have to undergo another licensure
process from OMH. They will not have to do that under the
regulations. They would have the ability to seek an expedited
approval in order to do that, and that should certainly
facilitate their ability to move forward. The regulations also
set forth some physical plant standards which may actually be
easier for some of the providers to meet than the existing
standards, so for example, some of the behavioral health
providers, they might offer you know, services in a clinic
setting in an existing space that it would be very difficult and
costly to renovate, so these regulations offer some
flexibility with those standards so that they can meet, you
know, the level that still supports the provision of safe and
hygienic services. The regulations also set forth operating
standards which you know, address things that you know, make
sure that the services are provided in a way that is of quality
and that supports all of the elements that you would expect to
see on both the behavioral and the primary care side, so they
will address things such as making sure there is appropriate
admission criteria, discharge planning, treatment planning,
other items such as that. And I think that, you know, there are
certainly another benefit to the providers that will come from
these regulations as the idea that once they are approved to
move forward as an integrated services provider, they will not
need to be licensed – I’m sorry, be inspected by more than one agency. They will be able to just be approved – just be inspected and overseen by one agency. Of course the agencies will work very closely together as that gets expedited. So, we think that overall this process will really help the providers do a better job at integrating their services so they can approach to co-occurring needs of their populations. The regulations and ours were published in the State registrar on October 15 as well as virtually identical regulations that were put forth by the other two agencies, OMH and OASAS. The comment period expired on the first. We have looked at those comments that were received. We made some changes to the regulations. Other changes we thought we could not make. For example, one item that I think we heard from some of the commenters was that the regulations didn’t necessarily go far enough, that we were still requiring that there be licensure by that second agency and some viewed that as an obstacle. I think our response to that is that this is one model of integrating care. It’s something that is important to us and there will be other models, for example, as I think some of the commenters acknowledged. We are proceeding under the DSRIP program with some regulatory flexibility which we do anticipate will be used to help some of the providers integrate their services. So, this is simply one model, and the way that it was structured, it was designed to you know, allow some flexibility and exchange
for that make sure that because there is that existing licensure
by the second agency that that just assures us that the provider
is in good standing and it gives us some comfort that you know,
the flexibility is appropriate.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Is that it? Thank you very much Ms.
Ullman. Any questions from members of the Committee? I have a
question, a couple. If you all have the copy of the summary of
expressed terms, I would like you to refer to page 24, third
paragraph from the top. Primary care services shall not include
prenatal care, dental services, ambulatory surgery, blah, blah,
blah. I’m concerned about that because a place like this will
attract hopefully young people with either mental or substance
abuse problems. A pregnant young woman in that situation may
have the only opportunity to get prenatal care. I do not know
why prenatal care is excluded.

LISA ULLMAN: It’s a very legitimate question and again,
one of our overall goals here was to, you know, make sure that
we’re helping expand access to necessary services, and I think
that it is something that we will look at closer in the future.
I think the idea now was that we wanted to make sure that you
know, the prenatal care was provided, you know, sort of as part
of a more comprehensive sort of opportunity that wouldn’t
necessarily be provided in these, so we just thought that this
wasn’t the right opportunity for that, but again, I think it’s
something that we’ll talk about in the future.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: The next concern has to
page 30 – I’m sorry, yes.

LAWRENCE BROWN: Good morning. And I want to thank you
for raising the concern. Thank you for the response from the
Department of Health. I do agree that given that these are
sites where access to care becomes so critical and for a woman
who is in the beginning of a pregnancy, I find it very less than
proactive thinking about how we can make sure that we improve
access to care by that limitation. That one is really when
that’s kind of challenging from a public health standpoint.

LISA ULLMAN: Yeah, I appreciate that, and again, I think
our focus really was on primary care, and I think obstetrical
care starts to sort of head into you know, more of a specialty
area, but certainly those patients can be seen and provided with
what we think of traditionally as primary care. But again, it’s
something we can certainly look at expanding in the future.

LAWRENCE BROWN: I look forward to hearing that,
hopefully not too distant in the future.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I have a question on procedure here. If in fact the feeling for that particular issue is strong enough, do we ask for modification now, removing that clause, or do we move it because we by virtue of how the schedule is, we’re going to be proposing to the Full Council something that we have some questions about.

LISA ULLMAN: My recommendation would be that we do go ahead because I think that there are a lot of providers that are very eager to move forward with what we’ve structured and we can certainly take that up and certainly answer your concerns more thoroughly, see if there is something else that we can do, but I think we are, again, very eager as I believe the community is too for us to move forward and get the structure put into place.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: The next –

JOHN RUGGE: Just, Dr. Gutierrez,

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I’m sorry. Go ahead please.

JOHN RUGGE: Lisa, would you be able to commit to a time table for that?

LISA ULLMAN: For?
JOHN RUGGE: Bringing the issue back?

LISA ULLMAN: I can certainly come back, discuss it more thoroughly with you at the next meeting if that’s OK, and you know, let you know that either we’ve talked about it and I can give you more substantive reasons about why we don’t think prenatal care necessarily falls into the primary care and is suitable for this, or whether it is appropriate for us to expand that at this time. Again, the focus was to be more on primary care, but you know, I’m recognizing your concerns as something that we really should explore. So if you’d like, I could come back at the next meeting.

JOHN RUGGE: I think the risk is that one or the other is going to fall away, either that person is going to receive behavioral healthcare or receive prenatal care but not both. So I think bring the proposal back for an up and down consideration rather than simply more information would be helpful.

LISA ULLMAN: Sure.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Dr. Martin.
GLEN MARTIN: So I certainly understand and applaud the enthusiasm for this, but it, just thinking that prenatal care covers a large range of severity, illness interventions, and concerns. I mean, simply weighing somebody and ordering an outside ultrasound and you know checking blood sugar, blood pressure, and the like is something that could easily be done here. If it gets more complicated it’s not, so I suspect that there may be some definitional issues and the like that are going to have to come into this that may not be quite as easy as simply saying, yes, prenatal care should be in these clinics, because certainly knowing the psych clinics that I’ve run that would be somewhat frightening. Not the easy part. I mean, certainly in the beginning, but at some point it would have to be a lot different than just saying a physical exam room is what I’m thinking. I can understand a little bit of hesitancy to say yes, we can simply remove that word and we’re done. I’m expressing sympathy for the Department’s desire to study. There’s a little bit, but also agree that it should be done expeditiously and with the idea that we should allow it to be integrated to the extent possible, as quickly as possible.

JOHN RUGGE: Spoken like a behavioral health provider, I might say.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: So, why can’t we as committee not be able to just strike that particular item from that particular page? Primary care services shall not include dental services or ambulatory surgery, blah, blah, blah? So we take that prenatal care out.

LISA ULLMAN: I do think it implements the concerns that were raised that this can go beyond primary care, but again, a basic level of services that do fall within the primary care realm is what’s anticipated. So, again, I do think it does warrant further discussion because these are legitimate reasonable concerns, and we do want to have that dialog with you further. I think we would prefer, if we could, to move forward with the regulations as drafted, so that we’re comfortable with what we’re adding are primary care services, and we can move forward expeditiously.

MR. DERING: If I could add in too from a process standpoint what Lisa’s mentioning makes sense to go forward, then we’re moving forward but address the other concerns as we move along.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: OK. Any further discussion on this particular part of the proposal? Then I’ll ask you to go to page 30 at the top where it says, “program space except medical
examination and treatment rooms may be shared between certified
patient services pursuant,…” blah, blah, blah. And my question
is why are we keeping an examination room from being used for
counseling purposes? I don’t see – I mean it happens all the
time and for instance, article 28 facilities? I have a problem
with a patient and I ask either mental health or substance abuse
staff to come and help me with a patient and I leave the
examination room and they carry the interview right then and
there. What is there about an examination room that excludes it
from being used for counseling purposes?

LISA ULLMAN: I think in part the thinking was just the
way that the room is structured probably would not be conducive
to some types of counseling, you know, certainly of a group
counseling couldn’t be held in a smaller exam room. I think we
can certainly flesh this out a little bit more potentially in
guidance, but the idea wasn’t to, you know, completely prohibit
the use of space, you know, for multiple purposes if it’s
appropriate. It’s just that we want to make sure certainly
those things aren’t happening in the same space at the same time
and it would have to be a structurally appropriate space for the
particular service. So we can, again, certainly make sure that
the providers have sufficient and understanding of what that
means and we can put that in guidance.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: My last concern on page 53 at the top where it mentions AIDS and HIV information “shall only be disclosed in accordance where article 27F of the public health law...” I found in my review no mention of a similar restriction to substance abuse information which is just as restrictive or more, and I wonder, that said, and look from the standpoint of a practicing physician who wants to find out more about my patient being seen at that facility, the wall that one finds regarding information about HIV or substance abuse is formidable. I don’t know how to negotiate that. I don’t know how to, shall we include substance abuse in here if we’re going to take that (tag) number one; number two, if it is known in the community that this particular article 28 facility there are services provided which include mental health and substance abuse, it is almost implied that questions about Joe Smith attending that clinic means not just his diabetes, he’s having other things being taken care of, that I am implicitly aware of. How do we negotiate that? I would like to hear Dr. Brown’s opinion on this.

LAWRENCE BROWN: As an internist and addiction medicine specialist I must share with you, Mr. Chair, that I continue to find a conundrum with respect to the issue of having sufficient information available to providers, irrespective of what that clinical discipline. And the real concern about issues about
confidentiality. I, on the one hand I see the comment that
you’re making with respect to the top of page 53. The issue
with respect to (sub-use) confidential information will still
stand. A state cannot reverse what a federal relation is,
42CFR. So, but I do believe that many primary care providers
may not know about the significance of those federal
regulations. So, somehow or another would seem to me that the
New York State Department of Health actually does make sure that
any providers who choose to do this understand that there
significance of separation, and even though, I must tell you,
I’m troubled by it in some ways because as even with our iStop
program in New York State, as a person who’s providing care for
a patient as a (substance abuse treatment) program, I know every
medication that is prescribed to my patient that is a
prescription narcotic. However, a provider who is not an
addiction treatment program and does not now that his patient or
her patient that they’re treating with the same prescription
narcotic is enrolled in a medication assisted treatment program.
They’re not allowed to get that information. That information is
not available to them in iStop. I only use that as an example
that the issue you raise is very complicated. I’m not sure in a
context of this committee meeting that we’re going to be able to
have enough time to really flesh them out, but I would recommend
that we do so at some point that is convenient in the schedule.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much, Dr. Martin. I’m sorry.

ART LEVIN: I’m his other arm. So, I guess my question is why one doesn’t suffice? In other words that introductory paragraph which basically says you’ve got to follow state and federal regulations, I think we create the problem by the exceptionalism and then putting in a specific reference to the state AIDS law on privacy and confidentiality, but why? I mean, doesn’t the first paragraph, number one, do it? Says you’ve got to pay attention to what state and federal law say you have to pay attention to.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I can appreciate that, but I’m trying to imagine what is going to happen if a practitioner from outside the facility asks for information about a patient being taken care of. If it is truly an integrated system, I can picture that in some history and physical done from the medical standpoint, there will be pertinent information of HIV and substance abuse, that, how’d you take that out in our communications with the community, medical care community? Dr. Martin.

GLENN MARTIN: So, having lived this all my life and living it now in health information exchange environments in the like,
the answer is it’s real tough. But I’m not saying that the laws as they currently state make a huge amount of sense, but all this reads to me that these are the laws and you’ve got to follow them. There’s also interestingly in two, mentioned something that usually gets forgotten most of these conversations, but just ask the patient’s permission. They get consent, you know, you then have that information available. And in our experience both with health information exchange consenting and in terms of asking patients in collaborative care models to consent to have that information shared, they will frequently be happy to do so. So, it is annoying, it is difficult operationally do deal with it. It would be nice if it got straightened out, but it is a question of both federal regs and state regs and I understand your concern, but I think that’s just what it is. So this doesn’t make it any worse. This just recognizes the issue and tells people you have to follow the rules, as much as I’d like them to be changed.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Thank you Dr. Martin. Are there any other questions from committee members or counsel members? We have a request from Mr. Heigel from HANYS to speak on the matter please.

FRED HEIGEL: Good morning. Thank you. I’m Fred Heigel from HANYS, and we did share these very detailed new regulations
with our membership. Got a lot of feedback, and frankly much of
the feedback came from the behavioral health side of the article
28 provider community. I’m not going to go through our lengthy
comments although many of them were addressed in the discussion
you just had within the Committee itself, and we appreciate that
recognition, and I think in general most practitioners agree
that treating mental health and physical health conditions in
conjunction with one another just benefits the patient.
Initially we thought, and Lisa described it this way really,
that the intent of these regulations was to facilitate
integration and even incentivize it in some cases. However, the
feedback we’ve got from our membership is that we fear it’s
going to have just the opposite effects on article 28 providers;
that it’s going to make it more complicated than it is right
now. And remember many of them already provide integrated
services up to a threshold level and I do appreciate Lisa’s
description earlier of the approach from DSRIP to potentially
relieve that threshold cap. You know, we believe that is an
incentive approach. But given the concerns that have been
raised by our membership and the fact that many at least view
this as creating additional hurdles, not incentives, we urge the
committee to consider our comments very carefully and modify the
regulations accordingly. Thank you.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. Any other comments from the public? If not, I will entertain a motion to approve this for adoption. Dr. Bhat. Second? OK. All in favor?

[Aye]

Anybody against? Any abstentions? The motion is carried.

The next item is for information only and deals with nursing home transfers and discharge rights. The final item on the agenda is a discussion of proposed amendments to section 415.3 of title 10 NYCRR to clarify the requirements for transfer and discharge of patients from nursing homes as mandated by federal law. The amendments more clearly define what constitutes a transfer of discharge, specify the elements that must be included in a notice of transfer or discharge the residence and deadlines for service of notice and clarify the rights of a resident at a hearing should one be requested. James Horan from the Department is here to explain the proposal. Mr. Horan, good morning.

JAMES HORAN: The federal nursing home guidelines require that the states provide due process hearings when a nursing home proposes to discharge a resident involuntarily. The Department was found out about 10 years ago that the Department standards were out of compliance with the federal regulations, and it was also, there were also complaints about how the hearings were done. The Department entered into a stipulation to settle that
NGEL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. Any questions from members of the committee? Any questions from members of the Council? Any comments from the public? This is only for information so this concludes the meeting and – the Codes Committee is closed.

CHRI Booth: Good morning. I’m Chris Booth. I’d like to call a special Establishment and Project Review Committee meeting. We have one application for this morning. It’s an application that was on our last meeting which some issues were
raised and some information requested. I’m going to read the application and put it on the table, take the motion and the second, and then open it up to the Department to provide some information. So the application is 142058E, Messina Center LLC, d/b/a Messina Dialysis Center. An interest declared by Mr. Booth. Establish Messina Center LLC, d/b/a Messina Dialysis Center as the new operator of an eight station dialysis center located at 290 Main Street, Messina, currently operated as an extension clinic of Messina Memorial Hospital. The Department recommended approval with conditions and contingencies. Can I have a motion? And a second? Motion and second. Mr. Abel.

CHARLIE ABEL: Thank you. So, this project was deferred from the meeting three weeks ago now, establishment and project review committee meeting primarily because of the interest by members of a particular member of the applicant entity who was a subject of disciplinary action. For folks who have seen my November 25 member to the members, you’ll note that that individual has had a medical incident and has been removed by the applicant from the applicant entity. Essentially removing the concern by members. We’ve revised the exhibit. It was sent out to everyone. It is still financially feasible. Character and competence is fine with the applicant, and the need is demonstrated so we can recommend, we can continue to recommend
approval and I believe the concern of the committee members has
been resolved.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you Mr. Abel. Any questions of the
Department? Yes, Dr. Berliner.

HOWARD BERLINER: Yeah, Charlie, I think to correctly
reflect the position of the Council, concern wasn’t a specific
incident. Thing is we didn’t know what that specific incident
was and therefore couldn’t make a judgment. So, it wasn’t –
just to be clear about that.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you. Any other questions? Any members
of the public wish to speak on this application? Please come
forward. Please identify yourself, thank you.

SEAN BRALEY: My name is Sean Braley. I’m a representative
from the New York State Nurses Association. The New York State
Nurses Association represents 37,000 registered nurses
throughout New York State and is a leading advocate for quality
patient care and universal access and care for all New York
residents. We are here to express our opposition to the pending
application by Messina Center, LLC, to receive approval to
purchase and operate the existing eight station chronic
outpatient dialysis facility currently owned and operated by Messina Memorial Hospital. We note at the outset that the proposed transfer will not result in the loss of employment of any of the current public employees who work for Messina Memorial Hospital in the dialysis clinic as the terms of the agreement appear to maintain the current staff as public sector employees of the hospital, and that they will be assigned to the hospital to work in the clinic once the new owner has assumed control of the operations. We wish to state however, that we continue to oppose the privatization of public hospital systems in general in a public dialysis facility in particular. Our concerns regarding the privatization of public health systems are based on issues regarding quality of and access to care particularly for vulnerable populations that are uninsured or underinsured. We also believe that for profit healthcare ownership and delivery is a threat to both access to care and quality as for-profit owners have a direct incentive to dilute the quality of care in pursuit of profits. This tenancy is even more pronounced in cases where the for-profit owner is a corporation that has a direct duty to maximize the returns of shareholders or that the corporate entity is closely held or publicly traded.

There’s ample evidence of the threat to patient care and to access to care in cases where dialysis clinics are transferred from public to –public or non-profit owners to for-profit
ownership. Studies have shown that for-profit dialysis operators tend to seek to reduce costs in order to generate profits to seek other ways to generate more income. This financial incentive increases the risk to patients and increases negative outcomes. It also negatively impacts access to care or the quality of care for uninsured patient populations. The threats to care resulting from private for-profit ownership and operation of dialysis facilities include the following: one, for-profit dialysis facilities have a 13 percent higher risk of patient mortality than non-profit dialysis facilities after adjusting for an array of socio-demographic risk factors. Patient disease severity, comorbid conditions and facility characteristics. Two; the evidence suggests a number of possible explanations for the higher death rates that are observed with for-profit dialysis providers. These explanations include responding to financial pressures for prioritizing stakeholder returns over implementing the necessary conditions to insure high quality of care, the lower equipment usage and shorter duration of each dialysis session that produces a lower average cost per dialysis session and also the lower staff skill mix and fewer registered nurse patient care hours provided for by the for-profit dialysis services providers. Three; in addition to higher risk of patient mortality, the research reveals that patients receive their care from for-profit dialysis providers spend more days in the hospital than those
who are cared for by non-profit providers. In fact, research shows patients treated in for-profit dialysis facilities experience 17 percent more risk adjusted hospital delays, hospital days than their non-profit counterparts. Preventing infections and other complications that lead to hospitalizations for dialysis patients are potentially costly activities that require adequate levels of professional staff and also require a willingness to implement the necessary conditions to insure high quality of care. As Lee (turtow) and Zineos explain patients treated in for-profit dialysis providers will have higher hospital days per year because the cost of any intervention that would prevent lengthy hospital admissions are greater than the financial rewards. Four; patients who are uninsured or underinsured in for-profit dialysis centers are less likely to receive critical information about transplantation options.

The application by Messina Center LLC, raises concerns related to quality of care and access that are noted in the research cited, that I just cited. We note first that Messina Center will be an LLC which, in which 60 percent of the ownership will reside with American Renal Associates. American Renal operates or has an ownership share in more than 23 states and we believe that they operate in excess of 100 facilities. We were unable to analyze the quality of their various facilities because the company does not list specific sites on it’s website. We do note however, that it does not appear that
the Department of Health made any analysis of this multistate operators quality track record. With respect to the data that is provided in the CON document issued by the DOH, it appears that ARA operates three sites in New York State. A comparison of the current Messina Hospital operated site and the three sites operated by ARA, that’s Elizabeth Town Center LLC, Mohawk Valley Dialysis Center LLC, and Plattsburgh Associates, LLC, raises serious concerns about the quality of care provided by ARA. According to the data produced by the November meeting of the Committee, and that should be exhibits 84 through 86, the Messina Hospital Clinic outperformed the ARA clinics in many areas.

The applicant provided data only for two facilities in New York State. Of the two facilities for which information was available to compare, Messina greatly outperformed the Elizabethtown facility and was equal or better in every category. The Mohawk Valley slightly outperformed the hospital facility in two categories, but the hospital greatly out performed that ARA facility in fistula formation, use of catheters, and calcium levels. It is thus fair to conclude that the level of care provided by the current Messina Hospital Operation of the clinic is of higher quality than that of the proposed buyer. This is without taking into account more detailed analysis of the 100+ other facilities operated by ARA which was not reviewed by the DOH it would appear.
CHRIS BOOTH: Could you wrap up soon please.

SEAN BRALEY: I am. Finally, we are concerned about the impact of the conversion of the facility to for-profit ownership upon access to care for uninsured patients and whether there would be a tendency to displace underinsured and uninsured patients currently receiving services in order to increase the number of commercially insured patients being treated. This issue was not apparently examined by the DOH staff.

In conclusion, based on the foregoing, the New York State Nurses Association believes that the application should be denied.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you very much. Any questions of this speaker? Hearing none, any other comments or questions? Yes. Please identify yourself. Thank you.

SUE (BOLUE): Yes. Good morning. Sue (Bolue) Chief Nurse Executive for Messina Memorial Hospital. Messina Hospital developed the dialysis unit as a request from the community with the need of having access to dialysis care in Messina, the closest area was 37 miles which is a long drive for them during our winter months three times a week. We did create the dialysis unit and we have been very successful in that, however
we have been experiencing losses of approximately $500,000 a year. Messina Hospital is overall losing money. We cannot continue at that rate and the question of whether we’ll be able to maintain the dialysis unit was why we sought out an organization to purchase the unit so that we could continue the life saving and vital care of dialysis to our community. So I ask the committee to make that part of your consideration.

Thank you.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you very much. Yes, Mr. Levin.

ART LEVIN: I know I sound like a broken record, but on this one, but it seems to me that we have more and more evidence that there may be problems out there in the land of large for profit change. I mean, we have Devita now with an immense fine for kickbacks and self-referrals and stuff. So, not specific to this application, but the question is really what do we do? What’s our responsibility now that we have systems that measure performance and where we seem to have some evidence that bad things may happen in the large chain environment, how do we deal with it here and what’s the relationship between what happens in the larger chain to what’s happening in our state and in our localities. So I think at some point the council really needs to take, and the department need to really take a closer look at this.
CHRIS BOOTH:  Charlie, is that something that you could take on and bring back to this group?

CHARLIE ABEL:  Well, couple things.  one, you know, I think it may be an issue to extrapolate from a certain national provider that those kinds of problems exist across all national providers.  I will say that one of the comments presented by the individual from the Nurses Association we did review out-of-state providers as we do all out-of-state providers that are related to applicants.  Didn’t find any issues that would be a problem with character and competence.  And of course we present all of the detailed quality information for all of the New York facilities that have operational experience and with this provider two of the three that they have in operation have been in operation long enough to have actual experience to be able to provide to you. And that information you know, I our opinion isn’t necessarily better or worse than the current provider, but the underlying question that I think is begged by the discussion is and I don’t have a good answer but I’ll throw it out, what does that really mean if the proposed provider, the applicant entity has a reasonable quality history that is not representative of a problematic provider, but the, may score some marginal less in terms of quality indicators than the person, than the entity that is operating now? Does that really
mean that we’re going to stop a sale transaction between two
willing partners that fall, that fall within the norm for the
industry in terms of quality? That’s a real issue I think for
us for staff to be able to understand where the Council is
going. So, we can, to get more direct question, we can
certainly do some research on the national facilities, national
dialysis providers and bring folks up to date in terms of you
know lawsuits and things like that. It’s not a trivial task
because as we know, some of the providers have facilities in
almost all the states. This provider, subject provider here has
facilities in many states, not in most of the states but we can
do that, and I’m not going to be able to promise you that it’ll
be next cycle, but we will do our best to get you something in
terms of that kind of an assessment.

CHRIS BOOTH: And Charlie, I’m not sure that the council
has a perspective on terms of where it’s going, but it’d be nice
to have some data to relate to some of the allegations that are
brought forth. So, to the extent there’s data that shows that
the quality of for-profit just making it up was significantly
below that of the not-for-profits or that the quality is
significantly lower than it was before the for-profit was
allowed to take it over. That’s information would be good to
have. We don’t know that that’s true, but we have, you know,
the allegations. And it would be good to be comfortable with
the information as to whether we think in general and it’s true
or not true or it’s significant or not significant.

CHARLIE ABEL: And in the attachment at least well we’ve
provided you got the quality indicators for comparison for the
facilities that the applicant has had operational experience in
New York versus the current facilities. Hopefully, at least
that’s a start in the right direction.

CHRIS BOOTH: OK. Thank you. We have one more person
that wishes to speak. Can you introduce yourself?

Yes. Thank you. Michael Cost. I’m the Vice President and
general counsel for American Renal Associates and I appreciate
your time here today in looking at our application, and I
respect your time sensitivity on all your other applicants, but
I did feel it would be appropriate for me to address just some
of the comments.

Number one, American Renal Associates owns and operates, as
of today, 163 dialysis centers in 25 states and the District of
Columbia. We actually service over 13,000 patients, and some of
our quality indicators which are available on the CMS website,
the (QUIPS) website, we meet and exceed quality indicators in
more of all the categories. I think one of the important things
to note is when we initially approached Messina Hospital as part of this transaction, our main emphasis was to improve quality of care, number one. Number two to keep the union employees and public employees in their positions and not displace them and not to disrupt the union. And thirdly, just to make sure that this critical most important access to services remains viable to people in these counties. I mean, it’s critically accessed to make sure that this dialysis center remains operational. So I don’t want to debate for-profit versus not-for-profit healthcare. I think that’s been debated in much literature. What I did want to just mention is that it’s important for us, and I felt the council to know that American Renal Associates is dedicated to improving the quality of care for not only the patients at Messina Dialysis Center, but for all of our patients throughout the country. Thank you.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you very much. Any further comments or questions? If not, I’ll call the question. All those in favor say aye.

[aye.]

Are there any opposed? One opposed. Any abstentions? One abstention. Motion passes and we are adjourned.

PETER ROBINSON: OK. We’re done with the preliminaries. Good morning. I’m Peter Robinson, member of the Council and
I’ll be presiding over this meeting in Mr. Kraut’s absence. I welcome you all, in particular Mr. Shepard who is here instead of Dr. Zucker. Welcome Mr. Shepard and members of the staff.

So, just a few little preliminaries before we get going. First I’d like to remind council members, staff, and the audience that this meeting is subject to the open meeting law and is broadcast over the internet. For those of you that are interested the webcasts are accessed at the Department of Health website – Nyhealth.gov. The on-demand webcast will be available no later than seven days after the meeting for a minimum of 30 days, and then a copy will be retained in the Department for four months. As a reminder for the members of our audience, there is a form that needs to be filled out before you enter the meeting room or now if you haven’t done it yet which records your attendance at meetings. That form is required by the joint commission on public ethics in accordance with executive law section 166. So thank you all for your cooperation to ensure that we’re complying with the law. Let me just briefly go over how we’re going to conduct today’s meeting. We’ll begin with the Department of Health reports, and Mr. Shepard will be reporting both for himself as well as for the commissioner. We’re going to blend those two reports together. Ms. (Misa) will give a report on the activities of the Office of Health Insurance Programs. And as I understand it Mr. Rohan and Mr. Gestin will give an update on the activities on the Office of Quality and Patient
Safety and the recent work of the ad-hoc office-based surgery, committee on office surgery.

Dr. Birkhead too has been at the last moment called away, and so he will not be available to give his report. We’re going to defer that until the next meeting of the Council. Ms. Rautenberg will give a report on the activities of the Committee on Public Health, and then Dr. Rugge will give his report on the Committee on Health Planning and present for approval and application for a stroke designation center. Dr. Gutierrez who recently adjourned the Codes Committee will give his report from the Codes Committee from this morning. And then I’ll give a very brief report on the activities of the ad-hoc committee on freestanding ambulatory surgery and charity care. And then last, but certainly not least the project review recommendations and establishment actions which will be presented by Mr. Booth.

So that’s what we have coming up.

A word about conflicts; members of the Council and most of our guests who regularly attend the meeting are now familiar with the reorganization of the agenda by topics or categories, and that caps the roles and responsibilities of the Council. This reorganization includes the batching of certificate of need applications and turning to the members here, I hope you’ve taken the time to review the batched applications and have thought about whether you would like a project moved to a different category. If not, we will proceed as it’s currently
been scheduled. So, everybody OK with the way we’ve got it
structured? Good.

OK. So, next, or first on the agenda is the approval of
the minutes of our last meeting. May I have a motion? Dr.
Gutierrez. Dr. Berliner, second. Any comments, corrections?
Hearing none, all in favor.

[Aye.]

Any opposed? That’s carried. Thank you. So let me turn
to Mr. Shepard who will be giving two reports in one.

DAN SHEPPARD: Good morning. Again, I’m here on behalf of
Dr. Zucker. He does send his regrets but there was an
unscheduled and high priority meeting that he had to attend this
morning. So, I’ll present his remarks and again, his apologies
and good wishes.

So, first of all, hope everybody had a very happy
Thanksgiving and on behalf of Dr. Zucker wishing you a joyous
upcoming holiday season. I’d like to begin by discussing the
biggest public health issue today which is Ebola. As you know,
a lot has happened on Ebola since last we met. For starters,
New York had its first Ebola patient in mid-October. Dr. Craig
Spencer was working in Guinea for Doctors without Borders when
he contracted the virus. Six days after his return he came down
with Ebola symptoms and went to Bellevue Hospital Center where
he was isolated and treated for three weeks. His discharge from Bellevue was a much celebrated event that demonstrated New York’s ability to successfully treat this disease. It has given us hope that we do have the capacity to manage Ebola which has inflicted so much pain and suffering mostly in West Africa. Since claiming its first victim last December, Ebola has effected more than 16,900 people in eight countries. More than 6,000 people have died. Luckily Dr. Spencer was not one of them, and the collective preparedness efforts by the health departments and hospitals kept others from getting sick, including the healthcare workers who took care of Dr. Spencer. New York began preparing for an Ebola patient long before Dr. Spencer got sick. We knew that we had to be ready for what seemed like an inevitability. Afterall, New York is a State with more than 19 million people and we’re home to a city that’s international travel hub, a bustling metropolis with more than 8 million people. We have one of five major U.S. Airports, JFK New York City, and that follows flights from countries where Ebola has become widespread. The other airports in the U.S. that have traffic from countries where Ebola is present are Newark, Washington-Dulles, Ohare in Chicago and Hartsfield in Atlanta.

So let me start by saying that the vast majority of travelers arriving in the U.S. who have a fever or any other suspicious symptoms do not have Ebola. So, even so, we have to
take precautions. Since October, travelers from effected countries have gone through an initial health screening. They are then referred to state and local public health authorities for active monitoring of Ebola symptoms. The monitoring goes on for 21 days following their last day of potential exposure to Ebola. Since the program began, health officials have monitored over 3000 travelers more than 30,000 times. Knowing our risk for having a patient with Ebola was high, New York was the first state in the nation to designate hospitals for the care of patients with Ebola. At the Governor’s request, 10 hospitals across the State agreed to serve as designated centers for treating people with confirmed cases of Ebola. Today I’m pleased to announce that five of New York’s designated hospitals have been approved by the CDC for inclusion on a list of U.S. facilities that will serve as Ebola treatment centers. The five CDC approved hospitals are the North Shore System in Glen Cove, New York; New York City Montefiore Health System; New York Presbyterian Hospital, the Allen Pavilion; Bellevue Hospital Center and Mt. Sinai Hospital. These five centers are among 35 hospitals in the country designated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human services as having the capabilities, training, and resources to provide the complex and extensive treatment that an Ebola patient requires while minimizing the risk to healthcare workers. They’ve undergone an intensive assessment by the CDC rapid Ebola preparedness team, the REP team, and we are
also importantly asking CDC to survey the other five hospitals in New York State that have worked so hard to be prepared, kind of agreed to be designated as treatment centers and may also be added to the federal list. And these remaining five hospitals are Erie County Medical Center in Buffalo, SUNY Stony Brook University Hospital on Long Island, SUNY Upstate Medical University in Syracuse, University of Rochester Medical Center, and the Women’s and Children’s Hospital of Buffalo. The Department continues to work with CDC and local health departments to ensure that these centers maintain the necessary state of readiness with respect to facilities, workforce, training, labs, and waste management, all of which are required to safely and effectively treat a patient with Ebola. The rapid Ebola response teams have assessed each facility on all infection control aspects of caring for a patient with Ebola from the use of personal protective equipment or PPE to details like how trash is removed from a patient’s room. And they also ensure that staff involved in the caring for a patient with Ebola has been appropriately trained. That means that the staff involved have demonstrated that they know how to put on and take off PPE, they know the appropriate protocols for proper waste management, they know how to do infection control, they know how to safely transport lab specimens, and that these designated hospitals also have processes in place to support the physical and emotional wellbeing of the staff providing care for someone
with Ebola. And that includes monitoring the staff for fever or other early symptoms so they can properly assess and treated.

It’s important to note the hospital staff caring for patients with Ebola will not be providing care to other patients. It’s a dedicated activity for the course of the disease. So, this is obviously very important to limit potential exposure to other patients. CDC is working with state and local authorities as well as domestic and global manufacturers to make sure we have enough PPE supplies for the Ebola response. Hospitals that have Ebola treatment centers must have enough PPE for at least seven days. But CDC also has strategic national stock pile of PPE that can be deployed to the hospitals if necessary. The CDC stock pile currently has enough PPE to support 50 days of Ebola care. They’ve ordered enough PPE to support 250 days of care and can deliver supplies in less than 24 hours to any hospital in New York – in the U.S., I apologize. And what about the other five hospitals in New York that have agreed to serve as Ebola treatment centers? While the designation by state or federal governments indicates facility has undergone special preparedness protocols, the reality is that all hospitals must be ready to handle a potential Ebola patient. All hospitals must be ready to assess patients with Ebola-like symptoms for the recent travel history and determine whether they were exposed to people sick with Ebola in the last 21 days. To assist us, the Greater New York Hospital Association in
collaboration with the Hospital Association of New York State hosted a meeting on November 19 to discuss Ebola care for these designated hospitals and other tertiary care hospitals that wanted to attend. The presenters discussed everything from the importance of teamwork in treating Ebola, to the ethical challenges of treating an Ebola patient when treatment like CPR for example, could potentially jeopardize the life of healthcare workers. The sessions were very informative and helped hospitals to better understand the intricacies involved in caring for someone with Ebola. These sessions were among the many collaborative efforts to help hospitals stay on top of the Ebola threat. And just something I’m sure the Commissioner would have mentioned when he hit this point, I think one of the most, having been through this for the past couple of months, I think one of the most notable things during Ebola crisis in New York or the preparation was how closely the State, the local health departments in particular, the City of New York and the hospitals and the provider associations worked together. It was really something. I was very honored to be part of, and I know the Commissioner would’ve said the same, would say the same.

The Department of Health has been preparing hospitals to treat Ebola all fall and have been in constant contact with the hospitals to make sure they’ve taken appropriate steps. The Department staff have visited 211 hospitals throughout the state and I’m very pleased to say that most of the facilities are
fully ready to handle a suspect Ebola patient. The Department is working with the few very few hospitals that are not ready to ensure that they get there quickly. But as I mentioned earlier all hospitals in New York must achieve some degree of readiness.

At Governor Cuomo’s request, Dr. Zucker issued a Commissioner’s order on October 16 that outlines what hospitals must do to be prepared. The order required hospitals to develop protocols, training, and drills, provide personal protective equipment and identify a care setting to ensure that early recognition safe handling a suspect Ebola patients is possible. The Commissioner’s order also requires all hospitals and clinics in the State to be ready to evaluate, isolate, and transport a person suspected of having Ebola. In addition, the Department has begun to do readiness assessments for nearly 1000 clinics. We’ve also met with state EMS providers to review their protocols for safe transportation. We’ve spoke with community health centers and other providers to ensure they were also ready for an Ebola patient or suspect Ebola patient. In addition, the Department amassed it’s own stockpile of PPE for hospitals who are unable to replenish their supplies in the midst of treatment. We’ve also done practice drills for early identification and isolation of suspect Ebola patients in an emergency department, and these drills have taught us a great deal about what we’re doing right and what we’re doing wrong and helped us to prepare for that first patient, Dr. Spencer.
Whether there will be others besides Dr. Spencer remains to be seen. But we do know that in Africa the virus is spreading. Ebola has recently affected another country, this time the nation of Mali. As of November 21, there have been eight cases in Mali and six patients died. As a result, CDC and the Department of Homeland Security have added Mali to the list of Ebola affected nations and they’re screening all travelers coming into the U.S. each day from Mali as well as those from Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea. Although there are no direct flights between the U.S. and Mali, approximately 15 to 20 residents of Mali do arrive in the United States every day by way of other countries. Most of these people are U.S. citizens coming home to America. In light of this possibility, we started enhancing our screening for travelers who originated in Mali. They’ll be subject to the same 21 day monitoring and movement protocols now in effect for travelers from Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. That means twice daily temperature checks as well as check-ins with the state and local public health authorities.

So as you can see, preparations for Ebola have escalated significantly in the last two months.

President Obama’s emergency funding request for $6.2 billion that’s now before Congress will help our nation grow the response capability to this international public health threat. It will help us maintain our hospital preparedness efforts, enable us to work towards development of vaccines, drugs, and
diagnostic tools, and fund our response in West Africa and other vulnerable countries while strengthening our global health security. I’m pleased to say that New York has played a major role and demonstrated to the nation that we can treat a patient with Ebola without compromising the health and safety of those providing that care.

So, the Commissioner also wanted to provide you with an update on World AIDS Day. In particular to acknowledge the commemoration of worlds AIDS day that took place the other day at the Empire State Plaza. It was an event that galvanized the AIDS community in our resolve to combat this disease and help us to remember those we have lost to it. As you know, today in New York we are at a turning point where we can actually envision a future without AIDS. It’s been a long and difficult journey. New York has been at the epicenter of this epidemic since it began in the 80s. In our darkest days the early 90s, New York had as many as 15,000 new diagnoses a year. Today we’re down to 3000 new diagnoses a year. Many factors played a role in what’s happened; better prevention strategies like free syringe distribution programs for the injectable drug users, more education and awareness such as our mandated offers of HIV testing, improvements in healthcare including the newly approved use of antiretrovirals for people who are HIV negative and want to stay that way - all these initiatives have had a hand in driving down infection rates of HIV. When we talk about the end
of the epidemic, we’re talking about not wiping out HIV altogether -- only a vaccine would enable us to do that --

Rather, we’re talking about bringing down the number of new infections to just 750. Last month, Governor Cuomo announced the creation of the ending the epidemic task force. To help us achieve our goals, this group will support his three point plan which includes identifying persons with HIV who remain undiagnosed and linking them to healthcare, linking and retaining persons diagnosed with HIV in healthcare to maximize virus suppression so they remain healthy and prevent further transmission, and providing access to pre-exposure prophylaxis or PREP for high-risk persons to keep them HIV negative. The plan will alter the future of AIDS in New York State. We’ll go from a state where the history of the worst HIV epidemic in the country to one where new infections are rare and those living with the disease will have normal lifespans with few complications. The fact that we can even contemplate this possibility demonstrates the power of public health and good healthcare and showcases what we’ve achieved in New York.

One other topic that the Commissioner, Dr. Zucker wanted to bring you up to speed on was the New York State of Health.

We’re now in the second year of the New York State of Health, our marketplace healthcare exchange. We enrolled more than 960,000 New Yorkers in the first enrollment period and we’re well-ahead of our goal of insuring more than one million people...
are insured by 2016. The premiums for the 2015 plans will continue to be more than 50 percent lower than they were before the marketplace was created. Nearly 75 percent of the people enrolled received financial assistance that helped further lower their monthly costs. And the Exchange is also enhancing its outreach efforts. Some of the informational materials will now be available in 10 languages including Arabic, Hindu and Yiddish. We’ve also enhanced the website and created a new Spanish version. Consumers in many counties will have more health plan options to choose from in 2015. We’ve added a plan and compare guide that lets consumers see all available plans in their county before they begin their application. Consumers will also get a personalized premium quote without entering personal information and completing the application. And we’ve literally assisted thousands of people, New Yorkers, in the enrollment process which began November 15 and ends on February 15 of next year.

In closing, Dr. Zucker wanted to express thanks to the people in Western New York and all those who assisted in recovery from the recent series of snow storms. These people worked hard to ensure the health and safety of people affected by the recent storms was protected. Dr. Zucker was personally there for several days and saw how hard people were working to keep communities safe from all the snow and subsequent potential for flooding. It was truly a testament to the human spirit and
for that again, he just wanted to convey his thanks. End of Dr. Zucker’s report.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Sheppard? Dr. Gutierrez?

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: Two questions. I wonder at what point we’ll find it appropriate to start calling the Ebola a pandemic, number one. Number two is I appreciate the celebration about the HIV situation. When, what the position of the Department? What role is the Department playing regarding the lifting of the restrictions from blood transfusions by certain populations groups?

DAN SHEPPARD: So, I’m probably not going to satisfy neither question, and I, on the pandemic, unless another member of the Department has the background to answer that, I don’t feel I’m in a position to answer that question. I apologize. And on your second question I, we’ll have to get back to you with an answer.

PETER ROBINSON: So, those were good questions then.

DAN SHEPPARD: Very good questions. And I wish there were a physician from the Department here to help answer them.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I’m concerned because I believe that there is a mental change that occurs when you stop using epidemic and you start using pandemic. It happened with the flu, but we have two other pandemics that we deal with every day. One is the multiple drug resistant tuberculosis. We don’t talk about it that way. But the other one is HIV. It’s a pandemic. And I think that is a differential - a change in the attitude if we change the nomenclature we use to refer to it. The second item deals with something that is up front in the press today. There is some restriction that keeps homosexuals, for instance, from giving blood and the red cross, and that restriction is an entry point level restriction. We have tests for blood obtained for transfusions that determines whether the person is positive or not. The original restriction goes to the early times of the pandemic, and it was justifiable then. It appears to be less justifiable today. And it’s upfront in the press I think we need to respond.

DAN SHEPPARD: Both very good questions.

PETER ROBINSON: So, could we ask the Department to look into that? I think that’s a very appropriate question. Thank you. Dr. Bhat.
DR. BHAT: Thank you Mr. Sheppard. Maybe I’ll ask you a question that you can answer.

DAN SHEPPARD: I hope so.

DR. BHAT: Ebola is going to be there in Africa for a long period of time. As long as Ebola is in Africa we are prepared here. Does it cost anything more? All the hospitals that have to prepare for it. Is there – it goes on for years. Is there any mechanism of funding either at the federal level or the state level to defer the cost?

DAN SHEPPARD: As I mentioned in Dr. Zucker’s remarks, the President has put forward to Congress the $6.2 billion request. We would hope that federal government, given the national and international nature of the situation would provide some support to states for, to cover the cost of not just the set up to be prepared, but then also the extraordinary ongoing costs to treat someone with the disease.

PETER ROBINSON: And actually the ongoing cost of training. Because you can’t remain static. It’s not a one-time thing. You actually have to take people off line and continuously rehearse them if you’re going to keep them current and active.
DAN SHEPPARD: What’s extraordinary when you start looking, breaking down the course of treatment is the cost of not just the staffing levels it takes but the disposal of waste and just right down the line it’s quite staggering.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Brown

LAWRENCE BROWN: Will you be able to come back to the Council to share with us the data you have in terms of the Ebola preparedness of the providers that have been reviewed by the Department? It would be useful to know.

DAN SHEPPARD: I’d be happy to do that. We’re in the midst of completing all the visits and happy to give you statistics on that. Sure.

PETER ROBINSON: Hello behind the pole there.

[it’s like the old Yankee Stadium. Hard to see.]

PETER ROBINSON: It is. Could you identify yourself.

GARY KALKUT: Dr. Kalkut. Hi. Just a comment. The arch of the AIDS epidemic from ’81, I actually saw a patient in 1980
at Boston City Hospital who in retrospect had toxoplasmosis and
AIDs and what had happened with the disease in terms of
treatment, public health, community involvement, and the privacy
of New York, New York State, and particularly the AIDS Institute
in New York State in moving this along, I think is dramatic and
incredible effort, and should be commended. And again, from
1981 till now when I was around the AIDS program at Montefiore
we had an inpatient unit with 110 patients, was the census, that
was closed. Bellevue closed their inpatient unit. There are
plenty of problems that still exist, and it is a global issue
for sure. But what’s happened in New York State is quite
remarkable.

DAN SHEPPARD: Thank you. I know the past couple months as
I’ve gotten to know the Department much more in depth than I had
before I came here in June, seeing visiting and meeting with
some folks who work in the AIDS Institute and seeing the level
of dedication and just the longevity of how long many of them
had worked there, how dedicated they are is quite inspiring.
Thank you. I’ll certainly make sure people are aware of your
comments.

PETER ROBINSON: Yes.
CARLA BOUTIN-FOSTER: I just wanted to go back to Dr. comments and just for the records that reasons to remove the restrictions it sends the wrong message. If there’s a missed opportunity for identifying new cases, gay men or women are not necessarily the fastest growing new infections and also it really raises the question of how safe the blood supply is. So I think these are reasons when you go back to the Department to mention why we should reconsider this.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. OK. So, now we turn to - thank Mr. Sheppard for his report and the responses to those questions that we were able to get answers to, and the rest will be forthcoming. Absolutely.

DAN SHEPPARD: Thanks for being gentle everybody.

PETER ROBINSON: And now for an update from the office of Health Insurance Programs. Ms. Misa. Did I pronounce that properly?

MS. MISA: It’s Misa. Thank you. So thank you and good morning. I just wanted to provide a brief update on our work with DSRIP. So we are still on track with our DSRIP year one deliverables, and currently we have 25 PPSs statewide, and a detailed list of the 25 PPSs is available on the Department’s
website for anyone looking for additional detail. I also today
wanted to briefly highlight some of the key DSRIP dates that
staff have been working on, and I wanted to mention that an
updated DSRIP timeline was circulated earlier this week and is
also available on the Department’s website. So, in the
beginning of October on October 1, the final DSRIP plan
application was released, and earlier this week on December 1
LEAD submitted their final partner lists within the network
tool. At the end of this month on December 22 project plan
applications must be completed and submitted by the PPS lead and
two days later on December 24 applications will be posted to the
website and public comment on those applications will begin. We
will receive public comment until January 26. In early February
the independent assessor will make recommendations to the public
and in mid-February the DSRIP project approval and oversight
team will begin public hearings and meetings and they will make
their final recommendations to the state and members of the
DSRIP project approval and oversight team should be announced
over the next four weeks. And then on April 1 DSRIP year one
begins. So there is a lot of work in a very tight timeline, but
I’m happy to announce that we are on track and there’s a ton of
information on DSRIP on the Department’s website for anyone
that’s interested. So, thank you, and that concludes my report.
PETER ROBINSON: Can you provide an update on the capital plan that’s linked to DSRIP?

MS. MISA: Yeah, and I would defer to OHSM. I don’t know, Lisa, if you have an update on –

CHARLIE ABLE: Peter, I can respond to that. So we released the application last month. We had an applicant conference as well, and the original due date for applications which had been concurrent with the DSRIP application due date of December 22 has been pushed back to February 20. So that as the DSRIP PPSs come together and they’re doing their final work now of this month they’ll have a little more time once that work is settled to be able to compose the necessary information and documentation to support their capital requests. So, it’s $1.2 billion statewide, and two processes, one specifically for DSRIP PPS participants and one for those facilities that are outside of a PPS. The processes will remain essentially the same. More details will be forthcoming on the website on the capital restructuring financing program website in the near future.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. Questions for Ms. Misa or Mr. Abel? Dr. Martin.
GLENN MARTIN: I think it was last cycle we had gotten an interesting presentation about regulatory relief as part of DSRIP and I’m just curious how that aspect of the process is going along. It may be too early for people to be asking for it, but I’m not sure. I figured I would just ask.

LISA ULLMAN: Yeah, I think that we had had some further discussions after we had posted to the web out document on regulatory flexibility, which really outlined the areas that we thought there would be potential for flexibility. We certainly wanted to make all the providers aware that we were interested in hearing from them, if they had ideas or questions about the types of flexibility that they might need, and that’s what culminated in that document. We do anticipate making additional information available as we get it. The requests for regulatory flexibility waivers are to be submitted along with the project plan applications which as states would be later this month. However, and I think we made this point in the presentation when we were before this body last time, that if a provider, a PPS recognizes a need for potentially additional waivers that hadn’t been requested in that application, they will have the opportunity to request that as well. So we are sort of looking forward to a continued ongoing dialog with the providers as they move forward considering what waivers they need to request, and we will make information available to them as we become, you
know, more able to sort of articulate specific regulatory
provisions where it looks like waivers might be available. So I
think we’ll probably be posting more information on an ongoing
basis.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Kalkut.

GARY KALKUT: Thanks. Thank you. Question about
partners, the partner list was submitted, finalized I think on
Monday. There was some communication in the week just prior to
Thanksgiving about an audit and review process for those partner
lists. I was wondering if you’d comment on that, what that
process will be to audit the list, what opportunity for the
individual performing provider systems to review the lists.
Then I have a specific issue I want to ask about.

I don’t have detail on the exact audit process, but I can
certainly go back to individuals who are working on that and get
back to you if that’s helpful.

GARY KALKUT: It would be.

[OK]

Peter?
Dr. Rugge.

JOHN RUGGE: Just with regard to capital is providers all around the state are looking at five year needs for new investment. I think there is a consensus that $1.2 billion is not going to suffice. Curious in terms of how the Department may be approaching this and what kinds of recommendations may be forthcoming.

CHARLIE ABEL: Well, I’m aware that there is that concern, and I’ve heard that there are discussions taking place, but don’t have any progress to report.

PETER ROBINSON: OK then. Thank you very much.

JOHN RUGGE: You’ve heard it from us, that’s all.

PETER ROBINSON: So I think we are now turning to an update on the activities of the Office of Quality and Patient Safety, and also I think the ad-hoc committee on office-based surgery. Is that correct? Is that Mr. Roohan and Dr. Gestin?

[that’s correct]
PAT ROOHAN: So, thank you for allowing me to speak today. I’m going to give a general overview of the office since we haven’t really presented to this group of what we’re doing and what our core functions are.

Basically we divided up into four core areas. The first quality improvement in patient safety, second evaluation measurement reporting and transparency. The third, data system enhancement and development, and the fourth healthcare transformation. I’m going to give a couple examples of what we’re working on and Foster can elaborate on office-based surgery for example.

So under quality improvement and patient safety one of the projects we’ve been working on is to improve sepsis care in New York State. Regulations has given us authority to review evidence-based protocols from hospitals. That’s the first part of the regulation. The second part is to measure process measures of sepsis care, and the third is develop a risk-adjusted mortality model to compare hospitals. We have been successful with the help of the hospitals, the hospitals’ participation, and this has been tremendous that the first review of the evidence-based protocols were in and approved, were in by December 31, 2013, and all have been approved are in play right now.
We have a very incredible workgroup of stakeholders that have been involved in developing data dictionary and how to collect data on this, and we have begun to successfully collect data. We are on our second data collection. We have two quarters of data, second quarter was in as of last week. We’re still fairly in the early stages of that. A lot of data to clean up. Working with stakeholders to improve that. Our goal is to continue to evaluate this and to eventually get to evaluate the impact on mortality. Sepsis mortality, sepsis shock and severe sepsis mortality, serious condition and the number one cause of inpatient mortality in New York State and we will continue to work diligently on that.

Secondly under evaluation measurement reporting and transparency, the Office of Quality and Patient safety is the lead on quality measurement of healthplan reporting for the Department for over 20 years. We’ve been doing, Foster, myself, and many of our staff have been collecting what we call QARR, the Quality Assurance Reporting Requirements. That system now collects data from various managed care plan types including commercial managed care, commercial PPO, Medicaid managed care, child health plus, Medicaid special need plans, and beginning this year the New York State of Health, healthplans for the exchange population. And all we have measurement on approximately 12 million people in the system.
Our staff also have been the lead in measurement and alignment, collection reporting for health homes, proposed (FIDA) program, the fully integrated duals program, DSRIP, HARP - the health and recovery plans, Medicaid behavioral health plans which are being implemented in the future. We are also the lead on measuring quality for the managed long term care program as well.

Other measurement activities include the New York State cardiac data reporting system. It’s been a powerful resource for quality improvement to improve the quality of care related to cardiac surgery and PCI in New York State. Providing hospitals and cardiac surgeons as well as cardiologists with data about their own outcomes for these procedures allows them to examine the quality of their own care, of the care they’re delivering and improve on that care.

The second area that we’re working in and Anna has presented to this group on is stroke. Stroke care in New York in July of 2012 received a grant from CDC to a quality improvement initiative to approve in-hospital care for acute stroke. With this grant, New York State has engaged a statewide quality improvement activities that expand and strengthen programs currently, the stroke designation program. In addition, we’re working with others in the Department in collaborating a focus QI program that will do the following things; one, increase the use and report of data on indicators
of stroke care collected from the stroke designated hospitals; develop both aggregate and hospital-specific reports on stroke outcomes collected through SPARCS data, the inpatient data system and provide TA, technical assistance to support data quality in hospital stroke care quality assurance.

Our third major area is what we call data system enhancements and developments. We are the lead in developing an all-payer database. An all-payer database will be claims, beginning with claims data across all payers in New York. We will begin this process with what we’re calling public payers, Medicaid, Child Health Plus and the New York State of Health. We already have what we call a data intake system to collect that data for the public payers that has begun this fall, and we will go into production in beginning January 2015. Medicare data will be added in 2015 in commercial insurance data collection will begin in late ’15. Funds were made available in the ’14-’15 budget to create the APD. We are currently developing procurement to procure a vendor to do data storage in analytics from the system. Serious considerations of the APD in terms of the IP side of this as we anticipate the system to be about $1.1 to $1.5 Billion with a B rolls of data a year. APD regs are in development. The Regs will address the submission requirements, who submits what to us and most importantly access to the data at what level who gets access to what, what could we release, what we can’t release. The second under data system
enhancements is a success story on SPARCS, the State health planning and research cooperative systems. We have revised regs presented to this group I believe last year. Some of those regs clarified how we collect the data and also streamlined the approval process and some of our data and processing. Through some efficiencies we have posted data - efficiencies as well as posting data on the Healthdata.ny website that completely deidentified. We have reduced the queue for getting SPARCS data from I believe it was around 90 to 100 requests in a queue that would take almost a year to less than five today, and often that queue is empty. Now our timeline is usually within a month we can get data from SPARCS.

Lastly on data system enhancement and development is the increase adoption utilization of the SHIN-NY, the State Health Information Network of New York. The SHIN-NY is a network of network that is connecting the regional health information organizations, aka RHIOs across the state with patient consent, electronic health records, can be exchanged instantaneously with the system. Adoption of (EHRs) by provider the key to success of the SHIN-NY as well as the ability of the EHRs to communicate to the RHIOs. The New York State appropriate of [$]55 million in the current budget as well as a federal match of another 28 million will fund the SHIN-NY and the RHIOs. The funding will create a standardized expectation across all RHIOs. For example, what we call a patient alert when a patient actually
goes to the ER or the hospital, primary care doctor for example will know that instantaneously.

Lastly, our office has been heavily involved in what we call healthcare transformation and under that is both the State Health Innovation Plan, aka SHIP which was submitted to the federal government last year. We are also the lead on the State Innovation model grant. That grant is a four-year grant for $10 million. We should hear any day to have fund parts of the SHIP. The SHIP dovetails very nicely with DSRIP. The SHIP is across the State plan to transform healthcare, but our staff has been the lead working very closely with Medicaid and all the measurement activities related to DSRIP including measures, specifications, reporting, and interaction with CMS.

And finally we have worked very closely with OHIP, the staff, to include a lot of data on publicly available data, things we haven’t put out publicly before under healthdata.ny as well as the DSRIP website including some of the core metrics of DSRIP which are preventable, prevention quality indicators which are called PQIs which are the preventable, potentially preventable inpatient events. PPRs, potentially preventable readmissions, and soon potentially preventable and avoidable ER use.

That concludes my report.
PETER ROBINSON: Well, I thank you very much. I’d like to sort of kick off maybe a couple of questions that I’m sure I’m gonna maybe steal Mr. Levin’s thunder a little bit here, but the – it’s just amazing the amount of data you apparently have access to and the populations that you’re able to capture information on. And the question is, is that capability, can that be delivered in such a way that we can evaluate the efficacy of policies or practices that the council has purview over? So, for example, the earlier discussion about dialysis that resulted in the approval of that transaction, well the whole question of how dialysis centers are performing comparatively in New York State and whether or not there is a difference between, in New York, the for-profits and the not-for-profits, and what quality metrics should we be looking at and can we make some kind of judgment about whether we’re making the right decision or not? I think that’s sort of the kind of question that the council would be interested in. Because it’s very difficult to deal with that when you’re dealing with an individual application, yet we kind of are somewhat ill informed when we’re making judgments about those individual transactions because we don’t have that context.

PAT ROOHAN: I would say in an ideal state an all-payer database will be able to answer those questions. And your particular question given that it’s Medicare data predominantly,
there will be additional access rules in terms of who gets what.
Part of the design feature of (RAPD) that is still under
development is how do we provide - there’s a catch 22 here - how
do we provide detailed patient-level data for research
evaluation purposes in this case. We have to do everything we
can to protect the integrity of the patient’s identifiable
information. So, we are working with that in general on the APD
and we will have to work with CMS on what can be released and
not released, but certainly this kind of data could help you
answer those questions.

PETER ROBINSON: Well, I’m actually thinking that we
could be a little bit more proactive in that, meaning that if
there could be over the course of a year two or three topics
that you would bring forward and present to the council on an
evaluative basis that would allow us to inform us better about
how we deal with some of the more controversial applications
that we deal with here, dialysis and the for-profit chains is
one issue that keeps coming up, ambulatory surgery has certainly
been an area where there’s been a fair amount of controversy.
Some of that does relate to the questions of quality and access
that we have no basis - I mean, we’re almost reacting
subjectively or anecdotally to that rather using a broader set
of data that might more appropriately inform policy judgments or
transactional judgments that the council makes. So, just a...
FOSTER GESTEN: If I could respond specifically to the dialysis issue, one of the things that the Committee should be aware of is that CMS does post publicly data on quality for dialysis centers. It’s available on their websites, so there is currently publicly available information on the quality of healthcare at dialysis centers. What is not on that website is a detailed analysis looking at for profit versus not-for-profit, although those sorts of analyses are certainly in the literature. And as some of you may be aware of there are articles and studies back and forth about whether previous studies have sufficiently adjusted for patient risk factors to do that analysis. But, to some degree, some of that information relative to quality is currently available.

PETER ROBINSON: Right, and although I think what we’re talking about here is obviously a New York State focused look at that data, and that seems to be something that you may be in a better position to do for us.

Are we going to continue with the ad-hoc committee report on surgery? Are there further questions from the Council? Ah, Dr. Berliner.
HOWARD BERLINER: Two questions. One, is there any timeline or any kind of date that you can give us for when the all-payer database would be available? And the second question is, is the State Department of Health going to be releasing a report on Yorkville Endoscopy given that CMS released one two weeks ago.

PAT ROOHAN: I’ll answer the first question on APD. So, we are fairly down the line building the front end, what we call the front end systems. Basically how to get the data into the system collected from the carriers starting with the public payers. So that system will be, like I mentioned, will be up and running in January. We have to get regulations through for the commercial carriers so we don’t have regulations, we’re in that pre-vetting process right now, so once we get the commercial – once we get the regulations in we anticipate that commercial data will be hopefully submitted by the late this year – late ’15. So I would say sometime in ’16 we will have data across multiple payers including commercial insurance.

FOSTER GESTEN: So, pertains to activities of not our office but the Office of Health Systems Management. I’m told that the SODs for Yorkville are up on our website. I don’t know if
that’s what you were referring to or you were referring to some other sort of report. Statement of deficiencies.

PETER ROBINSON: OK. So, -- I’m sorry, Dr. Brown.

LAWRENCE BROWN: I’m sort of curious, you mentioned curious about evidence-based approaches that you are focusing upon, and I’m sort of curious if you can share with us briefly how does the Department really assess whether they actually are in practice? I mean, we hear that term quite often. Really wonder how do you assess that’s indeed what happened?

PAT ROOHAN: Well, the plan is to assess it by measurements of compliance using the data that we’re collecting. We don’t have another loop on survey on this yet, do we?

LAWRENCE BROWN: So are you using outcome measures? Are you using process measures?

FOSTER GESTEN: You’re referring to sepsis is your question? So, I think this is one of the few examples, actually, where we have actually sort of a structural and a process and an outcome component as part of the evaluations. So the structural component as Pat mentioned is the evaluation of the protocols.
As you say, so that’s nice, but how do you know that they’re actually being used in practice? That part is part of the measurement in the data that we’re collecting is to evaluate the degree to which hospitals are adhering to their own protocols and specifically the aspects of protocols that have the strongest evidence and that have sort of a time limited component to it; three hour bundles, six hour bundles, that’s in the literature around surviving sepsis and other data. And then the third component in terms of outcomes obviously is to look at how patients do. So, in this case, unlike some others, we actually kind of have a complete set, and part of what we’re want to put together over the next year or two is how those components actually relate to one another, how the protocols, the specifics of the protocol relate to adherence and also ultimately relate to patient outcome.

PETER ROBINSON: So, Dr. Gesten, why don’t we let you continue with your report on the ad-hoc committee on office-based surgery.

FOSTER GESTEN: Happy to. So, I want to thank my colleagues who have been working on this issue with me. Nancy and Pat, but also the long standing interest that the Committee has on office-based surgery and the office-based surgery program,
including but not limited to support and suggestions relative to legislative changes which I’ll talk about a little bit later.

So, I’m going to provide a brief update on program activities related to our review of adverse events. We did create an ad-hoc office-based surgery advisory committee. We established this in late August of this year. That committee is chaired by Dr. Bernie Russoff who may be familiar to many of you. He’s certainly worked extensively both with the Department and nationally on quality and safety issues and has been the chair of two previous committees on quality assurance and office-based surgery that were appointed by the Department to look into specific issues of safety and adverse events at the request of the public health council. Our ad-hoc committee members include Dr. Clair Bradley from iPro, Dr. David Fox who’s a vasco-surgeon, Dr. Renee Garrick who’s a nephrologist, Dr. Gary Kalkut who’s a member of PHHPC and I have the ID specialist, I hope we have that right. Yes. Dr. Rebecca Twersky is an anesthesiologist, Jim Tift is a gastroenterologist, and (Pierre Robson) who is a clinical nurse specialist in interventional radiology. This, the major objectives of the Committee are to assist the patient safety center and the Department in reviewing adverse event data with a focus on office-based surgery related deaths to identify potential systemic and preventable issues that we can tackle as a program and as a state. We’re also looking for the group to
make recommendations to the program to enhance our data
collection and improve patient safety for those individuals who
are having office-based surgery procedures. The committee, to
date, is met by conference call. Initial call was on September
30 and we had a face to face meeting on November 13, and we have
meetings scheduled into 2015. We envision that the work of the
group in terms of concluding its recommendations and report may
be somewhere between a six to 10 month timeframe.

We have also done additional analysis of the office-based
surgery adverse event data that was received by the Department
over the past four years from 2010 to 2013 with a focus on
deaths. Particularly those involving vascular and GI
procedures, patients who have undergone those procedures, and
those were presented in deeper analysis to the Committee in the
two meetings that we had. As may have been stated previously
and some of you may know, the majority of the office-based
surgery deaths involve end stage renal disease patients,
apparently the subject of today, who are on dialysis and
receiving various kinds of surgical interventions to correct
shunt abnormalities or deal with shunt dysfunction. So a lot of
our focus is on looking at those cases and trying to better
understand those.

Our plans for next steps include review, and external
review of the 2014 deaths and those going forward with external
experts, combination of anesthesiology and appropriate
procedural lists to look at interrelated reliability between our internal review and having independent external expert review to better understand what it is that we’re looking at and help us come to appropriate conclusions about related or un-relatedness to procedure. We’re also looking to match the adverse event data to vital statistics death data to give us potentially more information, particularly on those individuals who may die outside of an institutional setting some number of days from a procedure. See if we can better understand whether there may have been any connection between the procedure and that event. We are engaging the office-based surgery accrediting bodies. There are three of them in New York state in discussions regarding the collection of adverse event data, their collection, what they collect, and other data from practices that may be useful to us. The requirements that they have for accreditation, particularly in some high interest areas including documentation, peri-procedural monitoring, staffing, and other areas that the Committee is starting to generate some particular questions around. And as well as the potential to calculate denominator or procedures which we suffer from not having. We have a numerator of reported adverse events, but we don’t have the denominator of the actual procedures to be able to look at the actual rate of adverse events which is critical to understand overall safety or to be able to compare for
example, the overall safety of procedures in one setting versus another.

We’ve engaged, planned to engage the targeted medical specialty societies and experts, particularly in vascular and GI to review, help us review and help the subcommittee, the ad-hoc committee review our findings and interpretations and look for other potential sources of data and recommendations that may be useful to us. We are in terms of data, not being able to maybe answer both this and broader questions that were raised earlier around dialysis centers, we’re interested in exploring the usefulness of the U.S. renal data system database which is a comprehensive dataset that may enable us to answer some questions about morbidity and mortality of end stage renal patients undergoing vascular access related procedures across all settings. It may also enable us to look at New York specific, which I think was part of your recommendation or suggestion. We’re also looking at the, and exploring the usefulness of other datasets that might help us fill in some gaps or look for potential underreporting. Those include looking at the Medicaid data sets, SPARCS. Again, with the focus on potentially identifying underreporting of adverse events or to gain additional information regarding adverse events, encourage subsequent procedures in regulated outpatient settings.
Couple of other things we’re continuing to pursue electronic submission as process for reporting adverse events to try to decrease the barriers or the burden of making adverse events reports to the Department, and also, as I mentioned up front we’ll be pursuing the amendments to OBS legislation that were supported by PHHPC last year, submitted last year. We’ll resubmit those again, because we think those are also important recommendations that help us enhance our ability to both understand what’s going on and also improve the safety. So, thank you. That concludes my update. I’d welcome comments, questions from the Committee but also would welcome any additions that Dr. Kalkut since he was part of those conversations might want to make.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you Dr. Gesten. Mr. Levin.

ART LEVIN: Couple things. I know it isn’t your bucket of water to carry, but back to your call for a moment. Is there actually a State Department of Health statement of deficiency on Yorkville? I mean, trying to find it on the website is like an adventure. And I’m curious. I mean, the CMS statement of the deficiency got widespread notice and publicity you could read it everywhere. As far as I know I haven’t seen a peep about anything the State has done. It’s just odd to me, and I know, again, it isn’t your office, but to the Department in general it
seems to me it’s sort of embarrassing to have a CMS SOD out there for two weeks and nothing from the State Department of Health and what went on in Yorkville. So that’s just a comment. Again, I know -

PETER ROBINSON: Is there somebody from the Department that can comment on that?

LISA ULLMAN: I don’t think so, but we’ll take it back and if there is further information we’ll provide it.

ART LEVIN: I mean, it would be nice to know whether the Department concurs or has additional concerns about what happened at Yorkville, and what the lessons learned are. I mean, if we want to make things better, that was a licensed ambulatory surgery - right? Facility. That wasn’t office-based surgery. So, we need to know. What went wrong and what can we do to make sure it doesn’t happen again.

Foster, on the denominator issue, legally is there a way to require offices, physician offices to report into something like SPARCS where we could create an denominator? If I remember having been part of this process for a long time, view was that the Department had no authority over offices. They had authority over physicians, and so everything was done through 230 and 6510 of ED law. But I mean, under what authority would
the Department be able to require physician offices to report
into a database like SPARCS and why aren’t we moving ahead with
that? Because we really need to have that denominator.

FOSTER GESTEN: So, Art, the view is that there isn’t
current authority to request this information from office-based
practices. That there’s current legislation that circumscribes
what information we collect, but the recommendations on new
legislation would allow us to collect information like that. I
don’t know that it would be like SPARCS, but it would be, for
example, information that would allow us to collect denominator
data on a number of procedures. Or also, as I mentioned,
exploring getting that information from accreditations agencies,
but I think that our desire, our preference would be to collect
it directly from practices as well.

PETER ROBINSON: And obviously as Mr. Levin was stating,
this is actually a licensed ambulatory surgery center, so in
this case, there are probably more reporting obligations and
hence some additional data that might be available already.

ART LEVIN: Am-surge licensed facilities report to
SPARCS. There’s a separate database.
FOSTER GESTEN: Yes, I assumed you were talking about office-based in your question, Art, not -

PETER ROBINSON: Is there a request here Mr. Levin?

ART LEVIN: Well, I think it’d be interesting to know why the proposal for sort of upgrading office-based surgery regulations sort of didn’t happen. And how helpful we can be since we passed on those proposals. How helpful this council can be in making sure that they happen this year. I mean, there are upgrades. They’re not everything that one might want, but they’re certainly upgrades.

PETER ROBINSON: So I guess there are two questions that we’re kind of handing back to the Department for follow-up. One is that and the other is the earlier question that was raised about the Yorkville ambulatory surgery center, and the status of the State Health Department’s stance with regard to it. Dr. Kalkut and then Dr. Bhat.

GARY KALKUT: All right. Thank you. It was a good discussion at the November 13 meeting and there was data presented that we hadn’t seen in the previous presentation to the Council that was helpful. I think to me there were two outstanding issues and Foster mentioned both of them. One is...
the issue of rates, which until it’s settled there’s a lot of
circular reasoning and circular discussion about what’s the
actual meaning of these numbers, and I think if it is in the
legislation that be resubmitted. I think that’s an absolute
foundation to try to assess what’s happening in the office-based
surgery. And the second is in classifying the cases that are
looked at, the Department is dependent wholly on the
documentation that is provided to them, and that documentation
is not always comprehensive, certainly, and is episodically it
seems like, not helpful. So in classifying whether they’re
related, unrelated or cannot determine, it really depends on
what we get from the office-based surgery center and some
standards for that could be helpful in saying really one of the
base questions is, is it related and are there issues in a
specific center. So I think that’s another area of sort of
basic focus for the group.

PETER ROBINSON: So it does seem as though the Council
is sort of requesting some greater level of accountability and
reporting here, and some of that probably does require
legislation and so therefore probably asking that the Department
be an advocate inside state government for the passage or the
submission of such legislature.

Dr. Bhat.
DR. BHAT: There was a reference that was made for U.S. RDS, it’s absolutely right. I think over the last one decade the number of admissions to the hospital for surgery has gone done by about 50 percent. That means most of them have migrated into am-surg and office-based. The issue about whether you could ask USRDS, USRDS has a lot of data but only thing is the one they are publishing may not have it but you have to go back and request them to tease it out and tell you how many of these procedures that were done in office-based hospital, then you might be able to find out about the denominator issue that you have. I think last time we had extensive discussion, we knew there were a lot of deaths in vascular surgery that died in office-based surgical centers. But we did not know how many procedures that were done. And the last issue that I have is, there’s a mention that was made about JACO and QUAD-A. I don’t think they’re coming back, the office-based, to ask them how many procedures were done or adverse events. Once the accreditation is done I doubt very much they would go back and take a look. Experience to say that they come back every four years. That means in the interim period nobody is looking at what’s going on in the office-based surgery.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you Dr. Bhat. Any other questions for Dr. Gesten? Thank you for your report. Appreciate that.
ELLEN RAUTENBERG: OK. Here’s the report from the public health committee. You will remember the Prevention Agenda is now two years old and the local planning activities are at the end of their first year. When we looked back on our first cycle five years ago, what we saw is that everything was great in the planning cycle, but then seemed to lose a lot of traction in the implementation cycle. So we are now highly focused on the implementation of the local plans between local health departments, hospitals, and their community partners.

A couple of things I want to highlight; in terms of health disparities, 10 members of the ad-hoc committee met in September to discuss how to support stronger action of local health departments and hospitals towards advancing health equity and specifically to identify ways to support local communities in addressing health disparities as requested by New York State as part of the public health agenda. There was a good discussion on that day and a lot of it came down to tracking the disparity related activities of each organization on the committee to find some success stories that we could talk about around the state and identify lessons learned from partnerships that are focusing on health disparities.
There’s a health equity report that’s coming out from the Office of Minority Health. They’re working around a legislative mandate to produce this report and the Committee has offered to help them communicate the findings of this report throughout the state. We’re also making sure that the local partnerships are aware of and have access to data on health disparities.

The second thing I want to highlight is a meeting that was held for those localities that are working on promoting mental health and the prevention of substance abuse. This was the second most-likely chosen priority within the Prevention Agenda—the first being chronic disease. The New York State Health Department, along with the New York State Office of Mental Health, the Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, and the New York State Association of County Health Officials, the Conference of Local Mental Health Agencies, and the New York Academy of Medicine hosted a one-day meeting to provide training and technical assistance to communities that selected this particular Prevention Agenda item as one of their top two. There were—and I think this is a great success—29 counties were in attendance at this meeting, and counties came with their government counterparts, as well as their hospital partners, and sometimes even the community partners. They were -- there was a lot of conversation about evidence-based interventions in areas around suicide prevention, prescription drug prevention, tobacco cessation for those with mental illness, and ESBERT. The meeting
was an opportunity for communities to share what they were doing and learn from each other.

New York State will be requesting a one-year update from the local health departments on hospitals via a survey tool, as well as the Schedule H from hospitals to see how investments in community benefit may be linked to the Prevention Agenda efforts. The survey asks local health departments and hospitals to answer brief questions about the progress made since they submitted the 2013 plan and on the two Prevention Agenda priorities or focus areas and the intervention selected for implementation. We plan to host an ad hoc committee meeting in early February to provide a summary of what we learned from the survey. I’ll take questions.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you, Ms. Rautenberg. Any questions? Hearing none, we’re going to move to the Committee on Health Planning and ask for Dr. Rugge’s report.

JOHN RUGGE: Health Planning has two items to report. One is informational and that is we’ve had two sessions on development criteria for the approval of off-campus EDs, where there has been no ED previously. There is a mechanism in place for recognition of off-campus EDs when a hospital closes but the ED continues. At our first meeting, the committee could do no better than come up with a Potter-Stuart solution—we’ll know it
when we see it, but we can’t imagine developing criteria. In
response, Chris Delker and the Health Department came back with
an array for potential criteria for identifying communities
that, indeed, would be well-served by an ED not currently in
place. Through committee discussion, the determination was to
focus on essentially the interaction of two criteria: one is
distance from the nearest available existing emergency
department and the second being the size of the population.
Recognizing that at a certain distance, but with very low
population, reliance would have to be made upon rescue squads
and more high-tech mobile services, but where there is
sufficient population density and growing communities, there may
well be a need in this era for emergency services—full-scope
emergency services—in the absence of in-patient beds. With that,
based on that conversation, the Department is now working on a
proposal, which may well be ripe for presentation to the full
Council. If there are any questions on that? I can pause and
barring any questions, move on. Yes. Dr. Martin.

GLENN MARTIN: Just a clarification. When you said
distance, I thought we... that included distance and also travel
time.

JOHN RUGGE: Yes, I should say distance and time. Yes.

Moving on. In addition, the Committee took up the proposed
designation of Nicholas Noyes Memorial Hospital as a stroke
center and I believe Anna Colello has some detail for
consideration by the full Council at this time. Anna.

ANNA COLELLO: Thank you, Dr. Rugge. At the time of the
committee meeting, we discussed several of the contingencies
that the application from Noyes Hospital had to meet prior to
becoming designated; those contingencies have been met, except
for approval of a transfer agreement for surgery when needed has
to be within two hours of when deemed necessary. I am still
awaiting that. The full Council can recommend that we go forward
and have that contingency remain and be subject to our seeing it
when we go on site prior to full designation.

JOHN RUGGE: With that report, I would, on behalf of the
Committee, move approval with that contingency for Nicholas
Noyes Hospital. Not sure who wants to take the lead here.

CHRIS BOOTH: Mr. Robinson’s absence.

JOHN RUGGE: We have a whole lot of seconds.

CHRIS BOOTH: Is there any further discussion? All those
in favor, say aye.
Aye.

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Motion passes.

Thank you.

CHRIS BOOTH: That concludes your report?

JOHN RUGGE: That concludes my report.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you, Dr. Rugge. Dr. Gutierrez, with a report on the Committee on Codes, Regulations, and Legislation.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: We’re past the meridian, so good afternoon. Today we’ll report on the proceedings of this morning’s Code Committee meeting. The Committee reviewed three regulations at the meeting—two for adoption and one for information. For adoption is a Certificate of Need Requirements. These proposed regulations are for an amendment section of Article 28 that now allows the submission of a written notice, as opposed to a CON application, for construction projects regardless of cost that involved only non-clinical infrastructure, facility repairs and maintenance, or the one-for-one replacement of equipment (medical or non-medical). Where applicable, architect and engineering certifications, and a plan for patient safety during construction would still have to be
submitted. The Committee voted to recommend for adoption to the
full Council, and I so move.

PETER ROBINSON: So, I have a motion. Do I have a
second? Dr. Berliner. Any questions? I’ll call the question. All
in favor?

[Aye].

Any opposed? Abstentions? The motion carried.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: For adoption also is the integrated
services licensure. IT’S an option to consider proposed
regulations pertaining to the integration of primary care and
behavioral health care outpatient services. Lisa Ullman, who was
present for question and further information from the Department
Advisory Committee, that the regulations have been jointly
developed by the Department of Health, the Office of Mental
Health, and the Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse
Services. For the Department, this proposal will create a new
part 404 of Title 10 of the NYCRR. OMH and OASAS will each issue
identical regulations. The regulations will apply to stand-alone
Article 28 diagnostic and treatment centers and extension
clinics, general hospital outpatient programs, mental hygiene
law Article 31 clinic treatment programs, [and] mental hygiene
law Article 32 substance-use disorder programs. Regulations will allow these outpatient providers, who are already licensed or certified by more than one state licensing agent or in the process of pursuing licensure or certification to add services at one of their other sites through an expedited process. Without the regulations, they would have to get licensed by the second agency in order to provide the additional services at the additional site. Providers adding behavioral services would have to engage in appropriate treatment planning and provide certain minimum services. Providers adding primary care services would have to meet hygiene and safety standards, pertaining to things like the storage of supplies, the handling of soiled linens, space requirements for treatment rooms and waiting areas, and the availability of hand-washing stations. Finally, providers would be subject to inspection only by the one agency that originally licensed this site at issue. The agencies will consult with each other as they conduct such oversight. With concerns expressed about the readiness of this proposal and assurances from the DOH that the concerns will be addressed, the Committee voted seven to one to recommend adoption to the full Council, and I so move.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. I have a second by Mr. Fassler. Questions? Call the question, all in favor... Oh, sorry, there is a question. Dr. Brown. I apologize.
LAWRENCE BROWN: Thank you. In fairness to the fact that Dr. Martin and I had an opportunity to speak to the Behavioral Health Services Advisor Council, the question I am going to pose is the one that I posed to them—that we didn’t get really an answer and it maybe something that the Department of Health could consider down the line—because it was not clear why OASAS certifies its providers to provide care and Department of Health licenses its providers to provide care. So it would be useful to understand is that a distinction because it gives the impression of something different and that something different is the thing, the reason why we are having to integrate so they won’t have that sense that something is so different that someone has to be treated a different way that was substandard. Only this allowed me to bring this up to the share with the Department, so that maybe they can bring back to us some sense from their collaborations with OASAS about the value of that, continuing in that way.

LISA ULLMAN: We can certainly, you know, bring back—I’ll be here again, so I can certainly bring back further information on that. I mean, the practical effect of the regulations as we talked about is that there are those formal approval processes. They are licensing in nature whether you call them licensure or certification. The point is that those formal approval processes
for both agencies and we were just trying to expedite that
formal process so that you wouldn’t have to undergo it for both
of them. But we can certainly…

LAWRENCE BROWN: I apologize. I have no objection with
the process, it’s just the nomenclature that we’re using and the
provision of care in the State of New York. For services that
are provided for physical health we say we license a provider;
services provided for behavioral health, particularly addiction
services, we say we certify a provider. So, that, just from the
standpoint of a citizen of the State of New York, to have such a
distinction to continue, if we can find out why it was the case
in the first place, and then decide, having discussion about why
it should continue.

LISA ULLMAN: Sure, the terminology in these regulations
is simply reflective of what’s used elsewhere. You know, the
practical effect, I think, is the same, but we can certainly,
you know, come back with more information next time.

PETER ROBINSON: So, we have a motion and second on the
floor, so I am now going to call the question. Oh. Dr.
Gutierrez.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I am still concerned about the language in the proposal and I understand that Dr. Rugge pressed the Department for a time of definition or change of the wording on that regulation. Their response was this needs immediate attention. We heard opinions strongly expressed that there is objections by the community out there on the moving of this regulation forward. It would take two months to recycle this. This is so pressing that we have to move it forward or can we just—or is there any other mechanism that we can hold the feet of the Health Department to the fire so they come back? One way or the other, they are going to have to come back.

PETER ROBINSON: Can we get a response to Dr. Gutierrez?

LISA ULLMAN: Yeah, I do feel the pressure of answering the questions in a very expedited fashion. If we do not move forward with the regulation at this time, you know, we will not have moved forward with the integration of services, which, I think everyone agrees is a really important thing that we need to achieve. What you have, you know, suggested the addition of those prenatal services, which we had not included, if we were to layer that on later, that’s, you know, something that we could do. If we did not move forward at this time, we just aren’t going to be able to put into play, you know, the important idea of trying to, you know, get services to people
who just aren’t able to get them now in those settings. So, again, I definitely appreciate, you know, your interest in getting an expedient answer and I want to provide one for you. And we can do that, you know, on the next occasion on which, you know, the Committee, and then the Council convenes. But, again, I would just urge that if we could move forward at this time, it would just allow us to move forward with the process and allow the providers to start putting together their requests to move forward with the integration of services.

JOHN RUGGE: I would just like to express my full confidence that you will be back with this in two months and I think going half a mile and the next half mile in another two months would be prudent.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I can live with that.

PETER ROBINSON: Please, could you repeat what you just said?

JOHN RUGGE: Yeah. Only that I am sure that the Department will bring back further information regarding the potential inclusion of prenatal services in the integration and to take this step forward today seems wise.
ANGEL GUTIERREZ: And also addressing the restriction on the use of perfectly usable...

JOHN RUGGE: Yes, absolutely, architectural...

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: If that, if we, if I can hear a guarantee that those two particular issues will be recycled, I am prepared to vote today.

LISA ULLMAN: Yeah, I absolutely confirm that we will come back to the next meeting and provide you, you know, with further explanation. If it does turn out that, you know, we do recommend making the changes, we’ll certainly process any needed regulatory changes at that time quickly. But, you know, you certainly will come back with the information.

PETER ROBINSON: So, I think what we’re saying here is that this would be an agenda item on the next Codes Committee meeting, with those two topics specifically being addressed. I think that’s the ....

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: I would appreciate that. Yes.

PETER ROBINSON: Ok. With that... Yes.
[unidentified]: Can we also get some kind of assurance that the discussion will be not only among the agencies, but the provider community, because what I heard expressed was that there was some concerns lingering in the provider community, which may go beyond what we talked about in the Codes Committee?

LISA ULLMAN: Yeah, we, as I sort of mentioned, we you know, certainly evaluated those, you know, requests that had come forward from commenters and, you know, we made some changes, but, you know, certainly, you know, there were items that we felt we could not address or some that we felt we could address by guidance going forward because some of it had to do with, you know, questions about the meaning of overlapping regulations and we think we can clarity that through guidance. We will, as we move forward in finalizing the regulations, if, you know, the council does, you know, agree to let us move forward, we will be assessing those comments on a more formal basis, and those will, you know, be published. So certainly there will be, you know, an opportunity to understand those comments in more detail. And with this initiative, you know, again, we don’t anticipate this is the end of the road. You know, we’ll certainly come back and have dialogue on the questions, you know, that were raised here, but we expect that as this initiative moves forward, this is going to be something that we’re engaging the provider community in on a regular
basis, and, you know, we look forward to continuing to refine it the best that we can to, you know, continue letting this go forward and help more and more people.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Martin.

GLENN MARTIN: It’s actually a process question, which I should know the answer to, but don’t. So, the public, the comments on regs that go to the State and are responded to, are those comments and the responses available online somewhere that I just can’t find or how does that work? Because I know that there’s a fair amount of work put into that, and it’s not distributed to us with the regulations, so is that readily available, or are we going to ask for that separately?

LISA ULLMAN: Well, when we publish the notice of adoption we would also include an assessment of the comments that were received, so that would be available in the State Registry. Is there, I mean, I’ll just turn to the full Council. Is that right?

JOHN DERING: Yes, that’s correct. Under the State Administrative Procedure Act, with the promulgation, there’s a document called “assessment of public comments,” where the
public comments are listed and there needs to be an explanation in terms of the consideration given to them.

GLENN MARTIN: So, the regulation that we’re voting on today, if I had done my homework, I could have found all of that before I walked in today?

JOHN DERING: No. It’s not on the Department website now in terms of the actual submission. That’s a statutory requirement. And it’s a summary of the comments, so it’s not—they aren’t, the letters themselves don’t get submitted. But I think if you have an interest in seeing those letters, what I would suggest is we could confer with Colleen’s office and Dan Sheppard and see what arrangements can be made.

GLENN MARTIN: Yeah, I have, I’m probably going to hate myself for saying that’s a good idea when I see how voluminous that is, but, no, there’s just the concept that it’s a bit—and, again, I say I didn’t review what probably was available, but there is a feeling of voting a little bit in a vacuum of just not knowing exactly what was there and I just for process it would be better if that was made available to us, at least as a possibility going forward.
PETER ROBINSON: So I am getting a strong sense that while we are voting on this particular item today, we expect there to be some additional discussion and significant—and potentially another vote following that next meeting as you bring forward those refinements that we’ve been discussing. Is that enough? I’m seeing a nod.

LISA ULLMAN: Absolutely.

PETER ROBINSON: OK, with that on the table, I will now call the question. All in favor?

Aye.

Any opposed? The motion carries. Thank you.

ANGEL GUTIERREZ: For information was the item of nursing home transfers and discharge rights. We were advised on this by Mr. HARAN from the Department, who is still available for questions. The proposed amendment to section 415.3 of Title 10 NYCRR are required to clarify the requirements for transfer and discharge of residents from nursing homes, as mandated by federal law. The amendments: more-clearly define what constitutes a transfer or discharge; specify the elements that must be included in a notice of transfer or discharge to the
residents; and the deadlines for service of notice; and clarify
the rights of a residents at a hearing, should one be requested.
These amendments do not change existing requirements, they
simply ensure that the Department’s regulations clearly reflect
the existing federal requirements. This proposal has gone
through the 45-day comment period, but has not been before the
Codes Committee for discussion or information before today.
Before it, because this was before the committee for
information, there was not vote. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my
report.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. Any questions of Dr.
Gutierrez? Thank you for the work of your committee. I’m up next
to provide a very brief report on the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
on Free-Standing Ambulatory Surgery Centers and Charity Care. I
want to thank Mr. Decker for his work in staffing the committee
and the members of the Council who have been participating in
this. I am actually not going to read the report, but I ask that
it be put into the record for the minutes, but I would say that
we made significant progress in working through the various
criteria that we think are going to be applied here and at the
next meeting we are going to see draft criteria, which we will
invite public comment on at the next round of committee
meetings, which is in January, right? So, that, along with the
written report, concludes my report—mercifully—I think we’ve
been reported out here. So, what we’re going to do now is take a
20-minute lunch break and when we reconvene, we will go through
the establishment and project review committee activities that
Mr. Booth will lead us through. So 20 minutes and we will be
back.

[BREAK]

PETER ROBINSON: So ladies and gentlemen, I’d like to
reconvene. Those of you who are enjoying lunch should continue
to do so. Do I have a quorum in the room?

[counting]

We have a quorum in the room. That’s terrific. Welcome back and
we are now moving to Project Review and Establishment actions
and I am going to turn this over to Mr. Booth for his report.
Mr. Booth.

CHRIS BOOTH: Thank you. The committee met on November
13th and again this morning. We have a number of applications.
We’re going to do a lot of batching, but not for the first
couple. The first application is 142157C, United Memorial
Medical Center, North Street Campus. A conflict declared by Mr.
Robinson and Ms. Hines, both of whom are leaving the room.
Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Construct a new 8,498-square-
foot building addition to the hospital’s main site to include
radiation therapy and medical oncology services. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with conditions and contingencies and I so move.

Second.

I have a second. Motion has been made and seconded. Is there any questions or comments? Hearing none, I’ll call the question. All those in favor say aye.

[Aye.]

Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

Application 142079C, CareFirst Southern Tier Hospice and Palliative Care. Southern Tier Hospice, Steuben County, interest Mr. Booth. Renovate previously purchased school building into administrative offices. Both the Department and the Committee recommends approval with conditions and contingencies and I so move.

We have a motion.

PETER ROBINSON: Back into the rhythm. I have a motion and a second. Any comments? Mr. Fassler.
MICHAEL FASSLER: Just a question to the Department. With the code changes made this morning, would that eliminate the need for this to come before us again? If a similar application comes before us.

CHARLIE ABEL: Actually, no, it’s a different article and we need to do some work over there on the Hospice regs.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you. I’ll call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]

Any opposed? Abstentions? Hearing none, the motion carries.

CHRIS BOOTH: Application 142140E, NYP Community Programs. Establish NYP Community Programs as the active parent and co-operator of Hudson Valley Hospital Center, which will then do business as New York Presbyterian Hudson Valley Hospital. Dr. Boutin-Foster has declared a conflict and has left the room. Both the Department and the Committee recommend approval with condition and contingencies and I so move.

Second.
PETER ROBINSON: Second by Dr. Berliner. Questions? I’ll call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]

Any opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.

CHRIS BOOTH: So I am going to batch a number of applications now that had no conflicts and no interests and no issues at the Committee. Application 132340B, Richmond ASC, LLC, d/b/a Richmond Pain Management. Establish and construct a new single-specialty ambulatory surgery center providing pain management services to be located at 1360 Highland Boulevard, State Island. Both the Department and the Committee recommend conditional and contingent approval with an expiration of the operating certificate five years from the date of issuance was recommended. Application 142077E, Island Digestive Health Center. Establish Good Samaritan Hospital Medical Center as a 51% member of the Center. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 142056E, Hope Center Operations, LLC, d/b/a Hope Center for HIV and Nursing Care. Establish Hope Center Operations, LLC, as the new operator of the facility located at 1401 University Avenue, Bronx, that is currently operated by Help/PSI. Both the Department and the committee recommended
approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 142090E, L&A Operations, LLC, d/b/a Adira at Riverside Rehabilitation. Establish L&A Operations, LLC, as the new operator of the facility located at 120 Odell Avenue, Yonkers, currently the Michael Malotz Skilled Nursing Pavilion. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with contingencies. Application 142060E, Dominican Sisters Family Health Services. Establish Dominican Sisters Family Health Services as the new operator of an existing certified home-health agency and long-term home health care program through a merger with Visiting Nurse Association of Long Island. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with conditions and contingencies. Application 142068E, Royal Care Certified Home Health Care, LLC. Establish Royal Care Certified Home Health Care, LLC, as the new operator of Franklin Medical Center's Home Health Agency located at 444 Merrick Road, Lynbrook. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. And finally, application 142100E, A and T Certified Home Care, LLC; 100% change in membership of A and T Certified Home Care, LLC, to marital trust of Tony BABBINGTON. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies and I move the batch. Motion and a second. Dr. Gutierrez. Oh.
PETER ROBINSON: Yes. Any questions for Mr. Booth? Call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Motion carries.

CHRIS BOOTH: We have three certificates that we will batch. The first one is a name change for Fletcher-Allen’s partners. Dr. Rugge had declared an interest in that and both the Department and the Committee recommended approval. There is a certificate of amendment of the application of authority for the Debutante Cotillion and Christmas Ball, Inc. for fundraising. Again, both the Department and the Committee recommended approval. And finally there is the restated certificate of incorporation of the Health Center Foundation at Syracuse, Inc., which is for fundraising and approval was recommended by the Department and the Committee and I move that batch.

Second.
PETER ROBINSON: Motion and a second by Dr. Gutierrez.

Any questions? All in favor?

[Aye.]


CHRIS BOOTH: I have a very large number of home health agency licensures that I am going to move as a batch and I will read the number for each of those applications: 2162L, 2172L, 2191L, 2161L, 2236L, 2187L, 2174L, 2252L, 2207L, 2060L, 2257L, 2164L, 2230L, 2232L, 2189L, 2087L, 2182L, 2201L, 2208L, 2159L, 1728L, 2183L, 2197L, 2055L, 2391L, 2127L, and 2256L. In each case, the Department and the Committee recommend approval with a contingency and I so move.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Motion and a second; Dr. Bhat, this time. Questions? Ms. Hines.

VICKY HINES: Not about any of these specific applications, but just for an update, I don’t remember if it was last cycle or the cycle before we had talked about having some separate review of the total number of licensed agencies that
we’ve approved over the last couple of years and what impact that has on the State’s ability to do surveillance and the impact it’s had on the structure of the home care agencies.

PETER ROBINSON: Right, and I think we discussed this with Mr. Abel prior to the meeting and he is going to be bringing a report to the Council at the next cycle, so thank you for reminding us and bringing that up. I’ll call the question, all in favor?

[Aye.]


CHRIS BOOTH: The next category will be a number of applications where there were interests declared but no issues at the Committee and I’ll also do these as a batch. 152108E, Long Island Jewish Medical Center. Interest declared by Dr. Bhat and Dr. Martin. Establish Forest Hills Hospital and Franklin Hospital as divisions of the Long Island Jewish Medical Center, and establish LIJ as the operator of the ORZAK Center for Extended Care and Rehabilitation. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 142105E, Mount Saint Mary’s Hospital and Health Center. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Establish the
Catholic Health System as the active parent/co-operator of Mount Saint Mary’s Hospital and Health Center. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 142039E, North County [sic] Orthopedic Ambulatory Surgi Center. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Change in ownership interests for three existing members, three new members, and four withdrawing members. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 142073E, Buffalo Surgery Center. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Transfer of 49.96 percent membership interest to nine new members and one current member. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with a condition and contingencies. Application 141210B, Peninsula Continuum Services, LLC, d/b/a Cassena Care Dialysis Center at Peninsula. Interest declared by Dr. Bhat. Establish and construct a new 20-station end-stage renal dialysis center to be located at 5015 Beech Channel Drive, Far Rockaway, at Cardiff Bay Center for Rehabilitation and Nursing. Both the Department and the Committee recommend approval with conditions and contingencies. Application 141280E, Liverpool LD, LLC, d/b/a FMS Liverpool Dialysis Center. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Establish Liverpool LD, LLC, as the new operator of the renal dialysis clinic located at 1304 Buckley Road, Syracuse, that is currently operated by Liverpool Dialysis
Center, LLC. Both the Department and the Committee recommend approval with condition and contingencies and I so move.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Brown, you get credit for that second.

Thanks for breaking up that rhythm. That’s good. That’s very good. Any questions for Mr. Booth? Hearing none, we’ll call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]


Mr. Booth.

CHRIS BOOTH: Application 132128B, DOJ Operations Associates, LLC, d/b/a Tri-Borough Center for Rehabilitation and Specialty Health Care. A conflict has been declared by Dr. Bhat, who is outside the room. Establish DOJ Operations Associates, LLC, as the permanent operator of the Daughters of Jacob Nursing Home. Both the Department and the Committee recommend approval with a condition and contingencies and I so move.
Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Motion and a second by Dr. Brown.

Fassler.

PETER ROBINSON: Oh, it was Mr. Fassler. Thank you for that correction. Questions? Call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]


CHRIS BOOTH: Application 141213E, Comprehensive at Williamsville, LLC, d/b/a Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Nursing Center at Williamsville. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Establish Comprehensive at Williamsville, LLC, as the new operator of the residential health care facility located at 147 REESE Street, Williamsville that is currently operated as St. Francis Home of Williamsville. Both the Department and the Committee recommend approval with a condition and contingencies and I so move.

Second.
Second.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Gutierrez, thank you. Who... You didn’t say anything? I keep missing these seconds. Dr. Berliner, you take the...

CHRIS BOOTH: Our regular chair doesn’t make these mistakes.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Oh... Let’s give Dr. Foster for this second. I think we should. We’re having fun here today. Any questions? Hearing none, I’ll call the question. All in favor? Any opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.

CHRIS BOOTH: We have several more home health agency licensures, these with interests. I will also do these as a batch: 2226L, Beech Development Corporation, interest declared by Mr. Booth and Ms. Hines; 2241L, New York Congregational Licensed Home Care Services Agency, interest declared by Mr. Fassler; 2316L—I don’t know if anybody can help me with that word, but whatever that word is—[Rehekah] Rehab Licensed Home
Care Services Agency, interest Mr. Fassler; 2449L, The Gardens
by Morningstar, interest by Mr. Booth; 2211 UCSL, interest
declared by Mr. Booth; and 2331, Shire Senior Living, interest
by Ms. Hines. I move it as a batch for approval.

Second.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Dr. Bhat. He got you. Questions? Call
the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]


CHRIS BOOTH: Application 141290B, SOW West Side, LLC,
d/b/a Surgi Care of West Side. A conflict declared by Dr. Kalkut
and Dr. Martin, both of whom are leaving the room. Establish and
construct a new free-standing multi-specialty ambulatory surgery
center to be located at 438 West 51st Street, New York. Both the
Department and the Committee recommend conditional and
contingent approval with an expiration of the operating
certificate five years from the date of issue was recommended,
with two members opposing at the committee level. I so move.
PETER ROBINSON: Second by Dr. Gutierrez. Questions?

We’ll call the question then. All in favor?

[Aye.]

Any opposed? Any abstentions? Motion carries. Please have Dr. Kalkut and Dr. Martin return.

CHRIS BOOTH: Application 142061E, East Side Endoscopy. Request for limited-life extension for project 082085. Both the Department and the Committee recommended conditional and contingent approval with a one-year extension to be to the operating certificate from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter of approval, and I so move.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Thank you, Ms. Fine. Glad to see you joining the fray. Questions? I’ll call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]

CHRIS BOOTH: The final application is 142058E, Massena Center, LLC, d/b/a Massena Dialysis Center. Interest declared by Mr. Booth. Establish Massena Center, LLC, d/b/a Massena Dialysis Center as the new operator of an eight-station dialysis center located at 290 Main Street, Massena, currently operated as an extension clinic of Massena Memorial Hospital. I would note for the record that the following contingency has been added: Submission of an executed amendment to the operating certificate of Massena Center, LLC, acceptable to the Department. Both the Department and the Committee recommended approval with conditions and contingencies and I so move.

Second.

PETER ROBINSON: Motion and a second, by Dr. Gutierrez. Questions? I’ll call the question. All in favor?

[Aye.]


CHRIS BOOTH: That concludes my report.
PETER ROBINSON: Excellent report, Mr. Booth. So to just remind you that the public session of the Public Health and Health Planning Council is now adjourned. Do we have a—we’re good. So we don’t actually go into executive session. Just as a reminder, the next Committee Day is January 29th and the full Council will convene on February 12th. Both of those meetings are in New York City. So we thank you very much and the meeting is adjourned.
Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on  
Freestanding ASCs and Charity Care  

Summary of November 13, 2014 Discussion

Discussion first focused on previously reported SPARCS data, clarifying that the low percentage of charity care reported by both freestanding and hospital-based ASCs (less than one percent) was accounted for by the fact that most providers report such care under the SPARCS Self-Pay category. This category also includes bad debt, which many providers may “forgive” and consider as charity care.

It was agreed that in evaluating ASC applications for proposed levels of charity care, applicants should describe such care in terms of the number of expected cases rather than number of procedures or associated costs.

Members also agreed that bad debt should be considered charity care in the evaluation of ASC applications.

Members reached consensus on several recommendations developed through discussions at the committee’s first meeting:

1. ASCs should be required to enter into contracts with Medicaid managed care plans. To ensure a sufficient number of Medicaid cases, ASCs should have contracts with at least two plans.

2. ASCs should be required to enter into referral arrangements with FQHCs or other providers of services to the uninsured. Based on comments by a currently operating ASC and other speakers, these arrangements should include special efforts by the ASC in the form of service coordinators or patient navigators to ensure that referred patients are actually able to connect to the ASC and be scheduled for services in a timely manner.

3. ASC applications should be evaluated according to the totality of the proposed level of services to the underserved, whether Medicaid, charity care or a combination of the two. It was agreed that this evaluation should be done through an integrated standard that would still identify a target for Medicaid and charity care but allow consideration of a blended number that would take into account the particular service mix and circumstances of the proposed ASC.

4. Members rejected the recommendation that ASCs be allowed to substitute payments to FQHCs for direct services to Medicaid and charity care clients.

Next Steps

Staff will draft possible criteria for the evaluation of charity care efforts by specialized ASCs that may be serving a clientele more likely to be insured or covered by Medicare.

Staff will draft guidelines for flexibility in the evaluation of an ASC applicant’s proposed total effort to serve Medicaid and charity care clients while still maintaining the notion of reasonable targeted percentages for each.
SUMMARY OF EXPRESS TERMS

The Department is amending 10 NYCRR Subpart 7-2 Children’s Camps as an emergency rulemaking to conform the Department’s regulations to requirements added or modified as a result of Chapter 501 of the Laws of 2012 which created the Justice Center for the Protection of Persons with Special Needs (Justice Center). Specifically, the revisions:

- amend section 7-2.5(o) to modify the definition of “adequate supervision,” to incorporate the additional requirements being imposed on camps otherwise subject to the requirements of section 7-2.25
- amend section 7-2.24 to address the provision of variances and waivers as they apply to the requirements set forth in section 7-2.25
- amend section 7-2.25 to add definitions for “camp staff,” “Department,” “Justice Center,” and “Reportable Incident”

With regard to camps with 20 percent or more developmentally disabled children, which are subject to the provisions of 10 NYCRR section 7-2.25, add requirements as follows:

- amend section 7-2.25 to add new requirements addressing the reporting of reportable incidents to the Justice Center, to require screening of camp staff, camp staff training regarding reporting, and provision of a code of conduct to camp staff
- amend section 7-2.25 to add new requirements providing for the disclosure of information to the Justice Center and/or the Department and, under certain circumstances, to make certain records available for public inspection and copying
• amend section 7-2.25 to add new requirements related to the investigation of reportable incidents involving campers with developmental disabilities
• amend section 7-2.25 to add new requirements regarding the establishment and operation of an incident review committee, and to allow an exemption from that requirement under appropriate circumstances
• amend section 7-2.25 to provide that a permit may be denied, revoked, or suspended if the camp fails to comply with the regulations, policies or other requirements of the Justice Center
Pursuant to the authority vested in the Public Health and Health Planning Council by Section 225 of the Public Health Law, subject to the approval by the Commissioner of Health, Subpart 7-2 of the State Sanitary Code, as contained in Chapter 1 of Title 10 (Health) of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York is amended as follows, to be effective upon filing with the Secretary of State.

SUBPART 7-2

Children’s Camps

(Statutory Authority: Public Health Law §§ 201, 225, 1390, 1394, 1395, 1399-a;
L. 2012, ch. 501)

Subdivision (o) of section 7-2.5 is amended to read as follows:

(o) The camp operator shall provide adequate supervision. Adequate supervision shall mean:

(1) supervision such that a camper is protected from any unreasonable risk to his or her health or safety, including physical or sexual abuse or any public health hazard; [and]

(2) as a minimum, there shall exist visual or verbal communications capabilities between camper and counselor during activities and a method of accounting for the camper’s whereabouts at all times[.]; and
(3) at camps required to comply with section 7-2.25 of this Subpart, protection from any unreasonable risk of experiencing an occurrence which would constitute a reportable incident as defined in section 7-2.25(h)(4) of this Subpart.

Section 7-2.24 is amended to read as follows:

Variance; waiver.

(a) Variance - In order to allow time to comply with certain provisions of this Subpart, an operator may submit a written request to the permit-issuing official for a variance from a specific provision(s) when the health and safety of the children attending the camp and the public will not be prejudiced by the variance, and where there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships in immediate compliance with the provision. An operator must meet all terms of an approved variance(s) including the effective date, the time period for which the variance is granted, the requirements being varied and any special conditions the permit-issuing official specifies. The permit-issuing official shall consult with the State Department of Health and shall obtain approval from the State Department of Health for the proposed decision, prior to granting or denying a variance request for requirements in section 7-2.25 of this Subpart.

(b) Waiver - In order to accept alternative arrangements that do not meet certain provisions of this Subpart but do protect the safety and health of the campers and the public, an operator may submit a written request to the permit-issuing official for a
waiver from a specific provision of this Subpart. Such request shall indicate justification that circumstances exist that are beyond the control of the operator, compliance with the provision would present unnecessary hardship and that the public and camper health and safety will not be endangered by granting such a waiver. The permit-issuing official shall consult with a representative of the State Department of Health prior to granting or denying a waiver request. An operator must meet all terms of an approved waiver(s), including the condition that it will remain in effect indefinitely unless revoked by the permit-issuing official or the facility changes operators. The permit-issuing official shall consult with the State Department of Health, and shall obtain the approval of the State Department of Health for the proposed decision, prior to granting or denying a waiver request related to the requirements in section 7-2.25 of this Subpart.

New subdivisions (h)-(m) of section 7-2.25 are added to read as follows:

(h) Definitions. The following definitions apply to Section 7-2.25 of this Subpart.

(1) Camp Staff shall mean a director, operator, employee or volunteer of a children’s camp; or a consultant or an employee or volunteer of a corporation, partnership, organization or governmental entity which provides goods or services to a children’s camp pursuant to contract or other arrangement that permits such person to have regular and substantial contact with individuals who are cared for by the children’s camp.

(2) Department shall mean the New York State Department of Health.
(3) **Justice Center** shall mean the Justice Center for the Protection of People with Special Needs, as established pursuant to Section 551 of the Executive Law.

(4) **Reportable Incident** shall include those actions incorporated within the definitions of “physical abuse,” “sexual abuse,” “psychological abuse,” “deliberate inappropriate use of restraints,” “use of aversive conditioning,” “obstruction of reports of reportable incidents,” “unlawful use or administration of a controlled substance,” “neglect,” and “significant incident” all as defined in Section 488 of the Social Services Law.

(i) Reporting.

(1) In addition to the reporting requirements of section 7-2.8(d), a camp operator subject to section 7-2.25 of this Subpart and all camp staff falling within the definition of “mandated reporter” under section 488 of the Social Services Law shall immediately report any reportable incident as defined in section 7-2.25(h)(4) of this Subpart and Section 488 of the Social Services Law, where such incident involves a camper with a developmental disability, to the permit-issuing official and to the Justice Center’s Vulnerable Persons’ Central Register. Such report shall be provided in a form and manner as required by the Justice Center.
(j) Employee Screening, Training, and Code of Conduct

(1) Prior to hiring anyone who will or may have direct contact with campers, or approving credentials for any camp staff, the operator shall follow the procedures established by the Justice Center in regulations or policy, to verify that such person is not on the Justice Center's staff exclusion list established pursuant to section 495 of the Social Services Law. If such person is not on the Justice Center's staff exclusion list, the operator shall also consult the Office of Children and Family Services State Central Registry of Child Abuse and Maltreatment as required by section 424-a of the Social Services Law. Such screening is in addition to the requirement that the operator similarly verify that a prospective camp staff is not on the sexual abuse registry, as required by section 7-2.5(l) of this Subpart.

(2) A camp operator must ensure that camp staff, and others falling within the definition of mandated reporter under Section 488 of the Social Services Law who will or may have direct contact with campers having a developmental disability, receive training regarding mandated reporting and their obligations as mandated reporters. A camp operator shall ensure that the telephone number for the Justice Center's hotline for the reporting of reportable incidents is conspicuously displayed in areas accessible to mandated reporters and campers.

(3) The camp operator shall ensure that all camp staff and others falling within the definition of “custodian” under Section 488 of the Social Services Law are
provided with a copy of the code of conduct established by the Justice Center pursuant to Section 554 of the Executive Law. Such code of conduct shall be provided at the time of initial employment, and at least annually thereafter during the term of employment. Receipt of the code of conduct must be acknowledged, and the recipient must further acknowledge that he or she has read and understands such code of conduct.

(k) Disclosure of information

(1) Except to the extent otherwise prohibited by law, the camp operator shall be obliged to share information relevant to the investigation of any incident subject to the reporting requirements of this Subpart with the permit-issuing official, the State Department of Health, and the Justice Center. The permit-issuing official, the department and the Justice Center shall, when required by law, or when so directed by the department or the Justice Center and except as otherwise prohibited by law, be permitted to share information obtained in their respective investigations of incidents subject to the reporting requirements of section 7-2.25 (i) of this Subpart.

(2) Except as otherwise prohibited by law, the operator of a camp not otherwise subject to Article Six of the Public Officers Law shall make records available for public inspection and copying to the extent required by subdivision six of Section 490 of the Social Services Law and regulations of the Justice Center.
(1) Incident Management.

(1) The camp operator shall cooperate fully with the investigation of reportable incidents involving campers with developmental disabilities and shall provide all necessary information and access to conduct the investigation. The camp operator shall promptly obtain an appropriate medical examination of a physically injured camper with a developmental disability. The camp operator shall provide information, whether obtained pursuant to the investigation or otherwise, to the Justice Center and permit-issuing official upon request, in the form and manner requested. Such information must be provided in a timely manner so as to support completion of the investigation subject to the time limits set forth in this subdivision.

(2) Unless delegated by the Justice Center to a delegate investigatory agency as defined in subdivision seven of Section 488 of the Social Services Law, incidents of abuse or neglect, as defined in subdivision eleven of Section 488 of the Social Services Law, shall be investigated by the Justice Center. With regard to all other reportable incidents, as defined in Section 488 of the Social Services Law, the permit-issuing official shall initiate a prompt investigation of an allegation of a reportable incident, which shall commence no later than five business days after notification of such an incident, unless the Justice Center agrees that it will undertake such investigation. Additional time for completion of the investigation
may be allowed, subject to the approval of the department, upon a showing of
good cause for such extension. At a minimum, the investigation of any reportable
incident shall comply with the following:

(i) Investigations shall include a review of medical records and
reports, witness interviews and statements, expert assessments, and the
collection of physical evidence, observations and information from care
providers and any other information that is relevant to the incident.
Interviews should be conducted by qualified, objective individuals in a
private area which does not allow those not participating in the interview
to overhear. Interviews must be conducted of each party or witness
individually, not in the presence of other parties or witnesses or under
circumstances in which other parties or witnesses may perceive any aspect
of the interview. The person alleging the incident, or who is the subject of
the incident, must be offered the opportunity to give his/her version of the
event. At least one of the persons conducting the interview must have an
understanding of, and be able to accommodate, the unique needs or
capabilities of the person being interviewed. The procedures required by
this Subparagraph (i) may be altered if, and only to the extent necessary to,
comply with an applicable collective bargaining agreement.

(ii) All evidence must be adequately protected and preserved.
(iii) Any information, including but not limited to documents and other materials, obtained during or resulting from any investigation shall be kept confidential, except as otherwise permissible under law or regulation, including but not limited to Article 11 of the Social Services Law.

(iv) Upon completion of the investigation, a written report shall be prepared which shall include all relevant findings and information obtained in the investigation and details of steps taken to investigate the incident. The results of the investigation shall be promptly reported to the department, if the investigation was not performed by the department, and to the Justice Center.

(v) If any remedial action is necessary, the permit-issuing official shall establish a plan in writing with the camp operator. The plan shall indicate the camp operator’s agreement to the remediation and identify a follow-up date and person responsible for monitoring the remedial action. The plan shall be provided, and any measures taken in response to such plan shall be reported, to the department and to the Justice Center.

(vi) The investigation and written report shall be completed and provided to the department and the Justice Center within 45 days of when the incident was first reported to the Justice Center. For purposes of this
section, “complete” shall mean that all necessary information has been
obtained to determine whether and how the incident occurred, and to
complete the findings referenced in paragraph (l)(2)(iv) of this
subdivision.

(3) (i) The camp shall maintain a facility incident review committee, composed of
members of the governing body of the children’s camp and other persons
identified by the camp operator, including some members of the following: camp
administrative staff, direct support staff, licensed health care practitioners, service
recipients, the permit-issuing official or designee and representatives of family,
consumer and other advocacy organizations, but not the camp director. The camp
operator shall convene a facility incident review panel to review the timeliness,
 thoroughness and appropriateness of the camp's responses to reportable incidents;
recommend additional opportunities for improvement to the camp operator, if
appropriate; review incident trends and patterns concerning reportable incidents;
and make recommendations to the camp operator to assist in reducing reportable
incidents. The facility incident review panel shall meet at least annually, and also
within two weeks of the completion of a written report and remedial plan for a
reportable incident.

(ii) Pursuant to paragraph (f) of subdivision one of section 490 of the Social Services
Law and regulations of the Justice Center, a camp operator may seek an
exemption from the requirement to establish and maintain an incident review committee. In order to obtain an exemption, the camp operator must file an application with the permit-issuing official, at least sixty days prior to the start of the camp operating season, or at any time in the case of exemptions sought within the first three months following the effective date of this provision. The application must provide sufficient documentation and information to demonstrate that compliance would present undue hardship and that granting an exemption would not create an undue risk of harm to campers' health and safety. The permit-issuing official shall consult with the State Department of Health (department), and shall not grant or deny an application for an exemption unless it first obtains department approval for the proposed decision. An operator must meet all terms of an approved exemption(s), including the condition that it will remain in effect for one year unless revoked by the permit-issuing official, subject to department approval, or the facility changes operators. Any application for renewal shall be made within 60 days prior to the start of the camp's operating season. The procedure set forth in this Subparagraph (ii) shall be used instead of the general procedures set forth in section 7-2.24 of this Subpart.

(m) In addition to the requirements specified by subdivisions (d) and (g) of section 7-2.4 of this Subpart, a permit may be denied, revoked, or suspended if the children's camp fails to comply with regulations, policies, or other requirements of the Justice Center. In
considering whether to issue a permit to a children's camp, the permit-issuing official shall consider the children's camp's past and current compliance with the regulations, policies, or other requirements of the Justice Center.
Regulatory Impact Statement

Statutory Authority:

The Public Health and Health Planning Council is authorized by Section 225(4) of the Public Health Law (PHL) to establish, amend and repeal sanitary regulations to be known as the State Sanitary Code (SSC), subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Health. Article 13-B of the PHL sets forth sanitary and safety requirements for children’s camps. PHL Sections 225 and 201(1)(m) authorize SSC regulation of the sanitary aspects of businesses and activities affecting public health including children’s camps.

Legislative Objectives:

In enacting to Chapter 501 of the Laws of 2012, the legislature established the New York State Justice Center for the Protection of People with Special Needs (Justice Center) to strengthen and standardize the safety net for vulnerable people that receive care from New York’s Human Services Agencies and Programs. The legislation includes children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities within its scope and requires the Department of Health to promulgate regulations approved by the Justice Center pertaining to incident management. The proposed amendments further the legislative objective of protecting the health and safety of vulnerable children attending camps in New York State (NYS).
Needs and Benefits:

The legislation amended Article 11 of Social Services law as it pertains to children’s camps as follows. It:

- included overnight, summer day and traveling summer day camps for children with developmental disabilities as facilities required to comply with the Justice Center requirements.

- defined the types of incident required to be reported by children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities to the Justice Center Vulnerable Persons’ Central Registry.

- mandated that the regulations pertaining to children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities are amended to include incident management procedures and requirements consistent with Justice Center guidelines and standards.

- required that children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities establish an incident review committee, recognizing that the Department could provide for a waiver of that requirement under certain circumstances.

- required that children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities consult the Justice Center’s staff exclusion list (SEL) to ensure that prospective employees are not on that list and to, where the prospective employee is not on
that list, to also consult the Office of Children and Family Services State Central Registry of Child Abuse and Maltreatment (SCR) to determine whether prospective employees are on that list.

- required that children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities publicly disclose certain information regarding incidents of abuse and neglect if required by the Justice Center to do so.

The children’s camp regulations, Subpart 7-2 of the SSC are being amended in accordance with the aforementioned legislation.

**Compliance Costs:**

**Cost to Regulated Parties:**

The amendments impose additional requirements on children’s camp operators for reporting and cooperating with Department of Health investigations at children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities (hereafter “camps”). The cost to affected parties is difficult to estimate due to variation in salaries for camp staff and the amount of time needed to investigate each reported incident. Reporting an incident is expected to take less than half an hour; assisting with the investigation will range from several hours to two staff days. Using a high estimate of staff salary of $30.00 an hour, total staff cost would range from $120 to $1600 for each investigation. Expenses are nonetheless expected to be minimal statewide as between 40 and 50 children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities operate each year, with combined reports of zero to two
incidents a year statewide. Accordingly, any individual camp will be very unlikely to experience costs related to reporting or investigation.

Each camp will incur expenses for contacting the Justice Center to verify that potential employees, volunteers or others falling within the definition of “custodian” under section 488 of the Social Services Law (collectively “employees”) are not on the Staff Exclusion List (SEL). The effect of adding this consultation should be minimal. An entry level staff person earning the minimum wage of $7.25/hour should be able to compile the necessary information for 100 employees, and complete the consultation with the Justice Center, within a few hours.

Similarly, each camp will incur expenses for contacting the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) to determine whether potential employees are on the State Central Registry of Child Abuse and Maltreatment (SCR) when consultation with the Justice Center shows that the prospective employee is not on the SEL. The effect of adding this consultation should also be minimal, particularly since it will not always be necessary. An entry level staff person earning the minimum wage of $7.25/hour should be able to compile the necessary information for 100 employees, and complete the consultation with the OCFS, within a few hours. Assuming that each employee is subject to both screens, aggregate staff time required should not be more than six to eight hours. Additionally, OCFS imposes a $25.00 screening fee for new or prospective employees.

Camps will be required to disclose information pertaining to reportable incidents to the Justice Center and to the permit issuing official investigating the incident. Costs
associated with this include staff time for locating information and expenses for copying materials. Using a high estimate of staff salary of $30.00 an hour, and assuming that staff may take up to two hours to locate and copy the records, typical cost should be under $100.

Camps must also assure that camp staff, and certain others, who fall within the definition of mandated reporters under section 488 of the Social Services Law receive training related to mandated reporting to the Justice Center, and the obligations of those staff who are required to report incidents to the Justice Center. The costs associated with such training should be minimal as it is expected that the training material will be provided to the camps and will take about one hour to review during routine staff training. Camps must also ensure that the telephone number for the Justice Center reporting hotline is conspicuously posted for campers and staff. Cost associated with such posting is limited, related to making and posting a copy of such notice in appropriate locations.

The camp operator must also provide each camp staff member, and others who may have contact with campers, with a copy of a code of conduct established by the Justice Center pursuant to Section 554 of the Executive Law. The code must be provided at the time of initial employment, and at least annually thereafter during the term of employment. Receipt of the code of conduct must be acknowledged, and the recipient must further acknowledge that he or she has read and understands it. The cost of providing the code, and obtaining and filing the required employee acknowledgment,
should be minimal, as it would be limited to copying and distributing the code, and to obtaining and filing the acknowledgments. Staff should need less than 30 minutes to review the code.

Camps will also be required to establish and maintain a facility incident review committee to review and guide the camp's responses to reportable incidents. The cost to maintain a facility incident review committee is difficult to estimate due to the variations in salaries for camp staff and the amount of time needed for the committee to do its business. A facility incident review committee must meet at least annually, and also within two weeks after a reportable incident occurs. Assuming the camp will have several staff members participate on the committee, an average salary of $50.00 an hour and a three hour meeting, the cost is estimated to be $450.00 dollars per meeting. However, the regulations also provide the opportunity for a camp to seek an exemption, which may be granted subject to Department approval based on the duration of the camp season and other factors. Accordingly, not all camps can be expected to bear this obligation and its associated costs.

Camps are now explicitly required to obtain an appropriate medical examination of a camper physically injured from a reportable incident. A medical examination has always been expected for such injuries.

Finally, the regulations add noncompliance with Justice Center-related requirements as a ground for denying, revoking, or suspending a camp operator's permit.
Cost to State and Local Government:

State agencies and local governments that operate children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities will have the same costs described in the section entitled “Cost to Regulated Parties.” Currently, it is estimated that five summer day camps that meet the criteria are operated by municipalities. The regulation imposes additional requirements on local health departments for receiving incident reports and investigations of reportable incidents, and providing a copy of the resulting report to the Department and the Justice Center. The total cost for these services is difficult to estimate because of the variation in the number of incidents and amount of time to investigate an incident. However, assuming the typically used estimate of $50 an hour for health department staff conducting these tasks, an investigation generally lasting between one and four staff days, and assuming an eight hour day, the cost to investigate an incident will range $400.00 to $1600. Zero to two reportable incidents occur statewide each year, so a local health department is unlikely to bear such an expense. The cost of submitting the report is minimal, limited to copying and mailing a copy to the Department and the Justice Center.

Cost to the Department of Health:

There will be routine costs associated with printing and distributing the amended Code. The estimated cost to print revised code books for each regulated children’s camp in NYS is approximately $1600. There will be additional cost for printing and distributing training materials. The expenses will be minimal as most information will be
distributed electronically. Local health departments will likely include paper copies of training materials in routine correspondence to camps that is sent each year.

**Local Government Mandates:**

Children’s camps for children with developmental disabilities operated by local governments must comply with the same requirements imposed on camps operated by other entities, as described in the “Cost to Regulated Parties” section of this Regulatory Impact Statement. Local governments serving as permit issuing officials will face minimal additional reporting and investigation requirements, as described in the “Cost to State and Local Government” section of this Regulatory Impact Statement. The proposed amendments do not otherwise impose a new program or responsibilities on local governments. City and county health departments continue to be responsible for enforcing the amended regulations as part of their existing program responsibilities.

**Paperwork:**

The paperwork associated with the amendment includes the completion and submission of an incident report form to the local health department and Justice Center. Camps for children with developmental disabilities will also be required to provide the records and information necessary for LHD investigation of reportable incidents, and to retain documentation of the results of their consultation with the Justice Center regarding whether any given prospective employee was found to be on the SEL or the SCR.
**Duplication:**

This regulation does not duplicate any existing federal, state, or local regulation. The regulation is consistent with regulations promulgated by the Justice Center.

**Alternatives Considered:**

The amendments to the camp code are mandated by law. No alternatives were considered.

Consideration was given to including a cure period to afford camp operators an opportunity to correct violations associated with this rule; however, this option was rejected because it is believed that lessening the department’s ability to enforce the regulations could place this already vulnerable population at greater risk to their health and safety.

**Federal Standards:**

Currently, no federal law governs the operation of children’s camps.

**Compliance Schedule:**

The proposed amendments are to be effective upon filing with the Secretary of State.
Contact Person: Katherine Ceroalo
New York State Department of Health
Bureau of House Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Unit
Corning Tower Building, Rm. 2438
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12237
(518) 473-7488
(518) 473-2019 (FAX)
REGSQNA@health.ny.gov
Regulatory Flexibility Analysis
for Small Business and Local Government

Types and Estimated Number of Small Businesses and Local Governments:

There are between 40 and 50 regulated children’s camps for children with development disabilities (38% are expected to be overnight camps and 62% are expected to be summer day camps) operating in New York State, which will be affected by the proposed rule. About 30% of summer day camps are operated by municipalities (towns, villages, and cities). Typical regulated children’s camps representing small business include those owned/operated by corporations, hotels, motels and bungalow colonies, non-profit organizations (Girl/Boy Scouts of America, Cooperative Extension, YMCA, etc.) and others. None of the proposed amendments will apply solely to camps operated by small businesses or local governments.

Compliance Requirements:

Reporting and Recordkeeping:

The obligations imposed on small business and local government as camp operators are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties,” “Local Government Mandates,” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement. The obligations imposed on local government as the permit issuing official is described in “Cost to State and Local Government” and “Local Government Mandates” portions of the Regulatory Impact Statement.
**Other Affirmative Acts:**

The obligations imposed on small business and local government as camp operators are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties” “Local Government Mandates,” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement.

**Professional Services:**

Camps with 20 percent or more developmentally disabled children are now explicitly required to obtain an appropriate medical examination of a camper physically injured from a reportable incident. A medical examination has always been expected for such injuries.

**Compliance Costs:**

**Cost to Regulated Parties:**

The obligations imposed on small business and local government as camp operators are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement.

**Cost to State and Local Government:**

The obligations imposed on small business and local government as camp operators are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in the
“Cost to Regulated Parties” section of the Regulatory Impact Statement. The obligations imposed on local government as the permit issuing official is described in “Cost to State and Local Government” and “Local Government Mandates” portions of the Regulatory Impact Statement.

**Economic and Technological Feasibility:**

There are no changes requiring the use of technology.

The proposal is believed to be economically feasible for impacted parties. The amendments impose additional reporting and investigation requirements that will use existing staff that already have similar job responsibilities. There are no requirements that involve capital improvements.

**Minimizing Adverse Economic Impact:**

The amendments to the camp code are mandated by law. No alternatives were considered. The economic impact is already minimized.

Consideration was given to including a cure period to afford camp operators an opportunity to correct violations associated with this rule; however, this option was rejected because it is believed that lessening the department’s ability to enforce the regulations could place this already vulnerable population at greater risk to their health and safety.
Small Business Participation and Local Government Participation:

No small business or local government participation was used for this rule development. The amendments to the camp code are mandated by law. Ample opportunity for comment will be provided as part of the process of promulgating the regulations, and training will be provided to affected entities with regard to the new requirements.
Rural Area Flexibility Analysis

Types and Estimated Number of Rural Areas:

There are between 40 and 50 regulated children’s camps for children with development disabilities (38% are expected to be overnight camps and 62% are expected to be summer day camps) operating in New York State, which will be affected by the proposed rule. Currently, there are seven day camps and ten overnight camps operating in the 44 counties that have population less than 200,000. There are an additional four day camps and three overnight camps in the nine counties identified to have townships with a population density of 150 persons or less per square mile.

Reporting and Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements:

Reporting and Recordkeeping:

The obligations imposed on camps in rural areas are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement.

Other Compliance Requirements:

The obligations imposed on camps in rural areas are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement.
Professional Services:

Camps with 20 percent or more developmentally disabled children are now explicitly required to obtain an appropriate medical examination of a camper physically injured from a reportable incident. A medical examination has always been expected for such injuries.

Compliance Costs:

Cost to Regulated Parties:

The costs imposed on camps in rural areas are no different from those imposed on camps generally, as described in “Cost to Regulated Parties” and “Paperwork” sections of the Regulatory Impact Statement.

Economic and Technological Feasibility:

There are no changes requiring the use of technology.

The proposal is believed to be economically feasible for impacted parties. The amendments impose additional reporting and investigation requirements that will use existing staff that already have similar job responsibilities. There are no requirements that involve capital improvements.
Minimizing Adverse Economic Impact on Rural Area:

The amendments to the camp code are mandated by law. No alternatives were considered. The economic impact is already minimized, and no impacts are expected to be unique to rural areas.

Consideration was given to including a cure period to afford camp operators an opportunity to correct violations associated with this rule; however, this option was rejected because it is believed that lessening the department’s ability to enforce the regulations could place this already vulnerable population at greater risk to their health and safety.

Rural Area Participation:

No rural area participation was used for this rule development. The amendments to the camp code are mandated by law. Ample opportunity for comment will be provided as part of the process of promulgating the routine regulations, and training will be provided to affected entities with regard to the new requirements.
Job Impact Statement

No Job Impact Statement is required pursuant to Section 201-a (2)(a) of the State Administrative Procedure Act. It is apparent, from the nature of the proposed amendment that it will have no impact on jobs and employment opportunities, because it does not result in an increase or decrease in current staffing level requirements. Tasks associated with reporting new incidents types and assisting with the investigation of new reportable incidents are expected to be completed by existing camp staff, and should not be appreciably different than that already required under current requirements.
Emergency Justification

Chapter 501 of the Laws of 2012 established the Justice Center for the Protection of People with Special Needs (“Justice Center”), in order to coordinate and improve the State's ability to protect those persons having various physical, developmental, or mental disabilities and who are receiving services from various facilities or provider agencies. The Department must promulgate regulations as a “state oversight agency.” These regulations will assure proper coordination with the efforts of the Justice Center.

Among the facilities covered by Chapter 501 are children's camps having enrollments with 20 percent or more developmentally disabled campers. These camps are regulated by the Department and, in some cases, by local health departments, pursuant to Article 13-B of the Public Health Law and 10 NYCRR Subpart 7-2. Given the effective date of Chapter 501 and its relation to the start of the camp season, these implementing regulations must be promulgated on an emergency basis in order to assure the necessary protections for vulnerable persons at such camps. Absent emergency promulgation, such persons would be denied initial coordinated protections until the 2015 camp season. Promulgating these regulations on an emergency basis will provide such protection, while still providing a full opportunity for comment and input as part of a formal rulemaking process which will also occur.
pursuant to the State Administrative Procedures Act. The Department is authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant to sections 201 and 225 of the Public Health Law.

Promulgating the regulations on an emergency basis will ensure that campers with special needs promptly receive the coordinated protections to be provided to similar individuals cared for in other settings. Such protections include reduced risk of being cared for by staff with a history of inappropriate actions such as physical, psychological or sexual abuse towards persons with special needs. Perpetrators of such abuse often seek legitimate access to children so it is critical to camper safety that individuals who have committed such acts are kept out of camps. The regulation provides an additional mechanism for camp operators to do so. The regulations also reduce the risk of incidents involving physical, psychological or sexual abuse towards persons with special needs by ensuring that such occurrences are fully and completely investigated, by ensuring that camp staff are more fully trained and aware of abuse and reporting obligations, allowing staff and volunteers to better identify inappropriate staff behavior and provide a mechanism for reporting injustice to this vulnerable population. Early detection and response are critical components for mitigating injury to an individual and will prevent a perpetrator from hurting additional children. Finally, prompt enactment of the proposed regulations will ensure that occurrences are fully investigated and evaluated by the camp, and that measures are taken to reduce the risk of re-occurrence in the future. Absent emergency adoption, these benefits and protections will not be available to campers
with special needs until the formal rulemaking process is complete, with the attendant
loss of additional protections against abuse and neglect, including physical,
psychological, and sexual abuse.
Summary of Express Terms

The amendments to section 415.3 of Title 10 (Health) NYCRR are required to clarify the requirements for transfer and discharge of residents from nursing homes as mandated by federal law. The amendments more clearly define what constitutes a transfer or discharge, specify the elements that must be included in a notice of transfer or discharge to the resident and the deadlines for service of notice, and clarify the rights of a resident at a hearing should one be requested. These amendments do not change existing requirements; they simply ensure that the Department’s regulations clearly reflect the existing federal requirements.
Pursuant to the authority vested in the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the Commissioner of Health by sections 2801, 2801-a and 2803(2) of the Public Health Law, Section 415.3(h) of Part 415 of Subchapter A (Medical Facilities-Minimum Standards) of Chapter V, Title 10 (Health) of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules, and Regulations of the State of New York are hereby amended to be effective upon publication of a Notice of Adoption in the State Register, to read as follows:

(h) Transfer and discharge rights. Transfer and discharge shall include movement of a resident to a bed outside of the certified facility whether that bed is in the same physical plant or not. Transfer and discharge shall not refer to movement of a resident to a bed within the same certified facility, and does not include transfer or discharge made in compliance with a request by the resident, the resident’s legal representative or health care agent, as evidenced by a signed and dated written statement, or those that occur due to incarceration of the resident.

(1) With regard to the transfer or discharge of residents, the facility shall:

i) permit each resident to remain in the facility, and not transfer or discharge the resident from the facility unless such transfer or discharge is made in recognition of the resident’s rights to receive considerate and respectful care, to receive necessary care and services, and to participate in the development of the comprehensive care plan and in recognition of the rights of other residents in the facility:
a) The resident may be transferred only when the interdisciplinary care team, in consultation with the resident or the resident’s designated representative, determines that:

1) the transfer or discharge is necessary for the resident’s welfare and the resident’s needs cannot be met after reasonable attempts at accommodation in the facility;

2) the transfer or discharge is appropriate because the resident’s health has improved sufficiently so the resident no longer needs the services provided by the facility;

3) the [health or] safety of individuals in the facility [would otherwise be] is endangered[, the risk to others is more than theoretical and all reasonable alternatives to transfer or discharge have been explored and have failed to safely address the problem]; or

4) The health of individuals in the facility is endangered;

b) transfer and discharge shall also be permissible when the resident has failed, after reasonable and appropriate notice, to pay for (or have paid under Medicare, Medicaid or third-party insurance) a stay at the facility. For a resident who becomes eligible for Medicaid after admission to a facility, the facility may charge a resident only allowable charges under Medicaid. Such transfer or discharge shall be permissible only if a charge is not in dispute, no appeal of a denial of benefits is pending, or funds for payment are actually available and the resident refuses to cooperate with the facility in obtaining the
funds;

c) transfer or discharge shall also be permissible when the facility discontinues operation and has received approval of its plan of closure in accordance with subdivision (i) of section 401.3 of this Title;

ii) ensure complete documentation in the resident’s clinical record when the facility transfers or discharges a resident under any of the circumstances specified in subparagraph (i) of this paragraph. The documentation shall be made by:

a) the resident’s physician and, as appropriate, interdisciplinary care team[, as appropriate], when discharge or transfer is necessary under subclause (1) or (2) of clause (a) of subparagraph (i) of this paragraph; and

b) a physician when transfer or discharge is necessary due to the endangerment of the health of other individuals in the facility under subclause (3) of clause (a) of subparagraph (i) of this paragraph;

iii) before it transfers or discharges a resident:

a) Notify the resident, designated representative, if any, and, if known, family member of the resident of the transfer or discharge and the reasons for the move in writing and in a language and manner the[ys] resident and/or family member understand;
b) record the reasons in the resident’s clinical record; and

c) include in the notice the items described in paragraph (v) of this paragraph;

iv) provide the notice of transfer or discharge required under subparagraph (iii) of this paragraph at least 30 days before the resident is transferred or discharged, except that notice shall be given as soon as practicable before transfer or discharge, but no later than the date on which a determination was made to transfer or discharge the resident, under the following circumstances:

(a) the safety of individuals in the facility would be endangered;

(b) the health of individuals in the facility would be endangered;

(c) the resident’s health improves sufficiently to allow a more immediate transfer or discharge;

(d) an immediate transfer or discharge is required by the resident’s urgent medical needs;

[or]

(e) [the transfer or discharge is being made in compliance with a request by the resident;]

the transfer or discharge is the result of a change in the level of medical care prescribed
by the resident’s physician; or

(f) the resident has not resided in facility for 30 days.

v) include in the written notice specified in subparagraph (iii) of this paragraph the following:

(a) The reason for transfer or discharge;

(b) The specific regulations that support, or the change in Federal or State law that requires, the action;

(c) The effective date of transfer or discharge;

(d) The location to which the resident will be transferred or discharged;

([a]e) [for transfers or discharges] a statement that the resident has the right to appeal the action to the State Department of Health, which includes: [in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subdivision. The statement shall include a current phone number for the department which can be used to initiate an appeal];

(1) an explanation of the individual’s right to request an evidentiary hearing appealing the decision;
(2) the method by which an appeal may be obtained;

(3) in cases of an action based on a change in law, an explanation of the circumstances under which an appeal will be granted;

(4) an explanation that the resident may remain in the facility (except in cases of imminent danger) pending the appeal decision if the request for an appeal is made within 15 days of the date the resident received the notice of transfer/discharge;

(5) in cases of residents discharged/transferred due to imminent danger, a statement that the resident may return to the first available bed if he or she prevails at the hearing on appeal; and

(6) a statement that the resident may represent him or herself or use legal counsel, a relative, a friend, or other spokesman;

([b]f) the name, address and telephone number of the State long term care ombudsman;

([c]g) for nursing facility residents [who are mentally ill or who have] with developmental disabilities, the mailing address and telephone number of the [Commission on Quality of Care for the Mentally Disabled which is responsible for the
protection and advocacy of such individuals] agency responsible for the protection and advocacy of developmentally disabled individuals established under Part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act; [and]

(h) for nursing facility residents who are mentally ill, the mailing address and telephone number of the agency responsible for the protection and advocacy of mentally ill individuals established under the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act;

[(d) a statement that, if the resident appeals the transfer or discharge to the Department of Health within 15 days of being notified of such transfer or discharge, the resident may remain in the facility pending an appeal determination. This clause shall not apply to transfers or discharges based on clauses (iv) (a), (b), (d), or (e) of this paragraph; and]

(vi) provide sufficient preparation and orientation to residents to ensure safe and orderly transfer or discharge from the facility [including an opportunity to participate in deciding where to go], in the form of a discharge plan which addresses the medical needs of the resident and how these will be met after discharge, and provide a discharge summary pursuant to section 415.11, subdivision (d) of this Title; and

(vii) permit the resident, their legal representative or health care agent the opportunity to participate in deciding where the resident will reside after discharge from the facility.
(2) The department shall grant an opportunity for a hearing to any resident who requests it because he or she believes the facility has erroneously determined that he or she must be transferred or discharged. Appeals of transfer and discharge decisions to the Department of Health as permitted by clause (a) of subparagraph (v) of paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the following:

(i) The resident has the right to:

(a) a pre-transfer on-site appeal determination under the auspices of the Department of Health, provided that the resident has appealed the transfer or discharge within 15 days of the notice, except in cases involving imminent danger to others in the facility; and

(b) request a hearing to appeal the transfer or discharge notice at any time within 60 days from the date the notice of transfer or discharge is received by the resident;

(b) remain in the facility pending an appeal determination if the appeal request is made within 15 days of the date of receipt of the transfer or discharge notice; [or]

(c) a post-transfer/discharge appeal determination [within 30 days of transfer] if the resident did not request an appeal determination [prior to transfer] within 15 days of the date of receipt of the transfer or discharge notice;

(d) return to the facility to the first available semi-private bed if the resident wins the appeal, prior to admitting any other person to the facility; and
(e) represent him or herself, or use legal counsel, a relative, a friend or other spokesman.
[examine his/her medical records.]

(ii) [The presiding officer shall have the power to obtain medical and psychosocial consultations.] The resident or the resident’s representative as described in (2)(i)(e) of this paragraph must be given the opportunity to:

(a) examine at a reasonable time before the date of the hearing, at the facility, and during the hearing, at the place of the hearing:

1) the contents of the resident’s file including his/her medical records; and

2) all documents and records to be used by the facility at the hearing on appeal;

(b) bring witnesses;

(c) establish all pertinent facts and circumstances;

(d) present an argument without undue interference; and

(e) question or refute any testimony or evidence, including the opportunity to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.
(iii) [The nursing home shall have the burden of proof that the transfer is/was necessary and the discharge plan appropriate.] All hearings must be conducted in accordance with Article 3 of the State Administrative Procedure Act, and in accordance with the following:

(a) the presiding officer shall have the power to obtain medical assessments and psychosocial consultations, and the authority to issue subpoenas;

(b) the nursing home shall have the burden of proof that the discharge or transfer is/was necessary and the discharge plan appropriate;

(c) an administrative hearing must be scheduled within 90 days from the date of the request for a hearing on appeal; and

(d) the parties must be notified in writing of the decision and provided information on the right to seek review of the decision, if review is available.

[(iv) in cases involving imminent danger to others in the facility, an involuntary transfer may be arranged before a hearing. However, the facility shall be required to hold the resident’s bed until after the hearing decision. If the transfer is found to be appropriate, the facility may charge a private pay resident for the time the bed was held. If the transfer is found to be inappropriate, the facility shall readmit the resident to his or her bed on a]
priority basis the first available bed.]

[(v) the department shall conduct a review and render a decision on the appeal as required in clause (a) of subparagraph (i) of this paragraph within 15 days of the request.]

[(3) If an appeal decision rendered after discharge finds the discharge or transfer to be inappropriate, the facility shall readmit the resident prior to admitting any other person.]

[(4)] The facility shall establish and implement a bed-hold policy and a readmission policy that reflect at least the following:

(i) at the time of admission and again at the time of transfer for any reason, the facility shall verbally inform and provide written information to the resident and the designated representative that specifies:

(a) the duration of the bed-hold policy during which the resident is permitted to return and resume residence in the facility; and

(b) the facility’s policies regarding bed-hold periods, which must be consistent with subparagraph (iii) of this paragraph, permitting a resident to return;

(ii) At the time of transfer of a resident for hospitalization or for therapeutic leave, a nursing home shall provide written notice to the resident and the designated
representative, which specifies the duration of the bed-hold policy described in subparagraph (i) of this paragraph.

(iii) a nursing home shall establish and follow a written policy under which a resident whose hospitalization or therapeutic leave exceeds the bed hold period is readmitted to the facility immediately upon the first availability of a bed in a semi-private room if the resident:

(a) requires the services provided by the facility; and

(b) is eligible for Medicaid nursing home services.

(iv) a nursing home shall establish and follow a written policy under which a resident who has resided in the nursing home for 30 days or more and who has been hospitalized or who has been transferred or discharged on therapeutic leave without being given a bed-hold is readmitted to the facility immediately upon the first availability of a bed in a semi-private room if the resident:

(a) requires the services provided by the facility; and

(b) is eligible for Medicaid nursing home services.

([54]) With regard to the assurance of equal access to quality care, the facility shall
establish and maintain identical policies and practices regarding transfer, discharge and the provision of all required services for all individuals regardless of source of payment.
Regulatory Impact Statement

Statutory Authority:

The statutory authority for this rule is Public Health Law, Sections 2801, 2801-a and 2803(2), which require the Public Health and Health Planning Council to promulgate regulations, subject to the Commissioner’s approval, governing the standards and procedures followed by nursing homes. Those standards and procedures must, at a minimum, meet federal standards.

Legislative Objectives:

To clarify, in accordance with a Stipulation of Settlement in Gautam, et. al. v. Novello, et. al., SDNY 03 Civ. 2473(THK), the requirements that must be met by nursing homes in connection with the transfer or discharge of residents. The state’s regulations governing transfer and discharge must meet, at a minimum, federal standards.

Needs and Benefits:

Since July 2005, transfer and discharge of nursing home residents has been in accordance with an interim policy that clarifies state requirements in a way that ensures compliance with federal requirements. Amending 10 NYCRR 415.3 in accordance with the interim policy will permanently clarify the requirements that must be met by nursing homes prior to transferring and discharging patients and will ensure that all required policies and procedures are clearly included in the Department’s regulations.
Costs:

Costs to Regulated Parties for the Implementation of and Continuing Compliance with the Rule:

Nursing homes are already required to comply with federal regulations prior to transferring and discharging residents. These regulations do not expand upon already existing requirements.

Costs to the Agency, the State and Local Governments for the Implementation and Continuation of the Rule:

The amendments to 10 NYCRR 415.3 will not increase any costs currently borne by the Department or state and local governments. The amendments clarify existing requirements that all facilities are required to follow.

The information, including the source(s) of such information and the methodology upon which the cost analysis is based:

Cost analysis is based on the substance of the regulations and the interim policy clarifying those regulations. There has been no change in the requirements that must be met by all affected entities.

Local Government Mandates:

Local governments that operate nursing homes are already complying with the requirements clarified by these amendments.
Paperwork:

The paperwork required by these amendments has not changed.

Duplication:

These amendments do not duplicate existing regulations or requirements.

Alternatives:

None. The amendments simply clarify state requirements by ensuring the Department’s regulations clearly incorporate existing federal mandates.

Federal Standards:

Federal requirements, upon which these amendments are based, are located at 42 CFR Parts 431 and 483. These amendments do not expand upon these requirements.

Compliance Schedule:

Affected entities are already required to comply with the proposed amendments.
Contact Person:

Katherine Ceroalo
New York State Department of Health
Bureau of House Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Unit
Corning Tower Building, Rm. 2438
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12237
(518) 473-7488
(518) 473-2019 (FAX)
REGSQNA@health.ny.gov
Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for Small Businesses and Local Governments

Effect of Rule:

Local governments will not be affected by this rule except to the extent that they operate a nursing home. There are 34 counties that operate nursing homes. The Department does not have information regarding the number of small business nursing homes in NYS readily available. As the amendments do not add to or change existing requirements, and are mandated by federal law, small businesses and local governments will not be affected.

Compliance Requirements:

There are no new reporting and record keeping requirements. The regulations simply clarify state requirements by ensuring the Department’s regulations clearly incorporate existing federal mandates.

Professional Services:

No additional professional staff is expected to be needed as a result of the regulations.

Compliance Costs:

There are no new or additional costs associated with these proposed rules.

Economic and Technological Feasibility:

These regulations simply clarify existing requirements. They do not require any new technology and should not affect the routine cost of doing business.
Minimizing Adverse Impact:

The Department has no flexibility with respect to these regulations as all requirements are mandated by federal law. Nonetheless, the rule will have no adverse economic impact on small businesses or local governments since it simply clarifies state requirements by ensuring the Department’s regulations clearly incorporate existing federal mandates.

Small Business and Local Government Participation:

The Department will meet the requirements of SAPA § 202-b(6) in part by publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the State Register with a comment period. Input was not requested with respect to these amendments since they reflect federal mandates. The proposed rules are not expected to have a deleterious effect on small businesses and local governments, since these requirements are already in effect. Accordingly, opposition is not expected.
Rural Area Flexibility Analysis

Types and Estimated Numbers of Rural Areas:

Rural areas are defined as counties with a population less than 200,000 and, for counties with a population greater than 200,000, includes towns with population densities of 150 persons or less per square mile. The proposed amendment will apply statewide, including the 43 rural counties with less than 200,000 inhabitants, and the 10 urban counties with a population density of 150 per square mile or less.

Reporting, Recordkeeping and Other Compliance Requirements and Professional Services:

There are no new or additional requirements as a result of this rule. The regulations simply clarify state requirements by ensuring the Department’s regulations clearly incorporate existing federal mandates.

Costs:

There are no capital costs associated with these rules. There are no additional operational costs as providers are currently required to have policies and procedures in place to implement existing transfer and discharge requirements. Any administrative costs associated with transfer or discharge are mandated by federal law.

Minimizing Adverse Impact:

The Department has no flexibility with respect to these regulations as all requirements are mandated by federal law. Nonetheless, the rule will have no adverse economic impact on
rural area providers since it simply clarifies state requirements by ensuring the Department’s regulations clearly incorporate existing federal mandates.

**Rural Area Participation:**

The Department will meet the requirements of SAPA Section 202-bb(7), in part, by publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the State Register with a comment period. The Department did not solicit input regarding these amendments since they reflect federal mandates. The proposed rules are not expected to have a deleterious effect on rural areas, since these requirements are already in effect. Accordingly, opposition is not expected.
Job Impact Statement

A Job Impact Statement is not required because it is apparent, from the nature and purpose of the proposed rule, that it will not have a substantial adverse impact on jobs and employment opportunities.
### Executive Summary

**Description**
Orange Regional Medical Center (ORMC or Orange Regional), a not-for-profit 383-bed acute care hospital, requests approval to construct a new medical office building and a cancer center on its main campus located at 707 East Main Street, Middletown. Upon completion ORMC will relocate many of the outpatient services currently being provided in its Orange Regional Medical Pavilion, located about one mile away at 75 Crystal Run Road, Middletown. Orange Regional will also relocate services currently being provided at its outpatient Patient Services Center located at 70 Hatfield Lane, Goshen. The hospital is not proposing to develop any new clinical services as a result of this project. Rather, this project seeks only to relocate existing services from remote locations onto ORMC’s main campus.

The medical office building will consist of five floors, of which floors 3 through 5 will be entirely non-Article 28 space. Floors 3 through 5 will house the Greater Hudson Valley Health System Medical Group (GHVMG). GHVMG is a New York Professional Service Corporation engaged in the private practice of medicine.

Orange Regional’s decision to pursue this project is based on a number of factors that include: improving the quality of its outpatient care services, the opportunity to develop a dedicated cancer center, creating a flagship location for the ORMC Medical Group, progression towards integrated delivery system development, achieving significant cost reductions, achieving various operational efficiencies to benefit both staff and patients, and giving ORMC the ability to directly impact at least three of the ten Delivery System Reform Incentive Payment (DSRIP) projects being pursued by its Performing Provider System (PPS). The applicant has indicated that Montefiore Medical Center is the lead applicant for ORMC’s PPS for the DSRIP program.

**DOH Recommendation**
Contingent Approval

**Need Summary**
This project would relocate many services from the two extension clinics to the site of the proposed expansion of Orange Regional Medical Center. The proposed expanded Cancer Center would relocate the Radiology and LINAC services from the two clinics to a centralized, modern cancer treatment facility in Orange County. Because such a move would keep the services in Orange County, there is little risk of a decline in utilization rates or a disruption in services.

**Program Summary**
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.
Financial Summary
Total Project Cost is $99,872,535. Total Reimbursable Cost is $77,155,692 due to Non-Article 28 and shell space on floors 3 through 5.

Project costs of $99,872,535 will be met as follows: Equity via operations of $16,828,342, Fundraising of $2,000,000, Outstanding 2008 Bond Proceeds from construction of ORMC’s new replacement hospital of $5,084,193, DASNY bond financing of $68,460,000 at an interest rate of 5.078% for a thirty year term, and an equipment lease of $7,500,000 at an interest rate of 3.80% for a five year term.

Enterprise Budget:
Revenues $382,745,550
Expenses 380,643,538
Excess Revenues over Expenses $2,102,012

Incremental Budget:
Revenues $4,371,421
Expenses 4,474,332
Excess Revenues over Expenses ($102,911)

Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and contingent approval is recommended.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management

Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. Submission of a commitment for a permanent mortgage for the project to be provided from a recognized lending institution at a prevailing rate of interest, acceptable by the Department of Health. This is to be provided within 120 days of approval of state hospital code drawings and before the start of construction. Included with the submitted permanent mortgage commitment must be a sources and uses statement and a debt amortization schedule, for both new and refinanced debt. [BFA]
3. The submission of State Hospital Code (SHC) Drawings for review and approval, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-02 SHC Hospitals (as required) and DSG-03 Outpatient Facilities (as required) [AER]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity's clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
6. The applicant shall start construction on or before April 1, 2015 and complete construction by October 1, 2016 upon the filing of Final Construction Documents in accordance with 10 NYCRR section 710.7. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 71 0.2(b)(5), if construction is not started on or before the start date, this shall constitute abandonment of the approval. In accordance with Part 710.1 O(a), this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]
7. The submission of Final Construction Documents, as described in BAER Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-05, prior to the applicant's request for, and Department's granting approval for the start of construction [AER]
8. Reimbursable project costs shall be limited to $77,155,692 due to the undeveloped 5th floor and Non-Article 28 Private Physician floors 3 & 4 of the MOB. These areas represent a total of $22,716,843 in project costs. Reimbursement of these costs will be withheld until these areas are approved for article 28 services by the department (via approval of future CON submission or modification of this CON project).
9. Submission of an executed equipment lease, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
Orange Regional Medical Center is a 383-bed acute care hospital located at 707 East Main Street, Middletown, 10940, in Orange County. It is requesting approval to renovate and expand the Cancer Center on its main campus, and to construct a 5-story medical office building there. The first two floors of the medical office building would be Article 28 certified and would contain relocated services from two extension clinics run by the Center. Floors three and four of the proposed medical office building will contain physician offices, examination rooms and procedure rooms. The fifth floor would be vacant.

A summary of the services the two extension clinics currently provide is as follows:

Orange Regional Radiation Oncology Extension Clinic
Linear Accelerator
Magnetic Resonance Imaging
Medical Services – Primary Care
Radiology – Diagnostic O/P
Radiology – Therapeutic O/P

Horton Medical Pavilion
Ambulatory Surgery – Multi Specialty
CT Scanner
Linear Accelerator
Medical Services – Primary Care
Radiology – Diagnostic O/P
Radiology – Therapeutic O/P

On completion of this project, the current location of the Orange Regional Oncology Extension Clinic would be left vacant, all services having been moved to the main site of Orange Regional Medical Center. Horton Medical Pavilion would continue to provide a Sleep Center and Wound Care services.

Table 1: Orange Regional Medical Center Bed Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Category</th>
<th>Certified Beds</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Certified Capacity Upon Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical / Surgical</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intensive Care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HFIS
Analysis
Utilization numbers for Orange Regional Medical Center and the two extension clinics involved in this project are shown below. With no change to services being proposed, these utilization numbers should not be affected by this project.

![Orange County Facility Utilization](image)

Source: SPARCS

Prevention Quality Indicators for Orange and Sullivan Counties are listed below. The PQIs for the primary service area of Orange Regional Medical Center and its extension clinics are well above the state average. This indicates a continuing need for primary care and ambulatory surgery. The medical office building with its primary care clinic would help to reduce these indicators.

Table 2: PQI Indicators for Orange and Sullivan Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed Rate Per 100,000</td>
<td>% Expected</td>
<td>Observed Rate Per 100,000</td>
<td>% Expected</td>
<td>Observed Rate Per 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Composite</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>245.6%</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>242.9%</td>
<td>3,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Composite</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>274.6%</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>258.1%</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Composite</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>227.5%</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>233.6%</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Circulatory Composite</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>237.8%</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>280.4%</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Diabetes Composite</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>191.1%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>202.1%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respiratory Composite</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>236.5%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>196.6%</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: health.data.ny.gov
**Conclusion**
This proposal is expected to improve the patient experience and access to vital health services in Orange and Sullivan Counties. The applicant believes that the project will increase the ability of the Center to respond to a patients’ needs by shortening supply chains and improving communication. By moving a primary care clinic onto the same campus as the Emergency Department, the triaging process can be improved and ED visits reduced. The high PQIs for the primary service area indicate that need still exists for additional primary care. The proposed medical office building, with an additional procedure room, will start to address this need. No change to services is being proposed. This project will increase the efficiency and accessibility of existing resources in Orange and Sullivan Counties.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Program Description**
Orange Regional Medical Center (ORMC) requests approval to construct a new medical office building (MOB) and a dedicated cancer center on its main campus located at 707 East Main Street in the Town of Wallkill (Orange County). ORMC is not proposing to develop any new clinical services as a result of this project, rather, this project seeks only to relocate existing services from remote locations onto the main campus. Once construction is complete many of the outpatient services currently being provided at the Orange Regional Medical Pavilion (located in Middletown) and services currently being provided the Patient Services Center (located in Goshen) will be relocated to the new medical office building. Additionally, the proposed cancer center, which will combine new construction with renovated space, will give ORMC the opportunity to consolidate all of its existing outpatient cancer services into a single site.

ORMC is one of two hospitals in the Greater Hudson Valley Health System (GHVHS), the other being Catskill Regional Medical Center. GHVHS serves as the active parent to both.

This project will consolidate most of ORMC’s services onto a single campus for added convenience and create technologic and operational efficiencies that will, in turn, result in a more seamless health care environment.

**Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations**
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.
Financial Analysis

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project cost, which is for new construction and the acquisition of moveable equipment, is estimated at $99,872,535, further broken down as follows:

- New Construction: $51,975,224
- Renovation and Demolition: $2,699,028
- Site Development: $8,071,476
- Temporary Utilities: $55,000
- Design Contingency: $6,280,073
- Construction Contingency: $3,274,988
- Architect/Engineering Fees: $3,592,000
- Construction Manager Fees: $1,808,895
- Other Fees (Consultant): $1,558,482
- Moveable Equipment: $12,773,012
- Telecommunications: $1,212,062
- Financing Costs: $960,000
- Interim Interest Expense: $5,188,271
- CON Fee: $2,000
- Additional Processing Fee: $422,024
- Total Project Cost: $99,872,535

Total Reimbursable Cost: $77,155,692

Project costs are based on an April 1, 2015 construction start date and an eighteen month construction period. The Bureau of Architectural and Engineering Review has determined that this project includes Non-Article 28 space costs totaling $22,716,843. As a result, the total approved project cost for reimbursement purposes shall be limited to $77,155,692.

Total project costs are divided into three subprojects as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subproject 1</td>
<td>Medical Office Building</td>
<td>$78,308,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Non-Article 28</td>
<td>Private Physician Practice</td>
<td>($22,716,843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project 1 Total:</td>
<td>Article 28 Allowable</td>
<td>$55,592,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project 2:</td>
<td>Cancer Center - New Construction</td>
<td>$16,659,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project 3:</td>
<td>Cancer Center - Renovation</td>
<td>$4,480,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON Fees:</td>
<td>Application Fees</td>
<td>$424,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reimbursable</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77,155,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant’s financing plan appears as follows:

- Equity: $16,828,342
- Fundraising: $2,000,000
- Outstanding 2008 Bond Proceeds: $5,084,193
- DASNY Bond Loan (5.078% interest, thirty year term): $68,460,000
- Equipment Lease (3.80% interest rate, five year term): $7,500,000
- Total: $99,872,535
Staff has contacted the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY) and verified that the funds from the Outstanding 2008 Bond Proceeds are available for use on this project. DASNY also indicated that they have been in contact with ORMC regarding the proposed bond financing and advised the applicant that they will consider issuing bonds in conjunction with the proposed plan of finance for the entire project as described in this CON. J.P. Morgan has provided a letter of interest in serving as underwriter for the Bond Issue.

Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted an incremental operating budget, in 2014 dollars, during the first and third years, summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$3,491,568</td>
<td>$4,371,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>5,761,145</td>
<td>4,474,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$5,761,145</td>
<td>$4,474,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Revenues over Expenses</td>
<td>($2,269,577)</td>
<td>($102,911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization: (Visits)</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>3,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization assumptions are based on modest increases based on growth in the area. Utilization is projected to increase by 2% from historical. Expense assumptions are based on incremental interest and depreciation expense and the reduction in lease rental payments as it vacates the old locations and/or sunsets existing leases on the old locations. The applicant has indicated that certain expenses are constant despite expected modest volume increases because they feel the volume increases can be absorbed with the current staffing levels and associated operating expenses. The applicant anticipates becoming more efficient in the new building space based on LEAN studies forcing the planning process and improved patient flow and co-location of related services and operational functions, thereby allowing it to treat more patients with the same number of staff.

Incremental utilization broken down by payor source during the first and third years (3,109 and 3,235 visits respectively) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
<td>37.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>.35%</td>
<td>.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee For Service</td>
<td>46.35%</td>
<td>46.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capability and Feasibility
Total project cost of $99,872,535 will be met as follows: Equity via operations of $16,828,342; Fundraising of $2,000,000; outstanding 2008 bond proceeds from construction of ORMC’s new replacement hospital of $5,084,193; Equipment Lease of $7,500,000 at an interest rate of 3.80% for a five year term; and DASNY bond financing of $68,460,000 at an interest rate of 5.078% for a thirty year term. If there are fundraising shortfalls, the hospital has indicated that they will provide equity to offset the shortfalls. BFA Attachment B is the 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of Orange Regional Medical Center, which indicates the availability of sufficient funds for the equity contribution and the fundraising portion if fundraising proceeds are not met.
The submitted incremental budget indicates an operating loss of $2,269,577 and $102,911 during the first and third years, respectively. The first and third year losses will be offset via operations. The budget for the whole facility for the third year after project completion is projecting excess revenues over expenses of $1,862,648. Revenues are based on current reimbursement rates.

As shown on BFA Attachment B the hospital had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2012 through 2013. Also, the hospital incurred average operations losses of $7,882,000 from 2012 through 2013. The applicant has indicated that the reasons for the losses are the result of the following:

- In August 2011, ORMC closed its two existing community hospitals and consolidated its operations into its new hospital, which led to increased expenses due to debt service on the new building.
- Rising unemployment rates in the area led to a loss of medical coverage for patients and subsequently, a delay in seeking medical care, which reduced patient volume and revenue.
- Medicare imposed Sequestration implemented in 2013 reduced Medicare rates by 2% which negatively impacted revenue.
- Inpatient discharges decreased as a result of patients who had historically been considered inpatients being re-classified as outpatient observation. Reimbursement for observation status patients is significantly less than for inpatient status, up to 60% less in some cases, contributing to operating losses.

The applicant implemented the following steps to improve operations: implemented a reduction in work force to bring down the FTEs to address the operating losses, worked to improve inpatient and outpatient volumes which increased by 7.5% and 2% respectively in the first half of 2014, and improved ORMC’s debt service coverage ratio which improved to 1.95 from 1.36 the prior year.

BFA Attachment A is the June 30, 2014 internal financial statement of Orange Regional Medical Center. As shown, the hospital had a positive working capital position and a positive net asset position through June 30, 2014. Also, the hospital achieved an operating income of $1,965,559 through June 30, 2014.

**Recommendation**

*From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.*

### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Financial Summary- Orange Regional Medical Center’s June 30, 2014 internal financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary- 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of Orange Regional Medical Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Health and Health Planning Council

Project # 142134-C
Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center

Program: Diagnostic & Treatment Center  County: Montgomery
Purpose: Construction  Acknowledged: October 6, 2014

Executive Summary

Description
Amsterdam REC, LLC d/b/a Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, an existing single-specialty ambulatory surgery center (ASC) located at 108 Holland Circle Drive in Amsterdam, Montgomery County, is requesting approval to become a multi-specialty ASC by adding interventional pain management services. Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center was established under CON 112179 and licensed as of June 11, 2013 for a five-year limited life.

As a contingency of approval, the center will submit a request for a new d/b/a such that the assumed name conveys the multi-specialty nature of the services.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval, maintaining the current expiration date of the operating certificate of June 11, 2018.

Need Summary
Amsterdam REC, LLC d/b/a Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, a single-specialty ophthalmology ASC proposes certification as a multi-specialty ASC by adding interventional pain management services in Amsterdam, Montgomery County. Amsterdam REC, LLC has determined the Center is not fully utilized, and it has the capacity to handle additional cases. The number of projected visits in pain management services is 1,000 in year 1, with 28 percent Medicaid and two (2) percent charity care. These projections are based on the current practices of participating physicians.

Program Summary
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.

Financial Summary
Project costs are $42,220 and will be met with accumulated funds from Dr. Kwiat, sole member.

Budget: Revenues: $712,874
Expenses: 196,150
Gain: $ 516,724

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval, maintaining the current expiration date of the operating certificate of June 11, 2018, contingent upon:

1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. A copy of the check must be uploaded into the Contingencies Tab within NYSECON upon mailing of the check. [PMU]

2. Submission of a signed agreement with an outside independent entity satisfactory to the Department to provide annual reports to the DOH beginning in the second year of operation. Said reports should include:
   a. Data showing actual utilization including procedures;
   b. Data showing breakdown of visits by payor source;
   c. Data showing number of patients who need follow-up care in a hospital within seven days after ambulatory surgery;
   d. Data showing number of emergency transfers to a hospital;
   e. Data showing percentage of charity care provided, and
   f. Number of nosocomial infections recorded during the year in question. [RNR]

3. Submission of a statement, acceptable to the Department, that the applicant will consider creating or entering into an integrated system of care that will reduce the fragmentation of the delivery system, provide coordinated care for patients, and reduce inappropriate utilization of services. The applicant will agree to submit a report to the Department beginning in the second year of operation and each year thereafter detailing these efforts and the results. [RNR]

4. Submission by the governing body of the ambulatory surgery center of an Organizational Mission Statement which identifies, at a minimum, the populations and communities to be served by the center, including underserved populations (such as racial and ethnic minorities, women and handicapped persons) and the center’s commitment to meet the health care needs of the community, including the provision of services to those in need regardless of ability to pay. The statement shall also include commitment to the development of policies and procedures to assure that charity care is available to those who cannot afford to pay. [RNR]

5. Submission of an acceptable dba recognizing that the facility provides more than just eye surgery services. [HSP]

Approval conditional upon:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
## Background
Amsterdam REC, LLC d/b/a Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center (MVESC) requests approval to certify the single-specialty ophthalmology ambulatory surgery center (ASC) as a multi-specialty ASC, by adding interventional pain management services. It is located at 108 Holland Circle Drive, Amsterdam, 12010, Montgomery County. It opened with one operating room on June 11, 2013 with a five year limited life under CON 112179. The proposed pain management services are currently being performed in an office setting. With the approval of this project, these services will be provided in a regulated Article 28 facility. The operating certificate expiration date will remain as June 11, 2018.

## Analysis
The service area includes Montgomery, Fulton, Herkimer, and Otsego Counties.

Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center is the only ambulatory surgery center in Montgomery County. Moreover, Fulton, Herkimer, and Otsego Counties have no freestanding ASCs.

Based on CON 112179, MVESC had the following projections for Year 1 and Year 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CON 112179: Projections</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Procedures</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CON 112179: Projections</th>
<th>% Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payor Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare FFS</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid FFS</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid MC</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial MC</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on utilization data submitted by the applicant, MVESC had 1,254 procedures from January to September 2014; Medicaid was 20.8 percent and charity was 2.8 percent.

Upon approval of this multi-specialty ASC, the number of projected visits in pain management services is 1,000 in year 1 and 1,060 visits in year 3 with 28 percent Medicaid and two (2) percent charity care. Projected utilization for Year 1 and Year 3 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CON 142134: Projections</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits by Payor Source</td>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare (FFS+MC)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (FFS+MC)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (FFS+MC)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other (Workers’ Comp.)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MVESC is located in a Health Professional Shortage Area for Primary Care Services-Medicaid Eligible-Montgomery County. (Source: HRSA).

The applicant is committed to serving patients needing care regardless of their ability to pay or the source of payment.
**Conclusion**
The proposed pain management services are currently being performed in an office setting. With the approval of this project, these services will be provided in a regulated Article 28 facility.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Project Proposal**
Amsterdam REC, LLC, d/b/a Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, an existing single-specialty ophthalmology ambulatory surgery center located at 108 Holland Circle Drive, in Amsterdam (Montgomery County), requests approval to add pain management services and become a multi-specialty ambulatory surgery center. The conversion to multi-specialty will not involve any renovation or alteration of the facility. It is anticipated that staffing will increase by 1.5 FTEs in the first year after completion and remain at that level through the third year.

**Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations**
The medical staff will continue to ensure that procedures performed at the facility conform to generally accepted standards of practice and that privileges granted are within the physician's scope of practice and/or expertise. The facility's admissions policy will include anti-discrimination regarding age, race, creed, color, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, religion, disability, or source of payment. All procedures will be performed in accordance with all applicable federal and state codes, rules and regulations, including standards for credentialing, anesthesiology services, nursing, patient admission and discharge, a medical records system, emergency care, quality assurance and data requirements.

This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility's enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.
Financial Analysis

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total cost for movable equipment is projected to be $42,220, broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movable Equipment</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON Application Fee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON Processing Fee</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted an operating budget for the first and third years, in 2014 dollars, which is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$672,420</td>
<td>$712,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$177,500</td>
<td>$188,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$185,500</td>
<td>$196,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income(Loss)</td>
<td>$503,537</td>
<td>$516,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Visit</td>
<td>$185.50</td>
<td>$185.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visits by payor source for the first year is as follows:
- Medicare Fee-For-Service: 35.0%
- Medicaid Managed Care: 28.0%
- Commercial Fee-For-Service: 20.0%
- Other: 15.0%
- Charity Care: 2.0%
- **Total: 100.0%**

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the historical private practice of Dr. Paul Soccio, the physician who will join the medical staff of the Center after final approval by the Public Health and Health Planning Council.

Capability and Feasibility
Project costs are $42,220 and will be met with accumulated funds from Dr. Kwiat, sole member of the ASC. Dr. Kwiat has submitted a personal bank statement showing he has sufficient funds for the total project cost.

The submitted budget projects a net profit of $503,537 and $516,724 during the first and third years, respectively. Medicare and Medicaid reflect prevailing reimbursement methodologies. All other revenues assume current reimbursement methodologies. The budget appears reasonable.

BFA Attachments A and B, financial summaries of Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, show negative working capital, net equity as of December 31, 2013 and October 27, 2014 and a net loss from operations of $113,482 as December 31, 2013. As of October 27, 2014, Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center is showing a net profit of $260,983. The negative working capital, net equity and the net loss in 2013 and negative working capital and net equity as of October 27, 2014 were due to startup costs. Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center opened in September of 2013 and 2014 is the first full year of operations.
It appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**  
*From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.*

---

**Supplemental Information**

Below are presented summaries of responses by hospitals to letters from the Department asking for information on the impact of the ambulatory surgery center’s proposed expansion of services in their service areas. There follows a summary of the applicant’s response to DOH’s request for information on the proposed facility’s expanded volume of surgical cases, the sources of those cases, and on how additional staff will be recruited and retained by the ambulatory surgery center (ASC).

**Facility:**  
St. Mary’s Hospital at Amsterdam  -- **No Response**  
427 Guy Park Avenue  
Amsterdam, New York  12010

**Facility:**  
Nathan Littauer Hospital  -- **No Response**  
99 East State Street  
Gloversville, New York  12078

**Supplemental Information from Applicant**  

**Need and Sources of Cases:**  The applicant states that all of the facility’s pain management cases will be drawn from the office-based cases of Dr. Soccio, the pain management physician who will join the facility.

**Staff Recruitment and Retention:**  The facility expects to add one 0.5 FTE registered nurse and 1.0 FTE licensed practical nurse to handle its interventional pain management cases. These positions will be filled by Dr. Soccio’s current employees. Additional staffing requirements, if any, will be met through recruitment from accredited schools and training programs and through advertisements in local newspapers and professional publications. To retain staff, the facility currently offers competitive salaries and benefits and maintains good human resource and communications systems. In addition, the facility provides a positive work environment and flexible working hours.

**Office-Based Cases:**  Fully 100 percent of the projected pain management procedure volume to be added to the ASC’s caseload is currently performed in an office setting.

**DOH Comment**  
In the absence of comments from hospitals in the ASC’s service area, the Department finds no basis on which to consider reversal or modification of the recommendation for approval based on public need, financial feasibility and operator character and

---

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Financial Summary of Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, 2013 draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary of Mohawk Valley Eye Surgery Center, as of October 27, 2014 draft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
Huntington Hospital (HH), a 408-bed not-for-profit acute care facility located at 270 Park Avenue, Huntington in Suffolk County, requests approval to construct a replacement Emergency Department.

HH is a member of the North Shore-Long Island Jewish Health System, Inc. (NS-LIJ), a comprehensive integrated delivery system. Also, the Hospital is a member of the NS-LIJ Obligated Group, formed to provide its members an enhanced credit position and expanded access to capital markets.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
Huntington Hospital (HH) proposes to construct a replacement emergency department (ED) to address its currently undersized ED (29 bays) by installing an additional 18 ED treatment bays, for a total of 47. During the construction of the replacement ED, the current ED will remain open and functioning without disruption of care. Huntington anticipates 56,747 visits by the 3rd year of operation. The addition of these stations will help reduce patient wait time and allow for future growth.

Program Summary
Based on the information reviewed, staff found nothing that would reflect adversely upon the applicant’s character and competence or standing in the community.

Financial Summary
Project costs of $45,150,953 will be met with $4,515,095 in accumulated funds and Tax Exempt DASNY Bonds of $40,635,858 @ 6.5% over 30 years.

Incremental Budget:
- Revenues: $16,357,600
- Expenses: $17,722,600
- Gain(Loss): $(1,365,000)

A letter from the CFO of the NSLIJ Health System has been submitted stating that NSLIJ is able and willing to absorb the operational incremental budgeted losses. Subject to the noted condition, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. The submission of State Hospital Code (SHC) Drawings for review and approval, as described in BAER Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-02. [AER]
3. Submission of written acknowledgment that the design contingency and the construction contingency will not be spent without written approval from the Construction Cost Control Unit. [CCC]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. This project is approved to be initially funded with North Shore-Long Island Jewish Hospital (NS-LIJ) obligated group equity with the prospect that the project will be 90% financed as part of a future NS-LIJ obligated group tax exempt bond financing through the Dormitory Authority. The bond issue is expected to include a 6.5% interest rate and a 30 year term. Financing is conditioned upon the Department having the opportunity to review the final financing proposal in advance to ensure that it meets approval standards. [BFA]
3. The applicant shall start construction on or before March 1, 2015 and complete construction by January 31, 2016 upon the filing of Final Construction Documents in accordance with 10 NYCRR section 710.7. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5), if construction is not started on or before the start date, this shall constitute abandonment of the approval. In accordance with Part 710.10(a), this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
**Need Analysis**

**Project Description**
Huntington Hospital (HH), a 408-bed community hospital located at 270 Park Avenue in Huntington (Suffolk County), is seeking approval for the construction, expansion, and replacement of their emergency department (ED). The purpose of this project is to improve operational efficiency and patient flow. Huntington Hospital is a member of North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. Additionally, North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. is the co-operator of HH.

Huntington Hospital is a Level II area trauma center. Its existing Emergency Department is over 30 years old and has become spatially, functionally, technologically and operationally obsolete. Current patient volume is roughly 50,000 visits/year and growing.

**Background/Analysis**
Huntington Hospital has the following inpatient certified beds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Type</th>
<th>Certified Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical-Surgical</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hospital has the following New York State designation(s):
- Stroke Center
- Level 2 Perinatal Center
- Area Trauma Center

The primary service area for the emergency department is Northwest Suffolk County. The hospital serves approximately 301,000 residents. PQI rates for this area are 6.1% higher than the expected rate.

The new ED will create a new fast track to decrease wait times and reduce overcrowding. The existing ED will remain open until construction is finished and state approval is granted. Upon opening the replacement ED, the existing ED will close.

The existing ED is 31 years old, severely undersized, and no longer able to efficiently handle the increasing annual patient volume. Huntington Hospital (HH) proposes to construct a replacement emergency department (ED) to address the currently undersized ED (29 bays) by installing an additional 18 ED treatment bays for a total of 47. During the construction of the replacement ED, the current ED will remain open and functioning without disruption of care. Huntington anticipates 56,747 visits by the 3rd year of operation. The addition of these stations will help reduce patient wait time and allow for future growth.
Current ED Data Utilization (Total ED Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51,211</td>
<td>49,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current ED volume shows that the hospital is treating approximately 50,000 ED patients yearly in an outdated and undersized ED space. The renovation and expansion will greatly enhance throughput and quality of patient care.

Projected Total Visits (Total ED Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54,543</td>
<td>56,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected visits are anticipated to be 54,543 in the first year and increase to 56,747 by the 3rd year. The anticipated visits to the new space will equate to approximately 1,207 visits per ED bay.

**Conclusion**
The replacement and expansion of the ED will reduce wait time, improve quality of ED care, and allow for growth of ED service.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Project Proposal**
Huntington Hospital (HH) is requesting approval for the construction of a replacement emergency department (ED) at 270 Park Avenue in Huntington (Suffolk County). The purpose of this project is to improve operational efficiency and patient flow by replacing the ED. Huntington Hospital is a member of North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. Additionally, North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. is the co-operator of HH.

Huntington Hospital, a 408-bed community hospital, is a level II area trauma center. Its existing Emergency Department is over 30 years old and has become spatially, functionally, technologically and operationally obsolete. Current patient volume is roughly 50,000 visits/year and growing. Combined with an inflexible, land-locked location in the hospital, there are no good options for expansion in its current location. A replacement ED, created from decanted non-clinical areas, will provide an appropriate number of treatment spaces and accompanying support space.

The replacement ED is designed to achieve faster throughput by implementing a dual-track ED, where patients are quickly assessed by a registered nurse at the reception desk, processed through an intake/triage area by dedicated staff, then directed to one of two treatment areas based on their acuity. Further efficiencies will be achieved by integrating value-added waiting into the patient experience.

Additionally, the replacement ED will include its own imaging service, with a dedicated CT Scan room, and radiography facilities (currently patients have to leave the ED to have a CT or MRI performed), as well as a new, larger, state-of-the-art trauma and resuscitation rooms.
Upon completion of this project, the total emergency department capacity will increase from 29 patient positions to 47 positions. The existing ED will remain open until construction is finished and state approval to occupy is granted. Upon opening the replacement ED, the existing ED will be decanted.

It is anticipated that the project will result in an additional 78.3 FTEs in the first year of operation and remain at that level through the third year.

**Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations**
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.

### Financial Analysis

#### Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project cost for new construction, renovations and movable equipment, is estimated at $45,150,953, broken down as follows:

- **New Construction**: $12,019,605
- **Renovation & Demolition**: $13,990,889
- **Asbestos Abatement or Removal**: $150,000
- **Design Contingency**: $2,601,049
- **Construction Contingency**: $2,601,049
- **Planning Consultant Fees**: $456,681
- **Architect/Engineering Fees**: $2,080,840
- **Construction manager Fees**: $200,000
- **Consultant Fees**: $825,600
- **Movable Equipment**: $5,120,000
- **Telecommunications**: $2,700,000
- **Financing Costs**: $2,156,279
- **Application Fees**: $2,000
- **Additional Processing Fees**: $246,961
- **Total Project Cost**: $45,150,953

The applicant’s financing plan is as follows:

- **Cash**: $4,515,095
- **Tax Exempt Bonds, Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, 6.5%, 30 years**: $40,635,858
- **Total**: $45,150,953
Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted incremental operating budgets, in 2014 dollars, for the first and third years, which are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$8,614,300</td>
<td>$13,377,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>$4,520,640</td>
<td>$5,731,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Revenue(Loss)</td>
<td>$4,093,660</td>
<td>$7,646,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$2,080,400</td>
<td>$2,980,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$6,384,400</td>
<td>$6,640,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,366,000</td>
<td>2,754,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>2,596,400</td>
<td>2,596,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$11,346,800</td>
<td>$11,991,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Revenue(Loss)</td>
<td>$(9,266,400)</td>
<td>$(9,011,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess Revenue(Loss)</td>
<td>$(5,172,740)</td>
<td>$(1,365,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Discharges</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>3,893</td>
<td>4,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization by payor source, for the first and third years, is projected as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years One and Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years One and Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses and utilization assumptions are based on the historical operations of HH, as well as market trends.

Capability and Feasibility
HH will finance $40,635,858 through the Dormitory Authority at stated terms with the remaining $4,515,095 as equity from the hospital. A letter of interest from Citigroup has been submitted by HH. BFA Attachment B and C are the financial summaries of HH, which is part of the NSLIJ Health System, Inc., and indicate the availability of sufficient resources for this project.

The submitted incremental budget projects net losses for the first and third years of $5,172,740 and $1,365,000, respectively. A letter from the CFO of the NSLIJ Health System has been submitted stating that NSLIJ is able and willing to absorb the operational incremental budgeted losses. Revenues are based on prevailing payment methodologies and current payment rates. The budget appears reasonable.
As shown on BFA Attachment B, as of December 31, 2013, and BFA Attachment C, as of June 30, 2014, HH has maintained positive working capital, positive net asset position and a net operating profit of $2,623,000 and $203,000, respectively.

Based on the preceding, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**  
From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.

### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Organizational Chart of the NS-LIJ Health System, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary for 2013, NS-LIJ Health System, Inc. and Huntington Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>Financial Summary as of June 30, 2014, NS-LIJ Health System, Inc. and Huntington Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
Westchester County Health Care Corporation (WCHCC), a public benefit corporation which operates Westchester Medical Center (WMC), a 652-bed public acute care hospital located at 100 Woods Road in Valhalla, seeks approval for the construction of a new Ambulatory Care Pavilion (ACP) on the main campus of the Medical Center. The project will also include a new addition adjacent to the main building that will be used for future inpatient rooms but will be fitted out as shell space at this time. The construction of the inpatient rooms will be the subject of a separate CON application. The new seven story addition will include Article 28 and non-Article 28 functional space. WMC is a Regional Trauma Center and also operates a separate division in Dutchess County known as Mid-Hudson Regional Hospital, a 243-bed acute care facility.

The healthcare marketplace is requiring that all providers become more integrated, patient-centered and cost-effective. This applicant intends the project to support the ongoing healthcare transformation efforts put forth by both the State and Federal governments, including the Medicaid Redesign Team of New York State and the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. This project will help support the realignment of healthcare services in the region by supporting WMC in its efforts as the lead agency for a Performing Provider System (PPS), the Hudson Valley Coalition for Care Transformation, under the Delivery System Reform Incentive Payment (DSRIP) program of the New York State Department of Health. The DSRIP program promotes community level collaborations and focuses on system reform, with a specific goal of achieving a 25% reduction in avoidable hospital use over a period of five (5) years. Through this project, WMC seeks to invest in its capabilities and facilities in order to be successful in achieving this goal and to adapt to the changing marketplace.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
The addition of this new ambulatory care pavilion will allow Westchester Medical Center (WMC) to focus their outpatient care into one pavilion. The expansion and consolidation of services will create a more efficient environment, streamlining patient care. The result of this will be convenient and timely care. WMC will be able to continue to provide quality care more efficiently.

The new facility will add two net new MRI machines, a new X-ray machine, a new CT-scanner, ultrasound, a procedure room, an operating room, an intervention room, and a new cardiac catheterization lab.

Program Summary
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.

Financial Summary
Total Project Cost is $205,899,357. However, as a result of identified non-Article 28 space and shell space, the Total Reimbursable Cost is limited to $119,198,762.
Project costs of $205,899,357 will be met with $20,651,444 in accumulated funds, $36,012,913 in capital leases, and $149,235,000 in tax exempt and taxable Westchester County Health Corporation Bonds at 6.0% interest over 30 years. Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

Incremental Budget:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td>$27,442,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td>$27,402,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain (Loss):</td>
<td>$39,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. Submission of a commitment for a permanent mortgage for the project to be provided from a recognized lending institution at a prevailing rate of interest, acceptable by the Department. This is to be provided within 120 days of approval of state hospital code drawings and before the start of construction. Included with the submitted permanent mortgage commitment must be a sources and uses statement and a debt amortization schedule, for both new and refinanced debt. [BFA]
3. Submission of an executed equipment lease acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
4. The submission of State Hospital Code (SHC) Drawings for review and approval, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-02 SHC Hospitals (as required) and DSG-03 Outpatient Facilities (as required). The drawings must address the following:
   a. The occupant load of each smoke/fire compartment and the occupant load of each type of exit being claimed, that proves compliance with NFPA 7.2.4.1.2. Presently the plan shows a ratio of 7 horizontal exits to 3 exit stairs. The label system described does not indicate actual occupant loads.
   b. An explanation why the three stairs are not required to be 48 inches wide to meet NFPA 7.5.4.4 and 7.2.12.2.3 accessibility requirements. Areas of refuge must be demonstrated if they are being claimed.
   c. Demonstrate a compliant egress from elevator lobby AB-121 to a compliant exit discharge.
   d. FGI Guidelines 3.7-7.2.2.1: a six foot wide ambulance transfer exit, or path to the attached hospital, from the surgical suites and the PACU units (each floor containing these uses) shall be clearly marked on the drawings. [AER]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within five years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity's clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
6. The applicant shall start construction on or before March 15, 2015 and complete construction by January 15, 2017 upon the filing of Final Construction Documents in accordance with 10 NYCRR section 710.7. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5), if construction is not started on or before the start date, this shall constitute abandonment of the approval. In accordance with Part 710.10(a), this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
Westchester Medical Center (WMC) is an existing 652-bed hospital located at 100 Woods Rd, Valhalla New York 10595. The facility is seeking approval to construct a new Ambulatory Care Pavilion on its main campus and an addition to the main building. The new Ambulatory pavilion will include two net new MRI machines, a new X-ray machine, a new CT-scanner, ultrasound, a procedure room, an operating room, an intervention room, and a new cardiac catheterization lab.

Background
Westchester Medical Center has the following certified beds and services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Category</th>
<th>Certified Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Marrow Transplant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Care</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical / Surgical</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intensive Care</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric ICU</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>652</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Center</td>
<td>Maternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Surgery - Multi Specialty</td>
<td>Medical Services - Primary Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology O/P</td>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn Center</td>
<td>Medical/Surgical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Care</td>
<td>Neonatal Intensive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Scanner</td>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Catheterization - Adult Diagnostic</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine - Diagnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Catheterization - Electrophysiology (EP)</td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine - Therapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Catheterization - Pediatric Diagnostic</td>
<td>Pediatric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Catheterization - Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (PCI)</td>
<td>Pediatric Intensive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Surgery - Adult</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Surgery - Pediatric</td>
<td>Physical Medical Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Mental Health Services O/P</td>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation O/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Dependence - Rehabilitation O/P</td>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Dependence - Withdrawal O/P</td>
<td>Radiology - Diagnostic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic Part Time Services</td>
<td>Radiology-Therapeutic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Service</td>
<td>Renal Dialysis - Acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental O/P</td>
<td>Therapy - Occupational O/P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Department | Therapy - Physical O/P
--- | ---
Family Planning O/P | Therapy - Speech Language Pathology
Intensive Care | Transplant - Bone Marrow
Linear Accelerator | Transplant - Heart - Adult
Lithotripsy | Transplant - Kidney

Transplant - Liver

State designations:
- AIDS Center;
- Regional Perinatal Center;
- Regional Trauma Center;
- Burn Center; and
- Stroke Center

**Analysis**
The new pavilion will house eight operating rooms and the Westchester Medical Center will decertify seven of its 25 operating rooms in its main building, resulting in the addition of one net new OR, for a total of 26 operating rooms. The case mix index at Westchester Medical Center is above two, which is higher than the average for most hospital centers. This indicates the hospital sees more difficult/specialized surgical procedures, leading to a slightly lower rate of surgical procedures per operating room than normally expected. Some examples of surgery include organ transplant, open heart surgery, trauma, bariatric, neurology and orthopedics, oncologic surgery, and specialty pediatric.

As seen in the table below, Westchester Medical Center completed 19,157 total surgeries in 2013. Based on the total surgeries and the total operating rooms, it is expected the hospital will see 737 surgeries per OR. Given the high acuity of patients and the specialty surgeries needed, this is an acceptable utilization level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Surgeries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>19,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new Ambulatory Care Pavilion will also include two new MRI units, a new digital X-Ray, a new CT Scanner, three new Ultrasounds, a new procedure room, a new vascular/interventional radiology room, and a cardiac catheterization lab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Procedures</td>
<td>9,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI Scans</td>
<td>8,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Ray</td>
<td>43,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Scans</td>
<td>25,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrasound Procedures</td>
<td>12,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal includes the addition of one net new Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory. Two labs will be certified in the new pavilion and one will be decertified on the main campus for a total of seven labs. Due to the way the labs are utilized by Westchester Medical Center - one space/lab is an EP lab and another is a Cath/EP lab - the facility considers that it is only running 4.5 labs.
Westchester Medical Center has seen an increase in more advanced procedures such as electrophysiology studies, device implementation, and peripheral procedures, leading to an increase in lab time needed. An additional factor affecting longer lab times is an increase in heart catheterizations and biopsies, leading to the use of one to two rooms every Monday and Wednesday for these procedures alone. Pediatric procedures, which take significantly longer than a standard procedure, also contribute to longer lab times, limiting the number of procedures that each lab can perform. Westchester Medical Center is the only provider of pediatric cardiac services in the Hudson Valley Region. These several factors help justify the addition of the new PCI lab, even though the number of procedures is on an overall decline.

- Section 405.29 (2)(iv): Minimum workload standards. There shall be sufficient utilization of a center to ensure both quality and economy of services, as determined by the Commissioner. For hospitals that are part of an Article 28 network and multi-site facilities with more than one approved PCI Capable Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory Center, and for PCI Capable Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory Centers operating under a co-operator agreement pursuant to section 709.14(d)(1)(ii)(c)(3)(viii), minimum volume standards are site specific and may not be combined for purposes of achieving minimum workload standards. Any hospital seeking to maintain approval shall present evidence that the annual minimum workload standards have been achieved by the second full year following initiation of the service and maintained thereafter. Each PCI Capable Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory Center must maintain a minimum volume of 150 percutaneous coronary intervention cases per year including at least 36 emergency percutaneous coronary intervention cases per year.

### HUDDSON VALLEY HSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>PFI</th>
<th>Cath Labs</th>
<th>Diag Cath W/O PCI</th>
<th>Diag Caths W/PCI</th>
<th>PCI Volume</th>
<th>Cardiac Surgery Vol.</th>
<th>Total Diag Caths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Samaritan Hosp.-Suffern</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Regional M.C.</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Hosp.-Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lukes Cornwall-Newburgh</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kingston Hospital</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassar Brothers M.C.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester M.C.</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Plains Hosp. Center</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>951</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**
This new pavilion will permit consolidation of equipment and services and will help streamline patient care. The dedicated outpatient care unit will help address the future direction of health care, where care is focused more on patient-centered treatment in an outpatient setting.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.
Project Proposal
Westchester Medical Center (WMC), an existing 895-bed hospital with two campuses, seeks approval for the construction of a new Ambulatory Care Pavilion (ACP) on the main (652 bed) campus of the Medical Center located at 100 Woods Road in Valhalla (Westchester County). The new, seven story building addition is to be constructed adjacent to the main building of the Medical Center and will include shell space to be used for future inpatient rooms (the fit-out of that shelled space will be the subject of a separate CON).

The Medical Center is experiencing growing volumes and currently lacks an appropriate dedicated outpatient venue on its campus. The proposed Ambulatory Care Pavilion will provide for a dedicated outpatient setting and will enable state-of-the-art ambulatory care services to be provided in a new, patient-friendly and operationally efficient building. It is the hope of WMC that the integrated outpatient services provided at the proposed Ambulatory Care Pavilion will lead to improved health outcomes, particularly those related to cardiac services and cancer.

It is anticipated that staffing will increase by 29.0 FTEs by the first year and by 50.0 FTE by the end of the third year in operation.

Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

Recommendation
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.
Financial Analysis

**Total Project Cost**
Total project cost for new construction and equipment is estimated at $205,899,357, broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$117,757,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>4,865,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency</td>
<td>11,678,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>5,839,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Equipment</td>
<td>2,168,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>7,496,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager Fees</td>
<td>309,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees (Consultant)</td>
<td>3,822,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable Equipment</td>
<td>31,730,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>4,282,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>2,238,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Interest Expense</td>
<td>13,056,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con Application Fee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional CON Processing Fee</td>
<td>651,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$205,899,357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Reimbursable Cost**

Total costs are based on a twenty two month construction period with a start date of May 1, 2015, and a completion date of March 1, 2017. Total project costs are divided into three sub projects as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project One</td>
<td>Ambulatory Care Pavilion</td>
<td>$119,198,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project Two</td>
<td>Shell-Inpatient Bed Tower</td>
<td>$11,857,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project Three</td>
<td>Physician Private Offices</td>
<td>$74,842,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$205,899,357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau of Architectural and Engineering Review has determined that this project includes non-Article 28 space costs for physician medical offices of $74,842,835, and shell space for an inpatient bed tower of $11,857,760 which will be submitted under a future CON. The to-be-built inpatient bed tower in the near future will be utilized to accommodate single patient rooms and will not result in a net increase of new beds. As a result, the total approved project cost for reimbursement purposes shall be limited to $119,198,762.

The applicant’s financing plan is as follows:

- **Accumulated Funds-WCHCC**: $20,651,444
- **Capital Leases**:
  - Movable Equipment: 31,730,064
  - Telecommunications: 4,282,849
- **Mortgage (30 years at 6% tax exempt and taxable bonds)**: 149,235,000
- **Total**: $205,899,357

WMC will utilize only tax-exempt bonds for Article 28 space. The taxable bonds will be used only for non-Article 28 space. WMC’s current bond rating is an A3 rating with Moody’s and a BBB rating with Standard & Poor’s.
Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted an incremental operating budget, in 2015 dollars, for the first and third years, summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$9,936,985</td>
<td>$10,749,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>3,770,541</td>
<td>6,296,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>7,445,922</td>
<td>6,739,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>7,544,429</td>
<td>9,305,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$18,760,892</td>
<td>$22,341,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Excess Revenue</td>
<td>$(8,823,907)</td>
<td>$(11,592,705)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$13,312,821</td>
<td>$16,693,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$857,431</td>
<td>$1,431,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,693,223</td>
<td>1,532,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>3,857,335</td>
<td>2,096,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$6,407,999</td>
<td>$5,060,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Excess Revenue</td>
<td>$6,904,832</td>
<td>$11,632,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Excess Revenue</td>
<td>$(1,919,075)</td>
<td>$39,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Discharges</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inpatient utilization by payor source for the first and third years is as follows:

- Medicaid Fee-For-Service: 6.5%
- Medicaid Managed Care: 23.3%
- Medicare Fee-For Service: 19.8%
- Medicare Managed Care: 3.7%
- Commercial Fee for Service: 11.3%
- Commercial Manage Care: 32.1%
- Private: 1.3%
- Charity Care: 2.0%

Outpatient utilization by payor source for the first and third years is as follows:

- Medicaid Fee-For-Service: 6.4%
- Medicaid Managed Care: 23.3%
- Medicare Fee-For Service: 19.8%
- Medicare Managed Care: 3.7%
- Commercial Fee for Service: 11.3%
- Commercial Manage Care: 32.1%
- Private: 1.4%
- Charity Care: 2.0%
Expenses and utilization are based upon WMC’s current experience in providing ambulatory care services, as well as the growth in diagnostic imaging, non-invasive cardiology, surgical, interventional radiology and cardiac catheterization programs at WMC. WMC serves a large number of individuals applying for emergency Medicaid coverage who are covered under Medicaid Fee-For-Service, and not Medicaid Managed Care, which leads to higher than expected utilization for Medicaid Fee-For-Service.

**Capability and Feasibility**

Total project costs will be met with WMC accumulated funds of $20,651,444, capital equipment leases of $36,012,913 and $149,235,000 from tax exempt and taxable bonds issued through WCHCC. A letter of interest has been submitted by WMC for both the capital equipment leasing from Insight Financial Services and the mortgage from Wells Fargo Securities. BFA Attachments A and B are Westchester County Health Care Corporation’s 2013 and WMC’s current 2014 certified financial summaries, respectively, which indicates sufficient resources to fund this project.

The submitted incremental budget indicates a loss of revenues over expenses of $1,919,075 and a net gain of $39,723 during the first and third years, respectively. WMC will absorb the first year incremental losses through operations. Revenues reflect current outpatient reimbursement methodologies for ambulatory care services. The budget appears reasonable.

As shown on BFA Attachments A and B, the WCHCC and the hospital maintained positive working capital and experienced negative net asset positions, and incurred an excess of revenues over expenses of $26,134,421 and $718,000 for 2013 and September 30, 2014, respectively. WMC has historically experienced negative net assets in the past and has decreased negative net assets by approximately $138,104,000 as of September 30, 2014 from $200,000,000 in 2005 with positive results.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

**Recommendation**

*From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.*

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFA Attachment A</th>
<th>Financial Summary of Westchester County Health Care Corporation, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary of Westchester Medical Center, 2013 - September 30, 2014 unaudited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

Description
Southside Hospital (SH), a 341-bed not-for-profit acute care facility located at 301 East Main St., Bay Shore in Suffolk County, requests approval to renovate and expand their Emergency Department.

SH is a member of the North Shore-Long Island Jewish Health System, Inc. (NSLIJ). Also, the Hospital is a member of the NSLIJ Obligated Group, formed to provide its members an enhanced credit position and expanded access to capital markets.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
Southside Hospital (SSH) propose to construct a replacement emergency department (ED) to address the currently undersized ED by adding an additional 14 ED treatment bays, for a total of 49, and expanding the square footage. Southside anticipates 82,783 visits by the 3rd year of operation, which equates to 1,689 visits per ED bay. The additional stations and space will help reduce patient wait time and improve throughput.

Program Summary
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.

Financial Summary
Project costs of $38,088,576 are initially provided to be met with $3,808,858 in accumulated funds and Tax Exempt DASNY Bonds of $34,279,718 @6.5% over 30 years. The applicant intends to apply for grant funding under the DSRIP Capital Restructuring Financing Program (CRFP). In the event that CRFP funding is granted as a source of capital to finance any portion of this project, then the amount of CRFP funding will be used as an alternative source for that portion of the project budget. In the event that CRFP funds are not available, then the original project financing sources will remain in place.

Incremental Budget:
Revenues: $6,573,000
Expenses: $10,094,300
Gain(Loss): ($3,521,300)

NSLIJ Health System has provided documentation stating that NSLIJ is able and willing to absorb the operational incremental budgeted losses as management focuses on various initiatives to improve efficiencies and revenues at SH.

Subject to the noted condition, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Health Systems Management

Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. The submission of State Hospital Code (SHC) Drawings for review and approval, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-02. [AER]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. This project is approved to be initially funded with North Shore-Long Island Jewish Hospital (NS-LIJ) obligated group equity, with the prospect that the project will be 90% financed as part of a future NS-LIJ obligated group tax exempt bond financing through the Dormitory Authority. The bond issue is expected to include a 6.5% interest rate and a 30 year term. The applicant intends to apply for DSRIP Capital Restructuring Financing Program (CRFP) grant funding for this project. In the event that CRFP funding is granted as a source of capital to finance any portion of this project, then the amount of CRFP funding will be used as an alternative source for that portion of the project budget. In the event that CRFP funds are not available, then the original project financing sources will remain in place. Financing is conditioned upon the Department having the opportunity to review the final financing proposal in advance to ensure that it meets approval standards. [BFA]
3. The submission of 100% Final Construction Documents for record, as described in BAER Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-05, prior to the applicant’s request for, and Department’s granting approval for the start of construction. [AER]
4. The applicant shall start construction on or before March 1, 2015 and complete construction by March 30, 2016 upon the filing of Final Construction Documents in accordance with 10 NYCRR section 710.7. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5), if construction is not started on or before the start date, this shall constitute abandonment of the approval. In accordance with Part 710.10(a), this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. The approved project does not qualify for, and the facility will not request Medicaid rated rebasing. [AER]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Background
Southside Hospital (SSH), a 341 bed voluntary not for profit hospital located at 301 East Main Street, Bay Shore, Suffolk County, is requesting approval for the renovation of its existing Emergency Department (ED) and its expansion from 35 to 49 bays. Southside Hospital is a member of North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. Additionally, North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. is the co-operator of SSH.

Southside Hospital’s existing ED was built in the late 1970s and has become spatially, functionally, technologically and operationally obsolete. The undersized space has resulted in operational inefficiency, inadequate storage and support space, long wait times and patient dissatisfaction. To meet current and projected patient volume, the ED is in need of comprehensive renovation and expansion.

Analysis
Southside Hospital has the following inpatient certified beds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Type</th>
<th>Certified Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coma Recovery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical-Surgical</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Continuing Care</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hospital has the following New York State designation(s):

- Stroke Center
- Level 2 Perinatal Center
- Area Trauma Center
- The primary service area for the emergency department is a large portion of Suffolk County extending beyond the Southside, serving approximately 601,272 residents.
- In addition, the ED will be expanding from 35 ED bays to a total of 49 and adding its own CT and Radiology room.
- The existing ED is over 30 years old, severely undersized, and finding it increasingly difficult to efficiently handle the expanding patient volume.
- The majority of patients in the service area receive emergency department services at a hospital. Southside is currently an area trauma center and will be a certified regional trauma center. Currently, Southside services approximately 70,000 emergency department visits with a space built for far fewer. The proposed expansion will help reduce extended wait times and improve quality of care.
Current ED Data Utilization (Total ED Visits)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69,300</td>
<td>67,849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current ED volume shows SSH has been treating approximately 70,000 ED patients yearly in an outdated and undersized ED space. The renovation and expansion will greatly enhance throughput and patient care quality. Southside Hospital (SSH) propose to construct a replacement emergency department (ED) to address the currently undersized ED by adding an additional 14 ED treatment bays, for a total of 49, and expanding the square footage. Southside anticipates 82,783 visits by the 3rd year of operation, which equates to 1,689 visits per ED bay. The additional stations and space will help reduce patient wait time and throughput.

Projected Total Visits (Total ED Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69,446</td>
<td>81,093</td>
<td>82,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The expansion of this high volume ED will allow residents to continued access to ED services but in an enhanced, more efficient environment.

**Recommendation**

From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Program Description**

Southside Hospital (SSH) is requesting approval for the renovation and expansion of their existing Emergency Department (ED) at 301 East Main Street, in Bay Shore (Suffolk County). Southside Hospital is a member of North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. Additionally, North Shore LIJ Health Care Inc. is the co-operator of SSH.

Southside Hospital's existing ED was built in the late 1970s and has become spatially, functionally, technologically and operationally obsolete. The undersized space has resulted in operational inefficiency, inadequate storage and support space, long wait times and patient dissatisfaction. To meet current and projected patient volume, the ED is in need of comprehensive renovation and expansion.

This will be achieved through renovation of the First Floor of the Brackett Building (an existing building adjacent to the existing ED to the west), construction of a one-story infill addition to the hospital which will connect the Brackett Building to the existing ED, and through renovation of the existing ED.

The upgrade and renovation will include the implementation of a dual-track ED where patient volume is split between acute treatment space and the Super Track ED to achieve faster throughput. Additionally, the new ED will also include its own CT and radiography rooms and sub-waiting areas to support improved patient flow throughout the department. New staff, patient and clinical support spaces throughout the ED will be created to appropriately support the expanded clinical footprint.

Upon completion of this project, the total ED capacity will increase from 35 to 49 patient treatment positions. SSH expects that the existing ED will remain open until construction is completed in the first phase of the expansion project. Once the expansion space is occupied, the existing Emergency Department will be renovated in phases, culminating in the completion of the fully modernized and expanded Emergency Department.
It is anticipated the project will result in an additional 37.5 FTEs in the first year of operation and remain at that level through the third year.

**Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations**
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.

### Financial Analysis

#### Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project cost for new construction, renovations and movable equipment, is estimated at $38,088,576, broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$ 8,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation &amp; Demolition</td>
<td>13,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>2,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Consultant Fees</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>1,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction manager Fees</td>
<td>1,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees</td>
<td>645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable Equipment</td>
<td>4,642,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>3,467,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>1,819,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fees</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Processing Fees</td>
<td>208,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,088,576</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant’s financing plan appears as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 3,808,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Exempt Bonds, Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, 6.5%, 30 years</td>
<td>$34,279,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,088,576</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The applicant intends to apply for CRFP grant funding for this project. In the event that DSRIP CRFP funding is granted as a source of capital to finance any portion of this project, then that amount of funding will be used as an alternative source of funds for that portion of the project budget.
## Operating Budget

The applicant has submitted incremental operating budgets, in 2014 dollars, for the first and third years, which are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$4,142,500</td>
<td>$1,074,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$783,800</td>
<td>$202,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Revenue</td>
<td>$3,358,700</td>
<td>$871,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$4,801,700</td>
<td>$5,498,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td>$5,091,400</td>
<td>$5,221,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$2,385,000</td>
<td>$2,323,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$2,346,100</td>
<td>$2,346,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$9,822,500</td>
<td>$9,891,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Revenue</td>
<td>($5,020,800)</td>
<td>($4,393,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess</td>
<td>($1,662,100)</td>
<td>($3,521,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization(Discharges)</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>11,647</td>
<td>13,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization by payor source, for the first and third years, is projected as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years One and Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the historical operations of SH, as well as market trends.

## Capability and Feasibility

The applicant intends to apply for DSRIP CRFP grant funding. Should any grant monies be awarded as a source of capital funding for this project, then the original funding will be reduced in direct proportion. In the event that CRFP funds are not available, then the original project financing sources will remain in place as follows.

SH will finance $34,279,718 through the Dormitory Authority at stated terms with the remaining $3,808,858 as equity from the hospital. A letter of interest from Citigroup has been submitted by SH. BFA Attachment B is the financial summary of SH, which is part of the NSLIJ Health System, Inc., documenting resources to provide the equity necessary for this project. BFA Attachments B and C, NSLIJ Health System, Inc. cash and cash equivalents indicates the availability of sufficient resources for this project.
The submitted incremental budget projects net losses for the first and third years of $1,662,100 and $3,521,300, respectively. A letter from the CFO of the NSLIJ Health System has been submitted stating that NSLIJ is able and willing to absorb the operational incremental budgeted losses. NSLIJ has stated that they recognize the third year losses are expected to increase due to continued declines in inpatient admissions and expects current trends to continue during the budgeted years with outpatient treat and release and observation volume increasing and inpatient admissions decreasing. Management continues to focus on various initiatives such as revenue cycle improvement, supply chain savings and productivity and efficiency initiatives to counteract programmatic losses. Revenues are based on prevailing payment methodologies and current payment rates. The budget appears reasonable.

As shown on BFA Attachments B and C, for the year ending December 31, 2013, and the six-months ended June 30, 2014, SH has experienced negative working capital, negative net asset position, and maintained net operating income of $5,221,000 and a net operating loss of $1,741,000, respectively. SH's negative working capital is due to the inclusion of the full value of certain paid time off and third party liabilities that may be resolved and paid in more than a one year period. Management is continually working to improve net assets by managing operating expenses and investing in the facility’s programs to enhance capacity. The June 30, 2014, net loss is due to lower than expected volume and employee overtime issues which are being corrected through the following strategic planning initiatives:

- Strategic program growth and physician recruitment to improve volume,
- Managing overtime utilization and flexing staff levels in conjunction with volume.

Based on the preceding, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**

From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.

---

**Attachments**

- BFA Attachment A: Organizational Chart of the NS-LIJ Health System, Inc.
- BFA Attachment B: Financial Summary for 2013, NS-LIJ Health System, Inc. and Southside Hospital
- BFA Attachment C: Financial Summary as of June 30, 2014, NS-LIJ Health System, Inc. and Southside Hospital
Project # 142185-C
New York Presbyterian Hospital - New York Weill Cornell Center

Program: Hospital
Purpose: Construction
County: New York
Acknowledged: November 4, 2014

Executive Summary

Description
New York Presbyterian Hospital (NYP Hospital) is part of a 2,478-bed not-for-profit hospital system consisting of the following campuses: Columbia University Medical Center (977 beds); Weill Cornell Medical Center (850 beds); Westchester Division (270 beds); Allen Hospital (201 beds); and Lower Manhattan Hospital (180 beds). NYP Hospital requests approval to certify an existing radiation oncology private practice as a new hospital extension clinic. The site, formerly known as the Farber Center, is located at 100 Church Street, New York, New York, with the facility’s entrance located at 21 West Broadway. The Center was acquired through an asset purchase agreement between Leonard A. Farber, M.D., PLLC and NYP Hospital. NYP Hospital proposes to certify the Farber Center as an extension clinic specializing in outpatient therapeutic radiation oncology services.

The Center will include one (1) linear accelerator, one (1) High Dose Rate (HDR) remote afterloader, and one (1) CT simulator. Certifying this existing radiation oncology practice will enable NYP Hospital to accomplish the following:

- Expand their existing capacity with state-of-the-art radiation oncology technology;
- Create a more patient-centered and accessible setting for radiation therapy;
- Provide high-quality care by internationally recognized skilled professional staff; and
- Provide continuity of care for patients already treated at the Center through increased access to NYP Hospital services.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
New York Presbyterian proposes to certify a private practice as an extension clinic specializing in outpatient radiation oncology services. The center will include one (1) linear accelerator, one (1) High Dose Rate (HDR) remote afterloader, and one (1) CT simulator. Certifying this project will expand the existing capacity of certified linear accelerators for radiation oncology services and provide continuity of care for patients in the New York City area.

Program Summary
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.

Project #142185-C Exhibit Page 1
**Financial Summary**

Project costs of $5,121,630 will be met via cash equity of $5,121,630.

Budget:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$6,051,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$5,380,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>$670,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and approval is recommended.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. The applicant is required to submit design development drawings, complying with requirements of 10NYCRR Part 710.4, for review and approval by DASNY. [DAS]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity's clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
6. All devices producing ionizing radiation must be licensed by the New York State Department of Health -- Bureau of Environmental Radiation Protection. [HSP]
7. The applicant is required to submit final construction documents, complying with requirements of 10NYCRR Part 710.7, to NYS DOH Bureau of Architecture and Engineering Facility Planning (BAEFP) prior to start of construction. [DAS]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
The New York Presbyterian Hospital is seeking approval to certify an existing radiation oncology private practice, known as The Faber Center, as an extension clinic. The extension clinic, to be called NY-Presbyterian Radiation Oncology Outpatient Center, will be located at 21 West Broadway, New York, 10007 in New York County. This project will also include the certification of one linear accelerator.

Background and Analysis
New York Presbyterian Hospital provides services to New York City, although the primary service area will consist of lower Manhattan including the zip codes of 10002-10007, 10009, 10011-10014, 10019, 10038 and 10280.

Cancer patients in lower Manhattan have limited access to radiation therapy treatments in their community. This limited access tends to increase the waiting time patients experience for treatments. Traveling to daily treatment appointments to other locations in Manhattan and New York City either by car or public transportation can result in patients spending more than an hour in travel time to and from treatments. The proposed extension clinic will be located within Manhattan’s busiest business district, which will help address the needs of patients who are able to work while undergoing radiation treatments. Many patients who work in lower Manhattan would benefit from having access to the NY Presbyterian Hospital expertise in radiation therapy close to where they work.

The need methodology set forth in 10 NYCRR Section 709.16 calculates the need for therapeutic radiology devices by health planning region. The five-county New York City health planning region has a total of 29 facilities - 22 hospitals and 7 hospital extension clinics - providing linear accelerator services as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Resources</th>
<th># Facilities With Linac. Services</th>
<th># Linac. Machines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>Hospital Clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New York City Region</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows a need for 12 MEV devices (linear accelerators) in the five-county New York City health planning region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linac Need in New York City</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Cancer Cases/Year</td>
<td>37,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% will be Candidates for Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>22,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Curative Patients</td>
<td>11,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Palliative Patients</td>
<td>11,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Curative Patients is 35 Treatments</td>
<td>397,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Palliative patients is 15 Treatments</td>
<td>170,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Total Number of Treatments [(5)+(6)]</td>
<td>567,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for MEV Machines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Each MEV Machine has Capacity for 6,500 Treatments)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing/Approved Resources (Upon Approval of 142185)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Need for MEV Machines</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below shows the need methodology calculation for MEV devices (linear accelerators) in the New York County area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linac Need in New York County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Cancer Cases/Year</td>
<td>8,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% will be Candidates for Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>4,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Curative Patients</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Palliative Patients</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Curative Patients is 35 Treatments</td>
<td>85,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Palliative patients is 15 Treatments</td>
<td>36,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Total Number of Treatments [(5)+(6)]</td>
<td>122,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need for MEV Machines
(Each MEV Machine has Capacity for 6,500 Treatments) | 19 |
Existing/Approved Resources (Upon Approval of 142185) | 23 |
Remaining Need for MEV Machines | -4 |

The table below shows a need for 1 MEV devices (linear accelerators) in the primary service area of lower Manhattan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linac Need in Primary Service Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Cancer Cases</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% will be Candidates for Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Curative Patients</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of (2) will be Palliative Patients</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Curative Patients is 35 Treatments</td>
<td>26,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course of Treatment for Palliative patients is 15 Treatments</td>
<td>11,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Total Number of Treatments [(5)+(6)]</td>
<td>37,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need for MEV Machines
(Each MEV Machine has Capacity for 6,500 Treatments) | 6 |
Existing/Approved Resources (Upon Approval of 142185) | 5 |
Remaining Need for MEV Machines | 1 |

1 Primary Service Area includes following zip codes: 10002-10007, 10009, 10011-10014, 10019, 10038 and 10280

**Conclusion**
Certification of this project will help create a more patient-centered and accessible setting for radiation therapy, provide high quality care, and continuity of care for cancer patients in the lower Manhattan area and the greater New York City region.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.
Program Analysis

Project Proposal
New York Presbyterian Hospital (NYP Hospital) requests approval to certify an existing radiation oncology private practice (formerly known as The Farber Center) as an extension clinic that will become known as the New York-Presbyterian Radiation Oncology Outpatient Center.

The Center will include one (1) linear accelerator, one (1) High Dose Rate (HDR) remote afterloader, one (1) CT simulator, exam/consultation space and associated support spaces. Certifying this existing radiation oncology center will enable NYP Hospital to expand the existing capacity, create a more patient centered and accessible setting for radiation therapy, and provide continuity and high quality care by skilled professional staff for patients already treated at the Center through increased access to NYP Hospital services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Approved Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York-Presbyterian Radiation Oncology Outpatient Center 21 West Broadway New York, NY 10007</td>
<td>Radiology – Therapeutic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

Recommendation
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.

Financial Analysis

Asset Purchase Agreement
The applicant has submitted an executed asset purchase agreement, which is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>October 15, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seller:</td>
<td>Leonard A. Farber, M.D., PLLC, d/b/a The Farber Center for Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser:</td>
<td>The New York and Presbyterian Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Assets:</td>
<td>Cash; accounts receivable; all rights, title and interest in and to the assets and properties of every kind, character and description (other than property and rights specifically excluded in the agreement), owned or leased by seller and used in the operation and management of the practice, or otherwise for the benefit of the practice, whether tangible, intangible, real, personal or mixed, movable or fixed, and wherever located. Only the excluded assets listed below will not be transferred via this agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excluded Assets: Income tax receivables; deferred tax assets; employee advances; prepaid professional liability insurance; contracts and leases that are not designated contracts; the purchase price and all rights of the seller under this agreement; any patient records in which the patients have objected to a transfer of the records; any claims, rights or interest of any seller in or to any refund, rebate, abatement or other recovery for taxes; all Medicare and Medicaid Provider agreements of the seller, and all other governmental licenses and permits not capable of being sold to the buyer; any claims or causes of action of the seller against its officers; all artwork located at the leased real property, to the extent that the artwork is not property of the seller as of the closing date; the proceeds of an insurance claim held by seller in a debtor-in-possession bank account at JP Morgan Chase bank.

Assumed Liabilities: Designated contracts with a Cure Cost Cap in the amount of $2,512,341

Excluded Liabilities: N/A

Purchase Price: $5,076,626

Payment: Due at closing, apportioned as follows:
- $400,000 for forgiveness of indebtedness,
- $2,512,341 cure cost,
- $1,477,500 settlement payment to Community National Bank,
- $550,000 settlement payment to Ocean Pacific Interiors, Inc. and Pristine Maintenance, Inc.
- $136,785 payment for unsecured claims.

Lease Rental Agreement
The applicant has submitted an executed lease rental agreement for the site they will occupy, which is summarized below:

Premises: 100 Church Street, New York, New York (entrance at 21 West Broadway)
Lessor: 100 Church Fee Owner, LLC
Lessee: The New York and Presbyterian Hospital
Term: 16 years 1 month with 1 10-year extension period
Space: 22,626 sq. ft.
Rental: First 3 months $299,283.21 or ($99,761.07 monthly), Year 1 at $1,233,046.80 annually or ($102,753.90 monthly). Annual rent increases of 3% each year based on the previous year’s rent.
Provisions: The lessee shall be responsible for maintenance, utilities and real estate taxes.

The applicant has indicated that the lease arrangement will be an arm’s length lease arrangement. The applicant has submitted 2 letters from realtors attesting to the reasonableness of the per square foot rental.

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project costs, which include fees associated with the Asset Purchase Agreement, are estimated at $5,121,630 broken down as follows:

Other Fees* $5,091,626
Application Fees $2,000
Additional Processing Fees $28,004
Total Project Cost $5,121,630
*Other Fees are broken down as follows:

Asset Purchase Agreement:
- Forgiveness of indebtedness: $400,000
- Cure cost: $2,512,341
- Settlement payment: $1,477,500
- Settlement payment: $550,000
- Payment of unsecured claims: $136,785
- DASNY Drawing Review: $15,000
Total: $5,091,626

The applicant’s financing will come from cash equity in the amount of $5,121,630.

**Operating Budget**
The applicant has submitted an operating budget, in 2015 dollars, for years 1 and 3 of operations, summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$5,504,927</td>
<td>$6,051,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$3,608,667</td>
<td>$3,883,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1,497,132</td>
<td>1,497,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$5,105,799</td>
<td>$5,380,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>$399,128</td>
<td>$670,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization:
- Treatments: 5,000 in Year 1, 5,202 in Year 3
- Cost per treatment: $1,021.16 in Year 1, $1,034.35 in Year 3

Utilization broken down by payor source during year 1 and 3 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 Treatments</th>
<th>Year 1 % Utilization</th>
<th>Year 3 Treatments</th>
<th>Year 3 % Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>34.50%</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>31.06%</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>31.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,202</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the historical experience of the hospital.

**Capability and Feasibility**
Total project costs of $5,121,630 will be met through cash equity from the overall operations of NYP Hospital.

Working capital requirements are estimated at $896,778, which is equivalent to two months of Year 3 expenses. The full amount of the working capital requirement will be provided as equity from the overall operations of NYP Hospital.
BFA Attachment A is NYP Hospital’s 2012 through 2013 certified financial statements and their internal financial summary for the period 1/1/14 through 8/31/14. The hospital generated both positive working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $352,524,000 for the period 2012 through 2013. The hospital generated both positive working capital and net asset positions, and had a net income of $239,609,000 for the period 1/1/2014-8/30/14. BFA Attachment A shows that NYP Hospital has sufficient funds available to cover both the working capital and equity requirements for this project.

The submitted budget indicates a net income of $399,128 and $670,999 during Year 1 and Year 3, respectively. Revenues are based on the current reimbursement methodologies for therapeutic radiology services. The submitted budget appears reasonable.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

**Recommendation**
From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description
Strong Memorial Hospital (SMH), an 830-bed not-for-profit hospital located at 601 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, New York (Monroe County), requests approval to renovate the existing Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) and add eight Level IV neonatal intensive care beds to its operating certificate. Upon completion of the project, 10 newly renovated neonatal intensive care single family rooms will be added to the 44 recently constructed single family rooms previously approved under CON 072135-C, and the hospital’s total licensed beds will increase to 838 beds. It is noted that SMH is a designated Regional Perinatal Center and serves the nine counties of the Finger Lakes Region. The facility is currently licensed for 60 neonatal beds as follows: 26 Level IV neonatal intensive care beds, 20 Level III neonatal intermediate care beds, and 14 Level II neonatal continuing care beds.

Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System (SPARCS) data indicates that SMH’s 26-bed Level IV NICU has been operating above capacity. From 2011 through September 30, 2014, average occupancy grew from 119% to 130% of capacity. The applicant indicated that NICU overflow is currently managed by boarding higher acuity patients in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) and lower acuity patients in the normal newborn nursery staffed and managed by NICU physicians and nurses. The eight new Level IV NICU beds for a total of 34 beds will help the facility more efficiently meet the increasing demand for high-risk neonatal subspecialty care in the region.

Program Summary
Based on the results of this review, a favorable recommendation can be made regarding the facility’s current compliance pursuant to 2802-(3)(e) of the New York State Public Health Law.

Financial Summary
The total project costs of $2,261,373 will be provided from Strong Memorial Hospital’s accumulated funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incremental Budget:</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>$461,154</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>410,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain/Loss</td>
<td>$50,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
The Finger Lakes Health Systems Agency recommends approval.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management

Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. The submission of State Hospital Code (SHC) Drawings for review and approval, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-02 SHC Hospitals (as required). The drawings must address the following:
   a. Stair widths must be properly dimensioned to demonstrate compliance with accessible egress where required. Actual drawing shall scale the same as listed dimensions.
   b. None of the submitted drawings provide a north arrow for orientation. A full drawing capable of showing the referenced elevators on the "east" side shall be provided.
   c. The Functional Program spaces indicated “south” of corridor 33450 i.e. Nurse/Supervisor, Social worker, and staff lounge, shall be labeled and room numbers shown.
   d. On-call rooms 33469 and 33467 shall be shown on drawing. [AER]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The applicant shall start construction on or before September 1, 2015 and complete construction by August 30, 2016 upon the filing of Final Construction Documents in accordance with 10 NYCRR section 710.7. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5), if construction is not started on or before the start date, this shall constitute abandonment of the approval. In accordance with Part 710.10(a), this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]
3. The approved project does not qualify for, and the facility will not request Medicaid rated rebasing. [AER]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
# Need Analysis

## Background
Strong Memorial Hospital, an 830-bed, voluntary, not-for-profit hospital located at 601 Elmwood Ave., Rochester, NY 14642 in Monroe County, requests approval to renovate existing space and add eight (8) Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) beds for a total of 34 NICU beds. The purpose of this project is to improve operational efficiency during census overflows.

Strong Memorial Hospital is a Regional Perinatal Center. The applicant attributes swings in census overflow to the increase in the number of preterm patients and their increased survival rates associated with longer NICU lengths of stay and out of region admissions needing subspecialty care.

As the designated Level IV Regional Perinatal Center, the Strong Memorial Hospital NICU provides services to the nine counties of the Finger Lakes Region: Chemung, Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Wayne and Yates. In 2012 and 2013, over 92% of Strong Memorial Hospital’s High Risk births originated in the aforementioned counties.

Strong Memorial Hospital has the following New York State designations:
- AIDS Center
- Burn Center
- Regional Perinatal Center
- Regional Trauma Center
- SAFE Center of Excellence
- Stroke Center

The combined number of Neonatal Continuing, Intensive and Intermediate Care beds is currently 60. There are 24 Neonatal Intensive Care beds which have been operating over census for the past three years. Census increase is due to an increase in the number of preterm patients as a result of assisted fertility, increasing maternal age and multiple births. NICU overflow is managed by boarding higher acuity patients in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit and lower acuity patients in the newborn nursery under the care of NICU physicians and nurses. The addition of eight (8) beds would bring the total number of neonatal intensive care beds to 34.

## Strong Memorial Hospital: Certified Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed Category</th>
<th>Certified Capacity</th>
<th>Requested Action</th>
<th>Certified Capacity Upon Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burns Care</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Surgical</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Continuing Care</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intensive Care</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric ICU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>830</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HFIS, December 2014
Through July 1, 2014, the applicant reports 801 NICU discharges with a total of 20,265 patient days. They anticipate reaching capacity of 813 discharges and 20,565 patient days by the end of the first year following project completion.

The number of high risk births at Strong Memorial Hospital increased from 539 in both 2011 and 2012 to 620 in 2013 while the number of normal births decreased from 2,300 in 2011 to 2,154 in 2013. The chart below presents data on utilization at Strong Memorial Hospital by service type. Over the last five years, the number of high-risk neonate discharges increased with a range of 817 in 2010 to 1,020 in 2013, an increase of 25%. The average length of stay for high-risk neonates is high with an average of 22.9 days for the period under review. A long average length of stay for high-risk neonates is explained by an increase in the survival rate for infants born preterm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Risk Neonates</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Newborns</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetric</td>
<td>3538</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>3585</td>
<td>3376</td>
<td>3397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>3770</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>3776</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Length of Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Risk Neonates</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Newborns</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetric</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The chart below presents utilization data for Strong Memorial Hospital’s 26 bed Level IV Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. From 2011 – 2014, NICU Level IV occupancy increased from 119% to 130%, a 9% jump, as of 9/30/14. During this period, the average NICU Level IV occupancy was 124%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Patient Days</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11,332</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11,416</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11,953</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014*</td>
<td>9,325</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPARCS 2011-2014

*Reporting dates 1/1/14 through 9/30/14

Conclusion
The renovation and expansion of the NICU to add eight neonatal intensive care beds to the facility will help meet the increasing demand for subspecialty neonatal care in the region. As a designated Regional Perinatal Center, expansion of Strong Memorial Hospital’s Level IV NICU will more efficiently allow the facility to provide critical care to neonates and their families throughout the Finger Lakes Region and beyond.

Recommendation
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.
Program Analysis

Program Description
Strong Memorial Hospital (SMH), an existing not-for-profit hospital, requests approval to renovate existing space within the hospital to certify an additional eight (8) Neonatal Intensive Care beds.

For the past three years, the NICU has operated over census. Most recently, in calendar year 2014 (through 11/19/14), the NICU operated over census for 161 days, or 50% of the year. The overflow has been managed by dispersing patients over three units—the NICU, the Pediatric ICU and the newborn nursery staffed with NICU physicians and nurses; but SMH believes that this is not an optimal, efficient or appropriate long-term solution.

The higher census and the need for additional beds has come from an increase in the number of preterm infants due to assisted fertility, increasing maternal age and multiple births, as well as SMH’s designation as a Regional Perinatal Center that serves patients from out of the region for subspecialty needs.

First year staffing will increase by an additional 3.5 FTEs and remain at that level through the third year of operation.

Compliance with Applicable Codes, Rules and Regulations
This facility has no outstanding Article 28 surveillance or enforcement actions and, based on the most recent surveillance information, is deemed to be currently operating in substantial compliance with all applicable State and Federal codes, rules and regulations. This determination was made based on a review of the files of the Department of Health, including all pertinent records and reports regarding the facility’s enforcement history and the results of routine Article 28 surveys as well as investigations of reported incidents and complaints.

Recommendation
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.

Financial Analysis

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project costs for the renovation and acquisition of moveable equipment is estimated at $2,261,373, which is broken down as follows:

- Renovation & Demolition: $1,234,115
- Design Contingency: 123,412
- Construction Contingency: 123,412
- Architect/Engineering Fees: 77,000
- Construction Manager Fees: 34,320
- Other Fees (consultant, etc.): 20,041
- Movable Equipment: 379,061
- Telecommunications: 255,653
- CON Application Fees: 2,000
- Additional Processing Fee: 12,359
- Total Project Cost: $2,261,373

Total project costs are based on a September 1, 2015 start date with a 12-month construction period.

Strong Memorial Hospital will fund the $2,261,373 total project cost from accumulated funds.
Operating Budget

The applicant has submitted their first and third year incremental operating budget for the total NICU complement of beds (intensive, intermediate, and continuing care), in 2014/2015 dollars, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Year 1 Incremental*</th>
<th>Year 3 Incremental*</th>
<th>Year 3 Cumulative*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$38,181,812</td>
<td>$461,154</td>
<td>$461,154</td>
<td>$38,642,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$23,863,985</td>
<td>$260,085</td>
<td>$271,209</td>
<td>$24,135,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$797,412</td>
<td>$139,101</td>
<td>$139,101</td>
<td>$936,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$24,661,397</td>
<td>$399,186</td>
<td>$410,310</td>
<td>$25,071,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income or (Loss)</td>
<td>$13,520,415</td>
<td>$61,968</td>
<td>$50,844</td>
<td>$13,571,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utilization:**

- **Discharges:** 801, 12, 12, 813
- **Patient Days:** 20,265, 300, 300, 20,565
- **Occupancy%:** 92.53%, 82.86%

**Cost per Discharge**

- **Operating:** $29,792.74, $29,686.59
- **Capital:** $995.52, $1,151.92
- **Total Cost Per Discharge:** $30,788.26, $30,838.51

* Over current 2014/2015 base year.

Utilization by payor source for the first and third years is anticipated as follows:

- Medicaid Fee-For-Service: 21.0%
- Medicaid Manage Care: 32.9%
- Commercial Fee-For-Service: 37.6%
- Commercial Manage Care: 7.0%
- All Other: 1.5%
- Total: 100.0%

Expenses are based upon SMH’s current experience in operating the neonatal care beds.

Utilization assumptions are based on SMH’s historical pattern for inpatient NICU neonatal care services. The applicant has indicated that over the years pre-term birth rates have increased as a result of assisted fertility, increasing maternal age, and an increase in the number of multiple births. There has also been an increased in the survival rates of infants born pre-term, which has impacted NICU utilization. As a designated Regional Perinatal Center for the Finger Lakes Region, SMH is the only hospital providing Level IV neonatal intensive care for a nine county area. They also admit out of region high-risk births that require neonatal subspecialty care available at SMH. As a result, the applicant has experienced an occupancy rate greater than 92% for the full NICU complement of beds, with the Level IV unit averaging 124% occupancy from 2011 through September 30, 2014.

**Capability and Feasibility**

SMH will satisfy the $2,261,373 total project cost from accumulated funds. BFA Attachment A is SMH’s 2012-2013 certified financial summary, which indicates the availability of sufficient resources.

Working capital requirements are estimated at $68,385 based upon two months of third year incremental cost and will be provided from operation. Review of BFA Attachment A indicates working capital requirements can be met through operations.
The incremental budgets project net incremental income for the first and third years of $61,968 and $50,844, respectively. Revenues are based on prevailing reimbursement methodologies while commercial payers are based on experience. The overall budget appears reasonable.

As shown on BFA Attachment A, for 2012 through 2013 SMH has maintained an average working capital position of $365,309,559, average net asset position of $497,492,664, and generated an average income from operation of $109,704,876. BFA Attachment B is SMH’s November 30, 2014 internal financial summary showing income from operations after clinical transfers of $97,519,000 and net assets totaling $626,094,220.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**

*From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Financial Summary for 2012 and 2013, Strong Memorial Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Internal Financial Summary for November 30, 2014, Strong Memorial Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLHSA Attachment</td>
<td>Project Review and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Description
Jewish Home of Rochester, a 362-bed skilled nursing facility located in Rochester, Monroe County, is requesting approval for a renovation and construction project. The certified bed capacity of Jewish Home is proposed to decrease to 328 beds at the conclusion of the project. The applicant also has an Adult Day Health Care Program (ADHCP) with 84 registrants, which will remain unchanged.

The proposed project includes construction of a total of 168 new resident rooms in Green House homes in the following configuration:
- Four new three-story Green House homes with each floor comprised of a household with twelve private bedrooms; and
- Two single-story Green House homes with twelve private bedrooms.

These rooms will replace the semi-private beds currently being operated at the Jewish Home site.

Jewish Home of Rochester is an affiliate of Jewish Senior Life, which is the nursing homes co-operator via CON #132135. Jewish Senior Life operates a full continuum of senior residential living options on its campus including independent living, assisted living and skilled nursing, in addition to a range of community based programs to meet the needs of seniors in the community at large.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
There will be a reduction of bed capacity from 362 to 328 as a result of this application.

Program Summary
The modernization of Jewish Home of Rochester will result in a greatly improved residential environment. The addition of Green House model of care will offer residents a choice of living arrangements, and the short term rehabilitation units will be modern and spacious.

Financial Summary
Total project costs of $89,926,882 will be met as follows: Fundraising of $27,784,577 and a loan of $62,142,305 at an interest rate of 7.5% for a 30 year term.

Total project cost is $89,926,882. However, based on current allowable bed caps, plus applicable fees, the total reimbursable cost is $77,677,882.

Budget:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>$44,573,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>44,277,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Revenues over Expenses</td>
<td>$295,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and contingent approval is recommended.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
The HSA recommends approval for this project.

Office of Health Systems Management

Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]
2. The submission of a commitment signed by the applicant which indicates that, within two years from the date of the council approval, the percentage of all admissions who are Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid eligible at the time of admission will be at least 75 percent of the planning area average of all Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid admissions, subject to possible adjustment based on factors such as the number of Medicaid patient days, the facility’s case mix, the length of time before private paying patients became Medicaid eligible, and the financial impact on the facility due to an increase in Medicaid admissions. [RNR]
3. Submission of a plan to continue to enhance access to Medicaid residents. At a minimum, the plan should include, but not necessarily be limited to, ways in which the facility will:
   - Reach out to hospital discharge planners to make them aware of the facility’s Medicaid Access Program;
   - Communicate with local hospital discharge planners on a regular basis regarding bed availability at the nursing facility;
   - Identify community resources that serve the low-income and frail elderly population who may eventually use the nursing facility, and inform them about the facility’s Medicaid Access policy; and
   - Submit an annual report for two years to the DOH which demonstrates substantial progress with the implement of the plan. The plan should include but not be limited to:
     - Information on activities relating to a-c above;
     - Documentation pertaining to the number of referrals and the number of Medicaid admissions;
     - Other factors as determined by the applicant to be pertinent.
   The DOH reserves the right to require continued reporting beyond the two year period. [RNR]
4. Submission and programmatic review and approval of the final floor plans for the construction of the Green Houses and the renovation of the existing Jewish Home building. Plans should demonstrate an equivalent residential environment, including activity space and resident amenities, between each renovated floor of the existing building, as well as the Green House units. [LTC]
5. Submission and programmatic review and approval of the final room layouts for all types of resident rooms, including the renovated Jewish Home building and the Green Houses. The plans should be labelled and depict the dimensions and total square footage of each resident room type. [LTC]
6. Submission of an expanded and updated phasing plan for the construction which explains how the existing residents will be selected for transfer into the new Green Houses, and how residents will be selected for transfer into the renovated short term rehabilitation nursing units. [LTC]
7. Submission of a commitment for a permanent mortgage for a maximum term of 30 years for the project to be provided from a recognized lending institution at a prevailing rate of interest that is determined to be acceptable by The Department of Health. This is to be provided within 120 days of approval of state hospital code drawings and before the start of construction. Included with the submitted permanent mortgage commitment must be a sources and uses statement and a debt amortization schedule, for both new and refinanced debt. [BFA]
8. Submission of documentation of contributions to be used as the source of financing, acceptable to the Department. [BFA]
9. Submission of design development drawings, complying with requirements of 10NYCRR Part 710.4, for review and approval by DASNY. [DAS]

10. Submission of State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) findings. [SEQ]

**Approval conditional upon:**
1. The project must be completed within five years from the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. Submission and approval of the patient safety and transfer plan by the Western Regional Office-Rochester. [LTC]
3. The applicant is required to submit final construction documents, complying with requirements of 10NYCRR Part 710.7, to NYS DOH Bureau of Architecture and Engineering Facility Planning (BAEFP) prior to start of construction. [DAS]
4. The anticipated construction start date is 5/15/2015 and the anticipated construction completion date is 8/25/2017. It is the applicant’s responsibility to request revised construction dates, if necessary. [AER]

**Council Action Date**
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Background
Jewish Home of Rochester seeks approval for renovation and construction to modernize the facility and to decertify 34 residential health care facility (RHCF) beds. Jewish Home of Rochester is an existing 362-bed Article 28 residential health care facility located at 2021 Winton Road South, Rochester, 14618, in Monroe County. Current plans for these decertified beds will be a conversion to Assisted Living Program (ALP) beds.

Analysis
As indicated in Table 1, there is currently a surplus of 1,150 beds in Monroe County below. The overall occupancy for Monroe County is 98.1% for 2012, as indicated in Table 2.

Table 1: RHCF Need – Monroe County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Projected Need</th>
<th>4,167</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Beds</td>
<td>5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds Under Construction</td>
<td>-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources</td>
<td>5,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need</td>
<td>-1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jewish Home of Rochester’s utilization in 2010-2012 was 95.6%, 93.2%, and 94.4% respectively. Current utilization for this facility is 92.8%, which falls below the Department’s 97% optimum, however, the reduction of 34 beds will put this facility at 97.5%, which exceeds the Department’s optimum.

Table 2: Jewish Home of Rochester/Monroe County Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/County/Region</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2010</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2011</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Home of Rochester</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access
Regulations indicate that the Medicaid patient admissions standard shall be 75% of the annual percentage of all Medicaid admissions for the long term care planning area in which the applicant facility is located. Such planning area percentage shall not include residential health care facilities that have an average length of stay 30 days or fewer. If there are four or fewer residential health care facilities in the planning area, the applicable standard for a planning area shall be 75% of the planning area percentage of Medicaid admissions, or of the Health Systems Agency area Medicaid admissions percentage, whichever is less. In calculating such percentages, the Department will use the most current data which have been received and analyzed by the Department.

An applicant will be required to make appropriate adjustments in its admission policies and practices so that the proportion of its own annual Medicaid patient’s admissions is at least 75% of the planning area percentage or the Health Systems Agency percentage, whichever is applicable.

Jewish Home of Rochester’s Medicaid admissions of 5.0% in 2011 and 6.6% in 2012 did not meet the Monroe County 75% rate of 13.3% occurring in 2011 and 2012. Jewish Home of Rochester will be required to follow the contingent approval requirements as noted below.

Conclusion
Approval of this application will result in a reduction of excess RHCF bed capacity in the planning area and in a higher, more efficient level of occupancy for an improved and modernized facility.

Recommendation
From a need perspective, contingent approval is recommended.
Program Analysis

Facility Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2021 Winton Road South</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, NY 14618</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHCF Capacity</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHCP Capacity</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Of Operator</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Of Operator</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Jewish Home of Rochester</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Review

Jewish Home (Jewish Home) of Rochester is an existing 362 bed nursing home which includes an adult day health care program with a program capacity of 84. Jewish Home is located on a 75 acre campus, which also includes separate independent living and assisted living apartment buildings. The project concept is to create a true multi-level campus providing a variety of residential alternatives. A separate application will request the addition of 34 assisted living program beds on the fifth floor of the existing Jewish Home building. The project will in turn completely renovate and modernize the Jewish Home building to create 100% single-bedded rooms. 110 of the newly renovated rooms will be programmed as short term rehabilitation units, and 50 rooms will remain as traditional long stay neighborhoods.

In concert with the reduction of beds in the existing building, the subject application proposes the construction of six separate Green Houses totaling 168 beds. The project will include two traditional one story Green Houses of 12 beds each, and four three-story Green Houses, each totaling 36 beds. This will be the first nursing home project to employ multi-level trademarked Green Houses in New York State. In keeping with the Green House model, the residences will be 100% single occupancy rooms surrounding the central living and dining area. The Green Houses will employ multi-purpose workers, or “shabazim”, to care for the residents of the Green House.

The construction of the six Green Houses and renovation of the existing building will result in the decertification of 34 beds, which will be converted into ALP beds.

The applicant has submitted a phasing plan for the construction, which requires some fine tuning. Construction is scheduled to commence in December, 2015 on the four multi-story Green House units, with the traditional Green Houses to be underway by February, 2016. Upon completion of the initial two Green House units in November, 2016, residents of the first wing of Floors 3-6 in the existing Jewish Home building will be relocated into the two 36 bed Green House buildings. When the next two multi-story Green Houses are completed in December, 2016, residents of the second wing of floors 3-6 will occupy the new units. Renovations for the first wing of the existing Jewish Home building will commence in November, 2016 and complete in March, 2017. Renovations for the next three wings will follow, beginning in December, 2016, with the final fourth wing slated for completion in January, 2018. The completion of renovations for the first two wings of floors 3-6 will enable the decanting of the first two wings of the second floor in April, 2017. The renovation of the remaining two wings of the second floor is slated for July, 2017, with construction to complete in October, 2017. The final phase of the project will undertake the modest renovations to the first floor public areas, in May, 2017, and the renovation of the fourth wing of floors 3-6 in September, 2017. The project’s estimated completion date is February, 2018. The applicant does not expect that the project will have any impact upon the overall census, or revenue during the construction period.
Physical Environment

The initial phase of the project will involve the construction of the Green Houses. The two single story houses will contain 12 single occupancy resident rooms, each with a bathroom containing European-type shower. The design includes the common elements of the Green House model, including hearth room, open dining area with meals prepared on premises, and spa room with whirlpool tub and salon services. The houses also feature a porch providing outdoor space which opens into the dining area. The design omits the garage usually included in traditional Green Houses, which may limit available storage space in the houses.

The three story Green Houses veer from the traditional model by locating houses on separate floors, with a spa room only located on the third floor. In order to comply with the Code, which requires the availability of assistive bathing on every floor, the applicant has agreed to create a separate stretcher shower on each floor. Egress from each floor is made via a single elevator adjacent to the entrance, or by a stairway located on the opposite end of the house. The elevator also doubles as the service elevator for transport of supplies and materials to the upper level houses.

Following the completion and occupancy of the Green Houses, Jewish Home will embark upon a comprehensive modernization of the existing nursing home building. The renovations will be focused upon transforming the nursing units to resident centered living space, with all bedrooms converted to single occupancy configuration. The second and third floor nursing units will be programmed as short term rehabilitation, and consist of 44 beds arrayed into sub-units of 10, 10, 11 and 13 beds respectively. The linear sub-units surround a core area which contains a 30 chair dining room with open kitchen, and a 14 chair private dining room and lounge area adjacent to the main dining room. A concierge desk is situated adjacent to the dining room, and its function will require subsequent development by the applicant. The opposite end of the core finds a den/library, with a socialization and gathering area connecting the den and the therapy room. A spa room with whirlpool tub and stretcher shower is situated on the northeast sub-unit, connected by corridor to the central core. The nursing suite is located on the northeast side, and includes a staff lounge and locker room. An additional bathing suite with stretcher shower is located on the other side of the nurse station. The floor includes a large rehabilitation area serving the residents of the floor. A bariatric sized resident room will be situated on the southeast sub-unit.

The sixth floor will be programmed as a conventional nursing unit serving mainly private pay residents, estimated as 50% private pay and 50% Medicaid. The design will offer a significant contrast to the other three floors, with the nursing unit consisting of only 28 beds divided into 7 bed sub-units. The resident rooms, or “SNF suites”, will be roughly twice the size of the other bedrooms in the building, and include a living room separated from the sleeping area by the generously sized bathroom with shower. The living area includes a couch facing a large flat screen television, a lounge chair with end tables, and a kitchenette with an adjacent dining room table and chairs. The design seems more suggestive of hotel-style occupancy than skilled nursing residency. The applicant has noted that the living room and kitchenette will be used for family and friends visitation. The floor layout also differs from floors 2 and 3, with the additional central shower area omitted, consistent with the sizing for a nursing unit with 36% fewer beds. The nursing suite will expand into this area and the concierge satellite station will be eliminated. The use for this area has not been identified. The rehabilitation area on the sixth floor is also sized in relation to the reduced bed complement, with a square footage roughly half that of the therapy rooms on the lower floors. The additional space becomes a living and socialization area, complete with fireplace. A bariatric sized SNF suite is also included on the north wing.

The fourth floor will be a hybrid nursing unit, containing 22 short term rehabilitation and 22 conventional beds. The design of the floor will be similar to the second and third floors, but the rehab gym will be of reduced size, similar to the sixth floor, with the area used for additional activity space. The programmatic relationships on this floor will require additional consideration prior to the submission of final plans. The current fifth floor will be emptied, to be re-used as an assisted living program bed unit.
Compliance
Jewish of Home of Rochester is currently in substantial compliance with all applicable codes, rules and regulations.

Conclusion
The modernization of Jewish Home of Rochester will result in a greatly improved residential environment. The addition of Green House model of care will offer residents a choice of living arrangements, and the short term rehabilitation units will be modern and spacious. The applicant should compare the design of the renovated sixth floor rooms to the needs of the wheelchair bound, long stay resident. Similarly the design of the renovated fourth floor should meet the needs of both the short term rehabilitation and long-stay residents. Sensitivity should be maintained to ensure that all living spaces, including the renovated nursing units in the existing building and the new Green House units, demonstrate an equivalent residential environment.

Recommendation
From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

Financial Analysis

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project cost for the new construction, renovations and acquisition of moveable equipment is estimated at $89,926,882, broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$30,724,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation and Demolition</td>
<td>20,737,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>5,577,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency</td>
<td>5,703,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>3,898,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Consultant Fees</td>
<td>536,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineering Fees</td>
<td>5,094,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager Fees</td>
<td>1,415,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees (Consultant Fees)</td>
<td>1,376,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveable Equipment</td>
<td>5,967,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Costs</td>
<td>2,491,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Interest Expense</td>
<td>5,908,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON Fee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Processing Fee</td>
<td>491,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$89,926,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reimbursable Cost</td>
<td>$77,677,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project costs are based on a May 15, 2015 construction start date and a twenty-seven month construction period. The Bureau of Architectural and Engineering Facility Planning has determined that project cost exceeds the allowable construction caps per bed. As a result, the reimbursable project cost is $77,677,882.

The applicant's financing plan is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>$27,784,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan (7.5% interest rate for a 30 year term)</td>
<td>62,142,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$89,926,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the applicant decertifying beds, the equity requirement will be reduced to 20% of reimbursable project cost.

**Operating Budget**
The applicant has submitted a budget for the whole facility, in 2014 dollars, for the third year after project completion. The budget is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHCF (328 beds)</th>
<th>Per Diem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>$223.33</td>
<td>$12,055,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>410.62</td>
<td>4,773,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>390.26</td>
<td>11,851,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>418.94</td>
<td>7,898,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other Operating Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,747,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$286.62</td>
<td>$32,783,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>80.49</td>
<td>9,197,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$367.11</td>
<td>$41,981,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Revenues over Expenses</td>
<td>($1,233,221)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization: (patient days) 114,273
Occupancy 95.45%

*Other operating income consists of $450,000 in miscellaneous income such as A/P discounts, interest income, and $1,779,000 in grant income (Jewish Home Foundation and Jewish Community Federation).

Utilization, broken down by payor source during the third year is as follows:
- Medicaid Managed Care 47.01%
- Medicare Fee-For-Service 10.12%
- Commercial Fee-For-Service 26.44%
- Commercial Managed Care 16.43%

**ADHCP and Other Programs**

| Revenues* | $3,825,026 |
| Expenses  | 2,296,205  |
| Excess of Revenues over Expenses | $1,528,821 |
| Visits    | 27,375     |

* Other Programs revenue consists of $925,000 for physician house calls, home services, and outpatient rehabilitation. ADHCP revenue is $2,900,026.

Utilization, broken down by payor source for the third year for the ADHCP is as follows:
- Medicaid Managed Care 94.66%
- Private 5.34%

The total revenues and expenses for the facility during the third year is as follows:
- Revenues $44,573,000
- Expenses 44,277,400
- Excess of Revenues over Expenses $295,600
Expense assumptions for the Green House were based on the staffing models and expense assumptions provided by the Green House organization. Expenses for the Tower, which includes the 110 Transitional Care beds, as well as 50 Long Term beds were based on current costs trended forward, with some adjustment for additional clinical staffing given the anticipated increase in acuity. Utilization assumptions for the Green House are based on the applicant's current occupancy rates and reflect a slight increase due to the fact that the number of long term care beds in the facility will be reduced with the reduction of 34 beds, as well as the conversion of 42 beds to transitional care. Utilization for the short term rehabilitation beds is based on current occupancy trends at the nursing home as well as market estimates for the future use of post-acute beds. Expense and utilization assumptions are based on historical experience.

**Capability and Feasibility**

Total project cost of $89,926,882 will be met as follows: Fundraising of $27,784,577 and a loan of $62,142,305 at an interest rate of 7.5% for a 30 year term. As of this date, the applicant has indicated that they have received pledges of $14,000,000. As a contingency of approval, the applicant must submit documentation of contributions to be used as the source of equity. If adequate funds are not received from fundraising, then the remaining funds will be provided via the Jewish Senior Life Foundation, Inc. BFA Attachment B are the 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of Jewish Senior Life Foundation, Inc., which indicates the availability of sufficient funds to offset any shortfalls of fundraising efforts.

The submitted budget indicates an excess of revenues over expenses of $295,600 during the third year after project completion. It is anticipated that with the decrease in the number of LTC beds (decertifying 34) and the use of an additional 42 beds for transitional care, the payor mix in the overall facility will change. The applicant is anticipating with the new Green House model the Jewish Home will be able to attract more private pay residents than currently, which will favorably impact the percentage of private pay. As a result, Medicaid utilization is projected to decrease. The submitted budget appears reasonable.

A transition of nursing home (NH) residents to Medicaid managed care is currently being implemented statewide. Effective February 1, 2015, all eligible beneficiaries in NYC age 21 and over, in need of long term placement in a nursing facility, will be required to join a Medicaid Managed Care Plan (MMCP) or a Managed Long Term Care Plan (MLTCP). On April 1, 2015, the counties of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester will be phased in, and the rest of the State is scheduled to transition beginning July 1, 2015, for both dual and non-dual eligible populations. Under the managed care construct, Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) will negotiate payment rates directly with the NH providers. In order to mitigate the financial impact to NH providers during the transition to managed care, a department policy, as described in the “Transition of Nursing Home Benefit and Population into Managed Care Policy Paper,” provided further guidance requiring MCOs to pay the benchmark Medicaid FFS rate, or a negotiated rate acceptable to both plans and NHs, for 3 years after a county has been deemed mandatory (phased in) for NH population enrollment. As a result, the benchmark FFS rate remains a reliable basis for assessing NH Medicaid revenues through to January 31, 2018 (NYC), March 31, 2018 (Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester), and June 30, 2018 (upstate), respectively.

BFA Attachment A is the financial summary of Jewish Home of Rochester from 2011 through 2013. As shown, the facility had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2011 through 2013. Also, the facility incurred average operating losses of $1,345,253 from 2011 through 2013. The applicant indicated that the reason for the historical operating losses were the result of the following:

- The Transitional Care Unit had a change in the nursing management, which resulted in overstaffing;
- The physical and occupational therapy departments were not as efficient as they should have been resulting in higher expenses;
- There was a significant turn over in administrative areas, such as finance, human resources and other support departments, resulting in overtime and higher training costs;
- Several residents of the nursing home contracted the Noro Virus in early 2012 and admissions had to be limited, which reduced the census and negatively impacted revenues from the ADHCP.
To improve operations, the applicant implemented a cost containment project in 2012 that significantly reduced operating expenses. All aspects of expenditures were reviewed including payroll costs, supplies, expenses and contract costs. Cost efficiencies were continued in 2013 with the elimination of the dining services contract.

As shown on Attachment B, Jewish Senior Life Foundation, Inc. had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2012 through 2013. Also, the entity achieved an average excess of revenues over expenses of $3,769,685 from 2012 through 2013.

BFA Attachment C is the October 31, 2014 internal financial statements of Jewish Home of Rochester. As shown, the entity had a positive working capital position and a positive net asset position for the period through October 31, 2014. Also, the entity achieved an income from operations of $690,715 through October 31, 2014. Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and contingent approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**
From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

## Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Financial Summary - Jewish Home of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary - Jewish Senior Life Foundation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>October 31, 2014 internal financial statements, Jewish Home of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHLC Attachment A</td>
<td>Quality Measures and Inspection Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Health and Health Planning Council

Project # 141253-E
South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center

Program: Diagnostic and Treatment Center  County: Kings
Purpose: Establishment  Acknowledged: June 13, 2014

Executive Summary

Description
Digestive Disease Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center (the Center), a New York limited liability company, is an existing Article 28 freestanding ambulatory surgical center (FASC) located at 214 Avenue P, Brooklyn (Kings County). The Center is certified as a single-specialty FASC specializing in the field of gastroenterology and is also certified to provide Lithotripsy O/P procedures.

On November 14, 2008, the applicant received contingent Public Health and Health Planning Council (PHHPC) approval under CON #081088 for the establishment and construction of a FASC with a limited life of five (5) years from the date of issuance of an operating certificate. The applicant received its operating certificate effective December 29, 2009; hence, the Center’s current limited life certification expired December 29, 2014. The applicant is requesting approval to extend its limited life for three (3) years, and also requests a partial change in the ownership of the facility. The ownership change consists of the removal of two current members, Dr. Oleg Gutnik and Mr. Jordan Fowler, and the transfer of 40% ownership interest in the Center to four new members: Dr.Rabin Rahmani, Dr. Ian Wall, Dr. Nison Badalov, and Dr. Pierre Hindy.

Membership in the Center is currently composed of 2 corporate entities, Frontier Healthcare Associates, LLC and Beth Israel Ambulatory Care Services Corp, and 10 individual members. Upon approval of this application, there will be a total of 14 members including two corporate entities. The proposed issuance of new membership interest exceeds 25% ownership change within five years, and therefore requires PHHPC approval.

Ownership of the operation before and after the requested change is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Owners</th>
<th>Proposed Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Israel</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srvs Corp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Chu, M.D.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Chu, M.D.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottaviano, M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhanna Gutnik,</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Weissbluth,</td>
<td>17.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Shapsis,</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor Grosman,</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cohen, M.D.</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Gutnik, M.D.</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Fowler</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval for a three year extension of the operating certificate from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter.
**Need Summary**
Based on CON 081088, SBEC was approved with contingencies for a three year limited life with Medicaid at five percent and charity care at two percent. The Center has satisfied its contingency that required filing annual reports with DOH. Upon approval of this project, the applicant projects to have a total of 9,935 procedures in year 1 with Medicaid at 35.5 percent and charity care at two percent. Based on the efforts taken by the applicant to improve its charity care, their application budget includes a projected charity care allowance of two percent, which they are confident that they can achieve in Year 1. There will be no changes in services.

**Program Summary**
Based on the information reviewed, staff found nothing that would reflect adversely upon the applicants’ character and competence or standing in the community.

**Financial Summary**
There are no project costs associated with this proposal. The purchase price of $1,192,884 will be met with $298,221 in personal equity from each of the four proposed new members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget:</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$8,304,631</td>
<td>$8,597,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$6,186,839</td>
<td>$6,487,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/(Loss)</td>
<td>$2,117,792</td>
<td>$2,109,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval for a three year extension of the operating certificate from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter, contingent upon:
1. Submission of an executed loan commitment from Dr. Hindy acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
2. Submission of an executed loan commitment from Dr. Wall acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
3. Submission of a signed agreement with an outside independent entity satisfactory to the Department to provide annual reports to the DOH beginning in the second year of operation. Said reports should include:
   a. Data showing actual utilization including procedures;
   b. Data showing breakdown of visits by payor source;
   c. Data showing number of patients who need follow-up care in a hospital within seven days after ambulatory surgery;
   d. Data showing number of emergency transfers to a hospital;
   e. Data showing percentage of charity care provided, and
   f. Number of nosocomial infections recorded during the year in question.
   g. Corrective measures implemented for submitting data to SPARCS. [RNR]
4. Submission of a statement, acceptable to the Department, that the applicant will consider creating or entering into an integrated system of care that will reduce the fragmentation of the delivery system, provide coordinated care for patients, and reduce inappropriate utilization of services. The applicant will agree to submit a report to the Department beginning in the second year of operation and each year thereafter detailing these efforts and the results. [RNR]
5. Submission by the governing body of the ambulatory surgery center of a detailed plan that will be implemented to improve charity care to two (2) percent. [RNR]
6. Submission of a photocopy of an executed amendment to the applicant’s Articles of Organization, acceptable to the department. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within one year from the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The applicant must submit proof from the Department of State of the filing of a certificate of amendment of its Articles of Organization that has found to be acceptable to the Department of Health. [DLA]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
Digestive Diseases Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center (SBEC), an existing single specialty (gastroenterology) Article 28 diagnostic and treatment center, requests approval to extend its limited life for three (3) additional years following a limited life of five-years from December 29, 2009 to December 29, 2014 (CON 081088). In addition, SBEC also requests approval to transfer 40 percent membership interest to four (4) new physician members and to remove two (2) existing members. The facility is located at 214 Avenue P, Brooklyn, 11204, Kings County.

Analysis
The table below provides information on the number of projected procedures and actual utilization for 2013. It shows that the applicant provided well above the projected number of procedures of 4,509. The actual utilization for Medicaid was 34.2 percent, close to the projected utilization at 35.3 percent. The applicant provided only 0.1 percent charity care, and thus did not meet its projection of two (2) percent (CON 081088).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Brooklyn: Procedures</th>
<th>Projected 2013</th>
<th>Projected 2013</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Total</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon approval of this application, SBEC projects to have a total of 9,935 procedures in year 1 and 10,286 procedures in year 3 with Medicaid at 35.5 percent and charity care at 2.0 percent. The proposed addition of four (4) new physicians supports the projected increases for Years 1 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>141253: South Brooklyn Projections</th>
<th>Projected Year 1</th>
<th>Projected Year 3</th>
<th>Projected Years 1 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>9,935</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Reports for 2010 to 2013 submitted by the applicant indicate that the applicant has not met its original commitment of two (2) percent charity care. During these years, charity care was less than one (1) percent. The applicants acknowledge the fact that their charity care utilization has been lower than the original projection. They relied on member referrals for charity care cases; it was difficult for them to obtain and refer a satisfactory number of cases to meet the projected rate. To ameliorate this, they have partnered with Charles B. Wang Community Health Center to obtain charity care case referrals. Additionally, SBEC is also in the process of implementing a formal, written Charitable Care Program to provide charity care to its communities. Based on these efforts, the applicants expect their charity care rate to grow to at least two (2) percent in Year 1.
The numbers for total visits shown on Annual Reports submitted by the applicant are comparable to those on the Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System (SPARCS); however, there are discrepancies between the numbers for Medicaid and Medicare among the two sources. The applicant believes that this is due to the difference in the breakout of cases on Applicants’ Annual Reports and on SPARCS. Specifically, on the SPARCS report, it appears that in certain years the Medicaid and Medicare figures represent just Fee-for-Service (FFS) visits, and that the Managed Care visits (for Medicaid and Medicare) were erroneously ascribed to the Commercial Insurance category by the applicants.

The applicants are committed to serving patients in need of care regardless of their ability to pay or the source of payment.

Program Analysis

Project Proposal

Digestive Diseases Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center, an existing single specialty (gastroenterology) Article 28 diagnostic and treatment center in Kings County, requests permission to extend the Center’s limited life for three (3) years following a five (5) year limited life (under CON 081088). There will be no changes in services however, due to the addition of four (4) new physician members to the center, staffing is expected to increase from 6.0 FTEs to 15.0 FTEs in the first year and then to 16.0 FTEs by the third year.

Additionally, South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center seeks approval to transfer 40% membership interest in the center to four (4) new physician members who will each purchase a 10% interest in the Center. In addition, two (2) existing members of the Center will withdraw from the Center as individual members. There is no construction or other capital cost associated with this proposal.

The following table details the proposed change in ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Current Membership Interest</th>
<th>Membership Interest Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Gutnik, MD</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Fowler</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier Healthcare Assoc., LLC</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleg Gutnik, MD (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Fowler (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Israel Ambulatory Care Services, Corp</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Adam Henick – board member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Donald Scanlon – board member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jeremy Boal, MD – board member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Chu, DO</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Chu, MD</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Ottaviano, MD</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhanna Gunik, MD</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Weissbluth, MD (Manager)</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Shapsis, MD</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor Grosman, MD</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cohen, MD</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rabin Rahmani, MD</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ian Wall, DO</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nison Badalov, MD</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pierre Hindy, MD</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Members subject to review
Character and Competence
The four new proposed individual members, Rabin Rahmani, MD; Ian Wall, DO; Nison Badalov, MD; and Pierre Hindy, MD, are all practicing general surgeons, who are board-eligible in gastrointestinal endoscopy.

The withdrawing members are: Oleg Gutnik, MD and Jordan Fowler (who will continue as members of Frontier Healthcare Associates, LLC, which is an existing member of the Center).

Staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the disclosure information submitted for the proposed individual members regarding licenses held, formal education, training in pertinent health and/or related areas, employment history, a record of legal actions, and a disclosure of the applicant’s ownership interest in other health care facilities. Licensed individuals were checked against the Office of Medicaid Management, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, and the Education Department databases as well as the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General Medicare exclusion database.

Recommendation
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.

Financial Analysis

Membership Purchase Agreement
The applicant has submitted an executed membership purchase agreement for the change of 40% membership interest of Digestive Disease D&TC, the terms of which are summarized below:

| Purpose: | Sale of 40% membership interest in Digestive Disease Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center |
| Date: | May 8, 2014 |
| Sellers: | Frontier Healthcare Associates, LLC (3.60%), Beth Israel Ambulatory Care Services Corp (5.34%), Mark Chu, M.D. (3.58%), Danny Chu, M.D. (3.58%), Lorenzo Ottaviano, M.D. (3.58%), Zhanna Gutnik, M.D. (6.83%), Jay Weissbluth, M.D. (7.32%), Alex Shapsis, M.D. (1.99%), Igor Grosman, M.D. (1.99%), Paul Cohen, M.D. (1.99%), Oleg Gutnik, M.D. (0.10%), and Jordan Fowler (0.10%) |
| Purchasers: | Dr. Rabin Rahmani (10.00%), Dr. Ian Wall (10.00%), Dr. Nison L Badalov (10.00%) and Dr. Pierre Hindy (10.00%) |
| Purchase Price: | $1,192,884 ($29,882.10 per percent) |
| Payment: | $12,000 dollars ($3,000 per purchaser) good faith deposit at execution of agreement held in escrow, with the remaining $1,180,884 due at closing ($295,221 per purchaser) |
**Operating Budgets**

Following is a summary of the submitted operating budget, presented in 2015 dollars, for the first and third year subsequent to change in ownership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Proc.</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Per Proc.</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$84,543</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$84,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$2,923,126</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$3,032,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>$853.96</td>
<td>$1,622,517</td>
<td>$853.96</td>
<td>$1,687,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$148,590</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$148,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee For Service</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$3,521,756</td>
<td>$853.97</td>
<td>$3,639,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay/Other</td>
<td>$256.19</td>
<td>$4,099</td>
<td>$256.17</td>
<td>$4,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$8,304,631</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,597,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$5,615,311</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,867,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$571,528</td>
<td></td>
<td>$620,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,186,839</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,487,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income/(Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$2,117,792</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,109,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization by payor source for the Current Year and Years 1 and 3 subsequent to the change in owner/operator is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor Source:</th>
<th>2013 Projected Utilization</th>
<th>2013 Actual Utilization</th>
<th>Projected Year 1 Utilization</th>
<th>Projected Year 3 Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>4,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay/Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>9,935</td>
<td>10,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor Source:</th>
<th>Projected %</th>
<th>2013 Projected</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Projected Year 1 %</th>
<th>Year 3 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee or Service</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>32.87%</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>34.45%</td>
<td>34.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>43.47%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>41.52%</td>
<td>41.44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay/Other</td>
<td>.38%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.16%</td>
<td>.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>.06%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anticipated increase in utilization from the current year (2013) to the projected Years 1 and 3 is due to the addition of 4 new doctors to the practice.
The Department has reviewed the facility’s certified 2010 through 2013 cost report submissions and determined that the facility has not met the 2% charity care commitment as provided in their establishment CON. The applicant indicated that the Center experienced 34.22% Medicaid utilization in 2013, exceeding their original Year 1 and Year 3 commitment of 5% Medicaid utilization, but acknowledges the charity care shortfall. The Center primarily relied upon member referrals for charity care cases, and the applicant indicates that while the members worked diligently to refer charity care patients to the Center, the need for additional charity care referral sources has become evident. To increase charity care volume, the facility implemented a formal Charity Care Program in 2014 to ensure that they serve the needs of the local community. After vetting alternatives, the Center entered into a partnership with Charles B. Wang Community Health Center, an organization dedicated to serving low income communities, to help refer charity care patients to the Center. The partnership began in September 2014 and they have already seen several additional referrals as a result. The Center is hopeful that this proactive relationship will allow them to increase charity care cases to at least the 2% level going forward. In addition to charity care cases, the Center will continue its emphasis on serving lower income populations.

After reviewing the corrective action information provided by the applicant, the Department recommends a three (3) year limited life extension to allow the facility additional time to achieve their 2% charity care commitment.

**Capability and Feasibility**

The purchase price of $1,192,884 will be met with $298,221 in personal equity from each proposed new member. BFA Attachment A, the net worth of two of the four proposed members, indicates that they do not have sufficient resources available to meet the required equity. The two members, Dr. Pierre Hindy and Dr. Ian Wall, have provided letters of interest from Chase bank for personal loans in the amount of $250,000 each, at 5% interest for a 5 year term. When these loans are secured, there will be sufficient resources to fund this transaction.

The submitted budget indicates an excess of revenues over expenses of $2,117,792 during Year 1 and $2,109,790 during Year 3 of operations. The budget is reasonable.

BFA Attachment B is the 2012 and 2013 certified financial summary for Digestive Disease D&TC, which indicates that the facility experienced both positive average working capital and members’ equity positions. The facility also generated an average net income of $1,909,382 for the years 2012 and 2013.

BFA Attachment C is the internal financial summary for Digestive Disease D&TC for the period 1/1/2014-10/31/2014, which indicates that the facility experienced a positive working capital position and a negative members’ equity position. The facility also generated a net income of $2,419,125 for the period ended 10/31/2014. The negative members’ equity position is due to a loan the Center took out in early 2014 to retire pre-existing debt and repurchase shares from existing members. The loan was for $2.587 million, with approximately $225,000 used to retire the debt and approximately $2,362,000 used to repurchase shares from existing members of the Center. The repurchased shares equated to 24.9% in ownership interest. The loan has already been paid down to $2.523 million by 10/31/2014. If the loan had not been taken out, the Center would have had a positive members’ equity position for the period as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original 2014 Internal Balance Sheet (with loan included)</th>
<th>Revised 2014 Internal Balance Sheet (without loan included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$1,361,816</td>
<td>$1,361,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$138,488</td>
<td>$138,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Long Term Liabilities</td>
<td>$2,253,027</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>$2,391,515</td>
<td>$138,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ Equity</td>
<td>($1,029,699)</td>
<td>$1,223,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendation
From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFA Attachment A</th>
<th>Net Worth Statement of New Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>2012-2013 Financial Summary, Digestive Disease Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>1/1/2014-10/31/2014 Internal Financial Summary, Digestive Disease Diagnostic and Treatment Center, LLC d/b/a South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to transfer 40% of membership interest to four (4) new members and the withdrawal of two (2) existing members; certify an additional three (3) year limited life extension for CON 081088, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: FACILITY/APPLICANT:

141253 E South Brooklyn Endoscopy Center
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

Approval for a three year extension of the operating certificate from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter, contingent upon:
1. Submission of an executed loan commitment from Dr. Hindy acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
2. Submission of an executed loan commitment from Dr. Wall acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
3. Submission of a signed agreement with an outside independent entity satisfactory to the Department to provide annual reports to the DOH beginning in the second year of operation. Said reports should include:
   a. Data showing actual utilization including procedures;
   b. Data showing breakdown of visits by payor source;
   c. Data showing number of patients who need follow-up care in a hospital within seven days after ambulatory surgery;
   d. Data showing number of emergency transfers to a hospital;
   e. Data showing percentage of charity care provided, and
   f. Number of nosocomial infections recorded during the year in question.
   g. Corrective measures implemented for submitting data to SPARCS. [RNR]
4. Submission of a statement, acceptable to the Department, that the applicant will consider creating or entering into an integrated system of care that will reduce the fragmentation of the delivery system, provide coordinated care for patients, and reduce inappropriate utilization of services. The applicant will agree to submit a report to the Department beginning in the second year of operation and each year thereafter detailing these efforts and the results. [RNR]
5. Submission by the governing body of the ambulatory surgery center of a detailed plan that will be implemented to improve charity care to two (2) percent. [RNR]
6. Submission of a photocopy of an executed amendment to the applicant’s Articles of Organization, acceptable to the department. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within one year from the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The applicant must submit proof from the Department of State of the filing of a certificate of amendment of its Articles of Organization that has found to be acceptable to the Department of Health. [DLA]

Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Project # 142152-E
Odyssey Community Services, Inc.

Program: Diagnostic & Treatment Center
Purpose: Establishment
County: New York
Acknowledged: October 15, 2014

Executive Summary

Description
Odyssey Community Services, Inc. a to-be-formed New York State not-for-profit corporation, seeks approval to be established as the operator of an Article 28 diagnostic and treatment center (D&T) facility, which is currently operated as an extension clinic of Odyssey House of New York, Inc. (Odyssey House). The D&T is located at 219 East 121st Street, New York, 10035 (New York County). Odyssey House seeks to establish the extension clinic site as a separate Article 28 D&T entity so it can obtain designation as a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) Look-Alike clinic. Odyssey House will submit a closure plan to the Department for its extension clinic upon Public Health and Health Planning Council approval of this application. There is no construction proposed for this project.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
Proposed services are Medical Services-Primary Care, Medical Services-Other, and Dental O/P. The proposed project will continue providing medical services to patients referred from Odyssey House, in addition to serving the communities of the service area. The number of projected visits is 14,476 in year 1, with Medicaid at 87.14 percent, and charity care at 11.85 percent.

Program Summary
The Department’s recommendation for approval has been made after consideration of the statutory factors found in the New York State Correction Law (Sections 752 and 753).

Financial Summary
There are no project costs associated with this application. There is no asset purchase agreement associated with this application.

Establishment as a separate Article 28 D&T is required before the facility can apply for FQHC designation. Therefore, the facility submitted their budget based on current D&T reimbursement rates as follows:

Current Rates:
(Year 1)
Revenues $1,519,980
Expenses 1,512,227
Gain $7,753

Current Rates:
(Year 3)
Revenues $1,612,547
Expenses 1,593,960
Gain $18,587

The FQHC sensitized budget for year 1 and year 3 based on projected FQHC payment rates is as follows:

FQHC Budget:
(Year 1)
Revenues $2,570,018
Expenses 2,518,057
Gain $51,961

FQHC Budget:
(Year 3)
Revenues $2,726,436
Expenses 2,638,638
Gain $87,798

DOH staff has reviewed the DTC budgets under both rate structures and has determined that the applicant can meet costs and maintain at least a break even operating margin under both scenarios. Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and contingent approval is recommended.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of an executed building lease, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
2. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
3. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital. [HSP]
4. Submission of a photocopy of the applicant’s executed Bylaws, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
5. Submission of a photocopy of an executed Certificate of Incorporation of Odyssey Community Services Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity’s clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
Odyssey Community Services, Inc., a to-be-formed NYS not-for-profit corporation, seeks approval to establish Odyssey Community Services, Inc. as the operator of a diagnostic and treatment facility located at 219 East 121st Street, 10035, New York County. This facility, on 121st Street, is currently being operated as an Article 28 diagnostic and treatment center (D&TC) extension clinic of Odyssey House of NY, Inc. (OHNY).

Background
Odyssey House of New York, Inc. is a Voluntary Not-for-Profit Corporation; it has a main facility, and three extension clinics, all in New York County. Additionally, OHNY also has an extension clinic in Bronx County. All these facilities are located as follows:

a) Main Facility: Odyssey House of New York, Inc.: 666 Broadway Tenth Floor, NY, 10012 (NY County)
b) Extension Clinic: OH East 121st Street: 219 East 121 Street, NY, 10035 (NY County)
c) Extension Clinic: OH East 6th Street Clinic: 309-11 East 6th Street, NY, 10003 (NY County)
d) Extension Clinic: OH Mabon Clinic: Mabon Bldg. #13 (600 East 125th St.), Ward’s Island, 10035 (NY County)
e) Extension Clinic-Bronx: 953 Southern Blvd-Suite 301, Bronx, 10459 (Bronx County)

The five facilities provide a range of medical services as described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensed Services Available Currently</th>
<th>Odyssey House of New York</th>
<th>Odyssey House East 121st St.</th>
<th>Odyssey House East 6th St.</th>
<th>Odyssey House Mabon Clinic</th>
<th>Odyssey House Bronx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental O/P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services- Primary Care</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Mental Health Services O/P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Dependence-Rehab O/P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic P/T Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HFIS

The table below provides information on time and distance from the proposed project on 121st Street in New York to the OHNY main facility and also to each extension clinic including the one in Bronx.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving Time and Distance from the CON 142152 Project Site (219 East 121 St to Other Facilities)</th>
<th>Minutes By Car/By Public Transit</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To: OHNY, Inc. Main Facility, 666 Broadway NY, 10012</td>
<td>22 min. / 34 min.</td>
<td>7.7 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: Extension Clinic at 309-11 East 6th Street, NY, 10003</td>
<td>21 min. / 38 min.</td>
<td>7.2 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: Extension Clinic at 600 East 125th St., Ward’s Island, 10035</td>
<td>7 min. / 15 min.</td>
<td>1.9 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: Extension Clinic at 953 Southern Blvd., Bronx, 10459</td>
<td>12 min. / 21 min.</td>
<td>3.9 mi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
The primary service area is East Harlem including zip codes 10029 and 10035. The proposed site and the surrounding extension clinics operated by Odyssey House will continue providing medical services to patients referred from Odyssey House, a social services agency, in addition to serving the communities of the primary service area.

Proposed services are as follows:

Certify:
Medical Services-Primary Care
Medical Services-Other
Dental O/P
The number of projected visits is 14,476 in Year 1 and 15,343 in Year 3. Sixty-six percent of the total visits will be primary care service visits and the remaining 34 percent will be dental care service visits. These projections are based on the current experience of OHNY, Inc.

The proposed location is in a Health Professional Shortage Area (HPSA) and also in a Medically Underserved Area/Population (MUA/P) as follows:
- HPSA for Primary Care Services: Medicaid Eligible-East Harlem
- HPSA for Dental Care Services: Medicaid Eligible-East Harlem
- MUA/P: Medicaid Eligible- East Harlem Service Area

The applicant is committed to serving all persons in need of care regardless of their ability to pay or the source of payment.

The applicant reports that the existing extension clinic of the OHNY, Inc. will remain open until this CON application 142152 is approved and that the proposed D&TC is established as the new Article 28 extension clinic of Odyssey Community Services, Inc.

**Conclusion**
The location of the proposed new center is currently operated as an extension clinic of Odyssey House of New York, and is an existing Article 28 provider. This change of sponsorship will enable the applicant to continue to meet the needs of a vulnerable population with complex health care needs, as well as provide an existing resource for residents of the primary service area.

**Recommendation**
From a need perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

---

### Program Analysis

**Program Description**
Odyssey Community Services, Inc., a to-be-formed, New York State not-for-profit corporation, seeks approval to establish an existing diagnostic and treatment center (D&TC) extension clinic operated by Odyssey House of New York, Inc. as a separate Article 28 entity so it may more easily seek designation as a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC).

Odyssey House is a comprehensive social services agency that provides housing services and substance abuse and mental health treatment. Odyssey House’s existing Article 28 D&TC, located at 219 East 121st Street in New York (New York County), provides comprehensive primary medical care services to clients of the larger social services agency. Under the new proposed operator, the clinic will be able to continue to provide medical services to patients referred from Odyssey House. Services will also be available to residents of the primary service area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Operator</th>
<th>Odyssey Community Services, Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>219 East 121st Street, New York, NY (NY County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialties</strong></td>
<td>Medical Services - Primary Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Services – Other Medical Specialties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental O/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours of Operation</strong></td>
<td>Monday &amp; Tuesday from 9:45 am – 5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday through Friday 9:45 am – 9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing (1st Year / 3rd Year)</strong></td>
<td>14.24 FTEs / 15.09 FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Director(s)</strong></td>
<td>David L. Foster, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance</strong></td>
<td>Is expected to be provided by Metropolitan Hospital Center 1.7 miles and 7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-call service</strong></td>
<td>After-hours On-Call Service available 24/7/365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Character and Competence
The members of the Odyssey Community Services, Inc. are:

Name
Sunita Manjrekar
Monica Thomas
Maria White
Cynthia Smith
Alexandra Arizaga
Jeffrey Savoy
Dwain Carryl
Malcolm Stone
Cecelia Scott-Croff

Ms. Manjrekar holds dual Master’s degrees in Education and Sociology. She is the Deputy Commissioner of Employment, Vocational and Community Services for the Nassau County Department of Social Services. Ms. Thomas holds a Master’s of Social Work degree and is currently pursuing a Master’s in Public Administration. She is a Licensed Social Worker (LSW) and a Certified Alcohol and Substance Abuse Counselor employed by Volunteers of America, a non-profit social services organization. In that capacity, she oversees all single adult homeless shelters for the organization, to include $19M budget, 9 programs and 240 employees. Ms. White holds a business certificate and was employed as the Assistant Manager of a retail establishment until her retirement in June 2008. She is a patient of the center. Ms. Smith worked as a housekeeper for a national hotel chain until her retirement in February 2010. She is also a patient of the center. Ms. Arizaga, who holds a Bachelors of Business Administration, has been employed by the Odyssey House for over 20 years and currently serves as its Assistant Controller. Mr. Savoy holds a Master of Social Work degree and is a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW). He has been employed by the Odyssey House since July 2001, currently serving as its Administrator. Mr. Carryl holds an MBA from the Yale School of Management and works as a Sr. Vice President/Portfolio Manager for the U.S. Trust. Mr. Stone earned a Master’s Degree in Marriage and Family Therapy and works as a Career Advisor for a non-profit organization. Ms. Scott-Croft, who holds dual Masters of Science in Education degrees (Early Childhood and Administration & Supervision) and numerous NY State teaching certifications, is the Executive Director of the Early Childhood Center for the City University of New York.

In addition to members of the Board, information was also submitted and reviewed for the Center’s Medical Director, David Foster, MD. Dr. Foster has operated a private practice for the past 14 years and, since June 2010, he has served as Odyssey House’s Medical Director.

Staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the disclosure information submitted regarding licenses held, formal education, training in pertinent health and/or related areas, employment history, a record of legal actions, and a disclosure of the applicant’s ownership interest in other health care facilities. Licensed individuals were checked against the Office of Medicaid Management, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, and the Education Department databases as well as the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General Medicare exclusion database.

Ms. Smith disclosed that she was convicted of a Class C Felony in 1975 and twelve (12) Class E Felonies between 1977 and 2004. On April 5, 2004, she was convicted of possession of a controlled substance that resulted in referral for Substance Use Disorder treatment, which she completed in July 2005.

Ms. White disclosed that she was convicted of a Class A Felony (Possession of controlled substance) in August 1990 and served 10 years in the federal prison system.

In evaluating this application, the Department needed to consider the statutory factors found in the New York State Correction Law Sections 752 and 753.
Section 752 prohibits unfair discrimination against persons previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses. Specifically, “No application for any license or employment…shall be denied or acted upon adversely by reason of the individual's having been previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses, or by reason of a finding of lack of "good moral character" when such finding is based upon the fact that the individual has previously been convicted of one or more criminal offenses, unless: (1) there is a direct relationship between one or more of the previous criminal offenses and the specific license or employment sought or held by the individual; or (2) the issuance or continuation of the license or the granting or continuation of the employment would involve an unreasonable risk to property or to the safety or welfare of specific individuals or the general public.”

Section 753 sets forth factors that are required to be considered in making a determination to deny licensure based on the conviction. Specifically, “(a) The public policy of this state, as expressed in this act, to encourage the licensure and employment of persons previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses; (b) The specific duties and responsibilities necessarily related to the license or employment sought or held by the person; (c) The bearing, if any, the criminal offense or offenses for which the person was previously convicted will have on his fitness or ability to perform one or more such duties or responsibilities; (d) The time which has elapsed since the occurrence of the criminal offense or offenses; (e) The age of the person at the time of occurrence of the criminal offense or offenses; (f) The seriousness of the offense or offenses. (g) Any information produced by the person, or produced on his behalf, in regard to his rehabilitation and good conduct; (h) The legitimate interest of the public agency or private employer in protecting property, and the safety and welfare of specific individuals or the general public.

**Recommendation**

From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

---

**Financial Analysis**

**Lease Rental Agreement**

The applicant has submitted a draft lease rental agreement for the site they will occupy, which is summarized below:

- **Premises:** 2,200 square feet located at 219 East 121st St., NY, NY 10035
- **Lessor:** Odyssey House, Inc.
- **Lessee:** Odyssey Community Services, Inc.
- **Term:** 10 years
- **Rental:** $77,000 annually ($35.00 per sq. ft.)
  - Rental of existing equipment is included in the base rent.
- **Provisions:** Utilities and maintenance services are included in the base rent.

The applicant has provided two letters indicating the rent reasonableness. The applicant has submitted an affidavit that indicates that the lease agreement will be a non-arms-length lease agreement.
Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted an operating budget, in 2015 dollars, for the first and third years based on current DTC reimbursement rates, which is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$1,519,980</td>
<td>$1,612,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$1,431,246</td>
<td>$1,515,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$80,981</td>
<td>$78,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$1,512,227</td>
<td>$1,593,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Revenues over Expenses</td>
<td>$7,753</td>
<td>$18,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization: (Visits)</td>
<td>14,476</td>
<td>15,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Visit</td>
<td>$104.46</td>
<td>$103.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the actual experience of Odyssey House of New York, Inc., which is the current operator of the extension clinic site. It is noted that the Odyssey House provides chemical dependency rehabilitation services and presently close to 100% of their patients are Medicaid eligible.

Utilization broken down by payor source during the first and third years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee For Service</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitized Budget
The applicant has provided a sensitized budget for the first and third years of operation, in 2015 dollars, based on FQHC reimbursement rates, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitized FQHC Rates</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$2,570,018</td>
<td>$2,726,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$2,437,076</td>
<td>$2,560,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$80,981</td>
<td>$78,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$2,518,057</td>
<td>$2,638,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Revenues over Expenses</td>
<td>$51,961</td>
<td>$87,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>14,476</td>
<td>15,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Visit</td>
<td>$173.95</td>
<td>$171.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization by payor source for the first and third years is as follows for the sensitized FQHC budgets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee For Service</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>87.07%</td>
<td>87.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget differences resulting from the use of sensitized FQHC rate assumptions are due to the following:
- The HRSA Section 330 Grant revenues have been included for FQHC status.
- Outreach and case management administrative staff expenses have been included for FQHC status.
**Capability and Feasibility**
There are no total project costs and no asset purchase agreement associated with this application.

Working capital requirements are estimated at $265,660, which is equivalent to two months of third year expenses. The applicant will finance $132,830 via a bank loan from Odyssey Foundation of New York, Inc. at an interest rate of 3% for a three year term. The remaining $132,830 will be provided in the form of equity to be provided by Odyssey Foundation of New York, Inc. BFA Attachment A is the June 30, 2013 certified financial statements and the June 30, 2014 internal financial statements of Odyssey Foundation of New York, Inc., which indicates the availability of sufficient funds for the equity contribution to meet the working capital requirement. BFA Attachment B is the pro forma balance sheet of Odyssey Community Services, Inc. as of the first day of operation, which indicates a positive net asset position of $132,830.

The submitted budget using current DTC reimbursement rates indicates an excess of revenues over expenses of $7,753 and $18,587 during the first and third years, respectively. Revenues are based on current reimbursement rates of the current facility, which are based on the Ambulatory Patient Group (APG) payment rate methodology.

The submitted sensitized FQHC status based budgets indicates an excess of revenues over expenses of $51,961 and $87,798 in Year 1 and Year 3. FQHC revenues are based on the current cost based reimbursement methodology applicable for FQHC designated facilities. The sensitized budget appears reasonable.

As shown on BFA Attachment A, Odyssey Foundation of New York, Inc. had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014. Also, the Foundation achieved an average increase in unrestricted net asset of $44,068 from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014.

Subject to the noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

**Recommendation**
*From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.*

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Financial Summary- Odyssey Foundation of New York, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Pro Forma Balance Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to establish Odyssey Community Services, Inc. as the operator of a diagnostic and treatment facility located at 219 East 121st Street, which is currently operated as an extension clinic of Odyssey House, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: FACILITY/APPLICANT:

142152 E Odyssey Community Services, Inc.
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of an executed building lease, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
2. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
3. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital. [HSP]
4. Submission of a photocopy of the applicant’s executed Bylaws, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
5. Submission of a photocopy of an executed Certificate of Incorporation of Odyssey Community Services Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity's clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]

Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Description

DRNC Operating, LLC d/b/a Delhi Rehabilitation & Nursing Center, a New York State limited liability company, seeks approval to be established as the operator of a to-be-constructed 176-bed residential health care facility (RHCF) at the former site of the Countryside Care Center, a 160-bed RHCF which closed in October 2012. The new facility will be located on a 58.73 acre parcel at 41861 State Route 10, Delhi (Delaware County).

On May 2, 2014, Personal Healthcare, LLC entered into an Agreement of Sale with Leatherstocking Realty for the acquisition of the property at 41861 State Route 10, Delhi. The members of Personal Healthcare, LLC will assign its acquisition of the land to DRNC Realty, LLC for $10 and other valuable consideration received in hand. DRNC Operating, LLC, as tenant, will enter into a proposed construction and lease agreement with DRNC Realty, LLC, as landlord, for site control of the facility. DRNC Realty, LLC will construct the 176-bed RHCF in accordance with plans approved by the tenant and will lease the facility to the tenant.

DRNC Realty, LLC will fund the cost of the property purchase, the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a new, 176-bed RHCF at a total cost of $30,846,346. The proposed financing plan is as follows: a loan from M&T Bank in the amount of $23,134,760, with the remaining $7,711,586 to be paid from the individual members' personal equity.

There is a non-arm’s length arrangement between the entity purchasing the real property, Personal Healthcare, LLC, the entity performing the construction and building on the real property, DRNC Realty, LLC, and the proposed operating entity, DRNC Operating, LLC. There is common ownership among the above mentioned entities as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>% Ownership</th>
<th>% Ownership</th>
<th>% Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim Zagelbaum</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Barth</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehudah J. Walden</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincus Zagelbaum</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yechiel Zagelbaum</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoel Zagelbaum</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the members of DRNC Operating, LLC have ownership interest in Highland Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, a 98-bed RHCF located in Middletown, which was given final approval under CON #121103 effective February 1, 2013.

Members Ephraim Zagelbaum, Alexander Barth, Pincus Zagelbaum, Yachiel Zagelbaum, and Yoel Zagelbaum have ownership interest in the following 3 RHCFs:

- Tarrytown Hall Care Center, a 120-bed RHCF located in Tarrytown;
- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, an 80-bed RHCF located in Little Falls; and
Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, an 80-bed RHCF located in Norwich.

Members Ephraim Zagelbaum, Alexander Barth, Yehuda Walden, Yachiel Zagelbaum, and Yoel Zagelbaum also have ownership interest in Utica Rehabilitation & Nursing Center, a 120-bed RHCF located in Utica, which was given final approval under CON #132357 effective November 6, 2014.

**DOH Recommendation**
Contingent Approval

**Need Summary**
Countryside Care Center’s utilization was 95.4% in 2009, 93.7% in 2010, and 82.6% in 2011. The county's overall utilization for 2012 and 2013 was 96.7% and 98.5%, respectively. This proposed application will provide a much needed resource in the community.

**Program Summary**
No negative information has been received concerning the character and competence of the proposed applicants identified as new members. The proposed design will create a modern resident-centered facility that will help meet the need for long term care beds in the area.

**Financial Summary**
The total project cost of $30,846,346 will be met with members' equity of $7,711,586 and a bank loan of $23,134,760 at 5.5% with a 10 year term and 25 year amortization. Each member of DRNC Operating, LLC has submitted an affidavit stating that they will personally contribute resources to fund the balloon payment should acceptable financing not be available at the time the loan comes due after the 10 year term.

| Budget | Revenues: | $16,166,695 |
|        | Expenses: | $14,547,030 |
|        | Gain:     | $1,619,665  |

Subject to noted contingencies, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:

1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]

2. Submission of a commitment signed by the applicant which indicates that, within two years from the date of the council approval, the percentage of all admissions who are Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid eligible at the time of admission will be at least 75 percent of the planning area average of all Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid admissions, subject to possible adjustment based on factors such as the number of Medicaid patient days, the facility’s case mix, the length of time before private paying patients became Medicaid eligible, and the financial impact on the facility due to an increase in Medicaid admissions. [RNR]

3. Submission of a plan to continue to enhance access to Medicaid residents. At a minimum, the plan should include, but not necessarily be limited to, ways in which the facility will:
   a. Reach out to hospital discharge planners to make them aware of the facility’s Medicaid Access Program;
   b. Communicate with local hospital discharge planners on a regular basis regarding bed availability at the nursing facility; and
   c. Identify community resources that serve the low-income and frail elderly population who may eventually use the nursing facility, and inform them about the facility’s Medicaid Access policy. [RNR]

4. Submission of a commitment, signed by the applicant, to submit annual reports to the DOH, for at least two years, demonstrating substantial progress with the implementation of the plan. These reports should include, but not be limited to:
   a. Describing how the applicant reached out to hospital discharge planners to make them aware of the facility’s Medicaid Access Program;
   b. Indicating that the applicant communicated with local hospital discharge planners on a regular basis regarding bed availability at the nursing facility;
   c. Identifying the community resources that serve the low-income and frail elderly population that have used, or may eventually use, the nursing facility, and confirming they were informed about the facility’s Medicaid Access policy.
   d. Documentation pertaining to the number of referrals and the number of Medicaid admissions; and
   e. Other factors as determined by the applicant to be pertinent. [RNR]

The DOH reserves the right to require continued reporting beyond the two year period.

5. Submission and programmatic review and approval of the final floor plans. [LTC]

6. Submission of a commitment for a permanent mortgage for the project to be provided from a recognized lending institution at a prevailing rate of interest, acceptable to the Department of Health. This is to be provided within 120 days of approval of state hospital code drawings and before the start of construction. Included with the submitted permanent mortgage commitment must be a sources and uses statement and a debt amortization schedule, for both new and refinanced debt. [BFA]

7. Submission of an executed building lease acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]

8. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
9. Submission of an executed assignment of agreement of sale acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]

10. The submission of Final Construction Documents, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-05, prior to the applicant’s request for, and Department’s granting approval for the start of construction. [AER]

11. Submission of an amended Articles of Organization of DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

12. Submission of an amended Operating Agreement of DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

13. Submission of an amended Agreement of Lease between DNRC Realty, LLC and DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within five years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

2. The applicant shall complete construction by February 1, 2017. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5) and 710.10(a), if construction is not completed on or before that date, this may constitute abandonment of the approval and this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
DRNC Operating, LLC dba Delhi Rehabilitation & Nursing Center seeks approval to become the established operator of a new 176-bed residential health care facility (RHCF) at the site of the former Countryside Care Center, located at 41861 State Route 10, Delhi, 13753, in Delaware County, which closed in 2012.

Analysis
There is currently a need for 309 beds in Delaware County as indicated in Table 1 below. The overall occupancy for Delaware County is 96.7% for 2012 and 98.5% for 2013, as indicated in Table 2.

Table 1: RHCF Need – Delaware County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Projected Need</th>
<th>511</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Beds</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Countryside Care Center/Delaware County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/County</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2009</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2010</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2011</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2012</th>
<th>% Occupancy 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Care Ctr</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>(Closed)</td>
<td>(Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countryside Care Center’s utilization was 95.4% in 2009, 93.7% in 2010, and 82.6% in 2011. As of December 22, 2014, county occupancy was 94.8%, with 11 vacant beds. Although the county’s utilization currently falls below 97%, there is a documented need for additional beds in this county. There are only two RHCFs remaining in Delaware County and none in the neighboring county of Schoharie. Residents of Schoharie County are utilizing the resources within Delaware County. Patients requiring nursing home care end up going to facilities outside of Delaware County, and many times out of state, thereby causing an undue burden for both patient and family. The addition of a replacement facility will not only serve the elderly, but will contribute to the overall well-being of all residents within both Delaware and Schoharie Counties.

Proposed changes to the county if this application is approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Current Beds</th>
<th>Proposed Beds</th>
<th>Upon Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Care Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi Rehabilitation Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+176</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainside Residential Care Center</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Terrace</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Beds</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>+176</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This application will result in new beds and services.

Since the closure of Countryside Care Center, two nursing homes remain in the county, with a combined total of 11 beds currently available. With such limited beds available for new patients, wait lists have been established and, according to one hospital provider, patients needing nursing home care are put in facilities that may be far from home (over 180 miles away), as well as placed out of state. This places an extreme hardship on the patient’s families, especially in the winter months when the roads can become too dangerous to traverse.
Letters and a memorandum of support were filed with this application noting a strong desire for additional nursing home beds within this county. Delaware Valley Hospital, the Critical Access Hospital in the county, said that of all the hospital discharges needing nursing home care, 80% would have chosen Countryside Care Center as their first choice had it remained open. This proposed project will be able to keep county residents closer to their communities and families.

The closure of Countryside Care Center had a negative impact on the county as the facility was one of its largest employers. The facility also provided placement for nursing students from SUNY Delhi’s School of Nursing Program. The proposed new facility is prepared to discuss the reinstatement of this program.

Access
Regulations indicate that the Medicaid patient admissions standard shall be 75% of the annual percentage of all Medicaid admissions for the long term care planning area in which the applicant facility is located. Such planning area percentage shall not include residential health care facilities that have an average length of stay 30 days or fewer. If there are four or fewer residential health care facilities in the planning area, the applicable standard for a planning area shall be 75% of the planning area percentage of Medicaid admissions, or of the Health Systems Agency area Medicaid admissions percentage, whichever is less. In calculating such percentages, the Department will use the most current data which have been received and analyzed by the Department.

An applicant will be required to make appropriate adjustments in its admission policies and practices so that the proportion of its own annual Medicaid patient’s admissions is at least 75% of the planning area percentage or the Health Systems Agency percentage, whichever is applicable.

Prior to its closure, Countryside Care Center’s Medicaid admissions for 2010 and 2011 45.6% and 59.6%, respectively. This facility exceeded Delaware County 75% rates in 2010 and 2011 of 31.1% and 29.6%, respectively.

Conclusion
Approval of this application will result in the provision of a much-needed resource for the residents in Delaware County and contiguous counties.

Recommendation
From a need perspective, contingent approval is recommended.
Facility Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Name</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Delhi Rehabilitation and Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>(site of former Countryside</td>
<td>41861 State Highway 10 Delhi, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care Center)</td>
<td>13753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHCF Capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHC Program Capacity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Operator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Limited Liability Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of Operator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Proprietary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DRNC Operating, LLC d/b/a Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation &amp; Nursing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Zagelbaum 48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Barth 23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yahudah Walden 23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yechiel Zagelbaum 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yoel Zagelbaum 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinchus Zagelbaum 2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Character and Competence - Background

Facilities Reviewed

Nursing Homes
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 04/2008 to present
- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 07/2009 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 01/2011 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 02/2013 to present

Massachusetts Nursing Homes
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 09/2010 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 04/2012 to present
- Rehabilitation and Nursing Center at Everett 01/2013 to present

Individual Background Review

Ephraim Zagelbaum is a licensed New York State Nursing Home Administrator with license in good standing. Mr. Zagelbaum currently is the President/Chief Executive Officer at Personal Healthcare Management LLC which is located in Tarrytown, NY. He was previously employed as Administrator at Windsor Park Nursing from 2004 to 2012. Mr. Zagelbaum discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 07/2009 to present
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 09/2010 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 01/2011 to present
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 04/2008 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Rehabilitation and Nursing Center at Everett (MA) 01/2013 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 02/2013 to present
**Alexander Barth** is a licensed New York State Nursing Home Administrator with license in good standing. Mr. Barth also holds a current EMT license. Mr. Barth is a Managing Partner at Personal Healthcare Management LLC since January 2013. Previous to this he was employed as Administrator at Tarrytown Hall Care Center from 2007 to 2012. Mr. Barth discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 07/2009 to present
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 09/2010 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 01/2011 to present
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 01/2010 to present Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Rehab & Nursing Center at Everett (MA) 01/2013 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center 02/2013 to present

**Yehudah Walden** is a managing member at Personal Healthcare since 2010. Mr. Walden discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 09/2010 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Rehab & Nursing Center at Everett (MA) 01/2013 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center 02/2013 to present

**Yechiel Zagelbaum** has been a pediatrician in private practice in Brooklyn, NY since 2002. Dr. Zagelbaum is a New York State Physician with license in good standing; and current certification in general pediatrics. Mr. Zagelbaum discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 07/2009 to present
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 09/2010 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 01/2011 to present
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 04/2008 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Rehab & Nursing Center at Everett (MA) 01/2013 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center 02/2013 to present

**Yoel Zagelbaum** is an attorney in good standing who serves as the President of Riverside Abstract, LLC, a title insurance company, located in Brooklyn, NY. Mr. Zagelbaum is a U.S. patent attorney in good standing. Mr. Zagelbaum discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 07/2009 to present
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 09/2010 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 01/2011 to present
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 04/2008 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Rehab & Nursing Center at Everett (MA) 01/2013 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center 02/2013 to present

**Pincus Zagelbaum** is currently employed as Chief Financial Officer at Personal Healthcare Management LLC since 2012. Previously Mr. Zagelbaum served as the Vice-President/CEO of St. Mary’s Healthcare System for Children, a specialty nursing home located in Bayside, Queens. Mr. Zagelbaum discloses the following health facility ownership interests:

- Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 7/29/2009 to present
- Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA) 9/23/2010 to present
- Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center 1/1/2011 to present
- Tarrytown Hall Care Center 4/1/2008 to present
- Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) 04/2012 to present
- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center 02/2013 to present
Character and Competence - Analysis
No negative information has been received concerning the character and competence of the above applicants.

A review of operations for Alpine Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, Norwich Rehabilitation and Nursing Center, Tarrytown Hall Care Center and Highland Rehab & Nursing Center results in a conclusion of substantially consistent high level of care since there were no enforcements. A review of the affidavits submitted by the applicant for Cambridge Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (MA), Rehab & Nursing Center at Everett (MA), and Medford Rehabilitation & Nursing Center (MA) for the periods identified above results in a conclusion of substantially consistent high level of care since there were no enforcements disclosed.

Project Review
Program Review
DRNC Operating, LLC d/b/a Delhi Rehabilitation and Nursing Center (Delhi), a proposed limited liability company, requests approval to establish and construct a 176-bed nursing home. The new facility will be located on the site of Countryside Care Center, a 160-bed nursing home that closed in October, 2010. The proposal will involve the demolition of the 1972 building applicant and the recycling of the existing 1963 building to be converted to a 56 bed short-term rehabilitation unit. A new 120 bed wing will be constructed and attached to the remaining building, with a new entryway joining the two buildings.

Physical Environment
The proposed Delhi nursing facility will be located on a large site totaling 66.2 acres, directly off Route 10. The remaining 1963 building totals 46,389 square feet, and the new addition will encompass 79,992 square feet. The new building will more than double the residential space contained in the to-be-demolished 1972 addition. The 1963 building consists of a one story structure with two linear nursing units in the general shape of a “4”, surrounding a central courtyard. Service and activity space is located on the north side of the courtyard. The new addition will be located on the west end of the existing building, and will consist of two story structure with two nursing units framing a pentagonal shaped interior courtyard. A new entrance with drop-off and covered patio will be constructed in a connector between the new and old buildings. The central connector will also include a new enlarged therapy suite serving the entire nursing home.

The new building will be constructed with two mirror image floors divided into three neighborhoods of 14, 20 and 28 beds respectively. Each floor will feature 30 single- bedded and 15 double- bedded rooms, for a total of 60 beds. The doubles will be designed as enhanced doubles with a partition separating the beds on opposite walls. Two dining rooms with country kitchens will be located adjacent to the interior courtyard, opening onto the entrance area on the first level. Each neighborhood will offer ample activity space, or parlors, generally situated in the center of the neighborhood allowing light to stream through windows located on the outside wall. Additional parlors are located next to the dining room, and on the opposite side of the courtyard in the corridor connecting the two residential clusters. Each neighborhood will include a central bathing area, two of which will include tub and shower.

In order to avoid an unfavorable comparison with the contemporary building, the single story 1963 building will be renovated to serve residents requiring short term rehabilitation. All of the existing resident rooms will be converted to single occupancy bedrooms, with each room fully ADA compliant. The unit will be re-designed to form 21 and 25 bed neighborhoods. The unit will be comprised of 14 enhanced doubles, 32 single bedrooms sharing a common toilet room, 6 conventional singles, 1 single with tub, and 3 singles with shower. Most of the rooms will face the existing or new entrance areas, with some new rooms created with view of the interior courtyard. The lounge area at the south finger will remain and new parlors/activity areas will be created in the corner of the eastern finger and adjacent to the interior courtyard.
The nursing unit will retain the existing dining room, appropriately sized for the number of residents, with a new area created for family dining. The private dining room will also open into the existing entry parlor, which will provide exclusive access into the short term rehabilitation unit. A multi-use auditorium lies opposite the dining room, providing large activity space for the entire nursing home.

Industrial and service functions are located on the north side of the 1963 building, including the boilers, laundry and kitchen. This space will undergo minor renovation, re-allocating space to create efficiencies. The staff dining room and medical office and records room will be relocated within this area. A new personal care area will be created adjacent to the central therapy suite, sized to serve the entire nursing home.

**Conclusion**

No negative information has been received concerning the character and competence of the proposed operators. The design reflects a sensitivity to residents’ needs, and successfully integrates an outdated nursing home building with a contemporary residential structure, culminating in a unified residential health care facility.

**Recommendation**

From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

---

### Financial Analysis

**Agreement of Sale**

Personal Healthcare, LLC entered into an Agreement of Sale with Leatherstocking Realty on May 2, 2014, for the acquisition of the property as shown below. A MAI appraisal was submitted by the applicant substantiating the purchase price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>May 2, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seller:</td>
<td>Leatherstocking Realty, of 321 N. Bellinger Street, Herkimer NY 13350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer:</td>
<td>Personal Healthcare LLC, of 20 Wood Court, Tarrytown NY 10591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased:</td>
<td>Parcel of real property and improvements constructed thereon known as 41861 State Highway 10, Delhi, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price:</td>
<td>$2,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Purchase Price:</td>
<td>$25,000 paid by Buyer prior to the execution of this agreement. $2,755,000 put in escrow account until legal closing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment of Agreement of Sale**

Personal Healthcare, LLC entered into an Assignment of Agreement of Sale with DRNC Realty, LLC on September 26, 2014, for assignment of the property as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>September 16, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignor:</td>
<td>Personal Healthcare, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td>DRNC Realty, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:</td>
<td>The Agreement of Sale for property known as 41861 State Highway 10, Delhi, New York 13753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price:</td>
<td>For $10 dollars and other valuable consideration received in hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lease Agreement
DRNC Realty, LLC will construct the 176-bed RHCF in accordance with plans approved by the tenant and will lease the facility to the tenant, DRNC Operating, LLC. The lease arrangement is a non-arm’s length agreement. The applicant has submitted an affidavit attesting to the relationship between the landlord and the operating entity. Facility occupancy is subject to a lease agreement, the terms of which are summarized as follows:

| Premises: | A 176-bed RHCF located at 41861 State Highway 10, Delhi, NY |
| Landlord: | DRNC Realty, LLC |
| Tenant: | DRNC Operating, LLC |
| Terms: | 10 years commencing on the execution of the lease with an additional 20 year renewal, year to year. |
| Rental: | Annual rent is $1,774,812 equal to the debt service on the initial permanent financing, insurance and real estate taxes. |
| Provisions: | Triple Net Lease. Tenant is responsible for taxes, general liability insurance, utilities and maintenance. |

Total Project Cost and Financing
Total project cost for land acquisition, new construction and movable equipment is estimated at $30,846,346, broken down as follows:

- Land acquisition $2,780,000
- New Construction 15,406,348
- Renovation and Demolition 4,168,293
- Site Development 968,159
- Asbestos Abatement or Removal 46,800
- Design Contingency 1,090,080
- Construction Contingency 1,090,080
- Architect/Engineering Fees 1,138,644
- Other Fees 192,400
- Movable Equipment 1,751,256
- Financing Costs 347,021
- Interim Interest 1,696,549
- CON Application Fee 2,000
- CON Additional Processing Fees 168,716

Total Project Cost $30,846,346

DRNC Realty, LLC will fund the total cost of $30,846,346 for the land purchase, demolition of existing buildings, and construction of a new 176-bed RHCF. The financing plan for the project is as follows:

- Members’ Equity $ 7,711,586
- Mortgage (5.5%, 10 year term, with a 25 year amortization) 23,134,760

Total project cost is based on a start date of December 1, 2015, with a 14 month construction period. The Bureau of Architectural and Engineering Facility Planning has determined that the reimbursable cost per bed of $174,293 (excluding CON fees) is acceptable.
Operating Budget
The applicant has provided an operating budget, in 2015 dollars, for the first and third years subsequent to project completion, summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>$8,578,849</td>
<td>$8,742,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>3,890,535</td>
<td>3,972,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Other</td>
<td>3,380,892</td>
<td>3,451,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$15,850,276</td>
<td>$16,166,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$12,352,177</td>
<td>$12,483,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>60,613</td>
<td>38,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Rent</td>
<td>2,024,991</td>
<td>2,024,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$14,437,781</td>
<td>$14,547,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$1,412,495</td>
<td>$1,619,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Patient Days</td>
<td>61,028</td>
<td>62,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy %</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of the budget reveals the following:
- Medicare and private pay revenues reflect historical payment rates of the members affiliated RHCFs.
- The facility’s Medicaid rate is based on Medicaid Regional Pricing methodology per Part 86-2 of Title 10 (Health) of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York.
- Overall utilization is based on 2009 from the former Countryside Care Center RHCF.
- Overall Occupancy is projected at 95.0% and 97.0% for the first and third years, respectively.
- Utilization by payer source for years one and three, based on historical experience, is expected as follows:
  - Medicaid: 70.0%
  - Medicare: 15.0%
  - Private: 10.0%
  - All Other: 5.0%
- Breakeven utilization is projected at 86.5% and 87.3% for year one and year three, respectively.

Capability and Feasibility
The total project cost of $30,846,836 will be met with members’ equity of $7,711,586 and a bank loan of $23,134,760 at terms stated previously. A letter of interest has been provided for mortgage financing from M&T Bank. BFA Attachment B is a summary of the net worth of the members of DRNC Operating, LLC, which indicates the availability of sufficient funds for project cost. It is noted that the members of DRNC Operating, LLC have different equity contributions than their ownership percentages as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>% Ownership</th>
<th>% Equity Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim Zagelbaum</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Barth</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehudah J. Walden</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincus Zagelbaum</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yechiel Zagelbaum</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoel Zagelbaum</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each member of DRNC Operating, LLC has submitted an affidavit stating that they will personally contribute resources to fund the balloon payment should acceptable financing not be available at the time the loan comes due after the 10 year term.
Working capital requirements are estimated at $2,424,505 based on two months of the third year budgeted expenses and will be met with a bank loan of $1,212,252 at 5% over 5 years with the remaining $1,212,253 from members’ equity. A letter of interest has been submitted from M&T Bank for the working capital. Affidavits from Yoel Zaglebaum and Yechiel Zaglebaum have been submitted to the Department of Health which state that they are willing to contribute resources disproportionate to their ownership percentages for working capital requirements. BFA Attachment B is a summary of the net worth of the members of DRNC Operating, LLC, which indicates the availability of sufficient funds for working capital. BFA Attachment C, the pro-forma balance sheet of DRNC Operating, LLC d/b/a Delhi Rehabilitation & Nursing Care as the first day of operation, indicates positive members’ equity of $1,212,253.

The submitted budget indicates a net profit of $1,412,495 and $1,619,665 for Years 1 and 3, respectively. Annual rental expense is sufficient to cover the landlord’s financing requirements. The budget appears reasonable.

A transition of nursing home (NH) residents to Medicaid managed care is currently being implemented statewide. Effective February 1, 2015, all eligible beneficiaries in NYC age 21 and over, in need of long term placement in a nursing facility, will be required to join a Medicaid Managed Care Plan (MMCP) or a Managed Long Term Care Plan (MLTCP). On April 1, 2015, the counties of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester will be phased in, and the rest of the State is scheduled to transition beginning July 1, 2015, for both dual and non-dual eligible populations. Under the managed care construct, Managed Care Organizations (MCOs) will negotiate payment rates directly with the NH providers. In order to mitigate the financial impact to NH providers during the transition to managed care, a department policy, as described in the “Transition of Nursing Home Benefit and Population into Managed Care Policy Paper,” provided further guidance requiring MCOs to pay the benchmark Medicaid FFS rate, or a negotiated rate acceptable to both plans and NHs, for 3 years after a county has been deemed mandatory (phased in) for NH population enrollment. As a result, the benchmark FFS rate remains a reliable basis for assessing NH Medicaid revenues through to January 31, 2018 (NYC), March 31, 2018 (Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester), and June 30, 2018 (upstate), respectively.

BFA Attachment D is a 2011 through 2013 financial summary of the operations for the members affiliated RHCFs, which shows the following:

- Alpine Rehabilitation & Nursing Center had an average negative working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2011 through 2013. The reason for the negative working capital position is due to Medicaid rate adjustment liabilities. Also, the entity achieved an average operating net income of $86,002 for the period.

- Norwich Rehabilitation & Nursing Center had an average negative working capital position and an average negative net asset position from 2011 through 2013. Also, the entity achieved an average net operating loss of $32,300 for the period. The facility was newly acquired effective January 1, 2011, and the current owners are attempting to turn the operation around from the previous owners.

- Tarrytown Hall Care Center had an average negative working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2011 through 2013. The negative working capital was largely due to the facility categorizing a $2.8 million Medicaid base year rate adjustment in 2011 as an expense rather than as revenue.

- Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center, which was acquired on February 1, 2013, ended the year 2013 with a negative working capital position, a negative net asset position, and a net operating loss $89,978. The facility was still in transition from the previous owners.
BFA Attachment E is a 2011 through 10/1/2014 financial summary of the combined operations of each nursing facility and its related realty company for the members affiliated RHCFs, which shows the following:

- **Alpine Rehabilitation & Nursing Center and Tarrytown Hall Center** had an average negative working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2011 through 2013. Also, the entities achieved an average operating net income of $532,380 and 1,718,496 respectively for the period.
- **Norwich Rehabilitation & Nursing Center** had an average negative working capital position and an average negative net asset position from 2011 through 2013. Also, the entity achieved an average net operating income of $462,241 for the period.
- **Highland Rehabilitation & Nursing Center**, which was acquired on February 1, 2013, ended the year 2013 with a negative working capital position, a positive net asset position, and a net operating income of $967,521.

A review of the 2014 internal financial statements presented as of 10/31/2014 for the combined operations indicates that all of the nursing homes demonstrated a positive net asset and working capital position. In addition, the aggregate net operating income of the combined operations of each nursing facility and its related realty company, for the periods 2011, 2012, and 2013, and year to date 10/31/2014, showed positive operating net income of $1,533,342, $2,507,236, $5,066,193, and $4,698,302 respectively.

Based on the preceding, and subject to the noted contingencies, it appears the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

**Recommendation**
From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Net Worth Statement of the Members of DRNC Operating, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>Pro Forma for Delhi Rehabilitation &amp; Nursing Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment D</td>
<td>Financial Summary-Affiliated Residential Health Care Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment E</td>
<td>Financial Summary-Combined Affiliated Facilities’ Operating and related Realty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHLC Attachment A</td>
<td>Quality Measures and Inspection Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to establish DRNC Operating, LLC as the operator of a to-be constructed, 176 bed residential health care facility to be located at 41861 Route 10, Delhi on the site of the former Countyside Care Center, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: 142195 B  
FACILITY/APPLICANT: Delhi Rehabilitation & Nursing Center
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of a check for the amount enumerated in the approval letter, payable to the New York State Department of Health. Public Health Law Section 2802.7 states that all construction applications requiring review by the Public Health and Health Planning Council shall pay an additional fee of fifty-five hundredths of one percent of the total capital value of the project, exclusive of CON fees. [PMU]

2. Submission of a commitment signed by the applicant which indicates that, within two years from the date of the council approval, the percentage of all admissions who are Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid eligible at the time of admission will be at least 75 percent of the planning area average of all Medicaid and Medicare/Medicaid admissions, subject to possible adjustment based on factors such as the number of Medicaid patient days, the facility’s case mix, the length of time before private paying patients became Medicaid eligible, and the financial impact on the facility due to an increase in Medicaid admissions. [RNR]

3. Submission of a plan to continue to enhance access to Medicaid residents. At a minimum, the plan should include, but not necessarily be limited to, ways in which the facility will:
   a. Reach out to hospital discharge planners to make them aware of the facility’s Medicaid Access Program;
   b. Communicate with local hospital discharge planners on a regular basis regarding bed availability at the nursing facility; and
   c. Identify community resources that serve the low-income and frail elderly population who may eventually use the nursing facility, and inform them about the facility’s Medicaid Access policy. [RNR]

4. Submission of a commitment, signed by the applicant, to submit annual reports to the DOH, for at least two years, demonstrating substantial progress with the implementation of the plan. These reports should include, but not be limited to:
   a. Describing how the applicant reached out to hospital discharge planners to make them aware of the facility’s Medicaid Access Program;
   b. Indicating that the applicant communicated with local hospital discharge planners on a regular basis regarding bed availability at the nursing facility;
   c. Identifying the community resources that serve the low-income and frail elderly population that have used, or may eventually use, the nursing facility, and confirming they were informed about the facility's Medicaid Access policy.
   d. Documentation pertaining to the number of referrals and the number of Medicaid admissions; and
   e. Other factors as determined by the applicant to be pertinent. [RNR]

The DOH reserves the right to require continued reporting beyond the two year period.

5. Submission and programmatic review and approval of the final floor plans. [LTC]

6. Submission of a commitment for a permanent mortgage for the project to be provided from a recognized lending institution at a prevailing rate of interest, acceptable to the Department of Health. This is to be provided within 120 days of approval of state hospital code drawings and before the start of construction. Included with the submitted permanent mortgage commitment must be a sources and uses statement and a debt amortization schedule, for both new and refinanced debt. [BFA]

7. Submission of an executed building lease acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
8. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
9. Submission of an executed assignment of agreement of sale acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
10. The submission of Final Construction Documents, as described in BAEFP Drawing Submission Guidelines DSG-05, prior to the applicant’s request for, and Department’s granting approval for the start of construction. [AER]
11. Submission of an amended Articles of Organization of DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
12. Submission of an amended Operating Agreement of DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
13. Submission of an amended Agreement of Lease between DNRC Realty, LLC and DNRC Operating, LLC, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within five years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The applicant shall complete construction by February 1, 2017. In accordance with 10 NYCRR Part 710.2(b)(5) and 710.10(a), if construction is not completed on or before that date, this may constitute abandonment of the approval and this approval shall be deemed cancelled, withdrawn and annulled without further action by the Commissioner. [AER]

Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (Kindred) and Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. (Kindred Operating) are seeking approval to become the new controlling persons of QC-Medi New York, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. (Gentiva). QC-Medi New York, Inc. presently operates five Gentiva Certified Home Health Agencies (CHHA) which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Counties Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 Elwood Davis Rd., Liverpool</td>
<td>Cayuga, Onondaga, Oswego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865 Merrick Ave., 3rd floor, Westbury</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888 Veterans Memorial Hwy, Hauppauge</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11649 East Corning Rd., Corning</td>
<td>Chemung, Steuben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Saratoga Village Blvd., Ballston Spa</td>
<td>Montgomery, Saratoga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindred and Gentiva are nationwide providers of health care services whose stock are publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange and the NASDAQ, respectively.

Kindred is also seeking approval, under separate application, as controlling persons of Quality Care-USA, Inc., Gentiva's other wholly-owned New York subsidiary, which presently operates four Gentiva Licensed Home Care Service Agencies (LHCSA).

On October 9, 2014, Kindred entered into and executed an Agreement and Plan of Merger with Gentiva whereby Kindred Operating will acquire 100% of the shares of Gentiva common stock by the merger into Gentiva, the surviving entity of Kindred Healthcare Development 2, Inc., and a wholly-owned subsidiary of Kindred Operating. Under the terms of the agreement, Gentiva shareholders will receive $14.50 per share in cash and $5.00 of Kindred common stock, which equates to 0.257 shares of Kindred common stock. The total purchase price in cash, stock and assumption of debt will be approximately $1.8 billion. The portion of the aggregate purchase price allocated to the Gentiva assets in New York is $38,086,770.

Gentiva, incorporated in Delaware and qualified to do business in New York, is the sole stockholder of Gentiva Health Services Holding Corp., the sole stockholder of QC-Medi New York, Inc. and Quality Care-USA, Inc., both of which are New York corporations. Therefore, the affiliation will create a “change in controlling person” for each of the Article 36 Entities due to their new relationships with Kindred and Kindred Operating. BFA Attachment A is the organizational chart for Kindred and Kindred Operating.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
This project is a change of ownership and is not expected to have an impact on services provided by the facility or the utilization of those services.

Program Summary
Five (5) Article 36 Certified Home Health Agencies (CHHAS) in New York State are currently operated by QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a proprietary business corporation. In addition, four (4) Article 36 Licensed Home Care Services Agencies (LCHSAs) in New York State are currently operated by Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a
Gentiva Health Services, a proprietary business corporation. The parent corporation and 100% stockholder of both QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services and Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, is Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation, a proprietary business corporation. The parent corporation and 100% stockholder of Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation is Gentiva Health Services, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation. This proposal seeks approval for Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., a proprietary business corporation, to become the new parent corporation and new 100% sole stockholder of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. Since the parent corporation and 100% sole stockholder of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. is Kindred Healthcare, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation, this proposal also seeks approval for Kindred Healthcare, Inc., to become the new grandparent corporation and ultimate controlling entity and stockholder of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. This CHHA CON application # 142193-E applies only to the five (5) QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services CHHAs, which are located in Ballston Spa, Liverpool (with branch offices in Auburn and Oswego), Corning, Westbury, and Hauppauge (with a sub-unit in Riverhead). A separate LHCSA application has been submitted for the four (4) Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services LHCSAs, which is also being presented on this agenda as LHCSA application # 2556-L.

The direct corporate operator of the five (5) CHHAs will remain QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services. The direct corporate operator of the four (4) LHCSAs will remain Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services. The parent corporation of both will remain Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation, and the grandparent corporation of both will remain Gentiva Health Services, Inc., as previously approved by both the State Hospital Review and Planning Council and the Public Health Council. However, the new incoming great-grandparent corporation and controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and the new incoming great-great-grandparent corporation and ultimate controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare, Inc. Programmatic Attachment A is the before and after organizational chart.

Financial Summary
There are no project costs associated with this application. The portion of the $1.8 billion purchase price allocated to the Gentiva assets in New York, comprised of the CHHAs and LHCSA, is $38,086,770 of which $37,917,489 is attributable to the CHHAs.

| Budget | Revenues: | $39,300,747 |
|        | Expenses: | $30,931,126 |
|        | Gain:     | $8,369,621  |

It appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of the executed Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
2. Submission of the executed Certificate of Merger of Kindred Healthcare Development 2, Inc. with and into Gentiva Health Services, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
**Need Analysis**

**Background**
Kindred Healthcare, Inc. a nationwide healthcare services company, is seeking to establish Kindred Healthcare, Inc. and Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., its subsidiary, as controlling persons of QC-Medi New York Inc., a New York corporation which operates five Certified Home Health Agencies in the state.

The five CHHAs owned and operated by Gentiva Health Services in New York State are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FacID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3852</td>
<td>Gentiva Health Services</td>
<td>888 Veterans Memorial Hwy</td>
<td>Hauppauge</td>
<td>11788</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4718</td>
<td>Gentiva Health Services</td>
<td>865 Merrick Avenue, 3rd Fl</td>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>11590</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3972</td>
<td>Gentiva Health Services</td>
<td>200 Elwood Davis Road</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>13088</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5554</td>
<td>Gentiva Health Services</td>
<td>100 Saratoga Village Blvd</td>
<td>Ballston Sp</td>
<td>12020</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4945</td>
<td>Gentiva Health Services</td>
<td>11849 East Corning Road</td>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>14830</td>
<td>Steuben</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**
This project will have no effect on the need for or utilization of services in the counties affected. Certified Home Health Agencies play an important role in reducing long-term care residents and reducing hospitalizations. This change in ownership should allow these facilities to continue to operate and gain access to more resources to support their work.

**Recommendation**
Because this transaction involves no change in services, the Bureau of Public Need Review has no recommendation regarding this proposal.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Program Description**
Five (5) Article 36 Certified Home Health Agencies (CHHAs) in New York State are currently operated by QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a proprietary business corporation. In addition, four (4) Article 36 Licensed Home Care Services Agencies (LCHSAs) in New York State are currently operated by Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a proprietary business corporation. The parent corporation and 100% stockholder of both QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services and Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, is Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation, a proprietary business corporation. The parent corporation and 100% stockholder of Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation is Gentiva Health Services, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation. This proposal seeks approval for Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., a proprietary business corporation, to become the new parent corporation and new 100% sole stockholder of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. Since the parent corporation and 100% sole stockholder of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. is Kindred Healthcare, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation, this proposal also seeks approval for Kindred Healthcare, Inc., to become the new grandparent corporation and ultimate controlling entity and stockholder of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. This CHHA CON application # 142193-E applies only to the five (5) QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services CHHAs, which are located in Ballston Spa, Liverpool (with branch offices in Auburn and Oswego), Corning, Westbury, and Hauppauge (with a sub-unit in Riverhead). A separate LHCSA application has been submitted for the four (4) Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services LHCSAs, which is also being presented on this agenda as LHCSA application # 2556-L.
The direct corporate operator of the five (5) CHHAs will remain QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services. The direct corporate operator of the four (4) LHCSAs will remain Quality Care - USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services. The parent corporation of both will remain Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation, and the grandparent corporation of both will remain Gentiva Health Services, Inc., as previously approved by both the State Hospital Review and Planning Council and the Public Health Council. However, the new incoming great-grandparent corporation and controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and the new incoming great-great-grandparent corporation and ultimate controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare, Inc. Programmatic Attachment A is the before and after organizational chart.

Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., a proprietary business corporation, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. Kindred Healthcare, Inc. owns 100% of the stock of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. Kindred Healthcare, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation, is authorized to issue 176,000,000 shares of capital stock, consisting of 175,000,000 shares of common stock and 1,000,000 shares of preferred stock, both with par value of $0.25 per share. The applicant confirms in writing that no stockholder (either natural person or business entity) owns 10% or more of the stock of Kindred Healthcare, Inc.

Kindred Healthcare, Inc., operates over 360 health care facilities and providers in 38 states. The complete list of affiliated health care facilities and providers, by provider type and by state, has been included in the application and a copy is attached (see Programmatic Attachment B – Kindred Providers / Facilities). All facilities and providers listed are therefore affiliated with each board member, and each officer, named below. Since there are no stockholders owning 10% or more of the publicly traded stock of Kindred Healthcare, Inc., there are no principal stockholders to disclose below.

The governing body of Kindred Healthcare, Inc., consists of the following members of the Board of Directors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Yale</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Advisory Partner, Bain and Company, Inc. (Management Consulting); Additional Affiliations: National Surgical Healthcare, Inc. (see Programmatic Attachment C – Ms. Yale Affiliations for list of ambulatory surgical center providers); Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts (Health Benefits Provider)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooper</td>
<td>MD (AL, AZ, FL, IN, LA, MN, MO, NY, OK, OR, TX, VA, WA, WI), Vice-Chairperson</td>
<td>Retired Founder and Vice Chairman, Vericare Management, Inc. (RHCF Management Contractor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Ackerman</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Champions Oncology, Inc. (Oncology Drug Development and Services)</td>
<td>Jonathan Blum (Senior Vice President / Chief Public Affairs Officer / Chief Global Nutrition Officer, Yum! Brands, Inc. (Restaurants))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Diaz</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>Heyward Donigan (President / Chief Executive Officer, ValueOptions, Inc. (Health Care Benefits Administrator))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Affiliations: DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc. (ESRD providers located both in NYS and out of state - see Programmatic Attachment D – Mr. Diaz Affiliations for list of NYS ESRD Centers operated by Liberty RC, Inc., and Knickerbocker Dialysis, Inc. both of which DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc., is the 100% sole stockholder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Goodman, PhD</td>
<td>Retired Executive Vice President – Global Operations / Chief Financial Officer, PepsiCo, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Hjelm</td>
<td>Senior Vice President / Chief Information Officer, The Kroger Company (Retail Grocery, Department, Convenience, Jewelry, and Pharmacy Stores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Kleisner</td>
<td>Gaming Licensure granted in IN, LA, MO, NJ, OH, Ontario, Canada, and Ak-Chin Tribe AZ; pending in AZ, CA, NY, PA, Cherokee Tribe NC, National Indian Gaming Commission DC, and Rincon Tribe CA. Retired Chief Executive Officer, Morgan’s Hotel Group (Luxury Hotels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Short, PhD</td>
<td>Retired Executive Board Chairman, Vericare Management, Inc. (RHCF Management Contractor) Additional Affiliations: Seton Family of Health Care Facilities / Providers in Texas (see Programmatic Attachment E – Mr. Short Affiliations for list of Seton providers); Wellpoint, Inc. (Health Care Benefits Company)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Altman, Esq. (DC)</td>
<td>Executive Vice President – Strategy, Policy, and Integrated Care, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Beal, LNHA (ME and NH)</td>
<td>President - Nursing Center Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Breier</td>
<td>President / Chief Operating Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Farber</td>
<td>Executive Vice President / Chief Financial Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Cunanan</td>
<td>Chief People Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Henry, Speech Language Pathologist (TX)</td>
<td>Executive Vice President / President of RehabCare Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Landenwich, Esq. (KY), CPA (KY)</td>
<td>Corporate Secretary Co-General Counsel, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Monaghan</td>
<td>President – Hospital Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Suzanne Riedman, Esq. (CA)</td>
<td>General Counsel / Chief Diversity Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Rousseau</td>
<td>President – Care Management Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The governing bodies of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., are identical, and consist of the following members of the Board of Directors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Cornutte, CPA (KY)</td>
<td>Senior Vice President – Corporate Development, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Cunanan</td>
<td>Chief People Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (Disclosed above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Landenwich, Esq. (KY), CPA (KY), Corporate Secretary Co-General Counsel, Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (Disclosed above)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional officers of both Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., who are not members of the Board of Directors listed above, are also identical as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William Altman, Esq. (DC)</th>
<th>Benjamin Breier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President – Strategy, Policy, and Integrated Care, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>President / Chief Operating Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mary Suzanne Riedman, Esq. (CA)</th>
<th>Jon Rousseau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel / Chief Diversity Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>President – Care Management Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A search of all of the above named board members, employers, and affiliations revealed no matches on either the NYS Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the federal Office of the Inspector General’s Provider Exclusion List.

The Bar Associations of the State of Kentucky, State of California, and the District of Columbia all report that the attorneys listed above are all licensed in good standing with no disciplinary actions taken. In addition, the NYS Education Department’s Office of the Professions, NYSDOH Office of Professional Medical Conduct, NYSDOH Physician Profile, Ohio Casino Control Commission, Maine Nursing Home Administrator Licensing Board, New Hampshire Nursing Home Administrator Licensing Board, Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services, Washington State Department of Health, Kentucky Board of Accountancy, Texas Department of State Health Services, Arizona Medical Board, Indiana Medical Licensing Board, Louisiana Board of Medical Examiners, Minnesota Board of Medical Practice, Missouri Division of Professional Registration, Oklahoma Board of Medical Licensure, Oregon Medical Board, Alabama State Medical Board, and Texas Medical Board all indicate there are no issues with the licensure of the health professionals and other licensed professionals associated with this application.

The Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine reports that in 2002, Thomas Cooper, MD, failed to respond to a state requirement to file certain information with the Department of Health Professions within the mandated time frame. Dr. Cooper did not update his physician profile as required until January 7, 2005. As such, the Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine imposed a $1000 monetary penalty upon Dr. Cooper in February 2005. In addition, the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine reports that Dr. Cooper violated Florida Statute section 458.331(1)(b), in that his medical license to practice in another jurisdiction (Virginia) was disciplined as described above, and Florida Statute section 458.331(1)(kk), in that he failed to report in writing within 30 days to the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine that the above described disciplinary action was imposed by the Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine. As such, the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine imposed a $5000 monetary penalty for the statute violations, plus $1000 for the Board’s administrative costs, upon Dr. Cooper in October 2006.

The applicant has provided the attached list of legal actions taken against Kindred Healthcare, Inc., its predecessor Vencor, Inc., and its affiliate RehabCare Group, Inc., which is now the RehabCare Division of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (see Programmatic Attachment F – Kindred Legal Actions).

The NYSDOH Division of Hospital Certification and Surveillance reviewed the compliance history of all End Stage Renal Dialysis (ESRD) centers located in New York State that are operated by Liberty RC, Inc., and Knickerbocker Dialysis, Inc., both of which DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc., is the 100% sole stockholder (see Programmatic Attachment D – Mr. Diaz Affiliations). For the time period 2007 through 2014, these ESRD centers affiliated with DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc. have all remained in substantial compliance with no history of enforcement action taken.
The NYSDOH Division of Home and Community Based Services reviewed the compliance history of all the affiliated Gentiva Health Services certified home health agencies (CHHAs) and licensed home care service agencies (LHCSAs) located in New York State, for the time period 2007 to 2014.

An enforcement action was taken in 2008 against QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a CHHA located in Liverpool, based on December 2006, February 2007, and March 2007 complaint surveys, citing two violations in Policies and Procedures of Service Delivery, two violations in Patient Assessment and Plan of Care, and two violations in Governing Authority. This action was resolved with a $12,000 civil penalty.

Another enforcement action was taken in 2010 against QC-Medi New York, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a CHHA located in Liverpool, based on an April 2009 survey, citing one violation in Policies and Procedures of Service Delivery, three violations in Patient Assessment and Plan of Care, and two violations in Governing Authority. This action was resolved with a $13,500 civil penalty.

It has been determined that the certified home health agencies and licensed home care service agencies have exercised sufficient supervisory responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of patients and to prevent the recurrence of code violations. When code violations did occur, it was determined that the operators investigated the circumstances surrounding the violation, and took steps appropriate to the gravity of the violation that a reasonably prudent operator would take to promptly correct and prevent the recurrence of the violation.

To date, the following states have responded to requests for out-of-state compliance status and enforcement history for each of the affiliated out-of-state health care providers listed on the attachments: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Connecticut, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. Out-of-state enforcement actions that were reported by the states are as follows:

Florida reported that Kindred Hospital South Florida – Fort Lauderdale was fined $350 based on a May 2010 application late fee; Kindred Hospital South Florida – Coral Gables was fined $250 based on a May 2008 application late fee; Kindred Hospital - The Palm Beaches was fined $500 based on a July 2010 application late fee, and $4000 based on a October 2011 survey; Kindred Hospital Bay Area – St. Petersburg was fined $1000 based on a November 2010 survey; Kindred Hospital Bay Area – Tampa was fined $1000 based on a September 2008 survey, $1000 based on a December 2010 survey, $1000 based on a January 2011 survey, and $1000 based on a July 2011 survey.

Georgia reported that Kindred Transitional Care, a nursing home in Fayetteville, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $11,570 based on a September 2012 survey, a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $24,245 based on a January 2012 survey, and a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $975 based on a September 2008 survey.

Indiana reported enforcements for the following facilities: Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Wildwood had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $250 per day from 05/22/2012 – 06/19/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Southwood was fined $2000 in June 2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Sellersburg was fined $6000 in August 2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Rolling Hills was fined $3000 in October 2014, and had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $600 per day from 08/22/2014 – 09/20/2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Kokomo had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of
$3600 per day and $100 per day from 02/02/2012 – 02/28/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Greenwood had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 11/01/2012 – 12/07/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Greenfield was fined $1500 in December 2011; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Columbus was fined $3000 in June 2012, had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 07/26/2012 – 07/26/2012, and had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of $5950 per day and $350 per day from 07/10/2014 – 07/14/2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Allison Pointe was fined $3000 in August 2009, and had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of $100 per day and $150 per day from 08/16/2012 – 09/21/2012; and Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation – Valley View Nursing Home had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 09/27/2012 – 10/26/2012.

Nevada reported that Kindred Hospital Las Vegas (Sahara Campus) was fined $400 based on a June 2010 survey; Kindred Hospital Las Vegas (Flamingo Campus) was fined $300 based on a December 2012 survey; and Torrey Pines Post-Acute and Rehabilitation Hospital was fined $1500 based on a January 2014 survey, and $400 based on a June 2012 survey.

North Carolina reported that Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Rose Manor, a nursing home in Durham, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $1950 based on an August 2012 survey, and a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $29,120 based on a January 2007 survey citing Immediate Jeopardy; and Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Elizabeth City, a nursing home in Elizabeth City, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $1885 based on a May, 2008 survey.

Texas reported that Kindred Hospital San Antonio was fined $22,750 based on a February 2008 survey; Kindred Hospital Town and Country was fined $6550 based on a January 2013 survey; Kindred Hospital Dallas Central was fined $9000 based on a May 2011 survey, and $4400 based on a February 2012 survey; and Kindred Rehabilitation Hospital Northeast Houston was fined $7150 based on a December 2013 survey.

Utah reported that Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation, a nursing home in St. George, had an enforcement action resolved in September, 2012. The state did not report the survey date or if any monetary fine was imposed.

Wyoming reported that Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation, a nursing home in Cheyenne, had a federal Denial of Payment for New Admissions (DoPNA) imposed for a two week period based on a June, 2008 survey, which was resolved in 2008. The state did not report if any monetary fine was imposed.

A review of all personal qualifying information indicates there is nothing in the background of the board members and officers of both Kindred Healthcare, Inc., and Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., to adversely affect their positions on the boards or as officers. The applicant has the appropriate character and competence under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

**Recommendation**

*From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.*
Financial Analysis

Operating Budget
The applicant has submitted operating budgets for the first and third years, in 2015 dollars, which is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>$1,258,786</td>
<td>$ 1,322,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>31,751,500</td>
<td>33,228,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>1,382,871</td>
<td>1,452,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee-for-Service</td>
<td>3,093,065</td>
<td>3,249,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>44,702</td>
<td>46,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$37,530,924</td>
<td>$39,300,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenses          | 29,156,444 | 30,931,126 |
Net Gain(Loss)           | $8,374,480  | $8,369,621 |
Visits                   | 215,568   | 228,033    |

Utilization by payor source in the first and third years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Managed Care</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee-for-Service</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Pay</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the existing CHHA Program’s historical experience. Revenues are reflective of current payment rates as well as the Medicaid Episodic Payment system. The operating costs include all expenditures incurred and to be incurred for management of the 8 QC-Medi New York, Inc. CHHA locations. Kindred Healthcare, Inc. does not anticipate that either legal or consulting services will be required in the ongoing operation of QC-Medi New York, Inc. Should any such services be necessary, they will be furnished by Kindred, with no allocation to QC-Medi New York of the cost of those services. Outside counsel may be retained in the event additional legal services are needed in the development stage of any new or purchased CHHA in New York. Any such engagement would be by Kindred and legal fees incurred would be a Kindred development expense and not a QC-Medi New York, Inc. operating expense.

Capability and Feasibility
There are no project costs associated with this application. The purchase price allocated to the New York entities is $38,086,770 of which $37,917,489 is attributable to the CHHAs which is comprised of $2,085,462 cash, $8,076,425 stocks and $27,755,602 assumption of debt. There is no change in program or utilization, but a change in governance.

Working capital requirements for all five CHHAs will be provided from current operations. Any additional working capital will be provided from Kindred Healthcare Inc. BFA Attachment B is the financial summary of Kindred Healthcare Inc. showing sufficient funds.
On October 9, 2014, Kindred issued a press release stating that with the merger of the two companies it would create a Pro Forma with annual revenues of $7.1 billion and operating income of $1 billion, and will create earnings and operating cash flows, exclusive of transaction and integration costs. Kindred expects the acquisition to be approximately $0.40 to $0.60 accretive to pro forma earnings, and pro forma operating cash flows of $350 million to $400 million (before capital expenditures, dividends and changes in working capital), both on a run rate basis, once Gentiva is fully integrated and expected synergies are fully realized in the second full year following the closing. On this same basis, following the combined company's expected annual maintenance capital expenditures of $120 million to $130 million, Kindred expects pro forma cash flows (before growth capital expenditures, dividends and changes in working capital) of $230 million to $270 million.

The submitted budget projects a net profit of $8,374,480 and $8,369,621 during the first and third years, respectively. Medicare and Medicaid reflect prevailing reimbursement methodologies. All other revenues assume current reimbursement methodologies. The budget appears reasonable.

BFA Attachment B is the 2013 certified statements of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. The entity has maintained positive working capital and net assets positions and has experienced a $36,136,000 net loss from operations. The net operating loss is due to corporate expenses and do not reflect Kindred’s ability to maintain operating divisions on a profitable basis going forward.

BFA Attachment C is the 2013 certified statements of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. The entity has maintained positive working capital and net assets positions and has experienced a $598,507,000 net loss from operations. However, as of June 30, 2014, Gentiva Health Services, Inc. is showing a $10,497,000 net gain from operations. The 2013 loss was due to one-time asset impairments of more than $610,000,000 due to corporate expenses rather than direct operating expenses.

Based on the preceding, it appears that the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner, and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**

From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Attachment A</th>
<th>Before and After Gentiva Organizational Charts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment B</td>
<td>Kindred Providers / Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment C</td>
<td>Ms. Yale Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment D</td>
<td>Mr. Diaz Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment E</td>
<td>Mr. Short Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment F</td>
<td>Kindred Legal Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Organizational Chart for Kindred and Kindred Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. - 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>Financial Summary of Gentiva Health Services, Inc. - 2013 and unaudited June 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 3606 of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015, having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council, and after due deliberation, hereby approves the following application to establish Kindred Healthcare, Inc. and Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. as new controlling persons of QC-Medi New York, Inc., the operator of five (5) certified home health agencies, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>APPLICANT/FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142193 E</td>
<td>Kindred Healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of the executed Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
2. Submission of the executed Certificate of Merger of Kindred Healthcare Development 2, Inc. with and into Gentiva Health Services, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONED UPON:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

   Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Description of Project:

1st Class Care Services, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Monique Merivil.

The Board of Directors of 1st Class Care Services, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Monique Merivil, President/CEO
Registered/Licensed Occupational Therapist
The Curtis Estabrook School, New York City Department of Education

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 2016 Ralph Avenue, Brooklyn, New York 11234:

| Bronx | Queens | Kings | Richmond | New York | Nassau |

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Physical Therapy
- Medical Social Services
- Housekeeper
- Home Health Aide
- Occupational Therapy
- Nutrition
- Personal Care
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Homemaker

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 2, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: All Heart Homecare Agency, Inc.
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2178-L

Description of Project:

All Heart Homecare Agency, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock, which are owned as follows:

Steven Gershkowitz – 140 Shares
Albert Finkelshteyn – 60 Shares

The Board of Directors of All Heart Homecare Agency, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Steven Gershkowitz, HHA, President
Administrator, A Life Saver Home Care Services, Inc.

Albert Finkelshteyn, Vice President
VP of Business Development, A Life Saver Home Care Services, Inc.

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

A search of the individual named above on the New York State Home Care Registry revealed that the individual is certified as an HHA and has no convictions or findings.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 1425 Kings Highway, 2nd Floor, Brooklyn, New York 11229:

New York
Kings
Queens
Richmond
Bronx
Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Physical Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology
Nutrition
Medical Equipment, Supplies and Appliances
Home Health Aide
Occupational Therapy
Audiology
Homemaker
Personal Care
Respiratory Therapy
Medical Social Services
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 17, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency  
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Angels of Mercy Counseling Center, Inc.  
Address: West Babylon  
County: Suffolk  
Structure: Not-For-Profit Corporation  
Application Number: 2292-L

Description of Project:

Angels of Mercy Counseling Center, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The Board of Directors of Angels of Mercy Counseling Center, Inc. is comprised of the following individuals:

Michele Butler, HHA – Director  
Steven Butler – Director  
Retired  
Stock Clerk, Amityville USFD

Tanisha Wilson – Program Coordinator  
Telemarketing & Sales, Pro-Quality

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

A search of the individual named above on the New York State Home Care Registry revealed that the individual is certified as a HHA, and has no convictions or findings.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 505 Lakeway Drive, West Babylon, New York:

Nassau  
Suffolk  
Queens  
Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing  
Physical Therapy  
Home Health Aide  
Nutrition  
Personal Care  
Homemaker  
Housekeeper  
Occupational Therapy  
Speech-Language Pathology  
Audiology  
Respiratory Therapy  
Medical Social Services

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 14, 2015
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: A Plus Homecare Agency, Inc.
Address: Woodside
County: Queens
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2272-L

Description of Project:

A Plus Homecare Agency, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned solely by Fei Guo.

The Board of Directors of A Plus Homecare Agency, Inc. is comprised of the following individual:

Fei Guo – President
Marketing Director, Asian Senior Adult Day Care Center

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 49-03 69th Street, Woodside, New York 11377:

Queens    Bronx    New York    Kings    Richmond    Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing    Home Health Aide    Personal Care
Physical Therapy    Respiratory Therapy    Occupational Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology    Audiology    Medical Social Services
Nutrition    Homemaker    Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 9, 2014
Bright Home Care, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

Bright Home Care, Inc. has authorized and issued 200 shares of stock to Yong Jun Kim, MD as the sole shareholder.

The Board of Directors is comprised of the following individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Director</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yong Jun Kim, MD</td>
<td>CEO/Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong Su Kim, MD</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong Uk Kung</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongmee Kim, RN</td>
<td>FNP, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasati Sankar</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongmee Kim, RN</td>
<td>FNP, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong Su Kim, MD</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yong Uk Kung</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongmee Kim, RN</td>
<td>FNP, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasati Sankar</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department and the Office of Professional Medical Conduct indicates no issues with the licenses of the medical professionals associated with this application.

The applicant confirmed that the proposed financial/referral structure has been assessed in light of anti-kickback and self-referral laws, with the consultation of legal counsel, and concluded that proceeding with the proposal is appropriate.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 33-37 Farrington Street, Suite #3, Flushing, New York 11354.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>Queens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Home Health Aide</td>
<td>Personal Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

**Contingency**
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date:
Name of Agency: Central Westchester Home Health Services, LLC
Address: Port Chester
County: Westchester
Structure: Limited Liability Company
Application Number: 2266-L

Description of Project:

Central Westchester Home Health Services, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The proposed membership of Central Westchester Home Health Services comprises the following individuals:

Yemisi Akintola-Okunoye, RN – 50%
Chief Executive Manager
Registered Nurse, Montefiore Medical Center

Segun Okunoye – 50%
Assistant Manager
Management Analyst, Westchester County Department of Health

A search of the individuals named above reveal no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the healthcare professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following county from an office located at 15 Nella Lane, Port Chester, New York 10573:

Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing          Home Health Aide          Personal Care
Homemaker        Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 6, 2015
Name of Agency: Chinatown Home Health Care, Inc.
Address: New York
County: New York
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2268-L

Description of Project:

Chinatown Home Health Care, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned as follows: Jie Li owns 100 shares and Yue Lam owns 100 shares.

The Board of Directors of Chinatown Home Health Care, Inc. is comprised of the following individuals:

Jie Li, Chief Executive Officer
Administration-Wellcare Health Plan

Yue Lam, Vice President
Administrator-Chinatown Senior Service, Inc.

Jie Li, Coordinator-Home Family Care

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 90 Ludlow Street, 2nd Floor, New York, New York 10002:

New York    Bronx    Kings    Queens    Richmond    Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing    Home Health Aide    Personal Care
Physical Therapy    Respiratory Therapy    Occupational Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology    Audiology    Medical Social Services
Nutrition    Homemaker    Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 9, 2015
Ciambella Home Care, Inc. d/b/a FirstLight Home Care of East Buffalo

Deferred at the Department’s Request
Description of Project:

Comprehensive Elder Care, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The sole member of Comprehensive Elder Care, LLC is:

Brian Rosenman, MBA – 100%
Real Estate Broker
Asset Manager, Woodman Enterprise, LLC

Affiliations:
Operator, Sutton Gardens Senior Living (2010 – Present)
Receiver, Kelly’s Home for Adults (2011 – Present)
Receiver, Birchwood Rest Home (2014 – Present)

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Bureau of Professional Credentialing has indicated that Brian Rosenman, holds a Real Estate Broker license in good standing and disciplinary action has never been taken against this individual or his license.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 147-02 34th Avenue, Flushing, New York 11354:

Bronx  Kings  Queens
Richmond  New York  Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing  Home Health Aide  Personal Care
Physical Therapy  Occupational Therapy  Medical Social Services
Nutrition  Homemaker  Housekeeper

A 7 year review of the operations of the following adult care facilities was performed as part of this review. The Adult Care Facility Policy and Surveillance unit has indicated the following:

Sutton Gardens Senior Living was fined two thousand dollars ($2,000.00) pursuant to a stipulation and order dated November 21, 2012 for surveillance findings of June 9, 2011 and August 25, 2011. Deficiencies were found under 18 NYCRR 487.8(e)(1) Food Service.

Kelly’s Home for Adults was fined thirty thousand dollars ($30,000.00) pursuant to a stipulation and order dated February 6, 2014 for surveillance findings of September 8, 2011, September 20, 2012, January 27, 2013 and October 10, 2013. Deficiencies were found under 18 NYCRR 487.4(a) Admission Standards, 487.6(a)(1) Resident Funds and Valuables, 487.7(g)(1)(i) Resident Services, 487.7(h)(1) Resident Services, 487.11(f)(19) Smoke/Fire Protection,
Kelly’s Home for Adults was fined one thousand five hundred dollars ($1,500.00) pursuant to stipulation and order dated October 22, 2014 for surveillance findings of October 10, 2013 and March 4, 2014. Deficiencies were found under 18 NYCRR 487.11(f)(10) Environmental Standards, 487.11(i)(11-12) Environmental Standards and 487.11(k)(5) Environmental Standards.

The information provided by the Division of Assisted Living has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 9, 2014
Name of Agency: Elite Home and Community Care Service, Inc.
Address: New City
County: Rockland
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2285-L

Description of Project:

Elite Home and Community Care Service, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned solely by Gharyea Wegee.

The Board of Directors of Elite Home and Community Care Service, Inc. is comprised of the following individuals:

Gharyea Wegee, RN – President/Secretary
Administrator/Supervisor – Elite Home Care Services, Inc.
Registered Nurse – Montefiore Medical Center Long Term Home Health Agency

Steve Karpeh, LPN – Vice-President/Treasurer
Licensed Practical Nurse – Pine Valley Rehab and Nursing Center

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the licenses of the healthcare professionals associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 6 Zabela Drive, New City, New York 10956:

Rockland  Putnam  Westchester  Orange  Bronx

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing  Home Health Aide  Personal Care
Physical Therapy  Respiratory Therapy  Occupational Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology  Audiology  Medical Social Services
Nutrition  Homemaker  Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 7, 2015
Description of Project:

Ellison Home Care Companion Agency, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned as follows: Shirley Ellison owns 60 shares. Cedric Ellison owns 40 shares. The remaining 100 shares are unissued.

The Board of Directors of Ellison Home Care Companion Agency, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Shirley Ellison, President
Executive Director, Ellison Home Care Companion Agency, Inc.

Cedric Ellison, Secretary/Treasurer
Director, MTA Transit

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 147 West Orange Street, Brentwood, New York 11717:

Nassau Westchester Rockland Queens Suffolk

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing Home Health Aide Personal Care
Homemaker Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 18, 2014
Name of Agency: Grupp II, Inc.
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2247-L

Description of Project:

Grupp II, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Aleksandr Vaysblat.

The Board of Directors of Grupp II, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Aleksandr Vaysblat, President
President, Grupp II, Inc.
Director of Operations, Light 101, Inc.

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 1954 78th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11214:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronx</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Physical Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology
Nutrition
Home Health Aide
Occupational Therapy
Audiology
Homemaker
Personal Care
Respiratory Therapy
Medical Social Services
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 3, 2014
Guiding Angels Home Care, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The sole member of Guiding Angels Home Care, LLC is:

Yolanda Vitulli, RN, 100%
President, Guiding Angels Home Care, LLC
Founder/CEO, Tender Care Human Services, Inc.

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the healthcare professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 92-21 165th Street, Jamaica, New York 11433:

- Bronx
- New York
- Queens
- Kings
- Richmond
- Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Home Health Aide
- Personal Care
- Physical Therapy
- Occupational Therapy
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Medical Social Services
- Nutrition
- Homemaker
- Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

**Contingency**
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

**Recommendation:** Contingent Approval
**Date:** October 31, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Home at Last Home Care Services, LLC
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: Limited Liability Company
Application Number: 2138-L

Description of Project:

Home at Last Home Care Services, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The sole member of Home at Last Home Care Services, LLC is as follows:

Cynthia V. Simpson, 100%
HHA, Blue Bird Home Care
HHA, All City Care

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 418 Bleecker Street, #3L, Brooklyn, New York 11237:

Kings
Bronx
Queens
Richmond
New York

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Physical Therapy
Speech Language Pathology
Nutrition
Home Health Aide
Occupational Therapy
Homemaker
Personal Care
Medical Social Services
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 4, 2014
Name of Agency: Human First Community Health Care, LLC
Address: Lynbrook
County: Nassau
Structure: Limited Liability Company
Application Number: 2175-L

Description of Project:

Human First Community Health Care, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The sole member of Human First Community Health Care, LLC is Human First, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation.

The Board of Directors of Human First, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Sharon Jones, RN, President
Sr. Physician Referral Service Nurse, NYU Langone Medical Center

Fadia Zahrieh, Treasurer
Homemaker/Care Provider for an Autistic Child

Audrey Jackman-Wesson, Secretary
Permit Manager, NYC Department of Transportation

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 128 Atlantic Avenue, Lynbrook, New York 11563:

Nassau  Suffolk  Queens

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing  Home Health Aide  Personal Care
Physical Therapy  Occupational Therapy  Speech-Language Pathology
Medical Social Services  Nutrition  Homemaker
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: October 31, 2014
Name of Agency: La'Dorch Homecare, Inc.
Address: Staten Island
County: Richmond
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2215-L

Description of Project:

La'Dorch Homecare, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Ruslan Braginskiy.

The members of the Board of Directors of La'Dorch Homecare, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Ruslan Braginskiy, HHA, President
Financial Associate, Blackrock, Inc. (2004 – 2012)
Administrator, Sincere Care Agency (2007 – 2010)

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The New York State Home Care Registry indicates no issues with the certification of the Home Health Aide associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 87 Alan Loop, Staten Island, New York 10304:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronx</th>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Queens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Physical Therapy
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Nutrition
- Medical Equipment, Supplies and Appliances
- Home Health Aide
- Occupational Therapy
- Audiology
- Homemaker
- Personal Care
- Respiratory Therapy
- Medical Social Services
- Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 25, 2014
Name of Agency: Marabi Homecare Agency, Inc.
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2261-L

Description of Project:

Marabi Homecare Agency, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Marina Rabinovich.

The Board of Directors of Marabi Homecare Agency, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Marina Rabinovich – President
Attorney/President, Law Offices of Marina Rabinovich

Affiliations:
MR Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (2012 – Present)

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 2698 East 66th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11234:

- New York
- Richmond
- Kings
- Bronx
- Queens
- Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Physical Therapy
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Nutrition
- Medical Supplies, Equipment and Appliances
- Home Health Aide
- Occupational Therapy
- Audiology
- Homemaker
- Personal Care
- Respiratory Therapy
- Medical Social Services
- Housekeeper

The information provided by the Division of Home and Community Based Services has indicated that MR Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

A Certificate of Good Standing has been received for the attorney associated with this application.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 28, 2014
Name of Agency: Masih Home Care Incorporated
Address: South Richmond Hill
County: Queens
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2274-L

Description of Project:

Masih Home Care Incorporation, a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned solely by Mana Masih.

The Board of Directors of Masih Home Care Incorporated is comprised of the following individuals:

Mana Masih, RN – President
Yasmin Masih - Treasurer
RN, Good Shepherd Hospice
Unemployed

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the healthcare professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 94-36 114th Street, South Richmond Hill, New York 11419:

Queens Kings Richmond New York Bronx Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing Home Health Aide Personal Care
Physical Therapy Occupational Therapy Nutrition
Speech-Language Pathology Housekeeper Medical Social Services
Homemaker

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 12, 2014
Name of Agency: MY Care Health Services, Inc.
Address: Fresh Meadows
County: Queens
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2202-L

Description of Project:

MY Care Health Services, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock, which are owned solely by Vandana Behl-Malhotra.

The members of the Board of Directors of MY Care Health Services, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Vandana Behl-Malhotra, RN
Hospice Nurse, Hospice Care Network
Patient Service Coordinator, Cold Spring Hills Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 192-20C 67th Avenue, Apt. 1A, Fresh Meadows, New York 11365:

Queens Bronx Kings
New York Richmond Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing Home Health Aide Personal Care
Physical Therapy Occupational Therapy Speech-Language Pathology
Medical Social Services Nutrition Homemaker
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: October 31, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: New Hope Services, Inc.
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2244-L

Description of Project:

New Hope Services, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Natalya Epshtein.

The Board of Directors of New Hope Services, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Natalya Epshtein, HHA
President, New Hope Services, Inc.

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The New York State Home Care Registry indicates no issues with the certification of the healthcare professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 175 Ardsley Loop, Apt. 4A, Brooklyn, New York 11239:

- Bronx
- Richmond
- New York
- Queens
- Kings
- Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing, Home Health Aide, Personal Care, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Respiratory Therapy, Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology, Medical Social Services, Nutrition, Homemaker, Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 5, 2014
Name of Agency: NMC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc.
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2259-L

Description of Project:
NMC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned solely by Natalya Chornaya.

The Board of Directors of NMC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. comprises the following individual:

Natalya Chornaya, RN, President
RN, Mount Sinai Beth Israel

Affiliations:
NC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc. (2011 – Present)
Unihelp Homecare, Inc. (2008 – 2009)

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 155 Oceana Drive, Apartment 2C, Brooklyn, New York 11235:

New York
Richmond
Kings
Bronx
Queens
Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Physical Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology
Nutrition
Medical Supplies, Equipment and Appliances
Home Health Aide
Occupational Therapy
Audiology
Homemaker
Personal Care
Respiratory Therapy
Medical Social Services
Housekeeper

The information provided by the Division of Home and Community Based Services has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: November 19, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Augusta Osinowo
d/b/a Nightingale Care Services

Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: Sole Proprietor
Application Number: 2176-L

Description of Project:

Augusta Osinowo, d/b/a Nightingale Care Services, a sole proprietorship, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The sole proprietor of Augusta Osinowo d/b/a Nightingale Care Services is the following individual:

Augusta Osinowo, RN, Sole Owner/Operator
RN Field Supervisor, Best Care, Inc.

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the licensure of the health professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 17 Paerdegat 7th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11236:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boroughs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Physical Therapy
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Nutrition
- Home Health Aide
- Occupational Therapy
- Audiology
- Homemaker
- Personal Care
- Respiratory Therapy
- Medical Social Services
- Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 1, 2014
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Passion for Seniors of NY, Inc.
Address: Kew Gardens
County: Queens
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2157-L

Description of Project:

Passion for Seniors of NY, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned as follows: Bipin Nirola owns 100 Shares and Reema Nirola owns 100 Shares.

The Board of Directors of Passion for Seniors of NY, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Bipin Nirola, President
Owner/President, Passion for Seniors, LLC d/b/a Seniors Helping Seniors (2007 - Present)

Reema Nirola, CNA, Vice President
Nursing Assistant
Owner/Vice President, Passion for Seniors, LLC d/b/a Seniors Helping Seniors (2007 - Present)

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 119-40 Metropolitan Avenue, CU2, Suite 107, Kew Gardens, New York 11415:

Bronx
Queens
Kings
Richmond
New York
Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Physical Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology
Nutrition
Home Health Aide
Occupational Therapy
Medical Equipment and Supplies
Personal Care
Respiratory Therapy
Medical Social Services

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 7, 2015
Name of Agency: Premium Home Services LLC
Address: Rockaway Park
County: Queens
Structure: Limited Liability Company
Application Number: 2299-L

Description of Project:

Premium Home Services LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The proposed membership of Premium Home Services LLC comprises the following individuals:

Manana Zaft, HHA – 50%
Case Manager/Coordinator – Scharome Cares
President – M&T Consulting NY, Inc.

Tamari Chikvaidze – 50%
Marketing Manager/Coordinator-Signature Care
Vice-President – M&T Consulting NY, Inc.

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

A search of the New York State Home Care Registry revealed that the Home Health Aid (HHA) is certified as a HHA with no convictions or findings.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 103-00 Shore Front Parkway #7H, Rockaway Park, New York: 11694:

Queens
Kings
Bronx
New York
Richmond
Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Home Health Aide
Personal Care

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 9, 2015
Name of Agency: Scope Healthcare Services, Inc.
Address: Melville
County: Suffolk
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2279-L

Description of Project:

Scope Healthcare Services, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares, which are owned as follows: Deren Karakaplan owns 160 shares. The remaining 40 shares are unissued.

The Board of Directors of Scope Healthcare Services, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

Deren Karakaplan, President/Chairman
Executive Director, Guiding Pathways, Inc.

Rachel R. Silverberg, RN, Vice President/Secretary
Certified Legal Nurse Consultant
Director of Resident Services, The Bristal at East Northport (2011 – 2012)

Ajaz U. Siddiqui, Treasurer
Senior Accountant/Accounting Officer, Bank Hapoalim (2000 – 2013)

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 68 South Service Road, Suite 100, Melville, New York 11747:

Suffolk  Nassau  Queens

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing  Personal Care

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 4, 2014
Global Private Home Care LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

The members of Global Private Home Care LLC are as follows:

Terence Kerrigan – 50%
Owner/Trainer, Terry Kerrigan Performance, LLC

Tiffany C. Italiano, RN, BSN – 50%
Private Duty Nurse, Private Duty, LLC

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The State of New York Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The State of New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety, Division of Consumer Affairs indicates no issues with the license of the health care professional associated with this application.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 119-40 Metropolitan Avenue, Suite 111, Kew Gardens, New York 11415:

Bronx, Kings, New York
Queens, Richmond, Nassau

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing, Home Health Aide, Personal Care
Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Respiratory Therapy
Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology, Medical Social Services
Nutrition, Medical Supplies, Equipment and Appliances

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: February 3, 2015
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Alice Hyde Medical Center
Address: Malone
County: Franklin
Structure: Not-For-Profit
Application Number: 2461L

Description of Project:

Alice Hyde Medical Center, a not-for-profit corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

This application amends and supersedes application number 1755L which was approved by the Public Health and Health Planning Council at July 2009 meeting. This LHCSA will be associated with Alice Hyde Medical Center Assisted Living Program.

The Board of Directors of Alice Hyde Medical Center is comprised of the following individuals:

Daniel E. Clark – Chair
President/Owner, King-Clark Co., Inc.
Co-Owner, Broker, North Country Realty
Co-Owner, Adirondack Quarry
Co-Owner, Rainbow Quarries, Inc.

Brian J. Monette – Vice Chair
Vice President, Adirondack Energy Products, Inc.

Dean F. Johnston, CPA – Treasurer
Chief Operating Officer, Citizen Advocates, Inc.

Craig E. LaVigne – Secretary
Owner/Operator, Craig, Inc. (tax preparation)

Anjni Bhagat, M.D. – Member
Private Practice, Main Street Medical Group
Affiliations:
- Member, Alice Hyde Nursing Home

Rev. William J. Bond – Member
Pastor, Upper New York Conference, Centenary United Methodist Church

Wayne R. Duso – Member
Management Consultant, Elbow Street Consulting, Inc.

Jerry E. Griffin – Member
Superintendent, Malone Central School District

Bryan J. Hughes, Esq. – Member
Senior Partner, Bryan J. Hughes, P.C/

Benson J. Kelly, M.D. – Member
Physician, St. Regis Mohawk Health Services

Paul F. Koehler, Registered Pharmacist – Member
Registered Pharmacist, Kinney Drugs, Inc.

Sharon O. Noreault – Member
Retired

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department, the New York State Physician Profile and the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, where appropriate, indicate no issues with the licensure of the health professionals associated with this application.

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed financial/referral structure has been assessed in light of anti-kickback and self-referral laws, with the consultation of legal counsel, and it is concluded that proceeding with the proposal is appropriate.
The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the Franklin County from an office located at 133 Park Street, Malone, New York 12953.

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Home Health Aide
- Personal Care
- Occupational Therapy
- Audiology
- Physical Therapy
- Respiratory Therapy
- Speech Language Pathology
- Housekeeper
- Homemaker
- Nutrition
- Medical Social Services

A 7 year review of the operations of the following facilities was performed as part of this review (unless otherwise noted):

- Alice Hyde Medical Center
- Alice Hyde Nursing Home

The information provided by the Division of Hospitals and Diagnostic & Treatment Centers has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

The Information provided by the Bureau of Quality Assurance for Nursing Homes has indicated that the residential health care facilities reviewed have provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

**Contingency**

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

**Recommendation:** Contingent Approval

**Date:** December 31, 2014
Hyde Park Assisted Living Facility, Inc., d/b/a Hyde Park Licensed Home Care Agency, a business corporation, requests approval to obtain licensure as a home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

James K. Rogers is the sole shareholder of Hyde Park Assisted Living Facility, Inc. Hyde Park Licensed Home Care Agency will be affiliated with an Assisted Living Program known as Hyde Park Assisted Living Program.

The applicant authorized 200 shares of stock of which 100 shares will be issued to James K. Rogers, RN. 100 shares of stock will remain unissued.

The Board of Directors of Hyde Park Assisted Living Facility, Inc. comprises of the following individual:

James K. Rogers, RN – President
Assistant Administrator/New Haven Manor

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department and the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, where appropriate, indicates no issues with the license of the medical professional associated with this application.

A 7 year review of the operations of the following facility was performed as part of this review (unless otherwise noted):

- Crystal House Manor (Adult Home)

Crystal House Manor was fined $5,000.00 for deficiencies cited pursuant to a stipulation and order dated August 22, 2011 for surveillance findings found on February 10, 2009, May 29, 2009, December 23, 2009 and on March 22, 2010. Deficiencies were found under 18 NYCRR 487.4(f) - Admission Standards and 18 NYCRR 487.8(c) - Food Service.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of Dutchess County from an office located at 394 Violet Avenue, Hyde Park, New York 12538.

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Personal Care Aide
- Housekeeper
The information provided by the Division of Assisted Living has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency:

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: January 12, 2015
Description of Project:

Acare HHC, Inc. d/b/a Four Seasons Home Care, a business corporation, requests approval for a change in ownership of a licensed home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

Acare HHC, Inc. was previously approved as a home care services agency by the Public Health Council at its May 2, 2008 meeting and subsequently licensed as 1635L001.

Acare Acquisition, LLC acquired a nine and nine-tenths percent (9.9%) interest in Acare HHC, Inc. effective as of April 1, 2013. The purpose of this proposal is for Acare Acquisition, LLC to acquire the remaining ninety and one-tenth percent (90.1%) interest in Acare HHC, Inc.

Acare Acquisition, LLC proposes to become the sole stockholder of Acare HHC, Inc. d/b/a Four Seasons Home Care and will own all 200 shares of authorized stock.

The Board of Directors of Acare HHC, Inc. d/b/a Four Seasons Home Care is comprised of the following individuals:

Rachel Friedman – Vice President/Director
Unemployed

Affiliations:
- Renaissance Home Health Care

Caroline L. Rich, NHA – Secretary/Treasurer/Director
Chief Operating Officer, Four Seasons Nursing and Rehabilitation Center

Affiliations:
- Parkshore Health Care LLC d/b/a Four Seasons Nursing & Rehabilitation Center
- Four Seasons Dialysis LLC d/b/a Gateway Dialysis Center
- Parkshore Home Health Care, LLC d/b/a Renaissance Home Health Care

The sole member of Acare Acquisition, LLC is:

Barry Friedman – Member
(Previously Disclosed)

Caroline Rich, NHA License # 04996 holds a NHA license in good standing and the Board of Examiners of Nursing Home Administrators has never taken disciplinary action against this individual or her license.

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

A seven year review was conducted for the following healthcare facilities:

- Four Seasons Dialysis LLC d/b/a Gateway Dialysis Center
- Parkshore Health Care LLC d/b/a Four Seasons Nursing and Rehabilitation Center
- Parkshore Home Health Care, LLC d/b/a Renaissance Home Health Care
The information provided by the Division of Home and Community Based Services has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

The information provided by the Division of Hospitals and Diagnostic & Treatment Centers has indicated that the applicant has provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

The Information provided by the Bureau of Quality Assurance for Nursing Homes has indicated that the residential health care facilities reviewed have provided sufficient supervision to prevent harm to the health, safety and welfare of residents and to prevent recurrent code violations.

The applicant proposes to continue to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 1222 East 96th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11236:

- Bronx
- Kings
- Nassau
- New York
- Queens
- Richmond

The applicant proposes to continue to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Home Health Aide
- Medical Social Services
- Personal Care
- Occupational Therapy
- Physical Therapy
- Speech-Language Pathology

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

**Contingency**
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

**Recommendation:** Contingent Approval
**Date:** December 23, 2014
Anchor Home Care LLC

Deferred at the Department’s Request
Licensed Home Care Services Agency
Character and Competence Staff Review

Name of Agency: Crown of Life Care NY, LLC
Address: Brooklyn
County: Kings
Structure: Limited Liability Company
Application Number: 2389-L

Description of Project:

Crown of Life Care NY, LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval for a change in ownership of a licensed home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

Crown of Life Care, Inc. was previously approved as a home care services agency by the Public Health Council at its May 16, 2003 meeting and subsequently licensed 1180L001. At that time it was owned as follows: Gussie Halyard – 70 Shares, Edward Blocker – 15 Shares and Bunny Lower – 15 Shares.

The proposed members of Crown of Life Care NY, LLC comprise the following individuals:

Toby Kahan, Owner – 95%
Homemaker

Caroline Nonan, RN, Owner – 5%
VP of Clinical Operations, Gemini Quality Care, Inc.

The Office of the Professions of the State Education Department indicate no issues with the licensure of the health professional associated with this application.

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The applicant proposes to continue to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 5308 13th Avenue, Suite 236, Brooklyn, New York 11219.

Bronx
Kings
Nassau
New York
Queens
Richmond

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing
Occupational Therapy
Physical Therapy
Home Health Aide
Respiratory Therapy
Nutrition
Personal Care
Audiology
Homemaker
Medical Social Services
Speech-Language Pathology
Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: October 31, 2014
Description of Project:

Elite HHC LLC, a limited liability company, requests approval for a change in ownership of a licensed home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

Elite Home Services, LLC was previously approved as a home care services agency by the Public Health and Health Planning Council at its August 4, 2011 meeting and subsequently licensed 1806L001. At that time it was owned as follows: Diane Schottenstein – sole member.

The sole member of Elite HHC, LLC is:

Gershon Strasser, NHA – Managing Member/President
Director of Operations, Dry Harbor HRF, Inc.

A search of the individual named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Bureau of Professional Credentialing has indicated that Gershon Strasser NHA license #05524 holds a NHA license in good standing and the Board of Examiners of Nursing Home Administrators has never taken disciplinary action against this individual or his license.

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 2050 57th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11204:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronx</th>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Queens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Westchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

- Nursing
- Occupational Therapy
- Physical Therapy
- Home Health Aide
- Respiratory Therapy
- Nutrition
- Personal Care
- Audiology
- Homemaker
- Medical Social Services
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Speech-Pathologist
- Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 17, 2014
Description of Project:

Prestige LHCSA Management, Inc., a business corporation, requests approval for a change in ownership of a licensed home care services agency under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

AZA Home Health Care, LLC d/b/a Hand in Hand Together Homecare was previously approved as a home care services agency by the Public Health and Health Planning Council at its August 4, 2011 meeting and subsequently licensed 1722L001. At that time it was owned as follows: Amy Monroe – 100% Membership. Through a Purchase Agreement, Amy Monroe will sell the company and will no longer be affiliated with the LHCSA.

The applicant has authorized 200 shares of stock which are owned as follows:

David Modnyy – 100 Shares     Diana Nabitovsky – 100 Shares

The proposed Board of Directors of Prestige LHCSA Management, Inc. comprises the following individuals:

David Modnyy – Chairman/Treasurer         Diana Nabitovsky – Vice Chairman/Secretary
Administrator, Hand in Hand Together Home Care  Assistant Administrator and Human Resources Director, Hand in Hand Together Home Care

A search of the individuals named above revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

AZA Home Health Care, LLC has entered into a management agreement with Prestige LHCSA Management, Inc. which was approved by the Department of Health on November 17, 2014.

The applicant proposes to continue to serve the residents of the following counties from an office located at 672 Britton Avenue, Staten Island, New York 10304.

Bronx      Kings      New York      Queens
Richmond   Westchester

The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services:

Nursing        Home Health Aide        Personal Care        Medical Social Services
Occupational Therapy  Respiratory Therapy  Audiology          Speech-Language Pathology
Physical Therapy      Nutrition         Homemaker           Housekeeper

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

Contingency
Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

Recommendation: Contingent Approval
Date: December 3, 2014
Name of Agency: Quality Care – USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services
Address: Merrick
County: Nassau
Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Application Number: 2556-L

Description of Project:

Quality Care – USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a business corporation with a corporate office in Merrick, NY, requests approval for a change in ownership of four (4) licensed home care services agencies under Article 36 of the Public Health Law.

Quality Care – USA, Inc. d/b/a Gentiva Health Services was previously approved as a home care services agency by the Public Health Council at its March 18, 1994 meeting and subsequently licensed as 9511L040, 9511L001, 9511L022 and 9511L027.

A separate CHHA CON application has been submitted as 142193-E for the five (5) QC-Medi New York, Inc., d/b/a Gentiva Health Services CHHAs, which are located in Ballston Spa, Liverpool (with branch offices in Auburn and Oswego), Corning, Westbury, and Hauppauge (with a sub-unit in Riverhead).

The direct corporate operator of the four (4) LHCSAs will remain Quality Care - USA, Inc., d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, the parent corporation will remain Gentiva Health Services Holding Corporation, the grandparent corporation will remain Gentiva Health Services, Inc., as was previously approved by both the Public Health Council. However, the new incoming great-grandparent corporation and controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and the new incoming great-great-grandparent corporation and ultimate controlling entity will now be Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (See Programmatic Attachment A – Before and After Organizational Charts)

Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., a proprietary business corporation, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. Kindred Healthcare, Inc. owns 100% of the stock of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc. Kindred Healthcare, Inc., a publicly-traded proprietary business corporation, is authorized to issue 176,000,000 shares of capital stock, consisting of 175,000,000 shares of common stock and 1,000,000 shares of preferred stock, both with par value of $0.25 per share. The applicant confirms in writing that no stockholder (either natural person or business entity) owns 10% or more of the stock of Kindred Healthcare, Inc.

Kindred Healthcare, Inc., operates over 360 health care facilities and providers in 38 states. The complete list of affiliated health care facilities and providers, by provider type and by state, has been included in the application and a copy is attached (see Programmatic Attachment B – Kindred Providers / Facilities). All facilities and providers listed are therefore affiliated with each board member, and each officer, named below. Since there are no stockholders owning 10% or more of the publicly traded stock of Kindred Healthcare, Inc., there are no principal stockholders to disclose below.

The Board of Directors of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. comprises the following individuals:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Yale, Chairperson</td>
<td>Advisory Partner, Bain and Company, Inc. (Management Consulting) Additional Affiliations: National Surgical Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Ackerman</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Champions Oncology, Inc. (Oncology Drug Development and Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Diaz</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc. Additional Affiliations: DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc. (ESRD providers located both in NYS and out of state - see Programmatic Attachment D – Mr. Diaz Affiliations for list of NYS ESRD Centers operated by Liberty RC, Inc., and Knickerbocker Dialysis, Inc. both of which DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc., is the 100% sole stockholder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Goodman, PhD</td>
<td>Retired Executive Vice President – Global Operations / Chief Financial Officer, PepsiCo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Kleisner, Gaming Licensure granted in IN, LA, MO, NJ, OH, Ontario, Canada, and Ak-Chin Tribe AZ; pending in AZ, CA, NY, PA, Cherokee Tribe NC, National Indian Gaming Commission DC, and Rincon Tribe CA. Retired Chief Executive Officer, Morgan’s Hotel Group (Luxury Hotels)</td>
<td>John Short, PhD Retired Executive Board Chairman, Vericare Management, Inc. (RHCF Management Contractor) Additional Affiliations: Seton Family of Health Care Facilities / Providers in Texas (see Programmatic Attachment E – Mr. Short Affiliations for list of Seton providers); Wellpoint, Inc. (Health Care Benefits Company)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional officers of Kindred Healthcare, Inc., who are not members of the Board of Directors listed above, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Altman, Esq. (DC)</td>
<td>Executive Vice President – Strategy, Policy, and Integrated Care, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Beal, LNHA (ME and NH)</td>
<td>President - Nursing Center Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Breier</td>
<td>President / Chief Operating Officer, Kindred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Cunanan</td>
<td>Chief People Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Landenwich, Esq. (KY), CPA (KY), Corporate Secretary Co-General Counsel, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Suzanne Riedman, Esq. (CA) General Counsel / Chief Diversity Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The governing bodies of Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., are identical, and consist of the following members of the Board of Directors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Cornutte, CPA (KY)</td>
<td>Senior Vice President – Corporate Development, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Landenwich, Esq. (KY), CPA (KY), Corporate Secretary Co-General Counsel, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional officers of both Kindred Healthcare Operating, Inc., and of Gentiva Health Services, Inc., who are not members of the Board of Directors listed above, are also identical as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Altman, Esq. (DC)</td>
<td>Executive Vice President – Strategy, Policy, and Integrated Care, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Breier</td>
<td>President / Chief Operating Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Suzanne Riedman, Esq. (CA) General Counsel / Chief Diversity Officer, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>(Disclosed above)</td>
<td>Jon Rousseau President – Care Management Division, Kindred Healthcare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant proposes to serve the residents of the following counties from offices located at:

425 Grant Avenue, Suite 2, Auburn, New York 13021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The applicant proposes to provide the following health care services from the indicated office locations:

Auburn, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Home Health Aide</th>
<th>Personal Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ballston Spa, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Home Health Aide</th>
<th>Personal Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Medical Supplies and Equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liverpool, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Home Health Aide</th>
<th>Personal Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
<td>Medical Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oswego, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursing</th>
<th>Home Health Aide</th>
<th>Personal Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
<td>Medical Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A search of all of the above named board members, employers, and affiliations revealed no matches on either the Medicaid Disqualified Provider List or the OIG Exclusion List.

The Bar Associations of the State of Kentucky, State of California, and the District of Columbia all report that the attorneys listed above are all licensed in good standing with no disciplinary actions taken. In addition, the NYS Education Department’s Office of the Professions, NYSDOH Office of Professional Medical Conduct, NYSDOH Physician Profile, Ohio Casino Control Commission, Maine Nursing Home Administrator Licensing Board, New Hampshire Nursing Home Administrator Licensing Board, Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services, Washington State Department of Health, Kentucky Board of Accountancy, Texas Department of
State Health Services, Arizona Medical Board, Indiana Medical Licensing Board, Louisiana Board of Medical Examiners, Minnesota Board of Medical Practice, Missouri Division of Professional Registration, Oklahoma Board of Medical Licensure, Oregon Medical Board, Alabama State Medical Board, and Texas Medical Board all indicate there are no issues with the licensure of the health professionals and other licensed professionals associated with this application. The Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine reports that in 2002, Thomas Cooper, MD, failed to respond to a state requirement to file certain information with the Department of Health Professions within the mandated time frame. Dr. Cooper did not update his physician profile as required until January 7, 2005. As such, the Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine imposed a $1000 monetary penalty upon Dr. Cooper in February 2005. In addition, the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine reports that Dr. Cooper violated Florida Statute section 458.331(1)(b), in that his medical license to practice in another jurisdiction (Virginia) was disciplined as described above, and Florida Statute section 458.331(1)(kk), in that he failed to report in writing within 30 days to the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine that the above described disciplinary action was imposed by the Virginia Department of Health Professions Board of Medicine. As such, the Florida Department of Health Board of Medicine imposed a $5000 monetary penalty for the statute violations, plus $1000 for the Board’s administrative costs, upon Dr. Cooper in October 2006.

The applicant has provided the attached list of legal actions taken against Kindred Healthcare, Inc., its predecessor Vencor, Inc., and its affiliate RehabCare Group, Inc., which is now the RehabCare Division of Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (See Programmatic Attachment F – Kindred Legal Actions)

The NYSDOH Division of Hospital Certification and Surveillance reviewed the compliance history of all End Stage Renal Dialysis (ESRD) centers located in New York State that are operated by Liberty RC, Inc., and Knickerbocker Dialysis, Inc., both of which DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc., is the 100% sole stockholder (see Programmatic Attachment D – Mr. Diaz Affiliations). For the time period 2007 through 2014, these ESRD centers affiliated with DaVita Healthcare Partners, Inc., have all remained in substantial compliance with no history of enforcement action taken.

The NYSDOH Division of Home and Community Based Services reviewed the compliance history of all the affiliated Gentiva Health Services certified home health agencies (CHHAs) and licensed home care service agencies (LHCSAs) located in New York State, for the time period 2007 to 2014.

An enforcement action was taken in 2008 against QC-Medi New York, Inc., d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a CHHA located in Liverpool, based on December 2006, February 2007, and March 2007 complaint surveys, citing two violations in Policies and Procedures of Service Delivery, two violations in Patient Assessment and Plan of Care, and two violations in Governing Authority. This action was resolved with a $12,000 civil penalty.

Another enforcement action was taken in 2010 against QC-Medi New York, Inc., d/b/a Gentiva Health Services, a CHHA located in Liverpool, based on an April 2009 survey, citing one violation in Policies and Procedures of Service Delivery, three violations in Patient Assessment and Plan of Care, and two violations in Governing Authority. This action was resolved with a $13,500 civil penalty.

It has been determined that the certified home health agencies and licensed home care service agencies have exercised sufficient supervisory responsibility to protect the health, safety, and welfare of patients and to prevent the recurrence of code violations. When code violations did occur, it was determined that the operators investigated the circumstances surrounding the violation, and took steps appropriate to the gravity of the violation that a reasonably prudent operator would take to promptly correct and prevent the recurrence of the violation.
To date, the following states have responded to requests for out-of-state compliance status and enforcement history for each of the affiliated out-of-state health care providers listed on the attachments: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Connecticut, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. Out-of-state enforcement actions that were reported by the states are as follows:

Florida reported that Kindred Hospital South Florida – Fort Lauderdale was fined $350 based on a May 2010 application late fee; Kindred Hospital South Florida – Coral Gables was fined $250 based on a May 2008 application late fee; Kindred Hospital - The Palm Beaches was fined $500 based on a July 2010 application late fee, and $4000 based on an October 2011 survey; Kindred Hospital Bay Area – St. Petersburg was fined $1000 based on a November 2010 survey; Kindred Hospital Bay Area – Tampa was fined $1000 based on a September 2008 survey, $1000 based on a December 2010 survey, $1000 based on a January 2011 survey, $1000 based on a July 2011 survey, $1000 based on a March 2012 survey, $600 based on a June 2012 survey, and $2000 based on an August 2012 survey; and Kindred Hospital – Central Tampa was fined $1000 based on a June 2010 survey, $1000 based on a November 2010 survey, $1000 based on a January 2011 survey, and $1000 based on a July 2011 survey.

Georgia reported that Kindred Transitional Care, a nursing home in Fayetteville, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $11,570 based on a September 2012 survey, a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $24,245 based on a January 2012 survey, and a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $975 based on a September 2008 survey.

Indiana reported enforcements for the following facilities: Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Wildwood had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $250 per day from 05/22/2012 – 06/19/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Southwood was fined $2000 in June 2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Sellersburg was fined $6000 in August 2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Rolling Hills was fined $3000 in October 2014, and had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $600 per day from 08/22/2014 – 09/20/2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Kokomo had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of $3600 per day and $100 per day from 02/02/2012 – 02/28/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Greenwood had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 11/01/2012 – 12/07/2012; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Greenfield was fined $1500 in December 2011; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Columbus was fined $3000 in June 2012, had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 07/26/2012 – 07/26/2012, and had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of $5950 per day and $350 per day from 07/10/2014 – 07/14/2014; Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Allison Pointe was fined $3000 in August 2009, and had federal Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) imposed of $100 per day and $150 per day from 08/16/2012 – 09/21/2012; and Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation – Valley View Nursing Home had a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) imposed of $100 per day from 09/27/2012 – 10/26/2012.

Nevada reported that Kindred Hospital Las Vegas (Sahara Campus) was fined $400 based on a June 2010 survey; Kindred Hospital Las Vegas (Flamingo Campus) was fined $300 based on a December 2012 survey; and Torrey Pines Post-Acute and Rehabilitation Hospital was fined $1500 based on a January 2014 survey, and $400 based on a June 2012 survey.

North Carolina reported that Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Rose Manor, a nursing home in Durham, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $1950 based on an August 2012 survey, and a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $29,120 based on a January 2007 survey citing Immediate Jeopardy; and Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Elizabeth City, a nursing home in Elizabeth City, was assessed a federal Civil Monetary Penalty (CMP) of $1885 based on a May, 2008 survey.
Texas reported that Kindred Hospital San Antonio was fined $22,750 based on a February 2008 survey; Kindred Hospital Town and Country was fined $6550 based on a January 2013 survey; Kindred Hospital Dallas Central was fined $9000 based on a May 2011 survey, and $4400 based on a February 2012 survey; and Kindred Rehabilitation Hospital Northeast Houston was fined $7150 based on a December 2013 survey.

Utah reported that Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation, a nursing home in St. George, had an enforcement action resolved in September, 2012. The state did not report the survey date or if any monetary fine was imposed.

Wyoming reported that Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation, a nursing home in Cheyenne, had a federal Denial of Payment for New Admissions (DoPNA) imposed for a two week period based on a June, 2008 survey, which was resolved in 2008. The state did not report if any monetary fine was imposed.

Review of the Personal Qualifying Information indicates that the applicant has the required character and competence to operate a licensed home care services agency.

**ATTACHMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Attachment A</th>
<th>Before and After Gentiva Organizational Charts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment B</td>
<td>Kindred Providers / Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment C</td>
<td>Ms. Yale Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment D</td>
<td>Mr. Diaz Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment E</td>
<td>Mr. Short Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Attachment F</td>
<td>Kindred Legal Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contingency**

Submission of any and all information requested by the Division of Legal Affairs, in a form and manner acceptable to the Department.

**Recommendation:**  Contingent Approval  
**Date:** January 14, 2015
KINDRED HEALTHCARE, INC.
KINDRED HEALTHCARE OPERATING, INC.
ORGANIZATIONAL SCHEMATIC
AFTER STOCK TRANSFER

QC-Medi New York, Inc. (CHHAs)
(NY) 11-2750425

Quality Care-USA, Inc. (LHCSAs)
(NY) 11-2256479

=Provider Entity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Arizona - Northwest Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Arizona - Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Baldwin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital South Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital South Bay - Tri-City Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Rancho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Brea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - San Francisco Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - La Mirada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - San Gabriel Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Santa Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Ocala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital The Palm Beaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - South Florida - Coral Gables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Bay Area St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Bay Area - Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - South Florida Ft. Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - North Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Central Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - South Florida - Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Chicago (Northlake Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Chicago (North Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Syacamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred - Chicago - Central Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred - Chicago - Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Indianapolis South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Northwest Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Northern Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Louisville at Jewish Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Boston North Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Northeast - Natick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Northeast - Stoughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - St. Louis - St. Anthony's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - St. Louis at Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital New Jersey - Morris County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital New Jersey - Rahway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital New Jersey - Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Las Vegas (Sahara Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Las Vegas - Flamingo Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Las Vegas at St. Rose Dominican Hospitals – Rose de Lima Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Greensboro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kindred Healthcare: Long-Term Care Hospitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Cleveland - Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Central Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Oklahoma City - South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Oklahoma City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Philadelphia - Havertown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital at Heritage Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital South Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Nashville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Tarrant County (Arlington Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Tarrant County (Fort Worth Southwest Campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital (Houston NW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital (Bay Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Mansfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Houston Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - White Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Town &amp; Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Sugar Land -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Dallas Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Tomball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital The Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Baytown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Clear Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Seattle - Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Seattle - First Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kindred Healthcare: Rehabilitation Hospitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>St. Luke's Rehabilitation Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Rehabilitation Hospital Northeast Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Rehabilitation Hospital Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Rehabilitation Hospital Clear Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Central Texas Rehabilitation Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hospital Based Subacute Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Brea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital Las Vegas - Flamingo Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Hospital - Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Seattle - Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Seattle - First Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kindred Healthcare: Nursing Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Hacienda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Village Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Tunnell Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Nineteenth Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Canyonwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Healthcare - Livermore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Lawton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation - Valley Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Transitional Care - Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation - Walnut Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Healthcare-Bayberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Transitional Care-South Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Medical Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Transitional Care - Pacific Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Smith Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Ygnacio Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Siena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Golden Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Healthcare - Victorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Foothill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Crossings West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Crossings East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Canyon West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Lewiston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Nampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Weiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Aspen Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Mountain Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-SouthPointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Eagle Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Allison Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Dyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Greenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Sellersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Indian Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Valley View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Dyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Greenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Sellersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Indian Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Valley View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Kokomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Wildwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Southwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Wedgewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Rolling Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Facility Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Heritage Manor Healthcare Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Bashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Hallmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Timberlyn Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Westborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Eagle Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Great Barrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Country Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Highgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Avery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Tower Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Harborlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Brantree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Forestview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Highlander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Laurel Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Ledgewood Rehabilitation and Skilled Nursing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Seacoast Nursing and Rehabilitation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Clark House Nursing Center at Fox Hill Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Park Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Parkview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Greenbriar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Rose Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Elizabeth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-The Greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Stratford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-LakeMed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Loudon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Smith County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Northhaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Ridgmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Mansfield Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Grapevine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Wasatch Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Birchwood Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Starr Farm Nursing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Nansemond Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-River Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Bay Pointe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation-Arden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation-Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Kindred Transitional Care and Rehabilitation – Cheyenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Kindred Nursing and Rehabilitation - Wind River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assisted Living Facilities: Independently Licensed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-Village Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-The Monarch Center of Saco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-Senior Day Program (Part of The Monarch Center of Saco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-Avery Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living - Laurel Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Foxhill Village Rehab Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-Fountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Kindred Assisted Living-Stratford Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Hillcrest Retirement Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hospice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Granite Mountain Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Granite Mountain Home Care &amp; Hospice Anthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Hospice-Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Professional Healthcare at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Professional Healthcare at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Hospice-Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Hospice-Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Bridgepoint Supportive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Peoplefirst HomeCare &amp; Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Virgin Valley Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Acclaim Hospice and Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare Hospice of Abilene, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare Hospice of West Texas Hospice, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare of Athens Hospice, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare Hospice of Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Hospice-South Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Hospice-West Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare Home Health and Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>BridgePoint Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Kindred at Home - Hospice - Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>BridgePoint Palliative Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Southern Utah Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Facility Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Granite Mountain Home Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Home Health-Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Professional Healthcare at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred at Home (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred at Home (Garden Grove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Professional Healthcare at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Home Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Home Health-Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>PeopleFirst Homecare (Ft. Collins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care (Boca Raton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care (Miami Lakes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care (Port Saint Lucie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care (Sunrise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Clearwater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Fort Myers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Ocala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Jacksonville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Maitland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Bodymax Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Pensacola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Spring Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Senior Home Care, Inc. (Tampa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Kindred at Home - Chicago Home Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred at Home-Home Health-Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Acadiana Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Capitol Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Central Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Northeastern Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Northshore Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Synergy Home Care-Northwestern Region, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Facility Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare of North Central Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare of Waco-Home Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>IntegraCare of Wichita Falls, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rehab Care Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency AL</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency MN / TCK Coon Rapids (#5514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Arkansas Agency</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Autumn View Gardens Ellisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency S CA (Laguna Hills)</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Crab Apple Village Senior Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency N CA (Pleasant Hill)</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Little Sisters of the Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Atria Inn at Lakewood</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Mother of Good Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Balfour Retirement</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>RehabCare, LLC - Colorado</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Brooks Howell Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Springbrooke</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency FL</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Emeritus at Spring Valley (Kindred Nevada LLC dba Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>RehabCare/Barrington Terrace</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Emeritus of Las Vegas (Kindred Nevada LLC dba Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency IL</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Emeritus of Las Vegas (Kindred Nevada LLC dba Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Cedarhurst at Shiloh</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Atria Eastlake Terrace</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Atria Tanglewood Trace</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency at Davidsville Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>First Steps KINDRED (special Medicaid program in IN)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Kindred Rehab Service, Inc., d/b/a Bedford Outpatient Therapy Specialists</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency IN</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Isle at Watermere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency KS</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>The Therapy Group, Inc.</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Peoplefirst Virginia, LLC, d/b/a Peoplefirst Rehabilitation Services (Envoy of Staunton)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Mercy Ridge Retirement Community (formerly Villa Assumpta/Maria Hilth)</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Peoplefirst Virginia, LLC, d/b/a Peoplefirst Rehabilitation Services (Envoy of Winchester)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Atria Shorehaven</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>RehabCare Agency MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona Spine and Joint Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Canyon Ambulatory Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Aspen Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Brentwood Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sequoia Surgical Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Skyway Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Sutter Surgical Hospital - North Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Fairfield Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Northwest Specialty Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>NSH Corporate Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Lafayette Surgical Specialty Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina Specialty Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Triangle Orthopaedics Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Lakes Surgery Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan Surgical Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>El Paso Specialty Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>South Texas Spine &amp; Surgical Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>South Texas Surgical Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>The Physicians Centre Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Cache Valley Specialty Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>OakLeaf Surgical Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Mountain View Regional Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center</td>
<td>Cleve Hill Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Bedford Park Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Celia Dill Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Dyker Heights Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Eastchester Road Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Hudson Valley Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Tarrytown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Lowville Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Lowville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Niagara Falls Kidney Care Center</td>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Port Chester Dialysis &amp; Renal Center</td>
<td>Port Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Renal Care of Buffalo</td>
<td>West Seneca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>South Brooklyn Nephrology Center</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Southtowns Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>White Plains Dialysis Center</td>
<td>White Plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Yonkers East Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Yonkers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center</td>
<td>Bronx Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Boston Post Road Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Catskill Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Central New York Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Garden City Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Jamestown Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Long Island Renal Care</td>
<td>Amityville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Lynbrook Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Lynbrook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Northtowns Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Tonawanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Orange Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Orachard Park Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Orchard Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Peekskill Cortland Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Cortlandt Manor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Port Washington Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Port Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Queens Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Queens Village Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Queens Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Richmond Kidney Center</td>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Riverdale Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Sheepshead Bay Renal Care Center</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Soundview Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>South Bronx Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Staten Island Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Suburban Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Williamsville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Waters Place Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Treatment Center Extension Clinic</td>
<td>Yonkers Dialysis Center</td>
<td>Yonkers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Family Facilities - Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Edgar B Davis Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Highland Lakes Home Health - Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Highland Lakes Hospice - Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Highland Lakes Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Lampasas Healthcare Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Lockhart Family Health Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Marble Falls Healthcare Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Medical Center Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Medical Center Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Northwest Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Riverbend Home Health - Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Shoal Creek Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Smithville Regional Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Southwest Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL Care-A-Van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHL Professional Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers Nursing Home - Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell Children's Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEBD Care-A-Van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEBD Professional Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Bertram Healthcare Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Burnet Healthcare Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Community Health Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Medical Center at Brackenridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 6.11(a)

Vencor, Inc. filed voluntary petitions for protection under the Bankruptcy Code on September 13, 1999, primarily as a result of decreased Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement rates introduced by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which led to the company being unable to meet its then-existing financial obligations, including rent payable to its principal landlord, Ventas, Inc. (“Ventas”), and debt service obligations under existing indebtedness. On March 1, 2001, the Bankruptcy Court approved the Vencor, Inc. Plan of Reorganization. From September 13, 1999 until the company emerged from bankruptcy on April 20, 2001, the company operated as a debtor-in-possession subject to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court.

Pursuant to the Plan of Reorganization, the company issued creditors (in exchange for their claims) secured notes, common stock and two series of warrants, entered into a new credit agreement as well as new master lease agreements with Ventas, and cancelled all existing senior debt and equity. The company also appointed a new board of directors including representatives of principal security holders, adopted fresh-start accounting pursuant to applicable accounting rules and changed its name to Kindred Healthcare, Inc.

ITEM 6.11(c)

1. **OIG Investigation into SNF RUGs Coding.** In October and November of 2009 the Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General (“OIG”) served various administrative subpoenas for documents on nine Kindred skilled nursing facilities located in seven different states, the corporate office and Kindred Rehab Services, Inc. The subpoenas sought numerous documents related to the billing of rehab therapy services to Medicare Part A and Part B from January 1, 2004 to the present. The OIG confirmed to us that this is an active industry-wide investigation involving skilled nursing providers in addition to Kindred, and that there is no whistleblower or “qui tam” lawsuit pending against Kindred. The federal government has not made any demand for money on the Company.

2. **Boston DOJ Investigation into RehabCare.** In September 2012 the Company received a subpoena from the United States Attorney’s Office in Boston, Massachusetts (“USAO”) which sought extensive information about RehabCare’s business customers and employees and various records concerning RehabCare’s provision of rehab therapy services to long term care facilities including skilled nursing facilities in Massachusetts from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011. The Company has continued to receive document requests including subpoenas seeking various records of RehabCare concerning its rehab therapy services and billings to skilled nursing facilities nationwide, and we have produced these records to the USAO. The Company’s attorneys met with USAO and other Government employees in Boston on July 22, 2014, and August 26, 2014, to discuss the Government’s federal False Claims Act (“FCA”) allegations against RehabCare and our defense response. The USAO has not made any demand for money upon the Company.
3. **Whistleblower Lawsuit regarding a RehabCare Missouri Transaction in 2005-2006 Settled.** Investigation began with a subpoena dated August 29, 2008, from the St. Paul Field Office, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Inspector General (the "Subpoena"), being served upon RehabCare Group, Inc. A whistleblower lawsuit pending "under seal" in federal court in Minnesota apparently initiated the investigation. [Kindred Healthcare, Inc. purchased RehabCare Group Inc. and its subsidiaries on June 1, 2011.] The Government intervened in the lawsuit styled United States ex rel. Health Dimensions Rehabilitation, Inc. v. RehabCare Group Inc., et al., Case No. 4:12-CV-00848AGF, by filing a new complaint and demand for jury trial in the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota against the defendants including RehabCare Group on December 5, 2011. The Government alleged violations of the federal Anti-Kickback Statute, the federal False Claims Act and other common law causes of action. This action was transferred to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri in St. Louis in May 2012. A final Settlement Agreement was executed by all parties effective January 17, 2014. RehabCare Group paid $25 million to the United States and $150,000 to the whistleblower's attorneys as fees and the unrelated co-defendants paid an additional $5 million to the United States to settle the lawsuit. The court dismissed the lawsuit with prejudice on January 31, 2014.

4. **Bettencourt/Harrison (formerly Walsh) v. Kindred Healthcare, Inc., et al.** On November 30, 2010, in state court in San Francisco County, California, a discharged resident of our Golden Gate nursing facility filed a purported class action lawsuit against the Company's nursing centers in California for alleged failures to meet the statutory 3.2 hour nursing home per patient day ("NHPPD") minimum during the alleged class period, which runs from November 23, 2006 through April 15, 2013. In June 2013 the parties agreed to a settlement in principle in which the Company agreed to fund up to $8.25 million to pay eligible class members who file timely claims pursuant to a formula. Defendants also agreed to pay up to $200,000 for settlement administration costs, using a third-party administrator; to pay a total of $35,000 as service payments to the seven named plaintiffs representing the class; to pay the costs of a third-party monitor to monitor the Company's compliance with a two-year forward injunction up to $100,000; and to pay the plaintiffs' class counsels' attorneys fees and expenses in the amount of $2.6 million as approved by the court. The court has approved the settlement. This matter is insured by the Company's wholly-owned subsidiary, Cornerstone Insurance Company.

5. **Bethany Lutheran Home, Inc. v. RehabCare Group East, et al.** On September 10, 2012, the plaintiff nursing home ("Bethany"), which formerly contracted for rehab therapy services with RehabCare, filed an indemnification action against RehabCare in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa. The complaint seeks to recover $675,000 paid by Bethany to the U.S. Government in settlement of alleged False Claims Act violations based on RehabCare's having provided excessive therapy services to Bethany's residents for the 2005 through 2008 time period. The claims include breach of contract, negligence and fraudulent misrepresentation; and plaintiff seeks money damages and injunctive relief. Plaintiff further seeks future indemnification for false claims allegedly submitted to Medicare from 2009 to 2011. The court has denied RehabCare's motion to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim. Discovery is ongoing.
6. **United States of America, et al., v. Amgen, Omnicare, PharMerica and Kindred Healthcare.** On February 4, 2014, the Company was served with a Summons and Complaint in the above-styled action which has been pending under seal as Case #311CV1464JFA in the U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina since June 2011. The lawsuit is brought by a whistleblower under the federal False Claims Act alleging violations of the federal and state Anti-Kickback Statutes. The defendants allegedly received illegal rebates and other kickbacks from Amgen for switching patients who were prescribed certain drugs from other manufacturers to Amgen’s products instead. The complaint seeks damages, statutory fines and penalties, the whistleblower’s attorneys’ fees and an injunction prohibiting such conduct in the future. Apparently the United States and twenty-five state Attorneys General and the District of Columbia and the City of Chicago have informed the Court that they are intervening in the lawsuit as against Omnicare. It also appears from the recently unsealed court docket sheet that the United States is entering into a settlement with Omnicare and is declining to intervene into the action against PharMerica and Kindred Healthcare. These actions by the Government leave the whistleblower to pursue his claims against PharMerica and Kindred Healthcare on his own. The Company has made a claim for indemnification against PharMerica as provided for in the Master Transaction Agreement related to Kindred’s spinoff of its former subsidiary, Kindred Pharmacy Services, Inc., to PharMerica on July 1, 2007, which PharMerica has accepted.

**ITEM 6.11(d)**

Effective April 20, 2001, Kindred Healthcare, Inc. entered into a Corporate Integrity Agreement with the Office of Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (the “OIG”) to promote compliance with the requirements of Medicare, Medicaid and all other federal healthcare programs. Under the Corporate Integrity Agreement, the company implemented a comprehensive internal quality improvement program and a system of internal financial controls in its hospitals, nursing centers, pharmacies, rehabilitation operations, and regional and corporate offices. The Corporate Integrity Agreement expired in April 2006.

The Corporate Integrity Agreement required the Company to, among other things:

- engage the Long Term Care Institute to monitor and evaluate the company’s quality improvement program and report its findings to the OIG;
- adopt and implement written standards on federal healthcare program requirements with respect to financial and quality of care issues;
- conduct training each year for all employees to promote compliance with federal healthcare requirements;
- put in place a comprehensive internal quality improvement program;
- enhance its system of internal financial controls to promote compliance with federal healthcare program requirements on billing and related financial issues, including a variety of internal audit and compliance reviews;
- notify the OIG of allegations that the company committed a crime, engaged in fraudulent activity, or discovered a potential violation of the federal fraud and abuse laws or other criminal or civil laws related to any federal healthcare program; and
- submit an implementation report to the OIG in August 2001 and an annual report each year thereafter.
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 3605 of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015, having considered any advice offered by the staff of the New York State Department of Health and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of the Council, and after due deliberation, hereby approves the following applications for licensure, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER:</th>
<th>FACILITY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2276 L</td>
<td>1st Class Care Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2178 L</td>
<td>All Heart Homecare Agency, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2292 L</td>
<td>Angels of Mercy Counseling Center, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Nassau Suffolk Queens and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2272 L A Plus Homecare Agency, Inc.  
(Queens, Bronx, New York, Kings, Richmond, and Nassau Counties)

2037 L Bright Home Care, Inc.  
(New York, Bronx, Kings, Richmond, Queens and Westchester Counties)

2266 L Central Westchester Home Health Services, LLC  
(Westchester County)

2268 L Chinatown Home Health Care, Inc.  
(New York, Bronx, Kings, Queens, Richmond and Nassau Counties)

2218 L Comprehensive Elder Care, LLC  
(Bronx, Richmond, Kings, New York, Queens, and Nassau Counties)

2285 L Elite Home and Community Care Service, Inc.  
(Rockland, Putnam, Westchester, Orange and Bronx Counties)

2254 L Ellison Home Care Companion Agency, Inc.  
(Nassau, Westchester, Rockland, Queens, and Suffolk Counties)

2247 L Grupp KK, Inc.  
(Bronx, Richmond, New York, Queens, Kings, Westchester Counties)

2152 L Guiding Angels Home Care, LLC  
(Bronx, Kings, New York, Richmond, Queens and Nassau Counties)

2138 L Home at Last Home Care Services, LLC  
(Kings, Bronx, Queens, Richmond, and New York Counties)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Number</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Areas Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2175 L</td>
<td>Human First Community Health Care, LLC</td>
<td>(Nassau, Suffolk and Queens Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2215 L</td>
<td>La’Dorch Homecare, Inc.</td>
<td>(Bronx, Richmond, Kings, New York, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2261 L</td>
<td>Marabi Homecare Agency, Inc.</td>
<td>(New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2274 L</td>
<td>Masih Home Care Incorporated</td>
<td>(Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York, Bronx, and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202 L</td>
<td>MY Care Health Services, Inc.</td>
<td>(Queens, New York, Bronx, Richmond, Kings, and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2244 L</td>
<td>New Hope Services, Inc.</td>
<td>(Bronx, Richmond, New York, Queens, Kings and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2259 L</td>
<td>NMC Homecare Agency of NY, Inc.</td>
<td>(New York, Richmond, Kings, Bronx, Queens, and Westchester Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2176 L</td>
<td>Augusta Osinowo d/b/a Nightingale Care Services</td>
<td>(Bronx, Queens, New York, Richmond, Kings, and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2157 L</td>
<td>Passion for Seniors of NY, Inc.</td>
<td>(Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2299 L</td>
<td>Premium Home Services, LLC</td>
<td>(Queens, Kings, Bronx, New York, Richmond, and Nassau Counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2279 L</td>
<td>Scope Healthcare Services, Inc.</td>
<td>(Suffolk, Nassau and Queens Counties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Private Home Care LLC
(Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York and Nassau Counties)

Alice Hyde Medical Center
(Franklin County)

Hyde Park Assisted Living Facility, Inc.
d/b/a Hyde Park Licensed Home Care Agency
(Dutchess County)

Acare HHC, Inc.
d/b/a Four Seasons Home Care
(Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, Nassau and New York Counties)

Crown of Life Care NY, LLC
(Bronx, Queens, Kings, Richmond, Nassau and New York Counties)

Elite HHC, LLC
(Bronx, Richmond, Kings, Westchester, New York and Queens Counties)

Prestige LHCSA Management, Inc.
(Bronx, Richmond, Kings, Westchester, New York and Queens Counties)

Quality Care – USA, Inc.
d/b/a Gentiva Health Services
(See exhibit for counties served)
Description
NYU Langone Health System, Inc. (NYUHS), an existing not-for-profit corporation which is controlled by New York University (NYU), a not-for-profit corporation in New York County, requests approval to become the active parent and co-operator of Lutheran Medical Center, a 450-bed not-for-profit hospital located at 150 55th Street, Brooklyn (Kings County). NYUHS would replace Lutheran Medical Center Health System, Inc. as the sole corporate member of Lutheran Medical Center. Approval is also sought to change the name of the Lutheran Medical Center to NYU Lutheran Medical Center.

The purpose of the transaction is to establish a more integrated system with the objectives of improving quality, increasing access and lowering the costs of health care in the communities served by Lutheran Medical Center. There will be no change in authorized services or the number or type of beds as a result of approval of this project. Also, there are no projected changes in the utilization, revenues or expenses of Lutheran Medical Center as a direct result of this project. The hospital will maintain a separate not-for-profit corporation licensed under Article 28 of the Public Health Law, maintaining its separate operating certificate following completion of the project.

As active parent and co-operator, NYUHS will have the following rights, powers and authorities with respect to Lutheran Medical Center:
- Electing the Corporation’s Board of Trustees;
- Removing the Corporation’s Board of Trustees;
- Filling any vacancies in the Corporation’s Board of Trustees;
- Amending or repealing these By-laws or adopting new By-laws;
- Approving the Corporation’s merger or consolidation with another entity;
- Approving the sale, lease, exchange or other disposition of all, or substantially all, the assets of the Corporation;
- Reviewing the vision, mission and strategic and financial plans to the Corporation;
- Reviewing the Corporation’s annual operating and capital budgets, provided that final approval of the budgets shall remain with the Corporation;
- Approving any transaction having a value of $25,000,000 or more; and
- Approving the creation, acquisition and/or dissolution of an entity in which the Corporation is proposed to be, or is, the contracting member.

Presented as BFA Attachment A are the organizational charts of Lutheran Medical Center and NYU Langone Health System, Inc. pre-closing and post-closing.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
This project will not change utilization, services, or beds. This transaction will help with the financial stability of the facility, improve access to clinical expertise, and establish a commitment to high quality care. NYUHS plans to expand the IT infrastructure and connectivity at Lutheran to further improve patient care.
Program Summary
Based on the information reviewed, staff found nothing that would reflect adversely upon the applicant’s character and competence or standing in the community.

Financial Summary
There are no project cost or budgets associated with this application.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and approval is recommended.
Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of evidence of approval by the Office of Mental Health, acceptable to the Department. [PMU]
2. Submission of the executed Certificate of Incorporation of NYULMC System, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
3. Submission of an executed amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation of NYULMC System, Inc., acceptable to the Department, that changes the corporation’s name to NYU Langone Health System, Inc. [CSL]
4. Submission of an executed amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation of Lutheran Medical Center, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
5. Submission of the finalized Amended and Restated Constitution and Bylaws of NYU Lutheran Medical Center, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
6. Submission of the Certificate of Incorporation of NYU Hospitals Center, and any amendments thereto, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
7. Submission of the bylaws of NYU Hospitals Center, and any amendments thereto, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Background
A newly formed entity, NYU Langone Health System, Inc., controlled by New York University, seeks approval to be established as the active parent and co-operator of Lutheran Medical Center (LMC), a 450-bed voluntary not-for-profit facility located at 150 55th street Brooklyn, NY 11220. The applicant plans to change the facility name to NYU Lutheran Medical Center upon project approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lutheran Hospital Certified Beds</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Dependence - Detoxification</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Care</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical / Surgical</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Continuing Care</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neonatal Intermediate Care</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
This project will allow the health system to operate in a more cost effective manner, provide a more streamlined patient health system, and offer better access to care.

Recommendation
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

Program Analysis

Program Description
A newly formed entity, NYU Langone Health System, Inc. (NYUHS), for which New York University (NYU), a not-for-profit corporation, is the passive parent, seeks approval to be established as the active parent and co-operator of the Lutheran Medical Center (LMC), an existing 450-bed not-for-profit hospital located in Kings County. Approval is also sought to change the name of LMC to NYU Lutheran Medical Center. Additionally, shortly after NYUHS is approved as the active parent and co-operator of LMC, NYU Medical Center will seek approval to become the co-operator of LMC’s Cardiac Catheterization Lab. The applicant does not anticipate any change in staffing, authorized services or number and/or type of bed complement.

NYU Langone Medical Center, located in Manhattan, is composed of the NYU School of Medicine which, since 1841, has trained thousands of physicians and scientists and three (3) hospitals: Tisch Hospital, its flagship acute care facility; the Rusk Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine, a university-affiliated facility devoted entirely to rehabilitation medicine; and the NYU Hospital for Joint Diseases, a facility dedicated to orthopedics and rheumatology.
Lutheran Medical Center is the principal provider of healthcare for the residents of southwest Brooklyn. Its emergency department is designated as a Level I Trauma Center as well as a Regional Stroke Center and it has one of the largest Federally Qualified Health Center networks in the nation, to include school-based health centers and social support services, a Level 3 Patient-Centered Medical home, and affordable housing and support services to older adults.

The applicant views an NYUHS-Lutheran affiliation as an opportunity to respond to the changing health care environment in Brooklyn through financial stability, leadership, expertise in population health and IT infrastructure which will support the delivery of comprehensive, highly coordinated care to Brooklyn patients and support local providers.

**Character and Competence**
The proposed Board of Directors of NYUHS is comprised of:

- Robert I. Grossman, MD  
  CEO/Director
- Robert Berne, PhD  
  Director
- Kenneth G. Langone  
  Director

Dr. Grossman serves as both Dean of the New York University School of Medicine and Chief Executive Officer of NYU Langone Medical Center. Mr. Berne is the Executive Vice President for Health at New York University and Mr. Langone is the CEO of Invemed Associates, an investment banking firm.

Staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the disclosure information submitted regarding licenses held, formal education, training in pertinent health and/or related areas, employment history, a record of legal actions, and a disclosure of the applicant’s ownership interest in other health care facilities. Licensed individuals were checked against the Office of Medicaid Management, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, and the Education Department databases as well as the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General Medicare exclusion database.

Additionally, the staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the ten-year surveillance history of all associated facilities. Sources of information included the files, records, and reports found in the Department of Health. Included in the review were the results of any incident and/or complaint investigations, independent professional reviews, and/or comprehensive/focused inspections. The review found that any citations were properly corrected with appropriate remedial action.

Between 2006 and 2008, the Department issued the following four (4) Stipulations and Orders to NYU Hospital Center:

- 11/16/06 - $16,000 fine based on an investigation of two occurrences of wrong-sided surgery (one involving a hernia and the other involved removal of a catheter).
- 2/7/07 - $6,000 fine based on a complaint investigation regarding the care rendered to a patient who had jaw surgery involving fixation. Following periods of extensive bleeding, the patient arrested. Intubation was hindered by the fixation and the patient died.
- 5/29/07 - $6,000 fine based on an incident involving the care rendered to an infant who presented to the ED bleeding from a tracheotomy site. There were significant delays in diagnosing a bowel that had herniated into the chest cavity and delays in recognizing the infant’s deteriorating condition and notifying senior staff which led to the patient’s death.
- 5/28/08 - $6,000 fine based on an incident relating to a patient who was admitted for treatment of a long-standing, poorly controlled seizure disorder. Hospital policy required continuous monitoring of such a patient but said monitoring did not occur due to a known problem with equipment at the nursing station.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, approval is recommended.
**Financial Analysis**

**Capability and Feasibility**
There are no issues of capability or feasibility, as there is no project cost or budgets associated with this application.

BFA Attachment B is the 2012 and 2013 consolidated certified financial statements of NYU Hospitals Center. As shown, the hospital had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2012 through 2013. Also, the hospital achieved an average operating income of $141,606,500 from 2012 and 2013.

BFA Attachment C is the August 31, 2014 internal financial statements of NYU Hospitals Center. As shown, the hospital had a positive working capital position and a positive net asset position through August 31, 2014. Also, the facility achieved an operating income of $214,791,000 through August 31, 2014.

BFA Attachment D is the 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of Lutheran HealthCare. As shown, the entity had an average positive working capital position and an average positive net asset position from 2012 through 2013. Also, the entity incurred average operating losses of $16,341,500 from 2012 through 2013. The applicant has indicated that the reasons for the losses are the result of the following:
- The losses were primarily generated by Lutheran Healthcare’s physician corporation, which had been supported by the positive margins generated at Lutheran Medical and Lutheran Family Health Centers.
- The operations of Health Plus were sold on May 1, 2012, and then changed its name to OHP. OHP’s function as of May 1, 2012, was to pay off liabilities, resolve all claims, collections and receivables (basically to run-out the company). In 2012 the company incurred significant additional cost as a result of the sale for staff retention bonus, severance and terminating cost that resulted in the loss from operations.
- The loss in 2013 was due to a run-out of administrative cost and settlements of above recorded liabilities.

The applicant implemented the following steps to improve operations:
- Over the last few years, the hospital invested in the retention and recruitment of physician and physician practices. Revenues will increase as the practices grow and they are able to negotiate better rates and realize additional admissions. Management is currently reviewing many of the physician practice sites to reduce costs through consolidation and efficiency.
- Under the proposed arrangement, the physician corporation of Lutheran Healthcare will become part of NYU School of Medicine’s Faculty Group Practice. This will eliminate the losses from Lutheran Healthcare, and the management of these physicians within the larger Faculty Group Practice will provide improved revenue collections and more efficient overhead.

BFA Attachment E is the September 30, 2014 internal financial statements of Lutheran HealthCare. As shown, the entity had a positive working capital position and a positive net asset position through September 30, 2014. Also, the entity incurred operating losses of $19,123,000 through September 30, 2014. The losses through September 30, 2014 were due to the run-out of administrative cost settlements above recorded liabilities of OHP. The hospital is at the tail-end of the run-out and they anticipate a resolution by May 1, 2015.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**
From a financial perspective, approval is recommended.
## Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFA Attachment A</th>
<th>Organizational Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Financial Summary - 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of NYU Hospitals Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>August 31, 2014 internal financial statements of NYU Hospitals Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment D</td>
<td>Financial Summary - 2012 and 2013 certified financial statements of Lutheran HealthCare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment E</td>
<td>September 30, 2014 internal financial statements of Lutheran HealthCare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to establish NYU Langone Health System, Inc. as the active parent and co-operator of Lutheran Medical Center to be renamed NYU Lutheran Medical Center, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: FACILITY/APPLICANT:

142218 E NYU Lutheran Medical Center
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of evidence of approval by the Office of Mental Health, acceptable to the Department. [PMU]
2. Submission of the executed Certificate of Incorporation of NYULMC System, Inc., acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
3. Submission of an executed amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation of NYULMC System, Inc., acceptable to the Department, that changes the corporation’s name to NYU Langone Health System, Inc. [CSL]
4. Submission of an executed amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation of Lutheran Medical Center, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
5. Submission of the finalized Amended and Restated Constitution and Bylaws of NYU Lutheran Medical Center, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
6. Submission of the Certificate of Incorporation of NYU Hospitals Center, and any amendments thereto, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
7. Submission of the bylaws of NYU Hospitals Center, and any amendments thereto, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]

Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Executive Summary

Description
Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. (Pure Life), a to-be formed corporation, requests approval to become the operator of Comprehensive Dialysis Center of Western New York, Inc. (Comprehensive Dialysis), an existing Article 28 diagnostic and treatment center (D&TC) located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville (Erie County), that provides in-center and home-based renal dialysis services. Pure Life will be a subsidiary of Pure Life Renal, Inc., a Delaware C Corporation that provides dialysis services to end stage and acute renal failure patients. Pure Life Renal, Inc. will own 100% of the stock of Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. and will provide all financing for the purchase of the program and provide working capital needs. The ownership of Pure Life Renal, Inc. is shown as BFA Attachment D.

Pure Life Renal, Inc. entered into a lease agreement with Buffalo Medical Group Building, Inc. (lessor), to lease the premises located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville, for the purpose of operating the outpatient renal dialysis clinic. There will be no disruption in services in the implementation of this arrangement.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
Erie County currently has a population of 919,866 with 1,132 residents needing dialysis treatment. Currently there are 256 total stations approved to be operational in Erie County which can treat 1,152 patients according to the Department of Health’s methodology. This project would not bring about a change in the dialysis capacity of Erie County.

Program Summary
Based on the information reviewed, staff found nothing that would reflect adversely upon the applicant’s character and competence or standing in the community.

Financial Summary
The purchase price of the business is $12,000,000 based on Pure Life’s assessment of the anticipated return on equity of the purchase. Payment of the purchase price will be met as follows: $12,000,000 from the operations of Pure Life Renal, Inc.

There are no project costs associated with this CON.

Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$7,739,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$6,665,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>$1,073,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the noted contingencies, the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
**Recommendations**

**Health Systems Agency**

There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

**Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management**

**Approval contingent upon:**

1. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital. [HSP]
2. Submission of an executed Medical Director Agreement, acceptable to the Department. [HSP]
3. Submission of an executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement associated with the asset purchase agreement, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
4. Submission of an executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement associated with the lease rental agreement, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
5. Submission of documentation showing the receipt of the additional funds from the sale of the Series A stock, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
6. Submission of the resolution of partners, corporate directors, or LLC managers, as the case may be, authorizing the project. [CSL]
7. Submission of Bylaws with the following amendments: (1) removal of proxy language or amended to provide that the proxy may vote only as specifically instructed by the shareholder with regard to each vote, unless the shareholders proxy is another shareholder approved by the Public Health and Health Planning Council to vote the shares that are covered by the proxy. [CSL]
8. Submission of an executed Certificate of Incorporation which must comply with 10 NYCRR Section 620.1. [CSL]
9. Submission of original stockholder affidavits from each stockholder including the specific information set forth in 10 NYCRR Section 620.1(b). [CSL]
11. Submission of the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of Pure Life Renal, Inc. [CSL]
12. Submission of an executed and dated Application for Authority authorizing Pure Life Renal, Inc., a Delaware corporation, to conduct business in the State of New York. [CSL]
13. Submission of a photocopy of the executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement with the following amendments: (1) all blanks must be filled in, (2) the document must be executed. [CSL]

**Approval conditional upon:**

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity’s clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]

**Council Action Date**

February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Project Description
Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc., is seeking approval to transfer ownership of Comprehensive Dialysis Center of Western New York, Inc., a 25 station renal dialysis diagnosis and treatment center located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville 14221. This project would have no impact on the number of renal dialysis stations in the county.

Analysis
The primary service area for this facility is Erie County, which had a population estimate of 919,866 in 2013. The percentage of the population aged 65 and over was 16.3%. The nonwhite population percentage was 23.1%. These are the two population groups that are most in need of end stage renal dialysis service. Comparisons between Erie County and New York State are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Erie County</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65 and Over:</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite:</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census 2013

Capacity
The Department’s methodology to estimate capacity for chronic dialysis stations is specified in Part 709.4 of Title 10 and is as follows:

- One free standing station represents 702 treatments per year. This is based on the expectation that the center will operate 2.5 patient shifts per day at 6 days per week, which can accommodate 15 patients per week (2.5 x 6 x 15 x 52 weeks). This projected 702 treatments per year is based on a potential 780 treatments x 52 weeks x 90% utilization rate = 702. The estimated average number of dialysis procedures each patient receives per year is 156.
- One hospital based station is calculated at 499 treatments per year per station. This is the result of 2.0 shifts per day x 6 days per week x 52 weeks x 80% utilization rate. One hospital based station can treat 3 patients per year.
- Per Department policy, hospital-based stations can treat fewer patients per year. Statewide, the majority of stations are free standing, as are the majority of applications for new stations. As such, when calculation the need for additional stations, the Department bases the projected need on establishing additional free standing stations.
- There are currently 256 free standing chronic dialysis stations operating in Erie County and 0 in pipeline for a total of 256. This project will not result in any changes to the capacity in the county. The total will remain 256 chronic dialysis stations. These stations will be able to treat 1,152 patients.

Erie County Projected Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients Treated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Treated</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Patients Treated*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Standing Stations Needed</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Stations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations with Pipeline</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Approval of This CON and Pipeline</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need With Approval</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Patient data is from 2012 and is projected out 5 years, assuming a 3% annual rate of increase. Resident data is from 2013 and is projected out 4 years, assuming a 3% annual rate of increase.
The data in the first row, "Free Standing Stations Needed," comes from the DOH methodology of each station being able to treat 4.5 patients, and each hospital station being able to treat 3 patients annually. The data in the next row, "Existing Stations," comes from the Department's Health Facilities Information System (HFIS). "Unmet Need" comes from subtracting needed stations from existing stations. "Total Patients Treated" is from IPRO data from 2012.

**Conclusion**

The facility accommodates a population in need of access to dialysis stations in the service area. The 256 stations in Erie County currently serve a population of 919,866 residents and the county is near capacity for dialysis stations. This indicates that these resources are well-utilized. The proposed ownership change would have no impact on the number of renal dialysis stations, and the facility would continue to provide this critical service.

**Recommendation**

From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

---

**Program Analysis**

**Project Proposal**

Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc., a to-be-formed corporation, requests approval for the transfer of ownership of Comprehensive Dialysis Center of Western New York, Inc. The existing 25-station center is located at 6010 Main Street in Williamsville (Erie County). If approved, the name of the facility will be changed to Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. and this will represent the first dialysis center owned/operated by Pure Life Renal, Inc. There are no significant programmatic changes anticipated as a result of this proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Operator</th>
<th>Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site Address      | 6010 Main Street  
|                   | Williamsville, NY (Erie County) |
| Approved Services | Chronic Renal Dialysis (25 stations)  
|                   | Home Hemodialysis Training & Support  
|                   | Home Peritoneal Dialysis Training & Support |
| Shifts/Hours/Schedule | 3 shifts per day, 6 days per week  
|                     | Monday/Wednesday/Friday 5:30am – 9:30 pm  
|                     | Tuesday/Thursday/Saturday 5:30 am – 8:30 pm |
| Staffing (1st Year / 3rd Year) | 33.09 FTEs / 34.59 FTEs |
| Medical Director(s) | Inkee Min, MD |
| Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance | Expected to be provided by Millard Fillmore Suburban Hospital  
|                     | 2.2 miles / 5 minutes |

**Character and Competence**

Pure Life Renal, Inc. holds 100% shares of Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.  
| Pure Life Renal, Inc. (100%) | 100% |
The proposed board members of Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orestes Lugo</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEO of Pure Life Renal, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Fernandez</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CFO of Pure Life Renal, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Sola</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stockholder of Pure Life Renal, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Messrs. Lugo and Fernandez each have considerable employment experience in health care entities providing renal dialysis services. Mr. Sola has extensive experience in international finance.

The proposed Medical Director, Dr. Min, has been a practicing physician for over 30 years and is board-certified in Internal Medicine and Nephrology.

Staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the disclosure information submitted regarding licenses held, formal education, training in pertinent health and/or related areas, employment history, a record of legal actions, and a disclosure of the applicant’s ownership interest in other health care facilities. Licensed individuals were checked against the Office of Medicaid Management, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, and the Education Department databases as well as the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General Medicare exclusion database.

Between 2002 and 2009, when Mr. Lugo was in the position of Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Mr. Fernandez was in the position of Controller, Renal Care Partners, Inc. was the parent entity of 24 dialysis centers operating in eight (8) states. In March 2007, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) determined that a center operating in Hialeah, Florida was not in substantial compliance with four (4) Medicare conditions for coverage and subsequently terminated the Hialeah center’s Medicare participation. (None of the compliance issues noted related to Messrs. Lugo and Fernandez’ duties and responsibilities.) In 2009, Renal Care reorganized its own management and appointed Mr. Lugo as the Chief Executive Officer and Mr. Fernandez as CFO. The dialysis facilities have sustained substantial compliance.

Additionally, the staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the ten-year surveillance history of all associated facilities. Sources of information included the files, records, and reports found in the Department of Health. Included in the review were the results of any incident and/or complaint investigations, independent professional reviews, and/or comprehensive/focused inspections. The review found that any citations were properly corrected with appropriate remedial action.

**Recommendation**

From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.
Financial Analysis

Asset Purchase Agreement
The applicant has submitted an executed asset purchase agreement, which is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>September 15, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Comprehensive Dialysis Center of Western New York, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser</td>
<td>Pure Life Renal, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Assets:</td>
<td>Seller’s right, title and interest in all of the following assets owned and used by the seller in the business: All inventories and other materials; All supplies, equipment, vehicles, machinery, furniture, fixtures, leasehold improvements and other tangible personal property; All proprietary knowledge, trade secrets, patient, physician and referral lists, technical information, quality control data, processes, methods or rights; The business as a going concern and its franchises, insurance policies, telephone numbers, customer and vendor lists, assigned contracts, personal property leases, advertising material and data, obligations owing to CDC, all physical and electronic data relating to the business; All other tangible and intangible property, other than the excluded assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Assets:</td>
<td>All cash owned by the Seller, including any bank accounts owned by the Seller as of the closing; All accounts and other receivables payable and reimbursable to the Seller relating to the period prior to the closing date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Liabilities:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Liabilities:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price:</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment:</td>
<td>$1,200,000 non-refundable deposit upon execution of this agreement, $1,260,000 refundable deposit upon execution of the agreement, $9,540,000 payable at closing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant has submitted an affidavit, which is acceptable to the Department, in which the applicant agrees, notwithstanding, any agreement, arrangement or understanding between the applicant and transferor to the contrary, to be liable and for any Medicaid overpayments, made to the facility and/or surcharges, assessments, or fees due from the Seller pursuant to Article 28 of the Public Health Law with respect to the period of time prior to the applicant acquiring its interest, without releasing the Seller of its liability and responsibility. Currently, the facility has no outstanding audit liabilities and assessments.

Lease Rental Agreement
The applicant has submitted an executed lease rental agreement for the proposed site, the terms are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>September 4, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessor</td>
<td>Buffalo Medical Group Building, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessee</td>
<td>Pure Life Renal, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>14,428 sq. ft. located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>5 years with 2 additional 5 year renewal terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment:</td>
<td>$259,704 for year 1 ($18.00 per sq. ft.), with a $0.25 per sq. ft. increase annually over the prior lease year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions:</td>
<td>The lessee shall be responsible for maintenance, utilities and real estate taxes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant has stated that the proposed lease is an arm’s length agreement. The applicant has submitted two letters from realtors attesting to the reasonableness of the per square foot rental.

**Assignment and Assumption Agreements**

The applicant has submitted draft Assignment and Assumption Agreements for both the assignment of the asset purchase agreement and the lease associated with this project, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignor:</th>
<th>Pure Life Renal, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignee:</td>
<td>Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Transferred:</td>
<td>All of the acquired assets listed in the asset purchase agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Assets:</td>
<td>All of the excluded assets listed in the asset purchase agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Assigned:</td>
<td>Lease associated with premises located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Terms/Payments and Provisions:</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Budget**

The applicant has submitted the Current Year, Year 1 and Year 3 operating budgets for the facility, in 2015 dollars, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>$145,856</td>
<td>$148,773</td>
<td>$154,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>729,281</td>
<td>743,867</td>
<td>773,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>2,771,268</td>
<td>2,826,694</td>
<td>2,940,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>3,062,981</td>
<td>3,124,240</td>
<td>3,250,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>583,425</td>
<td>595,093</td>
<td>619,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$7,292,811</td>
<td>$7,438,667</td>
<td>$7,739,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$4,725,470</td>
<td>$4,851,333</td>
<td>$5,033,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>238,296</td>
<td>1,675,961</td>
<td>1,631,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$4,963,766</td>
<td>$6,527,294</td>
<td>$6,665,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income</strong></td>
<td>$2,329,045</td>
<td>$911,373</td>
<td>$1,073,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor:</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>14,855</td>
<td>15,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>6,636</td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td>6,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25,117</td>
<td>25,366</td>
<td>25,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant increase in capital expenses from the current year to years 1 and 3 is due to the following:
- An increase in annual rental expense by approximately $100,000 due to an increase in the base rent.
- An increase of approximately $1.3 Million per year for the amortization of intangible assets (trade name, non-compete agreements and patient relationships) recorded in purchase accounting resulting from the acquisition of the clinic.

Utilization by payor source for the Current Year, Year 1 and Year 3, subsequent to the change in ownership, is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor:</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee For Service</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Managed Care</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee For Service</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>14,855</td>
<td>15,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Managed Care</td>
<td>6,636</td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td>6,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Care</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25,117</td>
<td>25,366</td>
<td>25,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the historical experience of the current operator, with the assumption of an annual 2% increase in revenues and an annual 1% increase in visits (treatments). These assumptions appear reasonable.

**Capability and Feasibility**

The total purchase price for the operation of the facility is $12,000,000. Pure Life will meet the purchase price as follows: $12,000,000 from the operations of Pure Life Renal, Inc., the facility’s sole shareholder. There are no project costs associated with this CON.

Working capital requirements are estimated at $1,087,882, based upon two months of Year 1 expenses. The applicant will provide the full amount of the working capital requirement from the operations of Pure Life Renal, Inc., the applicant’s sole shareholder. BFA Attachment B is the internal financial statement for Pure Life Renal, Inc. for the period February 10, 2014 through October 31, 2014, which indicates insufficient liquid resources to meet both the equity and working capital requirements for this project. The applicant has explained that they are in the process of raising funds through the sale of Series A Stock in the business and have an agreement in place to receive $10,500,000 in additional funds by the first quarter of 2015. When this additional money is received, the facility will have sufficient liquid resources to meet both the equity and working capital requirements, therefore making it financially feasible.

BFA Attachment C is the Pro Forma Balance sheet for Pure Life, which shows that the operations will start with $13,200,000 in equity. It is noted that assets include $3,433,000 in goodwill and $8,302,000 in net intangible assets, which are not available liquid resources, nor are they recognized for Medicaid reimbursement purposes. Thus, the net asset position would be a positive member’s equity position of $1,465,000.

The applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.

**Recommendation**

*From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A       Pure Life Table of Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B       Internal Financial Statements for Pure Life, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C       Pro-Forma Balance Sheet of Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment D       Pure Life Renal, Inc. ownership list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to establish Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc. as the new operator of the facility located at 6010 Main Street, Williamsville which is currently operated by Comprehensive Dialysis Center of New York, Inc., and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: 142115 E
FACILITY/APPLICANT: Pure Life Renal of Buffalo, Inc.
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital. [HSP]
2. Submission of an executed Medical Director Agreement, acceptable to the Department. [HSP]
3. Submission of an executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement associated with the asset purchase agreement, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
4. Submission of an executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement associated with the lease rental agreement, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
5. Submission of documentation showing the receipt of the additional funds from the sale of the Series A stock, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
6. Submission of the resolution of partners, corporate directors, or LLC managers, as the case may be, authorizing the project. [CSL]
7. Submission of Bylaws with the following amendments: (1) removal of proxy language or amended to provide that the proxy may vote only as specifically instructed by the shareholder with regard to each vote, unless the shareholders proxy is another shareholder approved by the Public Health and Health Planning Council to vote the shares that are covered by the proxy. [CSL]
8. Submission of an executed Certificate of Incorporation which must comply with 10 NYCRR Section 620.1. [CSL]
9. Submission of original stockholder affidavits from each stockholder including the specific information set forth in 10 NYCRR Section 620.1(b). [CSL]
11. Submission of the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of Pure Life Renal, Inc. [CSL]
12. Submission of an executed and dated Application for Authority authorizing Pure Life Renal, Inc., a Delaware corporation, to conduct business in the State of New York. [CSL]
13. Submission of a photocopy of the executed Assignment and Assumption Agreement with the following amendments: (1) all blanks must be filled in, (2) the document must be executed. [CSL]

APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity’s clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.
Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC

Program: Diagnostic and Treatment Center
Purpose: Establishment

County: Kings
Acknowledged: October 4, 2013

Executive Summary

Description
Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC d/b/a Big Apple, a for-profit corporation located at 23-14 College Point Blvd, College Point, NY, requests approval to become the established operator of four dialysis center programs currently operated by the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation (NYCHHC). Big Apple will acquire the dialysis centers through an asset purchase agreement and will operate the Kings County Hospital site as the main clinic location. The remaining three sites will be operated as extension clinic sites.

The four locations and the number of End-Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) stations per site are as follows:
- Kings Co. Hospital site at 451 Clarkson Avenue, Dialysis Unit Room C6210, Brooklyn – 26 stations;
- Lincoln Hospital site at 234 East 149th Street, Hemodialysis Unit Bronx – 8 stations;
- Metropolitan Hospital site at 1901 First Avenue, Dialysis Unit, New York – 12 stations;
- Harlem Hospital site at 506 Lenox Avenue-Room 18-107 Dialysis Unit, New York – 11 stations.

All of the dialysis centers/ESRD stations noted above are located within their respective hospitals and no change or modifications will occur to the approved number of stations or program locations upon the approval of the change in ownership.

Big Apple will enter into four separate license agreements with NYCHHC for the right to occupy the space and continue to provide ESRD services at each respective site. There will be no change in the physical environment of the facilities and no disruption in services to existing patients. The ESRD clinics are outpatient only clinics and will not be accepting any patients for dialysis services that are inpatients of the hospital within which the dialysis clinic is located. Such inpatients will receive their dialysis treatments in the given hospital’s acute dialysis center. Big Apple has stated that once the project receives contingent approval they will start to hire and retain all of the necessary dialysis staff members. This hiring process will prevent a lapse in services once the change in ownership is fully approved.

The members of Big Apple and their ownership percentages are as follows: Dr. Jodumutt G. Bhat (50%) and Dr. Nirmal Matoo (50%). Both members are New York State licensed Nephrologists.

The members of Big Apple Dialysis also own the following seven dialysis centers in New York State: Central Brooklyn Dialysis Center, LLC; East End Dialysis Management, LLC; New Hyde Park Dialysis Center, LLC; Newtown Dialysis Center, Inc.; New York Renal Associates, Inc.; Ridgewood Dialysis Center, Inc.; and West Nassau Dialysis Center, Inc. Shown as BFA Attachment D are the 2012 and 2013 certified and 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014 internal financial statements for the above listed facilities.

DOH Recommendation
Contingent Approval

Need Summary
All three counties serve a total population of 5,593,198 with a total of 1674 stations, including approval of not-yet-operational stations. There continues to be need in all three counties. These stations are necessary to provide continued service to patients in the service areas.
Program Summary
Based on the information reviewed, staff found nothing that would reflect adversely upon the applicant's character and competence or standing in the community.

Financial Summary
NYCHHC is selling the four ESRD dialysis programs listed above to Big Apple for a purchase price of $1,137,380.88. The purchase price is based on the estimated current fair market value of the equipment located within the centers. Payment of the purchase price will be met as follows: $113,738.88 in equity from the proposed members, and a loan of $1,023,642 with a 5-year term at 3.16% interest rate. The interest rate is based on the 30 day Libor rate plus 3.00%. The current 30 day Libor rate per the Wall Street Journal published December 4, 2014, is 0.16%.

There are no project costs associated with this CON.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$15,100,828</td>
<td>$16,897,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$12,021,686</td>
<td>$13,334,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income/(loss):</td>
<td>$3,079,142</td>
<td>$3,562,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the noted contingencies, the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner.
Recommendations

Health Systems Agency
There will be no HSA recommendation for this project.

Office of Primary Care and Health Systems Management
Approval contingent upon:
1. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital for each of the four (4) sites. [HSP]
2. Submission of a proposed Medical Director Agreement, acceptable to the Department. (The document entitled “Medical Director Agreement” submitted with the application delegates more authority to the contractor, Physicians Affiliate Group of New York, than is provided for in regulation. Specifically, it is an employment contract for the provision of multiple, unnamed, Medical Directors at four separate sites. As drafted, it constitutes an unacceptable management contract because the established operator is not retaining direct independent authority to appoint and discharge the Medical Directors as required by regulation.) [HSP]
3. Submission of an executed loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
4. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
5. Submission of site specific executed license agreements, acceptable to the Department of Health, for site control of the following dialysis center clinic programs: Kings County Hospital Center site, Lincoln Hospital Center site, Metropolitan Hospital Center site, and Harlem Hospital site. [BFA]
6. Submission of site specific executed administrative service agreements, acceptable to the Department of Health, for the following dialysis center clinic programs: Kings County Hospital Center site, Lincoln Hospital Center site, Metropolitan Hospital Center site, and Harlem Hospital site. [BFA]
7. The submission of existing conditions schematic floor plans and architect’s letter of certification for existing buildings, for review and approval. [AER]
8. Submission of a completed Schedule 3. [CSL]
9. Submission of an executed Certificate of Assumed Name, acceptable to the Department and clarification regarding whether each location requires a Certificate of Assumed Name – if they are all operating under different names. [CSL]
10. Submission of an executed Certificate of Amendment of the Articles of Organization, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
11. Submission of an executed Operating Agreement (and Joinder), acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
12. Submission of an executed Administrative Services Agreement for all four (Harlem, Kings, Lincoln and Metropolitan) locations, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
13. Submission of an executed license agreement for all four (Harlem, Kings, Lincoln and Metropolitan) sites, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
14. Submission of an executed Purchase and Sale Agreement. [CSL]

Approval conditional upon:
1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity’s clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
6. To provide Transfusion Services, licensure by the New York State Department of Health- Wadsworth Center is required. [HSP]

Council Action Date
February 12, 2015
Need Analysis

Background
Big Apple is seeking approval to be established as the new operator of four existing dialysis centers. These centers are as follows:

- Kings County Hospital Center, a 26-station chronic dialysis facility located at 451 Clarkson Avenue in Brooklyn, 11203;
- Lincoln Medical and Mental Health, an 8-station chronic dialysis facility located at 234 East 149th Street in the Bronx, 10451;
- Metropolitan Hospital Center, a 12-station chronic dialysis facility located at 1901 First Avenue in Manhattan, 10029;
- Harlem Hospital, an 11-station chronic dialysis unit located at 506 Lenox Ave Room 18-107 in Manhattan, 10037.

There is need in Kings, Bronx, and New York Counties for additional chronic dialysis stations. Retention of these existing facilities is necessary for community residents and patients. There will be no changes in the number of stations or the services offered at the facilities under the proposed new operator.

Analysis
The service area for Big Apple and the facilities they are purchasing is Kings, Bronx, and New York Counties.

Kings Population - 2,565,635
Ages 65 and Over: 11.7% State Average: 14.1%
Nonwhite: 64.2% State Average: 42.4%

Bronx Population - 1,408,473
Ages 65 and Over: 10.9% State Average: 14.1%
Nonwhite: 89.2% State Average: 42.4%

New York County Population - 1,619,090
Ages 65 and Over: 13.9% State Average: 14.1%
Nonwhite: 52.4% State Average: 42.4%

Source: U.S. Census 2012

The non-white and elderly groups are target groups with the highest need for dialysis services.

Capacity
The Department’s methodology to estimate capacity for chronic dialysis stations is specified in Part 709.4 of Title 10 and is as follows:

- One free standing station represents 702 treatments per year. This is based on the expectation that the center will operate 2.5 patient shifts per day at 6 days per week, which can accommodate 15 patients per week (2.5 x 6 x 15 x 52 weeks). This projected 702 treatments per year is based on a potential 780 treatments x 52 weeks x 90% utilization rate = 702. The estimated average number of dialysis procedures each patient receives per year is 156.
- One hospital based station is calculated at 499 treatments per year per station. This is the result of 2.0 shifts per day x 6 days per week x 52 weeks x 80% utilization rate. One hospital based station can treat 3 patients per year.
- Per Department policy, hospital-based stations can treat fewer patients per year. Statewide, the majority of stations are free standing, as are the majority of applications for new stations. As such, when calculating the need for additional stations, the Department bases the projected need on establishing additional free standing stations.
**Existing Stations**
Kings – 585 current stations and 132 in pipeline
Bronx– 389 current stations and 93 in pipeline
New York- 380 current stations and 95 in pipeline

Based upon DOH methodology, Kings County could treat 3227 patients with the operational stations and pipeline stations combined. Bronx County could treat 2169 patients with the operational stations and pipeline stations combined. New York County could treat 2138 patients with the operational stations and pipeline stations combined.

**Projected Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Patients Treated</td>
<td>Total Residents Treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings County</td>
<td>3954</td>
<td>4507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Standing Stations Needed</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations (Including Pipeline)</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new stations from this project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need With Approval</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Patients Treated</td>
<td>Total Residents Treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx County</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>2739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Standing Stations Needed</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations (Including Pipeline)</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new stations from this project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need With Approval</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Patients Treated</td>
<td>Total Residents Treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York County</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Standing Stations Needed</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Stations</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations (Including Pipeline)</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new stations from this project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need With Approval</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FS – Free Standing**
***Based upon an estimate of a three percent annual increase**

The data in the first row, “Free Standing Stations Needed,” comes from the DOH methodology of each station being able to treat 4.5 patients, and each hospital station being able to treat 3 patients annually. The data in the next row, “Existing Stations,” comes from the Department’s Health Facilities Information System (HFIS). “Unmet Need” comes from subtracting needed stations from existing stations. “Total Patients Treated" is from IPRO data from 2011.
Conclusion
All three counties serve a total population of 5,593,198 with a total 1674 stations, including pipeline stations. There continues to be need in all three counties. These stations are necessary to provide continued service to patients in the service areas, thus approval is recommended.

Recommendation
From a need perspective, approval is recommended.

Program Analysis

Project Proposal
Establish Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC as the new operator of four (4) dialysis programs/centers that are currently being operated by the New York City Health & Hospitals Corporation. The center in Kings Hospital will be designated as the main site, and three (3) remaining centers, located in Lincoln Hospital, Metropolitan Hospital and Harlem Hospital, will be designated as extension sites. The applicant does not anticipate any physical changes or changes to the number of stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Operator</th>
<th>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing Business As</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Kings County Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #1 Address</td>
<td>451 Clarkson Avenue, Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Services</td>
<td>Chronic Renal Dialysis (26 Stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts/Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>Open 6 days per week, nearly 3 shifts per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (1st Year/3rd Year)</td>
<td>28.0 FTEs and will remain at that level by the third year of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Director(s)</td>
<td>Gary Briefel, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance</td>
<td>Expected to be provided onsite by Kings County Hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Operator</th>
<th>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing Business As</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Lincoln Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #2 Address</td>
<td>234 East 149th Street, Bronx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Services</td>
<td>Chronic Renal Dialysis (8 Stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts/Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>Open 6 days per week, nearly 3 shifts per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (1st Year/3rd Year)</td>
<td>14.1 FTEs and will remain at that level by the third year of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Director(s)</td>
<td>Isaiarasi Gnanasekaran, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance</td>
<td>Expected to be provided onsite by Lincoln Hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Operator</th>
<th>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing Business As</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Metropolitan Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site #3 Address</td>
<td>1901 First Avenue, Manhattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Services</td>
<td>Chronic Renal Dialysis (12 Stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts/Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>Open 6 days per week, nearly 3 shifts per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (1st Year/3rd Year)</td>
<td>13.0 FTEs and will remain at that level by the third year of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Director(s)</td>
<td>Ashok P. Chaudhuri, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance</td>
<td>Expected to be provided onsite by Metropolitan Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Operator | Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC
---|---
Doing Business As | Big Apple Dialysis at Harlem Hospital
Site #4 Address | 506 Lenox Avenue, Manhattan
Approved Services | Chronic Renal Dialysis (11 Stations)
Shifts/Hours/Schedule | Open 6 days per week, nearly 3 shifts per day.
Staffing (1st Year/3rd Year) | 15.7 FTEs and will remain at that level by the third year of operation.
Medical Director(s) | LeRoy Herbert, MD
Emergency, In-Patient and Backup Support Services Agreement and Distance | Expected to be provided onsite by Harlem Hospital

Character and Competence
The members of the LLC are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jodumutt G. Bhat, MD</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirmal Mattoo, MD</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drs. Bhat and Mattoo are both local physicians, board-certified in Internal Medicine. Dr. Mattoo holds a subspecialty in Nephrology. As shareholders in Atlantic Dialysis Management Services, they each have over 20 years of experience operating multiple free-standing dialysis centers in New York State.

Staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the disclosure information submitted regarding licenses held, formal education, training in pertinent health and/or related areas, employment history, a record of legal actions, and a disclosure of the applicant’s ownership interest in other health care facilities. Licensed individuals were checked against the Office of Medicaid Management, the Office of Professional Medical Conduct, and the Education Department databases as well as the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of the Inspector General Medicare exclusion database.

Additionally, the staff from the Division of Certification & Surveillance reviewed the ten-year surveillance history of all associated facilities. Sources of information included the files, records, and reports found in the Department of Health. Included in the review were the results of any incident and/or complaint investigations, independent professional reviews, and/or comprehensive/focused inspections. The review found that any citations were properly corrected with appropriate remedial action.

Summary of Dialysis Facility Compare Statistics
A table has been prepared (HSP Attachment A) which lists the 10 quality performance measures (based on treatment and patient outcomes) for the four HHC and twelve (12) applicant dialysis facilities using publicly available information from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) website, “Medicare.gov Dialysis Facility Compare” [http://www.medicare.gov/dialysisfacilitycompare/search.html](http://www.medicare.gov/dialysisfacilitycompare/search.html).

A Summary Statistic (the percent of scores at, or better than, the New York State average) for the acquiring entity (Bhat and Mattoo) and the relinquishing entity (HHC) is presented below. The Summary Statistic is intended to be a rough indicator of performance. (Higher is better.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Reportable Statistics per Site</th>
<th>Total Statistics Possible (1) x (2)</th>
<th>Statistics Not Available or Do Not Apply</th>
<th>Denominator (3)-(4)</th>
<th>Statistics Not Reported</th>
<th>Statistics worse than NYS Average</th>
<th>Numerator (6)+(7)</th>
<th>Summary Statistic at or above NYS Average 100-((8)/(5))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhat &amp; Mattoo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the applicant commissioned a (third party) quality assessment study to compare publicly available Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) dialysis facility quality measures at both the HHC dialysis operations and those of the applicant members. The report was prepared by Nephrologists Drs. Hart and Perumal of Cook County Health & Hospitals System (Chicago, IL) and is included for review as HSP Attachment B.

**Recommendation**
From a programmatic perspective, contingent approval is recommended.

### Financial Analysis

#### Asset Purchase Agreement
The applicant has submitted a draft asset purchase agreement, which is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seller:</th>
<th>New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser:</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Assets:</td>
<td>The facilities’ physical assets including: reverse osmosis system, dialysis machines, telephone, fax and computers; all furniture; all inventory and supplies located at the facilities; all rights and interest in and to claims made or to be made by seller against the party from whom seller purchased the assets, and its principals and any recoveries or proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Assets:</td>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents immediately preceding the closing date; all accounts receivable relating to services rendered prior to the closing date; all retroactive rate increases and/or lump sum or other payments, which may be paid on or after the closing date for services rendered prior to the closing date; all payments or cash equivalent credits paid or accruing for periods prior to the closing date; Seller’s Medicare and Medicaid provider numbers and agreements; all income tax refunds and deposits for periods prior to the closing dates; all original documents and records of the Seller; goodwill and other intangible assets used in the operations of the facilities; any real property or real property improvements used in the operations of the facilities. The Seller retains the ownership of real property and improvements and licenses to Buyer their use under the License Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed and Excluded Liabilities:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price:</td>
<td>$1,137,380.88 allocated as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kings County Hospital Ctr. – $655,104.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lincoln Hospital Center – $35,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Center – $353,676.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Harlem Hospital Center – $92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment:</td>
<td>Members’ equity – $113,738.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loan – $1,023,642 (5 year term, 3.16% interest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant has submitted an affidavit, which is acceptable to the Department of Health, in which the applicant agrees, notwithstanding any agreement, arrangement or understanding between the applicant and transferor to the contrary, to be liable and responsible for any Medicaid overpayments made to the facility and/or surcharges, assessments or fees due from the transferor pursuant to Article 28 of the Public Health Law with respect to the period of time prior to the applicant acquiring its interest, without releasing the transferor of its liability and responsibility. Currently, the facilities have no outstanding Medicaid audit liabilities.
**Administrative Services Agreements**

The applicant submitted a draft administrative service agreement for each discrete site. The agreements are identical in terms, except for the compensation amount for the respective sites, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Atlantic Dialysis Management Services, LLC (ADMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Kings County Hospital (main site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Lincoln Hospital (extension site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Metropolitan Hospital (extension site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis at Harlem Hospital (extension site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Provided</td>
<td>Billing and collection services excluding physician professional services; accounting and financial services including developing and presenting annual budgets; quality and utilization controls; installation of ADMS proprietary and confidential dialysis clinical information system software program (Dialysis System) to support clinical and billing operations; discount pricing of all supplies, inventory and drugs necessary for operation. The dialysis centers shall be responsible for and pay directly to the laboratory any lab services ordered for the patients treated at the dialysis centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>3 Years with unlimited 1 year renewal terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Total Annual Compensation (Bi-Weekly Payments) as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kings: Yr. 1 $300,000 ($11,538.46), Yr. 2 $350,000 ($13,461.54), Yr. 3 $400,000 ($15,384.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lincoln: Yr. 1 $200,000 ($7,692.31), Yr. 2 $250,000 ($9,615.38), Yr. 3 $300,000 ($11,538.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Metro: Yr. 1 $200,000 ($7,692.31), Yr. 2 $250,000 ($9,615.38), Yr. 3 $300,000 ($11,538.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Harlem: Yr. 1 $300,000 ($11,538.46), Yr. 2 $350,000 ($13,461.54), Yr. 3 $400,000 ($15,384.62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both ADMS and the Big Apple are owned by the same individuals with the same ownership percentages: Dr. Jodumutt G. Bhat (50%) and Dr. Nirmal Matoo (50%).

**License Agreement**

The applicant has submitted draft license agreements for the proposed sites as summarized below:

| Premises                | Kings site: 6th floor “C” building |
|                        | Lincoln site: interim location 9th floor, permanent location 7th floor |
|                        | Metropolitan site: 14th floor Main hospital building |
|                        | Harlem site: 4th floor new patient pavilion |
| Licensor               | New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation |
| Licensee               | Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC |
| Fees                   | Kings: $484,380 annually ($54.00/sq. ft.) |
|                        | Lincoln: interim $239,920 annually ($40/sq. ft.), permanent $296,800 annually ($40/sq. ft.) |
|                        | Metropolitan $250,750 annually ($50/sq. ft.) |
|                        | Harlem $463,000 annually ($50/sq. ft.) |
|                        | On 5th anniversary of start date fees for all sites will increase 10% above original fees. |
| Term                   | 5-year term with one four (4) year extension |
| Provisions             | Licensor will provide utilities and maintenance services |

The applicant has stated that the proposed license agreements are arm’s length arrangements.
**Operating Budget**

The applicant has submitted year 1 and year 3 operating budgets, in 2014 dollars, for each discrete site. Presented below are the consolidated year 1 and year 3 budgets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$15,090,828</td>
<td>$16,897,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$10,138,306</td>
<td>$11,451,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1,883,380</td>
<td>1,883,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$12,021,686</td>
<td>$13,334,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>$3,069,142</td>
<td>$3,562,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization: (treatments)</td>
<td>54,187</td>
<td>60,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per treatment</td>
<td>$221.86</td>
<td>$219.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses include the cost of pharmaceuticals.

Consolidated utilization by payor source for years 1 and 3 subsequent to the change in operator is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payor Source</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>10.69%</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>78.62%</td>
<td>77.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fee-For-Service</td>
<td>10.69%</td>
<td>10.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense and utilization assumptions are based on the historical experience of the applicant’s other dialysis facilities.

**Capability and Feasibility**

The purchase price for the four sites is $1,137,380.88, allocated as follows: Kings $655,104.84; Lincoln $35,800; Metropolitan $353,676.04; and Harlem $92,000. Big Apple will meet the $1,137,380.88 purchase price as follows: $113,738.88 in equity from the proposed members, with the remaining $1,023,642 coming from a loan at the above stated terms. There are no project costs associated with this CON.

Working capital requirements are estimated at $2,222,500 based upon two months of Year 3 expenses. The proposed members will provide $1,111,250 of the working capital from personal resources. The remaining $1,111,250 will be provided through a proposed one year working capital line of credit at a 3.25 % interest rate. The interest rate is based on the current prime rate, which is 3.25% as of December 4, 2014, as published in the Wall Street Journal. BFA Attachment A is the personal net worth statements of the members which indicate sufficient liquid resources to meet both the equity and working capital requirements.

BFA Attachment C is the pro forma balance sheet for Big Apple which shows consolidated operations starting with $1,224,987 in members’ equity. The site specific operations will start with the following members’ equity: Kings $396,103; Lincoln $232,228; Metropolitan $219,765 and Harlem $263,152.

Year 1 shows a combined net income of $3,069,142 for the four sites with site specific net income as follows: Kings $ 866,728; Lincoln $ 694,968; Metropolitan $316,415; and Harlem $1,191,031. Year 3 shows a combined net income of $3,562,522 for the four sites with site specific net income as follows: Kings $1,398,674; Lincoln $728,573; Metropolitan $215,846; and Harlem $1,219,429.
Revenues reflect current reimbursement methodologies for Medicaid and Medicare. Commercial revenues are based on Big Apple’s experience in operating other dialysis centers throughout New York State. The budget is reasonable.

BFA Attachment D is the 2012 and 2013 certified and 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014 internal financial statements of the following facilities also owned by the members:

- **Central Brooklyn Dialysis Center, LLC**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $1,806,203 for the period 2012 through 2013. The D&TC generated both positive working capital and net asset positions and had a net income of $941,184 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **East End Dialysis Management, LLC**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $394,131 for the period 2012 through 2013. The D&TC generated both positive working capital and net asset positions, and had a net income of $357,796 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **New Hyde Park Dialysis Center, LLC**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $727,660 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **Newtown Dialysis Center, Inc.**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $850,811 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **New York Renal Associates, Inc.**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $903,392 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **Ridgewood Dialysis Center, Inc.**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $1,450,743 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

- **West Nassau Dialysis Center, Inc.**: The D&TC generated both positive average working capital and net asset positions, and had an average net income of $548,988 for the period 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014.

Subject to the noted contingencies, the applicant has demonstrated the capability to proceed in a financially feasible manner and contingent approval is recommended.

**Recommendation**

*From a financial perspective, contingent approval is recommended.*
## Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSP Attachment A</th>
<th>CON 132178 Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC - &quot;Dialysis Facility Compare&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSP Attachment B</td>
<td>CON 132178 Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC – Quality Assessment Study (commissioned and submitted by applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment A</td>
<td>Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC Member’s net worth statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment B</td>
<td>Big Apple site specific Year 1 budgets and utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Attachment C</td>
<td>Pro forma balance sheet for Big Apple Management, LLC and the 4 sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BFA Attachment D | The 2012 and 2013 certified and 1/1/2014 – 7/31/2014 internal financial statements of the following facilities:  
  - Central Brooklyn Dialysis Center, LLC  
  - East End Dialysis Management, LLC  
  - New Hyde Park Dialysis Center, LLC  
  - Newtown Dialysis Center, Inc.  
  - Ridgewood Dialysis Center, Inc.  
  - West Nassau Dialysis Center, Inc. |
RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, that the Public Health and Health Planning Council, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2801-a of the Public Health Law, on this 12th day of February, 2015 having considered any advice offered by the Regional Health Systems Agency, the staff of the New York State Department of Health, and the Establishment and Project Review Committee of this Council and after due deliberation, hereby proposes to approve the following application to establish Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC as the operator of a chronic renal dialysis diagnostic and treatment center and three extension clinics currently operated by the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, and with the contingencies, if any, as set forth below and providing that each applicant fulfills the contingencies and conditions, if any, specified with reference to the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon fulfillment by the applicant of the conditions and contingencies specified for the application in a manner satisfactory to the Public Health and Health Planning Council and the New York State Department of Health, the Secretary of the Council is hereby authorized to issue the approval of the Council of the application, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any approval of this application is not to be construed as in any manner releasing or relieving any transferor (of any interest in the facility that is the subject of the application) of responsibility and liability for any Medicaid (Medicaid Assistance Program -- Title XIX of the Social Security Act) or other State fund overpayments made to the facility covering the period during which any such transferor was an operator of the facility, regardless of whether the applicant or any other entity or individual is also responsible and liable for such overpayments, and the State of New York shall continue to hold any such transferor responsible and liable for any such overpayments, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon the failure, neglect or refusal of the applicant to submit documentation or information in order to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, the application will be deemed abandoned or withdrawn by the applicant without the need for further action by the Council, and be it further

RESOLVED, that upon submission of documentation or information to satisfy a contingency specified with reference to the application, within the stated time frame, which documentation or information is not deemed sufficient by Department of Health staff, to satisfy the contingency, the application shall be returned to the Council for whatever action the Council deems appropriate.

NUMBER: 132178 E
FACILITY/APPLICANT: Big Apple Dialysis Management, LLC
APPROVAL CONTINGENT UPON:

1. Submission of an executed transfer and affiliation agreement, acceptable to the Department, with a local acute care hospital for each of the four (4) sites. [HSP]
2. Submission of a proposed Medical Director Agreement, acceptable to the Department. (The document entitled "Medical Director Agreement" submitted with the application delegates more authority to the contractor, Physicians Affiliate Group of New York, than is provided for in regulation. Specifically, it is an employment contract for the provision of multiple, unnamed, Medical Directors at four separate sites. As drafted, it constitutes an unacceptable management contract because the established operator is not retaining direct independent authority to appoint and discharge the Medical Directors as required by regulation.) [HSP]
3. Submission of an executed loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
4. Submission of an executed working capital loan commitment, acceptable to the Department of Health. [BFA]
5. Submission of site specific executed license agreements, acceptable to the Department of Health, for site control of the following dialysis center clinic programs: Kings County Hospital Center site, Lincoln Hospital Center site, Metropolitan Hospital Center site, and Harlem Hospital site. [BFA]
6. Submission of site specific executed administrative service agreements, acceptable to the Department of Health, for the following dialysis center clinic programs: Kings County Hospital Center site, Lincoln Hospital Center site, Metropolitan Hospital Center site, and Harlem Hospital site. [BFA]
7. The submission of existing conditions schematic floor plans and architect’s letter of certification for existing buildings, for review and approval. [AER]
8. Submission of a completed Schedule 3. [CSL]
9. Submission of an executed Certificate of Assumed Name, acceptable to the Department and clarification regarding whether each location requires a Certificate of Assumed Name – if they are all operating under different names. [CSL]
10. Submission of an executed Certificate of Amendment of the Articles of Organization, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
11. Submission of an executed Operating Agreement (and Joinder), acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
12. Submission of an executed Administrative Services Agreement for all four (Harlem, Kings, Lincoln and Metropolitan) locations, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
13. Submission of an executed license agreement for all four (Harlem, Kings, Lincoln and Metropolitan) sites, acceptable to the Department. [CSL]
14. Submission of an executed Purchase and Sale Agreement. [CSL]
APPROVAL CONDITIONAL UPON:

1. The project must be completed within three years from the date of the Public Health and Health Planning Council recommendation letter. Failure to complete the project within the prescribed time shall constitute an abandonment of the application by the applicant and an expiration of the approval. [PMU]
2. The staff of the facility must be separate and distinct from staff of other entities. [HSP]
3. The signage must clearly denote the facility is separate and distinct from other adjacent entities. [HSP]
4. The entrance to the facility must not disrupt any other entity's clinical program space. [HSP]
5. The clinical space must be used exclusively for the approved purpose. [HSP]
6. To provide Transfusion Services, licensure by the New York State Department of Health-Wadsworth Center is required. [HSP]

Documentation submitted to satisfy the above-referenced contingencies shall be submitted within sixty (60) days. Enter a complete response to each individual contingency via the New York State Electronic Certificate of Need (NYSE-CON) system by the due date(s) reflected in the Contingencies Tab in NYSE-CON.