*Tentative Agenda*

# North Carolina
# State Health Coordinating Council

**Jane S. McKimmon Center**
*(Corner of Gorman Street and Western Boulevard)*
**Raleigh, NC**
**September 26, 2007**
**10:00 a.m.**

**Presiding: Dan Myers, M.D., Chairman**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Welcome and Announcements** | **Dr. Dan Myers** |
| **Approval of Minutes from May 30, 2007 Meeting** | **Council Members** |
| **Committee Reports:** | |
| **A. Acute Care Services Committee** *{Cover printed on green paper}* | **Mr. Mike Tarwater** |
| **B. Technology & Equipment Committee** *{Cover printed on blue paper}* | **Dr. Chris Ullrich** |
| **C. Long-Term & Behavioral Health Committee** *{Cover printed on salmon paper}* | **Dr. T. J. Pulliam** |
| **Comments regarding the Tentative CON Review Schedule** | **Ms. Lee Hoffman** |
| **Adoption of Final Recommendations regarding the 2008 SMFP** | **Council Members** |
| **Other Business** | **Council Members** |
| **Adjournment** | **Dr. Dan Myers** |

**Recommendations and Related Materials**

*from the*

# Acute Care Services Committee

*for the*

September 26, 2007

**State Health Coordinating Council Meeting**

# Acute Care Services Committee

## Recommendations to the N. C. State Health Coordinating Council

## September 26, 2007

The Acute Care Services (ACS) Committee met on September 4, 2007 to consider Petitions and Comments received in response to Chapters 5 through 8 of the Proposed 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan. Copies of Agency Reports, Petitions and Comments are enclosed.

**Acute Care Beds: Chapter 5 – pages 33-49 of the Proposed 2008 Plan:**

- At the September 4 meeting, the ACS Committee reviewed revised Acute Care Bed Need Projections. The Bed Need Projections were revised after the Acute Care Bed Need Growth Factor used in the Proposed 2008 SMFP was corrected by subtracting Inpatient Rehabilitation days, which were inadvertently included when the Growth Factor was first calculated. After correction, the Growth Factor changed from .82% to .47%.

  Correcting the Growth Factor changed the Acute Care Bed Need Projections published in the Proposed 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan, as follows:

| County | Corrected Acute Care Bed Need Determination |
|---|---|
| Mecklenburg | 27 (corrected from 45) |
| Wake | 41 (corrected from 47) |

  Also at the September 4 ACS Committee meeting, Staff informed Committee members that correcting discrepancies between the Thomson data and the License Renewal Application data is ongoing, with some hospitals correcting their License Renewal Application data and other hospitals correcting their Thomson data. Staff noted that at least one hospital has chosen not to correct their Thomson data and that other hospitals may make the same choice. Staff noted that data corrections would not effect need determinations. **The Committee recommends approval of the corrected Acute Care Bed Need Determinations. The Committee also recommends that Staff indicate incorrect data by noting with an asterisk in Table 5A, hospitals that do not correct their data and that Acute Care Bed Need is not effected by the incorrect data.**

- One petition, from Cape Fear Valley Health System, was received on the Acute Care Beds chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan during the public comment period. The

petitioner requests an adjusted need determination in the 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan for 20 additional acute care beds in Cumberland County. The basis for the petition was that additional beds are needed to accommodate the additional population expected to move to Cumberland County because of Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC). The Petitioner acknowledged that applying the Standard Methodology results in a projected surplus of Acute Care Beds for Cumberland County but submitted that using Cumberland County specific data to project growth resulted in a projected need for Acute Care Beds. The Agency supported the Standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

- **In summary, the Committee recommends approval of the Acute Care Beds chapter, including the revised bed need projections and notation of incorrect data in Table 5A.**

**Operating Rooms: Chapter 6 – pages 51-76 of the Proposed 2008 Plan:**

- Seven Petitions were received on the Operating Rooms chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan during the public comment period.

**OR Petition 1: Franklin Regional Medical Center:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for one additional Operating Room in Franklin County. The Petitioner provided as rationale an adjustment to the Standard Methodology, i.e., "rounding up" to 1 OR from .2 OR's. The Petitioner also provided as rationale data related to the ratio of the number of OR's per population. The Agency supported the standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

**OR Petition 2: Park Ridge Hospital:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for one additional Surgical Operating Room in Henderson County. The Petitioner provided as rationale an adjustment to the Standard Methodology, i.e., excluding 3 unused OR's from Henderson County's OR inventory when determining need for Henderson County. The Agency supported the standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

**OR Petition 3: Pitt county Memorial Hospital:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for six additional Operating Rooms in the Pitt-Greene Multi-County Operating Room Service Area. The Petitioner provided as rationale adjustments to the Standard Methodology, i.e., changing two of the OR Methodology assumptions and adjusting the Standard Growth Factor. The Agency supported the Standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

**OR Petition 4: Randolph Hospital:** The Petition requests an adjusted need determination for one additional Operating Room in Randolph County. The Petitioner provided as rationale an adjustment to the Standard Methodology, i.e., changing two of the OR Methodology assumptions. The Petitioner also provided as rationale data related to the ratio of the number of OR's per population. The Agency supported the standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

**OR Petition 5: Rex Hospital:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for four additional Operating Rooms in Wake County. The Petitioner provided as rationale an adjustment to the Standard Methodology, i.e., determining need for OR's based on individual facility's utilization. The Agency supported the standard Methodology and recommended that the Petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be approved, resulting in an Adjusted Need Determination for four operating rooms in Wake County.**

**OR Petition 6: Mecklenburg Foot and Ankle Associates and Diabetic Foot Clinic, P.C.:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for one single-specialty Operating Room dedicated for podiatric surgery cases only for Mecklenburg County. The Agency noted that the Petitioner is requesting a single surgical specialty adjusted need determination for one operating room to be located in an ambulatory surgical setting and that Mecklenburg County shows an OR surplus of 18.72 OR's. In consideration of the infeasibility of projecting need for single specialty operating rooms in a particular type of setting, the Agency recommended that the petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

**OR Petition 7: Raleigh Orthopaedic Clinic:** The Petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for six dedicated orthopedic ambulatory Operating Rooms to be developed in one or more freestanding (non-hospital) ambulatory surgery centers in Wake County. In consideration of the infeasibility of projecting need for single specialty operating rooms in a particular type of setting, the Agency recommended that the petition be denied. **The Committee recommends that the Petition be denied.**

- The Committee discussed part (d) of current Certificate of Need (CON) Rule 10A NCAC 14C .2106, which is shown below:
  *"In competitive reviews, an applicant proposing to perform ambulatory surgical procedures in at least three specialty areas shall be considered more favorably than an applicant proposing to perform ambulatory surgical procedures in fewer than three specialty areas."*
  **The Committee recommends that this rule be changed such that the CON Section is not required in a competitive review to consider an applicant proposing to perform ambulatory surgical procedures in at least three specialty areas more favorably.**

- The Committee acknowledged comments submitted about the Operating Room Methodology Work Group Recommendations but took no formal action related to the comments.

- **In summary, the Committee recommends approval of the Operating Rooms chapter, including the Wake County Adjusted Need Determination for four operating rooms.** *(Revised Table 6A, Table 6B and Table 6C, reflecting approval of Rex Hospital's petition, are attached to this report as Operating Room Attachment.)* **The Committee also recommends that CON Rule 10A NCAC 14C .2106 be changed.**

**Other Acute Care Services: Chapter 7 – pages 77-87 of the Proposed 2008 Plan:**

- No Petitions or Comments were received regarding Other Acute Care Services. This category includes Open-Heart Surgery Services, Heart-Lung Bypass Machines, Burn Intensive Care Units, Bone Marrow Transplantation Services and Solid Organ Transplantation Services. **The Committee recommends approval of the Other Acute Care Services chapter.**

**Inpatient Rehabilitation Services: Chapter 8 – pages 89-92 of the Proposed 2008 Plan:**

- No Petitions or Comments were received regarding Inpatient Rehabilitation Services. **The Committee recommends approval of the Inpatient Rehabilitation Services chapter.**

In order to facilitate completion of the Final 2008 SMFP, the Acute Care Services Committee also authorized staff to continue making changes in data *(e.g., inventory changes)* as additional information is received and to make non-substantive edits to the narrative.

# Operating Room Attachment

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alamance Regional Medical Center, Inc. | Alamance | 2,026 | 6,798 | 2 | 0 | 11 | -2 | 0 | -2 |
| Mebane Ambulatory Surgical Facility | Alamance | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 3 |
| **Totals for:** | **Alamance** | **2,026** | **6,798** | **2** | **0** | **11** | **-2** | **0** | **1** |
| Frye Regional Medical Center - Alexander Campus | Alexander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alleghany Memorial Hospital | Alleghany | 26 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anson Community Hospital | Anson | 133 | 461 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ashe Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Ashe | 235 | 615 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charles A. Cannon, Jr. Memorial Hospital, Incorporated | Avery | 218 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Beaufort County Hospital | Beaufort | 1,039 | 2,537 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pungo District Hospital Corporation * | Beaufort | 62 | 384 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Beaufort** | **1,101** | **2,921** | **1** | **0** | **7** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Bertie Memorial Hospital | Bertie | 19 | 743 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bladen County Hospital | Bladen | 277 | 486 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brunswick Community Hospital | Brunswick | 773 | 1,836 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 1 |
| J. Arthur Dosher Memorial Hospital | Brunswick | 245 | 1,110 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Brunswick** | **1,018** | **2,946** | **1** | **0** | **5** | **-1** | **0** | **1** |
| Asheville Eye Surgery Center (Licensed 3/2004) | Buncombe | | 2,955 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| FEMCARE, INC. | Buncombe | | 1,088 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| Mission Hospitals | Buncombe | 13,037 | 20,430 | 21 | 13 | 9 | -2 | -1 | 4 |
| Orthopaedic Surgery Center of Asheville | Buncombe | | 2,853 | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Buncombe** | **13,037** | **27,326** | **21** | **19** | **9** | **-2** | **-1** | **4** |
| Grace Hospital, Inc. | Burke | 1,121 | 3,607 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Surgery Center of Morganton Eye Physicians, P.A. | Burke | | 2,040 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| Valdese General Hospital, Inc. | Burke | 472 | 1,465 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Burke** | **1,593** | **7,112** | **1** | **2** | **9** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Eye Surgery And Laser Clinic | Cabarrus | | 2,568 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| NorthEast Medical Center | Cabarrus | 5,096 | 9,607 | 4 | 0 | 17 | -2 | -1 | 0 |
| Gateway Ambulatory Surgery Center (new 2006) | Cabarrus | | 1,681 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Cabarrus** | **5,096** | **13,856** | **4** | **6** | **17** | **-2** | **-1** | **0** |
| Caldwell Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Caldwell | 548 | 3,006 | 1 | 3 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Carteret General Hospital | Carteret | 1,979 | 1,842 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Carteret Surgery Center | Carteret | | 1,776 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Carteret** | **1,979** | **3,618** | **1** | **2** | **5** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Catawba Valley Medical Center | Catawba | 2,514 | 7,243 | 1 | 0 | 12 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Frye Regional Medical Center | Catawba | 3,579 | 9,423 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | -3 |
| Graystone Eye Surgery Center (X HealthSouth Surg. Cent.) | Catawba | | 853 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| Viewmont Surgery Center, LLC | Catawba | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 3 |
| **Totals for:** | **Catawba** | **6,093** | **17,519** | **3** | **8** | **27** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Chatham Hospital, Inc. | Chatham | 53 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Murphy Medical Center, Inc. | Cherokee | 358 | 1,873 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chowan Hospital | Chowan | 614 | 1,117 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cleveland Ambulatory Services * | Cleveland | | 1,745 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| Cleveland Regional Medical Center | Cleveland | 2,295 | 3,691 | 1 | 0 | 6 | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| Eye Surgery Center of Shelby | Cleveland | | 1,711 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| Kings Mountain Hospital | Cleveland | 271 | 1,212 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Cleveland** | **2,566** | **8,359** | **1** | **6** | **8** | **-1** | **-1** | **0** |
| Columbus Regional Healthcare System | Columbus | 1,510 | 3,527 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Columbus Regional Same Day Surgery, LLC | Columbus | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 1 |
| **Totals for:** | **Columbus** | **1,510** | **3,527** | **1** | **0** | **4** | **-1** | **0** | **1** |
| Craven Regional Medical Center | Craven | 3,669 | 9,527 | 3 | 6 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Cape Fear Valley Medical Center | Cumberland | 7,252 | 7,040 | 5 | 0 | 13 | -3 | 0 | 0 |
| Fayetteville Ambulatory Surgery Center | Cumberland | | 10,372 | | 11 | | | | 0 |
| Highsmith-Rainey Memorial Hospital | Cumberland | 171 | 2,895 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006 SMFP Need Determination | Cumberland | | | | | | | | 1 |
| **Totals for:** | **Cumberland** | **7,423** | **20,307** | **5** | **11** | **17** | **-3** | **0** | **1** |
| RMS Surgery Center | Dare | | 2,308 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| The Outer Banks Hospital, Inc. | Dare | 284 | 720 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Dare** | **284** | **3,028** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Lexington Memorial Hospital | Davidson | 1,010 | 2,620 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thomasville Medical Center | Davidson | 792 | 2,350 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Davidson** | **1,802** | **4,970** | **1** | **0** | **9** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Davie County Hospital | Davie | 8 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Duplin General Hospital, Inc. | Duplin | 728 | 1,319 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Duke University Hospital | Durham | 15,281 | 18,216 | 4 | 9 | 32 | 0 | -1 | 4 |
| Durham Regional Hospital | Durham | 4,619 | 3,546 | 3 | 0 | 12 | -2 | 0 | 0 |
| James E. Davis Ambulatory Surgical Center | Durham | | 7,575 | | 8 | | | | 0 |
| North Carolina Specialty Hospital, LLC | Durham | 810 | 4,557 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Durham** | **20,710** | **33,894** | **7** | **17** | **48** | **-2** | **-1** | **4** |
| Heritage Hospital | Edgecombe | 664 | 1,441 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Forsyth Medical Center | Forsyth | 10,153 | 6,109 | 5 | 2 | 19 | -2 | 0 | 2 |
| Hawthorne Surgical Center | Forsyth | | 6,933 | | 4 | | | | 2 |
| Medical Park Hospital, Inc. | Forsyth | 1,170 | 10,242 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Carolina Baptist Hospitals, Inc. | Forsyth | 11,900 | 15,842 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 0 | -2 | 0 |
| Plastic Surgery Center Of North Carolina, Inc. * | Forsyth | | 328 | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Forsyth** | **23,223** | **39,454** | **9** | **9** | **68** | **-2** | **-2** | **4** |
| Franklin Regional Medical Center | Franklin | 1,001 | 1,716 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CaroMont Specialty Surgery | Gaston | | 3,971 | | 6 | | | | 0 |
| Gaston Memorial Hospital | Gaston | 4,051 | 12,193 | 5 | 8 | 9 | -4 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Gaston** | **4,051** | **16,164** | **5** | **14** | **9** | **-4** | **0** | **0** |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Granville Medical Center | Granville | 668 | 1,997 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carolina Birth Center | Guilford | | 584 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| HEALTHSOUTH Greensboro Specialty Surgical Center | Guilford | | 5,099 | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| HEALTHSOUTH Surgical Center of Greensboro | Guilford | | 13,330 | | 13 | | | | 0 |
| High Point Regional Health System | Guilford | 3,643 | 3,018 | 3 | 0 | 9 | -1 | -1 | 1 |
| High Point Surgery Center | Guilford | | 5,765 | | 6 | | | | 0 |
| Kindred Hospital - Greensboro | Guilford | 829 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moses Cone Health System | Guilford | 13,447 | 11,677 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | -1 | 0 |
| Moses Cone Surgery Center | Guilford | | 6,735 | | 8 | | | | 0 |
| Piedmont Surgical Center | Guilford | | 941 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| Surgical Eye Center | Guilford | | 4,075 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| Wesley Long Surgery Center | Guilford | | 2,637 | | 5 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Guilford** | **17,919** | **53,901** | **7** | **42** | **47** | **-1** | **-2** | **1** |
| Halifax Regional Medical Center, Inc. | Halifax | 1,716 | 2,104 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Betsy Johnson Regional Hospital | Harnett | 1,092 | 2,334 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good Hope Hospital, Inc. (closed eff. 4/11/2006) | Harnett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Harnett Health System - Central Campus | Harnett | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Totals for:** | **Harnett** | **1,092** | **2,334** | **0** | **0** | **4** | **0** | **0** | **6** |
| Haywood Regional Medical Center | Haywood | 1,456 | 3,008 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Margaret R. Pardee Memorial Hospital | Henderson | 2,258 | 4,409 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Park Ridge Hospital | Henderson | 1,348 | 4,536 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1C-Sect |
| **Totals for:** | **Henderson** | **3,606** | **8,945** | **0** | **0** | **16** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| Roanoke-Chowan Hospital | Hertford | 930 | 1,835 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Davis Regional Medical Center | Iredell | 1,223 | 2,233 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Iredell Head Neck and Ear Ambulatory Surgery Center Inc. | Iredell | | 695 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| Iredell Memorial Hospital, Incorporated | Iredell | 2,561 | 3,646 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1+1 C-Sect |
| Iredell Surgical Center | Iredell | | 1,962 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| Lake Norman Regional Medical Center | Iredell | 1,942 | 2,573 | 1 | 0 | 7 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| The Surgical Center at Lake Norman | Iredell | | 2,544 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Iredell** | **5,726** | **13,653** | **3** | **7** | **20** | **-2** | **0** | **1** |
| Harris Regional Hospital, Inc. | Jackson | 869 | 3,909 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Johnston Memorial Hospital | Johnston | 2,113 | 3,562 | 1 | 1 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 2 |
| Central Carolina Hospital | Lee | 1,096 | 2,833 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Central Carolina Ambulatory Surgery Center | Lee | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | | 2 |
| **Totals for:** | **Lee** | 1,096 | 2,833 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 2 |
| Lenoir Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Lenoir | 2,088 | 3,347 | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Carolinas Medical Center - Lincoln | Lincoln | 721 | 1,558 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| East Lincoln Medical Center, LLC | Lincoln | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Totals for:** | **Lincoln** | 721 | 1,558 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Angel Medical Center, Inc. | Macon | 286 | 1,645 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Highlands-Cashiers Hospital, Inc. * | Macon | 56 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Macon** | **342** | **2,000** | **1** | **0** | **6** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Martin General Hospital | Martin | 300 | 1,153 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The McDowell Hospital | McDowell | 441 | 1,486 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Carolina Medical Center / Center for Mental Health | Mecklenburg | 15,600 | 14,759 | 10 | 11 | 22 | -4 | -1 | 0 |
| Carolinas Medical Center - Mercy and Pineville | Mecklenburg | 2,810 | 10,718 | 2 | 0 | 18 | -1 | 0 | 1C-Sect |
| Carolinas Medical Center - University | Mecklenburg | 1,110 | 6,973 | 1 | 4 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Carolinas Surgery Center - Randolph | Mecklenburg | | 5,598 | | 8 | | | | 0 |
| Carolina Center for Specialty Surgery (x Edgehill) * | Mecklenburg | | 21 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| HEALTHSOUTH Surgery Center of Charlotte | Mecklenburg | | 9,814 | | 7 | | | | 0 |
| Presbyterian Hospital | Mecklenburg | 5,622 | 12,042 | 6 | 0 | 22 | -3 | 0 | 0 |
| Presbyterian Hospital Huntersville | Mecklenburg | 628 | 3,486 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Presbyterian Hospital Matthews | Mecklenburg | 964 | 5,003 | 2 | 0 | 8 | -2 | 0 | 0 |
| Presbyterian Orthopaedic Hospital | Mecklenburg | 3,223 | 4,540 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Same Day Surgery Center at Ballantyne | Mecklenburg | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 3 |
| SameDay Surgery Center at Presbyterian | Mecklenburg | | 2,870 | | 6 | | | | -3 |
| South Park Surgery Center | Mecklenburg | | 5,920 | | 6 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Mecklenburg** | **29,957** | **81,744** | **22** | **44** | **95** | **-12** | **-1** | **0** |
| Spruce Pine Community Hospital | Mitchell | 301 | 742 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FirstHealth Montgomery Memorial Hospital | Montgomery | 179 | 642 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FirstHealth Moore Reg. Hosp. and Pinehurst Treatment | Moore | 6,659 | 5,377 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| HEALTHSOUTH Surgery Center of Southern Pines | Moore | | 9,915 | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| Surgery Center of Pinehurst, LLC | Moore | | 2,326 | | 6 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Moore** | **6,659** | **17,618** | **2** | **9** | **14** | **0** | **0** | **2** |
| Nash General Hospital | Nash | 2,238 | 7,380 | 1 | 0 | 13 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Atlantic Surgicenter, LLC | New Hanover | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 4 |
| New Hanover Regional Medical Center | New Hanover | 10,104 | 18,177 | 5 | 5 | 20 | -3 | -1 | 2 |
| Wilmington SurgCare | New Hanover | | 8,426 | | 7 | | | | 0 |
| 2006 SMFP Need Determination | New Hanover | | | | | | | | 2 |
| **Totals for:** | **New Hanover** | **10,104** | **26,603** | **5** | **12** | **20** | **-3** | **-1** | **8** |
| Onslow Memorial Hospital | Onslow | 1,815 | 1,379 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| SurgiCare of Jacksonville | Onslow | | 2,798 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Onslow** | **1,815** | **4,177** | **1** | **4** | **5** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Chapel Hill Surgical Center, Inc. * | Orange | | 812 | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| University of North Carolina Hospitals | Orange | 9,168 | 12,058 | 3 | 4 | 32 | -3 | -2 | 4 |
| **Totals for:** | **Orange** | **9,168** | **12,870** | **3** | **7** | **32** | **-3** | **-2** | **4** |
| Albemarle Hospital | Pasquotank | 1,999 | 4,678 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pender Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Pender | 64 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Person Memorial Hospital | Person | 898 | 2,741 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 1 |
| Pitt County Memorial Hospital | Pitt | 9,617 | 8,939 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 0 | -1 | 0 |
| Surgicenter Services of Pitt, Inc. | Pitt | | 9,605 | | 8 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Pitt** | **9,617** | **18,544** | **3** | **8** | **22** | **0** | **-1** | **0** |
| St. Luke's Hospital | Polk | 509 | 2,222 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Randolph Hospital, Inc. | Randolph | 1,249 | 3,208 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FirstHealth Richmond Memorial Hospital | Richmond | 468 | 1,076 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Sandhills Regional Medical Center | Richmond | 646 | 1,190 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Richmond** | **1,114** | **2,266** | **1** | **0** | **6** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Southeastern Regional Medical Center | Robeson | 2,215 | 4,139 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Annie Penn Hospital | Rockingham | 864 | 1,524 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Morehead Memorial Hospital | Rockingham | 1,246 | 2,428 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Rockingham** | **2,110** | **3,952** | **1** | **0** | **9** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Rowan Regional Medical Center | Rowan | 3,449 | 5,514 | 2 | 2 | 8 | -2 | 0 | 1 |
| Rutherford Hospital, Inc. | Rutherford | 1,150 | 2,040 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sampson Regional Medical Center | Sampson | 1,093 | 2,874 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scotland Memorial Hospital and Edwin Morgan Center | Scotland | 1,350 | 2,595 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Stanly Regional Medical Center | Stanly | 1,067 | 3,987 | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Stokes-Reynolds Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Stokes | 15 | 664 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hugh Chatham Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Surry | 1,018 | 2,480 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northern Hospital of Surry County | Surry | 1,247 | 2,006 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Surry** | **2,265** | **4,486** | **1** | **0** | **9** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Swain County Hospital * | Swain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transylvania Community Hospital, Inc. And Bridgeway | Transylvania | 447 | 1,933 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carolinas Medical Center - Union | Union | 1,495 | 5,388 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| Union Health Services | Union | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Presbyterian Same Day Surgery Center at Monroe | Union | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **Totals for:** | **Union** | **1,495** | **5,388** | **0** | **0** | **7** | **0** | **0** | **1** |
| Maria Parham Medical Center | Vance | 817 | 2,715 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Duke Health Raleigh Hospital | Wake | 2,366 | 8,155 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HealthSouth Blue Ridge Surgery Center | Wake | | 5,055 | | 6 | | | | 0 |
| Raleigh Plastic Surgery Center, Inc. * | Wake | | 371 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| Raleigh Women's Health Organization, Inc. | Wake | | 3,100 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| Rex Hospital | Wake | 9,255 | 18,222 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Eye Associates Ophthalmic Surgery Center * | Wake | | 487 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| WakeMed Raleigh Campus | Wake | 7,941 | 13,629 | 7 | 4 | 18 | -3 | -1 | 0 |
| WakeMed Cary Hospital | Wake | 1,467 | 6,770 | 2 | 0 | 9 | -2 | 0 | 0 |
| WakeMed Apex Day Surgery Center | Wake | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 4 |
| 2008 SMFP Adjusted Need Determination | Wake | | | | | Need Adjusted to 4 OR's in response to a petition. | | | 4 |
| **Totals for:** | **Wake** | **21,029** | **55,789** | **9** | **19** | **67** | **-5** | **-1** | **8** |
| Washington County Hospital, Inc. | Washington | 25 | 483 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blowing Rock Hospital * | Watauga | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Watauga Medical Center, Inc. | Watauga | 1,076 | 3,319 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 1 |
| **Totals for:** | **Watauga** | **1,076** | **3,320** | **1** | **0** | **5** | **-1** | **0** | **1** |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

## Table 6A: Operating Room Inventory *(Combined Data for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgical Facilities)*

*(Case Data for 10/01/05 through 9/30/06 as reported on the "2007 Hospital and Ambulatory Surgical Facility License Renewal Applications")*

| Facility Name | County | Inpt.- C-Sec. | Amb. Cases | Inpat. Rms. | Amb. Rms. | Shared Rms. | Exclu. C-Sec. | Exclu Tra/Bur | Adj.CON |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wayne Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Wayne | 3,718 | 8,192 | 1 | 2 | 10 | -1 | 0 | -2 |
| Wayne Ambulatory Surgery Center | Wayne | | 0 | | 0 | | | | 3 |
| **Totals for:** | **Wayne** | **3,718** | **8,192** | **1** | **2** | **10** | **-1** | **0** | **1** |
| Wilkes Regional Medical Center | Wilkes | 536 | 1,811 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Wilkes Regional Medical Center Ambulatory Surg. Facility | Wilkes | | 616 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Wilkes** | **536** | **2,427** | **1** | **1** | **4** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| HealthSouth Surgecenter of Wilson * | Wilson | | 713 | | 4 | | | | 0 |
| Wilson OB-GYN | Wilson | | 529 | | 1 | | | | 0 |
| Wilson Medical Center | Wilson | 2,360 | 3,890 | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals for:** | **Wilson** | **2,360** | **5,132** | **1** | **5** | **9** | **-1** | **0** | **0** |
| Hoots Memorial Hospital, Inc. | Yadkin | 1 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Chronically underutilized facility; operating rooms in these facilities are excluded from Need Determination calculations.

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology Continues on the Adjoining Page -- Note Continuation of Column Letters)*

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **Projection of Surgical Operating Room Requirements** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Estimated Total Surgery Hours** | | | | | | | **Application of Growth Factor** | | | |
| | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Inpatient Cases"** (w/o Exclusions) | **Avg. Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Ambulatory Cases"** | **Avg. Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Total Estimated Hours for 2006** (D + G) | **Growth Factor 2006-2010** (Population Change Rate) | **Projected Surgical Hours Anticipated in 2010** | **Standard Hours per OR per Year** (9/260/80%) | **Projected Operating Rooms Required in 2010** |
| Alamance | 2,026 | 3 | 6,078 | 6,798 | 1.5 | 10,197 | 16,275 | 0.0485 | 17,064.61 | 1872 | **9.12** |
| Caswell | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0039 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Alamance-Caswell Totals** | 2,026 | 3.0 | 6,078 | 6,798 | 1.5 | 10,197 | 16,275 | 0.0421 | 16,959.97 | 1872 | **9.06** |
| Beaufort | 1,039 | 3.0 | 3,117 | 2,537 | 1.5 | 3,806 | 6,923 | 0.0261 | 7,103.39 | 1872 | **3.79** |
| Hyde | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | -0.0185 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Beaufort-Hyde Totals** | 1,039 | 3.0 | 3,117 | 2,537 | 1.5 | 3,806 | 6,923 | 0.0214 | 7,070.55 | 1872 | **3.78** |
| Buncombe | 13,037 | 3.0 | 39,111 | 27,326 | 1.5 | 40,989 | 80,100 | 0.0636 | 85,193.49 | 1872 | **45.51** |
| Madison | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0359 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Yancey | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0377 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Buncombe-Madi-Yan Totals** | 13,037 | 3.0 | 39,111 | 27,326 | 1.5 | 40,989 | 80,100 | 0.0596 | 84,872.86 | 1872 | **45.34** |
| Cherokee | 358 | 3.0 | 1,074 | 1,873 | 1.5 | 2,810 | 3,884 | 0.0696 | 4,153.62 | 1872 | **2.22** |
| Clay | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0842 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Cherokee-Clay Totals** | 358 | 3.0 | 1,074 | 1,873 | 1.5 | 2,810 | 3,884 | 0.0736 | 4,169.26 | 1872 | **2.23** |
| Chowan | 614 | 3.0 | 1,842 | 1,117 | 1.5 | 1,676 | 3,518 | 0.0361 | 3,644.52 | 1872 | **1.95** |
| Tyrrell | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0224 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Chowan-Tyrrell Totals** | 614 | 3.0 | 1,842 | 1,117 | 1.5 | 1,676 | 3,518 | 0.0330 | 3,633.67 | 1872 | **1.94** |
| Craven | 3,669 | 3.0 | 11,007 | 9,527 | 1.5 | 14,291 | 25,298 | 0.0390 | 26,285.14 | 1872 | **14.04** |
| Jones | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0204 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Pamlico | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0149 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Craven-Jones-Pamlico Totals** | 3,669 | 3.0 | 11,007 | 9,527 | 1.5 | 14,291 | 25,298 | 0.0348 | 26,177.10 | 1872 | **13.98** |
| Halifax | 1,716 | 3.0 | 5,148 | 2,104 | 1.5 | 3,156 | 8,304 | -0.0187 | 8,148.53 | 1872 | **4.35** |
| Northampton | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | -0.0002 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Halifax-Northampton Totals** | 1,716 | 3.0 | 5,148 | 2,104 | 1.5 | 3,156 | 8,304 | -0.0136 | 8,191.37 | 1872 | **4.38** |
| Jackson | 869 | 3.0 | 2,607 | 3,909 | 1.5 | 5,864 | 8,471 | 0.0510 | 8,902.28 | 1872 | **4.76** |
| Graham | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0196 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Swain | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0621 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Jackson-Graham-Swain Totals** | 869 | 3.0 | 2,607 | 3,909 | 1.5 | 5,864 | 8,471 | 0.0493 | 8,887.80 | 1872 | **4.75** |
| Moore | 6,659 | 3.0 | 19,977 | 17,618 | 1.5 | 26,427 | 46,404 | 0.0711 | 49,702.94 | 1872 | **26.55** |
| Hoke | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.1502 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Moore-Hoke Totals** | 6,659 | 3.0 | 19,977 | 17,618 | 1.5 | 26,427 | 46,404 | 0.0979 | 50,947.70 | 1872 | **27.22** |
| Pasquotank | 1,999 | 3.0 | 5,997 | 4,678 | 1.5 | 7,017 | 13,014 | 0.0888 | 14,170.24 | 1872 | **7.57** |
| Camden | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.1357 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Currituck | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.1235 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Gates | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0856 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Perquimans | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0739 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Pasquo-Cam-Cur-Gat-Perq. Totals** | 1,999 | 3.0 | 5,997 | 4,678 | 1.5 | 7,017 | 13,014 | 0.0995 | 14,308.64 | 1872 | **7.64** |
| Pitt | 9,617 | 3.0 | 28,851 | 18,544 | 1.5 | 27,816 | 56,667 | 0.0692 | 60,589.23 | 1872 | **32.37** |
| Greene | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0387 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Pitt-Greene Totals** | 9,617 | 3.0 | 28,851 | 18,544 | 1.5 | 27,816 | 56,667 | 0.0654 | 60,373.60 | 1872 | **32.25** |
| Vance | 817 | 3.0 | 2,451 | 2,715 | 1.5 | 4,073 | 6,524 | 0.0234 | 6,676.17 | 1872 | **3.57** |
| Warren | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0014 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| **Vance-Warren Totals** | 817 | 3.0 | 2,451 | 2,715 | 1.5 | 4,073 | 6,524 | 0.0165 | 6,631.21 | 1872 | **3.54** |

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology -- Continued)*

| Column A *(Repeated for reference)* | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **2006 Inventory of Operating Rooms in Licensed Facilities *with* Adjustments** | | | | | **Adjustment for CONs Issued, Settlement Agreements and Previous Need** | **Adjusted Planning Inventory (Operating Rooms)** | **Projected Operating Room Deficit or Surplus (Surplus shows as a "-")** | **Projected Need for New Operating Rooms** |
| | **Inventory of Existing Operating Rooms** | | | **Adjustment** | **Adjustment** | | | | |
| | Number of Inpatient Operating Rooms | Number of Ambulatory Operating Rooms | Number of Shared Operating Rooms | Exclusion of Dedicated C-Section Rooms | Exclusion of One OR for each Level I, II, & III Trauma Center & Burn Unit | | | | |
| Alamance | 2 | 0 | 11 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 12.00 | -2.88 | |
| Caswell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Alamance-Caswell Totals** | 2 | 0 | 11 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 12.00 | -2.94 | 0 |
| Beaufort | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -1.21 | |
| Hyde | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Beaufort-Hyde Totals** | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -1.22 | 0 |
| Buncombe | 21 | 19 | 9 | -2 | -1 | 4 | 50.00 | -4.49 | |
| Madison | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Yancey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Buncombe-Madi-Yan Totals** | 21 | 19 | 9 | -2 | -1 | 4 | 50.00 | -4.66 | 0 |
| Cherokee | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -1.78 | |
| Clay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Cherokee-Clay Totals** | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -1.77 | 0 |
| Chowan | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -1.05 | |
| Tyrrell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Chowan-Tyrrell Totals** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -1.06 | 0 |
| Craven | 3 | 6 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 17.00 | -2.96 | |
| Jones | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Pamlico | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Craven-Jones-Pamlico Totals** | 3 | 6 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 17.00 | -3.02 | 0 |
| Halifax | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.00 | -1.65 | |
| Northampton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Halifax-Northampton Totals** | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.00 | -1.62 | 0 |
| Jackson | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -0.24 | |
| Graham | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Swain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Jackson-Graham-Swain Totals** | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -0.25 | 0 |
| Moore | 2 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27.00 | -0.45 | |
| Hoke | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Moore-Hoke Totals** | 2 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27.00 | 0.22 | 0 |
| Pasquotank | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8.00 | -0.43 | |
| Camden | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Currituck | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Gates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Perquimans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Pasquo-Cam-Cur-Gat-Perq. Totals** | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8.00 | -0.36 | 0 |
| Pitt | 3 | 8 | 22 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 32.00 | 0.37 | |
| Greene | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Pitt-Greene Totals** | 3 | 8 | 22 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 32.00 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Vance | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -1.43 | |
| Warren | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **Vance-Warren Totals** | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -1.46 | 0 |

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology Continues on the Adjoining Page -- Note Continuation of Column Letters)*

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **Projection of Surgical Operating Room Requirements** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Estimated Total Surgery Hours** | | | | | | | **Application of Growth Factor** | | | |
| | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Inpatient Cases"** (w/o Exclusions) | **Avg. Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Ambulatory Cases"** | **Avg. Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Total Estimated Hours for 2006** (D + G) | **Growth Factor 2006-2010** (Population Change Rate) | **Projected Surgical Hours Anticipated in 2010** | **Standard Hours per OR per Year** (9/260/80%) | **Projected Operating Rooms Required in 2010** |
| Alexander | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0450 | 0.00 | 1872 | **0.00** |
| Alleghany | 26 | 3.0 | 78 | 221 | 1.5 | 332 | 410 | 0.0305 | 421.97 | 1872 | **0.23** |
| Anson | 133 | 3.0 | 399 | 461 | 1.5 | 692 | 1,091 | -0.0257 | 1,062.43 | 1872 | **0.57** |
| Ashe | 235 | 3.0 | 705 | 615 | 1.5 | 923 | 1,628 | 0.0416 | 1,695.18 | 1872 | **0.91** |
| Avery | 218 | 3.0 | 654 | 344 | 1.5 | 516 | 1,170 | 0.0114 | 1,183.33 | 1872 | **0.63** |
| Bertie | 19 | 3.0 | 57 | 743 | 1.5 | 1,115 | 1,172 | -0.0249 | 1,142.38 | 1872 | **0.61** |
| Bladen | 277 | 3.0 | 831 | 486 | 1.5 | 729 | 1,560 | 0.0148 | 1,583.16 | 1872 | **0.85** |
| Brunswick | 1,018 | 3.0 | 3,054 | 2,946 | 1.5 | 4,419 | 7,473 | 0.1697 | 8,740.90 | 1872 | **4.67** |
| Burke | 1,593 | 3.0 | 4,779 | 7,112 | 1.5 | 10,668 | 15,447 | 0.0174 | 15,715.30 | 1872 | **8.39** |
| Cabarrus | 5,096 | 3.0 | 15,288 | 13,856 | 1.5 | 20,784 | 36,072 | 0.1317 | 40,823.35 | 1872 | **21.81** |
| Caldwell | 548 | 3.0 | 1,644 | 3,006 | 1.5 | 4,509 | 6,153 | 0.0231 | 6,295.00 | 1872 | **3.36** |
| Carteret | 1,979 | 3.0 | 5,937 | 3,618 | 1.5 | 5,427 | 11,364 | 0.0439 | 11,863.21 | 1872 | **6.34** |
| Catawba | 6,093 | 3.0 | 18,279 | 17,519 | 1.5 | 26,279 | 44,558 | 0.0516 | 46,858.41 | 1872 | **25.03** |
| Chatham | 53 | 3.0 | 159 | 194 | 1.5 | 291 | 450 | 0.0932 | 491.95 | 1872 | **0.26** |
| Cleveland | 2,566 | 3.0 | 7,698 | 6,614 | 1.5 | 9,921 | 17,619 | 0.0055 | 17,716.09 | 1872 | **9.46** |
| Columbus | 1,510 | 3.0 | 4,530 | 3,527 | 1.5 | 5,291 | 9,821 | 0.0174 | 9,991.16 | 1872 | **5.34** |
| Cumberland | 7,423 | 3.0 | 22,269 | 20,307 | 1.5 | 30,461 | 52,730 | 0.0186 | 53,712.89 | 1872 | **28.69** |
| Dare | 284 | 3.0 | 852 | 3,028 | 1.5 | 4,542 | 5,394 | 0.0544 | 5,687.39 | 1872 | **3.04** |
| Davidson | 1,802 | 3.0 | 5,406 | 4,970 | 1.5 | 7,455 | 12,861 | 0.0356 | 13,319.08 | 1872 | **7.11** |
| Davie | 8 | 3.0 | 24 | 62 | 1.5 | 93 | 117 | 0.0883 | 127.33 | 1872 | **0.07** |
| Duplin | 728 | 3.0 | 2,184 | 1,319 | 1.5 | 1,979 | 4,163 | 0.0599 | 4,411.66 | 1872 | **2.36** |
| Durham | 20,710 | 3.0 | 62,130 | 33,894 | 1.5 | 50,841 | 112,971 | 0.0662 | 120,455.26 | 1872 | **64.35** |
| Edgecombe | 664 | 3.0 | 1,992 | 1,441 | 1.5 | 2,162 | 4,154 | -0.0277 | 4,038.54 | 1872 | **2.16** |
| Forsyth | 23,223 | 3.0 | 69,669 | 39,126 | 1.5 | 58,689 | 128,358 | 0.0603 | 136,098.91 | 1872 | **72.70** |
| Franklin | 1,001 | 3.0 | 3,003 | 1,716 | 1.5 | 2,574 | 5,577 | 0.0896 | 6,076.57 | 1872 | **3.25** |
| Gaston | 4,051 | 3.0 | 12,153 | 16,164 | 1.5 | 24,246 | 36,399 | 0.0432 | 37,972.84 | 1872 | **20.28** |
| Granville | 668 | 3.0 | 2,004 | 1,997 | 1.5 | 2,996 | 5,000 | 0.0561 | 5,279.86 | 1872 | **2.82** |
| Guilford | 17,919 | 3.0 | 53,757 | 53,901 | 1.5 | 80,852 | 134,609 | 0.0601 | 142,696.92 | 1872 | **76.23** |
| Harnett | 1,092 | 3.0 | 3,276 | 2,334 | 1.5 | 3,501 | 6,777 | 0.0823 | 7,334.49 | 1872 | **3.92** |
| Haywood | 1,456 | 3.0 | 4,368 | 3,008 | 1.5 | 4,512 | 8,880 | 0.0281 | 9,129.49 | 1872 | **4.88** |
| Henderson | 3,606 | 3.0 | 10,818 | 8,945 | 1.5 | 13,418 | 24,236 | 0.0802 | 26,179.55 | 1872 | **13.98** |
| Hertford | 930 | 3.0 | 2,790 | 1,835 | 1.5 | 2,753 | 5,543 | 0.0079 | 5,586.33 | 1872 | **2.98** |
| Iredell | 5,726 | 3.0 | 17,178 | 13,653 | 1.5 | 20,480 | 37,658 | 0.1187 | 42,127.18 | 1872 | **22.50** |
| Johnston | 2,113 | 3.0 | 6,339 | 3,562 | 1.5 | 5,343 | 11,682 | 0.1323 | 13,227.13 | 1872 | **7.07** |
| Lee | 1,096 | 3.0 | 3,288 | 2,833 | 1.5 | 4,250 | 7,538 | 0.0749 | 8,101.84 | 1872 | **4.33** |
| Lenoir | 2,088 | 3.0 | 6,264 | 3,347 | 1.5 | 5,021 | 11,285 | -0.0028 | 11,252.88 | 1872 | **6.01** |
| Lincoln | 721 | 3.0 | 2,163 | 1,558 | 1.5 | 2,337 | 4,500 | 0.0839 | 4,877.37 | 1872 | **2.61** |
| Macon | 286 | 3.0 | 858 | 1,645 | 1.5 | 2,468 | 3,326 | 0.0760 | 3,578.14 | 1872 | **1.91** |
| Martin | 300 | 3.0 | 900 | 1,153 | 1.5 | 1,730 | 2,630 | -0.0164 | 2,586.49 | 1872 | **1.38** |
| McDowell | 441 | 3.0 | 1,323 | 1,486 | 1.5 | 2,229 | 3,552 | 0.0366 | 3,682.00 | 1872 | **1.97** |
| Mecklenburg | 29,957 | 3.0 | 89,871 | 81,723 | 1.5 | 122,585 | 212,456 | 0.1255 | 239,116.21 | 1872 | **127.73** |
| Mitchell | 301 | 3.0 | 903 | 742 | 1.5 | 1,113 | 2,016 | 0.0069 | 2,029.95 | 1872 | **1.08** |
| Montgomery | 179 | 3.0 | 537 | 642 | 1.5 | 963 | 1,500 | 0.0279 | 1,541.88 | 1872 | **0.82** |
| Nash | 2,238 | 3.0 | 6,714 | 7,380 | 1.5 | 11,070 | 17,784 | 0.0378 | 18,456.81 | 1872 | **9.86** |

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology -- Continued)*

| Column A *(Repeated for reference)* | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **2006 Inventory of Operating Rooms in Licensed Facilities *with* Adjustments** | | | | | **Adjustment for CONs Issued, Settlement Agreements and Previous Need** | **Adjusted Planning Inventory (Operating Rooms)** | **Projected Operating Room Deficit or Surplus (Surplus shows as a "-")** | **Projected Need for New Operating Rooms** |
| | **Inventory of Existing Operating Rooms** | | | **Adjustment** | **Adjustment** | | | | |
| | Number of Inpatient Operating Rooms | Number of Ambulatory Operating Rooms | Number of Shared Operating Rooms | Exclusion of Dedicated C-Section Rooms | Exclusion of One OR for each Level I, II, & III Trauma Center & Burn Unit | | | | |
| Alexander | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -2.00 | 0 |
| Alleghany | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.77 | 0 |
| Anson | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.43 | 0 |
| Ashe | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.09 | 0 |
| Avery | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.37 | 0 |
| Bertie | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.39 | 0 |
| Bladen | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.15 | 0 |
| Brunswick | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 6.00 | -1.33 | 0 |
| Burke | 1 | 2 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 11.00 | -2.61 | 0 |
| Cabarrus | 4 | 6 | 17 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 24.00 | -2.19 | 0 |
| Caldwell | 1 | 3 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 7.00 | -3.64 | 0 |
| Carteret | 1 | 2 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 7.00 | -0.66 | 0 |
| Catawba | 3 | 8 | 27 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 37.00 | -11.97 | 0 |
| Chatham | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.74 | 0 |
| Cleveland | 1 | 2 | 8 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 9.00 | 0.46 | 0 |
| Columbus | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 0.34 | 0 |
| Cumberland | 5 | 11 | 17 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 31.00 | -2.31 | 0 |
| Dare | 1 | 2 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -0.96 | 0 |
| Davidson | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 9.00 | -1.89 | 0 |
| Davie | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.93 | 0 |
| Duplin | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -0.64 | 0 |
| Durham | 7 | 17 | 48 | -2 | -1 | 4 | 73.00 | -8.65 | 0 |
| Edgecombe | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -2.84 | 0 |
| Forsyth | 9 | 6 | 68 | -2 | -2 | 4 | 83.00 | -10.30 | 0 |
| Franklin | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 0.25 | 0 |
| Gaston | 5 | 14 | 9 | -4 | 0 | 0 | 24.00 | -3.72 | 0 |
| Granville | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -0.18 | 0 |
| Guilford | 7 | 42 | 47 | -1 | -2 | 1 | 94.00 | -17.77 | 0 |
| Harnett | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10.00 | -6.08 | 0 |
| Haywood | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.00 | -2.12 | 0 |
| Henderson | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.00 | -2.02 | 0 |
| Hertford | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -2.02 | 0 |
| Iredell | 3 | 7 | 20 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 29.00 | -6.50 | 0 |
| Johnston | 1 | 1 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 7.00 | 0.07 | 0 |
| Lee | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 7.00 | -2.67 | 0 |
| Lenoir | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 9.00 | -2.99 | 0 |
| Lincoln | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -1.39 | 0 |
| Macon | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -2.09 | 0 |
| Martin | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -0.62 | 0 |
| McDowell | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -1.03 | 0 |
| Mecklenburg | 22 | 42 | 95 | -12 | -1 | 0 | 146.00 | -18.27 | 0 |
| Mitchell | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -1.92 | 0 |
| Montgomery | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.18 | 0 |
| Nash | 1 | 0 | 13 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 13.00 | -3.14 | 0 |

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology Continues on the Adjoining Page -- Note Continuation of Column Letters)*

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **Projection of Surgical Operating Room Requirements** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Estimated Total Surgery Hours** | | | | | | | **Application of Growth Factor** | | | |
| | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Inpatient Cases"** (w/o Exclusions) | **Avg. Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Inpat. Cases** | **2006 Surgical Cases reported as "Ambulatory Cases"** | **Avg. Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Esti-mated Hours for Amb. Cases** | **Total Estimated Hours for 2006** (D + G) | **Growth Factor 2006-2010** (Population Change Rate) | **Projected Surgical Hours Anticipated in 2010** | **Standard Hours per OR per Year** (9/260/80%) | **Projected Operating Rooms Required in 2010** |
| New Hanover | 10,104 | 3.0 | 30,312 | 26,603 | 1.5 | 39,905 | 70,217 | 0.0934 | 76,774.94 | 1872 | **41.01** |
| Onslow | 1,815 | 3.0 | 5,445 | 4,177 | 1.5 | 6,266 | 11,711 | 0.0346 | 12,115.44 | 1872 | **6.47** |
| Orange | 9,168 | 3.0 | 27,504 | 12,058 | 1.5 | 18,087 | 45,591 | 0.0479 | 47,774.37 | 1872 | **25.52** |
| Pender | 64 | 3.0 | 192 | 207 | 1.5 | 311 | 503 | 0.1326 | 569.11 | 1872 | **0.30** |
| Person | 898 | 3.0 | 2,694 | 2,741 | 1.5 | 4,112 | 6,806 | 0.0357 | 7,048.16 | 1872 | **3.77** |
| Polk | 509 | 3.0 | 1,527 | 2,222 | 1.5 | 3,333 | 4,860 | 0.0360 | 5,035.17 | 1872 | **2.69** |
| Randolph | 1,249 | 3.0 | 3,747 | 3,208 | 1.5 | 4,812 | 8,559 | 0.0468 | 8,959.83 | 1872 | **4.79** |
| Richmond | 1,114 | 3.0 | 3,342 | 2,266 | 1.5 | 3,399 | 6,741 | 0.0075 | 6,791.23 | 1872 | **3.63** |
| Robeson | 2,215 | 3.0 | 6,645 | 4,139 | 1.5 | 6,209 | 12,854 | 0.0405 | 13,374.10 | 1872 | **7.14** |
| Rockingham | 2,110 | 3.0 | 6,330 | 3,952 | 1.5 | 5,928 | 12,258 | 0.0045 | 12,313.52 | 1872 | **6.58** |
| Rowan | 3,449 | 3.0 | 10,347 | 5,514 | 1.5 | 8,271 | 18,618 | 0.0350 | 19,270.48 | 1872 | **10.29** |
| Rutherford | 1,150 | 3.0 | 3,450 | 2,040 | 1.5 | 3,060 | 6,510 | 0.0076 | 6,559.77 | 1872 | **3.50** |
| Sampson | 1,093 | 3.0 | 3,279 | 2,874 | 1.5 | 4,311 | 7,590 | 0.0531 | 7,992.80 | 1872 | **4.27** |
| Scotland | 1,350 | 3.0 | 4,050 | 2,595 | 1.5 | 3,893 | 7,943 | 0.0157 | 8,067.24 | 1872 | **4.31** |
| Stanly | 1,067 | 3.0 | 3,201 | 3,987 | 1.5 | 5,981 | 9,182 | 0.0184 | 9,350.76 | 1872 | **5.00** |
| Stokes | 15 | 3.0 | 45 | 664 | 1.5 | 996 | 1,041 | 0.0275 | 1,069.62 | 1872 | **0.57** |
| Surry | 2,265 | 3.0 | 6,795 | 4,486 | 1.5 | 6,729 | 13,524 | 0.0240 | 13,848.02 | 1872 | **7.40** |
| Transylvania | 447 | 3.0 | 1,341 | 1,933 | 1.5 | 2,900 | 4,241 | 0.0416 | 4,416.94 | 1872 | **2.36** |
| Union | 1,495 | 3.0 | 4,485 | 5,388 | 1.5 | 8,082 | 12,567 | 0.1927 | 14,988.40 | 1872 | **8.01** |
| Wake | 21,029 | 3.0 | 63,087 | 54,931 | 1.5 | 82,397 | 145,484 | 0.1479 | 166,999.51 | 1872 | **89.21** |
| Washington | 25 | 3.0 | 75 | 483 | 1.5 | 725 | 800 | -0.0134 | 788.79 | 1872 | **0.42** |
| Watauga | 1,076 | 3.0 | 3,228 | 3,319 | 1.5 | 4,979 | 8,207 | 0.0246 | 8,408.42 | 1872 | **4.49** |
| Wayne | 3,718 | 3.0 | 11,154 | 8,192 | 1.5 | 12,288 | 23,442 | 0.0167 | 23,833.24 | 1872 | **12.73** |
| Wilkes | 536 | 3.0 | 1,608 | 2,427 | 1.5 | 3,641 | 5,249 | 0.0138 | 5,321.04 | 1872 | **2.84** |
| Wilson | 2,360 | 3.0 | 7,080 | 4,419 | 1.5 | 6,629 | 13,709 | 0.0355 | 14,194.75 | 1872 | **7.58** |
| Yadkin | 1 | 3.0 | 3 | 296 | 1.5 | 444 | 447 | 0.0430 | 466.21 | 1872 | **0.25** |
| **STATE TOTALS:** | **265,117** | | | **638,900** | | | | **0.0705** | | | **1,005** |

# Table 6B: Projected Operating Room Need for 2010

*(Application of the Methodology -- Continued)*

| Column A *(Repeated for reference)* | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operating Room Service Areas (Single and Multi-County Groupings)** *Multi-County Groups listed first, followed by Single Counties* | **2006 Inventory of Operating Rooms in Licensed Facilities *with* Adjustments** | | | | | **Adjustment for CONs Issued, Settlement Agreements and Previous Need** | **Adjusted Planning Inventory** (Operating Rooms) | **Projected Operating Room Deficit or Surplus** (Surplus shows as a "-") | **Projected Need for New Operating Rooms** |
| | **Inventory of Existing Operating Rooms** | | | **Adjustment** | **Adjustment** | | | | |
| | Number of Inpatient Operating Rooms | Number of Ambulatory Operating Rooms | Number of Shared Operating Rooms | Exclusion of Dedicated C-Section Rooms | Exclusion of One OR for each Level I, II, & III Trauma Center & Burn Unit | | | | |
| New Hanover | 5 | 12 | 20 | -3 | -1 | 8 | 41.00 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Onslow | 1 | 4 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 9.00 | -2.53 | 0 |
| Orange | 3 | 4 | 32 | -3 | -2 | 4 | 38.00 | -12.48 | 0 |
| Pender | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.70 | 0 |
| Person | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | -0.23 | 0 |
| Polk | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | -0.31 | 0 |
| Randolph | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -0.21 | 0 |
| Richmond | 1 | 0 | 6 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 6.00 | -2.37 | 0 |
| Robeson | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.00 | -2.86 | 0 |
| Rockingham | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 9.00 | -2.42 | 0 |
| Rowan | 2 | 2 | 8 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 11.00 | -0.71 | 0 |
| Rutherford | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -1.50 | 0 |
| Sampson | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.00 | -3.73 | 0 |
| Scotland | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -0.69 | 0 |
| Stanly | 1 | 0 | 5 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Stokes | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -3.43 | 0 |
| Surry | 1 | 0 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 9.00 | -1.60 | 0 |
| Transylvania | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.00 | -1.64 | 0 |
| Union | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8.00 | 0.01 | 0 |
| Wake | 9 | 16 | 67 | -5 | -1 | 8 | 94.00 | -4.79 | 4* |
| Washington | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.58 | 0 |
| Watauga | 1 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | -0.51 | 0 |
| Wayne | 1 | 2 | 10 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 13.00 | -0.27 | 0 |
| Wilkes | 1 | 1 | 4 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | -2.16 | 0 |
| Wilson | 1 | 1 | 9 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 10.00 | -2.42 | 0 |
| Yadkin | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | -1.75 | 0 |
| **STATE TOTALS:** | **145** | **251** | **852** | **-76** | **-14** | **56** | **1,214** | | **4** |

*Need adjusted to 4 Operating Rooms in response to a petition.

## Table 6C: Operating Room Need Determinations

*(Scheduled for Certificate of Need Review Commencing in 2008)*

| Operating Room Service Area | Operating Room Need Determination * | Certificate of Need Application Due Date ** | Certificate of Need Beginning Review Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wake County | 4 | To Be Determined | To Be Determined |

* Need Determinations shown in this document may be increased or decreased during the year pursuant to Policy GEN-2 (see Chapter 4).

** Application Due Dates are absolute deadlines. The filing deadline is 5:30 p.m. on the Application Due Date. The filing deadline is absolute (see Chapter 3).

Recommendations and Related Materials

*from the*

# TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT COMMITTEE

*for the*

September 26, 2007

State Health Coordinating Council Meeting

# Technology and Equipment Committee
## Recommendations to the N.C. State Health Coordinating Council Related to Chapter 9 of the Final 2008 SMFP For the September 26, 2007 SHCC Meeting

**A. Recommendations Related to Lithotripsy:**
The Committee recommends that no need exists for additional lithotripters anywhere in the State and that, apart from data updates, no substantive changes will be reflected in the Final 2008 SMFP.

**B. Recommendations Related to Gamma Knife:**
The Committee recommends that no need exists for an additional Gamma Knife anywhere in the State and that, apart from data updates, no substantive changes will be reflected in the Final 2008 SMFP.

**C. Recommendations Related to Linear Accelerators:**
The methodology incorporates a geographic accessibility criterion (population base of 120,000), a criterion aimed at assuring efficient use of megavoltage radiation facilities (when ESTV Procedures divided by 6,750 minus the number of present linear accelerators equals .25+), and a criterion that when a service area has 45% or more of the patients coming from outside the service area. A need determination is generated when two of the three criteria are met within a service area.

In addition, it was suggested by some radiation oncologists last year that we do not count CPT Code 77427, weekly radiation therapy management, in the totals of freestanding radiation oncology centers. We did accept that advice last year and removed the totals for CPT Code 77427 from the totals. We have removed the totals for CPT Code 77427 from table 9G.

As Table 9H indicates, there are two service areas where the threshold equals .25+; however, there is no need determination for Service Areas 17 and 18 because these service areas do not meet the criterion of a population base of 120,000 per linear accelerator.

The Committee recommends that there is no need based on the regular methodology for any additional linear accelerator anywhere in the State unless there are adjusted need determinations that are approved based on petitions.

There were 3 petitions.

**Petitions:**

**Moses Cone Health System**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in its request for an adjusted need determination in Linear Accelerator Service Area 12 (Guilford & Rockingham) to add one (1) linear accelerator with stereotactic radiosurgery capabilities.

**Cape Fear Valley Health System**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in its request for separating the Cyber Knife linear accelerator from the regular category of linear accelerator equipment. The Committee further recommends approval of an adjusted need determination for an additional linear accelerator in Linear Accelerator Service Area 18 in the Final 2008 SMFP. However, it does not recommend creating a need determination that specifies certain configurations or specifications.

**Rex Hospital**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in its request to add the entity in Franklin County to the inventory of linear accelerators because a determination has not been made to date as to whether or not an oncology treatment center was developed prior to August 2005.

**D. Recommendations Related to Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Scanners:**

The Committee recommends that there is a need determination based on the methodology in the Proposed 2008 SMFP for one fixed dedicated PET scanner in HSA II. The Committee recommends that the methodology in the Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Scanners Section of Chapter 9 of the Proposed 2008 SMFP shall continue over into the Final 2008 SMFP, including retaining the annual capacity of a fixed dedicated PET scanner at 2,600 procedures. By the recommended approval of the petition from the Presbyterian Hospital, there is an adjusted need determination for a fixed dedicated PET scanner in Health Service Area (HSA) III. There is no need for any additional fixed dedicated PET scanners anywhere else in the State.

It is recommended that there is no need for any additional mobile dedicated PET scanners anywhere in the State.

**Petition:**

**The Presbyterian Hospital**

The Committee recommends approval of the petition in its request to adjust the need determination contained in the Proposed 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan (SMFP) in Table 9M, page 122, to show a need determination for a fixed dedicated positron emission tomography (PET) scanner in Health Service Area (HSA) III.

**E. Recommendations Related to Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)**

Table 9O includes tiers based on the number of scanners in a MRI Scanner Service Area. In addition, equivalents for the mobile scanners in the service areas are found in the

column labeled Fixed Equivalent Magnets. It is recommended that Table 9O be adopted and with its adoption there is a need for an additional MRI scanner in each of the 11 MRI Scanner Service Areas of Carteret, Chowan, Craven, Forsyth, Jackson, Lenoir, Lincoln, Orange, Surry, Vance-Warren, and Wilkes. It is recommended that there is no need based on the regular methodology for any additional fixed MRI scanners anywhere else in the State unless there are adjusted need determinations that are approved based on petitions.

The Committee recommends an adjusted need determination for 2 demonstration projects for a multi-position MRI scanner to be included in the Final 2008 SMFP. One demonstration project shall be located in the western portion of the state (HSAs I, II, and III). One demonstration project shall be located in the eastern portion of the state (HSAs IV, V and VI).

The multi-position MRI scanners are MRI scanners that can be placed in an upright position. The multi-position MRI scanners shall not be counted in the regular inventory of MRI scanners for the 1st year of operation. After the 1st year of operation they would be placed in the inventory of the MRI Service Area in which it is located. They could not later be replaced with a conventional MRI scanner. There would be equal access to all spine surgeons (both neurological and orthopaedic surgeons in the state). An annual report would be provided to the CON and Medical Facilities Planning Sections outlining the utilization of the MRI scanners and the patient mix of insured, underinsured, and uninsured clients.

**Petitions:**

**Alliance Imaging Inc.**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in its request for a change in Chapter 9 of the Final 2008 SMFP to include the following statement: "There is no need for any additional mobile magnetic resonance imaging scanners anywhere in the State."

**Ashe Memorial Hospital**

The Committee recommends approval of the petition in regards to an adjusted need determination for a fixed MRI scanner for the Ashe MRI Service Area in the Final 2008 SMFP given the geographic issues and the limited access to mobile MRI services.

**Greensboro Orthopaedics, P.A.**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in regards to an adjusted need determination for a fixed MRI scanner for the Guilford MRI service area in the Final 2008 SMFP.

**HOPE, A Women's Cancer Center**

The Committee recommends denial of the petition in regards to an adjusted need determination for one (1) dedicated breast MRI scanner for HSA I.

## F. Recommendations Related to Cardiac Catheterization Equipment

The Committee recommends that there is a need determination through the regular methodology of 2 additional fixed units of cardiac catheterization equipment: one each in Catawba County and one each in Moore County to be included in the Final 2008 SMFP. Services shall only be approved for development on hospital sites. It is determined that no need exists for additional units of fixed cardiac catheterization equipment anywhere else in the State and no other reviews are scheduled. It is recommended that it is further determined that mobile cardiac catheterization equipment and services shall only be approved for development on hospital sites.

It is also determined through the regular methodology that there is no need for additional units of shared fixed cardiac catheterization equipment unless there are adjusted need determinations that are approved based on petitions.

**Petitions:**

**Halifax Regional Medical Center**

The Committee recommends approval of the petition for an adjusted need determination for one unit of shared fixed cardiac catheterization equipment in Halifax County.

**Scotland Memorial**

The Committee recommends approval of the petition for an adjusted need determination for one unit of shared fixed cardiac catheterization equipment in Scotland County.

**TO:** Long Term and Behavioral Health Committee
**FR:** Edward R. Jagnandan
Executive Director, Wilson Housing Authority
**RE:** Clarification to Agency Report to Adult Care Home Petition
**DATE:** September 14, 2007

- We take exception to the standard methodology used to determine bed utilization as it does not take into account other factors that determine the need for long term care. The methodology works against the disabled adult population, living alone, and *under the poverty level*, that are in need of services. We requested that the methodology be reviewed to include other factors affecting need.
- A meeting with Wilson County Social Service Department revealed that the number of empty beds in adult day care is lower than reported by the plan, as it does include family care homes that, due to their size, are not able to provide the type of services required in an adult care home. A 10% vacancy rate in assisted living/nursing home facilities is considered full occupancy in all other states
- Existing adult care homes select the residents they want to admit. Telephone calls were made to all five adult care homes in the City of Wilson and although they had empty beds they were reluctant to admit individuals in wheel-chair, who were incontinent, or suffering from the early stages of Alzheimer's disease.
- Aging in place occurs when individuals are able to remain in the community where they have lived all their lives. That is the case for Continuum of Care Retirement Community where residents need to move from independent units to assisted living units within the same campus. Wilson Housing Authority residents will remain in the same campus, among friends and family members, and will receive services in private units, with private bathrooms, subsidized by the federal government. Adult Day Care homes provide to our residents only shared accommodations with common bathrooms shared by five other residents.
- Cost savings comes from the fact that these residents will avoid premature nursing home admission if given the opportunity to stay in their homes with the required services as well as less hospital admission and emergency room visits with services that will improve their cognitive and physical health.
- North Carolina lags behind other states in the nation that have successfully embraced public housing assisted living models. Numerous precedents exist in other states. We have provided the department with the names and phone numbers of state departments and housing authorities that have implemented this type of project. HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development) and the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) are in the process of signing an agreement to promote this type of projects throughout the U.S. This is a good precedent to set in North Carolina. The Department's concern should be the welfare of the low-income elderly/disabled North Carolinians.
- The physical plant requirement of expanding the corridors from 5' to 6' to comply with the Institutional building code is not possible in Tasman Towers. The Division's Construction Section indicated that the widening of corridors pertain only if the facility admits more than six individuals unable to evacuate on their

own. Wilson Housing Authority will not admit more than six individuals unable to evacuate on their own to their future project.

- Assisted living facilities are "home like" facilities. No 24 hour nursing/medical services are permitted. An individual that needs this higher level of care needs to be transferred to a nursing home – a "healthcare" facility. An assisted living license requires that assistance with activities of daily living, bathing, grooming, eating, transferring, toileting, be provided by unlicensed staff. Nursing oversight is performed by home health care nurses or by a registered nurse under contract. There is no conflict with the licensing requirements in our statement that healthcare services will be contracted out to home health agencies or registered nurses already providing these services.
- Originally, Adult Care Homes were not included in the certificate of need requirement, as is the case in most other states. In most cases, nursing homes, hospitals, acute care facilities, amongst others, are included in a certificate need requirement. Adult Care Homes were included in the certificate of need temporarily until "a finding of a more definitive means of developing and maintaining the quality of adult care homes beds is found". Public Housing assisted living projects represent a new solution to the rising costs and low quality services that the state is faced with today.
- Options given by the department fail to address the need for 24-hour supervision and these options are currently in a moratorium. We have discussed with the department both the Home Option and the Multi-Unit Assisted Housing with Services to find out that no funding is available for these options.

Respectfully, we understand why the industry association is objecting to this type of project since after all they have to represent the interests of their membership. However, we fail to understand the reluctance of the HHS department to test this project that has proven to be so successful in curtailing costs and improving the health and well-being of the poor seniors and disabled adults in most of the states of this nation. We can only conclude that there are other agendas than improving the care of these deserving and often neglected North Carolinians.

The housing Authority firmly believes that this is a moral issue and that our residents deserve better. We hope that the Long Term & Behavioral Health Committee will consider the best interests of these North Carolinians, and approve our petition.

HOSPICE

# *Hospice of Davidson County . . .*
## *We Make the Difference*

*Ask for us by name – Your Hometown Hospice*

DFS Health Planning
RECEIVED

SEP 07 2007

Medical Facilities
Planning Section

September 5, 2007

Mr. Floyd Cogley, Planner
Medical Facilities Planning Section
Division of Health Services Regulation
2714 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-2714

Dear Mr. Cogley:

Hospice of Davidson County, NC, Inc acknowledges that Kate B. Reynolds Hospice Home in Winston Salem has been instrumental in meeting the needs of terminally patients in and around Forsyth County, however we oppose the approval of the special needs petition for more beds at this time.

Our opposition is based upon the impact expected once our hospice house is completed in 2008 and those being constructed in surrounding counties. Currently, patients from counties adjacent to Forsyth County use the Kate B. Reynolds Hospice House. One the new facilities are constructed, patients will have the option of using several facilities capable of meeting the needs of hospice facility care. Adding additional beds now will not add value but risk creation of occupancy issues.

Ones the facilities currently under construction begin to serve patients, the need for additional beds should be re-evaluated to ensure the needs in our communities are being met.

Sincerely,

Gary M. Drake
Chief Executive Officer
Hospice of Davidson County, NC, Inc

Approved By
Accreditation Commission for Health Care, inc.

*HOSPICE of Davidson County, Inc.*
*524 South State Street; P.O. Box 1941*
*Lexington, North Carolina 27293-1941*
*(336) 248-6185 or 1 (800) 768-4677 Fax: (336) 248-4574*

United Way

**Recommendations and Related Materials**

*from the*

# Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee

*for the*

September 26, 2007

**State Health Coordinating Council Meeting**

# Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee

## Recommendations to the N. C. State Health Coordinating Council

## September 26, 2007

**On September 14, 2007, the Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee met to consider petitions and comments in response to the Proposed 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan. Copies of Agency Reports, Petitions and Comments are enclosed.**

**Nursing Care Facilities: Chapter 10 – pages 155 to 177 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**

No petitions or comments were received on the Nursing Care Facilities chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan during the public comment period.

Based on the standard methodology, the Proposed 2008 Plan identified need for new nursing facility beds in four counties: Camden – 10 beds; Lincoln – 30 beds; Perquimans – 20 beds; and, Union – 90 beds. No inventory changes have occurred to date that result in a change in need determinations based on the standard methodology. The committee recommends that the Nursing Care Facilities policies, assumptions, methodology and need determinations be approved.

**Adult Care Homes: Chapter 11 – pages 179 to 211 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**

One petition was received on the Adult Care Homes chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan during the public comment period.

**Adult Care Home Petition from the Housing Authority of the City of Wilson. (Please refer to Attachment - Adult Care Home Petition)** The petitioner requests a need determination for 58 adult care home beds in Wilson County. The Committee recommends that the petition be denied.

The committee recommends that the Adult Care Homes policies, assumptions, methodology and need determinations be approved. Based on the standard methodology in the Proposed 2008 Plan, there are to date, 16 counties with need determinations for a total of 880 beds. The counties and number of beds are: Alexander – 10; Alleghany – 40; Camden – 20; Carteret – 120; Cherokee – 150; Currituck – 90; Gates – 40; Haywood – 50; Hyde – 30; Jones – 30; Macon – 130; Mitchell – 80; Perquimans 30; Polk – 20; Tyrrell – 20; and, Washington – 20.

**Home Health Services – Chapter 12 – pages 213 to 251 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**

No petitions or comments were received on the Home Health Services chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan during the public comment period.

Based on the standard methodology, there is no need determination for an additional Medicare-certified home health agency or office anywhere in the State. The committee recommends that the Home Health policy, assumptions, methodology and need determination be approved. It is noted that a Home Health Task Force will be convened to consider issues for the Proposed 2009 Plan.

**Hospice Services – Chapter 13 – pages 253 to 290 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**

Six petitions and related comments were received during the public comment period on the Proposed 2008 Plan. The petitions requested adjusted need determinations for inpatient hospice beds.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 1 from Hospice and Palliative Care Cleveland County (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 1)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for four hospice inpatient beds for Cleveland County. The Committee recommends approval of the petition and that there be a need determination for four inpatient beds for Cleveland County. Four beds is consistent with the deficit identified in the Proposed 2008 Plan.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 2 from Hospice and Palliative Care Center (Forsyth County). (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 2)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for ten hospice inpatient beds for Forsyth County. The Committee recommends approval of the petition and that there be an adjusted need determination for ten inpatient beds in Forsyth County.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 3 from Hospice of Gaston County. (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 3)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination to eliminate the need determination that is in the Proposed 2008 Plan for seven additional hospice inpatient beds in Gaston County. The Committee recommends that the petition be denied.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 4 from Haywood Regional Medical Center Hospice. (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 4)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for six hospice inpatient beds for Haywood County. The Committee recommends approval of the petition and that there be an adjusted need determination for six inpatient beds in Haywood County.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 5 from Johnston Memorial Hospital Authority. (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 5)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination to reduce the need determination for Johnston County to four hospice inpatient beds rather than the eight beds that was in the Proposed 2008 Plan. The Committee recommends approval of the petition and that there be an adjusted need determination for four inpatient beds in Johnston County.

**Petition Inpatient Hospice – 6 from Angel Hospice and Palliative Care . (Please refer to Attachments – Hospice Inpatient and Hospice Inpatient 6)** The petitioner requests an adjusted need determination for six hospice inpatient beds for Macon County. The Committee recommends approval of the petition and that there be an adjusted need determination for six inpatient beds in Macon County.

Ten counties would have need determinations based on the 2008 Plan standard methodology and the above recommended need adjustments. The counties and number of beds are: Brunswick –

7; Cleveland – 4; Forsyth – 10; Gaston – 7; Haywood – 6; Henderson – 7; Johnston – 4; Lincoln – 6; Macon – 6; and, Wilson – 8.

There are no need determinations for additional hospice home care offices anywhere in the State.

The committee recommends the Hospice assumptions, methodologies and need determinations be approved. It is noted that Agency staff will work with the Carolinas Center for Hospice and End of Life Care and the Association for Home and Hospice Care to come up with recommendations for changes in the hospice inpatient methodology for the 2009 Plan.

**End-Stage Renal Disease Dialysis Facilities – Chapter 14 – pages 291 to 296 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**

The Committee reviewed one Petition and related comments regarding the Dialysis Chapter of the Proposed 2008 Plan.

**ESRD Petition from Transylvania County Department of Public Health (Please refer to Attachment – ESRD):** Petitioner requested an adjusted need determination for a new dialysis facility to be located in Transylvania County. The Petitioner noted the rural mountainous nature of Transylvania County and the hazardous travel conditions, particularly in inclement weather. The Committee recommends approval of an adjusted need determination for an 8-station dialysis facility to be located in Transylvania County.

Except for the adjusted need determination recommended in response to the Petition and updating of the inventory and utilization data, the LT&BH Committee recommends no other changes to Chapter 14 for the Final 2008 SMFP.

## Behavioral Health Chapters

**Psychiatric Inpatient Services – Chapter 15 – pages 297 to 306 of the Proposed 2008 Plan.**
The Committee recommends adoption of the final Chapter by the SHCC with any appropriate updates in the narrative and with continued updated inventory or other appropriate data in the Chapter's tables.

The Committee recommends adoption of the revised Policy PSY-2. The revisions clarify the language that was in the Proposed 2008 SMFP. There were no comments or petitions submitted during the public review and comment period related to Policy PSY-2.

There was one petition and two comments for consideration. **The petition was from Appalachian Regional Healthcare System, Boone, N.C.** requesting that the State Health Coordinating Council (SHCC) approve an adjusted need determination for 10 adult psychiatric beds to be included in Chapter 15 of the Final 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan (SMFP). The Committee recommends the adjusted need determination, and the need determination would be for 10 adult inpatient psychiatric beds in Mental Health Planning Area 3 to be included in Chapter 15 of the Final 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan.

**Substance Abuse, Detoxification, Inpatient and Residential Services – Chapter 16 - pages 307 to 316 of the Proposed 2008 Plan**

The Committee recommends adoption of the final Chapter by the SHCC with any appropriate updates in the narrative and with continued updated inventory or other appropriate data in the Chapter's tables. There was one petition and no comments received during the public review and comment period.

**The petition is from Path of Hope, Inc., Lexington, N.C.** requesting that the State Health Coordinating Council (SHCC) approve an adjusted need determination for twelve additional adult chemical dependency (substance abuse) residential treatment beds for the Piedmont Behavioral Healthcare Planning Area, comprising of Cabarrus, Davidson, Rowan, Stanly and Union Counties to be included in the Final 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan (SMFP). The Committee recommends the adjusted need determination, and the need determination would be for twelve adult chemical dependency (substance abuse) residential treatment beds for the Piedmont Behavioral Healthcare Mental Health Planning Area to be included in Chapter 16 of the Final 2008 State Medical Facilities Plan.

**Intermediate Care Facilities for the Mentally Retarded – Chapter 17 - pages 317 to 332 of the Proposed 2008 Plan**

There were no petitions and one comment. The Committee recommends adoption of the final Chapter by the SHCC with any appropriate updates in the narrative and with continued updated inventory or other appropriate data in the Chapter's tables.

**Other**

The committee recommends authorizing staff to update narrative, tables and need determinations as data is received between the committee meeting and the Council meeting.

**TO:** Long Term and Behavioral Health Committee
**FR:** Edward R. Jagnandan
Executive Director, Wilson Housing Authority
**RE:** Clarification to Agency Report to Adult Care Home Petition
**DATE:** September 14, 2007

- We take exception to the standard methodology used to determine bed utilization as it does not take into account other factors that determine the need for long term care. The methodology works against the disabled adult population, living alone, and *under the poverty level*, that are in need of services. We requested that the methodology be reviewed to include other factors affecting need.
- A meeting with Wilson County Social Service Department revealed that the number of empty beds in adult day care is lower than reported by the plan, as it does include family care homes that, due to their size, are not able to provide the type of services required in an adult care home. A 10% vacancy rate in assisted living/nursing home facilities is considered full occupancy in all other states
- Existing adult care homes select the residents they want to admit. Telephone calls were made to all five adult care homes in the City of Wilson and although they had empty beds they were reluctant to admit individuals in wheel-chair, who were incontinent, or suffering from the early stages of Alzheimer's disease.
- Aging in place occurs when individuals are able to remain in the community where they have lived all their lives. That is the case for Continuum of Care Retirement Community where residents need to move from independent units to assisted living units within the same campus. Wilson Housing Authority residents will remain in the same campus, among friends and family members, and will receive services in private units, with private bathrooms, subsidized by the federal government. Adult Day Care homes provide to our residents only shared accommodations with common bathrooms shared by five other residents.
- Cost savings comes from the fact that these residents will avoid premature nursing home admission if given the opportunity to stay in their homes with the required services as well as less hospital admission and emergency room visits with services that will improve their cognitive and physical health.
- North Carolina lags behind other states in the nation that have successfully embraced public housing assisted living models. Numerous precedents exist in other states. We have provided the department with the names and phone numbers of state departments and housing authorities that have implemented this type of project. HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development) and the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) are in the process of signing an agreement to promote this type of projects throughout the U.S. This is a good precedent to set in North Carolina. The Department's concern should be the welfare of the low-income elderly/disabled North Carolinians.
- The physical plant requirement of expanding the corridors from 5' to 6' to comply with the Institutional building code is not possible in Tasman Towers. The Division's Construction Section indicated that the widening of corridors pertain only if the facility admits more than six individuals unable to evacuate on their

own. Wilson Housing Authority will not admit more than six individuals unable to evacuate on their own to their future project.

- Assisted living facilities are "home like" facilities. No 24 hour nursing/medical services are permitted. An individual that needs this higher level of care needs to be transferred to a nursing home – a "healthcare" facility. An assisted living license requires that assistance with activities of daily living, bathing, grooming, eating, transferring, toileting, be provided by unlicensed staff. Nursing oversight is performed by home health care nurses or by a registered nurse under contract. There is no conflict with the licensing requirements in our statement that healthcare services will be contracted out to home health agencies or registered nurses already providing these services.
- Originally, Adult Care Homes were not included in the certificate of need requirement, as is the case in most other states. In most cases, nursing homes, hospitals, acute care facilities, amongst others, are included in a certificate need requirement. Adult Care Homes were included in the certificate of need temporarily until "a finding of a more definitive means of developing and maintaining the quality of adult care homes beds is found". Public Housing assisted living projects represent a new solution to the rising costs and low quality services that the state is faced with today.
- Options given by the department fail to address the need for 24-hour supervision and these options are currently in a moratorium. We have discussed with the department both the Home Option and the Multi-Unit Assisted Housing with Services to find out that no funding is available for these options.

Respectfully, we understand why the industry association is objecting to this type of project since after all they have to represent the interests of their membership. However, we fail to understand the reluctance of the HHS department to test this project that has proven to be so successful in curtailing costs and improving the health and well-being of the poor seniors and disabled adults in most of the states of this nation. We can only conclude that there are other agendas than improving the care of these deserving and often neglected North Carolinians.

The housing Authority firmly believes that this is a moral issue and that our residents deserve better. We hope that the Long Term & Behavioral Health Committee will consider the best interests of these North Carolinians, and approve our petition.

HOSPICE

*Hospice of Davidson County . . .*
*We Make the Difference*

*Ask for us by name – Your Hometown Hospice*

DFS Health Planning
RECEIVED

SEP 07 2007

Medical Facilities
Planning Section

September 5, 2007

Mr. Floyd Cogley, Planner
Medical Facilities Planning Section
Division of Health Services Regulation
2714 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-2714

Dear Mr. Cogley:

Hospice of Davidson County, NC, Inc acknowledges that Kate B. Reynolds Hospice Home in Winston Salem has been instrumental in meeting the needs of terminally patients in and around Forsyth County, however we oppose the approval of the special needs petition for more beds at this time.

Our opposition is based upon the impact expected once our hospice house is completed in 2008 and those being constructed in surrounding counties. Currently, patients from counties adjacent to Forsyth County use the Kate B. Reynolds Hospice House. One the new facilities are constructed, patients will have the option of using several facilities capable of meeting the needs of hospice facility care. Adding additional beds now will not add value but risk creation of occupancy issues.

Ones the facilities currently under construction begin to serve patients, the need for additional beds should be re-evaluated to ensure the needs in our communities are being met.

Sincerely,

Gary M. Drake

Gary M. Drake
Chief Executive Officer
Hospice of Davidson County, NC, Inc