



Technology & Equipment Committee Minutes

DRAFT September 8, 2010

10:00 am – 12 Noon

Council Building – Conference Room 201

Medical Facilities Planning

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Christopher Ullrich, Dr. Richard Bruch, Dr. Dennis Clements, Mr. Harold Hart, Mr. Laurence Hinsdale , Dr. Eric Janis, Dr. William McMillan, The Honorable William Wainwright
MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. John Holt, Jr.
MFPS Staff Present: Carol Potter, Patrick Baker, Kelli Fisk
DHSR Staff Present: Drexdal Pratt, Elizabeth Brown, Craig Smith, Martha Frisone, Angie Matthes

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
Welcome & Introductions	Dr. Ullrich welcomed members, staff and visitors. He stated the meeting was open to the public, but that the meeting did not include a public hearing. Discussion would be limited to Committee members and staff, unless questions were directed specifically to someone in the audience.		
Review of Executive Order No. 10: Ethical Standards for the State Health Coordinating Council	<p>Dr. Ullrich reviewed with Committee members Executive Order No.10 and the “Ethical Standards for the State Health Coordinating Council” guide. Dr. Ullrich asked members to introduce themselves and to state if there were any additional professional, institutional interest, or financial benefit they may derive from any matter on the agenda.</p> <p>Mr. Lawrence Hinsdale stated that should a vote come forth regarding the neo pet, LLC petition, he would recuse himself from voting. There were no other recusals.</p>		
Approval of minutes from the May 12, 2010 Committee Meeting	Motion to approve the minutes.	Dr. McMillan Dr. Janis	Minutes approved
Lithotripsy Section of the 2011 SMFP	Dr. Ullrich reviewed the Lithotripsy section of the 2011 Plan with Committee members, and reported that the Council received no petitions or comments over the summer regarding the Lithotripsy section of the 2011 SMFP. Dr. Potter reported that there were no substantive data updates thus far, and that the standard methodology continued to indicate no need for additional lithotripters in the state.		
Recommendations to the Council regarding the Lithotripsy Section	A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Lithotripsy portion of the 2011 SMFP.	Dr. Clements Mr. Hart	Motion unanimously approved
Linear Accelerator Section of the 2011 SMFP	The Council received no petitions or comments over the summer regarding the Linear Accelerator section of the 2011 SMFP. The Committee reviewed the linear accelerator draft tables and noted that there are no need		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
Recommendations to the Council regarding the Linear Accelerator Section	<p>determinations for additional linear accelerators anywhere in the state.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to adopt the linear accelerator section of the 2011 SMFP.</p>	Mr. Hinsdale Dr. McMillan	Motion unanimously approved
<p>Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Scanner Section of the 2011 SMFP</p> <p>Committee Review and Discussion of PET Scanner Petition/Agency Report/Comments</p> <p>Recommendations to the Council regarding PET Scanner Section</p>	<p>Dr. Ullrich reviewed the PET Scanner portion of the 2011 Plan with Committee members. Dr. Ullrich reported that the Council received one petition over the summer from neo pet, LLC.</p> <p>Petition: neo pet, LLC (the official company name is not capitalized) requested an adjusted need determination for one mobile PET scanner for the western region of the state.</p> <p>Agency Recommendation: The Agency concluded that there is sufficient combined fixed and mobile PET service capacity in western North Carolina, and recommended that the petition be denied.</p> <p>The Committee discussed aspects of the petition, including issues in the western part of the state regarding bad weather in winter. The Committee noted the availability of PET services in the western region of the state. A motion was made and seconded to accept the agency recommendation to deny the petition.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed and discussed the PET scanners draft tables and noted that there are no need determinations for additional PET scanners anywhere in the state. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the PET Scanner section of the 2011 SMFP.</p>	<p>Dr. McMillan Dr. Clements</p> <p>Dr. Janis Mr. Hart</p>	<p>Motion unanimously approved. Mr. Hinsdale recused himself from voting.</p> <p>Motion unanimously approved</p>
<p>Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Section of the 2011 SMFP</p> <p>Committee Review and Discussion of MRI Petition/Agency Report/Comments</p>	<p>Dr. Ullrich reviewed the MRI section of the 2011 SMFP with Committee members. Dr. Ullrich reported that the Council received one petition over the summer regarding the MRI section of the 2011 SMFP.</p> <p>Petition: Southeastern Orthopaedic Specialists, P.A. (SOS) requested an adjusted need determination for a fixed MRI scanner in Guilford County for the 2011 SMFP.</p> <p>Agency Recommendation: The standard methodology indicates that the 0.90 fixed equivalency for the mobile procedures performed at SOS, and the 1.00 placeholder for the 2009 SMFP need determination should be included in the 2011 SMFP, resulting in no need determination for a fixed MRI scanner in Guilford County. After thorough consideration and analysis, the Agency recommended that the petition be denied.</p>		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
Recommendations to the Council regarding MRI Section	<p>The Committee considered information about the petition, including the volume of mobile MRI procedures performed at SOS, and that the mobile MRI equipment serving SOS is a grandfathered unit belonging to Alliance Healthcare. The Committee concluded that there are not sufficiently unique circumstances in Guilford County to warrant an adjusted need determination for a fixed MRI scanner. A motion was made and seconded to accept the agency recommendation and deny the petition.</p> <p>Comments Received: The Committee acknowledged receipt of comments in support of language in the Proposed 2011 SMFP regarding no need determination for additional mobile MRI scanners in the state.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed tables for MRI scanners, and noted that there is a need determination for a fixed MRI scanner each in Gaston, Pitt-Greene-Hyde and Mecklenburg service areas, and no need for additional mobile MRI scanners anywhere in the state. A motion was made and seconded to accept the MRI section of the 2011 Plan.</p>	<p>Dr. McMillan Mr. Hart</p> <p>Dr. Bruch Mr. Hart</p>	<p>Vote was 5-1 to deny the petition</p> <p>Motion unanimously approved</p>
<p>Cardiac Catheterization Equipment Section of the 2011 SMFP</p> <p>Committee Review and Discussion of Cardiac Catheterization Equipment Petition/Agency Report/Comments</p>	<p>Dr. Ullrich reviewed the cardiac catheterization equipment section of the 2011 SMFP with Committee members. Dr. Ullrich reported that the Council received one petition over the summer regarding the cardiac catheterization equipment section of the 2011 SMFP.</p> <p>Petition: Central Carolina Hospital requested an adjusted need determination for shared fixed cardiac catheterization equipment for Lee County for the 2011 SMFP.</p> <p>Agency Recommendation: The agency report discussed the volume of mobile cardiac catheterization procedures provided in Lee County, which, though increasing, does not meet the criterion established through the standard methodology. Since 2007, the volumes have fluctuated from a low of 33 to the 2009 number of 174 procedures. Given the variability in volumes and in support of the standard methodology, the Agency recommended denial of this petition.</p> <p>The Committee considered and discussed the petition and the Agency recommendation to deny the petition. Committee members learned additional information from the petitioner during the Committee meeting, and decided that sufficiently unique circumstances exist in Lee County to warrant an adjusted need determination for one unit of shared fixed cardiac</p>		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
	<p>catheterization equipment.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to reject the agency’s recommendation and approve the petition.</p> <p>The Committee reviewed the cardiac catheterization section and noted that there are no need determinations, other than the adjusted need determination for Lee County, for cardiac catheterization equipment anywhere else in the state.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Cardiac Catheterization Equipment portion of the 2011 Plan.</p>	<p>Dr. Bruch Dr. Janis</p> <p>Dr. McMillan Dr. Janis</p>	<p>Vote was 5-1, motion carries to approve the petition</p> <p>Motion unanimously approved</p>
<p>Gamma Knife Section of the 2011 SMFP</p> <p>Recommendations to the Council regarding the Gamma Knife Section</p>	<p>Dr. Ullrich reviewed the Gamma Knife section of the 2011 Plan with Committee members, and reported that the Council received no petitions over the summer regarding the Gamma Knife section of the 2011 SMFP. Dr. Potter reported that there were no substantive data updates, and that the standard methodology continued to indicate no need for additional gamma knives in the state.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Gamma Knife section of the 2011 SMFP.</p>	 <p>Dr. McMillan Mr. Hart</p>	 <p>Motion unanimously approved</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<p>A motion was made and seconded to forward the entire set of Technology and Equipment Committee recommendations to the full SHCC for consideration at its October 6, 2010 meeting.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded authorizing staff to make updates and corrections to the data and tables as indicated.</p> <p>Dr. Ullrich announced that meetings for the Technology and Equipment Committee for 2011 are scheduled for April 20, May 11 and September 7. Dr. Ullrich also reminded members and the audience that the October 6, 2010 SHCC meeting would be held at the Holiday Inn Brownstone - Downtown beginning at 10:00 am.</p>	<p>Mr. Hart Dr. Janis</p> <p>Dr. Bruch Mr. Hinsdale</p>	<p>Motion unanimously approved</p> <p>Motion unanimously approved</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>There was no other business brought before the Committee. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.</p>		<p>Meeting adjourned</p>