# January 2006 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report

Issued January 3, 2006

Prepared by
Jim Keene, Planner
Medical Facilities Planning Section
Division of Facility Services
NC Department of Health and Human Services

Under the direction of the North Carolina State Health Coordinating Council

For information or copies, contact the Medical Facilities Planning Section Division of Facility Services 2714 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-2714 (919) 855 - 3865 Telephone Number (919) 715 - 4413 FAX Number



The North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.

# END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE DIALYSIS FACILITIES January 2006 Semiannual Dialysis Report

#### Introduction

The 2006 State Medical Facilities Plan requires semiannual determination of need for new dialysis stations in North Carolina. This approach calls for publication of "Semiannual Dialysis Reports" (SDR) during January and July. The 2006 Plan specifies that the Semiannual Dialysis Reports "...will use facility, station and active patient data as of June 30, 2005 for the 'January 2006 SDR,' and as of December 31, 2005 for the 'July 2006 SDR.' A new five-year trend line will be established in the 'July 2006 SDR,' based on validated data as reported to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for the time period ending December 31, 2005." This document is the "January 2006 SDR." It reiterates the methodology and presents need determinations for the Certificate of Need Review beginning April 1, 2006.

## Summary of Dialysis Station Supply and Utilization

For purposes of the Semiannual Dialysis Report, as of December 5, 2005 there were 145 End-Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) dialysis facilities certified and operating in North Carolina (i.e., facilities reporting patient data via the Southeastern Kidney Council), providing a total of 3,360 dialysis stations. Certificates of need had been issued for an additional 174 dialysis stations, but the stations were not yet certified. Another 154 dialysis stations had been requested, but had not completed the certificate of need review and appeals process. The number of facilities per county ranged from zero to twelve.

Utilization data as of June 30, 2005 are presented in the final two columns of Table A. Of the 145 certified facilities operational on that date, 74 were at or above 80% utilization (i.e., operating with at least 3.2 patients per station).

#### **Sources of Data**

#### Inventory Data:

Data on the current number of dialysis facilities and stations were obtained from the Certificate of Need Section and from the Licensure and Certification Section, Division of Facility Services, N. C. Department of Health and Human Services.

#### Dialysis Patient Data:

Data on the dialysis population by county and by facility as of June 30, 2005 were provided by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) through the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. (SEKC) and the Mid-Atlantic Renal Coalition, Inc.

County Data are designed to include all North Carolina residents of each county who are receiving dialysis, regardless of where they are currently being served. The numbers of North Carolina patients being served in North Carolina, Georgia and South Carolina as of June 30, 2005 were provided by the SEKC on November 16, 2005. The SEKC noted that data in their report were based upon information provided to the SEKC by dialysis facilities in Network 6 and were represented to the SEKC as current as of November 11, 2005. The SEKC stated that these data are subject to change (SEKC Disclaimer attached as Appendix A). County totals from the SEKC were supplemented by data from the Mid-Atlantic Renal Coalition indicating the number of patients residing in North Carolina counties and receiving dialysis in Virginia. Data for December 31<sup>st</sup> of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 have been provided by the same sources for the five-year trend analysis.

<u>Facility Data</u> include all patients being served by each provider as of June 30, 2005 regardless of the county or state of each patient's residence. These figures were also provided by the SEKC on November 16, 2005. Again, the SEKC noted that these figures reflect data provided to it by dialysis facilities in Network 6 and were represented to the SEKC as current as of November 11, 2005. The SEKC also stated that these figures are subject to change.

#### Method for Projection of New Dialysis Station Need

The 2006 State Medical Facilities Plan (SMFP) directs the Medical Facilities Planning Section to "...determine need for new dialysis stations two times each calendar year, and...make a report of such determinations available to all who request it." The basic principles, methodology and timeline to be used were specified in the 2006 SMFP and are presented below:

#### Basic Principles

The principles underlying projection of need for additional dialysis stations are as follows:

- 1. Increases in the number of facilities or stations should be done to meet the specific need for either a new facility or an expansion.
- 2. New facilities must have a projected need for at least 10 stations (or 32 patients at 3.2 patients per station) to be cost effective and to assure quality of care.
- 3. The Medical Facilities Planning Section will maintain a list of existing facilities and stations, utilization rates and projected need by county that is up-dated semiannually. Updated projections will be available two times a year on a published schedule. Existing or potential providers interested in expanding in any area of the State may contact the Medical Facilities Planning Section for projected need in the area of interest. (Note: A dialysis station's service area is the dialysis

station planning area in which the dialysis station is located. Except for the Cherokee-Clay-Graham Multi-County Planning Area and the new Avery-Mitchell-Yancey Multi-County Planning Area, each of the 94 remaining counties is a separate dialysis station planning area.)

- 4. Updates of the projections may target counties that have developed sufficient need to warrant consideration for facility expansion or for establishment of a new facility. Actual numbers are not published in the Plan so they can be updated as appropriate by the Medical Facilities Planning Section.
- 5. Home patients will not be included in the determination of need for new stations. Home patients include those that receive hemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis in their home.
- 6. No existing facility may expand unless its utilization is 80% or greater. Any facility at 80% utilization or greater may apply to expand.
- 7. Facilities reporting no patients through the Southeastern Kidney Council for four consecutive Semiannual Dialysis Reports, beginning from March 1997, will be excluded from future inventories.
- 8. Quality of Care: All facilities should comply with Medicare and Medicaid regulations relating to the delivery and certification of ESRD services and with relevant North Carolina statutory provisions. An applicant already involved in the provision of end-stage renal disease services should provide evidence that care of high quality has been provided in the past. The following are considered indicators of quality of care and existing providers proposing to expand their operations should include in their applications data which includes, but is not limited to, the following:
  - a. utilization rates
  - b. morbidity and mortality rates
  - c. numbers of patients that are home trained and patients on home dialysis
  - d. number of patients receiving transplants
  - e. number of patients currently on the transplant waiting list
  - f. hospital admission rates
  - g. conversion rates for patients who have acquired hepatitis or AIDS
- 9. Availability of Manpower and Ancillary/Support Services: The applicant should show evidence of the availability of qualified staff and other health manpower and management for the provision of quality ESRD services as well as the availability of a safe and adequate water supply, provision for treatment of wastewater discharge and a standing electrical service with backup capabilities.

- 10. Patient Access to In-Center ESRD Services: As a means of making ESRD services more accessible to patients, one of the goals of the N. C. Department of Health and Human Services is to minimize patient travel time to and from the center. Therefore,
  - a. End-stage renal disease treatment should be provided in North Carolina such that patients who require renal dialysis are able to be served in a facility no farther than 30 miles from the patients' homes.
  - b. In areas where it is apparent that patients are currently traveling more than 30 miles for in-center dialysis, favorable consideration should be given to proposed new facilities which would serve patients who are farthest away from existing, operational or approved facilities.
- 11. Transplantation Services: Transplantation services should be available to, and a priority for, all ESRD patients whose conditions make them suitable candidates for this treatment. New enrollees should meet with and have access to a transplantation representative to provide patient education and evaluation for transplantation.
- 12. Availability of Dialysis Care: The N. C. State Health Coordinating Council encourages applicants for dialysis stations to provide or arrange for:
  - a. Home training and backup for patients suitable for home dialysis in the ESRD dialysis facility or in a facility that is a reasonable distance from the patient's residence;
  - b. ESRD dialysis service availability at times that do not interfere with ESRD patients' work schedules;
  - c. Services in rural, remote areas.

#### Methodology

Need for new dialysis stations shall be determined as follows:

- (1) County Need (for the January 2006 SDR Using the trend line ending with 12/31/04 data)
  - (A) The average annual rate (%) of change in total number of dialysis patients resident in each county from the end of 2000 to the end of 2004 is multiplied by the county's June 30, 2005 total number of patients in the SDR, and the product is added to each county's most recent total number of patients reported in the SDR. The sum is the county's projected total June 30, 2006 patients.
  - (B) The percent of each county's total patients who were home dialysis patients on June 30, 2005 is multiplied by the county's projected total June 30, 2006 patients, and the

product is subtracted from the county's projected total June 30, 2006 patients. The remainder is the county's projected June 30, 2006 in-center dialysis patients.

- (C) The projected number of each county's June 30, 2006 in-center patients is divided by 3.2. The quotient is the projection of the county's June 30, 2006 in-center dialysis stations.
- (D) From each county's projected number of June 30, 2006 in-center stations is subtracted the county's number of stations certified for Medicare, CON-approved and awaiting certification, awaiting resolution of CON appeals, and the number represented by need determinations in previous State Medical Facilities Plans or Semiannual Dialysis Reports for which CON decisions have not been made. The remainder is the county's June 30, 2006 projected station surplus or deficit.
- (E) If a county's June 30, 2006 projected station deficit is ten or greater and the January SDR shows that utilization of each dialysis facility in the county is 80% or greater, the June 30, 2006 county station need determination is the same as the June 30, 2006 projected station deficit. If a county's June 30, 2006 projected station deficit is less than ten or if the utilization of any dialysis facility in the county is less than 80%, the county's June 30, 2006 station need determination is zero.

#### (2) Facility Need

A dialysis facility located in a county for which the result of the County Need methodology is zero in the current Semiannual Dialysis Report (SDR) is determined to need additional stations to the extent that:

- (A) Its utilization, reported in the current SDR, is 3.2 patients per station or greater.
- (B) Such need, calculated as follows, is reported in an application for a certificate of need:
  - (i) The facility's number of in-center dialysis patients reported in the previous Dialysis Report (SDR<sub>1</sub>) is subtracted from the number of in-center dialysis patients reported in the current SDR (SDR<sub>2</sub>). The difference is multiplied by 2 to project the net in-center change for 1 year. Divide the projected net in-center change for the year by the number of in-center patients from SDR<sub>1</sub> to determine the projected annual growth rate.
  - (ii) The quotient from (2)(B)(i) is divided by 12.
  - (iii) The quotient from (2)(B)(ii) is multiplied by 6 (the number of months from June 30, 2005 until December 31, 2005) for the January 3, 2006 SDR.

- (iv) The product from (2)(B)(iii) is multiplied by the number of the facility's incenter patients reported in the current SDR and that product is added to such reported number of in-center patients.
- (v) The sum from (2)(B)(iv) is divided by 3.2, and from the quotient is subtracted the facility's current number of certified stations as recorded in the current SDR and the number of pending new stations for which a certificate of need has been issued. The remainder is the number of stations needed.
- (C) The facility may apply to expand to meet the need established in (2)(B)(v), up to a maximum of ten stations.

[NOTE: "Rounding" to the nearest whole number is allowed only in Step 1(C) and Step 2(B)(v). In these instances, fractions of 0.5000 or greater shall be rounded to the next highest whole number.]

Unless specific "adjusted need determinations" are recommended by the North Carolina State Health Coordinating Council, an application for a certificate of need for additional dialysis stations can be considered consistent with the need determinations of this Plan only if it demonstrates a need by utilizing one of the methods of determining need outlined in this chapter.

#### Timeline

The schedule for publication of the North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Reports and for receipt of certificate of need applications based on each issue of that report in 2006 shall be as follows:

Data for Period Ending	Due Dates for SEKC Report	Publication of SDR	Application Due Dates for CON Applications	Beginning Review Dates
June 30, 2005	Nov. 12, 2005	January 3, 2006	March 15, 2006	April 1, 2006
Dec. 31, 2005	May 12, 2006	July 3, 2006	September 15, 2006	October 1, 2006

Please be advised that 5:30 p.m. on the specified Application Due Date is the filing deadline for any certificate of need application in response to these dialysis reports. The filing deadline is absolute. This document is the "January 2006 SDR." Applications in response to this report must be received no latger than 5:30 p.m. on March 15, 2006. The filing deadline is absolute.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12/05/05; Utilization Rates Calculated for 6/30/05)

								-				
				unz	× ∟	Stations	s of 12/US	S	Certified	# In-Center E	Othizat	Otilization Kates
ZINDO	PROVIDER	FACILITY	CHA	2000	75	Decision	Decision		Stations	Patients	À	Patients
	NUMBER			Certified	Not Cert. R	Rendered	Pending	TOTAL	9/30/02	6/30/05	Percent	per Station
ALAMANCE	34-2533	BMA of Burlington	Burlington	38	0	0	0	38	38	124	81.6%	3.26
	34-2567	Center	Burlington	27	О	0	0	27	27	75	69.4%	2.78
ALEXANDER								0				
ALLEGHANY								0				
ANSON	34-2560	Dialysis Care of Anson County	Wadesboro	13	0	0	0	13	13	40	76.9%	3.08
ASHE			-					0				
Avery - Mitchell - Yancey	n/a	An adjusted need determination for 9 stations has bee	ions has been approved for this	3-county area in the	2006	SMFP.		6				
BEAUFORT	34-2561	BMA of Pamlico	Washington	25	0	0	٥	25	25	77	77.0%	3.08
BERTIE	34-2547	Windsor Dialysis Unit (BIMA)	Windsor	16	0	0	0	16	16	75	84.4%	3.38
BLADEN	34-2578	Southeastem Dialysis Center, Inc.	Elizabethtown	17	0	0	4	21	17	55	80.9%	3.24
BRUNSWICK	34-2582	Southeastem Dialysis Center, Inc.	Shallotte	18	2	o	0	20	18	59	81.9%	3.28
BUNCOMBE	34-2506	Asheville Kidney Center	Asheville	98	4	F	0		36	133	92.4%	3.69
	34-2626		Swannanoa	10	О	S	0		10	36	97.5%	3.90
	34-2604	_	Weaverville	20	9	0	e-	23	20	63	78.8%	3.15
BURKE	34-2563	BMA of Burke County	Morganton	25	0	0	0		25	70	70.0%	2.80
CABARRUS	34-2519	Metrolina Kidney Center (BMA-Concord)	Concord	30	0	0	0		90	25	47.5%	1.90
	34-2631	Copperfield Dialysis	Concord	10	0	0	မ		10	42	105.0%	4.20
CALDWELL	34-2509	BMA-Lenoir	Lenoir	34	0	0	0	34	34	93	68.4%	2.74
CAMDEN						-		0				
CARTERET	34-2588	Crystal Coast Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Morehead City	20	0	0	0	20	20	90	75.0%	3.00
CASWELL	34-2597	Renal Care Group - Caswell (BMA)	Yanceyville	10	0	0	0	10	10	25	62.5%	2.50
CATAWBA	34-2516	BMA-Hickory	Hickory	30	0	0	3	33	30	115	95.8%	3.83
	34-2635	FMC Catawba Valley Dialysis	Conover	15	0	0	0		15	42	%0:02	2.80
CHATHAM	34-2621	Carolina Dialysis Siler City	Siler City	6	0	0	0		6	30	83.3%	3.33
	34-2617	Carolina Dialysis -Pittsboro	Pittsboro	10	0	0	0	10	10		20.0%	2.00
Cherokee - Clay - Graham	п/а	Smokey Mountains Dialysis Center	Murphy	0	10	0	0	10				
CHOWAN	34-2541	Gambro Healthcare Edenton	Edenton	17	0	0	0	17	17	56	82.4%	3.29
CLAY (Now part of	the Cherokee	CLAY (Now part of the Cherokee - Clay - Graham Multicounty Service Area.)										
CLEVELAND	34-2529	Dialysis Clinic, Inc. (DCI Shelby)	Shelby	36	-10	0	6	35	34	126	95.6%	3.71
	n/a		<b>Boiling Springs</b>	0	10	0	0					
	34-2611	DCI Kings Mountain	Kings Mtn.	12	0	0	0	12	12	32	66.7%	2.67
COLUMBUS	34-2521		Whiteville	21	0	0		6 27	21	74	88.1%	3.52
	34-2628	Chadbourn Dialysis Center	Chadbourn	10	9	0					105.0%	4.20

\* New site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations included with current locations shown above.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12/05/05, Utilization Rates Calculated for 6/30/05)

			00000	Num	Number of Dialysis Stations	ons as of 12/05/05	05/05	Certified	# In-Center	Utilizat	on Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER	FACILITY	CITY		CON Issued Decision	on Decision	น	Stations	Patients	By	Patients
	NUMBER			Certified	Not Cert. Rendered	ed Pending	TOTAL	90/08/9	6/30/05	Percent	per Station
CRAVEN	34-2534	New Bern Dialysis Unit (BMA)	New Bern	39	0	0			118	75.6%	3.03
	34-2585	FMC Craven County	New Bern	53	0	0	0 29		53	45.7%	1.83
CUMBERLAND	34-2510	П	Fayetteville	56	0	0			108	103.8%	4.15
	34-2643		Fayetteville	15	0	0			43	71.7%	2.87
	34-2593	FMC Dialysis Services-North Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	40	0	0		40	123	%6'92	3.08
	34-2601	(BMA)	Fayetteville	88	8	0			136	89.5%	3.58
CURRITUCK		. 1					0	000000			
DARE	34-2598	Dare County/Outer Banks Dialysis Clinic	Nags Head	6	0	0	6 0		26	72.2%	2.89
DAVIDSON	34-2553	Lexington Dialysis Center (WFU)	Lexington	36	0	0		36	104	72.2%	2.89
	34-2639	Thomasville Dialysis Center	Thomasville	10	0	0	0 10		32	80.08	3.20
DAVIE		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					0				
DUPLIN	34-2535	Southeastern Dialysis Center Kenansville	Kenansville	22	Ю	0	0 22		49	55.7%	2.23
	34-2630	Warsaw Dialysis Center (RAI)	Warsaw	14	o	0	14	14	49	87.5%	3.50
DURHAM	34-2302	Duke University Hospital ESRD Unit	Durham	16	0	0			48	75.0%	3.00
	34-2550		Durham	33	0	0			107	81.1%	3.24
	34-2616	Gambro Healthcare Durham-West	Durham	ଛ	0	0			75	93.8%	3.75
	34-2538	Freedom Lake Dialysis Center	Durham	28	0	0			91	87.5%	3.50
	34-2590	West Pettigrew Dialysis Center (FMC)	Durham	21	0	0		20000	59	70.2%	2.81
	34-2615	FMC Dialysis Services of Briggs Avenue	Durham	20	,	0			72	%0.06	3.60
EDGECOMBE	34-2577	Dialysis Care of Edgecombe County	Tarboro	20	0	0			68	85.0%	3.40
	34-2603		Rocky Mount	30	0	0			82	68.3%	2.73
FORSYTH	34-2304		Winston-Salem	4	0	0	0 4	******	2	12.5%	0.50
	34-2505	_	Winston-Salem	53	0	0			163	76.9%	3.08
	34-2612	$\neg$	Winston-Salem	क्ष	0	0			94	69.1%	2.76
	34-2569		Winston-Salem	72	0	0		200	200	69.4%	2.78
FRANKLIN	34-2571	Dialysis Care of Franklin County	Louisburg	22	1	0		22	68	77.3%	3.09
GASTON	34-2513	BMA of Gastonia	Gastonia	39	9-	0	0 33		140	89.7%	3.59
	n/a		Belmont	O	10	0					
	34-2595	BMA of Kings Mountain	Kings Mountain	16	0	0		16	41	64.1%	2.56
GATES	n/a		Gatesville	0	10	0					
GRAHAM (Now p	art of the Ch	(Now part of the Cherokee - Clay - Graham Multicounty Service Area.)									
GRANVILLE	34-2520	FMC Dialysis Serv. Neuse River	Oxford	25	01-	0	7 22	25	94	94.0%	3.76
	e/u	FMC Dialysis Serv. of Oxford *	Oxford	0	10	0					
GREENE	n/a	Greene County Dialysis Center	Snow Hill	0	10	0	0 10				
GUILFORD	34-2537		Greensboro	59	0	0			162	%9'89	2.75
	34-2600		Jamestown	20	11	0			78	97.5%	3.90
	34-2504	Greensboro Kidney Center (BMA)	Greensboro	64	0	0			157	100.6%	4.03
	34-2613		Greensboro	15	10	0 0	22 22		25	95.0%	3.80
	34-2514	7	Greensporo High Point	ह दि	5 6	5 C	8 8	8 6	134	78.0%	3.12
	34-2599	Triad Dialysis Center (WFU)	High Point	18	0	10			54	67.5%	2.70

\* New site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations included with current locations shown above.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12/05/05; Utilization Rates Calculated for 6/30/05)

					1,43		30/30/6137	١	1	1.		Thillipping Dates
		***********		Ž	Number of Dialysis Stations		)/C0/71 10 SE	0	Certified	# In-Center	DEZHIDO	on Kates
COUNTY	PROVIDER	FACILITY	CIL		CON Issued	Decision		*	Stations	Patients	Š	Fatients
	NOMBEK			Certified	/Not Cert.	Kendered	Fending	TO I VE	C0/05/0	c0/06/0	Percent	per Station
HALIFAX	34-2542		Roanoke Rapids	8	5	0	0	35	30	112	93.3%	3.73
	34-2619	FMC Dialysis of Halifax County (BMA)	Scotland Neck	11	0	0	0	11	11	29	65.9%	2.64
HARNETT	34-2557		Dunn	30	-5	0	0	25	30	86	81.7%	3.27
	n/a	Illington *	Lillington	О	10	0	0	10				
HAYWOOD	34-2629		Clyde	13	4	0	0	17	13	46	88.5%	3.54
HENDERSON	34-2564	Hendersonville Dialysis Center, Inc.	Hendersonville	20	0	0	4	24	20	87	108.8%	4.35
HERTFORD	34-2570	Gambro Healthcare Ahoskie	Ahoskie	17	4	0	0	21	17	63	92.6%	3.71
HOKE	34-2579	Dialysis Care of Hoke County	Raeford	32	-10	0	0	22	32	87	68.0%	2.72
HYDE								٥				
IREDELL	34-2527	Statesville Dialysis Center Inc. (WFU)	Statesville	29	0	0	-10	19	29	78	67.2%	2.69
	34-2636	West Iredell Dialysis Center	Statesville	9	3	0	0	13	10	39	97.5%	3.90
	34-2606	Lake Norman Dialysis Center (WFU)	Mooresville	20	0	0	2	22	20	99	85.0%	3.40
JACKSON	34-2556	Sylva Dialysis Center	Sylva	22	4	0	0	18	22	34	38.6%	1.55
JOHNSTON	34-2545	Smithfield Kidney Center (BMA)	Smithfield	13		0	o	19	13	49	94.2%	3.77
	34-2572	3MA)	Smithfield	25		0	0	25	25	71	71.0%	2.84
	n/a		Clayton	0		0	0	10				
JONES	34-2625	of Jones County	Trenton	10	0	0	0	10	10	20	50.0%	2.00
LEE	34-2620	Carolina Dialysis Sanford (UNC)	Sanford	24	4	0	5	33	24	100	104.2%	4.17
I FNOIR	34-2518	-	Kinston	39		0	0	39	39	123	78.8%	3.15
	34-2609	-	Kinston	24		0	0	24	24	73	76.0%	3.04
LINCOLN	34-2568	BMA of Lincolnton	Lincolnton	17	0	0	8	25	17	9	88.2%	3.53
MCDOWELL	34-2645	McDowell Dialysis Center	Marion	6	0	0	3	12	6	34	94.4%	3.78
MACON				000000				0				
MADISON								0			000000	
MARTIN	34-2584	Dialysis Care of Martin County	Williamston	23	0	0	0	23	23	49	53.3%	2.13
MECKLENBURG	34-2554	1	Charlotte	29				29	29		75.0%	3.00
	34-2581		Charlotte	26	0	0	0	8	28	80	76.9%	3.08
	34-2549	_	Charlotte	3				87	52		87.0%	3.48
	34-2306		Charlotte	6				6	6		2000	0.33
	34-2523	Gambro Healthcare South Charlotte	Matthews	1				17	17			3.76
	34-2552	RAI Care Centers - Charlotte	Charlotte	24				24	22		10000	3.00
	34-2591	RAI Care Centers - Mecklenburg/University	Charlotte	20				24	20	68	00000	3.40
	34-2548		Charlotte	29				53	29		333	3.34
	34-2627		Charlotte	16				16	16		22000	3.75
	34-2503		Charlotte	38				46	98		****	3.92
	34-2605	BMA of East Charlotte	Charlotte	3 3				47	3 5	0) 89	85.7%	3.30
	4507-40 0/a	7	Huntersville	ţ C				101	<u>t</u>	P	3	OF:0
	- 4	HUIIGISYIIG DIGIYSIS VOINGE	Humanariila	ì	,	,	?	2				

New site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations included with current location(s) shown above.
 Proposed new site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations shown with Statesville Dialysis Center in Iredell County.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates

(Inventory Compiled 12/05/05; Utilization Rates Calculated for 6/30/05)

			******	Nun	Number of Dialysis S	Stations as of	as of 12/05/05	ပ	Certified 3	# In-Center	Utilizat	Utilization Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER	FACILITY	CITY	ļ 	CON Issued De	Decision   Dec	Decision	S	Stations	Patients	By	Patients
	NUMBER			Certified			Pending TOTAL	_	6/30/05	6/30/05	Percent	per Station
MITCHELL (Now n	art of the Aver	(Now not of the Aven, Mitchell - Yansay Multicounty Senire Ares )		ľ	-	-	_	Ļ		ſ		Γ
MONTGOMERY	34-2583	Dialysis Care of Montgomery County	Biscoe	4	o	c	6	12	15	To	%00	80
		т: г										
MOORE	34-2555	Dialysis Care of Pinehurst (Moore Cnty.)	Pinehurst	33	0	0	0	33	33	126	95.5%	3.82
	34-2638	Southern Pines Dialysis Center	Southern Pines	10	0	0	0	101	10	28	%0.0%	2.80
NASH	34-2517	Rocky Mount Kidney Center (BMA)	Rocky Mount	42	0	0	0	42	42	139	82.7%	334
	34-2644	FMC Dialysis Services of Spring Hope	Spring Hope	10	0	0	0	10	10	14	35.0%	1.40
NEW HANOVER	34-2511		Wilmington	51	-2	0	0	49	51	1691	82.8%	3.31
NORTHAMPTON	34-2586	Rich Square Dialysis Unit (BMA Northampton)	Rich Square	#	0	0	0	4	14	39	%9.69	2.79
ONSLOW	34-2532		Jacksonville	35	0	0	0	35	35	106	75.7%	3.03
ORANGE	34-2622	Carolina Dialysis Carrboro (UNC) (x 34-3503)	Carrboro	36	0	0	0	36	36	87	60.4%	2.42
PAMLICO								0				
PASQUOTANK	34-2515	Gambro Healthcare Elizabeth City	Elizabeth City	16	0	0	0	16	16	62	%6.96	3.88
PENDER	34-2558	34-2558 Southeastern Dialysis Center Inc.	Burgaw	18	0	0	0	18	18	22	79.2%	3.17
PERQUIMANS								0				
PERSON	34-2562	Gambro Healthcare-Roxboro	Roxboro	20	3	0	0	23	20	78	97.5%	3.90
PITT	34-2502	Greenville Dialysis Center (BMA)	Greenville	43	0	0	2	₩ ₩	43	157	91.3%	3.65
	34-2632	1	Ayden	10	0	0	0	10	10	20	20.0%	2.00
	34-2596	FMC Dialysis of East Carolina Univ.	Greenville	38	0	0	0	38	38	118	77.6%	3.11
POLK								-				
RANDOLPH	34-2524	Bio-Medical Applications of Asheboro	Asheboro	27	0	0	0	27	27	78	72.2%	2.89
RICHMOND	34-2539	Dialysis Care of Richmond County	Hamlet	26	0	0	0	26	26	76	88.5%	3.54
ROBESON	34-2528	9	Lumberton	33	5	0	0	38	33	102	77.3%	3.09
	34-2623	$\Box$	Fairmont	15	0	0	0	15	15	50	83.3%	3.33
	34-2607	BMA of Red Springs	Red Springs	20	0	0	0	8	20	25	65.0%	2.60
	n/a	Dialysis Care of Saint Pauls **	St. Pauls	0	10	0	0	휘				
ROCKINGHAM	34-2536	Dialysis Care of Rockingham County	Eden	18	0	0	0	18	18	09	83.3%	3.33
	34-2624	П	Madison	10	0	0	0	10	10	24	%0.09	2.40
	34-2640		Reidsville	18	0	0	0	18	18	49	68.1%	2.72
	34-2641	Rockingham Kidney Center (BMA)	Reidsville	10	0	0	0	5	<b>•</b>	<u> 26</u>	65.0%	2.60
ROWAN	34-2546		Salisbury	22	4	-	0	27	22	88	100.0%	4.00
	34-2592	Dialysis Care of Kannapolis/Rowan	Kannapolis	15	0	0	10	25	15	58	%2'96	3.87
RUTHERFORD	34-2566	Dialysis Care of Rutherford County	Forest City	24	0	0	9	30	24	06	93.8%	3.75
SAMPSON	34-2559	BMA of Clinton	Olinton	39	0	0	0	39	39	115	73.7%	2.95

New site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations included with current location shown above.
 Proposed new site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations is shown with "Dialysis Care of Hoke County" in Hoke County.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12/05/05; Utilization Rates Calculated for 6/30/05)

				E N	<u>ي</u>	Stations a	s of 12/05/	2	Certified	# In-Center	Utilizati	Ottlization Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER	FACILITY	CITY	*******	Issued	Decision	Decision		Stations	Patients	By	Patients
	NUMBER			Certified	Not Cert. Re	Rendered	Pending	TOTAL	9/30/02	9/30/02	Percent	per Station
SCOTLAND	34-2540	BMA of Laurinburg	Laurinburg	56	5	0	3	34	26	108	103.8%	4.15
STANLY	34-2565	BMA of Albemarte	Albemarle	18	0	0	0	18	18	62	86.1%	3.44
STOKES	34-2633	King Dialysis Center	King	1	0	0	0	11	11	25	26.8%	2.27
SURRY	34-2551	Mt. Airy Dialysis Center (WFU)	Mt. Airy	20	0	0	0	20	20	62	77.5%	3.10
	34-2614		Elkin	49	0	o	0	19	19	53	%2.69	2.79
SWAIN	34-2602		Cherokee	14	0	0	0	14	14	51	91.1%	3.64
TRANSYLVANIA								0				
TYRRELL								0				
NOINO	34-2525	Metrolina Kidney Center (BMA Monroe)	Monroe	21	0	0	0	21	21	64	76.2%	3.05
	34-2526	Gambro Healthcare Union County	Мопгое	24	o	0	0	24	24	100	104.2%	4.17
VANCE	34-2543		Henderson	33	-15	0	0	18	33	141	106.8%	4.27
	n/a	Gambro Healthcare-Henderson West *	Henderson	0	17	0	0	17				
WAKE	34-2544	Cary Kidney Center (BMA)	Cary	28	-10	0	٥	18	28	96	85.7%	3.43
	n/a	FMS Dialysis Services of Apex *	Apex	0	10	0	0	10				
	34-2512	Rateigh Clinic Dialysis (BMA)	Raleigh	43	0	0	-1	42	43	186	108.1%	4.33
	34-2646	FMC New Hope Dialysis	Raleigh	20	0	0	10		20	16	20.0%	0.80
	34-2608	BMA of Fuquay Varina	Fuquay-Varina	17	5	0	3		17	63	92.6%	3.71
	34-2589		Zebulon	23	0	ा	^		0	19	88.2%	3.53
	34-2522		Raleigh	47	0	٥			47	179	95.2%	3.81
	e/u	* 83	Raleigh		10	0	0					
	34-2642	- 1		15	0	9	10		15	44	73.3%	2.93
	n/a	Four applications were received in response to	the July 2004 Cou	nty Need L	County Need Determination		5					
WARREN	34-2610	FMC Dialysis Services of Warren Hills	Warrenton	13	0	0	2	15	10	45	112.5%	4.50
WASHINGTON	34-2618	FMC Dialysis Services of Plymouth (BMA)	Plymouth	11	0	0	0	11	11	34	77.3%	3.09
WATAUGA	34-2311		Boone	12	1	0	0	13	12	39	81.3%	3.25
WAYNE	34-2531	Gambro Healthcare-Goldsboro	Goldsboro	25	0	0	0				83.0%	3.32
	34-2587	Gambro Healthcare-Goldsboro South	Goldsboro	21	0	0	0		*****	64	76.2%	3.05
	34-2573		Mount Olive	11	0	0	0	11	11	35	79.5%	3.18
	34-2576	RAI Care Centers - Goldsboro	Goldsboro	11	0	0	0	11	11	30	68.2%	2.73
WILKES	34-2313	3	N. Wilkesboro	10	9	0	0	16	10	43	107.5%	4.30
NOS IIM	34-2507	Gamhro Healthcare-Wilson	Wilson	26	10	o	C			100	96.2%	3.85
	34-2637	<del>Ť</del>	Forest Hills	20	0	0	0	20	20	9		3.00
YADKIN	_							ľ				
	art of the Av	(Now part of the Avery - Mitchell - Yancey Multicounty Service Area,										
						1		▓▁			L	Ī
STATE TOTALS				3,300	1/4	7	147	7,097	3,337	10,700		
The state of the s	CANCELLA LA CASTA CASTA DA		AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSONS ASSESSMENT			Contract Con				AND		

\* Proposed new site composed of existing dialysis stations. Utilization of existing stations included with current location shown above.

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by County

	1881															
i i	28	12/31/2001	12/31/2002	12/31/2003	12/31/2004	Average Annual	6/30/2005	Projected	6/30/2005	6/30/2005	Projected	Projected	Projected 6/30/06	Total	Projected	County
	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Past Five Years	m	Total Patients	Patients	Patients	Home Patients	in-Center Patients	Station Utilization	Stations	or Surplus	Determination
Alamance	166	179	177	180	186	0.029	194	199.7	12	6.2%	12.4	187.3	59	65	Surplus of 6	0
Alexander	22	23	23	21	21	-0.010	21	20.8	3	14.3%	3.0	17.8	9	0	9	0
Alleghany	6	7	6	9	10	0.099	6	6.6	0	%0.0	0.0	6.6	ε	0	8	0
Anson	53	57	29	29	65	0.058	89	72.0	<b>-</b>	1.5%	1.	70.9	22	13	o	0
Ashe	11	œ	12	15	11	0.053	80	8.4	2	25.0%	2.1	6.3	2	0	2	0
Avery *	6	13	12	12	8	600.0	10	10.1	1	10.0%	1.0	9.1	3	6	Surplus of 6	0
Beaufort	06	82	84	06	86	-0.009	88	87.2	14	15.9%	13.9	73.3	23	25	Semplus of 2	0
Bertie	25	20	99		62	0.047	70	73.3	3	7.1%	5.2	68.1	12	16		0
Bladen	22	09	99	25	59	0.022	57	58.2	2	3.5%	2.0			21	Surplus of 3	0
Brunswick	70	99	63	9.2	78	0.033	06	92.9	41	15.6%	14.5	78.5		20		0
Buncombe	184	196	211	234	225	0.057	232	245.3	23	9.6%	24.3	221.0		79	Semples of 10	0
Burke	83	78	77	70	78	-0.012	8	88.9	2	2.6%	4.9	83.9		25		0
Cabamus	152	152	142	131	152	0.004		154.7	17	11.0%	17.1	137.6		46	Serplus of 3	0
Caldwell	86	100	109	119	109	0.030		110.2	12	11.2%	12.4	97.8		34	Surplus of 3	o
Camden	1	15	15	1	-	0.024		9.2	3	33.3%	3.1	6.1		0	L	0
Carteret	35	45	49	61	9	0.151	25	65.6	2	3.5%	2.3	63.3	20	20	0	0
Caswell	34	29	33	38	30	-0.017	26	25.6	4	15.4%	3.9	21.6		10	Surplus of 3	0
Catawba	134		129	145	149	0.029	152	156.4	22	•	22.6	ļ		48	Surplus of 6	0
Chatham	53			45	20	-0.010	52	51.5	3	5.8%	3.0	48.5	15	19	Surplus of 4	0
Cherokee **	13	10			12	0.001	20	20.0	2	1	2.0	18.0		10	Surplus of 4	0
Chowan	35	29	29	32	36	0.014	31	31.4	9		6.1	25.4	8	17	Surplus of 9	0
Clay **	မ	7			2	-0.081	9	5.5	-	16.7%	0.9	4.6	7-	0	-	0
Cleveland	147	151	145		185	0.062	184	195.4	19	10.3%	20.2				Surplus of 2	0
Columbus	104	101	103		103	-0.002	123	122.7	4	3.3%	4.0		37		Samplus of 3	0
Craven	145	153	146		146	0.003			ις.	3.1%	5.0				Surples of 18	0
Cumberland	382	406	408	408	422	0.026		`	37	8.4%	37.9	414.3		135	Surplus of 6	0
Currituck	7	11	15		14	0.223			9	35.3%	7.3		4	0	4	0
Dare	20	17	19	20	27	0.093	30	32.8	5	16.7%	5.5	27.3		6	0	0
Davidson	130	153	136	•	159	0.058		184.1	22	12.6%	23.3	,	47	46	4	0
Davie	19	23			20	0.024			-	5.6%	1.0	17.4		0	5	0
Duplin	104	118		130	129	0.057	121	127.8	7	5.8%	7.4	120.4	38	36		0
Durham	378	391	409		427	0.031	452	466.2	25	5.5%	25.8	440.4		146	Surplus of 8	0
Edgecombe	121	144	166		180	0.107	182	201.4	20	11.0%	22.1	179.3	999		9	0
Forsyth	442	460	7		489				42	8.6%	43.1	7		-	Surplus of 19	0
Franklin	61	69			78	0.067			2	6.0%	5.3	83.2	26	23		0
Gaston	182	182			Ì		210		18	9.0%	19.4	,			2	0
Gates	17	21	24	26	24			27.4	T	4.0%	1.1	26.3	8	10	Surplus of 2	0
Graham **	6	12				0.049			0	0.0%	0.0			_	က	0

\* Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties were grouped as a "multi-county service area" in the 2006 State Medical Facilities Plan.

\*\* Cherokee, Clay and Graham Counties were grouped as a "multi-county service area" in the 2005 State Medical Facilities Plan.

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by County

į	8	15	12/31/2002	8	12/31/2004	Average Annual	6/30/2005	Projected	6/30/2005	6/30/2005	Projected	Projected	Projected 6/30/06	Total	Projected	County
	Patients	Pattents	Patients	Patients	Patients	Change Kate 10r	Patients	Total Patients	Patients	Patients	Home Patients	In-Center Patients	Station Utilization	Stations	I No.	Determination
Granville	74	85	92	96	86	0.074	103	110.6	Ω.	4.9%	5.4	105.2	33	32		0
Greene	23	33	38	39	37	0.140	36	41.1	2	2.6%	2.3	38.8	12	10	2	0
Guilford	280	621	692	714	731	090.0	747	791.9	41	5.5%	43.5	748.5	234	263	Semples of 29	0
Halifax	116	115	129	135	148	0.064	160	170.2	18	11.3%	19.2	151.1	47	46	-	0
Hamett	86	103	107	111	127	0.068	122	130.3	6	7.4%	9.6	120.7	38	35	8	0
Haywood	41	4	45	51	47	0.038	49	50.9	4	8.2%	4.2	46.7	15	17	Surplus of 2	0
Henderson	53	62	71	65	73	0.088	65	7.07	9	9.2%	6.5	64.2	20	24	Surplus of 4	0
Hertford	45	58	62	74	71	0.128	0.2	78.9	7	10.0%	6.7	71.0	22	21		0
Hoke	63	65	99	70	69	0.023		59.4	2	3.4%	2.0	57.3	18	22	Surplus of 4	0
Hyde	10	14	13	10	6	-0.001	6	0.6	0	0.0%		9.0	3	0	3	0
Iredell	149	161	140	148	167	0.034		171.6	15	%0.6	15.5	156.1	49	54	Surplus of 5	0
Jackson	171	20	13	12	11	-0.083	11	10.1	1	9.1%	6.0	9.2	8	18	3	0
Johnston	122	138	155	157	165	0.080		177.0	18	11.0%	19.4	157.6	7	54	1	0
Jones	82	23	24	21	24	0.053			ō	0.0%	0.0	25.3			Surplus of 2	0
Lee	66	96	100	91	06	-0.022		78.2	9	7.5%		72.3				0
Lenoir	170	179	190	179	180	0.016		Ì	6	4.9%		176.7	98		Surplus of 8	0
Lincoln	33	39	38	44	48	0.101			2	3.8%			17	·	Surplus of 8	0
Macon	17	12	15	13	11	-0.083	13	11.9	2	15.4%			8	0	3	0
Madison	7	7	12			0.199			7	9.1%	1.2	12.0		0		0
Martin	89		9/	78		0.020	99	6.79	9	9.1%	6.1	61.2	19	23	Surplus of 4	0
McDowell	28	23	31		31	0.050				5.7%		34.7			10.5	0
Mecklenburg	702		813	870	878	0.058	Ų,	96	71	7.8%	7	890.8		53	Sur	0
Mitchell *	9		7	9	7	-0.015	7	6.9	-	14.3%	1.0	5.9		0	2	0
Montgomery	42	40				0.023			1	2.7%		36.8			Semplus of 2	0
Moore	117	115		112	116	-0.002		125.8	14	11.1%		111.8		43	Surplus of 8	0
Nash	123					0.045			18	11.6%					Surplus of 7	0
New Hanover	r 140			170	167	0.046	176	184.1	27	15.3%		155.9			0	0
Northampton		59	64			0.042			9	9.2%			19			0
Onslow	108			106	106	-0.004		106.5	12	11.2%	11.9	94.6		35	Surples of 5	0
Orange	85	109	103	111		0.065		-	Ŧ	10.1%	11.7	104.4			Sumplus of 3	0
Pamlico	16			17		0.008			0							0
Pasquotank	46	54	24	54		0.085	59	64.0	10	46.9%	10.9				1	0
Pender	61		62			-0.020			7	11.7%			•	Υ.	Assemptes of 2	0
Perquimans	13	12				0.158			2	10.5%	2.3	19.7	9			0
Person	69			6/	82	0.045	98	83.8	8	3.5%			27	23	4	0
Pitt	206	241	262	259		0.065	2	2	19		Ž	26			Sum	0
Polk	18	41	13	16	2	-0.234			1	7.7%					3	0
Randolph	101	104	111	106	97	-0.008	86	97.2	9	5.1%	5.0	92.2		27	2	0

\* Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties were grouped as a "multi-county service area" in the 2006 State Medical Facilities Plan.

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by County

County	Station Need Determination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0			
_	Station Deficit Sta		4	2	Surplus of 10	Sarplas of 19	Surplus of 1	7	0	Surplus of 1	7	Simple of 15	Samplus of 2	9	~	Surplus of 6	4	Sumplus of 35	2	Surplus of 2	Surplus of 5	Surplus of 9	1	4	10	4			
	Available Sta		26	83	56 Sm	52 Sai	7	39	34	18 84	11	39 8	100	0	0	45 Su	35	4		11 S	13 Su	68 Su		46	0	0			
			30	92	46	33	29	41	34	17	13	24	12	9	-	39	39	212	17	6	8	59	17	50	10	4			
Projected 6/30/96	In-Center Station Utilization											i.																	
Projected	6/30/2006 In-Center Patients		95.2	271.5	148.3	106.2	92.5	130.4	108.5	53.9	42.9	6.77	39.9	20.2	4.5	124.0	125.5	679.5	55.1	29.4	27.1	188.5	53.2	160.6	30.7	12.8			
Projected	22		5.3	21.0	8.9	26.3	7.4	3.2	4.7	2.0	2.2						4.0		2.2	3.9	2.2	29.1	4.4	16.7	9.9	1.2			
6/30/2005	% Home Pattents		5.3%	7.2%	5.7%	19.8%	7.4%	2.4%	4.1%	3.6%	4.9%	6.7%	7.7%	13.0%	0.0%	7.8%	3.1%	8.6%	3.9%	11.8%	7.4%	13.4%	7.7%	9.4%	17.6%	8.3%		***************************************	
6/30/200\$	Home Pattents		5	20	6	26	2	3	4		2	5		8	0	101	4	9		4	2	58	4	16	9	7	0		
Projected	6/30/2086 Total Patients		100.6	292.5	157.2	132.5	6.66	133.6	113.2	55.9	45.1	83.4	43.2	23.3	4.5	134.5	129.6	743.7	57.3	33.3	29.3	217.6	57.6	177.3	37.2	14.0			
6/30/2005	Total Patients		g	279	159	131	8	126	. 97	55	41	75	39	23	4	128	129	695	51	34	27	217	52	170	34	12	0		
Average Annual	Change Rate for Past Five Years		0.070	0.048	-0.011	0.011	0.063	090'0	0.167	0.017	0.101	0.112	0.108	0.012	0.125	0.051	0.004	0.070	0.124	-0.020	0.084	0.003	0.108	0.043	0.095	0.167			
12/31/2004	Total Pattents	1	8	267	144	136	85	136	91	52	39	77	39	22	4	121	113	999	52	31	25	227	09	. 161	30	15	161		
12/31/2003	Total Patients		8	253	143	129		134	83	61	34	79	33	19	3	122	125	649	38	39	21	218	99	161	27	13	0		
12/31/2002	Total Pattents	1	75	267	156	119	89	118	63	25	36	73	37	22	3	121	126	621	42	34	26	220	53	160	26	13	0		
12/31/2001	Total Pattents	1	76	255	144	129	69	114	61	59	33	62	44	26	2	105	120	557	38	32	17	239	46	157	19	8	0		
12/31/2000	Total Patients		69	223	152	131	67	108	20	20	27	51	58	22	3	100	112	203	34	35	21	226	40	137	22	6	30		
	COUNTY		Richmond	Robeson	Rockingham	Rowan	Rutherford	Sampson	Scotland	Stanly	Stokes	Sumy	Swain	Transylvania	Tyrrell	Union	Vance	Wake	Warren	Washington	Watauga	Wayne	Wilkes	Wilson	Yadkin	Yancey *	Unknowns		

\* Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties were grouped as a "multi-county service area" in the 2006 State Medical Facilities Plan.

Table C: Need Determinations for New Dialysis Stations by County

(Based on the "County Need" Methodology -- January, 2006)

County	HSA	Number of New Dialysis Stations Needed	Certificate of Need Application Due Date *	Certificate of Need Beginning Review Date
Yadkin	II	10	March 15, 2006	April 1, 2006

<sup>\*</sup> Application Due Dates are absolute deadlines. The filing deadline is 5:30 p.m. on the Application Due Date. The filing deadline is absolute.

# EXCERPT from the "2006 SMFP" Regarding an "Adjusted Need Determination"

In response to a petition submitted to the North Carolina State Health Coordinating Council on behalf of the residents of Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties, the Council has recommended a multi-county service area composed of these three counties, with an adjusted need determination for nine dialysis stations. The adjusted need determination is intended to allow development of a dialysis facility within the multi-county service area in order to minimize travel for dialysis patients over hazardous mountain roads, particularly in adverse weather conditions.

Table 14A: Dialysis Station Adjusted Need Determination \*

(Scheduled for Certificate of Need Review Commencing in 2006)

Service Area	HSA	Number of Dialysis Stations Needed	Certificate of Need Application Due Date **	Certificate of Need Beginning Review Date
Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties	I	9	March 15, 2006	April 1, 2006

Need Determinations for all other counties will be calculated in accordance with the methodologies provided in this Chapter and will be presented in the "North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Reports."

<sup>\*\*</sup> 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).

## Disclaimer

The Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. is a nonprofit organization that contracts with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services for the provision of information-related services with respect to End Stage Renal Disease Network 6. The data in this report are based upon information generated by dialysis facilities in Network 6 and provided by these facilities to the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. The information has been represented to the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. as current as of November 11, 2005. These data are subject to change without notice.

This report is made available by the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. to the Medical Facilities Planning Section, Division of Facility Services, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services ("Department") solely for the Department's use. The Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. takes no responsibility for the use by the Department of this report or the information contained in it for any purpose, including but not limited to any dissemination by the Department of the report or any information in it to other agencies or the public, or any use by the Department of the report or any information in it in preparation of the Department's Semiannual Dialysis Reports or any need determinations for dialysis stations.

While the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. strives for as much accuracy as possible, it expressly disclaims any representations or warranties, whether express or implied, to the Department or any other entity or person regarding the accuracy or reliability for any purpose of the information in this report, including but not limited to any information provided to the Southeastern Kidney Council, Inc. by dialysis facilities.