July 2006 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report

Issued July 3, 2006

Prepared by
Victoria McClanahan, 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 July 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 "July 2006 SDR." It reiterates the methodology and presents need determinations for the Certificate of Need Review beginning October 1, 2006.

Summary of Dialysis Station Supply and Utilization

For purposes of the Semiannual Dialysis Report, as of June 26, 2006 there were 146 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 3,434 dialysis stations. Certificates of need had been issued for an additional 242 dialysis stations, but the stations were not yet certified. Another 94 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 December 31, 2005 are presented in the final two columns of Table A. Of the 145 certified facilities operational on that date, 83 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 December 31, 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 December 31, 2005 were provided by the SEKC on May 15, 2006. 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 May 8, 2006. 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 31st of 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 December 31, 2005 regardless of the county or state of each patient's residence. These figures were also provided by the SEKC on May 15, 2006. 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 May 8, 2006. 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:
 - 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 July 2006 SDR Using a new trend line based on 12/31/05 data)
 - (A) The average annual rate (%) of change in total number of dialysis patients resident in each county from the end of 2001 to the end of 2005 is multiplied by the county's December 31, 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 December 31, 2006 patients.
 - (B) The percent of each county's total patients who were home dialysis patients on December 31, 2005 is multiplied by the county's projected total December 31, 2006 patients, and the product is subtracted from the county's projected total December 31, 2006 patients. The remainder is the county's projected December 31, 2006 in-center dialysis patients.

- (C) The projected number of each county's December 31, 2006 in-center patients is divided by 3.2. The quotient is the projection of the county's December 31, 2006 in-center dialysis stations.
- (D) From each county's projected number of December 31, 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 December 31, 2006 projected station surplus or deficit.
- (E) If a county's December 31, 2006 projected station deficit is ten or greater and the July SDR shows that utilization of each dialysis facility in the county is 80% or greater, the December 31, 2006 county station need determination is the same as the December 31, 2006 projected station deficit. If a county's December 31, 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 December 31, 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 (SDR₁) is subtracted from the number of in-center dialysis patients reported in the current SDR (SDR₂). 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 SDR₁ 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 12 (the number of months from December 31, 2005 until December 31, 2006) for the July 3, 2006 SDR.

 (NOTE: For the July SDR, Steps (ii) and (iii) cancel one another.)

- (iv) The product from (2)(B)(iii) is multiplied by the number of the facility's in-center 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 the 2006 State Medical Facilities 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 "July 2006 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report" and for receipt of certificate of need applications pursuant to this report 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
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 (i.e., September 15, 2006) is the filing deadline for any certificate of need application in response to this report. The filing deadline is absolute.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates
(Inventory Compiled 6/26/06, Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/05)

	**************************************		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	N.	1000	10100100100	Children Control of the Control of t		% -			
VIII WILL	and to the	THE AID TO	į	P.T	≥1⊷	talions as	07/07/0	T		# in-Center [UTILIZATI	Utilization Kates
	FROVIDER	FACILITY	CILY		<u>z</u>				Stations	Patients	Βğ	Patients
	NOWBER			Certified	Not Cert. Rend	Rendered P	Pending TO	TOTAL	12/31/05	12/31/05	Percent	per Station
ALAMANCE	34-2533	BMA of Burlington	Burlington	38	o	-	2	43	38	132	RE RO	7.47
	34-2567	Center	Burlington	27	0	0	0	27	27	99	61.1%	244
ALEXANDER								1		X		
ALLEGHANY						<u> </u>		1				
ANSON	34-2560	Dialysis Care of Anson County	Wadesboro	13	0	0	0	13	13	49	94.2%	3.77
ASHE								0				
Avery - Mitchell - Yancey	n/a	Mayland Dialysis Center	Undetermined	0	0	0	6	65				
BEAUFORT	34-2561	BMA of Pamilco	Washington	25	0	0	0	52	25	71	71.0%	2.84
BERTIE	34-2547	Windsor Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Windsor	16	0	0	0	16	16	51	79.7%	3.19
BLADEN	34-2578	Southeastern Dialysis Center, Inc.	Elizabethtown	17	7	0	0	2	11	57	83.8%	3.35
BRUNSWICK	34-2582	Southeastern Dialysis Center, Inc.	Shallotte	20	0	0	0	28	20	61	76.3%	3.05
BUNCOMBE	34-2506		Asheville	36	5	0	10	41	36	133	92.4%	3.69
	34-2626		Swannanoa	9	5	0	0	15	10	40	100.0%	4.00
	34-2604	Weaverville Dialysis Center	Weaverville	50	9	0	-2	24	20	63	78.8%	3.15
BURKE	34-2563		Morganton	25	lo	0	0	25	25	99	%0.99	2.64
CABARRUS	34-2519	nter (BMA-Concord)	Concord	8	0	0	0	8	30	51	42.5%	1.70
	34-2631		Concord	16	0	0		16	10	45	112.5%	4.50
CALDWELL	34-2509	BMA-Lenoir	Lenoir	34	0	0	0	34	34	92	67.6%	2.71
CAMDEN								0				
CARTERET	34-2588	Crystal Coast Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Morehead City	20	0	0	0	20	20	55	68.8%	2.75
CASWELL	34-2597	Renal Care Group - Caswell (BMA)	Yanceyville	9	0	0	0	10	10	28	70.0%	2.80
CATAWBA	34-2516		Hickory	99	3	0	0	33	30	107	89.2%	3.57
	34-2635	FMC Catawba Valley Dialysis	Conover	15	Jo	0	0	15	15	51	85.0%	3.40
CHATHAM	34-2621		Siler City	6	0	0	0	6	6	34	94.4%	3.78
	34-2617	Carolina Dialysis -Pittsboro	Pittsboro	10	0	0	0	10	10	20	20.0%	2.00
Cherokee - Clay - Graham	n/a	Smokey Mountains Dialysis Center	Murphy	0	10	0	0	10				
CHOWAN	34-2541		Edenton	17	0	0	0	17	17	25	83.8%	3.35
CLAY (Now part of th	he Cherokee - C	CLAY (Now part of the Cherokee - Clay - Graham Mulitcounty Service Area.)										
CLEVELAND	34-2529	Dialysis Clinic, Inc. (DCI Shelby)	Shelby	36	-1	0		35	38	135	93.8%	3.75
	n/a	DCI Boiling Springs **	Boiling Springs	0	10	0	0	10				
	34-2611	DCI Kings Mountain	Kings Mtn.	12	0	0	0	12	12	41	85.4%	3.42
COLUMBUS	34-2521	ler	Whiteville	21	9	0	0	273	21	80	95.2%	3.81
	34-2020	Chadbourn Dialysis Center	Chadbourn	13	Ю	0	4	=	13	46	88.5%	3.54
Little and the second s	***************************************	<u>antenantenantenantenantenantenantananta</u>	\$255566556565656565656565656565656565656	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	\$55935555555555555555555555555555555555	3.151.151.151.15	\$1555156515551555	11111111111	3625465135613	NEW COUNTY		469698668866

** 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 6/26/06; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/05)

						1363636353			l.: -			
	10.00	a Australia de Augusta	į	2	<u> </u>	stations as	01 6/26/06	T		# In-Center	Chilizat	Utilization Rates
Z INOO	PROVIDER	FACILITY	Ë		CON Issued Dec	Decision Da		*****	Stations	Patients	À ,	Patients
	NOMBER			Certified	Cen	-10	Pending 101A	<u>.</u>	12/31/05	12/31/05	Fercent	per Station
CRAVEN	34-2534	New Bern Dialysis Unit (BMA)	New Bern	39	0	0	0	[E	39	96	61.5%	2.46
	34-2585	FMC Craven County	New Bern	29	0	0	0	<u> </u>	62	62	53.4%	2.14
CUMBERLAND	34-2510	Senter Inc. (BMA)	Favetteville	26	0	С	4	Į.	28	117	112 5%	4 50
	34-2643	teville	Fayetteville	15	5	0	0	202	15	53	88.3%	3.53
	34-2593	r (BMA)	Fayetteville	40	0	0	0	64	40	125	78.1%	3.13
	34-2601	FMC Dialysis Services-South Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	46	3	0	0	49	46	148	80.4%	3.22
CURRITUCK								0				
DARE	34-2598	Dare County/Outer Banks Dialysis Clinic	Nags Head	6	0	0	0	6	6	24	66.7%	2.67
DAVIDSON	34-2553		Lexington	36	0	0	0	36	36	105	72.9%	2.92
	34-2639	Thomasville Dialysis Center	Thomasville	10	0	0	2	12	9	32	80.0%	3.20
DAVIE		1 1						0				
DUPLIN	34-2535	Southeastern Dialysis Center Kenansville	Kenansville	22	0	0	8-	14	22	50	56.8%	2.27
	e/u	Wallace Dialysis Center	Wallace	0	0	0	10	10				
	34-2630	Warsaw Dialysis Center (RAI)	Warsaw	14	0	0	0	14	14	50	89.3%	3.57
DURHAM	34-2302	Duke University Hospital ESRD Unit	Durham	16	0	0	0	16	16	51	79.7%	3.19
	34-2550	Durham Dialysis	Durham	33	0	0	0	33	33	110	83.3%	3.33
	34-2616	Durham-West Dialysis	Durham	20	0	0	0	20	20	73	91.3%	3.65
	34-2538		Durham	92	0	0	ō	- I 8	56	8	86.5%	3.46
	34-2590	FMC Dialysis Services of West Pettigrew	Durham	21	3	0	0	77	21	09	71.4%	2.86
	34-2015	FWC Dialysis Services of Briggs Avenue	Dumam	07	,	5	n	77	20	89	65.0%	3.40
EDGECOMBE	34-2577	Dialysis Care of Edgecombe County	Tarboro	20	0	0	5	25	20	99	82.5%	3.30
	34-2603	BMA of East Rocky Mount	Rocky Mount	30	0	0	0	30	30	86	71.7%	2.87
FORSYTH	34-2304	N. C. Baptist Hospitals, Inc.	Winston-Salem	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	12.5%	0.50
	34-2505	Piedmont Dialysis	Winston-Salem	33	0	0	0	အ	53	182	85.8%	3.43
	34-2612	Northside Dialysis Center (WFU)	Winston-Salem	34	0	0	0 0	8	28	102	75.0%	300
	34-2508	Salem Maney Center (VYFU)	vvinston-Salem	77		5	5		7)	203	0.5%	79.7
FRANKLIN	34-2571	Dialysis Care of Franklin County	Louisburg	22	-	0	0	ន	22	61	69.3%	2.77
GASTON	34-2513		Gastonia	39	9-	0	2	35	39	153	98.1%	3.92
	n/a	- Belmont *	Belmont	0	10	0	0	10				
	34-2595		Kings Mountain	16	0	0	0	16	16	37	57.8%	2.31
GATES	n/a	Gambro Healthcare Gates County	Gatesville	0	10	0	0	10				
GRAHAM (Now p	art of the Cherok	(Now part of the Cherokee - Clay - Graham Multicounty Service Area.)										
GRANVILLE	34-2520	FMC Dialysis Serv. Neuse River	Oxford	22	0	0	0	22	22	88	88.0%	3.52
	34-2647	FMC Dialysis Serv. of Oxford *	Oxford	10	0	0	0	10				
GREENE	п/а		Snow Hill	0	10	0	0	10				
GUILFORD	34-2537	BMA of South Greensboro	Greensboro	169	0	0	0	59	59	154	65.3%	2.61
	34-2600	BMA of Southwest Greensboro	Jamestown	31	0	0	0	31	82	78	97.5%	3.90
	34-2504	Kidney Center of Greensboro (BMA)	Greensboro	49	7	0	0	26	49	153	78.1%	3.12
	34-2613	Northwest Greensboro Kidney Center (BMA)	Greensboro	15	10	5	0	52	15	27	95.0%	3.80
	34-2034	Link Doint Kidnay Contor (MEI)	Greensporo	2 5	5 0	3 3	0 0	S C	35 67	8/	00,0%	3.23
	34-2599	Triad Dialysis Center (WFU)	High Point	28	0	0	0	202	720	56	70.0%	2.80
							30000000000000000000000000000000000000					

* 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 6/26/06; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/05)

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 6/26/06; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/05)

	8	u.									l		*****						ſ	T	Ī		Ï	Ï	T	T				1	T		Ä	Ť.	Π		
Utilization Rates	Patients	per Station			2.36	2.88	3.60	3.50	1.30	3.53	3.07	3.31	2.53		4.00	3.50		3.43	3.42	2.60	3.05	383,0343,030	2.89	3.65		3.40	3.20			3.22	2.10	2.28	3.20	3.31	3.47	3.38	2.79
Utilizat	By	Percent			58.9%	72.0%	%0.06	87.5%	32.5%	88.3%	76.8%	82.9%	63.2%		100.0%	87.5%		85.9%	85 50%	65.0%	76.3%	2.00000000000	72.2%	91.3%	760 00	85.0%	%0.08			80.6%	52.5%	26.9%	80.0%	82.7%	86.7%	84.4%	69.9%
# In-Center	Patients	12/31/05			33	95	36	147	13	173	43	116	91	124.30	64	63		79	147	26	116		78	95	3	51	64			58	21	41	32	98	52	81	109
Certified # 1					14	33	10	42	10	49	44	35	36	`	16	18		23	43	10	38	-	27	28	66	15	20			18	10	18	10	26	15	24	39
		TOTAL 1			4	83	2	42	9	64	4	35	36	0	19	16	0	24	48	1	88		27	3		182	16	10	10	18	<u> </u>	18	2	88	25	30	36
f 6/26/06	Decision	-			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	-5		7-	7	0	0		0	6	,	3	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/26/06	sion De				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	_	,	0		0		700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0
Dialysis St	ued Decision				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	-	0	0		0	0		, 0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	-	10	9	0
fumber of	CON Issued														- 10	-						-							-	3		3		100		-	
V		Certified			4	33	10	42	10	94	14	35	36		16	18		23	4		38	441545454	27	3	96		2			18	٢	18	1	2	15	24	36
	CITY			Undetermined	Biscoe	Pinehurst	Southern Pines	Rocky Mount	Spring Hope	Wilmington	Rich Square	Jacksonville	Carrboro		Elizabeth City	Burgaw		Roxboro	Greenville	Ayden	Greenville	(BRISTATE BEST BEST BEST BEST BEST BEST BEST BE	Asheboro	Hamiet	25.555.555.555.555.555.55	Fairmont	Red Springs	St. Pauls	St. Pauls	Eden	Madison	Reidsville	Reidsville	Salisbury	Kannapolis	Forest City	Clinton
	FACILITY		1301131131313131	_	Dialysis Care of Montgomery County	Dialysis Care of Pinehurst (Moore Cnty.)		Rocky Mount Kidney Center (BMA)	be		orthampton)	Southeastern Dialysis Cfr. Jacksonville	Carolina Dialysis Camboro (UNC) (x 34-3503)		Elizabeth City Dialysis	Southeastern Dialysis Center Inc.		Roxboro Dialysis	Greenville Dialveic Center (BMA)		t Carolina Univ.		Bio-Medical Applications of Asheboro			FMC Dialvsis Services of Robeson County			Dialysis Care of Saint Pauls **	Dialysis Care of Rockingham County			Rockingham Kidney Center (BMA)	Dialysis Care of Rowan County	wan		BMA of Clinton
	PROVIDER	NUMBER		t of the Avery -	34-2583	34-2555	34-2638	34-2517	34-2644	34-2511	34-2586	34-2532	34-2622		34-2515	34-2558		34-2562	34-2502	34-2632	34-2596		34-2524	34-2539	24 9500	34-2623	34-2607	n/a	e/u	34-2536	34-2624	34-2640	34-2641	34-2546	34-2592	34-2566	34-2559
	COUNTY			MITCHELL (Now par	MONTGOMERY	MOORE		NASH		NEW HANOVER	NORTHAMPTON	ONSLOW	ORANGE	PAMLICO	PASQUOTANK	PENDER	PERQUIMANS	PERSON	La			ЯICa	RANDOLPH	RICHMOND	S COLUCTION OF THE PARTY OF THE					ROCKINGHAM				ROWAN		RUTHERFORD	SAMPSON

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 is shown with "Dialysis Care of Hoke County" in Hoke County.

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

(Inventory Compiled 6/26/06; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/05)

					335133313333333333	100000000000000000000000000000000000000						
COLINITA	aacuvoaa	HI LOVE	Ž.	R -	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/26/06	is Stations	as of 6/26/0		Certified	# In-Center	Utilizati	Utilization Rates
	NUMBER	FACILITY	Ē	Certified	Not Cert	Decision	Decision	TOTAL	Stations 12/31/05	Patrents 17/31/05	By	Patients ner Station
									100000000000000000000000000000000000000		***	
SCOTLAND	34-2540	BMA of Laurinburg	Laurinburg	31	3	0	0	34	31	115	92.7%	3.74
STANLY	34-2565	BMA of Albernarle	Albemarle	18	0	0	0	18	18	150	84.7%	3.39
STOKES	34-2633	King Dialysis Center	King	Ŧ	0	0	0	11	11	23	52.3%	2.09
SURRY	34-2551	Mt. Airy Dialysis Center (WFU)	Mt. Airv	2	0	6	4	74	2	74	02 F9	3.70
	34-2614	Elkin Dialysis Center (WFU)	Elkin	19	To	0	4	15	4	55	72.4%	2.89
SWAIN	34-2602	Cherokee Dialysis Center	Cherokee	14	0	4	C	18	14	57	101.8%	407
TRANSYLVANIA		With the state of						-			2	
TYRRELL								0				
INION	3030 80	Material Video Control Date Manual		7	335555555555555							
200	34-2526	High Comb Dialveis	Monroe	17	5 0	5 0	5	27	21	104	79.8%	3.19
	п/a	1 =	Marshville	10	50	0	2 2	10	5		200	60.4
VANCE	34-2543	Vance County Dialysis	Henderson	33	151-	-	COLUMN	8,	44	140	108 1%	757
	n/a	Gambro Healthcare-Henderson West*	Henderson	0	17	0	0	17			8	
WAKE	34-2544	Cary Kidney Center (BMA)	700	86	101	C	o accessors	200	00) o o o	500
	n/a	FMS Dialysis Services of Apex *	Anex	3 6	- 5	5 6	n C	101	07	2 -	90.270	5,83
	34-2512	BMA of Raleigh Dialysis	Raleigh	43	7	ō	-15	27	43	166	98 5%	386
	п/а	BMA Central Raleigh *	Raleigh	0	0	0	15	15	0			
	34-2646	FMC New Hope Dialysis	Rafeigh	8	10	0	0	30	20	51	63.8%	2.55
	34-2608	BMA of Fuquay Varina	Fuquay-Varina	17	8	0	0	25	171	64	94.1%	3.76
	34-2589	Zebulon Kidney Center (BMA)	Zebulon	23	7	0	0	30	23	72	78.3%	3.13
	34-2522	Wake Dialysis Clinic	Raleigh	47	0	0	0	47	47	167	88.8%	3.55
	n/a	FMS Dialysis Services of Six Forks *	Raleigh		10	0	0	2				
	34-2642	Southwest Wake County Dialysis	Raleigh	12	0	키	19	25	15	56	93.3%	3.73
	n/a	DaVita Dialysis of Wake Forest	Wake Forest	0	10	0	0	10				
WARREN	34-2610	FMC Dialysis Services of Warren Hills	Warrenton	13	2	0	0	15	13	49	94.2%	3.77
WASHINGTON	34-2618	FMC Dialysis Services of Plymouth (BMA)	Plymouth	11	0	0	0	11	111	32	72.7%	2.91
WATAUGA	34-2311	Watauga Kidney Dialysis Center	Boone	13	0	-	0	14	13	44	84.6%	3.38
WAYNE	34-2531	Goldsboro Dialysis	Goldsboro	25	О	0	0	25	25	94	94.0%	3.76
	34-2587	Goldsboro South Dialysis	Goldsboro	21	0	0	0	21	21	72	85.7%	3.43
	34-2573	Mount Olive Dialysis	Mount Olive	11	0	0	0	11	11	35	79.5%	3.18
	34-2576	RAI Care Centers - Goldsboro	Goldsboro	7	0	0	0	11	11	25	26.8%	2.27
WILKES	34-2313	Wilkes Regional Dialysis Center	N. Wilkesboro	10	9	0	0	16	101	39	97.5%	3.90
WILSON	34-2507	Wilson Dialysis	Wilson	28	0	0	9	31	26	66	95.2%	3,81
	34-2637	Forest Hills Dialysis	Forest Hills	82	0	0	0	20	20	57	71.3%	2.85
YADKIN	n/a	Yadkin Dialysis Center	Yadkinville	0		0	10	10				
YANCEY (Now pa	art of the Avery	(Now part of the Avery - Mitchell - Yancey Multicounty Service Area.)	Undetermined									
STATE TOTALS				3,434	242	20	74	3,770	3,389	10,933		
410 410 410 410 410 410 410 410 410 410												

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

		******	7.77	77777	*****		4437	A44.4.				*****			TIVE		77777	~~~					77777		752777		7577			7.7.						***			::::::	77.55
County	Station Need Determination		0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Projected	Station Deficit		12	5	1	13	2	97	l.	7		8	-12		5	-3	-				-1	0		3	3)	-24	9	4	7	2	7	.3		-2	-43	0	-qu-	-2	4
Total	Available Stations		70	0	0	13	0	6	25	16	21	20	80	25	46	34	0	20	10	48	19	10	17	0	57	44	99	139	0	6	48	0	38	146	55	163	23	61	10	0
Projected 12/31/06	In-Center Station Utilization		58	5	1	26	S	3	24	23	20	28	89	24	41	31	1	18	8	46	18	10	10	3	09	43	44	145	4	8	20	7	35	139	53	150	23		8	4
Projected	12/31/2006 In-Center Patients		185.4	15.1	4.0	82.8	17.3	6.6	78.3	72.1			219.1	78.2	Ļ	0.86	3.5		24.3			32.9		8.3	190.5		141.4	465.2			•	22.5	113.0	443.8	171.2	7	73.7		25.1	
Projected	12/31/2006 Home Patients		16.4	1.9	0.0	2.2	2.5	1.0	16.5	5.5	1.0	16.6	21.9	5.1	13.9	6.1	3.5			22.2	5.2	4.1	6.3		19.3		8.0	7	5.7		7	2.0	10.1	18.6	23.4	50.4	3.1			0.0
12/31/2005	% Home Patients		8.1%	11.1%	0.0%	2.6%	12.5%	9.1%	17.4%	7.0%	1.6%	15.6%	9.1%	6.1%	9.6%	5.8%	50.0%	3.6%	17.2%	13.2%	8.2%	11.1%	17.1%	0.0%	9.2%	3.0%	5.3%	8.6%	29.4%	18.5%	14.6%	8.3%	8.2%	4.0%	12.0%	9.5%	4.0%	11.2%	4.0%	%0.0
12/31/2005	Home Patients		16	2	0	2	2	Ţ	16	5	1	15	21	5	14	9	4	2	5	21	5	3	9	0	18	4	8	42	ຜ	ς,	26	2	10	18	22	49	8	24	+	0
Projected	12/31/2606 Total Patients		201.8	17.0	4.0	85.0	19.8	10.9	94.8	77.6	64.0	106.0	241.0	83.3	145.2	104.1	6.9	59.5	29.3	168.0	63.4	37.0	36.8	8.3	209.7	143.4	149.4	509.2	19.3			24.5	123.1		194.6	14,7		7		13.5
Average Annual	Change Rate for Past Five Years		0.025	-0.057	0.005	0.089	0.234	600.0-	0:030	0.093	0.016	0.104	0.043	0.015	-0.006	0.011	-0.135	0.063	0.011	0.057	0.040	0.371	0.050	0.377	0.070	0.078	-0.004	0.048	0.134	0.130	0.044	0.021	0.009	0.035	0.063	0.029	0.024	0.043	0.048	0.040
12/31/2005	Total Patients		197	18	4	78	16	11	35	71	63	96	231	82	146	103	8	56	29	159	61	27	35	9	196	133	150	486	17	27	178	24	122	447	183	515	22	215	25	13
12/31/2004	Total Patients		186	21	10	65	11	80	98	62	29	82	225	78	152	109	11	09	30	149	20	12	36	2	185	103	146	422	14	27	159	20	129	427	180	489	78	199	24	10
12/31/2003	Total Patients		180	21	9	59	15	12	90	56	22	76	234	70	131	119	11	61	38	145	45	14	32	6	169	100	152	408	17	20	139	23	130	435	168	501	84	202	26	6
12/31/2002	Total Patients		177	23	6	29	12	12	84	99	65	63	211	77	142	109	15	49	33	129	52	13	29	6	145	103	146	408	15	19	136	26	124	409	166	482	77	194	24	6
12/31/2001	Total Patients		179	23	2	25	80	13	82	20	09	99	196	7.8	152	100	15	45	29	128	ফ্র	9	29	7	151	101	153	406	11	17	153	23	118	391	144	460	69	182	21	12
	COUNTY		Alamance	Alexander	Alleghany	Anson	Ashe	Avery *	Beaufort	Bertie	Bladen	Brunswick	Buncombe	Burke	Cabarrus	Caldwell	Camden	Carteret	Caswell	Catawba	Chatham	Cherokee **	Chowan	Clay **	Cleveland	Columbus	Craven	Cumberland	Currituck	Dare	Davidson	Davie	Duplin	Durham	Edgecombe	Forsyth	Franklin	Gaston	Gates	Graham **

* 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

1		Ü	 	T	1	T	T	Ť	T	T		Ť	Ť	T	Ť	Ť	Ť	····	i i	T	Ť	T T	T	T	T	T	13. <u>13.</u>	T	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	T	<u> </u>	T	: <u></u>	T		r i	···········	ï	ä
County	Station Need Determination		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ò	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Projected	Station Deficit or Surplus		-	0	- 32	9	-	2.	7	-		2	33	-13	72	-2	9=	67	8	4	4	Ą	0	4	2	8		*	4	5	15	9	5	-2	2	9	3	61-	7	
Total	Available Stations	٦.	32	10	268	46	35	17	24	21	22	0	Z			10	31	63	25	0	0	23	11	300	0	14	43	52	49	14	35	36	0	19	16	0	24	96	0	,
Projected 12/31/06	In-Center Station Utilization		34	10	236	52	36	15	21	22	20	2	51	S	47	8	25	54	17	4	4	18	-	296	2	1-1	42	48	53	19	34	31	5	17	18	9	27	77	7	-
Projected	12/31/2006 In-Center Patients		97.6	30.5	753.8	166.9	115.6	48.5	68.4	71.9	63.7	4.9	162.9	17.5	150.9	25.6	81.0	172.9	54.6	14.4	14.4	. 57.0	35.4	946.3	9.9			153.4	169.3	60.3	110.3	8.66	16.6		58.9	20.8	2.98	,	21.0	
Projected	Home Patients		6.3	5.1	4.74	22.1	9.4	4.2	10.5	9.7	5.1	0.0	15.4	1.0	16.7	0.0	8.9	10.1		3.3		£12	6.9	76.8	0.9		15.8		27.5	4.1		13.1		11.4		2.3	4.2	22.5	0.0	
12/31/2005	% Home Patients		6.0%	14.3%	5.9%	11.7%	7.5%	8.0%	13.3%	11.8%	7.4%	0.0%	8.6%	5.6%	6.6%	0.0%	6.6%	5.5%	9.1%	18.8%	7.7%	11.9%	16.2%	7.5%	12.5%	0.0%	10.6%	10.5%	14.0%	6.3%	9.2%	11.6%	0.0%	17.7%	12.1%	10.0%	4.7%	8.4%	0.0%	
12/31/2005	Home	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	9	5	45	20	ტ	4	2	6	5	0	15	-	16	0	6	10	5	3	1	8	9	72	1	0	15	17	26	4	11	13	0	11	8	2	4	22	0	
Projected	Total Patients		104.2	35.6		189.0	125.0		79.0	81.6	8.89	4.9	-	18.6		25.6			60.1			64.8		1023.1					`	64.4		113.0		64.3		23.1			21.0	
Average Annual	Change Rafe for Past Five Years		0.042	0.018	0.053	0.105	0.041	0.054	0.053	0.073	0.012	-0.184	0.024	0.032	0.041	0.026	-0.012	0.005	0.092	0.104	0.199	-0.033	0.143	0.067	-0.063	-0.020	0.056	0.058	0.058	0.023	0.022	0.009	0.039	0.038	0.016	0.155	0.057	0.022	0.905	
12/31/2005	Patients		100	35	761	171	120	50	75	92	99	9	174	18	161	25	91	182	55	16	13	29	37	929	8	35	141	162	186	63	119	112	16	62	99	20	98	262	T	
12/31/2004	Patients		98	37	731	148	127	47	73	71	69	6	167	7	165	24	8	180	48	11	13	73	31	878	7	45	116	145	167	29	106	106	16	63	56	22	82	263	2	-
12/31/2003	Patients		96	39	714	135	111	51	65	74	2	10	148	12	157	21	8	179	4	13	12	78	92	870	9	37	112	128	2	25	106	111	4	25	57	17	62	259	16	
78	Patients		92	38	692	129	107	45	71	62	99	13	140	13	155	24	8	190	38	15	12	76	31	813	7	37	112	139	154	64	165	133	4	25	62	12	76	262	13	
12/31/2001	Patients		85	33	621	115	103	41	62	58	92	14	161	20	138	23	98	179	39	12	7	2	23	742	12	\$	115	131	149	29	110	9	4	22	63	12	69	241	17	
ALAIOS			Granville	Greene	Guilford	Halifax	Hamett	Haywood	Henderson	Hertford	Hoke	Hyde	Iredell	Jackson	Johnston	Jones	Lee	Lenoir	Lincoln	Macon	Madison	Martin	McDowell	Mecklenburg	Mitchell *	Montgomery	Moore	Nash	New Hanover	Northampton	Onslow	Orange	Pamilco	Pasquotank	Pender	Perquimans	Person	Pitt	Pok	

* 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

*****			 ****	*****						****				****													····	 	~
	Stephon Nand	Determination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		13	
	Chatton Deficit	or Surplus	1	9	- 10	.20	-2	τ-	0	-1	3	11-	-5	9	ဗ	0	9	-28	2	-2	- 2	-4	-2	-2	2	4			
	Aveilable	Stations	32	98	999	53	30	39	34	18	11	36	18	0	0	45	35	256	15	11	14	68	16	51	10	0			
	In-Canter	Station Utilization	33	85	46	33	28	40	34	17	14	28	13	9	3	45	41	228	17	6	6	64	14	49	12	4			
+	12/31/2006	5	104.0	294.5	146.8	106.2	89.6	127.1	110.2	53.5	43.7	88.1	40.2	18.2	8.4	144.9	130.6	730.7	55.0	29.7	29.0	203.3	45.1	157.4	36.8	12.8			
	12/1/2006	13	8.7	25.2	10.2	29.3	10.8	6.2		2.0		5.4		1.9	14	8.7	5.1	71.0		5.1	3.5	24.8	5.1	17.4	7.1	2.3			
3000	W. Home	Patients	7.7%	7.9%	6.5%	21.6%	10.8%	4.7%	3.0%	3.6%	2.4%	2.8%	7.0%	9.5%	14.3%	9.6%	3.8%	8.9%	5.7%	14.7%	10.7%	10.9%	10.2%	%6'6	16.2%	15.4%		8.7%	
	Hama	Patients	8	24	10	29	10	9	3	2	1	5	က	2	Ţ	8	5	99	3	5	3	25	5	47	9	7	E	1,041	
	19/41/2006	Total Patients	112.7	319.7	156.9	135.5	100.4	133.3	113.6	55.5	44.7	93.6	43.2	20.1	9.8	153.6	135.8	801.8	58.3	34.9	32.5	228.0	50.2	174.7	43.9	15.1			
	Change Rate for	·····	0.084	0.048	0.019	0.012	0.079	0.034	0.136	-0.009	0.065	0.088	0.004	-0.044	0.396	0.082	0.029	0.076	660.0	0.025	0.162	-0.009	0.024	0.022	0.188	0.161			
20000	Total	Patients	104	305	154	134	93	129	100	56	42	98	43	21	7	142	132	745	53	34	28	230	49	171	37	13	17	12,029	
2000	Total	Patients	06	267	144	136	85	136	91	25	39	111	39	22	4	121	113	999	52	31	25	227	09	161	30	15	161	11,417	
200174041	Total	Patients	80	253	143	129	8/	134	83	61	Þ E	62	33	61	ε	122	125	649	38		21	218	99	161	27		0	11,010	
40001011	Total	Patients	75	267	156	119	89	118	69	57	98	73	37	22	ε	121		621	42	34	26	220	83	160	26	13	0	10,702	
.000	Total	Patients	9.2	255	144	129	69	114	61	59	33	62	44	26	2	105	120	557	38	32	17	239	46	157	19	8	0	10,225	
	COMPLY	}	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	State Totals	

* 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 -- July, 2006)

County	HSA	Number of New Dialysis Stations Needed	Certificate of Need Application Due Date *	Certificate of Need Beginning Review Date
Anson	V	13	Septermber 15, 2006	October 1, 2006

^{*} Application Due Dates are absolute deadlines. The filing deadline is 5:30 p.m. on the Application Due Date. The filing deadline is absolute.

SEKC 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 May 8, 2006. 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.