

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
CERTIFICATE OF NEED

PUBLIC HEARING
REVIEW STANDARDS FOR UESWL SERVICES/UNITS, PB AND SERVICES, CC
SERVICES AND OHS SERVICES

BEFORE ANDREA MOORE, DEPARTMENT TECHNICIAN TO CON COMMISSION
201 Townsend Street, Lansing, Michigan
Wednesday, October 31, 2007, 9:00 a.m.

RECORDED BY: Rebecca A. Alexander, CER 4233
Certified Electronic Recorder
Network Reporting Corporation
1-800-632-2720

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2		PAGE
3		
	Statement by Ms. Moore.	3
4	Statement by Mr. McCafferty	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Lansing, Michigan

2 Wednesday, October 31, 2007 - 9:01 a.m.

3 MS. MOORE: Good morning. As many of you know, I
4 am Andrea Moore, Department Tech to the Certificate of Need
5 Commission from the Certificate of Need Policy Section of
6 the Department of Community Health. Chairperson Norma
7 Hagenow has directed the Department to conduct today's
8 hearing.

9 Please be sure that you have completed the sign-in
10 log. Copies of the Standards and comment cards can be found
11 on the back table with the sign-in log. A comment card
12 needs to be completed if you wish to provide testimony.

13 The proposed CON Review Standards for Litho
14 Services and Units are being reviewed and modified to
15 include, but not limited to the following:

- 16 1. Additional language to allow for acquisition of
17 units or services.
- 18 2. Added language to allow for relocation of a unit
19 or a service.
- 20 3. Developed separate definitions for "replace" and
21 "upgrade."
- 22 4. Clarifying language to reflect that only MIDB data
23 can be used for projections in initiation.
- 24 5. Additional language for initiation of a mobile
25 litho service to require that 100 procedures must

1 be projected in each region in which the proposed
2 mobile service is proposed to operate.

3 6. Elimination of the comprehensive kidney stone
4 treatment center and all references as it is no
5 longer necessary.

6 7. And additional technical changes.

7 The proposed CON Review Standards for Psychiatric Beds and
8 Services are being reviewed and modified to include but not
9 limited to:

- 10 1. Bed Need Methodology will be maintained and
11 calculated every two years to determine the
12 overall planning area need with an adjustment for
13 low occupancy facilities.
- 14 2. The adult planning areas have been modified from
15 the Community Mental Health borders to the health
16 service area boundaries.
- 17 3. Modification of the minimum average annual
18 occupancy rate within the project delivery
19 requirements for adult beds from 85 to 60 percent.
20 If a facility's average occupancy falls below 60
21 percent, the facility must decrease the number of
22 beds, not to be less than 10 beds, to bring its
23 annual average occupancy to 60 percent.
- 24 4. Modification of the minimum annual average
25 occupancy rate with the project delivery

1 requirement for child/adolescent beds from 75
2 percent to 40 percent. If a facility's average
3 occupancy falls below 40 percent, the facility
4 must decrease its number of beds, not to be less
5 than 10 beds, to bring its annual average
6 occupancy to 40 percent.

7 5. There was the addition of a high occupancy
8 provision that will allow expansion outside of the
9 bed need.

10 6. The replacement zone was increased to 15 miles
11 within the planning area.

12 7. The minimum number of beds in a psychiatric unit
13 will be 10 beds.

14 8. The 1 bed for 20 rule will be changed to 1 bed for
15 10 rule if the bed need is 9 beds or less in a
16 planning area.

17 9. To increase beds at a facility utilizing beds in
18 the inventory, the facility shall have at least 70
19 percent average occupancy for the previous two
20 years.

21 10. And additional technical changes and updates.

22 The proposed CON Review Standards for Cardiac Cath Services
23 are being reviewed and modified to include but limited to:

24 1. Facilities providing Cardiac Cath Services in
25 Michigan will be required to participate in the

- 1 American College of Cardiology National
2 Cardiovascular Data Registry.
- 3 2. Elimination of physician volume requirements for
4 adult diagnostic cardiac cath services.
- 5 3. Institutional volumes shall be minimum of 600
6 procedure equivalents in the category of pediatric
7 cardiac catheters to be performed annually.
- 8 4. Modifications in computing cardiac cath
9 equivalents, procedures and weights.
- 10 5. Cardiac permanent pacemaker/ICD device
11 implantations will be performed in diagnostic
12 cardiac cath laboratories in hospitals that do not
13 provide therapeutic cardiac cath services.
- 14 6. There was a revision to the definition of
15 "replace" and "upgrade."
- 16 7. The requirement for facilities proposing to
17 initiate a pediatric cardiac cath service must
18 meet the guidelines of American Academy of
19 Pediatrics for Pediatric Cardiovascular Centers,
20 March of 2002.
- 21 8. The definition of "Intra-Vascular Catheterization"
22 within Section 11, Methodology for Computing
23 Equivalents, Procedures and Weights.
- 24 9. And additional technical changes.

25 The proposed Review Standards for Open Heart Services are

1 being reviewed and modified to include but not limited to
2 the following:

- 3 1. Facilities providing open heart surgery services
4 in Michigan will be required to participate in the
5 Society of Thoracic Surgeons, STS, database and
6 the program's statewide auditing.
- 7 2. The ICD-9 Code groups and weights have been
8 updated.
- 9 3. Replaced the word "procedure" with the word
10 "cases" for count purposes, as any given case
11 could possibly involve multiple procedures.
- 12 4. Each physician credentialed by an applicant
13 hospital to perform adult open heart surgery cases
14 shall perform a minimum of 75 adult open heart
15 surgery cases per year. This is a revision from
16 50.
- 17 5. Consulting hospitals will be required to perform a
18 minimum of 400 cases per year for at least three
19 consecutive years. This was an increase from 350.
- 20 6. Once MIDB has been committed to support a CON
21 application for open heart surgery services, it
22 shall not be recommitted. After seven years, only
23 the incremental increase in the MIDB data could be
24 committed to support a CON application for open
25 heart surgery services. Additionally, if the

1 hospital committing data have experienced growth
2 in their own program and wish to initiate an open
3 heart service program, the hospital may use all of
4 its MIDB data, including previously committed
5 data, to support their own CON application and
6 meet initiation volume requirements.

7 7. Clarification of the adult and pediatric open
8 heart surgery definitions.

9 8. And additional technical changes.

10 In addition to the draft language, the Department and the
11 CON Commission is soliciting public comment on:

12 9. The geographic implications of the proposed
13 language.

14 10. The potential increase in programs as a result of
15 the methodology.

16 11. The implications of Sections 6(1)(b) and 6(2)(b)
17 in terms of the potential for double counting of
18 data.

19 12. And finally the proposed methodology which
20 proposes separate weights for both principal and
21 non-principal diagnostic codes.

22 If you wish to speak today on proposed Litho, Psychiatric
23 Beds, Cardiac Cath or Open Heart Surgery Standards, please
24 turn in a comment card to me. Additionally, if you have
25 written testimony, please provide a copy as well. Just as a

1 reminder, all cell phones and pagers need to be turned off
2 or set to vibrate during this hearing.

3 As indicated on the Notice of Public Hearing,
4 written testimony may be provided to the Department via our
5 Web site at www.michigan.gov/con through Wednesday, November
6 7, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.

7 Today is Wednesday, October 31st, and we will
8 begin the hearing by taking testimony on Litho, then
9 Psychiatric Beds, then Cardiac Cath and finally Open Heart
10 Surgery. And if I have anybody that's interested in
11 providing testimony, I'd take your cards at this point.

12 Just by a show of hands, do I have anybody
13 interested in providing testimony this morning? Then at
14 this point I show it is 9 minutes after 9:00, and we will go
15 ahead and recess. And unless somebody comes in before 10:30
16 to provide testimony, I will start the second hearing at
17 10:30.

18 MR. McCAFFERTY: Dennis McCafferty, Economic
19 Alliance.

20 MS. MOORE: Okay. And you are going to provide
21 testimony on?

22 MR. McCAFFERTY: On Open Heart Surgery and Cardiac
23 Cath.

24 MS. MOORE: Okay.

25 MR. McCAFFERTY: My name is Dennis McCafferty.

1 I'm from the Economic Alliance of Michigan, a statewide
2 business and labor coalition. A couple of issues we'd like
3 to comment on: First of all, the proposed methodology
4 change for Open Heart Surgery Standards. We strongly
5 believe that there is not a need for additional open heart
6 surgery programs in Michigan. Adding more programs,
7 especially when utilization of open heart surgery is
8 steadily declining, would be a bad outcome in producing
9 lower quality and higher costs. We wish that the refined
10 methodology would not allow additional programs; however,
11 given the extensive time and effort with this Standard, our
12 Health Group concluded -- that is, the Health Group of the
13 Economic Alliance concluded -- that we would support this
14 change in the methodology, this revision in the methodology.

15 The refinement to the methodology for projecting
16 the need for additional programs proposed by the staff --
17 the Michigan Department of Community Health staff -- was
18 developed pursuant to the strong request of the SAC and the
19 Commission. Those refinements have made the process much
20 simpler and have gone a long way to improve its
21 predictability. The staff members involved with developing
22 refinements in the methodology for projecting the need of
23 new programs should be commended for their efforts and
24 knowledge in producing this refinement.

25 In our detailed review of this we did identify a

1 few minor errors not yet in the final Impact sheet, and we
2 believe these are minor corrections. The Impact will
3 eventually have to be corrected to reflect these.

4 One of these is -- and it's pursuant to Section 6
5 of the Standards that have long provided that CON-approved
6 or operational Open Heart Surgery programs cannot provide
7 data for the potential of new programs; however, this
8 section would require that the recognition of Mid-Michigan
9 and Foote Hospital, their data is included in there, and it
10 doesn't be. It makes really no -- it's a moot point for
11 their regions, the numbers are so low anywhere -- anyways.

12 We also did a very thorough review of the data
13 that was produced for HSA 1. And we believe that the
14 numbers in this projection chart are understated by about
15 50. So we think that instead of being 555, it's probably
16 approximately 605. But again, the impacts of those are
17 relatively minor, and we did want to point them out.

18 The Economic Alliance has been following this
19 process very closely, and we put together our own little
20 summary of how this process of revising the methodology came
21 about, the background behind it and the things that have
22 happened through the process and how it has been resolved.
23 We'll make available copies of this on the back counter.

24 As far as the other Standards that were reviewed,
25 first of all, Cardiac Cath Standards. Our Economic Alliance

1 members supported the recommended changes to the CON
2 Standards for Catheterization. Of particular note were the
3 following: We particularly support the idea that requiring
4 facilities providing cardiac cath in Michigan being required
5 to participate in American College of Cardiology, the
6 National Cardiovascular Data Registry and the CAT PCI
7 Registry. I think that's a great idea. Requiring a
8 facility proposing to initiate a pediatric cardiac service
9 to meet certain guidelines of the American Academy of
10 Pediatrics also a fine idea we support. And maintaining
11 limitations to -- maintain the provision that CON for
12 elective angioplasty should only be done with on-site open
13 heart surgery; that only facilities that have on-site open
14 heart surgery are able to do elective angioplasty. We
15 strongly support that. Our members strongly support that.

16 Some general comments on the rest of the Open
17 Heart Surgical Center Standards: The EAM, our members,
18 support the recommended changes in the Standards for Open
19 Heart, in particular these following ones: Facilities
20 providing open heart surgery in Michigan will be required to
21 participate in the Society of Thoracic Surgery database and
22 the program's statewide auditing. We think that's a fine
23 idea. Collecting data and providing feedback to the
24 physicians is always a positive move. Maintaining a minimum
25 of 300 per year, we strongly endorse that. Increasing the

1 minimum volume for attending physicians from 50 to 75, we
2 strongly support that.

3 Consulting hospitals will be required to perform a
4 minimum of 400 cases per year for at least three consecutive
5 years, again we support that idea. Limiting hospitals'
6 ability to commit their data to only the data that they
7 previously committed; that they cannot recommit data thereby
8 limiting the ability to recycle their data every seven
9 years.

10 Refinements in the methodology projecting the need
11 for new programs; however, at the September Commission
12 meeting there was a point raised by the Attorney General's
13 office that did require the validity of the proposed
14 Standards to allow hospitals to use their own data
15 previously committed for starting their own program. The
16 Attorney General raised a question about that, and we
17 believe that has to be yet further followed up by staff. We
18 believe that the Attorney General's opinion will require
19 striking of the Section 6(1)(b), lines 154 and 158 of the
20 proposed Standards. This will allow for equal application
21 of the regulations for every provider.

22 On both of these issues, Open Heart Surgery and
23 Cardiac Cath, our members have expressed that they were
24 going to be providing additional written comment within the
25 time frame here. Mr. Wayne Cass is a business

1 representative of the International Union of Operating
2 Engineers, Local 547, and Marsha Manning, Manager of
3 Southeast Michigan Health Care Initiatives for General
4 Motors Corporation, both of these folks have expressed
5 interest in submitting -- they were unable to make it today,
6 but submitting written comments in conjunction with these.
7 That's all.

8 MS. MOORE: Thank you, Dennis. Do I have anybody
9 else that's interested in providing testimony on any of the
10 Standards this morning, Litho, Psych Beds, Cardiac Cath or
11 Open Heart Services? With that, we will recess until 10:30
12 when we well take public testimony on the 2003 Review
13 Standards. Thank you for your time today.

14 (Proceedings concluded at 9:20 a.m.)

15 -0-0-0-
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25