2

0

0

9

North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report January 2009





North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services Division of Health Service Regulation Medical Facilities Planning Section

2714 Mail Service Center ■ Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-2714

Michael F. Easley, Governor Dempsey Benton, Secretary

Elizabeth K. Brown, Section Chief

Phone: 919-855-3751 Fax: 919-733-2757

MEMORANDUM

TO: Individuals Interested in the North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Reports

FROM: Victoria McClanahan, Planner

Medical Facilities Planning Section

SUBJECT: North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report, January 2009

DATE: January 2, 2009

The North Carolina State Health Coordinating Council and the Medical Facilities Planning Section are pleased to make the "January 2009 Semiannual Dialysis Report" available. This report is published pursuant to Chapter 14 of the 2009 North Carolina State Medical Facilities Plan. It applies the County Need methodology based on patient data as of June 30, 2008, and calculates utilization rates for implementation of the Facility Need methodology.

Certificate of need applications in response to the "January 2009 Semiannual Dialysis Report" are due on March 16, 2009 for review beginning April 1, 2009. The filing deadline is 5:30 p.m. on the Application Due Date. The filing deadline is absolute.

General questions about the Semiannual Dialysis Report may be directed to the Medical Facilities Planning Section at 919-855-3865. For additional information regarding the certificate of need application process, please contact the Division of Health Service Regulation, Certificate of Need Section at 919-855-3873.





January 2009 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report

Issued January 2, 2009

Prepared by
Victoria McClanahan, Planner
Medical Facilities Planning Section
Division of Health Service Regulation
North Carolina 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 Health Service Regulation 2714 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-2714 (919) 855 - 3865 Victoria.mcclanahan@ncmail.net



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 Semiannual Dialysis Report, January 2009

Introduction

The <u>2009 North Carolina State Medical Facilities Plan</u> 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 <u>2009 North Carolina State Medical Facilities Plan</u> specifies that the Semiannual Dialysis Reports "...will use facility, station and active patient data as of June 30, 2008 for the 'January 2009 SDR,' and as of December 31, 2008 for the 'July 2009 SDR.' A new five-year trend line will be established in the 'July 2009 SDR,' based on validated data as reported to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for the time period ending December 31, 2008." This document is the "January 2009 SDR." It reiterates the methodology and presents need determinations for the certificate of need review beginning April 1, 2009.

Summary of Dialysis Station Supply and Utilization

For purposes of the Semiannual Dialysis Report, as of December 29, 2008 there were 160 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 3841 dialysis stations. Certificates of need had been issued for an additional 145 dialysis stations, but the stations were not yet certified. Another 128 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 13.

Utilization data as of June 30, 2008 are presented in the final two columns of Table A. Of the 156 certified facilities operational on that date, 73 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 Health Service Regulation, North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services.

Dialysis Patient Data:

Data on the dialysis population by county and by facility as of June 30, 2008 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, 2008 were provided by the SEKC on November 17, 2008. 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 14, 2008. The SEKC stated that these data are subject to change (*SEKC Disclaimer found on page 19*). 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 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 have been provided by the same sources for the five-year trend analysis.

Facility data include all patients being served by each provider as of June 30, 2008 regardless of the county or state of each patient's residence. These figures were also provided by the SEKC on November 17, 2008. 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 14, 2008. The SEKC also stated that these figures are subject to change.

Method for Projection of New Dialysis Station Need

The 2009 North Carolina 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 2009 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 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 North Carolina State Medical Facilities 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 include, but are 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 North Carolina 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 2009 SDR Using the trend line ending with 12/31/07 data)
 - (A) The average annual rate (percent) of change in total number of dialysis patients resident in each county from the end of 2003 to the end of 2007 is multiplied by the county's June 30, 2008 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, 2009 patients.
 - (B) The percent of each county's total patients who were home dialysis patients on June 30, 2008 is multiplied by the county's projected total June 30, 2009 patients, and the

- product is subtracted from the county's projected total June 30, 2009 patients. The remainder is the county's projected June 30, 2009 in-center dialysis patients.
- (C) The projected number of each county's June 30, 2009 in-center patients is divided by 3.2. The quotient is the projection of the county's June 30, 2009 in-center dialysis stations.
- (D) From each county's projected number of June 30, 2009 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, 2009 projected station surplus or deficit.
- (E) If a county's June 30, 2009 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, 2009 county station need determination is the same as the June 30, 2009 projected station deficit. If a county's June 30, 2009 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, 2009 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 6 (the number of months from June 30, 2008 until December 31, 2008) for the January 2, 2009 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 the 2009 State Medical Facilities Plan only if it demonstrates a need by utilizing one of the methods of determining need outlined in Chapter 14.

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 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, 2008	Nov. 10, 2008	January 2, 2009	March 16, 2009	April 1, 2009
Dec. 31, 2008	May 11, 2009	July 1, 2009	September 15, 2009	October 1, 2009

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.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12.29.08. Utilization Rates Calculated for 6.30.08)

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statio	ns as of 12	.29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
Alamance	34-2533	BMA of Burlington	Burlington	49	C) (0 0	49	43	149	87%	3.47
Alamance	34-2567	Burlington Dialysis Center	Burlington	27	C	(0 0	27	27	65	60%	2.41
Alexander									(0		
Alleghany									(0		
Anson	34-2560	Dialysis Care of Anson County	Wadesboro	13	2	. (0 0	15	13	43	83%	3.31
Anson	n/a	FMC of Anson County	Wadesboro	C	10) (0 0	10) (0		
Ashe									(0		
Avery	(Mitchell-Avery-Yand	cey Multicounty Planning Area.)										
Beaufort	34-2561	BMA of Pamlico	Washington	25	C) (0 0	25	5 25	74	74%	2.96
Bertie	34-2547	Windsor Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Windsor	20	C) (0 0	20	20	43	54%	2.15
Bladen	34-2578	Southeastern Dialysis Center	Elizabethtown	21	C) (0 0	21	21	66	79%	3.14
Brunswick	34-2582	Southeastern Dialysis Center	Shallotte	20	-7	' (0 0	13	3 20	71	89%	3.55
Brunswick	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	Southport Dialysis Center - utilization included with Southeastern Dialysis Center.	Southport		10		0 0	10				
Brunswick	n/a	FMC of Brunswick County	Supply				-) 0		
Buncombe	34-2506	Asheville Kidney Center	Asheville	41		1	0 0			·		3.39
Buncombe	34-2626	Swannanoa Dialvsis Center	Swannanoa	10			0 0					
Buncombe	34-2604	Weaverville Dialysis Center	Weaverville	20			•					
Burke	34-2563	BMA of Burke County	Morganton	25		1	0 0					
Cabarrus	34-2519	Davita - Branchview Dialysis	Concord	30			0 0					
Cabarrus	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	Harrisburg Dialysis Center - utilization included with Branchview Dialysis.	Concord	(10		0 0					
Cabarrus	34-2631	Copperfield Dialysis	Concord	16	C) (0 0	16	16	48	75%	3.00
Caldwell	34-2509	BMA-Lenoir	Lenoir	34) (0 0	34	34	92	68%	2.71
Camden									(0		
Carteret	34-2588	Crystal Coast Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Morehead City	20	С	(0 (20) 20	64	80%	3.20
Caswell	34-2597	Renal Care Group - Caswell (BMA)	Yanceyville	10		<u> </u>	0 0					
Catawba	34-2516	BMA-Hickory	Hickory	33		`	•					
Catawba	34-2635	FMC Catawba Valley Dialysis	Conover	23		'	0					
Chatham	34-2621	Carolina Dialysis Siler City	Siler City	9	C	1 (6 0	15	5 9	34	94%	3.78
Chatham	34-2617	Carolina Dialysis -Pittsboro	Pittsboro	10			0 0	10	10	19	48%	1.90

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

(Inventory Compiled 12.29.08. Utilization Rates Calculated for 6.30.08)

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statior	s as of 12.	29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
Cherokee												
(Cherokee-Clay-												
Graham												
Multicounty		Smokey Mountains Dialysis										
Planning Area.)	34-2649	Center	Murphy	10		0	0	10	10	29	73%	2.90
Chowan	34-2541	Edenton Dialysis	Edenton	17) 0	0				90%	3.59
Clay		ham Multicounty Planning Area.)	Edenton	''		,				01	3070	0.00
Clay	34-2529	Dialysis Clinic (DCI Shelby)	Shelby	35		-10	0	25	35	122	87%	3.49
	34-2529		/	10			-					1.70
Cleveland	34-2661 34-2611	DCI Boiling Springs	Boiling Springs	12			-					3.83
Cleveland	Proposed new site consisting of	DCI Kings Mountain DCI South - utilization included	Kings Mtn.	12	2 (0	0	12	12	46	96%	3.83
Cleveland	existing stations.	with DCI Shelby.	Shelby	C	, ,	10	0					
Columbus	34-2521	Southeastern Dialysis Center	Whiteville	26		0	-					2.92
Columbus	34-2628	Chadbourn Dialysis Center	Chadbourn	17		, ,	0					2.53
Craven	34-2534	New Bern Dialysis Unit (BMA)	New Bern	37		,	0					2.46
Craven	34-2585	FMC Craven County	New Bern	29	C	0	0	29	29	72	62%	2.48
Cumberland	34-2510	Fayetteville Kidney Center (BMA)	Fayetteville	36	S C	0	3	39	36	123	85%	3.42
Cumberland	34-2643	FMC Dialysis Services of West Fayetteville	Fayetteville	33	3 C	0	0	33	33	88	67%	2.67
Cumberland	34-2593	FMC Dialysis Services-North Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	40) C	0	0	40	40	118	74%	2.95
Cumberland	34-2601	FMC Dialysis Services-South Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	51	C	0	0	51	51	138		2.71
Currituck									0	0		
Dare	34-2598	Dare County/Outer Banks Dialysis Clinic	Nags Head	g) C	0	0	9	9	23	64%	2.56
Davidson	34-2553	Lexington Dialysis Center (WFU)	Lexington	36		· · ·	0				70%	2.81
Davidson	34-2639	Thomasville Dialysis Center	Thomasville	14	l C	0	0	14	14	45	80%	3.21
Davio	n/a	July 2008 County Need Determination (2 CON applications have been received for these 10 stations)				0	10	10		0		
Davie	n/a	,		ļ	1 (<u> </u>	10	10	0	<u> </u>		
Duplin	34-2535	Southeastern Dialysis Center Kenansville	Kenansville	12	,	0	0	12	14	38	68%	2.71
Duplin	34-2659	Wallace Dialysis Center	Wallace	12		,	0					3.70
Duplin	34-2630	Warsaw Dialysis Center (RAI)	Warsaw	16			0					2.19
Барііі	07-2000	Duke University Hospital ESRD	v v ai savv	10	, (1	0	10	10	33	33%	2.19
Durham	34-2302	Unit	Durham	16	s c	0	0	16	16	53	83%	3.31

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Station	ns as of 12	.29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
Durham	34-2550	Durham Dialysis	Durham	33	3 C	0) (33	33	123	93%	3.73
Durham	34-2616	Durham-West Dialysis	Durham	22	2 4	C	0	26	20	77	96%	3.85
Durham	34-2538	Freedom Lake Dialysis Center	Durham	26	-4	· c) () 22	26	89	86%	3.42
Durham	34-2590	FMC Dialysis Services of West Pettigrew	Durham	24	-4	· C) () 20	24	58	60%	2.42
Durham	34-2615	FMC Dialysis Services of Briggs Avenue	Durham	27	, -2	2 0		2 27	27	7 87	81%	3.22
Durham	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	FMC South Durham - utilization included with BMA Freedom Lake, FMC West Pettigrew and FMC Briggs Avenue. Dialysis Care of Edgecombe	Durham	C) 12	. c) () 12				
Edgecombe	34-2577	County	Tarboro	25	s c	0		25	25	74	74%	2.96
Edgecombe	34-2603	BMA of East Rocky Mount	Rocky Mount	30								2.93
Forsyth	34-2304	North Carolina Baptist Hospitals	Winston-Salem	4	· c) 4	. 4	1 2	13%	0.50
Forsyth	34-2505	Piedmont Dialysis	Winston-Salem	59) C) C) (59	60	193	80%	3.22
Forsyth	34-2612	Northside Dialysis Center (WFU)	Winston-Salem	36	6 C) 3	3 0	39	36	117	81%	3.25
Forsyth	34-2569	Salem Kidney Center (WFU)	Winston-Salem	72	-36	C) (36	72	194	67%	2.69
Forsyth	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	Miller Street Dialysis Center of WFU - utilization included with Salem Kidney Center.	Winston-Salem	C	36) () (36				
Franklin	34-2571	Dialysis Care of Franklin County		23								3.17
Gaston	34-2513	BMA of Gastonia Metrolina Kidney Center -	Gastonia	35	5 C) C) 2	2 37	35	145	104%	4.14
Gaston	34-2652	Belmont	Belmont	10								4.00
Gaston	34-2595	BMA of Kings Mountain	Kings Mountain	16	3 -2	2 0) (14	16	45	70%	2.81
Gaston	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	FMC South Gaston - utilization included with BMA Gastonia and BMA Kings Mountain. Gambro Healthcare Gates	Gastonia	C) 12	2 0) () 12				
Gates Graham	n/a (Cherokee-Clay-Gra	County ham Multicounty Service Area.)	Gatesville	С	10) C) (10	C	0 0)	
O Tariairi	(Cherokee-Clay-Gla	mann manicounty dervice Alea.)		1	1				<u> </u>	1	1	

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statio	ns as of 12	.29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
		FMC Dialysis Services Neuse					Ĭ					
Granville	34-2520		Oxford	22	-6	6) 2	18	22	73	83%	3.32
Granville	34-2647	FMS Dialysis Services of Oxford	Oxford	10	6	6 () 2	2 18	10	36	90%	3.60
Greene	34-2650	Greene County Dialysis Center	Snow Hill	10) 2		12	10	39	98%	3.90
Guilford	34-2537		Greensboro	59					59		66%	2.63
Guillora	34-2007	DWA GI GOUIT Greensboro	Oreerisboro	00		,) 33	00	100	0070	2.00
Guilford	34-2600	BMA of Southwest Greensboro	Jamestown	31	0			31	31	92	74%	2.97
		Kidney Center of Greensboro										
Guilford	34-2504		Greensboro	56	0) () (56	56	156	70%	2.79
		Northwest Greensboro Kidney	_									
Guilford	34-2613	Center (BMA)	Greensboro	25			,		25		54%	
Guilford	34-2634	FMC of East Greensboro	Greensboro	37	0) (0	37	35	100	71%	2.86
O:16- m-l	24.0544	High Point Kidney Center (WFU)	Llimb Daint	40				10	4.0	450	0.40/	2.75
Guilford Guilford	34-2514 34-2599		High Point High Point	40		,	_	2 42	40		94% 78%	3.75 3.10
Guillola	34-2399	Thad Dialysis Certier (WFO)	nigh Foint	20	-	,		20	20	02	1070	3.10
Halifax	34-2542	BMA of Roanoke Rapids	Roanoke Rapids	35	0) (35	35	127	91%	3.63
		FMC Dialysis of Halifax County										
Halifax	34-2619		Scotland Neck	11) (/ 11	11		77%	3.09
Harnett	34-2557		Dunn	22	0) () () 22	22	71	81%	3.23
	0.4.00.40	FMS Dialysis Services of	1.111.								700/	0.00
Harnett	34-2648 34-2629	Lillington Waynesville Dialysis Center	Lillington	13				, 10	13 17		73% 84%	2.92 3.35
Haywood	34-2029	Waynesville Dialysis Center	Clyde	17				17	17	57	04%	3.33
Henderson	34-2564	Hendersonville Dialysis Center	Hendersonville	20	6	6		26	20	82	103%	4.10
Hertford	34-2570		Ahoskie	21) 6	6 0		21			
Hoke	34-2579	Dialysis Care of Hoke County	Raeford	22	0) () 4	1 26	22	92	105%	
Hyde									C	0		
		Statesville Dialysis Center										
Iredell	34-2527	(WFU)	Statesville	25) (25	25		91%	
Iredell	34-2636	West Iredell Dialysis Center	Statesville	18	0) () (18	18	52	72%	2.89
lue dell	34-2606	Lake Norman Dialysis Center (WFU)	Maanaavilla	07				27	07	, 7,	69%	0.70
Iredell Jackson	34-2556	Sylva Dialysis Center	Mooresville Sylva	27 18		,			27 18	7 75 8 50		2.78 2.78
Johnston	34-2545		Four Oaks	19		1						3.05
00.1110.011	0.1 20-10	i iiio i dai daila (Bivii i)	i cai caio	10				13	13	, 30	, 0 / 0	0.00
Johnston	34-2572	Johnston Dialysis Center (BMA)	Smithfield	25	0	-10) 2	2 17	25	78	78%	3.12
	Proposed new site consisting of	FMC West Johnston - utilization included with Johnston Dialysis										
Johnston	existing stations.		Clayton		0	10		10				

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

(Inventory Compiled 12.29.08. Utilization Rates Calculated for 6.30.08)

				Numb	er of Dialv	sis Statio	ns as of 12	.29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	СІТҮ	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified		Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
Johnston	n/a	Clayton Dialysis Center	Clayton	(10) () (10	C	0		
		FMC Dialysis Services of Jones	,									
Jones	34-2625	County	Trenton	10) () () (10	10	25	63%	2.50
Lee	34-2620	Carolina Dialysis Sanford (UNC)	Sanford	31	C) () 8	39	31	117	94%	3.77
t an ata	04.0540	Kinston Dialysis Unit (BMA	IZ'(0.0						400	0.40/	0.50
Lenoir	34-2518 34-2609	Kinston) FMC Vernon Dialysis	Kinston	39		`	,	, 00				
Lenoir Lincoln	34-2609 34-2568	FMC Vernon Dialysis FMC Lincolnton	Kinston Lincolnton	_		1	· ·					
McDowell	34-2645	McDowell Dialysis Center	Marion	25		3 (
Macon	34-2043	McDowell Dialysis Center	IVIATION	10	3			13	10	1		3.10
Madison							+		0	<u> </u>		
Martin	34-2584	Dialysis Care of Martin County	Williamston	23	3 () (23		•		2.26
Mecklenburg	34-2554	BMA-West Charlotte	Charlotte	29							70%	
Mecklenburg	34-2581	BMA of Beatties Ford (Metrolina)	Charlotte	32								
Mecklenburg	34-2549	BMA of North Charlotte	Charlotte	28		`						
Mecklenburg	34-2306	Carolina's Medical Center	Charlotte	20			-					
Mecklenburg	34-2552	RAI Care Centers - Charlotte	Charlotte	24		`	,					
Weckleriburg	34-2332	RAI Care Centers - Chanotte	Chanotte	2-		,	,	27	27	17	1170	3.00
Mecklenburg	34-2591	Mecklenburg/University	Charlotte	29) (29	29	114	98%	
Mecklenburg	34-2523	South Charlotte Dialysis	Charlotte	17	-4	. () 4	17	17	77	113%	
Mecklenburg	34-2548	Charlotte Dialysis	Charlotte	31		(, 01		113	97%	
Mecklenburg	34-2627	Charlotte East Dialysis	Charlotte	16	-6	6) 6	16	16	74	116%	4.63
Mecklenburg	34-2663 - New site consisting of existing stations.	North Charlotte Dialysis Center - utilization included with Charlotte East, Charlotte Dialysis, and South Charlotte.	Charlotte	10) () () 10				
Mecklenburg	34-2503	BMA of Charlotte	Charlotte	46) () -4	42			67%	
Mecklenburg	34-2605	BMA of East Charlotte	Charlotte	25) (25			
Mecklenburg	34-2594	BMA of Nations Ford	Charlotte	20) () () (20	20	74	93%	3.70
	Proposed new site consisting of	New BMA Facility - Matthews - utilization included with BMA Nations Ford, BMA East Charlotte Dialysis, BMA West Charlotte, and BMA North										
Mecklenburg	existing stations.	Charlotte.	Matthews	C	11	() (11				
	Proposed new site consisting of	Mint Hill Dialysis Center - utilization included with Charlotte East and South										
Mecklenburg	existing stations.	Charlotte.	Mint Hill		10			10			1	1

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

(Inventory Compiled 12.29.08. Utilization Rates Calculated for 6.30.08)

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statior	s as of 12.	29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
	Proposed new site consisting of	FMC Huntersville (CON # F- 8073-08) - utilization included with BMA Beatties Ford, BMA North Charlotte and BMA					4.0	40				
Mecklenburg Mitchell (Mitchell-Avery- Yancey Multicounty	existing stations.	Charlotte.	Huntersville	C	0	0	12	12				
Planning Area)	34-2660	Mayland Dialysis Center Dialysis Care of Montgomery	Spruce Pine	g	0	0	0	9	g	19	53%	2.11
Montgomery	34-2583		Biscoe	14	5	0	0	19	14	59	105%	4.21
Moore	34-2555	(Moore County)	Pinehurst	33	0	-11	0	22	33	103	78%	3.12
Moore	34-2638	Southern Pines Dialysis Center	Southern Pines	12	2 0	1	0	13	12	2 41	85%	3.42
Moore	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	Carthage Dialysis Center - utilization included with Dialysis care of Moore County and Southern Pines Dialysis Center.	Carthago			12	0	12				
Nash	34-2517	Rocky Mount Kidney Center (BMA)	Rocky Mount	42			0			2 145	86%	3.45
Nash	34-2644	FMC Dialysis Services of Spring Hope	Spring Hope	10		0	0					
New Hanover	34-2511 Proposed new site consisting of	Southeastern Dialysis Center Cape Fear Dialysis Center - utilization included with Southeastern Dialysis Center -	Wilmington	49	0	0	-28	21	49	184	94%	3.76
New Hanover	existing stations.	Wilmington Rich Square Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Wilmington	С	0	0	28	28				
Northampton	34-2586	Northampton) Southeastern Dialysis Ctr.	Rich Square	14	2	0	0	16	14	41	73%	2.93
Onslow	34-2532	Jacksonville Carolina Dialysis Carrboro	Jacksonville	35	0	0	3	38	35	114	81%	3.26
Orange Pamlico	34-2622	(UNC)	Carrboro	36	6 0	0	0	36	36			3.17
Pasquotank	34-2515	Elizabeth City Dialysis Southeastern Dialysis Center	Elizabeth City	21	0	1	0	22				3.48
Pender	34-2558	Inc.	Burgaw	20	0	0	0	20	20			3.75
Perquimans Person	34-2562	Roxboro Dialysis	Roxboro	24	. 0	0	0	24		`		3.79

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statio	ns as of 12	29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	СІТҮ	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	
		Greenville Dialysis Center										
Pitt	34-2502	(BMA)	Greenville	48	3) (0	48				
Pitt	34-2632	FMC Care of Ayden	Ayden	10) () (10	10	30	75%	3.00
		FMC Dialysis of East Carolina										
Pitt	34-2596	University	Greenville	38	3) () (38		124	82%	3.26
Polk	n/a	Polk County Dialysis Center	Columbus	() () (10	10	C	0)	
		Bio-Medical Applications of										
Randolph	34-2524	Asheboro	Asheboro	27	7) () (27	27	87	81%	3.22
		Dialysis Care of Richmond										
Richmond	34-2539	County	Hamlet	32	2 () (0 0	32	32	110	86%	3.44
Robeson	34-2528	Lumberton Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Lumberton	32	2 -3	3 () (29	38	112	74%	2.95
		FMC Dialysis Services of										
Robeson	34-2623	Robeson County	Fairmont	19) () 4	23				
Robeson	34-2607	BMA of Red Springs	Red Springs	18	-4	1 () (14	20	50	63%	2.50
	34-2662 - New site	BMA of St. Pauls - utilization										
	consisting of	included with BMA Lumberton										
Robeson	existing stations.	and BMA Red Springs.	St. Pauls	10		,	, .	10				
Robeson	34-2651	St. Pauls Dialysis Center	St. Pauls	10) () () (10	10	16	40%	1.60
Robeson	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	FMC of Pembroke - utilization included with BMA Lumberton, BMA Red Springs, and BMA Laurinburg.	Pembroke) 10) () (10				
	-	Dialysis Care of Rockingham										
Rockingham	34-2536	County	Eden	20) 3	3		23	20	53	66%	2.65
Rockingham	34-2624	Madison Dialysis Center	Madison	10) () () (
Rockingham	34-2640	Reidsville Dialysis	Reidsville	18	3) () (18	18	58	81%	3.22
Rockingham	34-2641	Rockingham Kidney Center (BMA)	Reidsville	15	5 () () (15	15	5 41	68%	6 2.73
Rowan	34-2546	. ,	Salisbury	28	3 () () (28	28	97	87%	3.46
Rowan	34-2592	Dialysis Care of Kannapolis/Rowan	Kannapolis	25	5 () () (25	25	63	63%	2.52
Rutherford	34-2566	Dialysis Care of Rutherford County	Forest City	30		<u> </u>	, ,	00				
Sampson	34-2559	BMA of Clinton	Clinton	39	9 () (-10	29	39	125	80%	3.2
Sampson	Proposed new site consisting of existing stations.	FMC of Roseboro - utilization included with BMA of Clinton.	Roseboro) () 10	10				
Scotland	34-2540	BMA of Laurinburg	Laurinburg	29	`	`				1 125	92%	3.68
Julianu	104-2040	IDIVIA OF LAUFINDURY	LauIIIIDUI 9		71 -3	יו וי	η (/ ∠0	34	t 1∠3	92%	J.D

				Numb	er of Dialv	sis Station	ns as of 12	.29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified	CON Issued/Not Certified	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	
	34-2664 - New site	FMC of Scotland County -										
	consisting of	utilization included with BMA										
Scotland	existing stations.	Laurinburg.	Laurinburg	12		C	0	12				
Stanly	34-2565	BMA of Albemarle	Albemarle	18	2	2	2 0	22	18	68		
Stokes	34-2633	King Dialysis Center	King	14		C	0	14	14	42	75%	3.00
		Mount Airy Dialysis Center										
Surry	34-2551	(WFU)	Mt. Airy	22	2	: 3	0	27	21	76	90%	3.62
Surry	34-2614	Elkin Dialysis Center (WFU)	Elkin	15	-2	2	2 0	15	18	65	90%	3.61
Swain	34-2602	Cherokee Dialysis Center	Cherokee	18	2	e C	0	20	18	57	79%	3.17
Transylvania	n/a	Brevard Dialysis Center	Transylvania	C	8	C	0	8	C	0		
Tyrrell								0	C	0		
		Metrolina Kidney Center (BMA										
Union	34-2525	Monroe)	Monroe	21	C	C	0	21	21	68	81%	3.24
Union	34-2526	Union County Dialysis	Monroe	24		C	-10	14	24	106	110%	4.42
	Proposed new site consisting of	Indian Trail Dialysis Center - utilization included with Union										
Union	existing stations.	County Dialysis Center.	Indian Trail		ol c	o c	10	10				
	Proposed new site	Marshville Dialysis Center -					_					
	consisting of	utilization included with Union										
Union	existing stations.	County Dialysis Center.	Marshville		10		0	10				
Vance	34-2543	Henderson Dialysis Center	Henderson	33) 0			127	96%	3.85
Wake	34-2544	Cary Kidney Center (BMA)	Cary	27) 0					
Wake	34-2658	FMS Dialysis Services of Apex	Apex	10	o c	C	0	10	10	17	43%	1.70
Wake	34-2512	BMA of Raleigh Dialysis	Raleigh	48	C	C	-9	39	48	170	89%	3.54
Wake	34-2646	FMC New Hope	Raleigh	30	C	C	-4	26	30	97	81%	3.23
	Proposed new site consisting of	FMC St. Agnes - utilization included with BMA Raleigh and										
Wake	existing stations.	FMC New Hope.	Raleigh	C	C	C	13	13				
Wake	34-2608	BMA of Fuquay Varina	Fuquay-Varina	25	C	C	0	25			67%	2.68
Wake	34-2589	Zebulon Kidney Center (BMA)	Zebulon	30		C	0	30	30	86	72%	2.87
Wake	34-2522	Wake Dialysis Clinic	Raleigh	47	-12	2	9	44	47	170	90%	3.62
	Proposed new site consisting of	FMC Eastern Wake - utilization included with Wake Dialysis										
Wake	existing stations.	Clinic.	Rolesville	C	12	e c	0	12				
Wake	34-2653	FMC Millbrook	Raleigh	10	C	C	4	14	10	31	78%	3.10
		Southwest Wake County										
Wake	34-2642	Dialysis	Raleigh	27	C	C	-4	23	20	75	94%	3.75
Wake	n/a		Wake Forest	С	10	C	0	10	C	0		
Warren	34-2610	FMC Dialysis Services of Warren Hills	Warrenton	18	c		7	25	18	67	93%	3.72

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates (Inventory Compiled 12.29.08. Utilization Rates Calculated for 6.30.08)

				Numb	er of Dialy	sis Statior	ns as of 12.	29.08			Utilizatio	n Rates
COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Certified		Decision Rendered	Decision Pending	TOTAL	Certified Stations 6.30.08	Number In-Center Patients 6.30.08	Utilization by Percent	Patients per Station
		FMC Dialysis Services of										
Washington	34-2618	Plymouth (BMA)	Plymouth	11	0	0	0	11	11	35	80%	3.18
Watauga	34-2311	Watauga Kidney Dialysis Center	Boone	14	0	l o	0	14	14	42	75%	3.00
Wayne	34-2531	Goldsboro Dialysis	Goldsboro	25	7	0	0	32	25	98	98%	3.92
Wayne	34-2587	Goldsboro South Dialysis	Goldsboro	21	0	C	0	21	21	71	85%	3.38
Wayne	34-2573	Mount Olive Dialysis	Mount Olive	11	0	2	0	13	11	48	109%	4.36
Wayne	34-2576	RAI Care Centers - Goldsboro	Goldsboro	16	0	0	0	16	11	35	80%	3.18
Wilkes	34-2313	Wilkes Regional Dialysis Center	N. Wilkesboro	10	6	O	0	16	10	40	100%	4.00
Wilson	34-2507	Wilson Dialysis	Wilson	27	4	0	2	33	26	100	96%	3.85
Wilson	34-2637	Forest Hills Dialysis	Forest Hills	20	0	1	0	21	20	78	98%	3.90
Yadkin	34-2665	Yadkin Dialysis Center	Yadkinville	13	0	C	0	13				
Yancey	(Mitchell-Avery-Yand	ey Multicounty Planning Area.)										
State Totals		_		3841	145	46	82	4114	3787	11894		

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by Planning Area

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

County Planning Total Area Patients Pa	,	Jii piai ii iii	'5'														
Alamance 180 186 197 214 232 0.066 235 250.4 25 10.6% 26.6 223.8 70 76 Surplus of 6 O Alleghary 6 0 10 4 5 5 0.079 7 76 2 28.6% 2.2 5.4 2 0 2 O Alleghary 6 10 4 5 5 0.079 7 76 2 28.6% 2.2 5.4 2 0 2 O Alsham 75 0.066 76 81.0 4 5 5.3% 4.3 76.7 24 25 Surplus of 1 O Alsham 15 11 16 17 20 0.107 16 17.7 9 55.3% 10.0 7.7 2 0 2 O 2 O Alsham 15 11 16 17 20 0.107 16 17.7 9 55.3% 10.0 7.7 2 0 2 O 2 O O O O O O O	County Planning	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Change Rate for	Total	6.30.09 Total	Home	Home	6.30.09 Home	6.30.09 In-Center	6.30.09 In-Center Station	Available	Deficit (bolded) or	
Alleghany Care Ca																	
Alleghary 6																	
Anshor																	0
Sehe															-		
Deaufort 90 86 92 82 96 0.022 90 92.0 11 12.2% 11.2 80.7 25 25 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																	
Berlie																	0
Bladen 57 59 63 64 78 0.084 81 87.8 5 6.2% 5.4 82.4 22 21 5 0.082																	0
Brunswick 76																	0
Surpose 224 225 231 223 220 -0.004 225 224 19 8.4% 18.9 205.2 64 82 Surplus of 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																Surplus of 4	0
Surflex TO TS 82 90 90 0.066 99 105.5 8 8.1% 8.5 97.0 30 25 5 0 Cabarrus 131 152 146 150 170 0.070 167 178.8 20 12.0% 21.4 157.3 49 46 3 3 0 0 Caldwell 119 109 103 106 104 -0.032 105 101.6 10 9.5% 9.7 91.9 29 34 Surplus of 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																	0
Cabarus																	0
Caldwell 119 109 103 106 104 -0.032 105 101.6 10 9.5% 9.7 91.9 29 34 Surplus of 5 0 Camden 11 11 8 9 9 -0.037 11 10.6 3 27.3% 2.9 7.7 2 0 2 0 2 0 0 2 0 0																	0
Carteret 61 60 56 55 56 -0.021 58 568 2 3.4% 2.9 7.7 2 0 2 0 Carteret 61 60 56 55 56 -0.021 58 56.8 2 3.4% 2.0 54.8 17 20 Surplus of 3 0 Caswell 38 30 29 27 25 -0.097 27 24.4 2 7.4% 1.8 22.6 7 10 Surplus of 3 0 Catawba 145 149 159 157 157 0.021 147 150.0 13 8.8% 13.3 136.8 43 56 Surplus of 3 0 Catawba 45 50 61 64 73 0.130 68 76.9 8 11.8% 9.0 67.8 21 25 Surplus of 4 0 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.295 26 33.7 4 15.4% 52 25.5 9 10 Surplus of 4 0 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.295 26 33.7 4 15.4% 52 25.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 0.064 0 0.0% 0.0 0.0% 0.0 14.0 4 0 4 4 0 4 4 4 4																Surplus of 5	0
Caretret 61 60 56 55 56 -0.021 58 56.8 2 3.4% 2.0 54.8 17 20 Surplus of 3 0 Caswell 38 30 29 27 25 -0.097 27 24.4 2 7.4% 1.8 22.6 7 10 Surplus of 3 0 Catawba 145 149 159 157 157 0.021 147 150.0 13 8.8% 13.3 136.8 43 56 Surplus of 13 0 Chatham 45 50 61 64 73 0.130 68 76.9 8 11.8% 9.0 67.8 21 25 Surplus of 4 0 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 0.286 26 33.7 4 15.4% 5.2 28.5 9 10 Surplus of 1 Cherokee 14 12 27 27 29 28 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3																	0
Catawba																Surplus of 3	0
Cherokee 14			30														0
Cherokee	Catawba	145	149	159	157	157	0.021	147	150.0	13	8.8%	13.3	136.8	43	56	Surplus of 13	0
Cherokee	Chatham	45	50	61	64	73	0.130	68	76.9	8	11.8%	9.0	67.8	21	25	Surplus of 4	0
Clay 9	Cherokee	14	12	27	27		0.295			4	15.4%	5.2	28.5	9			
Cherokee- Clay- Graham Planning Area Total Surplus of 6 O Chowan Surplus of 6 O Surplus of 6 O Chowan Surplus of 6 O Cleveland Surplus of 6 O Cleveland Surplus of 6 O Cleveland Surplus of 6 O O Surplus of 6 O O Cleveland Surplus of 6 O O Surplus of 6 O O O O O O O O O		9	2	6	9	8	0.403	10	14.0	0	0.0%	0.0	14.0	4	0	4	i
Graham Planning Area Formation Forma	Graham	9	10	13	11	11	0.064	9	9.6	0	0.0%	0.0	9.6	3	0	3	1
Chowan 32 36 35 35 37 0.039 42 43.6 7 16.7% 7.3 36.4 11 17 Surplus of 6 0 Cleveland 169 185 196 203 206 0.051 216 227.0 17 7.9% 17.9 209.2 65 57 8 0 Columbus 100 103 133 128 137 0.088 140 152.4 7 5.0% 7.6 144.8 45 4 1 0 Craven 152 146 150 149 155 0.005 164 164.9 8 4.9% 8.0 1156.8 49 66 Surplus of 17 0 Currituck 17 14 17 17 15 -0.020 14 13.7 5 35.7% 4.9 8.8 3 0 3 0 Darie 20 27 27 29 23	Graham Planning Area																
Cleveland 169 185 196 203 206 0.051 216 227.0 17 7.9% 17.9 209.2 65 57 8 0			1 00	1 05	0.5	0.7	0.000	10	10.0		40.70/	7.0	00.4	- 44	47		
Columbus 100 103 133 128 137 0.088 140 152.4 7 5.0% 7.6 144.8 45 44 1 0 Craven 152 146 150 149 155 0.005 164 164.9 8 4.9% 8.0 156.8 49 66 Surplus of 17 0 Cumberland 408 422 486 479 510 0.059 480 518.9 48 9.8% 50.8 468.1 146 163 Surplus of 17 0 Currituck 17 14 17 17 15 -0.020 14 13.7 5 35.7% 4.9 8.8 3 0 3 0 Darie 20 27 27 29 23 0.054 27 28.5 6 22.2% 6.3 22.1 7 9 Surplus of 2 0 Davies 139 159 178 164																	
Craven 152 146 150 149 155 0.005 164 164.9 8 4.9% 8.0 156.8 49 66 Surplus of 17 0 Cumberland 408 422 486 479 510 0.059 490 518.9 48 9.8% 50.8 468.1 146 163 Surplus of 17 0 Currituck 17 14 17 17 15 -0.020 14 13.7 5 35.7% 4.9 8.8 3 0 3 0 Dare 20 27 27 29 23 0.054 27 28.5 6 22.2% 6.3 22.1 7 9 surplus of 2 0 Davies 23 20 24 30 36 0.130 41 46.3 11 26.8% 12.4 33.9 11 10 1 0 Duylin 130 129 122 118 118<																	
Cumberland 408 422 486 479 510 0.059 490 518.9 48 9.8% 50.8 468.1 146 163 Surplus of 17 0 Currituck 17 14 17 17 15 -0.020 14 13.7 5 35.7% 4.9 8.8 3 0 3 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 1 1 0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>																	
Currituck 17 14 17 17 15 -0.020 14 13.7 5 35.7% 4.9 8.8 3 0 3 0 Darie 20 27 27 29 23 0.054 27 28.5 6 22.2% 6.3 22.1 7 9 Surplus of 2 0 Davidson 139 159 178 164 172 0.058 181 191.6 21 11.6% 22.2 169.3 53 50 3 0 Davie 23 20 24 30 36 0.130 41 46.3 11 26.8% 12.4 33.9 11 10 1 0 Duplin 130 129 122 118 118 -0.024 119 116.2 5 4.2% 4.9 111.3 35 40 Surplus of 5 0 Durham 435 427 447 469 495 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>																	
Dare 20 27 27 29 23 0.054 27 28.5 6 22.2% 6.3 22.1 7 9 Surplus of 2 0 Davide 139 159 178 164 172 0.058 181 191.6 21 11.6% 22.2 169.3 53 50 3 0 Davie 23 20 24 30 36 0.130 41 46.3 11 26.8% 12.4 33.9 11 10 1 0 Duplin 130 129 122 118 118 -0.024 119 116.2 5 4.2% 4.9 111.3 35 40 Surplus of 5 0 Durham 435 427 447 469 495 0.033 491 507.3 31 6.3% 32.0 475.3 149 156 Surplus of 7 0 Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>																	
Davidson 139 159 178 164 172 0.058 181 191.6 21 11.6% 22.2 169.3 53 50 3 0 Davie 23 20 24 30 36 0.130 41 46.3 11 26.8% 12.4 33.9 11 10 1 0 Duplin 130 129 122 118 118 -0.024 119 16.2 5 4.2% 4.9 111.3 35 40 Surplus of 5 0 Duham 435 427 447 469 495 0.033 491 507.3 31 6.3% 32.0 475.3 149 156 Surplus of 7 0 Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 171 0.005 188 189.0 14 7.4% 14.1 174.9 55 55 0 0 Forsyth 501 489 515 545																	
Davie 23 20 24 30 36 0.130 41 46.3 11 26.8% 12.4 33.9 11 10 1 0 Duplin 130 129 122 118 118 -0.024 119 116.2 5 4.2% 4.9 111.3 35 40 Surplus of 5 0 Durham 435 427 447 469 495 0.033 491 507.3 31 6.3% 32.0 475.3 149 156 Surplus of 7 0 Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 171 0.005 188 189.0 14 7.4% 14.1 174.9 55 55 0 0 Forsyth 501 489 515 545 556 0.027 563 578.2 57 10.1% 58.5 519.6 162 174 Surplus of 12 0 Franklin 84 78 75 85<															-		
Duplin 130 129 122 118 118 -0.024 119 116.2 5 4.2% 4.9 111.3 35 40 Surplus of 5 0 Durham 435 427 447 469 495 0.033 491 507.3 31 6.3% 32.0 475.3 149 156 Surplus of 7 0 Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 171 0.005 188 189.0 14 7.4% 14.1 174.9 55 55 0 0 Forsyth 501 489 515 545 556 0.027 563 578.2 57 10.1% 58.5 519.6 162 174 Surplus of 12 0 Franklin 84 78 75 85 85 0.006 87 87.5 9 10.3% 9.1 78.5 25 23 2 0																	0
Durham 435 427 447 469 495 0.033 491 507.3 31 6.3% 32.0 475.3 149 156 Surplus of 7 0 Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 171 0.005 188 189.0 14 7.4% 14.1 174.9 55 55 0 0 0 Forsyth 501 489 515 545 556 0.027 563 578.2 57 10.1% 58.5 519.6 162 174 Surplus of 12 0 Franklin 84 78 75 85 85 0.006 87 87.5 9 10.3% 9.1 78.5 25 23 2 0																	0
Edgecombe 168 180 183 180 171 0.005 188 189.0 14 7.4% 14.1 174.9 55 55 0 0 Forsyth 501 489 515 545 556 0.027 563 578.2 57 10.1% 58.5 519.6 162 174 Surplus of 12 0 Franklin 84 78 75 85 85 0.006 87 87.5 9 10.3% 9.1 78.5 25 23 2 0	-1																
Forsyth 501 489 515 545 556 0.027 563 578.2 57 10.1% 58.5 519.6 162 174 Surplus of 12 0 Franklin 84 78 75 85 85 0.006 87 87.5 9 10.3% 9.1 78.5 25 23 2 0																	0
Franklin 84 78 75 85 85 0.006 87 87.5 9 10.3% 9.1 78.5 25 23 2 0	_																0
																	0
iidasion i zuzi 1991 z.151 z.541 z.451 U.D.11 z.511 z.74.41 181 b.9%1 18.91 z.55.51 801 791 1 1 0	Gaston	202					0.051		274.4	18		18.9				1	0
										1						•	0
										10							0
Greene 39 37 35 40 38 -0.003 37 36.9 2 5.4% 2.0 34.9 11 12 Surplus of 1 0																	

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by Planning Area

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

dialysis static	ni piai ii ii	ig alea.)														
												Projected	Projected 6.30.09			
	12.31.03	12.31.04	12.31.05	12.31.06	12.31.07		6.30.08	Projected	6.30.08	6.30.08 %		6.30.09	In-Center		Projected Station	County Station
County Planning		Total	Total		Total		Total	6.30.09 Total		Home	6.30.09 Home		Station		Deficit (bolded) or	Need
	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients		Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Patients	Utilization		Surplus	Determination
Guilford	714	731	761	769			797		49			767.7	240		Surplus of 30	0
Halifax	135	148		175			188				30.2	172.6				0
Harnett	111	127		122			148					143.3				0
						eed Methodology										
Haywood	51			48			54			,		49.6				0
Henderson	65					0.024	69					60.4			Surplus of 7	0
Hertford	74			84			69		7			63.0			Surplus of 7	0
Hoke	70			67	64		69				9.8	57.7			Surplus of 8	0
Hyde	10						8				0.0	7.2			2	0
Iredell	148	167		185	192		197		28		29.9	180.5			Surplus of 14	0
Jackson	12	11		20	25	0.229	27	33.2	1	3.7%	1.2	31.9	10	18	Surplus of 8	0
Johnston	157	165		181	193		192		24	12.5%	25.3	177.1			Surplus of 1	0
Jones	21	24	25	23	24	0.037	28	29.0	1	3.6%	1.0	28.0	9	10	Surplus of 1	0
Lee	91	90	91	106	100	0.027	93	95.5	12	12.9%	12.3	83.2	26	39	Surplus of 13	0
Lenoir	179	180	182	184	175	-0.005	171	170.1	10	5.8%	9.9	160.1	50	63	Surplus of 13	0
Lincoln	44	48	55	62	66	0.107	78	86.4	11	14.1%	12.2	74.2	23	25	Surplus of 2	0
Macon	13	11	16	20	21	0.150	27	31.1	5	18.5%	5.8	25.3	8	0	8	0
Madison	12			12			9				0.9	7.5			2	0
Martin	78			58	64	-0.044	66		6	9.1%		57.3			Surplus of 5	0
McDowell	26		37	40	38		41				4.4	40.9			0	0
Mecklenburg	870	878		986	1071	0.054	1081			8.9%	101.2	1038.1	324	330	Surplus of 6	0
Mitchell	6	7	8	12	8	0.119	7			14.3%	1.1	6.7	2	9	Surplus of 7	
Averv	12		11	11	10		9					7.9			2	
Yancey	13						18				3	16		0	5	
Mitchell-Avery-																
Yancey																
Planning Area																
Total															0	0
Montgomery	37	45	35	44	53	0.114	53	59.0	1	1.9%	1.1	57.9	18	19	Surplus of 1	0
Moore	112	116		138	150		144		10		10.8	144.6			Surplus of 2	0
Nash	128	145		167	176		176		22			166.9			0	0
New Hanover	170	167	186	175	180		189		15		15.2	176.9			6	0
Northampton	57	67		71	71	0.061	72		. 7		7.4	68.9			6	0
Onslow	106	106		121	125		118		12		12.5	110.6			Surplus of 3	0
Orange	111	106		114			135				10.7	133.6			6	0
Pamlico	17	16		17	20		18		1		1.0	17.8			6	0
Pasquotank	54	63		65	76		77		11		12.0	72.1	23		1	0
Pender	57	56		83	71	0.069	75		7		7.5	72.7	23		3	0
Perquimans	17			19			19			0.070	2.1	17.4			5	0
Person	79	82		84	86		87		2		2.0	86.9			3	0
Pitt	259	263		285			296					279.4			Surplus of 9	0
Polk	16			15	16		14		0		0.0	28.2	9		Surplus of 1	0
Randolph	106	97		104	105		109		-			99.9		27	4	0
, tandoipii	100	31	100	104	100	0.001	103	100.5	1 3	0.070	3.0	55.5	1 31		7	

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by Planning Area

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

County Planning Area	Total Patients	Total Patients	Total Patients	Total Patients	Total Patients		Total Patients	6.30.09 Total Patients		Home Patients	Projected 6.30.09 Home Patients	6.30.09 In-Center Patients	Projected 6.30.09 In-Center Station Utilization	Available Stations	Projected Station Deficit (bolded) or Surplus	County Station Need Determination
Richmond	80	90					109		7	6.4%						0
Robeson	253	267	305			0.067	325	346.8	24							0
Rockingham	143							169.6		0.070						0
Rowan	129	136							31						Surplus of 16	0
Rutherford	78	85					83	85.7	8	9.6%	8.3				Surplus of 6	0
Sampson	134	136	129	134	147	0.025	145	148.6	3	2.1%	3.1	145.5	45	39	6	0
Scotland	83		100						8	7.3%						0
Stanly	61	52	56	61	64	0.017	74	75.3	4	5.4%	4.1	71.2	22	22	0	0
Stokes	34	39	42	45	45	0.074	50	53.7	2	4.0%	2.1	51.5	16	14	2	0
Surry	79	77	86			0.054	94	99.1	9	9.6%	9.5	89.6	28	42	Surplus of 14	0
Swain	33	39	43	50	48	0.102	47	51.8	1	2.1%	1.1	50.7	16	20	Surplus of 4	0
Transylvania	19	22	21	24	23	0.053	18	19.0	2	11.1%	2.1	16.9	5	8	Surplus of 3	0
Tyrrell	3	4	7	12	11	0.429	9	12.9	1	11.1%	1.4	11.4	4	0	4	0
Union	122	121	142				142		15					55		0
Vance	125	113						148.5	9	6.3%					-	0
Wake	649					0.075	885	951.1	114	1=1070				273	Surplus of 14	0
Warren	38	52				0.120	61	68.3	1	1.6%				25		0
Washington	39		34				31	29.0	6	19.4%	5.6			11		0
Watauga	21	25	28	30	30	0.095	36	39.4	7	19.4%	7.7	31.8	10	14	Surplus of 4	0
Wayne	218	227	230	244	241	0.026	251	257.5	20	8.0%	20.5	237.0	74	82	Surplus of 8	0
Wilkes	56	60	49	55	61	0.030	58	59.7	7	12.1%	7.2	52.5	16	16	0	0
Wilson	161	161	171	179	192	0.045	186	194.4	14	7.5%	14.6	179.8	56	54	2	0
Yadkin	27	30	37	37	43	0.127	41	46.2	5	12.2%	5.6	40.6	13	13	0	0
Unknowns	0	161	17	7	6		0									
State Totals	11,010	11,417	12,029	12,408	12,947		13,099		1,219					4,114		0

Application of the County Need Methodology resulted in no dialysis station need determinations for the January 2009 Semiannual Dialysis Report.

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 November 17, 2008. 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.