

July 2004 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report

Issued July 1, 2004

Prepared by

Jim Keene, Planner

Medical Facilities Planning Section

Division of Facility Services

NC Department of Health and Human Services

Under the direction of the

North Carolina State Health Coordinating Council

For information or copies, contact the

Medical Facilities Planning Section

Division of Facility Services

2714 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-2714

(919) 855 - 3865 *Telephone Number*

(919) 715 - 4413 *FAX Number*



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



END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE DIALYSIS FACILITIES

July 2004 Semiannual Dialysis Report

Introduction

The 2004 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 2004 Plan specifies that the Semiannual Dialysis Reports "...will use facility, station and active patient data as of June 30, 2003 for the January 2004 SDR, and as of December 31, 2003 for the July 2004 SDR. A new five-year trend line will be established in the July 2004 SDR, based on validated data as reported to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for the time period ending December 31, 2003." This document is the July 2004 SDR. It reiterates the methodology and presents need determinations for the Certificate of Need Review beginning October 1, 2004.

Summary of Dialysis Station Supply and Utilization

For purposes of the Semiannual Dialysis Report, as of June 25, 2004 there were 137 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 3,120 dialysis stations. Certificates of need had been issued for an additional 205 dialysis stations, but the stations were not yet certified. Another 78 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, 2003 are presented in the final two columns of Table A. Of the 135 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 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, 2003 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, 2003 were provided by the SEKC on May 12, 2004. The SEKC noted that these figures reflect data submitted to it by dialysis facilities in Network 6 and were current as of May 12, 2004. The SEKC stated that these data are subject to change. 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 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 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 December 31, 2003 regardless of the county or state of each patient's residence. These figures were also provided by the SEKC on May 12, 2004. Again, the SEKC noted that these figures reflect data provided to it by dialysis facilities in Network 6 and were current as of May 12, 2004. The SEKC also stated that these figures are subject to change.

Method for Projection of New Dialysis Station Need

The 2004 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 2004 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.
4. Updates of the projections may target counties that have developed sufficient need to warrant consideration for facility expansion or for establishment of a new

facility. Actual numbers are not published in the Plan so they can be updated as appropriate by the Medical Facilities Planning Section.

5. Home patients will not be included in the determination of need for new stations. Home patients include those that receive hemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis in their home.
6. No existing facility may expand unless its utilization is 80% or greater. Any facility at 80% utilization or greater may apply to expand.
7. Facilities reporting no patients through the Southeastern Kidney Council for four consecutive Semiannual Dialysis Reports, beginning from March 1997, will be excluded from future inventories.
8. Quality of Care: All facilities should comply with Medicare and Medicaid regulations relating to the delivery and certification of ESRD services and with relevant North Carolina statutory provisions. An applicant already involved in the provision of end-stage renal disease services should provide evidence that care of high quality has been provided in the past. The following are considered indicators of quality of care and existing providers proposing to expand their operations should include in their applications data which includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. utilization rates
 - b. morbidity and mortality rates
 - c. numbers of patients that are home trained and patients on home dialysis
 - d. number of patients receiving transplants
 - e. number of patients currently on the transplant waiting list
 - f. hospital admission rates
 - g. conversion rates for patients who have acquired hepatitis or AIDS
9. Availability of Manpower and Ancillary/Support Services: The applicant should show evidence of the availability of qualified staff and other health manpower and management for the provision of quality ESRD services as well as the availability of a safe and adequate water supply, provision for treatment of wastewater discharge and a standing electrical service with backup capabilities.
10. Patient Access to In-Center ESRD Services: As a means of making ESRD services more accessible to patients, one of the goals of the N. C. Department of Health and Human Services is to minimize patient travel time to and from the center. Therefore,
 - a. End-stage renal disease treatment should be provided in North Carolina such that patients who require renal dialysis are able to be served in a facility no farther than 30 miles from the patients' homes.

- b. In areas where it is apparent that patients are currently traveling more than 30 miles for in-center dialysis, favorable consideration should be given to proposed new facilities which would serve patients who are farthest away from existing, operational or approved facilities.
11. Transplantation Services: Transplantation services should be available to, and a priority for, all ESRD patients whose conditions make them suitable candidates for this treatment. New enrollees should meet with and have access to a transplantation representative to provide patient education and evaluation for transplantation.
 12. Availability of Dialysis Care: The N. C. State Health Coordinating Council encourages applicants for dialysis stations to provide or arrange for:
 - a. Home training and backup for patients suitable for home dialysis in the ESRD dialysis facility or in a facility that is a reasonable distance from the patient's residence;
 - b. ESRD dialysis service availability at times that do not interfere with ESRD patients' work schedules;
 - c. Services in rural, remote areas.

Methodology

Need for new dialysis stations shall be determined as follows:

- (1) County Need *(for the July 2004 SDR – Using a new trend line based on 12/31/03 data)*
 - (A) The average annual rate (%) of change in total number of dialysis patients resident in each county from the end of 1999 to the end of 2003 is multiplied by the county's December 31, 2003 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, 2004 patients.
 - (B) The percent of each county's total patients who were home dialysis patients on December 31, 2003 is multiplied by the county's projected total December 31, 2004 patients, and the product is subtracted from the county's projected total December 31, 2004 patients. The remainder is the county's projected December 31, 2004 in-center dialysis patients.
 - (C) The projected number of each county's December 31, 2004 in-center patients is divided by 3.2. The quotient is the projection of the county's December 31, 2004 in-center dialysis stations.

- (D) From each county's projected number of December 31, 2004 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, 2004 projected station surplus or deficit.
- (E) If a county's December 31, 2004 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, 2004 county station need determination is the same as the December 31, 2004 projected station deficit. If a county's December 31, 2004 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, 2004 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, 2003 until December 31, 2004*) for the January 2, 2004 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 2004 State Medical Facilities Plan only if it demonstrates a need by utilizing one of the methods of determining need as outlined above.

Timeline

The schedule for publication of the "July 2004 North Carolina Semiannual Dialysis Report" and for receipt of certificate of need applications pursuant to this report shall be as follows:

<u>Data for Period Ending</u>	<u>Due Date for SEKC Report</u>	<u>Publication of SDR</u>	<u>Application Due Date for CON Applications</u>	<u>Beginning Review Date</u>
Dec. 31, 2003	May 12, 2004	July 1, 2004	September 15, 2004	October 1, 2004

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 this report. The filing deadline is absolute.

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates
(Inventory Compiled 6/25/04; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/03)

COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/25/04				Certified Stations 12/31/03	# In-Center Patients 12/31/03	Utilization Rates		
				Certified	CON Issued /Not Cert.	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending			TOTAL	By Percent	Patients per Station
ALAMANCE	34-2533	BMA of Burlington	Burlington	35	3	0	0	38	35	111	79.3%	3.17
	34-2567	Burlington Dialysis Center	Burlington	27	0	0	0	27	27	72	66.7%	2.67
ALEXANDER								0				
ALLEGHANY								0				
ANSON	34-2560	Dialysis Care of Anson County	Wadesboro	13	0	0	0	13	13	31	59.6%	2.38
ASHE								0				
AVERY								0				
BEAUFORT	34-2561	BMA of Pamlico	Washington	25	0	0	0	25	25	63	63.0%	2.52
BERTIE	34-2547	Windsor Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Windsor	16	0	0	0	16	16	45	71.9%	2.88
BLADEN	34-2578	Southeastern Dialysis Center, Inc.	Elizabethtown	17	0	0	0	17	17	47	69.1%	2.76
BRUNSWICK	34-2582	Southeastern Dialysis Center, Inc.	Shalotte	11	5	2	0	18	11	52	118.2%	4.73
BUNCOMBE	34-2506	Asheville Kidney Center	Asheville	36	0	0	0	36	36	140	97.2%	3.89
	34-2626	Swannanoa Dialysis Center	Swannanoa	10	0	0	0	10	10	39	97.5%	3.90
	34-2604	Weaverville Dialysis Center	Weaverville	20	0	0	0	20	20	72	90.0%	3.60
BURKE	34-2563	BMA of Burke County	Morganton	17	8	0	0	25	17	62	91.2%	3.65
CABARRUS	34-2519	Metrolina Kidney Center (BMA-Concord)	Concord	30	0	0	0	30	30	72	60.0%	2.40
	34-2631	Copperfield Dialysis	Concord	10	0	0	0	10	10	21	52.5%	2.10
CALDWELL	34-2509	BMA-Lenoir	Lenoir	29	5	0	0	34	29	98	84.5%	3.38
CAMDEN								0				
CARTERET	34-2588	Crystal Coast Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Morehead City	20	0	0	0	20	20	63	78.8%	3.15
CASWELL	34-2597	Carolina Dialysis Center--Caswell	Yanceyville	10	0	0	0	10	10	31	77.5%	3.10
CATAWBA	34-2516	BMA-Hickory	Hickory	31	0	-3	4	32	31	139	112.1%	4.48
	34-2635	FMC Catawba Valley Dialysis *	Conover	12	0	3	0	15	12	0	0.0%	0.00
CHATHAM	34-2621	Carolina Dialysis Siler City	Siler City	9	0	0	0	9	9	27	75.0%	3.00
	34-2617	Carolina Dialysis -Pittsboro	Pittsboro	10	0	0	0	10	10	17	42.5%	1.70
CHEROKEE								0				
CHOWAN	34-2541	Gambro Healthcare Edenton	Edenton	17	0	0	0	17	17	59	86.8%	3.47
CLAY								0				
CLEVELAND	34-2529	Dialysis Clinic, Inc. (DCI Shelby)	Shelby	29	0	0	0	29	29	102	87.9%	3.52
	34-2611	DCI Kings Mountain	Kings Mtn.	12	0	0	0	12	12	31	64.6%	2.56
COLUMBUS	34-2521	Southeastern Dialysis Center	Whiteville	21	0	0	0	21	21	64	76.2%	3.05
	34-2628	Chadbourn Dialysis Center	Chadbourn	10	0	0	0	10	10	29	72.5%	2.90

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

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

(Inventory Compiled 6/25/04; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/03)

COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/25/04				Certified Stations 12/31/03	# In-Center Patients 12/31/03	Utilization Rates	
				Certified	CON Issued /Not Cert.	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending			TOTAL	By Percent
CRAVEN	34-2534	New Bern Dialysis Unit (BMA)	New Bern	39	0	0	0	39	107	68.6%	2.74
	34-2585	FMC Craven County	New Bern	29	0	0	0	29	57	49.1%	1.97
CUMBERLAND	34-2510	Fayetteville Kidney Center Inc. (BMA)	Fayetteville	41	-15	0	0	26	119	72.6%	2.90
	n/a	FMC Dialysis Services of West Fayetteville *	Fayetteville	0	15	0	0	15			
	34-2593	FMC Dialysis Services-North Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	40	0	0	0	40	111	69.4%	2.78
	34-2601	FMC Dialysis Services-South Ramsey (BMA)	Fayetteville	38	0	8	0	46	131	86.2%	3.45
CURRITUCK							0				
DARE	34-2598	Dare County/Outer Banks Dialysis Clinic	Nags Head	9	0	0	0	9	17	47.2%	1.89
DAVIDSON	34-2553	Lexington Dialysis Center (WFU)	Lexington	46	-10	0	0	36	106	57.6%	2.30
	n/a	Thomasville Dialysis Center *	Thomasville	0	10	0	0	10			
DAVIE							0				
DUPLIN	34-2635	Southeastern Dialysis Ctr. Kenansville	Kenansville	16	6	0	0	22	59	92.2%	3.69
	34-2630	Warsaw Dialysis Center	Warsaw	14	0	0	0	14	41	73.2%	2.93
DURHAM	34-2302	Duke University Hospital ESRD Unit	Durham	16	0	0	0	16	42	65.6%	2.63
	34-2550	Gambro Healthcare-Durham	Durham	27	6	0	0	33	127	117.6%	4.70
	34-2616	Gambro Healthcare Durham-West	Durham	20	0	0	0	20	55	68.8%	2.75
	34-2538	Freedom Lake Dialysis Center	Durham	26	0	0	0	26	85	81.7%	3.27
	34-2590	West Pettigrew Dialysis Center (FMC)	Durham	21	0	0	0	21	61	72.6%	2.90
	34-2615	FMC Dialysis Services of Briggs Avenue	Durham	15	0	5	0	20	15	101.7%	4.07
EDGECOMBE	34-2577	Dialysis Care of Edgecombe Cnty.	Tarboro	20	0	0	0	20	56	70.0%	2.80
	34-2603	BMA of East Rocky Mount	Rocky Mount	21	9	0	0	30	21	91.7%	3.67
FORSYTH	34-2304	N. C. Baptist Hospitals, Inc.	Winston-Salem	4	0	0	0	4	2	12.5%	0.50
	34-2505	Piedmont Dialysis	Winston-Salem	50	3	0	0	53	50	85.5%	3.42
	34-2612	Northside Dialysis Center (WFU)	Winston-Salem	25	9	0	0	34	25	95.0%	3.80
	34-2569	Salem Kidney Center (WFU)	Winston-Salem	72	0	0	0	72	214	74.3%	2.97
	34-2571	Dialysis Care of Franklin County	Louisburg	22	0	0	0	22	72	81.8%	3.27
GASTON	34-2513	BMA of Gastonia	Gastonia	39	0	0	0	39	142	91.0%	3.64
	34-2595	BMA of Kings Mountain	Kings Mountain	16	0	0	0	16	41	64.1%	2.56
GATES							0				
GRAHAM							0				
GRANVILLE	34-2520	FMC Dialysis Serv. Neuse River	Oxford	23	0	2	0	25	79	85.9%	3.43
	n/a	Greene County Dialysis Center	Snow Hill	0	10	0	0	10			
GUILFORD	34-2537	BMA of South Greensboro	Greensboro	49	10	0	0	59	49	80.6%	3.22
	34-2600	BMA of Southwest Greensboro	Jamestown	20	11	0	0	31	20	105.0%	4.20
	34-2504	Greensboro Kidney Center (BMA)	Greensboro	49	-10	0	0	39	49	115.8%	4.63
	34-2613	Northwest Greensboro Kidney Center (BMA)	Greensboro	15	10	0	0	25	15	100.0%	4.00
	34-2634	FMC of East Greensboro *	Greensboro	30	0	0	0	30	30	100.0%	4.00
	34-2514	High Point Kidney Center (WFU)	High Point	42	0	0	0	42	142	84.5%	3.38
34-2599	Triad Dialysis Center (WFU)	High Point	20	0	0	0	20	20	73.8%	2.95	

* 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 6/25/04; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/03)

COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/25/04				Certified Stations 12/31/03	# In-Center Patients 12/31/03	Utilization Rates		
				Certified	CON Issued /Not Cert.	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending			TOTAL	By Percent	Patients per Station
HALIFAX	34-2542	BMA of Roanoke Rapids	Roanoke Rapids	29	0	6	0	35	29	99	85.3%	3.41
	34-2619	FMC Dialysis of Halifax County (BMA)	Halifax	11	0	0	0	11	11	28	63.6%	2.55
HARNETT	34-2557	Dunn Kidney Center (BMA)	Dunn	30	0	0	0	30	30	90	75.0%	3.00
HAYWOOD	34-2629	Waynesville Dialysis Center	Waynesville	13	0	1	0	14	11	44	100.0%	4.00
HENDERSON	34-2564	Hendersonville Dialysis Center, Inc.	Hendersonville	20	0	0	0	20	20	72	90.0%	3.60
HERTFORD	34-2570	Gambro Healthcare Ahsokie	Ahsokie	17	1	0	0	18	17	65	95.6%	3.82
HOKE	34-2579	Dialysis Care of Hoke County	Raeford	32	0	-10	0	22	27	97	89.8%	3.59
HYDE								0				
IREDELL	34-2527	Statesville Dialysis Center Inc. (WFU)	Statesville	29	0	0	-10	19	29	100	86.2%	3.45
	34-2636	West Iredell Dialysis Center *	Statesville	10	0	0	0	10	10	1	2.5%	0.10
	34-2606	Lake Norman Dialysis Center (WFU)	Mooresville	18	0	0	2	20	18	60	83.3%	3.33
JACKSON	34-2556	Sylva Dialysis Center	Sylva	22	0	-1	0	21	24	24	25.0%	1.00
JOHNSTON	34-2545	Smithfield Kidney Center (BMA)	Smithfield	13	3	0	0	16	13	51	98.1%	3.92
	34-2572	Johnston Dialysis Center, Inc. (BMA)	Smithfield	25	0	0	0	25	25	65	65.0%	2.60
	n/a	Four applications were submitted in response to the July 2003 County Need Determination.		10	0	0	0	10				
JONES	34-2625	FMC Dialysis Services of Jones County	Trenton	10	0	0	0	10	10	15	37.5%	1.50
LEE	34-2620	Carolina Dialysis Sanford (UNC)	Sanford	24	0	0	0	24	24	102	106.3%	4.25
LENOIR	34-2518	Kinston Dialysis Unit (BMA Kinston)	Kinston	39	0	0	0	39	39	122	78.2%	3.13
	34-2609	FMC Vernon Dialysis	Kinston	20	4	0	0	24	20	65	81.3%	3.25
LINCOLN	34-2568	BMA of Lincolnton	Lincolnton	17	0	0	0	17	17	46	67.6%	2.71
MCDOWELL	n/a	Two applications were submitted in response to the January 2004 Need Determination.				9	0	9				
MACON								0				
MADISON								0				
MARTIN	34-2584	Dialysis Care of Martin County	Williamston	23	0	0	0	23	23	55	59.8%	2.39
MECKLENBURG	34-2554	BMA-West Charlotte	Charlotte	29	0	0	0	29	29	82	70.7%	2.83
	34-2581	BMA of Beatties Ford (Metrolina)	Charlotte	26	0	0	0	26	26	75	72.1%	2.88
	34-2549	BMA of North Charlotte	Charlotte	20	3	0	0	23	20	74	92.5%	3.70
	34-2306	Carolina's Medical Center	Charlotte	9	0	0	0	9	9	0	0.0%	0.00
	34-2523	Gambro Healthcare South Charlotte	Matthews	17	0	0	0	17	17	65	95.6%	3.82
	34-2552	Dialysis Care of Charlotte (Meck. Cnty.)	Charlotte	15	0	-2	9	22	15	51	85.0%	3.40
	34-2591	Dialysis Care of Mecklenburg/University	Charlotte	20	0	-10	0	10	20	64	80.0%	3.20
	n/a	Sunset Dialysis Center *	Charlotte	0	0	12	0	12				
	34-2548	Gambro Healthcare Charlotte	Charlotte	23	0	0	6	29	23	107	116.3%	4.65
	34-2627	Gambro Healthcare Charlotte East	Charlotte	10	0	0	0	10	10	52	130.0%	5.20
34-2503	BMA of Charlotte	Charlotte	36	0	0	0	36	36	132	91.7%	3.67	
34-2605	BMA of East Charlotte	Charlotte	20	0	0	0	20	20	55	68.8%	2.75	
34-2594	BMA of Nations Ford	Charlotte	14	0	0	0	14	14	45	80.4%	3.21	
n/a	Huntersville Dialysis Center **	Huntersville				10	10					

* 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 6/25/04; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/03)

COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/25/04				Certified Stations 12/31/03	# In-Center Patients 12/31/03	Utilization Rates	
				Certified	/Not Cert.	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending			TOTAL	Percent
MITCHELL											
MONTGOMERY	34-2583	Dialysis Care of Montgomery County	Troy	12	0	0	0	12		83.3%	3.33
MOORE	34-2555	Dialysis Care of Pinehurst (Moore Cnty.)	Pinehurst	39	-6	0	0	33	39	67.9%	2.72
	n/a	Southern Pines Dialysis Center *	Southern Pines	0	10	0	0	10			
NASH	34-2517	Rocky Mount Kidney Center (BMA)	Rocky Mount	42	0	0	0	42	42	83.3%	3.33
	n/a	FMC Dialysis Services of Spring Hope *	Spring Hope	0	10	0	0	10			
NEW HANOVER	34-2511	Southeastern Dialysis Center Inc.	Wilmington	51	6	0	0	57	51	81.4%	3.25
NORTHAMPTON	34-2586	Rich Square Dialysis Unit (BMA Northampton)	Rich Square	14	0	0	0	14	14	60.7%	2.43
ONslow	34-2532	Southeastern Dialysis Ctr. Jacksonville	Jacksonville	35	0	0	0	35	35	79.3%	3.17
ORANGE	34-2622	Carolina Dialysis Carboro (UNC) (x 34-3503)	Carboro	36	0	0	0	36	36	72.9%	2.92
PAMLICO								0			
PASQUOTANK	34-2515	Gambro Healthcare Elizabeth City	Elizabeth City	16	0	0	0	16	16	93.8%	3.75
PENDER	34-2558	Southeastern Dialysis Center Inc.	Burgaw	14	4	0	0	18	14	101.8%	4.07
PERQUIMANS								0			
PERSON	34-2562	Gambro Healthcare-Roxboro	Roxboro	20	0	0	0	20	20	92.5%	3.70
PITT	34-2502	Greenville Dialysis Center (BMA)	Greenville	43	0	0	0	43	33	128.8%	5.15
	34-2632	FMC Care of Ayden *	Ayden	10	0	0	0	10	10	0.0%	0.00
	34-2596	FMC Dialysis of East Carolina Univ.	Greenville	33	5	0	0	38	33	93.2%	3.73
POLK								0			
RANDOLPH	34-2524	Bio-Medical Applications of Asheboro	Asheboro	27	10	0	0	37	27	74.1%	2.96
RICHMOND	34-2539	Dialysis Care of Richmond County	Hamlet	21	0	0	0	21	21	85.7%	3.43
ROBESON	34-2528	Lumberton Dialysis Unit (BMA)	Lumberton	33	0	0	0	33	33	77.3%	3.09
	34-2623	FMC Dialysis Services of Robeson County *	Fairmont	10	0	0	6	16	10	97.5%	3.90
	34-2607	BMA of Red Springs	Red Springs	20	0	0	0	20	20	60.0%	2.40
	n/a	Dialysis Care of Saint Pauls **	St. Pauls	0	0	10	0	10			
ROCKINGHAM	34-2536	Dialysis Care of Rockingham County	Eden	25	-10	0	3	18	25	82.0%	3.28
	34-2624	Madison Dialysis Center	Madison	10	0	0	0	10	10	37.5%	1.50
	n/a	Reidsville Dialysis Center *	Reidsville	0	10	0	0	10			
	n/a	BMA of Rockingham ***	Reidsville	0	10	0	0	10			
	34-2574	Gambro Healthcare Reidsville	Reidsville	8	0	0	0	8	8	100.0%	4.00
ROWAN	34-2546	Dialysis Care of Rowan County	Salisbury	22	0	0	0	22	27	78.7%	3.15
	34-2592	Dialysis Care of Kannapolis/Rowan	Kannapolis	15	0	0	0	15	10	85.0%	3.40
RUTHERFORD	34-2566	Dialysis Care of Rutherford County	Forest City	22	0	0	2	24	22	88.6%	3.55
SAMPSON	34-2559	BMA of Clinton	Clinton	39	0	0	0	39	39	74.4%	2.97

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

Table A: Inventory of Dialysis Stations and Calculation of Utilization Rates
 (Inventory Compiled 6/25/04; Utilization Rates Calculated for 12/31/03)

COUNTY	PROVIDER NUMBER	FACILITY	CITY	Number of Dialysis Stations as of 6/25/04				Certified Stations 12/31/03	# In-Center Patients 12/31/03	Utilization Rates		
				Certified	CON Issued /Not Cert.	Decision Rendered	Decision Pending			TOTAL	By Percent	Patients per Station
SCOTLAND	34-2540	BMA of Laurinburg	Laurinburg	21	5	0	0	26	21	91	108.3%	4.33
	34-2565	BMA of Albemarle	Albemarle	18	0	0	0	18	18	55	76.4%	3.06
	34-2633	King Dialysis Center	King	11	0	0	0	11				
SURRY	34-2551	Mt. Airy Dialysis Center (WFU)	Mt. Airy	16	4	0	0	20	16	57	89.1%	3.56
	34-2614	Elkin Dialysis Center (WFU)	Elkin	19	0	0	0	19	19	45	59.2%	2.37
SWAIN	34-2602	Cherokee Dialysis Center	Cherokee	14	0	0	0	14	14	37	66.1%	2.64
TRANSYLVANIA								0				
TYRRELL								0				
UNION	34-2525	Metrolina Kidney Center (BMA Monroe)	Monroe	21	0	0	0	21	21	69	82.1%	3.29
	34-2526	Gambro Healthcare Union County	Monroe	24	0	0	0	24	24	94	97.9%	3.92
VANCE	34-2543	Gambro Healthcare-Henderson	Henderson	33	-15	0	0	18	33	135	102.3%	4.09
	n/a	Gambro Healthcare-Henderson West *	Henderson	0	17	0	0	17				
WAKE	34-2544	Cary Kidney Center (BMA)	Cary	24	0	4	0	28	24	94	97.9%	3.92
	34-2512	Raleigh Clinic Dialysis (BMA)	Raleigh	43	0	0	0	43	43	182	105.8%	4.23
	n/a	FMC Capital City Dialysis Center *	Raleigh	0	20	0	0	20				
	34-2608	BMA of Fuquay Varina	Fuquay-Varina	16	1	0	0	17	16	52	81.3%	3.25
	34-2589	Zebulon Kidney Center (BMA)	Zebulon	19	0	0	0	19	19	75	98.7%	3.95
	34-2522	Wake Dialysis Clinic	Raleigh	48	-1	0	0	47	48	184	95.8%	3.83
	n/a	BMA of Southwest Wake *	Raleigh	0	15	0	0	15				
WARREN	34-2610	FMC Dialysis Services of Warren Hills	Warrenton	10	0	0	0	10	10	28	70.0%	2.80
WASHINGTON	34-2618	FMC Dialysis Services of Plymouth (BMA)	Plymouth	11	0	0	0	11	11	31	70.5%	2.82
WATAUGA	34-2311	Watauga Kidney Dialysis Center	Boone	10	2	0	0	12	10	35	87.5%	3.50
WAYNE	34-2531	Gambro Healthcare-Goldsboro	Goldsboro	25	0	0	0	25	25	87	87.0%	3.48
	34-2587	Gambro Healthcare-Goldsboro South	Goldsboro	16	5	0	0	21	16	63	98.4%	3.94
	34-2573	Gambro Healthcare-Mount Olive	Mount Olive	11	0	0	0	11	11	40	90.9%	3.64
	34-2576	Dialysis Care of Wayne County	Goldsboro	11	0	0	0	11	11	27	61.4%	2.45
WILKES	34-2313	Wilkes Regional Dialysis Center	N. Wilkesboro	10	1	0	0	11	10	42	105.0%	4.20
WILSON	34-2507	Gambro Healthcare-Wilson	Wilson	30	-4	0	0	26	40	149	93.1%	3.73
	34-2637	Gambro Healthcare-Forest Hills *	Forest Hills	10	10	0	0	20				
YADKIN							0					
YANCEY							0					
STATE TOTALS				3,120	205	46	32	3,403	3,094	9,991		

* 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

COUNTY	12/31/1999 Total Patients	12/31/2000 Total Patients	12/31/2001 Total Patients	12/31/2002 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Total Patients	Average Annual Change Rate for Past Five Years	Projected 12/31/2004 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Home Patients	% Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 In-Center Patients	Projected 12/31/04 In-Center Station Utilization	Total Available Stations	Projected Station Deficit or Surplus	County Station Need Determination
Alamance	150	166	179	177	180	0.048	188.6	6	3.3%	6.3	182.3	57	65	Surplus of 8	0
Alexander	18	22	23	23	21	0.045	21.9	6	28.6%	6.3	15.7	5	0	5	0
Alleghany	6	9	7	9	6	0.058	6.3	1	16.7%	1.1	5.3	2	0	2	0
Anson	41	53	57	67	59	0.106	65.3	2	3.4%	2.2	63.0	20	13	7	0
Ashe	11	11	8	12	15	0.119	16.8	3	20.0%	3.4	13.4	4	0	4	0
Avery	8	9	13	12	12	0.123	13.5	4	33.3%	4.5	9.0	3	0	3	0
Beaufort	73	90	82	84	90	0.060	95.4	22	24.4%	23.3	72.1	23	25	Surplus of 2	0
Bertie	49	52	50	56	56	0.036	58.0	3	5.4%	3.1	54.9	17	16	1	0
Bladen	44	55	60	65	57	0.075	61.3	4	7.0%	4.3	57.0	18	17	1	0
Brunswick	62	70	66	63	76	0.058	80.4	12	15.8%	12.7	67.7	21	18	3	0
Buncombe	167	181	196	211	234	0.088	254.6	26	11.1%	28.3	226.3	71	66	5	0
Burke	70	83	78	77	70	0.005	70.4	4	5.7%	4.0	66.4	21	25	Surplus of 4	0
Cabarrus	143	152	152	142	131	-0.020	128.4	14	10.7%	13.7	114.7	36	40	Surplus of 4	0
Caldwell	89	98	100	109	119	0.076	128.0	17	14.3%	18.3	109.7	34	34	0	0
Camden	11	11	15	15	11	0.024	11.3	5	45.5%	5.1	6.1	2	0	2	0
Carteret	29	35	45	49	61	0.207	73.6	2	3.3%	2.4	71.2	22	20	2	0
Caswell	40	34	29	33	38	-0.002	37.9	6	15.8%	6.0	31.9	10	10	0	0
Catawba	130	134	128	129	145	0.029	149.3	24	16.6%	24.7	124.6	39	47	Surplus of 8	0
Chatham	49	53	54	52	45	-0.018	44.2	4	8.9%	3.9	40.3	13	19	Surplus of 6	0
Cherokee	12	13	10	13	14	0.057	14.8	0	0.0%	0.0	14.8	5	0	5	0
Chowan	33	35	29	29	32	-0.002	31.9	3	9.4%	3.0	28.9	9	17	Surplus of 8	0
Clay	8	6	7	9	9	0.051	9.5	0	0.0%	0.0	9.5	3	0	3	0
Cleveland	133	147	151	145	169	0.065	179.9	21	12.4%	22.4	157.6	49	41	8	0
Columbus	86	104	101	103	100	0.043	104.3	2	2.0%	2.1	102.2	32	31	1	0
Craven	143	145	153	146	152	0.016	154.5	3	2.0%	3.0	151.4	47	68	Surplus of 21	0
Cumberland	323	382	406	408	408	0.063	433.5	39	9.6%	41.4	392.1	123	121	2	0
Currituck	8	7	11	15	17	0.236	21.0	3	17.6%	3.7	17.3	5	0	5	0
Dare	25	20	17	19	20	-0.045	19.1	5	25.0%	4.8	14.3	4	9	Surplus of 5	0
Davidson	115	130	153	136	139	0.055	146.6	15	10.8%	15.8	130.8	41	46	Surplus of 5	0
Davie	16	19	23	26	23	0.103	25.4	7	30.4%	7.7	17.7	6	0	6	0
Duplin	88	104	118	124	130	0.104	143.5	9	6.9%	9.9	133.6	42	36	6	0
Durham	333	378	391	409	435	0.070	465.4	19	4.4%	20.3	445.0	139	136	3	0
Edgecombe	107	121	144	166	168	0.121	188.4	10	6.0%	11.2	177.2	55	50	5	0
Forsyth	412	442	460	482	501	0.050	526.1	46	9.2%	48.3	477.8	149	163	Surplus of 14	0
Franklin	65	61	69	77	84	0.069	89.8	5	6.0%	5.3	84.5	26	22	4	0
Gaston	189	182	182	194	202	0.018	205.5	23	11.4%	23.4	182.1	57	55	2	0
Gates	12	17	21	24	26	0.220	31.7	1	3.8%	1.2	30.5	10	0	10	0
Graham	7	9	12	9	9	0.092	9.8	0	0.0%	0.0	9.8	3	0	3	0

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by County

COUNTY	12/31/1999 Total Patients	12/31/2000 Total Patients	12/31/2001 Total Patients	12/31/2002 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Total Patients	Average Annual Change Rate for Past Five Years	Projected 12/31/2004 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Home Patients	12/31/2003 % Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 In-Center Patients	Projected 12/31/04 In-Center Station Utilization	Total Available Stations	Projected Station Deficit or Surplus	County Station Need Determination
Granville	76	74	85	92	96	0.062	102.0	8	8.3%	8.5	93.5	29	25	4	0
Greene	24	23	33	38	39	0.143	44.6	4	10.3%	4.6	40.0	12	10	2	0
Guilford	529	580	621	692	714	0.078	769.9	42	5.9%	45.3	724.6	226	246	Surplus of 20	0
Halifax	110	116	115	129	135	0.054	142.2	9	6.7%	9.5	132.7	41	46	Surplus of 5	0
Harnett	84	98	103	107	111	0.073	119.2	11	9.9%	11.8	107.3	34	30	4	0
Haywood	25	41	41	45	51	0.218	62.1	7	13.7%	8.5	53.6	17	14	3	0
Henderson	50	53	62	71	65	0.073	69.7	9	13.8%	9.7	60.1	19	20	Surplus of 1	0
Herrford	49	45	58	62	74	0.117	82.7	4	5.4%	4.5	78.2	24	18	6	0
Hoke	58	63	65	66	70	0.048	73.4	2	2.9%	2.1	71.3	22	22	0	0
Hyde	7	10	14	13	10	0.132	11.3	0	0.0%	0.0	11.3	4	0	4	0
Iredell	140	149	161	140	148	0.018	150.6	17	11.5%	17.3	133.3	42	49	Surplus of 7	0
Jackson	15	17	20	13	12	-0.029	11.6	3	25.0%	2.9	8.7	3	21	Surplus of 18	0
Johnston	110	122	138	155	157	0.094	171.8	15	9.6%	16.4	155.4	49	51	Surplus of 2	0
Jones	26	20	23	24	21	-0.041	20.1	0	0.0%	0.0	20.1	6	10	Surplus of 4	0
Lee	100	99	96	100	91	-0.022	89.0	9	9.9%	8.8	80.2	25	24	1	0
Lenoir	155	170	179	190	179	0.038	185.9	8	4.5%	8.3	177.6	56	63	Surplus of 8	0
Lincoln	34	33	39	38	44	0.071	47.1	4	9.1%	4.3	42.8	13	17	Surplus of 4	0
Macon	13	17	12	15	13	0.033	13.4	6	46.2%	6.2	7.2	2	0	2	0
Madison	4	7	7	12	12	0.366	16.4	0	0.0%	0.0	16.4	5	0	5	0
Martin	66	68	77	76	78	0.044	81.4	10	12.8%	10.4	71.0	22	23	Surplus of 1	0
McDowell	25	28	23	31	26	0.032	26.8	2	7.7%	2.1	24.8	8	9	Surplus of 1	0
Mecklenburg	605	702	742	813	870	0.096	953.3	74	8.5%	81.1	872.2	273	267	6	0
Mitchell	10	9	12	7	6	-0.082	5.5	1	16.7%	0.9	4.6	1	0	1	0
Montgomery	40	42	40	37	37	-0.018	36.3	2	5.4%	2.0	34.4	11	12	Surplus of 1	0
Moore	97	117	115	112	112	0.041	116.6	9	8.0%	9.4	107.2	33	43	Surplus of 10	0
Nash	117	123	131	139	128	0.025	131.1	9	7.0%	9.2	121.9	38	52	Surplus of 14	0
New Hanover	155	140	149	154	170	0.026	174.5	17	10.0%	17.4	157.0	49	57	Surplus of 8	0
Northampton	52	58	59	64	57	0.027	58.5	2	3.5%	2.1	56.5	18	14	4	0
Onslow	101	108	110	105	106	0.013	107.4	7	6.6%	7.1	100.3	31	35	Surplus of 4	0
Orange	76	85	109	103	111	0.106	122.7	7	6.3%	7.7	115.0	36	36	0	0
Pamlico	19	16	14	14	17	-0.017	16.7	0	0.0%	0.0	16.7	5	0	5	0
Pasquotank	50	46	54	54	54	0.023	55.3	6	11.1%	6.1	49.1	15	16	Surplus of 1	0
Pender	53	61	63	62	57	0.022	58.2	5	8.8%	5.1	53.1	17	18	Surplus of 1	0
Perquimans	12	13	12	12	17	0.106	18.8	1	5.9%	1.1	17.7	6	0	6	0
Person	60	69	69	76	79	0.073	84.7	2	2.5%	2.1	82.6	26	20	6	0
Pitt	204	206	241	262	259	0.064	275.5	20	7.7%	21.3	254.3	79	91	Surplus of 12	0
Polk	14	18	17	13	16	0.056	16.9	3	18.8%	3.2	13.7	4	0	4	0
Randolph	73	101	104	111	106	0.109	117.5	8	7.5%	8.9	108.7	34	37	Surplus of 3	0

* Pursuant to Step (1)(E) of the County Need Methodology, the need determination is zero because a facility in this county was operating below 80% utilization (see "Utilization Rates" in Table A).

Table B: ESRD Dialysis Station Need Determinations by County

COUNTY	12/31/1999 Total Patients	12/31/2000 Total Patients	12/31/2001 Total Patients	12/31/2002 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Total Patients	Average Annual Change Rate for Past Five Years	Projected 12/31/2004 Total Patients	12/31/2003 Home Patients	12/31/2003 % Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 Home Patients	Projected 12/31/2004 In-Center Patients	Projected 12/31/04 In-Center Station Utilization	Total Available Stations	Projected Station Deficit or Surplus	County Station Need Determination
Richmond	75	69	76	75	80	0.019	81.5	5	6.3%	5.1	76.4	24	21	3	0
Robeson	201	223	255	267	253	0.062	268.7	20	7.9%	21.2	247.4	77	79	Surplus of 2	0
Rockingham	139	152	144	156	143	0.010	144.5	5	3.5%	5.1	139.4	44	56	Surplus of 12	0
Rowan	118	131	129	119	129	0.025	132.3	22	17.1%	22.6	109.7	34	37	Surplus of 3	0
Rutherford	57	67	69	68	78	0.084	84.6	5	6.4%	5.4	79.2	25	24	1	0
Sampson	107	108	114	118	134	0.059	141.9	6	4.5%	6.4	135.5	42	39	3	0
Scotland	44	50	61	63	83	0.177	97.7	5	6.0%	5.9	91.8	29	26	3	0
Stanly	44	50	59	57	61	0.088	66.4	4	6.6%	4.4	62.0	19	18	1	0
Stokes	24	27	33	36	34	0.096	37.3	5	14.7%	5.5	31.8	10	11	Surplus of 1	0
Surry	59	51	62	73	79	0.085	85.7	11	13.9%	11.9	73.8	23	39	Surplus of 16	0
Swain	3	29	44	37	33	2.229	106.6	7	21.2%	22.6	84.0	26	14	12	0*
Transylvania	20	22	26	22	19	-0.002	19.0	4	21.1%	4.0	15.0	5	0	5	0
Tyrrell	5	3	2	3	3	-0.058	2.8	0	0.0%	0.0	2.8	1	0	1	0
Union	88	100	105	121	122	0.087	132.6	10	8.2%	10.9	121.7	38	45	Surplus of 7	0
Vance	108	112	120	126	125	0.038	129.7	5	4.0%	5.2	124.5	39	35	4	0
Wake	471	509	557	621	649	0.084	703.3	62	9.6%	67.2	636.2	199	189	10	10
Warren	32	34	38	42	38	0.048	39.8	0	0.0%	0.0	39.8	12	10	2	0
Washington	30	35	32	34	39	0.073	41.8	5	12.8%	5.4	36.5	11	11	0	0
Watauga	18	21	17	26	21	0.078	22.6	2	9.5%	2.2	20.5	6	12	Surplus of 6	0
Wayne	226	226	239	220	218	-0.008	216.3	19	8.7%	18.9	197.5	62	68	Surplus of 6	0
Wilkes	36	40	46	53	56	0.117	62.6	9	16.1%	10.1	52.5	16	11	5	0
Wilson	124	137	157	160	161	0.069	172.1	20	12.4%	21.4	150.7	47	46	1	0
Yadkin	18	22	19	26	27	0.123	30.3	4	14.8%	4.5	25.8	8	0	8	0
Yancey	12	9	8	13	13	0.066	13.9	3	23.1%	3.2	10.7	3	0	3	0
Unknowns	47	30	0	0	0			0							
State Totals	8,849	9,644	10,225	10,702	11,010			957	8.7%						20

* Pursuant to Step (1)(E) of the County Need Methodology, the need determination is zero because a facility in this county was operating below 80% utilization (see "Utilization Rates" in Table A).

Table C: Need Determinations for New Dialysis Stations by County
(Based on the "County Need" Methodology -- July, 2004)

County	HSA	Number of New Dialysis Stations Needed	Certificate of Need Application Due Date *	Certificate of Need Beginning Review Date
Gates	VI	10	September 15, 2004	October 1, 2004
Wake	IV	10	September 15, 2004	October 1, 2004

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

