



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES REVIEW BOARD

525 WEST JEFFERSON ST. • SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62761 • (217) 782-3516 FAX: (217) 785-4111

<b>DOCKET NO:</b> I-01	<b>BOARD MEETING:</b> September 14, 2021	<b>PROJECT NO:</b> 20-040	<b>PROJECT COST:</b> Original: \$17,764,000
<b>FACILITY NAME:</b> OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin		<b>CITY:</b> Elgin	
<b>TYPE OF PROJECT:</b> Substantive			<b>HSA:</b> VIII

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This Application for Permit asks the State Board to approve the construction of a four-room ambulatory surgery center in Elgin in the HSA VIII Health Service Area. The Applicants are proposing to provide orthopedic, pain management, and podiatry surgical services. The estimated project cost is \$17,764,000 and the expected completion date March 1, 2023.

The purpose of the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act is to establish a procedure (1) which requires a person establishing, constructing or modifying a health care facility, as herein defined, to have the qualifications, background, character and financial resources to adequately provide a proper service for the community; (2) that promotes the orderly and economic development of health care facilities in the State of Illinois that avoids unnecessary duplication of such facilities; and (3) that promotes planning for and development of health care facilities needed for comprehensive health care especially in areas where the health planning process has identified unmet needs. Cost containment and support for safety net services must continue to be central tenets of the Certificate of Need process. (20 ILCS 3960/2)

The Certificate of Need process **required under this Act is designed to restrain rising health care costs by preventing unnecessary construction or modification of health care facilities.** The Board must assure that the establishment, construction, or modification of a health care facility or the acquisition of major medical equipment is consistent with the public interest and that the proposed project is consistent with the orderly and economic development or acquisition of those facilities and equipment and is in accord with the standards, criteria, or plans of need adopted and approved by the Board. Board decisions regarding the construction of health care facilities must consider capacity, quality, value, and equity.

Information received by the State Board regarding this project can be found at this link.  
<https://www2.illinois.gov/sites/hfsrb/Projects/Pages/OrthoIllinois-Surgery-Center-Elgin,-Elgin--20-040.aspx>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- This Application for Permit asks the State Board to approve the construction of a four-room ambulatory surgery center in Elgin in the HSA VIII Health Service Area. The Applicants are proposing to provide orthopedic, pain management, and podiatry surgical services. The estimated project cost is \$17,764,000 and the expected completion date March 1, 2023.
- On May 4, 2021, the State Board issued an Intent to Deny. In accordance with the regulation, the Applicants requested to reappear before the State Board and submit additional information. **Additional information** was received by the State Board on June 9, 2021 and is included at the end of this report along with **the transcript** from May 4, 2021 State Board meeting.
- In response to the State Board's concern of revenue by payor source and patients by payor source of the Applicants the State Board Staff has provided payor source information for the period 2015-2019 for the ASTC owned by OrthoIllinois in Rockford, Illinois [See page 8 of this report].
- Only those criteria that did not receive a positive finding at the May 4, 2021 State Board Meeting will be discussed as part of this report. The Applicant has successfully addressed the following criteria in the Original State Board Staff Report:
  1. Criterion 1110.110 (a) - Background of the Applicant
  2. Criterion 1110.110 (b) – Purpose of the Project
  3. Criterion 1110.110 (d) – Alternatives to the Proposed Project
  4. Criterion 1110.120 (a) - Size of the Project
  5. Criterion 1110.235(a) - (Formula Calculation)
  6. Criterion 1110.235(c)(8) - Staffing
  7. Criterion 1110.235(c)(9) – Charge Commitment
  8. Criterion 1120.130 – Financial Viability
  9. Criterion 1120.140 (a) - Reasonableness of Financing Arrangements
  10. Criterion 1120.140 (b) - Terms of Debt Service
  11. Criterion 1120.140 (c) - Reasonableness of Project Costs
  12. Criterion 1120.140 (d) - Direct Operating Costs
  13. Criterion 1120.140 (e) - Effect of the Project on Operating Costs

### PUBLIC HEARING/COMMENT:

- No public hearing was requested. The State Board has received a number of support and opposition comments/letters/emails related to this project. These letters of support and opposition can be found on the State Board's Website at the link above and are included in the packet of material forwarded to all State Board Members.

### STAFF NOTE:

- The Original State Board Staff Report did not accept two referral letters from the Applicants because two physicians had committed to refer patients to the Advocate Sherman ASTC [Project #16-038]<sup>1</sup>. State Board rules state “*Verification by the physician that the patient referrals have not been used to support another pending or approved CON application for the subject services*” [77 ILAC 1110.235 (c) (3) (b)]. In additional information to address the intent to deny the Applicants provided two revised physician referral letters in which the two physicians committed to refer patients to both Advocate Sherman ASTC [Project #16-038] and the proposed project. **Those two letters are included at the end of this report.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Permit #16-038 was approved in **January 2017** to establish an ASTC at a cost of \$12.7 million in Elgin, Illinois. The initial project completion date was March 31, 2019. In **March of 2019** a permit renewal was approved by the State Board extending the completion date to **September 30, 2021**. The Annual Report received **February 2021** stated: To date the work performed on the Project includes: • Construction Design and Design architectural and engineering packages have been approved by the Illinois Department of Public Health. • Work has been undertaken with the City of Elgin for permitting. • The General Contractor has been engaged and begun pre-construction activities and has begun to procure subcontractors. Advocate has expended approximately \$615,806. Advocate estimates that the Project is approximately 20% complete.

**CONCLUSION:**

- There are three ASTC within the 10-mile GSA that provide the services proposed by this project and one ASTC [Advocate Sherman ASTC – Permit #16-038] that the Board has approved but not yet in operation. In total these four ASTCs have been approved for a total surgical capacity of 13 operating rooms and 3 procedure rooms. 2019 surgical hours in this 10-mile GSA will justify 10 rooms and not the 13 operating rooms that have been approved by the State Board. Additionally, one hospital [AMITA Health Presence St. Joseph Hospital – Elgin] has sufficient excess capacity to accommodate all the workload proposed by this project.
- The Applicants have stated at page 178 of the Application for Permit, *“the physician investors of OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin, LLC intend to cease referring patient to other area facilities, and service their caseload at the proposed facility. With four operating rooms, the ASTC will have ample capacity to meet the needs of OrthoIllinois and demand of the physician group’s patients, while at the same time offering operating rooms to area providers under their open staff policy.”* As can be seen in the Table below the proposed project will impact five facilities in the area. Approximately 40% of the surgical hours and 29% of the cases will be removed from Algonquin Road Surgery Center. AMITA Health St Joseph Hospital-Elgin will have 9% of their cases and 12% of their hours redirected to the proposed project.

Facilities impacted by Proposed ASTC					
	Advocate Sherman Hospital	AMITA St. Joseph Elgin	NW Huntley Hospital	Algonquin Road Surgery Ctr.	Valley ASC
Total Cases <sup>(1)</sup>	15,174	3,816	5,410	2,927	5,495
Total Surgery Hours <sup>(1)</sup>	25,214	4,823	11,168	3,713	7,882
Estimated # of Cases to be moved to proposed ASTC	941	327	575	831	70
Estimated Hours	1,678	583	1,025	1,482	125
% of Total Cases Removed	6.2%	8.6%	10.6%	28.4%	1.3%
% of hours Removed	6.7%	12.1%	9.2%	39.9%	1.6%
1. Cases and Hours taken from 2019 Hospital and ASTC Profile Information					

- The Applicants addressed a total of 21 criteria and did not meet 8 criteria listed below in the Original State Board Staff Report. With the revised referral letters and a firm commitment letter from the lending institution that financing will be available the Applicants have successfully addressed Projected Utilization, Service Demand, Treatment Room Need Assessment, Assurances and Availability of Funds. Availability of Funds will be addressed at the State Board Meeting by a representative from the financial institution providing the funding. Projected Financial Information is included as **Exhibit I** at the end of this report
  - 77 IAC 1110.120 (b) – Projected Utilization
  - 77 IAC 1110.235(c)(3) - Service Demand
  - 77 IAC 1110.235 (c) (5) – Treatment Room Need Assessment
  - 77 IAC 1110.235 (c) (10) – Assurances
  - 77 IAC 1120.120 – Availability of Funds
  - 77 IAC 1110.235(c)(6) - Service Accessibility
  - 77 IAC 1110.235(c)(7) – Unnecessary Duplication of Service
  - 77 IAC 1110.235 (c) (7) – Impact on Other Providers

<b>State Board Standards Not Met</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Reasons for Non-Compliance</b>
77 IAC 1110.235(c)(6) - Service Accessibility	There are five ASTCs and two hospitals within the 10-mile GSA. One of the ASTCs is not in operation [Advocate Sherman ASTC] and one provides gastroenterology services only [Elgin Gastroenterology Endoscopy Center]. The remaining three ASTC provide orthopedic services and are not at the target occupancy of 1,500 hours per operating/procedure room and have the capacity to accommodate the workload proposed by the Applicants. Additionally, there has been no indication of restrictive admission policies in this GSA. Finally, this project is not a cooperative venture with a hospital. It appears service accessibility can be accomplished with the existing providers
77 IAC 1110.235(c)(7) – Unnecessary Duplication of Service	There are five ASTCs and two hospitals within the 10-mile GSA. One of the ASTCs is not in operation [Advocate Sherman ASTC] and one provides gastroenterology services only [Elgin Gastroenterology Endoscopy Center]. The remaining three ASTC provide orthopedic services and are not at target occupancy and have the capacity to accommodate the workload proposed by the Applicants.
77 IAC 1110.235 (c) (7) – Impact on Other Providers	As can be seen by the Table above the proposed project will impact five facilities in the area. Approximately 40% of the surgical hours and 29% of the cases will be removed from Algonquin Road Surgery Center. AMITA Health St Joseph Hospital-Elgin will have 9% of their cases and 12% of their hours redirected to the proposed project.

**STATE BOARD STAFF REPORT**  
 Project #20-040  
 OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC

<b>APPLICATION/CHRONOLOGY/SUMMARY</b>	
Applicants	OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC, Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois
Facility Name	OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC
Location	NE Corner of Alft Lane and Westfield Drive, Elgin, Illinois
Permit Holder	OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC, Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois
Operating Entity	OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC
Owner of Site	Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois
Application Received	October 11, 2020
Application Deemed Complete	October 13, 2020
Application Modified	February 10, 2021
Review Period Ends	April 11, 2021
Financial Commitment	24 months after Approval
Intent to Deny	May 4, 2021
Project Completion Date	March 31, 2023

**I. Project Description**

The Applicants are asking the State Board to approve the construction of a four-operating room ambulatory surgery treatment center in Elgin, Illinois. The Applicants are proposing to provide orthopedic, pain management, and podiatry surgical services. The estimated project cost is \$17,764,000 and the expected completion date March 1, 2023.

**II. Summary of Findings**

- A. State Board Staff finds the proposed project does **not** appear to be in conformance with the provisions of 77 ILAC 1110 (Part 1110).
- B. State Board Staff finds the proposed project is in conformance with the provisions of 77 ILAC 1120 (Part 1120).

**III. General Information**

The Applicants are OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC and Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois. Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois is a bone and joint physician practice comprised of 40 musculoskeletal subspecialty physicians and anesthesiologists founded in 1967. The practice includes four clinics and nine rehabilitation locations serving Winnebago, McHenry, and Kane counties, with a fifth clinic opening in McHenry, Illinois in August 2020. OrthoIllinois owns Rockford Orthopedic Surgery Center d/b/a OrthoIllinois, 346 Roxbury Road Rockford, IL

OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC is a new physician owned Illinois limited liability company. Rockford Orthopedic Associates, Ltd. d/b/a OrthoIllinois owns 9.09% of

OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC. The 10 physicians listed below have an ownership interest of 9.09% of OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC.

- Dr. Palmer
- Dr. Stanley
- Dr. Van Thiel
- Dr. Daniels
- Dr. HoltKamp
- Dr. Kazaglis
- Dr. Bohnenkamp
- Dr. Carlile
- Dr. Mox
- Dr. Brissey

This is a substantive project subject to a Parts 1110 and 1120 Review. Financial Commitment will occur after permit issuance.

**IV. Health Planning Area**

The proposed project is in the HSA VIII Health Service Area. HSA VIII includes Kane, McHenry, and Lake Counties. The State Board is projecting a 5-year increase (2017 to 2022) in the population from 1,547,300 in 2017 to 1,716,200 in 2022 an increase of 169,000 residents or 11% by 2022. The Geographical Service Area for this project is a 10-mile radius from the proposed location of the surgery center (77 ILAC 1100.510 (d)). This 10-mile radius includes 16-zip codes with a population of approximately 456,125 residents.

**V. Project Uses and Sources of Funds**

This project is being funded with cash in the amount of \$1 million and a mortgage of \$16,764,000. The Purchase price of 3.69 acres of land is \$1,025,000 (Purchase and Sale Agreement pages 28-47 of the Application for Permit). The estimated start-up costs and operating deficit are \$9,934,149.

<b>TABLE ONE</b>				
Project Costs and Sources of Funds				
USE OF FUNDS	Review	Non-Reviewable	Total	% of Total
Preplanning Costs	\$125,000	\$80,000	\$205,000	1.15%
Site Preparation	\$241,000	\$241,000	\$482,000	2.71%
Off Site Work	\$325,000	\$140,000	\$465,000	2.62%
New Construction Contracts	\$4,589,255	\$2,939,745	\$7,529,000	42.38%
Contingencies	\$235,000	\$235,000	\$470,000	2.65%
Architectural/Engineering Fees	\$405,000	\$300,000	\$705,000	3.97%
Consulting and Other Fees	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000	16.89%
Movable or Other Equipment	\$2,139,500	\$1,696,300	\$3,835,800	21.59%
Net Interest Expense During Construction	\$192,960	\$128,640	\$321,600	1.81%
Other Costs to Be Capitalized	\$450,360	\$300,240	\$750,600	4.23%
<b>TOTAL USES OF FUNDS</b>	<b>\$10,203,075</b>	<b>\$7,560,925</b>	<b>\$17,764,000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
SOURCE OF FUNDS	Review	Non-Reviewable	Total	% of Total
Cash and Securities	\$800,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000	5.63%
Mortgages	\$9,403,075	\$7,360,925	\$16,764,000	94.37%
<b>TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>	<b>\$10,203,075</b>	<b>\$7,560,925</b>	<b>\$17,764,000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Table Two below documents the five highest procedures to be performed at the proposed surgery center.

<b>TABLE TWO</b>				
Projected Five Highest Number of Procedures to be Performed at the Proposed ASTC & Charges				
Procedure Code	Description	Charges		
		Medicare	Medicaid	HOPD
27447	Total Knee Arthroplasty	\$8,875	\$4,467	\$11,900
64721	Carpel Tunnel Surgery	\$818	\$412	\$1,719
29827	Rotator Cuff Repair	\$2,978	\$1,499	\$5,981
22551	Anterior Cervical Fusion with Interbody Fusion	\$8,657	\$4,357	\$11,900
29881	Knee Arthroscopy, Meniscectomy, Medial OR Lateral	\$1,350	\$680	\$2,737

### A) Safety Net Impact Statement

The Applicants provided a Safety Net Impact Statement as required.

The Applicants stated the following:

*“Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Centers are not providers of safety net services, with all procedures scheduled on an elective basis. The applicants, however, are directly affiliated with OrthoIllinois, and physicians investing in this project are employed by OrthoIllinois. The practice has served the bone and joint needs of northern Illinois for over 70 years, since 1967. OrthoIllinois has a long history of civic engagement and commitment to the communities it serves. Since 2004, they have raised over \$450,000 for the programs at Northern Illinois Food Bank’s after school and weekend meal programs, enabling tens of thousands of children to be served. They also have a tradition of charitable giving and*

capital campaign pledges to hospital foundations, United Way programs, and University of Illinois School of Medicine and other not for profit agencies in the area. The applicant is a new entity; thus, has no history of services. However, the Safety Net Impact of OrthoIllinois practice is provided below.” No charity care information was provided by the Applicants.

OrthoIllinois, in the Table Three provided the number of Medicaid patients and Medicaid revenue for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019.

<b>TABLE THREE</b>			
<b>Medicaid Information</b>			
<b>OrthoIllinois</b>			
<b>Medicaid (# of patients)</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Outpatient	77	98	86
<b>Total</b>	77	98	86
<b>Medicaid (revenue)</b>			
Outpatient	\$712,670	\$956,728	\$772,005
<b>Total</b>	\$712,670	\$956,728	\$772,005

**Additional Information:**

In response to concerns expressed at the May 4, 2021 State Board Meeting payor source information for the Rockford ASTC owned by the Applicants are presented in Table Four below. The net revenue by payor source and the number of patients by payor source for the ASTC owned by OrthoIllinois in Rockford is outlined below for the years 2015-2019. Medicaid Revenue was less than ½ of 1% of total net revenue for those five years. The number of Medicaid patients cared for was (2%) of the total patients provided care for those five years at the Rockford ASTC.

<b>TABLE FOUR</b>							
<b>Rockford Orthopedic Surgery Center d/b/a Ortho</b>							
<b>Net Revenue by Payor Source</b>							
Year	Medicare	Medicaid	Other	Insurance	Private Pay	Charity	Total
2019	\$2,353,641	\$84,922	\$0	\$16,179,799	\$1,334,860	\$0	\$19,953,222
2018	\$2,079,909	\$49,750	\$0	\$15,784,848	\$1,125,118	\$0	\$19,039,625
2017	\$2,024,866	\$72,651	\$0	\$14,347,107	\$1,161,537	\$0	\$17,606,161
2016	\$1,188,346	\$47,810	\$0	\$10,628,653	\$791,423	\$0	\$12,656,232
2015	\$1,225,024	\$47,017	\$0	\$9,997,908	\$647,658	\$0	\$11,917,607
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,871,786</b>	<b>\$302,150</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$66,938,315</b>	<b>\$5,060,596</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$81,172,847</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>10.93%</b>	<b>0.37%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>82.46%</b>	<b>6.23%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Number of Patients by Payor Source</b>							
Year	Medicare	Medicaid	Other	Insurance	Private Pay	Charity	Total
2019	1,032	86	0	3,242	9	0	4,369
2018	854	98	0	3,146	10	0	4,108
2017	846	77	0	2,985	7	0	3,915
2016	807	69	0	2,725	5	0	3,606
2015	791	73	0	2,600	6	0	3,470
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,330</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,698</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,468</b>
<b>% of Total</b>	<b>22.24%</b>	<b>2.07%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>75.50%</b>	<b>0.19%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
1. Information from IDPH survey data for the years 2015-2019.							



## **B) Response to Safety Net Impact Statement**

**Advocate Sherman Hospital** responded to the Safety Net Impact Statement dated January 6, 2021.

*“Outpatient surgery is a critical service we provide to all patients in our service area, regardless of their ability to pay. It is also a service that contributes to our margin and allows us to offer safety net services that we would not otherwise be able to offer unless we had other services to subsidize them. This is especially important as the pandemic has seriously weakened our financial state. We're grateful for federal assistance but even that money does not come close to stemming our losses in 2020. In response, we are currently undergoing a significant leadership restructure which will help lower our expenses going into 2021. Our net revenues 2020 are down by \$37M (-13%) and we are budgeting an operating loss for 2021, which is a significant deterioration in financial performance over past years. We continue to provide care to the uninsured and financially deprived individuals within our community. Our charity care and the amount uncollectible from patients is up by \$21 M (53%). The proposed OrthoIllinois project directly undermines our ability to provide for these persons in need. Furthermore, this Project will do nothing to further the care for the underserved in our community. Unlike ambulatory surgery centers, Advocate Sherman Hospital cannot influence the payer mix of our emergency department nor do we screen out patients due to their insurance or uninsured status. In its CON application OrthoIllinois emphasizes the problem when it states that "Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Centers are not providers of safety net service". CON Application, p. 275. By not providing safety net services, this means that other providers, such as Advocate Sherman Hospital, must provide these necessary services.”*

### **Supplemental information regarding the Safety Net Impact Statement received from Advocate Sherman Hospital dated April 14, 2021**

*“By letter dated January 6, 2021 we filed a Response to Safety Net Impact Statement. In that Statement we outlined that our hospital net revenues were down by 13% to budget before COVID grant revenues and that our charity care and amount uncollectible from patients were up \$21,000,000 (53%). At that time, we also projected a significant operating loss. With calendar year 2020 now closed we can provide more detail. Over half of the hospital's revenue comes from public sources, such as Medicare and Medicaid. We are privileged to serve these patients and welcome all patients to Advocate Sherman Hospital regardless of their ability to pay. However, payments received from Medicare and Medicaid do not cover the cost of high-quality care for these patients. These are certainly trying times for hospitals. Hospitals such as Advocate Sherman more than ever are being forced to make difficult decisions as we face a number of financial headwinds including continuing expense inflation significantly exceeding reimbursement increases, the financial impact of COVID in 2020 and continued patient reluctance to seek services in the face of COVID in 2021 and increasing physician costs. We are grateful for the CARES ACT funding, but these dollars did not cover our losses in 2020. Even with those dollars the Sherman service area lost \$15 million last year. And this was not a one-time loss, we are budgeted to lose even more in 2021, and that is not sustainable for the long term. Advocate Sherman is in a way a safety net hospital given the population we serve. While we are of course taking appropriate action to strengthen our financial situation, the loss of profitable surgical volume to another ASC in the Elgin area will have a significant*

*detrimental impact to Advocate Sherman Hospital and the safety net services we provide at a time when we are already challenged as noted above.”*

**VI. Projected Utilization**

**A) Criterion 1110.120 (b) – Projected Utilization**

**Revised Finding:**

- a) The Applicants provided two revised physician referral letters [Dr. Kazaglis and Dr. Mox] in which the two physicians stated they are committed to referring patients to the proposed Advocate Sherman ASTC [Project #16-038] and the proposed project [Project #20-040]. With that commitment the Applicants propose to refer 2,715 patients to the proposed ASTC. With an average case time of 107 minutes the Applicants can justify the four operating rooms being requested. The Applicants have successfully addressed this criterion.

<b>TABLE FIVE</b>			
Summary of referrals to Proposed Project [#20-040] and Advocate Sherman ASTC [#16-038]			
Physicians	Total Cases	Refer to Proposed Project #[20-040]	Refer to Advocate Sherman ASTC [#16-038]
Kazaglis	425	268	157
Mox	356	170	116

- b) The Average Case Time for ASTCs in the State of Illinois for CY 2017, CY 2018, and CY 2019 is approximately 90 minutes. Using that average case time, the Applicants cannot justify the 4 rooms being requested. [2,715 referrals x 90 minutes = 4,073 hours ÷ 1,500 hours or 2.71 rooms or 3 rooms]. State Board rule states *“If the applicant does not meet the utilization standards in Appendix B, or if service areas do not have utilization standards in 77 Ill. Adm. Code 1100, the applicant shall justify its own utilization standard by providing published data or studies.* While the case time exceeds the State Average over the past 3 years the Applicants provided published data that justifies the Applicants’ Average Case Time of 107 minutes.<sup>2</sup> The Applicants have successfully addressed this criterion.

---

2 1. Does Operative Time Affect Infection Rate in Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty? Clinical Orthopedics and Related Research: January 2015 - Volume 473 - Issue 1 - p 64-69  
 2. Factors influencing operative time in arthroscopic rotator cuff repair: a comparison of knotless single-row vs. transosseous equivalent dual-row techniques. J Shoulder Elbow Surg. 2020 Jul;29(7S): S48-S52.  
 3. Safety and feasibility of outpatient ACDF in an ambulatory setting: A retrospective chart review. International Journal of Spine Surgery January 2013, 7 e84-e87  
 4. Operative Time as an Independent and Modifiable Risk Factor for Short-Term Complications After Knee Arthroscopy. Arthroscopy. 2019 Jul;35(7):2089-2098. doi: 10.1016/j.arthro.2019.01.059. Epub 2019 Jun 18. PMID: 31227396.  
 5. A prospective, randomized study with an independent observer comparing open carpal tunnel release with endoscopic carpal tunnel release. J Hand Surg Br. 1996 Apr;21(2):202-4. doi: 10.1016/s0266-7681(96)80097-0. PMID: 8732400.  
 6. Theatre time utilization in elective orthopedic surgery. J Perioper Pract. 2012 Aug;22(8):262-5. doi: 10.1177/175045891202200803. PMID: 23248928.

## VII. Non-Hospital Based Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center Services

### A) Service Demand

*The applicant shall document that the proposed project is necessary to accommodate the service demand experienced annually by the applicant, over the latest 2-year period, as evidenced by historical and projected referrals.*

**Revised Finding:** The Applicants provided two revised physician referral letters [Dr. Kazaglis and Dr. Mox] in which the two physicians stated they are committed to referring patients to the proposed Advocate Sherman ASTC [#16-038] and the proposed project[#20-040]. With that commitment the Applicants propose to refer a total of 2,745 patients to the proposed ASTC. With an average case time of 107 minutes the Applicants can justify the four operating rooms being requested. **The Applicants have successfully addressed this criterion.**

Physician	Referrals to Proposed ASTC	Historical Referrals				
		Total Referrals	Advocate Sherman Hospital	AMITA St. Joseph Elgin	NW Huntley	Valley ASTC
Bohnenkamp	292	612	64	0	514	0
Brissey	94	158	26	0	123	0
Carlile	30	253	52	0	201	0
Daniels <sup>(1)</sup>	180	503	0	0	419	0
Holtkamp	597	660	34	0	29	0
Izquierdo	263	523	250	0	10	0
Kazaglis	268	425	366	35	24	0
Mox	170	356	330	8	18	0
Palmer	420	760	190	400	0	170
Stanley	320	469	206	79	44	0
Van Thiel	111	136	24	0	16	0
Whitehurst	0	21				
Ferry	0	39				
Lawton	0	0				
Harvey	0	0				
Schott	0	0				
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,745</b>	<b>4,915</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>1,382</b>	<b>170</b>
1. 30 referrals were added to the 150 referrals of Dr. Daniels total to reflect his revised referral letter dated February 12, 2021.						

## **B) Treatment Room Need Assessment**

*The applicant shall document that the proposed number of surgical/treatment rooms for each ASTC service is necessary to service the projected patient volume. The number of rooms shall be justified based upon an annual minimum utilization of 1,500 hours of use per room, as established in 77 Ill. Adm. Code 1100.*

**Revised Finding:** Based upon the 2,715 referrals the Applicants have justified the 4 operating rooms being requested at 107 minutes per procedure. [2,715 procedures x 107 minutes = 4,842 hours ÷ 1,500 hours = 3.23 or 4 operating rooms. **The Applicants have met the requirements of this criterion.**

## **C) Service Accessibility**

*The proposed ASTC services being established or added are necessary to improve access for residents of the GSA. The applicant shall document that at least one of the following conditions exists in the GSA:*

- A) There are no other IDPH-licensed ASTCs within the identified GSA of the proposed project.*
- B) The other IDPH-licensed ASTC and hospital surgical/treatment rooms used for those ASTC services proposed by the project within the identified GSA are utilized at or above the utilization level specified in 77 Ill. Adm. Code 1100.*
- C) The ASTC services or specific types of procedures or operations that are components of an ASTC service are not currently available in the GSA or that existing underutilized services in the GSA have restrictive admission policies.*
- D) The proposed project is a cooperative venture sponsored by 2 or more persons, at least one of which operates an existing hospital.*

**Revised Finding:** There are five ASTCs and two hospitals within the 10-mile GSA. One of the ASTCs is not in operation [Advocate Sherman ASTC] and one provides gastroenterology services only [Elgin Gastroenterology Endoscopy Center]. The remaining three ASTC provide orthopedic services and are not at target occupancy and have the capacity to accommodate the workload proposed by the Applicants. Additionally, there has been no indication of restrictive admission policies in this GSA. Finally, this project is not a cooperative venture with a hospital. There is existing underutilized capacity in the 10-mile GSA, and it appears service accessibility can be accomplished with the existing providers. [See Table below]

**TABLE SIX**

## ASTCs and Hospitals within the GSA

Facility	City	Miles	Surgical Specialties	Operating Procedure Rooms	Hours	Rooms Justified	Met Standard? (1)
Algonquin Road Surgery Center, LLC	Lake in the Hills	1	Gastro, OB/GYN, Ophthalmology, Oral/Max, Orthopedics, Otolaryngology, Pain Man., Plastic Surgery Podiatry	4	4,064	3	No
Ashton Center for Day Surgery	Hoffman Estates	10	Orthopedics, Otolaryngology, Pain Man., Podiatry	4	1,407	1	No
Valley Ambulatory Surgery Center	St. Charles	9.8	Gastro, General Surgery, Neuro, OB/GYN, Ophthalmology, Oral/Max, Orthopedics, Otolaryngology, Pain Man., Podiatry, Urology	8	8,710	6	No
Elgin Gastroenterology Endoscopy Center	Elgin	2	Gastro	2	5,574	4	Yes
Advocate Sherman ASTC	Elgin	8	General Surgery, Ophthalmology, Orthopedics, Otolaryngology, Urology	3	NA	NA	NA
Hospitals							
Advocate Sherman Hospital	Elgin	5.5		16	28,116	19	Yes
AMITA Health Presence Saint Joseph Hospital - Elgin	Elgin	3.5		13	5,376	4	No
1. State Board Standard is 1,500 hours per operating/procedure rooms.							
2. Operating Rooms and Hours from 2019 Hospital and ASTC Profile Data.							

## D) Unnecessary Duplication/Maldistribution

### Revised Finding:

#### Maldistribution

There is not a surplus of operating and procedure rooms in this 10-mile GSA as the ratio of operating procedure rooms to population in this area is .1425 rooms per thousand population and the State of Illinois ratio is .1984 per thousand population. To have a surplus of operating procedure rooms in this area the ratio would need to be 1.5 times the State of Illinois ratio. To have a surplus of operating procedure rooms the ratio in this GSA would need to be .1323 rooms per thousand population. There is not a surplus of operating rooms procedure rooms based upon this State Board ratio in this 10-mile GSA.

#### Unnecessary Duplication

There are five ASTCs and two hospitals within the 10-mile GSA. One of the ASTCs is not in operation [Advocate Sherman ASTC] and one provides gastroenterology services only [Elgin Gastroenterology Endoscopy Center]. The remaining three ASTC provide orthopedic services and are not at target occupancy and have the capacity to accommodate the workload proposed by the Applicants.

#### Impact on Other Facilities

As seen below the proposed project will impact existing hospitals and ASTCs within the GSA.

<b>TABLE SEVEN</b>					
Facilities impacted by Proposed ASTC					
	Advocate Sherman Hospital	AMITA St. Joseph Elgin	NW Huntley	Algonquin Road Surgery Ctr.	Valley ASC
Cases <sup>(1)</sup>	15,174	3,816	5,410	2,927	5,495
Total Surgery Hours <sup>(1)</sup>	25,214	4,823	11,168	3,713	7,882
Estimated # of Cases to be moved to proposed ASTC	941	327	575	831	70
Estimated Hours	1,678	583	1,025	1,482	125
% of Total Cases Removed	6.2%	8.6%	10.6%	28.4%	1.3%
% of hours Removed	6.7%	12.1%	9.2%	39.9%	1.6%
1. Cases and Hours taken from 2019 Hospital and ASTC Profile Information					

Below are comments [in part] received from existing ASTCs and Hospitals within the

**Algonquin Road Surgery Ctr. dated April 13, 2021**

*“According to Applicants’ supplemental filing this Project will take 831 procedures from our facility. In 2020 we performed a total of 2,813 cases. The new Project would take a staggering 30% of our cases and even more staggering 50% of our surgical time. Our facility is already well under target utilization and losing 50% of our surgical hours would take our utilization far lower. A 50% loss of utilization would threaten the sustainability of our surgery center. While we are primarily concerned about the impact that would have on our facility, the Project negatively impacts all affected providers. In its opposition letter to this Project Valley Ambulatory Surgery Center calculated how the Project would affect utilization at all existing providers. The conclusion was that any provider currently operating above target utilization would fall below the standard and that all other facilities would have utilization lowered considerably. If this Project went forward, not a single area facility would meet target utilization.”*

**Fox Valley Orthopedics dated April 13, 2021**

*“The Applicants seek to justify a new facility in part, by claiming inadequacies at ARSC [Algonquin Road Surgery Center] and that it would be better to have a dedicated orthopedic facility. These alleged inadequacies are something the three of us are not aware of, and something that we have never seen personally. We have found ARSC to be a great place to perform our orthopedic procedures. We have never had a problem being able to schedule our orthopedic cases at this facility, and at times have done our public aid/Medicaid surgeries at ARSC. Orthopedics is by far the largest specialty at ARSC and constitutes 74% of the procedures performed. ARSC is more than well suited as a facility of excellence for our patients' orthopedic surgical needs. We are concerned about further access to patient care at this facility in this location and geographic area if ARSC is forced to close as a result of the Orthollinois project.”*

**Northwestern Medicine Huntley Hospital dated January 5, 2021**

*Five (5) of the ten (10) physicians listed as owners for the proposed ASTC are currently on staff at NMHH. The applicants have stated (page 178 of their CON application) that they intend to cease their referral of patients to other area facilities, servicing their caseload only at their proposed facility. Based on this statement, NMHH could experience a reduction of at least 1,300 surgical hours if this project is approved, lowering the utilization rate of the 8 ORs at NMHH to 1,233 hours/OR which is under the state standard of 1,500 hours/OR. Additionally, six (6) of the physicians involved in this project perform surgeries (four (4) are physician investors) at Algonquin Road Surgery Center, a joint venture ASTC with NMHH and Advocate Sherman Hospital, located approximately seven (7) miles from the proposed project. A new ASTC would have a significant negative impact on that facility as well. The COVID-19 pandemic has caused financial losses for hospitals nationwide as normal hospital operations have been halted to accommodate the surge of COVID-19 patients. The further redistribution of the proposed ambulatory surgeries from NMHH to a new ASTC could reduce NMHH's ability to cross subsidize important safety-net services.*

**Valley Ambulatory Surgery Center dated April 12, 2021**

*“Valley Ambulatory Surgery Center (“VASC”) is a new state-of-the-art surgery center that was approved by the Review Board in Project #17-057 and became operational in October 2019. The project replaced an outdated facility in St. Charles. VASC has a dedicated, specially equipped orthopedic surgical suite used primarily by one of the surgeons who is now committing referrals to the proposed Elgin ASTC. That physician does not need a new surgery center to provide orthopedic services, as he is currently providing those services now in VASC's new building with a dedicated orthopedic OR suite. This project is the epitome of an unnecessary duplication and maldistribution of services, as the Review Board has already approved two new ASTCs within the proposed project's service area, namely, VASC and the Sherman ASTC which is across the street from the site of the proposed project. The Sherman ASTC, Project #16-038 was approved by the Review Board and is not yet operational. The applicant touts an "industry wide shift in moving orthopedic, pain and podiatric [surgical] services to the less costly ASTC setting" (Application at 179), but the Review Board has already accommodated for this shift in this specific service area with its approvals of the new VASC and Sherman ASTC facilities. The area does not need yet another new ASTC in the same area to address the changing practice pattern. It is important to note that the project will provide no cost savings whatsoever with respect to the patients redirected from existing ASTCs such as VASC, Algonquin Road Surgery Center and the Advocate Sherman ASTC. The applicant's cost savings argument is based entirely on a comparison of ASTC facility fees to hospital facility fees. Obviously, there are no such cost differentials with respect to patients redirected from existing surgery centers”*

**Ashton Center for Day Surgery dated January 5, 2021**

*“1800 McDonough Road Surgery Center LLC dba Ashton Center for Day Surgery (Ashton) opposes the Certificate of Need application submitted by Ortholllinois Surgery Center of Elgin which seeks to establish an ambulatory surgery center in Elgin. Ashton has adequate capacity to handle the utilization identified by Ortholllinois in its application without affecting our ability to provide services for our existing patients. In 2019, Ashton operated at 35% of capacity and can easily handle the approximately 3,000 patients that Ortholllinois seeks to provide services to on an annual basis. In 2020, Ashton operated at even less capacity than in 2019 due to the COVID Pandemic. In addition, Ashton specializes in providing Orthopedic, Pain Management and Podiatry services-exactly the same type of services that Ortholllinois seeks to provide at its new ambulatory surgery center. For all the reasons above, Ashton strongly opposes the establishment of another ambulatory surgery center providing exactly the same type of services that Ashton provides.”*



**I) Assurance**

*A) The applicant shall attest that a peer review program exists or will be implemented that evaluates whether patient outcomes are consistent with quality standards established by professional organizations for the ASTC services, and if outcomes do not meet or exceed those standards, that a quality improvement plan will be initiated.*

*B) The applicant shall document that, in the second year of operation after the project completion date, the annual utilization of the surgical/treatment rooms will meet or exceed the utilization standard specified in 77 Ill. Adm. Code 1100. Documentation shall include, but not be limited to, historical utilization trends, population growth, expansion of professional staff or programs (demonstrated by signed contracts with additional physicians) and the provision of new procedures that would increase utilization.*

**Revised Finding:**

In response to this criterion the Applicants have stated that a peer review committee will be implemented as required. The Applicants have committed that in the second year of operation after the project completion date, the annual utilization of the surgical/treatment rooms will meet or exceed the utilization standard specified in 77 Ill. Adm. Code 1100. With the revised referral letters the Applicants have successfully addressed this criterion.

## VIII. Financial Viability

### A) Criterion 1120.120 – Availability of Funds

### B) Criterion 1120.130 – Financial Viability

#### A) Availability of Funds

##### Revised Finding

This project is being funded with cash in the amount of \$1 million and a mortgage of \$16,764,000. Rockford Orthopedic Associates, LTD d/b/a OrthoIllinois submitted its 2019 Auditors' Compilation Report which they considered proprietary. These compiled statements are included in the State Board's packet of material. State Board rules require audited financial statements and not compiled statements.<sup>3</sup>

The Applicants have also provided a letter from Illinois Bank and Trust documenting the proposed terms of the financing. The bank letter stated the following:

*“For close to ten years now we have enjoyed representing OrthoIllinois as its primary financial institution. Your organization is a pillar in our community recruiting and retaining top talent, contributing to organizations in need and consistently showing up as a good corporate citizen, We have much respect for the highly skilled and experienced administrative and financial teams you employ as well. we value the relationship that Illinois Bank & Trust has with OrthoIllinois both corporately as well as working closely with 75% or more of your shareholders and their personal banking/finance needs.”*

The Act requires that the Applicants have the financial resources to adequately provide a proper service for the community. The Applicants have provided the necessary financial commitment as required.

---

<sup>3</sup> The **compilation report** states that the CPA did not audit or review the financial statements and accordingly does not express an opinion, a conclusion or provide any assurance on them. A compilation is typically appropriate when initial or lower amounts of financing or credit are sought or there is significant collateral in place. The **review service** is one in which the CPA performs analytical procedures, inquiries, and other procedures to obtain “limited assurance” on the financial statements and is intended to provide a user with a level of comfort on their accuracy. The review is the base level of CPA assurance services. A review typically is appropriate as a business grows and is seeking larger and more complex levels of financing and credit. It is also useful when you, as the business owner, are seeking greater confidence in your financial statements for the purpose of evaluating results and making key business decisions. The **audit is the highest level of assurance service** that a CPA performs and is intended to provide a user comfort on the accuracy of the financial statements. The CPA performs procedures to obtain “reasonable assurance” (defined as a high but not absolute level of assurance) about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement. [Source: AICPA]

## **EXHIBIT I**

### **Assumptions used in Preparation of Pro-Forma Ratios and Financial Statements**

#### **Projected Statements of Income:**

- 1) The revenues were estimated based upon the number of referrals to the proposed ASTC by the physician/owners of OrthoIllinois and the related mix of cases by the sub-specialty trained orthopods. As an additional analysis, the case numbers and related revenues were compared to the ASTC in Rockford, IL that is owned by individual Rockford owners affiliated with OrthoIllinois and were determined to be reasonable.
- 2) Major expenses of employment and clinical supplies were estimated based upon a prorata analysis of the Rockford ASTC as related to case and revenue assumptions.
- 3) Depreciation was based upon the estimated economic life of the respective assets.
- 4) Management fees were based upon a contractual arrangement in place for the ASTC.
- 5) All other expenses were based upon similar assumptions and actual comparative analysis with the Rockford ASTC.

#### **Projected Balance Sheets:**

- 1) Projected cash is based upon the results of operations as modified by the changes in working capital components, capital contributions, and short-term lines of credit with Illinois Bank & Trust and OrthoIllinois.
- 2) Accounts receivable are based upon an average 45-day collection period.
- 3) Property and equipment costs are projected using the architect's estimates of projected square footage rates, size, and layout of the project.
- 4) Illinois Bank & Trust has committed to the long-term financing of the real estate project at commensurate market rates and terms.

**Orthollinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC**  
**Projected Viability Financial Ratios**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<u>Current Ratio (a)/(b):</u>			
(a) Current Assets	6,236,313	6,651,390	7,041,409
(b) Current Liabilities	3,236,433	1,085,805	1,138,395
Ratio	1.93	6.13	6.19
State Target	> 1.5	> 1.5	> 1.5
<u>Net Margin Percentage (d)/(c):</u>			
(c) Net Operating Revenues	14,000,000	14,700,000	15,435,000
(d) Net Income	3,292,351	3,628,176	3,896,900
Ratio	23.52%	24.68%	25.25%
State Target	> 3.5%	> 3.5%	> 3.5%
<u>Long Term Debt to Capitalization (f)/[(f)+(g)]*100:</u>			
(f) Long Term Debt	14,515,000	13,941,000	13,340,000
(g) Net Assets	6,492,351	9,120,527	9,517,428
Ratio	69.09	60.45	58.36
State Target	< 80	< 80	< 80
<u>Projected Debt Service Coverage [(e)+(h)+(i)]/[(i)+(j)]:</u>			
(e) Net Income	3,292,351	3,628,176	3,896,900
(h) Depreciation	781,529	811,529	841,529
(i) Interest Expense	773,500	667,000	641,000
(j) Principal Payments	525,000	549,000	574,000
Ratio	3.73	4.20	4.43
State Target	> 1.75	> 1.75	> 1.75
<u>Days Cash on Hand (k)/[(l)-(h)]/365:</u>			
(k) Cash	4,066,313	4,372,890	4,648,984
(l) Operating Expenses	9,934,149	10,404,824	10,897,100
(h) Depreciation	781,529	811,529	841,529
Ratio	162.16	166.38	168.75
State Target	> 45	> 45	> 45
<u>Cushion Ratio (k)/[(i)+(j)]:</u>			
(k) Cash	4,066,313	4,372,890	4,648,984
(i) Interest Expense	773,500	667,000	641,000
(j) Principal Payments	525,000	549,000	574,000
Ratio	3.13	3.60	3.83
State Target	> 3	> 3	> 3

**Orthollinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC**  
**Projected Statements of Income**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Revenues, net of allowances	14,000,000	14,700,000	15,435,000
<u>Operating expenses:</u>			
Wages	1,190,000	1,249,500	1,311,975
Payroll taxes	95,200	99,960	104,958
Retirement plan contributions	53,550	56,228	59,039
Employee benefits	202,300	212,415	223,036
Total employment expenses	1,541,050	1,618,103	1,699,008
Clinical supplies	4,200,000	4,410,000	4,630,500
Repairs and maintenance	140,000	147,000	154,350
Real estate taxes	250,520	255,530	260,641
Computer and IT expenses	72,000	74,160	76,385
Telephone expense	12,000	12,360	12,731
Office expense	30,000	30,900	31,827
Professional services	40,000	41,200	42,436
Meetings, recruitment, meals and dues	12,000	12,360	12,731
Directorship	25,000	25,750	26,523
Utilities	180,000	185,400	190,962
Malpractice and business insurance	48,000	49,440	50,923
Marketing	5,000	5,150	5,305
Bank and credit card charges	28,000	29,400	30,870
Bad debts	210,000	220,500	231,525
Depreciation	781,529	811,529	841,529
Management fees	770,000	808,500	848,925
Miscellaneous expenses	48,000	49,440	50,923
Total operating expenses	9,934,149	10,404,824	10,897,100
Operating income	4,065,851	4,295,176	4,537,900
<u>Other expense:</u>			
Interest expense	773,500	667,000	641,000
Net income	3,292,351	3,628,176	3,896,900

**OrthoIllinois Surgery Center Elgin, LLC**  
**Projected Balance Sheets**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<u>ASSETS</u>			
Current Assets			
Cash and Cash Equivalents	4,066,313	4,372,890	4,648,984
Accounts Receivable, Net	1,750,000	1,837,500	1,929,375
Inventory	420,000	441,000	463,050
Total Current Assets	6,236,313	6,651,390	7,041,409
Property and Equipment			
Land	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000
Land Improvements	947,000	947,000	947,000
Building	12,981,200	12,981,200	12,981,200
Furniture and Equipment	3,835,800	4,135,800	4,435,800
Total Property and Equipment	18,789,000	19,089,000	19,389,000
Less Accumulated Depreciation	781,529	1,593,057	2,434,586
Property and Equipment, Net	18,007,471	17,495,943	16,954,414
Total Assets	24,243,785	24,147,332	23,995,823
<u>LIABILITIES AND EQUITY</u>			
<u>Liabilities</u>			
Current Liabilities			
Bank Line of Credit	1,600,000	-	-
OrthoIllinois Line of Credit	600,000	-	-
Current Maturities of Long Term Debt	549,000	574,000	601,000
Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses	420,000	441,000	463,050
Self-Insured Liabilities	67,433	70,805	74,345
Total Current Liabilities	3,236,433	1,085,805	1,138,395
Long Term Debt, less current maturities	14,515,000	13,941,000	13,340,000
Total Liabilities	17,751,433	15,026,805	14,478,395
<u>Members' Equity</u>			
Members' Capital Contribution	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Accumulated retained income	-	3,292,351	5,920,527
Current year income	3,292,351	3,628,176	3,896,900
Member Distributions	-	(1,000,000)	(3,500,000)
Members' Equity	6,492,351	9,120,527	9,517,428
Total Liabilities and Members' Equity	24,243,785	24,147,332	23,995,823

# 20-040 Orthollinois Surgery Center - Elgin





June 8, 2021

Courtney Avery  
Board Administrator  
Illinois Health Facilities and Services Review Board  
525 West Jefferson Street, Second Floor  
Springfield, Illinois 62761

**Re: Additional Information- OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin, LLC  
Project# 20-040**

Dear Ms. Avery:

I am writing on behalf of OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin, LLC, in regards to its Certificate of Need application to establish a multi-specialty Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center (“ASTC”) in Elgin, Illinois. I am writing to provide additional information subsequent to the Illinois Health Facilities and Service Review Board (“HFSRB”) May 4, 2021 meeting where the project received five favorable votes, just one short of approval.

The Applicants have documented both significant community and patient support for their project and would like to provide the Board with additional information about the growing need for a specialized ASTC of this type to serve the community. The project is an extension of the services that the physicians of OrthoIllinois are already providing in the area hospitals and surgery centers, and will continue to perform at those facilities. This project is driven by what is in the best interests of the patient population and, simply put, there need to be better options *in addition* to what is already available from which patients and physicians can choose. This project is an ‘and’ not an ‘or’ for where services can be performed. OrthoIllinois will continue to serve the patients and the facilities they have, but need this facility if they are to be able to best meet the needs of the community.

This project is designed to address the critical need for ASTC services that can relieve access issues presented by the limitation of the existing facilities. As mentioned in our presentation to the Board, even if the existing facilities were to re-dedicate themselves to the provision of these services, doing so would displace the other specialties those facilities were designed and approved to provide, thereby undermining, rather than increasing, access to care.

Pursuant to 77 Illinois Admin. Code Section 1130.670 of the HFSRB’s rules, the Applicant respectfully submit supplemental information regarding the project. This letter describes the following:



1. Updated referral letters from Dr. Scott Mox and Dr. Jeffery Kazaglis.
2. Need for additional operating rooms in Geographic Service Area (“GSA”).
3. How will Advocate Sherman Hospital be impacted?
4. OrthoIllinois’ commitment to safety net care.

### **Updated referral letters from Dr. Scott Mox and Dr. Jeffery Kazaglis**

To fully address the misleading allegations from opponents that applicants are using referrals that were committed to another project to support the current project, the Applicants have enclosed two updated referral letters for Dr. Scott Mox and Dr. Jeffrey Kazaglis which address this issue. Both Drs. Mox and Kazaglis appeared before the Board and provided public comment discussing their existing referral letters for this project and referral letters they wrote to support another project 5 years ago. These updated referral letters reaffirm the doctor’s commitment to maintain their support for the ASTC project from five years ago (assuming it is ever completed) and to meet their commitment to refer patients for this project. As noted in their testimony before the Board, both physicians have experienced a considerable increase in patient volume in the last five years. Based on 2019 patient volume Dr. Kazaglis is able to support his commitment from five years ago and his updated letter restates the number of referrals he will commit to this project will be 268 patients, 29 patients less than his existing letter. Based on 2019 patient volume, Dr. Mox is able to support his commitment from five years ago and his commitment to this project. Both physicians will plan to treat patients at both facilities once approved and completed.

### **Need for additional operating rooms in GSA**

This project for a specialty ASTC will address the need for additional operating rooms thereby increasing access to the GSA. Opponents concerns are rooted in protecting their financial interests and market share. It is not the role of this Board to protect market shares. This application is designed and presented consistent with meeting the Board’s mission of increasing access to care and reducing overall costs to patients. If the Board members consider, as five already have, the need for increased access and reduced cost, this project should be approved.

There are multiple access issues in the GSA. These were detailed and supported with testimony provided under oath by Drs. Bear and Stanley. It’s important to note that the proposed facility will *not* siphon all orthopedic surgeries from area hospitals, despite claims to that effect. Many orthopedic procedures will still warrant being performed in hospitals, based upon either the procedure or the needs of the patients, and all of those procedures will still be performed in the hospitals. Moreover, those procedures will still be performed by OrthoIllinois doctors. The proposed facility will only be utilized to perform a percentage of the orthopedic outpatient surgeries that can be safely completed in an ASTC setting and are not served by other existing facilities. Today, there are hundreds of surgical procedures that could be safely performed in an ASTC setting that are being performed at the hospital because of access issues. This creates the two-fold problem of increasing costs for patients and decreasing access to available surgical time for all surgeons and patients at the area hospitals. Moreover, it results in unnecessary delay

which subject patients to unnecessary periods of chronic pain and discomfort. If the focus of consideration for this project is placed upon the patient population and the core principles of increasing access and reducing cost, this project should be approved.

Those opposed to this project have not once disputed the overwhelming evidence that reflects that surgeries performed in the hospital surgical suite are costlier than those performed in the ASTC setting. They cannot. This leads to the question, is there a need for additional operating rooms in the GSA? The answer is yes and OrthoIllinois has not only provided the evidence to support that need, but has also documented the referrals necessary to justify this project.

The last three Chairs of the Surgery Department at Advocate Sherman Hospital ***all support this project***. These surgeons have each stated the same thing, that there is no available block time at Sherman Hospital. This Board also heard testimony regarding issues with available block time at both Northwestern Huntley Hospital and Amita Saint Joseph who is not opposing this project. With no available capacity in the GSA hospital surgical suites, the next logical place to perform outpatient surgeries would be ASTCs within the GSA. However, the data submitted to this Board by the opponents themselves reflects access issues with existing ASTCs.

There are a total of three operating ASTCs and one proposed ASTC in the GSA. The access issues that have been detailed regarding the available ASTCs include:

- One ASTC that is only approved to perform gastroenterology procedures;
- One ASTC with a closed staff policy where no OrthoIllinois surgeons have privileges;
- Two ASTCs that are both owned in part by Advocate Health System.
  - One of these ASTCs is still an empty field of grass, five years after it was approved by this Board.
  - One lacks a sufficient commitment to the Medicaid population that OrthoIllinois serves in providing safety net services and has other issues ranging from available block time, staff expertise, small operating rooms which cannot accommodate total joint and spine procedures, insufficient sterile processing department for high volume total joint and spine procedures, and its overall inability to serve a high volume orthopedic practice like OrthoIllinois.

You also heard testimony about recent changes in the Medicare program that now allows for total joint replacements to be performed as outpatient procedures in an ASTC setting. This is going to dramatically reduce costs for the Medicare program as evidenced by the information already provided for our application, and importantly will increase the need for available outpatient operating rooms to accommodate these patients. The State Board Staff reports notes that the Board projected an 11% increase in population between 2017 and 2022. The 2019 patient mix for OrthoIllinois already consists of almost 40% Medicare patients. These Medicare patients are older individuals who are more likely to need total joint replacements, whether they

be shoulders, hips, or knees. As is common, the Illinois Medicaid program will also likely follow the lead of Medicare and allow for these procedures to be completed in the ASTC setting so as to lower costs to the program and improve patient outcomes. OrthoIllinois wants to be prepared for that. This project is designed to meet the needs of today and be prepared for the needs of tomorrow.

The application for the proposed facility included referral letters from some of the OrthoIllinois Eastern Division physicians, but not from all of them. There are 4 other current OrthoIllinois physicians who did not write referral letters supporting this project, and 2 new physicians starting this year who are going to perform procedures at area hospitals and other existing facilities. It has been alleged that OrthoIllinois is pulling all of its surgeries from area facilities, but the chart below demonstrates that is not the case. Based on 2019 patient data, OrthoIllinois would propose to move less than half of their total procedures to the new facility, thereby continuing to support area hospital surgical suites and other ASTCs in the GSA.

<b>OrthoIllinois Eastern Division Surgical Cases</b>			
<i>Service Dates: 2019</i>			
<b>Rendering Doctor Name</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>Proposed Referrals to Elgin ASTC</b>	<b>Procedures Remaining in Area Facilities</b>
Bohnenkamp, Frank	612	292	320
Brissey, Nicholas	158	94	64
Carlile, Kevin	253	30	223
Daniels, John	503	150	353
Ferry, Scott	39	0	30
Holtkamp, Kelly	660	597	63
Izquierdo, Rolando	523	263	260
Kazaglis, Jeffrey	425	297	128
Lawton, Cort	0	0	104
Mox, Scott	356	170	186
Palmer, Shawn	760	420	340
Stanley, Tom	469	320	149
Van Thiel, Geoffrey	136	111	25
Whitehurst, Jon	21	0	21
Harvey, Michael	0	0	182
Schott, Trevor	0	0	309
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,915</b>	<b>2,744</b>	<b>2,757</b>

Is there a need for operating rooms in the GSA designed to serve a growing patient population that is experiencing access issues? Yes, there is. Orthopedic outpatient procedures will continue to move out of the hospital surgical suite and into the ASTC setting because it costs less, and the patient outcomes are just as good as those procedures performed in the hospital surgical suite. This shift is driven by Medicare, Medicaid, and now private insurance. This is why those opposed to the project have established or are planning their own facilities to adapt to the changing healthcare delivery landscape. The proposed facility would allow for relief of the hospital surgical suites and would allow for orthopedic procedures that need to be performed in a

hospital surgical suite to be scheduled in a timely fashion. Finally, the proposed facility would be operated by a group with a proven model of care that results in low complications and excellent patient outcomes for all patients regardless of their ability to pay.

### **How will Advocate Sherman Hospital be impacted?**

The proposed project will have a net positive impact on the Advocate Sherman Hospital and not a negative one as the opponents of this project have alleged. The proposed project will open up desperately needed block time in the facility's surgical suites for all of the practices at the hospital. The proposed project does not affect the ability of Advocate to move forward with their proposed ASTC. While there has been no discernible progress on the project to date, when it was proposed and approved by this Board it was because the facility was designed to accommodate multiple specialties. Importantly, it was not designed solely for orthopedic procedures and the application only contained a commitment from two orthopedic surgeons both of whom are still going to meet their commitment to the project should it ever be constructed. Therefore, this proposed facility will not have a negative impact on the Advocate Sherman ASTC.

The opponents of this project have discussed at length the supposed negative financial impact to their facility from this project. Opponents have spent a considerable amount of time describing to the public and this Board how the facility would be unable to provide safety net services if this project was approved. We believe these statements are misleading and disingenuous. Advocate Sherman Hospital's President testified that the financial impact to the facility which is owned by the state's largest healthcare system will be \$2 million each year or 0.13% of their 2019 profit. Rather than repeat testimony from the Board hearing, it is common knowledge that the Advocate Health System has ample resources and this project does not impede the facility's ability to perform safety net services in the community.

### **OrthoIllinois' commitment to safety net care.**

Opponents of this project question OrthoIllinois' commitment to safety net care in the GSA. The physician leaders of OrthoIllinois stated before the Board, that OrthoIllinois physicians are the providers of safety net care in the GSA, and they will continue to be if this project is approved. The applicant does not view the Advocate Sherman Hospital as a competitor but rather as a partner where they are already providing safety net care and will continue to do so if that is where a patient elect to have their procedure performed.

The OrthoIllinois physicians expect that 44% of the patients that will utilize the proposed facility will be Medicare/Medicaid patients which is consistent with their historical patient base at both areas hospitals (given the access issues no Medicaid case were performed at area ASTCs). It is expected that upon Medicaid approving total joint procedures as an outpatient procedure that the volume of patients will increase. OrthoIllinois intends to continue accepting Medicaid and Medicaid Managed Care plans, and as the patient volume increases, all of those patients will be welcome at the OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin. To be clear this project is not solely dependent on Medicaid making this change, but given the applicant's commitment and long-standing history of providing safety net services they would welcome it. Finally, we would note that the OrthoIllinois practice also provides a significant amount of uncompensated care in

June 8, 2021

Page 6

fulfilling its role as a provider of safety net services. OrthoIllinois provided \$5.5 million in uncompensated care in 2019 and \$5 million in uncompensated care in 2020.

We look forward to re-appearing before the Board to discuss how this project will increase access to care for the GSA and lower costs for patients while improving outcomes. If you have any questions or need any additional information regarding the project, please feel free to contact me via phone at 312-212-4967 or via email at [JMorado@beneschlaw.com](mailto:JMorado@beneschlaw.com)

Very truly yours,

BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER,  
COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Juan Morado Jr.", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Juan Morado Jr.



May 12, 2021

Courtney Avery  
Board Administrator  
Illinois Health Facilities and Services Review Board  
525 W. Jefferson Street, Floor 2  
Springfield, IL 62761

**Re: Updated Referral Letter- OrthoIllinois ASTC CON Application**

Dear Ms. Avery,

My name is Jeffrey Kazaglis, M.D., and I am a sports surgeon affiliated with the OrthoIllinois physician group. This letter contains the referral documentation required per Ill. Admin. Code Section 1110.235(c)(3)(A)-(B). In 2019, I performed a total of 425 orthopedic surgical cases, and based on this historical volume I anticipate referring 268 surgical cases each year to the OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin. Below you will find a chart that indicates where the historical procedures were performed in 2019. Enclosed with this letter is a list of patient origin by zip code of residence for my 2019 historical caseload.

Additionally, I provided a letter of support on April 25, 2015 for the Advocate Sherman ASTC, Project #16-038. In the 2015 letter I committed to referring 157 patients to that proposed facility. My historical patient volume in 2014 at the time I wrote the letter for Project #16-038 was 189 surgical cases.

Based on the increase in my patient volume between 2014 and 2019, I have sufficient patient volume to meet my commitment to refer both 157 patients to Project #16-038 and to refer 268 patients to the OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin. I committed to the Illinois Health Facilities and Services Review Board during the public comment portion of their May 4, 2021 meeting that I can and will meet both commitments. I hereby confirm that commitment again in this letter.

I also certify that the patients I propose to refer reside within the applicant's proposed geographic service area. I further certify that the aforementioned referrals have not been used to support another pending or approved certificate of need permit application, other than the projects described in this letter. The information provided in this letter is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

**ROCKFORD**  
124 Roxbury Road, 61107  
5875 E. Riverdale Blvd., 61114

**ALBANY**  
650 S. Randal Rd., 60102

**ELGIN**  
Medical Bldg., Advocate Hospital  
1435 N. Randal Rd., 5TE 103

**MCHENRY**  
4TH W. Shamrock Lane, #103 60050

Historical Caseload by Licensed setting:

Name of Healthcare Facility	Type of Healthcare Facility	Number of Cases Referred in the Most Recent 12 month Period
Advocate Sherman Hospital	Hospital	366
AMITA St. Joseph Elgin	Hospital	35
Northwestern Huntley	Hospital	24
<b>Total</b>		<b>425</b>

Thank you,

Jeffrey Kazaglis, M.D.

Physician's Signature *Jeffrey Kazaglis* Date 5/18/2021

(Please Print/Type Name) Kathleen M Shukis

Signature of Notary:

*Kathleen M. Shukis*

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 18 day of May 2021



Seal



---

May 12, 2021

Courtney Avery  
Board Administrator  
Illinois Health Facilities and Services Review Board  
525 W. Jefferson Street, Floor 2  
Springfield, IL 62761

**Re: Updated Referral Letter- OrthoIllinois ASTC CON Application**

Dear Ms. Avery,

My name is Scott Mox, M.D. and I am a total joint surgeon affiliated with the OrthoIllinois physician group. This letter contains the referral documentation required per Ill. Admin. Code Section 1110.235(c)(3)(A)-(B). In 2019, I performed a total of 356 orthopedic surgical cases, and based on this historical volume I anticipate referring 170 surgical cases each year to the OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin. Below you will find a chart that indicates where the historical procedures were performed in 2019. Enclosed with this letter is a list of patient origin by zip code of residence for my 2019 historical caseload.

Additionally, I provided a letter of support on April 25, 2015 for the Advocate Sherman ASTC, Project #16-038. In the 2015 letter I committed to referring 116 patients to that proposed facility. My historical patient volume in 2014 at the time I wrote the letter for Project #16-038 was 143 surgical cases.

Based on the increase in my patient volume between 2014 and 2019, I have sufficient patient volume to meet my commitment to refer both 116 patients to Project #16-038 and to refer 170 patients to the OrthoIllinois Surgery Center of Elgin. I committed to the Illinois Health Facilities and Services Review Board during the public comment portion of their May 4, 2021 meeting that I can and will meet both commitments. I hereby confirm that commitment again in this letter.

I also certify that the patients I propose to refer reside within the applicant's proposed geographic service area. I further certify that the aforementioned referrals have not been used to support another pending or approved certificate of need permit application, other than the projects described in this letter. The information provided in this letter is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

---

**ROCKFORD**  
124 Roxbury Road, 61107  
5875 E. Riverside Blvd., 61114

**ALSOONQUIN**  
650 S. Randall Rd., 60102

**ELGIN**  
Medical Bldg., Advocate Hospital  
1435 N. Randall Rd., STE 103

**MCKENRY**  
470 W. Shamrock Lane, #103 60050



Historical Caseload by Licensed setting:

Name of Healthcare Facility	Type of Healthcare Facility	Number of Cases Referred in 2019
Advocate Sherman Hospital	Hospital	330
AMITA St. Joseph Elgin	Hospital	8
Northwestern Huntley	Hospital	18
<b>Total</b>		<b>356</b>

Thank you,

Scott Mox, M.D.

Physician's Signature *Scott W. Mox MD* Date 5-18-21

(Please Print/Type Name) Kathleen M Shukis

Signature of Notary:

*Kathleen M. Shukis*

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 18 day of May 2021



Seal

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 deny Project No. 20-040. Thank you.

2 MS. AVERY: Thank you for your comments.  
3 That was the last speaker for Project No. 20-040.  
4 If there are other speakers that I overlooked,  
5 please raise your hand. If you are a call-in  
6 user, Star 3.

7 (No response.)

8 MS. AVERY: Madam Chair, that concludes  
9 public participation for Project No. 20-040.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Thank you, Courtney.  
12 May I have a motion to approve Project 20-040  
13 OrthoIllinois to establish a four-room ambulatory  
14 surgery treatment center?

15 MEMBER MARTELL: I so move.

16 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: May I have a second?

17 MEMBER GRUNDY: Second.

18 MS. AVERY: Okay. If you are a speaker,  
19 Mark, or -- I'm sorry -- Juan, do you have the  
20 speakers there with you or is there anyone that I  
21 need to unmute?

22 MR. MORADO: Yeah. What we'd like to do,  
23 Courtney, is Mark is going to run the  
24 presentation. With us in the room we have

1 Dr. Brian Bear and Dr. Tom Stanley, who are both  
2 listed. So if we can make them presenters along  
3 with myself.

4 MS. AVERY: Okay. Wait one second. Let  
5 me --

6 MR. MORADO: Yep. I'm sorry.

7 MS. AVERY: I'm going to make Mark a  
8 panelist. And what were the other two that you  
9 needed?

10 MR. MORADO: Dr. Brian Bear and Dr. Tom  
11 Stanley are both listed as well.

12 MS. AVERY: Stanley and Bear.

13 MR. MORADO: I think they probably need to  
14 be made presenters.

15 MS. AVERY: I'm searching for them now.  
16 What's the first name again? Tom?

17 MR. MORADO: Tom Stanley.

18 MS. AVERY: Okay. One second. Let me  
19 find Tom. Tom, if you could raise your hand. Oh,  
20 there you are. And the second one, please?

21 MR. MORADO: Brian Bear. And I'll have  
22 him raise his hand right now.

23 MS. AVERY: Okay. And does everyone have  
24 a camera?

1 MR. MORADO: Yes, we do. And we also have  
2 -- we have two more, Courtney.

3 MS. AVERY: Oh, what's the other two?

4 MR. MORADO: Kay Wadsworth.

5 MS. AVERY: Wadsworth. One second.

6 MR. MORADO: And she's not going to be on  
7 camera, but she's available. And Dr. -- I'm  
8 sorry -- and Michael Smith. And those are the  
9 finance people, Courtney. They'll be available if  
10 there's any questions about that. We don't expect  
11 that there will be, but we just want to make sure  
12 they're there.

13 MS. AVERY: Would you like for them to be  
14 sworn?

15 MR. MORADO: Yes, please.

16 MS. AVERY: Thank you. Kay and -- I'm  
17 sorry, the last one?

18 MR. MORADO: Michael Smith.

19 MS. AVERY: Smith. Michael, can you raise  
20 your hand? I'm not seeing him, Juan. Am I  
21 missing him?

22 MR. MORADO: I'm checking right now. He's  
23 joining right now. He got kicked off.

24 MS. AVERY: Thank you.

1 MR. MORADO: And then for this  
2 OrthoIllinois ASC, if we can put the video on for  
3 that as well as for the other presenters, that  
4 would be great.

5 MS. AVERY: OrthoIllinois ASC, did I not  
6 give --

7 MR. MORADO: It's not allowing me to turn  
8 on video.

9 MS. AVERY: Oh, there you are. Make  
10 panelist. Sorry.

11 MR. MORADO: And Mr. Smith now has his  
12 hand raised, so you can --

13 MS. AVERY: There you are. Okay. Will  
14 you please double-check to make sure before we get  
15 started?

16 MR. MORADO: Yes. And then for Dr. Bear  
17 and Dr. Stanley -- oh, Dr. Stanley's video works,  
18 as does Dr. Bear's. Perfect. Okay. I think we  
19 are all set. And then we're going to have Mark  
20 begin to share --

21 MR. SILBERMAN: Once we get sworn in.

22 MR. MORADO. Yeah. Once we get sworn in.

23 (Whereupon, the witnesses were thereupon  
24 duly sworn.)

1 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Okay. Mike, would you  
2 please present the State Board staff report?

3 MR. CONSTANTINO: Thank you, Madam  
4 Chairwoman.

5 The applicants are proposing the  
6 construction of a four-room ambulatory surgery  
7 center in Elgin, Illinois in the HSA8 service  
8 area. The applicants propose to provide  
9 orthopedic pain management and podiatry surgical  
10 services. The estimated project cost is  
11 approximately 17.8 million, and the expected  
12 completion date is March 1st, 2023.

13 There was no public hearing, and the State  
14 Board did receive a number of letters of support  
15 and opposition on this project. We did receive  
16 one comment on the Board's staff report that was  
17 e-mailed to all Board members, and it's available  
18 on the Board's website.

19 I want to make two corrections on this  
20 report. I failed to add 30 referrals to  
21 Dr. Daniels's 150 referrals to the proposed  
22 facility. That would increase the total number of  
23 referrals for this project to 2,774 instead of  
24 2,744. However, because our Board rules require

1 an attestation by the physician that the patient  
2 referrals have not been used to support another  
3 pending or approval CON application for the  
4 subject services, we were required to remove 273  
5 referrals that were committed to the Advocate  
6 Sherman ASC. That has not yet been completed.

7 The removal of these referrals would bring  
8 the total number of referrals for this project to  
9 2,471 referrals, which does not support the four  
10 operating rooms being requested.

11 In their comment and again in public  
12 participation, these two doctors stated that they  
13 would be able to refer to both the proposed Elgin  
14 facility and the Advocate ASC. If this is the  
15 case, only 29 referrals would be removed from the  
16 proposed number of referrals and not 273. I  
17 believe in their presentation to the Board, their  
18 PowerPoint presentation, the applicants have a  
19 chart demonstrating this. We've reviewed it, and  
20 it is correct.

21 The final comment, I was mistaken, there  
22 are three hospitals within the GSA. Northwestern  
23 Huntley, Advocate Sherman, and AMITA Health Saint  
24 Joseph in Elgin. There are four ASCs in the GSA,

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 Elgin Gastro, which is at target utilization for  
2 gastro services only, Algonquin, Advocate Sherman,  
3 and Ashton Center for Day Surgery.

4 Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Thank you, Mike.

6 Okay. If you would please proceed with your  
7 presentation.

8 MR. MORADO: Absolutely. Thank you, Madam  
9 Chair, and good morning -- or, I guess, good early  
10 afternoon, everyone. My name is Juan Morado, Jr.  
11 I am CON counsel for the project. I'd like to  
12 thank the Board and especially its staff for their  
13 assistance and review of this application. It's  
14 great to virtually see you all, and we appreciate  
15 your time.

16 I'm pleased to introduce who I have with  
17 me for today's presentation, Dr. Brian Bear,  
18 president of OrthoIllinois, who is going to  
19 provide some background information on the  
20 OrthoIllinois practice; Dr. Tom Stanley, the vice  
21 chair of surgery at Advocate Sherman Hospital and  
22 a member of OrthoIllinois, who is going to discuss  
23 the various access issues for the types of  
24 procedures to be performed at the ASC; and, Mark



1 Silberman, my partner from Benesch Law, who is  
2 going to address the findings in the State Board  
3 staff report together with me.

4 Available for additional questions, if  
5 needed, are Kay Wadsworth, the vice president of  
6 commercial banking at Illinois Bank & Trust, who  
7 is available to testify regarding the bank's  
8 longstanding relationship with OrthoIllinois and  
9 their firm commitment to provide loan for this  
10 project. And, finally, we have Michael Smith,  
11 OrthoIllinois's financial consultant for the  
12 practice.

13 Members of the Board, the project before  
14 you today has had a long road to get to this  
15 point. And I know the folks from OrthoIllinois  
16 are eager to discuss their plans for improving  
17 access to care for this part of our state and  
18 their holistic approach to orthopedic care.

19 This project is designed to address the  
20 goals and mission that this Board is charged with,  
21 increasing access to high-quality care where there  
22 are currently access issues and reducing costs to  
23 the health care delivery system.

24 Admittedly, the project has received some

1 opposition that you've heard today, and,  
2 specifically, it's from two groups. One is our  
3 state's largest health care system, Advocate,  
4 which owns Sherman Hospital located within the  
5 geographic service area, and two ASCs that are  
6 located within the geographic service area, and  
7 one of those, Advocate Sherman, is the majority  
8 shareholder of.

9 While we understand their opposition, and  
10 as you will hear today in our presentation, we  
11 believe there's ample justification for the Board  
12 to use their discretion and approve these projects  
13 despite those objections.

14 We also heard from elected officials  
15 today. And we understand why they would oppose  
16 the project based on the Advocate side of the  
17 story, but that's why we're here today, to provide  
18 you with the other side and allow you to weigh  
19 both and make your decision.

20 We (indiscernible) community health plan,  
21 and we're happy to play a role in increasing  
22 access to care in the region. Kane County, where  
23 the proposed facility will be located, is one of  
24 the few counties in our state where there's

1 actually been strong population growth. That  
2 growth is cited in your State Board staff report,  
3 and, more importantly, it's reflected in the  
4 growing patient volumes of OrthoIllinois.

5 This is not a multispecialty ASC designed  
6 to capture any and all outpatient surgeries in the  
7 area. On the contrary, this is a well-designed  
8 project that involves a specialty ASC designed to  
9 relieve area hospital outpatient surgical suites  
10 and remove barriers to access for patients who are  
11 unable to have their procedures performed at other  
12 area ASCs.

13 If there are questions, we would be happy  
14 to respond to those. And we hope you will  
15 conclude, as we believe, that this is a worthy  
16 project of being approved. With that, I'd like to  
17 hand it off to Dr. Brian Bear, the president of  
18 OrthoIllinois Group. Dr. Bear.

19 DR. BEAR: Thank you. Thank you for the  
20 opportunity to speak -- hold on a second, we're  
21 getting our slides up here -- on behalf of our ASC  
22 and to tell you a bit about our organization.

23 MR. MORADO: I'm sorry. Give us one  
24 second here.

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: And, Juan, if he could  
2 speak just a little bit louder.

3 MR. MORADO: Of course. We can get that  
4 going. Yep. There we go. Is that working, Mark?  
5 We're going to switch computers. Just give us one  
6 moment. Can you hear us, Madam Chair?

7 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Yes. We can hear you  
8 now.

9 MR. MORADO: Okay. Hold on one second.  
10 There we go.

11 DR. BEAR: Thank you. Thank you for the  
12 opportunity. I want to tell you about our  
13 organization and who we really are.

14 Our mission statement is partnering with  
15 people to promote and restore active lives. We  
16 have 48 physicians, 550 employees, multiple  
17 clinics throughout northern Illinois, and we're  
18 very community centered.

19 Every day, many physicians give to charity  
20 by donating their time and professional services.  
21 Most physician groups, understandably, feel this  
22 is enough. At OrthoIllinois, we do more. We  
23 donate to many charities in our community, but I'd  
24 like to highlight the Northern Illinois Food Bank

1 that is very close to our organization.

2 For 15 years, we have been donating to the  
3 Northern Illinois Food Bank. Our funds are  
4 earmarked for nutritious meals for children.  
5 These meals we provide are often the only  
6 nutritious meal these children get during the  
7 entire day.

8 I'd like to quote from the Northern  
9 Illinois Food Bank newsletter 2019, These funds  
10 will not only continue to support child nutrition  
11 programs right here in Winnebago County, where  
12 more than 18 percent of the children face hunger  
13 every day, but we're excited that these funds will  
14 also support child nutrition programs in McHenry  
15 Counties -- McHenry and Kane Counties as well. To  
16 date, we've given over \$500,000 to the Northern  
17 Illinois Food Bank. We're very proud of that.

18 With regards to our organization as a  
19 health care company, we're a full-service,  
20 specialized orthopedic center of excellence. We  
21 provide high-quality care and top patient  
22 experience. We're dedicated to teaching. We're  
23 active in innovation and research. And we're  
24 providers of safety net care.

1           What's unique about our group is our  
2 surgeons are specialized, and what I mean by that  
3 is they are fellowship trained in one specific  
4 area of orthopedics. If you know orthopedics,  
5 you'll recognize these hospitals as the top  
6 training programs for orthopedic subspecialties.  
7 Our surgeons have trained at these prestigious  
8 institutions.

9           We provide total joint replacement, hand  
10 surgery, sports medicine, trauma surgery,  
11 pediatric surgery, foot-and-ankle surgery,  
12 rheumatology, physical medicine and  
13 rehabilitation, spine surgery, neurosurgery,  
14 occupational medicine, and orthopedic specialized  
15 anesthesiology.

16           We're very proud that 100 percent of our  
17 doctors have a four- or five-star rating on Health  
18 Grades, not common for organizations of our size,  
19 and the majority of our doctors are five stars.

20           Quality is very important to us. The  
21 overall complication rate at the OrthoIllinois  
22 Surgery Center in Rockford is less than one  
23 percent, and that includes our total joint  
24 program. The national average for complications

1 for total joint replacement is 2.4 percent.  
2 Sherman Hospital's complication rate for total  
3 joint replacement is 2.4 percent. We're 200  
4 percent less likely to have a complication at our  
5 surgery center than the national average or  
6 Sherman Hospital. If you have a joint infection  
7 or a dislocated joint, it's a miserable outcome.  
8 Your life is changed forever.

9 We're a member of the Press Ganey Patient  
10 Experience Scorecard. This is a scorecard which  
11 compares us to surgery centers across the country,  
12 hundreds of surgery centers, and we're  
13 consistently in the top eight percent.

14 We're involved in research, not common for  
15 a community practice. We have three full-time  
16 employees helping us with research, eleven  
17 peer-reviewed papers published last year, multiple  
18 innovative products have come to market. Products  
19 that our surgeons invented are being used all over  
20 the world. Also, innovations in total joint  
21 instruments, and that's what you're seeing one of  
22 our surgeons working on here in the image to the  
23 right.

24 We're the only group in the midwest that

1 has a functioning wet lab. This lab allows our  
2 doctors to practice on cadaveric specimens prior  
3 to performing new techniques on real people. In  
4 addition, we train surgeons not only from all over  
5 the United States, from all over the world. These  
6 surgeons are from South Korea. Surgeons from  
7 these countries have traveled to Rockford to learn  
8 the latest techniques from our doctors, not common  
9 for a community group.

10 We're dedicated to teaching. On average,  
11 111 students rotate through our organization in a  
12 year. We teach medical students, podiatry  
13 students, family practice residents, orthopedic  
14 residents. We teach surgical technicians and  
15 orthopedic nurses. We have a cast technician  
16 training program.

17 We noticed that people were showing up to  
18 our office after being seen in the local emergency  
19 room with a painful split or a cast on, sores, red  
20 heels, and unnecessary suffering. We started a  
21 certified cast technician training program; we now  
22 train the cast technicians for the local  
23 hospitals, and that problem is no longer present  
24 in our community. We train physical therapists,



1 and we train physician assistants.

2 We're committed to safety net access,  
3 contrary to what you've heard. 40 percent of the  
4 proposed payor mix will be Medicaid and Medicare.  
5 Access to ambulatory surgery, better outcomes, and  
6 cost savings for this group of people.

7 There's a fundamental shift in the  
8 delivery of outpatient care. This shift is driven  
9 by Medicare and private insurances to provide  
10 better outcomes and manage medical costs across  
11 the health care system.

12 Moving orthopedic surgeries to an ASC will  
13 save Medicare, on average, 42 percent. Blue Cross  
14 Blue Shield is decreasing reimbursement by 15  
15 percent for eligible surgeries performed in a  
16 hospital when they can be performed in an ASC,  
17 because they understand the outcomes are better.

18 Percents can sometimes be a little  
19 abstract. Let's look at real-dollar cost savings  
20 comparing surgeries performed in a hospital to an  
21 ASC, and these numbers come from Medicare.gov.  
22 Repair of rotator cuff, ASC, cost, \$2,803;  
23 hospital cost, \$5,981. For the savings of \$3,178.  
24 Anterior cervical fusion, savings of \$3,481.

1 Total knee arthroplasty, savings of \$3,291. Knee  
2 arthroscopy, a savings of \$1,451. And carpal  
3 tunnel surgery, even small procedures like carpal  
4 tunnel have nearly a \$1,000 savings when performed  
5 in an ambulatory setting.

6 But why build a specialty orthopedic ASC?  
7 What is the benefit to the community? The  
8 overwhelming most important answer, by far, is  
9 better outcomes. The benefits of an orthopedic  
10 specialty surgery center are specialized  
11 orthopedic nurses, specialized orthopedic  
12 technicians, and specialized orthopedic  
13 anesthesiology.

14 The operating layout is specific to  
15 orthopedics and vastly different than general  
16 surgical needs. The building design for  
17 orthopedic patients is vastly different. We need  
18 dedicated areas for physical therapy after surgery  
19 to get our patients walking and moving before  
20 discharge. We need areas for durable medical  
21 goods. And the hallways and corridors have to  
22 accommodate larger gurneys and wheelchairs. And,  
23 importantly, the sterilization capacity and  
24 equipment is vastly different for orthopedic cases

1 when compared to smaller general surgical cases.

2 The patient and community will benefit  
3 from an orthopedic specialty ASC. With  
4 OrthoIllinois, you will have a fellowship-trained  
5 orthopedic surgeon who is trained at the best  
6 programs in the country. An orthopedic  
7 specialized physician assistant, a specialized  
8 orthopedic nurse, and a specialized orthopedic  
9 surgical technician, and, importantly, a  
10 specialized anesthesiologist.

11 I have worked for over 20 years at many  
12 hospitals in northern Illinois, and I can tell you  
13 they are all very well-intentioned. The majority  
14 of time, however, when at the hospital, I do not  
15 receive a dedicated orthopedic team. The  
16 personnel are not familiar with the complicated  
17 orthopedic equipment, and they are not familiar  
18 with the procedures I perform. Operative times  
19 are longer, resulting in higher infection rates  
20 and higher complication rates. An infected total  
21 joint is a miserable outcome. It's a year off of  
22 your life with an inferior outcome. It's a  
23 horrible experience for anyone to go through.

24 Our complication rate is less than one

1 percent. The national average is 2.4 percent.  
2 And Sherman Hospital's average is 2.4 percent.  
3 Most of the time when I work at the hospital, I am  
4 not assigned an anesthesiologist who is  
5 comfortable doing nerve blocks. Now, nerve blocks  
6 in orthopedic surgery are critical, because  
7 patients can wake up from surgery with essentially  
8 no pain. Instead, when I do surgery at the  
9 hospitals, patients wake up in severe pain. They  
10 require more narcotic pain medication. Clearly,  
11 this is not good for patients, especially older  
12 patients.

13 True expertise in surgery comes from  
14 repetition, performing the same procedure with the  
15 same team over and over again, that's how you  
16 decrease complications, that's how you improve  
17 outcomes. A general hospital or a multispecialty  
18 ASC is unable to achieve this level of care.

19 I'd like to introduce my partner, Dr. Tom  
20 Stanley, vice chair of surgery at Advocate Sherman  
21 Hospital and an orthopedic spine surgeon.

22 DR. STANLEY: Thank you. I'm going to  
23 talk about access, an issue that I intimately  
24 understand, since I've practiced in Elgin for more

1 than a decade and as -- because of my role as vice  
2 chair of surgery at Sherman.

3           There are two parts to a safety net,  
4 there's the doctors and the nurses and everyone  
5 else that actually provides the care and then  
6 there's the building for them to do it. In Elgin,  
7 there are zero hospital-employed orthopedic  
8 surgeons. So when the hospitals talk about  
9 providing safety net orthopedic surgery, they're  
10 talking about us. We're the ones that actually  
11 provide those services.

12           And in Elgin, OrthoIllinois docs provide  
13 the overwhelming majority of orthopedic care.  
14 Even with the new surgery center, we are going to  
15 continue to provide the majority of hospital care.  
16 There's no secret shell company. There's no  
17 shadow investors. You heard from some of the  
18 investor doctors today.

19           The doctors building this center are the  
20 same doctors that have provided safety net care to  
21 this community for decades. And on top of that,  
22 we provide subspecialist care. Elgin has not had  
23 fellowship-trained trauma, hand, or pediatric  
24 orthopedic surgeons for over a decade until we

1 brought them in. The hospital didn't bring them  
2 in, we did.

3 This is subspecialty care that would  
4 normally have to be shipped out to a tertiary  
5 center. But because of us, patients can be  
6 treated in the community that they live in. And  
7 the way we can do this and continue to provide  
8 these services going forward is with a specialty  
9 center.

10 This picture is not a picture of our  
11 proposed ASC. This is a picture of the new  
12 medical office building that this committee  
13 approved last month. It's located directly across  
14 from Sherman Hospital, and we have already started  
15 work on it. It allows us to complete the entire  
16 injury pathway from initial diagnosis to full  
17 recovery by providing an urgent care, imaging, and  
18 postoperative physical therapy within a single  
19 facility. This investment shows our commitment to  
20 this community in making the safety net stronger.

21 The second part of a safety net is a place  
22 to do surgery. And the bottom line is that there  
23 are not enough operating rooms in the area. There  
24 are three existing surgery centers within a

1 ten-mile radius of our facility. The closest is  
2 Elgin Gastroenterology, a facility that is solely  
3 dedicated to GI procedures. No other services are  
4 provided at this facility, so it's not relevant to  
5 the discussion. And they have not opposed our  
6 application.

7 Aston Center for Day Surgery is a  
8 privately held ASC with restricted admission  
9 policies. Almost 94 percent of the patients seen  
10 at that facility are private pay based on  
11 published annual survey data. This is not a  
12 safety net facility.

13 Algonquin Road Surgery Center is approved  
14 for eight categories of service and is jointly  
15 owned by Northwestern and Advocate Aurora. We've  
16 been trying to expand service line at that  
17 facility, but it requires making the facility  
18 bigger. The operating rooms are too small,  
19 sterilizers don't have the power or capacity to do  
20 more complex procedures. I know this not only  
21 because I'm staff, but because my partner,  
22 Dr. Izquierdo, was president of the Board for more  
23 than a decade.

24 This Board actually approved an expansion,

1 and we went so far as to draw up plans for that  
2 expansion. And then our hospital partners, they  
3 blocked it. Our hospital partners have blocked  
4 all of our efforts to grow that facility. In  
5 fact, Northwestern has an HMO product that doesn't  
6 even allow patients to have surgery at Algonquin  
7 Road, forcing them instead to have the exact same  
8 procedures done at the hospital at a higher cost.  
9 This is despite their having ownership. And they  
10 don't accept Meridian Medicaid, whereas we already  
11 have a signed letter of intent. That is only the  
12 first. We are actively negotiating with the other  
13 public aid payors.

14           There are three hospitals within a  
15 ten-mile radius. You already heard from Drs.  
16 Daniels and Bohnenkamp, and chairmen of surgery at  
17 Huntley Hospital, and they spoke to the lack of  
18 operative availability at the institution. My  
19 personal experience is that I only get operative  
20 time one day every other month. That is six days  
21 of surgery in a year. And I've been requesting  
22 additional time since before the pandemic, but  
23 they are full.

24           AMITA Saint Joseph, it's the same story,



1 and they are not opposing our CON application.  
2 Sherman Hospital is similarly full. We have  
3 submitted letters and testimony from all of the  
4 chairs of surgery from 2016 until today. That's  
5 three different consecutive chairs all saying that  
6 there's not enough operative time at the hospital,  
7 and they're excited for us to build the surgery  
8 center so it can open up more operative time.

9 The hospital will tell you that they have  
10 plenty of OR time, but that time is during off  
11 hours into the evening. You have to be willing to  
12 operate into the night with a skeleton crew that  
13 doesn't specialize in orthopedic cases all while  
14 you're exhausted after a long day. That is not  
15 how you minimize complications, and that is not  
16 how you provide quality care, and it's not in the  
17 best interest of the patient. Not to mention  
18 missing out on family and dinner and homework and  
19 kids' sports. And, right now, this is exactly  
20 what we do, because we prioritize our patients  
21 over our personal lives, risking relationships and  
22 burnout, because we are the safety net.

23 But this committee already knows the needs  
24 in Elgin, because Advocate applied to build a

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 surgery center five years ago for this exact  
2 reason. In January of 2017, this committee  
3 approved a CON application to build an ASC on  
4 their Elgin campus. That proposal was to  
5 alleviate 15 surgeons and to create more operative  
6 capacity at the hospital. In 2018, all  
7 communications with the surgeons stopped. And  
8 when it became clear that the hospital wasn't  
9 going to build the center, we actually approached  
10 Advocate Aurora to partner with them to build it.

11 The picture that you see on the left is  
12 the exact vision that I shared with both the prior  
13 president of Sherman and the current president.  
14 It shows Sherman's hospital campus with the two  
15 parts of our proposed partnership. First, we  
16 would partner with them to build out the surgery  
17 center and make it an orthopedic center of  
18 excellence. And, second, we would rent land from  
19 the hospital to build an orthopedic services  
20 center and clinic space. After a year of  
21 conversation, they declined to work with us, and  
22 they told us to pursue a CON on our own, which is  
23 why we are here today.

24 The photo on the right is the current

1 state of the Sherman Hospital ASC. I took this  
2 photo of an empty lot two weeks ago. Note, there  
3 is no construction fence, and the grass is  
4 undisturbed. And I cannot explain why after four  
5 and a half years they haven't even broken ground.  
6 And it's not clear to me that they still intend to  
7 build this facility. But even if they did, their  
8 facility is designed for multiple subspecialties  
9 and would function in parallel to our center, not  
10 in competition.

11 There's a perception in the community that  
12 anything that is bad for the hospital is bad for  
13 the community. No more urgent care, just send  
14 everyone to the more expensive emergency room,  
15 because it's better for the hospital. Close all  
16 the imaging centers and have everyone pay double  
17 for an MRI at the hospital. The problem with this  
18 logic is that you are bleeding the community in  
19 the form of higher insurance costs, because  
20 everything is more expensive at the hospital.

21 You can measure the total dollars wasted  
22 on unnecessary hospital expenses just by looking  
23 at how much money they are claiming to lose.  
24 Their opposition is a confession about the volume

1 of surgery that just doesn't belong in a hospital.  
2 It's robbing Peter to pay Paul. The community  
3 could better spend the money on actually  
4 strengthening the safety net. Their higher costs  
5 do not expand access to care; it just makes health  
6 care unaffordable.

7 To summarize, there is a need for more OR  
8 space in this community, and our center does  
9 exactly that. There's no shortage of orthopedic  
10 procedures that cannot be done in an ASC and must  
11 be done at the hospital, and we will continue to  
12 provide the majority of hospital-based orthopedic  
13 services.

14 Our facility provides additional operative  
15 capacity, which unburdens the hospital and allows  
16 for more appropriate hospital utilization. It  
17 lowers the cost of health care for the community  
18 and allows us to bring new physicians to fill in  
19 voids in subspecialty care. And, finally, it is  
20 what is best for the community, reinforcing the  
21 safety net.

22 Thank you. Now, I'd like to turn it over  
23 to our CON counsel, Mark Silberman.

24 MR. SILBERMAN: Good afternoon, everybody.

1 So my job today is to address -- can you hear me?

2 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Mark, you need to be a  
3 tiny bit louder.

4 MS. AVERY: Mark, I'm going to unmute you.  
5 Mark?

6 MR. SILBERMAN: Yes.

7 MS. AVERY: Okay.

8 MR. SILBERMAN: Is that better?

9 MS. AVERY: Yes.

10 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Yes, we hear you now.

11 MR. SILBERMAN: All right. My apologies.

12 As I've said, literally, never in my life have I  
13 been told I was too quiet.

14 My job today is to address for you the  
15 negative findings that are contained within your  
16 staff report. There are eight negative findings,  
17 four of which we agree and we expected them. And  
18 those are the ones that relate to your need  
19 criteria. And those negative findings are driven  
20 by the fact that there are other existing  
21 facilities within the ten-mile radius and that  
22 there is capacity with regards to utilization.  
23 The other is related to how firm the commitment is  
24 regarding the financing available for our project.

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1           There are also four findings that, with  
2 all due deference and respect to the Planning  
3 Board staff, we disagree with. We strongly  
4 believe that the available facts should either  
5 warrant conversion of those findings to being  
6 positive or, at the very least, we want to address  
7 for you today why those should not act as an  
8 obstacle to the Board using its discretion in  
9 approving these projects.

10           Now, we want to address these points with  
11 you. We're going to try to point out all the  
12 relevant details. But we also firmly believe that  
13 it's important that we also allow staff to comment  
14 on these as well, as well as to address any  
15 questions the Board has. We really do want this  
16 to be a discourse rather than a disagreement.

17           I'd like to first address the question  
18 with regards to the availability of funds and the  
19 commitment from the bank. We fully understand why  
20 the Planning Board staff concluded why the letter  
21 that was originally provided by Kay Wadsworth,  
22 which talked about the longstanding history  
23 between the entities and expressed the interest of  
24 financing this project, was not accepted by your

1 staff as a firm commitment as envisioned by the  
2 Board's rules.

3 I think you all understand, this is an  
4 ongoing challenge that most any financed project  
5 experiences. Because in today's economic  
6 landscape, these decisions tend to be more  
7 corporate or committee driven, rather than based  
8 on personal relationships or result from  
9 individual decisions.

10 That being said, we hope that the Board  
11 will take into consideration the testimony you  
12 heard today from Kay Wadsworth during public  
13 comment where she stated unequivocally that there  
14 is a firm commitment from Illinois Bank & Trust to  
15 finance this project, subject, obviously, to this  
16 Board approving it. We hope that this testimony  
17 should resolve any concerns regarding this issue,  
18 but we also do have them available if there are  
19 any specific questions that the Board members or  
20 staff may have.

21 The second issue that we want to address  
22 relates to the question of the referrals that were  
23 provided. Now, there are two separate issues with  
24 regards to the referrals. The first, as Mike

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 mentioned to you somewhat, is that Drs. Mox and  
2 Kazaglis both did provide referrals to support the  
3 Advocate Surgery Center that was presented to this  
4 project Board in Project 16-038.

5 Now, whether or not physicians should be  
6 handcuffed when they commit referrals to a project  
7 that is no closer to being completed today than it  
8 was three years ago, is, fortunately, a  
9 philosophical question that I don't think we're  
10 going to have to answer today. And the reason  
11 that we're not going to need to answer that is, as  
12 you heard in today's public testimony from both  
13 Dr. Kazaglis and Dr. Mox, is the growth that their  
14 practices have experienced over the last five  
15 years since they made those commitments more than  
16 allows them to not only fulfill the projections  
17 that they made to the unbuilt Advocate Surgery  
18 Center, but also to support the, as of yet,  
19 unapproved OrthoIllinois project.

20 They've also both made it clear to you  
21 that they will continue to refer patients to both  
22 facilities on the assumption that Advocate ever  
23 does finish its facility. They are going to make  
24 those decisions as best suits their patients'



1 needs, and they are going to fulfill their  
2 obligations. However, what I think is most  
3 exemplified by this is the fact that it is clear  
4 just from these two doctors that the existing  
5 availability for the provision of the necessary  
6 orthopedic services does not exist within the  
7 current landscape and is not able to meet the  
8 needs of the patient population. Without  
9 approving this project, their ability to do so  
10 becomes an impossibility.

11 Now, at this point, I'm going to turn to  
12 Mr. Morado, who is going to address for you the  
13 mechanics of the numbers to show how -- no matter  
14 which way the Board looks at this, whether you  
15 choose to look at this as the appropriate use of  
16 your deference, or whether you choose to actually  
17 realize that we have shown enough need for  
18 referrals for this project, this is a project that  
19 warrants approval.

20 MR. MORADO: Thank you, Board. We  
21 originally (indiscernible) --

22 MS. AVERY: Hey, Juan, can you increase  
23 your volume, please?

24 MR. MORADO: How is that?

1 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: A little bit more.

2 MS. AVERY: Yes.

3 MR. MORADO: All right. How's that?

4 Okay. Does that work?

5 MS. AVERY: It's better. But if you can  
6 speak louder, that would be great.

7 MR. MORADO: No problem.

8 Members of the Board, we originally  
9 submitted referral letters for this project that  
10 justified 2,744 projected patient referrals. Back  
11 in December, Advocate submitted a letter pointing  
12 out that five years ago, Dr. Kazaglis and Dr. Mox  
13 submitted referral letters to support their  
14 project. Staff in their report then pulled all of  
15 the Mox and Kazaglis referrals for this project.  
16 We respectfully disagree with this approach.

17 Your rules state that the referral cannot  
18 exceed historical caseload, but they do not state  
19 that all projected referrals should be discounted  
20 and not included. And I'd like to walk you  
21 through how this project justifies four operating  
22 rooms.

23 I'll begin with Dr. John Daniels who  
24 submitted an updated referral letter back in

1 February increasing his referrals by 30 patients  
2 for a total of 180 projected referrals. You've  
3 heard Mike talk about those today. Those  
4 additional 30 projected referrals are important,  
5 and let me explain why.

6 First, we'll start with Dr. Mox, whose  
7 patient base increased 61 percent in the last five  
8 years. Dr. Mox provided data reflecting 356  
9 historical procedures performed in 2019. That  
10 means that Dr. Mox can meet his commitment to  
11 refer both 170 patients to the OrthoIllinois  
12 Surgery Center and 116 patients to the Advocate  
13 Sherman ASC, if it's ever constructed.

14 Next, let's look at Dr. Kazaglis. His  
15 patient base has increased 56 percent in the last  
16 five years. And Dr. Kazaglis has provided data  
17 that he performed 425 procedures in 2019. We  
18 disagree with the premise, and, quite frankly, we  
19 think it's an abuse of the planning process, for a  
20 permit holder to obtain a commitment for referrals  
21 from a doctor and then never construct the  
22 facility.

23 Nevertheless, we recognize that the  
24 commitment to that project came first, and,

1 therefore, we agree that once you subtract the 157  
2 referrals that would go to the Advocate Sherman  
3 ASC from Dr. Kazaglis's 425 number, that will  
4 leave the OrthoIllinois project short 29  
5 referrals. However, when you account for the 30  
6 additional referrals from Dr. Daniels that we  
7 started with and you remove the 29 from  
8 Dr. Kazaglis, we believe, as staff has explained  
9 and would agree, that 2,745 proposed referrals  
10 justifies four operating rooms as shown on the  
11 slide in front of you.

12 With that, I'd like to turn it over to  
13 Mark to address the impact on other providers.

14 MR. SILBERMAN: Okay. Can we hear me?

15 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Yes.

16 MR. SILBERMAN: All right.

17 So as we all know, when it comes to  
18 evaluating an ambulatory surgical treatment center  
19 and the question of need, that need assessment is  
20 driven by whether or not there are other  
21 facilities within ten miles that have existing  
22 capacity. If there are, you are going to receive  
23 a negative finding that there's a lack of need for  
24 your facility and that the creation of it is going

1 to create maldistribution, and that's okay,  
2 because that's what you're rules are.

3 But, importantly, that isn't the end of  
4 the discussion. Because that is the very reason  
5 this Board is afforded discretion to approve  
6 projects despite negative findings. Because if it  
7 weren't, there is literally not a single ASTC that  
8 would have been approved in years, because  
9 virtually all ambulatory surgery treatment  
10 centers, all regions, have some degree of  
11 capacity.

12 So I think when we talked about the  
13 surgery centers that are contained in your staff  
14 Board's report, we can address some of them very  
15 quickly, and we can address the appearance of  
16 there being sufficient capacity to be summarily  
17 resolved.

18 As we documented in our submission and as  
19 Mr. Constantino acknowledged this morning, neither  
20 Valley ASC nor Fox Valley ASTC are within ten  
21 miles of the proposed facility. And even though  
22 they don't like this project and even though  
23 Valley chose to offer opposition, they should not  
24 be considered in your consideration of this

1 application, because they should not have been  
2 part of the State Board staff report. They are  
3 outside of the statutory service area defined by  
4 your rules.

5 Also, and as I'm sure you expected this to  
6 be pointed out, and as Mr. Constantino  
7 acknowledged, the Elgin Gastroenterology is only  
8 approved for GI procedures, and, therefore, even  
9 though any capacity that it has will force a  
10 negative finding, that is simply not an option for  
11 providing the services that are contemplated by  
12 this application.

13 So what that leaves us with are Ashton,  
14 Algonquin, and Advocate. Now, Ashton is virtually  
15 an all private-pay facility. It has a close staff  
16 that none of the excellent doctors that make up  
17 OrthoIllinois are on their staff. And this  
18 project and these doctors are committed to a  
19 Medicare and Medicaid population. This project is  
20 predicting to serve over 40 percent of  
21 government-sponsored patients. So the Ashton  
22 Center for Day Surgery is simply not a realistic  
23 option.

24 Then we have to talk about Algonquin.

1 Algonquin is a multispecialty ASC that is approved  
2 for nine different categories of service. And  
3 multispecialty ASCs are a necessary part of health  
4 care delivery, but, if you are going to consider  
5 the capacity of a facility like this, then you  
6 have to ask yourselves and be honest about whether  
7 this facility can address the problem that is  
8 being proposed to solve through this project.

9         The problem that's being solved is how do  
10 these doctors meet the needs of their patients.  
11 Remember, our doctors work at these facilities.  
12 They have provided care and been in leadership  
13 positions at this facility, and this facility has  
14 proven not to be the solution to the orthopedic  
15 access issues, and, as such, we suggest that it  
16 cannot be viewed as a solution.

17         The rooms are not appropriate for the  
18 procedures. The sterilization and turnaround time  
19 is just not sufficient. And I think it's  
20 important to acknowledge that the sterilization  
21 and turnaround time is not reflected in their  
22 utilization numbers. And in doing that, that  
23 creates the appearance of there being capacity  
24 that does not really exist.

1           Finally, as a multispecialty ASTC, it just  
2 simply isn't designed for supporting a specialized  
3 staff nor maintaining the specialized equipment  
4 that these physicians and, more importantly, their  
5 patient population needs.

6           So now let's talk about the Advocate  
7 opposition. Now, you can't conclude that any  
8 reasonable health care system would object to this  
9 process, because I think it's important to note  
10 that there was no opposition from AMITA.

11 Advocate, on the other hand, has come out guns  
12 blazing. They are making it clear that the  
13 approval of this facility will jeopardize  
14 Advocate's very existence.

15           But before I start addressing the hospital  
16 system claims, let me address the ASC. All of the  
17 same issues that I talked about a moment ago with  
18 regards to Algonquin would be true for the  
19 Advocate Surgery Center if it's ever built. It's  
20 a multispecialty ASC, and it is not being designed  
21 to facilitate and allow for the provision of  
22 orthopedic specialized care.

23           You heard from Don Schreiner, CEO, that  
24 OrthoIllinois, we offered to partner with Advocate



1 with regards to this facility. We offered to do  
2 this. We offered to help them. We were willing  
3 to be their partner, and they passed. They told  
4 us to build our own, go get our on CON, they told  
5 us they wouldn't object. Now that we've done  
6 that, they're objecting. They have every right to  
7 do so.

8 But you have to consider that objection of  
9 whether or not that objection is truly what's in  
10 the best interest for the community or whether  
11 it's what's in the best interest of Advocate.  
12 Because here we are years later, and they haven't  
13 even obtained the necessary permits or even broken  
14 background on this surgery center. But  
15 OrthoIllinois and all of its physicians are  
16 experiencing growth and growth and growth in their  
17 practices with nowhere to accommodate these  
18 patients.

19 More importantly, I think we need to  
20 discuss the fundamental and philosophical issues  
21 with the Advocate opposition, both with regards to  
22 its impact on the unbuilt surgery center, but also  
23 to their claimed impact on the Advocate system.

24 Members of the Board, you have heard these

1 claims before, claims of poverty from a health  
2 system that despite experiencing an enjoying  
3 system-wide profits, they will isolate one  
4 facility to feign poverty. And they either do it,  
5 as the case is here, to object to appropriately  
6 increasing access by a project like this, or, as  
7 we've seen far too often, they feign poverty to  
8 shut down one hospital, which really decreases  
9 access to care for a community. And they do this  
10 all the while still enjoying system-wide profits.

11 Let me state this as simply and as plainly  
12 as I can. The suggestion that Advocate is going  
13 to experience financial ruin upon the approval of  
14 this project is laughable. You heard the CFO of  
15 Advocate this morning that they think the approval  
16 of this project is going to cost them \$2 million  
17 in reimbursement. Now, I'm going to try really  
18 hard to resist speculating on the numbers, but I  
19 think it's important that we look at some of the  
20 things we do know.

21 In 2019, Advocate Sherman, just that  
22 hospital, enjoyed profits of \$35 million. Now,  
23 there's some confusion, apparently, about what  
24 their numbers were in 2020. They claimed

1 previously to be down approximately 13 percent in  
2 profits for 2020. And while those numbers aren't  
3 published yet, that would result in them enjoying  
4 profits of only \$30 million. Today we heard them  
5 claim that they had a \$15 million operating cost.

6           Regardless of how the numbers play out,  
7 the one thing you have not heard from anyone is  
8 that Advocate is losing money. The best they  
9 could do when they submitted their safety letter  
10 is claim that, quote, The Sherman service area  
11 lost money. And let's just assume that that  
12 wasn't a very strategic and intentional choice of  
13 words.

14           Let's look at the performance of the  
15 system. According to the reports by Crain's, when  
16 they announced the advancement of Advocate's  
17 private equity group fund in 2020, they announced  
18 that, unfortunately, in 2020, Advocate only  
19 enjoyed a half-billion dollars in annual profits.  
20 I said that right. One-half billion dollars in  
21 2020, which would apparently be a significantly  
22 down year for them, because their own 990s show  
23 that in 2019, the Advocate system enjoyed a profit  
24 of \$1.45 billion.

1           If somehow the \$2 million that they're  
2 going lose, according to their own CFO, is  
3 insufficient to bear the brunt of this ASTC, if  
4 that is the line between whether or not Advocate  
5 can provide safety net services to this community,  
6 we have a much bigger health care delivery problem  
7 that we need to address.

8           What else do we know? We know that there  
9 is a strong push to move procedures to ASTCs.  
10 You've seen the letter from Blue Cross Blue  
11 Shield. One of the testimony today, I think it  
12 was the Valley testimony, acknowledged that  
13 there's a push to move things out of hospitals and  
14 into surgery centers.

15           But the capacity to meet the needs of this  
16 patient population simply doesn't exist. While  
17 Advocate testified to the fact that it would be  
18 inconvenient, cost them money, cost them money,  
19 what did you hear from OrthoIllinois doctor after  
20 doctor after doctor? They don't have access to  
21 the surgical time to meet the needs of their  
22 patients.

23           MS. AVERY: Mr. Silberman, I apologize for  
24 interrupting, but I think it's fair to alert you

1 that we will be losing a member at 12:30.

2 MR. SILBERMAN: I will be --

3 MS. AVERY: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. SILBERMAN: Then I will be incredibly  
5 quick.

6 OrthoIllinois has heard -- has committed  
7 itself to this population and has done everything  
8 it can.

9 The one thing I do need to address is  
10 this, let's assume for a second you deny this  
11 project and all of a sudden all of the  
12 OrthoIllinois needs has to be met by the existing  
13 facilities, if all of these facilities suddenly  
14 show the commitment to this patient population,  
15 then where do the other 10 to 12 specialties that  
16 are being served by these multispecialty ASCs go  
17 to receive the care that they need.

18 As simply as I can put this, the  
19 OrthoIllinois doctors have made it clear; they  
20 will meet their needs to the community. This is  
21 not about turf. This is not about hospital versus  
22 doctor. This is not about profit margins, at  
23 least not for OrthoIllinois. This is about what  
24 is in the best interest of responsible health care

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 delivery and about being in a position to meet the  
2 needs of their patients.

3 As simply and plainly as I can state this,  
4 this is about OrthoIllinois doctors being able to  
5 do their best and no longer being forced to do the  
6 best they can under someone else's priorities.  
7 With that, we'd be happy to address any questions  
8 that you have.

9 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Okay. Thank you. One  
10 moment. Okay. Do any of our State Board members  
11 have any questions for our applicants?

12 MEMBER GRUNDY: I have a question.

13 MEMBER KAATZ: Madam Chair, I do.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Dr. Grundy first.

15 MEMBER GRUNDY: Okay. I have a question  
16 as far as -- I know during your presentation you  
17 spoke about having only one day of OR time at --  
18 was it NW Huntley -- and you talked about  
19 insufficient OR time at Advocate. How many days  
20 or how much time do you all currently operate at  
21 Advocate?

22 MR. MORADO: Dr. Stanley, do you want to  
23 take that one?

24 DR. STANLEY: I can speak for myself,

1 personally. I get operative time three days a  
2 month at Advocate, and then I'm also on staff at  
3 AMITA Saint Joseph Hospital where I have  
4 additional operative time. Essentially, that's --  
5 what we are all doing right now is we are all on  
6 staff at multiple hospitals and juggling our  
7 operative days to try to meet the volume  
8 requirements. Because -- and even still with  
9 doing that, we end up operating late.

10 MEMBER GRUNDY: Okay. And then I have one  
11 follow-up question. Looking at table 5, as far as  
12 the summary of physician historical referrals, for  
13 many of your physicians, if you would look at the  
14 referrals that will go to the proposed center, you  
15 would take away all of the referrals that have  
16 historically gone to those hospitals. And so as  
17 far as -- how do you think that will impact the --  
18 you know, the current services that are being  
19 provided to those?

20 DR. STANLEY: So as we have continued to  
21 grow, our hospital volume also continues to grow.  
22 We're actually bringing in two additional surgeons  
23 in the next three months. And there's no shortage  
24 of cases that have to be done at the hospital.

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1           So this doesn't become a take cases away  
2           from one facility and then that facility is empty.  
3           What ends up happening is that cases that belong  
4           in the hospital can actually be done at the  
5           hospital and cases that don't belong in the  
6           hospital will be done at the surgery center.

7           MEMBER GRUNDY: Thank you.

8           MEMBER KAATZ: Madam Chairman, I have a  
9           couple questions, if I may, please.

10          CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Yes. Go ahead,  
11          Member Kaatz.

12          MEMBER KAATZ: I'll address this first  
13          question to all of you. With your current  
14          complication rate, which is a function of your  
15          business model, if your complication rate went  
16          from 1 percent to the 2.4 percent that is  
17          expressed for Sherman, give me a really rough  
18          ballpark estimate on what that additional or  
19          opportunity cost would look like.

20          MR. MORADO: Dr. Bear, do you want to  
21          touch on what the opportunity costs would be like?

22          DR. BEAR: So I think I understand your  
23          question. If we can take our complication rate  
24          from 2.4 percent to less than 1 percent, how many



1 lives would that affect?

2 If you look at all the total joints done  
3 by our organization at that hospital -- I've got  
4 to think about that. Let me do quick math in my  
5 head. That's about 500 joints. Now, you can't  
6 move all of them out. But let's say you can move,  
7 you know, 300 out of the hospital or 250 out of  
8 the hospital and your complication rate, you know,  
9 that would be -- you know, three -- that would be  
10 ten patients that you could potentially avoid a  
11 catastrophic, life-altering complication by  
12 shifting those surgeries.

13 I mean, these complications are not  
14 little. You have to have the prosthetic taken out  
15 of your knee; you have to have a cement spacer for  
16 three months; you have to go and try to have  
17 another revision, the outcome is never good. It's  
18 a horrible complication. So you would affect the  
19 lives, at minimum, of ten people. And if that  
20 person is you, you'll appreciate that.

21 MR. SILBERMAN: The only other thing that  
22 I think needs to be clarified is what's going to  
23 drive where a patient should be seen is what's in  
24 the best interest of the patients. This isn't an

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 abandonment of the existing facilities. This is  
2 just making sure that there's another facility  
3 available that allows the meeting of the needs.

4 DR. BEAR: And I think there's other  
5 complications in other -- I'm just picking joint  
6 replacements, but the overall complication rate  
7 for every surgery is down. So you'll see  
8 additional savings and decreasing complications by  
9 shifting them to an ambulatory surgery center by  
10 just having less complications --

11 MEMBER KAATZ: I'm just trying --

12 DR. BEAR: -- the problem, also, of going  
13 to four different operating rooms and operating in  
14 four different operating rooms is you're never at  
15 one enough to build a real expertise, and you're  
16 having different people rotate in your room. That  
17 is the way you drive up complications and you  
18 drive up cost and drive down efficiency. You want  
19 to be at the same place with the same team.

20 MEMBER KAATZ: Another question, if I may,  
21 Madam Chairman, just as a follow-up. I didn't  
22 hear anybody from the opposition and I didn't  
23 really hear the proponent talk about the impact on  
24 physician efficiency or productivity, which is

1 really behind everything that's being improved  
2 with regard to health care today.

3           Could I ask any of you from OrthoIllinois,  
4 what do you think the estimated benefit to the  
5 patient, to the system, to the community, however  
6 you want to define it, is from enhanced physician  
7 efficiency and productivity?

8           MR. SILBERMAN: I'll address this from a  
9 nonmedical perspective, and then I'll let the  
10 doctors chime in.

11           But I think the reality is this. Whether  
12 it's the patient being able to be seen in the  
13 facility that's designed for them, the patient  
14 being able to be seen in a facility with a staff  
15 that's specialized for the care they need, access  
16 to the equipment, not having to have surgical time  
17 based on when a facility's availability is but  
18 based on what's in the best of their care. I  
19 think these are the fundamental advantages.

20           I think you've highlighted an important  
21 point, which is, the majority of the opposition  
22 was not driven by what is going to be in the best  
23 interest of the orthopedic patient. The majority  
24 of the opposition really seemed to be focused on

1 Advocate will lose so much money that they won't  
2 be able to provide safety net services.

3 And I will reiterate what I said. If, in  
4 a bad year, they're only experiencing a half a  
5 billion dollars worth of profits. I have a hard  
6 time believing that whatever profits might lose,  
7 by placing care in the appropriate setting within  
8 their community is -- is sufficient to topple  
9 their system.

10 MR. MORADO: Dr. Bear, do you want to  
11 chime in on that as well?

12 DR. BEAR: The ambulatory surgery center  
13 makes physicians, on average, up to 100 percent  
14 more efficient. And that translates to patients  
15 in that, one, the footprint of an ASC is much  
16 smaller than a hospital and is much less  
17 intimidating, especially for older patients. They  
18 can drive right up and walk into the center and  
19 not have to park their car and valet park it or  
20 navigate through a complicated hospital system.

21 The total time spent in the facility is  
22 cut in half for an outpatient procedure done in  
23 the hospital versus an outpatient procedure done  
24 in an ambulatory surgery center for the patient

1 and their families. So time off of work for  
2 family and loved ones is cut in half. So there's  
3 a lot of intangible benefits of the efficiencies  
4 that get translated down to the patients by having  
5 their surgeries performed in a more efficient  
6 system.

7 MEMBER KAATZ: So last week the Chicago  
8 Tribune spent a lot of time on specialties in  
9 journalism with regard to Leapfrog where they  
10 rated all the regional and Chicago hospitals based  
11 on their outcomes, and with the exception of Rush,  
12 most performed poorly. And it really goes to  
13 patient safety issues. We touched on it here in  
14 terms of infection rates, complication rates.

15 What would your estimated result be -- and  
16 I know this is maybe a nuts question, crazy  
17 question -- but how would you guys stack up with  
18 regard to Leapfrog criteria that's also applied to  
19 a place such as Sherman Hospital?

20 DR. BEAR: Yeah. I think we would be very  
21 competitive with that. Our complication rate of  
22 less than one percent is difficult to improve  
23 upon.

24 MEMBER KAATZ: Last question. I'm a

1 little puzzled on all this discussion about  
2 access. Tell me again what your public aid and  
3 self-pay policy would be at the surgery center.

4 MR. SILBERMAN: We are predicting a 40  
5 percent population of Medicare, Medicaid. I can  
6 tell you that the facility already has an  
7 agreement in place with Meridian. We accept  
8 public aid, and we're in active negotiations with  
9 regards to the other public aid.

10 And I'm going to turn to the CEO who's  
11 going to tell me -- oh, and this is one other  
12 interesting detail. This facility has taken it  
13 upon itself, they, to my knowledge are the only  
14 ASTC -- they're rates are published. So even  
15 though ASTCs are not required to have the same  
16 kind of transparencies -- physician groups aren't  
17 required to have the same kind of transparency --  
18 and generally don't -- that hospitals do, they  
19 have -- I believe are leading the way by having --  
20 their rates are all published.

21 So anyone who has any concerns with  
22 regards to their rates, they have made them all  
23 available and they are all transparent, because  
24 they believe that rate transparency and commitment

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 to a patient population is fundamental and key.

2 MEMBER KAATZ: Thank you very much for all  
3 of the answers.

4 MEMBER MARTELL: Chairwoman Savage?

5 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Do you have a  
6 question?

7 MEMBER MARTELL: Yes, I do.

8 Again, I've heard the 40 percent Medicare,  
9 Medicaid. Why are you predicting that would  
10 differ from what you posed for the Rockford  
11 location?

12 MR. SILBERMAN: Dr. Bear is going to  
13 address that.

14 DR. BEAR: So if you look -- what's posted  
15 in the data, it's amount of collections, number of  
16 -- the amount of collections as a percent. So our  
17 percent of collections of Medicare and Medicaid  
18 are low. But if you look at the number of cases,  
19 we do a total of about 25 percent combined  
20 Medicare and Medicaid.

21 The other issue is that Medicaid currently  
22 does not pay for many orthopedic implants, you  
23 know, hip, knee, wrist, elbow, shoulder implants  
24 are not covered by Medicaid in an ASC setting, but

1 are covered by Medicaid in a hospital setting.

2 And our hospital partners have asked us to do  
3 those procedures in the hospital. But that's  
4 changing, because Medicaid is following suit to  
5 allow those implants to be covered in an ASC.

6 So our total blended rate in Rockford, if  
7 you look at number of cases, about 25 percent.  
8 But as a percent collection, it's much lower. The  
9 reimbursement is lower for Medicaid and Medicare  
10 patients compared to work comp and private  
11 insurance.

12 MR. MORADO: And, Dr. Martell, I think  
13 it's probably prudent to also add that the ASC in  
14 Rockford is a joint venture with OSF, so that's  
15 the hospital partner that Dr. Bear was referring  
16 to in terms of their request to send those  
17 procedures there.

18 The other thing I make mention of is, if  
19 you look at your 2019 data for ASCs and you look  
20 through the Medicaid column, for all of the ASCs  
21 that are owned by some of the folks that are  
22 opposing this project, Advocate, for example,  
23 they're either at a zero amount for Medicaid or at  
24 two-tenths of a percent. And that's the net



Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 revenue.

2 And so we would expect that, like us, that  
3 might be a little bit higher once you look at the  
4 total number of patients, but it's a phenomenon,  
5 as Dr. Bear described, that some of these types of  
6 procedures aren't currently approved by Medicaid,  
7 but we fully expect, with this continued shift,  
8 that they will be.

9 MR. SILBERMAN: When we saw those numbers,  
10 Madam Martell, we actually looked at that, because  
11 we thought the numbers were off. And I think the  
12 way that the State's numbers are reported, it's  
13 driven by volume. But when -- as Dr. Bear  
14 testified, the actual number of patients being  
15 served is closer to 25 percent Medicare and  
16 Medicaid.

17 MEMBER MARTELL: Thank you.

18 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Other questions? Yes,  
19 Toni.

20 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: Question. So is it  
21 fair to presume, then, that if Medicare is not  
22 currently covering all of those procedures, that  
23 they will be actually referred to one of the  
24 hospitals in the service area through your

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 relationship? And when do you propose to get the  
2 level of care provided for that population  
3 increased over time? And, I think, in addition to  
4 that, as you look at the 40 percent that you  
5 propose to cover, are you suggesting that you will  
6 cover that regardless of Medicaid coverage and  
7 payment or not, or will they be transferred to one  
8 of the local hospitals?

9 MR. SILBERMAN: So I'll answer that in a  
10 few ways. One is this, we would love --  
11 OrthoIllinois would love to be part of that  
12 discussion and how to advance that. We've been  
13 trying as much as we can, but the efforts have  
14 been splintered.

15 And part of the challenge is that we  
16 haven't been in a position to meet the needs of  
17 our Medicare and Medicaid population. Having this  
18 facility approved is going to go a large way  
19 towards doing that, and we will continue to  
20 Advocate, and we'll cooperate with anyone, state  
21 legislatures, local leaders, to accomplish that.

22 But as I've said before and as the doctors  
23 have talked about, what will always drive where a  
24 procedure is going to be performed is going to be

1 what's in the best interest for the patient. So  
2 as long as the reimbursement model mandated by the  
3 Illinois Department of Public Aid says -- or  
4 Health Care and Family Services, sorry, I'm  
5 showing my age there, as long as it shows that it  
6 will only be reimbursed if it's in a hospital, it  
7 will either be taken on as charity care or it will  
8 be performed in a hospital.

9 But as long as those discussions can continue  
10 and as long as we can figure out how not to have  
11 the reimbursement or the insurance that's  
12 available drive the care, we'd love to be part of  
13 those discussions. The way that we plan on fixing  
14 that is our continued commitment to a Medicare and  
15 Medicaid population. Dr. Bear?

16 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: You're on mute.

17 DR. BEAR: Can you hear me?

18 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: Yes.

19 DR. BEAR: We are absolutely committed to  
20 the Medicare and Medicaid population. Soft tissue  
21 procedures like carpal tunnel, flexor tendons, cut  
22 tendons, nerve lacerations can already be done and  
23 are already being done.

24 We also do cases there and just accept the

1 loss. If it's an urgent case and we can't get  
2 time at the hospital and the patient and family  
3 want it done soon, we'll frequently do those cases  
4 at a loss at our surgery center, and we'll do that  
5 in Elgin.

6 And I think, to this Board, I can give you  
7 our word that our commitment to that population is  
8 strong. We already are contracting with Meridian,  
9 which is going to allow those cases to come to our  
10 center. We do take straight public aid. And  
11 we're in active negotiations with the other --  
12 other managed care public aid contracting  
13 companies. So we're there.

14 Also, Medicare has just recently allowed  
15 total hips and total knees. So that -- that  
16 volume is going up just naturally. And so you'll  
17 see that naturally go up, because those have just  
18 been approved.

19 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: Thank you. I think  
20 one follow-up question would be my only concern is  
21 given the splintered relationship, as you called  
22 it, with Advocate Sherman, my question becomes,  
23 how do you repair that relationship in the event  
24 of, one, ensuring that those patients that you

1 can't cover in the clinic or in the surgery center  
2 are covered at the hospital? And, in the event  
3 you have higher acuity patients that require  
4 hospitalization, how do you ensure that there's  
5 continuity and consistency in care with those  
6 hospitals that are local?

7 MR. MORADO: Member Hardy-Waller, I'm  
8 going to have Dr. Stanley talk a little bit about  
9 that. One of the things I think I did want to  
10 point out, though, is these are all physician  
11 leaders within every single one of these  
12 hospitals.

13 And I think you heard a commitment today  
14 from everyone who testified in both public comment  
15 and during this presentation that this is not an  
16 abandonment of those hospitals, and they're going  
17 to continue to send patients there and perform  
18 procedures there. But it's probably better that  
19 you hear it from the vice chair of surgery at  
20 Sherman.

21 DR. STANLEY: The Elgin medical community  
22 is pretty small, right, and so we're not in  
23 competition with Sherman-employed orthopedic  
24 surgeons. There are none. So we will continue to

1 provide all of the orthopedic care or the vast  
2 majority of the orthopedic care at that hospital.

3 And even with this ASC, even with the  
4 approval, that won't change. I don't think that  
5 there's a splinter, as your describing it. Even  
6 Trent Gordon, their CFO, said it earlier today,  
7 right, they respect us, we respect them. We  
8 understand what their objection is. And what it  
9 really comes down to is they're worried about some  
10 financial loss to this billion-dollar cooperation.  
11 But at the end of this day, we are still serving  
12 this community, and we are going to continue to  
13 serve the community at all the Elgin hospitals,  
14 regardless of what this Board decides.

15 MR. MORADO: Did that answer your  
16 question, Member Waller?

17 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: Thank you. Yes, it  
18 did.

19 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Any other questions  
20 from our Board members?

21 DR. BEAR: We are building a 50,000 square  
22 foot new clinic in Elgin that's going to service  
23 the entire population, and insurance status is not  
24 a factor in who we see. Our doctors typically --

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 for patients that have to go to the hospital, we  
2 take them to the hospital that they're comfortable  
3 with or the hospital that their primary care is  
4 at. And that's not -- that tends to be the best  
5 continuity of care.

6 MR. MORADO: Thank you.

7 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Last call for  
8 questions.

9 MEMBER MARTELL: One more -- one last  
10 follow-up on the alternatives to the proposed  
11 project. Given the successful partnership with  
12 OSF in Rockford, can you speak to a little bit --  
13 I think, kind of going through that process, it  
14 does not seem like that was identified in the  
15 application. Did I miss that someplace?

16 MR. MORADO: The partnership with OSF?

17 MEMBER MARTELL: Correct. Sherman  
18 Advocate, since you had a successful model.

19 MR. MORADO: I'm sorry. My computer  
20 muted. Can you say that one more time for me?

21 MEMBER MARTELL: The question I had was  
22 under the kind of alternatives to the proposed  
23 project, the providers had a strong history of  
24 having a good partnership with a hospital come

1 into that. And, again, what I see is no  
2 discussion of was there an attempt to partner with  
3 Sherman Advocate in a similar way as an  
4 alternative.

5 MR. MORADO: Yeah. Definitely.

6 MR. SILBERMAN: So if I can address that,  
7 and I'll let -- but I'll refer to what Dr. Stanley  
8 testified to. Dr. Stanley met with them. He came  
9 up with a proposal. He designed not only how to  
10 join with the surgery center, but how to turn them  
11 into an orthopedic center of excellence, and they  
12 passed. And we don't begrudge them that. They're  
13 allowed to make their own economic decisions.

14 But when their economic decisions start to  
15 affect access to care, and when their economic  
16 decisions reach a point where it's affecting their  
17 ability to meet the needs of their patients,  
18 that's when OrthoIllinois decided they had to step  
19 up, and, candidly, take the advice that Advocate  
20 gave them, which is, if you want to do this, do it  
21 yourself.

22 DR, STANLEY: Yeah. So it wasn't just me  
23 that met with Advocate leadership. Our entire  
24 C-suite actually had multiple meetings with



1 Advocate over the course of a nine-month period  
2 where we offered to build their surgery center for  
3 them since they already had the CON and they  
4 weren't building it. And we offered them the  
5 exact same terms that they had for the facility  
6 that they were going to build.

7 And after extensive discussions, the  
8 conclusion was that the time that it would take  
9 them to really be able to partner with us would be  
10 so extensive and they would have so many  
11 restrictions that they just didn't think it would  
12 be worth their effort.

13 MR. MORADO: And I'd also highlight that  
14 this is a project that's supposed to be completed  
15 in September 2021. So September of this year,  
16 that project, which you saw that beautiful plot of  
17 grass, is supposed to contain a surgery center. I  
18 would gather that there's probably going to be a  
19 permit renewal coming your way in the future.

20 MS. AVERY: Madam Chair, please let the  
21 record reflect that Member LeGrand has departed.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Thank you. Okay. If  
23 there are no further questions, George, would you  
24 please call the roll?

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting

Conducted on May 4, 2021

132

1 MR. ROATE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 Motion made by Dr. Martell seconded by  
3 Dr. Grundy.

4 Dr. Grundy.

5 MEMBER GRUNDY: Okay. I'm actually going  
6 to have to vote no based on the staff report and  
7 that based on the information received in the  
8 report, especially table 5, I'm not convinced that  
9 there is an unmet need that this center will  
10 provide and that it looks to me that it will  
11 result in duplication of services. So my vote is  
12 no.

13 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

14 Mr. Kaatz.

15 MEMBER KAATZ: I vote yes. And I think  
16 while there are compelling arguments presented on  
17 both sides of the debate, I'm going to go to the  
18 responsibility that I have as a member of this  
19 Board to serve patients and communities in the  
20 best way possible and to also take responsibility  
21 for cost behavior.

22 And I think this business model shows an  
23 incredible clinical benefit to the people living  
24 in the surrounding area. And I think when you

1 move from the traditional, old archaic definition  
2 of cost to maybe the newer one that includes  
3 opportunity costs related to decisions, I think --  
4 I think this is a compelling reason to vote yes.  
5 It is a significant decrease in the cost of  
6 service and a significant increase in the benefit  
7 to the people who live in this area.

8 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

9 Dr. Martell.

10 MEMBER MARTELL: I'm going to vote no,  
11 although, I'm challenged by the information as  
12 well and the arguments on both sides. But I do  
13 have a concern regarding the documentation of the  
14 unmet need and concerns regarding the impact and  
15 the payor mix.

16 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

17 Dr. Murray.

18 MEMBER MURRAY: Well, this really doesn't  
19 matter how I vote, because we're not going to get  
20 to six votes. But let me say before I say my vote  
21 that I hope we can remember this specific  
22 application as we consider all of our rules and  
23 reqs.

24 And while I have some concerns about the

1 numbers and shifting and referrals, I was -- I was  
2 swayed by the fact that the ability to operate and  
3 to do it in a timely way with small operating  
4 times and small turnaround times is important. So  
5 there's more involved in need than just how many  
6 patients you have and how those patients are  
7 treated.

8 I am aware of the huge opposition that  
9 came forward in public testimony from the  
10 community, but, again, that was mostly in concern  
11 for the impact on this one hospital, which is part  
12 of a very wealthy network of hospitals. So I'm  
13 going to vote yes on this.

14 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

15 Ms. Hardy-Waller.

16 MEMBER HARDY-WALLER: I would vote yes as  
17 well. You know, as we go through the application  
18 process, I didn't see, as you argued, that there  
19 would be any material impact on the existing  
20 facilities in the area, particularly, Advocate  
21 Sherman, who had the largest opposition,  
22 particularly because OrthoIllinois is very  
23 narrowly focused on ortho surgery. And I do  
24 believe by having such a narrow focus, there is a

1 significant impact on quality care, as was  
2 demonstrated in your complication, your less than  
3 one percent, and your patient experience scores  
4 that you demonstrated.

5 So from that standpoint, I say yes. As  
6 well as, I believe that by moving patients -- and  
7 we know this, it's been proven -- from an  
8 inpatient to an outpatient or an ambulatory  
9 service, we can significantly reduce costs and  
10 infection rates and so on and so forth. Also, I  
11 believe that by having the ambulatory service  
12 treatment center, we can also increase capacity as  
13 well -- allow for more capacity.

14 My only concern, minor concern, and I  
15 think you've made the argument around safety net  
16 patients and access for those patients who are  
17 Medicaid or unable to pay, that you have a  
18 commitment to that patient population. And my  
19 hope would be if this went -- if this got approved  
20 that that would be -- that you would ensure the 40  
21 percent patient population would indeed be served  
22 by that.

23 So, again, based on those comments and  
24 those observations, I would vote yes.

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

2 Chairwoman Savage.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: I, too, was a bit  
4 conflicted. But with the testimony and relooking  
5 at everything, I vote yes, based on the clinical  
6 benefits to our patients and the decreased  
7 complication rates that just outpatient surgery,  
8 in general, can offer, the decreased costs, and  
9 also still keeping the appropriate patient  
10 procedures, of course, at the hospital that are  
11 required to do so.

12 And then under oath, they, in testimony,  
13 talked about keeping their commitment to Advocate  
14 Sherman and the other hospitals that they go to  
15 bring the volume that they had talked to, but with  
16 the ASTC that Sherman has yet to build, that they  
17 would still bring the patients that they promised  
18 to bring there.

19 So I think with the increasing volumes  
20 they talked about and the aging population, that  
21 that probably would be possible. And then their  
22 commitment to our safety net patients, which are  
23 so very important, Dr. Bear, I believe, his  
24 testimony was most compelling in that regard.

Transcript of Open Session - Meeting  
Conducted on May 4, 2021

1 MR. ROATE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: One moment.

3 MR. ROATE: Okay.

4 MS. AVERY: Okay. I'm sorry. We now have  
5 -- Member LeGrand is back on the record.

6 Member LeGrand.

7 MEMBER LeGRAND: I voted yes.

8 MR. ROATE: Thank you.

9 MS. AVERY: Do you want to expand on your  
10 vote, Member LeGrand?

11 MEMBER LeGRAND: I just -- listening to  
12 what everyone had to say about, you know, the  
13 center and not having enough places at some of the  
14 hospitals, I think there is a need there. So I  
15 vote yes.

16 MS. AVERY: Okay.

17 MR. ROATE: Thank you. That's five votes  
18 in the affirmative, two votes in the negative.

19 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Thank you, George.

20 MR. MORADO: Thank you, members of the  
21 Board. We recognize that had this been last week,  
22 this would have been a passed motion. So we look  
23 forward --

24 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: One second, Juan. We

1 haven't gotten to that yet.

2 MS. AVERY: One second, Juan.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Yeah. Sorry. I have  
4 to say that, unfortunately, the motion failed.  
5 And you have received an intent to deny. You will  
6 be given an opportunity to reappear before the  
7 Board and present additional information relevant  
8 to the approval of the permit.

9 Please notify the Board staff in writing  
10 within 14 calendar days to indicate whether you  
11 intend to reappear and/or submit additional  
12 information. Thank you.

13 MR. SILBERMAN: Thank you.

14 MS. AVERY: Mr. Morado, did you want to  
15 finish your comments?

16 MR. MORADO: I was just saying thank you  
17 to the Board. We appreciate it. We fully intend  
18 on coming back so we can address Member Grundy's  
19 concerns and make sure that we can address  
20 Dr. Martell's concerns as well. We think we have  
21 some good information for them that hopefully we  
22 can win their support the next time up. So, thank  
23 you.

24 MS. AVERY: Thank you, Mr. Morado.



1 CHAIRWOMAN SAVAGE: Okay. We're going to  
2 proceed to lunch for 30 minutes. And then we'll  
3 be back at 1:30.

4 MS. AVERY: For the audience information,  
5 we will have a quorum. Member LeGrand will not  
6 rejoin us. Thank you.

7 (A recess was taken.)

8 - - -

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24