CERTIFIED COPY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF HEALTH STRATEGY

DOCKET NO. 22-32511-CON

A HEARING REGARDING THE APPROVAL TO TERMINATE INPATIENT

LABOR AND DELIVERY SERVICES AT SHARON HOSPITAL

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Public Hearing held on Tuesday, December 6th, 2022, beginning at 9:30 a.m., via remote access.

Held Before:

DANIEL CSUKA, ESQ., Hearing Officer

Administrative Staff:

STEVEN W. LAZARUS, CON Program Supervisor

ANNALIESE FAIELLA, Planning Analyst

MAYDA CAPOZZI, Administrator

Reporter: Melissa M. Zamfir, CSR #455

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	For Applicant, SHARON HOSPITAL:
4	
5	ROBINSON & COLE
6	280 Trumbull Street
7	Hartford, ct 06103
8	Phone: 860.275.8200
9	BY: THEODORE TUCCI, ESQ.
10	
11	For Intervenor, SAVE SHARON HOSPITAL and DR. HOWARD
12	MORTMAN:
13	
14	MURTHA CULLINA, LLP
15	107 Elm Street
16	Four Stamford Plaza, 11th Floor
17	Stamford, CT 06902
18	Phone: 203.653.5407
19	BY: PAUL KNAG, ESQ.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	(All participants were present via remote access.)

(Whereupon, the hearing commenced at 9:30 a.m.)

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Good morning, everyone, and thank you again for joining us.

Vassar Health Connecticut, Inc. d/b/a Sharon Hospital, the Applicant in this matter, seeks a certificate of need for the termination of inpatient or outpatient services offered by a hospital pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes 19a-638a(5). Specifically, Sharon Hospital seeks CON approval to terminate inpatient labor and delivery services.

Today is December 6th 2022. This hearing was continued from October 18, 2022. My name is Daniel Csuka, Kimberly Martone. The executive director of OHS designated me to serve as the hearing officer for this matter, to rule on all motions, and to recommend findings of fact and conclusions of law upon completion of the hearing.

Section 149 of Public Act No. 21-2, as amended by Public Act No. 22-3, authorizes an agency to hold a public hearing by means of electronic equipment. In accordance with this legislature, any person who participates orally

in an electronic meeting shall make a good faith effort to state his or her name and title at the outset of each occasion that the person participates orally, during an uninterrupted dialogue, or series of questions and answers.

That'll be tremendously helpful for the Court Reporter, who is also with us today.

We ask that all members of the public mute the device that they are using to access the hearing and silence any additional devices that are around them.

And before we get too far into things, I did want to mention a few things about the public comment portion of today's hearing.

Sign-up for public comment is between 2:00 and 3:00 this afternoon. You can just add your names to the comment section in Zoom and we will take you as close to the order in which you sign up as possible.

If it looks like the technical component of the hearing will conclude by 3:00 p.m. Our -- excuse me, will not concluded by 3:00 p.m., I will ask that we all try to work towards finding a logical stopping point so that we can begin with the public comment promptly at 3:00 p.m. We

can always come back to the technical portion, if necessary.

Consistent with past practice, the order for the public comment will likely be as follows: Elected and appointed officials and representatives followed by the Applicant's clinical professionals and executives, any other clinical professionals and executives who might be in attendance who wish to speak, the other individuals that the Applicant signed up in advance of the hearing and any other members of public who wish to participate.

With that said, this public hearing is held pursuant to Connecticut General Statute Section 19a-639a(e), and as such, this matter constitutes a contested case under the UAPA and will be conducted in accordance therewith. The UAPA meaning the Uniformed Administrative Procedure Act.

Office of Health Strategy is here to assist me in gathering facts related to this application and will be asking applicants and the intervenors questions later on.

I'm going to ask that each staff person assisting with questions today identify

1 themselves with their name, spelling of their last name, and the OHS title, and we will start 2 with Steven Lazarus. 3 MR. LAZARUS: Good morning, Steven Lazarus, 5 L-a-z-a-r-u-s, and I am the Certificate of Need Program Supervisor. 7 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 8 Yadira McLaughlin? 9 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Good morning. Yadira 10 McLaughlin, M-c, capital L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n, and I'm 11 planning analyst. 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And then Annaliese 13 Faiella. 14 MS. FAIELLA: Good morning. Annaliese 15 Faiella, F as in Frank, a-i-e-l-l-a, and I am 16 also a planning analyst. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 18 Also, present on behalf of OHS are Mayda 19 Capozzi, spelled M-a-y-d-a, C-a-p-o-z-z-i; and 20 Leslie Greer, as well. That's L-e-s-l-i-e, G-e 21 -- excuse me -- G-r-e-e-r, and they are assisting 22 with the hearing logistics and will also assist 23 with gathering the names for the public comment. 24 The Certificate of Need process is a 25 regulatory process, and as such, the highest

level of respect will be accorded to the Applicant, members of public, our staff, and the interveners. Our priority is the integrity and transparency of this process. Accordingly, decorum must be maintained by all present during these proceedings.

This hearing is being transcribed and recorded and the video will also be made available on the OHS Website and its YouTube account. All documents related to this hearing that have been or will be submitted to OHS are available for review through the Certificate of Need, that's the CON portal which is accessible on the CON web page.

Next, as Zoom notified you, I wish to point out that by appearing on camera in this virtual hearing, you're consenting to being filmed, and if you wish to revoke your consent, please, do so at this time by exiting the hearing.

In making my decision, I will consider and make written findings in accordance with Section 19a-639 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

There are 12 separate factors in that statute; but in very short, I will be looking at need, cost-effectiveness, quality, and access.

I recently made certain findings on applicability of some of these criteria in an unrelated application for termination of labor and delivery services. I am not -- excuse me -- but I am not required adhere to those findings here. I am approaching this application on its own merits openly and objectively.

I also want to point out that there are certain topics that are not the focal points for today's hearing and both the intervenors and the public should make every effort to avoid those.

These topics include, No. 1, whether Nuvance

Health or Sharon Hospital have violated the terms of the agreed settlement issued in CON Docket No. 18-32238-CON;

And No. 2 is the substance and the Merits of Docket No. 22-32504, that's the pending application by Nuvance Health to convert Sharon Hospital's ICU into a PCU.

Now, I know that is part of the Sharon

Hospital overall strategic plan and I'm sure that
will come up to some extent, but I do want to try
to avoid the specifics of that application.

The CON portal contains the prehearing table record in this case at the time of its filing

last week; exhibits were identified in the table from A to PP. I jumped on the portal this morning and I saw that there were a couple more files that were uploaded from the Applicant over the past 24 hours.

Before we get to those, though, I did want to start with OHS first.

Ms. McLaughlin and Ms. Faiella, does OHS have any additional documents to be added to the record at this time?

MS. FAIELLA: Yes, OHS does plan to upload some APCB data related to this application, hopefully by the end of this week.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: And between last night and this morning, we received additional public comments which will be uploaded also, hopefully, tomorrow. I will be adding them to the exhibit already on file.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, the Affiant and the Intervenors are hereby advised that I am also taking administrative notice of the following documents: The Statewide Health Care Facilities & Services Plan, a Facilities & Services Inventory, the OHS Acute Care Hospital

Discharge database, the Au-Pair Claims database and Hospital Reporting System, that's HRS Financial and Utilization Data.

I may also take administrative notice of prior OHS decisions, agreed settlements, and determinations that may be relevant.

Counsel for the Applicant, Attorney Tucci, can you, please, identify yourself for the

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes. Good morning, Hearing Officer Csuka and members of the OHS staff. name is Theodore Tucci and along with Lisa Boyle and Connor Duffy, we represent the Applicant, Vassar Health Connecticut, doing business as

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Attorney Tucci. And are they present in the room with

Yes.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

And Counsel for the Intervenors, that is Sharon -- excuse me -- Save Sharon Hospital and Dr. Howard Mortman, can you, please, identify yourself for the record?

ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes. My name is Paul Knag,

1	K-n-a-g, of the firm of Murtha Cullina. I'm the
2	attorney for the Save Sharon Hospital and Howard
3	Mortman and with me is my colleague is Julia
4	Boisvert, B-o-i-s-v-e-r-t.
5	DR. MORTMAN: Yes, I'm here. This is
6	Dr. Howard Mortman.
7	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,
8	Dr. Mortman. Well, we'll get to the witnesses
9	shortly.
10	Is is Attorney is it Boisvert, was
11	that the pronunciation? Is she present in the
12	room with you? Do you appear
13	ATTORNEY KNAG: The correct way to pronounce
14	it is Boisvert.
15	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Boisvert. Thank
16	you.
17	And she is present?
18	ATTORNEY KNAG: She's sitting next to me
19	here, yes.
20	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thanks.
21	So, Attorney Tucci, I know that I said quite
22	a bit to start the hearing. Are there any
23	objections to the exhibits in the Table of Record
24	or the notice documents that I brought up?
25	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Good morning, Hearing

1 Officer Csuka. On behalf of Sharon Hospital, we have no objection to the Table of Record as it 2 currently exists, and no conditions at this time. 3 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, I did notice 5 that you or your client uploaded some letters of support over the past 24 hours? 7 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes. 8 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So I am planning to 9 mark those as QQ and RR, and I'm going to enter 10 those -- add those as separate exhibits to the 11 hearing record. Do you have any objection to that? 12 13 14 (Whereupon, Late-File Exhibit QQ was marked as an exhibit, 15 as described in the index.) 16 17 (Whereupon, Late-File Exhibit RR was marked as an exhibit, as described in the index.) 18 19 20 ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, thank you. 21 appreciate that very much. 22 And just for the sake of clarity, with 23 respect to public comment witnesses who wish to 24 speak on behalf of the Applicant who have already 25 signed up, am I correct in assuming that they are

in the queue and that we need to take no further action in order for them to be heard later in the day?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I believe that's correct. I forwarded their names to both Mayda and Leslie and they have already started a list, as well.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And with respect to the upload of the APCB excerpts that OHS indicated they will be filing later this week, do you have any concerns or objections to that?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: No objections or concerns on behalf of Sharon Hospital.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

So I'm going to identify and mark all exhibits as full exhibits at this time. That's A through RR with the APCB to be provided at some point later this week.

And Attorney Tucci, do you have any other exhibits that you wish to enter at this time?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Not at this time, thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, how about you? Do you have any additional exhibits

that you wish the enter at this time?

ATTORNEY KNAG: No, I believe that the -audited financial statements that were filed with
OHS were part of what you're taking
administrative notice of, so I have no exhibits
to mark at this time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: When you say "audited financial statements," can you just provide me --

ATTORNEY KNAG: Well, in particular, there's been a reference to the ENY audited financial statement dated for the year ending 2021 and the -- it's referred to in various testimony, and I believe it's part of the financial statement reporting that you said you would be taking administrative notice of here.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, yeah, that's correct.

So we are going to proceed in the order for this time -- at this time, we're going to proceed in the order established in the agenda for today's hearing. We may have to go out of order a little bit as we approach the public hearing or the public comment portion, but we'll get to that.

So I would like to advise the Applicant that we may ask questions related to the application that you feel you have already addressed, the same goes to the Intervenors and their submissions. We'll do -- excuse me. We will deal with this for the purpose of ensuring that the public has knowledge about your proposal and for the purpose of clarification.

I want to reassure you that we have reviewed the entire record up to this point and we will do so again before issuing a final decision.

As this hearing is being held virtually, we ask that all participants, to the extent possible and able to use the video cameras when testifying or making comments during the proceedings.

As I mentioned earlier, all participants should mute their devices and should disable their cameras when we go off the record or take a break.

Please, be advised that although we will try
to shut off the hearing recording during the
breaks, the audio and visual, itself, may
continue. If that's the case, any audio or
visual that are not disabled will be accessible
to all participants in the hearing.

1 And as I said earlier, public comment will likely go in the order established by OHS during 2 the registration process, but there will be some 3 exceptions to allow for appointed and elected 5 officials to speak first followed by clinical professionals and some other exceptions to the 7 usual order. Are there any other housekeeping matters, 9 Attorney Tucci, or procedural issues that you 10 want to address before we get started? 11 ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, thank you. I think 12 you've covered everything. 13 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 14 And Attorney Knag, do you have any other 15 housekeeping matters or procedural issues? 16 ATTORNEY KNAG: None. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 18 So, with that, we're going to turn ourselves 19 over to the technical portion of the hearing. 20 Is there an opening statement from the 21 Applicant? 22 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you, Hearing Officer 23 Csuka and members of OHS staff. This is Ted 24 Tucci on behalf of Applicant, Sharon Hospital. 25 We appreciate very much the opportunity to appear here before you this morning in this public hearing to discuss the application that's pending.

We'll reserve our comments more extensively for closing argument, but at this time, I'll just make the following brief opening remarks in support of Sharon Hospital's application.

First, as the Hearing Officer and OHS staff is well aware, we have submitted voluminous materials, facts, and data relating to this application and the operation of the labor and delivery services unit at Sharon Hospital over the course of the last several years and the current state of that service.

Our purpose in appearing here this morning and the testimony that we intend to present is not to repeat what is already in those voluminous materials, but rather to add color, additional information, facts, and to bring additional perspective to bear on this application that will assist OHS in making a fair, reasoned, and appropriate determination of this application.

To do that, we are presenting the comments of three witnesses this morning.

The first witness that you will hear from is

Dr. John Murphy, President of Nuvance Health
System, and Dr. Murphy will be speaking about
aspects of our application from a system-wide
perspective and how the application that's in
front of OHS fits into an appropriate delivery
system for health care for the citizens of
Litchfield County and the appropriate operation
of the health system here at Nuvance.

Dr. Murphy's testimony will be followed by testimony from Christina McCulloch, who is the president of Sharon Hospital, and Ms. McCulloch will present a boots-on-the-ground perspective of the operation of labor and delivery services at Sharon Hospital, the efforts that the hospital has made over the course of many years to -- to have that service be a viable service, a service that is one that is not only provides quality care, but is also economically viable.

And finally, our testimony will conclude with remarks by our last witness, who is Dr. Elizabeth Lucal, a board-certified OBGYN physician, who is going to present OHS with her knowledge and experience from a clinical perspective about the delivery of labor and delivery services.

And all of our testimony will be focused on, really, the three pillars that Hearing Officer

Csuka identified as being the central core of what the CON process is all about.

So, in particular, you will hear commentary from our witnesses that relate to the cost, both past and future, of providing these services in the community, the need, utilization, and demand for those services.

And finally, in the event that OHS

determines that the application should be

granted, the consideration of what the access to

quality care will look like in the service area

if those services are no longer offered at Sharon

Hospital.

And we respectfully submit that at the conclusion of this hearing, the facts, the data, the information that we present, will support the application for the termination of this service.

So I've told you what you will hear from our witnesses. Hearing Officer Csuka, I will also tell you that what you will not hear from the Sharon Hospital witnesses is testimony that consists of rumor, speculation, hopes, wishes, or anything that isn't backed up by facts or data.

We understand full well -- the Applicant,
Sharon Hospital, understands full well that there
are concerns and apprehension and that there's
always issues when change is proposed in the
health care delivery system in Connecticut, but
respectfully, CONs are not decided based on fear
or controversy or evidence of backlash or
concern. They should be based on, as you -- as
we all know, the criteria, that statutory
criteria, that applied to CONS and whether or not
they are appropriate findings of fact and
conclusions that back up those criteria.

So, with that, thank you very much and I now introduce to you Dr. John Murphy.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I will -- I guess
I'll swear each of your witnesses in as they come
up to the screen.

Does that work for you, Attorney Tucci?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, I think that's

appropriate. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Dr. Murphy, please, raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence you provided in your pre-filed testimony

1 and the evidence you shall give today or have already given in this case shall be the truth, 2 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so 3 4 help you God or upon penalty of perjury? 5 I do. DR. MURPHY: 6 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Do you adopt your 7 testimony today? DR. MURPHY: Yes, I adopt my pre-filed 9 testimony. 10 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 11 You can proceed whenever you're ready. 12 13 JOHN MURPHY, MD, 14 15 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by 16 Hearing Officer Csuka, testified on his oath as follows: 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF JOHN MURPHY, MD 19 20 DR. MURPHY: All right. Good morning, and 21 good morning to you, Officer Csuka, and the 22 Office of Healthcare Strategy. Thank you for 23 giving me this opportunity to testify today. 24 My name is John Murphy, J-o-h-n, 25 M-u-r-p-h-y. As Attorney Tucci said, I'm the

president and chief executive officer of Nuvance
Health, the parent of the Applicant in this
matter, Sharon Hospital. As I mentioned, I do
adopt my prefile testimony.

I just would like to begin, really, with the -- reminding everyone that we believe, firmly believe, that Sharon Hospital is a vital community asset. It's an important resource. It has a long and proud history of providing medical care to its community and it continues to do so. It provides high-quality care. It's one of the few 5-star hospitals in the State of Connecticut. We're proud of it and we are determined to save it and to preserve it and transform it so that it will be a here 50 years from now and we will be equally proud of its performance.

I do think it's important to acknowledge and recognize the serious financial distress that Sharon Hospital faces. Over the past two years, for instance, in '20 and '21, its financial losses exceeded \$20 million. In the month of October of this year, a single month, it lost \$1.9 million. So, if you look back since -- really, since '19, the losses have been more than \$50 million. It's about \$450,000 a week.

I think the bottom line there is that the current model of providing care and the services that we provide and the manner in which they are provided is simply not sustainable. We recognize that. We have not been complacent. We saw this a couple of years ago, this trend. By the way, this trend is facing hospitals across the United States, but particularly rural hospitals.

So we have been proactive. We recognize that we absolutely need to retool, to reconfigure the services that we provide so that we can meet the needs of community, but at the very same time, create and provide a model of care that is financially sustainable.

I think it's worthy of remembering that rural hospitals in the United States are confronting this very same crisis. Since 2010, 136 rural hospitals in the United States have closed. We very much want to avoid that fate.

As a matter of fact, in 2020 alone, 19 hospitals, rural hospitals, in the United States have closed because of these same macro economic forces.

So we recognize we need to plan. We've worked hard on that plan. We've met with numerous stakeholders over the past two years to

create that plan. We've met with board members, not only of the Sharon Hospital, but also the Foundation for Community Health. We've met with community leaders, elected officials, employees, staff members, physicians, and we've brought in outside experts, people who really are among the country's best experts in rural medicine and rural health care.

And what we have come up with is a plan that we believe provides Sharon Hospital with a future that is sustainable and will meet the needs of its community, and it will require some investments. We need to expand primary care. We to find primary care physicians. As I'm sure you know, there is a shortage and there will continue to be a shortage in the United States of primary care docs and we need to promote and provide specialty services through telehealth and we've already begun to make these investments.

We need to expand behavioral health services. The need for them continues to grow and is great. We need to provide critical emergency care services to the community as we have and very much want to continue to do, and in fact, continue to provide women's health services

with the exception of labor and delivery to the people who live in the Sharon community.

This plan requires some difficult decisions. In order to make the investments that I've just enumerated, we have to eliminate services that are underutilized and are inefficient. I wish that weren't the case, but it is, and labor and delivery is one of those services.

And I'd also like to remind you that since 2015, 89 hospitals, rural hospitals, in the United States have closed their OB services, their labor and delivery services, for these very same reasons.

And lastly, I want to reassure you that we know how to do this. We came before the Office of Health Care Access, it must've been eight or ten years ago with a very similar application for New Milford Hospital, where we wanted to close labor and delivery, and in fact, that was part of a similar transformation plan.

As you look back now, across those eight to ten years, New Milford Hospital is a vital community resource meeting the health care needs of its community with a reconfigured range of services. I think the community is delighted

with the care that we are providing; and with respect to labor and delivery, thank God, there has not been single unfortunate or adverse event.

We have done the right thing by that community. You have permitted us to do that. We have figured out how to let a small hospital play an important and vital and appropriate role in a larger regional health care system such as Nuvance Health.

So we respectfully request your permission to proceed with this plan and to close labor and delivery services at Sharon Hospital.

Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Dr. Murphy.

I'm going the go through each of your witnesses, their direct testimony and then we can take maybe a five-minute break and then we can start with cross-examination.

So, Attorney Tucci, I believe you said
Ms. McCulloch would be the next one?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, Hearing Officer. This is Ted Tucci.

And now, I'll introduce to you the president of Sharon Hospital, Christina McCulloch.

1 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Good morning, Ms. McCulloch. Thank you for coming. Can you, 2 3 please, raise your right hand? 4 Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and 5 sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence you provided in your prefile and the 6 7 evidence that you shall give or have already given in this case shall be the truth, the whole 9 truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God 10 or upon penalty of perjury? 11 MS. MCCULLOCH: I do. 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. You can 13 proceed whenever you're ready. 14 15 CHRISTINA MCCULLOCH, 16 17 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by Hearing Officer Csuka, testified on his oath as follows: 18 19 20 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHRISTINA MCCULLOCH 21 22 MS. MCCULLOCH: Good morning, Hearing 23 Officer Csuka and the staff of the Office of 24 Health Strategy. I thank you for opportunity to 25 testify today.

My name is Christina McCulloch,

C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-a, M-c-C-u-l-l-o-c-h. Excuse me.

I'm the president of Sharon Hospital, the

Applicant in this matter. I have been with

Sharon Hospital since 2014 in a variety of roles,

including chief nursing officer and chief quality

officer before assuming my current role as

president in July of 2022.

The purpose of my testimony today is to provide OHS with information surrounding why our labor and delivery unit is not sustainable, the low utilization of the labor and delivery, and how our plan to transform the hospital is in the best interest of our hospital and community.

Before I begin, I want to acknowledge that this decision was and is not taken lightly. All that have been honored to experience our labor and delivery unit note how truly special it is. We, as a leadership team, share in the emotion surrounding this decision. We do, however, have a responsibility and an obligation to pave the path for the future of Sharon Hospital.

And throughout my time at Sharon Hospital, I have seen extensive efforts to maintain the labor and delivery service. Our providers and

staff have come and gone, our volume remains low, and our demographics continue to age.

Over the years, the number of deliveries have fluctuated between the high 100s and the high 200s, all the while remains a low-utilized unit.

Our most recent fiscal year, 2022, had about 173 deliveries, with just over 100 of those deliveries being from our Connecticut residents. That is, on average, less than two deliveries per week from Connecticut residents on a fully-staffed unit.

Patients also continue to bypass Sharon
Hospital for other hospitals. We see about 50
percent of our Connecticut residents and our
Connecticut service area choosing other hospitals
to deliver, and that's for a very good reason;
some is patient preference, but many are because
patients are choosing to deliver at tertiary care
centers that have NICUs and neonatologists and
speciality services that we can't provide in a
community hospital.

We see women are delivering babies at more advanced maternal age than they were historically, and patients, with their

obstetricians and their families, are developing birth plans that include delivering at facilities that have services that aren't provided at Sharon Hospital.

There is access to labor and delivery services outside of Sharon Hospital in the service area, and these facilities will be maintained post-termination of the labor and delivery unit at Sharon, the closest facility being 24 miles away, that's Charlotte Hungerford Hospital. There's also Danbury Hospital in Danbury, Connecticut; Fairview Hospital in Great Barrington, Mass., approximately 25 miles away, and on our New York side, we have Northern Dutchess and Vassar Hospitals. Those hospitals are all utilized today by patients in our service area.

Of the patients that do deliver at Sharon Hospital, when we look at our most recent data, our Connecticut patients, in our most recent year, approximately 75 percent of the patients that have chosen to deliver at Sharon Hospital live closer to other facilities.

And when we look at our Medicaid population, the majority of our Medicaid population come from

the towns of Torrington, New Milford, and Winsted, all three of those towns being closer to other hospitals.

So what we see is patients are actually traveling further to deliver at our hospital.

Termination of labor and delivery services at Sharon Hospital does not create an access issue. It eliminates a choice.

Despite the continued low number of births and the reality that there is a percentage of our population that will never deliver at Sharon Hospital, we have maintained a fully-operational unit. This comes at a high cost and it is not easy to maintain.

Sharon Hospital can't afford to do the array of services that tertiary care centers offer, but we can thrive as a rural hospital by allocating our resources responsibly.

We have remained transparent with all stakeholders since our decision to apply to terminate labor and delivery services. We are prioritizing planning and communications to provide a smooth transition for patients to relieve labor -- to receive labor and delivery services in other regions.

Population data, demographic trends, and community health needs assessment all support that our greatest opportunity is to provide needed services for our community as in primary care, behavorial health and wellness. It also includes expanding our women's health program.

We are committed to expanding primary care access and wellness. We are committed to maintaining women's health services, including OB/GYN outside of delivering babies. We're also looking to expand those services, and the few examples that we're currently working on are maternal mental health support, and we're bringing on a women's health coordinator to our team to assist the women in our community with coordinating and finding where those services are and also helping to develop our women's health program.

Outside of women's health, our plan to transform our hospital also includes a recruitment of primary care, on-site and virtual access of specialists, delivery of behavioral health, and the repurposing of space on our hospital campus to become a one-stop ambulatory health care destination.

1 I conclude by asking OHS to recognize that Sharon Hospital is undertaking its transformation 2 3 plan to maintain access and high-quality care. The application to close labor and delivery 5 services is a necessary component of this plan. I respectfully request that OHS approve this 6 7 application to terminate labor and delivery service. 9 Thank you for the opportunity to speak today 10 and I'm available for any questions. 11 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 12 Ms. McCulloch. One quick thing. I don't believe 13 you adopted your pre-filed testimony. Do adopt 14 your pre-filed testimony? 15 MS. MCCULLOCH: I do. I adopt my prefile 16 testimony. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 18 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Hearing Officer Csuka, this 19 is Ted Tucci. We're now prepared to proceed with 20 our final witness and I introduce to you 21 Dr. Elizabeth Lucal. 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 23 DR. LUCAL: Good morning, Hearing Officer 24 Csuka and staff of the Office of Health Strategy. 25 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I need to swear you

1 in first. I'm sorry to interrupt. 2 DR. LUCAL: Good morning anyway. 3 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I want to make sure 4 we're able to consider whatever you say on the 5 record today. Please, raise your right hand. Do you 6 7 solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, 8 as the case may be, that the evidence you 9 provided in your prefile and the evidence that 10 you shall give today shall be the truth, the 11 whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help 12 you God or upon penalty of perjury? 13 DR. LUCAL: I do. 14 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Do you adopt your 15 prefile testimony? 16 DR. LUCAL: I do. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 18 Okay, now, you can proceed. I apologize for 19 that again. 20 21 22 23 24 ELIZABETH LUCAL, MD, 25

called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ELIZABETH LUCAL, MD

DR. LUCAL: Good morning. Good morning
Hearing Officer Csuka and staff of the Office of
Health Strategy. Thank you for allowing me to
testify today.

My name is Elizabeth Lucal,

E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h, L-u-c-a-l, and for the record,

I adopt my pre-filed testimony.

I am a board-certified practicing
obstetrician and gynecologist working for
Nuvance -- Nuvance Health at Vassar Brothers
Medical Center. In addition to being
board-certified, I am a fellow of the American
College of Obstetrics & Gynecology and I work
also as the system vice chair for women's health
at Nuvance Health.

I have over 20 years of experience providing OB/GYN care, including many years providing OB/GYN care in rural areas.

Prior to entering private practice, I did my residency and early career in the Armed Forces,

including a deployment to Iraq in 2009, and then 10-plus years in upstate rural New York working as an OB/GYN.

I am testifying today to offer OHS a clinical perspective on patient care, access, and quality considerations associated with Sharon Hospital's application to phase out inpatient labor and delivery services. Based on my education, training, and experience field -- in the field of women's health services, including working in the Sharon community and other rural health care settings, I have agreed with the idea that Sharon Hospital's transformation plan, with a critical piece being the termination of labor and delivery services, is the best path forward for Sharon Hospital to maintain viability as a high-quality clinical facility focused on the services most needed in this community, including services affecting maternal health care.

My testimony is also intended to clear up common misconceptions concerning the delivery of prenatal care and labor and delivery services concerning patients' safety, access, and emergency services. I welcome your questions.

Like many facilities, Sharon Hospital faces

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

difficult challenges and choices if it is to continue to serve as a vital health care delivery platform as previously discussed by Dr. Murphy.

Sharon Hospital has been a high-performing, high-quality hospital despite its size and rural location for many years. It is essential to communities in northwest Connecticut, but the recent health care trends, including consolidation of providers, increased costs of specialized equipment, specialized -- specialist providers, staffing shortages, and of course, the COVID pandemic has severely impacted the hospital and made it untenable for the hospital to continue trying to maintain all of its services, especially a 24/7 labor and delivery unit, we're also prioritizing the services most-needed in the community.

Sharon Hospital has worked diligently to maintain its labor and delivery service for a long period of time. This plan to close is not due to any lack of effort on the part of the hospital, the employees or the community. The reality is that it is very difficult to attract physicians seeking to build a practice that is tied to a low-volume hospital in a rural area.

There is limited protected growth in the service and the current volume hovers at a threshold that many Clinicians and experts deem the minimum required by a labor and delivery service needing to maintain safety and financial viability.

In recent years, the volume of mothers delivering at Sharon has steadily fallen. The volume trends and aging demographics also in the Sharon area paired with current clinical practice patterns where patients bypass Sharon Hospital to alternate facilities are reasons why few obstetricians relocate to and remain in the Sharon area.

Physicians starting their career seeking to become board-certified are discouraged from relocating to a low-volume hospital. Many will not take the risk that they may be unable to get experience with complicated cases in advance of their board certification due to complicated cases being directed to another facility.

Experienced physicians, even after board certification, do not want to relocate to a low-volume hospital mid-career because low volume yields lower productivity, and thus, lower

compensation.

I, therefore, believe Sharon Hospital's transformation plan with the closure of labor and delivery unit is a key component. It is the right path for Sharon Hospital and the community. As part of that plan, Sharon has committed to expanding services designed to maintain and promote not just women's health, but maternal health.

Sharon Hospital can play an even more vital role in keeping community members healthy. It's the burden of maintaining and underutilized labor and delivery service is listed(sic).

From a clinical's perspective, this reorientation for a facility like Sharon is consistent with trends in OB/GYN as more families choose birthing centers at larger facilities with more on-site capabilities. Inpatient labor and delivery is an extremely resource-intensive service requiring a fully-staffed birthing unit, 24/7 surgical and anesthesia support, as well as 24/7 OB/GYN on-call coverage. Running a labor and delivery unit that sits idle for significant periods of time using costly staff is not a -- is not a clinically-optimal situation.

In my experience in other rural markets has shown, it is not necessary for every facility to offer birthing services in order for families to maintain safe access to labor and delivery.

I previously worked in upstate New York near the Canadian border and treated many families who relied on local providers and facilities for antenatal and postnatal care while traveling in excess of an hour to regional tertiary centers for the delivery portion of their care.

Sharon Hospital has a viable path forward to sustainability by expanding its most highly-needed and cost effective services.

Sharon Hospital can and should promote well-being in its community but also serve as a entry point to larger facilities with access to extensive specialists and facilities across the Nuvance Health network.

I understand that this proposal may be disappointing to some and that some have raised safety concerns with phasing out labor and delivery at Sharon Hospital; however, these concerns seem to be based on misconceptions regarding prenatal and birthing care experiences that do need to be corrected.

First, patients in the service area will continue to seek pregnancy care from their community-based OB/GYNs which include appropriate lab work, testing, and support services at Sharon Hospital.

As OB/GYN clinicians, we appreciate the importance of the entire spectrum of maternal care, from the first antenatal visit through the postnatal process, with the delivery being one aspect of that process. Under this application, that process will not change other than the delivery location. In fact, with the upcoming changes proposed by Nuvance Health, women's health services, the antenatal and postnatal services will be enhanced for Sharon Hospital patients.

Pelvic floor physical therapy, once thought to be the domain of menopausal women, is expanded to include antenatal and especially postnatal women. The Nuvance Health Health breastfeeding working group, which has key members from the Sharon community, is also promoting an expansion of classes, access to NICUs using human breast milk to support preterm/at-risk infants and newborn nurseries, also promoting the use of

human breast milk for term infants.

Behavorial health is expanding a telehealth platform directed specifically at the needs of antenatal and postnatal.

There will be a continuity of care for patients and providers will work with patients in advance to identify and appropriate birthing facility. In consultation with their patients, OB/GYNs will develop care plans for pregnant women months in advance of the expected delivery date.

Furthermore, it is without question that birthing services can be safely provided for area patients at Danbury Hospital, Charlotte

Hungerford, Vassar Brothers Medical Center, and other facilities near this service area. The data show that Sharon Hospital's current volume includes a number of patients who already cross state lines to deliver in New York, and other facilities in the area are more than capable of taking care of those patients and delivering their babies.

What is left after eliminating out-of-state patients is approximately two Connecticut residents delivering per week at Sharon Hospital,

which is well below any reasonable threshold for maintaining the unit 24/7, and any threshold at which the unit could be attractive in the long-term for employment by providers and other clinical personnel.

We must face the reality that patients choose to deliver at larger facilities with more on-site capabilities such as a NICU. It is not uncommon for the NICU to be needed in less than emergent situations and this cannot be provided at Sharon Hospital.

There are also misconceptions relating to potential need for emergency birthing services and Sharon Hospital's capacity to meet that anticipated need.

The first misconception is that its labor and delivery -- that the labor and delivery unit is no longer operational, Sharon Hospital will be flooded with patients who need to deliver babies on an emergency basis. In my experience, such instances are not common given the way that pregnancies are managed as explained before.

Nuvance Health's successful winding down of the birthing services at New Milford Hospital provides a model that Sharon Hospital is

following here. Due to effective planning in communication with providers and its community regarding the cessation of birthing services, New Milford Hospital did not have a single emergency delivery following the closure of its labor and delivery services.

Sharon Hospital is similarly emphasizing advanced planning and communication with patients and providers to enable patients to identify alternate options so that they have the same successful outcome.

However, on the rare occasion when a woman is in need of child birth services and she presents to Sharon Hospital's emergency department, there are two paths to safely manage that patient.

First, the patient will be assessed to see if a safe transfer to another hospital is an option. As a rural hospital, Sharon Hospital's emergency department is well-versed in the stabilization and transfer process and successfully transfers more than 300 patients a year already. In that 300, there are multiple OB patients who are regularly transferred to other facilities. This is not a new process.

Second, in the event that the appropriate clinical courses for the patient to give birth at Sharon Hospital, that can be safely accomplished with the appropriately-trained emergency personnel. Emergency room physicians are trained in their residency to deliver babies and it is not uncommon for rural hospitals to serve this function when necessary.

All emergency department providers and staff at Sharon Hospital have already undergone and continue emergency births and complications and training through drills, module education, and are neonatal resuscitative certified. These trainings and certifications are vital to safely managing emergency deliveries, including identification of signs of unexpected complications and outcomes.

In conclusion, as a practicing board-certified OB/GYN, I have delivered many babies and dedicated my professional life to providing essential care to women and their families in rural and urban settings.

Closure, if it must happen, is not something that we relish. I understand the personal choices that families make about which provider

and facility to trust for safe care in this important life event. This decision has not been reached lightly and we do not seek to minimize the concerns of families in your community.

Ultimately, however, Sharon Hospital does need to continue to operate -- does not need to continue to operate an underutilized labor and delivery unit in order for patients in this service area to have access to birthing services. There multiple safe and accessible options available which area residents already utilize.

I firmly believe that the transformation

plan provides the best road map for Sharon

Hospital to provide the care most needed for the

Sharon community and to remain an essential

resource for the future. I, therefore, urge you

to approve the application and I thank you for

your time. I'm available for your questions.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you Dr. Lucal.

Attorney Tucci, do you have any other representatives from either the hospital or Nuvance that you wish to present today?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, Hearing Officer Csuka.

That concludes our direct presentation.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, just so that

I'm clear, do you have any other representatives from either Nuvance or the hospital in the event the three witnesses you've brought with you are unable to answer certain questions or --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: We have -- we have multiple resources available for you, Attorney Csuka, and OHS staff. Many people are in our -- are in the hearing room today, and hopefully, will be available to answer any specific and/or technical questions that may arise during the course of the day.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you.

Before we get into cross-examination, as I did mention earlier, I just wanted to take a five-minute break. We can come back at 10:30 and then we'll proceed at that time.

Just a reminder to everyone, you may want to turn the video and the audio off. You don't need to exit the hearing, but just be careful what is said and done on camera.

(Off the record at 10:25 a.m.)

(Back on the record at 10:31 a.m.)

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So let's go back on

1 the record, if everyone is ready to proceed. 2 So we're going to pick up where we left off 3 with cross-examination by the Intervenors, limited again to the 19a-639 criteria beginning 5 first with Dr. Murphy. Attorney Knag, do you have any 7 cross-examination for Dr. Murphy? 8 ATTORNEY KNAG: May I proceed? 9 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Certainly. 10 CROSS EXAMINATION OF JOHN MURPHY, MD 11 BY ATTORNEY KNAG: 12 Dr. Murphy, good morning. 0 13 Α Morning. 14 You mentioned that Sharon Hospital is a 5-star 0 hospital as rated by Medicare. What is Danbury's rating? 15 16 Α I believe the most recent rating was a three. 17 And is it also true that Vassar and Charlotte O 18 Hungerford are rated two? 19 I would -- I would have to double-check. I'm not 20 certain, as I sit here. 21 Q So it's -- but they're not -- they're definitely 22 not rated as high as Sharon; is that right? 23 No, we only had -- I know we only had two 5-star Α 24 hospitals in the system; one was one in Dutchess and one 25 was in Sharon Hospital.

1 Q And you agree that the quality of care at the 2 Sharon Hospital maternity is outstanding? I believe that it's very good, yes. 3 Α 4 And that -- and did ACOG, American College of Q 5 Obstetricians & Gynecologists, did they make recommendations for how to build on that quality? 6 7 They did an evaluation and made a series of Α 8 observations and recommendations about the program. 9 Did you implement any of the recommendations they Q 10 made to build on that quality? 11 If -- if you'd like to know the specifics, Α 12 Attorney Knag, I'd be happy to bring in someone who's more 13 familiar with the specifics of the question. 14 Q Okay. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Who would that 16 person -- who would that person be, Dr. Murphy? 17 DR. MURPHY: Christina McColloch. 18 Let me wait, then. I'll -- let's proceed with 0 19 you, Doctor --20 Α Okay. 21 -- and I'll ask her when I get to her. Q 22 Very good. Α 23 All right, do you agree that a substantial Q 24 profitable business such as labs, tests, and procedures, 25 has been transferred from Sharon Hospital to other Nuvance

facilities?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection as to relevance.

This goes outside the scope of what the Hearing

Officer has already indicated this hearing is

about.

ATTORNEY KNAG: May I comment on that, Hearing Officer?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Sure

ATTORNEY KNAG: They -- they're claiming that they have a large loss of \$20 million and the consultant's report, the Stroudwater report, said that should have been giving them, Sharon, credit for these procedures and tests that have been -- that were done at Sharon and now are done elsewhere, and that, actually, a lot of the losses are related to the fact that they pushed profitable services to over hospitals.

So they're claiming a loss of \$20 million.

I'm cross-examining to show that that's unfair to
the -- to you without clarification.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: But the question before OHS is -- relates to cost and financial viability of the service that is at issue in this hearing, not the general financial viability of Nuvance and/or Sharon Hospital as an entity.

ATTORNEY KNAG: But the -- but Dr. Murphy
has commented on both those issues and I'm just
cross-examining him based on what he's testified
to.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Well, again, Hearing

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Well, again, Hearing
Officer Csuka, I believe this violates not only
the letter but the spirit of the extensive ruling
that you issued, and the purpose of this
testimony is clearly offered to support some type
of conspiracy theory that money has been moved
around in a way to -- to suggest that there are
losses that are artificially higher than what
they really are, and if we go down this path,
we're going to turn this hearing into something
that really gets away from what the issues are
that need to be decided.

On that basis --

ATTORNEY KNAG: I'm not --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: -- I ask you to sustain the objection.

ATTORNEY KNAG: -- I'm not going to ask a long series of questions, just -- I just want to establish that there was profitable services diverted.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: All right, I think

this may go to cost-effectiveness, so I'm going to allow it, but let's not go too far down this path.

DR. MURPHY: I would answer your question,
Attorney Knag, by saying that we have been very
careful, very thoughtful, for crediting Sharon
Hospital for its contribution for services that
have appeared elsewhere in the system, and we
have reviewed those credits with the author of -the Stroudwater report shared our calculations
with him.

So we feel very confident that we have addressed the substance of your question and essentially held harmless Sharon Hospital's financial accounting for services that have been obtained elsewhere in the system.

Q And did you -- did you charge the hospital for -Sharon Hospital for losses from previous periods and
overhead fees for previous periods?

A We did not charge for services from previous periods in current periods. You know, we -- we -- our financial statements are audited, as you know, shared with the State, as you know, and we followed standard accounting policies.

Q Now, there were five primary care providers who

were hired by Nuvance in the Sharon area who left in the last several years since you took over Sharon Hospital; is that right?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Same objection as to relevance. This goes beyond the scope of the direct testimony and primary care providers are not at issue in this hearing.

relate to the question of whether the -- they say that part of their program is to increase primary care and they say that the volume is down, but the lack of primary care providers has contributed with -- would contribute to a loss of volume, and also, the fact that they're saying that they're going to recruit primary care providers in the future as part of their plan should be tested against the fact that all that's happened in recent years is they've lost primary care providers

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, can you tie this in to any of the statutory criteria that OHS is tasked with looking at?

ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes, it has to do with access. It has to do with cost-effectiveness. It has to do with quality in terms of providing

of these services.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Again, I renew my objection based on relevance. The -- the ability to attract or retain primary care physicians or not or the potential ability to do that in the future is irrelevant to the decision that OHS must make as to whether or not it makes sense to continue an investment of billions of dollars a year -- millions of dollars a year to maintain inpatient labor and delivery services.

attorney knag: They have stated that in order to -- that by eliminating maternity, they're going to be able to have a renewed focus on primary care, and my contention is that they -- that that's not the case and that their track record is poor and that there's no reason to believe that it won't continue to be poor in terms of providing primary care services in this area.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: This goes -- this goes back to the conspiracy theory issues that were raised in the voluminous intervenor materials that were submitted, and I respectfully submit that the question of whether or not Sharon Hospital may or may not be successful in the future in enhancing

primary care services has nothing whatever to do with whether or not it makes sense to continue the low-volume labor and delivery service that loses millions of dollars a year.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm going to sustain the objection. I'm inclined to agree with Attorney Tucci, that we're not able to look into the future and sort of define what the possibilities are or will not be.

So, Attorney Knag, you can -- ATTORNEY KNAG: I'll proceed.

Q Now, now, when you filed this -- this certificate of need, Doctor, you said that you were projecting 2023 gains for Sharon Hospital of \$164 million; is that -- is that correct?

A What? I'm sorry, I need a clarification of the question. What certificate of need is Attorney Knag talking about?

Q When you filed -- when you filed the certificate of need in the matter in Exhibit G, and then again in the completeness questions on Exhibit I, you stated that there were \$164 million of -- of gains projected for Sharon Hospital for 2023; is that correct?

A I do not believe it is, but I'm happy to bring forward our chief financial officer who's here who would be

delighted to answer the question.

- Q So the questions concerning the finances, I should ask the chief financial officer; is that right?
 - A I think you would be better served if you did.
- Q All right, I'll -- I'll take that opportunity at the end of this process.

You say you've consulted with stakeholders, but the fact is that the medical staff voted 25 to 1 against this plan; is that correct?

A I do not believe that it is correct, but I did -I can assure you that we have consulted with medical staff
extensively, including myself. I've had many conversations
with members of the medical staff.

- Q And there's a strong opposition to this plan among the medical staff; isn't that correct?
- A I would not characterize it as strong opposition, no.
- Q And there's strong opposition among the community and its leaders; is that correct?
- A I've talked to many community members, most of whom, but not everyone, believes that to preserve, to save Sharon Hospital, this plan is the most sensible path forward.
- I'm sure that there are individuals who see it differently and they're welcome to those different

opinions, but I've certainly had many conversations, including board members, who, in many respects, I think are closest to the role of advocating on behalf of the community and promoting the interests of the community and they unanimously endorsed this plan.

Q Do you believe that -- you mentioned the diverted -- that certain patients have not come to the hospital. You believe that that could be in part because of the announcements which started in 2018 that the maternity would close?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection; calls for speculation, also goes directly outside of the Hearing Officer's ruling on what's germane to this hearing.

ATTORNEY KNAG: The volume of -HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes, sir.

attorney knag: -- the volume of -- the effects of -- they claim that the people go to other hospitals because of quality issues, and we claim that they go to other hospitals because they've been told that the place is going to close and I think we're entitled to prove that.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: I renew my objection.

Again, this is part of the conspiracy theory
that, somehow, this has all been orchestrated by

Sharon Hospital and that there was an intent, as counterintuitive as it may be, to drive volume away from the hospital.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, can you say that the question again? I'm sorry, I didn't follow it completely.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I'm asking him whether the announcements in 2018 and 2020 and 2021 that they were intending to close the hospital resulted in reductions in patient count as opposed to the possibility that they -- the patients went to other hospitals because of the quality issues.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: And again, I renew my objection based on the Hearing Officer's clear decision about the proper scope of this hearing, but even beyond that, the question calls for not only Dr. Murphy but any witness to speculate about what's in the minds of dozens of -- of people who live in the Sharon Hospital service area and why they might have done what they did

ATTORNEY KNAG: Well, he has speculated. He said that they went because of -- they want to tertiary care services and I contest that as the reason that -- I believe they're also other reasons, which I'm just asking him about.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Dr. Murphy, have you done anything as a system to assess what the potential patients, what their reasoning would be in choosing a different hospital?

DR. MURPHY: Yeah, I would answer the question this way: First of all, I was not here in 2018 running -- Nuvance Health didn't exist in 2018, so I'm the wrong person to answer that question, nor did my testimony include facts that Attorney Knag has attributed to me. Christina McCulloch made reference that patients chose to go to other facilities largely because of the facilities that were available at tertiary facilities, but I don't know the specifics of the investigation that led to those conclusions

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

Attorney Knag, I'm going to ask that you move on to your next question and I'm going to sustain the objection.

Q If your request for permission to close the maternity unit is denied, would you be willing to work with Sharon's representative, Maria Horn, who is the incoming co-chairman of the finance community, and the governor and other leaders in an effort to find ways to improve reimbursement for Sharon's maternity unit?

1	A I would answer the question that I am always
2	happy to speak with elected officials and authorities.
3	I've met regularly with Governor Lamont and I have spoken
4	about this issue with Elected Representative Horn. I would
5	be happy to continue to do so regardless of how this
6	decision plays out. I think it's our responsibility to
7	maintain open communications with government officials.
8	ATTORNEY KNAG: That's all I have for
9	Dr. Murphy.
10	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.
11	Well, Dr. Murphy Attorney Tucci, do you
12	have any redirect for Dr. Murphy?
13	ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, I don't. Thank you.
14	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, Attorney Knag,
15	do you want Ms. McCulloch next?
16	ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes.
17	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, and Ms.
18	McCulloch, just a reminder that you're still
19	under oath.
20	And Attorney Knag, whenever you're ready,
21	you can proceed with cross.
22	ATTORNEY KNAG: Thank you.
23	
24	CROSS EXAMINATION OF CHRISTINA MCCOLLOCH:
25	BY ATTORNEY KNAG:

Q Ms. McCulloch, would you agree that serving the New York State patients is an important part of Sharon Hospital's mission?

A Yes.

Q So the fact that certain patients are from New York doesn't mean that that should be discounted?

A That is correct.

Q Where -- where is the nearest hospitals that have NIC- -- NICU availability?

A The nearest hospital in Connecticut, I believe, is Danbury Hospital, or some hospitals that are located in the Waterbury area, all on the New York side, the most local is Vassar Brothers Hospital.

Q So the other hospitals like Charlotte Hungerford don't have NICUs; is that right?

A That is correct.

Q And have you done any evaluation as to why patients that choose to not use Sharon but live in the Sharon area have chosen to go outside of Sharon, the Sharon Hospital, to deliver?

A When patients make the decision to deliver at other facilities, that's done before they associate with a hospital. So that birth-planning process occurs with the obstetrician and other support partners. The hospital is not involved in that birth --

1 So you don't know why they -- why they chose Q another hospital over -- over Sharon; is that your 2 3 testimony? 4 Α We know that patients are referred outside of 5 Sharon Hospital, and one of those examples of why is 6 because Sharon Hospital does not deliver high-risk 7 pregnancies, and so patients are referred to other 8 hospitals that have NICUs and neonatologists to support those high-risk deliveries. We know that --9 10 Do you know whether certain patients don't go to 11 Sharon because they've been told that the hospital may close the maternity unit? 12 13 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Same objection, which --14 which Hearing Officer previously sustained. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Sustained again. I 16 think she testified that they -- they believe 17 it's due to the other concerns. 18 0 Did you offer the top nurse at the Danbury 19 Hospital -- at Sharon Hospital a job at Danbury Hospital? 20 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Ms. McCulloch, your 21 audio cut out. 22 MS. MCCOLLOCH: Oh, that is -- that is not 23 an accurate statement. What was done with reference to that nurse in 24 Q 25 Danbury Hospital?

A So we support professional development for all of our staff at the hospital, and as we look at each individual staff member and their professional goals, they're always looking for opportunities for growth that may be specific to those individuals. As opportunities come up, we have conversations with staff as we attempt to retain staff within our hospital system.

Q So you did talk to that nurse about going to Danbury?

A I have had conversations with our charge nurse that you're referencing about opportunities for her professional growth.

Q As Danbury?

A There was a position open at Danbury at one point in time that we had discussed, yes, but for -- to clarify, there was a position offered to her there, discussions about professional growth.

Q Do you know if the -- if there was -- if there were conversations by your team with doctors and professional staff about the possibility that you would look for jobs or staff privileges elsewhere?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yeah, I do think I did
object earlier and probably should have. This
goes down, and you can see that we're already
going down the path that really doesn't have any

relationship to the issue of whether or not these services are sustainable at a rural hospital such as Sharon, but rather are directed to the argument that the Intervenor wants to make that in some -- in some form or fashion, Sharon Hospital intentionally drove professionals and providers out of the labor and delivery unit. I object. It's -- it violates the Hearing Officer's ruling directly.

not intended, the point here is that -- that because -- that they claim are being -- have gone up because the staff left, the nurses left, and they had to hire traveling nurses, and that's directly relevant to the question of the -- the potential savings because if the place is not about to close or if it was established that the maternity unit would not close, the staff could be rerecruited and they wouldn't need to use traveling staff.

So my -- my question is just to show that the loss of the staff was something that resulted from actions by the hospital resulted not resolved and that increased the cost, which are now saying can be saved by closing the unit.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Well, that explanation helps, Hearing Officer Csuka, because now, what Mr. Knag has said is that he wants to prove precisely what you ordered should not be the subject of this hearing, which is that there was a -- an alleged violation of the 2018 --

ATTORNEY KNAG: No.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: -- agreed settlement.

That's outside the boundaries --

ATTORNEY KNAG: No, it's just to assess the potential savings or lack thereof, but of closing this unit.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'll -- I'm going to allow the question.

MS. MCCULLOCH: May I ask you to repeat the question, please?

Q Did you and your team urge doctors and staff to look for jobs or affiliations, medical staff affiliations elsewhere?

A When we made the decision to apply to terminate labor and delivery services, we were transparent from the beginning with all of our stakeholders, including our medical staff. We did have conversations with our medical staff related to planning should our application get approved, and that planning does have to include where will

our providers deliver and at what hospitals, and so we did have conversations inquiring if our labor and delivery unit closed, where would our providers be delivering, or I -- I shouldn't say our providers because community providers are independent, but we did have conversations related to that as an attempt to plan should our application be approved.

Q Did ACOG, in its study, make recommendations as to what you might be with reference to the labor and delivery unit?

A Can you, please, clarify? ACOG -- ACOG did a quality review and they've made recommendations related to quality. Is that what you are referencing or are you referencing did they made recommendations based on something else?

- Q I'm asking whether there were recommendations in the ACOG study? You said they were related to quality.
 - A There were recommendations from ACOG, yes.
 - Q And what were they?

- A I cannot recall the recommendations specifically.
- Q Did you implement any of those recommendations?
- A My recollection is that those recommendations from the ACOG review were reviewed with all of our OB/GYNs, our quality team, and critical members of our obstetrics unit. They were brought to the OB committee for review and for recommendations for implementation, but I don't recall

1 what has or has not been implemented at this point. Did you do anything to recruit OB/GYNs? 2 Q 3 May I ask what time period you are --Α 4 From the time --Q 5 Α -- referencing? 6 -- from the time that Nuvance took ownership Q 7 until the present. 8 Α Yes. 9 What did you do? Q 10 So there had been recruitment efforts over the 11 years around the time. These are approximates, just based 12 upon my recollection. Around the time that we did become 13 Nuvance Health, there have been conversations with BWH 14 related to recruitment and discussions related to how that 15 recruitment would work as a partnership. 16 Q But you didn't successfully recruit any OB/GYNs? 17 Not since the time we have been Nuvance Health. Α 18 And --0 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm sorry, Ms. 20 McCulloch, what -- you sort of trailed off. 21 was the end of your response there? 22 MS. MCCULLOCH: No, as Nuvance Health, we 23 did not recruit any additional OB/GYNs. 24 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: All right. Thank 25 you.

Q And then -- then did -- did the -- did the OB/GYN group succeed in recruiting a new OB/GYN?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection as to relevance.

OB/GYN Group is not Sharon Hospital. Not
relevant to this application.

ATTORNEY KNAG: They're claiming that they're having dif- -- part of the problem is they're having difficulty recruiting and we're showing that it's possible to recruit successfully.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: The "they" -- the "they" that Mr. Knag is referring to is Sharon Hospital, but the question before OHS is what is Sharon Hospital's experience with regard to efforts to maintain the labor and delivery, not what some private practice's experience may or may not have been.

ATTORNEY KNAG: But the -- but the ability of the private practice to recruit successfully bears on their ability to recruit and which they claim is -- is a reason for terminating the service.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Is -- just for my own education, is the -- the practice you're talking about, is that in any way affiliated with

1 Sharon Hospital --2 ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes. 3 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: -- or Nuvance? ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes, it's Dr. Mortman's 5 practice, that in the -- this one group in Sharon that delivers babies and that's Dr. Mortman's 7 group associated with women's health and they --8 they success -- they recently successfully 9 recruited a new highly-qualified new OB/GYN for 10 this area and the -- and Sharon refused its 11 previous offer to support that with an income 12 guarantee, and I'm just trying to bring that out 13 in this cross-examination. 14 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Well, again, so Mr. Knag's 15 explanation is, I hope, illuminating to OHS and 16 the Hearing Officer because what he's talking 17 about is a practice that exists in the service 18 area, that is a private professional corporation, 19 that is not owned by, managed, affiliated or in 20 any way under the control of Sharon Hospital. 21 But those are --ATTORNEY KNAG: 22 ATTORNEY TUCCI: The doctors in that 23 practice -- excuse me. 24 ATTORNEY KNAG: Sorry. 25 The doctors in that ATTORNEY TUCCI:

practice may have privileges at this hospital and lots of other hospitals, but that has nothing whatever to do with what Sharon Hospital did, what its efforts were to maintain the L&D unit as a viable service here, and the question of whether or not individual doctors choose to join private practices somewhere in Litchfield County has no bearing on -- on the application presently pending.

ATTORNEY KNAG: It has everything is do with it because it shows that it's possible to recruit doctors, and that, in fact, that this group has recruited doctors for the Sharon Hospital medical staff. It's not unrelated to Sharon. These are the doctors that are delivering babies.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, I mean, wouldn't you be able to get this in through Dr. Mortman, himself?

ATTORNEY KNAG: We can do -- we can do that, yes. Okay, I'll move on.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I mean, I -- I feel like you're just asking her to speculate here.

ATTORNEY KNAG: All right, we'll move on.

Dr. Mortman will discuss it.

I have no further questions for this

1 witness. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 3 All right, Attorney Tucci, did you have any 4 redirect for Ms. McCulloch? 5 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you, Mr. Csuka. 6 REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHRISTINA MCCULLOCH: 7 BY ATTORNEY TUCCI: 8 Q Just a -- Ms. McCulloch, just a few questions for 9 you. 10 You talked about the availability of NICU 11 services in the service area here in Litchfield County, and 12 I believe you referred to Danbury Hospital as being the 13 closest Connecticut hospital that has NICU services 14 available, correct? 15 That's correct. Α 16 For my benefit, can you just talk a little bit 17 about what -- what the NICU services are all about and what level of care that is considered to be in terms of hospital 18 19 level services as compared with what's available at Sharon? 20 Α Sure. 21 So NICU -- NICUs change in levels from well-baby 22 NICU up to Level 4 in NICU. And as you increase in the 23 levels of NICUs, you increase in the capability of those 24 NICUs in the totality of the patients that those NICUs can

25

take care of.

When you look at the hospitals across the state, hospitals have different levels of NICU. Sharon Hospital has a well-baby nursery. So we care for well-babies. We do not deliver patients that have risk associated with their deliveries, and what we do maintain is the ability to, in the event that there is an unexpected outcome with an infant, we can resuscitate and appropriately coordinate a transfer to an accepting facility at the appropriate hospital that has that level of NICU that we need

- Q All right, and in -- in your comments to Mr.

 Knag, you talked about the fact that Sharon Hospital, the labor and delivery services unit, as it currently operates in your environment, does not accept or deliver patients who are at-risk for high-risk pregnancies; is that correct?
 - A Right. That is correct.
- Q All right, and can you -- again, for my benefit, can you give me a little bit of an education about what types of patients fall within this category of high-risk --

ATTORNEY KNAG: I object. this question goes beyond the scope of -- of cross.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: It's directly related to cross. I'm -- I'm following up on -- directly on the questions that Mr. Knag asked with respect to the availability of services at Sharon and where the nearest NICU was and all the questions he

asked related to that.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'll allow it.

MS. MCCULLOCH: Can you repeat the initial

question?

Q Yeah, sorry.

So my -- my question was: If you could, just elaborate on when you talk about Sharon Hospital's lack of current capacity to provide care for patients who are faced with high-risk pregnancy, can you -- can you give me some education on what -- what types of risks and patients fall into that category?

A Sure.

So patients that are considered higher risk are, to start, patients that are earlier on in the pregnancy, so before 36 weeks are considered a higher-risk pregnancy and there's a chance that that delivery may require NICU services.

Also, when we look at the health of the mother and the health of the pregnancy in general, if there are any co-morbidities or other factors that occurred during that pregnancy that may indicate that they may need other services following that birth that would consider them to be a higher risk.

Q All right, and so do I understand you correctly that with respect to that category of patient who is a

potential consumer of labor and delivery services, if
Sharon Hospital's labor and delivery service unit continues
on into the future, those patients will never come to
Sharon Hospital, correct? That volume does not come here?

- A That is correct.
- Q It goes somewhere else?
- A Mm-hm.

- Q And -- and do you have knowledge of -- for those particular kind of patients, what -- what the options or choices are in this service area?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Where do they go?
- A Well, we know that some go to Danbury Hospital,
 Connecticut. We also have patients that go to UConn.
 There's also another common facility that receives some of
 the patients in our service area. On the New York side,
 Vassar Brothers is one of the main --
- Q And with respect to the category of high-risk -high-risk patients that we've been talking about, high-risk
 labor and delivery patients, do you know whether or not
 that -- that category or subset of patients from the
 universe of volume that might be available for inpatient
 delivery, is that -- what -- what did the trends indicate
 with respect to that category of patient?
 - A Well, we know that women are delivering babies

1	at more advanced maternal age and that, in and of itself,
2	is a risk factor.
3	Q All right, Ms. McCulloch, you were asked a bunch
4	of questions by Mr. Knag about staffing and I think part of
5	what where you indicated is that when the decision was made
6	to make an application to end labor and delivery services
7	at Sharon Hospital, you had open and transparent
8	discussions with the staff that was in the labor and
9	delivery services unit, correct?
LO	A That is correct.
L1	Q Did you do everything you could do encourage
L2	those folks to continue to stay at Sharon Hospital?
L3	A We did.
L4	Q Did you ever tell any professional staff member
L5	that they should leave the hospital because if OHS
L6	eventually approved the application, the services would be
L7	terminated?
L8	A No, we did not.
L9	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you very much.
20	That's all I have.
21	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you,
22	Ms. McCulloch.
23	ATTORNEY KNAG: I have one question for
24	recross.
25	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Just one. I

1	typically don't allow recross, but
2	ATTORNEY KNAG: I'll desist.
3	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you. I
4	mean, it might be something you can ask one of
5	the other witnesses, too.
6	So do you have any cross-exam for Dr. Lucal?
7	ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes.
8	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: One moment. All
9	right, there she is.
10	Dr. Lucal, just a reminder, again, that you
11	are still under oath.
12	CROSS EXAMINATION OF ELIZABETH LUCAL, MD
13	BY ATTORNEY KNAG:
14	Q Doctor, were you in charge of the Vassar Brothers
15	OB/GYN residency program?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And what happened with that?
18	A The program was closed in January of this year.
19	Q Why was that?
20	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection as to relevance,
21	pardon me.
22	ATTORNEY KNAG: I claim it's relevant
23	because of the fact that Dr. Lucal let me
24	withdraw that question. I'll withdraw that
25	question.

Q Doctor, what is your role in going forward with reference to Sharon Hospital's women's health?

A As vice-chair of the system, I help

Dr. Schwann(ph), who is the chair, coordinate services that

work throughout the system, including Sharon Hospital. So

things that are collaborated between the hospitals as well

as outpatient offices.

Q Will you be involved in creating new women's programs as outlined in the CON?

A As it relates to women's health in the system, I am involved.

- Q Have you done anything to-date with reference to new women's programs that may be established as described in the CON?
 - A Yes, I have.

Q What have you done?

A To-date, we have initiated the system-wide breast-feeding working task force, which the immediate goal is to increase the exclusive breastfeeding rates at all of the hospitals actually utilizing the expertise of Sharon Hospital's own breast-feeding experts, we have instituted the pelvic floor physical therapy program for antenatal and postpartum patients, and just recently, we also initiated the maternal behavioral health program with Dr. Cruz to, again, focus on behavioral health issues specifically

related to antepartum and postpartum patients.

Q So is it the intent under the CON that pregnant women would receive prenatal care from someone at Sharon Hospital that was employed by Nuvance?

A The intent of the CON? Patients have their ability to choose their OB/GYN based on their own decision.

Q But would -- would Sharon Hospital be establishing a way for the patients to come to Sharon Hospital and receive prenatal care and post-delivery care?

A Not that I'm aware of. They're not establishing an employee provider model at Sharon.

Q All right, so, therefore, then, if the -- if
there were -- therefore, they would be reliant on resources
that are available outside of Sharon Hospital for those
services?

A No, these services that I'm discussing don't require patients to have any affiliation in the sense of Sharon Hospital other than the fact that their OB/GYN in the community can refer them to these services as they can refer their -- their patients to any --

Q But basic prenatal and post-natal care would be the -- continue to be the provence of the outside OB/GYNs?

A OB/GYNs that are collaborating with Sharon Hospital, yes.

Q All right, would you agree that pregnant women

1 who are at-term are better served if they don't have to travel an hour to get a delivery? 2 3 Α I would agree. 4 Do you agree that there are various emergencies Q 5 that might be encountered that can currently be handled by 6 Sharon Hospital that will not be within Sharon Hospital's 7 capabilities after the CON is employed if it's approved? 8 Α I disagree. 9 Suppose there's an ectopic pregnancy, would Q 10 Sharon have the ability to --11 Specifically, so that we're clear, that is not an Α 12 obstetrical situation. That is a gynecological situation 13 that is managed through multiple EDs with their GYN 14 provider throughout the nation. 15 I'm sorry, I missed that answer. Would you O 16 repeat the answer? 17 That is not an obstetrical emergency, that that Α 18 is a gynecological surgery that is managed regularly 19 throughout EDs and gynecological staff. 20 Who would do the ectopic emergency surgery if the 0 21 OB/GYNs were not on-call? 22 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection; it's not 23 relevant. The witness has already testified that 24 it doesn't have anything to do with obstetric

delivery services.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I don't --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: -- a procedure outside the scope of what the CON involves.

ATTORNEY KNAG: It's our contention that the quality of care is going to diminish if the -- if it's proposed the OB/GYNs are no longer on-call and I'm just trying to touch on that.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: The question relates to not whether OB/GYNs are on-call or not on-call. The question pertains to whether or not there is a 24/7 inpatient labor and delivery service unit. That's the only issue.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Right, and if there isn't, then they would not have an OB/GYNs on-call because you're claiming that they're going to be saving the money by not paying for that.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: The witness clearly testified that, with respect to the specific question asked by the Intervenor's Counsel relating to ectopic pregnancy, that that -- that that clinical situation, to the extent it might exist, is handled in emergency departments.

ATTORNEY KNAG: But I'm asking her -ATTORNEY TUCCI: It's not relevant.

ATTORNEY KNAG: It is relevant because it's

part of what's going to happen if this is approved, and it's a very important part of what's going to happen if there's no OB/GYN coverage. And she says it's handled in the emergency departments, but I don't know how you handle it if you don't have an OB/GYN surgeon on-call.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'll allow the question.

DR. LUCAL: Could you repeat the question?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yeah, I was going to
ask you, Attorney Knag, if you can repeat it?

So who would do the emergency surgery if there was an ectopic and there was no OB/GYN available?

A The gynecologist.

Yes.

Okay, so you're mixing apples and oranges. Just because a labor and delivery unit closes does not mean that the ED cannot have a gynecologist on-call. It also does not mean that any providers in the community cannot be on-call for gynecological issues with their ED.

Q But aren't you --

A There are multiple OB/GYNs who practice GYN only and there are multiple OB/GYNs who practice OB only.

Q But isn't your contention in support of your CON

that you're going to save by closing maternity and a key part of the saving is the call agreements with the OB/GYNs and the pediatricians?

A I am not familiar with what the call agreement is with the OB/GYNs and the pediatricians.

Q Okay, all right, would you agree that births that happen outside of the hospital are a leading cause of neonatal morbidity and mortality?

A Yes.

Q Would you agree that, at times, it may be more dangerous to transport a women in labor than to deliver her?

A Rarely, but yes.

Q Do you know that there are many minority farm workers in the area who are already prone not to seek care?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection; there's no foundation for that. That's -- that's Mr. Knag testifying about some fact that isn't in the record.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I'm asking her and it relates to the fact that if the OB/GYN -- and the OB/GYNs are no longer practicing in Sharon, that it's going to have a particularly negative impact on people of color/minorities who are located in this area.

DR. LUCAL: No, I didn't see any e-mail about that.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: So, again, again, Mr. Knag has now made --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Ms. Epstein, we -if you can mute your device, please, Ruth
Epstein.

Sorry about that. That's one of the pitfalls of doing virtual hearings.

I forgot where we left off, sorry.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Mr. Csuka, just briefly, I'm sorry, Mr. Csuka, this is Ted Tucci.

This is a relevance objection. What Mr.

Knag has specifically stated in his question is a
fear that if labor and delivery services no
lodger exist at Sharon Hospital, that there will
be no OB/GYN private practices in Sharon or in
the service area. That's not the question that's
before you or before OHS staff.

The issue is not whether or not private physicians will continue to come to Litchfield County to offer OB/GYN services. The issue is whether or not, with respect to that one piece of OB/GYN care that involves a birthing plan at an inpatient hospital, whether or not that service

is one that is continued to be needed and is financially-viable in this market.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I'll --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: OHS is not -- excuse me, excuse me, OHS is not concerned with whether or not a private doctor may or may not continue to have a viable financial practice in the market.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I don't agree that OHS is not concerned. OHS is required by the statute to consider the impact of driving the CON on the quality of care, on the accessibility of care, and its impact on minorities, and I'm attempting to induce evidence that's it's going to have a substantial impact on minorities.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So I -- I sort of agree with -- with Attorney Tucci. Maybe you skipped a little ahead here. You haven't even established that Dr. Lucal has any knowledge as to the -- the types of -- of like whether there's a high Medicaid population or an indigent population in the area. If you back up a little bit and start from there, we might be able to get to where you're trying to go.

ATTORNEY KNAG: All right, I'll try, and if I can't, then Dr. Mortman will fill in the

1 blanks. 2 Doctor, do you know whether there are minorities Q 3 in the Sharon area who deliver at Sharon Hospital? 4 There are minorities and people of color Α 5 everywhere, and yes, some do deliver at Sharon Hospital. 6 Do you know whether, in particular, there are --7 there are farm workers who are on Medicaid who comprise a 8 portion of that subset? 9 (Unintelligible) related to Sharon Hospital in Α 10 that delivery, I do not know. 11 ATTORNEY KNAG: Okay, all right, I'll pursue this through Dr. Mortman. I have no further 12 13 questions for Dr. Lucal. 14 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 15 Attorney Knag, correct me if I'm wrong, you 16 did want the -- a financial person to be 17 presented? 18 ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes. 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Was there anyone 20 else? ATTORNEY KNAG: I had some financial 21 22 questions that I want to ask, and I have no 23 further questions for this witness. 24 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 25 Thank you Dr. Lucal.

Attorney Tucci, when you come back on to the camera, do you have someone available who can answer some financial questions?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, Mr. Rosenberg is here in the conference room and can come up to the camera and speak to financial issues related to to application. If you're ready to proceed with that, we can do that now.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yeah, I am -- I'm ready.

MR. ROSENBERG: Good morning, Steven Rosenberg, S-t-e-v-e-n, R-o-s-e-n-b-e-r-g.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, I'm going to put you under oath. Please, raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence you will provide today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you god or upon penalty or perjury?

MR. ROSENBERG: I do.

STEVEN ROSENBERG,

1	called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by
2	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:
3	
4	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And Mr are you a
5	doctor or just a
6	MR. ROSENBERG: So I am the past CFO of
7	Nuvance Health.
8	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, you're not
9	currently the CFO; is that correct?
10	MR. ROSENBERG: So I'm not currently the
11	CFO, but I'm serving in a consultant capacity at
12	this point in time.
13	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.
14	Attorney Knag, you can proceed with whatever
15	questions you have.
16	CROSS EXAMINATION OF STEVEN ROSENBERG
17	BY ATTORNEY KNAG:
18	Q Thank you.
19	Good morning, Mr. Rosenberg.
20	A Good morning.
21	Q Was it in when you submitted the CON
22	application, were you involved in the preparing that
23	submission?
24	A I was not involved in the detail of the
25	submission, no.

1 Who did the submission in terms of the financial Q 2 aspects? 3 Sure, some of my finance staff. Α 4 Q Your staff? 5 Α Correct. And did the -- did the initial CON in Exhibit G 6 Q 7 state that there would be a gain for Sharon Hospital for 8 2023 with or without the CON in excess of \$160 million? 9 It did. Unfortunately, we made an error. We're Α 10 I wish that weren't the case. We subsequently 11 found that mistake, corrected it. We added a line instead 12 of subtracting a line. The detail of the revenue and 13 expenses is correct. The math is wrong. When we redid 14 that and resubmitted it, it came to loss of a little over \$19 million. 15 16 And you made the same mistake when you submitted 17 a revised version of that schedule with the completeness 18 question, in Exhibit I with the completeness question? 19 We did -- yes, we discovered that in 20 the (unintelligible). We corrected it when we found that 21 mistake, when it was pointed out to us, correct. 22 Now, you say that you're going to have savings of 23 approximately \$3 million; is that correct? 24 Α It is. 25 And does that savings reflect the fact that you Q

1 have been paying traveling nurses to staff the unit? 2 It reflects the average salary and cost of Α 3 staffing that unit, some of which would be travelers, 4 correct. 5 Right now, are there any nurses that are not Q travelers? 6 7 I am not familiar with that. Α 8 Q Do you know --"Yes" is the answer. 9 Α 10 Do you know how much extra money you're required O 11 to spend as a result of using travelers rather than employed nurses? 12 13 I don't have that information in detail available 14 now. 15 Do you know whether the Stroudwater said it was a 0 16 million dollars a year at that time when they did their 17 report? 18 I'm not familiar, but I'm sure you could go back Α 19 and check that. 20 In terms of projecting volume for purposes of 0 this comparison, did you assume that the volume would not 21 22 increase in terms of the volume of babies? 23 Α Correct. 24 And -- and did you -- in making that projection, Q 25 did you consider whether the volumes being experienced were

depressed based on the fact that there had been certain announcements of closures?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: This is the third time. I renew my objection.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I think it's relevant to -I'm trying to cross-examine him on his claim of
savings and the volume estimate is certainly
relevant.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: It really is not relevant.

I respectfully submit, Hearing Officer Csuka.

The theory here and what the Intervenors are going to argue to you at the end of the day is that this is all Sharon Hospital's fault because when they announced their intention to apply to a state agency for permission to close this service, that's the reason why a -- it became ex --

ATTORNEY KNAG: Our contention --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: -- the facts similarly don't bear that out.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Our contention is simply that if it became clear that the unit was not closing because the CON was disapproved, that that would result in higher volumes, and I think it's a reasonable point for us to attempt to

prove.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'll allow this

witness to answer that question because I guess it goes to the financial projections.

DR. ROSENBERG: So we base the forward-looking projections on the current volume do not build any increases or decreases into that.

Q How much did you plan -- do you plan to spend on the additional activities that are envisioned by the CON such as additional primary care, behavioral health, and women's health services?

A So I don't think we addressed that. We talked about the expansion of services that we would offer in the community. I don't think we put a dollar amount in there on that.

Q So, in projecting savings, it doesn't include any additional expenses that are -- that are embraced in those items?

A We're talking about the savings related to closure of the maternity unit, that those were talked about, the other items, correct.

Q Okay, yes.

Now, you say that there was -- there would be a savings -- I would refer you to the -- to the chart that is

your financial worksheet, which was submitted as part of the issues paper that was sent to you by OHS just prior to this hearing, where you -- that was where you revised the financial projections to make the corrections you previously described, and in that chart, you said that there would be salaries and wages saved of \$2.3 million. Do you know what that consists of?

A It consists of staffing on the unit.

Q Do you know how it breaks down? Do you have any breakdown of that -- of that number?

A Excuse me for one moment. Yeah, \$1.6 million of that is regular salary savings as a result of closure of the unit. About \$711,000 represents a reduction in agency expense.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Mr. Rosenberg, can I just ask you what you're referring to in your hands right now?

MR. ROSENBERG: Sure, just a financial worksheet that we've prepared as part of this filing. We would be happy to share it with you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Is that something -maybe Attorney Tucci can answer this? Is that
something that's already in the record.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, Hearing Officer Csuka, it's not in the record. It's a worksheet that

1 backs up -- a detailed worksheet that backs up what is in the -- in the materials in the 2 application and it can be shared. 3 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 5 ATTORNEY KNAG: We would ask that they -that they e-mail us and you a copy so we can 7 refer to it in our direct examination, which will follow. Is that possible? HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Tucci, do 9 10 you --11 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Well, Mr. Csuka, the answer 12 I'm not sure if it's possible, but we'll 13 endeavor to do that during a break. If at all 14 possible, we will. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 16 And then, Doctor, then -- the -- Mr. Rosenberg, O 17 there's a line item of \$1,984,000 saved for physician fees. What physicians are included in that number? 18 19 It includes a 25 percent reduction in an OB 20 subsidy. It has a \$600,000 in reduction in OB call, and 21 about a \$1.1 million reduction in anaesthesia and 22 surgeries, \$1.98 million. 23 Okay, do you know if that was the total cost of Q 24 anaesthesia and surgery, all? 25 Α Yes.

Q And isn't it true that anaesthesia and surgery support areas other than OB and GYN and maternity?

A I believe this is the call number just related to OB -- the OB/GYN, but we can't confirm that with you.

- Q You don't know at this point? How would you confirm that?
 - A We'll look at the detail of our numbers.
- Q All right, I would like to get that answer, but other than that, I have no further questions for this witness.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, we can -- I'm just going to add that we can have that be a late file. I think that's a fair question to ask.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Well, Hearing Officer, I -part of our testimony will be an analysis of
their -- of their presentation and it would be
very helpful to know that answer before the -before we present our testimony. If not, we will
just have to work around it, but if they can come
up with the answer now or soon, that would be
better than waiting until after the hearing.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Hearing Officer Csuka, Ted Tucci here, we -- you know, we'll do our best to provide whatever information we can reasonably

1 provide, but respectfully, this is not a discovery proceeding. We're here in a hearing. 2 3 So, if we're unable to do it, obviously, we'll supplement the record with a late file as you've already indicated here. 5 ATTORNEY KNAG: Very well. That's all I 7 have. HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, and thank you, 9 Mr. Rosenberg. 10 Attorney Knag, did you have any other 11 questions that you wanted answered? ATTORNEY KNAG: None that I haven't asked, 12 13 no. 14 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, Attorney 15 Tucci, I'm sorry, I should have asked: Did you 16 have any redirect for Dr. Rosenberg. 17 ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, I don't. Thank you for asking, though. 18 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, I think --20 let's take a short break now. We can come back 21 in -- jeez, would it be okay with everyone if we 22 came back around 11:50 and then went until, I 23 would say, 1:00, and then we can take a lunch break from 1:00 to 1:30 or 1:45? 24 25 ATTORNEY TUCCI: That works fine.

1 ATTORNEY KNAG: That's fine with us. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So we'll come back 3 at 11:50, and just as a reminder, you should probably turn your audio and your video off, and 5 we will see you back at 11:50. Thank you. 7 (Off the record at 11:39 a.m.) 9 10 (Back on the record at 11:53 a.m.) 11 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, we are back. 13 Attorney Tucci, did you have any luck with 14 getting that financial statement that Mr. 15 Rosenberg was referring to in electronic form? 16 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yeah, haven't been able to 17 accomplish that during the break, but we can 18 continue to try. It may be that this makes sense 19 to submit it as a late file; however, we'll let 20 you know. 21 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, since I think 22 that might be relevant and I think, probably, I 23 just may also have some questions based on that, 24 if it is submitted as a late file, I'm going to 25 permit the Intervenor to submit a response, just

1 because I don't want them to be foreclosed from -- from having an opportunity to review it. 2 3 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer. Ted Tucci here. 5 Well, understood, and we'll do our best to expedite that so that it can be part of the 7 process here today. HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 9 So we are going to move on to the 10 Intervenor's case. 11 Attorney Knag, I saw that there were 11 12 witnesses, you provided prefile testimony. 13 Are all 11 planning to provide any sort of 14 overview or direct testimony or only --15 ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes, we're going to follow 16 your direction to stay brief. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, I 18 appreciate that. 19 ATTORNEY KNAG: And I do have a logistical 20 issue I want to raise. Dr. Pri-Paz and Dr. Schweitzer are both 21 22 working today. They're available right now and I 23 intend to put them on as the first two witnesses, 24 and I'm wondering whether it might be possible --25 they both have a fairly brief testimony and I'm

wondering whether it might be possible that, in addition to cross from the Applicant, that if the staff had any specific questions of them, that they could ask those questions now because of the fact that availability later in the day is going to be a logistical issue.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Tucci, do you have any concerns or objections to going in that order?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: No, Hearing Officer Csuka. We'll do our best to accommodate the schedules of the physicians, if that's necessary.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you.

So, Attorney Knag, you feel free to present the case in whatever order you think is best, and we will allow cross-exam, if there is any, of Dr. Pri-Paz and Dr. Schweitzer after you present their testimony.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Thank you.

So I'll -- I'll follow Mr. Tucci's lead and make a short summary of what we're going to do by way of presentation and our key points and leave a more detailed summary to later in the day at the end of the day, but I want to emphasize that the key issue in our view here is that we have a

crisis in this country with reference to maternal mortality, and the rate of maternal mortality has been -- has doubled in the last several years in the United States, and why is that? Because we've been seeing this wave of closures of maternity units in rural areas, and once that happens, there's a precipitous increase in maternity and baby death rates.

And that's why we can't allow the maternity services to close. That's why the governor has made clear his concern about this. That's why the president and the White House has made clear their concerns about this, and that's why a host of other officials have made a similar point.

And we would point out that, unlike other applications like -- such as the Windham application, this is not a case where the hospital is claiming that this service needs to be closed because they can't find the people to do it. To the contrary, the hospital has conceded that it's a high -- it is a high-quality service and that it is an ongoing service that it is able to maintain, and that's a critical difference.

All they're talking about, therefore, is

that they want to save some money, and we say
that the deaths that are going to result, the
mortality and morbidity that's going to result
from this, based on these statistics, based on
the literature do not justify the small savings
that they project.

And furthermore, we note that in addition to who's -- to maternity -- maternity -- terminated deaths, they are -- they are proposing to delete all of the coverage for OB/GYN and pediatrics, and if they do that, there are going to be a host of other issues that are going to come up that the emergency room cannot adequately service.

It's not an emergency room. It's going to be the lack of the availability of an OB/GYN surgeon. If someone has an ectopic, all you can do is put them on transfusion and -- and put them in an ambulance and pray that they make it to the other hospital, but they will be greatly prejudiced by that.

And so that -- that lack of accessibility and quality is a key issue that we're focusing on here, and you know, we would further point out that the distances here are longer than we're talking about in the WIndham case. It's -- we're

1 talking about 43 minutes to an hour to get to these other hospitals from Sharon. That's a long 2 3 way, and so we think that it would be a travesty to close this unit, to allow it to be closed. 5 We think it's imperative to meet the goal of the leadership of this country and this state 7 of -- of reversing the trend of re -- women's mortality, and therefore, we need to have this 9 application denied. 10 So, with that said, I would like to start 11 now with Dr. Pri-Paz. Dr. Pri-Paz is on duty in 12 New York at a hospital, but he's joined us 13 briefly to give us testimony and to respond to 14 cross-examination. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'll just wait for Attorney Tucci to come back. I don't want him to 16 17 miss anything. 18 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, Ted Tucci. 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Are you all set, 20 Attorney Tucci? 21 ATTORNEY TUCCI: I'm here, yes. 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, and do we have 23 Dr. Pri-Paz? 24 DR. PRI-PAZ: Yes. 25 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, I'm having

1	trouble pulling you up.
2	DR. PRI-PAZ: Yes, I'm here.
3	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: There you are.
4	Sorry, I was having trouble finding you in my
5	DR. PRI-PAZ: Yeah, I tend to
6	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So, please, raise
7	your right hand.
8	Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and
9	sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the
10	evidence you provided in your prefile testimony
11	and the evidence you shall give today be the
12	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
13	truth, so help you god or upon penalty of
14	perjury?
15	DR. PRI-PAZ: I do.
16	
17	SHAI M. PRI-PAZ, MD,
18	
19	called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by
20	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:
21	
22	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Do you adopt your
23	prefile testimony?
24	DR. PRI-PAZ: Yes.
25	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

You can proceed.

2

1

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF SHAI M. PRI-PAZ, MD

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

DR. PRI-PAZ: Okay, and this is going to go over a bit over my prefile testimony.

So I'm an OB/GYN, certified -board-certified OB/GYN, board-certified in maternal fetal medicine. I'm currently practicing while at Cornell in New York, and during my fellowship, I used to moonlight at Sharon Hospital, so that's my knowledge of the hospital. It was a great experience over there. I found the staff to be very professional, very kind. We had -- I was there for weekends. Almost every weekend, we took care of patients, we triaged them, we delivered them. I don't recall, maybe one time, we had to transfer -transport a patient, but I basically got to know the area and the patients and I really endorsed them.

So, to talk about the point, the concern with closing it, so we recently had to -- actually, two years ago, during COVID, we actually built a new hospital up here just across

the street. So the whole maternity ward moved across, and that was a process of like a year, at least, and the training was drills and all kind of scenarios, but still, for about a year, we had to have OB/GYNs in the emergency room because with all the training and with all the preparations, we still ended up having deliveries done in the emergency room that we would not have time to just transport them to the street, even. So -- and that was just across the street.

So, when we're talking about about closing the unit and transferring patients 35, 40 minutes, it doesn't matter how prepared we are. Things can still happen. Even if we see them during the pregnancy and we tell them to go there for the delivery, you can't control it all, high-risk or not high-risk. Even low-risk patients can become high-risk during labor.

Also, I was reading the report about the decreasing number of deliveries, and I don't know, we have patients here -- we are a big hospital, but we still have patients who don't -- who basically don't want interventions, who want to do more natural, and I -- there's such a big potential over there in Sharon, that you can have

the OB/GYN supervising and you can still do low-risk pregnancies and give them the opportunity to -- think you can be great center.

Also, the comments about the prenatal care, like the whole idea of having to see a physician and them knowing that that physician is not going to be there for your delivery is not optimal, in my opinion.

The great thing -- one of the things we pride ourselves is trying to actually deliver our own patients, even though we are a high-risk group and it's a big volume. It really gives patients a lot of comfort, satisfaction when we can do the delivery, and I don't know. I don't know if patients will keep coming to us if they knew straightforward that we're not going to do the delivery. I mean, even if it's my partner, which is not ideal, it happens, but I know it's not going to be anyone they know, difficult for the patient.

Recruitment, I don't know, I see the discussion there between the OB/GYN, and they're not part of the hospital, but they are the -- they are the group that provides you to the hospital. So, when they talked about the

ectopic, if you don't have an OB/GYN, I don't think you have the GYN there. So the OB/G is the one that does the GYN, so I don't know who's going to do the ectopics.

And I know there was talks about like getting people with low -- to come to a place with low-volume, but you know, it's a new generation. Since COVID, people really like a balance between life and profession and Sharon can give it.

So, I think if you really try, you will be able to recruit patients. I had a great time there.

To summarize, I think it was a great place. It was a great staff when I was there, provided very important service to the population, which was a very diverse population, and I strongly believe that they should still do it. That's all.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you, Doctor.

Attorney Tucci, did you have any cross for him?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, Hearing Officer Csuka, thank you, just some brief cross-examination for

1	Dr. Pri-Paz.
2	CROSS EXAMINATION OF SHAI M. PRI-PAZ, MD
3	BY ATTORNEY TUCCI:
4	Q Doctor, can you hear me all right?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Good morning. How are you?
7	A Thanks. How are you?
8	Q Good, thanks.
9	Now, you are presently at Weill Cornell Medical
10	Center in New York City; is that correct?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And you have been at Weill Cornell, I think your
13	prefile indicates, you worked exclusively there for the
14	last 10 years, correct?
15	A 10-plus, yeah, 10-and-a-half, something like
16	that.
17	Q So, since at least 2012, your experience has been
18	focused exclusively on practicing at Weill Cornell,
19	correct?
20	A Yeah, I've been only been at Sharon during my
21	fellowship, so that was before I started at Weill Cornell,
22	yes.
23	Q Okay, and so your experience and your time at
24	Sharon goes back to a period before well before 2012,
25	correct?

1	A Yes.	
2	Q Okay, now, I've done a little research on Weill	
3	Cornell. Tell me if I'm correct. Weill Cornell is a 2,600	
4	bed hospital; is that right?	
5	A I trust you. I don't know. I just go with the OB	
6	part.	
7	Q And we have about 1,800 employees in your in	
8	your large hospital in New York City, correct?	
9	A I told you: I trust you. I don't know this	
10	information.	
11	Q Well, yeah, your prefile says, "I practice in a	
12	big medical center in a big city."	
13	A That's right, but I don't know the numbers.	
14	Q Okay, and you've talked about how, in your view,	
15	there's a real good opportunity at Sharon Hospital with	
16	respect to potentially doing low-risk births and how, you	
17	know, maybe being in a rural setting would be attractive to	
18	OB/GYNs.	
19	So my question to you, Doctor, is: When are you	
20	planning on moving back to Sharon?	
21	A How much are you offering me?	
22	Q We can talk after.	
23	A Okay, then I'll give you the answer.	
24	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, did	
25	you have any redirect for your witness?	

1	ATTORNEY KNAG: No.
2	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you, Dr.
3	Pri-Paz.
4	ATTORNEY KNAG: Mr. Hearing Officer, could
5	we could we find out whether the staff has any
6	questions? Because Dr. Pri-Paz has to go back to
7	his patients.
8	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yeah, I apologize
9	for that. I did say we would do that.
10	So, Mr. Lazarus, do you have any questions
11	for the Doctor?
12	MR. LAZARUS: We don't have any specific
13	questions, thank you.
14	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, and the same
15	goes for Ms. McLaughlin and Ms. Faiella; is that
16	correct?
17	MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Correct.
18	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, all right, so
19	Attorney Knag, I think you said Dr. Schweitzer
20	would be
21	DR. KNAG: Dr. Schweitzer is next, yes.
22	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, all right, Dr.
23	Schweitzer
24	ATTORNEY KNAG: Dr. Pri-Paz is excused; is
25	that correct?

1	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes.
2	DR. PRI-PAZ: Thank you.
3	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.
4	Please, raise your right hand, Dr.
5	Schweitzer.
6	Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and
7	sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the
8	evidence you provided in your prefile testimony
9	and the evidence you shall give today shall be
10	the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
11	truth, so help you god or upon penalty of
12	perjury?
13	DR. SCHWEITZER: I do, thank you.
14	
15	WILLIAM SCHWIETZER, MD,
16	
17	called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by
18	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:
19	
20	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, and do
21	adopt your prefile?
22	DR. SCHWEITZER: I do, thank you.
23	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thanks.
24	Okay, you can proceed whenever you're ready.
25	

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM SCHWEITZER

DR. SCHWEITZER: Okay, well, thank you for allowing me to present today.

My name is William Schweitzer. I'm also a board-certified OB/GYN, and actually, until a year ago, I was the vice-chair at NYU Langone, also in Manhattan, Department of OB/GYN. I decided to relocate to the northwest corner because of an interest I have in rural medicine and a desire to perform a broad range of compassionate and comprehensive care to women in this area.

I was recruited by Sharon OB/GYN to join their group and it was surprising to me at the time that Nuvance or Sharon Hospital was not involved during my recruitment process. I initially understand that the hospital was committed to providing a salary guarantee, but they decided to withdraw their offer of support. This meant that I would accept the lower salary than was initially offered, and I decided to do so anyway and did relocate because of interest to work in this area.

Now, over this last year, I've been extremely impressed with the quality and safety measures that exist within the maternity unit, and for the years that I was at NYU, I worked very hard to reduce primary sesections(sic) -- primary caesarian section rate, maternal hemorrhage, complications of delivery, and I've

At NYU, we never approached the less than 20 percent primary caesarian section rate that

Sharon enjoys, but -- and I will stay on because of the superb staff of nurses, physicians, and support people that are here, and also because I realize that the community really needs me. Our group provides not just maternity care, but offers also reproductive choices and treatment for acute and chronic gynecological problems.

been really impressed with what Sharon had done.

Abortion services are available within our practice. If the hospital closes maternity and our practice leaves, these services may be difficult to access if our practice is forced to go.

I welcome any questions.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Dr. Schweitzer.

1	Attorney Tucci, did you have any cross-exam
2	for him?
3	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, just briefly.
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM SCHWEITZER
5	BY ATTORNEY TUCCI:
6	Q Dr. Schweitzer, good morning. Can you hear me
7	all right?
8	A I can, thank you.
9	Q Doctor, just to confirm for me, you made the
10	decision to join the private practice in Sharon OB/GYN in
11	the some time in the fall of 2021; is that correct?
12	A Yes.
13	Q And I think you indicated in your direct
14	testimony that you're committed to staying in this
15	community and continuing to provide patients who need
16	obstetrics care with that care; is that right?
17	A I am.
18	Q And is that commitment regardless of what happens
19	with respect to the outcome of this certificate of need?
20	A I am committed to staying in the area and I will
21	see what my options are, but yes, I will stay.
22	Q Okay, and you made the decision to come to the
23	Sharon community and to join the private practice at Sharon
24	OB/GYN after knowing about the decision by the Sharon board
25	the seek OHS approval to end labor and delivery services at

1 Sharon Hospital, correct? 2 No, when I first started negotiation, I was Α 3 unaware of that, and once negotiations were in effect, and 4 I had made my decision emotionally, and also, beginning to 5 do it physically, I found out that the hospital was 6 beginning to close -- was going to close labor and 7 delivery. 8 Q The Sharon Board made -- considered this issue in 9 late August of 2021 and ordered it at that time to seek OHS 10 approval with respect to labor and delivery services. You 11 made your decision to join Sharon OB/GYN after that plan 12 occurred; isn't that correct, sir? 13 I began negotiation with them in the summer of Α 14 2021, so yes. 15 I just -- I didn't ask when you began O 16 negotiations. I asked when you made the decision to say, 17 "I'm going to move to Sharon, Connecticut." That was in the fall of 2021, correct? 18 19 I made my decision -- on August 11th, I submitted Α 20 my resignation. 21 Q Thank you very much. That's all I have. 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag, did 23 you have any redirect for your witness? 24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM SCHWEITZER

25

BY ATTORNEY KNAG:

1	Q So, Doctor, if if your group decided that it
2	was necessary to relocate their office from Sharon to some
3	other location nearer to one of the hospitals that were
4	going to provide deliveries, that would mean that would
5	that mean that you would also need to move with the group?
6	A I would, yes.
7	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, is that it,
8	Attorney Knag?
9	ATTORNEY KNAG: Thank you.
10	And what about the staff?
11	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes, I was about to
12	ask.
13	Mr. Lazarus, do you have any questions?
14	MR. LAZARUS: No, no specific questions,
15	thank you.
16	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And Ms. McLoughlin,
17	and Miss Faiella, do you have any questions?
18	MS. FAIELLA: No.
19	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay.
20	ATTORNEY KNAG: Dr. Schweitzer is excused?
21	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes, he is. Thank
22	you, Dr. Schweitzer.
23	DR. SCHWEITZER: You're welcome.
24	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So, what I would
25	like to do now is try to get through the rest of

1 your witnesses, and then we can do just -- we can take a break and then we can do cross. 2 3 ATTORNEY KNAG: Okay. HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So, Attorney Knag, 5 who would you like to --ATTORNEY KNAG: Dr. Howard Mortman. 7 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Do you plan -- okay, do you plan to go in the order that you provided 9 the prefile, just so that I can give Attorney 10 Tucci some --11 ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes, subject to possible 12 logistical issues if people are not available at 13 the right moment, but yes, it's my hope to stick 14 with the --15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 16 All right, so --17 ATTORNEY KNAG: Dr. Mortman is the next 18 witness. 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 20 Dr. Mortman, please, raise your right hand. 21 Do you some solemnly swear or solemnly and 22 sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the 23 evidence you provided in your prefile and the 24 evidence you shall give today shall be the truth, 25 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so

1	help you god or upon penalty of perjury?
2	DR. MORTMAN: I do.
3	
4	HOWARD MORTMAN, MD,
5	
6	called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by
7	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:
8	
9	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.
10	And do adopt your prefile testimony?
11	DR. MORTMAN: I do.
12	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.
13	Okay, you can proceed whenever you're ready.
14	
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF HOWARD MORTMAN, MD
16	
17	DR. MORTMAN: Thank you.
18	Good morning, Hearing Officer Csuka and
19	staff of the Office of Health Strategy.
20	I've been a resident of Sharon, Connecticut
21	since 1991 following completion of my residency
22	in OB/GYN at Yale New Haven Hospital.
23	Since then, I've practiced medicine,
24	specializing in obstetrics and gynecology to the
25	Sharon OB/GYN Associates, which is currently part

of Women's Health Connecticut located at 50

Amenia Road in Sharon, Connecticut. Throughout
this time, I have had full privileges to provide
medical services to patients at Sharon Hospital.
I've delivered thousands of babies, performed
hundreds of surgeries, and provided other
emergency and non-emergency medical services to
patients at Sharon Hospital.

I'm currently here to testify in opposition to the certificate of need application filed by Nuvance Health in January of 2022 in which it seeks authorization from the Office of Health Strategy to close the labor and delivery unit at Sharon Hospital.

The United States is experiencing a crisis in maternal health. Shockingly, among the world's developed nations, the United States leads in the maternal death rate, a reality that should shame us. In response, in June of 2022, the White House issued a landmark document called White House Blueprint for Addressing the Maternal Health Care crisis to address this national emergency. A major focus of the plan is implementation of increased access to local, high-quality maternal healthcare and local labor

and delivery services for pregnant women.

It is a painful truth that this crisis has erupted right here in the northwest corner of our state, right here in Sharon. OHS's recent proposed final decision regarding the closure of Windham's Hospital maternity unit summarized the conclusions of numerous studies showing the lack of access to appropriate maternal health services resulting from the closure of maternity units in rural communities puts women and children at risk for a number of bad outcomes, including premature birth, low birth weight, maternal mortality, severe maternal morbidity, and an increased risk of postpartum depression as well as a higher rate of infant mortality.

These studies further conclude that most pregnancy-related deaths are preventable and can be attributed to a lack of access to care, in large part resulting in out-of-hospital births, and they also note that increased travel distance to obtain care have been associated with an increased risk of non-indicated induced caesarian section, which can lead to more complications, postpartum hemorrhage, prolonged hospital stay, and postpartum depression.

OHS adds the finding that in rural counties, the absence of active labor and delivery units is associated with a significant increase in perinatal mortality.

While this crisis in women's health care is evident nationwide, Sharon and its surrounding towns both in Connecticut as well as New York have until now been sheltered from these bad outcomes. This is largely due to the world-class maternity unit at Sharon Hospital that has been taken care of women and families for decades with high-quality compassionate and expert care, and importantly, timely care.

In the 31 years that I've been here delivering babies at Sharon Hospital, we have not lost a single mother and our outcomes for babies has been consistently excellent. Our always-available maternity unit as well as the readily-available high-quality obstetricians, maternity nurses, pediatricians, operating room, and operating room personnel are essential to prevent our area from expending the nation's maternal health care crisis.

I implore OHS to help us preserve our excellent and necessary local access to care for

women and to avoid becoming part of what the
White House calls a health care desert. Please,
do not allow closure of our maternity unit at
Sharon Hospital.

Our newly-reelected governor, Ned Lamont, has made clear that access to local maternity services must be available in both the northeast and northwest corners of the Connecticut.

Our newly-reelected senator, Richard

Blumenthal, is all spoke passionately about the need to maintain and support the maternity unit at Sharon Hospital. Congresswoman Jahana Hayes did the same.

Our local elected officials, including Maria Horn, also believe that our labor and delivery unit is critical for the safety, well-being, and viability of our communities both in Connecticut and neighboring New York.

My submitted written testimony contains
extensive detail addressing the healthcare
disaster which would befall the residents of our
service area for the Sharon Hospital maternity
unit to be closed. There is no hospital close
enough that can provide the necessary services in
a timely manner required to have consistent, good

outcomes for mothers and babies. We know the travel time to transfer patients from Sharon Hospital or my from office, which is across the street, or from the surrounding communities to a distant hospital in an attempt to save the life of a pregnant mother or her unborn child or unstabilized, newly-delivered baby, it's never happened on my watch, on our watch. Without our fully-functioning maternity unit and all the ready-available support personnel who are currently available, that would change dramatically.

Based on my 31 years of practicing in this remote area, I'm certain that mothers and babies will die and undergo serious morbidity over the coming years.

In preparation for the closure of the labor and delivery unit, Nuvance has provided relatively-brief training to emergency room physicians and runs simulated emergencies. They can't provide the skills of experienced OB/GYNs that have completed at least four full years of daily OB/GYN residency.

This is not the time to be compromising women's health and safety. The Nuvance protocols

established to deal with obstetrical emergencies should maternity close do not include local pediatricians or local obstetricians or the surgical team required to perform urgent caesarian. With a dropping fetal heart rate or an imminently-delivering mother with a breech baby or a prolapsing umbilical cord or urgent placental removal in a severely-hemorrhaging mother who just delivered her baby, and that's just listing a few of the operative emergencies that we dealt with.

Emergency room physicians are underqualified to deal with other emergencies that can suddenly occur in any obstetrical or gynecological situation, nor whether they have the appropriate support services or personnel to deal with the myriad of obstetrical and gynecological emergencies that may present.

These include but are not limited to shoulder dystocia, placenta previa, and maternal hemorrhage, ruptured ectopic pregnancies, twisted ovaries, premenopausal hemorrhaging, and hemorrhaging during miscarriage. They will be unable to comprehensively manage abnormal fetal heart rate patterns including fetal myocardials,

recurrent decelerations, and sinusoidal fetal heart rate patterns.

They cannot fully and independently manage eclamptic seizures that can have immediate fetal consequences that may require expeditious cesarean section. They cannot manage postpartum uterine inversion or comprehensively manage preterm labor, especially if it's advanced preterm labor.

They're not trained to manage post-delivery lacerations of the cervix vagina, perineum, or rectum that can have severe consequences with hemorrhage that needs to be addressed promptly and often in the operating room.

They should not be put in the position of having to resuscitate a newborn full-term or pre-term baby without readily-available pediatric back-up. Nuvance, however, does not plan to have available pediatric back-up in the event of the maternity unit's exposure. Sharon Hospital will be unable to safely manage a patient with a ruptured uterus with the fetus still inside the uterus, where you can lose two humans at once or after delivery, where you can lose the mother, and the list goes on.

We've dealt with these emergencies with consistently excellent results until now. Any of these medical emergencies can result in the maternal or fetal death or permanent morbidity if not dealt with in a timely and comprehensive manner.

Our maternity unit has prevented deaths and disabilities precisely because of our current capabilities. An unstable patient should not leave Sharon Hospital in an ambulance. The roads in our area are neither straight nor flat and our cell service is often unreliable. We spend a good portion of the year with roads covered in ice and snow that compounds travel even further.

I'm not aware that Nuvance has a safe plan for timely ambulance transportation should it succeed in closing the maternity unit, and based on the past 30 years of living and practicing in this area, I do not believe that a safe plan is possible given the distances and the circumstances involved.

At Sharon Hospital, we strive to be able to perform cesarean sections within a minimum of 30 minutes, a time frame dictated by the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, also known

at ACOG. Our ability to do this has prevented deaths and serious morbidity in patients and their babies as detailed in my written statement.

As mentioned, there is no hospital reliably within 30 minutes of Sharon Hospital even in the best of circumstances. Given the unpredictability of emergencies and knowing that emergencies can arise at any moment of a seemingly-normal labor, not having the capability to deal effectively in a timely fashion with a laboring patient is unacceptable.

Depending on conditions or other factors, it can easily take hours to transport a patient.

I've been there. I've been there waiting four to five hours for a stable patient to transfer. The Sharon Hospital maternity unit has an unimpeachable reputation for quality and has consistently run one of the best units in the state.

ACOG reviewed our unit in March of 2022 and concluded that we were highly-qualified to provide obstetrical care, and that of all the hospitals they had reviewed before, none of them had the perfect chart review that we did. At the closing of the Zoom meeting, they actually

implored Nuvance to do everything they could to preserve our unit because of the need for it in our community.

Nuvance has publicly acknowledged our high quality, which is indisputable. We consistently do extremely well with benchmarks in comparison to the multiple maternity units in the Nuvance system. Sharon Hospital is one of only three 5-star hospitals for safety in the entire state of Connecticut, and this rating takes into account patient satisfaction, timeliness of care, and death rate.

I believe this would all change with the closing of the maternity unit. Our OBGYN practice has managed to recruit, as you've heard, a new highly-qualified OB/GYN physician despite Nuvance's refusal to honor previously-offered income guarantee. If we had supportive hospital ownership, I believe we can recruit obstetricians of the highest quality to our practice as-needed in the future.

We have seen resignations of every full-time maternity nurse from full-time positions that were employed by Sharon Hospital since Nuvance announced in September of 2021 that they would

close the maternity unit during mid-2022. This announcement, preceding the present CON application to OHS since its September 2021 announcement, Nuvance has refused to hire any full-time nurses for maternity. Instead, Nuvance has encouraged me and other full-time OBGYNs at Sharon Hospital to seek privileges elsewhere, and by the way, that happened right away after their announcement.

Nuvance has undermined our labor and delivery unit in a variety ways, including a offering the charge nurse a --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection. That testimony directly violates the Hearing Officer's order regarding the scope of this hearing and the decorum and protocol. I ask that it be stricken.

ATTORNEY KNAG: May I be heard?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: All right, yes.

admitted into the record without objection. This is just a summary of the testimony and I believe, in any event, that it's highly-relevant that they tried to recruit the charge nurse.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: That is -- that is a misstatement of fact. There has been -- there

has been no acknowledgment that any of this
testimony is admitted without objection. We made
our objection well-known in voluminous briefings
to the Hearing Officer objecting in great detail
to the improper, out-of-scope, inflammatory, and
other baseless statements made in the voluminous
prefile testimony that was submitted, and now is
the time to correct that error by not allowing it
to be repeated in the public hearing.

ATTORNEY KNAG: It's not an error. It's a very relevant thing that undermined the unit and increased the -- decreased the patient population and increased the nurses leaving.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Yes, this goes directly to your -- your -- Hearing Officer Csuka, this goes directly to your order that allegations concerning violation of the 2018 agreed settlement are not in any way to be the subject of this hearing, and all this is going to do is prolong the hearing until late in the day or --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm ready to make a ruling.

I -- I think that Attorney Tucci's witness has testified as to how that nurse ended up at the -- at the Danbury Hospital. I don't think we

need to get into that again. I am willing to strike that.

Dr. Mortman, I do -- I mean, I'm giving you some leeway here because I understand that you are an Intervenor and so you're going to be one of the main witnesses, but I did also order that any statement that's made on the record be, you know, relatively brief, and we're going on -- at this point, I think we're at 15 minutes.

So, if you can, I would ask that you try to wrap up whatever it is you would like to put on the record today, and you will have an opportunity to respond to cross-examination and redirect by your attorney -- your attorney and --

ATTORNEY KNAG: This is our key witness, and I do hope he'll be brief, and I -- he is being brief because he had a long testimony that he had summarized.

DR. MORTMAN: I don't have much more.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, that's exactly my point. I mean, you have submitted a lot in terms of written prefile. So, if we can just try to bring this to an end, relatively shorter, I would appreciate it. I do want to make sure we get through all the witnesses and all the public

comment today.

DR. MORTMAN: In 2018, Health

(unintelligible) announced that the maternity

unit would close, in 2019, Nuvance acquired

Sharon Hospital with a promise it would keep the

maternity unit open for at least five years in

accordance with the agreed settlement.

Nevertheless --

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Here we go again.

Objection.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm sorry, what is the nature of your objection?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: May I just say this is after explicit direction by the Hearing Officer?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Knag?

ATTORNEY KNAG: I believe -- he's not claiming violation. You said you can't prove a violation, but I believe that it's relevant that that was part of what was agreed, and that they then turned around and that helped for a short time and then it turned and said they were closing.

So he's just relating the chronology of what happened, which I think is highly relevant to this matter.

1

DR. MORTMAN: Let me move on.

2

ATTORNEY KNAG: He has to rule.

3

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yeah, I was going to

4 |

sustain the objection again.

5

DR. MORTMAN: In addition, Nuvance sent a letter to all of our pregnant patients in January

~ |

of 2022. These are my patients that are

7

pregnant, every single one of them received a

9

letter that the maternity unit would close in

10

late spring or summer of 2022 without mentioning

11

that this was not permitted under the agreed

12

settlement or in the absence of an approved CON.

13

This created --

14

ATTORNEY TUCCI: The same thing. I object.

15

I ask the Hearing Officer to strike that

16

testimony from the record.

17

have a -- they have pointed out that there -- the

ATTORNEY KNAG: Mr. Hearing Officer, they

18 19

volume went down to 177 in the latest fiscal

20

year, and the fact that they sent the -- the

21

patients a letter saying that it was going to

22

close when it wasn't going to close, when it

23

didn't close, is highly relevant to why the

24

volume trailed off, and I think we're -- I think

we should be entitled to show that they sent this

25

letter -- it's highly relevant to the fact that the volume trailed off following their erroneous letter.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Just briefly, Mr. Csuka, you've already ruled on this issue. If we're going to get into what the letter says or doesn't say, we'll expand the hearing by another hour because that's not what the letter said and there was no violation. It's clear, as a matter of fact, on the record, that the labor and delivery unit remains operational today, and that all Sharon Hospital did is comply with its obligation under the CON statute to request permission, and we did that in a transparent and open way.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm going to allow it.

Doctor, if you could just try to narrow your -- the remainder of your testimony, that would be helpful.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I also need to break in really quick. I need you to slow down in your reading. The last couple of times, you were reading very, very fast and I can't keep up with you if you're going to read that fast.

DR. MORTMAN: Sure thing. I understand. I

was just told to speed things up.

This is a very important point, so hear me out on this: When Health Quest announced in 2018 the planned closure of maternity, they spoke of a women's center at Sharon's hospital that would offer prenatal care, but not delivery services. That insult would have been wholey-inadequate and unsafe, but now, in their recent completeness responses to OHS, Nuvance actually states they will not even offer prenatal care at Sharon Hospital. Patients will find their way to their own private doctors.

There's a significant indigent population in our area. This goes back to something that was speculated on long before I could speak of it personally because every day I speak to these patients in my office with a translator phone.

Many of them, they don't speak English. Those patients and the many women that live and visit this area will be put in a profound risk for catastrophic outcomes.

Make no mistake, we don't just take our patients that are (unintelligible). We take our patients that are visiting, often pregnant, with emergencies. Their overall access to both

obstetrics and gynecological care will also be greatly compromised. This applies to both non-urgent and emergency needs.

This is a really important point. With the closing of the maternity unit at Sharon Hospital, our obstetrics and gynecologists will need to provide care for our patients elsewhere. It's worth noting that, as a group, my practice provides far more primary care to women in our service area than any other group.

Over the years, until the recent efforts to close the maternity unit began, we had a long history of high quality and low turnover among our nurses.

The OHS, if you rule that maternity will remain open, I believe, based on my discussions with these nurses, that those who resigned their full-time positions will not return to the full-time nursing jobs they had before, and moreover, I believe that a commitment from Sharon Hospital to maintain our maternity unit, if that happens, will significantly grow our patient numbers. We need robust determined advertisement and promotion by the hospital of our unit's quality and recognition of its need. We've had

none of that.

In closing, Governor Lamont, in a pre-election statement to the Connecticut Mirror, he noted, "It's really important that primary care and maternity care be widely and broadly available. If they don't have good maternity care in northwest and northeast Connecticut, young families are a lot less likely to move here and pregnancies would be more at risk."

I have (unintelligible) and have been told by several Sharon Hospital physicians they would never have moved here had there been no maternity unit. I'm confident that it will be much more difficult to recruit quality physicians and emergency room physicians through a hospital with the profoundly-reduced capability resulting from closure of the maternity unit and the loss of the readily-available support personnel we've had for many decades.

Sharon Hospital has an excellent record of success delivering high-quality care. Nuvance should not be permitted to dismantle it. Our patients and community desperately hope that you make the right decision regarding our vital and irreplaceable maternity unit.

Current patients and future generations
depend on you for their safety and well-being,
and I'm going to tap on three quick points. It's
really critical because of testimony that came
before from Nuvance is inaccurate.

One is this issue about high-risk patients. It was stated, respectfully, by Christina McCulloch that we don't take of nor deliver high-risk patients. We take care of, every single day in my office, multiple high-risk patients and we are very often delivering high-risk patients.

As a matter of fact, I delivered a high-risk patient last week, and this Monday, I delivered a number of high-risk patients. Patients with advanced maternal age, obesity, diabetes, prior cesarean section, Accessory Lobe of Placenta, like my patient did have on Friday, or even a very heavy smoker. Those are high-risk patients. We're very comfortable dealing with those patients and we work intimately with the maternal field medicine specialist both at Vassar and UConn, and when needed, we incorporate their consultations into our patient's care. And when a patient needs to deliver elsewhere, which is

very much an exception, we arrange for that, and it's a hardship to that patient, but most of the hardship patients that we take care of are delivered at Sharon Hospital with fantastic results.

And I would say on the record that the maternal fetal medicine individual at Vassar Hospital and the -- the head of maternal fetal medicine at UConn would testify on our behalf that we are both necessary and our care is impeccable, including our high-risk patient population.

So -- and then another point about the transfer of patients: Until now, we're sort of -- we did okay. Let's not forget that the OB/GYNs were very quickly involved with any patient showing up at the ER that was pregnant or with a gynecological emergency, and we knew if a patient could be transferred safely, and many of those patients, I would have in the operating room or often, in maternity, laboring, because I couldn't put them in an ambulance safely or we could lose the mother or a baby.

And so the idea that a future without OB/GYNs in charge, without the services that we

need for those emergencies, that an emergency room physician may be consulting a distant OB in another hospital or are going to be able to safely transfer those patients, to me, is absurd.

And the third point I'm going to make, and then I'm going to finish because I know there's a time issue here, let's just talk about that ectopic pregnancy. So we have dealt with numerous ectopic pregnancies over the years. It's one of the major causes of maternal death, and when those patients rupture their ectopics, they don't have a lot of time, and this is very important: When the initial plan by Nuvance was presented to the medical staff and to that board who went along with it, their plan included cutting 24-hour surgeries. So they would have surgeries to maybe 3:00, 4:00 5:00. It wasn't defined. There wouldn't be any weekend surgery, so what do you do, not only with the ectopic pregnancy that's ruptured there? Even if you have a gynecologist, what do you do with the patient whose baby is dying because the heart rate is dropping, or she's hemorrhaging and you can't transport her and you need to take her immediately to the operating room to remove that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

placenta before she goes into the BIC, which may not be reversible, and she will die.

What do you do with that patient who had no fetal care - and these are true stories - who showed up in my emergency room without any care? We get a phone call. She's got a prolapsed umbilical cord and we take a ride to the OR, we save that baby and mommy. What are we going to do with the patient I dealt with -- actually, I saw her for a six-week check-up when Nuvance announced their closure. So, six weeks before that, she came in through the ER with no care for 20 weeks with a ruptured uterus, and by the time I got her to the OR, a completely-separated placenta, I promise you, that baby would have died and that mother probably may have died if you had to transport her, and that's even if we had (unintelligible) qualified OB/GYN making those decisions.

So, unless we're prepared to go to the dark ages and become a health care desert, there's no way in the world that our area will be safe if you close maternity and the ancillary service that we've come to expect at Sharon Hospital.

I'm very thankful for the time to testify.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 2 Dr. Mortman. 3 DR. MORTMAN: Thank you. 4 ATTORNEY KNAG: You have to stay here. 5 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: As I mentioned earlier, I would like to try to get all of the 7 direct testimony from -- I'm sorry, is someone trying to speak? 9 ATTORNEY KNAG: No. HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I would like to try 10 11 to get all of the direct testimony on the record 12 before we take a break and let our Attorney Tucci 13 gather his thoughts before beginning 14 cross-examination. 15 So, with that, Dr. Mortman, I'm just going 16 to ask that you sort of return to your group. 17 And Attorney Knag, is it correct that we're 18 going to move on to Mr. Germack? 19 ATTORNEY KNAG: Yes. 20 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 21 Mr. Germack, can you, please, raise your 22 right hand? 23 Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and 24 sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the 25 evidence you provided in your prefile testimony

1 and the evidence you shall give here today shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but 2 3 the truth, so help you god or upon penalty of perjury? 5 MR. GERMACK: I do. 6 7 VICTOR GERMACK, 8 9 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by 10 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows: 11 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 13 And do adopt your prefile testimony? 14 MR. GERMACK: I do. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. You can 16 proceed. 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF VICTOR GERMACK 18 19 20 MR. GERMACK: Thank you, Hearing Officer. 21 Good morning. My name is Victor Germack and 22 I previously testified before OHS on August 14th, 23 2001, when Sharon Hospital was first sold to 24 Essent Healthcare. I'm a financial expert so I 25 will focus on the financial issues raised by

Nuvance in closing labor and delivery.

There are many good reasons for not closing Sharon Hospital's labor and delivery, but my testimony will focus on Nuvance's stated financial cost of maintaining it.

Nuvance health's primary stated reason for closing labor and delivery is their claim that they're losing three million dollars annually.

Furthermore, Dr. Murphy, in his prefiled testimony, claim that Nuvance, itself, is quote, is facing a dire financial situation, closed quotes. We strongly disagree as our analysis casts doubts on the three million dollar loss claimed. Even if the three million dollar loss was true, this would not justify closing maternity given the overall resources and financial strength of Nuvance and the needs of community.

Instead, the hospital should work to reduce any losses and aggressively market labor and delivery services to the community. We outline Sharon Hospital's detailed financial reports to OHS, spoke to Nuvance's CFO in December 2021, and several members of the professional medical staff. We requested a financial statement for

labor and delivery.

In January 2022, we received an outdated fiscal year 2019 profitability analysis for labor and delivery showing a loss of \$3.6 million.

This was derived from Page 59 of the Stroudwater consultants report, which was referred to in the CON by Nuvance.

We still don't understand why they gave us an old financial statement when they could have given us updated financial statements. We asked for but never received this stated detailed three million labor and delivery loss, detailed explanations for the allocation of all the head charges, or ancillary expenses, which constitute a large percentage of the labor and delivery stated losses.

However, using the 2019 analysis, we found what appears to be several major errors in their billion collection procedures, which substantially negatively impacted labor and delivery's costs and cash flow. Additionally, we were unable to fully account or confirm the amount of professional fees they had charged.

In addition, Sharon Hospital's premature announcement of closing labor and delivery

prompted the full-time employed nurses to quit; thus, forcing the hospital to use staffing agencies for travel nurses.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Move to strike it. Move to strike that. That's complete speculation. It's beyond the scope of this witness's expertise and violates the Hearing Officer's order. Move to strike.

ATTORNEY KNAG: I disagree. I think he allowed us to look at the issue of excess cost for nurses, and therefore, that -- and that's, in any event, quite relevant to the question of what the loss is. If they're charging us -- if they're saying they're going to recover by closing labor and delivery an amount that includes a substantial premium for travel nurses rather than regular nurses, that's a factor in considering what the real loss or savings would be, and to not allow us to probe into the -- into the facts prevents us from exploring the issue of whether they, in fact, would be recovering three million dollars if they were allowed to close.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Just briefly in response, Hearing Officer.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Sure.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: The witness did not testify as to facts. He's speculated, quote, that the premature announcement of the closure of labor and delivery caused nurses to quit. That violates the order of the Hearing Officer. It's complete speculation and it's not fact.

ATTORNEY KNAG: It's not complete speculation. Dr. Mortman works in the hospital with these nurses and knows why they quit.

ATTORNEY TUCCI: Mr. Germack is --

ATTORNEY KNAG: But he had -- he had obtained information from members of medical staff, he said.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm going to allow that, Attorney Tucci. You can probe into where that information may have come from, that informed him of these -- of these understandings and I'll take it for what it is.

ATTORNEY KNAG: You can continue.

MR. GERMACK: Thank you, Hearing Officer.

This policy forced the hospital to use staffing agencies for travel nurses, paying them up to \$225 an hour instead of the normal average rate of around \$45 plus per hour. This policy was ill-advised and costly. The difference of

\$180 an hour equates to all but \$300,000 per year for just one nurse at the \$225 hourly rate.

Currently, I'm told we have around six labor and delivery nurses, some travel and some on a per diem basis. This is confirmed by the Stroudwater consultants, again, mentioned by Nuvance in their filings, who note in their report that in 2019, there was a, quote, one million increase in traveler expense for the OB program plus a \$500,000 increase in salaries and wages for Sharon Hospital employees, closed quotes.

Thus, the State-approved \$3 million dollar labor and delivery loss is overstated on a normalized basis. There is another issue that Nuvance has not noticed or commented on and that is even if they eliminate all of labor and delivery's direct operating expenses, there still remains \$1.3 million of overhead that will not be covered.

So the real savings won't be \$3 million, it will only be by their calculation \$1.7 million.

Again, this is a very small amount for Nuvance given its large financial strength.

We, therefore, contend that the labor and

delivery losses asserted by Nuvance above are overstated and inaccurate.

So the real question still remains: Is closing labor and delivery worth the cost of the community? We say an emphatic no.

Examining Nuvance's fiscal year 2021, all their financial statements show they had a decent year. Nuvance showed a positive gain of \$105 million, excess of revenue over expenses, positive cash flow from operations, an increase in net assets of \$222 million, and \$3.8 billion in total assets.

Further, Nuvance's Note 11, in their consolidated, audited financial statements, tell us that Nuvance had financial assets available to meet general expenditures over the next 12 months of \$1.1 billion. Thus, the stated \$3 million labor and delivery loss is neither significant nor material given Nuvance's assets and earnings. One could almost say it's a rounding error.

Moreover, any loss is minimal compared to
the major damage dropping labor and delivery will
do to the future of our hospital on the
community. Labor and delivery is a gateway for
Sharon's Hospital's many services as it is for

most hospitals. If labor and delivery is closed, the net negative impact on Sharon Hospital's revenues will be much greater for Nuvance than keeping it open.

Our prefile testimony goes into details as to Sharon Hospital's claimed losses of \$41 million over the past five years. We explained how Sharon Hospital has not given any financial or economic credit to Sharon Hospital for their procedures and lab tests requested by Sharon Hospital doctors but ordered to be performed at other Nuvance hospitals.

The Stroudwater report stated the economic benefit of these procedures that Sharon Hospital, over a five-year period, was \$26.5 million with an additional \$5 million for lab tests. Also, Nuvance management charged \$7-and-a-half million in 2019 for medical practice losses, which occurred under a prior period when Health Quest was the owner.

Lastly, Sharon Hospital was charged \$5 million in a one-time reimbursement in 2021 for prior years corporate overhead expenses. All these economic benefits should be included in the loss calculation attributed to Sharon Hospital.

During the intervening 21 years, several profitable services, such as the Smilow Cancer Treatment Center, pain management, and the sleep specialist have been eliminated from Sharon Hospital while losing several good primary care physicians.

While the hospital has been sold several times during this period, the primary focus has always been on dropping services, cost-cutting, rather than expanding and marketing needed services to the community.

During our 2000 -- December 13th, 2021
meeting with Nuvance's CFO, Mr. Steven Rosenberg,
I asked Mr. Rosenberg directly how the community
could work with him financially to continue labor
and delivery. Unfortunately, he was not
responsive to my question.

We are open to all good-faith discussions with Nuvance and interested community parties to support labor and delivery in a joint fundraising program if Nuvance is committed to labor and delivery long-term.

In my view, with renewed commitment with an emphasis on marketing and with the further financial help of local, state, and federal

leaders, labor and delivery's future at Sharon Hospital can be assured.

Thank you very much for your time and attention. I appreciate it.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,
Mr. Germack.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Next is Dr. Kavle.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: That was still of greater length than I was hoping for. If there's anything that your witnesses can do to try to shorten their testimony, I would appreciate it.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: That's what I assumed, and that's, again, why I was giving some leeway, but you know, with 11 witnesses, it's -- that's a lot.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Thank you. Those were --

So, Dr. Kavle, please, raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence that you provided in your prefile testimony and the evidence that you shall give in this case shall the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you god or upon penalty of perjury?

1 DR. KAVLE: Yes. 2 3 EDWARD KAVLE, MD, 4 5 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows: 6 7 8 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 9 Do you adopt your prefile testimony? 10 DR. KAVLE: Yes. 11 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 12 You can proceed. 13 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF EDWARD KAVLE, MD 15 16 DR. KAVLE: Sure. 17 So my name is Dr. Kavle, K-a-v-l-e, and I 18 have a practice here in Sharon. I'm the 19 president of a practice that has four practices 20 around the northwest corner. I also work at 21 Bristol Hospital and Charlotte Hungerford in the 22 the neonatal units delivering babies if I'm not 23 delivering babies, taking care of babies that are 24 delivered. 25 I'm not surprised, you know, future of our

community and our world, they're often left out, and I think they've been left of Nuvance's presentation and I'm here to represent those one-half of the people that are going to be bothered by Nuvance's plan to close labor and delivery.

So I present myself today as a pediatrician who cares about the welfare of children.

Everyone knows that maternity units in rural hospitals have been closed, and because of that, there's data to tell us what happens to neonates because of that.

You hear some data. After rural hospitals closed their maternity units, there's an increase in births in ERs and out-of-hospital births. For every 100 possible births in a catchment area, you should expect three births per year in that hospital's ER. That's data, fact.

I think Dr. Lucal said, you know, somebody had said it's going to be a flood of people.

That's not a flood, but if you do the math, that would be between 12 and 15 kids a year delivering in an ER, and that would be one a month. No one said there's going to be a flood, but 15 and one a month is a lot.

Closing these maternal centers also exposes infants to poor outcomes, and what that means in neonates that are born, but infants are up to one year, and the morbidity that occurs during poor births at a community hospital ER without coverage exposes them to that problem.

Also, it exposes infants to preterm births by up to 5 percent. Of course, preterm births lead to bad outcomes. Women who present to rural hospitals requiring a C-section where there is no C-section available within an hour deliver infants with increased morbidity and mortality and they require double the date of stay in a NICU of babies that are delivered in a place where you can have a C-section within half an hour.

All birth reports, and this is a quote, "The ability to perform a C-section in a rural community can be life-saving for the mother and newborn infant, and ultimately, rural hospitals need greater financial support from our federal and state governments. Travel times of over 30 minutes in rural areas is associated with worse neonatal outcomes."

A brief study in Alabama, where the infant

mortality rate had been 7.2, which is below the international target of nine, doubled coincident with the closing of rural maternity centers between 2005 and 2016 and was reversed by allowing them to reopen and use family physicians to deliver. The CDC data from 2015 reflects that infant mortality is high at rural hospitals.

Julia Interrante, of the University of
Minnesota Rural Research Center, states that,
"Maternity," and now this is her quote, "closures
with black and indigenous women and infants had
even higher risk of morbidity and mortality
disproportionately reflecting systemic racism in
the act of closing rural labor and delivery
units, and despite the closure of labor and
delivery in these areas, 1.1 in five women in the
surrounding communities remain at childbearing
age. So, just before" -- "because the service
goes away, the need does not go away."

And that's the end of the quote.

So, as I read Ms. McCulloch and Dr. Lucal and Dr. Murphy's written testimony, they described Sharon Hospital at least 17 times as a rural hospital, and in their spoken testimony today, they did it 18 times. So I just cited

data and studies about the impact of closing a rural hospital maternity unit on the infants in this area.

Moreover, I've been in this area for a while and I know that there are many young, childbearing age, minority, low-income, itinerant, non-English speaking families who are going to be most at risk based on our literature.

This is not New Milford Hospital.

When I came to this area in 1997, people were thinking about closing Winsted Hospital, and I thought, that's fine. It's a six-minute trip down to Torrington. These people can get there.

New Milford Hospital is in an urban setting and we are not. Today, as I drove here, it took me, not 25 minutes as usual, but 45 minutes to get here because I followed two school buses, one electrical truck, and then there was an accident on the road coming up from the Housatonic River.

So we have challenges in this rural community that New Milford does not face. That would include travel time, EMS services, and the like. We're much more like Fairview Hospital, which is a critical-access hospital.

So it won't be like super easy, or -- you

know, to see morbidity and mortality in this small community. There will be extra. We know that because of the data, and I really think that that is a very low-bar descent.

It's pretty easy to, you know, say that data that we collect, death is a very good end point, right, because if you're doing research, death is pretty certain, but it's a low bar. So death in this area is not something that I want to think about.

I went into great detail in my written

testimony about Nuvance's plan to train ER

providers and nurses to deliver infants at Sharon

ER. So we are -- we know that there are going to be about one a month.

I'm going to restate: I don't know if I said it in my written testimony, but the N.R.P. textbook has a big quote that says, "Completion does not imply competency."

When I was trained, I spent half of my four years in NICUs and dealing with babies that were less than three months old. No ER physician or nurse after this course where you don't touch a patient and just work on a computer is going to be competent to deliver a problem -- a baby.

They're -- you know, a baby that can be delivered by somebody's son, they can deliver, but not somebody that has any complication.

10 percent of those 12 a year are going to have to have extra help to transition from being in the womb to extra uterine life, and 1 percent is going to need much higher levels of resuscitative efforts that may include placing umbilical lines, intubation, and then skills(sic) afterwards, and the measures to resuscitate a baby actually occur over 30 to 60 second intervals. So we have about 10 minutes to get a baby breathing and having a heart rate after they're born, 10 minutes. So my suspicion is that in an emergency setting with a kid that comes out is going to be in trouble.

Aftercare, if you get the kid through the resuscitation is just as daunting, and then it's just absolutely disingenuous to say in a written testimony that because ER physicians are good transport arrangers, that that will help neonates and women. That's not true.

Like Dr. Mortman said, and I work on three units, a lot of times, a 34-weeker comes into our unit, and they're too sick to transport. That

happens all the time. That doesn't happen rarely. That happens a lot, and now, with -- the people that are in that hospital are responsible to deliver that baby and take care of it until a transport arrives.

Now, I've waited six hours for transports here, six hours, because a team is out, they have to go back, they have to get themselves together. Any OB worth their salt would understand that some babies are going to have to be kept here and not transported.

And then, in terms of C-sections, there is no way to get a mother that shows up here that needs a C-section to another competent hospital within half an hour. There's no way. You can't do it.

So I would never pretend to be able to care for even the simplest heart attack patient at 70 years old if I were given a two-day refresher course in which I never touched a live patient and whose textbook says, "Completion does not imply competency" after caring for one or two heart attacks as a medical student 32 years ago.

In terms of quality of care, if Nuvance closes this unit, they will be closing their

highest-rated maternity center and a center which ACOG recently gave their highest rating, and I say this working at two other centers. This is the highest-quality center I work at.

As a real-life example, the other day, I was walking my dog and I was called that there was a baby coming in who was being delivered by a midwife at home and the kid had a shoulder dystocia. Shoulder dystocia is when a kid can't come out, and the kid was stuck for seven to twelve minutes. The midwife called EMS and EMS came and EMS didn't do NRP. They reverted to paddles. They actually ended up shocking this kid, which is not part of resuscitative efforts for a neonate, and gave him Amiodarone, which is incredible, besides giving it six rounds of epinephrine, and by the time the kid got to us, it was still blue.

I was called in and the maternal fetal nurses came down because not one person in that ER wanted to touch that kid because they were scared to death, and we, you know, resuscitated that kid. That kid is going to be damaged. He's in the hospital now at the high-tertiary care center on multiple medicines for their seizures

and is going to be cerebral palsy.

2

So these things happen. It happened the

3

other day.

5

ATTORNEY TUCCI: I apologize for

In terms of doing the numbers --

interrupting. We are now going on 15 minutes.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Hearing Officer issued an order that says the comments shall not -- the Intervenor -- the comments shall not (unintelligible) of the prefile testimony. Two, each witness shall make a good faith effort at keeping his, her, their comments brief. At the rate we're going, we're going to be here for 75 more minutes of Intervenor direct

testimony. I request that the Hearing Officer take steps to instruct Intervenors' Counsel that we need to manage this process in a way they allows us to complete this hearing in a timely and efficient way, and respectfully, I'm going to need a break in a moment for reasons that I don't

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I agree.

need to mention on the record.

DR. KAVLE: I'll be quick. I agree. That's why I agree, too.

> HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I want to say one

thing before you continue, Doctor.

I have a stopwatch going. It was 10 minutes and 23 seconds at the time that Attorney Tucci jumped in. So it was not 15 minutes, but still, we are well-beyond what I was expecting and hoping for in terms of introductory testimony from each of the witnesses.

I don't want to cut anyone off, but at the same time, you know, I am very much trying and planning to get this hearing done today because if we don't, then that's -- you know, it's going to push things out significantly and I just don't want to do that.

So, after this witness, I am planning to take a, let's say, lunch break, and we can go until -- we can take the lunch break until 2:00, and then we can -- we can pick up wherever we left off.

Attorney Tucci, does that work for you or would you prefer to try to get through all the direct and then take a longer lunch break for you to prepare your cross?

ATTORNEY TUCCI: I'll leave it to your discretion. Whatever you think is going to move us along more quickly, we will follow that

procedure.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So let's take a 45-minute break after Dr. Kavle completes his direct. Over that break, I'm going to order that the -- the remaining witnesses make every effort possible to shorten their testimony to approximately five minutes per person, no more than that, and then we can -- we can go on from there. Even -- even limiting a person's testimony to five minutes, that would mean one, two, three, four, five, six, an additional half hour of testimony.

So, Dr. Kavle, you can continue and then we will take the break.

DR. KAVLE: I'm sorry to be long. I think this is important. I'm sorry.

Doing the numbers, I was on the floor one day right after the CEO left in 2019 and the nurses reported to me that they hold them they were going to close the unit.

I agree with Dr. Mortman that there was a lot of repercussion last spring because a lot of patients came in my office, crying, saying that they couldn't see Dr. Mortman or deliver in that unit. It wasn't true.

1 I've never seen an advertisement for the health -- for the maternity center since I've 2 been here in 1997, and a lot of people say that 3 200 deliveries a year is fine financially for a unit to survive, and we're giving them a break. 5 Most hospitals pay about \$1.2 to \$1.4 million 6 7 dollars a year and our group charges Nuvance Hospital only \$450,000 a year. So they get an 9 \$800,000 break on the neonatal services here. 10 They still can't make it work. 11 I'm not -- the plan to promote primary care 12 is, you know, bewildering to me given the past 13 history, and I think I'll close with that. 14 Thank you very much. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 16 So, with that, we're going to take our 17 45-minute lunch break. Then we'll have 18 Dr. Kurish, Dr. Whyte, Mr. Colley, Ms. Horn, 19 Ms. Speck, and then Mr. Chandler. 20 Thank you very much, and you should turn 21 your video off and mute your device. 22 23 (Off the record at 1:16 p.m.) 24 25 (Back on the record at 2:02 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So we are back on the record in Docket No. 22-32511-CON at the application of Vassar health Connecticut, d/b/a Sharon Hospital.

We left off with the direct testimony of the Intervenors. We're going to pick up with Dr. Kurish and then go from there until 3:00.

So between now and 3:00 will be the public comment sign-up period, and all you have to do is just write your name in the chat function in Zoom and we will take you in the order in which you signed up, with a few exceptions; those being, we will have elected officials first and a few other clinical professionals, as well, that have been submitted.

So, with that, let's pick up with Dr. Kurish.

DR. KURISH: Thank you for requiring a CON for the closure of the maternity unit. I'm a --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Hang on, I'm sorry,
I didn't realize you were there already. I need
to swear you in. Thank you.

Please, raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and

1 sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence that you provided in your prefile 2 testimony and the evidence that you shall give 3 today shall be the truth, the whole truth, and 5 nothing but the truth, so help you god? 6 DR. KURISH: I do. 7 8 DAVID KURISH, MD, 9 10 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by 11 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows: 12 13 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And again, I'm going 14 to ask that the remaining witnesses limit their 15 testimony to five minutes or less, and that's in 16 the interest of making sure that the hearing is 17 done today and all the public have an opportunity 18 to speak. 19 So, thank you, Dr. Kurish. You can proceed. 20 21 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF DAVID KURISH, MD 22 23 DR. KURISH: Thank you requiring a CON to 24 close the maternity unit. 25 I'm a board-certified internist. I was also

trained in cardiology at the University of Rochester. I've been here for 44 years (unintelligible) as chief of staff of staff.

As we've discussed already, America is in a healthcare crisis. Corporate medicine, Big Pharma, and federal interventions seem to be making things worse rather than better.

First of all, rural hospitals, like the disadvantaged in our society, we are taking the brunt of the inequities. One of the roles of OHS is to ensure people have access to maternity and other vital services that small hospitals provide.

The next closest hospital is about one hour away from Sharon in good weather. The CON should be denied to avoid catastrophic damage to health care in the tri-state area. It hasn't been pointed out, but about 65 percent of the patients at Sharon Hospital in our service area come from New York state.

In 2017, there was 267 births at Sharon

Hospital. I spoke with the gynecologist my wife

and I used, and you -- as far as he can recall,

that goes back any 50 years, there have been no

maternity deaths or infant deaths at our

1 hospital. So, to go from 267 births to 176, it's more 2 3 than a demographic change. There's a lot more 4 going on. Maternity problems started in 2018 5 when Health Quest announced (unintelligible) closure alleging quality issues, but these issues 6 7 were easily debunked. I feel, with the rest of the management, 9 according to figures provided by Nuvance, there 10 could be 300 deliveries a year in our hospital, 11 but Nuvance required the hospital in 2017 12 (unintelligible) place a keep maternity and other 13 vital services open for at least five years. 14 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection. Here we go. 15 object. 16 It was supposed to be around five minutes, 17 and now, we're getting into alleged violations of other CONs, for which there's no basis. 18 19 ATTORNEY KNAG: Let's move on. DR. KURISH: (Unintelligible) cannot be 20 21 trusted. 22 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Again, strike that. It's 23 inflammatory, conspiratorial, derogatory 24 comments. 25 DR. KURISH: Management team hired

Stroudwater Associates, a consulting firm specializing in downsizing hospitals to justify the shutdown. Stroudwater did not meet with shareholders in the community, stakeholders in the community. They only spoke with a few doctors before their report was presented.

Medical staff performed a leadership council
-- performed a leadership council that
(unintelligible) in the spring and summer of
2021, including a meeting with Dr. John Murphy.
Unfortunately, the council had negligible
influence on the plan. When a transformation
plan was presented to the (unintelligible) staff
at a quarterly staff meeting, the staff voted 21
to 1 against it. The meeting was confidential
because members -- medical staff who are employed
by Nuvance had their contracts that they're not
allowed to speak up publicly.

Subsequently, the medical staff met with the board at Sharon Hospital, and again, to no avail. Thank god, OHS's investigation stopped the closure.

Nuvance reports quality when its actions indicate otherwise. Primary care doctors and specialists have not been supported. In the past

five years, five primary care doctors -ATTORNEY TUCCI: Objection; irrelevant.

Move to strike it.

DR. KURISH: -- five specialists in neurology and dermatology have left and were not replaced, primary care doctors and nurse practitioners in our service area and specialists, not only gynecologists and urologists, but other specialists to provide proper care for their patients.

Furthermore, patients now have to travel an hour longer (unintelligible) of getting here.

Patients are forced to travel to surrounding hospitals to get their tests, x-rays, and other procedures done that they normally had done here.

I feel (unintelligible) maternity,
after-hour surgery, and the ICU is only part of
Nuvance's plan to downsize Sharon Hospital.
Unfortunately, communities realize it was
happening to our hospital and its effects on the
community.

On October 16th, 2022, 400 people attended a rally on the Sharon Green to rally against the transformation plan. At the rally, where Senator Blumenthal, Jahana Hayes, Maria Horn, and

numerous other selectman or leaders in the community. Since that time, OHS has received 330 letters and also subsequent testimony from other members of the community.

Governor Lamont has been mentioned, spoken out to support the need for a full-service hospital. To paraphrase him, he said, "You can't have a hospital without a maternity unit."

Thank you for your time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Dr. Kurish.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Dr. Whyte is online.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Dr. Whyte, can you speak?

DR. WHYTE: Yes, right here.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence that you provided in your prefile testimony and the evidence that you shall give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you god or upon penalty or perjury?

DR. WHYTE: I do. I adopt my prefile testimony and I will begin my timer.

ANDREW WHYTE, MD,

called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF ANDREW WHYTE, MD

DR. WHYTE: I'll try to be brief.

So I'm just going to just forgo trying to reread my prefile testimony. If everyone would just read that, it would be great.

I'm here today not as a representative of any organization. I'm here solely as representing myself, and quite honestly, to speak up on behalf of my colleagues in the emergency department as well as the community of Sharon. I had the privilege of working at Sharon Hospital in the emergency department with a group of physicians, that we actually manned the emergency department from 2002 to 2014.

I live in New Haven County and made the commute for a better part of 12 years. So I'm very familiar with the commute and the

difficulties, especially during inclement
weather. Why do I bring that up? My first point
I would like to bring up is these times you
quoted in distances. Distances are nice. Time
is the all-killer here. That is a snowstorm is
not inevitable in Sharon by any stretch of the
imagination. In fact, I was often delayed to my
shift even with leaving two hours, three hours
for a commute, which would normally take an hour
due to a foot of snow or more.

I say this because transfer to Charlotte

Hungerford or Danbury Hospital may be 45 minutes
or an hour on a good day, but could be
significantly longer going up or down the hills
in Litchfield County to that next closest
hospital.

I'd like to speak on behalf, also, of my colleagues in the emergency department, that as Dr. Mortman alluded to earlier, emergency physicians, I do agree, are required to know something about, essentially, every specialty and then the next one or at least two steps beyond what goes on in the emergency department. So, cardiac, OB, neurologist, et cetera. I don't need to list everything.

Yes, training occurs in medical school and during residency for obstetrics and gynecology. With that said, there are plenty of emergencies that can occur between everything is fine in the womb to the baby is fine. Those emergencies are the part that are difficult for anyone that doesn't train full-time in obstetrics, labor, and delivery will have difficulty managing, and why I, personally, would be afraid practicing in an emergency department that does not allow for the subspecialties coming in.

Emergency departments have long call lists in pretty much all subspecialties that are are available in the area for a reason. The reason being is because we cannot be specialists in each area of all medicines, and therefore, we rely on our colleagues in these specialties to come in and help us when we need it.

To imagine that an emergency physician would handle every sort of obstetric emergency would be difficult at best, in my opinion. I'm not going to lie: The elation of delivering a perfectly healthy baby is wonderful. I'm not going to lie in the fact that I've told friends, colleagues, family that I would much rather run three or four

cardiac arrests at one time than deliver one baby for the mere fact that I'm terrified of what may happen between baby's fine and mom, baby's not doing well coming out of mom.

And as far as financially, there's no financial gain for me by speaking today or financial loss to me. I have no incentive to speak one way or the other other than for the benefit of my colleague, as I said, and the community.

My question would be: What is the financial worth of one child, one mother, or the combination thereof? Is it \$100,000, a hundred million? I would propose that if it's my wife, my daughter, they're worth all the money in the world to me, and to take away a service that already exists is counterintuitive to me when it already exists, and the potential for a horrendous outcome, even if it's small, it's still a percentage, and I'm not a gambler and I don't want to take any gamble on my family nor the community in Sharon, and I'll end my testimony there and reserve for any questions.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I did want to say:
All of your testimony is very important. We're

1

2

3

4

5

6

going to consider it. I'm not limiting you because it's -- it's not important. It's just, you know, my order was to keep testimony brief because there's already a lot in your written testimony.

So I didn't want to give the impression that we're somehow not considering it in the same way as we are the Applicant's testimony, and I just wanted the public to know that, as well.

So Attorney Knag, you can continue with your --

ATTORNEY KNAG: Our next witness is the first selectman of the town of Sharon, Brent Colley.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Again, Mr. Colley, please, raise your right hand, thank you.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence that you provided in your prefile testimony and the evidence that you shall give in this case shall the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God or upon penalty of perjury?

MR. COLLEY: I do.

1 BRENT COLLEY, 2 3 4 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by 5 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows: 6 7 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. And do adopt your prefile testimony? 9 MR. COLLEY: I do. 10 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, you can -- you 11 can proceed whenever you're ready. 12 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF BRENT COLLEY 14 15 MR. COLLEY: Sure. 16 So my name is Brent Colley, B-r-e-n-t, 17 C-o-l-l-e-y. I'm the first selectman in Sharon, 18 Connecticut and I will keep it brief. 19 In these small towns, especially Sharon, Cornwall, Salisbury, and Kent, we are out really 20 in the middle of nowhere when it comes to 21 22 services, and what's important about this 23 hospital is what it provides to everyone, no matter what their age. In the time that we had, 24 25 because of the 45-minute break, what I did was I

took the opportunity to go out into the community and asked people on the street and stores and businesses, "What does Sharon Hospital mean to you," and "what does the closing of maternity to you basically concern you?" And there was a pretty common theme and that was Sharon Hospital is the heart of Sharon. It's the life blood of Sharon. People enjoy access, the community involvement in everything that's involved with it, doctors, nurses, outside doctor facilities, an economic engine which really is what this hospital really is.

For people that live in larger towns, we're a factory town, we're a hospital town. So what this is to us is everything. There's two degrees of separation with the hospital to everyone who lives here, meaning that we all either live with someone or know someone who works within the hospital.

And as far as the maternity services goes, specifically, it's not just the deliveries, but it's the aftercare. So a lot of the people that move here and have babies, their families become attached to the hospital and OB/GYN as their general provider for services. That was true of

my wife. She basically survived two boughts of cancer because of your doctors and GYN.

As far as overall concerns with the community is that we are looking at something that we're not quite sure of what's going to grow, meaning that I brought two things of dominos. The domino effects in a lot of rural small hospitals is that one service is gone and then other services fall. How many dominos there are is clearly unclear at this moment in time, and that's the reason why we fight so hard and we're asking of you to really consider what's being asked from Nuvance of us.

Obviously, you're going to hear a lot of testimony, you're going to read a lot of testimony, but as a group, as a health care basically overlooking the board, please, consider what this means to us. It's -- you've heard from the doctors. You're hearing from me as a representative of many first selectmen and mayors in our region, 21 to be exact, is that this impacts our overall economy and the services that we provide.

Since the pandemic, we are growing and expanding the youth in our communities, and a lot

of them came here from, whether it was Brooklyn or Manhattan or Long Island because of the hospital. They're young families, they find it safe here, beautiful here, and they want to expand their life here.

Now, to lose maternity at this moment in time is going to impact that and we don't know what that impact will be, but again, that's why we fight so hard to ask of you to look at it, not from a profit standpoint of the hospital, but as an overall quality of life for this region of Connecticut. And it's not just us. New York state is right here. Amenia is right across the border 10 minutes away, and New York and Massachusetts and Connecticut here in this region come together.

So I'm keeping it short because I know you guys want to keep it short, but that's the overall theme.

Think about what this impact will have on us and what this hospital truly means to us because we've been through a great amount of change in -I've been here just nine years. In nine years,
I've been through five CEOs, and a large change from a forprofit to a nonprofit to Health-Plus to

Nuvance and I don't know what's next.

So I ask of all of you to really look at this from our perspective, and if you can, come on out and visit us. I'm happy to drive you around and show you our beautiful areas and regions, but also show you how long it would take us to get to the different hospitals that are our other options. They're not 40 minutes away. They're 45 to an hour, if we're lucky.

And Jean Speck from Kent will talk more about the EMS and ambulance after me, but just consider that. That's my goal.

So thank you for your time and your consideration.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,

Mr. Colley. Again, I just want to reiterate that

my interest is not in keeping your testimony

abbreviated or short. My interest is making sure

that we run the hearing efficiently and we get

through everything that we need to get through.

Our next witness is Maria Horn, state representative.

Thank you.

MS. HORN: Can you hear me?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I can.

MS. HORN: Great, so I am --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Ms. Horn, please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence that you provided in your prefile testimony and the evidence that you shall give in this case shall the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God or upon penalty of perjury?

MS. HORN: I do, and I also adapt my pre -- adopt my previous testimony that's also useful.

MARIA HORN,

called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF MARIA HORN

MS. HORN: So, yes, I'm State Representative Maria Horn. I represent the 64th District, which includes Sharon and other adjacent communities which are served by Sharon Hospital and I'm limiting a lot of things because I don't want to repeat what others have said, and I really want

to thank OHS for conducting such a thoughtful hearing.

I have confidence that you are, in fact, hearing from both sides of this and all the evidence before you, which is really important. Sharon Hospital needs partners, and so both sides of this, you know, equation, I believe people are here in good faith trying to resolve the real problems. So I'm grateful for the fact that you're doing it.

The central important question, of course, is access to quality, high-quality health care, and this -- this application is very similar to the one that OHS looked at somehow recently with respect to Windham Hospital in which OHS denied the application to close maternity, and that Windham Hospital being a hospital that has a birth rate less than half that of Sharon Hospital, the unit was actually closed and the distances in question were less than at Sharon Hospital.

Again, this is a difficult issue for everyone. It has been for many years in Sharon. This is an ongoing conversation about delivering services and particularly medical services in a

rural area which is costly, and so I don't question the fact that there is additional costs.

If there are significant questions as to quantum of those costs, both in terms of absolute terms and in relative terms that I hope to have engagement with. I do think we've arrived to the point where we need OHS in order to continue with or to have a constructive engagement. Others have discussed the, you know, really frightening nationwide trends with respect to rural hospitals, maternity care in particular, and I am, for one, don't believe that one should look at those challenges and give up on people who live in rural areas.

We have to make sure that we, the State, and I, as the incoming chair of the Finance, Revenue, and Bonding Committee, and I know the attorney general and the governor all join in being open to discussing ways to resolve this issue as long as we can face constructive engagement.

I've been a part of many meetings with the community and the Sharon Hospital and one meeting with Dr. -- Dr. Murphy about how to resolve this, and we've worked constructively on a series of issues, but not on the one we're hearing about

today, and in fact, I was very disheartened when, at one point, I was told by the former chair or the president of Sharon Hospital that he was just wearing me down, which leads to the feeling that we're just sort of going through the motions until -- you know, rather than constructive thinking in how to solve a real problem in a rural community.

So I thank OHS for engaging in that conversation and I look forward to being part of those conversations in terms of resources that the State and federal government can bring to try to resolve this because in order to have a thriving community, we need to have a thriving hospital, which includes maternity care.

So thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Representative Horn.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Someone needs to mute.

So I'm going to ask -- our next witness is Jean Speck, first selectman of the Town of Kent.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Ms. Speck, please, raise your right hand. Okay, there you go.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the

1 evidence you provided in your prefile and the 2 evidence that you shall give today shall the 3 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the 4 truth, so help you god or upon penalty of 5 perjury? 6 MS. SPECK: Yes. 7 8 JEAN SPECK, 9 10 called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by 11 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows: 12 13 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. 14 Do you adopt your prefile testimony? 15 MS. SPECK: Yes. 16 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, you can 17 proceed whenever you're ready. 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION OF JEAN SPECK 20 21 MS. SPECK: Good afternoon and I appreciate 22 the time before the Hearing Officer today. 23 I'm the first selectman of the Town of Kent. 24 I'm a 25-year long resident and a patient of 25 Dr. Mortman's.

24 years ago this coming January, my
daughter, Sharon, was born at Sharon Hospital,
personally delivered by Dr. Mortman, and she
was -- she is part of that high-risk birth data.

As a person speaking to you today in my capacity as the chief-elected official, I want to underscore that the residents of our community need Sharon Hospital to continue the services of maternity, labor, delivery, and other core services that they're looking to discontinue.

I join other local political leaders in emphasizing that this is -- this is going to do harm to our communities.

As Brent Colley mentioned earlier, this is a key driver to bring new residents to our towns and to keep those residents who already live here.

Second, I want to just discuss with you from the perspective of a former employee of the Department of Public Health. I worked there for 10 years in the Office of Medical Services as a regional coordinator, having regulatory oversight over EMS systems in the state.

If there was a need for a patient to be -- a pregnant patient to be transferred to another

hospital and the one licensed EMS provider was already tied up servicing one of the approximately 23 towns that services over in New York state, Sharon Hospital Emergency Department would have to pick up the phone, literally just as you or I would do, call 9-1-1, and have the local EMS provider dispatch to get that patient transported. This is not how the system is designed. That would mean the local certified EMS organization would be unavailable for several hours to respond to any 9-1-1 calls in their primary service area during that time, putting a lot of stress, additional stress, on the surrounding towns.

So what happens if someone during that time experiences a cardiac arrest? Another town -- another local EMS organization with likely maybe one or two ambulances in their fleet would have to be dispatched under mutual aid for their taxing system.

(Technical interruption.)

The six towns surrounding Sharon Hospital all are certified EMS providers whose role,

according to DPH regulations, is to respond to 9-1-1 requests for services. Certified ambulance organizations doing interfacility transfers is not how the EMS system is designed. EMS systems in every corner of the state are facing staffing shortages, increased training requirements, and burnout secondary to the pandemic. Ending labor and delivery at Sharon Hospital will place even more stress on this already-fragile system.

This has not been addressed with Sharon

Hospital as yet, and I appreciate the time for -and your balance, Hearing Officer, in trying to
get us moved forward.

Thanks very much.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.

ATTORNEY KNAG: Our final witness is going to be Chisholm Chandler.

MR. CHANDLER: Good afternoon.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Mr. Chandler, please, raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or solemnly and sincerely affirm, as the case may be, that the evidence you have provided in your prefile testimony and the evidence that you shall give today shall be the truth, the whole truth, and

1	nothing but the truth, so help you god or upon
2	penalty of perjury?
3	MR. CHANDLER: I do.
4	
5	CHISHOLM CHANDLER,
6	
7	called as a witness, being first duly sworn (remotely) by
8	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA, testified on his oath as follows:
9	
10	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.
11	And do you adopt your prefile testimony?
12	MR. CHANDLER: I do.
13	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thanks.
14	You can proceed whenever you're ready.
15	
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF CHISHOLM CHANDLER:
17	
18	MR. CHANDLER: Good afternoon, and thank you
19	for allowing me to speak today.
20	My name is Chisholm Chandler and I serve as
21	the Emeritus Headmaster at Salisbury School in
22	Salisbury, Connecticut.
23	As an aside, I was born at Sharon Hospital
24	in June of 1966, and my four children were born
25	there, as well. So we're all tremendously

grateful for the hospital's Five Star care
referenced earlier in the meeting, and like my -the previous speaker, Dr. Mortman, delivered two
of my children.

This morning, I'm honored to share my thoughts on this proposed certificate of need application and what we believe is the grievous impact of the potential loss of exceptional women's health care in our area.

It's important to note that one of the largest employers in the northwest corner of Connecticut is the independent school industry.

ATTORNEY KNAG: When is this appointment?

MR. CHANDLER: I'll get to my appointment.

And the direct and indirect revenue generated by this sector is a significant part of the local economy, fueling a local retail, restaurant, and real estate businesses in particular.

So, today, I'm speaking on behalf of all independent schools located in the area:

Berkshire, Forman, Hotchkiss, Indian Mountain,

Kent, Millbrook, Rumsey Hall, Salisbury, Taft,

and others. This is a group that comprises over

2,000 students and school professionals, all of

whom stand together in opposing this application, and I have three very brief points to share.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first is the impact of this application on our hiring processes and our abilities to build exceptional educational communities. Independent schools depend on hiring young professionals from all over the country to teach, coach, and mentor adolescent boys and girls, and it is incredibly advantageous for us to recruit young couples intent on establishing routes in raising their own families on our campuses. This is so because longevity and continuity in faculty and staff are critical elements of well-run, highly-valued, and sought-after schools, and having a celebrated and distinguished women's health care practice where faculty and staff can have their babies in a Five Star hospital so close in proximity to our campuses is an important asset for us in terms of our ability to attract and retain these young professionals.

Second, the potential impact of diminishing ER capabilities: In addition to maternity resources, a fully-functional and thriving ER is also a critical asset for our school communities. The health and safety of our students and their

the tuition-paying parents, expect, and frankly, demand. The impact of this application, which would most certainly diminish ER capabilities, as we heard earlier, by eliminating maternity services and night and weekend surgery coverages is dangerous and frightening to all constituents, heads of school, trustees, faculty and staff, and our clients, the students and their families.

Ours is a large universe of stakeholders.

Not having these critical services will

undoubtedly adversely impact the effective

operations of our schools, and so there is

potentially enormous collateral damage in

approving this application.

The final point: The impact on families who moved here during the pandemic. We have had many families relocate to the local area from New York City as a result of the pandemic. We heard this earlier. Local populations have swelled, which is beneficial for many reasons, including the independent school enrollment picture. In fact, there's a current article in the local newspapers that tells the story of this migration. The vast majority of these new residents, according to

those who were interviewed for the article, say
they intend to make their move permanent and
reference the reason that they hadn't realized
just how good the local human services were when
they were just weekend homeowners and visitors.

Downgrading our health care infrastructure, especially women's reproductive care, will have a damaging impact on the surrounding communities, no doubt, and will most certainly weaken our schools. It is our collective opinion that we must, absolutely must maintain our commitment to comprehensive women's health care at Sharon Hospital.

Thank you for your time and for listening to the pleas of the independent school community.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Mr. Chandler.

Attorney Knag, do you have anyone else there?

attorney knag: No, I think we've covered everyone, and I would just make one -- we have one logistical point: Dr. Whyte has stated that he has some commitments later in the afternoon and if we didn't finish the public comment section fast enough, he might become unavailable.

So I would ask that if -- if there's cross-examination or questions from staff for Dr. Whyte, that they be propounded at this time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, at this point,

I think we have 26 people who have signed up to

provide public comment, so it's likely to take a

considerable amount of time, like an

hour-and-a-half, maybe two hours, if everybody

were to take the full three hours(sic), so --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I think we should probably start with him on cross, but I do want to take -- let's take a four-minute break and we'll come back at 2:40, and we'll start with Dr. Whyte.

(Off the record at 2:36 p.m.)

ATTORNEY KNAG: Three minutes.

(Back on the record at 2:40 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you very much.

We are back on the record in the matter of sorry, I am all over the place right now - Vassar

Health Connecticut Inc. d/b/a Sharon Hospital,

Docket No. 22-32511-CON.

1 During that short break, we appear to have lost the Court Reporter, and we made efforts to 2 try to get her back, to no avail. We are 3 continuing to record the proceedings through Zoom 5 and we'll make that available to her for purposes of preparing a transcript. Both Counsel have 6 7 agreed to continue with the hearing, notwithstanding her absence, and with that, we 9 are going to turn to the public comment 10 portion -- or I'm sorry, we're going to just take 11 Dr. Whyte briefly because he has a commitment. 12 So, Attorney Tucci, did you have any 13 cross-examination for Dr. Whyte? 14 ATTORNEY TUCCI: Thank you, Hearing 15 Officer. On behalf of the Applicant, we have no 16 questions for Dr. Whyte. 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, thank you. 18 So, Dr. Whyte, you can be excused. 19 ATTORNEY KNAG: Does the staff have any 20 questions? 21 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I don't believe so. 22 MR. LAZARUS: We do not. 23 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And Mr. Lazarus, 24 you're speaking on behalf of yourself and the two 25 analysts?

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, yes.

2

ATTORNEY KNAG: So Dr. Whyte is excused?

3

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Correct.

4

DR. WHYTE: Thank you very much.

5

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.

6

So, now, we are going to turn to public

7

comment. Let's see. So we will be calling the

8

names of those who have signed up to speak in the

9

order in which they are registered, and

10

afterwards, I will ask that anyone else who is

11

present who wishes to be heard, let us know.

12

There are some exceptions to this. We're going

13

to hear from elected and appointed public

14

officials first, followed by some clinical and

15

non-clinical executives who have other

16

obligations later today, and then we will proceed

17

in -- I believe, in the order in which people

18

signed up.

so.

19

Each person is limited to three minutes.

20

Please, do not be dismayed if I interrupt you and

21

cut you off. I'm doing this in fairness to

22

others present to make sure that everyone who

23

wishes to speak today has an opportunity to do

24

I would ask anyone else listening to submit

25

any further written comments to OHS by e-mail or mail no later than one week, that is seven calendar days, from today. Our contact information is on our Website and on the public information sheet, which were provided at the hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to be here today and for your cooperation.

So we're now ready to hear statements from the public. As I mentioned earlier, Mayda
Capozzi and Leslie Greer from our office have been kind enough to keep a list of the individuals who have submitted their names. So I am probably going to need their assistance in listing those off.

Anyone who's speaking, I would remind you to turn your video and your microphone on and we will try to give you some heads-up as to who will in the queue. As of this writing, I believe we have in excess of 30 people who have signed up.

I don't have the list in front of me right now, but --

MS. CAPOZZI: At least 28.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: 28, okay.

So, Mayda, can you just --

1	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Just Hearing Officer
2	Csuka, this is Ted Tucci.
3	Just as a point of procedure clarification,
4	and I apologize for my confusion, so we are going
5	to we are going to move through the public
6	comment portion of the proceedings and then
7	resume cross the technical part of the
8	hearing? Is that
9	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: That was my plan,
10	yes.
11	ATTORNEY TUCCI: Okay.
12	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I'm sorry. It's
13	does that work for you?
14	ATTORNEY TUCCI: That's however you want
15	to proceed, we're fine.
16	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, that's what I
17	would like to do.
18	So, Mayda, who will be first?
19	MS. CAPOZZI: Representative Stephen
20	Harding.
21	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Actually, can you
22	just name the first, let's say, three people who
23	would be on the list?
24	MS. CAPOZZI: Sure.
25	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So it would be

1 Representative Harding.

MS. CAPOZZI: Mm-hm, Gordon Ridgway, First Selectman of Cornwall, and Dr. Cornelius Ferreira.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, so let's start with Representative Harding.

MR. HARDING: Good afternoon, Hearing officer Csuka, and members of OHS. I am Representative Stephen Harding representing the 107th district. I also am fortunate to be elected as the state senator for the 30th district upcoming in January, which covers the majority of the communities in Connecticut that utilize the incredible services at Sharon Hospital.

I am testifying today in addition to the written correspondence I submitted in absolute opposition to the closure of the labor and delivery at Sharon Hospital as well as the critical cuts proposed to the ICU.

Just to highlight just quickly, you know, on what I've written, particularly with rural hospitals -- this is what OHS, I think, is there for and should be reviewing today. A rural hospital obviously is defined by its geography,

and as I said in my written testimony, Sharon
Hospital may not have as many patients as
Hartford, New Haven, or other cities in urban
areas of our state, but its very location in the
middle of a less-populated region makes it that
much more important. Sharon Hospital must offer
maternity and ICU care to the residents of
northwest Connecticut because if they don't, no
one else will.

There have been previous closures of labor and delivery units across the state in the past, but this one is particularly precarious for the individuals in northwest Connecticut. If you are pregnant and live in Sharon, the closest alternative hospital conceivably is Charlotte Hungerford, and there is no three-lane highway or good way to get there, particularly in the winter season, where there's ice and snow, et cetera.

As a father to young children, myself, I cannot imagine forcing a mother to endure the stress of traveling nearly an hour while in labor to reach the hospital medical staff. In some circumstances, this very well may threaten the life of the baby and the mother.

Now, you know, we heard the incredible

testimony from Dr. Mortman and his advocacy that he has worked with the patients and the newborns at the labor and delivery unit for many years at Sharon Hospital.

Individuals -- you would be dealing with individuals' lives: Babies potentially losing their lives, mothers potentially losing their lives if OHS allows this closure.

So I am asking -- I am imploring OHS to do
the right thing here for the people of northwest
Connecticut to ensure that the health and safety
and well-being of northwest Connecticut is
respected, and I believe OHS has a critical
opportunity to do that here and I think they have
no choice, please, but to, please, keep the labor
and delivery units open and stop the critical
cuts to ICU.

So I thank you very much for you time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,
Representative Harding.

So next on the list would be First Selectman Ridgway.

MR. RIDGWAY: Good afternoon, and thank you for holding this hearing on this very important issue.

My name is Gordon Ridgway. I am First
Selectman of the town of Cornwall, which is
adjacent to the town of Kent -- or the town of
Kent and also, this hearing in Sharon, which is
the primary hospital that most people in Cornwall
go to, and I've been First Selectman for over 30
years, and I would just like to say to start that
there is no support for this transformative plan
among any of the local officials that I have
talked to, both in Connecticut and in New York
State, and I'm here to speak for the most
vulnerable people, that's basically the people
that have a long way to go to get health care and
the youngest members of our community.

I think there is tremendous appreciation of our area for what we have now in Sharon Hospital, the great care that we have gotten for generations at Sharon Hospital. I know from personal experience, my three children were born there under the care of Drs. Mortman and Schnurr. All three kids now are EMTs with the Cornwall Ambulance Service, and the picture above me was -- was drawn by a Sharon artist that shows Sharon -- the older section of Sharon, which Cornwall Ambulance has to go over to get to

Sharon Hospital, and I think that's very important because a lot of people in other parts of the state may not appreciate our topography.

And our ambulance also covers a good part of Sharon on the west bank of the Housatonic River, so we have to go down a hill, up a hill to get people back down the hill and over -- over another hill to get to Sharon Hospital. That's just the reality of what we have. On a good day, it's fine. On a -- on a snowy day, it can be rough.

So I would just like to say that seeing and reading up on this issue, I think this transformative plan would transform our region into something much less than it is now. It would take away an extremely vital service to our community. We have had people, young families come here. There's waiting lists in our -- on our child centers here and they are -- rely on this service, and I would like to see Sharon Hospital do more to support this essential service and do the advertising and give the publicity that it needs and help them grow their business and support the hospital because I think we have a really great service here that needs to

be supported and enhanced and publicized, not closed.

Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.

Next on the list, I believe, was Dr. Ferreira. Is Dr. Ferreira here?

DR. FERREIRA: I am here. Thank you so much.

so my name is Dr. Cornelius Ferreira and I am Nuvance Health's chair of primary care. I'm here to express my support for Sharon Hospital's application as the best path forward to keep the hospital strong and maintain access to care in the community. With my years of experience in health care, particularly in primary care with a board certification in family medicine, I recognize the importance of supporting women throughout the duration of their life span.

However, we must also recognize that a rural community hospital like Sharon Hospital needs to adapt to best meet the needs of our community as health care evolves.

Prior to joining Nuvance Health, I worked in rural Iowa, where labor and delivery patients were always referred to tertiary care centers.

These patients were safely and successfully transferred to hospitals within driving distance where mothers and babies were still guaranteed high-quality care.

Sharon Hospital's proposed transformation plan is focused on strengthening the services that data shows are needed most across the region. Closing labor and delivery is a difficult but necessary part of this plan. As the Sharon community changes and health care delivery evolves, we need to expand access to primary and specialty care across the region for our patients. For example, as my team works to support the transformation plan and focus on growing primary care in a rural market, we must be creative so we can attract new talent to build and maintain a strong infrastructure for the future.

We have made progress in partnership with our local volunteer-based recruitment committee. Recent additions of new, skilled clinicians to our primary care team are proof of our commitment to growth-based aspects of the transformation plan.

Sharon Hospital's transformation plan will

1 allow us to devote more time and resources to this important work to expand our area's 2 highest-demanded services. Sharon Hospital must 3 adapt to remain sustainable. Beyond that, we 5 need resources to invest in expanding access to This plan will allow us to achieve both care. 7 these important goals so we can keep Sharon Hospital strong, and ultimately, create a 9 healthier region. 10 I urge you to approve this application, and 11 thank you for your consideration. 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 13 Dr. Ferreira. 14 Mayda, who would be the next three? 15 MS. CAPOZZI: Okay, so Dr. Thomas Koobatian, 16 Dr. Mark Marshall, and Bob Schnurr, clinical di-17 -- clinical. 18 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay, so we'll start 19 with Dr. Koobatian. 20 DR. KOOBATIAN: Good afternoon. 21 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 22 DR. KOOBATIAN: Hi, my name is Dr. Thomas 23 Koobatian. I've been an emergency physician at 24 New Milford Hospital in New Milford, Connecticut 25 for the past 25 years. I also serve as the

hospital's executive director and chief of staff.

I'm speaking today because I've experienced the

challenges of Sharon Hospital and the difficult

decision that needs to be made to continue

serving its community.

In 2013, New Milford Hospital was facing similar problems as Sharon faces today. With a declining delivery volume, we struggled to maintain financial stability while managing staffing challenges. These obstacles prevented our not-for-profit hospital for making needed investments to maintain and expand crucial services for our community. After a thorough review process, we made the difficult decision to close our labor and delivery unit. While this path was no one's first choice, it was undoubtedly the best decision to serve the community's needs and the hospital's future.

It's been nine years since New Milford

Hospital closed its maternity unit and we are
thriving. We've built a new primary care office
that serves thousands of patients a year. We
recently opened a new multi-disciplinary office
staffed with the most-needed medical specialists.

And seeing is believing, so I would like to

invite OHS committee members to visit New Milford Hospital and see firsthand this amazing transformation. Our emergency department remains trained and ready for OB emergencies; however, thanks to exhaustive planning and precautions among physicians, EMS providers, and the community, we have not had a single emergency birth in our emergency department.

If granted approval to close labor and delivery, Sharon Hospital can replicate New Milford's success. No one enters health care intending to cut services and I know how difficult it was to reach this decision; however, by reallocating resources from this underused service and investing them to improve and expand access elsewhere, Sharon Hospital can better serve its community. Ultimately, Sharon Hospital's transformation plan is the best decision for the hospital and its community.

Thank you for your time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,

Dr. Koobatian, and I apologize for pronouncing

your name incorrect.

DR. KOOBATIAN: No worries.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Next on the list is

1 Dr. Marshall, Mark Marshall. DR. MARSHALL: Yes, hi, good afternoon, and 2 3 thank you. I'm Dr. Mark Marshall, the vice-president of medical affairs at Sharon Hospital and the 5 Nuvance Health System, Sharon County of Medicine. 7 I've practiced at Sharon Hospital and lived in the Sharon community for approximately 24 years. 9 I wish to express my support for Sharon 10 Hospital and its preservation. Economic stresses 11 have placed Sharon Hospital in jeopardy. 12 essential community hospital cannot be allowed to 13 fail. 14 Speaking for myself and many of my 15 neighbors, we are heartbroken about the 16 possibility of losing a beloved and high-quality 17 service. If we don't act, we are at risk of 18 losing our hospital. I'm saddened by the 19 prospect of losing labor and delivery, but the 20 loss of the hospital would be an irreparable blow 21 to the community. 22 Thank you. 23 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 24 Dr. Marshall. 25 Then we have Dr. Bob Schnurr.

DR. SCHNURR: Thank you for letting me speak. My sartorial choice is not a reflection of my lack of respect for the organization. It's as Mark Antony said to Cleopatra, "I didn't come here to talk," but I feel right now, having listened to all of this, I feel like I should say something.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm a retired, board-certified OB-GYN, and in addition to that, I served for three years on the Connecticut Mortality -- Maternal Mortality. So, every time a mother died, I was there to review the cases. In addition, I served for three years as a consultant to the State of Connecticut to review any physicians who are being brought up -- any OB-GYN physicians that are being brought up for sort of practice violations. In addition to that, I was one of the founders of Women's Health Care of Connecticut, which then became Women's Health Care U.S.A., and we currently deliver one out of 18 babies born in the United States is born to somebody in our practice. So, even though Dr. Mortman tried to look like they're a tiny, little practice, they are supervised by a huge, very high-quality organization that reviews the

templates, reviews the standard procedures. So they're not just a rural little community hospital. They're getting the utmost in care.

My major concern is that you're not looking at maternity; you're closing women's services. I have been involved for years in recruitment.

I've recruited Dr. Jaffe, Mortman, Schweitzer. I recruited many doctors along with many doctors to join my big group. It is not easy.

There is no plan that I've seen about retaining women's services here. All of a sudden, they're going to find three GYN doctors to be on-call, one every three nights to cover the emergency room? Dr. Mortman and Schweitzer, they're not going to be able to cover two hospitals. There will not be anybody covering women's services here, either prenatal, post-natal, or gynecological services if you close OB.

Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,
Dr. Schnurr.

Before we move on to the next commenter, I did want to point out that it appears that people are leaving comments in the chat other than just

their names. I don't know whether that is also being recorded, so I would suggest that if you do have public comment that you wish to submit, you submit it in written form after the fact or even during the hearing, if you want. Just don't put it in the chat function because it may get lost and it also serves to confuse what is going on during the hearing. We're really just using that for people to sign up so that we are able to keep some sense of order to the people who are providing comment.

(Off the record at 3:28 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Melissa Zamfir, a Notary Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the District of New Haven, State of Connecticut, do hereby certify that, pursuant to notice and in accordance with the stipulations set forth, do hereby certify that the foregoing testimony is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge and ability of the HEARING REGARDING THE APPROVAL TO TERMINATE INPATIENT LABOR AND DELIVERY SERVICES AT SHARON HOSPITAL on December 6th, 2022.

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of the parties to the action in which this deposition is taken, and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the outcome of said action.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 20th day of December, 2022.

(My Commission expires July 31, 2024.)

Melissa Zamfir, Notary Public Shorthand Reporter, License #455

1	INDEX	
2		Pg
3	WITNESSES	
4	FOR THE APPLICANT:	
5	JOHN MURPHY, MD	
6	Direct Examination	21
7	Cross Examination	48
8	CHRISTINA MCCULLOCH	
9	Direct Examination	27
10	Cross Examination	61
11	Redirect Examination	71
12	ELIZABETH LUCAL, MD	
13	Direct Examination	35
14	Cross Examination	76
15	STEVEN ROSENBERG	
16	Cross Examination	87
17		
18	FOR THE INTERVENOR:	
19	SHAI M. PRI-PAZ, MD	
20	Direct Examination	103
21	Cross Examination	107
22	WILLIAM SCHWEITZER, MD	
23	Direct Examination	111
24	Cross Examination	113
25	Redirect Examination	114

I N D E X (Continued)	
HOWARD MORTMAN, MD	
Direct Examination	117
VICTOR GERMACK	
Direct Examination	142
EDWARD KAVLE, MD	
Direct Examination	152
DAVID KURISH, MD	
Direct Examination	166
ANDREW WHYTE, MD	
Direct Examination	172
BRENT COLLEY	
Direct Examination	177
MARIA HORN	
Direct Examination	182
JEAN SPECK	
Direct Examination	186
	HOWARD MORTMAN, MD Direct Examination

1	I N D E X (Continued)	
2		
3	CHISHOLM CHANDLER	
4	Direct Examination	190
5		
6	LATE-FILE EXHIBITS	
7	EXHIBIT QQ Letter of Support	12
8	EXHIBIT RR Letter of Support	12
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		