1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT 2 OFFICE OF HEALTH STRATEGY 3 4 DOCKET NO. 21-32439-CON 5 A HEARING REGARDING THE ACQUISITION OF ONE CT SCANNER AND ONE MRI SCANNER BY 6 ROCKY HILL IMAGING CENTER, LLC 7 8 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE 9 10 Public Hearing held on Wednesday, June 29, 2022, beginning at 10:03 a.m. via remote access. 11 12 Held Before: 13 DANIEL J. CSUKA, ESQ., Hearing Officer 14 Administrative Staff: 15 YADIRA McLAUGHLIN, Planning Analyst 16 STEVEN W. LAZARUS, Operations Manager LESLIE GREER, Community Outreach Coordinator 17 Appearances: 18 For the Applicant: 19 REID AND RIEGE, P.C. One Financial Plaza, 21st Floor 20 Hartford, Connecticut 06103 ADAM CARTER ROSE, ESQ. BY: 21 MARY M. MILLER, ESQ. 22 23 24 25 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

(Whereupon, the hearing commenced at 10:03 a.m.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Good morning, everyone. Rocky Hill Imaging Center, the Applicant in this matter, seeks to acquire one Siemens Medical Magnetom Altea 1.5T MRI unit and one Siemens SOMATOM Drive CT scanner. I may have pronounced those wrong, but just bear with me. its application Rocky Hill states that it is an entity that is jointly owned by Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center and also Radiology Associates of Hartford for the sole purpose of providing the proposed imaging services at an ambulatory medical hub having an address of 476 Cromwell Avenue, Rocky Hill, Connecticut. According to the application, this medical hub was expected to open in the fall of 2021, and based on some of the recent filings, it appears that it is currently operational.

Today is June 29, 2022. My name is
Daniel J. Csuka. It is currently 10:04 a.m.
Victoria Veltri, the outgoing executive director
of the Office of Health Strategy, has designated
me to serve as the hearing officer for this matter
to rule on all motions or recommend findings of
fact and conclusions of law upon the 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 legislation, 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 such person participates orally during an uninterrupted dialogue or series of questions and answers.

We ask that all members of the public mute their devices that they are using to access the hearing and silence any additional devices that are around them. This public hearing is held pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 19a-639a(e) and will be conducted under the provisions of Chapter 54 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Office of Health Strategy staff is here to assist me in gathering facts related to this application and will be asking the applicant witnesses questions. I'm going to ask each staffperson assisting with questions today to first identify themselves with their name, spelling of their last name, and OHS title. So

I'll start first with Steve.

MR. LAZARUS: Good morning. My name is Steven Lazarus. I'm the operations manager at Office of Health Strategy.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And Yadira?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Good morning. My name is Yadira McLaughlin, M-c, capital "L,"

A-U-G-H-L-I-N. And I am the planning analyst at Office of Health Strategy.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. The Certificate of Need process is a regulatory process, and as such, the highest level of respect will be accorded to the applicant, to members of the public and to our staff. Our priority is the integrity and transparency of this process.

Accordingly, decorum will be maintained by all present during these proceedings.

This hearing is being transcribed and recorded, and the video will 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 the Office of Health Strategy are available for review through our Certificate of Need portal which is accessible through our website. In making my decision, I

will consider and make findings in accordance with Section 19a-639 of the general statutes.

And lastly, as Zoom notified you in the course of entering this meeting, I do wish to point out that by appearing on camera in this virtual hearing, you're consenting to being filmed. So if you wish to revoke your consent either now or in the future, please let me know.

So, getting into the substance of today's hearing, the CON portal contains the Table of Record in this case. As of this morning, exhibits were identified from A to DD. The table of record will be updated to reflect the late submitted prefile from the applicant yesterday afternoon.

I also wanted to point out that all of the public comment submissions that are currently in Exhibit Q are also incorporated into Exhibit Z but not the other way around. So I would just recommend that if you're going to reference anything in Exhibit Q, you reference Exhibit Z instead.

In accordance with Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-178, the applicant is hereby on notice that I am taking administrative notice

1 of the following documents. The Statewide Health 2 Care Facilities and Service Plan as well as all of 3 the supplements. The Facilities and Services 4 Inventory. The OHS Acute Care Hospital discharge 5 database. And All-Payer Claims Database claims 6 data of which a relevant except was uploaded as 7 Exhibit AA on June 27th a couple days ago. I may also take administrative notice of the hospital 8 9 reporting system financial and utilization data 10 and also prior OHS final decisions that may be relevant to this matter. I believe the only 11 12 docket that has been brought to my attention is 13 the application filed by Radiology Associates of 14 Hartford, and the applicant requested that I take 15 administrative notice of that. Certainly, if 16 there are any other dockets in the record that I 17 missed, I will also take notice of those as well 18 without the applicant identifying them at this 19 very time.

Ms. McLaughlin, do you have any additional exhibits to enter into the record at this time?

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McLAUGHLIN: No, I do not.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So as I mentioned earlier, Exhibit DD, that's not in the

Table of Record but we will be adding that.

So counsel for applicant, can you please identify yourself for the record, spelling your last name.

MR. ROSE: So Attorney Adam Rose,
R-O-S-E. And I'm also assisted by my partner,
Mary Miller, who's off camera right now. We've
got the three of us on camera. She may not be
participating. We'll see if that's necessary. If
so, she would shift seats. Would you like her to
make an appearance?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: No, that's fine. It's enough that I know she's in the room. And you also have your appearance on file for her as well, so I assumed she might have been present. So thank you for letting me know.

Are there any objections to the exhibits in the Table of Record or the noticed documents?

MR. ROSE: No, it looks good.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So with that, all identified and marked exhibits are entered as full exhibits.

And Attorney Rose, do you have any other additional exhibits that you wish to enter

at this time before we get into the hearing itself or the substance of the hearing?

MR. ROSE: Not at this time. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So we will proceed in the order established in the agenda for today's hearing. I just want to advise the applicant that we may ask questions related to your application that you feel you have already addressed. We will do 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 your application, your completeness responses, and the prefiled testimony. And trust me when I say I will do so many times before issuing a decision. So don't be too frustrated if the questions seem like you've already provided answers.

As this hearing is being held virtually, we ask that all participants, to the extent possible, should enable the use of video cameras when testifying or commenting. And certainly if Attorney Miller has any comments that she would like to make, I would appreciate if she'd come onto the camera. Anyone who is not

testifying or commenting shall mute all their electronic devices, including telephones, televisions, et cetera. And I would also recommend that if we take any breaks you turn your camera and your microphones off. We do try to stop the recording, but I can't promise that will happen in every instance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So public comment taken during a hearing will likely go in the order established by OHS during the registration process. However, I may allow public officials to testify out of I or OHS staff will call each individual by name when it is his or her turn to speak. Registration for public comment will take place at 2 p.m. and is scheduled to start at 3 p.m. I don't expect this to be the case, but if the technical portion of this hearing has not been completed by 2 p.m., public comment may be postponed until the technical portion is complete. And if the technical portion is complete before 2 p.m., we will break until 3 p.m. The applicant's witnesses must be available after public comment as OHS may have additional follow-up questions based on the public comment itself.

With that, Attorney Rose, are there any

you.

other housekeeping matters or procedural issues
you would like to address before we start?

MR POSE: No not at this time. Than

MR. ROSE: No, not at this time. Thank

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you. So we are going to start with the technical portion of this hearing. So is there an opening statement from the applicant's counsel?

MR. ROSE: Well, do you guys mind if I go first or do you want to go first?

MS. SMITH: You can go first.

MR. ROSE: Okay. I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you for your time. This application was prepared by the applicant on the assistance of the hospital counsel. And Reid & Riege and I were engaged at the point that CIP Jefferson called for this hearing. And that gave me a unique opportunity to sort of look at the application and the series of completeness questions and responses from a somewhat objective view and see the dialogue as I see it going back and forth between the applicant. And my role was from that point to take the hearing issues and use that as an opportunity to resolve any issues relating to the overall need for this application.

And having done that, I understand, Hearing Officer Csuka, that your job is to look at the statutory criteria under 19a-639 and to make your findings, and our job is to demonstrate to you that you can make positive findings in each category so you can approve this application. with that, we went to the standards and guidelines with the assistance of a certificate of need consultant, and we very carefully followed every single aspect of the standard and guidelines to do an objective analysis of how do you determine your towns, which of course they didn't have the ability to use the plan definition when they filed the application, so they had to project which towns the patients would be coming from.

However, at this point in time, as you had acknowledged in your opening remarks, the Rocky Hill Medical Hub and the applicant's imaging center there has been operational. And so that allowed them to actually have utilization data to see who actually is receiving the imaging services and what towns do they live in, compile that data and use the definition in the plan to come up with those towns.

So it's been my experience, and we did

ask that you take administrative notice of our previous, or I should say Radiology Associates of Hartford's previous application with respect to Bloomfield, because in that proceeding the intervenor had taken issue with the manner in which we chose the towns. And we did a Late-File, and it became a part of the proceeding. And what we had established in that proceeding in our Late-File is that, well, there isn't a regulatory definition, and it is difficult to define your towns when you can't use the plan's guidelines which are based on actual utilization of an existing site.

So I would say, if you could bear with us in acknowledging that and look at the responses to the hearing issues anew with respect to analyzing whether or not there's a clear public need for this proposal, I think what you'll find is that there's a sound determination of the towns that are involved. I think you'll find a very detailed table of the existing providers in those towns and the reported capacities that we use to determine that the community threshold for both modalities, CT and MRI, is above the agency's established capacity threshold of 85 percent

optimal capacity.

And so with that as background, I just want to go through some of the highlights that will help you make the findings that you need to make related to the statutory criteria, a lot of which actually depend on those calculations. So the first one I just alluded to that the community need in a defined service area is 105 percent for CT and 90 percent for MRI.

Second, the plan requires that if the applicant has existing scanners in the PSA that there's a separate category, the 3B category, that the applicant could use if the community need wasn't there. But I want to be clear that while the community need is there, but we included the Saint Francis Hospital capacity numbers because they have these scanners in the PSA. And so you will see that Saint Francis Hospital is at 164 percent for CT and 92 percent for MRI.

And then in recognizing that the plan doesn't technically include RAH's numbers, but that has been part of the dialogue with the agency, and it's also been noted in public comment, we made the supplemental finding. And there you will find that RAH's 2021 total numbers

for all of its offices which span Enfield, Avon, Bloomfield and Glastonbury. The total for all those offices in 2021 comes to 104 percent for CT and 92 percent for MRI. And to be fully transparent, we want to let you know that the Glastonbury MRI scanner was down for seven weeks last year. So when we say 92 percent for MRI, what we are using is a diminished capacity threshold that takes those seven weeks out. So we don't use the full 4,000. We use the diminished number that we indicated on our chart.

But I want to note that even if you don't diminish that and you use the 4,000 expected scans on the scanner, notwithstanding the fact that it was down for seven weeks, then RAH's total offices still show that MRI is 88 percent. So when you look at these numbers, and I will make -- I hate to belabor the point because all of the numbers support approval of this proposal, but I also want to note that we're now also almost -- well, we were halfway through the year when we were able to look at RAH's 2022 numbers through May 31st to see, okay, where are the volumes.

Because I think what you're going to hear and in what you've probably read in the

prefile testimony is that, well, we think we're seeing growth trends. And what I recognized in the application in the dialogue is that the projections and the calculations and the assumptions behind them, their projections were, I wouldn't say called into question, but I think that the agency was focused on what went behind those projections.

But I want to note that because we're in 2022 and RAH has this actual utilization data of all of the RAH's offices, when you annualize those numbers, so you take the five months and you annualize it, you're going to see that the total is 117 percent for CT and 99 percent for MRI. And those are solid numbers based on where we are today asking for additional scanners to address capacity that's shown in the community, it's shown at the hospital, and it's shown throughout all of RAH's offices.

And to the extent that there's that question of, oh, well, could RAH's Glastonbury office absorb any of the additional capacity in the Rocky Hill service area. To outline that one specifically, I want to say that the Glastonbury 2022 annualized data is 153 percent CT and 92

percent for MRI.

should feel comfortable that, yeah, what they had projected in the strategic planning that began years ago where they're using Truven data, they're using Advisory Board data, and they're trying to project into the future how to best address the community need for advanced imaging that the numbers are supporting their projections at this point. And that if you hit the reset button and said is there a clear public need to add these scanners today, absolutely, in every single measure.

And I don't think I need to belabor this point, but the fact that this is a joint venture between Saint Francis Hospital Medical Center and their radiology practice that are part of what is now referred to as SoNE, which is their risk bearing, you know, clinically integrated network. I mean, we've explained ad nauseam in the Bloomfield application really what they're trying to achieve with this network, and we've touched upon it again in this application. So if you're looking at the identity of who's trying to fill this need that we've already demonstrated, I

mean, it's a great partnership between a hospital and a radiology practice located at a medical hub that the hospital had already invested in and you have SoNE network physicians. And you'll also see in the data that 90 percent of the referrals for the existing imaging services at the medical hub come from SoNE network physicians. So you can see this is really a network focused initiative.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'll also note that the Bloomfield MRI and CT that was established, that has shown that 93 percent of the MRI and CT referrals come from SoNE network physicians, and the value of the SoNE network has also been demonstrated with the Medicare Shared Savings Program. I mean -- well, I want to be clear to respect the distinctions. SoNE owns ACO. That's the Trinity Health of New England ACO LLC, and that ACO participates in the Medicare Shared Saving Program. And what you'll see in the data is in 2020 they had extraordinary savings to the Medicare program, and they receive a lot of money back. And it's because of their efforts that have, I think, spanned decades in terms of looking at how to shift into value-based care and being the leader of that. So when it comes to identity of who's filling the need, I

can't think of anyone better.

And I also want to say that when it comes to patient choice, diversity of providers, you know, this is in the statutory criteria.

Allowing Saint Francis in its joint venture with its radiology practice to have similar imaging capabilities and access points as its competitor is, I think, important to allow and preserve for patient choice and diversity of providers.

so what I hope we can accomplish today is that if there's any of the findings that you feel you can't make in good faith today based on the information presented, in my mind that could only be the function of a miscommunication or something that needs to be clarified because, I mean, I think everything is just there and that this is something that you can make findings to approve. And if that's not the case, or you're just looking for clarifications and just want to know more about the project, we're glad we're here before you. And I think that Dr. Twohig and Kathy are going to be able to adequately answer all your questions.

So with that, thank you for your time, and I'll turn it over to Dr. Twohig so he can say

1 his piece. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So before we 3 get started, Dr. Twohig, can you just spell your 4 name for the record. As well, I'm also going to 5 swear you in as a witness. 6 DR. TWOHIG: Sure. It's T-W-O-H-I-G. 7 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. And your 8 first name is Michael, correct? 9 DR. TWOHIG: Yes. 10 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: All right. So 11 please raise your right hand. 12 MICHAEL TWOHIG, 13 having been first duly sworn (remotely) by 14 Hearing Officer Csuka, testified on his oath 15 as follows: 16 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank 17 So you can proceed with your testimony, and 18 you can say whatever you would like at this point. 19 DR. TWOHIG: Well, first of all, I'd 20 like to thank Attorney Rose for that great 21 introduction. I think he summarized a lot of our 22 work in this regard, and I would just like to give 23 a short introduction as well. 24 Good morning, Hearing Officer Csuka, 25 and esteemed members of the Office of Health

Strategy. My name, as you heard, is Dr. Michael Twohig, and I'm president of Rocky Hill Imaging Center and chairman of the Department of Radiology at Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center.

And, until my recent transition, I've also served as president of Radiology Associates of Hartford for almost two decades. I have also, beyond these roles, however, and near and dear to my heart, I've been a practicing neuroradiologist for the last 32 years. And I adopt my prefile testimony.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.

DR. TWOHIG: Thank you. I'm here today to attest that there is a clear public need for the CT and MR equipment that we are proposing and to explain why this application will bring true value to the communities we serve. Some of my remarks are redundant of those I made regarding RAH's Bloomfield application in 2020, but this proposal is part of the same vision to bring affordable high quality value-based advanced imaging into the communities served by Saint Francis Hospital. Very simple, this proposal addresses every consideration with respect to acquiring new advanced imaging equipment. There is a clear public need based on the application of

the agency's guidelines which will be discussed in more granular detail by my colleague to my left, Kathy Smith.

Beyond the numbers, CT and MR services at the Rocky Hill Medical Hub will generate value for patients and providers alike, all the while improving efficiencies, patient satisfaction and outcome. Patients enjoy receiving physician, laboratory and imaging services in a familiar and comfortable setting. This improved patient satisfaction translates into increased utilization and positive health outcomes.

And as one of my colleagues stated in their letter that they had sent in in support of this, if there's one thing the pandemic has taught us, especially with patients who are in his setting, sometimes immunosuppressed cancer patients, we need to have multiple access points to really allow us to continue treatment in light of the pandemic or whatever the next obstacle we face along the road towards health and recovery. We need to have these points of access to give us that diversity of access into the system in the face of unknown challenges like a pandemic.

Providers also find satisfaction in

being part of a rich environment of like-minded caregivers who understand that health care is a team sport. And in that medical hub they're able to work in that rich environment and not only provide care and support to the patients but support to one another. Our goal continues to be to improve care while lowering costs, and timely access to advanced imaging plays a critical role in these efforts.

You will find in the vast amount of materials we submitted -- in the materials we submitted a lot of information about who we are as a network, but nothing can really convey the excitement we feel being part of a larger health care system, Trinity Health of New England, that has such a positive defined mission and mandate to empower us as clinicians to find ways to improve health and have that principal be at the core of our financial model.

What's even better though is to have our efforts validated, as they have been recently, with the State of Connecticut Health Plan designating Saint Francis Hospital as a center for excellence for hip replacement and hip revision, knee replacement and knee revision, lumbar

laminectomy and lumbar spine fusion episodes of care. So it really recognizes the collective workings of the integrated network in providing this high level of care that has been identified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The proposal to have MR and CT at the medical hub will help us to enhance access to the services while also being able to control costs. Some of these services have historically been done at a hospital such as coronary CTA where we look at the arteries of the heart and CT preoperative planning for aortic valve replacement. And now moving them into the community not only will allow us to control cost, but do so, as I said earlier, in a comfortable and familiar environment. We don't want to lose sight, as Attorney Rose had said earlier, about the fact that RAH's imaging offices, particularly in Glastonbury, have been experiencing unprecedented growth in both MR and CT, and so added capacity to the network in the surrounding communities will also improve overall access to RAH's community-based imaging operations.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We respectfully request your approval of this application so that we may offer

1	these MR and and CT services to further bring our
2	network vision to our medical hub. Thank you.
3	And I would now like to turn over the testimony to
4	Kathy Smith, chief operating officer of Rocky Hill
5	Imaging Center, who will address some of the more
6	granular aspects of the data supporting a clear
7	public need for this proposal. Thank you.
8	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,
9	Doctor.
10	Ms. Smith, would you mind just stating
11	your name for the record and spelling your last
12	name as well?
13	MS. SMITH: Certainly Kathy Smith, and
14	it's spelled S-M-I-T-H.
15	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. So
16	I'm going to swear you in now.
17	KATHLEEN SMITH,
18	having been first duly sworn (remotely) by
19	Hearing Officer Csuka, testified on her oath
20	as follows:
21	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. And
22	do you adopt your prefile testimony?
23	MS. SMITH: I do.
24	HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.
25	Okay. You can proceed.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Hearing
Officer Csuka, and members of the Office of Health
Strategy staff. As you heard, my name is Kathy
Smith, and I am the chief operating officer of
Rocky Hill Imaging Center, LLC and the executive
director of Radiology Associates of Hartford which
manages the imaging center. I also serve as a
member of the Southern New England Health Care
Organization's Contracts & Finance Committee where
I actively participate in the review of regional
payer contracts for the organization and SoNE's
Bundles Valuation Committee. I adopt my prefile
testimony.

I've come before you today to testify as to how the information we have presented in our application and the documents that followed demonstrate the need for MRI and CT scanners that we are asking permission to install at our site at the Rocky Hill Medical Hub. My testimony is based on my personal experience managing RAH since 2011 where I joined following 11 years as the assistant director of radiology and imaging at Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center. In addition, I played a key role in the development of the joint venture between RAH and Saint Francis and the

development of the proposal before you today.

At the outset I want to apologize for any confusion regarding the data or other information that we presented in this process.

Our responses to the hearing issues, however, along with our testimony, will hopefully bring everything into focus regarding the clear public need for this proposal. You will see that we completed thorough diligence in addressing Hearing Issue No. 1 regarding clear public need. This is the product of my work with a CON consultant and Reid & Riege and involves a detailed analysis of our community and internal capacities that demonstrate the need for these scanners.

We trust that you will have the applicable pages from the standards and guidelines with you as you read the response because we organized the letters and numbers to track the sections noted on those pages. You can see that the percentages in the community and our internal capacities for both modalities are above the 85 percent threshold. We came to these numbers following the guidelines to a T. For example, the towns listed in the revised PSA are the product of using the actual utilization data of the imaging

services at the Medical Hub between January and May 2022. These towns generally track what we had projected prior to becoming operational with only a few additions.

With the revised PSA, we then followed the guidelines' instructions and quantified the scanners in the PSA which does not include the towns of West Hartford, New Britain, Bloomfield or Glastonbury. Additionally, since RAH does not have any scanners in the PSA, we did not include RAH's volumes in the internal capacity analysis. We only included the Saint Francis scanners on the hospital campus because they are located in Hartford which is part of the PSA. We recognize, however, that the focus on following the guidelines so closely may give the impression that RAH's volumes, if included, would show that RAH can address the need that we are trying to address with this proposal. This is not the case.

So to correct this potential misimpression, we submitted the supplemental tables that demonstrate that RAH is not in a position to address the need met by the scanners being proposed today as any office near the PSA is also above the agency's capacity thresholds. The

Glastonbury office, in particular, demonstrates the need for additional capacity in both modalities.

You've heard from Dr. Twohig how RAH and now the joint venture with the hospital have been enhancing access to value-based imaging services through the communities served by Saint Francis Hospital and the SoNE network physicians. We believe this enhanced access improves the quality of care for our population. And while adding scanners to enhance access may not seem cost efficient if you are only measuring how many scans you are producing on an individual scanner, it has been shown to be incredibly cost efficient when you look at the total cost of care and resulting savings, some of which are shared with us as part of our payer contracts.

Case in point, and as Attorney Rose mentioned, in 2020 our ACO saved Medicare \$22.4 million and therefore received approximately 16 million back in shared savings. RAH and SoNE providers were able to enjoy this share of the savings because of our willingness to bear financial risk up front which many providers are still reluctant to do.

In sum, adding the proposed MRI and CT scanners to our Rocky Hill Medical Hub in support of our Sone physicians and the patients they serve while preserving and enhancing access to services at the hospital and RAH's other sites is critical to our ability to continue to build a robust value-based clinically integrated network with access to advanced imaging in furtherance of our goal to improve patient health and control the total cost of care. I'm personally very proud to be part of this integral network and welcome your support with approval of this application.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Ms. Smith. And thank you, Dr. Twohig, again.

So Mr. Rose, unless you have any objection, I think we're going to proceed to questions from OHS staff.

MR. ROSE: No objection. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So Ms.

McLaughlin, I believe you're going to go up first,

correct?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And certainly if anybody has any issues hearing Yadira, just let us know and we'll make some corrections.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you, Dan.

For my first set of questions if you can turn to Exhibit A, the CON application. Okay. The first question is, on page 13 of the application it states, Based upon SFHMC patient experience, many SFHMC patients, especially older patients, would prefer to receive their medical care closer to their homes in a location with easy access and accessible parking. What data do you have to support this statement?

MS. SMITH: Saint Francis participates in Press Ganey surveys, and we had received feedback via those surveys that patients wanted to have more extensive services offered into the community.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And would you be willing to share any of the results of those surveys, or is there a way in which you are able to do that sort of compiled data or something along those lines?

MS. SMITH: I would need to work with our Saint Francis colleagues to compile that data.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. But to your knowledge, you think it would be possible, at least?

1 MS. SMITH: I do. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 3 you. 4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. My next 5 question is, on page 18 and throughout the 6 application the applicant mentions that both Saint 7 Francis and RAH are above capacity at their 8 existing imaging center locations. What 9 calculations were used to determine this 10 methodology, was it the OHS State Facilities Plan 11 or something different? 12 MS. SMITH: We used the OHS State 13 Facilities Plan to calculate the capacity. 14 Page 18. I just want to MR. ROSE: 15 make sure you're going to page 18. That's still 16 in Exhibit A, page 18? 17 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, we're still on 18 Exhibit A. 19 MR. ROSE: Okay. Yeah, I'm sorry, I'm 20 looking at, I see different percentages. 21 sorry, if you can direct us exactly to which of 22 the capacity statements you're referring to? 23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: On page 18 it should 24 be letter B. 25 Okay, I see. MR. ROSE: Yes. So

there's a representation about Jefferson

Radiology. And -- oh, thank you. So currently

both. Oh, okay. Yeah, so you're asking about

currently both Saint Francis and RAH are at or

above capacity and what calculations were used to

support that statement, right?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

MS. SMITH: The 2018 inventory.

MR. ROSE: I think they're asking --

MS. SMITH: I'm sorry.

MR. ROSE: They're asking about your internal capacity, so not the inventory. And so at this point I know that we had run your numbers in the hearing process using the exact standards and guidelines. Those calculations are not stated here. So she's asking did you do that exercise that you did for the hearing issues in part three to support the statement, or are you saying that Saint Francis and RAH were at or above capacity using some other measure. Is that correct, Yadira?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Were the calculations used to determine this methodology the OHS State Facilities Plan or something different, a different methodology?

1 MS. SMITH: That statement was made 2 based on our experience of how we're managing our 3 scanners at both locations, both Saint Francis and 4 RAH. 5 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 6 that answer your question, Ms. McLaughlin? 7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Thank you very 8 much. And we're still staying on Exhibit A for 9 the next question, same page. On page 18 of the 10 application and throughout the applicant mentions 11 data extraction and projections from Truven Market 12 Expert and Advisory Board projections. Can you 13 provide underlying data to support this? 14 MS. SMITH: Yes. 15 MR. ROSE: I'm sorry, if you have the 16 I missed the page number. And I don't 17 want to hold you guys up but --18 MS. SMITH: We're still on page 18, so 19 letter C. And Ms. McLaughlin is asking if we have 20 supporting data from the Truven and advisory data 21 that we reference. 22 MR. ROSE: Okay. 23 MS. SMITH: So yes, we can support that 24 and provide that to you. 25 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Just to be clear, there are a number of references to Truven Market Expert throughout the application. So we're not just looking for, well, correct me if I'm wrong, Yadira, but we're not just looking for what's on page 18 but any place in the application where that is referenced. Is that correct?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: That's correct.

MS. SMITH: We do have that data. I worked with a strategic analyst at Saint Francis Hospital on this project, and so we can put that together and certainly provide that to you.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. Okay.

Next --

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So we'll keep a list going here. And Attorney Rose, it looks like you're also diligently writing.

MR. ROSE: Yeah, I'm going to rely on you guys though.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So we'll discuss Late-Files towards the close of the hearing and how much time you think you might need once we figure out what the Late-Files actually are. There are no fewer than, I'd say, three people taking notes on what the Late-Files are, so

together I think we can probably get through this.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. SMITH: Great.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. And again, I'm staying on Exhibit A. On page 24 of the application the applicant states, "There will be no financing, and the capital contributions will be made by the two LLC members from their respective strategic operating budgets." However, on page 43 of the application there is a copy of a financing proposal. Can you please clarify would the proposed equipment be leased or financed?

MS. SMITH: So when I look at page -oh, 43 is the lease agreement with Siemens medical
systems. I just want to make sure I'm referencing
the correct page.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, you are.

MS. SMITH: Yes. So we did the buildout for the entire Rocky Hill Imaging Center, LLC with equal contributions between the applicants, Radiology Associates of Hartford, and Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center. Each took that money out of their operating budgets. It is our standard at Radiology Associates of Hartford in reference to page 43 to lease. It's

1 an operational lease. It will come out of the 2 operational budget which is funded equally between 3 both parties. We lease our equipment to give us 4 the flexibility to upgrade our equipment through 5 the life cycle. 6 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. And 7 who will be paying for the proposed equipment? The CT and MR, that comes 8 MS. SMITH: 9 out of the operating budget which is equally 10 funded by both Saint Francis Hospital and Medical 11 Center and Radiology Associates of Hartford. 12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And on 13 Exhibit A, page 16, specifically the letter C of 14 the application, the provider URL for UHC is 15 broken. Can you please provide a functional URL 16 or a hard copy as a Late-File? 17 On page 16. MS. SMITH: 18 And which link is broken? MR. ROSE: 19 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Page 16, the UHC. 20 MS. SMITH: Yes. Yes, we can. 21 MR. ROSE: One note though --22 I was just going to say --MS. SMITH: 23 MR. ROSE: We updated it. 24 MS. SMITH: We did update in the 25 hearing issues. Isn't that --

1 MR. ROSE: Yes. 2 MS. SMITH: -- updated? And I believe 3 the updated link is included in the hearing 4 issues. 5 MR. ROSE: Do you want us to turn your attention to where that link is? Because United 6 7 updated, and there's a policy that's effective as 8 of, I think, April of this year. 9 MS. SMITH: April of this year. UHC 10 updated their policy. 11 MR. ROSE: Yeah. And we did provide a 12 link to that. So perhaps the new one works which 13 obviously that will be the more relevant one at 14 this point. 15 So was that in your prefile testimony? 16 Sorry, we'll track that down real quick 17 here. 18 MS. SMITH: It's in the hearing issues. 19 MR. ROSE: Oh, I'm sorry, if it is, 20 then -- I'll check. Yeah, you're right, it is in the hearing issues. A lot of trees died and 21 22 sacrificed for this proposal. 23 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I think the 24 same goes for any CON proposal. 25 (Laughter.)

1	MR. ROSE: So that would have been
2	probably
3	MS. SMITH: It's on page 20 of the
4	response to the hearing issues.
5	MR. ROSE: So that's Exhibit V, as in
6	"Victor."
7	MS. SMITH: It's the fourth bullet
8	down.
9	MS. McLAUGHLIN: I see it. Thank you.
10	MS. SMITH: You're welcome.
11	MS. McLAUGHLIN: Similar question, page
12	36 of the application, the provider URL for Cigna
13	is broken.
14	MS. SMITH: We can take that as a
15	Late-File. I believe that policy has been updated
16	as well. I just referenced it recently myself.
17	But we are happy to provide that as a Late-File.
18	MR. ROSE: Do you want the most recent
19	same as United, whatever is in effect today?
20	MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.
21	MR. ROSE: Okay. So Late-File, Cigna.
22	And what page was that referenced on?
23	MS. SMITH: 36.
24	MR. ROSE: 36. Okay.
25	MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. So

1 my next set of questions, you can turn to Exhibit 2 C, the applicant's responses to first completeness 3 letter. Okay. Please turn to page 119 of Exhibit 4 There are significant increases between the 5 actual and projected MRI and CT body scans. What 6 is the basis for these increases? 7 MS. SMITH: We submitted at this time 8 the calendar year 2021, I believe that was through 9 May of 2021, and moved forward to make the 10 projections. The volume increase, we had seen a 11 significant increase in volume, but we 12 overprojected those numbers. You will see as part 13 of the supplemental table that we submitted that 14 the actual volumes were, we have demonstrated a 15 significant growth, but those volumes are 16 overstated. 17 MR. ROSE: All of them? 18 MS. SMITH: Not all of them, just the 19 Glastonbury MRI. 20 MR. ROSE: What about Enfield and 21 Bloomfield? 22 Enfield and Bloomfield we MS. SMITH: 23 actually exceeded those projections. 24 So you underprojected for MR. ROSE: 25

those?

1 MS. SMITH: We underprojected. Let me 2 just backtrack here a little bit. So we 3 underprojected Enfield and Bloomfield MRI. The 4 only overprojection was Glastonbury MRI. You'll 5 note in the Glastonbury CT that is also underprojected. We overperformed that number as 6 7 well. 8 MR. ROSE: Okay. 9 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. 10 DR. TWOHIG: Glastonbury MR was down 11 for a period of time. 12 MR. LAZARUS: This is Steve Lazarus. 13 Just for clarification, so the volumes you 14 projected, would they need to be revised because 15 of what was submitted yesterday? 16 MR. ROSE: Yeah. So because these are 17 projections -- I mean, if you asked us what we 18 project for 2022, then we'd absolutely say that 19 what we submitted in the supplemental table should 20 supplant any 2022 projections because those are 21 actually -- numbers based on actual data because 22 obviously the passage of time. 23 Okay. So these replaced MR. LAZARUS: 24 the original projections then? 25 MR. ROSE: Yeah. Well, they're

annualized, so you can call annualized projections. So yes, if you want to take the table that we gave, I think we did actually add up the numbers in terms of the totals for the annualized versus the totals for our projected. And Kathy, I need you to verify that the totals for the three offices -- I actually don't want to speak to the data. But I will very succinctly say, Steve, that yes our projected 2022 volumes for scanners should be supplanted by the table

MR. LAZARUS: Okay.

data that you have.

MR. ROSE: So if you want to know where we're going to be at 12/31/2022 in terms of what we think the final volumes would be, please refer to the supplemental table.

MS. SMITH: And to Adam's point, these were projected in June of 2020. So with the passage of time we obviously have more accurate annualized data for 2022.

MR. LAZARUS: All right. Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Sorry for the long road to a short answer.

MR. LAZARUS: We got there. That's all that matters.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And remaining on Exhibit C, page 119, as originally asked by OHS in Question No. 10, please provide the actual cost comparison for CT and MRI scans at the proposed imaging center compared to hospital and hospital outpatient department imaging cost per scan.

MS. SMITH: So we did provide to the agency an average difference of 5.1 percent between the hospital and the RAH offices. I can share with you that the hospital has made a concerted effort to decrease their imaging fees for patients. The policies, as we've referenced between Cigna, Anthem and UnitedHealthcare, even with a decrease in those fees, the payers are still actively steering patients into the outpatient market and away from the hospital site of service.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Ms. McLaughlin,

I think -- so you're looking for more information
relating to cost per scan rather than like the
ratio that the different -- the difference between
hospital and outpatient, right?

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Cost per scan, correct.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Is that provided anywhere in the application or anywhere else?

MR. ROSE: In the completeness responses. So I'll tell you what exhibit, so one second. I could tell you it's 176 of the CON application, but I'm just trying to see where it is. Oh, is it in this same exhibit?

MS. SMITH: I think I have it. It's right here.

MR. ROSE: I'm sorry, it's Exhibit E.

MS. SMITH: No, G. Exhibit G.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Exhibit G as in "go," and page 176. And if you guys don't mind, as a jumping off point, I think, Yadira, this is related to your question, and you can tell me if it's off point, when we saw that exhibit about the All-Payer database uploaded and we looked at it -- so, I mean, I understand that you guys are trying to get a sense of, well, how are we competitive with costs, how do we relate, what is our, you know. And I think, and correct me if I'm wrong, if you added Radiology Associates of Hartford in Glastonbury, in particular, but I think it will be any --

MS. SMITH: Radiology Associates of Hartford.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So if you took what you did MR. ROSE: on that exhibit for the All-Payer Claims Database and you included Radiology Associates of Hartford, those are going to be the same cost points that relate to this joint venture. So that would allow you to look at apples to apples. But when you try to, you know, talk about, well, what is the average cost, even among, say, commercial payers, there's so many ins and outs to it. I'm trying to nail my own client down on these measures. It's just very difficult because you keep getting different variables back. But in our discussion we were thinking, well, the All-Payer Claims Database, you had your search parameters in there, and apparently that was coming up with other providers and their reported numbers, and there was the average that was right there in the middle and then there was the median towards the end with dollar amounts for various procedures. So if you added Radiology Associates of Hartford to that in your search parameters, so maybe open it up to Glastonbury and then just look at what are the reports in Glastonbury or any other office, I

1 think that will get you the cost comparison that 2 you're looking for. So is that on point? 3 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Steve, is that 4 something that we are able to do with APCD? 5 MR. LAZARUS: We should be able to pull 6 it up, but it would be also helpful to make sure 7 that maybe the applicants can provide that as well 8 so we can actually just verify that. 9 MS. SMITH: So we fill in that exact 10 spreadsheet that you had by those CPT codes that 11 are listed. 12 MR. LAZARUS: I think that would be 13 very helpful, especially since they're going to 14 match up the same CPT codes because that can be 15 the problem sometimes. 16 MS. SMITH: So even though -- and I 17 understand it can't have the CPT codes. That's a public payer issue. But on the copy that I 18 19 supplied to you I'll include the CPT codes and a 20 description of the CPT code with all of the 21 respective columns. Would that satisfy that 22 request? 23 MR. LAZARUS: Yes, I think that would 24 be helpful. We can take that as a Late-File. 25 MR. ROSE: Okay. So as long as you

know what you're reporting.

MS. SMITH: I do.

MR. ROSE: Okay. I'm going to leave it good.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And my last question on Exhibit C is on page 22 -- I'm sorry, page 122. The applicant provided a draft operating agreement between Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center and Radiology Associates of Hartford for Rocky Hill Imaging Center. Please provide an executed copy of the final operating agreement as a Late-File.

MS. SMITH: We would be happy to.

MR. ROSE: Just one question about that. I assume that you guys won't have any issue with anything that's proprietary or sensitive being redacted.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Steve can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think in past applications we've asked that the original document be sent directly by email to us and you provide a redacted version on the portal.

MR. ROSE: Okay. And with the caveat then that you guys will protect anything that we redacted for FOIA purposes obviously. So FOIA has

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all the exceptions as long as we're on the same page with the materials that we redact. obviously if you think we overredacted and we don't fit a FOIA exception, please let us know, but I think that's generally the principal there that if we redact it the public won't be able to see it, but we're fine with you guys seeing it.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes. I think if you email a copy to us, the unredacted copy, the hearing officer will review it and actually decide what's confidential, and we will label it as such, and that would not be available. And the redacted copy can be uploaded to the portal.

MR. ROSE: Okay. So are you guys going to redact and then upload, is that what you're saying?

MS. SMITH: We redact it for the portal. They redact it for FOIA but they should let us know what --

MR. LAZARUS: There will be a clean copy and a redacted copy, but a clean copy can be sent directly via email and not through the portal.

> Okay. MR. ROSE:

MR. LAZARUS: And then you can send it

1 to me or anybody, and then we will make sure it 2 gets forwarded to the hearing officer who will 3 then review it to make the call whether it's 4 acceptable to label it as confidential. 5 MR. ROSE: Okay. And is it okay if we email it to you? 6 7 MR. LAZARUS: That's fine. 8 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: And if you want 9 to use any sort of encrypted email methodology, 10 that's fine as well. 11 MR. ROSE: Thank you. 12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And my 13 last set of questions will be focused on Exhibit 14 V, "V" as in "Victor," applicant's final responses 15 to hearing issues. 16 MR. ROSE: "V" as in "Victor"? 17 MS. SMITH: "V" as in "Victor"? I'm 18 sorry. 19 MS. McLAUGHLIN: "V." 20 MS. SMITH: I'm sorry. 21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay? 22 MS. SMITH: Uh-huh. 23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. So on page 15 24 of the application the PSA, primary service area, 25 was based off of a 10-minute drive to the medical

1 hub. On page 4 of Exhibit V the rationale for the 2 updated primary service area towns is based on 75 3 percent of applicant's patients. Please clarify 4 the "applicant" for this statement. Is the Saint 5 Francis and RAH? 6 MS. SMITH: It's actually the Rocky 7 Hill Imaging Center. 8 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: At the medical 9 hub, correct? 10 MS. SMITH: At the medical hub, that's 11 correct. 12 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Please clarify, are 75 13 percent of the patients from Saint Francis or from 14 the medical hub? 15 MS. SMITH: From the Rocky Hill Imaging 16 Center at the medical hub. So it's based on the 17 actual patient utilization of the imaging services 18 that we're providing at the Rocky Hill Imaging Center at the Medical Hub to date from January 19 20 18th of this year to May 31st of this year. 21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. On page 4 22 of the same Exhibit V, the applicant provided an 23 updated PSA, primary service area, adding three

additional towns. Based on the OHS inventory,

there are other existing providers in the

24

25

contiguous areas. Why were they omitted from the final PSA?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SMITH: Why were contiguous towns omitted.

I mean, I can answer. MR. ROSE: The reason is because when the standards and guidelines ask you to apply the methodology, the need methodology, they ask you to quantify the scanners in the PSA. But if there's a reference to also including contiguous towns to the PSA, certainly point that out. But our reading of how do you do your needs analysis is that you literally just, first off, the PSA is a specific definition. I have it in front of me, but I'm sure you guys are familiar with it on page 60. And reading from it, the PSA is that geographic area by town for the services location in the application consisting of the lowest number of contiguous zip codes from which the applicant draws at least 75 percent of its patients for this service at such location. So that gets you to your primary service area.

And then when you do your actual need methodology and Section 3 on page 61, and I'm using the MRI one, 3A says the applicant is

expected to demonstrate that the percentage utilization of current capacity in the primary service area exceeds 85 percent. So in that calculation you wouldn't include any towns outside the service area. So, you know, you guys reserve the right to, you know, want the information and to ask the questions, and so I note that in the responses to the hearing issues where you did ask about other existing providers and why they weren't included from other towns, first off, I'd refer you to that answer that has been adopted by Kathy as part of her prefile testimony, so that would be page 23 of Exhibit V. And so that response was intended to, I think, get to this question. And if we didn't exactly hit the mark, we're happy to address any follow-up questions you have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So Mr. Lazarus,

Ms. McLaughlin, are you seeking a Late-File

relating to contiguous towns outside of the PSA or

not based on what Mr. Rose just said on behalf of

his clients?

MR. LAZARUS: This is Steve Lazarus. I think it would be helpful to have the contiguous

towns submitted with the providers in those towns.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSE: Yeah. I think we can -we've looked at that and we still think -- I mean, I can tell you ten ways to Tuesday clear public need is proven for this, and so we have looked at that so we're happy to give you the same analysis including those towns. But I will say prior to doing that that we think that, you know, the need -- so when you say contiguous towns, it starts to get to very loose. And when you look at sort of practical realities of, you know, do we think somebody seeking services at the medical hub should be redirected to West Hartford, it starts to come -- what starts to come into play is that, you know, there's very practical reasons why those patients would not likely access those resources or it wouldn't be optimal, but we'll spare you those explanations. But I just want to make sure that on the record we have that caveat that the plan contemplated that you only quantify what's in But with that, we will give you this the PSA. additional data, and I think you will see it continues to support the need for the proposal.

MR. LAZARUS: Thank you. And I think it would be fine if you do want to include an

explanation as to why those towns are not included. You're welcome to do that.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. Still on Exhibit V, staying on Exhibit V, can you please turn to page 5. The applicant provided updated projection data for MRI scan volume and capacity. How were these projections calculated? Can you provide a quantitative calculation for the projected volumes for each of the three projected years?

MS. SMITH: We did look at the capacity in the region in the PSA, and we did rely heavily on the Advisory Board Imaging Performance Market Estimator to look at their depth of knowledge and what they project for imaging volume. So we do have copies of that, and we'd be happy to supply that as well.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: Great. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: What was that
again? I'm sorry.

MS. SMITH: We relied heavily on the Advisory Board's Aging Performance Market Estimator. And we do have that. We'd be able to supply that to you in a Late-File.

1 |

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay.

2

MS. SMITH: It's based on the PSA.

3

MR. LAZARUS: So I think if you can

4

provide the data but also if you can include -- so

5

I think that would be very helpful. But I think

6

also it would be helpful to have the actual

7

calculation that gets us to the projections. So

8

however you arrived at those projections it would

9

be helpful to have that with the backup data.

10

MR. ROSE: And just to clarify, so

11

these projections are the same projections that

12

were in application, just pushed out a year.

MR. ROSE: And so I just want to make

13

MR. LAZARUS: Uh-huh.

14

MS. SMITH: That's correct.

15

sure I understand, at least, so I can help Kathy

16

17

with what we're providing.

18

MR. LAZARUS: So you said you based

19

them on this imaging advisory board material,

20

which is fine, so we're happy to have that. But

21

if we can actually have some sort of a calculation

22

that gets us to the numbers saying based on this,

23

this is what we used as a basis, this is what we

24

projected out as a percentage based on what, and

25

then this is how we got to each of the year's

1 projections. So actually I'm just trying to 2 quantify it with a backup. 3 MR. ROSE: Again, I'm ten steps behind. 4 She says she's got it so --5 MS. SMITH: Yeah, we have it. 6 MR. LAZARUS: Thank you. 7 MS. SMITH: We're happy to supply that. 8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. And 9 Exhibit V, please provide updated projected CT 10 scan volume and capacity for 2023, 2024 and 2025, 11 as provided for the MRI, and also provide a 12 quantitative calculation for the projected volumes 13 for each of the three projected years as a 14 Late-File. 15 MS. SMITH: That's what we just talked 16 about, correct? 17 MS. MILLER: CT and MRI. 18 MS. SMITH: Oh, CT and MRI separately. 19 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Right. 20 MR. LAZARUS: So we can include that in 21 that same Late-File, just if you can break it out 22 by CT and MRI. 23 MS. SMITH: That's correct. 24 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you. And 25 still on Exhibit V, page 15, the apartment and the

1	mention that's RAH has observed a steady growth of
2	lung cancer screening over the years. Can you
3	provide articles and data from other locations to
4	support these statements?
5	MS. SMITH: In addition to the
6	footnotes on this page?
7	MS. SMITH: I'm sorry. Could you
8	repeat your request, Ms. McLaughlin?
9	MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Page 15. The
10	applicant mentions that RAH has observed a steady
11	growth of lung cancer screening over the years.
12	Can you provide articles and data from other
13	locations to support this statement?
14	MR. ROSE: Do you want so that
15	statement is related to RAH's personal experience
16	in growth and volume. Would you like to see the
17	RAH volume?
18	MS. SMITH: Over the years to
19	demonstrate that?
20	MR. LAZARUS: Yes, please.
21	MR. ROSE: Okay. So you just want data
22	to support that statement
23	MR. LAZARUS: Yes.
24	MR. ROSE: what we're looking at to
25	make that observation?

1 MR. LAZARUS: Exactly, yes. 2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. 3 So that's a Late-File. MR. ROSE: Do 4 you know what you're doing on that? 5 MS. SMITH: Exactly. 6 MR. ROSE: Okay. RAH data to support 7 growth in lung cancer screening. 8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. And on page 23 9 of the same Exhibit V, the applicant mentions that 10 RAH has been experiencing strong volumes at its 11 community-based imaging sites. Can you clarify 12 what is a community-based site? 13 MS. SMITH: Those are each of our 14 imaging centers in Avon, Glastonbury, Bloomfield 15 and Enfield, our existing imaging centers. I was 16 going to say has been submitted in various --17 MR. ROSE: Yeah, it's a semantics 18 thing, and we apologize for using different -- so 19 sometimes we refer to them as imaging, like RAH's 20 offices, sometimes we call them imaging sites. 21 Sometimes we clarify and say, well, RAH's 22 community-based imaging sites because -- so RAH as 23 a practice does to the professional services at 24 various hospitals in the area, but they don't own 25 equipment. It's not their own. So that was just

1 a way of basically saying RAH's technical 2 component operations in the communities. But it 3 is just Glastonbury, CT in Avon, and then 4 Enfield --5 MS. SMITH: And Bloomfield. 6 MR. ROSE: And Bloomfield. So both 7 modalities are provided at all locations except 8 for Avon where RAH does the CT and the hospital 9 does the MRI. 10 MR. LAZARUS: All right. Got it. 11 Thank you. I think that helps clarify. I think 12 we got caught up on the community-based site 13 versus an office site. Thank you. That helps. 14 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. That wraps 15 it up for me and my questions. Thank you for your 16 answers. 17 MS. SMITH: Thank you. 18 MR. ROSE: Thank you. 19 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Mr. Lazarus, do 20 you have any questions? 21 MR. LAZARUS: No, I do not. Thank you. 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 23 Attorney Rose, did you have any follow-up on 24 anything that came up over the past hour and a 25 half that you wanted to address with your

witnesses?

MR. ROSE: I want to make sure that we understand the Late-Files. At the end of this I think we'll probably, but before I do that, I want to make sure that some of the things that we nodded our head like, oh, yeah, we know what we're doing. So if we can go offline for a bit and I can go to my notes and look at all the Late-Files and we can make sure that at least we understand it. Collectively if we understand, then okay. But if there's ones where we have different views on what we think we're giving you, I think it would be helpful after a quick break that we kind of outline those for you so then you can tell us more specifically what you were envisioning.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I was actually going to suggest that we do that after the public comment, if there is any. That way you'll have even more time to figure it out and so that we don't need a break now and then come back for a few minutes and then break again.

MR. ROSE: Yeah, that sounds fine.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So does that work for you, Yadira, and you, Steve?

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, that's fine.

1 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So we 3 will have closing argument or comments after the 4 public comment, if there is any public comment. I 5 wish there was a way for us to move things further 6 up into the day, but due to the way these hearings 7 proceed, it's just the way we have to do it here. 8 So we will have the public hearing 9 sign-up between 2 and 3. And if anybody signs up, 10 we will hear their perspective at 3 o'clock. And 11 then we will sort of wrap up the -- tie up the 12 loose ends and adjourn the hearing at that point. 13 Does that work for you, Attorney Rose? 14 MR. ROSE: Yeah, sounds good. 15 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. And 16 certainly if anything comes up over the break that 17 you'd like to address, we can address that at the 18 back end as well. 19 MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you guys for 20 your time. 21 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you. 22 MS. SMITH: Appreciate it. 23 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. We 24 will see you a little later. 25 I hope you guys get outside. MR. ROSE:

It looks like a beautiful day.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. And we are adjourned for right now.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 11:27 a.m. until 3:01 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Welcome back. For those just joining us, this is the second portion of today's hearing concerning a CON application filed by Rocky Hill Imaging Center. It's docketed as 21-32439-CON. We had the technical portion of the hearing this morning, and now we are moving on to the public comment portion.

We will call the names of those who have signed up to speak in the order in which they are registered. I understand that at least one of the doctors who has pre-registered has patients though, so that may require us to go a little bit out of order. If we miss anyone, please utilize the raise hand function, if that's available to us. I know we were having some issues with the chat function in Zoom. So if that's not working, feel free to just make your presence known, and we'll be happy to hear from you.

Speaking time is limited to three

minutes. Please do not be dismayed if we stop you at the conclusion of your time. We want to be fair in how those comments are presented. Additionally, we strongly encourage you to submit any further written comments to OHS by email or mail no later than one week, seven calendar days, from today. And contact information is on our website and on the public information sheet which you were provided at the beginning of this hearing.

Thank you for taking the time to be here today and for your cooperation. We are now ready to hear statements from the public. Leslie Greer from our office has been kind enough to keep a list of individuals who have submitted their names. So I may need her assistance with this. Anyone speaking, I would just remind you to turn your video and microphone on before you begin talking.

So we are going to begin, I believe, with Lucio Ciogli. Is that correct, Ms. Greer?

MS. GREER: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. So Mr. Ciogli, please state your name for the record and be sure to spell it as well, if you don't

mind, and then you can continue with your comment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LUCIO CIOGLI: Thank you. My name is Lucio Ciogli. That is spelled L-U-C-I-O, C-I-O-G-L-I. My family lives in Rocky Hill, and we have been cared for by many physicians and people with Saint Francis Hospital. We're part of the SoNE network. My mother passed away a few years ago from lung cancer and complications from an underlying heart condition. My father followed last year after a long battle with Leukemia. During this time, there were many trips to see physicians, including specialists in oncology and cardiology. There were also many visits to the hospital and many diagnostic imaging tests with CT and MRI provided by the providers at RAH which were critical in guiding their care. Through it all, the specialists and doctors with Saint Francis were all supportive and worked together as a team to provide my parents with the best care possible.

During this time, I came to appreciate how the radiologists at RAH help guide my parents' care through their imaging services and how they were an integral part of the care team as we worked through managing their cancer and my

mother's heart issues. My family and I continue to have our care with Saint Francis and the affiliated providers that are part of their network. I'm excited that there is now a Trinity access site here in my community, and that will include advanced imaging services with CT and MRI provided by RAH pending approval of this CON.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There were many times when my parents were ill. My family had to transport them across town for care with their providers, including CT and MRI services, at either the hospital or other imaging sites in the network. This was a burden to my family as we had to juggle jobs, child care with caring for my parents to obtain access to our providers and services. I was fortunate to have had the support system and resources to help manage this situation, but the majority of families faced with these care scenarios do not. Having access to our physicians, providers and imaging services here in Rocky Hill back then would have made things much easier for us over the years, and there are many others who live here in Wethersfield and Rocky Hill who have similar hurdles in accessing care. They'll benefit greatly from the new Trinity access center and the imaging services from RAH.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for your time in allowing me to provide this comment. And I would just like to add that I give my full support to this application. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Mr. Ciogli. I believe next on the list is Susan "Albano" or "Albono." Is she with us right now? MS. ALBANO: Yes, I am. My name is Susan Albano. That's S-U-S-A-N, A-L-B-A-N-O. Good afternoon, Hearing Officer Csuka, members of the Office of Health Strategy and my colleagues at Radiology Associates of Hartford. I'm the chief executive officer of Prime Healthcare. Prime Healthcare is a 70 provider primary care driven multi-specialty group with offices located throughout the greater Hartford area as well as Tolland and New Haven Counties. With approximately 20,000 (inaudible), we are the largest private practice group in the Southern New England Health Care Organization, which is also known as SoNE. Our group works collaboratively with other providers in SoNE on population health initiatives and the delivery of clinically

integrated care to the patients that we mutually

serve.

I'm here today to express our support for the Rocky Hill Imaging Center Certificate of Need application for a CT scanner and MRI to be located in the new Trinity Health Medical Hub in Rocky Hill. Prime Healthcare relies heavily on our colleagues at Radiology Associates of Hartford to provide timely high quality imaging within our network. Our providers depend on the coordination of care with the radiology providers reading patient visits prior to interpretation as well as access to comparison imaging performed throughout our network.

The Prime Healthcare providers are well versed in network integrity as it pertains to Medicare shared savings and other at-risk contracts. With two of our offices located in Wethersfield, the location of the Rocky Hill Imaging Center will provide enhanced access for our patients who live in Rocky Hill and the surrounding communities, thus assisting our providers in meeting their goals.

I'm appreciative of your time today and the opportunity to speak before you in support of the Rocky Hill Imaging Center CON application, and thank you for your time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

though.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, Ms. Next on the list is Dr. James Albano. Vredenburgh. Is he with us at the moment? DR. VREDENBURGH: I am. Thank you, sir, yes. So the last name is "V" as in "Victor," R-E-D-E-N-B-U-R-G-H. First name is James. the neuro-oncologist here at Saint Francis Hospital. So we take care of brain tumor patients, spinal tumor patients, spinal cord compression. It's critically important as we take care of these patients to have timely access to MRI, less so CT, but the MRIs are really critically important to keep these patients in the State of Connecticut and to be able to care for

The more important part is my collaboration. I have to meet with the neurosurgeons, the neurologist, radiation therapist, and we work through the neuroradiologist at RAH in order to provide compassionate and timely care. I think we really expanded our neuro-oncology program, and I think having an imaging facility in Rocky Hill will

them locally. It's not just access to the MRIs

1 further enhance our ability to care for these very 2 sick patients. I appreciate the opportunity to 3 speak. 4 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 5 Next on the list I believe it's Dr. Doctor. 6 Richard Shumway. Is he here? I don't see him 7 listed. 8 DR. SHUMWAY: Yes. 9 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: There he is. 10 DR. SHUMWAY: I just had to turn on my 11 microphone. 12 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank 13 you. 14 DR. SHUMWAY: I'm Dr. Richard Shumway. 15 It's R-I-C-H-A-R-D. Last name, S-H-U-M-W-A-Y. 16 I'm a senior attending physician in radiation 17 oncology at Saint Francis, and I'm a director of 18 the Connecticut CyberKnife Center at Saint 19 Francis. And so I've been here for over 30 years. 20 And in my specialty, which really evolved in the 21 past 10, 20 years with treating cancer with 22 radiation, is that we use what's called image 23 guidance. So pretty much all of our treatments 24 are planned using sort of very precise MRI and CT 25

scans. And this is critical to have these scans

available on a timely basis.

And what I've noticed over the past several years since MRIs and CTs have become more involved in all of medicine that it's become more and more difficult to obtain a scan on a timely basis. So in fact, yesterday I had a patient with a cancer going into his spinal cord, and we had to make phone call after phone call in order to find a scan that could be done on a timely basis. And so this evening they're going to be staying after hours to image this patient.

And what's also important is we need to have these scans available that are connected to the Saint Francis system because we import these images and use them to plan our radiation treatments. And so many of our patients live in the Rocky Hill area, and up until now it's been very difficult finding scans that are available on a timely basis in that area. So I greatly support the introduction of CT and MRI at the Rocky Hill Center. Thank you for your time.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,

Doctor. Next on the list is Karen Letizio. Is
she here?

MS. LETIZIO: Yes, I am. Can you hear

me?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I can, yes. I can't see your video though. There you are.

MS. LETIZIO: Okay?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes.

MS. LETIZIO: Good afternoon, Attorney Csuka, and officials of the Office of Health Strategy. My name is Karen Letizio, K-A-R-E-N, Letizio, L-E-T-I-Z-I-O. I am a resident of Wethersfield, Connecticut. Several members of my family have had services provided by Radiology Associates of Hartford as well as being patients of various physicians across several specialties all within Southern New England Healthcare, Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Network.

I'm here today to speak to you about my husband, Vinny. In 2001 Vinny had a CT scan at Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center interrupted by a RAH physician indicating a strong likelihood of pancreatic cancer in the tail of his pancreas. The identification of a mass allowed him to have it surgically removed, and I am blessed and happy to report that Vinny remains in good health today.

In the 11 years since the scan, Vinny

has seen many providers of the network. With very few exceptions, Vinny's imaging has been performed at Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center or the RAH Glastonbury office. As we face the same time challenges that many working patients face, we were thrilled to learn of the Medical Hub opening so close to our home. This location will provide Vinny access in our community to the doctors that manage his care. As MR imaging is a regular component to monitor his health, knowing that we have access close to home makes coordinating appointments in our busy lives that much easier. It also ensures the same outstanding care by the providers we are so used to and honestly helped to save Vinny's life. We are eternally grateful to all of these outstanding caregivers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I ask for your support of the Rocky
Hill Imaging Center Certificate of Need
application. I understand the value it brings to
my family and what I believe it will bring to the
community. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you,

Ms. Letizio. Next on the list, I believe the last

one as well, is Dr. David Silver.

1

DR. SILVER: Yes. Can you hear me?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes.

3

DR. SILVER: Can you see me?

4

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Yes.

5

DR. SILVER: Okay. Just checking. My

6

last name is spelled just like the metal,

7

S-I-L-V-E-R, first name David.

8

Good morning, Hearing Officer Csuka,

9

and members of the Office of Health Strategy. My

10

name is Dr. David Silver. I am the medical

11

director for the Trinity Medical Group Medical Hub

12

in Rocky Hill. I am pleased to share with you

13

today my reasons for supporting the CON

14

application for the CT scanner and MRI scanner

15

proposed to be located within the Medical Hub.

16

board certified by the American Board of Internal

I am a primary care physician. I am

17 18

Medicine. I've been in private practice and work

19

for other healthcare systems. The Rocky Hill

20

Medical Hub presents an opportunity for patients

21

to have immediate local access to high quality,

22

low cost imaging. Since the opening in January

23

2022, the physicians who practice at the Medical

24

Hub have found it incredibly beneficial to the

25 management of patients to having immediate access

1 to medical imaging within the building. The 2 service has been extraordinary. The addition of 3 the CT scan and MRI in this location will allow 4 patients to obtain high-tech imaging and allow the 5 results to be discussed with the patients within 6 the same location literally at the same visit. 7 This creates an improved level of care to the 8 patient in a convenient setting. 9 As providers, we are challenged with 10 ensuring we manage our patient population at the 11 highest level of care in the lowest cost setting. 12 This application has my support and it meets both these objectives. I strongly support the Rocky 13 14 Hill Imaging Center CON application for a CT scan 15 and MRI at the Medical Hub location. Thank you. 16 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 17 Doctor. 18 Ms. Greer, do we have anyone else who 19 signed up? 20 MS. GREER: No, we do not have anyone else signed up. 21 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. And is 23 there anyone else present who would like to be 24 heard?

(No response.)

25

you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Ms. McLaughlin and Mr. Lazarus, do you have any questions for the applicant based on what you heard from the public today?

MR. LAZARUS: No, I don't. Thank you.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: No, I do not. Thank

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. Thank you. So we are going to move on. I guess we should discuss the Late-File first and the timeline in terms of when that Late-File should be submitted. So I think the best place to start would be to have, Steve, I think we decided you were going to list what we determined were the Late-Files. So maybe let's start with No. 1 and we'll just take them one at a time and make sure everybody is on the same page.

MR. LAZARUS: Sure. So I have a total of eight Late-Files, and I'll start reading through each one. The first one is copies of the survey or supporting material regarding what Saint Francis Hospital Medical Center customers have requested related to the location of services.

Do the applicants concur on that one?

MR. ROSE: So what we did is we

1 underlined that sentence on page 13 about the 2 statement about the challenges of accessibility at 3 Saint Francis Hospital and how that translates 4 into older patients, in particular, wanting to 5 access, you know, better parking lots and easier, 6 more comfortable care. So we underlined that one 7 sentence, and we're going to go and get survey 8 data from the hospital where people make basically 9 statements about the accessibility. 10 MR. LAZARUS: Okay. That's fine. I've 11 added the word accessibility in mine just so we 12 can make sure we are on the same page. 13 (Late-File No. 1, noted in index.) 14 MR. LAZARUS: And so No. 2 is 15 supporting data used throughout the application 16 for Truven Market Experts and Advisory Board. 17 Does that make sense, No. 2? 18 MS. SMITH: Yes. 19 DR. TWOHIG: Yes. 20 MR. ROSE: Yes. 21 (Late-File No. 2, noted in index.) 22 MR. LAZARUS: Okay. No. 3 is provide a 23 working URL for the current Cigna guidelines. 24 DR. TWOHIG: Yes. 25 MS. SMITH: Yes.

1 (Late-File No. 3, noted in index.) 2 MR. LAZARUS: Okay. No. 4, an updated 3 exhibit to include cost comparison of CPT codes 4 and costs related data for the CT and MRI. 5 MR. ROSE: Yeah. And on that one, the 6 way that the All-Payer Claims Database was 7 submitted, blinded the exact CPT codes to, I 8 assume, protect the market competitiveness of the 9 exact pricing information. So we can give you the 10 CPT level data, but we'd like to do the same thing 11 where we email that to you and then upload to the 12 portal something that looks more like the blinded 13 that you sent us as a public exhibit related to 14 the other providers. 15 MR. LAZARUS: Hearing Officer, your 16 opinion? 17 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I don't have 18 any issues with that if that will provide you with 19 the same amount of information. 20 MR. LAZARUS: Yeah, we should be okay 21 with that. 22 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. 23 MR. LAZARUS: So yeah, you can email us 24 a copy of the list of the CPT codes. 25 Okay. MR. ROSE:

1

(Late-File No. 4, noted in index.)

MR. LAZARUS: And then No. 5, final

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

executed copy of the agreement between Saint Francis Hospital Medical Center and RAH for the Rocky Hill Imaging Center Medical Hub. And in this case I think we're asking for both the redacted and unredacted form. And it may be best if you just email us both instead of uploading This way we can, I can have it actually reviewed by the hearing officer. Once we agree what a redacted copy is, and then we will upload it. So I will make that clear. I will also

provide you a copy of this list later afterwards, I'll email it to you, Attorney Rose, so you have it to work off as well.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: On that point, I was just going to suggest that we do it as a letter.

> MR. LAZARUS: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Just confirming everybody's understanding as to what the Late-Files are going to be.

MR. LAZARUS: Sure. We'll get that out to you within the next day or so.

(Late-File No. 5, noted in index.)

MR. LAZARUS: No. 6, provide in a table list of towns contiguous to the applicant's proposed primary service area. Include all the existing MRIs and CTs located in those towns. Additionally, provide an explanation as to why the applicants feel that these existing providers would not have an impact on their projected volumes.

MR. ROSE: So on that point I want to avoid falling into the trap of, you know, us just saying the same thing that we've said over and over if you're dissatisfied with the answer. So we're happy to give you the towns and the inventory of those scanners, and we will undergo an analysis to say why that isn't going to impact the need that we've demonstrated.

So I think we're going to do that, but I do want to just also add to our response without you guys feeling like we're saying the same thing over is that our firm belief is that the only imaging providers that are part of SoNE are RAH and Saint Francis Hospital and that there is a strong value of the patient population, the SoNE patient population that we're serving to be, you

know, imaged within the network. So we just want to say it again as we're doing this because that really is, I think, the first level of why other providers aren't going to be able to provide the same level of service and aren't even part of our target population. So I just wanted to telegraph that and get your comments and see if you're okay with that.

MR. LAZARUS: Yes, you can put that in the explanation portion.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you.

(Late-File No. 6, noted in index.)

MR. LAZARUS: So No. 7, for the proposed MRI and CT provide the actual quantitative calculations that are utilized to achieve the projected volumes for fiscal years 2023, '24, '25 -- I'm not sure if it's fiscal years or calendar years, maybe calendar years. I apologize for that -- based on the Imaging Advisory Board recommendations data provided, any data that's applicable, and make sure it's separated by the MRI and the CT.

MR. ROSE: Okay. On this point, we certainly, we're going to get you that data. We also want to just note, and we'll note in the

1 explanation that before the application was filed 2 there were observations and a lot things that were 3 being accessed that I think were theoretical. RAH's actual growth numbers in recent years, which 4 5 is shown in that supplemental table and where they 6 are in terms of capacity, certainly is going to 7 feed the volume and demonstrates that there's 8 going to be initial volumes right out of the gate 9 and perhaps even similar growth in Rocky Hill. 10 I just want to make sure it's appropriate if we 11 also just make that note along with giving you the 12 support for the original quantitative data used 13 for the projections. 14 MR. LAZARUS: I think the explanation 15 is fine. 16 MR. ROSE: Thank you. 17 (Late-File No. 7, noted in index.) 18 MR. LAZARUS: And lastly, No. 8 that's 19 on my list is RAH's data to support the 20 applicant's statement regarding experiencing 21 significant growth in screening of lung cancer. 22 MR. ROSE: Yes, absolutely. 23 MR. LAZARUS: And that's all I have. 24 (Late-File No. 8, noted in index.) 25 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Attorney Rose,

do you have any others on your list?

MR. ROSE: No. I think that almost exactly tracks what we had discussed, and so I'm glad to see that we have a mutual understanding.

In terms of timing, we have more vacations coming up. It's always difficult in the summer. Do you think that we could submit this by July 29?

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: I don't see why not. We have a number of hearings coming up as well, so that should be fine.

MR. ROSE: Yeah. And I will say July 29 or sooner because we are eager to get approval, assuming approval is forthcoming, and be able to operationalize the scanners. So we're not looking to delay this on our end, but we do want to be respectful of people's vacation schedules. So we will try to get it to you in advance of July 29, but I think we can commit to doing it by then.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. That works. Thank you. So again, I'll have either Ms. McLaughlin or Mr. Lazarus memorialize this in a letter that will be uploaded to the portal just so that everybody has it and so that's publicly available.

With that, Attorney Rose, did you have any other questions or concerns before we go on to closing argument or closing statement?

MR. ROSE: No, I don't. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay.

Mr. Lazarus, Ms. McLaughlin, do you have any other questions or concerns?

MR. LAZARUS: We're all set.

MS. McLAUGHLIN: I do not.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Okay. So with that, Mr. Rose, if you'd like to make a closing statement, feel free to do so.

MR. ROSE: Thank you. So I just want to thank you guys again for your time and attention to this matter. I know that every CON application includes a volume of information, and I can see that Yadira really did take the time to sort of dig in and question. We appreciate that she's asking us for things to validate what we've given to the agency and the statements that we've made, and I'm pleased with the list that we have because I'm confident that we're going to be able to get you that information.

And all I'd say from there is I want to reiterate my remarks in the beginning that I think

that the clear public need is there, the information to support positive findings with respect to all the statutory criteria is there, and I'd say that the sooner we can get approval, assuming it's forthcoming, would be great because the Medical Hub is operational and imaging is being provided. And as you can see from the public comments, there's folks that are very excited to see it implemented. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Did you guys want to make closing remarks?

DR. TWOHIG: Nothing additional to add other than I'd like to thank the OHS team for your time, your very thoughtful questions, and your attention. And certainly the public comments, I thank you to the clinicians, I thank you for taking time out of your busy day. I know it's not easy. All the other folks who spoke, patient advocates and families, thank you. It means a lot to me to hear the feedback. I will certainly take it back to our team. And I appreciate everybody for taking the time. This is a very important venture. It can have significant effects, as we've heard, on lives in the community, and I

1 appreciate the time and attention. 2 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you, 3 Doctor. 4 And Ms. Smith, did you want to make any 5 additional comments? 6 MS. SMITH: Again, just extend my 7 thanks to all of you for all of the detailed 8 conversation that we had this morning. I look 9 forward to completing my to-do list to you by the 10 end of July, and I look forward to hopefully a 11 positive outcome for everyone. We're looking 12 forward to get going in Rocky Hill. 13 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: Thank you. So 14 on behalf of OHS, I just wanted to thank everybody 15 who was in attendance today, including the 16 witnesses and those who submitted public comment, 17 and Attorney Rose and your colleague who may or 18 may not be off camera still at this point. 19 (Laughter.) 20 HEARING OFFICER CSUKA: So this hearing 21 is hereby adjourned, but the record will remain 22 open until closed by OHS. So thank you again. 23 MR. ROSE: Thank you. 24 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 25 3:33 p.m.

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING 2 STATE OF CONNECTICUT 3 4 I, Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R. 061, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that on June 29, 2022, at 10:03 a.m., the foregoing REMOTE HEARING before the CONNECTICUT 5 OFFICE OF HEALTH STRATEGY IN RE: DOCKET NO. 6 21-32439-CON, A HEARING REGARDING THE ACQUISITION 7 OF ONE CT SCANNER AND ONE MRI SCANNER BY ROCKY HILL IMAGING CENTER, LLC, was reduced to writing 8 under my direction by computer-aided transcription. 9 I further certify that I am neither attorney 10 or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken, and further that I am not 11 a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel 12 employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action. 13 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my 14 hand this 11th day of July, 2022. 15 16 Lisa Wallel 17 18 19 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061 Notary Public 2.0 My commission expires: May 31, 2023 21 22 23 24

25

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES:	
3	DR. MICHAEL TWOHIG (Sworn on page 19)	
4	KATHLEEN SMITH (Sworn on page 24)	
5	EXAMINATION BY MS. McLAUGHLINPage 30	
6		
7	PUBLIC SPEAKERS:	PAGE
8	LUCIO CIOGLI	63
9	SUSAN ALBANO	65
10	DR. JAMES VREDENBURGH	67
11	DR. RICHARD SHUMWAY	68
12	KAREN LETIZIO	70
13	DR. DAVID SILVER	72
14		
15	LATE-FILE EXHIBITS	
16	EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION	PAGE
17	Late-File 1 Copies of the survey or	75
18	supporting material regarding what Saint Francis Hospital Medical Center	
19	customers have requested related to the location of services and survey	
20	data about accessibility	75
21	Late-File 2 Supporting data used throughout the application for Truven Market	75
22	Experts and Advisory Board	7.6
23	Late-File 3 Provide working URL for the current Cigna guidelines	76
24		
25		

1	Index:	(Cont'd)	
2	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4 5	cost co	An updated exhibit to include imparison of CPT codes and elated data for CT and MRI ed to hearing officer)	77
6 7 8	agreeme Hospita Rocky H both re	Final executed copy of ent between Saint Francis al Medical Center and RAH for Hill Imaging Center Medical Hub, edacted and unredacted (emailed ring officer)	78
10 11 12	contiguerimary the exition towns. explanate that	Provide in a table list of towns to the applicant's proposed service area, and include all sting MRIs and CTs located in those Additionally, provide an ation as to why the applicants feel lese existing providers would not impact on their projected volumes	se 1
14 15 16	provide that ar volumes based o recomme	For the proposed MRI and CT actual quantitative calculations to utilized to achieve the projects for fiscal years 2023, '24, '25, on the Imaging Advisory Board and attains data provided, separated MRI and CT	80 ed
18 19 20	applica experie	RAH's data to support the ant's statement regarding encing significant growth ining of lung cancer	80
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			