BROOKWOOD MEDICAL CENTER OF GULFPORT INC
Form 424B3
March 01, 2010

Table of Contents

Filed Pursuant to Rule 424(b)(3)
Registration Nos. 333-159511 and 333-159511-01 to 333-159511-184

HCA INC.
SUPPLEMENT NO. 10 TO
MARKET MAKING PROSPECTUS DATED
JULY 10, 2009
THE DATE OF THIS SUPPLEMENT IS MARCH 1, 2010
On March 1, 2010, HCA Inc. filed the attached Annual Report on Form 10-K
for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2009

Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

Form 10-K

(Mark One)

þ	**ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934** **For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2009**
	OR
o	**TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934** **For the transition period from_____to_____**

Commission File Number 1-11239

HCA INC.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in its Charter)

Delaware (State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation or Organization)	**75-2497104** (I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)
One Park Plaza **Nashville, Tennessee** (Address of Principal Executive Offices)	**37203** (Zip Code)

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: **(615) 344-9551**

Securities Registered Pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act: None

Securities Registered Pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: Common Stock, $0.01 Par Value

Indicate by check mark if the Registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes o No þ

Indicate by check mark if the Registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes o No þ

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the Registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes þ No o

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the Registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes o No o

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§ 229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of Registrant s knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K. o

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer o	Accelerated filer o	Non-accelerated filer þ (Do not check if a smaller reporting company)	Smaller reporting company o

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes o No þ

As of February 28, 2010, there were approximately 94,652,100 shares of Registrant s common stock outstanding. There is not a market for the Registrant s common stock; therefore, the aggregate market value of the Registrant s common stock held by non-affiliates is not calculable.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of the Registrant s definitive Information Statement in connection with its action on written consent of stockholders in lieu of an annual meeting are incorporated by reference into Part III hereof.

INDEX

		Page Reference
	PART I	
Item 1.	Business	3
Item 1A.	Risk Factors	24
Item 1B.	Unresolved Staff Comments	34
Item 2.	Properties	35
Item 3.	Legal Proceedings	35
Item 4.	Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders	36
	PART II	
Item 5.	Market for Registrant s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	37
Item 6.	Selected Financial Data	38
Item 7.	Management s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations	40
Item 7A.	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk	60
Item 8.	Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	60
Item 9.	Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	60
Item 9A.	Controls and Procedures	60
Item 9B.	Other Information	62
	PART III	
Item 10.	Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	63
Item 11.	Executive Compensation	63
Item 12.	Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	63
Item 13.	Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence	63
Item 14.	Principal Accountant Fees and Services	64
	PART IV	
Item 15.	Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules	64
	Signatures	72

Table of Contents

PART I

Item 1. *Business*

General

HCA Inc. is one of the leading health care services companies in the United States. At December 31, 2009, we operated 163 hospitals, comprised of 157 general, acute care hospitals; five psychiatric hospitals; and one rehabilitation hospital. The 163 hospital total includes eight hospitals (seven general, acute care hospitals and one rehabilitation hospital) owned by joint ventures in which an affiliate of HCA is a partner, and these joint ventures are accounted for using the equity method. In addition, we operated 105 freestanding surgery centers, eight of which are owned by joint ventures in which an affiliate of HCA is a partner, and these joint ventures are accounted for using the equity method. Our facilities are located in 20 states and England. The terms Company, HCA, we, our or us, as u herein, refer to HCA Inc. and its affiliates unless otherwise stated or indicated by context. The term affiliates means direct and indirect subsidiaries of HCA Inc. and partnerships and joint ventures in which such subsidiaries are partners. The terms facilities or hospitals refer to entities owned and operated by affiliates of HCA and the term employees refers to employees of affiliates of HCA.

Our primary objective is to provide a comprehensive array of quality health care services in the most cost-effective manner possible. Our general, acute care hospitals typically provide a full range of services to accommodate such medical specialties as internal medicine, general surgery, cardiology, oncology, neurosurgery, orthopedics and obstetrics, as well as diagnostic and emergency services. Outpatient and ancillary health care services are provided by our general, acute care hospitals, freestanding surgery centers, diagnostic centers and rehabilitation facilities. Our psychiatric hospitals provide a full range of mental health care services through inpatient, partial hospitalization and outpatient settings.

The Company was incorporated in Nevada in January 1990 and reincorporated in Delaware in September 1993. Our principal executive offices are located at One Park Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee 37203, and our telephone number is (615) 344-9551.

On November 17, 2006, HCA Inc. completed its merger (the Merger) with Hercules Acquisition Corporation, pursuant to which the Company was acquired by Hercules Holding II, LLC (Hercules Holding), a Delaware limited liability company owned by a private investor group comprised of affiliates of Bain Capital Partners, Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co., Merrill Lynch Global Private Equity (each a Sponsor), affiliates of Citigroup Inc. and Bank of America Corporation (the Sponsor Assignees) and affiliates of HCA founder, Dr. Thomas F. Frist Jr., (the Frist Entities, and together with the Sponsors and the Sponsor Assignees, the Investors), and by members of management and certain other investors. The Merger, the financing transactions related to the Merger and other related transactions are collectively referred to in this annual report as the Recapitalization. The Merger was accounted for as a recapitalization in our financial statements, with no adjustments to the historical basis of our assets and liabilities. As a result of the Recapitalization, our outstanding capital stock is owned by the Investors, certain members of management and key employees. On April 29, 2008, we registered our common stock pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, thus subjecting us to the reporting requirements of Section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. Our common stock is not traded on a national securities exchange.

Available Information

We file certain reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the SEC), including annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q and current reports on Form 8-K. The public may read and copy any materials we file with the SEC at the SEC s Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20549. The public may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. We are an electronic filer, and the SEC maintains an Internet site at http://www.sec.gov that contains the reports, proxy and information statements and other information we file electronically. Our website address is www.hcahealthcare.com. Please note that our website address is provided as an inactive textual reference only. We make available free of charge, through our website, our annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K and all amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, as soon as reasonably practicable after such material is electronically

Table of Contents

filed with or furnished to the SEC. The information provided on our website is not part of this report, and is therefore not incorporated by reference unless such information is specifically referenced elsewhere in this report.

Our Code of Conduct is available free of charge upon request to our Corporate Secretary, HCA Inc., One Park Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Business Strategy

We are committed to providing the communities we serve high quality, cost-effective health care while complying fully with our ethics policy, governmental regulations and guidelines and industry standards. As a part of this strategy, management focuses on the following principal elements:

- maintain our dedication to the care and improvement of human life;
- maintain our commitment to ethics and compliance;
- leverage our leading local market positions;
- expand our presence in key markets;
- continue to leverage our scale;
- continue to develop physician relationships; and
- become the health care employer of choice.

Health Care Facilities

We currently own, manage or operate hospitals; freestanding surgery centers; diagnostic and imaging centers; radiation and oncology therapy centers; comprehensive rehabilitation and physical therapy centers; and various other facilities.

At December 31, 2009, we owned and operated 150 general, acute care hospitals with 38,349 licensed beds, and an additional seven general, acute care hospitals with 2,269 licensed beds are operated through joint ventures, which are accounted for using the equity method. Most of our general, acute care hospitals provide medical and surgical services, including inpatient care, intensive care, cardiac care, diagnostic services and emergency services. The general, acute care hospitals also provide outpatient services such as outpatient surgery, laboratory, radiology, respiratory therapy, cardiology and physical therapy. Each hospital has an organized medical staff and a local board of trustees or governing board, made up of members of the local community.

Our hospitals do not typically engage in extensive medical research and education programs. However, some of our hospitals are affiliated with medical schools and may participate in the clinical rotation of medical interns and residents and other education programs.

At December 31, 2009, we operated five psychiatric hospitals with 490 licensed beds. Our psychiatric hospitals provide therapeutic programs including child, adolescent and adult psychiatric care, adult and adolescent alcohol and drug abuse treatment and counseling.

We also operate outpatient health care facilities which include freestanding surgery centers, diagnostic and imaging centers, comprehensive outpatient rehabilitation and physical therapy centers, outpatient radiation and oncology therapy centers and various other facilities. These outpatient services are an integral component of our strategy to develop comprehensive health care networks in select communities. A majority of our surgery centers are operated through partnerships or limited liability companies, with majority ownership of each partnership or limited liability company typically held by a general partner or subsidiary that is an affiliate of HCA.

Certain of our affiliates provide a variety of management services to our health care facilities, including patient safety programs; ethics and compliance programs; national supply contracts; equipment purchasing and leasing contracts; accounting, financial and clinical systems; governmental reimbursement assistance; construction planning and coordination; information technology systems and solutions; legal counsel; human resources services; and internal audit services.

Table of Contents

Sources of Revenue

Hospital revenues depend upon inpatient occupancy levels, the medical and ancillary services ordered by physicians and provided to patients, the volume of outpatient procedures and the charges or payment rates for such services. Charges and reimbursement rates for inpatient services vary significantly depending on the type of payer, the type of service (e.g., medical/surgical, intensive care or psychiatric) and the geographic location of the hospital. Inpatient occupancy levels fluctuate for various reasons, many of which are beyond our control.

We receive payment for patient services from the federal government under the Medicare program, state governments under their respective Medicaid or similar programs, managed care plans, private insurers and directly from patients. The approximate percentages of our revenues from such sources were as follows:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2009	**2008**	**2007**
Medicare	23%	23%	24%
Managed Medicare	7	6	5
Medicaid	6	5	5
Managed Medicaid	4	3	3
Managed care and other insurers	52	53	54
Uninsured	8	10	9
Total	100%	100%	100%

Medicare is a federal program that provides certain hospital and medical insurance benefits to persons age 65 and over, some disabled persons, persons with end-stage renal disease and persons with Lou Gehrig s Disease. Medicaid is a federal-state program, administered by the states, which provides hospital and medical benefits to qualifying individuals who are unable to afford health care. All of our general, acute care hospitals located in the United States are certified as health care services providers for persons covered under Medicare and Medicaid programs. Amounts received under Medicare and Medicaid programs are generally significantly less than established hospital gross charges for the services provided.

Our hospitals generally offer discounts from established charges to certain group purchasers of health care services, including private insurance companies, employers, HMOs, PPOs and other managed care plans. These discount programs generally limit our ability to increase revenues in response to increasing costs. See Item 1, Business Competition. Patients are generally not responsible for the total difference between established hospital gross charges and amounts reimbursed for such services under Medicare, Medicaid, HMOs or PPOs and other managed care plans, but are responsible to the extent of any exclusions, deductibles or coinsurance features of their coverage. The amount of such exclusions, deductibles and coinsurance continues to increase. Collection of amounts due from individuals is typically more difficult than from governmental or third-party payers. We provide discounts to uninsured patients who do not qualify for Medicaid or charity care under our charity care policy. These discounts are similar to those provided to many local managed care plans. In implementing the discount policy, we attempt to qualify uninsured patients for Medicaid, other federal or state assistance or charity care under our charity care policy. If an uninsured patient does not qualify for these programs, the uninsured discount is applied.

Medicare

Inpatient Acute Care

Under the Medicare program, we receive reimbursement under a prospective payment system (PPS) for general, acute care hospital inpatient services. Under the hospital inpatient PPS, fixed payment amounts per inpatient discharge are established based on the patient s assigned Medicare severity diagnosis-related group (MS-DRG). The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) recently completed a two-year transition to full implementation of MS-DRGs to replace the previously used Medicare diagnosis related groups in an effort to better recognize severity of illness in Medicare payment rates. MS-DRGs classify treatments for illnesses according to the estimated intensity of hospital resources necessary to furnish care for each principal diagnosis. MS-DRG weights

---

represent the average resources for a given MS-DRG relative to the average resources for all MS-DRGs. MS-DRG payments are adjusted for area wage differentials. Hospitals, other than those defined as new, receive PPS reimbursement for inpatient capital costs based on MS-DRG weights multiplied by a geographically adjusted federal rate. When the cost to treat certain patients falls well outside the normal distribution, providers typically receive additional outlier payments.

MS-DRG rates are updated and MS-DRG weights are recalibrated using cost relative weights each federal fiscal year (which begins October 1). The index used to update the MS-DRG rates (the market basket) gives consideration to the inflation experienced by hospitals and entities outside the health care industry in purchasing goods and services. In federal fiscal year 2009, the MS-DRG rate was increased by the full market basket of 3.6%. For the federal fiscal year 2010, CMS has set the MS-DRG rate increase at the full market basket of 2.1%. A decrease in payments rates or an increase in rates that is below the increase in our costs may adversely affect the results of our operations.

In federal fiscal years 2008 and 2009, CMS reduced payments to hospitals through a documentation and coding adjustment intended to account for changes in payments under the MS-DRG system that are not related to changes in patient case mix. In addition, CMS has the authority to determine retrospectively whether the documentation and coding adjustment levels for federal fiscal years 2008 and 2009 were adequate to account for changes in payments not related to changes in case mix. CMS has not imposed an adjustment for federal fiscal year 2010, but has announced its intent to impose reductions to payments in federal fiscal years 2011 and 2012 because of what CMS has determined to be an inadequate adjustment in federal fiscal year 2008. Such payment adjustments may adversely affect the results of our operations.

Further realignments in the MS-DRG system could also reduce the payments we receive for certain specialties, including cardiology and orthopedics. CMS has focused on payment levels for such specialties in recent years in part because of the proliferation of specialty hospitals. Changes in the payments received for specialty services could have an adverse effect on our results of operations.

The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) provides for rate increases at the full market basket if data for patient care quality indicators are submitted to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). As required by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA 2005), CMS has expanded, through a series of rulemakings, the number of quality measures that must be reported to receive a full market basket update. CMS currently requires hospitals to report 46 quality measures in order to qualify for the full market basket update to the inpatient prospective payment system in federal fiscal year 2011. Failure to submit the required quality indicators will result in a two percentage point reduction to the market basket update. All of our hospitals paid under Medicare inpatient MS-DRG PPS are participating in the quality initiative by submitting the requested quality data. While we will endeavor to comply with all data submission requirements as additional requirements continue to be added, our submissions may not be deemed timely or sufficient to entitle us to the full market basket adjustment for all of our hospitals.

As part of CMS s goal of transforming Medicare from a passive payer to an active purchaser of quality goods and services, for discharges occurring after October 1, 2008, Medicare no longer assigns an inpatient hospital discharge to a higher paying MS-DRG if a selected hospital-acquired condition (HAC) was not present on admission. In this situation, the case is paid as though the secondary diagnosis was not present. Currently, there are ten categories of conditions on the list of HACs. Furthermore, on January 15, 2009, CMS announced three National Coverage Determinations (NCDs) that prohibit Medicare reimbursement for erroneous surgical procedures performed on an inpatient or outpatient basis. These three erroneous surgical procedures are in addition to the HACs designated in CMS regulations. These changes are not expected to have a material effect on our revenues or cash flows.

Historically, the Medicare program has set aside 5.10% of Medicare inpatient payments to pay for outlier cases. CMS estimates that outlier payments accounted for 4.8% of total operating DRG payments for federal fiscal year 2008. For federal fiscal year 2009, CMS established an outlier threshold of $20,045, and for federal fiscal year 2010, CMS has increased the outlier threshold to $23,140. We do not anticipate the increase to the outlier threshold for federal fiscal year 2010 will have a material impact on our results of operations.

Table of Contents

Outpatient

CMS reimburses hospital outpatient services (and certain Medicare Part B services furnished to hospital inpatients who have no Part A coverage) on a PPS basis. CMS continues to use fee schedules to pay for physical, occupational and speech therapies, durable medical equipment, clinical diagnostic laboratory services and nonimplantable orthotics and prosthetics, freestanding surgery centers services and services provided by independent diagnostic testing facilities.

Hospital outpatient services paid under PPS are classified into groups called ambulatory payment classifications (APCs). Services for each APC are similar clinically and in terms of the resources they require. A payment rate is established for each APC. Depending on the services provided, a hospital may be paid for more than one APC for a patient visit. The APC payment rates were updated for calendar years 2008 and 2009 by market baskets of 3.30% and 3.60%, respectively. On November 20, 2009, CMS published a final rule that updated payment rates for calendar year 2010 by the full market basket of 2.1%. CMS continues to require hospitals to submit quality data relating to outpatient care to receive the full market basket increase under the outpatient PPS in calendar year 2010. CMS required hospitals to report data on eleven quality measures in calendar year 2009 for the payment determination in calendar year 2010 and will continue to require hospitals to report the existing eleven quality measures in calendar year 2010 for the 2011 payment determination. Hospitals that fail to submit such data will receive the market basket update minus two percentage points for the outpatient PPS.

Rehabilitation

CMS reimburses inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs) on a PPS basis. Under IRF PPS, patients are classified into case mix groups based upon impairment, age, comorbidities (additional diseases or disorders from which the patient suffers) and functional capability. IRFs are paid a predetermined amount per discharge that reflects the patient s case mix group and is adjusted for area wage levels, low-income patients, rural areas and high-cost outliers. The Medicare, Medicaid and State Children s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) Reauthorization Act of 2007 eliminated the market basket update for federal fiscal year 2009. However, CMS issued a final rule setting the market basket update at 2.5% for fiscal year 2010. As of December 31, 2009, we had one rehabilitation hospital, which is operated through a joint venture, and 46 hospital rehabilitation units.

On May 7, 2004, CMS published a final rule to change the criteria for being classified as an IRF. Pursuant to that final rule, 75% of a facility s inpatients over a given year had to have been treated for at least one of 10 specified conditions, and a subsequent regulation expanded the number of specified conditions to 13. Since then, several statutory and regulatory adjustments have been made to the rule, including adjustments to the percentage of a facility s patients that must be treated for one of the 13 specified conditions. Currently, the compliance threshold is set by statute at 60%. Implementation of this 60% threshold has reduced our IRF admissions and can be expected to continue to restrict the treatment of patients whose medical conditions do not meet any of the 13 approved conditions. In addition, effective January 1, 2010, IRFs must meet additional coverage criteria, including patient selection and care requirements relating to pre-admission screenings, post-admission evaluations, ongoing coordination of care and involvement of rehabilitation physicians. A facility that fails to meet the 60% threshold or other criteria to be classified as an IRF will be paid under the acute care hospital inpatient or outpatient PPS, which generally provide for lower payment amounts.

Psychiatric

Inpatient hospital services furnished in psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric units of general, acute care hospitals and critical access hospitals are reimbursed under a prospective payment system (IPF PPS), a per diem payment, with adjustments to account for certain patient and facility characteristics. IPF PPS contains an outlier policy for extraordinarily costly cases and an adjustment to a facility s base payment if it maintains a full-service emergency

department. CMS has established the IPF PPS payment rate in a manner intended to be budget neutral and has adopted a July 1 update cycle. The rehabilitation, psychiatric and long-term care (RPL) market basket update is used to update the IPF PPS. The annual RPL market basket update for rate year 2010 is 2.1%. As of December 31, 2009, we had five psychiatric hospitals and 32 hospital psychiatric units.

Ambulatory Surgery Centers

CMS reimburses ambulatory surgery centers (ASCs) using a predetermined fee schedule. Reimbursements for ASC overhead costs are limited to no more than the overhead costs paid to hospital outpatient departments under the Medicare hospital outpatient PPS for the same procedure. Effective January 1, 2008, ASC payment groups increased from nine clinically disparate payment groups to an extensive list of covered surgical procedures among the APCs used under the outpatient PPS for these surgical services. Because the new payment system has a significant impact on payments for certain procedures, CMS has established a four-year transition period for implementing the required payment rates. Moreover, if CMS determines that a procedure is commonly performed in a physician s office, the ASC reimbursement for that procedure is limited to the reimbursement allowable under the Medicare Part B Physician Fee Schedule, with limited exceptions. In addition, all surgical procedures, other than those that pose a significant safety risk or generally require an overnight stay, are payable as ASC procedures. As a result, more Medicare procedures now performed in hospitals may be moved to ASCs, reducing surgical volume in our hospitals. Also, more Medicare procedures now performed in ASCs may be moved to physicians offices. Commercial third-party payers may adopt similar policies.

Other

Under PPS, the payment rates are adjusted for the area differences in wage levels by a factor (wage index) reflecting the relative wage level in the geographic area compared to the national average wage level. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2007, CMS adjusted 100% of the wage index factor for occupational mix. The redistributive impact of wage index changes, while slightly negative in the aggregate, is not anticipated to have a material financial impact for 2010.

As required by the MMA, CMS is implementing contractor reform whereby CMS has competitively bid the Medicare fiscal intermediary and Medicare carrier functions to 15 Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs), which are geographically assigned. CMS has awarded contracts to all 15 MAC jurisdictions; as a result of filed protests, CMS is taking corrective action regarding the contracts in several jurisdictions. While chain providers had the option of having all hospitals use one home office MAC, HCA chose to use the MACs assigned to the geographic areas in which our hospitals are located. The individual MAC jurisdictions are in varying phases of transition. For the transition periods and for a potentially unforeseen period thereafter, all of these changes could impact claims processing functions and the resulting cash flow; however, we are unable to predict the impact at this time.

The MMA established the Recovery Audit Contractor (RAC) three-year demonstration program to conduct post-payment reviews to detect and correct improper payments in the fee-for-service Medicare program. The Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 made the RAC program permanent and mandated its nationwide expansion by 2010. CMS has awarded contracts to four RACs that are implementing the permanent RAC program on a nationwide basis.

Managed Medicare

Managed Medicare plans relate to situations where a private company contracts with CMS to provide members with Medicare Part A, Part B and Part D benefits. Managed Medicare plans can be structured as HMOs, PPOs or private fee-for-service plans. The Medicare program allows beneficiaries to choose enrollment in certain managed Medicare plans. In 2003, MMA increased reimbursement to managed Medicare plans and expanded Medicare beneficiaries healthcare options. Since 2003, the number of beneficiaries choosing to receive their Medicare benefits through such plans has increased. However, the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 imposed new restrictions and implemented focused cuts to certain managed Medicare plans. In addition, some health care reform proposals would reduce payments to managed Medicare plans. In light of the current economic downturn and the political climate, managed Medicare plans may experience reduced premium payments, which may lead to decreased

enrollment in such plans.

Medicaid

Medicaid programs are funded jointly by the federal government and the states and are administered by states under approved plans. Most state Medicaid program payments are made under a PPS or are based on negotiated

payment levels with individual hospitals. Medicaid reimbursement is often less than a hospital s cost of services. The federal government and many states are currently considering altering the level of Medicaid funding (including upper payment limits) or program eligibility that could adversely affect future levels of Medicaid reimbursement received by our hospitals. As permitted by law, certain states in which we operate have adopted broad-based provider taxes to fund their Medicaid programs.

Since most states must operate with balanced budgets and since the Medicaid program is often the state s largest program, states can be expected to adopt or consider adopting legislation designed to reduce their Medicaid expenditures. The current economic downturn has increased the budgetary pressures on most states, and these budgetary pressures have resulted and likely will continue to result in decreased spending for Medicaid programs in many states. Further, many states have also adopted, or are considering, legislation designed to reduce coverage and program eligibility, enroll Medicaid recipients in managed care programs and/or impose additional taxes on hospitals to help finance or expand the states Medicaid systems.

Through DRA 2005, Congress has expanded the federal government s involvement in fighting fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicaid program by creating the Medicaid Integrity Program. Among other things, this legislation requires CMS to employ private contractors, referred to as Medicaid Integrity Contractors (MICs), to perform post-payment audits of Medicaid claims and identify overpayments. MICs are assigned to five geographic regions and have commenced audits in several of the states assigned to those regions. Throughout 2010, MIC audits will continue to expand to other states. In addition to MICs, several other contractors, including the state Medicaid agencies, have increased their review activities. Future legislation or other changes in the administration or interpretation of government health programs could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations.

Managed Medicaid

Managed Medicaid programs enable states to contract with one or more entities for patient enrollment, care management and claims adjudication. The states usually do not relinquish program responsibilities for financing, eligibility criteria and core benefit plan design. We generally contract directly with one of the designated entities, usually a managed care organization. The provisions of these programs are state-specific.

Enrollment in managed Medicaid plans has increased in recent years, as state governments seek to control the cost of Medicaid programs. However, general economic conditions in the states in which we operate may require reductions in premium payments to these plans and may reduce enrollment in these plans.

TRICARE

TRICARE is the Department of Defense s health care program for members of the armed forces. On May 1, 2009, the Department of Defense implemented a prospective payment system for hospital outpatient services furnished to TRICARE beneficiaries similar to that utilized for services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries. Because the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system APC rates have historically been below TRICARE rates, the adoption of this payment methodology for TRICARE beneficiaries reduces our reimbursement; however, TRICARE outpatient services do not represent a significant portion of our patient volumes.

Annual Cost Reports

All hospitals participating in the Medicare, Medicaid and TRICARE programs, whether paid on a reasonable cost basis or under a PPS, are required to meet certain financial reporting requirements. Federal and, where applicable, state regulations require the submission of annual cost reports covering the revenues, costs and expenses associated with the services provided by each hospital to Medicare beneficiaries and Medicaid recipients.

Annual cost reports required under the Medicare and Medicaid programs are subject to routine audits, which may result in adjustments to the amounts ultimately determined to be due to us under these reimbursement programs. These audits often require several years to reach the final determination of amounts due to or from us under these programs. Providers also have rights of appeal, and it is common to contest issues raised in audits of cost reports.

Table of Contents

Managed Care and Other Discounted Plans

Most of our hospitals offer discounts from established charges to certain large group purchasers of health care services, including managed care plans and private insurance companies. Admissions reimbursed by commercial managed care and other insurers were 34%, 35% and 37% of our total admissions for the years ended December 31, 2009, 2008 and 2007, respectively. Managed care contracts are typically negotiated for terms between one and three years. While we generally received annual average yield increases of 6% to 7% from managed care payers during 2009, there can be no assurance that we will continue to receive increases in the future.

Uninsured and Self-Pay Patients

A high percentage of our uninsured patients are initially admitted through our emergency rooms. For the year ended December 31, 2009, approximately 81% of our admissions of uninsured patients occurred through our emergency rooms. The Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) requires any hospital that participates in the Medicare program to conduct an appropriate medical screening examination of every person who presents to the hospital s emergency room for treatment and, if the individual is suffering from an emergency medical condition, to either stabilize that condition or make an appropriate transfer of the individual to a facility that can handle the condition. The obligation to screen and stabilize emergency medical conditions exists regardless of an individual s ability to pay for treatment.

We are taking proactive measures to reduce our provision for doubtful accounts by, among other things:

- screening all patients, including the uninsured, through our emergency screening protocol, to determine the appropriate care setting in light of their condition, while reducing the potential for bad debt; and

- increasing up-front collections from patients subject to co-pay and deductible requirements and uninsured patients.

Hospital Utilization

We believe the most important factors relating to the overall utilization of a hospital are the quality and market position of the hospital and the number and quality of physicians and other health care professionals providing patient care within the facility. Generally, we believe the ability of a hospital to be a market leader is determined by its breadth of services, level of technology, emphasis on quality of care and convenience for patients and physicians. Other factors that impact utilization include the growth in local population, local economic conditions and market penetration of managed care programs.

The following table sets forth certain operating statistics for our health care facilities. Health care facility operations are subject to certain seasonal fluctuations, including decreases in patient utilization during holiday

Table of Contents

periods and increases in the cold weather months. The data set forth in this table includes only those facilities that are consolidated for financial reporting purposes.

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Number of hospitals at end of period(a)	155	158	161	166	175
Number of freestanding outpatient surgery centers at end of period(b)	97	97	99	98	87
Number of licensed beds at end of period(c)	38,839	38,504	38,405	39,354	41,265
Weighted average licensed beds(d)	38,825	38,422	39,065	40,653	41,902
Admissions(e)	1,556,500	1,541,800	1,552,700	1,610,100	1,647,800
Equivalent admissions(f)	2,439,000	2,363,600	2,352,400	2,416,700	2,476,600
Average length of stay (days)(g)	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Average daily census(h)	20,650	20,795	21,049	21,688	22,225
Occupancy rate(i)	53%	54%	54%	53%	53%
Emergency room visits(j)	5,593,500	5,246,400	5,116,100	5,213,500	5,415,200
Outpatient surgeries(k)	794,600	797,400	804,900	820,900	836,600
Inpatient surgeries(l)	494,500	493,100	516,500	533,100	541,400

(a) Excludes eight facilities in 2009, 2008 and 2007 and seven facilities in 2006 and 2005 that are not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.

(b) Excludes eight facilities in 2009 and 2008, nine facilities in 2007 and 2006 and seven facilities in 2005 that are not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.

(c) Licensed beds are those beds for which a facility has been granted approval to operate from the applicable state licensing agency.

(d) Weighted average licensed beds represents the average number of licensed beds, weighted based on periods owned.

(e) Represents the total number of patients admitted to our hospitals and is used by management and certain investors as a general measure of inpatient volume.

(f) Equivalent admissions are used by management and certain investors as a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume. Equivalent admissions are computed by multiplying admissions (inpatient volume) by the sum of gross inpatient revenue and gross outpatient revenue and then dividing the resulting amount by gross inpatient revenue. The equivalent admissions computation equates outpatient revenue to the volume measure (admissions) used to measure inpatient volume, resulting in a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume.

(g) Represents the average number of days admitted patients stay in our hospitals.

(h) Represents the average number of patients in our hospital beds each day.

(i) Represents the percentage of hospital licensed beds occupied by patients. Both average daily census and occupancy rate provide measures of the utilization of inpatient rooms.

(j) Represents the number of patients treated in our emergency rooms.

(k) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who were not admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in outpatient surgeries.

(l) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who have been admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in inpatient surgeries.

Competition

Generally, other hospitals in the local communities served by most of our hospitals provide services similar to those offered by our hospitals. Additionally, in recent years the number of freestanding surgery centers and diagnostic centers (including facilities owned by physicians) in the geographic areas in which we operate has

increased significantly. As a result, most of our hospitals operate in a highly competitive environment. In some cases, competing hospitals are more established than our hospitals. Some competing hospitals are owned by tax-supported government agencies and many others are owned by not-for-profit entities that may be supported by endowments, charitable contributions and/or tax revenues and are exempt from sales, property and income taxes. Such exemptions and support are not available to our hospitals. In certain localities there are large teaching hospitals that provide highly specialized facilities, equipment and services which may not be available at most of our hospitals. We are facing increasing competition from physician-owned specialty hospitals and both our own and unaffiliated freestanding surgery centers for market share in high margin services.

Psychiatric hospitals frequently attract patients from areas outside their immediate locale and, therefore, our psychiatric hospitals compete with both local and regional hospitals, including the psychiatric units of general, acute care hospitals.

Our strategies are designed to ensure our hospitals are competitive. We believe our hospitals compete within local communities on the basis of many factors, including the quality of care, ability to attract and retain quality physicians, skilled clinical personnel and other health care professionals, location, breadth of services, technology offered and prices charged. We have increased our focus on operating outpatient services with improved accessibility and more convenient service for patients, and increased predictability and efficiency for physicians.

Two of the most significant factors to the competitive position of a hospital are the number and quality of physicians affiliated with the hospital. Although physicians may at any time terminate their affiliation with a hospital we operate, our hospitals seek to retain physicians with varied specialties on the hospitals medical staffs and to attract other qualified physicians. We believe physicians refer patients to a hospital on the basis of the quality and scope of services it renders to patients and physicians, the quality of physicians on the medical staff, the location of the hospital and the quality of the hospital s facilities, equipment and employees. Accordingly, we strive to maintain and provide quality facilities, equipment, employees and services for physicians and patients.

Another major factor in the competitive position of a hospital is our ability to negotiate service contracts with purchasers of group health care services. Managed care plans attempt to direct and control the use of hospital services and obtain discounts from hospitals established gross charges. In addition, employers and traditional health insurers continue to attempt to contain costs through negotiations with hospitals for managed care programs and discounts from established gross charges. Generally, hospitals compete for service contracts with group health care services purchasers on the basis of price, market reputation, geographic location, quality and range of services, quality of the medical staff and convenience. Our future success will depend, in part, on our ability to retain and renew our managed care contracts and enter into new managed care contracts on favorable terms. Other health care providers may impact our ability to enter into managed care contracts or negotiate increases in our reimbursement and other favorable terms and conditions. For example, some of our competitors may negotiate exclusivity provisions with managed care plans or otherwise restrict the ability of managed care companies to contract with us. The trend toward consolidation among non-government payers tends to increase their bargaining power over fee structures. The importance of obtaining contracts with managed care organizations varies from community to community, depending on the market strength of such organizations.

State certificate of need (CON) laws, which place limitations on a hospital s ability to expand hospital services and facilities, make capital expenditures and otherwise make changes in operations, may also have the effect of restricting competition. We currently operate health care facilities in a number of states with CON laws. Before issuing a CON, these states consider the need for additional or expanded health care facilities or services. In those states which have no CON laws or which set relatively high levels of expenditures before they become reviewable by state authorities, competition in the form of new services, facilities and capital spending is more prevalent. See Item 1, Business Regulation and Other Factors.

We and the health care industry as a whole face the challenge of continuing to provide quality patient care while dealing with rising costs and strong competition for patients. Changes in medical technology, existing and future legislation, regulations and interpretations and managed care contracting for provider services by private and government payers remain ongoing challenges.

Table of Contents

Admissions and average lengths of stay continue to be negatively affected by payer-required pre-admission authorization, utilization review and payer pressure to maximize outpatient and alternative health care delivery services for less acutely ill patients. Increased competition, admission constraints and payer pressures are expected to continue. To meet these challenges, we intend to expand our facilities or acquire or construct new facilities where appropriate, to better enable the provision of a comprehensive array of outpatient services, offer market competitive pricing to private payer groups, upgrade facilities and equipment, and offer new or expanded programs and services.

Regulation and Other Factors

Licensure, Certification and Accreditation

Health care facility construction and operation are subject to numerous federal, state and local regulations relating to the adequacy of medical care, equipment, personnel, operating policies and procedures, maintenance of adequate records, fire prevention, rate-setting and compliance with building codes and environmental protection laws. Facilities are subject to periodic inspection by governmental and other authorities to assure continued compliance with the various standards necessary for licensing and accreditation. We believe our health care facilities are properly licensed under applicable state laws. Each of our acute care hospitals are certified for participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and are accredited by The Joint Commission. If any facility were to lose its Medicare or Medicaid certification, the facility would be unable to receive reimbursement from federal health care programs. If any facility were to lose accreditation by The Joint Commission, the facility would be subject to state surveys, potentially be subject to increased scrutiny by CMS and likely lose payment from non-government payers. Management believes our facilities are in substantial compliance with current applicable federal, state, local and independent review body regulations and standards. The requirements for licensure, certification and accreditation are subject to change and, in order to remain qualified, it may become necessary for us to make changes in our facilities, equipment, personnel and services. The requirements for licensure also may include notification or approval in the event of the transfer or change of ownership. Failure to obtain the necessary state approval in these circumstances can result in the inability to complete an acquisition or change of ownership.

Certificates of Need

In some states where we operate hospitals and other health care facilities, the construction or expansion of health care facilities, the acquisition of existing facilities, the transfer or change of ownership and the addition of new beds or services may be subject to review by and prior approval of state regulatory agencies under a CON program. Such laws generally require the reviewing state agency to determine the public need for additional or expanded health care facilities and services. Failure to obtain necessary state approval can result in the inability to expand facilities, complete an acquisition or change ownership.

State Rate Review

Some states have adopted legislation mandating rate or budget review for hospitals or have adopted taxes on hospital revenues, assessments or licensure fees to fund indigent health care within the state. In the aggregate, indigent tax provisions have not materially, adversely affected our results of operations. Although we do not currently operate facilities in states that mandate rate or budget reviews, we cannot predict whether we will operate in such states in the future, or whether the states in which we currently operate may adopt legislation mandating such reviews.

Federal Health Care Program Regulations

Participation in any federal health care program, including the Medicare and Medicaid programs, is heavily regulated by statute and regulation. If a hospital fails to substantially comply with the numerous conditions of participation in

the Medicare and Medicaid programs or performs certain prohibited acts, the hospital s participation in the federal health care programs may be terminated, or civil or criminal penalties may be imposed under certain provisions of the Social Security Act, or both.

Anti-kickback Statute

A section of the Social Security Act known as the Anti-kickback Statute prohibits providers and others from directly or indirectly soliciting, receiving, offering or paying any remuneration with the intent of generating referrals or orders for services or items covered by a federal health care program. Courts have interpreted this statute broadly and held that there is a violation of the Anti-kickback Statute if just one purpose of the remuneration is to generate referrals, even if there are other lawful purposes. Violations of the Anti-kickback Statute may be punished by a criminal fine of up to $25,000 for each violation or imprisonment, civil money penalties of up to $50,000 per violation and damages of up to three times the total amount of the remuneration and/or exclusion from participation in federal health care programs, including Medicare and Medicaid.

The Office of Inspector General at HHS (OIG), among other regulatory agencies, is responsible for identifying and eliminating fraud, abuse and waste. The OIG carries out this mission through a nationwide program of audits, investigations and inspections. As one means of providing guidance to health care providers, the OIG issues Special Fraud Alerts. These alerts do not have the force of law, but identify features of arrangements or transactions that the government believes may cause the arrangements or transactions to violate the Anti-kickback Statute or other federal health care laws. The OIG has identified several incentive arrangements that constitute suspect practices, including: (a) payment of any incentive by a hospital each time a physician refers a patient to the hospital, (b) the use of free or significantly discounted office space or equipment in facilities usually located close to the hospital, (c) provision of free or significantly discounted billing, nursing or other staff services, (d) free training for a physician s office staff in areas such as management techniques and laboratory techniques, (e) guarantees which provide, if the physician s income fails to reach a predetermined level, the hospital will pay any portion of the remainder, (f) low-interest or interest-free loans, or loans which may be forgiven if a physician refers patients to the hospital, (g) payment of the costs of a physician s travel and expenses for conferences, (h) coverage on the hospital s group health insurance plans at an inappropriately low cost to the physician, (i) payment for services (which may include consultations at the hospital) which require few, if any, substantive duties by the physician, (j) purchasing goods or services from physicians at prices in excess of their fair market value, and (k) rental of space in physician offices, at other than fair market value terms, by persons or entities to which physicians refer. The OIG has encouraged persons having information about hospitals who offer the above types of incentives to physicians to report such information to the OIG.

The OIG also issues Special Advisory Bulletins as a means of providing guidance to health care providers. These bulletins, along with the Special Fraud Alerts, have focused on certain arrangements that could be subject to heightened scrutiny by government enforcement authorities, including: (a) contractual joint venture arrangements and other joint venture arrangements between those in a position to refer business, such as physicians, and those providing items or services for which Medicare or Medicaid pays, and (b) certain gainsharing arrangements, i.e., the practice of giving physicians a share of any reduction in a hospital s costs for patient care attributable in part to the physician s efforts.

In addition to issuing Special Fraud Alerts and Special Advisory Bulletins, the OIG issues compliance program guidance for certain types of health care providers. The OIG guidance identifies a number of risk areas under federal fraud and abuse statutes and regulations. These areas of risk include compensation arrangements with physicians, recruitment arrangements with physicians and joint venture relationships with physicians.

As authorized by Congress, the OIG has published safe harbor regulations that outline categories of activities deemed protected from prosecution under the Anti-kickback Statute. Currently, there are statutory exceptions and safe harbors for various activities, including the following: certain investment interests, space rental, equipment rental, practitioner recruitment, personnel services and management contracts, sale of practice, referral services, warranties, discounts, employees, group purchasing organizations, waiver of beneficiary coinsurance and deductible amounts, managed care arrangements, obstetrical malpractice insurance subsidies, investments in group practices, freestanding surgery

centers, ambulance replenishing, and referral agreements for specialty services.

The fact that conduct or a business arrangement does not fall within a safe harbor, or it is identified in a Special Fraud Alert or Advisory Bulletin or as a risk area in the Supplemental Compliance Guidelines for Hospitals, does

not necessarily render the conduct or business arrangement illegal under the Anti-kickback Statute. However, such conduct and business arrangements may lead to increased scrutiny by government enforcement authorities.

We have a variety of financial relationships with physicians and others who either refer or influence the referral of patients to our hospitals and other health care facilities, including employment contracts, leases, medical director agreements and professional service agreements. We also have similar relationships with physicians and facilities to which patients are referred from our facilities. In addition, we provide financial incentives, including minimum revenue guarantees, to recruit physicians into the communities served by our hospitals. While we endeavor to comply with the applicable safe harbors, certain of our current arrangements, including joint ventures and financial relationships with physicians and other referral sources and persons and entities to which we refer patients, do not qualify for safe harbor protection.

Although we believe our arrangements with physicians and other referral sources have been structured to comply with current law and available interpretations, there can be no assurance regulatory authorities enforcing these laws will determine these financial arrangements comply with the Anti-kickback Statute or other applicable laws. An adverse determination could subject us to liabilities under the Social Security Act, including criminal penalties, civil monetary penalties and exclusion from participation in Medicare, Medicaid or other federal health care programs.

Stark Law

The Social Security Act also includes a provision commonly known as the Stark Law. The Stark Law prevents the entity from billing Medicare and Medicaid programs for any items or services that result from a prohibited referral and requires the entity to refund amounts received for items or services provided pursuant to the prohibited referral. The law, thus, effectively prohibits physicians from referring Medicare and Medicaid patients to entities with which they or any of their immediate family members have a financial relationship, if these entities provide certain designated health services reimbursable by Medicare, including inpatient and outpatient hospital services, clinical laboratory services and radiology services. Sanctions for violating the Stark Law include denial of payment, civil monetary penalties of up to $15,000 per claim submitted and exclusion from the federal health care programs. The statute also provides for a penalty of up to $100,000 for a circumvention scheme. There are exceptions to the self-referral prohibition for many of the customary financial arrangements between physicians and providers, including employment contracts, leases and recruitment agreements. There is also an exception for a physician s ownership interest in an entire hospital, as opposed to an ownership interest in a hospital department. Unlike safe harbors under the Anti-kickback Statute with which compliance is voluntary, an arrangement must comply with every requirement of a Stark Law exception or the arrangement is in violation of the Stark Law.

Through a series of rulemakings, CMS has issued final regulations implementing the Stark Law. Additional changes to these regulations, which became effective October 1, 2009, further restrict the types of arrangements facilities and physicians may enter, including additional restrictions on certain leases, percentage compensation arrangements, and agreements under which a hospital purchases services under arrangements. While these regulations were intended to clarify the requirements of the exceptions to the Stark Law, it is unclear how the government will interpret many of these exceptions for enforcement purposes. CMS has indicated it is considering additional changes to the Stark Law regulations. Because many of these laws and their implementing regulations are relatively new, we do not always have the benefit of significant regulatory or judicial interpretation of these laws and regulations. We attempt to structure our relationships to meet an exception to the Stark Law, but the regulations implementing the exceptions are detailed and complex, and we cannot assure that every relationship complies fully with the Stark Law.

On September 14, 2007, CMS published an information collection request called the Disclosure of Financial Relations Report (DFRR). The DFRR and its supporting documentation are currently under review by the Office of Management and Budget, and it is unclear when, or if, it will be finalized. CMS has indicated that responding

hospitals will have a limited amount of time to compile a significant amount of information relating to their financial relationships with physicians. A hospital may be subject to substantial penalties if it is unable to assemble and report this information within the required time frame or if any applicable government agency determines that

15

the submission is inaccurate or incomplete. Depending on the final format of the DFRR, responding hospitals may be subject to substantial penalties as a result of enforcement actions brought by government agencies and whistleblowers acting pursuant to the federal False Claims Act (FCA) and similar state laws, based on such allegations as failure to respond within required deadlines, that the response is inaccurate or contains incomplete information, or that the response indicates a potential violation of the Stark Law or other requirements.

Similar State Laws

Many states in which we operate also have laws similar to the Anti-kickback Statute that prohibit payments to physicians for patient referrals and laws similar to the Stark Law that prohibit certain self-referrals. The scope of these state laws is broad, since they can often apply regardless of the source of payment for care, and little precedent exists for their interpretation or enforcement. These statutes typically provide for criminal and civil penalties, as well as loss of facility licensure.

Other Fraud and Abuse Provisions

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) broadened the scope of certain fraud and abuse laws by adding several criminal provisions for health care fraud offenses that apply to all health benefit programs. The Social Security Act also imposes criminal and civil penalties for making false claims and statements to Medicare and Medicaid. False claims include, but are not limited to, billing for services not rendered or for misrepresenting actual services rendered in order to obtain higher reimbursement, billing for unnecessary goods and services, and cost report fraud. Federal enforcement officials have the ability to exclude from Medicare and Medicaid any investors, officers and managing employees associated with business entities that have committed health care fraud, even if the officer or managing employee had no knowledge of the fraud. Criminal and civil penalties may be imposed for a number of other prohibited activities, including failure to return known overpayments, certain gainsharing arrangements, billing Medicare amounts that are substantially in excess of a provider s usual charges, offering remuneration to influence a Medicare or Medicaid beneficiary s selection of a health care provider, contracting with an individual or entity known to be excluded from a federal health care program, making or accepting a payment to induce a physician to reduce or limit services, and soliciting or receiving any remuneration in return for referring an individual for an item or service payable by a federal health care program. Like the Anti-kickback Statute, these provisions are very broad. To avoid liability, providers must, among other things, carefully and accurately code claims for reimbursement, as well as accurately prepare cost reports.

Some of these provisions, including the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law, require a lower burden of proof than other fraud and abuse laws, including the Anti-kickback Statute. Civil monetary penalties that may be imposed under the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law range from $10,000 to $50,000 per act, and in some cases may result in penalties of up to three times the remuneration offered, paid, solicited or received. In addition, a violator may be subject to exclusion from federal and state health care programs. Federal and state governments increasingly use the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law, especially where they believe they cannot meet the higher burden of proof requirements under the Anti-kickback Statute. Further, individuals can receive up to $1,000 for providing information on Medicare fraud and abuse that leads to the recovery of at least $100 of Medicare funds under the Medicare Integrity Program.

The Federal False Claims Act and Similar State Laws

The *qui tam*, or whistleblower, provisions of the FCA allow private individuals to bring actions on behalf of the government alleging that the defendant has defrauded the federal government. Further, the government may use the FCA to prosecute Medicare and other government program fraud in areas such as coding errors, billing for services not provided and submitting false cost reports. When a private party brings a *qui tam* action under the FCA, the

defendant is not made aware of the lawsuit until the government commences its own investigation or makes a determination whether it will intervene. When a defendant is determined by a court of law to be liable under the FCA, the defendant may be required to pay three times the actual damages sustained by the government, plus mandatory civil penalties of between $5,500 and $11,000 for each separate false claim. There are many potential bases for liability under the FCA. Liability often arises when an entity knowingly submits a false claim for

Table of Contents

reimbursement to the federal government. The FCA defines the term knowingly broadly. Though simple negligence will not give rise to liability under the FCA, submitting a claim with reckless disregard to its truth or falsity constitutes a knowing submission under the FCA and, therefore, will qualify for liability. On May 20, 2009, the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act of 2009 expanded the scope of the FCA by, among other things, creating liability for knowingly and improperly avoiding repayment of an overpayment received from the government and broadening protections for whistleblowers.

In some cases, whistleblowers and the federal government have taken the position, and some courts have held, that providers who allegedly have violated other statutes, such as the Anti-kickback Statute and the Stark Law, have thereby submitted false claims under the FCA. Every entity that receives at least $5 million annually in Medicaid payments must have written policies for all employees, contractors or agents, providing detailed information about false claims, false statements and whistleblower protections under certain federal laws, including the FCA, and similar state laws. In addition, federal law provides an incentive to states to enact false claims laws comparable to the FCA. A number of states in which we operate have adopted their own false claims provisions as well as their own whistleblower provisions under which a private party may file a civil lawsuit in state court. We have adopted and distributed policies pertaining to the FCA and relevant state laws.

HIPAA Administrative Simplification and Privacy and Security Requirements

The Administrative Simplification Provisions of HIPAA require the use of uniform electronic data transmission standards for certain health care claims and payment transactions submitted or received electronically. These provisions are intended to encourage electronic commerce in the health care industry. HHS has issued regulations implementing the HIPAA Administrative Simplification Provisions and compliance with these regulations is mandatory for our facilities. In addition, HIPAA requires that each provider use a National Provider Identifier. In January 2009, CMS published a final rule making changes to the formats used for certain electronic transactions and requiring the use of updated standard code sets for certain diagnoses and procedures known as ICD-10 code sets. While use of the ICD-10 code sets is not mandatory until October 1, 2013, we will be modifying our payment systems and processes to prepare for the implementation. Implementing the ICD-10 code sets will require significant administrative changes, but we believe that the cost of compliance with these regulations has not had and is not expected to have a material, adverse effect on our business, financial position or results of operations.

The privacy and security regulations promulgated pursuant to HIPAA extensively regulate the use and disclosure of individually identifiable health information and require covered entities, including health plans and most health care providers, to implement administrative, physical and technical safeguards to protect the security of such information. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), which was signed into law on February 17, 2009, broadened the scope of the HIPAA privacy and security regulations. In addition, ARRA extends the application of certain provisions of the security and privacy regulations to business associates (entities that handle identifiable health information on behalf of covered entities) and subjects business associates to civil and criminal penalties for violation of the regulations. We enforce a HIPAA compliance plan, which we believe complies with HIPAA privacy and security requirements and under which a HIPAA compliance group monitors our compliance. The privacy regulations and security regulations have and will continue to impose significant costs on our facilities in order to comply with these standards.

As required by ARRA, HHS published an interim final rule on August 24, 2009, that requires covered entities to report breaches of unsecured protected health information to affected individuals without unreasonable delay but not to exceed 60 days of discovery of the breach by a covered entity or its agents. Notification must also be made to HHS and, in certain situations involving large breaches, to the media. Various state laws and regulations may also require us to notify affected individuals in the event of a data breach involving individually identifiable information.

Violations of the HIPAA privacy and security regulations may result in civil and criminal penalties, and ARRA has strengthened the enforcement provisions of HIPAA, which may result in increased enforcement activity. Under ARRA, HHS is required to conduct periodic compliance audits of covered entities and their business associates. ARRA broadens the applicability of the criminal penalty provisions to employees of covered entities and requires HHS to impose penalties for violations resulting from willful neglect. ARRA also significantly increases the amount of the civil penalties, with penalties of up to $50,000 per violation for a maximum civil penalty of

$1,500,000 in a calendar year for violations of the same requirement. In addition, ARRA authorizes state attorneys general to bring civil actions seeking either injunction or damages in response to violations of HIPAA privacy and security regulations that threaten the privacy of state residents. Our facilities also remain subject to any federal or state privacy-related laws that are more restrictive than the privacy regulations issued under HIPAA. These laws vary and could impose additional penalties.

There are numerous other laws and legislative and regulatory initiatives at the federal and state levels addressing privacy and security concerns. For example, the Federal Trade Commission issued a final rule in October 2007 requiring financial institutions and creditors, which may include health providers and health plans, to implement written identity theft prevention programs to detect, prevent, and mitigate identity theft in connection with certain accounts. The Federal Trade Commission has delayed enforcement of this rule until June 1, 2010.

EMTALA

All of our hospitals in the United States are subject to EMTALA. This federal law requires any hospital participating in the Medicare program to conduct an appropriate medical screening examination of every individual who presents to the hospital s emergency room for treatment and, if the individual is suffering from an emergency medical condition, to either stabilize the condition or make an appropriate transfer of the individual to a facility able to handle the condition. The obligation to screen and stabilize emergency medical conditions exists regardless of an individual s ability to pay for treatment. There are severe penalties under EMTALA if a hospital fails to screen or appropriately stabilize or transfer an individual or if the hospital delays appropriate treatment in order to first inquire about the individual s ability to pay. Penalties for violations of EMTALA include civil monetary penalties and exclusion from participation in the Medicare program. In addition, an injured individual, the individual s family or a medical facility that suffers a financial loss as a direct result of a hospital s violation of the law can bring a civil suit against the hospital.

The government broadly interprets EMTALA to cover situations in which individuals do not actually present to a hospital s emergency room, but present for emergency examination or treatment to the hospital s campus, generally, or to a hospital-based clinic that treats emergency medical conditions or are transported in a hospital-owned ambulance, subject to certain exceptions. At least one court has interpreted the law also to apply to a hospital that has been notified of a patient s pending arrival in a non-hospital owned ambulance. EMTALA does not generally apply to individuals admitted for inpatient services. The government has expressed its intent to investigate and enforce EMTALA violations actively in the future. We believe our hospitals operate in substantial compliance with EMTALA.

Corporate Practice of Medicine/Fee Splitting

Some of the states in which we operate have laws prohibiting corporations and other entities from employing physicians, practicing medicine for a profit and making certain direct and indirect payments or fee-splitting arrangements between health care providers designed to induce or encourage the referral of patients to, or the recommendation of, particular providers for medical products and services. Possible sanctions for violation of these restrictions include loss of license and civil and criminal penalties. In addition, agreements between the corporation and the physician may be considered void and unenforceable. These statutes vary from state to state, are often vague and have seldom been interpreted by the courts or regulatory agencies.

Health Care Industry Investigations

Significant media and public attention has focused in recent years on the hospital industry. This media and public attention, changes in government personnel or other factors may lead to increased scrutiny of the health care industry.

While we are currently not aware of any material investigations of the Company under federal or state health care laws or regulations, it is possible that governmental entities could initiate investigations or litigation in the future at facilities we operate and that such matters could result in significant penalties, as well as adverse

publicity. It is also possible that our executives and managers could be included in governmental investigations or litigation or named as defendants in private litigation.

Our substantial Medicare, Medicaid and other governmental billings result in heightened scrutiny of our operations. We continue to monitor all aspects of our business and have developed a comprehensive ethics and compliance program that is designed to meet or exceed applicable federal guidelines and industry standards. Because the law in this area is complex and constantly evolving, governmental investigations or litigation may result in interpretations that are inconsistent with our or industry practices.

In public statements surrounding current investigations, governmental authorities have taken positions on a number of issues, including some for which little official interpretation previously has been available, that appear to be inconsistent with practices that have been common within the industry and that previously have not been challenged in this manner. In some instances, government investigations that have in the past been conducted under the civil provisions of federal law may now be conducted as criminal investigations.

Both federal and state government agencies have increased their focus on and coordination of civil and criminal enforcement efforts in the health care area. The OIG and the Department of Justice have, from time to time, established national enforcement initiatives, targeting all hospital providers that focus on specific billing practices or other suspected areas of abuse. In addition, governmental agencies and their agents, such as the Medicare Administrative Contractors, fiscal intermediaries and carriers, may conduct audits of our health care operations. Private payers may conduct similar post-payment audits, and we also perform internal audits and monitoring.

In addition to national enforcement initiatives, federal and state investigations have addressed a wide variety of routine health care operations such as: cost reporting and billing practices, including for Medicare outliers; financial arrangements with referral sources; physician recruitment activities; physician joint ventures; and hospital charges and collection practices for self-pay patients. We engage in many of these routine health care operations and other activities that could be the subject of governmental investigations or inquiries. For example, we have significant Medicare and Medicaid billings, numerous financial arrangements with physicians who are referral sources to our hospitals, and joint venture arrangements involving physician investors. Certain of our individual facilities have received, and other facilities may receive, government inquiries from federal and state agencies. Any additional investigations of the Company, our executives or managers could result in significant liabilities or penalties to us, as well as adverse publicity.

Commencing in 1997, we became aware we were the subject of governmental investigations and litigation relating to our business practices. As part of the investigations, the United States intervened in a number of *qui tam* actions brought by private parties. The investigations related to, among other things, DRG coding, outpatient laboratory billing, home health issues, physician relations, cost report and wound care issues. The investigations were concluded through a series of agreements executed in 2000 and 2003 with the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, various U.S. Attorneys offices, CMS, a negotiating team representing states with claims against us, and others. In January 2001, we entered into an eight-year Corporate Integrity Act (CIA) with the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, which expired January 24, 2009. If the government were to determine that we violated or breached the CIA or other federal or state laws relating to Medicare, Medicaid or similar programs, we could be subject to substantial monetary fines, civil and criminal penalties and/or exclusion from participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and other federal and state health care programs. Alleged violations may be pursued by the government or through private *qui tam* actions. Sanctions imposed against us as a result of such actions could have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations and financial position.

Health Care Reform

Health care is one of the largest industries in the United States and continues to attract much legislative interest and public attention. National health care reform is a focus at the federal level. In the final months of 2009, both houses of the U.S. Congress passed separate bills intended to reform the health care system through, among other things, decreasing the number of uninsured individuals and reducing health care costs. While neither of these bills has yet become law, such laws or similar proposals have been, and we anticipate will continue to be, a focus at the federal level. Several states are also considering health care reform measures. This focus on health care

reform may increase the likelihood of significant changes affecting the health care industry. In addition, possible future changes in the Medicare, Medicaid, and other state programs, including Medicaid supplemental payments pursuant to upper payment limit programs, may impact reimbursements to health care providers and insurers. Many states have enacted, or are considering enacting, measures designed to reduce their Medicaid expenditures and change private health care insurance. States have also adopted, or are considering, legislation designed to reduce coverage and program eligibility, enroll Medicaid recipients in managed care programs and/or impose additional taxes on hospitals to help finance or expand states Medicaid systems. Some states, including the states in which we operate, have applied for and have been granted federal waivers from current Medicaid regulations to allow them to serve some or all of their Medicaid participants through managed care providers. Hospital operating margins have been, and may continue to be, under significant pressure because of deterioration in pricing flexibility and payer mix, and growth in operating expenses in excess of the increase in PPS payments under the Medicare program.

General Economic and Demographic Factors

The United States economy has weakened significantly. Depressed consumer spending and higher unemployment rates continue to pressure many industries. During economic downturns, governmental entities often experience budget deficits as a result of increased costs and lower than expected tax collections. These budget deficits may force federal, state and local government entities to decrease spending for health and human service programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and similar programs, which represent significant payer sources for our hospitals. Other risks we face from general economic weakness include potential declines in the population covered under managed care agreements, patient decisions to postpone or cancel elective and non-emergency health care procedures, potential increases in the uninsured and underinsured populations and further difficulties in our collecting patient co-payment and deductible receivables.

The health care industry is impacted by the overall United States financial pressures. The federal deficit, the growing magnitude of Medicare expenditures and the aging of the United States population will continue to place pressure on federal health care programs.

Compliance Program and Corporate Integrity Agreement

We maintain a comprehensive ethics and compliance program that is designed to meet or exceed applicable federal guidelines and industry standards. The program is intended to monitor and raise awareness of various regulatory issues among employees and to emphasize the importance of complying with governmental laws and regulations. As part of the ethics and compliance program, we provide annual ethics and compliance training to our employees and encourage all employees to report any violations to their supervisor, an ethics and compliance officer or a toll-free telephone ethics line.

Until January 24, 2009, we operated under a Corporate Integrity Agreement (CIA), which was structured to assure the federal government of our overall federal health care program compliance and specifically covered DRG coding, outpatient PPS billing and physician relations. We underwent major training efforts to ensure that our employees learned and applied the policies and procedures implemented under the CIA and our ethics and compliance program. The CIA had the effect of increasing the amount of information we provided to the federal government regarding our health care practices and our compliance with federal regulations. Under the CIA, we had numerous affirmative obligations, including the requirement to report potential violations of applicable federal health care laws and regulations. Pursuant to this obligation, we reported a number of potential violations of the Stark Law, the Anti-kickback Statute, EMTALA, HIPAA and other laws, most of which we consider to be nonviolations or technical violations. We submitted our final report pursuant to the CIA on April 30, 2009. These reports could result in greater scrutiny by regulatory authorities. The government could determine that our reporting and/or our resolution of reported issues was inadequate. A determination that we breached the CIA and/or a finding of violations of applicable

health care laws or regulations could subject us to repayment requirements, substantial monetary penalties, civil penalties, exclusion from participation in the Medicare and Medicaid and other federal and state health care programs and, for violations of certain laws and regulations, criminal penalties. Although the CIA expired on January 24, 2009, we maintain our ethics and compliance program in substantially the same form. However, the audit plans in the CIA have been modified and the reportable events process has been converted to an internal reporting process.

Antitrust Laws

The federal government and most states have enacted antitrust laws that prohibit certain types of conduct deemed to be anti-competitive. These laws prohibit price fixing, concerted refusal to deal, market monopolization, price discrimination, tying arrangements, acquisitions of competitors and other practices that have, or may have, an adverse effect on competition. Violations of federal or state antitrust laws can result in various sanctions, including criminal and civil penalties. Antitrust enforcement in the health care industry is currently a priority of the Federal Trade Commission. We believe we are in compliance with such federal and state laws, but future review of our practices by courts or regulatory authorities could result in a determination that could adversely affect our operations.

Environmental Matters

We are subject to various federal, state and local statutes and ordinances regulating the discharge of materials into the environment. We do not believe that we will be required to expend any material amounts in order to comply with these laws and regulations.

Insurance

As is typical in the health care industry, we are subject to claims and legal actions by patients in the ordinary course of business. Subject to a $5 million per occurrence self-insured retention, our facilities are insured by our wholly-owned insurance subsidiary for losses up to $50 million per occurrence. The insurance subsidiary has obtained reinsurance for professional liability risks generally above a retention level of $15 million per occurrence. We also maintain professional liability insurance with unrelated commercial carriers for losses in excess of amounts insured by our insurance subsidiary.

We purchase, from unrelated insurance companies, coverage for directors and officers liability and property loss in amounts we believe are adequate. The directors and officers liability coverage includes a $25 million corporate deductible for the period prior to the Recapitalization and a $1 million corporate deductible subsequent to the Recapitalization. In addition, we will continue to purchase coverage for our directors and officers on an ongoing basis. The property coverage includes varying deductibles depending on the cause of the property damage. These deductibles range from $500,000 per claim up to 5% of the affected property values for certain flood and wind and earthquake related incidents.

Employees and Medical Staffs

At December 31, 2009, we had approximately 190,000 employees, including approximately 49,000 part-time employees. References herein to employees refer to employees of our affiliates. We are subject to various state and federal laws that regulate wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions relating to employment. At December 31, 2009, employees at 20 of our hospitals are represented by various labor unions. It is possible additional hospitals may unionize in the future. We consider our employee relations to be good and have not experienced work stoppages that have materially, adversely affected our business or results of operations. Our hospitals, like most hospitals, have experienced labor costs rising faster than the general inflation rate. In some markets, nurse and medical support personnel availability has become a significant operating issue to health care providers. To address this challenge, we have implemented several initiatives to improve retention, recruiting, compensation programs and productivity.

Our hospitals are staffed by licensed physicians, who generally are not employees of our hospitals. However, some physicians provide services in our hospitals under contracts, which generally describe a term of service, provide and establish the duties and obligations of such physicians, require the maintenance of certain performance criteria and fix

compensation for such services. Any licensed physician may apply to be accepted to the medical staff of any of our hospitals, but the hospital s medical staff and the appropriate governing board of the hospital, in accordance with established credentialing criteria, must approve acceptance to the staff. Members of the medical staffs of our hospitals often also serve on the medical staffs of other hospitals and may terminate their affiliation with one of our hospitals at any time.

Table of Contents

We may be required to continue to enhance wages and benefits to recruit and retain nurses and other medical support personnel or to hire more expensive temporary or contract personnel. As a result, our labor costs could increase. We also depend on the available labor pool of semi-skilled and unskilled employees in each of the markets in which we operate. Certain proposed changes in federal labor laws, including the Employee Free Choice Act, could increase the likelihood of employee unionization attempts. To the extent a significant portion of our employee base unionizes, our costs could increase materially. In addition, the states in which we operate could adopt mandatory nurse-staffing ratios or could reduce mandatory nurse-staffing ratios already in place. State-mandated nurse-staffing ratios could significantly affect labor costs, and have an adverse impact on revenues if we are required to limit patient admissions in order to meet the required ratios.

Executive Officers of the Registrant

As of February 28, 2010, our executive officers were as follows:

Name	Age	Position(s)
Richard M. Bracken	57	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer
R. Milton Johnson	53	Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Director
David G. Anderson	62	Senior Vice President Finance and Treasurer
Victor L. Campbell	63	Senior Vice President
Charles J. Hall	56	President Eastern Group
Samuel N. Hazen	49	President Western Group
A. Bruce Moore, Jr.	50	President Outpatient Services Group
Jonathan B. Perlin, M.D.	49	President Clinical Services Group and Chief Medical Officer
W. Paul Rutledge	55	President Central Group
Joseph A. Sowell, III	53	Senior Vice President Development
Joseph N. Steakley	55	Senior Vice President Internal Audit Services
John M. Steele	54	Senior Vice President Human Resources
Donald W. Stinnett	53	Senior Vice President and Controller
Beverly B. Wallace	59	President Shared Services Group
Robert A. Waterman	56	Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Chief Labor Relations Officer
Noel Brown Williams	54	Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Alan R. Yuspeh	60	Senior Vice President and Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer

Richard M. Bracken has served as Chief Executive Officer since January 2009 and was appointed as Chairman of the Board in December 2009. Mr. Bracken served as President and Chief Executive Officer from January 2009 to December 2009. Mr. Bracken was appointed Chief Operating Officer in July 2001 and served as President and Chief Operating Officer from January 2002 to January 2009. Mr. Bracken served as President Western Group of the Company from August 1997 until July 2001. From January 1995 to August 1997, Mr. Bracken served as President of the Pacific Division of the Company. Prior to 1995, Mr. Bracken served in various hospital Chief Executive Officer and Administrator positions with HCA-Hospital Corporation of America.

R. Milton Johnson has served as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the Company since July 2004 and was appointed as a director in December 2009. Mr. Johnson served as Senior Vice President and Controller

of the Company from July 1999 until July 2004. Mr. Johnson served as Vice President and Controller of the Company from November 1998 to July 1999. Prior to that time, Mr. Johnson served as Vice President Tax of the Company from April 1995 to October 1998. Prior to that time, Mr. Johnson served as Director of Tax for Healthtrust from September 1987 to April 1995.

Table of Contents

David G. Anderson has served as Senior Vice President Finance and Treasurer of the Company since July 1999. Mr. Anderson served as Vice President Finance of the Company from September 1993 to July 1999 and was elected to the additional position of Treasurer in November 1996. From March 1993 until September 1993, Mr. Anderson served as Vice President Finance and Treasurer of Galen Health Care, Inc. From July 1988 to March 1993, Mr. Anderson served as Vice President Finance and Treasurer of Humana Inc.

Victor L. Campbell has served as Senior Vice President of the Company since February 1994. Prior to that time, Mr. Campbell served as HCA-Hospital Corporation of America s Vice President for Investor, Corporate and Government Relations. Mr. Campbell joined HCA-Hospital Corporation of America in 1972. Mr. Campbell serves on the Board of the Nashville Health Care Council, as a member of the American Hospital Association s President s Forum, and on the Board and Executive Committee of the Federation of American Hospitals.

Charles J. Hall was appointed President Eastern Group of the Company in October 2006. Prior to that time, Mr. Hall had served as President North Florida Division since April 2003. Mr. Hall had previously served the Company as President of the East Florida Division from January 1999 until April 2003, as a Market President in the East Florida Division from January 1998 until December 1998, as President of the South Florida Division from February 1996 until December 1997, and as President of the Southwest Florida Division from October 1994 until February 1996, and in various other capacities since 1987.

Samuel N. Hazen was appointed President Western Group of the Company in July 2001. Mr. Hazen served as Chief Financial Officer Western Group of the Company from August 1995 to July 2001. Mr. Hazen served as Chief Financial Officer North Texas Division of the Company from February 1994 to July 1995. Prior to that time, Mr. Hazen served in various hospital and regional Chief Financial Officer positions with Humana Inc. and Galen Health Care, Inc.

Bruce Moore, Jr. was appointed President Outpatient Services Group in January 2006. Mr. Moore had served as Senior Vice President and as Chief Operating Officer Outpatient Services Group since July 2004 and as Senior Vice President Operations Administration from July 1999 until July 2004. Mr. Moore served as Vice President Operations Administration of the Company from September 1997 to July 1999, as Vice President Benefits from October 1996 to September 1997, and as Vice President Compensation from March 1995 until October 1996.

Dr. Jonathan B. Perlin was appointed President Clinical Services Group and Chief Medical Officer in November 2007. Dr. Perlin had served as Chief Medical Officer and Senior Vice President Quality of the Company from August 2006 to November 2007. Prior to joining the Company, Dr. Perlin served as Under Secretary for Health in the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs since April 2004. Dr. Perlin joined the Veterans Health Administration in November 1999 where he served in various capacities, including as Deputy Under Secretary for Health from July 2002 to April 2004, and as Chief Quality and Performance Officer from November 1999 to September 2002.

W. Paul Rutledge was appointed as President Central Group in October 2005. Mr. Rutledge had served as President of the MidAmerica Division since January 2001. He served as President of TriStar Health System from June 1996 to January 2001 and served as President of Centennial Medical Center from May 1993 to June 1996. He has served in leadership capacities with HCA for more than 27 years, working with hospitals in the United States and London, England.

Joseph A. Sowell, III was appointed as Senior Vice President and Chief Development Officer of the Company in December 2009. From 1987 to 1996 and again from 1999 to 2009, Mr. Sowell was a partner at the law firm of Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis. From 1996 to 1999, Mr. Sowell served as the head of development, and later as the Chief Operating Officer of Arcon Healthcare.

Joseph N. Steakley has served as Senior Vice President Internal Audit Services of the Company since July 1999. Mr. Steakley served as Vice President Internal Audit Services from November 1997 to July 1999. From October 1989 until October 1997, Mr. Steakley was a partner with Ernst & Young LLP. Mr. Steakley is a member of the board of directors of J. Alexander s Corporation, where he serves on the compensation committee and as chairman of the audit committee.

John M. Steele has served as Senior Vice President Human Resources of the Company since November 2003. Mr. Steele served as Vice President Compensation and Recruitment of the Company from November 1997

Table of Contents

to October 2003. From March 1995 to November 1997, Mr. Steele served as Assistant Vice President Recruitment.

Donald W. Stinnett has served as Senior Vice President and Controller since December 2008. Mr. Stinnett served as Chief Financial Officer Eastern Group from October 2005 to December 2008 and Chief Financial Officer of the Far West Division from July 1999 to October 2005. Mr. Stinnett served as Chief Financial Officer and Vice President of Finance of Franciscan Health System of the Ohio Valley from 1995 until 1999, and served in various capacities with Franciscan Health System of Cincinnati and Providence Hospital in Cincinnati prior to that time.

Beverly B. Wallace was appointed President Shared Services Group in March 2006. From January 2003 until March 2006, Ms. Wallace served as President Financial Services Group. Ms. Wallace served as Senior Vice President Revenue Cycle Operations Management of the Company from July 1999 to January 2003. Ms. Wallace served as Vice President Managed Care of the Company from July 1998 to July 1999. From 1997 to 1998, Ms. Wallace served as President Homecare Division of the Company. From 1996 to 1997, Ms. Wallace served as Chief Financial Officer Nashville Division of the Company. From 1994 to 1996, Ms. Wallace served as Chief Financial Officer Mid-America Division of the Company.

Robert A. Waterman has served as Senior Vice President and General Counsel of the Company since November 1997 and Chief Labor Relations Officer since March 2009. Mr. Waterman served as a partner in the law firm of Latham & Watkins from September 1993 to October 1997; he was Chair of the firm s healthcare group during 1997.

Noel Brown Williams has served as Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer of the Company since October 1997. From October 1996 to September 1997, Ms. Williams served as Chief Information Officer for American Service Group/Prison Health Services, Inc. From September 1995 to September 1996, Ms. Williams worked as an independent consultant. From June 1993 to June 1995, Ms. Williams served as Vice President, Information Services for HCA Information Services. From February 1979 to June 1993, she held various positions with HCA-Hospital Corporation of America Information Services.

Alan R. Yuspeh has served as Senior Vice President and Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer of the Company since May 2007. From October 1997 to May 2007, Mr. Yuspeh served as Senior Vice President Ethics, Compliance and Corporate Responsibility of the Company. From September 1991 until October 1997, Mr. Yuspeh was a partner with the law firm of Howrey & Simon. As a part of his law practice, Mr. Yuspeh served from 1987 to 1997 as Coordinator of the Defense Industry Initiative on Business Ethics and Conduct.

Item 1A. *Risk Factors*

If any of the events discussed in the following risk factors were to occur, our business, financial position, results of operations, cash flows or prospects could be materially, adversely affected. Additional risks and uncertainties not presently known, or currently deemed immaterial, may also constrain our business and operations.

Our Substantial Leverage Could Adversely Affect Our Ability To Raise Additional Capital To Fund Our Operations, Limit Our Ability To React To Changes In The Economy Or Our Industry, Expose Us To Interest Rate Risk To The Extent Of Our Variable Rate Debt And Prevent Us From Meeting Our Obligations.

We are highly leveraged. As of December 31, 2009, our total indebtedness was $25.670 billion. Our high degree of leverage could have important consequences, including:

- increasing our vulnerability to downturns or adverse changes in general economic, industry or competitive conditions and adverse changes in government regulations;

requiring a substantial portion of cash flow from operations to be dedicated to the payment of principal and interest on our indebtedness, therefore reducing our ability to use our cash flow to fund our operations, capital expenditures and future business opportunities;

exposing us to the risk of increased interest rates as certain of our unhedged borrowings are at variable rates of interest;

limiting our ability to make strategic acquisitions or causing us to make nonstrategic divestitures;

limiting our ability to obtain additional financing for working capital, capital expenditures, product or service line development, debt service requirements, acquisitions and general corporate or other purposes; and

limiting our ability to adjust to changing market conditions and placing us at a competitive disadvantage compared to our competitors who are less highly leveraged.

We and our subsidiaries have the ability to incur additional indebtedness in the future, subject to the restrictions contained in our senior secured credit facilities and the indentures governing our outstanding notes. If new indebtedness is added to our current debt levels, the related risks that we now face could intensify.

We May Not Be Able To Generate Sufficient Cash To Service All Of Our Indebtedness And May Not Be Able To Refinance Our Indebtedness On Favorable Terms. If We Are Unable To Do So, We May Be Forced To Take Other Actions To Satisfy Our Obligations Under Our Indebtedness, Which May Not Be Successful.

Our ability to make scheduled payments on or to refinance our debt obligations depends on our financial condition and operating performance, which is subject to prevailing economic and competitive conditions and to certain financial, business and other factors beyond our control. We cannot assure you we will maintain a level of cash flows from operating activities sufficient to permit us to pay the principal, premium, if any, and interest on our indebtedness.

As of December 31, 2009, our substantial indebtedness included $9.702 billion of indebtedness under our senior secured credit facilities maturing in 2012 and 2013, $2.750 billion aggregate principal amount of first lien notes maturing in 2019 and 2020, $6.088 billion aggregate principal amount of second lien notes maturing in 2014, 2016 and 2017 and $6.856 billion aggregate principal amount of unsecured senior notes and debentures that mature on various dates from 2010 to 2095 (including $5.454 billion maturing through 2016). Because a significant portion of our indebtedness matures in the next few years, we may find it necessary or prudent to refinance that indebtedness with longer-maturity debt at a higher interest rate. In February, April and August of 2009, for example, we issued $310 million in aggregate principal amount of 97/8% second lien notes due 2017, $1.500 billion in aggregate principal amount of 81/2% first lien notes due 2019 and $1.250 billion in aggregate principal amount of 77/8% first lien notes due 2020, respectively. We used the net proceeds of those offerings to prepay term loans under our cash flow credit facility, which currently bears interest at a lower floating rate. Our ability to refinance our indebtedness on favorable terms, or at all, is directly affected by the current global economic and financial conditions. In addition, our ability to incur secured indebtedness (which would generally enable us to achieve better pricing than the incurrence of unsecured indebtedness) depends in part on the value of our assets, which depends, in turn, on the strength of our cash flows and results of operations, and on economic and market conditions and other factors.

If our cash flows and capital resources are insufficient to fund our debt service obligations or we are unable to refinance our indebtedness, we may be forced to reduce or delay investments and capital expenditures, or to sell assets, seek additional capital or restructure our indebtedness. These alternative measures may not be successful and may not permit us to meet our scheduled debt service obligations. If our operating results and available cash are insufficient to meet our debt service obligations, we could face substantial liquidity problems and might be required to dispose of material assets or operations to meet our debt service and other obligations. We may not be able to consummate those dispositions, or the proceeds from the dispositions may not be adequate to meet any debt service obligations then due.

Our Debt Agreements Contain Restrictions That Limit Our Flexibility In Operating Our Business.

Our senior secured credit facilities and the indentures governing our outstanding notes contain various covenants that limit our ability to engage in specified types of transactions. These covenants limit our and certain of our subsidiaries ability to, among other things:

- incur additional indebtedness or issue certain preferred shares;

- pay dividends on, repurchase or make distributions in respect of our capital stock or make other restricted payments;
- make certain investments;
- sell or transfer assets;
- create liens;
- consolidate, merge, sell or otherwise dispose of all or substantially all of our assets; and
- enter into certain transactions with our affiliates.

Under our asset-based revolving credit facility, when (and for as long as) the combined availability under our asset-based revolving credit facility and our senior secured revolving credit facility is less than a specified amount for a certain period of time or, if a payment or bankruptcy event of default has occurred and is continuing, funds deposited into any of our depository accounts will be transferred on a daily basis into a blocked account with the administrative agent and applied to prepay loans under the asset-based revolving credit facility and to cash collateralize letters of credit issued thereunder.

Under our senior secured credit facilities, we are required to satisfy and maintain specified financial ratios. Our ability to meet those financial ratios can be affected by events beyond our control, and there can be no assurance we will continue to meet those ratios. A breach of any of these covenants could result in a default under both our cash flow credit facility and our asset-based revolving credit facility. Upon the occurrence of an event of default under our senior secured credit facilities, our lenders could elect to declare all amounts outstanding under our senior secured credit facilities to be immediately due and payable and terminate all commitments to extend further credit. If we were unable to repay those amounts, the lenders under our senior secured credit facilities could proceed against the collateral granted to them to secure such indebtedness. We have pledged a significant portion of our assets as collateral under our senior secured credit facilities, and that collateral (other than certain European collateral securing our senior secured European term loan facility) is also pledged as collateral under our outstanding notes. If any of the lenders under our senior secured credit facilities accelerate the repayment of borrowings, there can be no assurance we will have sufficient assets to repay our senior secured credit facilities or our outstanding notes.

Our Hospitals Face Competition For Patients From Other Hospitals And Health Care Providers.

The health care business is highly competitive, and competition among hospitals and other health care providers for patients has intensified in recent years. Generally, other hospitals in the local communities we serve provide services similar to those offered by our hospitals. In addition, CMS publicizes on a website performance data related to quality measures and data on patient satisfaction surveys hospitals submit in connection with their Medicare reimbursement. Federal law provides for the future expansion of the number of quality measures that must be reported. Additional quality measures and future trends toward clinical transparency may have an unanticipated impact on our competitive position and patient volumes. If any of our hospitals achieve poor results (or results that are lower than our competitors) on these quality measures or on patient satisfaction surveys, patient volumes could decline.

In addition, the number of freestanding specialty hospitals, surgery centers and diagnostic and imaging centers in the geographic areas in which we operate has increased significantly. As a result, most of our hospitals operate in a highly competitive environment. Some of the facilities that compete with our hospitals are owned by governmental agencies or not-for-profit corporations supported by endowments, charitable contributions and/or tax revenues and can finance

capital expenditures and operations on a tax-exempt basis. Our hospitals are facing increasing competition from physician-owned specialty hospitals and from both our own and unaffiliated freestanding surgery centers for market share in high margin services and for quality physicians and personnel. If ambulatory surgery centers are better able to compete in this environment than our hospitals, our hospitals may experience a decline in patient volume, and we may experience a decrease in margin, even if those patients use our ambulatory surgery centers. In states that do not require a CON for the purchase, construction or expansion of health care facilities or services, competition in the form of new services, facilities and capital spending is more prevalent.

Further, if our competitors are better able to attract patients, recruit physicians, expand services or obtain favorable managed care contracts at their facilities than our hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers, we may experience an overall decline in patient volume. See Item 1, Business Competition.

The Growth Of Uninsured And Patient Due Accounts And A Deterioration In The Collectibility Of These Accounts Could Adversely Affect Our Results Of Operations.

The primary collection risks of our accounts receivable relate to the uninsured patient accounts and patient accounts for which the primary insurance carrier has paid the amounts covered by the applicable agreement, but patient responsibility amounts (deductibles and copayments) remain outstanding. The provision for doubtful accounts relates primarily to amounts due directly from patients.

The amount of the provision for doubtful accounts is based upon management s assessment of historical writeoffs and expected net collections, business and economic conditions, trends in federal and state governmental and private employer health care coverage, the rate of growth in uninsured patient admissions and other collection indicators. Due to a number of factors, including the recent economic downturn and increase in unemployment, we believe our facilities may experience growth in bad debts, uninsured discounts and charity care. At December 31, 2009, our allowance for doubtful accounts represented approximately 94% of the $5.176 billion patient due accounts receivable balance. The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care increased from $6.134 billion for 2007, to $7.009 billion for 2008 and to $8.362 billion for 2009.

A continuation of the trends that have resulted in an increasing proportion of accounts receivable being comprised of uninsured accounts and a deterioration in the collectibility of these accounts will adversely affect our collection of accounts receivable, cash flows and results of operations.

Health Care Reform And Changes In Governmental Programs May Reduce Our Revenues.

National health care reform remains a focus at the federal level. In the final months of 2009, both houses of the U.S. Congress passed separate bills intended to reform the health care system through, among other things, decreasing the number of uninsured individuals and reducing health care costs. While neither of these bills has yet become law, such laws or similar proposals have been, and we anticipate will continue to be, a focus at the federal level. Several states are also considering health care reform measures. Federal or state health care reform could adversely affect our business and results of operations.

The focus on health care reform may also increase the likelihood of significant changes affecting existing government health care programs. A significant portion of our patient volumes is derived from government health care programs, principally Medicare and Medicaid, which are highly regulated and subject to frequent and substantial changes. We derived approximately 60% of our admissions from the Medicare and Medicaid programs in 2009. In recent years, legislative and regulatory changes have resulted in limitations on and, in some cases, reductions in levels of payments to health care providers for certain services under these government programs. Possible future changes in the Medicare, Medicaid, and other state programs may reduce reimbursements to health care providers and insurers and may also increase our operating costs, which could reduce our profitability.

Effective January 1, 2008, CMS increased ASC payment groups from nine clinically disparate payment groups to an extensive list of covered surgical procedures among the APCs used under the outpatient PPS for these surgical services. CMS established a four-year transition period for implementing the revised payment rates and significantly expanded the number of procedures that Medicare reimburses if performed in an ASC. CMS also limited ASC reimbursement for procedures commonly performed in physicians offices. More Medicare procedures now performed in hospitals, such as ours, may be moved to ASCs, reducing surgical volume in our hospitals. Also, more Medicare

procedures now performed in ASCs, such as ours, may be moved to physicians offices. Commercial third-party payers may adopt similar policies.

CMS has recently completed a two-year transition to full implementation of the MS-DRGs system, which represents a refinement to the existing MS-DRG system. Realignments in the DRG system could impact the margins we receive for certain services. For federal fiscal year 2010, CMS has provided a 2.1% market basket update for hospitals that submit certain quality patient care indicators and a 0.1% update for hospitals that do not

Table of Contents

submit this data. While we will endeavor to comply with all quality data submission requirements, our submissions may not be deemed timely or sufficient to entitle us to the full market basket adjustment for all of our hospitals. Medicare payments to hospitals in federal fiscal years 2008 and 2009 were reduced to eliminate what CMS estimated to be the effect of coding or classifications changes as a result of hospitals implementing the MS-DRG system. If CMS retrospectively determines the adjustment levels for federal fiscal years 2008 and 2009 were inadequate, CMS may impose additional adjustments in future years. Although CMS has not imposed an adjustment for federal fiscal year 2010, CMS has announced its intent to impose payment adjustments in federal fiscal years 2011 and 2012 because of what CMS has determined to be an inadequate adjustment in federal fiscal year 2008. Additionally, Medicare payments to hospitals are subject to a number of other adjustments, and the actual impact on payments to specific hospitals may vary. In some cases, commercial third-party payers and other payers such as some state Medicaid programs rely on all or portions of the Medicare MS-DRG system to determine payment rates, and adjustments that negatively impact Medicare payments may also negatively impact payments from those payers.

Since most states must operate with balanced budgets and since the Medicaid program is often the state s largest program, states can be expected to adopt or consider adopting legislation designed to reduce their Medicaid expenditures. The current economic downturn has increased the budgetary pressures on most states, and these budgetary pressures have resulted, and likely will continue to result, in decreased spending for Medicaid programs in many states. Further, many states have also adopted, or are considering, legislation designed to reduce coverage and program eligibility, enroll Medicaid recipients in managed care programs and/or impose additional taxes on hospitals to help finance or expand the states Medicaid systems.

On May 1, 2009, the Department of Defense implemented a prospective payment system for hospital outpatient services furnished to TRICARE beneficiaries similar to that utilized for services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries. Because the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system APC rates have historically been below TRICARE rates, the adoption of this payment methodology for TRICARE beneficiaries reduces our reimbursement; however, TRICARE outpatient services do not represent a significant portion of our patient volumes.

Changes in laws or regulations regarding government health programs or other changes in the administration of government health programs could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations.

If We Are Unable To Retain And Negotiate Favorable Contracts With Nongovernment Payers, Including Managed Care Pla