

## Constantino, Mike

---

**From:** ANDREI AND MARIA NEUHAUS [amneuhaus@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 19, 2013 2:40 PM  
**To:** Constantino, Mike  
**Subject:** Fw: Response to Appeal from Riverside Project 12-089

I submitted this on Tuesday, March 12th and do not see it on the website.

**From:** ANDREI AND MARIA NEUHAUS  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2013 4:33 PM  
**To:** Mike Constantino  
**Subject:** Response to Appeal from Riverside Project 12-089

Dear Mr. Constantino,

Riverside has recently provided supplemental information in an attempt to reverse the Illinois State Health Board's recent decision to deny their request to build an FEC. I would like to address the information that they have provided:

First, Riverside recently hired a third party consulting firm in an attempt to revise the data supporting the board's decision to deny their proposal, specifically duplication/maldistribution of services. It is rather apparent that most anyone can hire a third party consultant to skew numbers in their favor for projected utilization. Most interestingly enough to point out is one area of the report where numbers were skewed. For example, Riverside claims that the current ED stays for Medicare patients "did not take into consideration room-turnover", and that this turn-over would require 30 minutes each. First off, that is quite a stretch. I have yet to see an emergency department that takes an entire half of an hour in an urgent care setting to clean up a room to prepare it for the next patient. Regardless, this is just one of the attempts Riverside made, and even with those numbers, it is still a stretch. The rest of their report goes on to show this consulting firm's market projection numbers being manipulated just enough to prove that existing healthcare centers in the area would not be underutilized according to their future projections. Again, any firm can be paid to hypothesize projected statistics on any data provided. This does not change the fact that the information provided from Riverside's own reporting at the time of the board's decision to deny clearly showed that approving the Riverside FEC project would indeed duplicate existing services in the area for which it intends to serve.

Second, in order to combat the issue of the cost of their proposed project exceeding the state's standards, thus leading to the intent to deny decision, Riverside simply played around with the numbers again to suddenly reduce the cost of the proposed project by almost \$85,000! Wow. And just like that, they have solved that problem. It is amazing to me that they can quickly cut the cost of such a substantial project by almost 6 figures in order to make it fit. Again, this is simply an attempt at manipulating the numbers in order to comply with the standard, albeit a little too late.

Third, Riverside is now stating that their proposed project is part of a larger effort to recruit primary care physicians. If this is the case, then why not go back to their original plans of building medical offices and not an FEC? As a result of the Affordable Care Act, it is apparent that Riverside's true intention is for financial profit. Rather than having standard medical offices in that location as originally intended, Riverside is well aware that they stand to profit substantially by converting to an FEC. With everyone entitled to healthcare in the near future, there will be a large influx of patients walking into an FEC such as the one Riverside is

proposing, for the most minor of care for which they could and should probably see a primary care physician. This will cause an increase in profit, much more so than their originally slated medical offices would. This should be apparent to anyone that takes a closer look at their timing in accordance with the Affordable Care Act.

Fourth, none of the information provided takes into account the fact that St. James Franciscan Alliance is opening an immediate care facility in March 2013 on Lagrange Road in Frankfort **just 4 blocks north of their proposed site.** This only further validates the board's decision to deny their request for approval of this unnecessary project.

Finally, Riverside created an online petition in a final attempt to show that there is support, and therefore a need, in this area for their FEC. I am actually quite pleased that they chose to submit this as evidence because what it actually does is provide further proof that there is absolutely no need or interest for their facility in the Frankfort or immediate surrounding area. I would like to point out that out of the 246 (not 300) online signatures that they received, **only two** were from the Frankfort area, and **only nine** were from towns immediately neighboring Frankfort, such as New Lenox and Mokena. Also, the first signature was dated January 29, 2013, but the remaining 245 signatures are all dated March 6 and 7, 2013, which happens to be the exact date they submitted their appeal. Coincidence? Furthermore, it is interesting to note that in addition to a majority of their support coming from Kankakee and even further south than that, they also had signatures from as far away as Pittsburgh, PA, New City, New York, and my personal favorite, Belize City, Belize. Exactly how do those signatures contain any merit whatsoever in support for this project? In fact, if any of the signatures were to be of value when the board meets to review the appeal, it would be important to determine how many of those signatures are actually from people who are employed by Riverside or have an affiliation with them and would therefore benefit financially or otherwise as a result of the approval of this project. I can already conclude that Carl Maronich, Director of Marketing and Public Relations for Riverside Medical, who actually submitted the petition to the board, is the 4th signature on the petition. Of course he supports it, he is employed there. He is not a private citizen supporting the project, he is a paid executive. How that would even be a consideration for appeal is just plain silly. If we were to analyze the signatures even further, it would not surprise anyone to note that so many other "supporters" are actually employees.

In addition, I would also like to address the fact that Silver Cross has also appealed the decision by the board for their FEC also in Frankfort for the same reason, duplication of services. Their appeal basically states that they would not be duplicating services but rather be an extension of the current services that they already provide to thousands of Frankfort and surrounding area residents **that already count on Silver Cross Hospital and their physicians for all of their medical needs.** This appeal is a much stronger case than what Riverside has submitted. If the board decided it needed to reverse its decision on either one of these projects, I would urge you to approve the Silver Cross proposal as it clearly makes more sense, especially in light of the rather weak response Riverside has submitted to the denial. Silver Cross already has a longstanding history with the Frankfort, New Lenox, Mokena and surrounding area residents, and building an FEC would indeed be just an extension of the medical care that Silver Cross already provides to a large majority of the population for which it intends on extending its existing service to.

Thank you for rejecting the proposal of this project. I, along with hundreds of other area residents, are grateful for the informed decision the board has made. Nothing Riverside has submitted in their reply to Intent To Deny warrants a single change in vote. We hope that you can see through it all and we urge you to continue to deny their appeal based on the facts that have already been presented.

Sincerely,

**Maria Neuhaus**  
**Concerned Private Resident of Frankfort, IL**