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CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Good afternoon. I'll call this meeting of the Green Mountain Care Board back to order. The last item on our agenda is a meeting to hear a request for an emergency CON. I want to preface this a little bit for the room, for the viewers, and for the folks at the other table. This is not a CON hearing. This is a meeting to determine whether or not a potential CON should be handled through the emergency criteria that are outlined in statute and that are provided for in our rule. And so that is what we are here to do today. There will be no decision made on a CON that you would normally think of where we come out with an order. That's not what we are here for.

I would like to welcome our guests. If you could say who you are, who you represent, and your favorite flavor of Ben \& Jerry's ice cream that be helpful.

MS. WOHL: Thank you, Chairman
Gobeille. My name is Elizabeth Wohl. I'm with the law firm of Downs, Rachlin \& Martin. My partner Tom Moody is here with me as well and we represent the applicant, the potential applicant, Burlington Labs Acquisition, LLC. And Mr. Crook?

MR. CROOK: James Crook.

MS. WOHL: Jim Crook is here as well as a representative of that entity. My favorite flavor of Ben \& Jerry's ice cream no longer exists, and it was Wavy Gravy.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Well played. Tom, yours?

MR. MOODY: Chunky Monkey.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: All right, we're brothers. Jim?

MR. CROOK: I don't eat ice cream. You can't get to look like this without eating ice cream.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: All right. Well
now that we are at the right blood pressure level, what I would like to do is turn it over to the attorneys that are here to present, and possibly Jim yourself, and hear what you have to say. And then the Board will ask questions and kind of take it from there.

MS. WOHL: Great. Thank you so much. I would like to start by thanking you and the Board and your staff for working with us to make this a priority. As you can tell from our letter and from the materials that we provided since, we feel that this is a project that needs to move forward on an expedited basis, really an emergency basis under your
rules, under Rule 4.303. And I feel that we have laid out a pretty detailed and thorough explanation of that. But we are more than happy to answer additional questions.

What we would really like to hear from you today is any questions that you have or that you need answered to, one, determine the nature of the emergency, and then two, to determine further process to move toward a Certificate of Need.

And with that, I would really like to hear your questions and let my colleagues who can speak more about the whole transaction speak.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Sure. I think that we should start just basically from what are you up to? You know, like what are you doing? Why are you doing it? It's in the letter, but $I$ think just a plain language explanation might be helpful if you want to do that.

MS. WOHL: Absolutely. Do you want to take that?

MR. CROOK: Sure. My name is Jim Crook. I've lived in Vermont 37 years. I know some of you. I've spent most of my time in Vermont at a company called IDX Systems Corporation which we sold in 2006. I spent 25 years there.

Since then I have been sort of a serial investor, mostly in health care companies that are small, and we help them -- nourish them and help them to get larger and do more good for the health care system.

This situation, Burlington Labs, came to my attention in late March when a friend called me and said there is a financial distress going on inside of Burlington Labs, and they need money to meet payroll. And they were looking for a half a million dollars at the time. I told the party that brought it to me that I'm not a banker. That's not my thing, but I'm happy to listen to the story and determine if there is some other way that I could help.

I heard the story. And I concluded very quickly what the company really needed -- I concluded two things. One, is they built a very impressive business from scratch. They served significant need in this state in terms of handling or addressing the needs of patients that have opiate addiction. And three, the business would never be able to be all that it could be if it didn't have a change in leadership and governance. And I told my friend who brought it to me that that was the case,
and if the business was interested in that path, then I might be interested, but not being a banker, I wasn't anyone that was going to loan money to the business.

So didn't hear anything. And about eight weeks went by to the end of May and Michael Casarico called me and asked me for some time. We spent time on the telephone. I was able to move a little bit shorter with him on the conversation that I had already received a download two months before about what the business was all about. And I communicated to him at the time that if he was willing to -- that $I$ was not interested in providing short-term financing. But if he was willing to change the leadership of the CEO and the CFO position in the company and accept a different level of governance at the board level, then we might have some game. And we might be willing to go through due diligence.

The other stipulation I had is the investments I make -- the only time I make an investment is when I have a CEO sort of on the bench that can come in, one of my guys or gals. Usually it's ex-IDX people. So we went through a very short process where I checked with a fellow named Chris

Powell. Chris is someone that I spent almost 30 years with, 20 at IDX and 10 afterwards. He was coming out of a privately backed arrangement, a company called Precise. Precise was sold last summer, and he was ready. So we went back to Michael and Jodi and said we are willing to go through the process of due diligence.

At that point as we get into the early part of June it became very evident that there were three things about this that were very, very attractive. Number one, was the social epidemic which was opiate abuse, and to be able to do something that matters. It's what I spent my entire career trying to do. That was important. Two, there were 180 jobs in this company that were at risk if we didn't step in and do something to help this business out, 140 of them in Burlington, Vermont.

My children all grew up in Vermont. I've lived in Vermont for 37 years. If I could do something to help save those 140 Burlington jobs and 180 jobs overall, that's also a plus. And three, it was going to be hard. And we sort of like hard things. And those three things were -- I didn't expect it to be this hard by the way. This is -this whole process here we are going through is a
little bit of a twist. I don't even want to classify it as hard necessarily, but didn't expect this element. But we are very, very appreciative of you stuffing us into a very busy schedule to listen to this tale, and to make a ruling on what we are trying to do. Those three elements, the ability to help a social problem, the ability to save jobs, and the ability to bring to bear what we are good at and what we know, with the right resources to save a very important asset in the state became really, really exciting to us.

We went through the month of June, as we told Michael and Jodi we were going to spend the month of June doing due diligence and determining on June 30 whether we were going to green light the situation. And we got through the month. We spent time meeting with Key Bank. We spent time meeting with UVM Health Network. We spent time meeting with any other -- UVM was not a creditor at the time nor is now. But we spent time meeting with every party we could to make sure we had a clear picture not only of what the state of the business was in today, but what we thought we could do with the business to serve more patients statewide, region wide and nationwide potentially.

And we came to a conclusion at the end of the month, based upon each sort of domino that fell, I mean UVMHN was enthusiastic about this. Key Bank was enthusiastic about us getting involved. There was another creditor at the time that we have since taken out of the picture that was enthusiastic about us getting involved. And at every turn it just kept saying we can fix this. We can do this.

So in the middle part of June we formulated a term sheet for Michael and Jodi to acquire the majority of the company. I represent the lead in the investor group. I'm the backstop in the investor group. One of the things that $I$ have as a hallmark of the deals that $I$ do $I$ don't do a deal unless I'm willing to put all the money in myself. And the reason for that is that it's a marker that tells me whether this is really, really something worthwhile. I never do anything myself because I have too many voids in my capabilities. I always need partners. Associating ourselves with UVMHN in this situation our perspectives are aligned on the importance of this company and what it does. Aligning ourselves, myself with Chris Powell, Jack Kane will also be a board member. Jack was the CFO at IDX with me as CEO. We worked 25 years together.

We have joint ownership in a number of companies. Now we sort of finish each other's sentences. The last time $I$ was in a group like this was in Wall Street with him. It was a similar situation. We've done a lot of that.

So we have assembled the team, and we are ready to go. We have committed almost 10 million dollars of cash invested in the business. We are ready to invest, and in debt that we have assembled, and we are ready to proceed. And we believe that we can make this asset what it was always intended to be .

The flip side of this, unfortunately, is we communicated with Michael and Jodi early, is that if this didn't work out, this business was likely to fail. One other element that's important to note in the late part of May, Burlington Labs hired Dorman and Fawcett. Dorman and Fawcett is a workout firm, that was very important to me to have them involved, because if for some reason June 30th came, and we didn't fund this, I wanted to be able to sleep at night. I didn't want this to be on my nickel, if you will, as to whether this business was going to fail or not.

So Dorman and Fawcett has been involved
since the early part of June. They have been helping us get a full picture of what the economic situation looks like in the company. As of last week they are the chief recovery officer for this business. They are employed by Burlington Labs, not by Jim Crook. We are being very careful not to overstep where we are right now.

What's in front of us with the CON, sort of depending upon length of time that it takes to work ourselves through this, it makes our challenge a little greater. And it's the reason we needed to put the chief recovery officer in place. Because some of the changes that need to be made to make sure the business is spending money properly and is around to be all it can be need to start now. CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: And so the question that comes to my mind is the last CON that we pretty much approved took about nine months to handle. Others have taken less; some have taken more. What would happen to this company if it took nine months, you know, six to nine months? You know, pick a number to do this.

MR. CROOK: Yeah. I don't mean this to be callous or off the cuff. You won't see me again. I don't have the resources, and I'm not willing to
put the resources in to this project beyond, as we have said in the application, 30 days. And we fully respect what you've got to go through to sort this out for the benefit of the population, people of the State of Vermont and the people. But 30 days is too long also.

Because what's happening now, and it's accelerated in the last two days with the press that we have received over this, this is no longer a private affair. I'm generally a fairly low profile guy. That's changing right now in this situation, which is fine, because the benefit of the good of what we are going to do is that significant. Happy to do it. But what's happening is that there is a great deal of anxiety out there in the population that consists of creditors, the Attorney General's office in the state, landlords, vendors, treatment centers and most importantly, patients. As you can imagine, this patient population we serve or we will serve, if this is successful, is a tenuous one, and any interruption in the flow of the good work that Burlington Labs has been doing can have effects that we don't want to deal with. So it's a long-winded answer, Al, to your question, but the answer is that I will not go beyond 30 days before we pull the plug
on this and move on.
And what's most important, and again I mean this in the respectful way that it's intended, we really appreciate you making time. We know how busy this budget season is for you. We know what we are up to right now in trying to get an approval for an emergency CON placement. But anything you can do as quickly as possible will help our cause.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Okay. Is there anything that the two attorneys would like to add? That was a great explanation. Are we good? I'll open it up to the Board for questions or comments.

MR. HOGAN: Just would you in just a few words conclude on why this is an emergency?

MR. CROOK: This is an emergency because the patients that are dependent upon our lab work, need the lab work done in a quality fashion, we provide it, to get themselves off of their addiction to heroin in most cases. If this business isn't in play, they don't have a lot of other alternatives. And those folks that have hit the bottom and want to climb out of it, it's going to be more difficult without Burlington Labs in play.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Allan.

DR. RAMSAY: Mr. Crook, can you -- I'm trying to get the time tables clear in my head here. Could you remind me again about when did you first speak to Mr. Casarico?

MR. CROOK: End of May.
DR. RAMSAY: May. Okay. And your
attractiveness is laudable. I mean we all know -- we hear all -- we know more about the opiate crisis and how it's affected everything in our state. And we know about jobs. The third thing you said it was going to be hard. That's what attracted you to this, and probably what attracted me to some of the things I do.

But when will change actually -- again part of the timetable -- you just mentioned 30 days. You said there had to be a change in leadership and governance. When do you anticipate that change actually being implemented at Burlington Labs?

MR. CROOK: This answer is going to work against my urgency, but I've got to give it to you. With Dorman and Fawcett in the CRO role now, it's happening right now. My anxiety, and I trust these Dorman and Fawcett guys, they are the real deal. They are spending my money, and it's my personal money at this point in time. I trust them
with it, Dr. Ramsay. What I'm anxious about is getting Chris and the CFO that we have waiting in the wings to join the company so that we can take this business on the accelerated ride it should be on to the benefit of the patients.

To answer your question, in the next 90 days you'll see -- we will see significant change in that. This business is bleeding, it needs to stop bleeding, and it needs to strategically align itself with what's best for the benefit of the patients that it serves. We know how to do that.

DR. RAMSAY: You have leadership in the wings. You said you don't know how quickly they can be integrated into the recovery process. But you actually have identified those resources?

MR. CROOK: We have the leadership people assembled and ready to go. We have Chris Powell is waiting. His intention was to start August 29. That was the plan we were on before we -- it was brought to our attention we needed to go to the CON process. He's ready to go.

The CFO is ready to go, and the board members of which are -- I will chair the board. Jack Kane will be the chairman of the audit and finance committee. Chris Powell who is the CEO will be on
the board. Todd Keating will be on the board as a representative of minority investor. And Michael Casarico, the founder of the business, will be on the board.

We are ready to go -- we will go
tomorrow if you want to accelerate your process.
DR. RAMSAY: Since the process began with you, have any other alternative investors, venture capital, any other opportunities arisen for Burlington Labs that you know of?

MR. CROOK: There were three alternatives Burlington Labs had when I got involved. And the answer is no. I think that we are now deep enough into the process, and with the funding we provided to hold this business up, it would be very difficult -- not that we would lock anybody up.

My main objective here is to save this company, whether I'm involved with the saving or not is not what's driving me. How much money I'm going to make is not what's driving me. I'm not going to do anything that we don't have an outcome that we think can continue to fuel the business to be successful. So don't get me wrong. This is not a philanthropic pursuit. But it would be very hard for anyone to step into this business right now and do
what we are doing. We are very, very, very pregnant with this company.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Ladies?
MS. RAMBUR: Just a couple of --
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Either.
MS. RAMBUR: Just a couple of
questions. My experience with Burlington Labs has been primarily as a clinician knowing other clinicians who I've used these services. So I have just two questions.

One is when you became aware that a Certificate of Need would be required. And then, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if it would be helpful to outline the parameters by which an emergency Certificate of Need can be considered. I think that would be helpful for the public and the Board to hear.

MR. CROOK: The first question I'll take maybe -- and Mr. Commissioner maybe take the second one. The first one is about two weeks ago, and we have forged a very, very strong paper partnership with our friends at UVM Health Care Network, and they brought it to our attention. And it was -- I don't know whether it was Spencer Knapp or their outside counsel, but my first reaction was,
oh, an obstacle. Perfect. That's all we need. But I'm very thankful they brought it up because at some point in time this was going to raise its head, and we were going to have to deal with it, and I'm glad we are doing it now.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Judy, do you want to outline --

MS. HENKIN: Sure. I'll just give you the references in statute in our rule. I'm sure the lawyers up there have read it many times at this point. But the statute is under a Certificate of Need Statute 9440, Section E, allows for the Board to -- the Board shall adopt rules governing procedure for expeditious processing of applications, going on, for health care facility or HMO. The relevant part: Is there any circumstance beyond the control of the applicant where the Board finds that the circumstances require action in less time than normally required for review. If the nature of the emergency requires it, an application may be reviewed by the Board without notice and opportunity for public hearing or intervention by any party.

And we did promulgate a rule on that, and the rule is part of our CON rule. It's Rule 4.0 . You can read it on our Web site. It's section 4.303.

And it does set forth that the Board upon a finding that the issuance of an emergency CON is appropriate, the Board notifies the applicant of the process that's going to be applicable to the application, and in the Board's discretion the process shall include as much process as provided under this rule as can be accommodated under the specific circumstances. And if the nature of the emergency requires it, it can be reviewed without notice and opportunity for a public hearing or intervention by another party. So that's the governing statute --

MS. RAMBUR: Thank you.
MS. HENKIN: -- in the rule.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Jessica.
MS. HOLMES: Thank you. Can you just clarify a little bit further this role of Dorman and Fawcett, chief recovery officer, exactly -- elaborate on that role, what they are doing.

MR. CROOK: When they got involved in early June -- gladly. When they got involved in early June as I mentioned it was important that they were involved in the business in case we did not -the term I used was green light at the end of June. At the end of June -- we have not signed agreements to buy this company still. At the end of June we
agreed to do what $I$ was unwilling to do in March, that's provide interim capital almost as a bank. I'm not a banker. But once I realized that Michael and Jodi were willing to accept new leadership in the business and governance of it, and once the other pieces came together, it became apparent that this was an opportunity that we could help. So Dorman and Fawcett was involved in early June, and they were sort of acting as a -- not a big brother, but they were acting as an overseer of making sure that the cash flow primarily was managed as well as possible.

It was dealing with the vendors, dealing with the trade payables, and making sure that people were not going to leave in terms of -- if we had a vendor that provided a reagent that was critical for us to continue to do business, but receivables were over 90 days with them or over 120 days, if we didn't get that reagent from that party, we were in trouble. I say we, it's not we yet, but Burlington Labs was in trouble.

So Dorman and Fawcett has a particular skill in making sure that those relationships don't jump off the track. That was the initial play. When the CON learning came to me, I'll first person this, it became apparent that we weren't going to close on

August 29. And we needed Dorman and Fawcett to step in in a chief recovery role. They are running the business, Stephen Barraclough is running this business. And I'm sure he's thrilled to be dealing with all the $P R$ that's going on right now, but that's an element he didn't expect either. But he's running the business, great confidence in Stephen and Terry Dorman in running the business. But that's who they are right now.

They will continue to run the business until we close on this project. And after that, they will be involved for a period of time as well. Because the institutional knowledge that they have built up and the plans that they are executing, there is a necessary hang over that is needed before Chris and the rest of his team really take the reins.

MR. HOGAN: Is there a bank involved here?

MR. CROOK: Key Bank.
MR. HOGAN: Is there any danger of moving for Chapter 7?

MR. CROOK: This business?
MR. HOGAN: Yeah.
MR. CROOK: Yes.
MR. HOGAN: All right. That's
important.
MR. CROOK: Either an 11 or 7. I'm not thankfully conversant in what they are. This business is going down if we don't provide this funding and if we don't stay in there. And we are -I say that not to overly dramatize it. It is the reality. But the people that have built the business, done a lot of good work, and we are looking to give them wings.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: And I would like to add something to Judy's reading of the CON, and that is my interpretation of it and my thoughts on it. Because when this came up the question was what does the Green Mountain Care Board do with a statute that basically allows for no public anything. What we chose to do was have this meeting, to have this in public, to allow all of the documents to be transparent. You know, so while there is a statute and a rule that allows for an emergency process, that was intended for a commissioner, where a commissioner would decide in an office, and then things would be decided in that same office.

And if you think about the state hospital, if you think about Irene, that is the way matters were handled. This is an attempt by the

Board to do virtually the impossible, to have a private meeting in public, to look like we have any idea what we are talking about while we hear it for the first time, to look like we have done our due diligence when we are hearing something for the first time and reviewing material for the first time. That's why it's important that regardless of if we give an emergency CON today, status, or not, there is no CON granted. That process is yet to be determined if it's an emergency, and it's in statute and rule if it is not an emergency.

But that's why this is such an
interesting point. The Board has chose to do this in public. Okay. And I just want everyone to understand that.

Jessica, did you have more to your questioning? I didn't mean to -- I wanted to clarify that at that time.

MS. HOLMES: No, that's terrific. I just guess -- I just want -- if you could say once again this business is closing if you do not step in.

MR. CROOK: That's my opinion.
MS. HOLMES: That is your opinion.
What happens to the patients?
MR. CROOK: What happens to the
patients? I don't want to think about it. I can't answer the question. I think everybody knows what happens to the patients, they get less care than they are getting now, and the likelihood of them rehabilitating is much lower. And that is what we are here for.

MS. HOLMES: Okay.
MS. WOHL: If I -- may $I$ just jump in
for a second?
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Absolutely.
MS. WOHL: We just provided to you this afternoon letters of support from some of the Burlington Labs partners, and I want to make sure that you know that you have them and that you have the opportunity to read them. But I think that that -- those -- the context of those letters is part of the answer to the question.

We have submitted information that Burlington Labs has served more than 2,000 patients just in the first $2 / 3$ of this year. They are a big player in this part of providing health care, and that's one of the reasons why we think it's so important that you have the information that you need and that you take the time you need to consider this. And we certainly are grateful that you are taking the
time to do it and to do it in public.
There is nothing I think -- although Mr. Crook likes to fly under the radar, there is no -- there are no secrets here. There are just a time constraint.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Right. I think that's come across loud and clear. Just for the record, there is a letter from the Turning Point Center of Addison County, Turning Point Center of Central Vermont, Spectrum Youth and Family Services, United Way Chittenden County and St. Albans, and the Howard Center.

And realize that this has really just been available to people for about 24 hours in the public domain and my mind. And so that that's just to say that this is on the record, we would -- most of our things allow for both verbal public comment and written. This falls under that normal operating procedure.

Allan, did you have a question?

DR. RAMSAY: Yeah. I just wanted to be clear about Mr. Crook, you, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Kane, what relationship you actually have to UVM Health Network, you know, other than being a patient, I mean board activities, any financial relationships, do you
have any?
MR. CROOK: Great question. Chris, no relationship. Jack, no relationship. I sit on Rick Moran's -- the UMEA, University Medical Education Association.

DR. RAMSAY: I know that one.
MR. CROOK: I sit on Rick's board, but
none other -- no other relationship.
MS. RAMBUR: I just have a clarifying point. That's an advisory board; correct?

MR. CROOK: It is an advisory board. I
have no -- I have no -- I'm not paid. I have no economic interest. I don't own part of UVM Health Network. So no. Nothing.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Con, did you have something?

MR. HOGAN: Well yeah. It's a comment.
I just haven't been through something like this. I just want to get the decision to these people as quickly as we can.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Okay. So are there other questions from the Board at this time?

MS. RAMBUR: I guess the only other question I have, and I'm not sure it's to you or to whom it's to, but these services are apparently not
available easily elsewhere is my understanding.
MR. CROOK: There is another -- there is another provider in Rhode Island. They are a smaller provider. As we did our due diligence on the competitive landscape, we don't believe -- we believe we have an edge in terms of the way we observe the collection of the sample, that's critical. We believe the quality control that comes from that is something that will save state's money. We are not asking for any new money from the state. We are not coming in here and saying, gee, we are going to raise our prices. We bill Medicaid for the most part. It's controlled.

The point about saving money is that if the lab work isn't done properly, and if the patient in anyway is able to game it, ultimately it costs the taxpayer money because the result isn't achieved or more lab work needs to be done. We think the Burlington Labs business has a significant competitive advantage there, and we look forward to allowing greater benefit to the Vermont population and beyond as a result of it. Does that answer your question?

MS. RAMBUR: Yes. Yes. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Other comments or

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
questions?
DR. RAMSAY: So there is a commercial market here as well. I know it's dominates -dominated by Medicaid, but there are certainly insured people. We have the Affordable Care Act that have substance or opiate abuse that use Burlington Labs. And but you're now on the record as saying you have no -- you don't have any plans for increasing prices to any of the people who utilize Burlington Labs; is that correct?

MR. CROOK: You know, I think I did just say that. It was probably irresponsible for me to say it. My point, Dr. Ramsay, was to let you know that we are not coming to the state to look for more money.

DR. RAMSAY: Okay. We always appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Other questions or comments from the Board at this time? All right. I'll open it up for public comment or questions. If anyone has any, I would ask that they go through me, and then I will try to get you an answer.

Yes. Just identify yourself.
MS. KUIPER: I'm Kaili Kuiper. I'm
from the Office of Health Care Advocate. The letter
of intent described one of the main issues with this company was Medicaid fraud and a huge payment that they have to make to the state and the federal government for the Medicaid fraud. I was wondering if the application will address how that's -- how the management structure is being changed, how they are changing the way --

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: So what I would say is that regardless of whether this is an emergency CON, or a regular CON, there is no way that the Board would allow that not to be addressed either in the money side or the operational side that led to the money side. And so that would be part of the process either way. But you know, that's an issue with the company. And in the letter that was sent to us, they attempt to address it, but you know, typically in a CON decision we address our thoughts on that issue as well.

Is there anything you would like to add?

MR. CROOK: The only thing Commissioner -- Mr. Commissioner, is that there was a billing challenge that this company faced. We have worked through with the Attorney General a settlement that's almost ready to be executed based upon us getting to
the next stage.
Words are, you know, the press may attach themselves to that word. I don't believe that's the case. That's just my opinion, it really doesn't matter. The important thing here is to make sure we are all on the same page with what the story is. The story is that Burlington Labs, if it's funded, whatever that billing challenge is, will pay state and federal government back every dollar, so this isn't a story about that act. That's an element of it. It's part of what put them in the cash flow situation they are in.

The real story here is how do we save the asset or do we save the asset. But the Medicaid billing issue was real, it was a mixup from my standpoint. We are trying to get beyond it. We will get beyond it. And most importantly every dollar will be paid back.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Did that answer your question?

MS. KUIPER: No. I would be interested in a lot more detail on how the problem occurred. And --

MR. CROOK: Well the detail is pretty simple. In 2014, in the fall of 2014, CMS which is

Medicare-Medicaid determined that they were going to move from ICD 9 to ICD 10. At the time Vermont didn't have a reimbursement rate published for this work.

Burlington Labs continued to bill with I don't know what level of authority from the State of Vermont and overbilled for a period of time. The state came back in April of '16 and said, hey, this is an issue -- or February of '16. Sometime in '16. The money needs to be paid back. The business didn't have the money which is what put them primarily into the cash flow crunch that we are in now.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: What I would also say is that's what a CON process is for. That's what our decision would be about whether it's an emergency or not.

The other point I would make is that this is for that company. Burlington Labs isn't in front of us today. In other words, if Burlington Labs was trying to do something, we may ask them about that. But that's between the AG's office and the Burlington Labs.

I mean in other words we are not -- we haven't been working on that. So that's just my answer to you.

MS. KUIPER: Okay.
MR. CROOK: One other thing, Mr. Commissioner, please. We spent between Jack and Chris and myself, I'm not sure I'll do the math right, we have over a hundred years of reimbursement health care revenue cycle experience. It's really the only thing $I$ know in all the other business I'm involved with. I understand this. That will have a tremendous focus from a compliance standpoint inside the company.

That coupled with our partner, UVM Health Network, where we can lean and sort out how to get the expertise they have in this area is something that's front and center for us. Very, very, very important.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Thank you. Other comments or questions? Yes, ma'am.

MS. WALSH: Molly Walsh with Seven Days. Hi. You're saying this is a billing error. But the AG's investigation is not complete. If criminal charges were to come and be filed against leadership of the company, how would that affect your plans to buy the company, and how would that affect the emergency CON?

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Yeah. So what --

I'm going to answer the question because, as I said, all questions go through me. Jim, at some point you can hold your own press conference, but not today. MR. CROOK: I hope not to.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Okay. But the point is that today's matter is whether there should be an emergency CON. Not are we diving into what the AG is doing or what is the issue with Burlington Labs. That's not the issue that's trying to be settled today. So I don't think we want to dig into something that the Board doesn't have enough information on to answer your question, because, you know, it's our meeting.

Like I said, you can have your own press conference.

MR. MIDURA: Kyle Midura with CAX. CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Hey gang, the way we do it whether you're the press or a member of the public, you ask to be called on, and I will get you an answer. Kyle.

MR. MIDURA: Kyle Midura, WCAX. I
mention the press is part of the public.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: I included you.
MR. MIDURA: I know. I just didn't
want to feel separated out. I think part of the
public interest is that the person who was CEO as this alleged fraud went down is going to be on the board under this plan. And that's why we have questions on it.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Yeah. I think that's a matter that we would have to dig into. When we do a CON whether it's an emergency or not, you take a look at Genesis, you take a look at anything we have done. We ask, Donna, how many questions did we ask with Genesis?

MS. JERRY: Four or five rounds.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Of how many? A
hundred in total?
MS. JERRY: Probably a hundred.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: That's typically
the process when we do a CON whether it's an emergency or not, we will ask a lot of questions. And we still have to satisfy the criteria that are in the statute. But that's not what we are trying to do today. We are not investigating -- we don't have the AG here to tell us what they have been doing or a decision on that. That's not where we are at. We can't give you an outcome of that today, Kyle.

MR. MIDURA: No, I'm just saying that's why the question.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: I totally think it's a legitimate concern. I'm not trying to say it's not. It's not something that we are here to dive into.

Other comments or questions? Mr. Whitaker, how are you?

MR. WHITAKER: I'm good. I just want to call to your attention that it's reminding me of a parallel of the Fed in 2007. Basically this is a -being represented as a too-big-to-fail business. And you're potentially putting a thumb on the scale for an emerging competitor.

Now it appears to me from what I'm hearing that in the future all these costs and penalties and fines, et cetera, are all going to be built into the rates that this entity charges whereas they wouldn't be if a competitor were to emerge. So in effect, you're going to tilt the scales by granting an emergency Certificate of Need prior to the full process being done.

I also understand that there may be a conflict in regards to the same attorney at Downs, Rachlin \& Martin representing Burlington Labs while another attorney at Downs, Rachlin \& Martin is representing Burlington Labs, LLC, or Labs -- what's
the name of the new one?
MR. MOODY: I could speak to that. So
I'm Tom Moody. I'm a director at Downs, Rachlin \& Martin, a business lawyer. And he's referring to Tristram Coffin who represents Michael and Jodi Casarico personally. That representation predated Mr. Crook's involvement in the transaction. We looked at that as a conflict question, and we determined that there wasn't a reason for him not to -- to discontinue that representation of them on a personal level, and because the transaction is really independent of that -- any action that would be taken against them.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Thank you. Other comments or questions? All right. Seeing none, oh sorry. Lila?

MS. RICHARDSON: Yeah. I just had a -Lila Richardson. I also work with the Office of the Health Care Advocate. I just had a clarification about what has been submitted so far. Because we saw a letter of intent, but we haven't seen an actual CON application. Has one been submitted? It seems it's hard for the Board to act on something that hasn't been sulmitted yet.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: I can't hear you.

MS. RICHARDSON: It would seem that the Board would have to have the full CON application before taking any action.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Well I think there were confusing actions here, meaning I think the question here today is should this be handled as an emergency CON or not. We need a CON application to decide the CON. Correct. But the question today is, are we willing to do it under an emergency CON process.

I don't think the applicant would submit a CON if it is -- I'm not speaking on your behalf, but from what I've heard today there is no reason to submit a CON if it's going to take nine months. Their question is can it be handled as an emergency, and if so, then I'm assuming that we will work through this. If it can't, then I'm assuming that then it's a moot point. Is that fair, Lila?

MS. RICHARDSON: The letter had just referenced filing an actual application very quickly. So that was my question.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Judy will go through what we had on that.

MS. HENKIN: Just today while we were in hospital budget hearings we did receive some
things. They haven't been posted yet. We received letters of support, proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. They will be posted. They just came in today, and they are dated the 24 th, so that's -- just hasn't been done yet. But we literally just printed these at lunchtime and were handed some of it as they came in.

MS. RICHARDSON: I understand the documents are coming in very quickly.

MS. HENKIN: We did not receive an application yet.

MS. WOHL: May I add just a little bit to what you have said?

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Sure.
MS. WOHL: The rule does allow, if the Board chooses to grant an emergency CON process, it then allows the Board to define what process that is.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: That's right.
MS. WOHL: As you pointed out, it can include no process and no public hearing at all. That's not what we are looking for. But we are looking for some guidance as to what are the documents that you need. Is it an application? And if it is an application, in what form?

Which of the HRAP criteria does the

Board believe are relevant to this project, because as I'm sure Ms. Richardson knows, there is often conversation that goes on with Board staff about which criteria to address in the typical CON procedure. That's all been compressed so far. And we hope that we continue to be compressed, but we don't want certainly to shortcut your review.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Are there other comments or questions from the public?

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Chair, I didn't get a chance to finish. I got interrupted.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Sorry.
MR. WHITAKER: Courteously informed by the --

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Sure.
MR. WHITNEY: -- counsel. It appears that -- I mean I hate to use the analogy you've got a gun to your head, that in effect this business or the offer to purchase this business to the tune of 10 million dollars or whatever is going to go away. But it also appears that you're being asked to not only grant an emergency Certificate of Need while the process goes, but give assurance that you're not going to take it away. Because it sounds like this 10 million dollars is going to walk if you don't give
them reassurance that they are going to get their Certificate of Need however many months down the line.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: No. That's not what I'm hearing. And I just want to clarify. What I'm hearing them say is, and I guess this is what I was trying to say to Lila. If we grant an emergency CON status today, we then define the process, and we have to work through the criteria of a CON which is still a CON. The point being it would have to be done quick enough so that the company could be purchased before the company collapses. And so the point is, no, it can't take months is what they are saying. But it can be done expeditiously, but it can still meet the standards.

And I also want to answer a question that you asked earlier which was about rate. I think the question of how do you finance a company, and then how do you pay for it out of the rates that you charge. If this was a company that was 95 percent commercial, and I think this is what Board member Ramsay was asking, if it was 95 percent commercial, then they may be looking for a commercial rate increase. But because this is paid primarily by Medicaid and Medicaid is a one-way negotiator,
meaning they tell you what they are going to pay you, unfortunately the company will have no ability to negotiate that rate. It just doesn't -- if Medicaid -- if Medicaid negotiated rates, all 14 hospitals would not have submitted a zero percent rate increase this year.

So I think that -- but again, that's something the Board would look at in its due diligence of a CON. Not of an emergency CON decision.

MR. WHITAKER: Because I understand that Shaws and other, you know, employers who aren't billing Medicaid used this same company for drug tests to vet employees.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Right. In the minority of their business. And your point is well taken, and in fact, the CON criteria asks those questions.

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.
MS. RAMBUR: So Mr. Chair, just to make a point of clarity, it seems to me still that there is at least some confusion. What we are talking about today is should this be able to be considered in a more expeditious manner as what's called an emergency rather than going in line tucked behind how
many things are in place. That's all we are doing today is deciding if this could be done more expeditiously in terms of its review, and the review still has to happen.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Right. And also to be clear, and this is the Kyle Midura's question, this does nothing to step in between the AG and the current management of the company. If there is a settlement, you know, that's not, you know, it's not fraud unless the judge says so. You know, and if that's not what happens, that's not what happens. But that has nothing to do with the Green Mountain Care Board to be clear. That is literally between the AG and the present company.

What happens with the new company, you know, it's a new day when you buy it. And that's a whole 'nother thing. So --

MS. HENKIN: Did anyone come here from the AG's office? I know I had a call yesterday from Jason Turner. He said someone might be here, but he couldn't be.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Is there anyone here from the AG's office who at this moment doesn't want to say that? Allan.

DR. RAMSAY: And just being here
assumes, in my mind, that the entities involved, Burlington Lab, Burlington Lab, LLC, Dorman and Kaufmann (sic), the investors, will respond in a very timely and expedient way to any of the potential concerns we have if we do indeed go to the CON process. That's assumed. Right?

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Absolutely. I mean because we have seen this where we ask questions and people don't get back to us for six months.

DR. RAMSAY: Right.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: And then that
hospital blames us for not passing their CON. Copley.

DR. RAMSAY: Been there, done that.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: It's tough to be on the Board. So other comments or questions? All right. Seeing none, it's up to the Board at this point what you want to do.

MR. HOGAN: I'll say what I said before. I want to move as quickly as we can to get to the point where we can make a decision.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Is that a motion?
MR. HOGAN: That's a motion.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: You're going to have to clarify that for Judy.

MR. HOGAN: What else do you need? MS. HENKIN: Do you move that this should proceed as an emergency Certificate of Need? MR. HOGAN: Yes. You said it better than I could.

MS. HENKIN: You said it more angrily.
MS. RAMBUR: Certificate of Need consideration. If it's a Certificate of Need consideration, I will second the motion.

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: So that's a
friendly amendment. Do you accept that?
MR. HOGAN: (Nodding)
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: That was a yes.
MR. HOGAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: So we are in consideration of CON. So we have a motion. We have a second. Is there any discussion from the Board? All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Any opposed? Any
abstaining?
(No response)
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Okay. We are now into emergency CON land. What we will do is we will meet, and we will let you know exactly the process,
and we will get that to you post haste. Is that fair?

MS. WOHL: Perfect.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: And I guarantee you that it will be a lot of what you've heard from the public in this room. So it was time well spent and nothing was wasted so --

MS. RAMBUR: Mr. Chair, does that -- it goes to them, but is that posted publicly as well in terms of what's asked in a timely --

CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: It's up to the Board when it decides the process.

MS. RAMBUR: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Okay. So anything else from the Board? Anything else from the applicant?

MR. CROOK: Thank you.
MR. MOODY: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: Thank you. Is there a motion to adjourn?

MS. RAMBUR: So moved.
MS. HOLMES: Second.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: All those in favor?
BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN GOBEILLE: All right. Thank

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC. (802) 863-6067
you.

> (Whereupon, the proceeding was adjourned at 3:51 p.m.)
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| telephone 8:8 tells 11:17 | Tristram 38:5 trouble [2]-22:19, | 2:6 | written 27:18 wrong 18:23 |  |  |
| tenuous 14:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 20 \\ & \text { trust [2] - 16:22, } \end{aligned}$ | W |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { term [2]-11:10, } \\ & 21: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trust [2]-16:22, } \\ & 16: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  | Y |  |  |
| terms [5] - 7:20, 22:14, 29:6, 44:3, | tucked 43:25 tune 41:19 | waiting [2] - 17:2, 17:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yeah [7] - 13:23, } \\ & 23: 23,27: 21, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

