

in writing that the helicopter was not subject to Certificate of Need under the existing Certificate of Need law. So I simply want to emphasize that this Certificate of Need amendment, the amendments in LB 378, would have no greater effect on that helicopter service than existed prior to the amendments I am proposing, or that were proposed and adopted earlier. So Senator Wesely's amendments doesn't change that situation because the current Certificate of Need law did not according to the Department of Health require a Certificate of Need review. It is my opinion on reading of the statute that Certificate of Need probably should have been required for that new helicopter service, and I will obtain some additional information from the Department of Health to try and track that down and find out exactly what reasoning and rationale the Department of Health offered for not subjecting that new service to review. But at any rate I would like to address specifically the amendments that Senator Wesely has put before you. Senator Wesely objects to the approach that I have taken in the amendments to LB 378 as far as architect certification is concerned. This follows the Kansas system where when a project is close to one of the thresholds and a facility is not sure whether or not they should undergo certificate of need review, they submit a statement certified by an architect or an engineer that they expect the facility to cost so many dollars. The Department of Health then can look at that certified statement by the architect and can require them to undergo the certificate of need process if indeed they think that the project will exceed that architect's or engineer's estimate. So this really is just getting away...is a means to get a decision from the Department of Health as to whether or not a project that is close to one of these thresholds should or should not undergo certificate of need review. It is nothing more than that. The clinical equipment minimum that Senator Wesely has addressed in his amendment, I am not sure I understand his amendment very well, but the clinical equipment provision currently under LB 378 provides \$400,000 for pieces of equipment in physicians' offices and the physicians' office review is completely separate from that by the hospitals. The hospitals would still have to undergo certificate of need for any piece of equipment that would cost more than \$600,000. So they are completely separate thresholds and I am not exactly sure what Senator Wesely is trying to do there. But it is not an error. The certificate of need does apply to new equipment in hospitals that would cost over \$600,000. The appropriate and significant criteria which Senator Wesely mentioned which is number 12 in his handout sheet, I think is a rather important