

COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC
Form 10-K
February 27, 2013
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

Form 10-K

(Mark One)

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
For the year ended December 31, 2012
OR
 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 001-15925

COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS, INC.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State of incorporation)

13-3893191
(IRS Employer

Identification No.)

4000 Meridian Boulevard
Franklin, Tennessee

37067
(Zip Code)

(Address of principal executive offices)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code:

(615) 465-7000

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of Each Class

Name of Each Exchange on Which Registered

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Common Stock, \$.01 par value

New York Stock Exchange

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. YES NO

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Act. YES NO

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 NO

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 (§ 232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

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 the registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of the Form 10-K or any amendment to the Form 10-K.

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. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer

Smaller reporting company

(Do not check if a smaller reporting company)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act). YES NO

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the Registrant was \$2,549,100,980. Market value is determined by reference to the closing price on June 30, 2012 of the Registrant's Common Stock as reported by the New York Stock Exchange. The Registrant does not (and did not at June 30, 2012) have any non-voting common stock outstanding. As of February 20, 2013, there were 92,163,048 shares of common stock, par value \$.01 per share, outstanding.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The information required for Part III of this annual report is incorporated by reference to portions of the Registrant's definitive proxy statement for its 2013 annual meeting of stockholders to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission within 120 days after the end of the Registrant's fiscal year ended December 31, 2012.

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS, INC.

Year ended December 31, 2012

	Page
<u>PART I</u>	
Item 1. <u>Business</u>	1
Item 1A. <u>Risk Factors</u>	22
Item 1B. <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	30
Item 2. <u>Properties</u>	30
Item 3. <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	38
Item 4. <u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	41
<u>PART II</u>	
Item 5. <u>Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	42
Item 6. <u>Selected Financial Data</u>	44
Item 7. <u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	45
Item 7A. <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u>	68
Item 8. <u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	69
Item 9. <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	133
Item 9A. <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	133
Item 9B. <u>Other Information</u>	133
<u>PART III</u>	
Item 10. <u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	136
Item 11. <u>Executive Compensation</u>	137
Item 12. <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	137
Item 13. <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions</u>	137
Item 14. <u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	137

PART IV

Table of Contents

PART I

Item 1. *Business of Community Health Systems, Inc.*

Overview of Our Company

We are one of the largest publicly-traded operators of hospitals in the United States in terms of number of facilities and net operating revenues. We were originally founded in 1986 and were reincorporated in 1996 as a Delaware corporation. We provide healthcare services through the hospitals that we own and operate in non-urban and selected urban markets throughout the United States. As of December 31, 2012, we owned or leased 135 hospitals, comprised of 131 general acute care hospitals and four stand-alone rehabilitation or psychiatric hospitals. These hospitals are geographically diversified across 29 states, with an aggregate of 20,334 licensed beds. We generate revenues by providing a broad range of general and specialized hospital healthcare services and other outpatient services to patients in the communities in which we are located. Services provided through our hospitals and affiliated businesses include general acute care, emergency room, general and specialty surgery, critical care, internal medicine, obstetrics, diagnostic, psychiatric and rehabilitation services. We also provide additional outpatient services at urgent care centers, occupational medicine clinics, imaging centers, cancer centers, ambulatory surgery centers and home health and hospice agencies. An integral part of providing these services is our relationship and network of affiliated physicians at our hospitals and affiliated businesses. We employ approximately 2,500 physicians and an additional 600 licensed healthcare practitioners. Through our management and operation of these businesses, we provide standardization and centralization of operations across key business areas; strategic assistance to expand and improve services and facilities; implementation of patient safety and quality of care improvement programs and assistance in the recruitment of additional physicians and licensed healthcare practitioners to the markets in which our hospitals are located. In a number of our markets, we have partnered with local physicians or not-for-profit providers, or both, in the ownership of our facilities. In addition to our hospitals and related businesses, we also own and operate 64 licensed home care agencies and 31 licensed hospice agencies, located primarily in markets where we also operate a hospital. Also, through our wholly-owned subsidiary, Quorum Health Resources, LLC, or QHR, we provide management and consulting services to non-affiliated general acute care hospitals located throughout the United States. The financial information for our reportable operating segments is presented in Note 14 of the Notes to our Consolidated Financial Statements included under Item 8 of this Report.

Our strategy has also included growth by acquisition. We generally target hospitals in growing, non-urban and selected urban healthcare markets for acquisition because of their favorable demographic and economic trends and competitive conditions. Because non-urban service areas have smaller populations, there are generally fewer hospitals and other healthcare service providers in these communities and generally a lower level of managed care presence in these markets. We believe that smaller populations support less direct competition for hospital-based services and these communities generally view the local hospital as an integral part of the community. We believe opportunities exist for skilled, disciplined operators in selected urban markets to create networks between urban hospitals and non-urban hospitals while improving physician alignment in those markets and making it more attractive to managed care. In recent years, our acquisition strategy has also included acquiring selective physician practices and physician-owned ancillary service providers. Such acquisitions are executed in markets where we already have a hospital presence and provide an opportunity to increase the number of affiliated physicians or expand the range of specialized healthcare services provided by our hospitals.

Throughout this Form 10-K, we refer to Community Health Systems, Inc., or the Parent Company, and its consolidated subsidiaries in a simplified manner and on a collective basis, using words like we, our, us and the Company. This drafting style is suggested by the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, and is not meant to indicate that the publicly-traded Parent Company or any other subsidiary of the Parent Company owns or operates any asset, business or property. The hospitals, operations and businesses described in this filing are owned and operated, and management services provided, by distinct and indirect subsidiaries of Community Health Systems, Inc.

Available Information

Our website address is www.chs.net and the investor relations section of our website is located at www.chs.net/investor/index.html. We make available free of charge, through the investor relations section of our website, annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q and current reports on Form 8-K as well as amendments to those reports, as soon as reasonably practical after they are filed with the SEC. Our filings are also available to the public at the website maintained by the SEC, www.sec.gov.

Table of Contents

We also make available free of charge, through the investor relations section of our website, our Governance Principles, our Code of Conduct and the charters of our Audit and Compliance Committee, Compensation Committee and Governance and Nominating Committee.

We have included the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer certifications regarding the public disclosure required by Sections 302 and 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 as Exhibits 31.1, 31.2, 32.1 and 32.2 of this report.

Our Business Strategy

Our objective is to increase shareholder value by providing high-quality patient care using cost effective and efficient operations while pursuing selective growth opportunities. The key elements of our business strategy to achieve this objective are to:

increase revenue at our facilities,

improve profitability,

improve patient safety and quality of care and

grow through selective acquisitions.

Increase Revenue at Our Facilities

Overview. We seek to increase revenue at our facilities by providing a broader range of services in a more attractive care setting, as well as by supporting, recruiting and employing physicians. We identify the healthcare needs of the community by analyzing demographic data and patient referral trends. We also work with local hospital boards, management teams and medical staffs to determine the number and type of additional physician specialties needed. Our initiatives to increase revenue include:

recruiting and/or employing additional primary care physicians and specialists,

expanding the breadth of services offered at our hospitals and in the communities in which we operate through targeted capital expenditures and physician alignment to support the addition of more complex services, including orthopedics, cardiovascular services and urology,

providing the capital to invest in technology and the physical plant at our facilities, particularly in our emergency rooms, surgery departments, critical care departments and diagnostic services and

executing select managed care contracts through a centrally managed review process.

We believe that appropriate capital investments in our facilities, combined with the development of our service capabilities, will reduce the migration of patients to competing providers while providing an attractive return on investment.

Physician Recruiting. The primary method of adding or expanding medical services is the recruitment of new physicians into the community. A core group of primary care physicians is necessary as an initial contact point for all local healthcare. The addition of specialists who offer services, including general surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, cardiovascular services, orthopedics and urology, completes the full range of medical and surgical services required to meet a community's core healthcare needs. At the time we acquire a hospital and from time to time thereafter, we identify the healthcare needs of the community by analyzing demographic data and patient referral trends. As a result of this

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

analysis, we are able to determine what we believe to be the optimum mix of primary care physicians and specialists. We employ recruiters at the corporate level to support the local hospital managers in their recruitment efforts. Additionally, in response to the recent trend in physicians seeking employment, we have begun employing more physicians, including, in many instances, acquiring physician practices. We have increased the number of physicians affiliated with us through our recruiting and employment efforts, net of turnover, by approximately 1,147 in 2012, 869 in 2011 and 935 in 2010. The percentage of recruited or other physicians commencing practice with us that were specialists was over 50% in 2012. However, most of the physicians in our communities remain in private practice and are not our employees. We believe we have been successful in recruiting physicians because of the practice opportunities afforded physicians in our markets, as well as lower managed care penetration as compared to larger urban areas.

Table of Contents

Expansion of Services. In an effort to better meet the healthcare needs of the communities we serve and to capture a greater portion of the healthcare spending in our markets, we have added a broad range of services to our facilities and, in certain markets, acquired physician practices to broaden our service offerings. These services range from various types of diagnostic equipment capabilities to additional and renovated emergency rooms, surgical and critical care suites and specialty services. For example, we spent approximately \$197.3 million on 45 major construction projects that were completed in 2012. The 2012 projects included new emergency rooms, cardiac catheterization laboratories, intensive care units, hospital additions and surgical suites. These projects improved various diagnostic and other inpatient and outpatient service capabilities. We continue to believe that appropriate capital investments in our facilities, combined with the development of our service capabilities, will reduce the migration of patients to competing providers while providing an attractive return on investment. We also employ a small group of clinical consultants at our corporate headquarters to assist the hospitals in their development of surgery, emergency, critical care, cardiovascular and hospitalist services. In addition to spending capital on expanding services at our existing hospitals, we also build replacement facilities in certain markets to better meet the healthcare needs in those communities. In 2012, we spent \$96.0 million on construction projects related to three replacement hospitals that we were required to build pursuant to either a hospital purchase agreement or an amendment to a lease agreement. All three of these hospitals were completed and opened in 2012. As part of an acquisition in 2012, we agreed to build a replacement hospital in York, Pennsylvania by July 2017. No capital was spent on this project in 2012. In addition, in September 2010, we received approval of our request for a certificate of need, or CON, from the Alabama Certificate of Need Review Board for the construction of a replacement hospital in Birmingham, Alabama. This CON was challenged in the Alabama state circuit and appellate courts but has recently been upheld, with issuance subject to the final resolution of the appeal process. The total cost of these remaining two replacement hospitals is estimated to be \$380.0 million.

Managed Care Strategy. Managed care has seen growth across the U.S. as health plans expand service areas and membership in an attempt to control rising medical costs. As we service primarily non-urban markets, we do not have significant relationships with individual managed care organizations, including Medicare Advantage. We have responded with a proactive and carefully considered strategy developed specifically for each of our facilities. Our experienced corporate managed care department reviews and approves all managed care contracts, which are organized and monitored using a central database. The primary mission of this department is to select and evaluate appropriate managed care opportunities, manage existing reimbursement arrangements and negotiate increases. Generally, we do not intend to enter into capitated or risk sharing contracts. However, some purchased hospitals have risk sharing contracts at the time we acquire them. We seek to discontinue these contracts to eliminate risk retention related to payment for patient care. We do not believe that we have, at the present time, any risk sharing contracts that would have a material impact on our results of operations.

Improve Profitability

Overview. To improve efficiencies and increase operating margins, we implement cost containment programs and adhere to operating philosophies that include:

standardizing and centralizing our methods of operation and management,

improving patient safety and optimizing resource allocation through our case and resource management program, which assists in improving clinical care and containing costs,

monitoring and enhancing productivity of our human resources,

capitalizing on purchasing efficiencies through the use of company-wide standardized purchasing contracts and terminating or renegotiating specified vendor contracts and

installing standardized management information systems, resulting in more streamlined clinical operations and more efficient billing and collection procedures.

In addition, each of our hospital management teams is supported by our centralized operational, reimbursement, regulatory and compliance expertise, as well as by our senior management team, a seasoned group of executives with an average of over 25 years of experience in the healthcare industry.

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Standardization and Centralization. Our standardization and centralization initiatives encompass nearly every aspect of our business, from developing standard policies and procedures with respect to patient accounting and physician practice management to implementing standard processes to initiate, evaluate and complete construction projects. Our standardization and centralization initiatives are a key element in improving our operating results.

Table of Contents

Billing and Collections. We have adopted standard policies and procedures with respect to billing and collections. We have also automated and standardized various components of the collection cycle, including statement and collection letters and the movement of accounts through the collection cycle. Upon completion of an acquisition, our management information systems team converts the hospital's existing information system to our standardized system. This enables us to quickly implement our business controls and cost containment initiatives.

Physician Support. We support our newly recruited physicians to enhance their transition into our communities. All newly recruited physicians who enter into contracts with us are required to attend a three-day introductory seminar that covers issues involved in starting up a practice. We have also implemented physician practice management seminars, webinars and other training. We host these seminars monthly.

Procurement and Materials Management. We have standardized and centralized our operations with respect to medical supplies, equipment and pharmaceuticals used in our hospitals. We have a participation agreement with HealthTrust Purchasing Group, L.P., or HealthTrust, a group purchasing organization, or GPO. HealthTrust contracts with certain vendors who supply a substantial portion of our medical supplies, equipment and pharmaceuticals. Our agreement with HealthTrust extends to January 2014, with automatic renewal terms of one year unless either party terminates by giving notice of non-renewal.

Facilities Management. We have standardized interiors, lighting and furniture programs. We have also implemented a standard process to initiate, evaluate and complete construction projects. Our corporate staff monitors all construction projects, and reviews and pays all construction project invoices. Our initiatives in this area have reduced our construction costs while maintaining the same level of quality and have shortened the time it takes us to complete these projects.

Other Initiatives. We have also improved margins by implementing standard programs with respect to ancillary services in areas, including emergency rooms, pharmacy, laboratory, imaging, home care, skilled nursing, centralized outpatient scheduling and health information management. We have improved quality and reduced costs associated with these services by improving contract terms and standardizing information systems. We work to identify and communicate best practices and monitor these improvements throughout the Company.

Internal Controls Over Financial Reporting. We have centralized many of our significant internal controls over financial reporting and standardized those other controls that are performed at our hospital locations. We continuously monitor compliance with and evaluate the effectiveness of our internal controls over financial reporting.

Case and Resource Management. The primary goal of our case management program is to ensure the delivery of safe, high quality care in an efficient and cost effective manner. The program focuses on:

appropriate management of length of stay consistent with national standards and benchmarks;

reducing unnecessary utilization;

discharge planning;

developing and implementing operational best practices and

compliance with all regulatory standards.

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Our case management program integrates the functions of utilization review, discharge planning, assessment of medical necessity and resource management. Patients are assessed upon presentation to the hospital with ongoing reviews throughout their course of care. Industry standard criteria are utilized in patient assessments, and discharge plans are adjusted according to patient needs. Cases are monitored to prevent delays in service or unnecessary utilization of resources. When a patient is ready for discharge, a case manager works with the patient's attending physician to evaluate and coordinate the patient's needs for continued care in the post-acute setting. Each hospital has the support of a physician advisor to act as a liaison to the medical staff and assist with all the activities of the program.

Improve Patient Safety and Quality of Care

Each of our hospitals has a board of trustees, which includes members of the hospital's medical staff. The board of trustees establishes policies concerning the hospital's medical, professional, and ethical practices, monitors these practices, and is responsible for ensuring that these practices conform to legally required standards. We maintain quality assurance programs to support and monitor quality of care standards and to meet Medicare and Medicaid accreditation and regulatory requirements. Patient care evaluations and other quality of care assessment activities are reviewed and monitored continuously with comparison to regional and national benchmarks when available.

Table of Contents

We have implemented various programs to support our hospitals in an effort to ensure continuous improvement in patient safety and the quality of care provided. We have developed high reliability/safety and quality training programs for all senior hospital management, chief nursing officers, quality directors, physicians and other clinical staff. We share information among our hospital management to implement best practices and assist in complying with regulatory requirements. We have standardized many of our processes for documenting compliance with accreditation requirements and clinical practices proven to lead to improved patient outcomes. All hospitals conduct patient, physician and staff satisfaction surveys to help identify methods of improving patient safety and the quality of care.

To ensure the experience of our emergency room patients meets our service and quality expectations, we have implemented a program to contact selected patients as a follow-up to the services they received. We verify that patients were able to obtain any prescriptions and outpatient appointments recommended at discharge. We also ensure that their symptoms have abated and that they understood the discharge instructions given at the hospital. Through this program, we placed in excess of one million follow-up calls in 2012.

In 2011, we established a component patient safety organization, or PSO, which was listed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality on January 11, 2012. We believe our PSO will assist us in improving patient safety at our hospitals.

Grow Through Selective Acquisitions

Acquisition Criteria. Each year we intend to acquire, on a selective basis, approximately two to four hospitals that fit our acquisition criteria. Generally, we pursue acquisition candidates that:

have a stable or growing population base,

are the sole or primary provider of acute care services in the community,

are located in an area with the potential for service expansion,

are not located in an area that is dependent upon a single employer or industry and

have financial performance that we believe will benefit from our management's operating skills.

Occasionally, we have pursued acquisition opportunities outside of our specified criteria when such opportunities have had uniquely favorable characteristics. In addition, in recent years, we have been successful in acquiring multi-hospital systems in larger metropolitan areas. We believe the acquisition of certain hospitals located in select urban or other geographic regions can provide additional opportunities for increased services and leveraging of our existing presence in some regions as well as reduced costs through shared resources.

In 2010, we acquired five hospitals located in Marion, South Carolina; Youngstown, Ohio; Warren, Ohio and Bluefield, West Virginia and in 2011, we acquired four hospitals located in Scranton, Pennsylvania; Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania; Nanticoke, Pennsylvania and Tomball, Texas. In 2012, we acquired four hospitals located in Scranton, Pennsylvania; Peckville, Pennsylvania; Blue Island, Illinois and York, Pennsylvania and a large physician practice located in Longview, Texas. We believe that our access to capital, reputation for providing quality care and ability to recruit physicians makes us an attractive partner for these communities.

Disciplined Acquisition Approach. We believe that we have been disciplined in our approach to acquisitions. We have a dedicated team of internal and external professionals who complete a thorough review of the hospital's financial and operating performance, the demographics and service needs of the market and the physical condition of the facilities. Based on our historical experience, we then build a pro forma financial model that reflects what we believe can be accomplished under our ownership. Whether we buy or lease the existing facility or agree to construct a replacement hospital, we believe we have been disciplined in our approach to pricing. We typically begin the acquisition process by entering into a non-binding letter of intent with an acquisition candidate. After we complete business and financial due diligence and financial modeling, we decide whether or not to enter into a definitive agreement. Once an acquisition is completed, we have an organized and systematic approach to transitioning and integrating the new hospital into our system of hospitals.

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Acquisition Efforts. Most of our acquisition targets are municipal or other not-for-profit hospitals. We believe that our access to capital, ability to recruit physicians and reputation for providing quality care make us an attractive partner for these communities. In addition, we have found that communities located in states where we already operate a hospital are more receptive to our acquiring their hospitals, because they are aware of our operating track record with respect to our other hospitals within the state.

Table of Contents

At the time we acquire a hospital, we may commit to an amount of capital expenditures, such as a replacement facility, renovations, or equipment over a specified period of time. Pursuant to a hospital purchase agreement in effect as of December 31, 2012, we are required to build a replacement facility in York, Pennsylvania by July 2017. Estimated construction costs, including equipment costs, are approximately \$100.0 million for this replacement facility. No capital was spent on this project in 2012. In addition, in October 2008, after the purchase of the noncontrolling owner's interest in our Birmingham, Alabama facility, we initiated the purchase of a site, which includes a partially constructed hospital structure, for a potential replacement for our existing Birmingham facility. In September 2010, we received approval of our request for a CON from the Alabama Certificate of Need Review Board. This CON was challenged in the Alabama state circuit and appellate courts but has recently been upheld, with issuance subject to the final resolution of the appeal process. Our estimated construction costs, including the acquisition of the site and equipment costs, are approximately \$280.0 million for the Birmingham replacement facility, of which approximately \$3.6 million has been incurred to date. Under other purchase agreements in effect as of December 31, 2012, we have committed to spend \$493.5 million, generally over a five to seven year period after acquisition, for costs such as capital improvements, equipment, selected leases and physician recruiting. Through December 31, 2012, we have incurred approximately \$254.0 million related to these commitments.

Industry Overview

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, reported that in 2011 total U.S. healthcare expenditures grew by 3.9% to approximately \$2.7 trillion. CMS also projected total U.S. healthcare spending to grow by 4.2% in 2012 and by an average of 5.7% annually from 2011 through 2021. By these estimates, healthcare expenditures will account for approximately \$4.8 trillion, or 19.6% of the total U.S. gross domestic product, by 2021.

Hospital services, the market within the healthcare industry in which we operate, is the largest single category of healthcare at 31.5% of total healthcare spending in 2011, or approximately \$850.6 billion, as reported by CMS. CMS projects the hospital services category to grow by at least 4.1% per year through 2021. It expects growth in hospital healthcare spending to continue due to the aging of the U.S. population and consumer demand for expanded medical services. As hospitals remain the primary setting for healthcare delivery, CMS expects hospital services to remain the largest category of healthcare spending.

U.S. Hospital Industry. The U.S. hospital industry is broadly defined to include acute care, rehabilitation and psychiatric facilities that are either public (government owned and operated), not-for-profit private (religious or secular), or for-profit institutions (investor owned). According to the American Hospital Association, there are approximately 5,000 inpatient hospitals in the U.S. which are not-for-profit owned, investor owned, or state or local government owned. Of these hospitals, approximately 40% are located in non-urban communities. We believe that a majority of these hospitals are owned by not-for-profit or governmental entities. These facilities offer a broad range of healthcare services, including internal medicine, general surgery, cardiology, oncology, orthopedics, OB/GYN and emergency services. In addition, hospitals also offer other ancillary services, including psychiatric, diagnostic, rehabilitation, home care and outpatient surgery services.

Urban vs. Non-Urban Hospitals. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 19.3% of the U.S. population lives in communities designated as non-urban. In these non-urban communities, hospitals are typically the primary source of healthcare. In many cases a single hospital is the only provider of general healthcare services in these communities.

Factors Affecting Performance. Among the many factors that can influence a hospital's financial and operating performance are:

facility size and location,

facility ownership structure (i.e., tax-exempt or investor owned),

a facility's ability to participate in group purchasing organizations and

facility payor mix.

Patients needing the most complex care are more often served by the larger and/or more specialized urban hospitals. We believe opportunities exist in selected urban markets to create networks between urban hospitals and non-urban hospitals in order to expand the breadth of services offered in the non-urban hospitals while improving physician alignment in those markets and making it more attractive to managed care.

Table of Contents

Hospital Industry Trends

Demographic Trends. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are presently approximately 40.3 million Americans aged 65 or older in the U.S. who comprise approximately 13.0% of the total U.S. population. By the year 2030, the number of Americans aged 65 or older is expected to climb to 72.1 million, or 19.3% of the total population. Due to the increasing life expectancy of Americans, the number of people aged 85 years and older is also expected to increase from 5.8 million to 8.7 million by the year 2030. This increase in life expectancy will increase demand for healthcare services and, as importantly, the demand for innovative, more sophisticated means of delivering those services. Hospitals, as the largest category of care in the healthcare market, will be among the main beneficiaries of this increase in demand. Based on data compiled for us, the populations of the service areas where our hospitals are located grew by 2.5% from 2006 to 2011 and are expected to grow by 3.8% from 2011 to 2016. The number of people aged 65 or older in these service areas grew by 7.6% from 2006 to 2011 and is expected to grow by 16.5% from 2011 to 2016. People aged 65 or older comprised 13.9% of the total population in our service areas in 2011, yet they could comprise 15.6% of the total population in our service areas by 2016.

Consolidation. In addition to our own acquisitions in recent years, consolidation activity in the hospital industry, primarily through mergers and acquisitions involving both for-profit and not-for-profit hospital systems, is continuing. Reasons for this activity include:

ample supply of available capital,

valuation levels,

financial performance issues, including challenges associated with changes in reimbursement and collectability of self-pay revenue,

the desire to enhance the local availability of healthcare in the community,

the need and ability to recruit primary care physicians and specialists,

the need to achieve general economies of scale and to gain access to standardized and centralized functions, including favorable supply agreements and access to malpractice coverage and

regulatory changes.

The healthcare industry is also undergoing consolidation in anticipation of and in reaction to efforts to reform the payment system. Hospital systems are acquiring physician practices and other outpatient and sub-acute providers to position themselves for readmission, bundling and other payment restructuring. Similarly, payors are consolidating and acquiring disease management service providers in an effort to offer more competitive programs.

Trends in Payment for Healthcare Services. As discussed in more detail in the Government Regulation section, the impact of health care reform legislation, combined with the growing financial and economic pressures on the healthcare industry, has resulted in challenges to current and future reimbursement trends. Because of higher healthcare costs and expanded coverage for uninsured patients, the healthcare industry must face the risk that higher deductibles and co-payment requirements for insured patients will increase, resulting in the potential for greater write-offs of uncollectible amounts from those patients.

Shift to Outpatient Services. Because of the growing availability of stand-alone outpatient healthcare facilities and the increase in the services that are able to be provided at these locations, many individuals are seeking a broader range of services at outpatient facilities. This trend has contributed to an increase in outpatient services while inhibiting the growth of inpatient admissions.

Table of Contents**Selected Operating Data**

The following table sets forth operating statistics for our hospitals for each of the years presented, which are included in our continuing operations. Statistics for 2012 include a full year of operations for 131 hospitals and partial periods for four hospitals acquired during the year. Statistics for 2011 include a full year of operations for 127 hospitals and partial periods for four hospitals acquired during the year. Statistics for 2010 include a full year of operations for 122 hospitals and partial periods for five hospitals acquired during the year. Statistics for hospitals which have been sold are excluded from all periods presented.

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2012	2011	2010
	(Dollars in thousands)		
Consolidated Data			
Number of hospitals (at end of period)	135	131	127
Licensed beds (at end of period)(1)	20,334	19,695	19,004
Beds in service (at end of period)(2)	17,265	16,832	16,264
Admissions(3)	701,837	675,050	678,284
Adjusted admissions(4)	1,418,472	1,330,988	1,277,235
Patient days(5)	3,058,931	2,970,044	2,891,699
Average length of stay (days)(6)	4.4	4.4	4.3
Occupancy rate (beds in service)(7)	48.6 %	49.1 %	50.2 %
Net operating revenues	\$ 13,028,985	\$ 11,906,212	\$ 11,092,422
Net inpatient revenues as a % of operating revenues before provision for bad debt	44.7 %	46.1 %	49.3 %
Net outpatient revenues as a % of operating revenues before provision for bad debt	53.4 %	51.9 %	48.5 %
Net income attributable to Community Health Systems, Inc.	\$ 265,640	\$ 201,948	\$ 279,983
Net income attributable to Community Health Systems, Inc. as a % of net operating revenues	2.0 %	1.7 %	2.5 %
Liquidity Data			
Adjusted EBITDA(8)	\$ 1,977,715	\$ 1,836,650	\$ 1,761,484
Adjusted EBITDA as a % of net operating revenues(8)	15.2 %	15.4 %	15.9 %
Net cash flows provided by operating activities	\$ 1,280,120	\$ 1,261,908	\$ 1,188,730
Net cash flows provided by operating activities as a % of net operating revenues	9.8 %	10.6 %	10.7 %
Net cash flows used in investing activities	\$ (1,383,202)	\$ (1,195,775)	\$ (1,044,310)
Net cash flows provided by (used in) financing activities	\$ 361,030	\$ (235,437)	\$ (189,792)

Table of Contents

	Year Ended December 31,		(Decrease)
	2012	2011	Increase
	(Dollars in thousands)		
Same-Store Data(9)			
Admissions(3)	668,679	675,050	(0.9)%
Adjusted admissions(4)	1,351,043	1,330,988	1.5 %
Patient days(5)	2,902,418	2,970,044	
Average length of stay (days)(6)	4.3	4.4	
Occupancy rate (beds in service)(7)	48.3 %	49.1 %	
Net operating revenues	\$ 12,438,580	\$ 11,893,095	4.6 %
Income from operations	\$ 1,198,243	\$ 1,164,545	2.9 %
Income from operations as a % of net operating revenues	9.6 %	9.8 %	
Depreciation and amortization	\$ 703,236	\$ 652,674	
Equity in earnings of unconsolidated affiliates	\$ 42,210	\$ 49,491	

(1) Licensed beds are the number of beds for which the appropriate state agency licenses a facility regardless of whether the beds are actually available for patient use.

(2) Beds in service are the number of beds that are readily available for patient use.

(3) Admissions represent the number of patients admitted for inpatient treatment.

(4) Adjusted admissions is a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume. We computed adjusted admissions by multiplying admissions by gross patient revenues and then dividing that number by gross inpatient revenues.

(5) Patient days represent the total number of days of care provided to inpatients.

(6) Average length of stay (days) represents the average number of days inpatients stay in our hospitals.

(7) We calculated occupancy rate percentages by dividing the average daily number of inpatients by the weighted-average number of beds in service.

Table of Contents

- (8) EBITDA consists of net income attributable to Community Health Systems, Inc. before interest, income taxes, depreciation and amortization. Adjusted EBITDA is EBITDA adjusted to exclude discontinued operations, impairment of long-lived assets, gain/loss from early extinguishment of debt and net income attributable to noncontrolling interests. We have from time to time sold noncontrolling interests in certain of our subsidiaries or acquired subsidiaries with existing noncontrolling interest ownership positions. We believe that it is useful to present adjusted EBITDA because it excludes the portion of EBITDA attributable to these third-party interests and clarifies for investors our portion of EBITDA generated by continuing operations. We use adjusted EBITDA as a measure of liquidity. We have included this measure because we believe it provides investors with additional information about our ability to incur and service debt and make capital expenditures. Adjusted EBITDA is the basis for a key component in the determination of our compliance with some of the covenants under our senior secured credit facility, as well as to determine the interest rate and commitment fee payable under the senior secured credit facility (although adjusted EBITDA does not include all of the adjustments described in the senior secured credit facility).

Adjusted EBITDA is not a measurement of financial performance or liquidity under generally accepted accounting principles. It should not be considered in isolation or as a substitute for net income, operating income, cash flows from operating, investing or financing activities, or any other measure calculated in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The items excluded from adjusted EBITDA are significant components in understanding and evaluating financial performance and liquidity. Our calculation of adjusted EBITDA may not be comparable to similarly titled measures reported by other companies.

The following table reconciles adjusted EBITDA, as defined, to our net cash provided by operating activities as derived directly from our Consolidated Financial Statements for the years ended December 31, 2012, 2011 and 2010 (in thousands):

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2012	2011	2010
Adjusted EBITDA	\$ 1,977,715	\$ 1,836,650	\$ 1,761,484
Interest expense, net	(622,933)	(644,410)	(647,593)
Provision for income taxes	(157,502)	(137,653)	(163,681)
Deferred income taxes	53,407	107,032	97,370
Loss from operations of hospitals sold	(466)	(7,769)	(6,772)
Depreciation and amortization of discontinued operations	-	4,991	14,842
Stock-based compensation expense	40,896	42,542	38,779
Excess tax benefit relating to stock-based compensation	(3,973)	(5,290)	(10,219)
Other non-cash expenses, net	33,251	28,716	12,503
Changes in operating assets and liabilities, net of effects of acquisitions and divestitures:			
Patient accounts receivable	(204,151)	(138,332)	(27,049)
Supplies, prepaid expenses and other current assets	(99,799)	(42,858)	(39,904)
Accounts payable, accrued liabilities and income taxes	246,301	246,110	161,952
Other	17,374	(27,821)	(2,982)

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Net cash provided by operating activities	\$	1,280,120	\$	1,261,908	\$	1,188,730
---	----	-----------	----	-----------	----	-----------

(9) Includes acquired hospitals to the extent we operated them during comparable periods in both years.

Table of Contents**Sources of Revenue**

We receive payment for healthcare services provided by our hospitals from:

the federal Medicare program,

state Medicaid or similar programs,

healthcare insurance carriers, health maintenance organizations or HMOs, preferred provider organizations or PPOs, and other managed care programs and

patients directly.

The following table presents the approximate percentages of operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before provision for bad debts), by payor source for the periods indicated. The data for the years presented are not strictly comparable due to the effect that hospital acquisitions have had on these statistics.

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2012	2011	2010
Medicare	26.0 %(1)	26.8 %	27.4 %
Medicaid	9.8 %	9.7 %	10.7 %
Managed Care and other third-party payors	51.2 %	51.5 %	50.4 %
Self-pay	13.0 %	12.0 %	11.5 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

(1) Excludes the \$84.3 million reimbursement settlement and payment update as discussed below.

As shown above, we receive a substantial portion of our revenues from the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Included in Managed Care and other third-party payors is operating revenues from insurance companies with which we have insurance provider contracts, Medicare managed care, insurance companies for which we do not have insurance provider contracts, workers compensation carriers and non-patient service revenue, such as rental income and cafeteria sales. In the future, we generally expect revenues received from the Medicare and Medicaid programs to increase due to the general aging of the population. In addition, as discussed below, the Reform Legislation should increase the number of insured patients, which, in turn, should reduce revenues from self-pay patients and reduce our provision for bad debts. The Reform Legislation, however, imposes significant reductions in amounts the government pays Medicare managed care plans. The trend toward increased enrollment in Medicare managed care may adversely affect our operating revenue growth. Other provisions in the Reform Legislation impose minimum medical-loss ratios and require insurers to meet specific benefit requirements. Furthermore, in the normal course of business, managed care programs, insurance companies and employers actively negotiate the amounts paid to hospitals. There can be no assurance that we will retain our existing reimbursement arrangements or that these third-party payors will not attempt to further reduce the rates they pay for our services.

Medicare is a federal program that provides medical insurance benefits to persons age 65 and over, some disabled persons, and persons with end-stage renal disease. Medicaid is a federal-state funded program, administered by the states, which provides medical benefits to individuals

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

who are unable to afford healthcare. All of our hospitals are certified as providers of Medicare and Medicaid services. Amounts received under the Medicare and Medicaid programs are generally significantly less than a hospital's customary charges for the services provided. Since a substantial portion of our revenue comes from patients under Medicare and Medicaid programs, our ability to operate our business successfully in the future will depend in large measure on our ability to adapt to changes in these programs.

In addition to government programs, we are paid by private payors, which include insurance companies, HMOs, PPOs, other managed care companies and employers, and by patients directly. Blue Cross payors are included in the Managed Care and other third-party payors line in the above table. Patients are generally not responsible for any difference between customary hospital charges and amounts paid for hospital services by Medicare and Medicaid programs, insurance companies, HMOs, PPOs and other managed care companies, but are responsible for services not covered by these programs or plans, as well as for deductibles and co-insurance obligations of their coverage. The amount of these deductibles and co-insurance obligations has increased in recent years. Collection of amounts due from individuals is typically more difficult than collection of amounts due from government or business payors. To further reduce their healthcare costs, an increasing number of insurance companies, HMOs, PPOs and other managed care companies are negotiating discounted fee structures or fixed amounts for hospital services performed, rather than paying healthcare providers the amounts billed. We negotiate discounts with managed care companies, which are typically smaller than discounts under governmental programs. If an

Table of Contents

increased number of insurance companies, HMOs, PPOs and other managed care companies succeed in negotiating discounted fee structures or fixed amounts, our results of operations may be negatively affected. For more information on the payment programs on which our revenues depend, see *Payment* on page 18.

As of December 31, 2012, Indiana, Texas and Pennsylvania represented our only areas of geographic concentration. Operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), generated in Indiana, as a percentage of consolidated operating revenues, were 10.5% in 2012, 10.3% in 2011 and 10.6% in 2010. Operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), generated in Texas, as a percentage of consolidated operating revenues, were 14.4% in 2012, 13.1% in 2011 and 13.0% in 2010. Operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), generated in Pennsylvania, as a percentage of consolidated operating revenues, were 12.6% in 2012, 11.5% in 2011 and 10.3% in 2010.

Hospital revenues depend upon inpatient occupancy levels, the volume of outpatient procedures and the charges or negotiated payment rates for hospital services provided. Charges and payment rates for routine inpatient services vary significantly depending on the type of service performed and the geographic location of the hospital. In recent years, we have experienced a significant increase in revenue received from outpatient services. We attribute this increase to:

advances in technology, which have permitted us to provide more services on an outpatient basis and

pressure from Medicare or Medicaid programs, insurance companies and managed care plans to reduce hospital stays and to reduce costs by having services provided on an outpatient rather than on an inpatient basis.

Government Regulation

Overview. The healthcare industry is required to comply with extensive government regulation at the federal, state and local levels. Under these regulations, hospitals must meet requirements to be certified as hospitals and qualified to participate in government programs, including the Medicare and Medicaid programs. These requirements relate to the adequacy of medical care, equipment, personnel, operating policies and procedures, maintenance of adequate records, hospital use, rate-setting, compliance with building codes and environmental protection laws. There are also extensive regulations governing a hospital's participation in these government programs. If we fail to comply with applicable laws and regulations, we can be subject to criminal penalties and civil sanctions, our hospitals can lose their licenses and we could lose our ability to participate in these government programs. In addition, government regulations may change. If that happens, we may have to make changes in our facilities, equipment, personnel and services so that our hospitals remain certified as hospitals and qualified to participate in these programs. We believe that our hospitals are in substantial compliance with current federal, state and local regulations and standards.

Hospitals are subject to periodic inspection by federal, state and local authorities to determine their compliance with applicable regulations and requirements necessary for licensing and certification. All of our hospitals are licensed under appropriate state laws and are qualified to participate in Medicare and Medicaid programs. In addition, most of our hospitals are accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. This accreditation indicates that a hospital satisfies the applicable health and administrative standards to participate in Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Healthcare Reform. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, or ARRA, was signed into law on February 17, 2009, providing for a temporary increase in the federal matching assistance percentage (FMAP), a temporary increase in federal Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital, or DSH, allotments, subsidization of health insurance premiums (COBRA) for up to nine months, and grants and loans for infrastructure and incentive payments for providers who adopt and use health information technology. This act also provides penalties by reducing reimbursement from Medicare in the form of reductions to scheduled market basket increases beginning in federal fiscal year 2015 if eligible hospitals and professionals fail to demonstrate meaningful use of electronic health record technology.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or PPACA, was signed into law on March 23, 2010. In addition, the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010, or Reconciliation Act, which contains a number of amendments to PPACA, was signed into law on March 30, 2010. These two healthcare acts, referred to collectively as the Reform Legislation, include a mandate that requires substantially all U.S. citizens to maintain medical insurance coverage, which will ultimately increase the number of persons with access to health insurance in the United States. The Reform Legislation, as originally enacted, is expected to expand health insurance coverage through a combination of public program expansion and private sector health insurance reforms. We believe the expansion of private sector and Medicaid coverage will, over time, increase our reimbursement related to providing services to individuals who were previously uninsured, which should reduce our expense from uncollectible accounts receivable. The Reform Legislation also makes a number of other changes to Medicare and Medicaid, such as

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

reductions to the Medicare annual market basket update for federal fiscal years 2010 through 2019, a productivity offset to the Medicare market basket update which began October 1, 2011, and a reduction to the Medicare and Medicaid disproportionate share payments, that could adversely impact the reimbursement received under these programs. The various provisions in the Reform Legislation that directly or indirectly affect reimbursement are scheduled to take effect over a

Table of Contents

number of years. Over time, we believe the net impact of the overall changes as a result of the Reform Legislation will have a positive effect on our net operating revenues. Other provisions of the Reform Legislation, such as requirements related to employee health insurance coverage, should increase our operating costs.

Also included in the Reform Legislation are provisions aimed at reducing fraud, waste and abuse in the healthcare industry. These provisions allocate significant additional resources to federal enforcement agencies and expand the use of private contractors to recover potentially inappropriate Medicare and Medicaid payments. The Reform Legislation amends several existing federal laws, including the Medicare Anti-Kickback Statute and the False Claims Act, making it easier for government agencies and private plaintiffs to prevail in lawsuits brought against healthcare providers. These amendments also make it easier for potentially severe fines and penalties to be imposed on healthcare providers accused of violating applicable laws and regulations.

On June 28, 2012, the Supreme Court of the United States largely upheld the constitutionality of the Reform Legislation, though it overturned an aspect of the legislation that would have permitted the Federal government to withhold all Medicaid funding from a state if that state did not expand Medicaid coverage to the extent required by the Reform Legislation. The Supreme Court's ruling instead held that only new incremental funding could be withheld from a state in such a situation. As a result, states will face less severe financial consequences if they refuse to expand Medicaid coverage to individuals with incomes below certain thresholds. Since the Supreme Court's ruling, some states have suggested that, for budgetary and other reasons, they would not expand their Medicaid programs. If states refuse to expand their Medicaid programs, the number of uninsured patients at our hospitals will decline by a smaller margin as compared to our expectations when the Reform Legislation was first adopted. In response to the Supreme Court ruling, the previous estimates of the reduction in uninsured individuals as a result of the Reform Legislation have been revised, with approximately 27 million additional individuals expected to have health insurance coverage by 2017. Because of the many variables involved, including clarifications and modifications resulting from the rule-making process, the development of agency guidance and future judicial interpretations, whether and how many states decide to expand or not to expand Medicaid coverage, the number of uninsured who elect to purchase health insurance coverage, and budgetary issues at federal and state levels, we may not be able to realize the positive impact the Reform Legislation may have on our business, results of operations, cash flow, capital resources and liquidity. Furthermore, we cannot predict whether we will be able to modify certain aspects of our operations to offset any potential adverse consequences from the Reform Legislation.

In a number of markets, we have partnered with local physicians in the ownership of our facilities. Such investments have been permitted under an exception to the physician self-referral law, or Stark Law, that allows physicians to invest in an entire hospital (as opposed to individual hospital departments). The Reform Legislation changes the whole hospital exception to the Stark Law. The Reform Legislation permits existing physician investments in a whole hospital to continue under a grandfather clause if the arrangement satisfies certain requirements and restrictions, but physicians are now prohibited, from the time the Reform Legislation became effective, from increasing the aggregate percentage of their ownership in the hospital. The Reform Legislation also restricts the ability of existing physician-owned hospitals to expand the capacity of their facilities.

In addition to the Reform Legislation, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 included provisions for implementing health information technology under the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act, or HITECH. These provisions were designed to increase the use of electronic health records, or EHR, technology and establish the requirements for a Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments program beginning in 2011 for eligible hospitals and providers that adopt and meaningfully use certified EHR technology. These incentive payments are intended to offset a portion of the costs incurred to implement and qualify as a meaningful user of EHR. Rules adopted in July 2010 by the Department of Health and Human Services established an initial set of standards and certification criteria. Our hospital facilities have begun to implement EHR technology on a facility-by-facility basis beginning in 2011. We anticipate recognizing incentive reimbursement related to the Medicare or Medicaid incentives as we are able to implement the certified EHR technology, meet the defined meaningful use criteria, and information from completed cost report periods is available from which to calculate the incentive reimbursement. The timing of recognizing incentive reimbursement will not correlate with the timing of recognizing operating expenses and incurring capital costs in connection with the implementation of EHR technology which may result in material period-to-period changes in our future results of operations. Hospitals that do not qualify as a meaningful user of EHR technology by 2015 are subject to a reduced market basket update to the inpatient prospective payment system standardized amount in 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year. Although we believe that our hospital facilities will be in compliance with the EHR standards by 2015, there can be no assurance that all of our facilities will be in compliance and therefore not subject to the penalty provisions of HITECH.

Table of Contents

Fraud and Abuse Laws. Participation in the Medicare program is heavily regulated by federal statute and regulation. If a hospital fails substantially to comply with the requirements for participating in the Medicare program, the hospital's participation in the Medicare program may be terminated and/or civil or criminal penalties may be imposed. For example, a hospital may lose its ability to participate in the Medicare program if it performs any of the following acts:

making claims to Medicare for services not provided or misrepresenting actual services provided in order to obtain higher payments,

paying money to induce the referral of patients where services are reimbursable under a federal health program or

paying money to limit or reduce the services provided to Medicare beneficiaries.

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, or HIPAA, broadened the scope of the fraud and abuse laws. Under HIPAA, any person or entity that knowingly and willfully defrauds or attempts to defraud a healthcare benefit program, including private healthcare plans, may be subject to fines, imprisonment or both. Additionally, any person or entity that knowingly and willfully falsifies or conceals a material fact or makes any material false or fraudulent statements in connection with the delivery or payment of healthcare services by a healthcare benefit plan is subject to a fine, imprisonment or both.

Another law regulating the healthcare industry is a section of the Social Security Act, known as the anti-kickback statute. This law prohibits some business practices and relationships under Medicare, Medicaid and other federal healthcare programs. These practices include the payment, receipt, offer, or solicitation of remuneration of any kind in exchange for items or services that are reimbursed under most federal or state healthcare programs. Violations of the anti-kickback statute may be punished by criminal and civil fines, exclusion from federal healthcare programs and damages up to three times the total dollar amount involved.

The Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, or OIG, is responsible for identifying and investigating fraud and abuse activities in federal healthcare programs. As part of its duties, the OIG provides guidance to healthcare providers by identifying types of activities that could violate the anti-kickback statute. The OIG also publishes regulations outlining activities and business relationships that would be deemed not to violate the anti-kickback statute. These regulations are known as safe harbor regulations. However, the failure of a particular activity to comply with the safe harbor regulations does not necessarily mean that the activity violates the anti-kickback statute.

The OIG has identified the following incentive arrangements as potential violations of the anti-kickback statute:

payment of any incentive by the hospital when a physician refers a patient to the hospital,

use of free or significantly discounted office space or equipment for physicians in facilities usually located close to the hospital,

provision of free or significantly discounted billing, nursing, or other staff services,

free training for a physician's office staff, including management and laboratory techniques (but excluding compliance training),

guarantees which provide that if the physician's income fails to reach a predetermined level, the hospital will pay any portion of the remainder,

low-interest or interest-free loans, or loans which may be forgiven if a physician refers patients to the hospital,

payment of the costs of a physician's travel and expenses for conferences,

payment of services which require few, if any, substantive duties by the physician, or payment for services in excess of the fair market value of the services rendered or

purchasing goods or services from physicians at prices in excess of their fair market value.

Table of Contents

We have a variety of financial relationships with physicians who refer patients to our hospitals. Physicians own interests in a number of our facilities. Physicians may also own our stock. We also have contracts with physicians providing for a variety of financial arrangements, including employment contracts, leases, management agreements and professional service agreements. We provide financial incentives to recruit physicians to relocate to communities served by our hospitals. These incentives include relocation, reimbursement for certain direct expenses, income guarantees and, in some cases, loans. Although we believe that we have structured our arrangements with physicians in light of the safe harbor rules, we cannot assure you that regulatory authorities will not determine otherwise. If that happens, we could be subject to criminal and civil penalties and/or exclusion from participating in Medicare, Medicaid, or other government healthcare programs.

The Social Security Act also includes a provision commonly known as the Stark Law. This law prohibits physicians from referring Medicare patients to healthcare entities in which they or any of their immediate family members have ownership interests or other financial arrangements. These types of referrals are commonly known as self referrals. Sanctions for violating the Stark Law include denial of payment, civil money penalties, assessments equal to twice the dollar value of each service and exclusion from government payor programs. There are ownership and compensation arrangement exceptions to the self-referral prohibition. One exception allows a physician to make a referral to a hospital if the physician owns an interest in the entire hospital, as opposed to an ownership interest in a department of the hospital. Another exception allows a physician to refer patients to a healthcare entity in which the physician has an ownership interest if the entity is located in a rural area, as defined in the statute. There are also exceptions for many of the customary financial arrangements between physicians and providers, including employment contracts, leases and recruitment agreements. From time to time, the federal government has issued regulations which interpret the provisions included in the Stark Law. The Reform Legislation changed the whole hospital exception to the Stark Law. The Reform Legislation permitted existing physician investments in a whole hospital to continue under a grandfather clause if the arrangement satisfies certain requirements and restrictions, but physicians became prohibited, from the time the Reform Legislation became effective, from increasing the aggregate percentage of their ownership in the hospital. The Reform Legislation also restricted the ability of existing physician-owned hospitals to expand the capacity of their aggregate licensed beds, operating rooms and procedure rooms. The whole hospital exception, as amended, also contains additional disclosure requirements. For example, a grandfathered physician-owned hospital is required to submit an annual report to the Department of Health and Human Services, or the DHHS, listing each investor in the hospital, including all physician owners. In addition, grandfathered physician-owned hospitals must have procedures in place that require each referring physician owner to disclose to patients, with enough notice for the patient to make a meaningful decision regarding receipt of care, the physician's ownership interest and, if applicable, any ownership interest held by the treating physician. A grandfathered physician-owned hospital also must disclose on its web site and in any public advertising the fact that it has physician ownership. The Reform Legislation required grandfathered physician-owned hospitals to comply with these new requirements by September 23, 2011, and required audits of the hospitals' compliance beginning no later than May 1, 2012.

Sanctions for violating the Stark Law include denial of payment, civil monetary penalties of up to \$15,000 per claim submitted and exclusion from federal healthcare programs. The statute also provides for a penalty of up to \$100,000 for a scheme intended to circumvent the Stark Law prohibitions.

In addition to the restrictions and disclosure requirements applicable to physician-owned hospitals under the Stark Law, CMS regulations require physician-owned hospitals and their physician owners to disclose certain ownership information to patients. Physician-owned hospitals that receive referrals from physician owners must disclose in writing to patients that such hospitals are owned by physicians and that patients may receive a list of the hospital's physician investors upon request. Additionally, a physician-owned hospital must require all physician owners who are members of the hospital's medical staff to agree, as a condition of continued medical staff membership or admitting privileges, to disclose in writing to all patients whom they refer to the hospital their (or an immediate family member's) ownership interest in the hospital. A hospital is considered to be physician-owned if any physician, or an immediate family member of a physician, holds debt, stock or other types of investment in the hospital or in any owner of the hospital, excluding physician ownership through publicly-traded securities that meet certain conditions. If a hospital fails to comply with these regulations, the hospital could lose its Medicare provider agreement and be unable to participate in Medicare.

Evolving interpretations of current, or the adoption of new, federal or state laws or regulations could affect many of the arrangements entered into by each of our hospitals. In addition, law enforcement authorities, including the OIG, the courts and Congress are increasing scrutiny of arrangements between healthcare providers and potential referral sources to ensure that the arrangements are not designed as a mechanism to improperly pay for patient referrals and/or other business. Investigators also have demonstrated a willingness to look behind the formalities of a business transaction to determine the underlying purpose of payments between healthcare providers and potential referral sources.

Table of Contents

Many states in which we operate have also adopted laws that prohibit payments to physicians in exchange for referrals similar to the federal anti-kickback statute or that otherwise prohibit fraud and abuse activities. Many states have also passed self-referral legislation similar to the Stark Law, prohibiting the referral of patients to entities with which the physician has a financial relationship. Often these state laws are broad in scope and may apply regardless of the source of payment for care. These statutes typically provide criminal and civil penalties, as well as loss of licensure. Little precedent exists for the interpretation or enforcement of these state laws.

Our operations could be adversely affected by the failure of our arrangements to comply with the anti-kickback statute, the Stark Law, billing laws and regulations, current state laws or other legislation or regulations in these areas adopted in the future. We are unable to predict whether other legislation or regulations at the federal or state level in any of these areas will be adopted, what form such legislation or regulations may take or how they may affect our operations. We are continuing to enter into new financial arrangements with physicians and other providers in a manner structured to comply in all material respects with these laws. We cannot assure you, however, that governmental officials responsible for enforcing these laws or whistleblowers will not assert that we are in violation of them or that such statutes or regulations ultimately will be interpreted by the courts in a manner consistent with our interpretation.

We strive to comply with the Stark Law and regulations; however, the government may interpret the law and regulations differently. If we are found to have violated the Stark Law or regulations, we could be subject to significant sanctions, including damages, penalties and exclusion from federal healthcare programs.

Federal False Claims Act and Similar State Laws. Another trend affecting the healthcare industry today is the increased use of the federal False Claims Act, or FCA, and, in particular, actions being brought by individuals on the government's behalf under the FCA's qui tam or whistleblower provisions. Whistleblower provisions allow private individuals to bring actions on behalf of the government alleging that the defendant has defrauded the federal government. If the government intervenes in the action and prevails, the party filing the initial complaint may share in any settlement or judgment. If the government does not intervene in the action, the whistleblower plaintiff may pursue the action independently and may receive a larger share of any settlement or judgment. When a private party brings a qui tam action under the FCA, the defendant generally will not be made aware of the lawsuit until the government commences its own investigation or makes a determination whether it will intervene. Further, 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.

When a defendant is determined by a court of law to be liable under the FCA, the defendant must 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. Settlements entered into prior to litigation usually involve a less severe calculation of damages. There are many potential bases for liability under the FCA. Liability often arises when an entity knowingly submits a false claim for reimbursement to the federal government. The FCA broadly defines the term "knowingly." Although simple negligence will not give rise to liability under the FCA, submitting a claim with reckless disregard to its truth or falsity can constitute "knowingly" submitting a false claim and result in liability. In some cases, whistleblowers, the federal government and courts have taken the position that providers who allegedly have violated other statutes, such as the anti-kickback statute or the Stark Law, have thereby submitted false claims under the FCA. The Reform Legislation clarifies this issue with respect to the anti-kickback statute by providing that submission of a claim for an item or service generated in violation of the anti-kickback statute constitutes a false or fraudulent claim under the FCA. 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. Under the Reform Legislation, the FCA is implicated by the knowing failure to report and return an overpayment within 60 days of identifying the overpayment or by the date a corresponding cost report is due, whichever is later. Further, the FCA will cover payments involving federal funds in connection with the new health insurance exchanges to be created pursuant to the Reform Legislation. Even if the FCA is not implicated and a mistake is made in the submission of claims, substantial financial liability can arise with respect to any overpayments. There is a notable gap in the time periods for which overpayments may be recouped by the government but for which corrected claims can be submitted.

A number of states, including states in which we operate, have adopted their own false claims provisions as well as their own whistleblower provisions whereby a private party may file a civil lawsuit in state court. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 created an incentive for states to enact false claims laws that are comparable to the FCA. From time to time, companies in the healthcare industry, including ours, may be subject to actions under the FCA or similar state laws.

Table of Contents

Corporate Practice of Medicine; Fee-Splitting. Some states have laws that prohibit unlicensed persons or business entities, including corporations, from employing physicians. Some states also have adopted laws that prohibit direct or indirect payments or fee-splitting arrangements between physicians and unlicensed persons or business entities. Possible sanctions for violations of these restrictions include loss of a physician's license, civil and criminal penalties and rescission of business arrangements. These laws vary from state to state, are often vague and have seldom been interpreted by the courts or regulatory agencies. We structure our arrangements with healthcare providers to comply with the relevant state law. However, we cannot be assured that governmental officials responsible for enforcing these laws will not assert that we, or transactions in which we are involved, are in violation of these laws. These laws may also be interpreted by the courts in a manner inconsistent with our interpretations.

Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act. The Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act imposes requirements as to the care that must be provided to anyone who comes to facilities providing emergency medical services seeking care before they may be transferred to another facility or otherwise denied care. Sanctions for failing to fulfill these requirements include exclusion from participation in Medicare and Medicaid programs and civil money penalties. In addition, the law creates private civil remedies which enable an individual who suffers personal harm as a direct result of a violation of the law to sue the offending hospital for damages and equitable relief. A medical facility that suffers a financial loss as a direct result of another participating hospital's violation of the law also has a similar right. Although we believe that our practices are in compliance with the law, we can give no assurance that governmental officials responsible for enforcing the law or others will not assert we are in violation of these laws.

Conversion Legislation. Many states, including some where we have hospitals and others where we may in the future acquire hospitals, have adopted legislation regarding the sale or other disposition of hospitals operated by not-for-profit entities. In other states that do not have specific legislation, the attorneys general have demonstrated an interest in these transactions under their general obligations to protect charitable assets from waste. These legislative and administrative efforts primarily focus on the appropriate valuation of the assets divested and the use of the proceeds of the sale by the not-for-profit seller. While these reviews and, in some instances, approval processes can add additional time to the closing of a hospital acquisition, we have not had any significant difficulties or delays in completing the process. There can be no assurance, however, that future actions on the state level will not seriously delay or even prevent our ability to acquire hospitals. If these activities are widespread, they could limit our ability to acquire hospitals.

Certificates of Need. The construction of new facilities, the acquisition of existing facilities and the addition of new services at our facilities may be subject to state laws that require prior approval by state regulatory agencies. These CON laws generally require that a state agency determine the public need and give approval prior to the construction or acquisition of facilities or the addition of new services. As of December 31, 2012, we operated 58 hospitals in 16 states that have adopted CON laws for acute care facilities. If we fail to obtain necessary state approval, we will not be able to expand our facilities, complete acquisitions or add new services in these states. Violation of these state laws may result in the imposition of civil sanctions or the revocation of a hospital's licenses.

HIPAA Administrative Simplification and Privacy and Security Requirements. HIPAA requires the use of uniform electronic data transmission standards for healthcare claims and payment transactions submitted or received electronically. These provisions are intended to encourage electronic commerce in the healthcare industry. The DHHS has established electronic data transmission standards that all healthcare providers must use when submitting or receiving certain healthcare transactions electronically. 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. Use of the ICD-10 code sets is mandatory on October 1, 2014, so we are modifying our payment systems and processes to prepare for their implementation. Use of the ICD-10 code sets will require significant changes; however, 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 Reform Legislation requires the DHHS to adopt standards for additional electronic transactions and to establish operating rules to promote uniformity in the implementation of each standardized electronic transaction.

As required by HIPAA, the DHHS has issued privacy and security regulations that extensively regulate the use and disclosure of individually identifiable health-related information and require healthcare providers to implement administrative, physical and technical practices to protect the security of individually identifiable health information that is electronically maintained or transmitted. ARRA broadens 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-related information on behalf of covered entities) and subjects business associates to civil and criminal penalties for violation of the regulations. On July 14, 2010, the DHHS issued a proposed rule that would implement these ARRA provisions. If finalized, these changes would likely require amendments to existing agreements with business associates and would subject business associates and their subcontractors to direct liability under the HIPAA privacy and security regulations. We have developed and utilize a HIPAA compliance plan as part of our effort to comply with HIPAA privacy and security requirements. The privacy regulations and security regulations have and will continue to impose significant costs on our facilities in order to comply with these standards.

Table of Contents

As required by ARRA, the DHHS 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 the covered entity or its agents. Notification must also be made to the DHHS 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, the DHHS 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 the DHHS to impose penalties for violations resulting from willful neglect. ARRA 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. Further, 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 are 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.

Payment

Medicare. Under the Medicare program, we are paid for inpatient and outpatient services performed by our hospitals.

Payments for inpatient acute services are generally made pursuant to a prospective payment system, commonly known as PPS. Under PPS, our hospitals are paid a predetermined amount for each hospital discharge based on the patient's diagnosis. Specifically, each discharge is assigned to a diagnosis-related group, commonly known as a DRG, based upon the patient's condition and treatment during the relevant inpatient stay. Commencing with the federal fiscal year 2009 (i.e., the federal fiscal year beginning October 1, 2008), each DRG is assigned a payment rate using 100% of the national average cost per case and 100% of the severity adjusted DRG weights. DRG payments are based on national averages and not on charges or costs specific to a hospital. Severity adjusted DRGs more accurately reflect the costs a hospital incurs for caring for a patient and account more fully for the severity of each patient's condition. However, DRG payments are adjusted by a predetermined geographic adjustment factor assigned to the geographic area in which the hospital is located. While a hospital generally does not receive payment in addition to a DRG payment, hospitals may qualify for an outlier payment when the relevant patient's treatment costs are extraordinarily high and exceed a specified regulatory threshold.

The DRG payment rates are adjusted by an update factor on October 1 of each year, the beginning of the federal fiscal year. The index used to adjust the DRG payment rates, known as the market basket index, gives consideration to the inflation experienced by hospitals in purchasing goods and services. DRG payment rates were increased by the full market basket index, for the federal fiscal years 2013, 2012, 2011, and 2010, by 2.6%, 3.0%, 2.6%, and 2.1%, respectively. In addition, the DRG payment rates were reduced by 0.25% on April 1, 2010 and by 0.25% on October 1, 2010, as mandated by the Reform Legislation. The DRG payment rates were also reduced by 2.9% for federal fiscal year 2011 for behavioral changes in documentation and coding practices related to the Medicare severity diagnosis-related group known as MS-DRG, system. For federal fiscal year 2012, the DRG payment rates were reduced by 1% for the multi-factor productivity adjustment; reduced by 0.1% in accordance with the Reform Legislation; reduced by 2% for documentation and coding; and increased by 1.1% as a result of the decision in *Cape Cod Hospital v. Sebelius*. In addition, for federal fiscal year 2013, the DRG payment rates were increased by 2.9% to restore the one-time recoupment adjustment made to the national standardized amount for federal fiscal year 2012 and reduced by 1.9% for documentation and coding; reduced by 0.7% for the multi-factor productivity adjustment; and reduced by 0.1% in accordance with the Reform Legislation. The rates are also adjusted for readmission reduction factors and value-based purchasing factors for federal fiscal year 2014. For behavioral changes in coding practices related to MS-DRGs, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 provides for an approximate 2% reduction to Medicare inpatient PPS DRG rates for federal fiscal year 2014. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 imposed a two percentage point reduction to the market basket index beginning October 1, 2007, and each year thereafter, if patient quality data is not submitted. We are complying with this data submission requirement. Future legislation may decrease the rate of increase for DRG payments or even decrease such payment rates, but we are not able to predict the amount of any reduction or the effect that any reduction will have on us.

In addition, hospitals may qualify for Medicare disproportionate share payments when their percentage of low income patients exceeds specified regulatory thresholds. A majority of our hospitals qualify to receive Medicare disproportionate share payments. For the majority of our hospitals that qualify to receive Medicare disproportionate share payments, these payments were increased by the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003, effective April 1, 2004. These Medicare disproportionate share payments as a percentage of operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), were 1.3%, 1.5% and 1.7% for the years ended December 31, 2012, 2011 and 2010, respectively. Effective at the beginning of federal fiscal year 2014, Medicare disproportionate share payments will be reduced by 75% in accordance with the Reform Legislation. The funds from the 75% Medicare disproportionate share reduction are reduced as the U.S. uninsured population declines and are then returned to hospitals depending on the amount of uncompensated

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

care they provide. The funds from the 75% Medicare disproportionate share reduction will continue to be reduced over time as the uninsured population decreases. At this time, we cannot predict an impact for this

Table of Contents

change. Hospitals may also qualify for Medicaid disproportionate share payments when they qualify under the state established guidelines. These Medicaid disproportionate share payments as a percentage of operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), were 0.4%, 0.5% and 0.4% for the years ended December 31, 2012, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

Beginning August 1, 2000, we began receiving Medicare reimbursement for outpatient services through a PPS. Under the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999, non-urban hospitals with 100 beds or less were held harmless. The Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act extended the hold harmless provision for non-urban hospitals with 100 beds or less, including non-urban sole community hospitals, through December 31, 2009, at 85% of the hold harmless amount. Of our 125 hospitals at December 31, 2009, 44 qualified for this relief. The Reform Legislation extended the hold harmless provision for non-urban hospitals with 100 beds or less, including non-urban sole community hospitals, through December 31, 2010, at 85% of the hold harmless amount. Of our 130 hospitals at December 31, 2010, 46 qualified for this relief. The Medicare and Medicaid Extenders Act of 2010 extended the hold harmless provision for non-urban hospitals with 100 beds or less, including non-urban sole community hospitals, through December 31, 2011, at 85% of the hold harmless amount. Of our 131 hospitals at December 31, 2011, 45 qualified for this relief. The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act extended the hold harmless provision for non-urban hospitals with 100 beds or less, including non-urban sole community hospitals, through December 31, 2012, at 85% of the hold harmless amount. Of our 135 hospitals at December 31, 2012, 46 qualified for this relief. The outpatient conversion factor was increased 2.1% effective January 1, 2010; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with outpatient PPS, an approximate 1.8% to 2.2% net increase in outpatient payments occurred. The outpatient conversion factor was increased 2.35% effective January 1, 2011; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with outpatient PPS, an approximate 2.1% to 2.5% net increase in outpatient payments occurred. The outpatient conversion factor was increased 3.0% effective January 1, 2012; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with outpatient PPS, an approximate 2.1% to 2.5% net increase in outpatient payments occurred. The outpatient conversion factor was increased 2.6% effective January 1, 2013; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with outpatient PPS, an approximate 1.6% to 2.0% net increase in outpatient payments is expected to occur. The Medicare Improvements and Extension Act of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 imposed a two percentage point reduction to the market basket index beginning January 1, 2009, and each year thereafter, if patient quality data is not submitted. We are complying with this data submission requirement.

The DHHS established a PPS for home health services (i.e., home care) effective October 1, 2000. The home health agency PPS per episodic payment rate increased 2.0% on January 1, 2010; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with home health agency PPS, an approximate 2.3% net increase in home health agency payments occurred. The home health agency PPS per episodic payment rate increased 1.1% on January 1, 2011; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with home health agency PPS, an approximate 4.9% net decrease in home health agency payments occurred. The home health agency PPS per episodic payment rate increased 2.4% on January 1, 2012; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with home health agency PPS, an approximate 2.31% net decrease in home health agency payments occurred. The home health agency PPS per episodic payment rate increased by 2.3% on January 1, 2013; however, coupled with adjustments to other variables with home health agency PPS, an approximate 0.01% net decrease in home health agency payments is expected to occur. The Reform Legislation increases the home health agency PPS per episodic payment rate by 3.0% for home health services provided to patients in rural areas on or after April 1, 2010 through December 31, 2016. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 imposed a two percentage point reduction to the market basket index beginning January 1, 2007, and each year thereafter, if patient quality data is not submitted. We are complying with this data submission requirement.

The Medicare reimbursement discussed above could be reduced in 2013 due to federal legislation that requires across-the-board spending cuts to the federal budget, also known as sequestration. These sequestration cuts include reductions in payments for Medicare and other federally funded healthcare programs, including TRICARE. Such cuts were originally identified to go into effect on January 1, 2013 as part of the Budget Control Act of 2011, which was passed as the result of attempts by the government to reduce the federal budget deficit. The passage of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 delayed the effective date of the sequestration until March 1, 2013, with the sequester-related Medicare reimbursement cuts occurring sometime after April 1, 2013. We cannot determine at this time whether the sequester-related cuts to reimbursement will be postponed further, amended, or eliminated entirely. If the sequestration cuts occur as currently scheduled, they could have a material impact on our net operating revenues and cash flows.

Medicaid. Most state Medicaid payments are made under a PPS or under programs which negotiate payment levels with individual hospitals. Medicaid is currently funded jointly by state and federal government. The federal government and many states are currently considering significantly reducing Medicaid funding, while at the same time expanding Medicaid benefits. Currently, several states utilize supplemental reimbursement programs for the purpose of providing reimbursement to providers to offset a portion of the cost of providing care to Medicaid and indigent patients. These programs are designed with input from CMS and are funded with a combination of state and federal resources, including, in certain instances, fees or taxes levied on the providers. Similar programs are also being considered by other states. We can provide no assurance that reductions to Medicaid fundings will not have a material adverse effect on our consolidated results of operations.

Table of Contents

Annual Cost Reports. Hospitals participating in the Medicare and some Medicaid programs, whether paid on a reasonable cost basis or under a PPS, are required to meet specified financial reporting requirements. Federal and, where applicable, state regulations require submission of annual cost reports identifying medical 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 some Medicaid programs are subject to routine governmental audits. These audits may result in adjustments to the amounts ultimately determined to be due to us under these reimbursement programs. Finalization of these audits often takes several years. Providers can appeal any final determination made in connection with an audit. DRG outlier payments have been and continue to be the subject of CMS audit and adjustment. The DHHS OIG is also actively engaged in audits and investigations into alleged abuses of the DRG outlier payment system.

Commercial Insurance and Managed Care Companies. Our hospitals provide services to individuals covered by private healthcare insurance or by health plans administered by managed care companies. These payors pay our hospitals or in some cases reimburse their policyholders based upon the hospital's established charges and the coverage provided in the insurance policy. They try to limit the costs of hospital services by negotiating discounts, including PPS, which would reduce payments by commercial insurers or health plans to our hospitals. Commercial insurers and Managed Care companies also seek to reduce payments to hospitals by establishing payment rules that in effect recharacterize the services ordered by physicians. For example, some payors vigorously review each patient's length of stay in the hospital and recharacterize as outpatient all in-patient stays of less than a particular duration (e.g. 24 hours). Reductions in payments for services provided by our hospitals to individuals covered by these payors could adversely affect us.

Supply Contracts

In March 2005, we began purchasing items, primarily medical supplies, medical equipment and pharmaceuticals, under an agreement with HealthTrust, a GPO in which we are a noncontrolling partner. As of December 31, 2012, we have a 17.4% ownership interest in HealthTrust. By participating in this organization, we are able to procure items at competitively priced rates for our hospitals. There can be no assurance that our arrangement with HealthTrust will continue to provide the discounts that we have historically received.

Competition

The hospital industry is highly competitive. An important part of our business strategy is to continue to acquire hospitals in non-urban markets and selected urban markets. However, other for-profit hospital companies and not-for-profit hospital systems generally attempt to acquire the same type of hospitals as we do. In addition, some hospitals are sold through an auction process, which may result in higher purchase prices than we believe are reasonable.

In addition to the competition we face for acquisitions, we must also compete with other hospitals and healthcare providers for patients. The competition among hospitals and other healthcare providers for patients has intensified in recent years. Our hospitals are located in non-urban and selected urban service areas. Those hospitals in non-urban service areas face no direct competition because there are no other hospitals in their primary service areas. However, these hospitals do face competition from hospitals outside of their primary service area, including hospitals in urban areas that provide more complex services. Patients in those service areas may travel to these other hospitals for a variety of reasons, including the need for services we do not offer or physician referrals. Patients who are required to seek services from these other hospitals may subsequently shift their preferences to those hospitals for services we do provide. Those hospitals in selected urban service areas may face competition from hospitals that are more established than our hospitals. Certain of these competing facilities offer services, including extensive medical research and medical education programs, which are not offered by our facilities. In addition, in certain markets where we operate, there are large teaching hospitals that provide highly specialized facilities, equipment and services that may not be available at our hospitals.

Some of our hospitals operate in primary service areas where they compete with another hospital. Some of these competing hospitals use equipment and services more specialized than those available at our hospitals and/or are owned by tax-supported governmental agencies or not-for-profit entities supported by endowments and charitable contributions. These hospitals do not pay income or property taxes, and can make capital expenditures without paying sales tax. We also face competition from other specialized care providers, including outpatient surgery, orthopedic, oncology and diagnostic centers.

The number and quality of the physicians on a hospital's staff is an important factor in a hospital's competitive position. Physicians decide whether a patient is admitted to the hospital and the procedures to be performed. Admitting physicians may be on the medical staffs of other hospitals in addition to those of our hospitals. We attempt to attract our physicians' patients to our hospitals by offering quality services and facilities, convenient locations and state-of-the-art equipment.

Table of Contents

Compliance Program

We take an operations team approach to compliance and utilize corporate experts for program design efforts and facility leaders for employee-level implementation. We believe compliance is another area that demonstrates our utilization of standardization and centralization techniques and initiatives which yield efficiencies and consistency throughout our facilities. We recognize that our compliance with applicable laws and regulations depends on individual employee actions as well as company operations. Our approach focuses on integrating compliance responsibilities with operational functions. This approach is intended to reinforce our company-wide commitment to operate strictly in accordance with the laws and regulations that govern our business.

Our company-wide compliance program has been in place since 1997. Currently, the program's elements include leadership, management and oversight at the highest levels, a Code of Conduct, risk area specific policies and procedures, employee education and training, an internal system for reporting concerns, auditing and monitoring programs and a means for enforcing the program's policies.

Since its initial adoption, the compliance program continues to be expanded and developed to meet the industry's expectations and our needs. Specific written policies, procedures, training and educational materials and programs, as well as auditing and monitoring activities, have been prepared and implemented to address the functional and operational aspects of our business. Included within these functional areas are materials and activities for business sub-units, including laboratory, radiology, pharmacy, emergency, surgery, observation, home care, skilled nursing and clinics. Specific areas identified through regulatory interpretation and enforcement activities have also been addressed in our program. Claims preparation and submission, including coding, billing and cost reports, comprise the bulk of these areas. Financial arrangements with physicians and other referral sources, including compliance with the federal anti-kickback statute and the Stark Law, emergency department treatment and transfer requirements and other patient disposition issues, are also the focus of policy and training, standardized documentation requirements and review and audit. Another focus of the program is the interpretation and implementation of the HIPAA standards for privacy and security.

We have a Code of Conduct which applies to all directors, officers, employees and consultants, and a confidential disclosure program to enhance the statement of ethical responsibility expected of our employees and business associates who work in the accounting, financial reporting and asset management areas of our Company. Our Code of Conduct is posted on our website at www.chs.net/company_overview/code_conduct.html.

Employees

At December 31, 2012, we employed approximately 72,000 full-time employees and 24,000 part-time employees. We have approximately 8,000 employees who are union members. We currently believe that our labor relations are good.

Professional Liability Claims

As part of our business of owning and operating hospitals, we are subject to legal actions alleging liability on our part. To cover claims arising out of the operations of hospitals, we maintain professional malpractice liability insurance and general liability insurance on a claims made basis in excess of those amounts for which we are self-insured, in amounts we believe to be sufficient for our operations. We also maintain umbrella liability coverage for claims which, due to their nature or amount, are not covered by our other insurance policies. However, our insurance coverage does not cover all claims against us or may not continue to be available at a reasonable cost for us to maintain adequate levels of insurance. For a further discussion of our insurance coverage, see our discussion of professional liability claims in Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations in Item 7 of this Report.

Environmental Matters

We are subject to various federal, state and local laws and regulations governing the use, discharge and disposal of hazardous materials, including medical waste products. Compliance with these laws and regulations is not expected to have a material adverse effect on us. It is possible, however, that environmental issues may arise in the future which we cannot now predict.

We are insured for damages of personal property or environmental injury arising out of environmental impairment for both above ground and underground storage tank issues under one insurance policy for all of our hospitals. Our policy coverage is \$5 million per occurrence with a \$50,000 deductible and a \$20 million annual aggregate. This policy also provides pollution legal liability coverage.

Table of Contents

Item 1A. Risk Factors

The following risk factors could materially and adversely affect our future operating results and could cause actual results to differ materially from those predicted in the forward-looking statements we make about our business.

Our level of indebtedness 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 and prevent us from meeting our obligations under the agreements relating to our indebtedness.

We are significantly leveraged. Our wholly-owned subsidiary CHS/Community Health Systems, Inc., or CHS, has obtained senior secured financing under a credit facility, or Credit Facility, with a syndicate of financial institutions led by Credit Suisse, as administrative agent and collateral agent. The table below shows our level of indebtedness and other information as of December 31, 2012. As of December 31, 2012, a \$750 million revolving credit facility was available to us for working capital and general corporate purposes under the Credit Facility, with \$37.8 million of the revolving credit facility being set aside for outstanding letters of credit. On November 5, 2010, we entered into an amendment and restatement of our existing Credit Facility, which extended by two and a half years, until January 25, 2017 (subject to customary acceleration events), the maturity date of \$1.5 billion of our existing term loans under the Credit Facility. In addition, effective February 2, 2012, we completed an additional amendment and restatement of the Credit Facility, which extended by two and a half years the maturity date of an additional \$1.6 billion of our term loans due 2014 under the Credit Facility, until January 25, 2017 (subject to customary acceleration events). On March 6, 2012, we obtained a new \$750 million incremental term loan A facility, or the Incremental Term Loan, with a maturity date of October 25, 2016, subject to customary acceleration events and to earlier maturity if the repayment, extension or refinancing with longer maturity debt of substantially all of our outstanding term loans maturing on July 25, 2014 and the now fully redeemed 8⁷/₈% Senior Notes due 2015, or the 8⁷/₈% Senior Notes, does not occur by April 25, 2014. The proceeds of the Incremental Term Loan were used to prepay the same amount of the existing term loans due July 25, 2017 under the Credit Facility. On August 22, 2012, we entered into a loan modification agreement with respect to the Credit Facility to extend approximately \$340 million of the term loans due 2014 to match the maturity date and interest rate margins of the term loans due January 25, 2017. After the prepayment of \$1.6 billion of the term loans due 2014 from the issuance of the 5¹/₈% Senior Secured Notes discussed below, the remaining approximately \$266.1 million in term loans mature in 2014.

On November 22, 2011, CHS completed its offering of \$1.0 billion aggregate principal amount of 8% Senior Notes due 2019, or the 8% Senior Notes, which were issued in a private placement. The net proceeds from this issuance, together with available cash on hand, were used to finance the purchase of up to \$1.0 billion aggregate principal amount of CHS then outstanding 8³/₈% Senior Notes and related fees and expenses. The 8% Senior Notes are unsecured senior obligations of CHS and are guaranteed on a senior basis by us and by certain of our domestic subsidiaries. On March 21, 2012, CHS completed its offering of \$1.0 billion aggregate principal amount of additional 8% Senior Notes. The net proceeds from this issuance, together with available cash on hand, were used to finance the purchase of approximately \$850 million aggregate principal amount of the then outstanding 8⁷/₈% Senior Notes, to pay related fees and expenses and for general corporate purposes. On July 18, 2012, CHS completed its offering of \$1.2 billion aggregate principal amount of 7¹/₈% Senior Notes due 2020, or the 7¹/₈% Senior Notes. A portion of the net proceeds from this issuance were used to purchase approximately \$639.7 million principal amount (out of the then approximately \$934.3 million total aggregate principal amount outstanding) of 8⁷/₈% Senior Notes that were validly tendered and not validly withdrawn in the cash tender offer commenced on July 3, 2012, to pay for consents delivered in connection therewith and to pay related fees and expenses. On August 17, 2012, pursuant to our redemption option, we redeemed the remaining \$294.6 million principal outstanding of the 8⁷/₈% Senior Notes. The 8% Senior Notes and the 7¹/₈% Senior Notes are its unsecured senior obligations and are guaranteed on a senior basis by us and by certain of our domestic subsidiaries. On August 17, 2012, CHS completed its offering of \$1.6 billion aggregate principal amount of 5¹/₈% Senior Secured Notes due 2018, or the 5¹/₈% Senior Secured Notes. The net proceeds from this issuance, together with available cash on hand, were used to finance the prepayment of \$1.6 billion of the then outstanding term loans due 2014 under the Credit Facility and related fees and expenses.

On March 21, 2012, we entered into an accounts receivable loan agreement, or the Receivables Facility, with a group of lenders and banks with a maximum borrowing capacity of \$300 million and with an expiration date of March 21, 2014. The existing and future patient-related accounts receivable for certain of the Company's hospitals serve as collateral for the outstanding borrowings under the Receivables Facility. The outstanding borrowings at December 31, 2012, pursuant to the Receivables Facility totaled \$300.0 million.

With the exception of some small principal payments of our term loans under our Credit Facility, approximately \$266.1 million of term loans under our Credit Facility mature in 2014, the remaining \$3.4 billion in term loans mature in 2017, our 5¹/₈% Senior Secured Notes are due in 2018, our 8% Senior Notes are due in 2019 and our 7¹/₈% Senior Notes are due 2020. The remaining \$712.5 million in term loans under the incremental term loan A facility mature in 2016 and require quarterly amortization payments of 1²/₃% per quarter in 2012, 2.5% per quarter during 2013 and 2014, 3.75% per quarter during 2015 and 15% per quarter during 2016 through the maturity date, in each case, subject to customary adjustments for prepayments, with the balance payable in full on the maturity date.

Table of Contents**December 31, 2012**

(\$ in millions)

Senior secured credit facility term loans	\$	4,331.6
8% Senior Notes		2,022.8
7 ¹ / ₈ % Senior Notes		1,200.0
5 ¹ / ₈ % Senior Secured Notes		1,600.0
Receivables Facility		300.0
Other		86.9
Total debt	\$	9,541.3
Community Health Systems, Inc. stockholders' equity	\$	2,731.2

As of December 31, 2012, our approximately \$3.1 billion notional amount of interest rate swap agreements represented approximately 67% of our variable rate debt. On a prospective basis, a 1% change in interest rates on the remaining unhedged variable rate debt existing as of December 31, 2012, would result in interest expense fluctuating approximately \$15.3 million per year.

The Credit Facility and/or the 8% Senior Notes, the 7¹/₈% Senior Notes and the 5¹/₈% Senior Secured Notes, or collectively known as the Notes, contain various covenants that limit our ability to take certain actions, including our ability to:

incur, assume or guarantee additional indebtedness,

issue redeemable stock and preferred stock,

repurchase capital stock,

make restricted payments, including paying dividends and making investments,

redeem debt that is junior in right of payment to the Notes,

create liens,

sell or otherwise dispose of assets, including capital stock of subsidiaries,

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

enter into agreements that restrict dividends from subsidiaries,

merge, consolidate, sell or otherwise dispose of substantial portions of our assets,

enter into transactions with affiliates and

guarantee certain obligations.

In addition, our Credit Facility contains restrictive covenants and requires us to maintain specified financial ratios and satisfy other financial condition tests. Our ability to meet these restrictive covenants and financial ratios and tests can be affected by events beyond our control, and we cannot assure you that we will meet those tests.

The counterparty to the interest rate swap agreements exposes us to credit risk in the event of non-performance. However, at December 31, 2012, we do not anticipate non-performance by the counterparty due to the net settlement feature of the agreements and our liability position with respect to each of our counterparties.

A breach of any of these covenants could result in a default under our Credit Facility and/or the Notes. Upon the occurrence of an event of default under our Credit Facility or the Notes, all amounts outstanding under our Credit Facility and the Notes may become immediately due and payable and all commitments under the Credit Facility to extend further credit may be terminated.

Table of Contents

Our leverage could have important consequences for you, including the following:

it may limit our ability to obtain additional debt or equity financing for working capital, capital expenditures, debt service requirements, acquisitions and general corporate or other purposes,

a substantial portion of our cash flows from operations will be dedicated to the payment of principal and interest on our indebtedness and will not be available for other purposes, including our operations, capital expenditures and future business opportunities,

the debt service requirements of our indebtedness could make it more difficult for us to satisfy our financial obligations,

some of our borrowings, including borrowings under our Credit Facility, are at variable rates of interest, exposing us to the risk of increased interest rates,

it may limit our ability to adjust to changing market conditions and place us at a competitive disadvantage compared to our competitors that have less debt and

we may be vulnerable in a downturn in general economic conditions or in our business, or we may be unable to carry out capital spending that is important to our growth.

The ratio of earnings to fixed charges is a measure of our ability to meet our fixed obligations related to our indebtedness. The following table shows the ratio of earnings to fixed charges for the periods indicated:

	Year Ended December 31,				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Ratio of earnings to fixed charges(1)	1.47x	1.60x	1.69x	1.61x	1.66x

(1) Fixed charges include interest expensed and capitalized during the year plus an estimate of the interest component of rent expense.

There are no shares of preferred stock outstanding. See exhibit 12 filed as part of this Report for the calculation of this ratio.

Despite current indebtedness levels, we may be able to incur substantially more debt. This could further exacerbate the risks described above.

We may be able to incur substantial additional indebtedness in the future. The terms of the indentures governing the Notes do not fully prohibit us from doing so. For example, under the indentures for the 8% Senior Notes, the 7 1/8% Senior Notes and the 5 1/8% Senior Secured Notes, we may incur up to approximately \$5.0 billion pursuant to a credit facility and \$300 million for a qualified receivables transaction, less certain amounts repaid with the proceeds of asset dispositions. As of December 31, 2012, our Credit Facility and Receivables Facility provided for commitments of up to approximately \$5.3 billion in the aggregate. Additionally, our Credit Facility also gives us the ability to provide for one or more additional tranches of term loans in the aggregate principal amount of up to \$1.0 billion without the consent of the existing lenders if specified criteria are satisfied. If new debt is added to our current debt levels, the related risks that we now face could be further exacerbated.

If competition decreases our ability to acquire additional hospitals on favorable terms, we may be unable to execute our acquisition strategy.

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

An important part of our business strategy is to acquire two to four hospitals each year. However, not-for-profit hospital systems and other for-profit hospital companies generally attempt to acquire the same type of hospital as we do. Some of these other purchasers have greater financial resources than us. Our principal competitors for acquisitions have included Health Management Associates, Inc. and LifePoint Hospitals, Inc. On some occasions, we also compete with HCA Holdings Inc., Universal Health Services, Inc., other non-public, for-profit hospitals and local market hospitals. In addition, some hospitals are sold through an auction process, which may result in higher purchase prices than we believe are reasonable. Therefore, we may not be able to acquire additional hospitals on terms favorable to us.

If we fail to improve the operations of acquired hospitals, we may be unable to achieve our growth strategy.

Many of the hospitals we have acquired had, or future acquisitions may have, significantly lower operating margins than we do and/or operating losses prior to the time we acquired or will acquire them. In the past, we have occasionally experienced temporary delays in improving the operating margins or effectively integrating the operations of these acquired hospitals. In the future, if we are unable to improve the operating margins of acquired hospitals, operate them profitably, or effectively integrate their operations, we may be unable to achieve our growth strategy.

Table of Contents

If we acquire hospitals with unknown or contingent liabilities, we could become liable for material obligations.

Hospitals that we acquire may have unknown or contingent liabilities, including liabilities for failure to comply with healthcare laws and regulations. Although we generally seek indemnification from prospective sellers covering these matters, we may nevertheless have material liabilities for past activities of acquired hospitals.

State efforts to regulate the construction, acquisition or expansion of hospitals could prevent us from acquiring additional hospitals, renovating our facilities or expanding the breadth of services we offer.

Some states require prior approval for the construction or acquisition of healthcare facilities and for the expansion of healthcare facilities and services. In giving approval, these states consider the need for additional or expanded healthcare facilities or services. In some states in which we operate, we are required to obtain CONs for capital expenditures exceeding a prescribed amount, changes in bed capacity or services and some other matters. Other states may adopt similar legislation. We may not be able to obtain the required CONs or other prior approvals for additional or expanded facilities in the future. In addition, at the time we acquire a hospital, we may agree to replace or expand the facility we are acquiring. If we are not able to obtain required prior approvals, we would not be able to replace or expand the facility and expand the breadth of services we offer. Furthermore, if a CON or other prior approval, upon which we relied to invest in construction of a replacement or expanded facility, were to be revoked or lost through an appeal process, then we may not be able to recover the value of our investment.

State efforts to regulate the sale of hospitals operated by not-for-profit entities could prevent us from acquiring additional hospitals and executing our business strategy.

Many states, including some where we have hospitals and others where we may in the future acquire hospitals, have adopted legislation regarding the sale or other disposition of hospitals operated by not-for-profit entities. In other states that do not have specific legislation, the attorneys general have demonstrated an interest in these transactions under their general obligations to protect the use of charitable assets. These legislative and administrative efforts focus primarily on the appropriate valuation of the assets divested and the use of the proceeds of the sale by the non-profit seller. While these review and, in some instances, approval processes can add additional time to the closing of a hospital acquisition, we have not had any significant difficulties or delays in completing acquisitions. However, future actions on the state level could seriously delay or even prevent our ability to acquire hospitals.

If we are unable to effectively compete for patients, local residents could use other hospitals.

The hospital industry is highly competitive. In addition to the competition we face for acquisitions and physicians, we must also compete with other hospitals and healthcare providers for patients. The competition among hospitals and other healthcare providers for patients has intensified in recent years. The majority of our hospitals are located in non-urban service areas. In nearly 60% of our markets, we are the sole provider of general acute care health services. In most of our other markets, the primary competitor is a not-for-profit hospital. These not-for-profit hospitals generally differ in each jurisdiction. However, our hospitals face competition from hospitals outside of their primary service area, including hospitals in urban areas that provide more complex services. Patients in our primary service areas may travel to these other hospitals for a variety of reasons. These reasons include physician referrals or the need for services we do not offer. Patients who seek services from these other hospitals may subsequently shift their preferences to those hospitals for the services we provide.

Some of our hospitals operate in primary service areas where they compete with one other hospital; 26 of our hospitals compete with more than one other hospital in their respective primary service areas. Some of these competing hospitals use equipment and services more specialized than those available at our hospitals. In addition, some competing hospitals are owned by tax-supported governmental agencies or not-for-profit entities supported by endowments and charitable contributions. These hospitals do not pay income or property taxes, and can make capital expenditures without paying sales tax. We also face competition from other specialized care providers, including outpatient surgery, orthopedic, oncology and diagnostic centers.

We expect that these competitive trends will continue. Our inability to compete effectively with other hospitals and other healthcare providers could cause local residents to use other hospitals.

Table of Contents

The failure to obtain our medical supplies at favorable prices could cause our operating results to decline.

We have a participation agreement with HealthTrust, a GPO. This agreement extends to January 2014, with automatic renewal terms of one year, unless either party terminates by giving notice of non-renewal. GPOs attempt to obtain favorable pricing on medical supplies with manufacturers and vendors who sometimes negotiate exclusive supply arrangements in exchange for the discounts they give. To the extent these exclusive supply arrangements are challenged or deemed unenforceable, we could incur higher costs for our medical supplies obtained through HealthTrust. These higher costs could cause our operating results to decline.

There can be no assurance that our arrangement with HealthTrust will provide the discounts we expect to achieve.

If the fair value of our reporting units declines, a material non-cash charge to earnings from impairment of our goodwill could result.

At December 31, 2012, we had approximately \$4.4 billion of goodwill recorded on our books. We expect to recover the carrying value of this goodwill through our future cash flows. On an ongoing basis, we evaluate, based on the fair value of our reporting units, whether the carrying value of our goodwill is impaired. If the carrying value of our goodwill is impaired, we may incur a material non-cash charge to earnings.

A significant decline in operating results or other indicators of impairment at one or more of our facilities could result in a material, non-cash charge to earnings to impair the value of long-lived assets.

Our operations are capital intensive and require significant investment in long-lived assets, such as property, equipment and other long-lived intangible assets, including capitalized internal-use software. If one of our facilities experiences declining operating results or is adversely impacted by one or more of these risk factors, we may not be able to recover the carrying value of those assets through our future operating cash flows. On an ongoing basis, we evaluate whether changes in future undiscounted cash flows reflect an impairment in the fair value of our long-lived assets. If the carrying value of those assets is impaired, we may incur a material non-cash charge to earnings.

Risks related to our industry

We are subject to uncertainties regarding healthcare reform.

In recent years, Congress and some state legislatures have introduced an increasing number of proposals to make major changes in the healthcare system, including an increased emphasis on the linkage between quality of care criteria and payment levels such as the submission of patient quality data to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In addition, CMS conducts ongoing reviews of certain state reimbursement programs.

ARRA was signed into law on February 17, 2009, providing for a temporary increase in the federal matching assistance percentage (FMAP), a temporary increase in federal Medicaid DSH allotments, subsidization of health insurance premiums (COBRA) for up to nine months and grants and loans for infrastructure and incentive payments for providers who adopt and use health information technology. This act also provides penalties by reducing reimbursement from Medicare in the form of reductions to scheduled market basket increases beginning in federal fiscal year 2015 if eligible hospitals and professionals fail to demonstrate meaningful use of electronic health record technology.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or PPACA, was signed into law on March 23, 2010. In addition, the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010, or Reconciliation Act, which contains a number of amendments to PPACA, was signed into law on March 30, 2010. These two healthcare acts, referred to collectively as the Reform Legislation, include a mandate that requires substantially all U.S. citizens to maintain medical insurance coverage, which will ultimately increase the number of persons with access to health insurance in the United States. The Reform Legislation, as originally enacted, is expected to expand health insurance coverage through a combination of public program expansion and private sector health insurance reforms. We believe the expansion of private sector and Medicaid coverage will, over time, increase our reimbursement related to providing services to individuals who were previously uninsured, which should reduce our expense from uncollectible accounts receivable. The Reform Legislation also makes a number of other changes to Medicare and Medicaid, such as reductions to the Medicare annual market basket update for federal fiscal years 2010 through 2019, a productivity offset to the Medicare market basket update which began October 1, 2011, and a reduction to the Medicare and Medicaid disproportionate share payments, that could adversely impact the reimbursement received under these programs. The various provisions in the Reform Legislation that directly or indirectly affect reimbursement are scheduled to take effect over a number of years. Over time, we believe the net impact of the overall changes as a result of the Reform Legislation will have a positive effect on our net operating revenues. Other provisions of the Reform Legislation, such as requirements related to employee health insurance coverage, should increase our operating costs.

Table of Contents

Also included in the Reform Legislation are provisions aimed at reducing fraud, waste and abuse in the healthcare industry. These provisions allocate significant additional resources to federal enforcement agencies and expand the use of private contractors to recover potentially inappropriate Medicare and Medicaid payments. The Reform Legislation amends several existing federal laws, including the Medicare Anti-Kickback Statute and the False Claims Act, making it easier for government agencies and private plaintiffs to prevail in lawsuits brought against healthcare providers. These amendments also make it easier for potentially severe fines and penalties to be imposed on healthcare providers accused of violating applicable laws and regulations.

On June 28, 2012, the Supreme Court of the United States largely upheld the constitutionality of the Reform Legislation, though it overturned an aspect of the legislation that would have permitted the Federal government to withhold all Medicaid funding from a state if that state did not expand Medicaid coverage to the extent required by the Reform Legislation. The Supreme Court's ruling instead held that only new incremental funding could be withheld from a state in such a situation. As a result, states will face less severe financial consequences if they refuse to expand Medicaid coverage to individuals with incomes below certain thresholds. Since the Supreme Court's ruling, some states have suggested that, for budgetary and other reasons, they would not expand their Medicaid programs. If states refuse to expand their Medicaid programs, the number of uninsured patients at our hospitals will decline by a smaller margin as compared to our expectations when the Reform Legislation was first adopted. In response to the Supreme Court ruling, the previous estimates of the reduction in uninsured individuals as a result of the Reform Legislation have been revised, with approximately 27 million additional individuals expected to have health insurance coverage by 2017. Because of the many variables involved, including clarifications and modifications resulting from the rule-making process, the development of agency guidance and future judicial interpretations, whether and how many states decide to expand or not to expand Medicaid coverage, the number of uninsured who elect to purchase health insurance coverage, and budgetary issues at federal and state levels, we may not be able to realize the positive impact the Reform Legislation may have on our business, results of operations, cash flow, capital resources and liquidity. Furthermore, we cannot predict whether we will be able to modify certain aspects of our operations to offset any potential adverse consequences from the Reform Legislation.

In a number of markets, we have partnered with local physicians in the ownership of our facilities. Such investments have been permitted under an exception to the physician self-referral law, or Stark Law, that allows physicians to invest in an entire hospital (as opposed to individual hospital departments). The Reform Legislation changes the whole hospital exception to the Stark Law. The Reform Legislation permits existing physician investments in a whole hospital to continue under a grandfather clause if the arrangement satisfies certain requirements and restrictions, but physicians are now prohibited, from the time the Reform Legislation became effective, from increasing the aggregate percentage of their ownership in the hospital. The Reform Legislation also restricts the ability of existing physician-owned hospitals to expand the capacity of their facilities.

If federal or state healthcare programs or managed care companies reduce the payments we receive as reimbursement for services we provide, our net operating revenues may decline.

In 2012, 35.8% of our operating revenues, net of contractual allowances and discounts (but before the provision for bad debts), came from the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Federal healthcare expenditures continue to increase and state governments continue to face budgetary shortfalls as a result of the current economic downturn and accelerating Medicaid enrollment. As a result, federal and state governments have made, and continue to make, significant changes in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Some of these changes have decreased, or could decrease, the amount of money we receive for our services relating to these programs.

In addition, insurance and managed care companies and other third parties from whom we receive payment for our services increasingly are attempting to control healthcare costs by requiring that hospitals discount payments for their services in exchange for exclusive or preferred participation in their benefit plans. We believe that this trend may continue and our inability to negotiate increased reimbursement rates or maintain existing rates may reduce the payments we receive for our services.

If we fail to comply with extensive laws and government regulations, including fraud and abuse laws, we could suffer penalties or be required to make significant changes to our operations.

The healthcare industry is required to comply with many laws and regulations at the federal, state and local government levels. These laws and regulations require that hospitals meet various requirements, including those relating to the adequacy of medical care, equipment, personnel, operating policies and procedures, maintenance of adequate records, compliance with building codes, environmental protection and privacy. These laws include, in part, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 and a section of the Social Security Act, known as the anti-kickback statute. If we fail to comply with applicable laws and regulations, including fraud and abuse laws, we could suffer civil or criminal penalties, including the loss of our licenses to operate and our ability to participate in the Medicare, Medicaid and other federal and state healthcare programs.

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

In addition, there are heightened coordinated civil and criminal enforcement efforts by both federal and state government agencies relating to the healthcare industry, including the hospital segment. Recent enforcement actions have focused on financial arrangements between hospitals and physicians, billing for services without adequately documenting the medical necessity for such services and billing for services outside the coverage guidelines for such services. Specific to our hospitals, we have received inquiries and subpoenas from

Table of Contents

various governmental agencies regarding these and other matters, and we are also subject to various claims and lawsuits relating to such matters. For a further discussion of these matters, see **Legal Proceedings** in Item 3 of this Report.

In the future, different interpretations or enforcement of these laws and regulations could subject our current practices to allegations of impropriety or illegality or could require us to make changes in our facilities, equipment, personnel, services, capital expenditure programs and operating expenses.

If we become subject to significant legal actions, we could be subject to substantial uninsured liabilities or increased insurance costs.

In recent years, physicians, hospitals and other healthcare providers have become subject to an increasing number of legal actions alleging malpractice, product liability, or related legal theories. Even in states that have imposed caps on damages, litigants are seeking recoveries under new theories of liability that might not be subject to the caps on damages. Many of these actions involve large claims and significant defense costs. To protect us from the cost of these claims, we maintain claims made professional malpractice liability insurance and general liability insurance coverage in excess of those amounts for which we are self-insured. This insurance coverage is in amounts that we believe to be sufficient for our operations. However, our insurance coverage does not cover all claims against us or may not continue to be available at a reasonable cost for us to maintain adequate levels of insurance. As a percentage of net operating revenues, our expense related to malpractice and other professional liability claims, including the cost of excess insurance, was relatively unchanged in 2012, and decreased by 0.2% and 0.3% in 2011 and 2010, respectively. If these costs rise rapidly, our profitability could decline. For a further discussion of our insurance coverage, see our discussion of professional liability claims in **Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations** in Item 7 of this Report.

If we experience growth in self-pay volume and revenues, our financial condition or results of operations could be adversely affected.

Like others in the hospital industry, we have experienced an increase in our provision for bad debts as a percentage of net operating revenues due to a growth in self-pay volume and revenues. Although we continue to seek ways of improving point of service collection efforts and implementing appropriate payment plans with our patients, if we experience growth in self-pay volume and revenues, our results of operations could be adversely affected. Further, our ability to improve collections for self-pay patients may be limited by statutory, regulatory and investigatory initiatives, including private lawsuits directed at hospital charges and collection practices for uninsured and underinsured patients.

Currently, the global economies, and in particular the United States, are experiencing a period of economic uncertainty and the related financial markets are experiencing a high degree of volatility. This current financial turmoil is adversely affecting the banking system and financial markets and resulting in a tightening in the credit markets, a low level of liquidity in many financial markets and extreme volatility in fixed income, credit, currency and equity markets. This uncertainty poses a risk as it could potentially lead to higher levels of uninsured patients, result in higher levels of patients covered by lower paying government programs and/or result in fiscal uncertainties at both government payors and private insurers.

If there are delays in regulatory updates by governmental entities to federal and state healthcare programs, we may experience increased volatility in our operating results as such delays may result in a timing difference between when such program revenues are earned and when they become known or estimable for purposes of accounting recognition.

We derive a significant amount of our net operating revenues from governmental health care programs, primarily from the Medicare and Medicaid programs. The reimbursements due to us from those programs are subject to legislative and regulatory changes that can have a significant impact on our operating results. When delays occur in the passage of regulations or legislation, there is the potential for material increases or decreases in operating revenues to be recognized in periods subsequent to when such related services were performed, resulting in the potential for a material effect on our consolidated financial position and consolidated results of operations.

Table of Contents

If our implementation of electronic health record systems is not effective or exceeds our budget and timeline, our consolidated results of operations could be adversely affected.

ARRA created an incentive payment program for eligible hospitals and healthcare professionals to adopt and meaningfully use certified electronic health records, or EHR, technology. The implementation of EHR that meets the meaningful use criteria requires a significant capital investment, and our current plan to implement EHR anticipates maximizing the incentive payment program created by ARRA. If our hospitals and employed professionals are unable to meet the requirements for participation in the incentive payment program, we will not be eligible to receive incentive payments that could offset some of the costs of implementing EHR systems. As additional incentive, beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, if eligible hospitals and professionals fail to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology, they will be penalized with reduced reimbursement from Medicare in the form of reductions to scheduled market basket increases. If we fail to implement EHR systems effectively and in a timely manner, there could be a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial position and consolidated results of operations.

This Report includes forward-looking statements which could differ from actual future results.

Some of the matters discussed in this Report include forward-looking statements. Statements that are predictive in nature, that depend upon or refer to future events or conditions or that include words such as expects, anticipates, intends, plans, believes, estimates, thinks, and similar expressions are forward-looking statements. These statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause our actual results and performance to be materially different from any future results or performance expressed or implied by these forward-looking statements. These factors include the following:

general economic and business conditions, both nationally and in the regions in which we operate,

implementation and effect of adopted and potential federal and state healthcare legislation,

risks associated with our substantial indebtedness, leverage and debt service obligations,

demographic changes,

changes in, or the failure to comply with, governmental regulations,

potential adverse impact of known and unknown government investigations, audits, and Federal and State False Claims Act litigation and other legal proceedings,

our ability, where appropriate, to enter into and maintain managed care provider arrangements and the terms of these arrangements,

changes in, or the failure to comply with, managed care provider contracts, which could result in, among other things, disputes and changes in reimbursements, both prospectively and retroactively,

changes in inpatient or outpatient Medicare and Medicaid payment levels,

increases in the amount and risk of collectability of patient accounts receivable,

increases in wages as a result of inflation or competition for highly technical positions and rising supply costs due to market pressure from pharmaceutical companies and new product releases,

liabilities and other claims asserted against us, including self-insured malpractice claims,

competition,

our ability to attract and retain, at reasonable employment costs, qualified personnel, key management, physicians, nurses and other healthcare workers,

trends toward treatment of patients in less acute or specialty healthcare settings, including ambulatory surgery centers or specialty hospitals,

changes in medical or other technology,

changes in accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, or U.S. GAAP,

Table of Contents

the availability and terms of capital to fund additional acquisitions or replacement facilities,

our ability to successfully acquire additional hospitals or complete divestitures,

our ability to successfully integrate any acquired hospitals or to recognize expected synergies from such acquisitions,

our ability to obtain adequate levels of general and professional liability insurance and

timeliness of reimbursement payments received under government programs.

Although we believe that these statements are based upon reasonable assumptions, we can give no assurance that our goals will be achieved. Given these uncertainties, prospective investors are cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements are made as of the date of this filing. We assume no obligation to update or revise them or provide reasons why actual results may differ.

Item 1B. *Unresolved Staff Comments*

None

Item 2. *Properties*

Corporate Headquarters

We own our corporate headquarters building located in Franklin, Tennessee.

Hospitals

Our hospitals are general care hospitals offering a wide range of inpatient and outpatient medical services. These services generally include general acute care, emergency room, general and specialty surgery, critical care, internal medicine, obstetrics, diagnostic, psychiatric and rehabilitation services. In addition, some of our hospitals provide skilled nursing and home care services based on individual community needs.

Table of Contents

For each of our hospitals owned or leased as of December 31, 2012, the following table shows its location, the date of its acquisition or lease inception and the number of licensed beds:

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
<i>Alabama</i>				
LV Stabler Memorial Hospital	Greenville	72	October, 1994	Owned
South Baldwin Regional Medical Center	Foley	112	June, 2000	Leased
Cherokee Medical Center	Centre	60	April, 2006	Owned
Dekalb Regional Medical Center	Fort Payne	134	April, 2006	Owned
Trinity Medical Center	Birmingham	534	July, 2007	Owned
Flowers Hospital	Dothan	235	July, 2007	Owned
Medical Center Enterprise	Enterprise	131	July, 2007	Owned
Gadsden Regional Medical Center	Gadsden	346	July, 2007	Owned
Crestwood Medical Center	Huntsville	150	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Alaska</i>				
Mat-Su Regional Medical Center	Palmer	74	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Arizona</i>				
Payson Regional Medical Center	Payson	44	August, 1997	Leased
Western Arizona Regional Medical Center	Bullhead City	139	July, 2000	Owned
Northwest Medical Center	Tucson	300	July, 2007	Owned
Northwest Medical Center Oro Valley	Oro Valley	144	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Arkansas</i>				
Harris Hospital	Newport	133	October, 1994	Owned
Helena Regional Medical Center	Helena	155	March, 2002	Leased
Forrest City Medical Center	Forrest City	118	March, 2006	Leased
Northwest Health System				
Northwest Medical Center - Bentonville	Bentonville	128	July, 2007	Owned

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Northwest Medical Center - Springdale	Springdale	222	July, 2007	Owned
Northwest Medical Center - Willow Creek Women s Hospital	Johnson	64	July, 2007	Owned
Siloam Springs Regional Hospital	Siloam Springs	73	February, 2009	Owned
Medical Center of South Arkansas	El Dorado	166	April, 2009	Leased

31

Table of Contents

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
<i>California</i>				
Barstow Community Hospital	Barstow	30	January, 1993	Owned
Fallbrook Hospital	Fallbrook	47	November, 1998	Operated (2)
Watsonville Community Hospital	Watsonville	106	September, 1998	Owned
<i>Florida</i>				
Lake Wales Medical Center	Lake Wales	160	December, 2002	Owned
North Okaloosa Medical Center	Crestview	110	March, 1996	Owned
<i>Georgia</i>				
Fannin Regional Hospital	Blue Ridge	50	January, 1986	Owned
Trinity Hospital of Augusta	Augusta	231	July, 2007	Leased
<i>Illinois</i>				
Crossroads Community Hospital	Mt. Vernon	57	October, 1994	Owned
Gateway Regional Medical Center	Granite City	367	January, 2002	Owned
Heartland Regional Medical Center	Marion	92	October, 1996	Owned
Red Bud Regional Hospital	Red Bud	31	September, 2001	Owned
Galesburg Cottage Hospital	Galesburg	173	July, 2004	Owned
MetroSouth Medical Center	Blue Island	330	March, 2012	Owned
Vista Medical Center East	Waukegan	336	July, 2006	Owned
Vista Medical Center West (psychiatric and rehabilitation beds)	Waukegan	71	July, 2006	Owned
Union County Hospital	Anna	25	November, 2006	Leased
<i>Indiana</i>				
Porter Hospital	Valparaiso	301	May, 2007	Owned
Lutheran Health Network				
Bluffton Regional Medical Center	Bluffton	79	July, 2007	Owned
Dupont Hospital	Fort Wayne	131	July, 2007	Owned

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Lutheran Hospital	Fort Wayne	396	July, 2007	Owned
Lutheran Musculoskeletal Center	Fort Wayne	39	July, 2007	Owned
Lutheran Rehabilitation Hospital (rehabilitation)	Fort Wayne	36	July, 2007	Owned
St. Joseph's Hospital	Fort Wayne	191	July, 2007	Owned
Dukes Memorial Hospital	Peru	25	July, 2007	Owned
Kosciusko Community Hospital	Warsaw	72	July, 2007	Owned

32

Table of Contents

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
<i>Kentucky</i>				
Parkway Regional Hospital	Fulton	70	May, 1992	Owned
Three Rivers Medical Center	Louisa	90	May, 1993	Owned
Kentucky River Medical Center	Jackson	55	August, 1995	Leased
<i>Louisiana</i>				
Byrd Regional Hospital	Leesville	60	October, 1994	Owned
Northern Louisiana Medical Center	Ruston	159	April, 2007	Owned
Women & Children s Hospital	Lake Charles	88	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Mississippi</i>				
Wesley Medical Center	Hattiesburg	211	July, 2007	Owned
River Region Health System	Vicksburg	341	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Missouri</i>				
Moberly Regional Medical Center	Moberly	101	November, 1993	Owned
Northeast Regional Medical Center	Kirksville	115	December, 2000	Leased
<i>Nevada</i>				
Mesa View Regional Hospital	Mesquite	25	July, 2007	Owned
<i>New Jersey</i>				
Memorial Hospital of Salem County	Salem	140	September, 2002	Owned
<i>New Mexico</i>				
Mimbres Memorial Hospital	Deming	25	March, 1996	Owned
Eastern New Mexico Medical Center	Roswell	162	April, 1998	Owned
Alta Vista Regional Hospital	Las Vegas	54	April, 2000	Owned
Carlsbad Medical Center	Carlsbad	115	July, 2007	Owned

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Lea Regional Medical Center	Hobbs	201	July, 2007	Owned
Mountain View Regional Medical Center	Las Cruces	168	July, 2007	Owned

Table of Contents

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
<i>North Carolina</i>				
Martin General Hospital	Williamston	49	November, 1998	Leased
<i>Ohio</i>				
Affinity Medical Center	Massillon	266	July, 2007	Owned
Valleycare System of Ohio				
Northside Medical Center	Youngstown	355	October, 2010	Owned
Trumbull Memorial Hospital	Warren	311	October, 2010	Owned
Hillside Rehabilitation Hospital (rehabilitation)	Warren	69	October, 2010	Owned
<i>Oklahoma</i>				
Ponca City Medical Center	Ponca City	140	May, 2006	Owned
Deaconess Hospital	Oklahoma City	291	July, 2007	Owned
Woodward Regional Hospital	Woodward	87	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Oregon</i>				
McKenzie-Willamette Medical Center	Springfield	113	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Pennsylvania</i>				
Commonwealth Health Network				
Berwick Hospital	Berwick	101	March, 1999	Owned
Wilkes-Barre General Hospital	Wilkes-Barre	412	April, 2009	Owned
First Hospital Wyoming Valley (psychiatric)	Wilkes-Barre	135	April, 2009	Owned
Regional Hospital of Scranton	Scranton	230	May, 2011	Owned
Special Care Hospital	Nanticoke	67	May, 2011	Leased
Tyler Memorial Hospital	Tunkhannock	48	May, 2011	Owned
Moses Taylor Hospital	Scranton	217	January, 2012	Owned
Mid-Valley Hospital	Peckville	25	January, 2012	Owned
Brandywine Hospital	Coatesville	246	June, 2001	Owned

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Chestnut Hill Hospital	Philadelphia	135	February, 2005	Owned
Easton Hospital	Easton	254	October, 2001	Owned
Jennersville Regional Hospital	West Grove	62	October, 2001	Owned
Lock Haven Hospital	Lock Haven	47	August, 2002	Owned
Pottstown Memorial Medical Center	Pottstown	224	July, 2003	Owned
Phoenixville Hospital	Phoenixville	137	August, 2004	Owned
Sunbury Community Hospital	Sunbury	89	October, 2005	Owned
Memorial Hospital	York	100	July, 2012	Owned

Table of Contents

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
<i>South Carolina</i>				
Marlboro Park Hospital	Bennettsville	102	August, 1996	Leased
Chesterfield General Hospital	Cheraw	59	August, 1996	Leased
Springs Memorial Hospital	Lancaster	231	November, 1994	Owned
Mary Black Memorial Hospital	Spartanburg	207	July, 2007	Owned
Carolinas Hospital System - Florence	Florence	420	July, 2007	Owned
Carolinas Hospital System - Marion	Mullins	124	July, 2010	Owned
<i>Tennessee</i>				
Lakeway Regional Hospital	Morristown	135	May, 1993	Owned
Regional Hospital of Jackson	Jackson	152	January, 2003	Owned
Dyersburg Regional Medical Center	Dyersburg	225	January, 2003	Owned
Haywood Park Community Hospital	Brownsville	62	January, 2003	Owned
Henderson County Community Hospital	Lexington	45	January, 2003	Owned
McKenzie Regional Hospital	McKenzie	45	January, 2003	Owned
McNairy Regional Hospital	Selmer	45	January, 2003	Owned
Volunteer Community Hospital	Martin	100	January, 2003	Owned
Heritage Medical Center	Shelbyville	60	July, 2005	Owned
Sky Ridge Medical Center	Cleveland	351	October, 2005	Owned
Gateway Medical Center	Clarksville	270	July, 2007	Owned
<i>Texas</i>				
Big Bend Regional Medical Center	Alpine	25	October, 1999	Owned
Scenic Mountain Medical Center	Big Spring	150	October, 1994	Owned
Hill Regional Hospital	Hillsboro	116	October, 1994	Leased
Lake Granbury Medical Center	Granbury	83	January, 1997	Leased
South Texas Regional Medical Center	Jourdanton	67	November, 2001	Owned
Laredo Medical Center	Laredo	326	October, 2003	Owned
Weatherford Regional Medical Center	Weatherford	99	November, 2006	Leased

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

Abilene Regional Medical Center	Abilene	231	July, 2007	Owned
Brownwood Regional Medical Center	Brownwood	194	July, 2007	Owned
College Station Medical Center	College Station	167	July, 2007	Owned
Navarro Regional Hospital	Corsicana	162	July, 2007	Owned
Longview Regional Medical Center	Longview	131	July, 2007	Owned
Woodland Heights Medical Center	Lufkin	149	July, 2007	Owned

Table of Contents

Hospital	City	Licensed Beds(1)	Date of Acquisition/Lease Inception	Ownership Type
San Angelo Community Medical Center	San Angelo	171	July, 2007	Owned
DeTar Healthcare System	Victoria	308	July, 2007	Owned
Cedar Park Regional Medical Center	Cedar Park	85	December, 2007	Owned
Tomball Regional Hospital	Tomball	358	October, 2011	Owned
<i>Utah</i>				
Mountain West Medical Center	Tooele	44	October, 2000	Owned
<i>Virginia</i>				
Southern Virginia Regional Medical Center	Emporia	80	March, 1999	Owned
Southampton Memorial Hospital	Franklin	105	March, 2000	Owned
Southside Regional Medical Center	Petersburg	300	August, 2003	Owned
<i>Washington</i>				
Rockwood Health System				
Deaconess Hospital	Spokane	388	October, 2008	Owned
Valley Hospital	Spokane Valley	123	October, 2008	Owned
<i>West Virginia</i>				
Plateau Medical Center	Oak Hill	25	July, 2002	Owned
Greenbrier Valley Medical Center	Ronceverte	122	July, 2007	Owned
Bluefield Regional Medical Center	Bluefield	240	October, 2010	Owned
<i>Wyoming</i>				
Evanston Regional Hospital	Evanston	42	November, 1999	Owned
Total Licensed Beds at December 31, 2012		20,334		

Edgar Filing: COMMUNITY HEALTH SYSTEMS INC - Form 10-K

- (1) Licensed beds are the number of beds for which the appropriate state agency licenses a facility regardless of whether the beds are actually available for patient use.
- (2) We operate this hospital under a lease-leaseback and operating agreement. We recognize all operating statistics, revenues and expenses associated with this hospital in our consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

The real property of substantially all of our wholly-owned hospitals is encumbered by mortgages under the Credit Facility.

The following table lists the hospitals owned by joint venture entities in which we do not have a consolidating ownership interest, along with our percentage ownership interest in the joint venture entity as of December 31, 2012. Information on licensed beds was provided by the majority owner and manager of each joint venture. A subsidiary of HCA is the majority owner of Macon Healthcare LLC, and a subsidiary of UHS is the majority owner of Summerlin Hospital Medical Center LLC and Valley Health System LLC.

Joint Venture	Facility Name	City	State	Licensed
				Beds
Macon Healthcare LLC	Coliseum Medical Center (38%)	Macon	GA	250
Macon Healthcare LLC	Coliseum Psychiatric Center (38%)	Macon	GA	60
Macon Healthcare LLC	Coliseum Northside Hospital (38%)	Macon	GA	103
Summerlin Hospital Medical Center LLC	Summerlin Hospital Medical Center (26.1%)	Las Vegas	NV	454
Valley Health System LLC	Desert Springs Hospital (27.5%)	Las Vegas	NV	293
Valley Health System LLC	Valley Hospital Medical Center (27.5%)	Las Vegas	NV	320
Valley Health System LLC	Spring Valley Hospital Medical Center (27.5%)	Las Vegas	NV	231
Valley Health System LLC	Centennial Hills Hospital Medical Center (27.5%)	Las Vegas	NV	171

Table of Contents

Item 3. *Legal Proceedings*

From time to time, we receive various inquiries or subpoenas from state regulators, fiscal intermediaries, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Department of Justice regarding various Medicare and Medicaid issues. In addition to the subpoenas discussed below, we are currently responding to subpoenas and administrative demands concerning certain cardiology procedures, medical records and policies at a New Mexico hospital. In addition, we are subject to other claims and lawsuits arising in the ordinary course of our business. We are not aware of any pending or threatened litigation that is not covered by insurance policies or reserved for in our consolidated financial statements or which we believe would have a material adverse impact on us; however, some pending or threatened proceedings against us may involve potentially substantial amounts as well as the possibility of civil, criminal, or administrative fines, penalties, or other sanctions, which could be material. Settlements of suits involving Medicare and Medicaid issues routinely require both monetary payments as well as corporate integrity agreements. Additionally, qui tam or whistleblower actions initiated under the civil False Claims Act may be pending but placed under seal by the court to comply with the False Claims Act's requirements for filing such suits. Also, from time to time, we detect issues of non-compliance with Federal healthcare laws pertaining to claims submission and reimbursement practices and/or financial relationships with physicians. We avail ourselves of various mechanisms to address potential overpayments arising out of these issues, including repayment of claims, rebilling of claims, and participation in voluntary disclosure protocols offered by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Office of the Inspector General. Participating in voluntary repayments and voluntary disclosure protocols can have the potential for significant settlement obligations or even enforcement action, however, we are not aware of any such exposures that have not been reserved for in our consolidated financial statements or which we believe would have a material adverse impact on us.

The following items have been previously disclosed in our annual and/or quarterly reports, however, the narrative descriptions have been reorganized and revised to shorten and better summarize the disclosures.

U.S. ex rel. Baker vs. Community Health Systems, Inc. (United States District Court for the District of New Mexico)

Our knowledge of this matter originated in early 2006 with correspondence from the Civil Division of the Department of Justice requesting documents in an investigation it was conducting involving the Company. The inquiry related to the way in which different state Medicaid programs apply to the federal government for matching or supplemental funds that are ultimately used to pay for a small portion of the services provided to Medicaid and indigent patients. These programs are referred to by different names, including intergovernmental payments, upper payment limit programs, and Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments. For approximately three years, we provided the Department of Justice with requested documents, met with its personnel on numerous occasions and otherwise cooperated in its investigation. During the course of the investigation, the Civil Division notified us that it believed that we and three of our New Mexico hospitals caused the State of New Mexico to submit improper claims for federal funds, in violation of the Federal False Claims Act. This investigation has culminated in the federal government's intervention in the referenced qui tam lawsuit, which alleges that our New Mexico hospitals caused to be filed false claims from the period of August 2000 through June 2011. Two of our parent company's subsidiaries are also defendants in this lawsuit. We continue to vigorously defend this action. The current posture of this case is that discovery is closed and both parties' motions for summary judgment have been on file for approximately 11 months. There is currently no hearing date on these motions and no trial date has been set.

Multi-provider National Department of Justice Investigations

Kyphoplasty. Kyphoplasty is a surgical spine procedure that returns a compromised vertebra (either from trauma or osteoporotic disease process) to its previous height, reducing or eliminating severe pain. We were first made aware of this investigation in June 2008, when two of our hospitals received document request letters from the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of New York. Subsequently, additional hospitals (a total of five) also received requests for documents and/or medical records. The investigation covers the period of January 1, 2002 through June 9, 2008. This investigation is part of a national investigation and is related to a qui tam settlement between the same United States Attorney's office and the manufacturer and distributor of the Kyphon product, which is used in performing the kyphoplasty procedure. We are cooperating with the investigation and we are continuing to evaluate and discuss this matter with the federal government.

Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators (ICDs). We were first made aware of this investigation in September 2010, when we received a letter from the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice. The letter advised us that an investigation was being conducted to determine whether certain hospitals have improperly submitted claims for payment for ICDs. The period of time covered by the investigation was 2003 to 2010. We continue to fully cooperate with the government in this investigation and have provided requested records and documents. On August 30, 2012, the Department of Justice issued a document entitled, "Medical Review Guidelines/Resolution Model," which sets out, for the purposes of this investigation, the patient conditions and criteria for the medical necessity of the implantation of ICDs in Medicare beneficiaries and how the Department of Justice will enforce the repayment obligations of hospitals. We are in the process of reviewing our medical records in light of the guidance contained in this document.

Table of Contents

Laredo, Texas Department of Justice Investigation

In December 2009, we received a document subpoena from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General, or OIG, requesting documents related to our hospital in Laredo, Texas. The categories of documents requested included case management, resource management, admission criteria, patient medical records, coding, billing, compliance, the Joint Commission accreditation, physician documentation, payments to referral sources, transactions involving physicians, disproportionate share hospital status and audits by the hospital's Quality Improvement organization. In January 2010, we received a request for information or assistance from the OIG's Office of Investigation requesting patient medical records from this facility for certain Medicaid patients with an extended lengths of stay. We continue to cooperate fully with this investigation.

Department of Justice Investigation of Medicare Short-Stay Admissions from Emergency Departments

In April 2011, we received a document subpoena from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, OIG, in connection with an investigation of possible improper claims submitted to Medicare and Medicaid. The subpoena was directed to all of our hospitals and requested documents concerning emergency department processes and procedures, including our hospitals' use of the Pro-MED Clinical Information System, a third-party software system that assists with the management of patient care and provides operational support and data collection for emergency department management. The subpoena also sought information about our relationships with emergency department physicians, including financial arrangements. This investigation is being led by the Department of Justice. We are continuing to cooperate with the government with the ongoing document production, as well as conducting a joint medical necessity review of a sampling of medical records at a small number of hospitals.

The following matters, although initiated independently of the Department of Justice's April 2011 subpoena, are factually related in some manner to that subpoena and are grouped here for clarity.

Texas Attorney General Investigation of Emergency Department Procedures and Billing. In November 2010, we were served with substantially identical Civil Investigative Demands (CIDs) from the Office of Attorney General, State of Texas for all 18 of our affiliated Texas hospitals. The subject of the requests concerns emergency department procedures and billing. We have complied with these requests and provided all documentation and reports requested. We continue to cooperate fully with this investigation.

United States ex rel. and Reuille vs. Community Health Systems Professional Services Corporation and Lutheran Musculoskeletal Center, LLC d/b/a Lutheran Hospital (United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division). This lawsuit was originally filed under seal in January 2009. The suit is brought under the False Claims Act and alleges that Lutheran Hospital of Indiana billed the Medicare program for (a) false 23 hour observation after outpatient surgeries and procedures, and (b) intentional assignment of inpatient status to one-day stays for cases that do not meet Medicare criteria for inpatient intensity of service or severity of illness. In December 2010, the government filed a notice that it declined to intervene in this suit. On April 22, 2011, a joint motion was filed by the relator and the Department of Justice to extend the period of time for the relator to serve us in the case to allow the government more time to decide if it will intervene in the case. The motion to stay was granted, as have subsequent joint motions, and the stay is currently continued until April 29, 2013. The original motion and subsequent filings gave insight to the fact that there are other qui tam complaints in other jurisdictions and that the government was consolidating its investigations and working cooperatively with other investigative bodies (including the Attorney General of the State of Texas). The government also confirmed that it considers the allegations made in the complaint styled *Tenet Healthcare Corporation vs. Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.* filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division on April 11, 2011 to be related to the government's consolidated investigation. We are cooperating fully with the government in its investigations.

Shelbyville, Tennessee OIG Subpoena. In May 2011, we received a subpoena from the Houston Office of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, OIG, requesting 71 patient medical records from our hospital in Shelbyville, Tennessee. We provided the requested records and have met with the government regarding this matter. We continue to cooperate fully with this investigation.

SEC Subpoena. In May 2011, we received a subpoena from the SEC requesting documents related to or requested in connection with the various inquiries, lawsuits and investigations regarding, generally, emergency room admissions or observation practices at our hospitals. The subpoena also requested documents relied upon by us in responding to the Tenet litigation, as well as other communications about the Tenet litigation. As with all government investigations, we are cooperating fully with the SEC.

Table of Contents

Class Action Shareholder Federal Securities Cases. Three purported class action cases have been filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; namely, *Norfolk County Retirement System v. Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.*, filed May 5, 2011; *De Zheng v. Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.*, filed May 12, 2011; and *Minneapolis Firefighters Relief Association v. Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.*, filed June 2, 2011. All three seek class certification on behalf of purchasers of our common stock between July 27, 2006 and April 11, 2011 and allege that misleading statements resulted in artificially inflated prices for our common stock. In December 2011, the cases were consolidated for pretrial purposes and NYC Funds and its counsel were selected as lead plaintiffs/lead plaintiffs counsel. Our motion to dismiss this case has been fully briefed and is pending before the court. We believe this consolidated matter is without merit and will vigorously defend this case.

Shareholder Derivative Actions. Three purported shareholder derivative actions have also been filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; *Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union No. 630 Pension Annuity Trust Fund v. Wayne T. Smith, et al.*, filed May 24, 2011; *Roofers Local No. 149 Pension Fund v. Wayne T. Smith, et al.*, filed June 21, 2011; and *Lambert Sweat v. Wayne T. Smith, et al.*, filed October 5, 2011. These three cases allege breach of fiduciary duty arising out of allegedly improper inpatient admission practices, mismanagement, waste and unjust enrichment. These cases have been consolidated into a single, consolidated action. The plaintiffs filed an operative amended derivative complaint in these three consolidated actions on March 15, 2012. Our motion to dismiss has been fully briefed and is pending before the court. We believe all of these matters are without merit and will vigorously defend them.

Other Government Investigations

Easton, Pennsylvania Urologist. On June 13, 2011, our hospital in Easton, Pennsylvania received a document subpoena from the Philadelphia office of the United States Department of Justice. The documents requested included medical records for certain urological procedures performed by a non-employed physician who is no longer on the medical staff and other records concerning the hospital's relationship with the physician. Certain procedures performed by the physician had been previously reviewed and appropriate repayments had been made. We are cooperating fully with the government in this investigation.

Hattiesburg, Mississippi Allegiance Health Management, Inc. On February 23, 2012, our hospital in Hattiesburg, Mississippi received a document subpoena from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, OIG relating to its relationship with Allegiance Health Management, Inc., or Allegiance, a company that provides intensive outpatient psychiatric, or IOP, services to its patients. The subpoena seeks information concerning the hospital's financial relationship with Allegiance, medical records of patients receiving IOP services, and other documents relating to Allegiance such as agreements, policies and procedures, audits, complaints, budgets, financial analyses and identities of those delivering services. This is our only hospital that received services from this vendor. We are cooperating fully with this investigation.

Qui Tam Cases Government Declined Intervention

On June 2, 2011, an order was entered unsealing a relator's qui tam complaint in the matter of *U.S. ex rel. Wood M. Deming, MD, individually and on behalf of Regional Cardiology Consultants, PC v. Jackson-Madison County General Hospital, an Affiliate of West Tennessee Healthcare, Regional Hospital of Jackson, a Division of Community Health Systems Professional Services Corporation, James Moss, individually, Timothy Puthoff, individually, Joel Perchik, MD, individually, and Elie H. Korban, MD, individually*. The action is pending in the Western District of Tennessee, Jackson Division. Regional Hospital of Jackson is an affiliated hospital and Mr. Puthoff is a former chief executive officer there. The Order recited that the United States had elected to intervene to a limited degree only concerning the claims against Dr. Korban for false and fraudulent billing for allegedly unnecessary stent procedures and for causing the submission of false claims by the hospitals. On July 28, 2011, we were served by the relator. We believe the claims against our hospital are without merit and we are vigorously defending this case.

On February 2, 2012, an order was entered unsealing a relator's qui tam complaint in the matter of *U.S. ex rel. Pamela Gronemeyer v. Crossroads Community Hospital*. The action is pending in the United States District Court, Southern District of Illinois. Crossroads Community Hospital is an affiliated hospital. The order recited that the United States had declined to intervene in this matter. The allegations in this case pertain to blood administration practices at an affiliated Illinois hospital. We were served in this case on April 18, 2012. In an amended filing in November 2012, the relator dropped her qui tam claims and is proceeding on a wrongful (retaliatory) termination claim only, even though she was never an employee of the hospital. We have filed a motion to dismiss this case. We believe the claim against our hospital is without merit and we are vigorously defending this case. Due to the change in character of this case, we will no longer refer to it in our reports.

On August 8, 2012, an order was entered unsealing a relator's qui tam complaint in the matter of *U.S. and N.M. ex rel. Sally Hansen v. Mimbres Memorial Hospital, et al.* This action is pending in the United States District Court for New Mexico. This case cites alleged quality control failures as violations of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 as the basis for a False Claims Act suit. Both the U.S. government and the New Mexico state government declined to intervene in this case. We have filed a motion to dismiss this case. We believe the claim against our hospital is without merit and we are vigorously defending this case.

Table of Contents

Commercial Litigation and Other Lawsuits

Managed Care Solutions, Inc. v. Community Health Systems, Inc. (United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida). This suit was filed on February 4, 2010. Plaintiff contracted with two affiliated hospitals to provide services collecting receivables from third-party payors. Plaintiff sought to extend the contract to additional facilities at which it never provided any services and claimed \$435 million in damages. A motion for summary judgment was filed on February 17, 2012. On June 4, 2012, the District Court affirmed the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge limiting the Plaintiff's claims to only two hospitals. The Court has continued the trial until July 2013 and our renewed motion for summary judgment has been fully briefed and is waiting disposition. We will continue to vigorously defend this action.

Becker v. Community Health Systems, Inc. d/b/a Community Health Systems Professional Services Corporation d/b/a Community Health Systems d/b/a Community Health Systems PSC, Inc. d/b/a Rockwood Clinic P.S. and Rockwood Clinic, P.S. (Superior Court, Spokane, Washington). This suit was filed on February 29, 2012, by a former chief financial officer at Rockwood Clinic in Spokane, Washington. Becker claims he was wrongfully terminated for allegedly refusing to certify a budget for Rockwood Clinic in 2012. On February 29, 2012, he also filed an administrative complaint with the Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration alleging that he is a whistleblower under Sarbanes-Oxley; a response was filed on May 21, 2012. At a hearing on July 27, 2012, the court dismissed Community Health Systems, Inc. from this case and has subsequently certified the case for an interlocutory appeal of the denial to dismiss his employer and the management company. We are vigorously defending this action.

Management of Significant Legal Proceedings

In accordance with our governance documents, including our Governance Guidelines and the charter of the Audit and Compliance Committee, our management of significant legal proceedings is overseen by the independent members of the Board of Directors and, in particular, the Audit and Compliance Committee. The Audit and Compliance Committee is charged with oversight of compliance, regulatory and litigation matters, and enterprise risk management. Management has been instructed to refer all significant legal proceedings and allegations of financial statement fraud, error, or misstatement to the Audit and Compliance Committee for its oversight and evaluation. Consistent with New York Stock Exchange and Sarbanes-Oxley independence requirements, the Audit and Compliance Committee is comprised entirely of individuals who are independent of Company management, and all three members of the Audit and Compliance Committee are audit committee financial experts as defined in the Exchange Act.

In addition, the Audit and Compliance Committee and the other independent members of the Board of Directors oversee the functions of the voluntary compliance program, including its auditing and monitoring functions and confidential disclosure program. In recent years, the voluntary compliance program has addressed the potential for a variety of billing errors that might be the subject of audits and payment denials by the CMS Recovery Audit Contractors' permanent project, including MS-DRG coding, outpatient hospital and physician coding and billing, and medical necessity for services (including a focus on hospital stays of very short duration). Efforts by management, through the voluntary compliance program, to identify and limit risk from these government audits have included significant policy and guidance revisions, training and education, and auditing.

Since April 2011, our Audit and Compliance Committee and/or Board of Directors has met, on average, monthly to review the status of the lawsuits and investigations relating to allegations of improper billing for inpatient care at our hospitals and to oversee management in connection with our investigation and defense of these matters. At many of those meetings, the independent members of the Board of Directors have met in separate session, first with outside counsel handling the investigations and lawsuits, and then alone, to discuss their duties and oversight of these matters. The independent members of our Board of Directors remain fully engaged in the oversight of these matters.

Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures

Not applicable.

Table of Contents**PART II****Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities**

We completed an initial public offering of our common stock on June 14, 2000. Our common stock began trading on June 9, 2000 and is listed on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol CYH. At February 20, 2013, there were approximately 45 record holders of our common stock. The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the high and low sale prices per share of our common stock as reported by the New York Stock Exchange.

	High	Low
Year Ended December 31, 2011		
First Quarter	\$ 42.50	\$ 34.62
Second Quarter	41.09	22.33
Third Quarter	27.63	15.91
Fourth Quarter	21.92	14.61
Year Ended December 31, 2012		
First Quarter	\$ 25.74	\$ 16.37
Second Quarter	28.79	20.71
Third Quarter	29.59	22.51
Fourth Quarter	32.70	26.33

Table of Contents

Stock Performance Graph

The following graph sets forth the cumulative return of our common stock during the five year period ended December 31, 2012, as compared to the cumulative return of the Standard & Poor's 500 Stock Index (S&P 500) and the cumulative return of the Dow Jones Healthcare Index. The graph assumes an initial investment of \$100 in our common stock and in each of the foregoing indices and the reinvestment of dividends where applicable.

Historically, we have not paid any cash dividends. In December 2012, we declared and paid a special dividend of \$0.25 per share to holders of our common stock at the close of business as of December 17, 2012, which totaled approximately \$23.0 million. In the foreseeable future, we do not anticipate the payment of any other cash dividends. Our Credit Facility limits our ability to pay dividends and/or repurchase stock to an amount not to exceed \$150 million in the aggregate plus the aggregate amount of proceeds from the exercise of stock options. The indentures governing our 8% Senior Notes due 2019, our 7^{1/8}% Senior Notes due 2020 and our 5^{1/8}% Senior Secured Notes due 2018 also limit our ability to pay dividends and/or repurchase stock. As of December 31, 2012, under the most restrictive test under these agreements, we have approximately \$178.1 million available with which to pay permitted dividends and/or repurchase shares of stock or our Notes.

On December 14, 2011, we adopted a new open market repurchase program for up to 4,000,000 shares of our common stock, not to exceed \$100 million in repurchases. The new repurchase program will conclude at the earliest of three years, when the maximum number of shares has been repurchased, or when the maximum dollar amount has been expended. Through December 31, 2012, no shares have been purchased and retired under this program.

On September 15, 2010, we commenced an open market repurchase program for up to 4,000,000 shares of our common stock, not to exceed \$100 million in repurchases. This program will conclude at the earliest of three years from the commencement date, when the maximum number of shares has been repurchased or when the maximum dollar amount has been expended. During the year ended December 31, 2012, we did not repurchase any shares under this program. During the year ended December 31, 2011, we repurchased and retired 3,469,866 shares at a weighted-average price of \$24.68 per share. The cumulative number of shares that have been repurchased and retired under this program through December 31, 2012 is 3,921,138 shares at a weighted-average price of \$25.39 per share.

Table of Contents**Item 6. Selected Financial Data**

The following table summarizes specified selected financial data and should be read in conjunction with our related Consolidated Financial Statements and accompanying Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements. The amounts shown below have been adjusted for discontinued operations.

Community Health Systems, Inc.**Five Year Summary of Selected Financial Data**

Year Ended December 31,

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
--	------	------	------	------	------

(in thousands, except share and per share data)

Consolidated Statement of Income Data

Net operating revenues	\$ 13,028,985	\$ 11,906,212	\$ 11,092,422	\$ 10,333,501	\$ 9,398,781
Income from operations	1,210,124	1,134,485	1,121,044	1,064,831	970,086
Income from continuing operations	346,269	335,894	355,213	305,811	238,386
Net income	345,803	277,623	348,441	306,377	252,734
Net income attributable to noncontrolling interests	80,163	75,675	68,458	63,227	34,430
Net income attributable to Community Health Systems, Inc.	265,640	201,948	279,983	243,150	218,304

*Basic earnings per share attributable to Community**Health Systems, Inc. common stockholders (1):*

Continuing operations	\$ 2.98	\$ 2.89	\$ 3.13	\$ 2.68	\$ 2.18
Discontinued operations	(0.01)	(0.65)	(0.07)	-	0.16
Net income	\$ 2.98	\$ 2.24	\$ 3.05	\$ 2.68	\$ 2.34

*Diluted earnings per share attributable to Community**Health Systems, Inc. common stockholders (1):*

Continuing operations	\$ 2.96	\$ 2.87	\$ 3.08	\$ 2.65	\$ 2.16
Discontinued operations	0.01	(0.64)	(0.07)	-	0.16
Net income	\$ 2.96	\$ 2.23	\$ 3.01	\$ 2.66	