

ENSIGN GROUP, INC
Form 10-K
February 10, 2016
Table of Contents

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

FORM 10-K

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13(a) OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2015

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: 001-33757

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Its Charter)

Delaware

33-0861263

(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation or Organization)

(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

27101 Puerta Real, Suite 450

Mission Viejo, CA 92691

(Address of Principal Executive Offices and Zip Code)

(949) 487-9500

(Registrant's Telephone Number, Including Area Code)

N/A

(Former Name, Former Address and Former Fiscal Year, If Changed Since Last Report)

Title of Each Class

Name of Each Exchange on Which Registered

Common Stock, par value \$0.001 per share

NASDAQ Global Select Market

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

None

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 Section 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 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 this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Edgar Filing: ENSIGN GROUP, INC - Form 10-K

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, 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 a check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

The aggregate market value of the registrant's common stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant, computed by reference to the closing price as of the last business day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter, June 30, 2015, was approximately \$1,211,000,000. Shares of Common Stock held by each executive officer, director and each person owning more than 10% of the outstanding Common Stock of the registrant have been excluded in that such persons may be deemed to be affiliates of the registrant. This determination of affiliate status is not necessarily a conclusive determination for other purposes.

As of February 8, 2016, 50,721,035 shares of the registrant's common stock were outstanding.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE:

Part III of this Form 10-K incorporates information by reference from the Registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Registrant's 2016 Annual Meeting of Stockholders to be filed within 120 days after the close of the fiscal year covered by this annual report.

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.
INDEX TO ANNUAL REPORT ON FORM 10-K
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I.		
<u>Item 1.</u>	<u>Business</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Item 1A.</u>	<u>Risk Factors</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Item 1B.</u>	<u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Item 2.</u>	<u>Properties</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Item 3.</u>	<u>Legal Proceedings</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>Item 4.</u>	<u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	<u>61</u>
PART II.		
<u>Item 5.</u>	<u>Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>Item 6.</u>	<u>Selected Financial Data</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>Item 7.</u>	<u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>Item 7A.</u>	<u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	<u>96</u>
<u>Item 8.</u>	<u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	<u>96</u>
<u>Item 9.</u>	<u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Item 9A.</u>	<u>Controls and Procedures</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Item 9B.</u>	<u>Other Information</u>	<u>100</u>
PART III.		
<u>Item 10.</u>	<u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Item 11.</u>	<u>Executive Compensation</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Item 12.</u>	<u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Item 13.</u>	<u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions and Director Independence</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Item 14.</u>	<u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	<u>100</u>
PART IV.		
<u>Item 15.</u>	<u>Exhibits, Financial Statements and Schedules</u>	<u>100</u>
	<u>Signatures</u>	<u>101</u>
	EX-21.1	
	EX-23.1	
	EX-31.1	
	EX-31.2	
	EX-32.1	
	EX-32.2	
	EX-101	

CAUTIONARY NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Annual Report on Form 10-K contains forward-looking statements, which include, but are not limited to our expected future financial position, results of operations, cash flows, financing plans, business strategy, budgets, capital expenditures, competitive positions, growth opportunities and plans and objectives of management. Forward-looking statements can often be identified by words such as “anticipates,” “expects,” “intends,” “plans,” “predicts,” “believes,” “seeks,” “estimates,” “may,” “will,” “should,” “would,” “could,” “potential,” “continue,” “ongoing,” similar expressions, and variations and negatives of these words. These statements are subject to the safe harbors created under the Securities Act of 1933 (Security Act) and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act). These statements are not guarantees of future performance and are subject to risks, uncertainties and assumptions that are difficult to predict. Therefore, our actual results could differ materially and adversely from those expressed in any forward-looking statements as a result of various factors, some of which are listed under the section “Risk Factors” in Part I, Item 1A of this Annual Report on Form 10-K. Accordingly, you should not rely upon forward-looking statements as predictions of future events. These forward-looking statements speak only as of the date of this Annual Report, and are based on our current expectations, estimates and projections about our industry and business, management's beliefs, and certain assumptions made by us, all of which are subject to change. We undertake no obligation to revise or update publicly any forward-looking statement for any reason, except as otherwise required by law.

As used in this Annual Report on Form 10-K, the words, "Ensign," Company, "we," "our" and "us" refer to The Ensign Group, Inc. and its consolidated subsidiaries. All of our operating subsidiaries, the Service Center (defined below) and our wholly-owned captive insurance subsidiary (the Captive) are operated by separate, wholly-owned, independent subsidiaries that have their own management, employees and assets. References herein to the consolidated “Company” and “its” assets and activities, as well as the use of the terms “we,” “us,” “our” and similar terms in this Annual Report is not meant to imply, nor should it be construed as meaning, that The Ensign Group, Inc. has direct operating assets, employees or revenue, or that any of the subsidiaries are operated by The Ensign Group.

The Ensign Group, Inc. is a holding company with no direct operating assets, employees or revenues. In addition, certain of our wholly-owned independent subsidiaries, collectively referred to as the Service Center, provide centralized accounting, payroll, human resources, information technology, legal, risk management and other centralized services to the other operating subsidiaries through contractual relationships with such subsidiaries. In addition, our wholly-owned captive insurance subsidiary, which we refer to as the Captive, provides some claims-made coverage to our operating subsidiaries for general and professional liability, as well as for certain workers' compensation insurance liabilities.

We were incorporated in 1999 in Delaware. The Service Center address is 27101 Puerta Real, Suite 450, Mission Viejo, CA 92691, and our telephone number is (949) 487-9500. Our corporate website is located at www.ensigngroup.net. The information contained in, or that can be accessed through, our website does not constitute a part of this Annual Report.

EnsignTM is our United States trademark. All other trademarks and trade names appearing in this annual report are the property of their respective owners.

PART I.

Item 1. Business

Company Overview

We, through our operating subsidiaries, are a provider of healthcare services across the post-acute care continuum, as well as urgent care centers and mobile ancillary businesses located in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin. Our operating subsidiaries, each of which strives to be the service of choice in the community it serves, provide a broad spectrum of skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice, mobile ancillary and urgent care services. As of December 31, 2015, we offered skilled nursing, assisted living and rehabilitative care services through 186 skilled nursing and assisted living facilities across 13 states. Our home health and hospice business provided home health, hospice and home care services from 32 agencies across nine states. Our 17 urgent care centers and mobile ancillary operations are located in Arizona, Colorado, Utah and Washington.

Our organizational structure is centered upon local leadership. We believe our organizational structure, which empowers leaders and staff at the local level, is unique within the healthcare services industry. Each of our operations is led by highly dedicated individuals who are responsible for key operational decisions at their operations. Leaders and staff are trained and motivated to pursue superior clinical outcomes, high patient and family satisfaction, operating efficiencies and financial performance at their operations.

We encourage and empower our leaders and staff to make their operation the “operation of choice” in the community it serves. This means that our leaders and staff are generally authorized to discern and address the unique needs and priorities of healthcare professionals, customers and other stakeholders in the local community or market, and then work to create a superior service offering for, and reputation in, that particular community or market. We believe that our localized approach encourages prospective customers and referral sources to choose or recommend the operation. In addition, our leaders are enabled and motivated to share real-time operating data and otherwise benchmark clinical and operational performance against their peers in order to improve clinical care, enhance patient satisfaction and augment operational efficiencies, promoting the sharing of best practices.

We view healthcare services primarily as a local business, influenced by personal relationships and community reputation. We believe our success is largely dependent upon our ability to build strong relationships with key stakeholders from the local healthcare community, based upon a solid foundation of reliably superior care. Accordingly, our brand strategy is focused on encouraging the leaders and staff of each operation to focus on clinical excellence, and promote their operation independently within their local community.

Much of our historical growth can be attributed to our expertise in acquiring real estate or leasing both under-performing and performing post-acute care operations and transforming them into market leaders in clinical quality, staff competency, employee loyalty and financial performance. We have also invested in new business lines that are complementary to our existing businesses, such as urgent care centers and ancillary services. We plan to continue to grow our revenue and earnings by:

- continuing to grow our talent base and develop future leaders;
- increasing the overall percentage or “mix” of higher-acuity patients;
- focusing on organic growth and internal operating efficiencies;
- continuing to acquire additional operations in existing and new markets;

- expanding and renovating our existing operations;
- constructing new facilities in existing and new markets, and
- strategically investing in and integrating other post-acute care healthcare businesses.

Company History

Our company was formed in 1999 with the goal of establishing a new level of quality care within the skilled nursing industry. The name “Ensign” is synonymous with a “flag” or a “standard,” and refers to our goal of setting the standard by which all others in our industry are measured. We believe that through our efforts and leadership, we can foster a new level of patient care and

professional competence at our operating subsidiaries, and set a new industry standard for quality skilled nursing and rehabilitative care services.

We organize our operating subsidiaries into portfolio companies, which we believe has enabled us to maintain a local, field-driven organizational structure and attract additional qualified leadership talent, and to identify, acquire, and improve operations at a generally faster rate. Each of our portfolio companies has its own president. These presidents, who are experienced and proven leaders that are generally taken from the ranks of operational CEOs, serve as leadership resources within their own portfolio companies, and have the primary responsibility for recruiting qualified talent, finding potential acquisition targets, and identifying other internal and external growth opportunities. We believe this organizational structure has improved the quality of our recruiting and will continue to facilitate successful acquisitions.

Recent Events

On December 9, 2015, we announced a two-for-one stock split of our outstanding shares of common stock. The stock split was effected in the form of a stock dividend, paid on December 23, 2015 to shareholders of record at the close of business December 17, 2015. Our common stock began trading at the split-adjusted price on December 24, 2015. We have reflected the two-for-one stock split in our share and per share amount presented.

On November 4, 2015, we announced that our Board of Directors authorized a stock repurchase program, under which we may repurchase up to \$15.0 million of our common stock over a period of 12 months. Under this program, we are authorized to repurchase our issued and outstanding common shares from time to time in open-market and privately negotiated transactions and block trades in accordance with federal securities laws. The number of shares repurchased will depend entirely upon the levels of cash available, the attractiveness of alternate investment and business opportunities either at hand or on the horizon, management's perception of value relative to market price and other legal, regulatory and contractual requirements. The stock repurchase program is scheduled to expire on November 4, 2016. We did not purchase any shares pursuant to this stock repurchase program during the year ended December 31, 2015.

Subsequent to December 31, 2015, we repurchased 0.7 million shares of our common stock for a total of \$15.0 million.

In February 2015, we completed a common stock offering, issuing approximately 5.5 million shares. We used the net proceeds to pay off outstanding amounts under our credit facility.

In the fourth quarter of 2014, we realigned our operating segments to correlate more closely with our service offerings, which coincide with the way that we measure performance and allocate resources. We have two reportable operating segments: (1) transitional, skilled and assisted living services (TSA services), which includes the operation of skilled nursing facilities, assisted and independent living facilities and is the largest portion of our business; and (2) home health and hospice services, which includes our home health, home care and hospice businesses. Our Chief Executive Officer, who is our chief operating decision maker, or CODM, reviews financial information at the operating segment level.

We also report an "all other" category that includes results from our urgent care centers and mobile ancillary operations. Our urgent care centers and mobile ancillary businesses are neither significant individually nor in aggregate and therefore do not constitute a reportable segment. Our reporting segments are business units that offer different services and are managed separately to provide greater visibility into those operations. The expansion of our home health and hospice business led us to separate our home health and hospice businesses into distinct reportable segment in the fourth quarter of 2014. Previously, we had a single reportable segment, healthcare services, which included providing skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice, urgent care and related ancillary services. For more information about our operating segments, as well as financial information, see Part II Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations and Note 8, Business Segments of the

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

On June 1, 2014, we completed the spin-off of our real estate operations to our stockholders through the distribution of all of the outstanding shares of common stock of CareTrust REIT, Inc. (CareTrust) to Ensign stockholders on a pro rata basis (the Spin-Off). We transferred 97 skilled nursing, assisted and independent living facilities to CareTrust as part of the Spin-Off. We continue to operate 94 of these facilities under multiple, long-term, triple-net leases with CareTrust.

Segments

Transitional, Skilled and Assisted Living Services Segment

Skilled Nursing Operations

As of December 31, 2015, our skilled nursing companies provided skilled nursing care at 146 operations, with 15,099 operational beds, in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin. Through our skilled nursing operations, we provide short stay patients and long stay patients with a full range of medical, nursing, rehabilitative, pharmacy and routine services, including daily dietary, social and recreational services. We generate our revenue from Medicaid, private pay, managed care and Medicare payors. During the year ended December 31, 2015, approximately 44.0% and 29.5% of our skilled nursing revenue was derived from Medicaid and Medicare programs, respectively.

Assisted and Independent Living Operations

We complement our skilled nursing care business by providing assisted and independent living services at 55 operations, of which 15 are located on the same site location as our skilled nursing care operations. As of December 31, 2015, we had 4,554 units. Our assisted living companies located in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin, provide residential accommodations, activities, meals, security, housekeeping and assistance in the activities of daily living to seniors who are independent or who require some support, but not the level of nursing care provided in a skilled nursing operation. Our independent living units are non-licensed independent living apartments in which residents are independent and require no support with the activities of daily living. We generate revenue at these units primarily from private pay sources, with a small portion earned from Medicaid or other state-specific programs. During the year ended December 31, 2015, approximately 92.3% of our assisted and independent living revenue was derived from private pay sources.

Home Health and Hospice Services Segment

Home Health

As of December 31, 2015, we provided home health care services in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Washington. Our home health care services generally consist of providing some combination of nursing, speech, occupational and physical therapists, medical social workers and certified home health aide services. Home health care is often a cost-effective solution for patients, and can also increase their quality of life and allow them to receive quality medical care in the comfort and convenience of a familiar setting. We derive the majority of our home health revenue from Medicare and managed care organizations. During the year ended December 31, 2015, approximately 55.9% of our home health revenue were derived from Medicare.

Hospice

As of December 31, 2015, we provided hospice care services in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Texas, Utah and Washington. Hospice services focus on the physical, spiritual and psychosocial needs of terminally ill individuals and their families, and consists primarily of palliative and clinical care, education and counseling. We derive the majority of our hospice revenue from Medicare reimbursement. During the year ended December 31, 2015, approximately 85.5% of our hospice revenue was derived from Medicare.

Other

In addition, as of December 31, 2015, we operated 17 urgent care clinics and held majority membership interest of mobile ancillary operations located in Arizona, Colorado, Washington and Utah. Our urgent care centers provide daily access to healthcare for minor injuries and illnesses, including x-ray and lab services, all from convenient neighborhood locations with no appointments.

We have invested in and are exploring new business lines that are complementary to our existing transitional, skilled and assisted living services and home health and hospice businesses. These new business lines consist of mobile ancillary services, including digital x-ray, ultrasound, electrocardiograms, patient transportation, ankle-brachial index, and phlebotomy services to people in their homes or at long-term care facilities. To date these businesses are not meaningful contributors to our operating results.

Growth

We have an established track record of successful acquisitions. Much of our historical growth can be attributed to our expertise in acquiring real estate or leasing both under-performing and performing post-acute care operations and transforming them into

6

market leaders in clinical quality, staff competency, employee loyalty and financial performance. With each acquisition, we apply our core operating expertise to improve these operations, both clinically and financially. In years where pricing has been high, we have focused on the integration and improvement of our existing operating subsidiaries while limiting our acquisitions to strategically situated properties.

In the last few years, our acquisition activity accelerated, allowing us to add 84 facilities between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2015. From January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2015, we acquired 125 facilities, which added 12,548 operational beds to our operating subsidiaries.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, we continued to expand our operations with the addition of 50 stand-alone skilled nursing and assisted living facilities, seven home health, hospice and home care agencies, and three urgent care centers. In addition, we have invested in new business lines that are complementary to our existing TSA services and home health and hospice businesses. The following table summarizes our growth through December 31, 2015:

	December 31,										
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Cumulative number of skilled nursing, assisted and independent living operations	46	57	61	63	77	82	102	108	119	(1) 136	(1) 186
Cumulative number of operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds/units	5,585	6,667	7,105	7,324	8,948	9,539	11,702	12,198	13,204	(1) 14,725	(1) 19,653
Number of home health, hospice and home care agencies	—	—	—	—	1	3	7	10	16	25	32
Number of urgent care centers	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	7	14	17

(1) Included in 2013 operational beds/units are operational beds/units of the three independent living facilities we transferred to CareTrust as part of the Spin-Off. Prior to the Spin-Off, the Company separated the healthcare operations from the independent living operations at two locations, resulting in two separate facilities and transferred the two separate facilities and one stand-alone independent facilities to CareTrust. Included in 2013 number of operations includes the one stand-alone independent facility transferred to CareTrust as part of the Spin-Off. 2014 operational beds/units and number of operations do not include the three independent living facilities.

New Market CEO and New Ventures Programs. In order to broaden our reach into new markets, and in an effort to provide existing leaders in our company with the entrepreneurial opportunity and challenge of entering a new market and starting a new business, we established our New Market CEO program in 2006. Supported by our Service Center and other resources, a New Market CEO evaluates a target market, develops a comprehensive business plan, and relocates to the target market to find talent and connect with other providers, regulators and the healthcare community in that market, with the goal of ultimately acquiring facilities and establishing an operating platform for future growth. In addition, this program was expanded to broaden our reach to other lines of business closely related to the skilled nursing industry through our New Ventures program. For example, we entered into home health as part of this program. The New Ventures program encourages facility CEOs to evaluate service offerings with the goal of establishing an operating platform in new markets. We believe that this program will not only continue to drive growth, but will also provide a valuable training ground for our next generation of leaders, who will have experienced the challenges of growing and operating a new business.

Acquisition History

The following table sets forth the location of our facilities and the number of operational beds located at our facilities as of December 31, 2015:

7

Edgar Filing: ENSIGN GROUP, INC - Form 10-K

	CA	AZ	TX	UT	CO	WA	ID	NV	NE	IA	WI	SC	KS	Total
Cumulative number of skilled nursing, assisted and independent living operations	48	28	28	15	10	10	9	3	7	5	17	4	2	186
Cumulative number of operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds/units	4,989	4,288	3,444	1,613	745	943	719	304	662	356	899	426	265	19,653

As of December 31, 2015, we provided home health and hospice services through our 32 agencies in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Washington.

During 2015, we completed transactions to expand our operations with the addition of 50 stand-alone skilled nursing and assisted living facilities, seven home health, hospice and home care agencies and three urgent care centers through purchases and long-term lease agreements. We did not acquire any material assets or assume any liabilities other than the tenant's post-assumption rights and obligations under the long-term leases. As part of these transactions, we acquired the real estate at 18 of the skilled nursing and assisted and independent living operations. The acquisitions of skilled nursing and assisted and independent living operations added 2,580 and 2,391 operational skilled nursing beds and operational assisted and independent living units, respectively, operated by our operating subsidiaries. In addition, we have invested in new business lines that are complementary to our existing transitional, skilled and assisted living services and home health and hospice businesses. The aggregate purchase price conveyed in all acquisitions was approximately \$120.0 million.

We also acquired the underlying real estate and assets of three skilled nursing operations, which we previously operated under a long-term lease agreements for an aggregate purchase price of approximately \$24.0 million in addition to our transactions described above.

Subsequent to December 31, 2015, we entered into a long-term lease for a newly constructed post-acute care campus. The newly constructed post-acute care campus added 70 operational skilled nursing beds and 30 operational assisted living units operated by our operating subsidiaries.

After careful consideration and some clinical survey challenges, we voluntarily discontinued operations in one of our skilled nursing facilities in order to preserve the overall ability to serve the residents in surrounding counties. The operation represented approximately 0.5% of our revenue and adjusted EBITDAR. As part of this closure we have entered into an agreement with our landlord allowing for the closure of the property as well as other provisions to allow our landlord to transfer the property and the licenses free and clear of the applicable master lease. This arrangement will not impact the rent expense recognized in 2015 or expected to be paid in future periods and will have no material impact on our lease coverage ratios under the Master Leases. We expect the operating losses, continued obligation under the lease and related closing expenses will range from \$7.0 million to \$7.5 million, including the present value of rental payments of approximately \$5.8 million. Residents of the affected facility were transferred to other local skilled nursing facilities in an orderly fashion and in accordance with their individual clinical needs.

For further discussion of our facility acquisitions, see Note 9, Acquisitions in the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Quality of Care Measures

In December 2008, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) introduced the Five-Star Quality Rating System to help consumers, their families and caregivers compare nursing homes more easily. The Five-Star Quality Rating System gives each nursing home a rating of between one and five stars in various categories. In cases of acquisitions, the previous operator's clinical ratings are included in our overall Five-Star Quality Rating. The prior operator's results will impact our rating until we have sufficient clinical measurements subsequent to the acquisition date. Generally we acquire facilities with a 1 or 2-Star rating. We believe compliance and quality outcomes are precursors to outstanding financial performance. The table below summarizes the improvements we have made in these quality measures since 2010:

8

	As of December 31,					
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Cumulative number of skilled nursing facilities(1)	78	93	98	106	121	146
4 and 5-Star Quality Rated skilled nursing facilities	21	38	45	60	77	72
Percentage of 4 and 5-Star Quality Rated skilled nursing facilities	26.9 %	40.9 %	45.9 %	56.6 %	63.6 %	49.3 %

(1) Cumulative number includes only skilled nursing facilities as of the end of the respective period as star rating reports are only applicable to skilled nursing facilities

Our star ratings in 2015 were impacted by changes in the CMS Five Star Quality Rating System requirements that were established on February 20, 2015. These changes include the use of antipsychotics in calculating the star ratings, modified calculations for staffing levels and reflect higher standards for nursing homes to achieve a high rating on the quality measure dimension. Since the revised standards for performance are more difficult to achieve, many nursing homes are experiencing a lower quality measure rating, resulting in a decrease in our percentage of 4 and 5-Star Quality Rated skilled nursing facilities. Because of these changes, it may not be appropriate to compare our 2015 star ratings with those that appeared in earlier years. In addition, our percentage of 4 and 5-Star Quality Rated skilled nursing facilities is also dependent on the number of newly acquired facilities. As mentioned above, generally we acquire facilities with a 1 or 2-Star rating. In 2015, we acquired 25 skilled nursing facilities compared to 15 and eight in 2014 and 2013, respectively.

Industry Trends

The post-acute care industry has evolved to meet the growing demand for post-acute and custodial healthcare services generated by an aging population, increasing life expectancies and the trend toward shifting of patient care to lower cost settings. The industry has evolved in recent years, which we believe has led to a number of favorable improvements in the industry, as described below:

Shift of Patient Care to Lower Cost Alternatives. The growth of the senior population in the United States continues to increase healthcare costs, often faster than the available funding from government-sponsored healthcare programs. In response, federal and state governments have adopted cost-containment measures that encourage the treatment of patients in more cost-effective settings such as skilled nursing facilities, for which the staffing requirements and associated costs are often significantly lower than acute care hospitals, inpatient rehabilitation facilities and other post-acute care settings. As a result, skilled nursing facilities are generally serving a larger population of higher-acuity patients than in the past.

Significant Acquisition and Consolidation Opportunities. The skilled nursing industry is large and highly fragmented, characterized predominantly by numerous local and regional providers. We believe this fragmentation provides significant acquisition and consolidation opportunities for us.

Improving Supply and Demand Balance. The number of skilled nursing facilities has declined modestly over the past several years. We expect that the supply and demand balance in the skilled nursing industry will continue to improve due to the shift of patient care to lower cost settings, an aging population and increasing life expectancies.

Increased Demand Driven by Aging Populations and Increased Life Expectancy. As life expectancy continues to increase in the United States and seniors account for a higher percentage of the total U.S. population, we believe the overall demand for skilled nursing services will increase. At present, the primary market demographic for skilled nursing services is primarily individuals age 75 and older. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, there were over 40 million people in the United States in 2010 that are over 65 years old. The 2010 U.S. Census estimates this group is one of the fastest growing segments of the United States population and is expected to more than double between 2000 and 2030.

Accountable Care Organizations and Reimbursement Reform. A significant goal of federal health care reform is to transform the delivery of health care by changing reimbursement for health care services to hold providers accountable for the cost and quality of care provided. Medicare and many commercial third party payors are implementing Accountable Care Organization (ACO) models in which groups of providers share in the benefit and risk of providing care to an assigned group of individuals. Other reimbursement methodology reforms include value-based purchasing, in which a portion of provider reimbursement is redistributed based on relative performance

on designated economic, clinical quality, and patient satisfaction metrics. In addition, CMS is implementing demonstration and mandatory programs to bundle acute care and post-acute care reimbursement to hold providers accountable for costs across a broader continuum of care. These reimbursement methodologies and similar programs are likely to continue and expand, both in public and commercial health plans. On January 26, 2015, CMS announced its goal to have 30% of Medicare payments for quality and value through alternative payment models such as ACOs or bundled payments by 2016 and up to 50% by the end of

2018. Providers who respond successfully to these trends and are able to deliver quality care at lower cost are likely to benefit financially.

We believe the post-acute industry has been and will continue to be impacted by several other trends. The use of long-term care insurance is increasing among seniors as a means of planning for the costs of skilled nursing services. In addition, as a result of increased mobility in society, reduction of average family size, and the increased number of two-wage earner couples, more seniors are looking for alternatives outside the family for their care.

Effects of Changing Prices

Medicare reimbursement rates and procedures are subject to change from time to time, which could materially impact our revenue. Medicare reimburses our skilled nursing operations under a PPS for certain inpatient covered services. Under the PPS, facilities are paid a predetermined amount per patient, per day, based on the anticipated costs of treating patients. The amount to be paid is determined by classifying each patient into a resource utilization group (RUG) category that is based upon each patient's acuity level. As of October 1, 2010, the RUG categories were expanded from 53 to 66 with the introduction of minimum data set (MDS) 3.0. Should future changes in skilled nursing facility payments reduce rates or increase the standards for reaching certain reimbursement levels, our Medicare revenues could be reduced and/or our costs to provide those services could increase, with a corresponding adverse impact on our financial condition or results of operations.

Our Medicare reimbursement rates and procedures for our home health and hospice operations are based on the severity of the patient's condition, his or her service needs and other factors relating to the cost of providing services and supplies. Our home health rates and services are bundled into 60-day episodes of care. Payments can be adjusted for: (a) an outlier payment if our patient's care was unusually costly (capped at 10% of total reimbursement per provider number); (b) a low utilization payment adjustment (LUPA) if the number of visits during the episode was fewer than five; (c) a partial payment if our patient transferred to another provider or we received a patient from another provider before completing the episode; (d) a payment adjustment based upon the level of therapy services required (with various incremental adjustments made for additional visits, and larger payment increases associated with the sixth, fourteenth and twentieth visit thresholds); (e) a payment adjustment if we are unable to perform periodic therapy assessments; (f) the number of episodes of care provided to a patient, regardless of whether the same home health provider provided care for the entire series of episodes; (g) changes in the base episode payments established by the Medicare program; (h) adjustments to the base episode payments for case mix and geographic wages; and (i) recoveries of overpayments.

Various healthcare reform provisions became law upon enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Healthcare Education and Reconciliation Act (collectively, the ACA). The reforms contained in the ACA have affected our operating subsidiaries in some manner and are directed in large part at increased quality and cost reductions. Several of the reforms are very significant and could ultimately change the nature of our services, the methods of payment for our services and the underlying regulatory environment. These reforms include the possible modifications to the conditions of qualification for payment, bundling of payments to cover both acute and post-acute care and the imposition of enrollment limitations on new providers.

On November 16, 2015, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) issued the final rule for a new mandatory Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement (CJR) model focusing on coordinated, patient-centered care. Under this model, the hospital in which the hip or knee replacement takes place is accountable for the costs and quality of care from the time of the surgery through 90 days after, or an "episode" of care. Depending on the hospital's quality and cost performance during the episode, the hospital either earns a financial reward or is required to repay Medicare for a portion of the costs. This payment is intended to give hospitals an incentive to work with physicians, home health agencies and nursing facilities to make sure beneficiaries receive the coordinated care they need with the goal of reducing avoidable hospitalizations and complications. This model initially covers 67 geographic areas throughout the country and most hospitals in those regions are required to participate. Following the implementation of the CJR program, our Medicare revenues derived from our affiliated skilled nursing facilities and other post-acute services related to lower extremity joint replacement hospital discharges could be increased or decreased in those geographic areas identified by CMS for mandatory participation in the bundled payment program.

On July 13, 2015, CMS released a proposed rule that would reform requirements for long-term care (LTC) facilities, specifically skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) and nursing facilities (NFs), to participate in Medicare and Medicaid. The

rule would reorder, clarify, and update regulations that the agency has not reviewed comprehensively since 1991. Under the proposed rule, facilities are required to 1) create interim care plans within 48 hours of admission, notify a resident's physician after a change in status, engage in interdisciplinary care planning, have a practitioner assess the patient in-person prior to a transfer to the hospital, and improve clinical records to ensure providers have the necessary information to decide on hospitalization; 2) conduct comprehensive assessments of their staff and patient needs, apply current requirements for antipsychotic drugs to all psychotropic drugs, and require physicians to document their response to irregularities identified by consultant pharmacists; 3) conduct assessments of their resident population, implement and update periodically an infection prevention and control program, and

establish an antibiotic stewardship program; 4) address requirements related to behavioral health services, ensuring facilities have adequate staffing to meet the needs of residents with mental illness and cognitive impairment; and 5) conduct assessments of their patient populations and related care needs to determine adequate staffing levels (i.e., number and skillsets) for nursing, behavioral health, and nutritional services. CMS estimates that these proposed regulations would cost facilities nearly \$46.5 million in the first year and over \$40.6 million in subsequent years. However, these amounts would vary considerably among organizations. In addition to the monetary costs, these regulations may create compliance issues, as state regulators and surveyors interpret requirements that are less explicit.

Skilled Nursing

CMS Payment Rules. On July 30, 2015, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2016 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimates that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities will increase by 1.2% for fiscal year 2016. This estimate increase reflected a 2.3% market basket increase, reduced by a 0.6% point forecast error adjustment and further reduced by 0.5% multi-factor productivity (MFP) adjustment required by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This final rule also identified a new skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing program and all-cause all-condition hospital readmission measure.

On July 31, 2014, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2015 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimates that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities will increase by \$750 million, or 2.0% for fiscal year 2015, relative to payments in 2014. The estimated increase reflects a 2.5% market basket increase, reduced by the 0.5% MFP adjustment required by PPACA.

On July 31, 2013, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2014 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimated that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities would increase by \$470 million, or 1.3% for fiscal year 2014, relative to payments in 2013. This estimated increase reflected a 2.3% market basket increase, reduced by the 0.5% forecast error correction and further reduced by the 0.5% MFP as required by Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). The forecast error correction is applied when the difference between the actual and projected market basket percentage change for the most recent available fiscal year exceeds the 0.5% threshold. In its 2014 report to congress, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission recommended eliminating the market basket update and reducing payments through the SNF prospective payments system.

Should future changes in PPS include further reduced rates or increased standards for reaching certain reimbursement levels, our Medicare revenues derived from our affiliated skilled nursing facilities (including rehabilitation therapy services provided at our affiliated skilled nursing facilities) could be reduced, with a corresponding adverse impact on our financial condition or results of operations.

Home Health

On November 5, 2015, CMS issued final payment changes to the Medicare home health prospective payment system (HH PPS) for calendar year 2016. Under this rule, CMS projects that Medicare payments will be reduced by 1.4%. This decrease reflects a 1.9% home health payment update percentage; a 0.9% decrease in payments due to the 0.97% payment reduction to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rate to account for nominal case-mix growth from 2012 through 2014; and a 2.4% decrease in payments due to the third year of the four-year phase-in of the rebasing adjustments to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rate, the national per-visit payment rates, and the non-routine medical supplies (NRS) conversion factor. Along with the payment update, CMS is revising the ICD-10-CM translation list and adding certain initial encounter codes to the HH PPS Grouper based upon revised ICD-10-CM coding guidance.

Pursuant to the rule, CMS is also implementing a Home Health Value-Based Purchasing model effective for calendar year 2016, in which all Medicare-certified HHAs in selected states will be required to participate. The model would apply a payment reduction or increase to current Medicare-certified home health agency (HHA) payments, depending on quality performance, for all agencies delivering services within nine randomly-selected states. Payment adjustments would be applied on an annual basis, beginning at 3.0% in the first payment adjustment year, 5.0% in the second payment adjustment year, 6.0% in the third payment adjustment year and 8.0% in the final two payment adjustment years. CMS estimates that implementing a home health value-based model will result in a 1.4% decrease in Medicare payments to home health agencies across the industry.

Lastly, CMS proposed one standardized cross-setting measure for calendar year 2016. The Home Health Conditions of Participation (CoPs) require home health agencies to submit OASIS assessments as a condition of payment and also for quality measurement purposes. Home health agencies that do not submit quality measure data to CMS will see a 2.0% reduction in their annual home health payment update percentage. Under the proposed rule, all home health agencies are required to submit both

admission and discharge OASIS assessments for a minimum of 70.0% of all patients with episodes of care occurring during the reporting period starting July 1, 2015. The proposed rule will incrementally increase this compliance threshold by 10.0% in each of the subsequent periods (July 1, 2016 and July 1, 2017) to reach 90.0%.

On October 30, 2014, CMS announced payment changes to the Medicare HH PPS for calendar year 2015. Under this rule, CMS projects that Medicare payments to home health agencies in calendar year 2015 will be reduced by 0.3%, or \$60 million. The decrease reflects the 2.1% home health payment update percentage and the rebasing adjustments to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rate, the national per-visit payment rates, and the NRS conversion factor. CMS is also finalizing three changes to the face-to-face encounter requirements under the ACA. These changes include: a) eliminating the narrative requirement currently in regulation, b) establishing that if each HHA claim is denied, the corresponding physician claim for certifying/re-certifying patient eligibility for Medicare-covered home health services is considered non-covered as well because there is no longer a corresponding claim for Medicare-covered home health services and c) clarifying that a face-to-face encounter is required for certifications, rather than initial episodes; and that a certification (versus a re-certification) is generally considered to be any time a new start of care assessment is completed to initiate care. This rule also established a minimum submission threshold for the number of OASIS assessments that each HHA must submit under the Home Health Quality Reporting Program and the Home Health Conditions of Participant for speech language pathologist personnel.

On November 22, 2013, CMS issued its final ruling regarding Medicare payment rates for home health agencies effective January 1, 2014. As required by PPACA, this rule included rebasing adjustments, with a four-year phase-in, to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rates; the national per-visit rates; and the NRS conversion factor. Under the ruling, CMS projected that Medicare payments to home health agencies in calendar year 2014 would be reduced by 1.05%, or \$200 million, reflecting the combined effects of the 2.3% increase in the home health national payment update percentage; a 2.7% decrease due to rebasing adjustments to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rate, mandated by the Affordable Care Act; and a 0.6% decrease due to the effects of Home Health Prospective Payment Systems Grouper refinements. This final rule also updated the home health wage index for calendar year 2014. The ruling also established home health quality reporting requirements for 2014 payment and subsequent years to specify that Medicaid responsibilities for home health surveys be explicitly recognized in the State Medicaid Plan, which is similar to the current regulations for surveys of skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities for individuals with intellectual disabilities.

Hospice

On July 31, 2015, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2016 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Under the final rule, hospices will see an estimated 1.1% increase in their payments effective October 1, 2015. The hospice payment increase would be the net result of a hospice payment update to the hospice per diem rates of 2.1% (a "hospital market basket" increase of 2.4% minus 0.3% for reductions required by law) and 1.2% decrease in payments to hospices due to updated wage data and the phase-out of its wage index budget neutrality adjustment factor (BNAF), offset by the newly announced Core Based Statistical Areas (CBSA) delineation impact of 0.2%. The rule also created two different payment rates for routine home care (RHC) that would result in a higher base payment rate for the first 60 days of hospice care and a reduced base payment rate for 61 or more days of hospice care and a Service Intensity Add-On (SIA) Payment for fiscal year 2016 and beyond in conjunction with the proposed RHC rates.

On August 1, 2014, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2015 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Under the final rule, hospices will see an estimated 1.4% increase in their payments for fiscal year 2015. The hospice payment increase would be the net result of a hospice payment update to the hospice per diem rates of 2.1% (a "hospital market basket" increase of 2.9% minus 0.8% for reductions required by law) and a 0.7% decrease in payments to hospices due to updated wage data and the sixth year of CMS' seven-year phase-out of its wage index BNAF. The final rule also states that CMS will begin national implementation

of the CAHPS Hospice Survey starting January 1, 2015. In the final rule, CMS requires providers to complete their hospice cap determination within 150 days after the cap period and remit any overpayments. If a hospice does not complete its cap determination in a timely fashion, its Medicare payments would be suspended until the cap determination is complete and received by the contractor. This is similar to the current practice for all other provider types that file cost reports with Medicare.

On August 2, 2013, CMS issued its final rule that updated fiscal year 2014 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Among other matters finalized in this rule, CMS planned to update the hospice per diem rates for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent years through the annual hospice rule or notice, rather than solely through a Change Request, as has been done in prior years.

Medicare Part B Therapy Cap. Some of our rehabilitation therapy revenue is paid by the Medicare Part B program under a fee schedule. Congress has established annual caps that limit the amounts that can be paid (including deductible and coinsurance amounts) for rehabilitation therapy services rendered to any Medicare beneficiary under Medicare Part B. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) added Sec. 1833(g)(5) of the Social Security Act and directed CMS to develop a process that allows exceptions for Medicare beneficiaries to therapy caps when continued therapy is deemed medically necessary.

Annual limitations on beneficiary incurred expenses for outpatient therapy services under Medicare Part B are commonly referred to as “therapy caps.” All beneficiaries began a new cap year on January 1, 2015 since the therapy caps are determined on a calendar year basis. For physical therapy (PT) and speech-language pathology services (SLP) combined, the limit on incurred expenses is \$1,940 in 2015. For occupational therapy (OT) services, the limit is \$1,940 in 2015. Deductible and coinsurance amounts paid by the beneficiary for therapy services count toward the amount applied to the limit.

An “exceptions process” to the therapy caps exists; however. Manual policies relevant to the exceptions process apply only when exceptions to the therapy caps are in effect. The therapy exception process, which under previous legislation was due to expire, was extended and the expected SGR of 21% to the Physician Fee Screen for outpatient therapy services was repealed through the H.R. 2 Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015. Under the legislation, the therapy cap exception extends through December 31, 2017.

A manual medical review process, as part of the therapy exceptions process, applies to therapy claims when a beneficiary’s incurred expenses exceed a threshold amount of \$3,700 annually. Specifically, combined PT and SLP services that exceed \$3,700 are subject to manual medical review, as well as OT services that exceed \$3,700. A beneficiary’s incurred expenses apply towards the manual medical review thresholds in the same manner as it applies to the therapy caps. Manual medical review was in effect through a post-payment review system until March 31, 2015. As part of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, the manual medical review process will be replaced with a new process to be developed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Medicare Coverage Settlement Agreement. A proposed federal class action settlement was filed in federal district court on October 16, 2012 that would end the Medicare coverage standard for skilled nursing, home health and outpatient therapy services that a beneficiary's condition must be expected to improve. The settlement was approved on January 24, 2013, which tasked CMS with revising its Medicare Benefit Manual and numerous other policies, guidelines and instructions to ensure that Medicare coverage is available for skilled maintenance services in the home health, skilled nursing and outpatient settings. CMS was also required to develop and implement a nationwide education campaign for all who make Medicare determinations to ensure that beneficiaries with chronic conditions are not denied coverage for critical services because their underlying conditions will not improve, after which the members of the class were given the opportunity for re-review of their claims. The major provisions of this settlement agreement have been implemented by CMS, which could favorably impact Medicare coverage reimbursement for our services. However, health care providers may be subject to liability in the event they fail to appropriately adapt to the newly clarified reimbursement rules and consequently overbill state Medicaid programs in connection with services rendered to dual-eligible Medicare patients (i.e., by not maximizing Medicare coverage before billing Medicaid).

Historically, adjustments to reimbursement under Medicare have had a significant effect on our revenue. For a discussion of historic adjustments and recent changes to the Medicare program and related reimbursement rates, see Part II, Item 1A Risk Factors under the headings Risks Related to Our Business and Industry - “Our revenue could be impacted by federal and state changes to reimbursement and other aspects of Medicaid and Medicare,” “Our future revenue, financial condition and results of operations could be impacted by continued cost containment pressures on Medicaid spending,” “We may not be fully reimbursed for all services for which each facility bills through consolidated billing, which could adversely affect our revenue, financial condition and results of operations” and “Reforms to the U.S. healthcare system will impose new requirements upon us and may lower our reimbursements.” The federal government and state governments continue to focus on efforts to curb spending on healthcare programs such as

Medicare and Medicaid. We are not able to predict the outcome of the legislative process. We also cannot predict the extent to which proposals will be adopted or, if adopted and implemented, what effect, if any, such proposals and existing new legislation will have on us. Efforts to impose reduced allowances, greater discounts and more stringent cost controls by government and other payors are expected to continue and could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Payor Sources

We derive revenue primarily from the Medicaid and Medicare programs, private pay patients and managed care payors. Medicaid typically covers patients that require standard room and board services, and provides reimbursement rates that are generally lower than rates earned from other sources. We monitor our quality mix, which is the percentage of non-Medicaid revenue

from each of our facilities, to measure the level received from each payor across each of our business units. We intend to continue to focus on enhancing our care offerings to accommodate more high acuity patients.

Medicaid. Medicaid is a state-administered program financed by state funds and matching federal funds. Medicaid programs are administered by the states and their political subdivisions, and often go by state-specific names, such as Medi-Cal in California and the Arizona Healthcare Cost Containment System in Arizona. Medicaid programs generally provide health benefits for qualifying individuals, and may supplement Medicare benefits for financially needy persons aged 65 and older. Medicaid reimbursement formulas are established by each state with the approval of the federal government in accordance with federal guidelines. Seniors who enter skilled nursing facilities as private pay clients can become eligible for Medicaid once they have substantially depleted their assets. Medicaid is the largest source of funding for nursing home facilities.

Medicaid reimburses home health and hospice providers, physicians, and certain other health care providers for care provided to certain low income patients. Reimbursement varies from state to state and is based upon a number of different systems, including cost-based, prospective payment and negotiated rate systems. Rates are subject to statutory and regulatory changes and interpretations and rulings by individual state agencies.

Medicare. Medicare is a federal program that provides healthcare benefits to individuals who are 65 years of age or older or are disabled. To achieve and maintain Medicare certification, a skilled nursing facility must sign a Medicare provider agreement and meet the CMS “Conditions of Participation” on an ongoing basis, as determined in periodic facility inspections or “surveys” conducted primarily by the state licensing agency in the state where the facility is located. Medicare pays for inpatient skilled nursing facility services under the prospective payment system. The prospective payment for each beneficiary is based upon the medical condition of and care needed by the beneficiary. Medicare skilled nursing facility coverage is limited to 100 days per episode of illness for those beneficiaries who require daily care following discharge from an acute care hospital.

The Medicare home health benefit is available both for patients who need care following discharge from a hospital and patients who suffer from chronic conditions that require ongoing but intermittent care. As a condition of participation under Medicare, beneficiaries must be homebound (meaning that the beneficiary is unable to leave his/her home without a considerable and taxing effort), require intermittent skilled nursing, physical therapy or speech therapy services, and receive treatment under a plan of care established and periodically reviewed by a physician. Medicare rates are based on the severity of the patient’s condition, his or her service needs and other factors relating to the cost of providing services and supplies, bundled into 60-day episodes of care. There is no limit to the number of episodes a patient may receive as long as he or she remains Medicare eligible.

The Medicare hospice benefit is also available to Medicare-eligible patients with terminal illnesses, certified by a physician, where life expectancy is six months or less. Medicare rates are based on standard prospective rates for delivering care over a base 90-day or 60-day period (90-day episodes of care for the first two episodes and 60-day episodes of care for any subsequent episodes). Payments are based on daily rates for each day a beneficiary is enrolled in the hospice benefit. Rates are set based on specific levels of care, are adjusted by a wage index to reflect health care labor costs across the country and are established annually through Federal legislation. Medicare payments are subject to two fixed annual caps, which are assessed on a provider number basis. The annual caps per patient, known as hospice caps, are calculated and published by the Medicare fiscal intermediary on an annual basis and cover the twelve month period from November 1 through October 31. The caps can be subject to annual and retroactive adjustments, which can cause providers to owe money back to Medicare if such caps are exceeded.

Managed Care and Private Insurance. Managed care patients consist of individuals who are insured by certain third-party entities, typically a senior HMO plan, or who are Medicare beneficiaries who have assigned their Medicare benefits to a senior HMO plan. Another type of insurance, long-term care insurance, is also becoming more widely available to consumers, but is not expected to contribute significantly to industry revenues in the near term.

Private and Other Payors. Private and other payors consist primarily of individuals, family members or other third parties who directly pay for the services we provide.

Billing and Reimbursement. Our revenue from government payors, including Medicare and state Medicaid agencies, is subject to retroactive adjustments in the form of claimed overpayments and underpayments based on rate adjustments, audits or asserted billing and reimbursement errors. We believe billing and reimbursement errors, disagreements, overpayments and underpayments are common in our industry, and we are regularly engaged with government payors and their contractors in reviews, audits and appeals of our claims for reimbursement due to the subjectivity inherent in the processes related to patient diagnosis and care, recordkeeping, claims processing and other aspects of the patient service and reimbursement processes, and the errors or disagreements those subjectivities can produce.

We take seriously our responsibility to act appropriately under applicable laws and regulations, including Medicare and Medicaid billing and reimbursement laws and regulations. Accordingly, we employ accounting, reimbursement and compliance specialists who train, mentor and assist our clerical, clinical and rehabilitation staffs in the preparation of claims and supporting documentation, regularly monitor billing and reimbursement practices within our operating subsidiaries, and assist with the appeal of overpayment and recoupment claims generated by governmental, Medicare contractors and other auditors and reviewers. In addition, due to the potentially serious consequences that could arise from any impropriety in our billing and reimbursement processes, we investigate allegations of impropriety or irregularity relative thereto, and sometimes do so with the aid of outside auditors (other than our independent registered public accounting firm), attorneys and other professionals.

Whether information about our billing and reimbursement processes is obtained from external sources or activities such as Medicare and Medicaid audits or probe reviews, internal investigations, or our regular day-to-day monitoring and training activities, we collect and utilize such information to improve our billing and reimbursement functions and the various processes related thereto. While, like other operators in our industry, we experience billing and reimbursement errors, disagreements and other effects of the inherent subjectivities in reimbursement processes on a regular basis, we believe that we are in substantial compliance with applicable Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement requirements. We continually strive to improve the efficiency and accuracy of all of our operational and business functions, including our billing and reimbursement processes.

The following table sets forth our total revenue by payor source generated by each of our reportable segments and our "All Other" category and as a percentage of total revenue for the periods indicated (dollars in thousands):

Year ended December 31, 2015

	TSA Services		Home Health and Hospice Services		All Other		Total Revenue	Revenue %
	Skilled Nursing Facilities	Assisted and Independent Living Facilities	Home Health Services	Hospice Services	Other Services			
Medicaid	\$424,265	\$6,785	\$3,598	\$5,348	\$—	\$439,996	32.8	%
Medicare	332,429	—	26,828	36,246	—	395,503	29.5	
Medicaid-skilled	71,905	—	—	—	—	71,905	5.4	
Subtotal	828,599	6,785	30,426	41,594	—	907,404	67.7	
Managed care	194,743	—	11,391	636	—	206,770	15.4	
Private and other	103,046	81,344	6,138	171	36,953	(1) 227,652	16.9	
Total revenue	\$1,126,388	\$88,129	\$47,955	\$42,401	\$36,953	\$1,341,826	100.0	%

(1) Private and other payors in our "All Other" category includes revenue from urgent care centers and mobile ancillary operations.

Year ended December 31, 2014

	TSA Services		Home Health and Hospice Services		All Other		Total Revenue	Revenue %
	Skilled Nursing Facilities	Assisted and Independent Living Facilities	Home Health Services	Hospice Services	Other Services			
Medicaid	\$349,100	\$3,774	\$1,971	\$3,274	\$—	\$358,119	34.9	%
Medicare	274,723	—	17,353	21,068	—	313,144	30.5	
Medicaid-skilled	51,157	—	—	—	—	51,157	5.0	
Subtotal	674,980	3,774	19,324	24,342	—	722,420	70.4	

Edgar Filing: ENSIGN GROUP, INC - Form 10-K

Managed care	138,215	—	7,213	368	—	145,796	14.2	
Private and other	88,275	45,074	3,040	229	22,572	(1) 159,190	15.4	
Total revenue	\$901,470	\$48,848	\$29,577	\$24,939	\$22,572	\$1,027,406	100.0	%

(1) Private and other payors in our "All Other" category includes revenue from urgent care centers and mobile ancillary operations.

15

Edgar Filing: ENSIGN GROUP, INC - Form 10-K

Year ended December 31, 2013

	TSA Services		Home Health and Hospice Services		All Other	Total Revenue	Revenue %	
	Skilled Nursing Facilities	Assisted and Independent Living Facilities	Home Health Services	Hospice Services	Other Services			
Medicaid	\$318,232	\$2,348	\$1,003	\$2,220	\$—	\$323,803	35.8	%
Medicare	264,223	—	13,427	15,267	—	292,917	32.4	
Medicaid-skilled	36,085	—	—	—	—	36,085	4.0	
Subtotal	618,540	2,348	14,430	17,487	—	652,805	72.2	
Managed care	112,669	—	5,291	208	—	118,168	13.1	
Private and other	81,139	38,583	2,257	89	11,515	(1) 133,583	14.7	
Total revenue	\$812,348	\$40,931	\$21,978	\$17,784	\$11,515	\$904,556	100.0	%

(1) Private and other payors in our "All Other" category includes revenue from urgent care centers and mobile ancillary operations.

Payor Sources as a Percentage of Skilled Nursing Services. We use both our skilled mix and quality mix as measures of the quality of reimbursements we receive at our skilled nursing operations over various periods. The following table sets forth our percentage of skilled nursing patient days by payor source:

Percentage of Skilled Nursing Days:	Year Ended December 31,			
	2015	2014	2013	
Medicare	14.6	% 14.2	% 14.8	%
Managed care	11.4	9.7	8.9	
Other skilled	4.4	3.7	2.7	
Skilled mix	30.4	27.6	26.4	
Private and other payors	12.1	13.1	13.7	
Quality mix	42.5	40.7	40.1	
Medicaid	57.5	59.3	59.9	
Total skilled nursing	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%

Reimbursement for Specific Services

Reimbursement for Skilled Nursing Services. Skilled nursing facility revenue is primarily derived from Medicaid, private pay, managed care and Medicare payors. Our skilled nursing operations provide Medicaid-covered services to eligible individuals consisting of nursing care, room and board and social services. In addition, states may, at their option, cover other services such as physical, occupational and speech therapies.

Reimbursement for Rehabilitation Therapy Services. Rehabilitation therapy revenue is primarily received from private pay, managed care and Medicare for services provided at skilled nursing operations and assisted living operations. The payments are based on negotiated patient per diem rates or a negotiated fee schedule based on the type of service rendered.

Reimbursement for Assisted Living Services. Assisted living facility revenue is primarily derived from private pay patients at rates we establish based upon the services we provide and market conditions in the area of operation. In addition, Medicaid or other state-specific programs in some states where we operate supplement payments for board

and care services provided in assisted living facilities.

Reimbursement for Hospice Services. Hospice revenues are primarily derived from Medicare. We receive one of four predetermined daily or hourly rates based on the level of care we furnish to the beneficiary. These rates are subject to annual adjustments based on inflation and geographic wage considerations.

We are subject to two limitations on Medicare payments for hospice services. First, if inpatient days of care provided to patients at a hospice exceed 20% of the total days of hospice care provided for an annual period beginning on November 1st, then payment for days in excess of this limit are paid at the routine home care rate.

Second, overall payments made by Medicare to us on a per hospice program basis are also subject to a cap amount calculated by the Medicare fiscal intermediary at the end of the hospice cap period. The Medicare revenue paid to a hospice program from November 1 to October 31 may not exceed the annual aggregate cap amounts. For cap years ended on or after October 31, 2012, and all subsequent cap years, the hospice aggregate cap is calculated using the proportional method. Under the proportional method, the hospice shall include in its number of Medicare beneficiaries only that fraction which represents the portion of a patient's total days of care in all hospices and all years that were spent in that hospice in that cap year, using the best data available at the time of the calculation. The whole and fractional shares of Medicare beneficiaries' time in a given cap year are then summed to compute the total number of Medicare beneficiaries served by that hospice in that cap year. The hospice's total Medicare beneficiaries in a given cap year is multiplied by the Medicare per beneficiary cap amount, resulting in that hospice's aggregate cap, which is the allowable amount of total Medicare payments that hospice can receive for that cap year. If a hospice exceeds its aggregate cap, then the hospice must repay the excess back to Medicare. The Medicare cap amount is reduced proportionately for patients who transferred in and out of our hospice services.

Reimbursement for Home Health Services. We derive substantially all of the revenue from our home health business from Medicare and managed care sources. Our home health care services generally consist of providing some combination of the services of registered nurses, speech, occupational and physical therapists, medical social workers and certified home health aides. Home health care is often a cost-effective solution for patients, and can also increase their quality of life and allow them to receive quality medical care in the comfort and convenience of a familiar setting.

Competition

The post-acute care industry is highly competitive, and we expect that the industry will become increasingly competitive in the future. The industry is highly fragmented and characterized by numerous local and regional providers, in addition to large national providers that have achieved geographic diversity and economies of scale. Our operating subsidiaries also compete with inpatient rehabilitation facilities and long-term acute care hospitals. Competitiveness may vary significantly from location to location, depending upon factors such as the number of competing facilities, availability of services, expertise of staff, and the physical appearance and amenities of each location. We believe that the primary competitive factors in the post-acute care industry are:

- ability to attract and to retain qualified management and caregivers;
- reputation and commitment to quality;
- attractiveness and location of facilities;
- the expertise and commitment of the facility management team and employees; and
- community value, including amenities and ancillary services.

We seek to compete effectively in each market by establishing a reputation within the local community as the “operation of choice.” This means that the operation leaders are generally free to discern and address the unique needs and priorities of healthcare professionals, customers and other stakeholders in the local community or market, and then create a superior service offering and reputation for that particular community or market that is calculated to encourage prospective customers and referral sources to choose or recommend the operation.

Increased competition could limit our ability to attract and retain patients, maintain or increase rates or to expand our business. Some of our competitors have greater financial and other resources than we have, may have greater brand recognition and may be more established in their respective communities than we are. Competing companies may also offer newer facilities or different programs or services than we offer, and may therefore attract individuals who are currently patients of our facilities, potential patients of our facilities, or who are otherwise receiving our healthcare services. Other competitors may have lower expenses or other competitive advantages than us and, therefore, provide services at lower prices than we offer.

There are few barriers to entry in the home health and hospice business in jurisdictions that do not require certificates of need or permits of approval. Our primary competition in these jurisdictions comes from local privately and publicly-owned and hospital-owned health care providers. We compete based on the availability of personnel, the quality of services, expertise of visiting staff, and, in certain instances, on the price of our services. In addition, we compete with a number of non-profit organizations that finance acquisitions and capital expenditures on a tax-exempt basis and charity-funded programs that may have strong ties to their local medical communities and receive charitable contributions that are unavailable to us.

Our other services, such as assisted living facilities and other ancillary services, also compete with local, regional, and national companies. The primary competitive factors in these businesses are similar to those for our skilled nursing facilities and include reputation, cost of services, quality of clinical services, responsiveness to patient/resident needs, location and the ability to provide support in other areas such as third-party reimbursement, information management and patient recordkeeping.

Our Competitive Strengths

We believe that we are well positioned to benefit from the ongoing changes within our industry. We believe that our ability to acquire, integrate and improve our facilities is a direct result of the following key competitive strengths:

Experienced and Dedicated Employees. We believe that our operating subsidiaries' employees are among the best in their respective industry. We believe each of our operating subsidiaries is led by an experienced and caring leadership team, including dedicated front-line care staff, who participates daily in the clinical and operational improvement of their individual operations. We have been successful in attracting, training, incentivizing and retaining a core group of outstanding business and clinical leaders to lead our operating subsidiaries. These leaders operate as separate local businesses. With broad local control, these talented leaders and their care staffs are able to quickly meet the needs of their patients and residents, employees and local communities, without waiting for permission to act or being bound to a "one-size-fits-all" corporate strategy.

Unique Incentive Programs. We believe that our employee compensation programs are unique within the industry. Employee stock options and performance bonuses, based on achieving target clinical quality, cultural, compliance and financial benchmarks, represent a significant component of total compensation for our operational leaders. We believe that these compensation programs assist us in encouraging our leaders and key employees to act with a shared ownership mentality. Furthermore, our leaders are motivated to help local operations within a defined "cluster," which is a group of geographically-proximate operations that share clinical best practices, real-time financial data and other resources and information.

Staff and Leadership Development. We have a company-wide commitment to ongoing education, training and professional development. Accordingly, our operational leaders participate in regular training. Most participate in training sessions at Ensign University, our in-house educational system. Other training opportunities are generally offered on a monthly basis. Training and educational topics include leadership development, our values, updates on Medicaid and Medicare billing requirements, updates on new regulations or legislation, emerging healthcare service alternatives and other relevant clinical, business and industry specific coursework. Additionally, we encourage and provide ongoing education classes for our clinical staff to maintain licensing and increase the breadth of their knowledge and expertise. We believe that our commitment to, and substantial investment in, ongoing education will further strengthen the quality of our operational leaders and staff, and the quality of the care they provide to our patients and residents.

Innovative Service Center Approach. We do not maintain a corporate headquarters; rather, we operate a Service Center to support the efforts of each operation. Our Service Center is a dedicated service organization that acts as a resource and provides centralized information technology, human resources, accounting, payroll, legal, risk management, educational and other centralized services, so that local leaders can focus on delivering top-quality care and efficient business operations. Our Service Center approach allows individual operations to function with the strength, synergies and economies of scale found in larger organizations, but without what we believe are the disadvantages of a top-down management structure or corporate hierarchy. We believe our Service Center approach is unique within the industry, and allows us to preserve the “one-facility-at-a-time” focus and culture that has contributed to our success.

Proven Track Record of Successful Acquisitions. We have established a disciplined acquisition strategy that is focused on selectively acquiring operations within our target markets. Our acquisition strategy is highly operations driven. Prospective leaders are included in the decision making process and compensated as these acquired operations reach pre-established clinical quality and financial benchmarks, helping to ensure that we only undertake acquisitions that key leaders believe can become clinically sound and contribute to our financial performance.

As of December 31, 2015, we have acquired 186 facilities with 19,653 operational beds, including 3,299 assisted living units and 1,255 independent living units, through both long-term leases and purchases. We believe our experience in acquiring these facilities and our demonstrated success in significantly improving their operations enables us to consider a broad range of acquisition targets. In addition, we believe we have developed expertise in transitioning newly-acquired facilities to our unique organizational culture and operating systems, which enables us to acquire facilities with limited disruption to patients, residents and facility operating staff, while significantly improving quality of care. We have also constructed new facilities to target demand, which exists for high-end healthcare facilities when we determine that market conditions justify the cost of new construction in some of our markets.

Reputation for Quality Care. We believe that we have achieved a reputation for high-quality and cost-effective care and services to our patients and residents within the communities we serve. We believe that our reputation for quality, coupled with the integrated services that we offer, allows us to attract patients that require more intensive and medically complex care and generally result in higher reimbursement rates than lower acuity patients.

Community Focused Approach. We view our services primarily as a local, community-based business. Our local leadership-centered management culture enables each operation's nursing and support staff and leaders to meet the unique needs of their patients and local communities. We believe that our commitment to this "one-operation-at-a-time" philosophy helps to ensure that each operation, its patients, their family members and the community will receive the individualized attention they need. By serving our patients, their families, the community and our fellow healthcare professionals, we strive to make each individual facility the operation of choice in its local community.

We further believe that when choosing a healthcare provider, consumers usually choose a person or people they know and trust, rather than a corporation or business. Therefore, rather than pursuing a traditional organization-wide branding strategy, we actively seek to develop the facility brand at the local level, serving and marketing one-on-one to caregivers, our patients, their families, the community and our fellow healthcare professionals in the local market.

Investment in Information Technology. We utilize information technology that enables our facility leaders to access, and to share with their peers, both clinical and financial performance data in real time. Armed with relevant and current information, our operation leaders and their management teams are able to share best practices and the latest information, adjust to challenges and opportunities on a timely basis, improve quality of care, mitigate risk and improve both clinical outcomes and financial performance. We have also invested in specialized healthcare technology systems to assist our nursing and support staff. We have installed automated software and touch-screen interface systems in each facility to enable our clinical staff to more efficiently monitor and deliver patient care and record patient information. We believe these systems have improved the quality of our medical and billing records, while improving the productivity of our staff.

Our Growth Strategy

We believe that the following strategies are primarily responsible for our growth to date, and will continue to drive the growth of our business:

Grow Talent Base and Develop Future Leaders. Our primary growth strategy is to expand our talent base and develop future leaders. A key component of our organizational culture is our belief that strong local leadership is a primary key to the success of each operation. While we believe that significant acquisition opportunities exist, we have

generally followed a disciplined approach to growth that permits us to acquire an operation only when we believe, among other things, that we will have qualified leadership for that operation. To develop these leaders, we have a rigorous “CEO-in-Training Program” that attracts proven business leaders from various industries and backgrounds, and provides them the knowledge and hands-on training they need to successfully lead one of our operating subsidiaries. We generally have between five and 20 prospective administrators progressing through the various stages of this training program, which is generally much more rigorous, hands-on and intensive than the minimum 1,000 hours of training mandated by the licensing requirements of most states where we do business. Once administrators are licensed and assigned to an operation, they continue to learn and develop in our facility Chief Executive Officer Program, which facilitates the continued development of these talented business leaders into outstanding facility CEOs, through regular peer review, our Ensign University and on-the-job training.

In addition, our Chief Operating Officer Program recruits and trains highly-qualified Directors of Nursing to lead the clinical programs in our skilled nursing facilities. Working together with their facility CEO and/or administrator, other key facility leaders and front-line staff, these experienced nurses manage delivery of care and other clinical personnel and programs to optimize both clinical outcomes and employee and patient satisfaction.

Increase Mix of High Acuity Patients. Many skilled nursing facilities are serving an increasingly larger population of patients who require a high level of skilled nursing and rehabilitative care, whom we refer to as high acuity patients, as a result of government and other payors seeking lower-cost alternatives to traditional acute-care hospitals. We generally receive higher reimbursement rates for providing care for these medically complex patients. In addition, many of these patients require therapy and other rehabilitative services, which we are able to provide as part of our integrated service offerings. Where therapy services are medically necessary and prescribed by a patient's physician or other appropriate healthcare professional, we generally receive additional revenue in connection with the provision of those services. By making these integrated services available to such patients, and maintaining established clinical standards in the delivery of those services, we are able to increase our overall revenues. We believe that we can continue to attract high acuity patients and therapy patients to our facilities by maintaining and enhancing our reputation for quality care and continuing our community focused approach.

Focus on Organic Growth and Internal Operating Efficiencies. We plan to continue to grow organically by focusing on increasing patient occupancy within our existing facilities. Although some of the facilities we have acquired were in good physical and operating condition, the majority have been clinically and financially troubled, with some facilities having had occupancy rates as low as 30% at the time of acquisition. Additionally, we believe that incremental operating margins on the last 20% of our beds are significantly higher than on the first 80%, offering opportunities to improve financial performance within our existing facilities. Our overall occupancy is impacted significantly by the number of facilities acquired and the operational occupancy on the acquisition date. Therefore, consolidated occupancy will vary significantly based on these factors. Our average occupancy rates for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013 were 77.9%, 78.0%, and 77.5%, respectively.

We also believe we can generate organic growth by improving operating efficiencies and the quality of care at the patient level. By focusing on staff development, clinical systems and the efficient delivery of quality patient care, we believe we are able to deliver higher quality care at lower costs than many of our competitors.

We also have achieved incremental occupancy and revenue growth by creating or expanding outpatient therapy programs in existing facilities. Physical, occupational and speech therapy services account for a significant portion of revenue in most of our skilled nursing facilities. By expanding therapy programs to provide outpatient services in many markets, we are able to increase revenue while spreading the fixed costs of maintaining these programs over a larger patient base. Outpatient therapy has also proven to be an effective marketing tool, raising the visibility of our facilities in their local communities and enhancing the reputation of our facilities with short-stay rehabilitation patients.

Add New Facilities and Expand Existing Facilities. A key element of our growth strategy includes the acquisition of new and existing facilities from third parties, the expansion and upgrade of current facilities, and the construction of new facilities. In the near term, we plan to take advantage of the fragmented skilled nursing industry by acquiring operations within select geographic markets and may consider the construction of new facilities or by partnering with a construction company to build out new facilities. In addition, we have targeted facilities that we believed were performing and operations that were underperforming, and where we believed we could improve service delivery, occupancy rates and cash flow. With experienced leaders in place at the community level, and demonstrated success in significantly improving operating conditions at acquired facilities, we believe that we are well positioned for continued growth. While the integration of underperforming facilities generally has a negative short-term effect on overall operating margins, these facilities are typically accretive to earnings within 12 to 18 months following their acquisition. For the 95 facilities that we acquired from 2001 through 2015, the aggregate EBITDAR (defined below) as a percentage of revenue improved from 11.6% during the first full three months of operations to 13.9% during the thirteenth through fifteenth months of operations.

Constructing New Facilities in Existing and New markets. Another key element to our growth strategy includes constructing new skilled nursing and assisted living facilities in new and existing markets. We plan to target geographies that we believe to be under served or where the demand exists for new high-end healthcare facilities that will offer a wide array of hospitality-oriented amenities, activities and services. In addition, lowering the average age of our facilities will allow us to manage the cost of renovating and maintaining our facilities. We entered into several build-to-suit leases with Main Street Property Group, LLC (Mainstreet) in the states of Colorado, Kansas and Texas and opened our first two newly-constructed operations in 2015. We also expect to work together with Mainstreet to select additional locations in the future. In addition, we also have plans underway to construct some small replacement facilities and are looking to develop additional relationships with other developers.

Strategically Investing In and Integrating Other Post-Acute Care Healthcare Businesses. Another important element to our growth strategy includes acquiring new and existing home health, hospice and other post-acute care healthcare businesses. Since 2010, we have steadily expanded our home health and hospice businesses through the acquisition of smaller third-party providers.

Our strategy is to provide a more seamless experience to manage the transition of care throughout the post-acute continuum. Our objective is to simultaneously improve patient outcomes and reduce costs to payers, ACOs and hospital systems. We believe that the same principles that have guided our skilled nursing and assisted living operations are transferable to these businesses, including reliance on experienced local leaders at the community level to focus on integrating these operations into the continuum of care services we provide. Between 2009 and February 2016, we have acquired 14 hospice agencies, 18 home health and home care agencies, and we are well positioned for continued growth in these and other healthcare businesses.

Labor

The operation of our skilled nursing and assisted living facilities, home health and hospice operations and urgent care centers requires a large number of highly skilled healthcare professionals and support staff. At December 31, 2015, we had approximately 16,494 full-time equivalent employees who were employed by our Service Center and our operating subsidiaries. For the year ended December 31, 2015, approximately 60.0% of our total expenses were payroll related. Periodically, market forces, which vary by region, require that we increase wages in excess of general inflation or in excess of increases in reimbursement rates we receive. We believe that we staff appropriately, focusing primarily on the acuity level and day-to-day needs of our patients and residents. In most of the states where we operate, our skilled nursing facilities are subject to state mandated minimum staffing ratios, so our ability to reduce costs by decreasing staff, notwithstanding decreases in acuity or need, is limited and subject to government audits and penalties in some states. We seek to manage our labor costs by improving staff retention, improving operating efficiencies, maintaining competitive wage rates and benefits and reducing reliance on overtime compensation and temporary nursing agency services.

The healthcare industry as a whole has been experiencing shortages of qualified professional clinical staff. We believe that our ability to attract and retain qualified professional clinical staff stems from our ability to offer attractive wage and benefits packages, a high level of employee training, an empowered culture that provides incentives for individual efforts and a quality work environment.

Government Regulation

The regulatory environment within the skilled nursing industry continues to intensify in the amount and type of laws and regulations affecting it. In addition to this changing regulatory environment, federal, state and local officials are increasingly focusing their efforts on the enforcement of these laws. In order to operate our businesses we must comply with federal, state and local laws relating to licensure, delivery and adequacy of medical care, distribution of pharmaceuticals, equipment, personnel, operating policies, fire prevention, rate-setting, billing and reimbursement, building codes and environmental protection. Additionally, we must also adhere to anti-kickback laws, physician referral laws, and safety and health standards set by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Changes in the law or new interpretations of existing laws may have an adverse impact on our methods and costs of doing business.

Our operating subsidiaries are also subject to various regulations and licensing requirements promulgated by state and local health and social service agencies and other regulatory authorities. Requirements vary from state to state and these requirements can affect, among other things, personnel education and training, patient and personnel records, services, staffing levels, monitoring of patient wellness, patient furnishings, housekeeping services, dietary requirements, emergency plans and procedures, certification and licensing of staff prior to beginning employment, and patient rights. These laws and regulations could limit our ability to expand into new markets and to expand our services and facilities in existing markets.

State Regulations. On March 24, 2011, the governor of California signed Assembly Bill 97 (AB 97), the budget trailer bill on health, into law. AB 97 outlines significant cuts to state health and human services programs. Specifically, the law reduced provider payments by 10% for physicians, pharmacies, clinics, medical transportation, certain hospitals, home health, and nursing facilities. AB X1 19 Long Term Care was subsequently approved by the governor on June 28, 2011. Federal approval was obtained on October 27, 2011. AB X1 19 limited the 10% payment reduction to skilled-nursing providers to 14 months for the services provided on June 1, 2011 through July 31, 2012. The 10% reduction in provider payments was repaid by December 31, 2012.

Federal Health Care Reform. On April 16, 2015, the President signed into law MACRA. This bill includes a number of provisions, including (1) replacement of the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula used by Medicare to pay physicians with new systems for establishing annual payment rate updates for physicians' services, (2) an extension of the outpatient therapy cap exception process until December 31, 2017; and (3) payment updates for post-acute providers at 1% after other adjustments required

by the ACA for 2018. In addition, it increases premiums for Part B and Part D of Medicare for beneficiaries with income above certain levels and makes numerous other changes to Medicare and Medicaid.

On October 30, 2015, CMS released a final rule addressing, among other things, implementation of certain provisions of MACRA, including the implementation of the new Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS). The current Value-Based Payment Modifier program is set to expire in 2018, with MIPS to begin in 2019. The October 30, 2015 final rule added measures where gaps exist in the current Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS), which is used by CMS to track the quality of care provided to Medicare beneficiaries. The final rule also excludes services furnished in SNFs from the definition of primary care services for purposes of the Shared Savings Program. The final rule could impact our revenue in the future.

On February 20, 2015, CMS modified the Five Star Quality Rating System for nursing homes to include the use of antipsychotics in calculating the star ratings, modified calculations for staffing levels and reflect higher standards for nursing homes to achieve a high rating on the quality measure dimension. Since the standards for performance are more difficult to achieve, the number of our 4 and 5 star facilities could be reduced. In addition, CMS announced proposals to adopt new standards that home health agencies must comply with in order to participate in the Medicare program, including the strengthening of patient rights and communication requirements that focus on patient well-being.

The Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act of 2014 (the IMPACT Act), which was signed into law on October 6, 2014, requires the submission of standardized assessment data for quality improvement, payment and discharge planning purposes across the spectrum of post-acute care providers (PACs), including skilled nursing facilities and home health agencies. The IMPACT Act will require PACs to begin reporting: (1) standardized patient assessment data at admission and discharge by October 1, 2018 for post acute care providers, including skilled nursing facilities by January 1, 2019 for home health agencies; (2) new quality measures, including functional status, skin integrity, medication reconciliation, incidence of major falls, and patient preference regarding treatment and discharge at various intervals between October 1, 2016 and January 1, 2019; and (3) resource use measures, including Medicare spending per beneficiary, discharge to community, and hospitalization rates of potentially preventable readmissions by October 1, 2016 for post-acute care providers, including skilled nursing facilities and by January 1, 2017 for home health agencies. Failure to report such data when required would subject a facility to a two percent reduction in market basket prices then in effect.

The IMPACT Act further requires HHS and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), a commission chartered by Congress to advise it on Medicare payment issues, to study alternative PAC payment models, including payment based upon individual patient characteristics and not care setting, with corresponding Congressional reports required based on such analysis. The IMPACT Act also included provisions impacting Medicare-certified hospices, including: (1) increasing survey frequency for Medicare-certified hospices to once every 36 months; (2) imposing a medical review process for facilities with a high percentage of stays in excess of 180 days; and (3) updating the annual aggregate Medicare payment cap.

On April 1, 2014, the President signed into law the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, which averted a 24% cut in Medicare payments to physicians and other Part B providers until March 31, 2015. In addition, this law maintains the 0.5% update for such services through December 31, 2014 and provides a 0.0% update to the 2015 Medicare Physician Fee Schedule (MPFS) through March 31, 2015. Among other things, this law provides the framework for implementation of a value-based purchasing program for skilled nursing facilities. Under this legislation HHS is required to develop by October 1, 2016 measures and performance standards regarding preventable hospital readmissions from skilled nursing facilities. Beginning October 1, 2018, HHS will withhold 2% of Medicare payments to all skilled nursing facilities and distribute this pool of payment to skilled nursing facilities as incentive payments for preventing readmissions to hospitals.

On January 2, 2013, the President signed the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 into law. This statute created a Commission on Long Term Care, the goal of which is to develop a plan for the establishment, implementation, and financing of a comprehensive, coordinated, and high-quality system that ensures the availability of long-term care services and supports for individuals in need of such services and supports. Any implementation of recommendations from this commission may have an impact on coverage and payment for our services.

On February 22, 2012, the President signed into law H.R. 3630, which among other things, delayed a cut in physician and Part B services. In establishing the funding for the law, payments to nursing facilities for patients' unpaid Medicare A co-insurance was reduced. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 had previously limited reimbursement of bad debt to 70% on privately responsibility co-insurance. However, under H.R. 3630, this reimbursement will be reduced to 65%.

Further, prior to the introduction of H.R. 3630, we were reimbursed for 100% of bad debt related to dual-eligible Medicare patients' co-insurance. H.R. 3630 will phase down the dual-eligible reimbursement over three years. Effective October 1, 2012, Medicare dual-eligible co-insurance reimbursement decreased from 100% to 88%, with further rates reductions to 77% and 65%

as of October 1, 2013 and 2014, respectively. Any reductions in Medicare or Medicaid reimbursement could materially adversely affect our profitability.

On August 2, 2011, the President signed into law the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Budget Control Act), which raised the debt ceiling and put into effect a series of actions for deficit reduction. The Budget Control Act created a Congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction (the Committee) that was tasked with proposing additional deficit reduction of at least \$1.5 trillion over ten years. As the Committee was unable to achieve its targeted savings, this regulation triggered automatic reductions in discretionary and mandatory spending, or budget sequestration, starting in 2013, including reductions of not more than 2% to payments to Medicare providers. The Budget Control Act also requires Congress to vote on an amendment to the Constitution that would require a balanced budget.

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed the PPACA or the Affordable Care Act into law, which contained several sweeping changes to America's health insurance system. Among other reforms contained in PPACA, many Medicare providers received reductions in their market basket updates. Unlike for some other Medicare providers, PPACA made no reduction to the market basket update for skilled nursing facilities in fiscal years 2010 or 2011. However, under PPACA, the skilled nursing facility market basket update became subject to a full productivity adjustment beginning in fiscal year 2012. In addition, PPACA enacted several reforms with respect to skilled nursing facilities and hospice organizations, including payment measures to realize significant savings of federal and state funds by deterring and prosecuting fraud and abuse in both the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Some key provisions of PPACA include (i) enhanced civil monetary penalties, (ii) substantial and onerous transparency requirements for Medicare-participating nursing facilities, (iii) face-to-face encounter requirements applicable to home health agencies and hospices, (iv) expanded authority to suspend payment if a provider is investigated for allegations or issues of fraud, (v) a requirement that overpayments for services provided to Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries be reported to the applicable payor within sixty days of identification of the overpayment or the date of the corresponding cost report, (vi) implementation of a value-based purchasing program for Medicare payments to skilled nursing facilities, (vii) implementation of a value-based purchasing program for home health services, (viii) implementation of a voluntary bundled payments pilot program (i.e., Bundled Payments for Care Improvement), and (ix) the creation of Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs).

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the enactment of PPACA did not violate the Constitution of the United States. On June 25, 2015, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the tax credits described in Section 36B of PPACA are available to individuals who purchase health insurance on an exchange created by the federal government. These rulings, taken together, permit the implementation of most of the provisions of PPACA to proceed in substantially the same form contemplated after PPACA's enactment. The provisions of PPACA discussed above are only examples of federal health reform provisions that we believe may have a material impact on the long-term care industry and on our business. However, the foregoing discussion is not intended to constitute, nor does it constitute, an exhaustive review and discussion of PPACA. It is possible that these and other provisions of PPACA may be interpreted, clarified, or applied to our affiliated facilities or operating subsidiaries in a way that could have a material adverse impact on the results of operations.

Regulations Regarding Our Facilities. Governmental and other authorities periodically inspect our facilities to assess our compliance with various standards. The intensified regulatory and enforcement environment continues to impact healthcare providers, as these providers respond to periodic surveys and other inspections by governmental authorities and act on any noncompliance identified in the inspection process. Unannounced surveys or inspections generally occur at least annually, and also following a government agency's receipt of a complaint about a facility. We must pass these inspections to maintain our licensure under state law, to obtain or maintain certification under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, to continue participation in the Veterans Administration (VA) program at some facilities, and to comply with our provider contracts with managed care clients at many facilities. From time to time, we, like others in the healthcare industry, may receive notices from federal and state regulatory agencies alleging that we failed to

comply with applicable standards. These notices may require us to take corrective action, may impose civil monetary penalties for noncompliance, and may threaten or impose other operating restrictions on skilled nursing facilities such as admission holds, provisional skilled nursing license or increased staffing requirements. If our facilities fail to comply with these directives or otherwise fail to comply substantially with licensure and certification laws, rules and regulations, we could lose our certification as a Medicare or Medicaid provider, or lose our state licenses to operate the facilities.

Regulations Protecting Against Fraud. Various complex federal and state laws exist which govern a wide array of referrals, relationships and arrangements, and prohibit fraud by healthcare providers. Governmental agencies are devoting increasing attention and resources to such anti-fraud efforts. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) expanded the penalties for healthcare fraud. Additionally, in connection with our involvement with federal healthcare reimbursement programs, the government or those acting on its behalf may bring an action under the False Claims Act (FCA), alleging that a healthcare provider has defrauded the government. These claimants may seek treble damages

for false claims and payment of additional civil monetary penalties. The FCA allows a private individual with knowledge of fraud to bring a claim on behalf of the federal government and earn a percentage of the federal government's recovery. Due to these "whistleblower" incentives, suits have become more frequent. Many states also have a false claim prohibition that mirrors or tracks the federal FCA.

In May 2009, Congress passed the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act (FERA) of 2009 which made significant changes to the federal False Claims Act (FCA), expanding the types of activities subject to prosecution and whistleblower liability. Following changes by FERA, health care providers face significant penalties for the knowing retention of government overpayments, even if no false claim was involved. Health care providers can now be liable for knowingly and improperly avoiding or decreasing an obligation to pay money or property to the government. This includes the retention of any government overpayment. The government can argue, therefore, that a FCA violation can occur without any affirmative fraudulent action or statement, as long as it is knowingly improper. In addition, FERA extended protections against retaliation for whistleblowers, including protections not only for employees, but also contractors and agents. Thus, there is no need for an employment relationship in order to qualify for protection against retaliation for whistleblowing.

On January 2, 2013 the President signed the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 into law. This statute lengthened the retrospective time period for which CMS can recover overpayments from health care providers, from three to five years following the year in which payment was made.

Regulations Regarding Financial Arrangements. We are also subject to federal and state laws that regulate financial arrangement by healthcare providers, such as the federal and state anti-kickback laws, the Stark laws, and various state referral laws. The federal anti-kickback laws and similar state laws make it unlawful for any person to pay, receive, offer, or solicit any benefit, directly or indirectly, for the referral or recommendation for products or services which are eligible for payment under federal healthcare programs, including Medicare and Medicaid. For the purposes of the anti-kickback law, a "federal healthcare program" includes Medicare and Medicaid programs and any other plan or program that provides health benefits which are funded directly, in whole or in part, by the United States government.

The arrangements prohibited under these anti-kickback laws can involve nursing homes, hospitals, physicians and other healthcare providers, plans, suppliers and non-healthcare providers. These laws have been interpreted very broadly to include a number of practices and relationships between healthcare providers and sources of patient referral. The scope of prohibited payments is very broad, including anything of value, whether offered directly or indirectly, in cash or in kind. Federal "safe harbor" regulations describe certain arrangements that will not be deemed to constitute violations of the anti-kickback law. Arrangements that do not comply with all of the strict requirements of a safe harbor are not necessarily illegal, but, due to the broad language of the statute, failure to comply with a safe harbor may increase the potential that a government agency or whistleblower will seek to investigate or challenge the arrangement. The safe harbors are narrow and do not cover a wide range of economic relationships.

Violations of the federal anti-kickback laws can result in criminal penalties of up to \$25,000 and five years imprisonment. Violations of the anti-kickback laws can also result in civil monetary penalties of up to \$50,000 and an assessment of up to three times the total amount of remuneration offered, paid, solicited, or received. Violation of the anti-kickback laws may also result in an individual's or organization's exclusion from future participation in Medicare, Medicaid and other state and federal healthcare programs. Exclusion of us or any of our key employees from the Medicare or Medicaid program could have a material adverse impact on our operations and financial condition.

In addition to these regulations, we may face adverse consequences if we violate the federal Stark laws related to certain Medicare physician referrals. The Stark laws prohibit a physician from referring Medicare patients for certain

designated health services where the physician has an ownership interest in or compensation arrangement with the provider of the services, with limited exceptions. Also, any services furnished pursuant to a prohibited referral are not eligible for payment by the Medicare programs, and the provider is prohibited from billing any third party for such services. The Stark laws provide for the imposition of a civil monetary penalty of \$15,000 per prohibited claim, and up to \$100,000 for knowingly entering into certain prohibited cross-referral schemes, and potential exclusion from Medicare for any person who presents or causes to be presented a bill or claim the person knows or should know is submitted in violation of the Stark laws. Such designated health services include physical therapy services; occupational therapy services; radiology services, including CT, MRI and ultrasound; durable medical equipment and services; radiation therapy services and supplies; parenteral and enteral nutrients, equipment and supplies; prosthetics, orthotics and prosthetic devices and supplies; home health services; outpatient prescription drugs; inpatient and outpatient hospital services; clinical laboratory services; and diagnostic and therapeutic nuclear medical services.

Regulations Regarding Patient Record Confidentiality. We are also subject to laws and regulations enacted to protect the confidentiality of patient health information. For example, HHS has issued rules pursuant to HIPAA, which relate to the privacy of certain patient information. These rules govern our use and disclosure of protected health information. We have established policies and procedures to comply with HIPAA privacy and security requirements at these facilities. We believe that we are in compliance with all current HIPAA laws and regulations.

Antitrust Laws. We are also subject to federal and state antitrust laws. Enforcement of the antitrust laws against healthcare providers is common, and antitrust liability may arise in a wide variety of circumstances, including third party contracting, physician relations, joint venture, merger, affiliation and acquisition activities. In some respects, the application of federal and state antitrust laws to healthcare is still evolving, and enforcement activity by federal and state agencies appears to be increasing. At various times, healthcare providers and insurance and managed care organizations may be subject to an investigation by a governmental agency charged with the enforcement of antitrust laws, or may be subject to administrative or judicial action by a federal or state agency or a private party. Violators of the antitrust laws could be subject to criminal and civil enforcement by federal and state agencies, as well as by private litigants.

Environmental Matters

Our business is subject to a variety of federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations. As a healthcare provider, we face regulatory requirements in areas of air and water quality control, medical and low-level radioactive waste management and disposal, asbestos management, response to mold and lead-based paint in our facilities and employee safety.

As an owner or operator of our facilities, we also may be required to investigate and remediate hazardous substances that are located on and/or under the property, including any such substances that may have migrated off, or may have been discharged or transported from the property. Part of our operations involves the handling, use, storage, transportation, disposal and discharge of medical, biological, infectious, toxic, flammable and other hazardous materials, wastes, pollutants or contaminants. In addition, we are sometimes unable to determine with certainty whether prior uses of our facilities and properties or surrounding properties may have produced continuing environmental contamination or noncompliance, particularly where the timing or cost of making such determinations is not deemed cost-effective. These activities, as well as the possible presence of such materials in, on and under our properties, may result in damage to individuals, property or the environment; may interrupt operations or increase costs; may result in legal liability, damages, injunctions or fines; may result in investigations, administrative proceedings, penalties or other governmental agency actions; and may not be covered by insurance.

We believe that we are in material compliance with applicable environmental and occupational health and safety requirements. However, we cannot assure you that we will not encounter liabilities with respect to these regulations in the future, and such liabilities may result in material adverse consequences to our operations or financial condition.

Available Information

We are subject to the reporting requirements under the Exchange Act. Consequently, we are required to file reports and information with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), including reports on the following forms: annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act. These reports and other information concerning our company may be accessed through the SEC's website at <http://www.sec.gov>.

You may also find on our website at <http://www.ensigngroup.net>, electronic copies of our annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act. Such filings are placed on our website as soon as reasonably possible after they are filed with the SEC. All such filings are available free of charge. Information contained in our website is not deemed to be a part of this Annual Report.

Table of Contents

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Set forth below are certain risk factors that could harm our business, results of operations and financial condition. You should carefully read the following risk factors, together with the financial statements, related notes and other information contained in this Annual Report on Form 10-K. This Annual Report on Form 10-K contains forward-looking statements that contain risks and uncertainties. Please refer to the section entitled "Cautionary Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements" on page 1 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K in connection with your consideration of the risk factors and other important factors that may affect future results described below.

Risks Related to Our Business and Industry

Our revenue could be impacted by federal and state changes to reimbursement and other aspects of Medicaid and Medicare.

We derived 38.2% and 39.9% of our revenue from the Medicaid program for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. We derived 29.5% and 30.5% of our revenue from the Medicare program for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. If reimbursement rates under these programs are reduced or fail to increase as quickly as our costs, or if there are changes in the way these programs pay for services, our business and results of operations would be adversely affected. The services for which we are currently reimbursed by Medicaid and Medicare may not continue to be reimbursed at adequate levels or at all. Further limits on the scope of services being reimbursed, delays or reductions in reimbursement or changes in other aspects of reimbursement could impact our revenue. For example, in the past, the enactment of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA), the Medicaid Voluntary Contribution and Provider-Specific Tax Amendments of 1991 and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) caused changes in government reimbursement systems, which, in some cases, made obtaining reimbursements more difficult and costly and lowered or restricted reimbursement rates for some of our patients.

The Medicaid and Medicare programs are subject to statutory and regulatory changes affecting base rates or basis of payment, retroactive rate adjustments, annual caps that limit the amount that can be paid (including deductible and coinsurance amounts) for rehabilitation therapy services rendered to Medicare beneficiaries, administrative or executive orders and government funding restrictions, all of which may materially adversely affect the rates and frequency at which these programs reimburse us for our services. For example, the Medicaid Integrity Contractor (MIC) program is increasing the scrutiny placed on Medicaid payments, and could result in recoupments of alleged overpayments in an effort to rein in Medicaid spending. Recent budget proposals and legislation at both the federal and state levels have called for cuts in reimbursement for health care providers participating in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Enactment and implementation of measures to reduce or delay reimbursement could result in substantial reductions in our revenue and profitability. Payors may disallow our requests for reimbursement based on determinations that certain costs are not reimbursable or reasonable because either adequate or additional documentation was not provided or because certain services were not covered or considered reasonably necessary. Additionally, revenue from these payors can be retroactively adjusted after a new examination during the claims settlement process or as a result of post-payment audits. New legislation and regulatory proposals could impose further limitations on government payments to healthcare providers.

In addition, on October 1, 2010, the next generation of the Minimum Data Set (MDS) 3.0 was implemented, creating significant changes in the methodology for calculating the resource utilization group (RUG) category under Medicare Part A, most notably eliminating Section T. Because therapy does not necessarily begin upon admission, MDS 2.0 and the RUGS-III system included a provision to capture therapy services that are scheduled to occur but have not yet been provided in order to calculate a RUG level that better reflects the level of care the recipient would actually receive. This is eliminated with MDS 3.0, which creates a new category of assessment called the Medicare Short Stay Assessment. This assessment provides for calculation of a rehabilitation RUG for patients discharged on or before day eight who received less than five days of therapy.

On November 16, 2015, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) issued the final rule for a new mandatory Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement (CJR) model focusing on coordinated, patient-centered care.

Under this model, the hospital in which the hip or knee replacement takes place is accountable for the costs and quality of care from the time of the surgery through 90 days after, or an “episode” of care. Depending on the hospital’s quality and cost performance during the episode, the hospital either earns a financial reward or is required to repay Medicare for a portion of the costs. This payment is intended to give hospitals an incentive to work with physicians, home health agencies and nursing facilities to make sure beneficiaries receive the coordinated care they need with the goal of reducing avoidable hospitalizations and complications. This model initially covers 67 geographic areas throughout the country and most hospitals in those regions are required to participate. Following the implementation of the CJR program, our Medicare revenues derived from our affiliated skilled nursing facilities and other post-acute services related to lower extremity joint replacement hospital discharges could be increased or decreased in those geographic areas identified by CMS for mandatory participation in the bundled payment program.

Table of Contents

On October 1, 2015, International Classification of Diseases (ICD) 10 was implemented as the new medical coding system. Some of the main points include: Claims with antibiotic removal devices (ARDs) on or after October 1, 2015 must contain a valid ICD-10 code. CMS will reject MDS assessments if a Section I diagnosis code version does not apply for the ARD entered. Flexibility is being provided to physician providers with coding, but this flexibility will not be passed on to facility-based providers, including skilled nursing facilities that are providing Part B services.

On July 13, 2015, CMS released a proposed rule that would reform requirements for long-term care (LTC) facilities, specifically skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) and nursing facilities (NFs), to participate in Medicare and Medicaid. The rule would reorder, clarify, and update regulations that the agency has not reviewed comprehensively since 1991.

Under the proposed rule, facilities are required to 1) create interim care plans within 48 hours of admission, notify a resident's physician after a change in status, engage in interdisciplinary care planning, have a practitioner assess the patient in-person prior to a transfer to the hospital, and improve clinical records to ensure providers have the necessary information to decide on hospitalization; 2) conduct comprehensive assessments of their staff and patient needs, apply current requirements for antipsychotic drugs to all psychotropic drugs, and require physicians to document their response to irregularities identified by consultant pharmacists; 3) conduct assessments of their resident population, implement and update periodically an infection prevention and control program, and establish an antibiotic stewardship program; 4) address requirements related to behavioral health services, ensuring facilities have adequate staffing to meet the needs of residents with mental illness and cognitive impairment; and 5) conduct assessments of their patient populations and related care needs to determine adequate staffing levels (i.e., number and skillsets) for nursing, behavioral health, and nutritional services. CMS estimates that these proposed regulations would cost facilities nearly \$46.5 million in the first year and over \$40.6 million in subsequent years. However, these amounts would vary considerably among organizations. In addition to the monetary costs, these regulations may create compliance issues, as state regulators and surveyors interpret requirements that are less explicit.

Various healthcare reform provisions became law upon enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Healthcare Education and Reconciliation Act (collectively, the ACA). The reforms contained in the ACA have affected our operating subsidiaries in some manner and are directed in large part at increased quality and cost reductions. Several of the reforms are very significant and could ultimately change the nature of our services, the methods of payment for our services and the underlying regulatory environment. These reforms include the possible modifications to the conditions of qualification for payment, bundling of payments to cover both acute and post-acute care and the imposition of enrollment limitations on new providers.

On July 30, 2015, CMS published its final rule outlining fiscal year 2016 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimates that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities will increase by 1.2% for fiscal year 2016. This estimate increase reflected a 2.3% market basket increase, reduced by a 0.6% point forecast error adjustment and further reduced by 0.5% multi-factor productivity (MFP) adjustment required by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This final rule also identified a new skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing program and all-cause all-condition hospital readmission measure.

On July 31, 2014, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2015 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimates that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities will increase by \$750 million, or 2.0% for fiscal year 2015, relative to payments in 2014. The estimated increase reflects a 2.5% market basket increase, reduced by the 0.5% MFP adjustment required by PPACA.

On July 31, 2013, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2014 Medicare payment rates for skilled nursing facilities. CMS estimated that aggregate payments to skilled nursing facilities would increase by \$470 million, or 1.3% for fiscal year 2014, relative to payments in 2013. This estimated increase reflects a 2.3% market basket increase, reduced by the 0.5% forecast error correction and further reduced by the 0.5% MFP adjustment as required by PPACA. The forecast error correction is applied when the difference between the actual and projected market basket percentage change for the most recent available fiscal year exceeds the 0.5% threshold. For fiscal year 2012 (most recent available fiscal year), the projected market basket percentage change exceeded the actual market basket

percentage change by 0.51%.

On July 27, 2012, CMS announced a final rule updating Medicare skilled nursing facility PPS payments in fiscal year 2013.

The update, a 1.8% or \$670 million increase, reflected a 2.5% market basket increase, reduced by a 0.7% multi-factor productivity (MFP) adjustment mandated by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This increase will be offset by the 2% sequestration reduction, discussed below, which became effective April 1, 2013.

Should future changes in PPS, similar to those described above, include further reduced rates or increased standards for reaching certain reimbursement levels, our Medicare revenues derived from our affiliated skilled nursing facilities (including rehabilitation therapy services provided at our affiliated skilled nursing facilities) could be reduced, with a corresponding adverse impact on our financial condition or results of operations.

27

Table of Contents

On November 5, 2015, CMS issued a final rule updating the Medicare HH PPS rates and wage index for calendar year 2016. In the final rule, CMS implemented the third year of the four year phase-in of rebasing adjustments to the HH PPS payment rates as required by PPACA. In addition, CMS will decrease the national, standardized 60-day episode payment amount by 0.97% in each year for calendar years 2016, 2017 and 2018. Pursuant to the rule, CMS is also implementing a Home Health Value-Based Purchasing model effective for calendar year 2016, in which all Medicare-certified HHAs will be required to participate. In the aggregate, CMS estimates that the net impact of the payment provisions of the final rule will result in a decrease of 1.4%, or \$260 million, in aggregate Medicare payments to HHAs for calendar year 2016.

Pursuant to the rule, CMS is also implementing a Home Health Value-Based Purchasing model effective for calendar year 2016, in which all Medicare-certified HHAs in selected states will be required to participate. The model would apply a payment reduction or increase to current Medicare-certified home health agency (HHA) payments, depending on quality performance, for all agencies delivering services within nine randomly-selected states. Payment adjustments would be applied on an annual basis, beginning at 3.0% in the first payment adjustment year, 5.0% in the second payment adjustment year, 6.0% in the third payment adjustment year and 8.0% in the final two payment adjustment years. CMS estimates that implementing a home health value-based model will result in a 1.4% decrease in Medicare payments to home health agencies across the industry.

Lastly, CMS proposed one standardized cross-setting measure for calendar year 2016. The Home Health Conditions of Participation (CoPs) require home health agencies to submit OASIS assessments as a condition of payment and also for quality measurement purposes. Home health agencies that do not submit quality measure data to CMS will see a 2.0% reduction in their annual home health payment update percentage. Under the proposed rule, all home health agencies are required to submit both admission and discharge OASIS assessments for a minimum of 70.0% of all patients with episodes of care occurring during the reporting period starting July 1, 2015. The proposed rule will incrementally increase this compliance threshold by 10.0% in each of the subsequent periods (July 1, 2016 and July 1, 2017) to reach 90.0%.

On October 30, 2014, CMS announced payment changes to the Medicare HH PPS for calendar year 2015. Under this rule, CMS projects that Medicare payments to home health agencies in calendar year 2015 will be reduced by 0.3%, or \$60 million. The decrease reflects the 2.1% home health payment update percentage and the rebasing adjustments to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rate, the national per-visit payment rates, and the non-routine medical supplies (NRS) conversion factor. CMS is also finalizing three changes to the face-to-face encounter requirements under the ACA. These changes include: a) eliminating the narrative requirement currently in regulation, b) establishing that if a HHA claim is denied, the corresponding physician claim for certifying/re-certifying patient eligibility for Medicare-covered home health services is considered non-covered as well because there is no longer a corresponding claim for Medicare-covered home health services and c) clarifying that a face-to-face encounter is required for certifications, rather than initial episodes; and that a certification (versus a re-certification) is generally considered to be any time a new start of care assessment is completed to initiate care. This rule also established a minimum submission threshold for the number of OASIS assessments that each HHA must submit under the Home Health Quality Reporting Program and the Home Health Conditions of Participant for speech language pathologist personnel.

On November 22, 2013, CMS issued its final ruling regarding Medicare payment rates for home health agencies effective January 1, 2014. As required by PPACA, this rule included rebasing adjustments, with a four-year phase-in, to the national, standardized 60-day episode payment rates; the national per-visit rates; and the NRS conversion factor. Under the ruling, CMS projected that Medicare payments to home health agencies in calendar year 2014 would be reduced by 1.05%, or \$200 million, reflecting the combined effects of the 2.3% increase in the home health national payment update percentage; a 2.7% decrease due to rebasing adjustments to the national, standardized 60-day episode

payment rate, mandated by the Affordable Care Act; and a 0.6% decrease due to the effects of HH PPS Grouper refinements. This final rule also updated the home health wage index for calendar year 2014. The ruling also established home health quality reporting requirements for 2014 payment and subsequent years to specify that Medicaid responsibilities for home health surveys be explicitly recognized in the State Medicaid Plan, which is similar to the current regulations for surveys of skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities for individuals with intellectual disabilities.

In November 2012, CMS issued final regulations regarding Medicare payment rates for home health agencies effective

January 1, 2013. These final regulations implemented a net market basket increase of 1.3% consisting of a 2.3% market basket

inflation increase, less a 1.0% adjustment mandated by the PPACA. In addition, CMS implemented a 1.3% reduction in case mix. The impact of these changes would result in a less than 0.1% decrease in payments to home health agencies.

On July 31, 2015, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2016 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Under the final rule, hospices will see an estimated 1.1% increase in their payments effective October 1, 2015. The hospice payment increase would be the net result of a hospice payment update to the hospice per diem rates of 2.1% (a “hospital market basket” increase of 2.4% minus 0.3% for reductions required by law) and a 1.2% decrease

Table of Contents

in payments to hospices due to updated wage data and the phase-out of its wage index budget neutrality adjustment factor (BNAF), offset by the newly announced Core Based Statistical Areas (CBSA) delineation impact of 0.2%. The rule also created two different payment rates for routine home care (RHC) that would result in a higher base payment rate for the first 60 days of hospice care and a reduced base payment rate for 61 or more days of hospice care and a Service Intensity Add-On (SIA) Payment for fiscal year 2016 and beyond in conjunction with the proposed RHC rates.

On August 1, 2014, CMS issued its final rule outlining fiscal year 2015 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Under the final rule, hospices will see an estimated 1.4% increase in their payments for fiscal year 2015. The hospice payment increase would be the net result of a hospice payment update to the hospice per diem rates of 2.1% (a “hospital market basket” increase of 2.9% minus 0.8% for reductions required by law) and a 0.7% decrease in payments to hospices due to updated wage data and the sixth year of CMS’ seven-year phase-out of its wage index BNAF. The final rule also states that CMS will begin national implementation of the CAHPS Hospice Survey starting January 1, 2015. In the final rule, CMS requires providers to complete their hospice cap determination within 150 days after the cap period and remit any overpayments. If a hospice does not complete its cap determination in a timely fashion, its Medicare payments would be suspended until the cap determination is complete and received by the contractor. This is similar to the current practice for all other provider types that file cost reports with Medicare.

On August 2, 2013, CMS issued its final rule that updated fiscal year 2014 Medicare payment rates and the wage index for hospices serving Medicare beneficiaries. Among other matters finalized in this rule, CMS planned to update the hospice per diem rates for fiscal year 2014 and subsequent years through the annual hospice rule or notice, rather than solely through a Change Request, as has been done in prior years.

In July 2012, CMS issued its final rule for hospice services for its 2013 fiscal year. These final regulations implemented a net market basket increase of 1.6% consisting of a 2.6% market basket inflation increase, less offsets to the standard payment 27 conversion factor mandated by the PPACA of 0.7% to account for the effect of a productivity adjustment, and 0.3% as required by statute. CMS projected the impact of these changes would result in a 0.9% increase in payments to hospice providers.

On April 1, 2014, the President signed into law the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, which averted a 24% cut in Medicare payments to physicians and other Part B providers until March 31, 2015. In addition, this law maintained the 0.5% update for such services through December 31, 2014 and provides a 0.0% update to the 2015 Medicare Physician Fee Schedule (MPFS) through March 31, 2015. Among other things, this law provides the framework for implementation of a value-based purchasing program for skilled nursing facilities. Under this legislation HHS is required to develop by October 1, 2016 measures and performance standards regarding preventable hospital readmissions from skilled nursing facilities. Beginning October 1, 2018, HHS will withhold 2% of Medicare payments to all skilled nursing facilities and distribute this pool of payment to skilled nursing facilities as incentive payments for preventing readmissions to hospitals.

On April 16, 2015, the President signed into law MACRA. This bill includes a number of provisions, including replacement of the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula used by Medicare to pay physicians with new systems for establishing annual payment rate updates for physicians' services. In addition, it increases premiums for Part B and Part D of Medicare for beneficiaries with income above certain levels and makes numerous other changes to Medicare and Medicaid.

On October 30, 2015, CMS released a final rule (with comment period) addressing, among other things, implementation of certain provisions of MACRA, including the implementation of the new Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS). The current Value-Based Payment Modifier program is set to expire in 2018, with MIPS to begin in 2019. The October 30, 2015 final rule added measures where gaps exist in the current Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS), which is used by CMS to track the quality of care provided to Medicare beneficiaries. The

final rule also excludes services furnished in SNFs from the definition of primary care services for purposes of the Shared Savings Program. The final rule could impact our revenue in the future.

The Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act of 2014 (the IMPACT Act), which was signed into law on October 6, 2014, requires the submission of standardized assessment data for quality improvement, payment and discharge planning purposes across the spectrum of post-acute care providers (PACs), including skilled nursing facilities and home health agencies. The IMPACT Act will require PACs to begin reporting: (1) standardized patient assessment data at admission and discharge by October 1, 2018 for post acute care providers, including skilled nursing facilities by January 1, 2019 for home health agencies; (2) new quality measures, including functional status, skin integrity, medication reconciliation, incidence of major falls, and patient preference regarding treatment and discharge at various intervals between October 1, 2016 and January 1, 2019; and (3) resource use measures, including Medicare spending per beneficiary, discharge to community, and hospitalization rates of potentially preventable readmissions by October 1, 2016 for post-acute care providers, including skilled nursing facilities and by January 1, 2017 for home health agencies. Failure to report such data when required would subject a facility to a two percent reduction in market basket prices then in effect.

Table of Contents

The IMPACT Act further requires HHS and the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), a commission chartered by Congress to advise it on Medicare payment issues, to study alternative PAC payment models, including payment based upon individual patient characteristics and not care setting, with corresponding Congressional reports required based on such analysis. The IMPACT Act also included provisions impacting Medicare-certified hospices, including: (1) increasing survey frequency for Medicare-certified hospices to once every 36 months; (2) imposing a medical review process for facilities with a high percentage of stays in excess of 180 days; and (3) updating the annual aggregate Medicare payment cap.

On April 1, 2014, the President signed into law the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, which averted a 24% cut in Medicare payments to physicians and other Part B providers until March 31, 2015. In addition, this law maintains the 0.5% update for such services through December 31, 2014 and provided a 0.0% update to the 2015 Medicare Physician Fee Schedule (MPFS) through March 31, 2015. Among other things, this law provides the framework for implementation of a value-based purchasing program for skilled nursing facilities. Under this legislation HHS is required to develop by October 1, 2016 measures and performance standards regarding preventable hospital readmissions from skilled nursing facilities. Beginning October 1, 2018, HHS will withhold 2% of Medicare payments to all skilled nursing facilities and distribute this pool of payment to skilled nursing facilities as incentive payments for preventing readmissions to hospitals.

On January 2, 2013 the President signed the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 into law. This statute delayed significant cuts in Medicare rates for physician services until December 31, 2013. The statute also created a Commission on Long Term Care, the goal of which was to develop a plan for the establishment, implementation, and financing of a comprehensive, coordinated, and high-quality system that ensures the availability of long-term care services and supports for individuals in need of such services and supports.

On February 22, 2012, the President signed into law H.R. 3630, which among other things, delayed a cut in physician and Part B services. In establishing the funding for the law, payments to nursing facilities for patients' unpaid Medicare A co-insurance was reduced. The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 had previously limited reimbursement of bad debt to 70% on privately responsibility co-insurance. However, under H.R. 3630, this reimbursement will be reduced to 65%.

Further, prior to the introduction of H.R. 3630, we were reimbursed for 100% of bad debt related to dual-eligible Medicare patients' co-insurance. H.R. 3630 will phase down the dual-eligible reimbursement over three years. Effective October 1, 2012, Medicare dual-eligible co-insurance reimbursement decreased from 100% to 88%, with further reductions to 77% and 65% as of October 1, 2013 and 2014, respectively. Any reductions in Medicare or Medicaid reimbursement could materially adversely affect our profitability.

Our future revenue, financial condition and results of operations could be impacted by continued cost containment pressures on Medicaid spending.

Medicaid, which is largely administered by the states, is a significant payor for our skilled nursing services. Rapidly increasing Medicaid spending, combined with slow state revenue growth, has led many states to institute measures aimed at controlling spending growth. For example, in February 2009, the California legislature approved a new budget to help relieve a \$42 billion budget deficit. The budget package was signed after months of negotiation, during which time California's governor declared a fiscal state of emergency in California. The new budget implemented spending cuts in several areas, including Medi-Cal spending. Further, California initially had extended its cost-based Medi-Cal long-term care reimbursement system enacted through Assembly Bill 1629 (A.B.1629) through the

2009-2010 and 2010-2011 rate years with a growth rate of up to five percent for both years. However, due to California's severe budget crisis, in July 2009, the State passed a budget-balancing proposal that eliminated this five percent growth cap by amending the current statute to provide that, for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 rate years, the weighted average Medi-Cal reimbursement rate paid to long-term care facilities shall not exceed the weighted average Medi-Cal reimbursement rate for the 2008-2009 rate year. In addition, the budget proposal increased the amounts that California nursing facilities will pay to Medi-Cal in quality assurance fees for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 rate years by including Medicare revenue in the calculation of the quality assurance fee that nursing facilities pay under A.B. 1629. Although overall reimbursement from Medi-Cal remained stable, individual facility rates varied.

California's Governor signed the budget trailer into law in October 2010. Despite its enactment, these changes in reimbursement to long-term care facilities were to be implemented retroactively to the beginning of the calendar quarter in which California submitted its request for federal approval of CMS. California's Governor released a 2014-2015 budget that includes \$1.2 billion in additional Medi-Cal funding. This proposal, however, would not eliminate retroactive rate cuts for hospital-based skilled nursing facilities.

Because state legislatures control the amount of state funding for Medicaid programs, cuts or delays in approval of such funding by legislatures could reduce the amount of, or cause a delay in, payment from Medicaid to skilled nursing facilities. Since

Table of Contents

a significant portion of our revenue is generated from our skilled nursing operating subsidiaries in California, these budget reductions, if approved, could adversely affect our net patient service revenue and profitability. We expect continuing cost containment pressures on Medicaid outlays for skilled nursing facilities, and any such decline could adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

To generate funds to pay for the increasing costs of the Medicaid program, many states utilize financial arrangements such as provider taxes. Under provider tax arrangements, states collect taxes or fees from healthcare providers and then return the revenue to these providers as Medicaid expenditures. Congress, however, has placed restrictions on states' use of provider tax and donation programs as a source of state matching funds. Under the Medicaid Voluntary Contribution and Provider-Specific Tax Amendments of 1991, the federal medical assistance percentage available to a state was reduced by the total amount of healthcare related taxes that the state imposed, unless certain requirements are met. The federal medical assistance percentage is not reduced if the state taxes are broad-based and not applied specifically to Medicaid reimbursed services. In addition, the healthcare providers receiving Medicaid reimbursement must be at risk for the amount of tax assessed and must not be guaranteed to receive reimbursement through the applicable state Medicaid program for the tax assessed. Lower Medicaid reimbursement rates would adversely affect our revenue, financial condition and results of operations.

We may not be fully reimbursed for all services for which each facility bills through consolidated billing, which could adversely affect our revenue, financial condition and results of operations.

Skilled nursing facilities are required to perform consolidated billing for certain items and services furnished to patients and residents. The consolidated billing requirement essentially confers on the skilled nursing facility itself the Medicare billing responsibility for the entire package of care that its patients receive in these situations. The BBA also affected skilled nursing facility payments by requiring that post-hospitalization skilled nursing services be "bundled" into the hospital's Diagnostic Related Group (DRG) payment in certain circumstances. Where this rule applies, the hospital and the skilled nursing facility must, in effect, divide the payment which otherwise would have been paid to the hospital alone for the patient's treatment, and no additional funds are paid by Medicare for skilled nursing care of the patient. At present, this provision applies to a limited number of DRGs, but already is apparently having a negative effect on skilled nursing facility utilization and payments, either because hospitals are finding it difficult to place patients in skilled nursing facilities which will not be paid as before or because hospitals are reluctant to discharge the patients to skilled nursing facilities and lose part of their payment. This bundling requirement could be extended to more DRGs in the future, which would accentuate the negative impact on skilled nursing facility utilization and payments. We may not be fully reimbursed for all services for which each facility bills through consolidated billing, which could adversely affect our revenue, financial condition and results of operations.

Reforms to the U.S. healthcare system will impose new requirements upon us and may lower our reimbursements.

PPACA and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (the Reconciliation Act) include sweeping changes to how health care is paid for and furnished in the United States.

PPACA, as modified by the Reconciliation Act, is projected to expand access to Medicaid for approximately 11 to 13 million additional people each year between 2015 - 2024. It also reduces the projected growth of Medicare by \$106 billion by 2020 by tying payments to providers more closely to quality outcomes. It also imposes new obligations on skilled nursing facilities, requiring them to disclose information regarding ownership, expenditures and certain other information. This information is disclosed on a website for comparison by members of the public.

To address potential fraud and abuse in federal health care programs, including Medicare and Medicaid, PPACA includes provider screening and enhanced oversight periods for new providers and suppliers, as well as enhanced penalties for submitting false claims. It also provides funding for enhanced anti-fraud activities. The new law imposes

enrollment moratoria in elevated risk areas by requiring providers and suppliers to establish compliance programs. PPACA also provides the federal government with expanded authority to suspend payment if a provider is investigated for allegations or issues of fraud. Section 6402 of the PPACA provides that Medicare and Medicaid payments may be suspended pending a “credible investigation of fraud,” unless the Secretary of HHS determines that good cause exists not to suspend payments. To the extent the Secretary applies this suspension of payments provision to one of our affiliated facilities for allegations of fraud, such a suspension could adversely affect our results of operations.

Under PPACA, HHS will establish, test and evaluate alternative payment methodologies for Medicare services through a five-year, national, voluntary pilot program starting in 2013. This program will provide incentives for providers to coordinate patient care across the continuum and to be jointly accountable for an entire episode of care centered around a hospitalization. HHS will develop qualifying provider payment methods that may include bundled payments and bids from entities for episodes of care. The bundled payment will cover the costs of acute care inpatient services; physicians’ services delivered in and outside

Table of Contents

of an acute care hospital; outpatient hospital services including emergency department services; post-acute care services, including home health services, skilled nursing services; inpatient rehabilitation services; and inpatient hospital services. The payment methodology will include payment for services, such as care coordination, medication reconciliation, discharge planning and transitional care services, and other patient-centered activities. Payments for items and services cannot result in spending more than would otherwise be expended for such entities if the pilot program were not implemented. As with Medicare's shared savings program discussed above, payment arrangements among providers on the backside of the bundled payment must take into account significant hurdles under the Anti-kickback Law, the Stark Law and the Civil Monetary Penalties Law. This pilot program may expand in 2016 if expansion would reduce Medicare spending without also reducing quality of care.

PPACA attempts to improve the health care delivery system through incentives to enhance quality, improve beneficiary outcomes and increase value of care. One of these key delivery system reforms is the encouragement of Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs). ACOs will facilitate coordination and cooperation among providers to improve the quality of care for Medicare beneficiaries and reduce unnecessary costs. Participating ACOs that meet specified quality performance standards will be eligible to receive a share of any savings if the actual per capita expenditures of their assigned Medicare beneficiaries are a sufficient percentage below their specified benchmark amount. Quality performance standards will include measures in such categories as clinical processes and outcomes of care, patient experience and utilization of services.

In addition, PPACA required HHS to develop a plan to implement a value-based purchasing program for Medicare payments to skilled nursing facilities. HHS delivered a report to Congress outlining its plans for implementing this value-based purchasing program. The value-based purchasing program would provide payment incentives for Medicare-participating skilled nursing facilities to improve the quality of care provided to Medicare beneficiaries. Among the most relevant factors in HHS' plans to implement value-based purchasing for skilled nursing facilities is the current Nursing Home Value-Based Purchasing Demonstration Project, which concluded in 2012. HHS provided Congress with an outline of plans to implement a value-based purchasing program, and any permanent value-based purchasing program for skilled nursing facilities will be implemented after that evaluation.

On July 6, 2015, CMS announced a proposal to launch Home Health Value-Based Purchasing model to test whether incentives for better care can improve outcomes in the delivery of home health services. The model would apply a payment reduction or increase to current Medicare-certified home health agency payments, depending on quality performance, for all agencies delivering services within nine randomly-selected states. Payment adjustments would be applied on an annual basis, beginning at 5.0% in each of the first two payment adjustment years, 6.0% in the third payment adjustment year and 8.0% in the final two payment adjustment years.

On June 28, 2012, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the enactment of PPACA did not violate the Constitution of the United States. This ruling permits the implementation of most of the provisions of PPACA to proceed. The provisions of PPACA discussed above are only examples of federal health reform provisions that we believe may have a material impact on the long-term care industry and on our business. However, the foregoing discussion is not intended to constitute, nor does it constitute, an exhaustive review and discussion of PPACA. It is possible that these and other provisions of PPACA may be interpreted, clarified, or applied to our affiliated facilities or operating subsidiaries in a way that could have a material adverse impact on the results of operations.

On April 1, 2014, the President signed into law the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 which, among other things, provides the framework for implementation of a value-based purchasing program for skilled nursing facilities. Under this legislation HHS is required to develop by October 1, 2016 measures and performance standards regarding preventable hospital readmissions from skilled nursing facilities. Beginning October 1, 2018, HHS will withhold 2% of Medicare payments to all skilled nursing facilities and distribute this pool of payment to skilled nursing facilities as incentive payments for preventing readmissions to hospitals.

We cannot predict what effect these changes will have on our business, including the demand for our services or the amount of reimbursement available for those services. However, it is possible these new laws may lower reimbursement and adversely affect our business.

The Affordable Care Act and its implementation could impact our business.

In addition, the Affordable Care Act could result in sweeping changes to the existing U.S. system for the delivery and financing of health care. The details for implementation of many of the requirements under the Affordable Care Act will depend on the promulgation of regulations by a number of federal government agencies, including the HHS. It is impossible to predict the outcome of these changes, what many of the final requirements of the Health Reform Law will be, and the net effect of those

Table of Contents

requirements on us. As such, we cannot predict the impact of the Affordable Care Act on our business, operations or financial performance.

A significant goal of Federal health care reform is to transform the delivery of health care by changing reimbursement for health care services to hold providers accountable for the cost and quality of care provided. Medicare and many commercial third party payors are implementing Accountable Care Organization models in which groups of providers share in the benefit and risk of providing care to an assigned group of individuals at lower cost. Other reimbursement methodology reforms include value-based purchasing, in which a portion of provider reimbursement is redistributed based on relative performance on designated economic, clinical quality, and patient satisfaction metrics. In addition, CMS is implementing programs to bundle acute care and post-acute care reimbursement to hold providers accountable for costs across a broader continuum of care. These reimbursement methodologies and similar programs are likely to continue and expand, both in public and commercial health plans. Providers who respond successfully to these trends and are able to deliver quality care at lower cost are likely to benefit financially.

The Affordable Care Act and the programs implemented by the law may reduce reimbursements for our services and may impact the demand for the Company's products. In addition, various healthcare programs and regulations may be ultimately implemented at the federal or state level. Failure to respond successfully to these trends could negatively impact our business, results of operations and/or financial condition.

Increased competition for, or a shortage of, nurses and other skilled personnel could increase our staffing and labor costs and subject us to monetary fines.

Our success depends upon our ability to retain and attract nurses, Certified Nurse Assistants (CNAs) and therapists. Our success also depends upon our ability to retain and attract skilled management personnel who are responsible for the day-to-day operations of each of our affiliated facilities. Each facility has a facility leader responsible for the overall day-to-day operations of the facility, including quality of care, social services and financial performance. Depending upon the size of the facility, each facility leader is supported by facility staff that is directly responsible for day-to-day care of the patients and marketing and community outreach programs. Other key positions supporting each facility may include individuals responsible for physical, occupational and speech therapy, food service and maintenance. We compete with various healthcare service providers, including other skilled nursing providers, in retaining and attracting qualified and skilled personnel.

We operate one or more affiliated skilled nursing facilities in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. With the exception of Utah, which follows federal regulations, each of these states has established minimum staffing requirements for facilities operating in that state. Failure to comply with these requirements can, among other things, jeopardize a facility's compliance with the conditions of participation under relevant state and federal healthcare programs. In addition, if a facility is determined to be out of compliance with these requirements, it may be subject to a notice of deficiency, a citation, or a significant fine or litigation risk. Deficiencies (depending on the level) may also result in the suspension of patient admissions and/or the termination of Medicaid participation, or the suspension, revocation or nonrenewal of the skilled nursing facility's license. If the federal or state governments were to issue regulations which materially change the way compliance with the minimum staffing standard is calculated or enforced, our labor costs could increase and the current shortage of healthcare workers could impact us more significantly.

Increased competition for or a shortage of nurses or other trained personnel, or general inflationary pressures may require that we enhance our pay and benefits packages to compete effectively for such personnel. We may not be able to offset such added costs by increasing the rates we charge to the patients of our operating subsidiaries. Turnover rates and the magnitude of the shortage of nurses or other trained personnel vary substantially from facility to facility. An increase in costs associated with, or a shortage of, skilled nurses, could negatively impact our business. In

addition, if we fail to attract and retain qualified and skilled personnel, our ability to conduct our business operations effectively would be harmed.

We are subject to various government reviews, audits and investigations that could adversely affect our business, including an obligation to refund amounts previously paid to us, potential criminal charges, the imposition of fines, and/or the loss of our right to participate in Medicare and Medicaid programs.

As a result of our participation in the Medicaid and Medicare programs, we are subject to various governmental reviews, audits and investigations to verify our compliance with these programs and applicable laws and regulations. We are also subject to audits under various government programs, including Recovery Audit Contractors (RAC), Zone Program Integrity Contractors (ZPIC), Program Safeguard Contractors (PSC) and Medicaid Integrity Contributors (MIC) programs, in which third party firms engaged by CMS conduct extensive reviews of claims data and medical and other records to identify potential improper payments under the Medicare programs. Private pay sources also reserve the right to conduct audits. We believe that billing and reimbursement errors and disagreements are common in our industry. We are regularly engaged in reviews, audits and appeals of our claims for

Table of Contents

reimbursement due to the subjectivities inherent in the process related to patient diagnosis and care, record keeping, claims processing and other aspects of the patient service and reimbursement processes, and the errors and disagreements those subjectivities can produce. An adverse review, audit or investigation could result in:

- an obligation to refund amounts previously paid to us pursuant to the Medicare or Medicaid programs or from private payors, in amounts that could be material to our business;
- state or federal agencies imposing fines, penalties and other sanctions on us;
- loss of our right to participate in the Medicare or Medicaid programs or one or more private payor networks;
- an increase in private litigation against us; and
- damage to our reputation in various markets.

In 2004, our Medicare fiscal intermediaries began to conduct selected reviews of claims previously submitted by and paid to some of our affiliated facilities. While we have always been subject to post-payment audits and reviews, more intensive “probe reviews” appear to be a permanent procedure with our fiscal intermediary. Although some of these probe reviews identified patient miscoding, documentation deficiencies and other errors in our recordkeeping and Medicare billing, these errors resulted in no Medicare revenue recoupment, net of appeal recoveries, to the federal government and related resident copayments.

If the government or court were to conclude that such errors and deficiencies constituted criminal violations, or were to conclude that such errors and deficiencies resulted in the submission of false claims to federal healthcare programs, or if it were to discover other problems in addition to the ones identified by the probe reviews that rose to actionable levels, we and certain of our officers might face potential criminal charges and/or civil claims, administrative sanctions and penalties for amounts that could be material to our business, results of operations and financial condition. In addition, we and/or some of the key personnel of our operating subsidiaries could be temporarily or permanently excluded from future participation in state and federal healthcare reimbursement programs such as Medicaid and Medicare. In any event, it is likely that a governmental investigation alone, regardless of its outcome, would divert material time, resources and attention from our management team and our staff, and could have a materially detrimental impact on our results of operations during and after any such investigation or proceedings.

In some cases, probe reviews can also result in a facility being temporarily placed on prepayment review of reimbursement claims, requiring additional documentation and adding steps and time to the reimbursement process for the affected facility. Failure to meet claim filing and documentation requirements during the prepayment review could subject a facility to an even more intensive “targeted review,” where a corrective action plan addressing perceived deficiencies must be prepared by the facility and approved by the fiscal intermediary. During a targeted review, additional claims are reviewed pre-payment to ensure that the prescribed corrective actions are being followed. Failure to make corrections or to otherwise meet the claim documentation and submission requirements could eventually result in Medicare decertification. None of our operating subsidiaries are currently on prepayment review, although some may be placed on prepayment review in the future. As of December 31, 2015, we have two operating subsidiaries that are currently under probe review.

Public and government calls for increased survey and enforcement efforts toward long-term care facilities could result in increased scrutiny by state and federal survey agencies. In addition, potential sanctions and remedies based upon alleged regulatory deficiencies could negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations.

CMS has undertaken several initiatives to increase or intensify Medicaid and Medicare survey and enforcement activities, including federal oversight of state actions. CMS is taking steps to focus more survey and enforcement efforts on facilities with findings of substandard care or repeat violations of Medicaid and Medicare standards, and to identify multi-facility providers with patterns of noncompliance. In addition, HHS has adopted a rule that requires CMS to charge user fees to healthcare facilities cited during regular certification, recertification or substantiated complaint surveys for deficiencies, which require a revisit to assure that corrections have been made. CMS is also increasing its oversight of state survey agencies and requiring state agencies to use enforcement sanctions and remedies more promptly when substandard care or repeat violations are identified, to investigate complaints more promptly, and to survey facilities more consistently.

The intensified and evolving enforcement environment impacts providers like us because of the increase in the scope or number of inspections or surveys by governmental authorities and the severity of consequent citations for alleged failure to comply with regulatory requirements. We also divert personnel resources to respond to federal and state investigations and other enforcement actions. The diversion of these resources, including our management team, clinical and compliance staff, and others take away from the time and energy that these individuals could otherwise spend on routine operations. As noted, from time to

Table of Contents

time in the ordinary course of business, we receive deficiency reports from state and federal regulatory bodies resulting from such inspections or surveys. The focus of these deficiency reports tends to vary from year to year. Although most inspection deficiencies are resolved through an agreed-upon plan of corrective action, the reviewing agency typically has the authority to take further action against a licensed or certified facility, which could result in the imposition of fines, imposition of a provisional or conditional license, suspension or revocation of a license, suspension or denial of payment for new admissions, loss of certification as a provider under state or federal healthcare programs, or imposition of other sanctions, including criminal penalties. In the past, we have experienced inspection deficiencies that have resulted in the imposition of a provisional license and could experience these results in the future. We currently have no affiliated facilities operating under provisional licenses which were the result of inspection deficiencies.

Furthermore, in some states, citations in one facility impact other facilities in the state. Revocation of a license at a given facility could therefore impair our ability to obtain new licenses or to renew existing licenses at other facilities, which may also trigger defaults or cross-defaults under our leases and our credit arrangements, or adversely affect our ability to operate or obtain financing in the future. If state or federal regulators were to determine, formally or otherwise, that one facility's regulatory history ought to impact another of our existing or prospective facilities, this could also increase costs, result in increased scrutiny by state and federal survey agencies, and even impact our expansion plans. Therefore, our failure to comply with applicable legal and regulatory requirements in any single facility could negatively impact our financial condition and results of operations as a whole.

When a facility is found to be deficient under state licensing and Medicaid and Medicare standards, sanctions may be threatened or imposed such as denial of payment for new Medicaid and Medicare admissions, civil monetary penalties, focused state and federal oversight and even loss of eligibility for Medicaid and Medicare participation or state licensure. Sanctions such as denial of payment for new admissions often are scheduled to go into effect before surveyors return to verify compliance. Generally, if the surveyors confirm that the facility is in compliance upon their return, the sanctions never take effect. However, if they determine that the facility is not in compliance, the denial of payment goes into effect retroactive to the date given in the original notice. This possibility sometimes leaves affected operators, including us, with the difficult task of deciding whether to continue accepting patients after the potential denial of payment date, thus risking the retroactive denial of revenue associated with those patients' care if the operators are later found to be out of compliance, or simply refusing admissions from the potential denial of payment date until the facility is actually found to be in compliance. In the past, some of our affiliated facilities have been in denial of payment status due to findings of continued regulatory deficiencies, resulting in an actual loss of the revenue associated with the Medicare and Medicaid patients admitted after the denial of payment date. Additional sanctions could ensue and, if imposed, these sanctions, entailing various remedies up to and including decertification, would further negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations. In the first quarter of 2016, we elected to voluntarily close one operating subsidiary as a result of multiple regulatory deficiencies in order to avoid continued strain on our staff and other resources and to avoid restrictions on our ability to acquire new facilities or expand or operate existing facilities. In addition, from time to time, we have opted to voluntarily stop accepting new patients pending completion of a new state survey, in order to avoid possible denial of payment for new admissions during the deficiency cure period, or simply to avoid straining staff and other resources while retraining staff, upgrading operating systems or making other operational improvements. If we elect to voluntarily close any operations in the future or to opt to stop accepting new patients pending completion of a state or federal survey, it could negatively impact our financial condition and results of operation.

Facilities with otherwise acceptable regulatory histories generally are given an opportunity to correct deficiencies and continue their participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs by a certain date, usually within nine months, although where denial of payment remedies are asserted, such interim remedies go into effect much sooner. Facilities with deficiencies that immediately jeopardize patient health and safety and those that are classified as poor performing facilities, however, are not generally given an opportunity to correct their deficiencies prior to the imposition of

remedies and other enforcement actions. Moreover, facilities with poor regulatory histories continue to be classified by CMS as poor performing facilities notwithstanding any intervening change in ownership, unless the new owner obtains a new Medicare provider agreement instead of assuming the facility's existing agreement. However, new owners (including us, historically) nearly always assume the existing Medicare provider agreement due to the difficulty and time delays generally associated with obtaining new Medicare certifications, especially in previously-certified locations with sub-par operating histories. Accordingly, facilities that have poor regulatory histories before we acquire them and that develop new deficiencies after we acquire them are more likely to have sanctions imposed upon them by CMS or state regulators. In addition, CMS has increased its focus on facilities with a history of serious quality of care problems through the special focus facility initiative. A facility's administrators and owners are notified when it is identified as a special focus facility. This information is also provided to the general public. The special focus facility designation is based in part on the facility's compliance history typically dating before our acquisition of the facility. Local state survey agencies recommend to CMS that facilities be placed on special focus status. A special focus facility receives heightened scrutiny and more frequent regulatory surveys. Failure to improve the quality of care can result in fines and termination from participation in Medicare and Medicaid. A facility "graduates" from the program once it demonstrates significant improvements in quality of care that are continued over time.

Table of Contents

We have received notices of potential sanctions and remedies based upon alleged regulatory deficiencies from time to time, and such sanctions have been imposed on some of our affiliated facilities. We have had several affiliated facilities placed on special focus facility status, due largely or entirely to their respective regulatory histories prior to our acquisition of the operating subsidiaries, and have successfully graduated five operating subsidiaries from the program to date. Other operating subsidiaries may be identified for such status in the future.

Annual caps that limit the amounts that can be paid for outpatient therapy services rendered to any Medicare beneficiary may reduce our future revenue and profitability or cause us to incur losses.

Some of our rehabilitation therapy revenue is paid by the Medicare Part B program under a fee schedule. Congress has established annual caps that limit the amounts that can be paid (including deductible and coinsurance amounts) for rehabilitation therapy services rendered to any Medicare beneficiary under Medicare Part B. The BBA requires a combined cap for physical therapy and speech-language pathology and a separate cap for occupational therapy.

The DRA directs CMS to create a process to allow exceptions to therapy caps for certain medically necessary services provided on or after January 1, 2006 for patients with certain conditions or multiple complexities whose therapy services are reimbursed under Medicare Part B. A significant portion of the patients in our affiliated skilled nursing facilities and patients served by our rehabilitation therapy programs whose therapy is reimbursed under Medicare Part B have qualified for the exceptions to these reimbursement caps. DRA added Section 1833(g)(5) of the Social Security Act and directed them to develop a process that allows exceptions for Medicare beneficiaries to therapy caps when continued therapy is deemed medically necessary.

The therapy cap exception has been reauthorized in a number of subsequent laws, including the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, which extended the cap and exception process through March 31, 2015. That statute implemented a two-tiered exception process, with an automatic exception process for patients who reach a \$1,940 threshold and a manual medical review exception process for patient at the \$3,700 threshold. Most recently, the therapy cap exception was extended through December 31, 2017 pursuant to MACRA.

The Multiple Procedure Payment Reduction (MPPR) continues at a 50% reduction applied to therapy procedure codes by reducing payments for practice expense of the second and subsequent therapies when therapies are provided on the same day. The implementation of MPPR includes 1) facilities that provide Medicare Part B speech-language pathology, occupational therapy, and physical therapy services and bill under the same provider number; and 2) providers in private practice, including speech-language pathologists, who perform and bill for multiple services in a single day.

The application of annual caps, or the discontinuation of exceptions to the annual caps, could have an adverse effect on our rehabilitation therapy revenue. The exceptions to these caps were extended through the remainder of calendar year 2015 and for all of calendar year 2016 and 2017.

Our hospice operating subsidiaries are subject to annual Medicare caps calculated by Medicare. If such caps were to be exceeded by any of our hospice providers, our business and consolidated financial condition, results of operations and cash flows could be materially adversely affected.

With respect to our hospice operating subsidiaries, overall payments made by Medicare to each provider number are subject to an inpatient cap amount and an overall payment cap, which are calculated and published by the Medicare fiscal intermediary on an annual basis covering the period from November 1 through October 31. If payments received by any one of our hospice provider numbers exceeds either of these caps, we are required to reimburse Medicare for payments received in excess of the caps, which could have a material adverse effect on our business and consolidated

financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. During the year ended December 31, 2015, we had one operating subsidiary that exceeded the annual Medicare cap by approximately \$0.3 million.

We are subject to extensive and complex federal and state government laws and regulations which could change at any time and increase our cost of doing business and subject us to enforcement actions.

We, along with other companies in the healthcare industry, are required to comply with extensive and complex laws and regulations at the federal, state and local government levels relating to, among other things:

• facility and professional licensure, certificates of need, permits and other government approvals;
• adequacy and quality of healthcare services;

Table of Contents

qualifications of healthcare and support personnel;
quality of medical equipment;
confidentiality, maintenance and security issues associated with medical records and claims processing;
relationships with physicians and other referral sources and recipients;
constraints on protective contractual provisions with patients and third-party payors;
operating policies and procedures;
certification of additional facilities by the Medicare program; and
payment for services.

The laws and regulations governing our operations, along with the terms of participation in various government programs, regulate how we do business, the services we offer, and our interactions with patients and other healthcare providers. These laws and regulations are subject to frequent change. We believe that such regulations may increase in the future and we cannot predict the ultimate content, timing or impact on us of any healthcare reform legislation. Changes in existing laws or regulations, or the enactment of new laws or regulations, could negatively impact our business. If we fail to comply with these applicable laws and regulations, we could suffer civil or criminal penalties and other detrimental consequences, including denial of reimbursement, imposition of fines, temporary suspension of admission of new patients, suspension or decertification from the Medicaid and Medicare programs, restrictions on our ability to acquire new facilities or expand or operate existing facilities, the loss of our licenses to operate and the loss of our ability to participate in federal and state reimbursement programs.

We are subject to federal and state laws, such as the federal False Claims Act, state false claims acts, the illegal remuneration provisions of the Social Security Act, the federal anti-kickback laws, state anti-kickback laws, and the federal “Stark” laws, that govern financial and other arrangements among healthcare providers, their owners, vendors and referral sources, and that are intended to prevent healthcare fraud and abuse. Among other things, these laws prohibit kickbacks, bribes and rebates, as well as other direct and indirect payments or fee-splitting arrangements that are designed to induce the referral of patients to a particular provider for medical products or services payable by any federal healthcare program, and prohibit presenting a false or misleading claim for payment under a federal or state program. They also prohibit some physician self-referrals. Possible sanctions for violation of any of these restrictions or prohibitions include loss of eligibility to participate in federal and state reimbursement programs and civil and criminal penalties. Changes in these laws could increase our cost of doing business. If we fail to comply, even inadvertently, with any of these requirements, we could be required to alter our operations, refund payments to the government, enter into a corporate integrity agreement, deferred prosecution or similar agreements with state or federal government agencies, and become subject to significant civil and criminal penalties. For example, in April 2013, we announced that we reached a tentative settlement with the Department of Justice (DOJ) regarding their investigation related to claims submitted to the Medicare program for rehabilitation services provided at skilled nursing facilities in Southern California. As part of the settlement, we entered into a Corporate Integrity Agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS. Failure to comply with the terms of the Corporate Integrity Agreement could result in substantial civil or criminal penalties and being excluded from government health care programs, which could adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

In May 2009, Congress passed the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act (FERA) of 2009 which made significant changes to the federal False Claims Act (FCA), expanding the types of activities subject to prosecution and whistleblower liability. Following changes by FERA, health care providers face significant penalties for known retention of government overpayments, even if no false claim was involved. Health care providers can now be liable for knowingly and improperly avoiding or decreasing an obligation to pay money or property to the government. This includes the retention of any government overpayment. The government can argue, therefore, that a FCA violation can occur without any affirmative fraudulent action or statement, as long as it is knowingly improper. The PPACA supplements FERA by imposing an affirmative obligation on health care providers to return an overpayment to CMS within 60 days of “identification” or the date any corresponding cost report is due, whichever is later. On August 3,

2015, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York held that the 60 day clock following “identification” of an overpayment begins to run when a provider is put on notice of a potential overpayment, rather than the moment when an overpayment is conclusively ascertained. Retention of any overpayment beyond this period may result in FCA liability. In addition, FERA extended protections against retaliation for whistleblowers, including protections not only for employees, but also contractors and agents. Thus, there is no need for an employment relationship in order to qualify for protection against retaliation for whistleblowing.

We are also required to comply with state and federal laws governing the transmission, privacy and security of health information. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) requires us to comply with certain standards for the use of individually identifiable health information within our company, and the disclosure and electronic transmission of

Table of Contents

such information to third parties, such as payors, business associates and patients. These include standards for common electronic healthcare transactions and information, such as claim submission, plan eligibility determination, payment information submission and the use of electronic signatures; unique identifiers for providers, employers and health plans; and the security and privacy of individually identifiable health information. In addition, some states have enacted comparable or, in some cases, more stringent privacy and security laws. If we fail to comply with these state and federal laws, we could be subject to criminal penalties and civil sanctions and be forced to modify our policies and procedures.

On January 25, 2013, HHS promulgated new HIPAA privacy, security, and enforcement regulations, which increase significantly the penalties and enforcement practices of the Department regarding HIPAA violations. In addition, any breach of individually identifiable health information can result in obligations under HIPAA and state laws to notify patients, federal and state agencies, and in some cases media outlets, regarding the breach incident. Breach incidents and violations of HIPAA or state privacy and security laws could subject us to significant penalties, and could have a significant impact on our business. The new HIPAA regulations are effective as of March 26, 2013, and compliance was required by September 23, 2013.

Our failure to obtain or renew required regulatory approvals or licenses or to comply with applicable regulatory requirements, the suspension or revocation of our licenses or our disqualification from participation in federal and state reimbursement programs, or the imposition of other harsh enforcement sanctions could increase our cost of doing business and expose us to potential sanctions. Furthermore, if we were to lose licenses or certifications for any of our affiliated facilities as a result of regulatory action or otherwise, we could be deemed to be in default under some of our agreements, including agreements governing outstanding indebtedness and lease obligations.

Increased civil and criminal enforcement efforts of government agencies against skilled nursing facilities could harm our business, and could preclude us from participating in federal healthcare programs.

Both federal and state government agencies have heightened and coordinated civil and criminal enforcement efforts as part of numerous ongoing investigations of healthcare companies and, in particular, skilled nursing facilities. The focus of these investigations includes, among other things:

- cost reporting and billing practices;
- quality of care;
- financial relationships with referral sources; and
- medical necessity of services provided.

If any of our affiliated facilities is decertified or loses its licenses, our revenue, financial condition or results of operations would be adversely affected. In addition, the report of such issues at any of our affiliated facilities could harm our reputation for quality care and lead to a reduction in the patient referrals of our operating subsidiaries and ultimately a reduction in occupancy at these facilities. Also, responding to enforcement efforts would divert material time, resources and attention from our management team and our staff, and could have a materially detrimental impact on our results of operations during and after any such investigation or proceedings, regardless of whether we prevail on the underlying claim.

Federal law provides that practitioners, providers and related persons may not participate in most federal healthcare programs, including the Medicaid and Medicare programs, if the individual or entity has been convicted of a criminal offense related to the delivery of a product or service under these programs or if the individual or entity has been

convicted under state or federal law of a criminal offense relating to neglect or abuse of patients in connection with the delivery of a healthcare product or service. Other individuals or entities may be, but are not required to be, excluded from such programs under certain circumstances, including, but not limited to, the following:

- medical necessity of services provided;
- conviction related to fraud;
- conviction relating to obstruction of an investigation;
- conviction relating to a controlled substance;
- licensure revocation or suspension;

Table of Contents

• exclusion or suspension from state or other federal healthcare programs;

• filing claims for excessive charges or unnecessary services or failure to furnish medically necessary services;

• ownership or control of an entity by an individual who has been excluded from the Medicaid or Medicare programs, against whom a civil monetary penalty related to the Medicaid or Medicare programs has been assessed or who has been convicted of a criminal offense under federal healthcare programs; and

• the transfer of ownership or control interest in an entity to an immediate family or household member in anticipation of, or following, a conviction, assessment or exclusion from the Medicare or Medicaid programs.

The OIG, among other priorities, is responsible for identifying and eliminating fraud, abuse and waste in certain federal healthcare programs. The OIG has implemented a nationwide program of audits, inspections and investigations and from time to time issues “fraud alerts” to segments of the healthcare industry on particular practices that are vulnerable to abuse. The fraud alerts inform healthcare providers of potentially abusive practices or transactions that are subject to criminal activity and reportable to the OIG. An increasing level of resources has been devoted to the investigation of allegations of fraud and abuse in the Medicaid and Medicare programs, and federal and state regulatory authorities are taking an increasingly strict view of the requirements imposed on healthcare providers by the Social Security Act and Medicaid and Medicare programs. Although we have created a corporate compliance program that we believe is consistent with the OIG guidelines, the OIG may modify its guidelines or interpret its guidelines in a manner inconsistent with our interpretation or the OIG may ultimately determine that our corporate compliance program is insufficient.

In some circumstances, if one facility is convicted of abusive or fraudulent behavior, then other facilities under common control or ownership may be decertified from participating in Medicaid or Medicare programs. Federal regulations prohibit any corporation or facility from participating in federal contracts if it or its principals have been barred, suspended or declared ineligible from participating in federal contracts. In addition, some state regulations provide that all facilities under common control or ownership licensed within a state may be de-licensed if one or more of the facilities are de-licensed. If any of our operating subsidiaries were decertified or excluded from participating in Medicaid or Medicare programs, our revenue would be adversely affected.

The Office of the Inspector General or other regulatory authorities may choose to more closely scrutinize billing practices in areas where we operate or propose to expand, which could result in an increase in regulatory monitoring and oversight, decreased reimbursement rates, or otherwise adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In September 2015, the OIG released a report entitled “The Medicare Payment System for Skilled Nursing Facilities Needs to Be Reevaluated.” Among other things, the report used Medicare cost reports to compare Medicare payments to skilled nursing facilities’ costs for therapy over a ten year period, and found that Medicare payments for therapy greatly exceeded skilled nursing facilities’ costs for therapy. The OIG recommended, and CMS concurred with such recommendations, that CMS evaluate the extent to which Medicare payment rates for therapy should be reduced, change the method for paying for therapy, adjust Medicare payments to eliminate any increases that are unrelated to beneficiary characteristics, and strengthen oversight of Skilled Nursing Facility billing.

In January 2015, the OIG released a report entitled “Medicare Hospices Have Financial Incentives to Provide Care in Assisted Living Facilities.” The report analyzed all Medicare hospices claims from 2007 through 2012, and raised concerns about the financial incentives created by the current payment system and the potential for hospices-especially for-profit hospices-to target beneficiaries in assisted living facilities because they may offer the

hospices the greatest financial gain. Accordingly, the report recommended that CMS reform payments to reduce the incentive for hospices to target beneficiaries with certain diagnoses and those likely to have long stays, target certain hospices for review, develop and adopt claims-based measures of quality, make hospice data publicly available for the beneficiaries, and provide additional information to hospices to educate them about how they compare to their peers. CMS concurred with all five recommendations.

In August 2012, the OIG released a report entitled “Inappropriate and Questionable Billing for Medicare Home Health Agencies.” The report analyzed data from home health, inpatient hospital, and skilled nursing facilities claims from 2010 to identify inappropriate home health payments. The report found that in 2010, Medicare made overpayments largely in connection with three specific errors: overlapping with claims for inpatient hospital stays, overlapping with claims for skilled nursing facility stays, or billing for services on dates after beneficiaries’ deaths. The report also concluded that home health agencies with questionable billing were located mostly in Texas, Florida, California, and Michigan. The report recommended that CMS implement claims processing edits or improve existing edits to prevent inappropriate payments for the three specific errors

Table of Contents

referenced above, increase monitoring of billing for home health services, enforce and consider lowering the ten percent cap on the total outlier payments a home health agency may receive annually, consider imposing a temporary moratorium on new home health agency enrollments in Florida and Texas, and take appropriate action regarding the inappropriate payments identified and home health agencies with questionable billing. CMS concurred with all five recommendations. Moratoria were subsequently put in place, and effective July 29, 2015, moratoria on new home health agencies and home health agency sub-units were extended for an additional six months in various counties in Florida, Michigan, Texas and Illinois. Additionally, following recommendations made by the OIG in an April 2014 report entitled "Limited Compliance with Medicare's Home Health Face-to-Face Documentation Requirements," CMS committed to implement a plan for oversight of home health agencies through Supplemental Medical Review Contractor audits of every home health agency in the country.

In December 2010, the OIG released a report entitled "Questionable Billing by Skilled Nursing Facilities." The report examined the billing practices of skilled nursing facilities based on Medicare Part A claims from 2006 to 2008 and found, among other things, that for-profit skilled nursing facilities were more likely to bill for higher paying therapy RUGs, particularly in the ultra high therapy categories, than government and not-for-profit operators. It also found that for-profit skilled nursing facilities showed a higher incidence of patients using RUGs with higher activities of daily living (ADL) scores, and had a "long" average length of stay among Part A beneficiaries, compared to their government and not-for-profit counterparts. The OIG recommended that CMS vigilantly monitor overall payments to skilled nursing facilities, adjust RUG rates annually, change the method for determining how much therapy is needed to ensure appropriate payments and conduct additional reviews for skilled nursing operators that exceed certain thresholds for higher paying therapy RUGs. CMS concurred with and agreed to take action on three of the four recommendations, declining only to change the methodology for assessing a patient's therapy needs. The OIG issued a separate memorandum to CMS listing 384 specific facilities that the OIG had identified as being in the top one percent for use of ultra high therapy, RUGs with high ADL scores, or "long" average lengths of stay, and CMS agreed to forward the list to the appropriate fiscal intermediaries or other contractors for follow up. Although we believe our therapy assessment and billing practices are consistent with applicable law and CMS requirements, we cannot predict the extent to which the OIG's recommendations to CMS will be implemented and, what effect, if any, such proposals would have on us. Two of our affiliated facilities have been listed on the report. Our business model, like those of some other for-profit operators, is based in part on seeking out higher-acuity patients whom we believe are generally more profitable, and over time our overall patient mix has consistently shifted to higher-acuity and higher-RUGs patients in most facilities we operate. We also use specialized care-delivery software that assists our caregivers in more accurately capturing and recording ADL services in order to, among other things, increase reimbursement to levels appropriate for the care actually delivered. These efforts may place us under greater scrutiny with the OIG, CMS, our fiscal intermediaries, recovery audit contractors and others, as well as other government agencies, unions, advocacy groups and others who seek to pursue their own mandates and agendas. In its fiscal year 2014 work plan, OIG specifically stated that it will continue to study and report on questionable Part A and Part B billing practices amongst skilled nursing facilities.

In addition, in its 2016 Work Plan, the OIG indicated that it will review compliance with various aspects of the skilled nursing facility prospective payment system, including the documentation requirement in support of the claims paid by Medicare. According to the 2016 Work Plan, prior OIG reviews found that Medicare payments for therapy greatly exceeded skilled nursing facilities' cost for therapy, and the OIG found that skilled nursing facilities have increasingly billed for the highest level of therapy even though key beneficiary characteristics remained largely the same. The OIG's 2016 Work Plan provides that the OIG will review Medicare payments for portable x-ray equipment and services to determine whether payments were correct and were supported by documentation.

Efforts by officials and others to make or advocate for any increase in regulatory monitoring and oversight, adversely change RUG rates, reduce payment rates, revise methodologies for assessing and treating patients, conduct more frequent or intense reviews of our treatment and billing practices, or implement moratoria in areas where we operate

or propose to expand, could reduce our reimbursement, increase our costs of doing business and otherwise adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

State efforts to regulate or deregulate the healthcare services industry or the construction or expansion of healthcare facilities could impair our ability to expand our operations, or could result in increased competition.

Some states require healthcare providers, including skilled nursing facilities, to obtain prior approval, known as a certificate of need, for:

- the purchase, construction or expansion of healthcare facilities;

- capital expenditures exceeding a prescribed amount; or

- changes in services or bed capacity.

Table of Contents