HCA Holdings, Inc.
Form 10-K
February 26, 2015
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

Form 10-K

(Mark One)

x **ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**
For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2014

Or

¨ **TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**
For the transition period from to

Commission File Number 1-11239

HCA Holdings, Inc.

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in its Charter)

Delaware **(State or Other Jurisdiction of** **Incorporation or Organization)**	**27-3865930** **(I.R.S. Employer** **Identification No.)**
One Park Plaza **Nashville, Tennessee** **(Address of Principal Executive Offices)**	**37203** **(Zip Code)**

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: (615) 344-9551

Securities Registered Pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of Each Class	**Name of Each Exchange on Which Registered**
Common Stock, $0.01 Par Value	New York Stock Exchange

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 x 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 x

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 x 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 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the Registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes x No ¨

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§ 229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of 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. x

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer and smaller reporting company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer	x	Accelerated filer	¨
Non-accelerated filer	¨ (Do not check if a smaller reporting company)	Smaller reporting company	¨

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes ¨ No x

As of January 31, 2015, there were 420,576,500 outstanding shares of the Registrant s common stock. As of June 30, 2014, the aggregate market value of the common stock held by nonaffiliates was approximately $18.502 billion. For purposes of the foregoing calculation only, Hercules Holding II, LLC and the Registrant s directors and executive officers have been deemed to be affiliates.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of the Registrant s definitive proxy materials for its 2015 Annual Meeting of Stockholders are incorporated by reference into Part III hereof.

Table of Contents

INDEX

		Page Reference
Part I		
Item 1.	Business	3
Item 1A.	Risk Factors	36
Item 1B.	Unresolved Staff Comments	51
Item 2.	Properties	51
Item 3.	Legal Proceedings	52
Item 4.	Mine Safety Disclosures	54
Part II		
Item 5.	Market for Registrant s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	55
Item 6.	Selected Financial Data	57
Item 7.	Management s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations	59
Item 7A.	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk	83
Item 8.	Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	83
Item 9.	Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	83
Item 9A.	Controls and Procedures	83
Item 9B.	Other Information	85
Part III		
Item 10.	Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	85
Item 11.	Executive Compensation	85
Item 12.	Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	85
Item 13.	Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence	86
Item 14.	Principal Accountant Fees and Services	86
Part IV		
Item 15.	Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules	87
	Signatures	99

Table of Contents

PART I

Item 1. *Business*

General

HCA Holdings, Inc. is one of the leading health care services companies in the United States. At December 31, 2014, we operated 166 hospitals, comprised of 162 general, acute care hospitals; three psychiatric hospitals; and one rehabilitation hospital. In addition, we operated 113 freestanding surgery centers. Our facilities are located in 20 states and England.

The terms Company, HCA, we, our or us, as used herein and unless otherwise stated or indicated by context, refer to HCA Holdings, Inc. ar affiliates. The term affiliates means direct and indirect subsidiaries of HCA Holdings, Inc. and partnerships and joint ventures in which such subsidiaries are partners. The terms facilities or hospitals refer to entities owned and operated by affiliates of HCA, and the term employees refers to employees of affiliates of HCA.

Our primary objective is to provide a comprehensive array of quality health care services in the most cost-effective manner possible. Our general, acute care hospitals typically provide a full range of services to accommodate such medical specialties as internal medicine, general surgery, cardiology, oncology, neurosurgery, orthopedics and obstetrics, as well as diagnostic and emergency services. Outpatient and ancillary health care services are provided by our general, acute care hospitals, freestanding surgery centers, freestanding emergency care facilities, diagnostic centers and rehabilitation facilities. Our psychiatric hospitals provide a full range of mental health care services through inpatient, partial hospitalization and outpatient settings.

Our common stock is traded on the New York Stock Exchange (symbol HCA). The Company was incorporated in Nevada in January 1990 and reincorporated in Delaware in September 1993. Our principal executive offices are located at One Park Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee 37203, and our telephone number is (615) 344-9551.

Available Information

We file certain reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the SEC), including annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q and current reports on Form 8-K. The public may read and copy any materials we file with the SEC at the SEC s Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20549. The public may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. We are an electronic filer, and the SEC maintains an Internet site at http://www.sec.gov that contains the reports, proxy and information statements and other information we file electronically. Our website address is www.hcahealthcare.com. Please note that our website address is provided as an inactive textual reference only. We make available free of charge, through our website, our annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K and all amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, as soon as reasonably practicable after such material is electronically filed with or furnished to the SEC. The information provided on our website is not part of this report, and is therefore not incorporated by reference unless such information is specifically referenced elsewhere in this report.

Our Code of Conduct is available free of charge upon request to our Corporate Secretary, HCA Holdings, Inc., One Park Plaza, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Business Strategy

We are committed to providing the communities we serve with high quality, cost-effective health care while growing our business, increasing our profitability and creating long-term value for our stockholders. To achieve these objectives, we align our efforts around the following growth agenda:

- grow our presence in existing markets;

Table of Contents

- achieve industry-leading performance in clinical and satisfaction measures;
- recruit and employ physicians to meet the need for high quality health services;
- continue to leverage our scale and market positions to enhance profitability; and
- selectively pursue a disciplined development strategy.

Health Care Facilities

We currently own, manage or operate hospitals, freestanding surgery centers, diagnostic and imaging centers, radiation and oncology therapy centers, comprehensive rehabilitation and physical therapy centers and various other facilities.

At December 31, 2014, we owned and operated 162 general, acute care hospitals with 42,860 licensed beds. Most of our general, acute care hospitals provide medical and surgical services, including inpatient care, intensive care, cardiac care, diagnostic services and emergency services. The general, acute care hospitals also provide outpatient services such as outpatient surgery, laboratory, radiology, respiratory therapy, cardiology and physical therapy. Each hospital has an organized medical staff and a local board of trustees or governing board, made up of members of the local community.

Our hospitals do not typically engage in extensive medical research and education programs. However, some of our hospitals are affiliated with medical schools and may participate in the clinical rotation of medical interns and residents and other education programs.

At December 31, 2014, we operated three psychiatric hospitals with 396 licensed beds. Our psychiatric hospitals provide therapeutic programs including child, adolescent and adult psychiatric care, adult and adolescent alcohol and drug abuse treatment and counseling.

We also operate outpatient health care facilities, which include freestanding ambulatory surgery centers (ASCs), freestanding emergency care facilities, diagnostic and imaging centers, comprehensive outpatient rehabilitation and physical therapy centers, outpatient radiation and oncology therapy centers and various other facilities. These outpatient services are an integral component of our strategy to develop comprehensive health care networks in select communities. Most of our ASCs are operated through partnerships or limited liability companies, with majority ownership of each partnership or limited liability company typically held by a general partner or member that is an affiliate of HCA.

Certain of our affiliates provide a variety of management services to our health care facilities, including patient safety programs, ethics and compliance programs, national supply contracts, equipment purchasing and leasing contracts, accounting, financial and clinical systems, governmental reimbursement assistance, construction planning and coordination, information technology systems and solutions, legal counsel, human resources services and internal audit services.

Sources of Revenue

Hospital revenues depend upon inpatient occupancy levels, the medical and ancillary services ordered by physicians and provided to patients, the volume of outpatient procedures and the charges or payment rates for such services. Charges and reimbursement rates for inpatient services vary significantly depending on the type of payer, the type of service (e.g., medical/surgical, intensive care or psychiatric) and the geographic location of the hospital. Inpatient occupancy levels fluctuate for various reasons, many of which are beyond our control.

Table of Contents

We receive payments for patient services from the federal government under the Medicare program, state governments under their respective Medicaid or similar programs, managed care plans (includes plans offered through the health insurance exchanges, beginning in 2014), private insurers and directly from patients. Our revenues from third-party payers and the uninsured for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012 are summarized in the following table (dollars in millions):

	Years Ended December 31,					
	2014	**Ratio**	**2013**	**Ratio**	**2012**	**Ratio**
Medicare	**$ 8,354**	**22.6%**	$ 7,951	23.3%	$ 8,292	25.1%
Managed Medicare	**3,614**	**9.8**	3,279	9.6	2,954	8.9
Medicaid	**1,848**	**5.0**	1,480	4.3	1,464	4.4
Managed Medicaid	**1,923**	**5.2**	1,570	4.6	1,504	4.6
Managed care and other insurers	**20,066**	**54.4**	18,654	54.6	17,998	54.5
International (managed care and other insurers)	**1,311**	**3.6**	1,175	3.4	1,060	3.2
	37,116	**100.6**	34,109	99.8	33,272	100.7
Uninsured	**1,494**	**4.0**	2,677	7.8	2,580	7.8
Other	**1,477**	**4.0**	1,254	3.7	931	2.8
Revenues before provision for doubtful accounts	**40,087**	**108.6**	38,040	111.3	36,783	111.3
Provision for doubtful accounts	**(3,169)**	**(8.6)**	(3,858)	(11.3)	(3,770)	(11.3)
Revenues	**$ 36,918**	**100.0%**	$ 34,182	100.0%	$ 33,013	100.0%

Medicare is a federal program that provides certain hospital and medical insurance benefits to persons age 65 and over, some disabled persons, persons with end-stage renal disease and persons with Lou Gehrig s Disease. Medicaid is a federal-state program, administered by the states, which provides hospital and medical benefits to qualifying individuals who are unable to afford health care. All of our general, acute care hospitals located in the United States are eligible to participate in Medicare and Medicaid programs. Amounts received under Medicare and Medicaid programs are generally significantly less than established hospital gross charges for the services provided.

Our hospitals generally offer discounts from established charges to certain group purchasers of health care services, including private insurance companies, employers, health maintenance organizations (HMOs), preferred provider organizations (PPOs) and other managed care plans, including plans offered through the American Health Benefit Exchanges (Exchanges). These discount programs generally limit our ability to increase revenues in response to increasing costs. See Item 1, Business Competition. Patients are generally not responsible for the total difference between established hospital gross charges and amounts reimbursed for such services under Medicare, Medicaid, HMOs, PPOs and other managed care plans, but are responsible to the extent of any exclusions, deductibles or coinsurance features of their coverage. The amount of such exclusions, deductibles and coinsurance continues to increase. Collection of amounts due from individuals is typically more difficult than from governmental or third-party payers. We provide discounts to uninsured patients who do not qualify for Medicaid or charity care under our charity care policy. In implementing the uninsured discount policy, we attempt to qualify uninsured patients for Medicaid, other federal or state assistance or charity care under our charity care policy. If an uninsured patient does not qualify for these programs, the uninsured discount is applied.

Medicare

In addition to the reimbursement reductions and adjustments discussed below, the Budget Control Act of 2011 (the BCA) requires automatic spending reductions to reduce the federal deficit, including Medicare spending reductions of up to 2% per fiscal year, with a uniform percentage reduction across all Medicare programs. These automatic spending reductions began on March 1, 2013, with CMS imposing a 2% reduction on Medicare claims beginning on April 1, 2013. These reductions have been extended through 2024.

Table of Contents

Inpatient Acute Care

Under the Medicare program, we receive reimbursement under a prospective payment system (PPS) for general, acute care hospital inpatient services. Under the hospital inpatient PPS, fixed payment amounts per inpatient discharge are established based on the patient s assigned Medicare severity diagnosis-related group (MS-DRG). MS-DRGs classify treatments for illnesses according to the estimated intensity of hospital resources necessary to furnish care for each principal diagnosis. MS-DRG weights represent the average resources for a given MS-DRG relative to the average resources for all MS-DRGs. MS-DRG payments are adjusted for area wage differentials. Hospitals, other than those defined as new, receive PPS reimbursement for inpatient capital costs based on MS-DRG weights multiplied by a geographically adjusted federal rate. When the cost to treat certain patients falls well outside the normal distribution, providers typically receive additional outlier payments.

MS-DRG rates are updated, and MS-DRG weights are recalibrated, using cost-relative weights each federal fiscal year (which begins October 1). The index used to update the MS-DRG rates (the market basket) gives consideration to the inflation experienced by hospitals and entities outside the health care industry in purchasing goods and services. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (collectively, the Health Reform Law), provides for annual decreases to the market basket, including the following reductions for each of the following federal fiscal years: 0.2% in 2015 and 2016 and 0.75% in 2017, 2018 and 2019. For each federal fiscal year, the Health Reform Law provides for the annual market basket update to be further reduced by a productivity adjustment based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. At the time of enactment, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) estimated that the combined market basket and productivity adjustments would reduce Medicare payments under the inpatient PPS by $112.6 billion from 2010 to 2019. The American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 requires a negative documentation and coding adjustment for four years beginning in federal fiscal year 2014. It is estimated that this documentation and coding adjustment will reduce Medicare inpatient PPS payments by $10.5 billion. A decrease in payment rates or an increase in rates that is below the increase in our costs may adversely affect our results of operations.

For federal fiscal year 2014, CMS increased the MS-DRG rate by 0.7%. This increase reflected a 2.5% market basket increase, the 0.3% reduction required by the Health Reform Law, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment, a negative 0.8% prospective documentation and coding adjustment and a negative 0.2% adjustment to offset projected spending increases associated with new admission and medical review criteria for inpatient services commonly known as the two midnight rule. Under the rule, Medicare beneficiaries are only to be admitted as inpatients when there is a reasonable expectation that the hospital care is medically necessary and will be required across two midnights, absent unusual circumstances. Compliance with the two midnight rule was required for admissions beginning October 1, 2013 and will become subject to Recovery Audit Contractor (RAC) audits for admissions on or after April 1, 2015. For federal fiscal year 2015, CMS issued a final rule that results in a net increase of 1.4%. This increase reflects a 2.9% market basket increase, the 0.2% reduction required by the Health Reform Law, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment, and a negative 0.8% prospective documentation and coding adjustment.

CMS has implemented or is implementing a number of programs and requirements intended to transform Medicare from a passive payer to an active purchaser of quality goods and services. For example, hospitals receive a 2% reduction to their market basket updates if they fail to submit data for patient care quality indicators to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, hospitals that do not participate will lose an additional one-quarter of the percentage increase in their payment updates. All of our hospitals paid under the Medicare inpatient PPS are participating in the quality initiative by submitting the requested quality data. While we will endeavor to comply with all data submission requirements as additional requirements continue to be added, our submissions may not be deemed timely or sufficient to entitle all of our hospitals to the full market basket adjustment.

Further, Medicare does not allow an inpatient hospital discharge to be assigned to a higher paying MS-DRG if a selected hospital acquired condition (HAC) was not present on admission, and it is the only condition

resulting in the assignment of the higher paying MS-DRG. In this situation, the case is paid as though the secondary diagnosis was not present. There are currently 11 categories of conditions on the list of HACs. In addition, CMS has established three National Coverage Determinations that prohibit Medicare reimbursement for erroneous surgical procedures performed on an inpatient or outpatient basis. The Health Reform Law provides for reduced payments based on a hospital s HAC rates. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, the 25% of hospitals with the worst risk-adjusted HAC rates in the designated performance period will receive a 1% reduction in their inpatient PPS Medicare payments.

The Health Reform Law also provides for reduced payments to hospitals based on readmission rates. Each federal fiscal year, inpatient payments are reduced if a hospital experiences excess readmissions within the 30-day time period from the date of discharge for conditions designated by CMS. For federal fiscal year 2015, these conditions are heart attack, heart failure, pneumonia, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, total hip arthroplasty and total knee arthroplasty. Hospitals with what CMS defines as excess readmissions for these conditions receive reduced payments for all inpatient discharges, not just discharges relating to the conditions subject to the excess readmission standard. The amount by which payments are reduced is determined by comparing the hospital s performance for each condition using three years of discharge data to a risk-adjusted national average, subject to a cap established by CMS. The reduction in payments to hospitals with excess readmissions was capped at 2% for federal fiscal year 2014, but increases to 3% for federal fiscal year 2015 and thereafter. Each hospital s performance is publicly reported by CMS.

The Health Reform Law additionally establishes a hospital value-based purchasing program to further link payments to quality and efficiency. For each federal fiscal year, CMS will reduce the inpatient PPS payment amount for all discharges by the following: 1.5% for 2015; 1.75% for 2016; and 2% for 2017 and subsequent years. The total amount collected from these reductions is pooled and used to fund payments to reward hospitals that meet certain quality performance standards established by CMS. CMS scores each hospital based on achievement (relative to other hospitals) and improvement ranges (relative to the hospital s own past performance) for each applicable performance standard. Because the Health Reform Law provides that the pool will be fully distributed, hospitals that meet or exceed the quality performance standards receive greater reimbursement under the value-based purchasing program than they would have otherwise. Hospitals that do not achieve the necessary quality performance receive reduced Medicare inpatient hospital payments. Hospitals are scored on a number of individual measures that are categorized into four domains: Patient Experience of Care, Process of Care, Outcomes and Efficiency. CMS estimates that it will distribute $1.4 billion in federal fiscal year 2015 to hospitals under the value-based purchasing program.

Historically, the Medicare program has set aside 5.10% of Medicare inpatient payments to pay for outlier cases. For federal fiscal year 2014, CMS established an outlier threshold of $21,748, and for federal fiscal year 2015, CMS increased the outlier threshold to $24,758. We do not anticipate that the increase to the outlier threshold for federal fiscal year 2015 will have a material impact on our results of operations.

Outpatient

CMS reimburses hospital outpatient services (and certain Medicare Part B services furnished to hospital inpatients who have no Part A coverage) on a PPS basis. CMS uses fee schedules to pay for physical, occupational and speech therapies, durable medical equipment, clinical diagnostic laboratory services, nonimplantable orthotics and prosthetics, freestanding surgery center services and services provided by independent diagnostic testing facilities.

Hospital outpatient services paid under PPS are classified into groups called ambulatory payment classifications (APCs). Services for each APC are similar clinically and in terms of the resources they require. A payment rate is established for each APC. Depending on the services provided, a hospital may be paid for more than one APC for a patient visit. The APC payment rates are updated for each calendar year. The Health Reform Law provides for reductions to the market basket update, including the following reductions for each of the following calendar years: 0.2% in 2015 and 2016 and 0.75% in 2017, 2018 and 2019. For each calendar year,

the Health Reform Law provides for the annual market basket update to be further reduced by a productivity adjustment based on the BLS 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. At the time of enactment, CMS estimated that the combined market basket and productivity adjustments would reduce Medicare payments under the outpatient PPS by $26.3 billion from 2010 to 2019. For calendar year 2014, CMS increased APC payment rates by 1.7%, which represented the full market basket update of 2.5%, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment and the negative 0.3% adjustment required by the Health Reform Law. For calendar year 2015, CMS has issued a final rule that increases the APC payment rate by 2.2%, which includes the full market basket update of 2.9%, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment and the negative 0.2% adjustment required by the Health Reform Law. CMS requires hospitals to submit quality data relating to outpatient care to avoid receiving a 2% reduction to the market basket update under the outpatient PPS.

Rehabilitation

CMS reimburses inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs) on a PPS basis. Under the IRF PPS, patients are classified into case mix groups based upon impairment, age, comorbidities (additional diseases or disorders from which the patient suffers) and functional capability. IRFs are paid a predetermined amount per discharge that reflects the patient s case mix group and is adjusted for area wage levels, low-income patients, rural areas and high-cost outliers. The Health Reform Law also provides for reductions to the market basket update, including the following reductions for each of the following federal fiscal years: 0.2% in 2015 and 2016 and 0.75% in 2017, 2018 and 2019. For each federal fiscal year, the Health Reform Law provides for the annual market basket update to be further reduced by a productivity adjustment based on the BLS 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. At the time of enactment, CMS estimated that the combined market basket and productivity adjustments would reduce Medicare payments under the IRF PPS by $5.7 billion from 2010 to 2019. For federal fiscal year 2014, CMS updated inpatient rehabilitation rates by 1.8%, which reflected a 2.6% market basket increase, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment and a 0.3% reduction required by the Health Reform Law. For federal fiscal year 2015, CMS has issued a final rule updating inpatient rehabilitation rates by 2.2%, which reflects a 2.9% market basket increase, a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment and a 0.2% reduction required by the Health Reform Law. In addition, IRFs are required to report quality measures to CMS or they will receive a 2% reduction to the market basket update.

In order to qualify for classification as an IRF, at least 60% of a facility s inpatients during the most recent 12-month CMS-defined review period must have required intensive rehabilitation services for one or more of 13 specified conditions. IRFs must also meet additional coverage criteria, including patient selection and care requirements relating to pre-admission screenings, post-admission evaluations, ongoing coordination of care and involvement of rehabilitation physicians. A facility that fails to meet the 60% threshold, or other criteria to be classified as an IRF, will be paid under the acute care hospital inpatient or outpatient PPS, which generally provide for lower payment amounts. As of December 31, 2014, we had one rehabilitation hospital and 50 hospital rehabilitation units.

Psychiatric

Inpatient hospital services furnished in psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric units of general, acute care hospitals and critical access hospitals are reimbursed under a prospective payment system (the IPF PPS), which is based upon a per diem payment, with adjustments to account for certain patient and facility characteristics. The IPF PPS contains an outlier policy for extraordinarily costly cases and an adjustment to a facility s base payment if it maintains a full-service emergency department. CMS has established the IPF PPS payment rate in a manner intended to be budget neutral. The rehabilitation, psychiatric and long-term care market basket update is used to update the IPF PPS. The Health Reform Law also provides for reductions to the market basket update, including the following reductions for the following federal fiscal years: 0.3% in 2015, 0.2% in 2016 and 2017 and 0.75% in 2018, 2019 and 2020. For each payment year, the Health Reform Law provides for the annual market basket update to be further reduced by a productivity adjustment based on the BLS 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. At the time of enactment, CMS estimated that the

combined market basket and productivity adjustments would reduce Medicare payments under the IPF PPS by $4.3 billion from 2010 to 2019. For federal fiscal year 2014, CMS increased inpatient psychiatric payment rates by 2%, including a market basket increase of 2.6%, reduced by a 0.5% productivity adjustment and a reduction of 0.1% as required by the Health Reform Law. For federal fiscal year 2015, CMS has increased inpatient psychiatric payment rates by 2.1%, including a market basket increase of 2.9%, reduced by a 0.5% productivity adjustment and 0.3% as required by the Health Reform Law. Inpatient psychiatric facilities are required to report quality measures to CMS or will receive a 2% reduction to the market basket update. As of December 31, 2014, we had three psychiatric hospitals and 49 hospital psychiatric units.

Ambulatory Surgery Centers

CMS reimburses ASCs using a predetermined fee schedule. Reimbursements for ASC overhead costs are limited to no more than the overhead costs paid to hospital outpatient departments under the Medicare hospital outpatient PPS for the same procedure. If CMS determines that a procedure is commonly performed in a physician s office, the ASC reimbursement for that procedure is limited to the reimbursement allowable under the Medicare Part B Physician Fee Schedule, with limited exceptions. All surgical procedures, other than those that pose a significant safety risk or generally require an overnight stay, are payable as ASC procedures. From time to time, CMS considers expanding the services that may be performed in ASCs, which may result in more Medicare procedures that historically have been performed in hospitals being moved to ASCs, reducing surgical volume in our hospitals. Also, more Medicare procedures that historically have been performed in ASCs may be moved to physicians offices. Commercial third-party payers may adopt similar policies. For each federal fiscal year, the Health Reform Law provides for an annual reduction to the ASC payment system by a productivity adjustment based on the BLS 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. For calendar year 2015, CMS has issued a final rule that provides for a 1.4% annual update to ASC payments, which includes the consumer price index update of 1.9% and a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment. In addition, CMS has also established a quality reporting program for ASCs under which ASCs that fail to report on specified quality measures will receive a 2% reduction in reimbursement.

Physician Services

Physician services are reimbursed under the physician fee schedule (PFS) system, under which CMS has assigned a national relative value unit (RVU) to most medical procedures and services that reflects the various resources required by a physician to provide the services relative to all other services. Each RVU is calculated based on a combination of work required in terms of time and intensity of effort for the service, practice expense (overhead) attributable to the service and malpractice insurance expense attributable to the service. These three elements are each modified by a geographic adjustment factor to account for local practice costs and are then aggregated. The aggregated amount is multiplied by a conversion factor that accounts for inflation and targeted growth in Medicare expenditures (as calculated by the sustainable growth rate (SGR)) to arrive at the payment amount for each service. While RVUs for various services may change in a given year, any alterations are required by statute to be virtually budget neutral, such that total payments made under the PFS may not differ by more than $20 million from what payments would have been if adjustments were not made.

The PFS rates are adjusted each year, and reductions in both current and future payments are anticipated. The SGR formula, if implemented as mandated by statute, would result in significant reductions to payments under the PFS. Since 2003, the U.S. Congress has passed multiple legislative acts delaying application of the SGR to the PFS. Barring further delay or repeal of the SGR, payments under the PFS are scheduled to be cut by approximately 24% effective April 1, 2015.

Other

Under PPS, the payment rates are adjusted for the area differences in wage levels by a factor (wage index) reflecting the relative wage level in the geographic area compared to the national average wage level and taking into account occupational mix. The redistributive impact of wage index changes, while slightly negative in the

Table of Contents

aggregate, is not anticipated to have a material financial impact for 2015. Based on the Health Reform Law s mandate, HHS submitted recommendations on reform to the Medicare wage index system, but Congress has not yet acted on the proposed reforms.

Medicare reimburses hospitals for a portion of bad debts resulting from deductible and coinsurance amounts that are uncollectable from Medicare beneficiaries. The Middle Class Tax Relief and Jobs Creation Act of 2012 (the Jobs Creation Act) reduced the percentage of bad debt amounts that Medicare reimburses from 70% to 65%. These reductions were intended to offset, in part, the impact of the legislative delay of the SGR reductions in physician compensation under the PFS. The U.S. Congress has not permanently addressed the SGR reductions, and any further delays or revisions to the SGR may be offset by additional reductions in Medicare payments to other types of providers.

As required by the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA), CMS has implemented contractor reform whereby CMS competitively bids the Medicare fiscal intermediary and Medicare carrier functions to 15 Medicare Administrative Contractors (MACs), which are geographically assigned and service both Part A and Part B providers within a given jurisdiction. CMS awarded initial contracts to all 15 MAC jurisdictions, but CMS is currently engaged in a consolidation strategy to move from 15 MAC jurisdictions to 10. While chain providers had the option of having all hospitals use one home office MAC, we chose to use the MACs assigned to the geographic areas in which our hospitals are located. CMS periodically re-solicits bids, and the MAC servicing a geographic area can change as a result of the bid competition. MAC transition periods can impact claims processing functions and the resulting cash flow.

Under the RAC program, CMS contracts with RACs on a contingency basis to conduct post-payment reviews to detect and correct improper payments in the fee-for-service Medicare program. CMS has implemented the RAC program on a permanent, nationwide basis as required by statute. The compensation for the RACs is based on their review of claims submitted to Medicare for billing compliance, including correct coding and medical necessity, and the amount of overpayments and underpayments they identify.

Historically, RACs have conducted their reviews on a post-payment basis. However, CMS has also established the Recovery Audit Prepayment Review (RAPR) demonstration, which allows RACs to perform prepayment reviews. Under the RAPR demonstration, RACs conduct prepayment reviews on certain types of claims that historically result in high rates of improper payments, beginning with claims for short stay inpatient hospital services. These reviews focus on seven states (Florida, California, Michigan, Texas, New York, Louisiana and Illinois) with high populations of fraud and error-prone providers and four states (Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina, and Missouri) with high claims volumes of short inpatient hospital stays. The RAPR demonstration began in September 2012 and runs for a three year period.

We have established policies and procedures to respond to the RAC requests and payment denials. Payment recoveries resulting from RAC reviews and denials are appealable through administrative and judicial processes, and we pursue reversal of adverse determinations at appropriate appeal levels. We are incurring additional costs related to responding to RAC requests and denials, including costs associated with responding to requests for records and pursuing the reversal of payment denials and losses associated with overpayments that are not reversed upon appeal. Amounts that have not been reversed upon appeal have not been significant, but the number and amount of claims subject to RAC review has been steadily increasing, and we expect this trend to continue. Further, HHS has suspended the assignment of new Medicare appeals to Administrative Law Judges for at least two years beginning July 16, 2013, so that HHS may work through a backlog of appeals. Thus, we will experience a significant delay in appealing any RAC payment denials that occur during the suspension period. HHS recently gave hospitals the option to settle disputed inpatient status claims, offering to pay 68% of the net allowable amount in exchange for a hospital s withdrawal of all medical claims appealed. We accepted the settlement offer and executed an administrative agreement with HHS. Depending upon the growth of RAC programs and our success in appealing claims in future periods, our cash flows and results of operations could be negatively impacted.

Managed Medicare

Under the Managed Medicare program, the federal government contracts with private health plans to provide members with Medicare Part A, Part B and Part D benefits. Managed Medicare plans can be structured as HMOs, PPOs or private fee-for-service plans. The Medicare program allows beneficiaries to choose enrollment in certain managed Medicare plans. MMA increased reimbursement to managed Medicare plans and expanded Medicare beneficiaries health care options. The Health Reform Law reduces, on a gradual basis through 2017, premium payments to managed Medicare plans such that CMS managed care per capita premium payments are, on average, equal to traditional Medicare. In addition, the Health Reform Law requires managed Medicare plans to keep annual administrative costs lower than 15% of annual premium revenue. The Health Reform Law also implements fee payment adjustments based on service benchmarks and quality ratings. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated that, as a result of these changes, payments to plans will be reduced by $138 billion between 2010 and 2019, while CMS has estimated the reduction to be $145 billion. In addition, the Health Reform Law expands the RAC program to include managed Medicare plans. In light of the current economic environment and the Health Reform Law, managed Medicare plans may experience reduced premium payments from CMS, which may lead to increased beneficiary premiums or limits on benefits which, in turn, may cause decreased enrollment in such plans.

Medicaid

Medicaid programs are funded jointly by the federal government and the states and are administered by states under approved plans. Most state Medicaid program payments are made under a PPS or are based on negotiated payment levels with individual hospitals. Medicaid reimbursement is often less than a hospital s cost of services. The Health Reform Law requires states to expand Medicaid coverage to all individuals under age 65 with incomes up to 133% of the federal poverty level (FPL) and to apply a 5% income disregard to the eligibility standard, so that eligibility is effectively extended to those with incomes up to 138% of the FPL. However, states may opt out of the expansion without losing existing federal Medicaid funding. A number of states, including Texas and Florida, have opted out of the Medicaid expansion, but these states could choose to implement the expansion at a later date. It is unclear how many states will ultimately implement the Medicaid expansion provisions of the law.

Because most states must operate with balanced budgets and because the Medicaid program is often the state s largest program, states can be expected to adopt or consider adopting legislation designed to reduce their Medicaid expenditures. The current economic environment has increased the budgetary pressures on most states, and these budgetary pressures have resulted and likely will continue to result in decreased spending, or decreased spending growth, for Medicaid programs in many states.

Certain states in which we operate have adopted broad-based provider taxes to fund the non-federal share of Medicaid programs. Many states have also adopted, or are considering, legislation designed to reduce coverage, enroll Medicaid recipients in managed care programs and/or impose additional taxes on hospitals to help finance or expand the states Medicaid systems. However, the Health Reform Law requires states to at least maintain Medicaid eligibility standards established prior to the enactment of the law for children until October 1, 2019.

Federal funds under the Medicaid program may not be used to reimburse providers for medical assistance provided to treat certain provider-preventable conditions. Each state Medicaid program must deny payments to providers for the treatment of health care-acquired conditions designated by CMS as well as other provider-preventable conditions that may be designated by the state.

Congress has expanded the federal government s involvement in fighting fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicaid program through the Medicaid Integrity Program. CMS employs private contractors, referred to as Medicaid Integrity Contractors (MICs), to perform post-payment audits of Medicaid claims and identify

Table of Contents

overpayments. In addition to MICs, several other contractors and state Medicaid agencies have increased their review activities. The Health Reform Law increases federal funding for the MIC program and expands the RAC program s scope to include Medicaid claims by requiring all states to enter into contracts with RACs to audit payments to Medicaid providers.

Managed Medicaid

Managed Medicaid programs enable states to contract with one or more entities for patient enrollment, care management and claims adjudication. The states usually do not relinquish program responsibilities for financing, eligibility criteria and core benefit plan design. We generally contract directly with one of the designated entities, usually a managed care organization. The provisions of these programs are state-specific.

Enrollment in managed Medicaid plans has increased in recent years, as state governments seek to control the cost of Medicaid programs. However, general economic conditions in the states in which we operate may require reductions in premium payments to these plans and may reduce enrollment in these plans.

Accountable Care Organizations and Bundled Payment Initiatives

Pursuant to the Health Reform Law, HHS established a Medicare Shared Savings Program (MSSP) that seeks to promote accountability and coordination of care through the creation of Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs). The program allows certain providers and suppliers (including hospitals, physicians and other designated professionals) to voluntarily form ACOs and work together along with other ACO participants to invest in infrastructure and redesign delivery processes to achieve high quality and efficient delivery of services. The program is intended to produce savings as a result of improved quality and operational efficiency. ACOs that achieve quality performance standards established by HHS are eligible to share in a portion of the amounts saved by the Medicare program. HHS has significant discretion to determine key elements of the program. As authorized by the Health Reform Law, certain waivers are available from fraud and abuse laws for ACOs. CMS has approved over 300 ACOs to participate in the MSSP.

The Health Reform Law created the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation with responsibility for establishing demonstration projects and other initiatives in order to identify, develop, test and encourage the adoption of new methods of delivering and paying for health care that create savings under the Medicare and Medicaid programs while improving quality of care. One initiative implemented by the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation is a voluntary bundled payment initiative known as the Bundled Payment for Care Improvement (BPCI) initiative. The BPCI initiative is comprised of four broadly defined models of care and links payments to participating providers for services provided during an episode of care. As required by the Health Reform Law, HHS established a separate five-year, voluntary, national pilot program on payment bundling for Medicare services. Under the program, organizations enter into payment arrangements that include financial and performance accountability for episodes of care, and these models are intended to lead to higher quality, more coordinated care at a lower cost to the Medicare program. Participating providers agree to receive one payment for services provided to Medicare patients for certain medical conditions or episodes of care. The Health Reform Law also provides for a bundled payment demonstration project for Medicaid services, but CMS has not yet implemented this project. HHS may select up to eight states to participate, and these state programs may target particular categories of beneficiaries, selected diagnoses or geographic regions of the state. The selected state programs will provide one payment for both hospital and physician services provided to Medicaid patients for certain episodes of inpatient care.

Disproportionate Share Hospital Payments

In addition to making payments for services provided directly to beneficiaries, Medicare makes additional payments to hospitals that treat a disproportionately large number of low-income patients (Medicaid and Medicare patients eligible to receive Supplemental Security Income). Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) payments are determined annually based on certain statistical information required by HHS and are calculated as a percentage addition to MS-DRG payments.

Under the Health Reform Law, Medicare DSH payments are reduced to 25% of the amount they otherwise would have been absent the law. The remaining 75% of the amount that would otherwise be paid under Medicare DSH is effectively pooled, and this pool is reduced further each year by a formula that reflects reductions in the national level of uninsured who are under 65 years of age. Thus, the greater the level of coverage for the previously uninsured nationally, the more the Medicare DSH payment pool will be reduced. Each DSH hospital is then to be paid, out of the reduced DSH payment pool, an amount allocated based upon its estimated cost of providing uncompensated care.

Hospitals that provide care to a disproportionately high number of low-income patients may receive Medicaid DSH payments. The federal government distributes federal Medicaid DSH funds to each state based on a statutory formula. The states then distribute the DSH funding among qualifying hospitals. States have broad discretion to define which hospitals qualify for Medicaid DSH payments and the amount of such payments. The Health Reform Law, as modified by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, provides for reductions to the Medicaid DSH hospital program in federal fiscal years 2016 through 2020 by the following amounts: 2016 ($1.2 billion); 2017 ($1.8 billion); 2018 ($5 billion); 2019 ($5.6 billion); and 2020 ($4 billion). The Jobs Creation Act, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 provide for additional Medicaid DSH reductions in federal fiscal years 2021, 2022 and 2023 estimated at $4.1 billion, $4.2 billion and $4.3 billion, respectively. CMS has issued a final rule establishing the methodology for allocating the cuts among the states based on the volume of Medicaid inpatients and levels of uncompensated care in each state. States largely retain the ability to manage the reduced allotments and to allocate these cuts among providers within the state.

TRICARE

TRICARE is the Department of Defense s health care program for members of the armed forces. For inpatient services, TRICARE reimburses hospitals based on a DRG system modeled on the Medicare inpatient PPS. For outpatient services, TRICARE reimburses hospitals based on a PPS that is similar to that utilized for services furnished to Medicare beneficiaries.

Annual Cost Reports

All hospitals participating in the Medicare, Medicaid and TRICARE programs, whether paid on a reasonable cost basis or under a PPS, are required to meet certain financial reporting requirements. Federal and, where applicable, state regulations require the submission of annual cost reports covering the revenues, costs and expenses associated with the services provided by each hospital to Medicare beneficiaries and Medicaid recipients.

Annual cost reports required under the Medicare and Medicaid programs are subject to routine audits, which may result in adjustments to the amounts ultimately determined to be due to us under these reimbursement programs. These audits often require several years to reach the final determination of amounts due to or from us under these programs. Providers also have rights of appeal, and it is common to contest issues raised in audits of cost reports.

Managed Care and Other Discounted Plans

Most of our hospitals offer discounts from established charges to certain large group purchasers of health care services, including managed care plans and private insurance companies. Admissions reimbursed by commercial managed care and other insurers were 30% of our total admissions for each of the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Managed care contracts are typically negotiated for terms between one and three years. While we generally received contracted annual average increases that were expected to yield 4% to 5% from managed care payers during 2014, there can be no assurance that we will continue to receive increases in the future. It is not clear what impact, if any, the increased obligations on managed care payers and other health plans imposed by the Health Reform Law will have on our ability to negotiate reimbursement increases or the impact of plans offered through the Exchanges on us.

Table of Contents

Uninsured and Self-Pay Patients

A high percentage of our uninsured patients are initially admitted through our emergency rooms. For the year ended December 31, 2014, approximately 82% of our admissions of uninsured patients occurred through our emergency rooms. The Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) requires any hospital that participates in the Medicare program to conduct an appropriate medical screening examination of every person who presents to the hospital s emergency room for treatment and, if the individual is suffering from an emergency medical condition, to either stabilize that condition or make an appropriate transfer of the individual to a facility that can handle the condition. The obligation to screen and stabilize emergency medical conditions exists regardless of an individual s ability to pay for treatment. The Health Reform Law requires health plans to reimburse hospitals for emergency services provided to enrollees without prior authorization and without regard to whether a participating provider contract is in place. Further, the Health Reform Law contains provisions that seek to decrease the number of uninsured individuals, including requirements and incentives, most of which became effective on January 1, 2014, for individuals to obtain, and large employers to provide, insurance coverage. These mandates are reducing the financial impact of screening for and stabilizing emergency medical conditions. However, many factors are unknown regarding the impact of the Health Reform Law, including how many previously uninsured individuals will obtain and maintain coverage as a result of the law, the change, if any, in the volume of inpatient and outpatient hospital services that are sought by and provided to previously uninsured individuals, any changes to the payer mix and any increases in plan structures that result in higher patient responsibility amounts.

Electronic Health Record Incentives

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provides for Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments for eligible hospitals and for eligible professionals that adopt and meaningfully use certified electronic health record (EHR) technology and provides for penalties for eligible hospitals and eligible professionals that do not adopt and meaningfully use EHR technology. Through December 2014, approximately $26 billion in incentive payments have been made through the Medicare and Medicaid EHR incentive programs to eligible hospitals and eligible professionals.

Under the Medicare incentive program, eligible hospitals that demonstrate meaningful use will receive incentive payments for up to four fiscal years. The Medicare incentive payment amount is the product of three factors: (1) an initial amount comprised of a base amount of $2,000,000, plus $200 for each acute care inpatient discharge, beginning with a hospital s 1,150th discharge of the applicable year and ending with a hospital s 23,000th discharge of the applicable year; (2) the Medicare share, which is the sum of Medicare Part A and Part C acute care inpatient-bed-days divided by the product of the total acute care inpatient-bed-days and a charity care factor; and (3) a transition factor applicable to the payment year. In order to maximize their incentive payments, acute care hospitals must have begun participating in the incentive program by federal fiscal year 2013. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, acute care hospitals that have failed to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology in an applicable prior reporting period will receive reduced market basket updates under inpatient PPS.

Eligible professionals who demonstrate meaningful use are entitled to incentive payments for up to five payment years in an amount equal to 75% of their estimated Medicare allowed charges for covered professional services furnished during the relevant calendar year, subject to an annual limit. Eligible professionals must have begun participating in the incentive payment program by calendar year 2012 in order to maximize their incentive payments and must have participated by calendar year 2014 in order to receive any incentive payments. Beginning in calendar year 2015, eligible professionals who have failed to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology in an applicable prior reporting period will face Medicare payment reductions.

The Medicaid EHR incentive program is voluntary for states to implement. For participating states, the Medicaid EHR incentive program provides incentive payments for acute care hospitals and eligible professionals that meet certain volume percentages of Medicaid patients, as well as children s hospitals. Providers may only

Table of Contents

participate in a single state s Medicaid EHR incentive program. Eligible professionals can only participate in either the Medicaid incentive program or the Medicare incentive program and can change this election only one time. Eligible hospitals may participate in both the Medicare and Medicaid incentive programs.

To qualify for incentive payments under the Medicaid program, providers must either adopt, implement, upgrade or demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology during their first participation year or successfully demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology in subsequent participation years. Payments may be received for up to six participation years. For hospitals, the aggregate Medicaid EHR incentive amount is the product of two factors: (1) the overall EHR amount, which is comprised of a base amount of $2,000,000 plus a discharge-related amount, multiplied by the Medicare share (which is set at one by statute) multiplied by a transition factor, and (2) the Medicaid share, which is the estimated Medicaid inpatient-bed days plus estimated Medicaid managed care inpatient bed-days, divided by the product of the estimated total inpatient bed-days and a charity care factor. Under the Medicaid incentive program, eligible professionals may receive payments based on their EHR costs, up to a total amount of $63,750, or for pediatricians, $42,500. There is no penalty for hospitals or professionals under Medicaid for failing to meet EHR meaningful use requirements.

Hospital Utilization

We believe the most important factors relating to the overall utilization of a hospital are the quality and market position of the hospital and the number and quality of physicians and other health care professionals providing patient care within the facility. Generally, we believe the ability of a hospital to be a market leader is determined by its breadth of services, level of technology, quality and condition of the facilities, emphasis on quality of care and convenience for patients and physicians. Other factors that impact utilization include the growth in local population, local economic conditions and market penetration of managed care programs.

The following table sets forth certain operating statistics for our health care facilities. Health care facility operations are subject to certain seasonal fluctuations, including decreases in patient utilization during holiday periods and increases in the cold weather months. The data set forth in this table includes only those facilities that are consolidated for financial reporting purposes.

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2014	**2013**	**2012**	**2011**	**2010**
Number of hospitals at end of period(a)	**166**	165	162	163	156
Number of freestanding outpatient surgery centers at end of period(b)	**113**	115	112	108	97
Number of licensed beds at end of period(c)	**43,356**	42,896	41,804	41,594	38,827
Weighted average licensed beds(d)	**43,132**	42,133	41,795	39,735	38,655
Admissions(e)	**1,795,300**	1,744,100	1,740,700	1,620,400	1,554,400
Equivalent admissions(f)	**2,958,700**	2,844,700	2,832,100	2,595,900	2,468,400
Average length of stay (days)(g)	**4.8**	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Average daily census(h)	**23,835**	22,853	22,521	21,123	20,523
Occupancy rate(i)	**55%**	54%	54%	53%	53%
Emergency room visits(j)	**7,450,700**	6,968,100	6,912,000	6,143,500	5,706,200
Outpatient surgeries(k)	**891,600**	881,900	873,600	799,200	783,600
Inpatient surgeries(l)	**518,900**	508,800	506,500	484,500	487,100

(a) Excludes eight facilities in 2010 that were not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.
(b) Excludes one facility in 2012 and 2011 and nine facilities in 2010 that were not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.
(c) Licensed beds are those beds for which a facility has been granted approval to operate from the applicable state licensing agency.
(d) Represents the average number of licensed beds, weighted based on periods owned.

(e) Represents the total number of patients admitted to our hospitals and is used by management and certain investors as a general measure of inpatient volume.
(f) Equivalent admissions are used by management and certain investors as a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume. Equivalent admissions are computed by multiplying admissions (inpatient volume) by the sum of gross inpatient revenue and gross outpatient revenue and then dividing the resulting amount by gross inpatient revenue. The equivalent admissions computation equates outpatient revenue to the volume measure (admissions) used to measure inpatient volume, resulting in a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume.
(g) Represents the average number of days admitted patients stay in our hospitals.
(h) Represents the average number of patients in our hospital beds each day.
(i) Represents the percentage of hospital licensed beds occupied by patients. Both average daily census and occupancy rate provide measures of the utilization of inpatient rooms.
(j) Represents the number of patients treated in our emergency rooms.
(k) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who were not admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in outpatient surgeries.
(l) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who have been admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in inpatient surgeries.

Competition

Generally, other hospitals in the communities we serve provide services similar to those offered by our hospitals. Additionally, in recent years the number of freestanding specialty hospitals, surgery centers, emergency departments, urgent care centers and diagnostic and imaging centers in the geographic areas in which we operate has increased significantly. As a result, most of our hospitals operate in a highly competitive environment. In some cases, competing hospitals are more established than our hospitals. Some competing facilities are physician-owned or are owned by tax-supported government agencies and many others are owned by not-for-profit entities that may be supported by endowments, charitable contributions and/or tax revenues and are exempt from sales, property and income taxes. Such exemptions and support are not available to our hospitals and may provide the tax-supported or not-for-profit entities an advantage in funding capital expenditures. In certain localities there are large teaching hospitals that provide highly specialized facilities, equipment and services that may not be available at most of our hospitals. We also face competition from specialty hospitals and from both our own and unaffiliated freestanding ASCs for market share in certain high margin services.

Psychiatric hospitals frequently attract patients from areas outside their immediate locale and, therefore, our psychiatric hospitals compete with both local and regional hospitals, including the psychiatric units of general, acute care hospitals.

Our strategies are designed to ensure our hospitals are competitive. We believe our hospitals compete within local communities on the basis of many factors, including the quality of care, ability to attract and retain quality physicians, skilled clinical personnel and other health care professionals, location, breadth of services, technology offered, quality and condition of the facilities and prices charged. Hospitals must make public a list of their standard charges for items and services or their policies for providing a list of such charges in response to an inquiry. We have increased our focus on operating outpatient services with improved accessibility and more convenient service for patients, and increased predictability and efficiency for physicians.

Two of the most significant factors to the competitive position of a hospital are the number and quality of physicians affiliated with or employed by the hospital. Although physicians may at any time terminate their relationship with a hospital we operate, our hospitals seek to retain physicians with varied specialties on the hospitals medical staffs and to attract other qualified physicians. We believe physicians refer patients to a hospital on the basis of the quality and scope of services it renders to patients and physicians, the quality of physicians on the medical staff, the location of the hospital and the quality of the hospital s facilities, equipment

and employees. Accordingly, we strive to maintain and provide quality facilities, equipment, employees and services for physicians and patients. Our hospitals face competition from competitors that are implementing physician alignment strategies, such as employing physicians, acquiring physician practice groups and participating in ACOs or other clinical integration models.

Another major factor in the competitive position of our hospitals is our ability to negotiate service contracts with purchasers of group health care services. Managed care plans attempt to direct and control the use of hospital services and obtain discounts from hospitals established gross charges. In addition, employers and traditional health insurers continue to attempt to contain costs through negotiations with hospitals for managed care programs and discounts from established gross charges. Generally, hospitals compete for service contracts with group health care services purchasers on the basis of price, market reputation, geographic location, quality and range of services, quality of the medical staff and convenience. Our future success will depend, in part, on our ability to retain and renew our managed care contracts and enter into new managed care contracts on favorable terms. Other health care providers may impact our ability to enter into managed care contracts or negotiate increases in our reimbursement and other favorable terms and conditions. For example, some of our competitors may negotiate exclusivity provisions with managed care plans or otherwise restrict the ability of managed care companies to contract with us. The trend toward consolidation among non-government payers tends to increase their bargaining power over fee structures. In addition, various provisions of the Health Reform Law, including the Exchanges and limitations on rescissions of coverage and pre-existing condition exclusions, may lead to non-government payers increasingly demanding reduced fees or being unwilling to negotiate reimbursement increases. Most of the plans offered through the Exchanges provide for narrow networks that restrict the number of participating providers or tiered networks that impose significantly higher cost sharing obligations on patients that obtain services from providers in a disfavored tier. The importance of obtaining contracts with managed care organizations varies from community to community, depending on the market strength of such organizations.

State certificate of need (CON) laws, which place limitations on a health care facility s ability to expand services and facilities, make capital expenditures and otherwise make changes in operations, may also have the effect of restricting competition. We currently operate health care facilities in a number of states with CON laws or that require other types of approvals for the establishment or expansion of certain facility types or services. Before issuing a CON or other approval, these states consider the need for additional or expanded health care facilities or services. In those states that do not require state approval or that set relatively high levels of expenditures before they become reviewable by state authorities, competition in the form of new services, facilities and capital spending is more prevalent. See Item 1, Business Regulation and Other Factors.

We and the health care industry as a whole face the challenge of continuing to provide quality patient care while dealing with rising costs and strong competition for patients. Changes in medical technology, existing and future legislation, regulations and interpretations and managed care contracting for provider services by private and government payers remain ongoing challenges.

Admissions, average lengths of stay and reimbursement amounts continue to be negatively affected by payer-required pre-admission authorization, utilization review and payer pressure to maximize outpatient and alternative health care delivery services for less acutely ill patients. The Health Reform Law expanded the use of prepayment review by Medicare contractors by eliminating statutory restrictions on their use. Increased competition, admission constraints and payer pressures are expected to continue. To meet these challenges, we intend to expand and update our facilities or acquire or construct new facilities where appropriate, to enhance the provision of a comprehensive array of outpatient services, offer market competitive pricing to private payer groups, upgrade facilities and equipment and offer new or expanded programs and services.

Table of Contents

Regulation and Other Factors

Licensure, Certification and Accreditation

Health care facility construction and operation are subject to numerous federal, state and local regulations relating to the adequacy of medical care, equipment, personnel, operating policies and procedures, maintenance of adequate records, fire prevention, rate-setting and compliance with building codes and environmental protection laws. Facilities are subject to periodic inspection by governmental and other authorities to assure continued compliance with the various standards necessary for licensing and accreditation. We believe our health care facilities are properly licensed under applicable state laws. Each of our acute care hospitals located in the United States is eligible to participate in Medicare and Medicaid programs and is accredited by The Joint Commission. If any facility were to lose its Medicare or Medicaid certification, the facility would be unable to receive reimbursement from federal health care programs. If any facility were to lose accreditation, the facility would be subject to state surveys, potentially be subject to increased scrutiny by CMS and likely lose payment from non-government payers. Management believes our facilities are in substantial compliance with current applicable federal, state, local and independent review body regulations and standards. The requirements for licensure, certification and accreditation are subject to change and, in order to remain qualified, it may become necessary for us to make changes in our facilities, equipment, personnel and services. The requirements for licensure, certification and accreditation also include notification or approval in the event of the transfer or change of ownership or certain other changes. Failure to provide required notifications or obtain necessary approvals in these circumstances can result in the inability to complete an acquisition or change of ownership, loss of licensure, lapses in reimbursement or other penalties.

Certificates of Need

In some states where we operate hospitals and other health care facilities, the construction or expansion of health care facilities, the acquisition of existing facilities, the transfer or change of ownership and the addition of new beds or services may be subject to review by and prior approval of, or notifications to, state regulatory agencies under a CON program. Such laws generally require the reviewing state agency to determine the public need for additional or expanded health care facilities and services. Failure to provide required notifications or obtain necessary state approvals can result in the inability to expand facilities, complete an acquisition or change ownership or other penalties.

State Rate Review

Some states have adopted legislation mandating rate or budget review for hospitals or have adopted taxes on hospital revenues, assessments or licensure fees to fund indigent health care within the state. In the aggregate, indigent tax provisions have not materially, adversely affected our results of operations. Although we do not currently operate facilities in states that mandate rate or budget reviews, we cannot predict whether we will operate in such states in the future, or whether the states in which we currently operate may adopt legislation mandating such reviews.

Federal Health Care Program Regulations

Participation in any federal health care program, including the Medicare and Medicaid programs, is heavily regulated by statute and regulation. If a hospital fails to substantially comply with the numerous conditions of participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs or performs certain prohibited acts, the hospital s participation in the federal health care programs may be terminated, or civil and/or criminal penalties may be imposed.

Anti-kickback Statute

A section of the Social Security Act known as the Anti-kickback Statute prohibits providers and others from directly or indirectly soliciting, receiving, offering or paying any remuneration with the intent of generating referrals or orders for services or items covered by a federal health care program. Courts have interpreted this

Table of Contents

statute broadly and held that there is a violation of the Anti-kickback Statute if just one purpose of the remuneration is to generate referrals, even if there are other lawful purposes. Furthermore, the Health Reform Law provides that knowledge of the law or the intent to violate the law is not required. Violations of the Anti-kickback Statute may be punished by a criminal fine of up to $25,000 for each violation or imprisonment, civil money penalties of up to $50,000 per violation and damages of up to three times the total amount of the remuneration and/or exclusion from participation in federal health care programs, including Medicare and Medicaid. In addition, submission of a claim for services or items generated in violation of the Anti-kickback Statute may be subject to additional penalties under the federal False Claims Act (FCA) as a false or fraudulent claim.

The HHS Office of Inspector General (OIG), among other regulatory agencies, is responsible for identifying and eliminating fraud, abuse and waste. The OIG carries out this mission through a nationwide program of audits, investigations and inspections. The OIG provides guidance to the industry through various methods including advisory opinions and Special Fraud Alerts. These Special Fraud Alerts do not have the force of law, but identify features of arrangements or transactions that the government believes may cause the arrangements or transactions to violate the Anti-kickback Statute or other federal health care laws. The OIG has identified several incentive arrangements that constitute suspect practices, including: (a) payment of any incentive by a hospital each time a physician refers a patient to the hospital, (b) the use of free or significantly discounted office space or equipment in facilities usually located close to the hospital, (c) provision of free or significantly discounted billing, nursing or other staff services, (d) free training for a physician s office staff in areas such as management techniques and laboratory techniques, (e) guarantees which provide, if the physician s income fails to reach a predetermined level, the hospital will pay any portion of the remainder, (f) low-interest or interest-free loans, or loans which may be forgiven if a physician refers patients to the hospital, (g) payment of the costs of a physician s travel and expenses for conferences, (h) coverage on the hospital s group health insurance plans at an inappropriately low cost to the physician, (i) payment for services (which may include consultations at the hospital) which require few, if any, substantive duties by the physician, (j) purchasing goods or services from physicians at prices in excess of their fair market value, (k) rental of space in physician offices, at other than fair market value terms, by persons or entities to which physicians refer, and (l) physician-owned entities (frequently referred to as physician-owned distributorships or PODs) that derive revenue from selling, or arranging for the sale of, implantable medical devices ordered by their physician-owners for use on procedures that physician-owners perform on their own patients at hospitals or ASCs. The OIG has encouraged persons having information about hospitals who offer the above types of incentives to physicians to report such information to the OIG.

The OIG also issues Special Advisory Bulletins as a means of providing guidance to health care providers. These bulletins, along with the Special Fraud Alerts, have focused on certain arrangements that could be subject to heightened scrutiny by government enforcement authorities, including: (a) contractual joint venture arrangements and other joint venture arrangements between those in a position to refer business, such as physicians, and those providing items or services for which Medicare or Medicaid pays, and (b) certain gainsharing arrangements, i.e., the practice of giving physicians a share of any reduction in a hospital s costs for patient care attributable in part to the physician s efforts.

In addition to issuing Special Fraud Alerts and Special Advisory Bulletins, the OIG issues compliance program guidance for certain types of health care providers. The OIG guidance identifies a number of risk areas under federal fraud and abuse statutes and regulations. These areas of risk include compensation arrangements with physicians, recruitment arrangements with physicians and joint venture relationships with physicians.

As authorized by Congress, the OIG has published safe harbor regulations that outline categories of activities deemed protected from prosecution under the Anti-kickback Statute. Currently, there are statutory exceptions and safe harbors for various activities, including the following: certain investment interests, space rental, equipment rental, practitioner recruitment, personnel services and management contracts, sale of practice, referral services, warranties, discounts, employees, group purchasing organizations, waiver of beneficiary

Table of Contents

coinsurance and deductible amounts, managed care arrangements, obstetrical malpractice insurance subsidies, investments in group practices, freestanding surgery centers, ambulance replenishing, and referral agreements for specialty services.

The fact that conduct or a business arrangement does not fall within a safe harbor or is identified in a Special Fraud Alert, Special Advisory Bulletin or other guidance does not necessarily render the conduct or business arrangement illegal under the Anti-kickback Statute. However, such conduct and business arrangements may lead to increased scrutiny by government enforcement authorities.

We have a variety of financial relationships with physicians and others who either refer or influence the referral of patients to our hospitals, other health care facilities and employed physicians, including employment contracts, leases, medical director agreements and professional service agreements. We also have similar relationships with physicians and facilities to which patients are referred from our facilities and other providers. In addition, we provide financial incentives, including minimum revenue guarantees, to recruit physicians into the communities served by our hospitals. While we endeavor to comply with the applicable safe harbors, certain of our current arrangements, including joint ventures and financial relationships with physicians and other referral sources and persons and entities to which we refer patients, do not qualify for safe harbor protection.

Although we believe our arrangements with physicians and other referral sources and referral recipients have been structured to comply with current law and available interpretations, there can be no assurance regulatory authorities enforcing these laws will determine these financial arrangements comply with the Anti-kickback Statute or other applicable laws. An adverse determination could subject us to liabilities under the Social Security Act and other laws, including criminal penalties, civil monetary penalties and exclusion from participation in Medicare, Medicaid or other federal health care programs.

Stark Law

The Social Security Act also includes a provision commonly known as the Stark Law. The Stark Law prohibits physicians from referring Medicare and Medicaid patients to entities with which they or any of their immediate family members have a financial relationship, if these entities provide certain designated health services reimbursable by Medicare or Medicaid unless an exception applies. The Stark Law also prohibits entities that provide designated health services reimbursable by Medicare and Medicaid from billing the Medicare and Medicaid programs for any items or services that result from a prohibited referral and requires the entities to refund amounts received for items or services provided pursuant to the prohibited referral on a timely basis. Designated health services include inpatient and outpatient hospital services, clinical laboratory services and radiology services. Sanctions for violating the Stark Law include denial of payment, civil monetary penalties of up to $15,000 per claim submitted and exclusion from the federal health care programs. Failure to refund amounts received as a result of a prohibited referral on a timely basis may constitute a false or fraudulent claim and may result in civil penalties and additional penalties under the FCA. The statute also provides for a penalty of up to $100,000 for a circumvention scheme. There are exceptions to the self-referral prohibition for many of the customary financial arrangements between physicians and providers, including employment contracts, leases and recruitment agreements. Unlike safe harbors under the Anti-kickback Statute with which compliance is voluntary, a financial relationship must comply with every requirement of a Stark Law exception or the arrangement is in violation of the Stark Law. Although there is an exception for a physician s ownership interest in an entire hospital, the Health Reform Law prohibits physician-owned hospitals established after December 31, 2010 from billing for Medicare or Medicaid patients referred by their physician owners. As a result, the law effectively prevents the formation of new physician-owned hospitals that participate in Medicare or Medicaid. While the Health Reform Law grandfathers existing physician-owned hospitals, it does not allow these hospitals to increase the percentage of physician ownership and significantly restricts their ability to expand services.

Through a series of rulemakings, CMS has issued final regulations implementing the Stark Law. While these regulations were intended to clarify the requirements of the exceptions to the Stark Law, it is unclear how the government will interpret many of these exceptions for enforcement purposes. Further, we do not always

have the benefit of significant regulatory or judicial interpretation of the Stark Law and its implementing regulations. We attempt to structure our relationships to meet an exception to the Stark Law, but the regulations implementing the exceptions are detailed and complex, and we cannot assure that every relationship complies fully with the Stark Law.

Similar State Laws

Many states in which we operate also have laws similar to the Anti-kickback Statute that prohibit payments to physicians for patient referrals and laws similar to the Stark Law that prohibit certain self-referrals. The scope of these state laws is broad because they can often apply regardless of the source of payment for care, and little precedent exists for their interpretation or enforcement. These statutes typically provide for criminal and civil penalties, as well as loss of licensure.

Other Fraud and Abuse Provisions

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) broadened the scope of certain fraud and abuse laws by adding several criminal provisions for health care fraud offenses that apply to all health benefit programs. The Social Security Act also imposes criminal and civil penalties for making false claims and statements to Medicare and Medicaid. False claims include, but are not limited to, billing for services not rendered or for misrepresenting actual services rendered in order to obtain higher reimbursement, billing for unnecessary goods and services and cost report fraud. Federal enforcement officials have the ability to exclude from Medicare and Medicaid any investors, officers and managing employees associated with business entities that have committed health care fraud, even if the officer or managing employee had no knowledge of the fraud. Criminal and civil penalties may be imposed for a number of other prohibited activities, including failure to return known overpayments, certain gainsharing arrangements, billing Medicare amounts that are substantially in excess of a provider s usual charges, offering remuneration to influence a Medicare or Medicaid beneficiary s selection of a health care provider, contracting with an individual or entity known to be excluded from a federal health care program, making or accepting a payment to induce a physician to reduce or limit services, and soliciting or receiving any remuneration in return for referring an individual for an item or service payable by a federal health care program. Like the Anti-kickback Statute, these provisions are very broad. Civil penalties may be imposed for the failure to report and return an overpayment within 60 days of identifying the overpayment or by the date a corresponding cost report is due, whichever is later. To avoid liability, providers must, among other things, carefully and accurately code claims for reimbursement, promptly return overpayments and accurately prepare cost reports.

Some of these provisions, including the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law, require a lower burden of proof than other fraud and abuse laws, including the Anti-kickback Statute. Civil monetary penalties that may be imposed under the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law range from $10,000 to $50,000 per act, and in some cases may result in penalties of up to three times the remuneration offered, paid, solicited or received. In addition, a violator may be subject to exclusion from federal and state health care programs. Federal and state governments increasingly use the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law, especially where they believe they cannot meet the higher burden of proof requirements under the Anti-kickback Statute. Further, individuals can receive up to $1,000 for providing information on Medicare fraud and abuse that leads to the recovery of at least $100 of Medicare funds under the Medicare Integrity Program.

The Federal False Claims Act and Similar State Laws

We are subject to state and federal laws that govern the submission of claims for reimbursement and prohibit the making of false claims or statements. One of the most prominent of these laws is the FCA, which may be enforced by the federal government directly or by a *qui tam* plaintiff, or whistleblower, on the government s behalf. The government may use the FCA to prosecute Medicare and other government program fraud in areas such as coding errors, billing for services not provided and submitting false cost reports. In

addition, the FCA covers payments made in connection with the Exchanges created under the Health Reform Law, if those payments include any federal funds. When a private party brings a *qui tam* action under the FCA, the defendant is not made aware of the lawsuit until the government commences its own investigation or makes a determination whether it will intervene. If a defendant is determined by a court of law to be liable under the FCA, the defendant may be required to pay three times the actual damages sustained by the government, plus mandatory civil penalties of between $5,500 and $11,000 for each separate false claim.

There are many potential bases for liability under the FCA, including knowingly and improperly avoiding repayment of an overpayment received from the government and the knowing failure to report and return an overpayment in a timely manner. Liability often arises when an entity knowingly submits a false claim for reimbursement to the federal government. The FCA defines the term knowingly broadly. Though simple negligence will not give rise to liability under the FCA, submitting a claim with reckless disregard to its truth or falsity constitutes a knowing submission under the FCA and, therefore, may create liability. Submission of claims for services or items generated in violation of the Anti-kickback Statute constitutes a false or fraudulent claim under the FCA. Whistleblowers and the federal government have taken the position, and some courts have held, that providers who allegedly have violated other statutes, such as the Stark Law, have thereby submitted false claims under the FCA.

Every entity that receives at least $5 million annually in Medicaid payments must have written policies for all employees, contractors or agents, providing detailed information about false claims, false statements and whistleblower protections under certain federal laws, including the FCA, and similar state laws. In addition, federal law provides an incentive to states to enact false claims laws comparable to the FCA. A number of states in which we operate have adopted their own false claims provisions as well as their own whistleblower provisions under which a private party may file a civil lawsuit in state court. We have adopted and distributed policies pertaining to the FCA and relevant state laws.

HIPAA Administrative Simplification and Privacy and Security Requirements

The Administrative Simplification Provisions of HIPAA and implementing regulations require the use of uniform electronic data transmission standards for certain health care claims and payment transactions submitted or received electronically. These provisions are intended to encourage electronic commerce in the health care industry. As required by the Health Reform Law, HHS is in the process of adopting standards for additional electronic transactions and establishing operating rules to promote uniformity in the implementation of each standardized electronic transaction. In addition, HIPAA requires that each provider use a National Provider Identifier. CMS has also published a final rule requiring the use of updated standard code sets for certain diagnoses and procedures known as ICD-10 code sets. Implementing the ICD-10 code sets will require significant administrative changes. Use of the ICD-10 code sets is required beginning October 1, 2015.

The privacy and security regulations promulgated pursuant to HIPAA extensively regulate the use and disclosure of individually identifiable health information, known as protected health information, and require covered entities, including health plans and most health care providers, to implement administrative, physical and technical safeguards to protect the security of such information. Certain provisions of the security and privacy regulations apply to business associates (entities that handle protected health information on behalf of covered entities), and business associates are subject to direct liability for violation of the regulations. In addition, a covered entity may be subject to penalties as a result of a business associate violating HIPAA, if the business associate is found to be an agent of the covered entity.

Covered entities must report breaches of unsecured protected health information to affected individuals without unreasonable delay but not to exceed 60 days of discovery of the breach by a covered entity or its agents. Notification must also be made to HHS and, in certain situations involving large breaches, to the media. HHS is required to publish on its website a list of all covered entities that report a breach involving more than 500 individuals. All non-permitted uses or disclosures of unsecured protected health information are presumed to be

Table of Contents

breaches unless the covered entity or business associate establishes that there is a low probability the information has been compromised. Various state laws and regulations may also require us to notify affected individuals in the event of a data breach involving individually identifiable information.

Violations of the HIPAA privacy and security regulations may result in criminal penalties and in civil penalties of up to $50,000 per violation for a maximum of $1,500,000 in a calendar year for violations of the same requirement. HHS is required to perform compliance audits and has announced its intent to perform audits in 2015. In addition to enforcement by HHS, state attorneys general are authorized to bring civil actions seeking either injunction or damages in response to violations that threaten the privacy of state residents. HHS may resolve HIPAA violations through informal means, such as allowing a covered entity to implement a corrective action plan, but HHS has the discretion to move directly to impose monetary penalties and is required to impose penalties for violations resulting from willful neglect. We enforce a HIPAA compliance plan, which we believe complies with the HIPAA privacy and security regulations and under which a HIPAA compliance group monitors our compliance. The HIPAA privacy regulations and security regulations have and will continue to impose significant costs on our facilities in order to comply with these standards.

There are numerous other laws and legislative and regulatory initiatives at the federal and state levels addressing privacy and security concerns. Our facilities remain subject to any federal or state privacy-related laws that are more restrictive than the privacy regulations issued under HIPAA. These laws vary and could impose additional penalties. For example, the Federal Trade Commission uses its consumer protection authority to initiate enforcement actions in response to data breaches.

EMTALA

All of our hospitals in the United States are subject to EMTALA. This federal law requires any hospital participating in the Medicare program to conduct an appropriate medical screening examination of every individual who presents to the hospital s emergency room for treatment and, if the individual is suffering from an emergency medical condition, to either stabilize the condition or make an appropriate transfer of the individual to a facility able to handle the condition. The obligation to screen and stabilize emergency medical conditions exists regardless of an individual s ability to pay for treatment. There are severe penalties under EMTALA if a hospital fails to screen or appropriately stabilize or transfer an individual or if the hospital delays appropriate treatment in order to first inquire about the individual s ability to pay. Penalties for violations of EMTALA include civil monetary penalties and exclusion from participation in the Medicare program. In addition, an injured individual, the individual s family or a medical facility that suffers a financial loss as a direct result of a hospital s violation of the law can bring a civil suit against the hospital.

The government broadly interprets EMTALA to cover situations in which individuals do not actually present to a hospital s emergency room, but present for emergency examination or treatment to the hospital s campus, generally, or to a hospital-based clinic that treats emergency medical conditions or are transported in a hospital-owned ambulance, subject to certain exceptions. At least one court has interpreted the law also to apply to a hospital that has been notified of a patient s pending arrival in a non-hospital owned ambulance. EMTALA does not generally apply to individuals admitted for inpatient services. The government has expressed its intent to investigate and enforce EMTALA violations actively. We believe our hospitals operate in substantial compliance with EMTALA.

Corporate Practice of Medicine/Fee Splitting

Some of the states in which we operate have laws prohibiting corporations and other entities from employing physicians, practicing medicine for a profit and making certain direct and indirect payments to, or entering into fee-splitting arrangements with, health care providers designed to induce or encourage the referral of patients to, or the recommendation of, particular providers for medical products and services. Possible sanctions for violation of these restrictions include loss of license and civil and criminal penalties. In addition,

agreements between the corporation and the physician may be considered void and unenforceable. These statutes vary from state to state, are often vague and have seldom been interpreted by the courts or regulatory agencies.

Health Care Industry Investigations

Significant media and public attention has focused in recent years on the hospital industry. This media and public attention, changes in government personnel and other factors have led to increased scrutiny of the health care industry. Except as may be disclosed in our SEC filings, we are not aware of any material investigations of the Company under federal or state health care laws or regulations. It is possible that governmental entities could initiate investigations or litigation in the future at facilities we operate and that such matters could result in significant penalties, as well as adverse publicity. It is also possible that our executives and managers could be included in governmental investigations or litigation or named as defendants in private litigation.

Our substantial Medicare, Medicaid and other governmental billings result in heightened scrutiny of our operations. We continue to monitor all aspects of our business and have developed a comprehensive ethics and compliance program that is designed to meet or exceed applicable federal guidelines and industry standards. Because the law in this area is complex and constantly evolving, governmental investigations or litigation may result in interpretations that are inconsistent with our or industry practices.

In public statements surrounding current investigations, governmental authorities have taken positions on a number of issues, including some for which little official interpretation previously has been available, that appear to be inconsistent with practices that have been common within the industry and that previously have not been challenged in this manner. In some instances, government investigations that have in the past been conducted under the civil provisions of federal law may now be conducted as criminal investigations.

Both federal and state government agencies have increased their focus on and coordination of civil and criminal enforcement efforts in the health care area. The OIG and the Department of Justice (DOJ) have, from time to time, established national enforcement initiatives, targeting all hospital providers that focus on specific billing practices or other suspected areas of abuse. The Health Reform Law includes additional federal funding of $350 million over 10 years to fight health care fraud, waste and abuse, including $30 million in federal fiscal year 2015. In addition, governmental agencies and their agents, such as MACs, fiscal intermediaries and carriers, may conduct audits of our health care operations. Private payers may conduct similar post-payment audits, and we also perform internal audits and monitoring.

In addition to national enforcement initiatives, federal and state investigations have addressed a wide variety of routine health care operations such as: cost reporting and billing practices, including for Medicare outliers; financial arrangements with referral sources; physician recruitment activities; physician joint ventures; and hospital charges and collection practices for self-pay patients. We engage in many of these routine health care operations and other activities that could be the subject of governmental investigations or inquiries. For example, we have significant Medicare and Medicaid billings, numerous financial arrangements with physicians who are referral sources to our hospitals, and joint venture arrangements involving physician investors. Certain of our individual facilities have received, and other facilities may receive, government inquiries from, and may be subject to investigation by, federal and state agencies. Any additional investigations of the Company, our executives or managers could result in significant liabilities or penalties to us, as well as adverse publicity.

Health Care Reform

The Health Reform Law changes how health care services are covered, delivered and reimbursed through expanded coverage of uninsured individuals, reduced growth in Medicare program spending, reductions in Medicare and Medicaid DSH payments, and the establishment of programs that tie reimbursement to quality and integration. In addition, the law reforms certain aspects of health insurance, expands existing efforts to tie Medicare and Medicaid payments to performance and quality, and strengthens fraud and abuse enforcement.

Table of Contents

Expanded Coverage

Based on the CBO s January 2015 projection, by 2025, the Health Reform Law will expand coverage to 27 million additional individuals. This increased coverage will occur through a combination of public program expansion and private sector health insurance and other reforms.

Medicaid Expansion

The primary public program coverage expansion is occurring through changes in Medicaid, and to a lesser extent, expansion of the Children s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The most significant changes expand the categories of individuals eligible for Medicaid coverage and permit individuals with relatively higher incomes to qualify. The Health Reform Law requires all state Medicaid programs to provide, and the federal government to subsidize, Medicaid coverage to virtually all adults under 65 years old with incomes at or under 133% of the federal poverty level (FPL) and to apply a 5% income disregard to the eligibility standard, so that eligibility is effectively extended to those with incomes up to 138% of the FPL. However, states may opt out of the expansion without losing existing federal Medicaid funding. States that choose not to implement the Medicaid expansion are foregoing funding established by the Health Reform Law to cover most of the expansion costs. A number of states, including Texas and Florida, have chosen not to participate in the expanded Medicaid program, but these states could choose to implement the expansion at a later date. For states that do not participate, the maximum income level required for individuals and families to qualify for Medicaid varies widely from state to state. According to the CBO s January 2015 projection, the new eligibility requirements will expand Medicaid and CHIP coverage by an estimated 16 million persons nationwide by 2025.

As Medicaid is a joint federal and state program, the federal government provides states with matching funds in a defined percentage, known as the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP). Beginning in 2014, states began receiving an enhanced FMAP for the individuals enrolled in Medicaid pursuant to the Health Reform Law. The FMAP percentage is as follows: 100% for calendar years 2014 through 2016; 95% for 2017; 94% in 2018; 93% in 2019; and 90% in 2020 and thereafter. CMS has indicated that states that only partially expand their Medicaid programs will not receive an enhanced FMAP.

Pursuant to the Health Reform Law, the federal government subsidizes states that create non-Medicaid plans for residents whose incomes are greater than 133% of the FPL but do not exceed 200% of the FPL. Approved state plans are eligible to receive federal funding. The amount of that funding per individual is equal to 95% of subsidies that would have been provided for that individual had he or she enrolled in a health plan offered through one of the Exchanges, as discussed below.

Historically, states often have attempted to reduce Medicaid spending by limiting benefits and tightening Medicaid eligibility requirements. However, the Health Reform Law requires states to at least maintain Medicaid eligibility standards established prior to the enactment of the law for children until October 1, 2019.

Private Sector Expansion

The expansion of health coverage through the private sector as a result of the Health Reform Law occurs through new requirements applicable to health insurers, employers and individuals. Health insurers must keep their annual nonmedical costs lower than 15% of premium revenue for the group market and lower than 20% in the small group and individual markets or rebate to enrollees the amount spent in excess of the percentage. In addition, health insurers are not permitted to deny coverage to children based upon a pre-existing condition and must allow dependent care coverage for children up to 26 years old. Health insurers are prohibited from imposing annual coverage limits, dropping coverage, excluding persons based upon pre-existing conditions or denying coverage for any individual who is willing to pay the premiums for such coverage.

Larger employers are subject to new requirements and incentives to provide health insurance benefits to their full time employees. This requirement became effective January 1, 2015, except that for employers with 50 to 99 employees, this requirement has been delayed until January 1, 2016. Employers subject to this requirement

that do not offer health insurance will be subject to a penalty if an employee obtains government-subsidized coverage through an Exchange. The employer penalties will range from $2,000 to $3,000 per employee, subject to certain thresholds and conditions.

The Health Reform Law uses various means to induce individuals who do not have health insurance to obtain coverage. Individuals are required to maintain health insurance for a minimum defined set of benefits or pay a tax penalty. The penalty in most cases is the greater of $325 or 2% of income in 2015, $695 or 2.5% of income in 2016, and indexed to a cost of living adjustment in subsequent years. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS), in consultation with HHS, is responsible for enforcing the tax penalty, although the Health Reform Law limits the availability of certain IRS enforcement mechanisms. In addition, for individuals and families below 400% of the FPL, the cost of obtaining health insurance through the Exchanges is subsidized by the federal government. Those with lower incomes are eligible to receive greater subsidies. It is anticipated that those at the lowest income levels will have the majority of their premiums subsidized by the federal government, in some cases in excess of 95% of the premium amount. However, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear a case known as King v. Burwell during the 2015 session which may affect the federal subsidies. The case challenges the extension of premium subsidies to health insurance policies purchased through federally-operated Exchanges, arguing that subsidies must be limited to state-operated Exchanges. If decided in favor of the plaintiffs, this case could make it more difficult for uninsured individuals in states that do not operate an Exchange to purchase coverage and otherwise significantly affect implementation of the Health Reform Law in a manner that could result in less than projected numbers of newly insured individuals.

To facilitate the purchase of health insurance by individuals and small employers, the Health Reform Law mandated that each state establish or participate in an Exchange or default to a federally-operated Exchange by January 1, 2014. Based on CBO estimates issued in January 2015, approximately 24 million individuals will obtain their health insurance coverage through an Exchange by 2025. This amount will include individuals who were previously uninsured and individuals who have switched from their prior insurance coverage to a plan obtained through an Exchange. Health insurers participating in an Exchange must offer a set of minimum benefits, as defined by HHS, and may offer more benefits. Health insurers must offer at least two, and may offer up to five, levels of plans that vary by the percentage of medical expenses that must be paid by the enrollee. These levels are referred to as platinum, gold, silver, bronze and catastrophic plans, with gold and silver being the two mandatory levels of plans. Each level of plan must require the enrollee to share the following percentages of medical expenses up to the deductible/copayment limit: platinum, 10%; gold, 20%; silver, 30%; bronze, 40%; and catastrophic, 100%. Health insurers may establish varying deductible/copayment levels, up to the statutory maximum. The health insurers must cover 100% of the amount of medical expenses in excess of the deductible/copayment limit. For example, an individual making 100% to 200% of the FPL will have copayments and deductibles reduced to about one-third of the amount payable by those with the same plan with incomes at or above 400% of the FPL.

Public Program Spending

The Health Reform Law provides for Medicare, Medicaid and other federal health care program spending reductions between 2010 and 2019. In March 2010, CMS estimated Medicare fee-for-service reductions from 2010 to 2019 would be $233 billion and the Medicare and Medicaid DSH reductions would be an additional $64 billion. In July 2012, the CBO estimated that from 2013 to 2022, the Health Reform Law reductions would include $415 billion in Medicare fee-for-service market basket and productivity reimbursement reductions, the majority of which will come from hospitals. The CBO estimate included an additional $56 billion in reductions in Medicare and Medicaid DSH funding.

Payments for Hospitals and Ambulatory Surgery Centers

Inpatient Market Basket and Productivity Adjustment. Under the Medicare program, hospitals receive reimbursement under a PPS for general, acute care hospital inpatient services. CMS establishes fixed PPS payment amounts per inpatient discharge based on the patient s assigned MS-DRG. These MS-DRG rates are

updated each federal fiscal year, which begins October 1, using a market basket index that takes into account inflation experienced by hospitals and other entities outside the health care industry in purchasing goods and services.

The Health Reform Law provides for three types of annual reductions in the market basket. The first is a general reduction of a specified percentage each federal fiscal year that began in 2010 and extends through 2019. The remaining reductions are as follows: 2015 (0.2%); 2016 (0.2%); 2017 (0.75%); 2018 (0.75%); and 2019 (0.75%).

The second type of reduction to the market basket is a productivity adjustment that was implemented by HHS beginning in federal fiscal year 2012. The amount of that reduction is the projected nationwide productivity gains over the preceding 10 years. To determine the projection, HHS uses the BLS 10-year moving average of changes in specified economy-wide productivity. For federal fiscal year 2015, CMS has announced a negative 0.5% productivity adjustment to the market basket. In 2010, CMS estimated that the combined market basket and productivity adjustments would reduce Medicare payments under the inpatient PPS by $112.6 billion from 2010 to 2019.

The third type of reduction is in connection with the value-based purchasing program discussed in more detail below. For each federal fiscal year, CMS will reduce the inpatient PPS payment amount for all discharges by the following: 1.5% for 2015; 1.75% for 2016; and 2% for 2017 and subsequent years. For each federal fiscal year, the total amount collected from these reductions will be pooled and used to fund payments to hospitals that satisfy certain quality metrics. While some or all of these reductions may be recovered if a hospital satisfies these quality metrics, the recovery amounts may be delayed.

If the aggregate of the three market basket reductions described above is more than the annual market basket adjustments made to account for inflation, there will be a reduction in the MS-DRG rates paid to hospitals.

Quality-Based Payment Adjustments and Reductions for Inpatient Services. The Health Reform Law establishes or expands three provisions to promote value-based purchasing and to link payments to quality and efficiency. First, HHS has implemented a value-based purchasing program for inpatient hospital services that rewards hospitals that meet certain quality performance standards established by HHS. The Health Reform Law provides HHS considerable discretion over the value-based purchasing program. Under this program, CMS will distribute an estimated $1.4 billion in federal fiscal year 2015 to hospitals based on their overall performance on a set of quality measures that have been linked to improved clinical processes of care and patient satisfaction. Hospitals are scored based on a weighted average of patient experience scores using the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey and certain clinical measures. CMS scores each hospital based on achievement (relative to other hospitals) and improvement ranges (relative to the hospital s own past performance) for each applicable measure. Because the Health Reform Law provides that the pool will be fully distributed, hospitals that meet or exceed the quality performance standards set by HHS will receive greater reimbursement under the value-based purchasing program than they would have otherwise. Hospitals that do not achieve the necessary quality performance will receive reduced Medicare inpatient hospital payments.

Second, inpatient payments are reduced each federal fiscal year if a hospital experiences excess readmissions within the 30-day period from the date of discharge for conditions designated by CMS. Hospitals with what CMS defines as excess readmissions for these conditions will receive reduced payments for all inpatient discharges, not just discharges relating to the conditions subject to the excess readmission standard. The amount by which payments will be reduced if a hospital experiences excess readmissions is determined by comparison of the hospital s readmission performance to a risk-adjusted national average and is subject to a cap established by CMS. Each hospital s performance is publicly reported by CMS.

Third, reimbursement will be reduced based on a facility s HAC rates. A HAC is a condition that is acquired by a patient while admitted as an inpatient in a hospital, such as a surgical site infection. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, the 25% of hospitals with the worst national risk-adjusted HAC rates in the previous year will

receive a 1% reduction in their total inpatient operating Medicare payments. In addition, the Health Reform Law prohibits the use of federal funds under the Medicaid program to reimburse providers for medical services provided to treat HACs. States may add additional provider-preventable conditions to the list of HACs for which Medicaid reimbursement will not be allowed.

Outpatient Market Basket and Productivity Adjustment. Hospital outpatient services paid under PPS are classified into APCs. The APC payment rates are updated each calendar year based on the market basket. The first two market basket changes outlined above the general reduction and the productivity adjustment apply to outpatient services as well as inpatient services, although these are applied on a calendar year basis. The percentage changes specified in the Health Reform Law summarized above as the general reduction for inpatients e.g., 0.2% in 2015 are the same for outpatients.

Medicare and Medicaid DSH Payments. The Medicare DSH program provides for additional payments to hospitals that treat a disproportionate share of low-income patients. Under the Health Reform Law, Medicare DSH payments are reduced to 25% of the amount they otherwise would have been absent the law. The remaining 75% of the amount that would otherwise be paid under Medicare DSH is effectively pooled, and this pool will be reduced further each year by a formula that reflects reductions in the national level of uninsured who are under 65 years of age. In other words, the greater the level of coverage for the uninsured nationally, the more the Medicare DSH payment pool will be reduced. Each hospital is then paid, out of the reduced DSH payment pool, an amount allocated based upon its level of uncompensated care, which was not the basis for DSH payments prior to implementation of the Health Reform Law.

Hospitals that provide care to a disproportionately high number of low-income patients may receive Medicaid DSH payments. The federal government distributes federal Medicaid DSH funds to each state based on a statutory formula. The states then distribute the DSH funding among qualifying hospitals. Although federal Medicaid law defines some level of hospitals that must receive Medicaid DSH funding, states have broad discretion to define additional hospitals that also may qualify for Medicaid DSH payments and the amount of such payments. The Health Reform Law, as modified by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, provides for reductions to the Medicaid DSH hospital program in federal fiscal years 2016 through 2020 by the following amounts: 2016 ($1.2 billion); 2017 ($1.8 billion); 2018 ($5 billion); 2019 ($5.6 billion); and 2020 ($4 billion). The Jobs Creation Act, the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 provide for additional Medicaid DSH reductions in federal fiscal years 2021, 2022 and 2023 estimated at $4.1 billion, $4.2 billion and $4.3 billion, respectively. CMS has issued a final rule establishing the methodology for allocating the cuts among the states based on the volume of Medicaid inpatients and levels of uncompensated care in each state. States largely retain the ability to manage the reduced allotments and to allocate these cuts among providers within the state.

ACOs. Pursuant to the Health Reform Law, HHS established the MSSP, which seeks to promote accountability and coordination of care through the creation of ACOs. The MSSP allows certain providers and suppliers (including hospitals, physicians and other designated professionals) to voluntarily form ACOs and work together along with other ACO participants to invest in infrastructure and redesign delivery processes to achieve high quality and efficient delivery of services. The program is intended to produce savings as a result of improved quality and operational efficiency. ACOs that achieve quality performance standards established by HHS will be eligible to share in a portion of the amounts saved by the Medicare program. As authorized by the Health Reform Law, certain waivers are available from fraud and abuse laws for ACOs. CMS has approved over 300 ACOs to participate in the MSSP.

Bundled Payment Pilot Programs. The Health Reform Law created the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation with responsibility for establishing demonstration projects and other initiatives in order to identify, develop, test and encourage the adoption of new methods of delivering and paying for health care that create savings under the Medicare and Medicaid programs while improving quality of care. One initiative announced by the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation is a voluntary bundled payment initiative known as the Bundled

Table of Contents

Payment for Care Improvement (BPCI) initiative. The BPCI initiative is comprised of four broadly defined models of care and links payments to participating providers for services provided during an episode of care. In addition, HHS established a five-year, voluntary, national pilot program on payment bundling for Medicare services. Under the program, organizations may enter into payment arrangements that include financial and performance accountability for episodes of care, and these models are intended to lead to higher quality, more coordinated care at a lower cost to the Medicare program. Participating providers agree to receive one payment for services provided to Medicare patients for certain medical conditions or episodes of care. HHS has discretion to determine how the program will function, including what medical conditions will be included in the program and the amount of the payment for each condition. The Health Reform Law also provides for a five-year bundled payment pilot program for Medicaid services, but CMS has not yet implemented this program. HHS may select up to eight states to participate based on the potential to lower costs under the Medicaid program while improving care. State programs may target particular categories of beneficiaries, selected diagnoses or geographic regions of the state. The selected state programs will provide one payment for both hospital and physician services provided to Medicaid patients for certain episodes of inpatient care. For both pilot programs, HHS will determine the relationship between the programs and restrictions in certain existing laws, including the Civil Monetary Penalty Law, the Anti-kickback Statute, the Stark Law and the HIPAA privacy, security and transaction standard requirements. However, the Health Reform Law does not authorize HHS to waive other laws that may impact the ability of hospitals and other eligible participants to participate in the pilot programs, such as antitrust laws.

Ambulatory Surgery Centers. The Health Reform Law reduces reimbursement for ASCs through a productivity adjustment to the consumer price index similar to the productivity adjustment for inpatient and outpatient hospital services. In addition, CMS has established a quality reporting program for ASCs under which ASCs that fail to report on required quality measures will receive a 2% reduction in reimbursement.

Medicare Managed Care (Medicare Advantage or MA). Under the MA program, the federal government contracts with private health plans to provide inpatient and outpatient benefits to beneficiaries who enroll in such plans. In 2014, approximately 15.7 million Medicare beneficiaries elected to enroll in MA plans. The Health Reform Law requires MA plans to keep annual administrative costs lower than 15% of annual premium revenue. The Health Reform Law reduces, on a gradual basis through 2017, premium payments to the MA plans such that CMS managed care per capita premium payments are, on average, equal to traditional Medicare. In addition, the Health Reform Law implements fee payment adjustments based on service benchmarks and quality ratings. As a result of these changes, payments to MA plans are estimated to be reduced by $138 to $145 billion between 2010 and 2019. These reductions to MA plan premium payments paid by the federal government may cause some plans to raise beneficiary premiums or limit benefits, which in turn might cause some Medicare beneficiaries to terminate their MA coverage and enroll in traditional Medicare.

Physician-Owned Hospital Limitations

Over the last decade, we have faced competition from hospitals that have physician ownership. The Health Reform Law prohibits newly created physician-owned hospitals from billing for Medicare patients referred by their physician owners. As a result, the law effectively prevents the formation of new physician-owned hospitals that participate in Medicare and Medicaid after December 31, 2010. While the law grandfathers existing physician-owned hospitals, it does not allow these hospitals to increase the percentage of physician ownership and significantly restricts their ability to expand services.

Program Integrity and Fraud and Abuse

The Health Reform Law makes several significant changes to health care fraud and abuse laws, provides additional enforcement tools to the government, increases cooperation between agencies by establishing mechanisms for the sharing of information and enhances criminal and administrative penalties for non-compliance. For example, the Health Reform Law: (1) provides $350 million in increased federal funding over

Table of Contents

10 years to fight health care fraud, waste and abuse; (2) expands the scope of the RAC program to include MA plans and Medicaid; (3) authorizes HHS, in consultation with the OIG, to suspend Medicare and Medicaid payments to a provider of services or a supplier pending an investigation of a credible allegation of fraud; (4) provides Medicare contractors with additional flexibility to conduct random prepayment reviews; and (5) tightens up the rules for returning overpayments made by governmental health programs and expands FCA liability to include failure to timely repay identified overpayments.

Impact of Health Reform Law on the Company

The expansion of health insurance coverage under the Health Reform Law may result in an increase in the number of patients using our facilities who have either private or public program coverage. In addition, the Health Reform Law provides for initiatives that create possible sources of additional revenue, such as ACOs. However, any positive effects of the Health Reform Law could be offset, and the Company could be significantly impacted, by reductions to the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Substantial uncertainty remains regarding the net effect of the Health Reform Law on the Company because the resolution of a number of material factors remains unclear, including the following:

- how many states will ultimately implement the Medicaid expansion provisions and under what terms;
- the potential for and impact of further delays in or complications related to implementation of the Health Reform Law (for example, there were significant problems during the initial implementation of the Exchanges that negatively impacted the ability of individuals to purchase health insurance);
- the possibility of enactment of additional federal or state health care reforms and possible changes to the Health Reform Law;
- our ability to participate in health insurance plans offered through the Exchanges and the terms of our participation as well as treatment of out of network claims;
- how many previously uninsured individuals will obtain coverage as a result of the Health Reform Law (based on the CBO s January 2015 estimates, by 2025, the Health Reform Law will expand coverage to 27 million additional individuals);
- what percentage of the newly insured patients will be covered under the Medicaid program and what percentage will be covered by private health insurers;
- the extent to which states will enroll new Medicaid participants in managed care programs;
- the pace at which insurance coverage expands, including the pace of different types of coverage expansion;
- the change, if any, in the volume of inpatient and outpatient hospital services that are sought by and provided to previously uninsured individuals;
- the rate paid to hospitals by private payers for newly covered individuals and individuals with existing coverage, including those covered through health insurance plans offered through the Exchanges, some of whom may have been previously covered by employer-sponsored plans;

the rate paid by state governments and private payers pursuant to contracts with the state under the Medicaid program for newly covered individuals;

the effect of the value-based purchasing provisions of the Health Reform Law on our hospitals revenues and the effects of other quality programs;

the percentage of individuals in the Exchanges who select the restricted network plans, since health insurers offering those kinds of products have traditionally sought to pay lower rates to hospitals;

the amount of overall revenues the Company will generate from Medicare and Medicaid business when the reductions are implemented (42.6% of our revenues in 2014 were from Medicare and Medicaid);

- the size of the Health Reform Law s annual productivity adjustment to the market basket;
- the amount of the Medicare DSH reductions and the allocation of the Medicaid DSH reductions to our hospitals;
- how successful ACOs will be at coordinating care and reducing costs or whether they will decrease reimbursement;
- the scope and nature of potential changes to Medicare reimbursement methods, such as an emphasis on bundling payments or coordination of care programs;
- whether the Company s revenues from Medicaid supplemental programs developed through a federally approved waiver program (Waiver Program), will be adversely affected because there may be reductions in available state and local government funding for the programs; and
- the impact of court challenges, including the King v. Burwell challenge to the extension of premium subsidies to plans purchased through federally-operated Exchanges, and efforts to repeal or revise the Health Reform Law.

General Economic and Demographic Factors

The health care industry is impacted by the overall United States economy. Budget deficits at federal, state and local government entities have had a negative impact on spending for many health and human service programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and similar programs, which represent significant payer sources for our hospitals. The federal deficit, the growing magnitude of Medicare expenditures and the aging of the United States population will continue to place pressure on federal health care programs. Other risks we face during periods of economic weakness and high unemployment include potential declines in the population covered under managed care agreements, increased patient decisions to postpone or cancel elective and nonemergency health care procedures, increases in the uninsured and underinsured populations, increased adoption of health plan structures that shift financial responsibility to patients and further difficulties in our collecting patient receivables for copayment and deductible amounts. The Health Reform Law seeks to decrease over time the number of uninsured individuals, but it is difficult to predict the full impact of the Health Reform Law.

Compliance Program

We maintain a comprehensive ethics and compliance program that is designed to meet or exceed applicable federal guidelines and industry standards. The program is intended to monitor and raise awareness of various regulatory issues among employees and to emphasize the importance of complying with governmental laws and regulations. As part of the ethics and compliance program, we provide annual ethics and compliance training to our employees and encourage all employees to report any violations to their supervisor, an ethics and compliance officer or a toll-free telephone ethics line. The Health Reform Law requires providers to implement core elements of compliance program criteria to be established by HHS, on a timeline to be established by HHS, as a condition of enrollment in the Medicare or Medicaid programs, and we may have to modify our compliance programs to comply with these new criteria.

Antitrust Laws

The federal government and most states have enacted antitrust laws that prohibit certain types of conduct deemed to be anti-competitive. These laws prohibit price fixing, market allocation, bid-rigging, concerted refusal to deal, market monopolization, price discrimination, tying arrangements, acquisitions of competitors and other practices that have, or may have, an adverse effect on competition. Violations of federal or state antitrust laws can result in various sanctions, including criminal and civil penalties. Antitrust enforcement in the health care industry is currently a priority of the Federal Trade Commission and the DOJ. We believe we are in compliance with such federal and state laws, but courts or regulatory authorities may reach a determination in the future that could adversely affect our operations.

Environmental Matters

We are subject to various federal, state and local statutes and ordinances regulating the discharge of materials into the environment. We do not believe that we will be required to expend any material amounts in order to comply with these laws and regulations.

Insurance

As is typical in the health care industry, we are subject to claims and legal actions by patients in the ordinary course of business. Subject, in most cases, to a $5 million per occurrence self-insured retention (effective January 1, 2015, the self-insured retention is increasing to $15 million per occurrence), our facilities are insured by our 100% owned insurance subsidiary for losses up to $50 million per occurrence. The insurance subsidiary has obtained reinsurance for professional liability risks generally above a retention level of $25 million per occurrence. We also maintain professional liability insurance with unrelated commercial carriers for losses in excess of amounts insured by our insurance subsidiary.

We purchase, from unrelated insurance companies, coverage for cyber security incidents, directors and officers liability and property loss in amounts we believe are adequate. The cyber security and directors and officers liability coverage each include a $5 million corporate deductible. In addition, we will continue to purchase coverage for our directors and officers on an ongoing basis. The property coverage includes varying deductibles depending on the cause of the property damage. These deductibles range from $500,000 per claim up to 5% of the affected property values for certain flood and wind and earthquake related incidents.

Employees and Medical Staffs

At December 31, 2014, we had approximately 225,000 employees, including approximately 56,000 part-time employees. References herein to employees refer to employees of our affiliates. We are subject to various state and federal laws that regulate wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions relating to employment. At December 31, 2014, certain employees at 38 of our domestic hospitals are represented by various labor unions. While no elections are expected in 2015, it is possible additional hospitals may unionize in the future. We consider our employee relations to be good and have not experienced work stoppages that have materially, adversely affected our business or results of operations. Our hospitals, like most hospitals, have experienced rising labor costs. In some markets, nurse and medical support personnel availability has become a significant operating issue to health care providers. To address this challenge, we have implemented several initiatives to improve retention, recruiting, compensation programs and productivity.

Our hospitals are staffed by licensed physicians, including both employed physicians and physicians who are not employees of our hospitals. Some physicians provide services in our hospitals under contracts, which generally describe a term of service, provide and establish the duties and obligations of such physicians, require the maintenance of certain performance criteria and fix compensation for such services. Any licensed physician may apply to be accepted to the medical staff of any of our hospitals, but the hospital s medical staff and the appropriate governing board of the hospital, in accordance with established credentialing criteria, must approve acceptance to the staff. Members of the medical staffs of our hospitals often also serve on the medical staffs of other hospitals and may terminate their affiliation with one of our hospitals at any time.

We may be required to continue to enhance wages and benefits to recruit and retain nurses and other medical support personnel or to hire more expensive temporary or contract personnel. As a result, our labor costs could increase. We also depend on the available labor pool of semi-skilled and unskilled employees in each of the markets in which we operate. Certain proposed changes in federal labor laws and the National Labor Relations Board s (the NLRB) modification of its election procedures could increase the likelihood of employee unionization attempts. To the extent a significant portion of our employee base unionizes, our costs could increase materially. In addition, the states in which we operate could adopt mandatory nurse-staffing ratios

Table of Contents

or could reduce mandatory nurse-staffing ratios already in place. State-mandated nurse-staffing ratios could significantly affect labor costs, and have an adverse impact on revenues if we are required to limit patient admissions in order to meet the required ratios.

Executive Officers of the Registrant

As of January 31, 2015, our executive officers were as follows:

Name	Age	Position(s)
R. Milton Johnson	58	Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and Director
David G. Anderson	67	Senior Vice President Finance
Victor L. Campbell	68	Senior Vice President
Ravi S. Chari, M.D.	49	Senior Vice President Clinical Excellence
Michael S. Cuffe, M.D.	49	President Physician Services Group
Jana J. Davis	56	Senior Vice President Corporate Affairs
Jane D. Englebright	56	Senior Vice President and Chief Nursing Officer
Jon M. Foster	53	President American Group
Charles J. Hall	61	President National Group
Samuel N. Hazen	54	Chief Operating Officer
A. Bruce Moore, Jr.	54	President Service Line and Operations Integration
Sandra L. Morgan	52	Senior Vice President Provider Relations
P. Martin Paslick	55	Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Jonathan B. Perlin, M.D.	53	President Clinical Services Group and Chief Medical Officer
William B. Rutherford	51	Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Joseph A. Sowell, III	58	Senior Vice President and Chief Development Officer
Joseph N. Steakley	60	Senior Vice President Internal Audit Services
John M. Steele	59	Senior Vice President Human Resources
Donald W. Stinnett	58	Senior Vice President and Controller
Juan Vallarino	54	Senior Vice President Employer and Payer Engagement
Robert A. Waterman	61	Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Chief Labor Relations Officer
Alan R. Yuspeh	65	Senior Vice President and Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer

R. Milton Johnson was appointed Chairman and Chief Executive Officer effective December 31, 2014. Mr. Johnson served as President and Chief Executive Officer from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014 and has been a director of the Company since December 2009. Mr. Johnson previously served the Company as President and Chief Financial Officer from February 2011 through December 2013 and Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from July 2004 to February 2011. Prior to that time, he served as Senior Vice President and Controller from July 1999 until July 2004 and as Vice President and Controller of the Company from November 1998 to July 1999. From April 1995 to October 1998, Mr. Johnson served as Vice President Tax of the Company. Prior to that time, Mr. Johnson served as Director of Tax for Healthtrust, Inc. The Hospital Company from September 1987 to April 1995.

David G. Anderson has served as Senior Vice President Finance since July 1999 and also served as Treasurer of the Company from November 1996 to July 2014. Mr. Anderson also served as Vice President Finance from September 1993 to July 1999. From March 1993 until September 1993, Mr. Anderson served as Vice President Finance and Treasurer of Galen Health Care, Inc. From July 1988 to March 1993, Mr. Anderson served as Vice President Finance and Treasurer of Humana Inc.

Victor L. Campbell has served as Senior Vice President of the Company since February 1994. He is responsible for government and investor relations. Prior to that time, Mr. Campbell served as HCA-Hospital Corporation of America s Vice President for Investor, Corporate and Government Relations. Mr. Campbell

joined HCA-Hospital Corporation of America in 1972. Mr. Campbell serves on the board of the Nashville Health Care Council, as a member of the American Hospital Association s President s Forum, and on the board and executive committee of the Federation of American Hospitals.

Dr. Ravi S. Chari was appointed Senior Vice President Clinical Excellence in January 2015. Prior to that time, Dr. Chari served as Vice President Clinical Excellence from September 2011 to January 2015 and Chief Medical Officer of HCA s TriStar Division from October 2010 to September 2011. He served as Chief Medical Officer at Centennial Medical Center from September 2008 to October 2010 and also served as interim Chief Operating Officer of the Sarah Cannon Cancer Centers for the TriStar Division from October 2009 to March 2010. Dr. Chari has also served as Clinical Professor of Surgery at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine since November 2008 and previously served as Professor of Surgery from 2005 to 2008 and Associate Professor from 2001 to 2005.

Dr. Michael S. Cuffe has served as President Physician Services Group since October 2011. From October 2011 to January 2015, Dr. Cuffe also served as a Vice President of the Company. Prior to that time, Dr. Cuffe served Duke University Health System as Vice President for Ambulatory Services and Chief Medical Officer from March 2011 to October 2011 and Vice President Medical Affairs from June 2005 to March 2011. He also served Duke University School of Medicine as Vice Dean for Medical Affairs from June 2008 to March 2011, Deputy Chair of the Department of Medicine from August 2009 to August 2010 and Associate Professor of Medicine from March 2005 to October 2011. Prior that time, Dr. Cuffe served in various leadership roles with the Duke Clinical Research Institute, Duke University Medical Center and Duke University School of Medicine.

Jana J. Davis was appointed Senior Vice President Corporate Affairs of the Company in December 2012. Prior to that time, she served as the Company s Senior Vice President Communications from February 2011 to December 2012 and Vice President of Communications from November 1997 to February 2011. Ms. Davis joined HCA in 1997 from Burson-Marsteller, where she was a Managing Director and served as Corporate Practice Chair for Latin American operations. Ms. Davis also held a number of Public Affairs positions in the George H.W. Bush and Reagan Administrations. Ms. Davis is an attorney and serves as chair of the Public Relations Committee for the Federation of American Hospitals.

Dr. Jane D. Englebright was appointed Senior Vice President and Chief Nursing Officer in January 2015. Dr. Englebright previously served as Vice President and Chief Nursing Officer from 2007 to January 2015. Dr. Englebright joined HCA in 1992 as a critical care nurse at Lewisville Medical Center in Texas and became Chief Nursing Officer of HCA s San Antonio Community Hospital in 1996. Dr. Englebright currently serves as the At-Large Nursing Representative to The Joint Commission s Board of Commissioners and chairs the Board of Governors of the National Patient Safety Foundation.

Jon M. Foster was appointed President American Group in January 2013. Prior to that, Mr. Foster served as President Southwest Group from February 2011 to January 2013 and as Division President for the Central and West Texas Division from January 2006 to February 2011. Mr. Foster joined HCA in March 2001 as President and CEO of St. David s HealthCare in Austin, Texas and served in that position until February 2011. Prior to joining the Company, Mr. Foster served in various executive capacities within the Baptist Health System, Knoxville, Tennessee and The Methodist Hospital System in Houston, Texas.

Charles J. Hall was appointed President National Group in February 2011. Prior to that, Mr. Hall served as President Eastern Group from October 2006 to February 2011. Mr. Hall had previously served the Company as President North Florida Division from April 2003 until October 2006, as President of the East Florida Division from January 1999 until April 2003, as a Market President in the East Florida Division from January 1998 until December 1998, as President of the South Florida Division from February 1996 until December 1997, and as President of the Southwest Florida Division from October 1994 until February 1996, and in various other capacities since 1987.

Samuel N. Hazen was appointed Chief Operating Officer in January 2015. Prior to that time, he served as President Operations of the Company from February 2011 to January 2015. Mr. Hazen served as President Western Group from July 2001 to February 2011 and as Chief Financial Officer Western Group of the

Table of Contents

Company from August 1995 to July 2001. Mr. Hazen served as Chief Financial Officer North Texas Division of the Company from February 1994 to July 1995. Prior to that time, Mr. Hazen served in various hospital and regional Chief Financial Officer positions with Humana Inc. and Galen Health Care, Inc.

A. Bruce Moore, Jr. was appointed President Service Line and Operations Integration in February 2011. Prior to that, Mr. Moore had served as President Outpatient Services Group since January 2006. Mr. Moore served as Senior Vice President and as Chief Operating Officer Outpatient Services Group from July 2004 to January 2006 and as Senior Vice President Operations Administration from July 1999 until July 2004. Mr. Moore served as Vice President Operations Administration of the Company from September 1997 to July 1999, as Vice President Benefits from October 1996 to September 1997, and as Vice President Compensation from March 1995 until October 1996.

Sandra L. Morgan was appointed Senior Vice President Provider Relations in January 2015. Prior to that time, she served as Vice President National Sales from April 2008 to January 2015. From 2000 to 2008, Ms. Morgan served in various capacities with Pfizer Inc., including Vice President of Sales for the Customer Business Unit from 2005 to 2008.

P. Martin Paslick was appointed Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer of the Company in June 2012. Prior to that time, he served as Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of Information Technology & Services from March 2010 to May 2012 and Vice President Information Technology & Services Field Operations from September 2006 to February 2010. From January 1998 to September 2006, he served in various Vice President roles in the Company s Information Technology & Services department. Mr. Paslick joined the Company in 1985.

Dr. Jonathan B. Perlin was appointed President Clinical Services Group and Chief Medical Officer in November 2007. Dr. Perlin had served as Chief Medical Officer and Senior Vice President Quality of the Company from August 2006 to November 2007. Prior to joining the Company, Dr. Perlin served as Under Secretary for Health in the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs since April 2004. Dr. Perlin joined the Veterans Health Administration in November 1999 where he served in various capacities, including as Deputy Under Secretary for Health from July 2002 to April 2004, and as Chief Quality and Performance Officer from November 1999 to September 2002. He also served as Senior Advisor to the Acting Secretary of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs from July 2014 to September 2014 and is the current Chairman-elect for the American Hospital Association.

William B. Rutherford has served as the Company s Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer since January 2014. Mr. Rutherford previously served as Chief Operating Officer of the Company s Clinical and Physician Services Group from January 2011 to January 2014 and Chief Financial Officer of the Company s Outpatient Services Group from November 2008 to January 2011. Prior to that time, Mr. Rutherford was employed by Summit Consulting Group of Tennessee from July 2007 to November 2008 and was Chief Operating Officer of Psychiatric Solutions, Inc. from March 2006 to June 2007. Mr. Rutherford also previously served in various positions with the Company from 1986 to 2005, including Chief Financial Officer of what was then the Company s Eastern Group, Director of Internal Audit and Director of Operations Support.

Joseph A. Sowell, III was appointed as Senior Vice President and Chief Development Officer of the Company in December 2009. From 1987 to 1996 and again from 1999 to 2009, Mr. Sowell was a partner at the law firm of Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis where he specialized in the areas of health care law, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, private equity financing, tax law and general corporate law. He also co-managed the firm s corporate and commercial transactions practice. From 1996 to 1999, Mr. Sowell served as the head of development, and later as the Chief Operating Officer of Arcon Healthcare.

Joseph N. Steakley has served as Senior Vice President Internal Audit Services of the Company since July 1999. Mr. Steakley served as Vice President Internal Audit Services from November 1997 to July 1999. From October 1989 until October 1997, Mr. Steakley was a partner with Ernst & Young LLP.

John M. Steele has served as Senior Vice President Human Resources of the Company since November 2003. Mr. Steele served as Vice President Compensation and Recruitment of the Company from

November 1997 to October 2003. From March 1995 to November 1997, Mr. Steele served as Assistant Vice President Recruitment.

Donald W. Stinnett has served as Senior Vice President and Controller since December 2008. Mr. Stinnett served as Chief Financial Officer Eastern Group from October 2005 to December 2008 and Chief Financial Officer of the Far West Division from July 1999 to October 2005. Mr. Stinnett served as Chief Financial Officer and Vice President of Finance of Franciscan Health System of the Ohio Valley from 1995 until 1999, and served in various capacities with Franciscan Health System of Cincinnati and Providence Hospital in Cincinnati prior to that time.

Juan Vallarino was appointed Senior Vice President Employer and Payer Engagement (former Senior Vice President Strategic Pricing and Analytics) in February 2011. From October 2006 to February 2011, Mr. Vallarino served as Vice President Strategic Pricing and Analytics. Prior to that, Mr. Vallarino served as Vice President of Managed Care for the Western Group of the Company from January 1998 to October 2006.

Robert A. Waterman has served as Senior Vice President and General Counsel of the Company since November 1997 and Chief Labor Relations Officer since March 2009. Mr. Waterman served as a partner in the law firm of Latham & Watkins from September 1993 to October 1997; he was Chair of the firm s health care group during 1997.

Alan R. Yuspeh has served as Senior Vice President and Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer of the Company since May 2007. From October 1997 to May 2007, Mr. Yuspeh served as Senior Vice President Ethics, Compliance and Corporate Responsibility of the Company. From September 1991 until October 1997, Mr. Yuspeh was a partner with the law firm of Howrey & Simon. As a part of his law practice, Mr. Yuspeh served from 1987 to 1997 as Coordinator of the Defense Industry Initiative on Business Ethics and Conduct.

Item 1A. ***Risk Factors***

If any of the events discussed in the following risk factors were to occur, our business, financial position, results of operations, cash flows or prospects could be materially, adversely affected. Additional risks and uncertainties not presently known, or currently deemed immaterial, may also constrain our business and operations.

Our substantial leverage could adversely affect our ability to raise additional capital to fund our operations, limit our ability to react to changes in the economy or our industry, expose us to interest rate risk to the extent of our variable rate debt and prevent us from meeting our obligations.

We are highly leveraged. As of December 31, 2014, our total indebtedness was $29.645 billion. As of December 31, 2014, we had availability of $1.944 billion under our senior secured revolving credit facility and $168 million under our asset-based revolving credit facility, after giving effect to letters of credit and borrowing base limitations. Our high degree of leverage could have important consequences, including:

- increasing our vulnerability to downturns or adverse changes in general economic, industry or competitive conditions and adverse changes in government regulations;

- requiring a substantial portion of cash flow from operations to be dedicated to the payment of principal and interest on our indebtedness, therefore reducing our ability to use our cash flow to fund our operations, capital expenditures and future business opportunities;

- exposing us to the risk of increased interest rates as certain of our unhedged borrowings are at variable rates of interest;

- limiting our ability to make strategic acquisitions or causing us to make nonstrategic divestitures;

- limiting our ability to obtain additional financing for working capital, capital expenditures, product or service line development, debt service requirements, acquisitions and general corporate or other purposes; and

limiting our ability to adjust to changing market conditions and placing us at a competitive disadvantage compared to our competitors who are less highly leveraged.

Table of Contents

We and our subsidiaries have the ability to incur additional indebtedness in the future, subject to the restrictions contained in our senior secured credit facilities and the indentures governing our outstanding notes. If new indebtedness is added to our current debt levels, the related risks that we now face could intensify.

We may not be able to generate sufficient cash to service all of our indebtedness and may not be able to refinance our indebtedness on favorable terms. If we are unable to do so, we may be forced to take other actions to satisfy our obligations under our indebtedness, which may not be successful.

Our ability to make scheduled payments on or to refinance our debt obligations depends on our financial condition and operating performance, which are subject to prevailing economic and competitive conditions and to certain financial, business and other factors beyond our control. We cannot assure you we will maintain a level of cash flows from operating activities sufficient to permit us to pay the principal, premium, if any, and interest on our indebtedness.

In addition, we conduct our operations through our subsidiaries. Accordingly, repayment of our indebtedness is dependent on the generation of cash flow by our subsidiaries and their ability to make such cash available to us by dividend, debt repayment or otherwise. Our subsidiaries may not be able to, or may not be permitted to, make distributions to enable us to make payments in respect of our indebtedness. Each subsidiary is a distinct legal entity, and, under certain circumstances, legal and contractual restrictions may limit our ability to obtain cash from our subsidiaries. We may find it necessary or prudent to refinance our outstanding indebtedness with longer-maturity debt at a higher interest rate. Our ability to refinance our indebtedness on favorable terms, or at all, is directly affected by the current global economic and financial conditions. In addition, our ability to incur secured indebtedness (which would generally enable us to achieve better pricing than the incurrence of unsecured indebtedness) depends in part on the value of our assets, which depends, in turn, on the strength of our cash flows and results of operations, and on economic and market conditions and other factors.

If our cash flows and capital resources are insufficient to fund our debt service obligations or we are unable to refinance our indebtedness, we may be forced to reduce or delay investments and capital expenditures, or to sell assets, seek additional capital or restructure our indebtedness. These alternative measures may not be successful and may not permit us to meet our scheduled debt service obligations. If our operating results and available cash are insufficient to meet our debt service obligations, we could face substantial liquidity problems and might be required to dispose of material assets or operations to meet our debt service and other obligations. We may not be able to consummate those dispositions, or the proceeds from the dispositions may not be adequate to meet any debt service obligations then due.

Our debt agreements contain restrictions that limit our flexibility in operating our business.

Our senior secured credit facilities and, to a lesser extent, the indentures governing our outstanding notes contain various covenants that limit our ability to engage in specified types of transactions. These covenants limit our and certain of our subsidiaries ability to, among other things:

- incur additional indebtedness or issue certain preferred shares;
- pay dividends on, repurchase or make distributions in respect of our capital stock or make other restricted payments;
- make certain investments;
- sell or transfer assets;
- create liens;
- consolidate, merge, sell or otherwise dispose of all or substantially all of our assets; and

enter into certain transactions with our affiliates.

Under our asset-based revolving credit facility, when (and for as long as) the combined availability under our asset-based revolving credit facility and our senior secured revolving credit facility is less than a specified amount for a certain period of time or, if a payment or bankruptcy event of default has occurred and is continuing, funds deposited into any of our depository accounts will be transferred on a daily basis into a blocked account with the administrative agent and applied to prepay loans under the asset-based revolving credit facility and to cash collateralize letters of credit issued thereunder.

Under our senior secured credit facilities, we are required to satisfy and maintain specified financial ratios. Our ability to meet those financial ratios can be affected by events beyond our control, and there can be no assurance we will continue to meet those ratios. A breach of any of these covenants could result in a default under both the cash flow credit facility and the asset-based revolving credit facility. Upon the occurrence of an event of default under the senior secured credit facilities, the lenders thereunder could elect to declare all amounts outstanding under the senior secured credit facilities to be immediately due and payable and terminate all commitments to extend further credit. If we were unable to repay those amounts, the lenders under the senior secured credit facilities could proceed against the collateral granted to them to secure such indebtedness. We have pledged a significant portion of our assets under our senior secured credit facilities and that collateral is also pledged as collateral under our first lien notes. If any of the lenders under the senior secured credit facilities accelerate the repayment of borrowings, there can be no assurance there will be sufficient assets to repay the senior secured credit facilities, the first lien notes and our other indebtedness.

Our hospitals face competition for patients from other hospitals and health care providers.

The health care business is highly competitive, and competition among hospitals and other health care providers for patients has intensified in recent years. Generally, other hospitals in the communities we serve provide services similar to those offered by our hospitals. In addition, CMS publicizes on its Hospital Compare website performance data related to quality measures and data on patient satisfaction surveys hospitals submit in connection with their Medicare reimbursement. Federal law provides for the future expansion of the number of quality measures that must be reported. Additional quality measures and future trends toward clinical transparency may have an unanticipated impact on our competitive position and patient volumes. Further, every hospital must establish and update annually a public listing of the hospital s standard charges for items and services. If any of our hospitals achieve poor results (or results that are lower than our competitors) on these quality measures or on patient satisfaction surveys or if our standard charges are higher than our competitors, our patient volumes could decline.

In addition, the number of freestanding specialty hospitals, surgery centers, emergency departments, urgent care centers and diagnostic and imaging centers in the geographic areas in which we operate has increased significantly. As a result, most of our hospitals operate in a highly competitive environment. Some of the facilities that compete with our hospitals are physician-owned or are owned by governmental agencies or not-for-profit corporations supported by endowments, charitable contributions and/or tax revenues and can finance capital expenditures and operations on a tax-exempt basis. Our hospitals face competition from competitors that are implementing physician alignment strategies, such as employing physicians, acquiring physician practice groups and participating in ACOs or other clinical integration models. Our hospitals compete with specialty hospitals and with both our own and unaffiliated freestanding surgery centers for market share in certain high margin services and for quality physicians and personnel. If ambulatory surgery centers are better able to compete in this environment than our hospitals, our hospitals may experience a decline in patient volume, and we may experience a decrease in margin, even if those patients use our ambulatory surgery centers. In states that do not require a CON or other type of approval for the purchase, construction or expansion of health care facilities or services, competition in the form of new services, facilities and capital spending is more prevalent. Further, if our competitors are better able to attract patients, make capital expenditures and maintain modern and technologically upgraded facilities and equipment, recruit physicians, expand services or obtain favorable managed care contracts at their facilities than our hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers, we may experience an overall decline in patient volume. See Item 1, Business Competition.

Table of Contents

A deterioration in the collectability of uninsured and patient due accounts could adversely affect our results of operations.

The primary collection risks of our accounts receivable relate to the uninsured patient accounts and patient accounts for which the primary insurance carrier has paid the amounts covered by the applicable agreement, but patient responsibility amounts (exclusions, deductibles and copayments) remain outstanding. The provision for doubtful accounts relates primarily to amounts due directly from patients. Medicare reimburses hospitals for 65% of eligible Medicare bad debts. To be eligible for reimbursement, the amounts claimed must meet certain criteria, including that the debt is related to unpaid deductible or coinsurance amounts and that the hospital first attempted to collect the fees from the Medicare beneficiary.

The amount of the provision for doubtful accounts is based upon management s assessment of historical write-offs and expected net collections, business and economic conditions, trends in federal and state governmental and private employer health care coverage, the rate of growth in uninsured patient admissions and other collection indicators. At December 31, 2014, our allowance for doubtful accounts represented approximately 91.4% of the $5.482 billion patient due accounts receivable balance. The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care increased from $13.841 billion for 2012 to $15.565 billion for 2013 and to $15.943 billion for 2014.

Any increase in the amount or deterioration in the collectability of uninsured accounts receivable will adversely affect our cash flows and results of operations. Our facilities may experience growth in bad debts, uninsured discounts and charity care as a result of a number of factors, including conditions impacting the overall economy and high unemployment. The Health Reform Law contains provisions that seek to decrease, over time, the number of uninsured individuals through reforms, most of which became effective January 1, 2014, but it is difficult to predict the full impact of the Health Reform Law. For example, a number of states have opted out of the Medicaid expansion. Further, the employer mandate, which requires firms with 50 or more full-time employees to offer health insurance or pay fines, will not be fully implemented until January 1, 2016. Even after full implementation of the Health Reform Law, we may continue to experience bad debts and have to provide uninsured discounts and charity care for individuals residing in states that choose not to implement the Medicaid expansion, for undocumented aliens who are not permitted to enroll in an Exchange or government health care programs and for certain others who may not have insurance coverage. Further, implementation of the Health Reform Law could result in some patients terminating their current insurance plans in favor of lower cost Medicaid plans or other insurance coverage with lower reimbursement levels. We may also be adversely affected by the growth in patient responsibility accounts as a result of increases in the adoption of plan structures that shift greater responsibility for care to individuals through greater exclusions and copayment and deductible amounts.

Changes in government health care programs may adversely affect our revenues.

A significant portion of our patient volume is derived from government health care programs, principally Medicare and Medicaid. Specifically, we derived 42.6% of our revenues from the Medicare and Medicaid programs in 2014. Changes in government health care programs may reduce the reimbursement we receive and could adversely affect our business and results of operations.

In recent years, legislative and regulatory changes have resulted in limitations on and, in some cases, reductions in levels of payments to health care providers for certain services under the Medicare program. The Budget Control Act of 2011 (the BCA) requires automatic spending reductions of $1.2 trillion for federal fiscal years 2013 through 2021, minus any deficit reductions enacted by Congress and debt service costs. However, the percentage reduction for Medicare may not be more than 2% for a fiscal year, with a uniform percentage reduction across all Medicare programs. These reductions have been extended by Congress through 2024. We are unable to predict what other deficit reduction initiatives may be proposed by Congress or whether Congress will attempt to suspend or restructure the automatic budget cuts. These reductions are in addition to reductions mandated by the Health Reform Law, which provides for material reductions in the growth of Medicare program spending, including reductions in Medicare market basket updates and Medicare DSH funding. Further, from

Table of Contents

time to time, CMS revises the reimbursement systems used to reimburse health care providers, including changes to the MS-DRG system and other payment systems, which may result in reduced Medicare payments. For example, CMS has established what is referred to as the two midnight rule, which provides that Medicare beneficiaries are only to be admitted as inpatients when there is a reasonable expectation that the hospital care is medically necessary and will be required across two midnights, absent unusual circumstances. Compliance with the rule became required for admissions beginning October 1, 2013 and will become subject to RAC audits for admissions on or after April 1, 2015.

Because most states must operate with balanced budgets and because the Medicaid program is often a state s largest program, some states have enacted or may consider enacting legislation designed to reduce their Medicaid expenditures. Further, many states have also adopted, or are considering, legislation designed to reduce coverage, enroll Medicaid recipients in managed care programs and/or impose additional taxes on hospitals to help finance or expand the states Medicaid systems. The economic downturn increased the budgetary pressures on many states, and these budgetary pressures have resulted, and likely may continue to result, in decreased spending, or decreased spending growth, for Medicaid programs and the Children s Health Insurance Program in many states. Some states that provide Medicaid supplemental payments are reviewing these programs or have filed waiver requests with CMS to replace these programs, which could result in Medicaid supplemental payments being reduced or eliminated. CMS approved a five-year Medicaid waiver in December 2011 that allows Texas to continue receiving supplemental Medicaid reimbursement while expanding its Medicaid managed care program. On October 1, 2014, the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (THHSC) issued a notice to hospitals participating in the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program. According to the notice, a review conducted by CMS identified certain local government/hospital affiliations it believes may be inconsistent with the waiver. In addition, CMS notified THHSC that it would defer the federal portion of the Medicaid payments associated with the affiliations while it completes the review. CMS announced on January 7, 2015 that the payment deferral has been released, but the review is continuing. We cannot predict whether the Texas private supplemental Medicaid Waiver Program will continue or guarantee that revenues recognized from the program will not decrease.

The Health Reform Law made changes to the Medicaid program and will likely cause additional changes in the future. For example, the Health Reform Law provides for material reductions to Medicaid DSH funding. The Health Reform Law will result in increased state legislative and regulatory changes in order for states to comply with new federal mandates, such as the requirement to establish or participate in Exchanges and to participate in grants and other incentive opportunities. A number of states have opted out of the Medicaid expansion provisions of the Health Reform Law, but these states could choose to implement the expansion at a later date. It is unclear how many states will ultimately implement the Medicaid expansion provisions of the law.

In some cases, commercial third-party payers rely on all or portions of Medicare payment systems to determine payment rates. Changes to government health care programs that reduce payments under these programs may negatively impact payments from commercial third-party payers.

Current or future health care reform and deficit reduction efforts, changes in laws or regulations regarding government health care programs, other changes in the administration of government health care programs and changes to commercial third-party payers in response to health care reform and other changes to government health care programs could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations.

We are unable to predict the ultimate impact of the Health Reform Law, which represents a significant change to the health care industry.

The Health Reform Law changes how health care services are covered, delivered, and reimbursed through expanded coverage of uninsured individuals, reduced growth in Medicare program spending, reductions in Medicare and Medicaid DSH payments and the establishment and expansion of programs that tie reimbursement to quality and integration. In addition, the law reforms certain aspects of health insurance, contains provisions intended to strengthen fraud and abuse enforcement and establishes ACOs and bundled payment pilot programs.

Table of Contents

The expansion of health insurance coverage under the Health Reform Law may result in an increase in the number of patients using our facilities who have either private or public program coverage, and our facilities may benefit from Health Reform Law initiatives that create possible sources of additional revenue. However, any positive effects of the Health Reform Law could be offset and the Company could be significantly impacted by reductions to the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Substantial uncertainty remains regarding the net effect of the Health Reform Law on the Company because the resolution of a number of material factors remains unclear, including the following:

- how many states will ultimately implement the Medicaid expansion provisions and under what terms;
- the potential for and impact of further delays in or complications related to implementation of the Health Reform Law (for example, there were significant problems during the initial implementation of the Exchanges that negatively impacted the ability of individuals to purchase health insurance);
- the possibility of enactment of additional federal or state health care reforms and possible changes to the Health Reform Law;
- our ability to participate in health insurance plans offered through the Exchanges and the terms of our participation as well as treatment of out of network claims;
- how many previously uninsured individuals will obtain coverage as a result of the Health Reform Law (based on the CBO s January 2015 estimates, by 2025, the Health Reform Law will expand coverage to 27 million additional individuals);
- what percentage of the newly insured patients will be covered under the Medicaid program and what percentage will be covered by private health insurers;
- the extent to which states will enroll new Medicaid participants in managed care programs;
- the pace at which insurance coverage expands, including the pace of different types of coverage expansion;
- the change, if any, in the volume of inpatient and outpatient hospital services that are sought by and provided to previously uninsured individuals;
- the rate paid to hospitals by private payers for newly covered individuals and individuals with existing coverage including those covered through health insurance plans offered through the Exchanges, some of whom may have been previously covered by employer-sponsored plans;
- the rate paid by state governments and private payers pursuant to contracts with the state under the Medicaid program for newly covered individuals;
- the effect of the value-based purchasing provisions of the Health Reform Law on our hospitals revenues and the effects of other quality programs;

the percentage of individuals in the Exchanges who select restricted network plans, since health insurers offering those kinds of products have traditionally sought to pay lower rates to hospitals;

the amount of overall revenues the Company will generate from Medicare and Medicaid business when the reductions are implemented (42.6% of our revenues in 2014 were from Medicare and Medicaid);

the size of the Health Reform Law s annual productivity adjustment to the market basket;

the amount of the Medicare DSH reductions and the allocation of the Medicaid DSH reductions to our hospitals;

how successful ACOs will be at coordinating care and reducing costs or whether they will decrease reimbursement;

the scope and nature of potential changes to Medicare reimbursement methods, such as an emphasis on bundling payments or coordination of care programs;

whether the Company s revenues from Medicaid supplemental programs developed through a federally approved waiver program (Waiver Program), will be adversely affected because there may be reductions in available state and local government funding for the programs; and

the impact of court challenges, including the King v. Burwell challenge to the extension of premium subsidies to plans purchased through federally-operated Exchanges, and efforts to repeal or revise the Health Reform Law.

If we are unable to retain and negotiate favorable contracts with nongovernment payers, including managed care plans, our revenues may be reduced.

Our ability to obtain favorable contracts with nongovernment payers, including HMOs, PPOs and other managed care plans significantly affects the revenues and operating results of our facilities. Revenues derived from these entities and other insurers (domestic only) accounted for 54.4%, 54.6% and 54.5% of our revenues for 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Nongovernment payers, including managed care payers, continue to demand discounted fee structures, and the trend toward consolidation among nongovernment payers tends to increase their bargaining power over fee structures. As various provisions of the Health Reform Law are implemented, including the Exchanges, nongovernment payers increasingly may demand reduced fees and utilize plan structures such as narrow networks and tiered networks that limit beneficiary provider choices or impose significantly higher cost sharing obligations when care is obtained from providers in a disfavored tier. Other health care providers may impact our ability to enter into managed care contracts or negotiate increases in our reimbursement and other favorable terms and conditions. For example, some of our competitors may negotiate exclusivity provisions with managed care plans or otherwise restrict the ability of managed care companies to contract with us. Our future success will depend, in part, on our ability to retain and renew our managed care contracts and enter into new managed care contracts on terms favorable to us. It is not clear what impact, if any, the increased obligations on managed care payers and other payers imposed by the Health Reform Law will have on our ability to negotiate reimbursement increases and participate in plan networks on favorable terms. If we are unable to retain and negotiate favorable contracts with managed care plans or experience reductions in payment increases or amounts received from nongovernment payers, our revenues may be reduced.

Our performance depends on our ability to recruit and retain quality physicians.

The success of our hospitals depends in part on the number and quality of the physicians on the medical staffs of our hospitals, the admitting and utilization practices of those physicians, maintaining good relations with those physicians and controlling costs related to the employment of physicians. Although we employ some physicians, physicians are often not employees of the hospitals at which they practice and, in many of the markets we serve, most physicians have admitting privileges at other hospitals in addition to our hospitals. Such physicians may terminate their affiliation with our hospitals at any time. If we are unable to provide adequate support personnel or technologically advanced equipment and hospital facilities that meet the needs of those physicians and their patients, they may be discouraged from referring patients to our facilities, admissions may decrease and our operating performance may decline.

Our hospitals face competition for staffing, which may increase labor costs and reduce profitability.

Our operations are dependent on the efforts, abilities and experience of our management and medical support personnel, such as nurses, pharmacists and lab technicians, as well as our physicians. We compete with other health care providers in recruiting and retaining qualified management and support personnel responsible for the daily operations of each of our hospitals, including nurses and other nonphysician health care professionals. In some markets, the availability of nurses and other medical support personnel has been a significant operating issue to health care providers. We may be required to continue to enhance wages and benefits to recruit and retain nurses and other medical support personnel or to hire more expensive temporary or contract personnel. As a result, our labor costs could increase. We also depend on the available labor pool of semi-skilled and unskilled employees in each of the markets in which we operate. Certain proposed changes in federal labor laws and the NLRB s modification of its election procedures could increase the likelihood of

employee unionization attempts. To the extent a significant portion of our employee base unionizes, it is possible our labor costs could increase materially. When negotiating collective bargaining agreements with unions, whether such agreements are renewals or first contracts, there is the possibility that strikes could occur during the negotiation process, and our continued operation during any strikes could increase our labor costs. In addition, the states in which we operate could adopt mandatory nurse-staffing ratios or could reduce mandatory nurse staffing ratios already in place. State-mandated nurse-staffing ratios could significantly affect labor costs and have an adverse impact on revenues if we are required to limit admissions in order to meet the required ratios. If our labor costs increase, we may not be able to raise rates to offset these increased costs. Because a significant percentage of our revenues consists of fixed, prospective payments, our ability to pass along increased labor costs is constrained. Our failure to recruit and retain qualified management, nurses and other medical support personnel, or to control labor costs, could have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations.

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

The health care industry is required to comply with extensive and complex laws and regulations at the federal, state and local government levels relating to, among other things:

- billing and coding for services and properly handling overpayments;
- appropriateness and classification of level of care provided, including proper classification of inpatient admissions, observation services and outpatient care;
- relationships with physicians and other referral sources and referral recipients;
- necessity and adequacy of medical care;
- quality of medical equipment and services;
- qualifications of medical and support personnel;
- confidentiality, maintenance, data breach, identity theft and security issues associated with health-related and personal information and medical records;
- screening, stabilization and transfer of individuals who have emergency medical conditions;
- licensure, certification and enrollment with government programs;
- hospital rate or budget review;
- debt collection;

- preparing and filing of cost reports;
- operating policies and procedures;
- activities regarding competitors;
- addition of facilities and services; and
- environmental protection.

Among these laws are the federal Anti-kickback Statute, the federal Stark Law, the federal FCA and similar state laws. We have a variety of financial relationships with physicians and others who either refer or influence the referral of patients to our hospitals, other health care facilities and employed physicians or who are the recipients of referrals, and these laws govern those relationships. The OIG has enacted safe harbor regulations that outline practices deemed protected from prosecution under the Anti-kickback Statute. While we endeavor to comply with the applicable safe harbors, certain of our current arrangements, including joint ventures and financial relationships with physicians and other referral sources and persons and entities to which we refer patients, do not qualify for safe harbor protection. Failure to qualify for a safe harbor does not mean the arrangement necessarily violates the Anti-kickback Statute but may subject the arrangement to greater scrutiny. However, we cannot offer assurance that practices outside of a safe harbor will not be found to violate the Anti-

Table of Contents

kickback Statute. Allegations of violations of the Anti-kickback Statute may be brought under the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law, which requires a lower burden of proof than other fraud and abuse laws, including the Anti-kickback Statute.

Our financial relationships with referring physicians and their immediate family members must comply with the Stark Law by meeting an exception. We attempt to structure our relationships to meet an exception to the Stark Law, but the regulations implementing the exceptions are detailed and complex, and we cannot provide assurance that every relationship complies fully with the Stark Law. Unlike the Anti-kickback Statute, failure to meet an exception under the Stark Law results in a violation of the Stark Law, even if such violation is technical in nature.

Additionally, if we violate the Anti-kickback Statute or Stark Law, or if we improperly bill for our services, we may be found to violate the FCA, either under a suit brought by the government or by a private person under a *qui tam*, or whistleblower, suit. See Item 1, Business Regulation and Other Factors.

We also operate health care facilities in the United Kingdom and have operations and commercial relationships with companies in other foreign jurisdictions and, as a result, are subject to certain U.S. and foreign laws applicable to businesses generally, including anti-corruption laws. The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act regulates U.S. companies in their dealings with foreign officials, prohibiting bribes and similar practices, and requires that they maintain records that fairly and accurately reflect transactions and appropriate internal accounting controls. In addition, the United Kingdom Bribery Act has wide jurisdiction over certain activities that affect the United Kingdom.

If we fail to comply with these or other applicable laws and regulations, we could be subject to liabilities, including civil penalties, the loss of our licenses to operate one or more facilities, exclusion of one or more facilities from participation in the Medicare, Medicaid and other federal and state health care programs and criminal penalties.

We do not always have the benefit of significant regulatory or judicial interpretation of these laws and regulations. In the future, different interpretations or enforcement of, or amendment to, these or other laws and regulations could subject our current or past practices to allegations of impropriety or illegality or could require us to make changes in our facilities, equipment, personnel, services, capital expenditure programs and operating expenses. A determination that we have violated these or other laws, or the public announcement that we are being investigated for possible violations of these or other laws, could have a material, adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations or prospects, and our business reputation could suffer significantly. In addition, other legislation or regulations at the federal or state level may be adopted that adversely affect our business.

We have been and could become the subject of governmental investigations, claims and litigation.

Health care companies are subject to numerous investigations by various governmental agencies. Further, under the FCA, private parties have the right to bring *qui tam*, or whistleblower, suits against companies that submit false claims for payments to, or improperly retain overpayments from, the government. Some states have adopted similar state whistleblower and false claims provisions. Certain of our individual facilities have received, and other facilities may receive, government inquiries from, and may be subject to investigation by, federal and state agencies. Depending on whether the underlying conduct in these or future inquiries or investigations could be considered systemic, their resolution could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position, results of operations and liquidity.

Governmental agencies and their agents, such as the Medicare Administrative Contractors, fiscal intermediaries and carriers, as well as the OIG, CMS and state Medicaid programs, conduct audits of our health care operations. Private payers may conduct similar post-payment audits, and we also perform internal audits and monitoring. Depending on the nature of the conduct found in such audits and whether the underlying conduct could be considered systemic, the resolution of these audits could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position, results of operations and liquidity.

Table of Contents

CMS contracts with RACs on a contingency fee basis to conduct post-payment reviews to detect and correct improper payments in the fee-for-service Medicare program. The Health Reform Law expands the RAC program s scope to include managed Medicare plans and Medicaid claims. RAC denials are appealable; however, HHS has imposed a suspension of assignment of new Medicare appeals to Administrative Law Judges for at least two years beginning July 16, 2013, which negatively impacts our ability to appeal RAC payment denials. HHS recently offered to pay hospitals 68% of the net allowable amount associated with inpatient status claims denials in exchange for the withdrawal of all medical claims appealed. We accepted the settlement offer and executed an administrative agreement with HHS.

In addition, CMS employs MICs to perform post-payment audits of Medicaid claims and identify overpayments. The Health Reform Law increases federal funding for the MIC program. In addition to RACs and MICs, the state Medicaid agencies and other contractors have increased their review activities.

Should we be found out of compliance with any of these laws, regulations or programs, depending on the nature of the findings, our business, our financial position and our results of operations could be negatively impacted.

Changes to physician utilization practices and treatment methodologies or governmental or managed care controls designed to reduce inpatient services or surgical procedures may reduce our revenues.

Controls imposed by Medicare, managed Medicare, Medicaid, managed Medicaid and commercial third-party payers designed to reduce admissions, intensity of services, surgical volumes and lengths of stay, in some instances referred to as utilization review, have affected and are expected to continue to affect our facilities. Utilization review entails the review of the admission and course of treatment of a patient by health plans. The Medicare program also issues national or local coverage determinations that restrict the circumstances under which Medicare pays for certain services. Inpatient utilization, average lengths of stay and occupancy rates continue to be negatively affected by payer-required preadmission authorization, coverage restrictions and utilization review and by payer pressure to maximize outpatient and alternative health care delivery services for less acutely ill patients. Efforts to impose more stringent cost controls are expected to continue. For example, the Health Reform Law expanded the use of prepayment review by Medicare contractors by eliminating statutory restrictions on their use. Additionally, trends in physician treatment protocols and managed care health plan design, such as plans that shift increased costs and accountability for care to patients, could reduce our surgical volumes and admissions in favor of lower intensity and lower cost treatment methodologies. Changes in treatment regimens and medical technology advances may reduce the demand for services we offer and decrease the reimbursement that we receive. Significant limits on the scope of services reimbursed, cost controls, and changes to physician utilization practices, treatment methodologies, reimbursement rates and fees could have a material, adverse effect on our business, financial position and results of operations.

Our overall business results may suffer during periods of general economic weakness.

Budget deficits at federal, state and local government entities have had a negative impact on spending, and may continue to negatively impact spending, for health and human service programs, including Medicare, Medicaid and similar programs, which represent significant payer sources for our hospitals. Other risks we face during periods of economic weakness and high unemployment include potential declines in the population covered under managed care agreements, patient decisions to postpone or cancel elective and nonemergency health care procedures (including delaying surgical procedures), potential increases in the uninsured and underinsured populations and further difficulties in collecting patient copayment and deductible receivables.

The industry trend toward value-based purchasing may negatively impact our revenues.

There is a trend in the health care industry toward value-based purchasing of health care services. These value-based purchasing programs include both public reporting of quality data and preventable adverse events

tied to the quality and efficiency of care provided by facilities. Governmental programs including Medicare currently require hospitals to report certain quality data to receive full reimbursement updates. In addition, Medicare does not reimburse for care related to certain preventable adverse events (also called never events). The Health Reform Law also prohibits the use of federal funds under the Medicaid program to reimburse providers for medical assistance provided to treat HACs. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2015, the 25% of hospitals with the worst risk-adjusted HAC rates in the designated performance period will receive a 1% reduction in their inpatient PPS Medicare payments.

Hospitals with excess readmission rates for conditions designated by HHS will receive a reduction in their inpatient PPS operating Medicare payments for all Medicare inpatient discharges, not just discharges relating to the conditions subject to the excess readmission standard. The reduction in payments to hospitals with excess readmissions is capped at 3% for federal fiscal year 2015 and subsequent years.

As required by the Health Reform Law, HHS has implemented a value-based purchasing program for inpatient hospital services that reduces inpatient hospital payments for all discharges by 1.5% in federal fiscal year 2015. This percentage increases by 0.25% each fiscal year up to 2% in federal fiscal year 2017 and subsequent years. HHS pools the amount collected from these reductions to fund payments to reward hospitals that meet or exceed certain quality performance standards established by HHS. HHS estimates that it will distribute $1.4 billion to hospitals in federal fiscal year 2015 based on their achievement (relative to other hospitals) and improvement (relative to the hospital s own past performance). Hospitals that meet or exceed the quality performance standards will receive greater reimbursement under the value-based purchasing program than they would have otherwise.

Many large commercial payers currently require hospitals to report quality data, and several commercial payers do not reimburse hospitals for certain preventable adverse events. Further, we have implemented a policy pursuant to which we do not bill patients or third-party payers for fees or expenses incurred due to certain preventable adverse events.

We expect value-based purchasing programs, including programs that condition reimbursement on patient outcome measures, to become more common and to involve a higher percentage of reimbursement amounts. We are unable at this time to predict our future reductions and payments under these programs or how this trend will affect our results of operations, but it could negatively impact our revenues.

Our operations could be impaired by a failure of our information systems.

The performance of our information systems is critical to our business operations. In addition to our shared services initiatives, our information systems are essential to a number of critical areas of our operations, including:

- accounting and financial reporting;
- billing and collecting accounts;
- coding and compliance;
- clinical systems;
- medical records and document storage;
- inventory management;
- negotiating, pricing and administering managed care contracts and supply contracts; and

monitoring quality of care and collecting data on quality measures necessary for full Medicare payment updates.

Table of Contents

Information systems may be vulnerable to damage from a variety of sources, including telecommunications or network failures, human acts and natural disasters. We have taken precautionary measures to prevent unanticipated problems that could affect our information systems. Nevertheless, we may experience system failures. The occurrence of any system failure could result in interruptions, delays, the loss or corruption of data and cessations or interruptions in the availability of systems, all of which could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations and harm our business reputation.

A cyber security incident could result in a loss of confidential data, give rise to remediation and other expenses, expose us to liability under HIPAA, consumer protection laws, or other common law theories, subject us to litigation and federal and state governmental inquiries, damage our reputation, and otherwise be disruptive to our business.

We collect and store on our networks sensitive information, including intellectual property, proprietary business information and personally identifiable information of our patients and employees. In addition, we have made significant investments in technology to adopt and utilize electronic health records and to become meaningful users of health information technology. The secure maintenance of this information is critical to our business operations. We have implemented multiple layers of security measures to protect the confidentiality, integrity and availability of this data through technology, processes, and our people. We utilize current security technologies, and our defenses are monitored and routinely tested internally and by external parties. Despite these efforts, threats from malicious persons and groups, new vulnerabilities and advanced new attacks against information systems create risk of cyber security incidents. There can be no assurance that we will not be subject to cyber security incidents that bypass our security measures, result in loss of personal health information or other data subject to privacy laws or disrupt our information systems or business. As a result, cyber security and the continued development and enhancement of our controls, processes and practices designed to protect our information systems from attack, damage or unauthorized access remain a priority for us. As cyber threats continue to evolve, we may be required to expend significant additional resources to continue to modify or enhance our protective measures or to investigate and remediate any cyber security vulnerabilities. The occurrence of any of these events could result in (i) business interruptions and delays; (ii) the loss, misappropriation, corruption or unauthorized access of data; (iii) litigation and potential liability under privacy, security and consumer protection laws or other applicable laws; and (iv) federal and state governmental inquiries, any of which could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations and harm our business reputation.

If we fail to effectively and timely implement electronic health record systems and transition to the ICD-10 coding system, our operations could be adversely affected.

As required by ARRA, the Secretary of HHS has developed and implemented an incentive payment program for eligible hospitals and health care professionals that adopt and meaningfully use certified EHR technology. HHS uses the Provider Enrollment, Chain and Ownership System (PECOS) to verify Medicare enrollment prior to making EHR incentive program payments. During 2014, we received Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments for being a meaningful user of certified EHR technology and recorded incentive income of $125 million for the year.

We have incurred and will continue to incur both capital costs and operating expenses in order to implement and maintain our certified EHR technology and meet meaningful use requirements. These expenses are ongoing and are projected to continue over all stages of implementation of meaningful use. The timing of expenses will not correlate with the receipt of the incentive payments and the recognition of incentive income. During 2014, we incurred $112 million of operating expenses to implement our certified EHR technology and to meet meaningful use. If our eligible hospitals and eligible employed professionals are unable to meet the requirements for participation in the incentive payment program, including having an enrollment record in PECOS, we will not be eligible to receive incentive payments that could offset some of the costs of implementing certified EHR

Table of Contents

technology. Further, eligible hospitals and eligible professionals that have failed to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology in an applicable prior reporting period will be subject to reduced payments from Medicare, beginning in federal fiscal year 2015 for eligible hospitals and calendar year 2015 for eligible professionals. Failure to implement and continue to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position and results of operations.

Health plans and providers, including our hospitals, are required to transition to the new ICD-10 coding system, which greatly expands the number and detail of billing codes used for inpatient claims. Use of the ICD-10 system is required beginning October 1, 2015. Transition to the new ICD-10 system requires significant investment in training of staff and physicians involved in the coding and billing process as well as investment in coding technology and software. In addition to these upfront costs of transition to ICD-10, it is possible that our hospitals could experience disruption or delays in payment due to technical or coding errors or other implementation issues involving our systems or the systems and implementation efforts of health plans and their business partners. Further, the transition to the more detailed ICD-10 coding system could result in decreased reimbursement if the use of ICD-10 codes results in conditions being reclassified to MS-DRGs or commercial payer payment groupings with lower levels of reimbursement than assigned under the previous system.

The emergence and effects related to a pandemic, epidemic or outbreak of an infectious disease, such as the Ebola virus, could adversely affect our operations.

If a pandemic, epidemic, outbreak of an infectious disease, such as the Ebola virus, or other public health crisis were to occur in an area in which we operate, our operations could be adversely affected. Such a crisis could diminish the public trust in health care facilities, especially hospitals that fail to accurately or timely diagnose, or are treating (or have treated) patients affected by infectious diseases. If any of our facilities were involved, or perceived as being involved, in treating patients from such an infectious disease, patients might cancel elective procedures or fail to seek needed care at our facilities. Further, a pandemic, epidemic or outbreak might adversely affect our operations by causing a temporary shutdown or diversion of patients, by disrupting or delaying production and delivery of materials and products in the supply chain or by causing staffing shortages in our facilities. We have disaster plans in place and operate pursuant to infectious disease protocols, but the potential emergence of a pandemic, epidemic or outbreak is difficult to predict and could adversely affect our operations.

State efforts to regulate the construction or expansion of health care facilities could impair our ability to operate and expand our operations.

Some states, particularly in the eastern part of the country, require health care providers to obtain prior approval, often known as a CON, for the purchase, construction or expansion of health care facilities, to make certain capital expenditures or to make changes in services or bed capacity. In giving approval, these states consider the need for additional or expanded health care facilities or services. We currently operate health care facilities in a number of states with CON laws or that require other types of approvals for the establishment or expansion of certain facility types or services. The failure to obtain any requested CON or other required approval could impair our ability to operate or expand operations. Any such failure could, in turn, adversely affect our ability to attract patients and physicians to our facilities and grow our revenues, which would have an adverse effect on our results of operations.

We may encounter difficulty acquiring hospitals and other health care businesses, encounter challenges integrating the operations of acquired hospitals and other health care businesses and become liable for unknown or contingent liabilities as a result of acquisitions.

A component of our business strategy is acquiring hospitals and other health care businesses. We may encounter difficulty acquiring new facilities or other businesses as a result of competition from other purchasers that may be willing to pay purchase prices that are higher than we believe are reasonable. Some states require CONs in order to acquire a hospital or other facility or to expand facilities or services. In addition, the acquisition

of health care facilities often involves licensure approvals or reviews and complex change of ownership processes for Medicare and other payers. Further, many states have laws that restrict the conversion or sale of not-for-profit hospitals to for-profit entities. These laws may require prior approval from the state attorney general, advance notification of the attorney general or other regulators and community involvement. Attorneys general in states without specific requirements may exercise broad discretionary authority over transactions involving the sale of not-for-profits under their general obligations to protect the use of charitable assets. These conversion legislative and administrative efforts often focus on the appropriate valuation of the assets divested and the use of the proceeds of the sale by the non-profit seller and may include consideration of commitments for capital improvements and charity care by the purchaser. Also, the increasingly challenging regulatory and enforcement environment may negatively impact our ability to acquire health care businesses if they are found to have material unresolved compliance issues, such as repayment obligations. Resolving compliance issues as well as completion of oversight, review or approval processes could seriously delay or even prevent our ability to acquire hospitals or other businesses and increase our acquisition costs.

We may be unable to timely and effectively integrate hospitals and other businesses that we acquire with our ongoing operations, or we may experience delays implementing operating procedures and systems. Hospitals and other health care businesses that we acquire may have unknown or contingent liabilities, including liabilities for failure to comply with health care and other laws and regulations, medical and general professional liabilities, workers compensation liabilities and tax liabilities. Although we typically exclude significant liabilities from our acquisition transactions and seek indemnification from the sellers for these matters, we could experience difficulty enforcing those obligations, experience liability in excess of any indemnification obtained or otherwise incur material liabilities for the pre-acquisition conduct of acquired businesses. Such liabilities and related legal or other costs could harm our business and results of operations.

Our facilities are heavily concentrated in Florida and Texas, which makes us sensitive to regulatory, economic, environmental and competitive conditions and changes in those states.

We operated 166 hospitals at December 31, 2014, and 78 of those hospitals are located in Florida and Texas. Our Florida and Texas facilities combined revenues represented approximately 46% of our consolidated revenues for the year ended December 31, 2014. This concentration makes us particularly sensitive to regulatory, economic, environmental and competitive conditions and changes in those states. Any material change in the current payment programs or regulatory, economic, environmental or competitive conditions in those states could have a disproportionate effect on our overall business results.

In addition, our hospitals in Florida, Texas and other areas across the Gulf Coast are located in hurricane-prone areas. In the past, hurricanes have had a disruptive effect on the operations of our hospitals in Florida, Texas and other coastal states and the patient populations in those states. Our business activities could be harmed by a particularly active hurricane season or even a single storm, and the property insurance we obtain may not be adequate to cover losses from future hurricanes or other natural disasters.

We may be subject to liabilities from claims by taxing authorities.

The IRS Examination Division began an audit of HCA Holdings, Inc. s 2011 and 2012 federal income tax returns during 2014. We are also subject to examination by state and foreign taxing authorities.

Management believes HCA Holdings, Inc., its predecessors, subsidiaries and affiliates properly reported taxable income and paid taxes in accordance with applicable laws and agreements established with the IRS, state and foreign taxing authorities and final resolution of any disputes will not have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations or financial position. However, if payments due upon final resolution of any issues exceed our recorded estimates, such resolutions could have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations or financial position.

We may be subject to liabilities from claims brought against our facilities.

We are subject to litigation relating to our business practices, including claims and legal actions by patients and others in the ordinary course of business alleging malpractice, product liability or other legal theories. Many of these actions seek large sums of money as damages and involve significant defense costs. We insure a portion of our professional liability risks through a 100% owned subsidiary. Management believes our reserves for self-insured retentions and insurance coverage are sufficient to cover insured claims arising out of the operation of our facilities. Our 100% owned liability insurance subsidiary has entered into certain reinsurance contracts, and the obligations covered by the reinsurance contracts are included in its reserves for professional liability risks, as the subsidiary remains liable to the extent that the reinsurers do not meet their obligations under the reinsurance contracts. If payments for claims exceed actuarially determined estimates, are not covered by insurance, or reinsurers, if any, fail to meet their obligations, our results of operations and financial position could be adversely affected.

We are exposed to market risk related to changes in the market values of securities and interest rate changes.

We are exposed to market risk related to changes in market values of securities. The investments in debt and equity securities of our 100% owned insurance subsidiaries were $555 million and $3 million, respectively, at December 31, 2014. These investments are carried at fair value, with changes in unrealized gains and losses being recorded as adjustments to other comprehensive income. At December 31, 2014, we had a net unrealized gain of $19 million on the insurance subsidiaries investment securities.

We are exposed to market risk related to market illiquidity. Investments in debt and equity securities of our 100% owned insurance subsidiaries could be impaired by the inability to access the capital markets. Should the 100% owned insurance subsidiaries require significant amounts of cash in excess of normal cash requirements to pay claims and other expenses on short notice, we may have difficulty selling these investments in a timely manner or be forced to sell them at a price less than what we might otherwise have been able to in a normal market environment. We may be required to recognize other-than-temporary impairments on long-term investments in future periods should issuers default on interest payments or should the fair market valuations of the securities deteriorate due to ratings downgrades or other issue specific factors.

We are also exposed to market risk related to changes in interest rates, and we periodically enter into interest rate swap agreements to manage our exposure to these fluctuations. Our interest rate swap agreements involve the exchange of fixed and variable rate interest payments between two parties, based on common notional principal amounts and maturity dates. The notional amounts of the swap agreements represent balances used to calculate the exchange of cash flows and are not our assets or liabilities.

The Investors may continue to have influence over us and may have conflicts of interest with us in the future.

On November 17, 2006, HCA Inc. was acquired by a private investor group, including affiliates of or funds sponsored by Bain Capital Partners, LLC, Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co., BAML Capital Partners and HCA founder, Dr. Thomas F. Frist, Jr. (collectively, the Investors) and by members of management and certain other investors. Through their investment in Hercules Holding II, LLC, certain of the Investors continue to hold a significant interest in our outstanding common stock (approximately 22% as of January 31, 2015). In addition, pursuant to a shareholders agreement we entered into with Hercules Holding II, LLC, certain representatives of the Investors have the continued right to designate certain of the members of our Board of Directors. As a result, certain of the Investors potentially have the ability to influence our decisions to enter into corporate transactions (and the terms thereof) and prevent changes in the composition of our Board of Directors and any transaction that requires stockholder approval.

Additionally, the Investors are in the business of making investments in companies and may acquire and hold interests in businesses that compete directly or indirectly with us. One or more of the Investors may also

Table of Contents

pursue acquisition opportunities that may be complementary to our business and, as a result, those acquisition opportunities may not be available to us.

Item 1B. ***Unresolved Staff Comments***

None.

Item 2. ***Properties***

The following table lists, by state, the number of hospitals (general, acute care, psychiatric and rehabilitation) directly or indirectly owned and operated by us as of December 31, 2014:

State	Hospitals	Beds
Alaska	1	250
California	5	1,725
Colorado	7	2,357
Florida	42	11,366
Georgia	7	1,609
Idaho	2	486
Indiana	1	278
Kansas	4	1,360
Kentucky	2	384
Louisiana	5	1,159
Mississippi	1	130
Missouri	5	1,014
Nevada	3	1,164
New Hampshire	2	295
Oklahoma	2	772
South Carolina	3	811
Tennessee	13	2,435
Texas	36	10,815
Utah	8	950
Virginia	10	3,132
International		
England	7	864
	166	43,356

In addition to the hospitals listed in the above table, we directly or indirectly operate 113 freestanding surgery centers. We also operate medical office buildings in conjunction with some of our hospitals. These office buildings are primarily occupied by physicians who practice at our hospitals. Fourteen of our general, acute care hospitals and two of our other properties have been mortgaged to support our obligations under our senior secured cash flow credit facility and first lien secured notes.

We maintain our headquarters in approximately 1,500,000 square feet of space in the Nashville, Tennessee area. In addition to the headquarters in Nashville, we maintain regional service centers related to our shared services initiatives. These service centers are located in markets in which we operate hospitals.

We believe our headquarters, hospitals and other facilities are suitable for their respective uses and are, in general, adequate for our present needs. Our properties are subject to various federal, state and local statutes and ordinances regulating their operation. Management does not believe that compliance with such statutes and ordinances will materially affect our financial position or results of operations.

Item 3. ***Legal Proceedings***

We operate in a highly regulated and litigious industry. As a result, various lawsuits, claims and legal and regulatory proceedings have been and can be expected to be instituted or asserted against us. We are subject to claims for additional taxes and related interest and penalties. We are also subject to claims and suits arising in the ordinary course of business, including claims for personal injuries or wrongful restriction of, or interference with, physicians staff privileges. In certain of these actions the claimants may seek punitive damages against us which may not be covered by insurance. The resolution of any such lawsuits, claims or legal and regulatory proceedings could have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations or financial position.

Government Investigations, Claims and Litigation

Health care companies are subject to numerous investigations by various governmental agencies. Further, under the federal False Claims Act (FCA), private parties have the right to bring *qui tam*, or whistleblower, suits against companies that submit false claims for payments to, or improperly retain overpayments from, the government. Some states have adopted similar state whistleblower and false claims provisions. Certain of our individual facilities have received, and from time to time, other facilities may receive, government inquiries from, and may be subject to investigation by, federal and state agencies. Depending on whether the underlying conduct in these or future inquiries or investigations could be considered systemic, their resolution could have a material, adverse effect on our financial position, results of operations and liquidity.

As initially disclosed in 2010, the Civil Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) has contacted the Company in connection with its nationwide review of whether, in certain cases, hospital charges to the federal government relating to implantable cardio-defibrillators (ICDs) met the CMS criteria. In connection with this nationwide review, the DOJ has indicated that it will be reviewing certain ICD billing and medical records at 95 HCA hospitals; the review covers the period from October 2003 to the present. In August 2012, HCA, along with non-HCA hospitals across the country subject to the DOJ s review, received from the DOJ a proposed framework for resolving the DOJ s review of ICDs. The Company is cooperating in the review. The review could potentially give rise to claims against the Company under the federal FCA or other statutes, regulations or laws. At this time, we cannot predict what effect, if any, this review or any resulting claims could have on the Company.

In July 2012, the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney s Office in Miami requested information on reviews assessing the medical necessity of interventional cardiology services provided at any Company facility (other than peer reviews). The Company cooperated with the government s request and produced medical records associated with particular reviews at eight hospitals, located primarily in Florida. On February 23, 2015, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida unsealed a *qui tam* action which had been filed under seal on February 16, 2012, and that alleges particular False Claims Act violations relating to two specific facilities that were among the subjects of the Miami U.S. Attorney s Office investigation. On January 30, 2015, the U.S. Attorney s Office filed with the District Court a formal notice that the Department of Justice had declined to intervene in that action. The U.S. Attorney s Office in Miami is continuing its evaluation of the medical necessity of certain interventional cardiology services at the other hospitals for which the Company produced records. At this time, we cannot predict what effect, if any, the *qui tam* action, or any claims that might result from the U.S. Attorney s continued review, including any potential claims under the federal FCA, other statutes, regulations or laws, could have on the Company.

On April 2, 2014, the UK Competition and Markets Authority (Authority) issued a final report on its investigation of the private health care market in London. It concluded, among other things, that many private hospitals face little competition in central London, and that there are high barriers to entry. As part of its remedies package, the Authority ordered HCA to sell either: (a) its London Bridge and Princess Grace hospitals; or (b) its Wellington Hospital, including the Hospital Platinum Medical Centre. It also imposed other remedial conditions on HCA and other private health care providers, including: regulation of incentives to referring physicians; increased access to information about fees and performance; and restrictions on future arrangements

between private providers and National Health Service private patient units. HCA disagrees with the Authority s assessment of the competitive conditions for hospitals in London, as well as its proposed divestiture remedy, and appealed the decision to the Competition Appeal Tribunal. The Competition Appeal Tribunal overturned certain of the Authority s findings and sent the matter back to the Authority for further proceedings.

Securities Class Action Litigation

On October 28, 2011, a shareholder action, Schuh v. HCA Holdings, Inc. et al., was filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee seeking monetary relief. The case sought to include as a class all persons who acquired the Company s stock pursuant or traceable to the Company s Registration Statement issued in connection with the March 9, 2011 initial public offering. The lawsuit asserted a claim under Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 against the Company, certain members of the board of directors, and certain underwriters in the offering. It further asserted a claim under Section 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 against the same members of the board of directors. The action alleged various deficiencies in the Company s disclosures in the Registration Statement. Subsequently, two additional class action complaints, Kishtah v. HCA Holdings, Inc. et al. and Daniels v. HCA Holdings, Inc. et al., setting forth substantially similar claims against substantially the same defendants were filed in the same federal court on November 16, 2011 and December 12, 2011, respectively. All three of the cases were consolidated. On May 3, 2012, the court appointed New England Teamsters & Trucking Industry Pension Fund as Lead Plaintiff for the consolidated action. On July 13, 2012, the lead plaintiff filed an amended complaint asserting claims under Sections 11 and 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 against the Company, certain members of the board of directors, and certain underwriters in the offering. It further asserts a claim under Section 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 against the same members of the board of directors and Hercules Holding II, LLC, a majority shareholder of the Company at the time of the initial public offering. The consolidated complaint alleges deficiencies in the Company s disclosures in the Registration Statement and Prospectus relating to: (1) the accounting for the Company s 2006 recapitalization and 2010 reorganization; (2) the Company s failure to maintain effective internal controls relating to its accounting for such transactions; and (3) the Company s Medicare and Medicaid revenue growth rates. The Company and other defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint on September 11, 2012. The court granted the motion in part on May 28, 2013. The action proceeded to discovery on the remaining claims. The plaintiffs motion for class certification was granted on September 22, 2014. The court certified a class consisting of all persons that acquired HCA stock on or before October 28, 2011 (the date of the lawsuit) pursuant to the Registration Statement issued in connection with the March 9, 2011 initial public offering. A request to the court of appeals to hear an immediate appeal of this ruling was denied.

In addition to the above described shareholder class actions, on December 8, 2011, a federal shareholder derivative action, Sutton v. Bracken, et al., putatively initiated in the name of the Company, was filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee against certain officers and present and former directors of the Company seeking monetary relief. The action alleges breaches of fiduciary duties by the named officers and directors in connection with the accounting and earnings claims set forth in the shareholder class actions described above. Setting forth substantially similar claims against substantially the same defendants, an additional federal derivative action, Schroeder v. Bracken, et al., was filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee on December 16, 2011, and a state derivative action, Bagot v. Bracken, et al., was filed in Tennessee state court in the Davidson County Circuit Court on December 20, 2011. The federal derivative actions were consolidated in the Middle District of Tennessee and stayed pending developments in the shareholder class actions. The state derivative action had also been stayed pending developments in the shareholder class actions, but that stay has expired. The plaintiff in the state derivative action subsequently filed an amended complaint on September 9, 2013 that added additional allegations made in the shareholder class actions. On September 24, 2013, an additional state derivative action, Steinberg v. Bracken, et al., was filed in Tennessee state court in the Davidson County Circuit Court. This action against our board of directors has been consolidated with the earlier filed state derivative action. The plaintiffs in the consolidated action filed a consolidated complaint on December 4, 2013. The Company filed a motion to again stay the state derivative action pending developments in the class action, but the court has not yet acted on that motion.

Table of Contents

Health Midwest Litigation

In October 2009, the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City, a nonprofit health foundation, filed suit against HCA Inc. in the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri and alleged that HCA did not fund the level of capital expenditures and uncompensated care agreed to in connection with HCA s purchase of hospitals from Health Midwest in 2003. The central issue in the case was whether HCA s construction of new hospitals counted towards its $450 million five-year capital commitments. In addition, the plaintiff alleged that HCA did not make its required capital expenditures in a timely fashion. On January 24, 2013, the court ruled in favor of the plaintiff and awarded at least $162 million. The court also ordered a court-supervised accounting of HCA s capital expenditures, as well as of expenditures on charity and uncompensated care during the ten years following the purchase. The court also indicated it would award plaintiff attorneys fees, which the parties have stipulated are approximately $12 million for the trial phase. HCA recorded $175 million of legal claim costs in the fourth quarter of 2012 related to this ruling, and consistent with the judge s order, has been accruing interest on that sum at 9% per annum. On April 25, 2014, the parties stipulated to an additional $78 million shortfall relating to the capital expenditures issue. HCA recorded $78 million of legal claims costs in the first quarter of 2014 as a result of the stipulation, and is accruing interest on that amount at 9% per annum. Pursuant to the terms of the stipulation, the parties have preserved their respective rights to contest the judge s underlying ruling, whether through motions in the trial court or on appeal. On February 9, 2015, the parties reached an agreement to settle the part of their dispute relating to charity and uncompensated care for $15 million. The foundation is required to use that amount, net of attorneys fees, for charitable activities in the Kansas City area. Final judgment in the case currently is anticipated for sometime in 2015. At this time, we cannot predict what effect, if any, the final judgment could have on the Company. HCA plans to appeal the trial court s ruling on the capital expenditures issues once the trial court enters judgment.

Item 4. ***Mine Safety Disclosures***

None.

Table of Contents

PART II

Item 5. ***Market for Registrant s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities***

During October 2014, our Board of Directors authorized a share repurchase program for up to $1 billion of our outstanding common stock. Repurchases made during the fourth quarter of 2014, as detailed below, were made pursuant to this authorization. The November 2014 repurchases were made in the open market. The December 2014 repurchases included the purchase of 7,612,921 shares of our common stock that were beneficially owned by affiliates of Bain Capital Investors, LLC at a purchase price of $73.26 per share, the closing price of our common stock on the New York Stock Exchange (the NYSE) on December 5, 2014, less a discount of 1%, and repurchases in the open market of 1,964,661 shares of our common stock at an average price of $72.44 per share.

The following table provides certain information with respect to our repurchases of common stock from October 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014 (dollars in millions, except per share amounts).

Period	Total Number of Shares Purchased	Average Price Paid per Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs	Approximate Dollar Value of Shares That May Yet Be Purchased Under Publicly Announced Plans or Programs
October 1, 2014 through October 31, 2014		$		$ 1,000
November 1, 2014 through November 30, 2014	4,451,009	$ 67.42	4,451,009	$ 700
December 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014	9,577,582	$ 73.09	14,028,591	$
Total for Fourth Quarter 2014	14,028,591	$ 71.29	14,028,591	$

Our common stock is traded on the NYSE (symbol HCA). There were no dividends or distributions declared during 2014 or 2013.

The table below sets forth, for the calendar quarters indicated, the high and low sales prices per share reported on the NYSE for our common stock.

	Sales Price	
	High	**Low**
2014		
First Quarter	$ 52.68	$ 46.02
Second Quarter	58.55	47.79
Third Quarter	73.94	53.61
Fourth Quarter	75.82	62.50
2013		
First Quarter	$ 40.92	$ 30.65
Second Quarter	41.83	35.40
Third Quarter	43.11	35.20
Fourth Quarter	49.52	42.60

At the close of business on February 13, 2015, there were approximately 340 holders of record of our common stock.

Table of Contents

	3/10/2011	3/2011	6/2011	9/2011	12/2011	3/2012	6/2012	9/2012	12/2012	3/2013	6/2013	9/2013	12/2013	3/2014	6/2014	9/2014	12/
Holdings Inc.	**100.00**	**109.19**	**106.38**	**64.99**	**71.02**	**86.11**	**105.92**	**115.73**	**121.66**	**163.84**	**145.41**	**172.39**	**192.39**	**211.71**	**227.35**	**284.37**	**2**
00	**100.00**	**100.04**	**100.14**	**86.25**	**96.44**	**108.58**	**105.60**	**112.30**	**111.88**	**123.74**	**127.35**	**134.02**	**148.11**	**150.79**	**158.68**	**160.47**	**1**
lealth Care	**100.00**	**101.90**	**109.91**	**98.90**	**108.76**	**118.61**	**120.68**	**128.12**	**128.21**	**148.48**	**154.18**	**164.69**	**181.37**	**191.90**	**200.56**	**211.50**	**2**

The graph shows the cumulative total return to our stockholders beginning as of March 10, 2011, the day our stock began trading on the NYSE, and through December 31, 2014, in comparison to the cumulative returns of the S&P 500 Index and the S&P Health Care Index. The graph assumes $100 invested on March 10, 2011 in our common stock and in each index with the subsequent reinvestment of dividends. The stock performance shown on the graph represents historical stock performance and is not necessarily indicative of future stock price performance.

Table of Contents

Item 6. ***Selected Financial Data***

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

AS OF AND FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31

(Dollars in millions, except per share amounts)

	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Summary of Operations:					
Revenues before provision for doubtful accounts	**$ 40,087**	$ 38,040	$ 36,783	$ 32,506	$ 30,683
Provision for doubtful accounts	**3,169**	3,858	3,770	2,824	2,648
Revenues	**36,918**	34,182	33,013	29,682	28,035
Salaries and benefits	**16,641**	15,646	15,089	13,440	12,484
Supplies	**6,262**	5,970	5,717	5,179	4,961
Other operating expenses	**6,755**	6,237	6,048	5,470	5,004
Electronic health record incentive income	**(125)**	(216)	(336)	(210)	
Equity in earnings of affiliates	**(43)**	(29)	(36)	(258)	(282)
Depreciation and amortization	**1,820**	1,753	1,679	1,465	1,421
Interest expense	**1,743**	1,848	1,798	2,037	2,097
Losses (gains) on sales of facilities	**(29)**	10	(15)	(142)	(4)
Losses on retirement of debt	**335**	17		481	
Legal claim costs	**78**		175		
Gain on acquisition of controlling interest in equity investment				(1,522)	
Termination of management agreement				181	
Impairments of long-lived assets					123
	33,437	31,236	30,119	26,121	25,804
Income before income taxes	**3,481**	2,946	2,894	3,561	2,231
Provision for income taxes	**1,108**	950	888	719	658
Net income	**2,373**	1,996	2,006	2,842	1,573
Net income attributable to noncontrolling interests	**498**	440	401	377	366
Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc.	**$ 1,875**	$ 1,556	$ 1,605	$ 2,465	$ 1,207
Per common share data:					
Basic earnings per share	**$ 4.30**	$ 3.50	$ 3.65	$ 5.17	$ 2.83
Diluted earnings per share	**$ 4.16**	$ 3.37	$ 3.49	$ 4.97	$ 2.76
Cash dividends declared per share	**$**	$	$ 6.50	$	$ 9.43
Financial Position:					
Assets	**$ 31,199**	$ 28,831	$ 28,075	$ 26,898	$ 23,852
Working capital	**3,450**	2,342	1,591	1,679	2,650
Long-term debt, including amounts due within one year	**29,645**	28,376	28,930	27,052	28,225
Equity securities with contingent redemption rights					141
Noncontrolling interests	**1,396**	1,342	1,319	1,244	1,132
Stockholders deficit	**(6,498)**	(6,928)	(8,341)	(7,014)	(10,794)
Cash Flow Data:					
Cash provided by operating activities	**$ 4,448**	$ 3,680	$ 4,175	$ 3,933	$ 3,085

Cash used in investing activities	**(2,918)**	(2,346)	(2,063)	(2,995)	(1,039)
Capital expenditures	**(2,176)**	(1,943)	(1,862)	(1,679)	(1,325)
Cash used in financing activities	**(1,378)**	(1,625)	(1,780)	(976)	(1,947)

Table of Contents

	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Operating Data:					
Number of hospitals at end of period(a)	**166**	165	162	163	156
Number of freestanding outpatient surgical centers at end of period(b)	**113**	115	112	108	97
Number of licensed beds at end of period(c)	**43,356**	42,896	41,804	41,594	38,827
Weighted average licensed beds(d)	**43,132**	42,133	41,795	39,735	38,655
Admissions(e)	**1,795,300**	1,744,100	1,740,700	1,620,400	1,554,400
Equivalent admissions(f)	**2,958,700**	2,844,700	2,832,100	2,595,900	2,468,400
Average length of stay (days)(g)	**4.8**	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Average daily census(h)	**23,835**	22,853	22,521	21,123	20,523
Occupancy(i)	**55%**	54%	54%	53%	53%
Emergency room visits(j)	**7,450,700**	6,968,100	6,912,000	6,143,500	5,706,200
Outpatient surgeries(k)	**891,600**	881,900	873,600	799,200	783,600
Inpatient surgeries(l)	**518,900**	508,800	506,500	484,500	487,100
Days revenues in accounts receivable(m)	**54**	54	51	52	49
Outpatient revenues as a % of patient revenues(n)	**38%**	38%	38%	37%	36%

(a) Excludes eight facilities in 2010 that were not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.

(b) Excludes one facility in 2012 and 2011 and nine facilities in 2010 that were not consolidated (accounted for using the equity method) for financial reporting purposes.

(c) Licensed beds are those beds for which a facility has been granted approval to operate from the applicable state licensing agency.

(d) Represents the average number of licensed beds, weighted based on periods owned.

(e) Represents the total number of patients admitted to our hospitals and is used by management and certain investors as a general measure of inpatient volume.

(f) Equivalent admissions are used by management and certain investors as a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume. Equivalent admissions are computed by multiplying admissions (inpatient volume) by the sum of gross inpatient revenue and gross outpatient revenue and then dividing the resulting amount by gross inpatient revenue. The equivalent admissions computation equates outpatient revenue to the volume measure (admissions) used to measure inpatient volume, resulting in a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume.

(g) Represents the average number of days admitted patients stay in our hospitals.

(h) Represents the average number of patients in our hospital beds each day.

(i) Represents the percentage of hospital licensed beds occupied by patients. Both average daily census and occupancy rate provide measures of the utilization of inpatient rooms.

(j) Represents the number of patients treated in our emergency rooms.

(k) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who were not admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in outpatient surgeries.

(l) Represents the number of surgeries performed on patients who have been admitted to our hospitals. Pain management and endoscopy procedures are not included in inpatient surgeries.

(m) Revenues per day is calculated by dividing the revenues for the fourth quarter of each year by the days in the period. Days revenues in accounts receivable is then calculated as accounts receivable, net of the allowance for doubtful accounts, at the end of the period divided by revenues per day. Revenues used in this computation are net of the provision for doubtful accounts.

(n) Represents the percentage of patient revenues related to patients who are not admitted to our hospitals.

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

Item 7. ***Management s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations***

The selected financial data and the accompanying consolidated financial statements present certain information with respect to the financial position, results of operations and cash flows of HCA Holdings, Inc. which should be read in conjunction with the following discussion and analysis. The terms HCA, Company, we, our, or us, as used herein, refer to HCA Holdings, Inc. and its affiliates. The term affiliates direct and indirect subsidiaries of HCA Holdings, Inc. and partnerships and joint ventures in which such subsidiaries are partners.

Forward-Looking Statements

This annual report on Form 10-K includes certain disclosures which contain forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements include statements regarding estimated EHR incentive income and related EHR operating expenses, expected share-based compensation expense, expected capital expenditures and expected net claim payments and all other statements that do not relate solely to historical or current facts, and can be identified by the use of words like may, believe, will, expect, project, estimate, anticipate, plan, initiative or forward-looking statements are based on our current plans and expectations and are subject to a number of known and unknown uncertainties and risks, many of which are beyond our control, which could significantly affect current plans and expectations and our future financial position and results of operations. These factors include, but are not limited to, (1) the impact of our substantial indebtedness and the ability to refinance such indebtedness on acceptable terms, (2) the effects related to the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (collectively, the Health Reform Law), possible delays in or complications related to implementation of the Health Reform Law, court challenges, the possible enactment of additional federal or state health care reforms and possible changes to the Health Reform Law and other federal, state or local laws or regulations affecting the health care industry, (3) the effects related to the continued implementation of the sequestration spending reductions required under the Budget Control Act of 2011, and related legislation extending these reductions, and the potential for future deficit reduction legislation that may alter these spending reductions, which include cuts to Medicare payments, or create additional spending reductions, (4) increases in the amount and risk of collectability of uninsured accounts and deductibles and copayment amounts for insured accounts, (5) the ability to achieve operating and financial targets, and attain expected levels of patient volumes and control the costs of providing services, (6) possible changes in the Medicare, Medicaid and other state programs, including Medicaid upper payment limit programs or Waiver Programs, that may impact reimbursements to health care providers and insurers, (7) the highly competitive nature of the health care business, (8) changes in service mix, revenue mix and surgical volumes, including potential declines in the population covered under managed care agreements, the ability to enter into and renew managed care provider agreements on acceptable terms and the impact of consumer driven health plans and physician utilization trends and practices, (9) the efforts of insurers, health care providers and others to contain health care costs, (10) the outcome of our continuing efforts to monitor, maintain and comply with appropriate laws, regulations, policies and procedures, (11) increases in wages and the ability to attract and retain qualified management and personnel, including affiliated physicians, nurses and medical and technical support personnel, (12) the availability and terms of capital to fund the expansion of our business and improvements to our existing facilities, (13) changes in accounting practices, (14) changes in general economic conditions nationally and regionally in our markets, (15) the emergence and effects related to infectious diseases, including Ebola, (16) future divestitures which may result in charges and possible impairments of long-lived assets, (17) changes in business strategy or development plans, (18) delays in receiving payments for services provided, (19) the outcome of pending and any future tax audits, disputes and litigation associated with our tax positions, (20) potential adverse impact of known and unknown government investigations, litigation and other claims that may be made against us, (21) our ongoing ability to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Forward-Looking Statements (continued)

technology and recognize income for the related Medicare or Medicaid incentive payments, and (22) other risk factors described in this annual report on Form 10-K. As a consequence, current plans, anticipated actions and future financial position and results of operations may differ from those expressed in any forward-looking statements made by or on behalf of HCA. You are cautioned not to unduly rely on such forward-looking statements when evaluating the information presented in this report.

2014 Operations Summary

Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc. totaled $1.875 billion, or $4.16 per diluted share, for 2014, compared to $1.556 billion, or $3.37 per diluted share, for 2013. The 2014 results include net gains on sales of facilities of $29 million, or $0.04 per diluted share, losses on retirement of debt of $335 million, or $0.47 per diluted share, and legal claim costs of $78 million, or $0.11 per diluted share. The 2013 results include net losses on sales of facilities of $10 million, or $0.02 per diluted share, and losses on retirement of debt of $17 million, or $0.02 per diluted share. All per diluted share disclosures are based upon amounts net of the applicable income taxes. Shares used for diluted earnings per share were 450.352 million shares and 461.913 million shares for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. During 2014, we repurchased 28.583 million shares of our common stock.

Revenues increased to $36.918 billion for 2014 from $34.182 billion for 2013. Revenues increased 8.0% and 6.9%, respectively, on a consolidated basis and on a same facility basis for 2014, compared to 2013. The consolidated revenues increase can be primarily attributed to the combined impact of a 3.8% increase in revenue per equivalent admission and a 4.0% increase in equivalent admissions. The same facility revenues increase resulted primarily from a 3.9% increase in same facility revenue per equivalent admission and a 2.9% increase in same facility equivalent admissions.

During 2014, consolidated admissions increased 2.9% and same facility admissions increased 2.1%, compared to 2013. Inpatient surgical volumes increased 2.0% on a consolidated basis and increased 1.3% on a same facility basis during 2014, compared to 2013. Outpatient surgical volumes increased 1.1% on a consolidated basis and declined 0.1% on a same facility basis during 2014, compared to 2013. Emergency room visits increased 6.9% on a consolidated basis and increased 5.8% on a same facility basis during 2014, compared to 2013.

For 2014, the provision for doubtful accounts declined $689 million, compared to 2013. The self-pay revenue deductions for charity care and uninsured discounts increased $278 million and $789 million, respectively, for 2014, compared to 2013. The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, as a percentage of the sum of revenues, the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, was 30.2% for 2014, compared to 31.3% for 2013. Same facility uninsured admissions declined 9.4% and same facility uninsured emergency room visits declined 6.6% for 2014, compared to 2013. We believe these declines were primarily due to previously uninsured patients obtaining medical coverage through the health insurance exchanges and Medicaid expansion programs.

Interest expense totaled $1.743 billion for 2014, compared to $1.848 billion for 2013. The $105 million decline in interest expense for 2014 was due primarily to a decline in the average interest rate.

Cash flows from operating activities increased $768 million, from $3.680 billion for 2013 to $4.448 billion for 2014. The increase in cash flows from operating activities was primarily related to the net impact of an

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

2014 Operations Summary (continued)

increase in net income of $377 million, net positive changes in working capital items of $150 million, a net benefit of $357 million related to gains (losses) on sales of facilities, losses on retirement of debt and legal claim costs, and a negative impact of $226 million related to income taxes.

Business Strategy

We are committed to providing the communities we serve with high quality, cost-effective health care while growing our business, increasing our profitability and creating long-term value for our stockholders. To achieve these objectives, we align our efforts around the following growth agenda:

Grow Our Presence in Existing Markets. We believe we are well positioned in a number of large and growing markets that will allow us the opportunity to generate long-term, attractive growth through the expansion of our presence in these markets. We plan to continue recruiting and strategically collaborating with the physician community and adding attractive service lines such as cardiology, emergency services, oncology and women s services. Additional components of our growth strategy include expanding our footprint through developing various outpatient access points, including surgery centers, rural outreach, freestanding emergency departments and walk-in clinics.

Achieve Industry-Leading Performance in Clinical and Satisfaction Measures. Achieving high levels of patient safety, patient satisfaction and clinical quality are central goals of our business model. To achieve these goals, we have implemented a number of initiatives including infection reduction initiatives, hospitalist programs, advanced health information technology and evidence-based medicine programs. We routinely analyze operational practices from our best-performing hospitals to identify ways to implement organization-wide performance improvements and reduce clinical variation. We believe these initiatives will continue to improve patient care, help us achieve cost efficiencies, grow our revenues and favorably position us in an environment where our constituents are increasingly focused on quality, efficacy and efficiency.

Recruit and Employ Physicians to Meet Need for High Quality Health Services. We depend on the quality and dedication of the health care providers and other team members who serve at our facilities. We believe a critical component of our growth strategy is our ability to successfully recruit and strategically collaborate with physicians and other professionals to provide high quality care. We attract and retain physicians by providing high quality, convenient facilities with advanced technology, by expanding our specialty services and by building our outpatient operations. We believe our continued investment in the employment, recruitment and retention of physicians will improve the quality of care at our facilities.

Continue to Leverage Our Scale and Market Positions to Enhance Profitability. We believe there is significant opportunity to continue to grow the profitability of our company by fully leveraging the scale and scope of our franchise. We are currently pursuing next generation performance improvement initiatives such as contracting for services on a multistate basis and expanding our support infrastructure for additional clinical and support functions, such as physician credentialing, medical transcription and electronic medical recordkeeping. We believe our centrally managed business processes and ability to leverage cost-saving practices across our extensive network will enable us to continue to manage costs effectively. We continue to invest in our Parallon subsidiary group to leverage key components of our support infrastructure, including revenue cycle management, health care group purchasing, supply chain management and staffing functions and are offering these services to other hospital companies.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Business Strategy (continued)

Selectively Pursue a Disciplined Development Strategy. We continue to believe there are significant growth opportunities in our markets. We will continue to provide financial and operational resources to analyze and develop our in-market opportunities. To complement our in-market growth agenda, we intend to focus on selectively developing and acquiring new hospitals, outpatient facilities and other health care service providers. We believe the challenges faced by the hospital industry may spur consolidation and we believe our size, scale, national presence and access to capital will position us well to participate in any such consolidation. We have a strong record of successfully acquiring and integrating hospitals and entering into joint ventures and intend to continue leveraging this experience.

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates

The preparation of our consolidated financial statements requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, the disclosure of contingent liabilities and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses. Our estimates are based on historical experience and various other assumptions we believe are reasonable under the circumstances. We evaluate our estimates on an ongoing basis and make changes to the estimates and related disclosures as experience develops or new information becomes known. Actual results may differ from these estimates.

We believe the following critical accounting policies affect our more significant judgments and estimates used in the preparation of our consolidated financial statements.

Revenues

Revenues are recorded during the period the health care services are provided, based upon the estimated amounts due from payers. Estimates of contractual allowances under managed care health plans are based upon the payment terms specified in the related contractual agreements. Laws and regulations governing the Medicare and Medicaid programs are complex and subject to interpretation. The estimated reimbursement amounts are made on a payer-specific basis and are recorded based on the best information available regarding management s interpretation of the applicable laws, regulations and contract terms. Management continually reviews the contractual estimation process to consider and incorporate updates to laws and regulations and the frequent changes in managed care contractual terms resulting from contract renegotiations and renewals. We have invested significant resources to refine and improve our billing systems and the information system data used to make contractual allowance estimates. We have developed standardized calculation processes and related training programs to improve the utility of our patient accounting systems.

The Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) requires any hospital participating in the Medicare program to conduct an appropriate medical screening examination of every person who presents to the hospital s emergency room for treatment and, if the individual is suffering from an emergency medical condition, to either stabilize the condition or make an appropriate transfer of the individual to a facility able to handle the condition. The obligation to screen and stabilize emergency medical conditions exists regardless of an individual s ability to pay for treatment. Federal and state laws and regulations, including but not limited to EMTALA, require, and our commitment to providing quality patient care encourages, the provision of services to patients who are financially unable to pay for the health care services they receive. The Health Reform Law requires health plans to reimburse hospitals for emergency services provided to enrollees without prior authorization and without regard to whether a participating provider contract is in place. Further, the Health Reform Law contains provisions that seek to decrease the number of uninsured individuals, including

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates (continued)

Revenues (continued)

requirements or incentives, most of which became effective on January 1, 2014, for individuals to obtain, and large employers to provide, insurance coverage. These mandates are reducing the financial impact of screening for and stabilizing emergency medical conditions. However, many factors are continuing to develop regarding the impact of the Health Reform Law, including how many previously uninsured individuals will obtain and maintain coverage as a result of the law, the change, if any, in the volume of inpatient and outpatient hospital services that are sought by and provided to previously uninsured individuals and overall changes in the payer mix.

We do not pursue collection of amounts related to patients who meet our guidelines to qualify as charity care; therefore, they are not reported in revenues. Patients treated at our hospitals for nonelective care, who have income at or below 200% of the federal poverty level, are eligible for charity care. The federal poverty level is established by the federal government and is based on income and family size. We provide discounts from our gross charges to uninsured patients who do not qualify for Medicaid or charity care. After the discounts are applied, we are still unable to collect a significant portion of uninsured patients accounts, and we record significant provisions for doubtful accounts (based upon our historical collection experience) related to uninsured patients in the period the services are provided.

Due to the complexities involved in the classification and documentation of health care services authorized and provided, the estimation of revenues earned and the related reimbursement are often subject to interpretations that could result in payments that are different from our estimates. Adjustments to estimated Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement amounts and disproportionate-share funds, which resulted in net increases to revenues, related primarily to cost reports filed during the respective year were $50 million, $41 million and $50 million in 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. The adjustments to estimated reimbursement amounts, which resulted in net increases to revenues, related primarily to cost reports filed during previous years were $53 million, $68 million and $242 million in 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. The 2012 amount related to cost reports filed during previous years includes two adjustments to Medicare revenues that affected multiple annual cost report periods for the majority of our hospitals (the Rural Floor Provision Settlement increased revenues by approximately $271 million and the implementation of revised Supplemental Security Income ratios reduced revenues by approximately $75 million). Excluding the effect of these Medicare adjustments, the 2012 amount related to previous years would have been $46 million. We expect adjustments during the next 12 months related to Medicare and Medicaid cost report filings and settlements will result in increases to revenues generally similar to the amounts recorded during 2014 and 2013.

Provision for Doubtful Accounts and the Allowance for Doubtful Accounts

The collection of outstanding receivables from Medicare, Medicaid, managed care payers, other third-party payers and patients is our primary source of cash and is critical to our operating performance. The primary collection risks relate to uninsured patient accounts, including patient accounts for which the primary insurance carrier has paid the amounts covered by the applicable agreement, but patient responsibility amounts (deductibles and copayments) remain outstanding. The provision for doubtful accounts and the allowance for doubtful accounts relate primarily to amounts due directly from patients. An estimated allowance for doubtful accounts is recorded for all uninsured accounts, regardless of the aging of those accounts. Accounts are written off when all reasonable internal and external collection efforts have been performed. Our collection policies include a review of all accounts against certain standard collection criteria, upon completion of our primary internal collection efforts. Accounts determined to possess positive collectibility attributes are forwarded to a secondary internal or external collection agency and the other accounts are written off. The accounts that are not collected by the

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates (continued)

Provision for Doubtful Accounts and the Allowance for Doubtful Accounts (continued)

secondary collection agency are written off when secondary collection efforts are completed (usually within 12 months). Writeoffs are based upon specific identification and the writeoff process requires a writeoff adjustment entry to the patient accounting system. We do not pursue collection of amounts related to patients that meet our guidelines to qualify as charity care.

The amount of the provision for doubtful accounts is based upon management s assessment of historical writeoffs and expected net collections, business and economic conditions, trends in federal, state, and private employer health care coverage and other collection indicators. Management relies on the results of detailed reviews of historical writeoffs and recoveries at facilities that represent a majority of our revenues and accounts receivable (the hindsight analysis) as a primary source of information in estimating the collectibility of our accounts receivable. We perform the hindsight analysis quarterly, utilizing rolling twelve-months accounts receivable collection and writeoff data. We believe our quarterly updates to the estimated allowance for doubtful accounts at each of our hospital facilities provide reasonable valuations of our accounts receivable. These routine, quarterly changes in estimates have not resulted in material adjustments to our allowance for doubtful accounts, provision for doubtful accounts or period-to-period comparisons of our results of operations. At December 31, 2014 and 2013, the allowance for doubtful accounts represented approximately 91.4%, of the $5.482 billion and 92.6% of the $5.927 billion, respectively, patient due accounts receivable balance. The patient due accounts receivable balance represents the estimated uninsured portion of our accounts receivable. The estimated uninsured portion of Medicaid pending and uninsured discount pending accounts is included in our patient due accounts receivable balance.

To quantify the total impact of and trends related to uninsured accounts, we believe it is beneficial to view the revenue deductions related to uninsured accounts (charity care and uninsured discounts) and provision for doubtful accounts in combination, rather than each separately. A summary of these amounts for the years ended December 31, follows (dollars in millions):

	2014	2013	2012
Charity care	**$ 3,775**	$ 3,497	$ 3,093
Uninsured discounts	**8,999**	8,210	6,978
Provision for doubtful accounts	**3,169**	3,858	3,770
Totals	**$ 15,943**	$ 15,565	$ 13,841

The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, as a percentage of the sum of revenues, the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care was 30.2% for 2014, 31.3% for 2013 and 29.5% for 2012. We believe the decline from 2013 to 2014 was primarily due to previously uninsured patients obtaining medical coverage through the health insurance exchanges and Medicaid expansion programs.

Days revenues in accounts receivable were 54 days, 54 days and 51 days at December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Management expects a continuation of the challenges related to the collection of the patient due accounts. Adverse changes in the percentage of our patients having adequate health care coverage, increases in patient responsibility amounts under certain health care coverages, general economic conditions, patient accounting service center operations, payer mix, or trends in federal, state, and private employer health care coverage could affect the collection of accounts receivable, cash flows and results of operations.

64

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates (continued)

Provision for Doubtful Accounts and the Allowance for Doubtful Accounts (continued)

The approximate breakdown of accounts receivable by payer classification as of December 31, 2014 and 2013 is set forth in the following table:

		% of Accounts Receivable	
	Under 91 Days	**91 180 Days**	**Over 180 Days**
Accounts receivable aging at December 31, 2014:			
Medicare and Medicaid	**13%**	**1%**	**2%**
Managed care and other insurers	**23**	**5**	**5**
Uninsured	**17**	**7**	**27**
Total	**53%**	**13%**	**34%**
Accounts receivable aging at December 31, 2013:			
Medicare and Medicaid	12%	2%	1%
Managed care and other insurers	21	4	5
Uninsured	20	8	27
Total	53%	14%	33%

Professional Liability Claims

We, along with virtually all health care providers, operate in an environment with professional liability risks. Our facilities are insured by our 100% owned insurance subsidiary for losses up to $50 million per occurrence, subject to a $5 million per occurrence self-insured retention (effective January 1, 2015, the self-insure retention increased to $15 million per occurrence). The insurance subsidiary has obtained reinsurance for professional liability risks generally above a retention level of $15 million per occurrence. We purchase excess insurance on a claims-made basis for losses in excess of $50 million per occurrence. Provisions for losses related to professional liability risks were $395 million, $314 million and $331 million for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

Reserves for professional liability risks represent the estimated ultimate cost of all reported and unreported losses incurred through the respective consolidated balance sheet dates. The estimated ultimate cost includes estimates of direct expenses and fees paid to outside counsel and experts, but does not include the general overhead costs of our insurance subsidiary or corporate office. Individual case reserves are established based upon the particular circumstances of each reported claim and represent our estimates of the future costs that will be paid on reported claims. Case reserves are reduced as claim payments are made and are adjusted upward or downward as our estimates regarding the amounts of future losses are revised. Once the case reserves for known claims are determined, information is stratified by loss layers and retentions, accident years, reported years, and geographic location of our hospitals. Several actuarial methods are employed to utilize this data to produce estimates of ultimate losses and reserves for incurred but not reported claims, including: paid and incurred extrapolation methods utilizing paid and incurred loss development to estimate ultimate losses; frequency and severity methods utilizing paid and incurred claims development to estimate ultimate average frequency (number of claims) and ultimate average severity (cost per claim); and Bornhuetter-Ferguson methods which add expected development to actual paid or incurred experience to estimate ultimate losses. These methods use our company-specific historical claims data and other information. Company-specific claim reporting and payment data collected over an approximate 20-year period is used in our reserve estimation process. This company-specific

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates (continued)

Professional Liability Claims (continued)

data includes information regarding our business, including historical paid losses and loss adjustment expenses, historical and current case loss reserves, actual and projected hospital statistical data, professional liability retentions for each policy year, geographic information and other data.

Reserves and provisions for professional liability risks are based upon actuarially determined estimates. The estimated reserve ranges, net of amounts receivable under reinsurance contracts, were $1.229 billion to $1.469 billion at December 31, 2014 and $1.137 billion to $1.359 billion at December 31, 2013. Our estimated reserves for professional liability claims may change significantly if future claims differ from expected trends. We perform sensitivity analyses which model the volatility of key actuarial assumptions and monitor our reserves for adequacy relative to all our assumptions in the aggregate. Based on our analysis, we believe the estimated professional liability reserve ranges represent the reasonably likely outcomes for ultimate losses. We consider the number and severity of claims to be the most significant assumptions in estimating reserves for professional liabilities. A 2% change in the expected frequency trend could be reasonably likely and would increase the reserve estimate by $21 million or reduce the reserve estimate by $20 million. A 2% change in the expected claim severity trend could be reasonably likely and would increase the reserve estimate by $78 million or reduce the reserve estimate by $72 million. We believe adequate reserves have been recorded for our professional liability claims; however, due to the complexity of the claims, the extended period of time to resolve the claims and the wide range of potential outcomes, our ultimate liability for professional liability claims could change by more than the estimated sensitivity amounts and could change materially from our current estimates.

The reserves for professional liability risks cover approximately 2,700 individual claims and 2,600 individual claims at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, and estimates for unreported potential claims. The time period required to resolve these claims can vary depending upon the jurisdiction and whether the claim is settled or litigated. The average time period between the occurrence and final resolution for our professional liability claims is approximately five years, although the facts and circumstances of each individual claim can result in an occurrence-to-resolution timeframe that varies from this average. The estimation of the timing of payments beyond a year can vary significantly.

Reserves for professional liability risks were $1.407 billion and $1.279 billion at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The current portion of these reserves, $329 million and $330 million at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, is included in other accrued expenses. Obligations covered by reinsurance and excess insurance contracts are included in the reserves for professional liability risks, as we remain liable to the extent reinsurers and excess insurance carriers do not meet their obligations. Reserves for professional liability risks (net of $25 million and $24 million receivable under reinsurance and excess insurance contracts at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively) were $1.382 billion and $1.255 billion at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The estimated total net reserves for professional liability risks at December 31, 2014 and 2013 are comprised of $746 million and $710 million, respectively, of case reserves for known claims and $636 million and $545 million, respectively, of reserves for incurred but not reported claims.

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates (continued)

Professional Liability Claims (continued)

Changes in our professional liability reserves, net of reinsurance recoverable, for the years ended December 31, are summarized in the following table (dollars in millions):

	2014	2013	2012
Net reserves for professional liability claims, January 1	**$ 1,255**	$ 1,248	$ 1,252
Provision for current year claims	**359**	343	324
Unfavorable (favorable) development related to prior years claims	**36**	(29)	7
Total provision	**395**	314	331
Payments for current year claims	**13**	7	6
Payments for prior years claims	**255**	300	329
Total claim payments	**268**	307	335
Net reserves for professional liability claims, December 31	**$ 1,382**	$ 1,255	$ 1,248

Income Taxes

We calculate our provision for income taxes using the asset and liability method, under which deferred tax assets and liabilities are recognized by identifying the temporary differences that arise from the recognition of items in different periods for tax and accounting purposes. Deferred tax assets generally represent the tax effects of amounts expensed in our income statement for which tax deductions will be claimed in future periods.

Although we believe we have properly reported taxable income and paid taxes in accordance with applicable laws, federal, state or international taxing authorities may challenge our tax positions upon audit. Significant judgment is required in determining and assessing the impact of uncertain tax positions. We report a liability for unrecognized tax benefits from uncertain tax positions taken or expected to be taken in our income tax return. During each reporting period, we assess the facts and circumstances related to uncertain tax positions. If the realization of unrecognized tax benefits is deemed probable based upon new facts and circumstances, the estimated liability and the provision for income taxes are reduced in the current period. Final audit results may vary from our estimates.

Results of Operations

Revenue/Volume Trends

Our revenues depend upon inpatient occupancy levels, the ancillary services and therapy programs ordered by physicians and provided to patients, the volume of outpatient procedures and the charge and negotiated payment rates for such services. Gross charges typically do not reflect what our facilities are actually paid. Our facilities have entered into agreements with third-party payers, including government programs and managed care health plans, under which the facilities are paid based upon the cost of providing services, predetermined rates per diagnosis, fixed per diem rates or discounts from gross charges. We do not pursue collection of amounts related to patients who meet our guidelines to

qualify for charity care; therefore, they are not reported in revenues. We provide discounts to uninsured patients who do not qualify for Medicaid or charity care.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Revenue/Volume Trends (continued)

Revenues increased 8.0% to $36.918 billion for 2014 from $34.182 billion for 2013 and increased 3.5% for 2013 from $33.013 billion for 2012. The increase in revenues in 2014 can be primarily attributed to the combined impact of a 3.8% increase in revenue per equivalent admission and a 4.0% increase in equivalent admissions compared to the prior year. The increase in revenues in 2013 can be primarily attributed to the combined impact of a 3.1% increase in revenue per equivalent admission and a 0.4% increase in equivalent admissions compared to 2012. We recorded $142 million of Medicaid revenues during the second quarter of 2014 related to the receipt of reimbursements in excess of our estimates for the indigent care component of the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program for the program year ended September 30, 2013. We recorded $94 million of Medicare revenues during the third quarter of 2014 as the estimated settlement amount for certain claims denied by Recovery Audit Contractor (RAC) entities conducting reviews on behalf of CMS and pending in the appeals process. CMS offered an administrative agreement to providers willing to withdraw their pending appeals in exchange for a timely partial payment (generally, 68% of the claim amount, subject to certain adjustments), which we accepted during 2014. All revenue amounts and revenue-related statistics for the year ended December 31, 2014 include the impact of these two items that resulted in increases to revenues.

Same facility revenues increased 6.9% for the year ended December 31, 2014 compared to the year ended December 31, 2013 and increased 3.1% for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to the year ended December 31, 2012. The 6.9% increase for 2014 can be primarily attributed to the combined impact of a 3.9% increase in same facility revenue per equivalent admission and a 2.9% increase in same facility equivalent admissions. The 3.1% increase for 2013 can be primarily attributed to the combined impact of a 3.0% increase in same facility revenue per equivalent admission and a 0.1% increase in same facility equivalent admissions.

Consolidated admissions increased 2.9% in 2014 compared to 2013 and increased 0.2% in 2013 compared to 2012. Consolidated inpatient surgeries increased 2.0% and consolidated outpatient surgeries increased 1.1% during 2014 compared to 2013. Consolidated inpatient surgeries increased 0.5% and consolidated outpatient surgeries increased 0.9% during 2013 compared to 2012. Consolidated emergency room visits increased 6.9% during 2014 compared to 2013 and increased 0.8% during 2013 compared to 2012.

Same facility admissions increased 2.1% in 2014 compared to 2013 and increased 0.1% in 2013 compared to 2012. Same facility inpatient surgeries increased 1.3% and same facility outpatient surgeries declined 0.1% during 2014 compared to 2013. Same facility inpatient surgeries increased 0.3% and same facility outpatient surgeries declined 0.5% during 2013 compared to 2012. Same facility emergency room visits increased 5.8% during 2014 compared to 2013 and increased 0.7% during 2013 compared to 2012.

Same facility uninsured emergency room visits declined 6.6% and same facility uninsured admissions declined 9.4% during 2014 compared to 2013. We believe these declines were primarily due to previously uninsured patients obtaining medical coverage through the health insurance exchanges and Medicaid expansion programs. Same facility uninsured emergency room visits increased 2.2% and same facility uninsured admissions increased 7.6% during 2013 compared to 2012.

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Revenue/Volume Trends (continued)

The approximate percentages of our admissions related to Medicare, managed Medicare, Medicaid, managed Medicaid, managed care and other insurers, and the uninsured for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012 are set forth below.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2014	**2013**	**2012**
Medicare	**32%**	32%	33%
Managed Medicare	**14**	13	12
Medicaid	**7**	8	8
Managed Medicaid	**10**	9	9
Managed care and other insurers	**30**	30	30
Uninsured	**7**	8	8
	100%	100%	100%

The approximate percentages of our inpatient revenues, before provision for doubtful accounts, related to Medicare, managed Medicare, Medicaid, managed Medicaid, managed care plans and other insurers, and the uninsured for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012 are set forth below.

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2014	**2013**	**2012**
Medicare	**29%**	29%	30%
Managed Medicare	**11**	10	10
Medicaid	**7**	6	6
Managed Medicaid	**5**	4	4
Managed care and other insurers	**47**	46	45
Uninsured	**1**	5	5
	100%	100%	100%

We believe the decline in inpatient revenues related to the uninsured is primarily due to the combination of increases in discounts provided to the uninsured and previously uninsured patients obtaining medical coverage through the health insurance exchanges and Medicaid expansion programs.

At December 31, 2014, we owned and operated 42 hospitals and 31 surgery centers in the state of Florida. Our Florida facilities revenues totaled $8.336 billion, $7.545 billion and $7.336 billion for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. At December 31, 2014, we owned and operated 36 hospitals and 25 surgery centers in the state of Texas. Our Texas facilities revenues totaled $8.706 billion, $8.192 billion and $8.012 billion for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. During 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively, 56%, 55% and 55% of our admissions and 46%, 46% and 47% of our revenues were generated by our Florida and Texas facilities. Uninsured admissions in Florida and Texas represented 66%, 62% and 61% of our uninsured admissions during 2014, 2013 and 2012,

respectively.

We receive a significant portion of our revenues from government health programs, principally Medicare and Medicaid, which are highly regulated and subject to frequent and substantial changes. In 2011, the Centers

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Revenue/Volume Trends (continued)

for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) approved a Medicaid waiver that allows Texas to continue receiving supplemental Medicaid reimbursement while expanding its Medicaid managed care program. Thus, Texas is operating pursuant to a Waiver Program. The Texas Waiver Program includes two primary components: the continuation of an indigent care component and the establishment of a Delivery System Reform Incentive Payment (DSRIP) component. Initiatives under the DSRIP program are designed to provide incentive payments to hospitals and other providers for their investments in delivery system reforms that increase access to health care, improve the quality of care and enhance the health of patients and families they serve. We provide indigent care services in several communities in the state of Texas, in affiliation with other hospitals. The state of Texas has been involved in efforts to increase the indigent care provided by private hospitals. As a result of additional indigent care being provided by private hospitals, public hospital districts or counties in Texas have available funds that were previously devoted to indigent care. The public hospital districts or counties are under no contractual or legal obligation to provide such indigent care. The public hospital districts or counties have elected to transfer some portion of these available funds to the state s Medicaid program. Such action is at the sole discretion of the public hospital districts or counties. It is anticipated that these contributions to the state will be matched with federal Medicaid funds. The state then may make supplemental payments to hospitals in the state for Medicaid services rendered. Hospitals receiving Medicaid supplemental payments may include those that are providing additional indigent care services. Our Texas Medicaid revenues included $472 million ($81 million DSRIP related and $391 million indigent care related), $393 million ($76 million DSRIP related and $317 million indigent care related) and $387 million (all indigent care related) during 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively, of Medicaid supplemental payments.

In the second quarter of 2014, we recorded $142 million of Medicaid revenues related to the receipt of reimbursements in excess of our estimates for the indigent care component of the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program for the program year ended September 30, 2013. On October 1, 2014, the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (THHSC) issued a notice to hospitals participating in the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program indicating that a review conducted by CMS identified certain local government/hospital affiliations it believes may be inconsistent with the waiver. In addition, CMS notified THHSC that it would defer the federal portion of the Medicaid payments associated with the affiliations while it completes the review. During the third quarter of 2014, we recorded a reduction of $68 million to Medicaid revenues related to the CMS review and deferral of the federal portion of the Medicaid payments, and we ceased recognizing the estimated Medicaid revenues related to certain components of the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program. CMS announced on January 7, 2015 that the payment deferral has been released, but the review is continuing. During the fourth quarter of 2014, due to the updated information and the receipt of a program payment during December, we reversed the $68 million reduction to Medicaid revenues recorded in the third quarter. We continue the nonrecognition of Medicaid revenues related to certain components of the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program.

In addition, we receive supplemental payments in several other states. We are aware these supplemental payment programs are currently being reviewed by certain state agencies and some states have made waiver requests to the CMS to replace their existing supplemental payment programs. It is possible these reviews and waiver requests will result in the restructuring of such supplemental payment programs and could result in the payment programs being reduced or eliminated. Because deliberations about these programs are ongoing, we are unable to estimate the financial impact the program structure modifications, if any, may have on our results of operations.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Electronic Health Record Incentive Payments

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provides for Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments, beginning in 2011, for eligible hospitals and professionals that adopt and meaningfully use certified electronic health record (EHR) technology. We recognize income related to Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments using a gain contingency model that is based upon when our eligible hospitals have demonstrated meaningful use of certified EHR technology for the applicable period and the cost report information for the full cost report year that will determine the final calculation of the incentive payment is available.

During 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively, we recognized $125 million, $216 million and $336 million of electronic health record incentive income related to Medicare ($118 million, $183 million and $252 million) and Medicaid ($7 million, $33 million and $84 million) incentive programs. At December 31, 2014, we have $39 million of deferred EHR incentive income, which represents initial incentive payments received for which EHR incentive income has not been recognized.

We have incurred and will continue to incur both capital costs and operating expenses in order to implement our certified EHR technology and meet meaningful use requirements. These expenses are ongoing and are projected to continue over all stages of implementation of meaningful use. The timing of recognizing the expenses may not correlate with the receipt of the incentive payments and the recognition of incentive income. During 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively, we incurred $112 million, $113 million and $80 million of operating expenses to implement our certified EHR technology and meet meaningful use.

For 2015, we estimate EHR incentive income will be recognized in the range of $40 million to $50 million and that related EHR operating expenses will be in the range of $30 million to $40 million. Actual incentive payments and EHR operating expenses could vary from these estimates due to certain factors such as availability of federal funding for both Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments and our ability to continue to demonstrate meaningful use of certified EHR technology. The failure of our ability to continue to demonstrate meaningful use of EHR technology could have a material, adverse effect on our results of operations.

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Operating Results Summary

The following are comparative summaries of operating results for the years ended December 31, 2014, 2013 and 2012 (dollars in millions):

	2014		2013		2012	
	Amount	Ratio	Amount	Ratio	Amount	Ratio
Revenues before provision for doubtful accounts	**$ 40,087**		$ 38,040		$ 36,783	
Provision for doubtful accounts	**3,169**		3,858		3,770	
Revenues	**36,918**	**100.0**	34,182	100.0	33,013	100.0
Salaries and benefits	**16,641**	**45.1**	15,646	45.8	15,089	45.7
Supplies	**6,262**	**17.0**	5,970	17.5	5,717	17.3
Other operating expenses	**6,755**	**18.2**	6,237	18.2	6,048	18.3
Electronic health record incentive income	**(125)**	**(0.3)**	(216)	(0.6)	(336)	(1.0)
Equity in earnings of affiliates	**(43)**	**(0.1)**	(29)	(0.1)	(36)	(0.1)
Depreciation and amortization	**1,820**	**5.0**	1,753	5.1	1,679	5.1
Interest expense	**1,743**	**4.7**	1,848	5.4	1,798	5.4
Losses (gains) on sales of facilities	**(29)**	**(0.1)**	10		(15)	
Losses on retirement of debt	**335**	**0.9**	17	0.1		
Legal claim costs	**78**	**0.2**			175	0.5
	33,437	**90.6**	31,236	91.4	30,119	91.2
Income before income taxes	**3,481**	**9.4**	2,946	8.6	2,894	8.8
Provision for income taxes	**1,108**	**3.0**	950	2.8	888	2.7
Net income	**2,373**	**6.4**	1,996	5.8	2,006	6.1
Net income attributable to noncontrolling interests	**498**	**1.3**	440	1.2	401	1.2
Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc.	**$ 1,875**	**5.1**	$ 1,556	4.6	$ 1,605	4.9
% changes from prior year:						
Revenues	**8.0%**		3.5%		11.2%	
Income before income taxes	**18.2**		1.8		(18.7)	
Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc.	**20.5**		(3.1)		(34.9)	
Admissions(a)	**2.9**		0.2		7.4	
Equivalent admissions(b)	**4.0**		0.4		9.1	
Revenue per equivalent admission	**3.8**		3.1		2.0	
Same facility % changes from prior year(c):						
Revenues	**6.9**		3.1		4.5	
Admissions(a)	**2.1**		0.1		3.0	
Equivalent admissions(b)	**2.9**		0.1		4.1	

Revenue per equivalent admission	**3.9**	3.0	0.3

(a) Represents the total number of patients admitted to our hospitals and is used by management and certain investors as a general measure of inpatient volume.
(b) Equivalent admissions are used by management and certain investors as a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume. Equivalent admissions are computed by multiplying admissions (inpatient volume) by the sum of gross inpatient revenue and gross outpatient revenue and then dividing the resulting amount by gross inpatient revenue. The equivalent admissions computation equates outpatient revenue to the volume measure (admissions) used to measure inpatient volume, resulting in a general measure of combined inpatient and outpatient volume.
(c) Same facility information excludes the operations of hospitals and their related facilities that were either acquired, divested or removed from service during the current and prior year.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Years Ended December 31, 2014 and 2013

Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc. totaled $1.875 billion, or $4.16 per diluted share, for the year ended December 31, 2014 compared to $1.556 billion, or $3.37 per diluted share, for the year ended December 31, 2013. Financial results for 2014 include net gains on sales of facilities of $29 million, or $0.04 per diluted share, losses on retirement of debt of $335 million, or $0.47 per diluted share, and legal claim costs of $78 million, or $0.11 per diluted share. Financial results for 2013 include net losses on sales of facilities of $10 million, or $0.02 per diluted share, and a loss on retirement of debt of $17 million, or $0.02 per diluted share. All per diluted share disclosures are based upon amounts net of the applicable income taxes. Shares used for diluted earnings per share were 450.352 million shares and 461.913 million shares for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. During 2014, we repurchased 28.583 million shares of our common stock.

During 2014, consolidated admissions increased 2.9% and same facility admissions increased 2.1% compared to 2013. Consolidated inpatient surgeries increased 2.0%, and same facility inpatient surgeries increased 1.3% during 2014 compared to 2013. Consolidated outpatient surgeries increased 1.1%, and same facility outpatient surgeries declined 0.1% during 2014 compared to 2013. Emergency room visits increased 6.9% on a consolidated basis and increased 5.8% on a same facility basis during 2014 compared to 2013.

Revenues before provision for doubtful accounts increased 5.4% to $40.087 billion for 2014 from $38.040 billion for 2013. The provision for doubtful accounts declined $689 million from $3.858 billion in 2013 to $3.169 billion in 2014. The provision for doubtful accounts and the allowance for doubtful accounts relate primarily to uninsured amounts due directly from patients, including copayment and deductible amounts for patients who have health care coverage. The self-pay revenue deductions for charity care and uninsured discounts increased $278 million and $789 billion, respectively, during 2014 compared to 2013. The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, as a percentage of the sum of revenues, the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, was 30.2% for 2014 compared to 31.3% for 2013. At December 31, 2014, our allowance for doubtful accounts represented approximately 91.4% of the $5.482 billion total patient due accounts receivable balance, including accounts, net of estimated contractual discounts, related to patients for which eligibility for Medicaid coverage or uninsured discounts was being evaluated.

Revenues increased 8.0% to $36.918 billion for 2014 from $34.182 billion for 2013. The increase in revenues was due primarily to the combined impact of a 3.8% increase in revenue per equivalent admission and a 4.0% increase in equivalent admissions compared to 2013. Same facility revenues increased 6.9% due primarily to the combined impact of a 3.9% increase in same facility revenue per equivalent admission and a 2.9% increase in same facility equivalent admissions compared to 2013. We recorded $142 million of Medicaid revenues during the second quarter of 2014 related to the receipt of reimbursements in excess of our estimates for the indigent care component of the Texas Medicaid Waiver Program for the program year ended September 30, 2013. We recorded $94 million of Medicare revenues during the third quarter of 2014 as the estimated settlement amount for certain claims denied by Recovery Audit Contractor (RAC) entities conducting reviews on behalf of CMS and pending in the appeals process. CMS offered an administrative agreement to providers willing to withdraw their pending appeals in exchange for a timely partial payment (generally, 68% of the claim amount, subject to certain adjustments), which we accepted during 2014. All revenue amounts and revenue-related statistics for the year ended December 31, 2014 include the impact of these two items that resulted in increases to revenues.

Salaries and benefits, as a percentage of revenues, were 45.1% in 2014 and 45.8% in 2013. Salaries and benefits per equivalent admission increased 2.3% in 2014 compared to 2013. Same facility labor rate increases

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Years Ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 (continued)

averaged 2.3% for 2014 compared to 2013. Share-based compensation expense increased from $113 million in 2013 to $163 million in 2014, and we expect the 2015 expense will increase by approximately $60 million.

Supplies, as a percentage of revenues, were 17.0% in 2014 and 17.5% in 2013. Supply costs per equivalent admission increased 0.9% in 2014 compared to 2013. Supply costs per equivalent admission increased 1.4% for medical devices, 2.7% for pharmacy supplies and 0.4% for general medical and surgical items in 2014 compared to 2013.

Other operating expenses, as a percentage of revenues, was 18.2% in both 2014 and 2013. Other operating expenses are primarily comprised of contract services, professional fees, repairs and maintenance, rents and leases, utilities, insurance (including professional liability insurance) and nonincome taxes. Provisions for losses related to professional liability risks were $395 million and $314 million for 2014 and 2013, respectively.

During 2014 and 2013, respectively, we recognized $125 million and $216 million of electronic health record incentive income related to Medicare ($118 million and $183 million) and Medicaid ($7 million and $33 million) incentive programs. We recognize income related to Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments using a gain contingency model that is based upon when our eligible hospitals have demonstrated meaningful use of certified EHR technology for the applicable period and the cost report information for the full cost report year that will determine the final calculation of the incentive payment is available.

Equity in earnings of affiliates increased from $29 million for 2013 to $43 million for 2014.

Depreciation and amortization, as a percentage of revenues, was 5.0% in 2014 and 5.1% in 2013. Depreciation expense was $1.798 billion for 2014 and $1.733 billion for 2013.

Interest expense declined to $1.743 billion for 2014 from $1.848 billion for 2013. The decline in interest expense was due to a decline in the average interest rate. Our average debt balance was $28.762 billion for 2014 compared to $28.377 billion for 2013. The average interest rate for our long-term debt declined from 6.5% for 2013 to 6.1% for 2014.

Net gains on sales of facilities were $29 million for 2014 and related to the sale of a hospital facility and sales of real estate and other investments. Net losses on sales of facilities were $10 million for 2013 and related to the sale of a hospital facility and sales of real estate and other investments.

During 2014, we redeemed all $1.500 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $8^{1}/_{2}$% senior secured notes due 2019, all $1.250 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $7^{7}/_{8}$% senior secured notes due 2020, and all $1.400 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $7^{1}/_{4}$% senior secured notes due 2020. The pretax losses on retirement of debt related to these redemptions were $335 million. During 2013, we redeemed all $201 million aggregate principal amount of our $9^{7}/_{8}$% senior secured second lien notes due 2017. The pretax loss on retirement of debt related to this redemption was $17 million.

We recorded $78 million of legal claim costs during 2014 to increase the estimate of our legal liability with respect to a previously disclosed lawsuit alleging we did not make the full level of capital expenditures and uncompensated care agreed to in connection with the purchase of the hospitals from Health Midwest in 2003.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Years Ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 (continued)

The effective tax rate was 37.2% and 37.9% for 2014 and 2013, respectively. The effective tax rate computations exclude net income attributable to noncontrolling interests as it relates to consolidated partnerships.

Net income attributable to noncontrolling interests increased from $440 million for 2013 to $498 million for 2014. The increase in net income attributable to noncontrolling interests related primarily to growth in operating results of hospital joint ventures in two of our Texas markets and our group purchasing organization.

Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012

Net income attributable to HCA Holdings, Inc. totaled $1.556 billion, or $3.37 per diluted share, for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to $1.605 billion, or $3.49 per diluted share, for the year ended December 31, 2012. Financial results for 2013 include net losses on sales of facilities of $10 million, or $0.02 per diluted share, and a loss on retirement of debt of $17 million, or $0.02 per diluted share. Financial results for 2012 include legal claim costs of $175 million, or $0.24 per diluted share, and net gains on sales of facilities of $15 million, or $0.02 per diluted share. All per diluted share disclosures are based upon amounts net of the applicable income taxes. Shares used for diluted earnings per share were 461.913 million shares and 459.403 million shares for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

During 2013, consolidated admissions increased 0.2% and same facility admissions increased 0.1% for 2013 compared to 2012. Consolidated inpatient surgeries increased 0.5%, and same facility inpatient surgeries increased 0.3% during 2013 compared to 2012. Consolidated outpatient surgeries increased 0.9%, and same facility outpatient surgeries declined 0.5% during 2013 compared to 2012. Emergency room visits increased 0.8% on a consolidated basis and increased 0.7% on a same facility basis during 2013 compared to 2012.

Revenues before provision for doubtful accounts increased 3.4% to $38.040 billion for 2013 from $36.783 billion for 2012. The provision for doubtful accounts increased $88 million from $3.770 billion in 2012 to $3.858 billion in 2013. The provision for doubtful accounts and the allowance for doubtful accounts relate primarily to uninsured amounts due directly from patients, including copayment and deductible amounts for patients who have health care coverage. The self-pay revenue deductions for charity care and uninsured discounts increased $404 million and $1.232 billion, respectively, during 2013 compared to 2012. The sum of the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, as a percentage of the sum of revenues, the provision for doubtful accounts, uninsured discounts and charity care, was 31.3% for 2013 compared to 29.5% for 2012. At December 31, 2013, our allowance for doubtful accounts represented 92.6% of the $5.927 billion total patient due accounts receivable balance, including accounts, net of estimated contractual discounts, related to patients for which eligibility for Medicaid coverage or uninsured discounts was being evaluated.

Revenues increased 3.5% to $34.182 billion for 2013 from $33.013 billion for 2012. The increase in revenues was due primarily to the combined impact of a 3.1% increase in revenue per equivalent admission and a 0.4% increase in equivalent admissions compared to 2012. Same facility revenues increased 3.1% due primarily to the combined impact of a 3.0% increase in same facility revenue per equivalent admission and a 0.1% increase in same facility equivalent admissions compared to 2012.

Salaries and benefits, as a percentage of revenues, were 45.8% in 2013 and 45.7% in 2012. Salaries and benefits per equivalent admission increased 3.2% in 2013 compared to 2012. Same facility labor rate increases averaged 1.8% for 2013 compared to 2012. Share-based compensation expense increased from $56 million in 2012 to $113 million in 2013.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 (continued)

Supplies, as a percentage of revenues, were 17.5% in 2013 and 17.3% in 2012. Supply costs per equivalent admission increased 4.0% in 2013 compared to 2012. Supply costs per equivalent admission increased 5.7% for medical devices, increased 0.3% for pharmacy supplies and 5.1% for general medical and surgical items in 2013 compared to 2012.

Other operating expenses, as a percentage of revenues, declined to 18.2% in 2013 from 18.3% in 2012. Other operating expenses are primarily comprised of contract services, professional fees, repairs and maintenance, rents and leases, utilities, insurance (including professional liability insurance) and nonincome taxes. Provisions for losses related to professional liability risks were $314 million and $331 million for 2013 and 2012, respectively.

During 2013 and 2012, respectively, we recognized $216 million and $336 million of electronic health record incentive income related to Medicare ($183 million and $252 million) and Medicaid ($33 million and $84 million) incentive programs. We recognize income related to Medicare and Medicaid incentive payments using a gain contingency model that is based upon when our eligible hospitals have demonstrated meaningful use of certified EHR technology for the applicable period and the cost report information for the full cost report year that will determine the final calculation of the incentive payment is available.

Equity in earnings of affiliates declined from $36 million for 2012 to $29 million for 2013.

Depreciation and amortization, as a percentage of revenues, was 5.1% in 2013 and 2012. Depreciation expense was $1.733 billion for 2013 and $1.673 billion for 2012.

Interest expense increased to $1.848 billion for 2013 from $1.798 billion for 2012. The increase in interest expense was due to an increase in the average debt balance. Our average debt balance was $28.377 billion for 2013 compared to $27.397 billion for 2012. The average interest rate for our long-term debt declined from 6.6% for 2012 to 6.5% for 2013.

Net losses on sales of facilities were $10 million for 2013 and related to the sale of a hospital facility and sales of real estate and other investments. Net gains on sales of facilities were $15 million for 2012 and related to sales of health care entity investments.

During 2013, we redeemed all $201 million aggregate principal amount of our 9 $^{7}/_{8}$% senior secured second lien notes due 2017, at a redemption price of 104.938% of the principal amount. The pretax loss on retirement of debt related to this redemption was $17 million.

During January 2013, a Missouri judge ruled in favor of a nonprofit health foundation in a lawsuit against HCA. In the case, the plaintiff alleged HCA did not make the full level of capital expenditures and uncompensated care agreed to in connection with its purchase of hospitals from Health Midwest in 2003. We recorded $175 million of legal claim costs during the fourth quarter of 2012 related to this ruling.

The effective tax rate was 37.9% and 35.6% for 2013 and 2012, respectively. The effective tax rate computations exclude net income attributable to noncontrolling interests as it relates to consolidated partnerships. Our provision for income taxes for 2012 was reduced by $33 million related to a reduction in interest expense related to taxing authority examinations. Excluding the effect of this adjustment, the effective tax rate for 2012 would have been 36.9%.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Results of Operations (continued)

Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 (continued)

Net income attributable to noncontrolling interests increased from $401 million for 2012 to $440 million for 2013. The increase in net income attributable to noncontrolling interests related primarily to growth in operating results of a hospital joint venture in one of our Texas markets.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our primary cash requirements are paying our operating expenses, servicing our debt, capital expenditures on our existing properties, acquisitions of hospitals and other health care entities, repurchases of our common stock, distributions to stockholders and distributions to noncontrolling interests. Our primary cash sources are cash flows from operating activities, issuances of debt and equity securities and dispositions of hospitals and other health care entities.

Cash provided by operating activities totaled $4.448 billion in 2014 compared to $3.680 billion in 2013 and $4.175 billion in 2012. Working capital totaled $3.450 billion at December 31, 2014 and $2.342 billion at December 31, 2013. The $768 million increase in cash provided by operating activities for 2014, compared to 2013, was primarily related to the net impact of an increase in net income of $377 million, net positive changes in working capital items of $150 million, a net benefit of $357 million related to gains (losses) on sales of facilities, losses on retirement of debt and legal claim costs, and a negative impact of $226 million related to income taxes. The $495 million decline in cash provided by operating activities for 2013, compared to 2012, was primarily related to net negative changes in working capital items of $521 million. Cash payments for interest and income taxes increased $289 million for 2014 compared to 2013 and increased $185 million for 2013 compared to 2012.

Cash used in investing activities was $2.918 billion, $2.346 billion and $2.063 billion in 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Excluding acquisitions, capital expenditures were $2.176 billion in 2014, $1.943 billion in 2013 and $1.862 billion in 2012. We expended $766 million, $481 million and $258 million for acquisitions of hospitals and health care entities during 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Planned capital expenditures are expected to approximate $2.4 billion in 2015. At December 31, 2014, there were projects under construction which had an estimated additional cost to complete and equip over the next five years of approximately $1.9 billion. We expect to finance capital expenditures with internally generated and borrowed funds.

During 2014, we received cash of $51 million from sales of real estate and other investments. We also expended cash of $37 million related to net changes in our investments. During 2013, we received cash of $33 million from sales of a hospital, real estate and other investments. We also received net cash proceeds of $36 million related to net changes in our investments. During 2012, we received cash of $30 million from sales of real estate and other investments. We also received net cash proceeds of $16 million related to net changes in our investments.

Cash used in financing activities totaled $1.378 billion in 2014, $1.625 billion in 2013 and $1.780 billion in 2012. During 2014, we had a net increase of $778 million in our indebtedness and used cash of $1.750 billion for repurchases of common stock. During 2013, we had a decline of $692 million in our indebtedness and used cash of $500 million for repurchases of common stock. During 2012, we had a net increase of $1.724 billion in our indebtedness. During 2014, 2013 and 2012, we paid $7 million, $16 million and $3.148 billion, respectively, in distributions to our stockholders. During 2014, 2013 and 2012, we made distributions to noncontrolling interests of $442 million, $435 million and $401 million, respectively. We paid debt issuance costs of $73 million, $5 million and $62 million for 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively. During 2014, 2013 and 2012, we received

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Liquidity and Capital Resources (continued)

income tax benefits of $134 million, $113 million and $174 million, respectively, for certain items (primarily the cash distributions to holders of our stock options and exercises of stock options) that were deductible expenses for tax purposes, but were recognized as adjustments to stockholders deficit for financial reporting purposes. We, or our affiliates, may in the future repurchase portions of our debt or equity securities, subject to certain limitations, from time to time in either the open market or through privately negotiated transactions, in accordance with applicable SEC and other legal requirements. The timing, prices, and sizes of purchases depend upon prevailing trading prices, general economic and market conditions, and other factors, including applicable securities laws. Funds for the repurchase of debt or equity securities have, and are expected to, come primarily from cash generated from operations and borrowed funds.

In addition to cash flows from operations, available sources of capital include amounts available under our senior secured credit facilities ($2.112 billion as of December 31, 2014 and $2.488 billion as of January 31, 2015) and anticipated access to public and private debt and equity markets. These amounts reflect the October 2014 amendment to our senior secured asset-based revolving credit facility, which increased the revolving credit commitments by $750 million.

During 2012, our Board of Directors declared three distributions to our stockholders and holders of certain vested share-based awards. The distributions totaled $6.50 per share and vested share-based award, or $3.142 billion in the aggregate. There were no distributions declared during 2014 or 2013.

Investments of our professional liability insurance subsidiaries, to maintain statutory equity and pay claims, totaled $558 million and $510 million at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The insurance subsidiary maintained net reserves for professional liability risks of $347 million and $315 million at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. Our facilities are insured by our 100% owned insurance subsidiary for losses up to $50 million per occurrence; however, this coverage is subject to a $5 million per occurrence self-insured retention (effective January 1, 2015, this coverage is subject to a $15 million per occurrence self-insured retention). Net reserves for the self-insured professional liability risks retained were $1.035 billion and $940 million at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. Claims payments, net of reinsurance recoveries, during the next 12 months are expected to approximate $317 million. We estimate that approximately $253 million of the expected net claim payments during the next 12 months will relate to claims subject to the self-insured retention.

Financing Activities

We are a highly leveraged company with significant debt service requirements. Our debt totaled $29.645 billion and $28.376 billion at December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. Our interest expense was $1.743 billion for 2014 and $1.848 billion for 2013.

During March 2013, we redeemed all $201 million aggregate principal amount of our 9 $^{7}/_{8}$% senior secured second lien notes due 2017, at a redemption price of 104.938% of the principal amount. The pretax loss on retirement of debt related to this redemption was $17 million.

During November 2013, our $329 million senior secured European term loan facility matured.

During March 2014, we issued $3.500 billion aggregate principal amount of notes, comprised of $1.500 billion aggregate principal amount of 3.75% senior secured notes due 2019 and $2.000 billion aggregate principal amount of 5.00% senior secured notes due 2024 and repaid at maturity all $500 million aggregate principal

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Liquidity and Capital Resources (continued)

Financing Activities (continued)

amount of our outstanding 5.75% senior unsecured notes. During April 2014, we used proceeds from the March 2014 debt issuance to redeem all $1.500 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $8^1/_2$% senior secured notes due 2019 and all $1.250 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $7^7/_8$% senior secured notes due 2020. The pretax loss on retirement of debt related to these redemptions was $226 million.

During October 2014, we issued $2.000 billion aggregate principal amount of notes, comprised of $600 million aggregate principal amount of 4.25% senior secured notes due 2019 and $1.400 billion aggregate principal amount of 5.25% senior secured notes due 2025. During November 2014, we used a portion of the proceeds from the October 2014 debt issuance to redeem all $1.400 billion aggregate principal amount of our outstanding $7^1/_4$% senior secured notes due 2020. The pretax loss on retirement of debt related to this redemption was $109 million.

During January 2015, we issued $1.000 billion aggregate principal amount of notes 5.375% senior notes due 2025. We used a portion of the net proceeds to repay at maturity our $750 million aggregate principal amount of 6.375% senior notes due 2015.

Management believes that cash flows from operations, amounts available under our senior secured credit facilities and our anticipated access to public and private debt markets will be sufficient to meet expected liquidity needs during the next twelve months.

Table of Contents

HCA HOLDINGS, INC.

MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS (continued)

Contractual Obligations and Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

As of December 31, 2014, maturities of contractual obligations and other commercial commitments are presented in the table below (dollars in millions):

		Payments Due by Period			
Contractual Obligations(a)	**Total**	**Current**	**2-3 Years**	**4-5 Years**	**After 5 Years**
Long-term debt including interest, excluding the senior secured credit facilities(b)	$ 31,204	$ 2,280	$ 3,577	$ 4,952	$ 20,395
Loans outstanding under the senior secured credit facilities, including interest(b)	9,356	440	3,667	5,249	
Operating leases(c)	1,951	273	467	296	915
Purchase and other obligations(c)	24	17	7		

&nb