

or surgical treatment to infants consistent with hospital policies developed by the ICRC, unless the case was previously before the ICRC pursuant to paragraph (f)(3)(ii) of this section. If the ICRC finds that a deviation was made from the institutional policies in a given case, it shall conduct a review and report the findings to appropriate hospital personnel for appropriate action.

(4) *Records.* The ICRC will maintain records of all of its deliberations and summary descriptions of specific cases considered and the disposition of those cases. Such records will be kept in accordance with institutional policies on confidentiality of medical information. They will be made available to appropriate government agencies, or upon court order, or as otherwise required by law.

NOTE: The mandatory provisions set forth in paragraphs (b)–(e) inclusive of this section are subject to an injunction prohibiting their enforcement. In *Bowen v. American Hospital Association*, _____ U.S. _____, 106 S. Ct. 2101 (1986), the Supreme Court upheld the action of a United States District Court, 585 F. Supp. 541 (S.D.N.Y. 1984), declaring invalid and enjoining enforcement of provisions under this section, promulgated January 12, 1984.

(Information collection requirements contained in paragraph (c) have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0990-0114)

[49 FR 1651, Jan. 12, 1984, as amended at 52 FR 3012, Jan. 30, 1987; 70 FR 24320, May 9, 2005]

§§ 84.56–84.60 [Reserved]

Subpart G—Procedures

§ 84.61 Procedures.

The procedural provisions applicable to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 apply to this part. These procedures are found in §§ 80.6 through 80.10 and Part 81 of this Title.

[42 FR 22677, May 4, 1977; 42 FR 22888, May 5, 1977]

APPENDIX A TO PART 84—ANALYSIS OF FINAL REGULATION

SUBPART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions—1. “*Recipient*”. Section 84.23 contains definitions used throughout the

regulation. Most of the comments concerning §84.3(f), which contains the definition of “recipient,” commended the inclusion of recipient whose sole source of Federal financial assistance is Medicaid. The Secretary believes that such Medicaid providers should be regarded as recipients under the statute and the regulation and should be held individually responsible for administering services in a nondiscriminatory fashion. Accordingly, §84.3(f) has not been changed. Small Medicaid providers, however, are exempt from some of the regulation’s administrative provisions (those that apply to recipients with fifteen or more employees). And such recipients will be permitted to refer patients to accessible facilities in certain limited circumstances under revised §84.22(b). The Secretary recognizes the difficulties involved in Federal enforcement of this regulation with respect to thousands of individual Medicaid providers. As in the case of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Office for Civil Rights will concentrate its compliance efforts on the state Medicaid agencies and will look primarily to them to ensure compliance by individual providers.

One other comment requested that the regulation specify that nonpublic elementary and secondary schools that are not otherwise recipients do not become recipients by virtue of the fact their students participate in certain federally funded programs. The Secretary believes it unnecessary to amend the regulation in this regard, because almost identical language in the Department’s regulations implementing title VI and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 has consistently been interpreted so as not to render such schools recipients. These schools, however, are indirectly subject to the substantive requirements of this regulation through the application of §84.4(b)(iv), which prohibits recipients from assisting agencies that discriminate on the basis of handicap in providing services to beneficiaries of the recipients’ programs.

2. “*Federal financial assistance*”. In §84.3(h), defining Federal financial assistance, a clarifying change has been made: procurement contracts are specifically excluded. They are covered, however, by the Department of Labor’s regulation under section 503. The Department has never considered such contracts to be contracts of assistance; the explicit exemption has been added only to avoid possible confusion.

The proposed regulation’s exemption of contracts of insurance or guaranty has been retained. A number of comments argued for its deletion on the ground that section 504, unlike title VI and title IX, contains no statutory exemption for such contracts. There is no indication, however, in the legislative history of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or of the amendments to that Act in 1974, that Congress intended section 504 to have a