



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20224

Date: JAN 10 2004

Contact Person: [REDACTED]
Identification Number: [REDACTED]
Contact Number: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

NO PROTEST RECEIVED
Release copies to District
Date [REDACTED]
Surname [REDACTED]

Employer Identification Number: [REDACTED]

Dear Applicant:

We have considered your application for recognition of exemption from federal income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as an organization described in section 501(c)(3). Based on the information submitted, we have concluded that you do not qualify for exemption under that section. The basis for our conclusion is set forth below.

Information presented discloses that you were incorporated on [REDACTED] under the non-profit corporation laws of the State of [REDACTED]. The Third Article of your Certificate of Incorporation lists your powers and purposes as follows:

To arrange by contract for the delivery or provision of behavioral health services by individuals, entities and facilities licensed or certified to practice medicine and other health professions, and, as appropriate, ancillary medical services and equipment, by which arrangements such health care providers and suppliers will provide their services in accordance with and for such compensation as may be established by contract between the Corporation and one or more health maintenance organizations which have been granted a certificate of authority pursuant to the provisions of Article 44 of the Public Health Law of the State of [REDACTED] as amended.

You are a membership organization and represent that all of your members are organizations that are recognized as exempt from federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and are classified as other than private foundations under section 509(a). You further state that you are a facilitating organization operated exclusively for your members and to serve members by arranging contracts for the delivery of health services to be provided by the member organizations and health maintenance organizations. At this time, you state that you have had preliminary discussions with health maintenance organizations but have not yet entered into any contracts. You do not directly provide any health care services. Your sources of financial support are membership fees, which you state are a prorated share of expenses incurred by you.

Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (the Code) provides for the exemption from federal income tax of organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable, scientific

[REDACTED]

or educational purposes, provided no part of the organization's net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Section 1.501(c)(3)-1(a)(1) of the Income Tax Regulations (the regulations) provides that in order for an organization to be exempt as one described in section 501(c)(3) of the Code, it must be both organized and operated exclusively for one or more exempt purposes. Under section 1.501(c)(3)-1(d)(1)(i)(b) of the regulations, an exempt purpose includes a charitable purpose.

Section 1.501(c)(3)-1(d)(2) of the regulations provides that the term "charitable" is used in Code section 501(c)(3) in its generally accepted legal sense. The promotion of health has long been regarded as a charitable purpose. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts, sections 368, 372 (1959); 4A Scott and Fratcher, The Law of Trusts, sections 368, 372 (4th ed. 1989); Rev. Rul. 69-545, 1969-2 C. B. 117.

Section 1.501(c)(3)-1(c)(1) of the regulations provides that an organization will be regarded as "operated exclusively" for one or more exempt purpose only if it engages primarily in activities which accomplish one or more of such exempt purposes specified in section 501(c)(3) of the Code. An organization will not be so regarded if more than an insubstantial part of its activities is not in furtherance of an exempt purpose.

In Rev. Rul. 69-545, 1969-2 C.B. 117, the Service established the community benefit standard as the test by which the Service determines whether a hospital is organized and operated for the charitable purpose of promoting health.

Section 1.501(c)(3)-1(e)(1) of the regulations states that an organization which is organized and operated for the primary purpose of carrying on an unrelated trade or business is not exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

In Better Business Bureau of Washington, D. C. v. United States, 326 U.S. 279, 283 (1945), the Court stated that "the presence of a single ... [nonexempt] purpose, if substantial in nature, will destroy the exemption regardless of the number or importance of truly ... [exempt] purposes."

Geisinger Health Plan v. Commissioner, 985 F. 2d 1210 (3rd Cir. 1993 rev'g 62 TCM 1656 (1991) ("Geisinger II"), held that a prepaid health care organization that arranges for the provision of health care services only to its members benefits its members, not the community as a whole and therefore does not promote health in a charitable sense. Under the community benefit standard, the organization must benefit the community as a whole in addition to its members. In concluding that the organization did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) on the basis of promoting health, the court of appeals stated that an organization must meet a "flexible community benefit test based on a variety of indicia.

Rev. Rul. 75-197, 1975-1 C.B. 156, held that a nonprofit organization that operates a free computerized donor authorization retrieval system to facilitate transplantation of body organs upon a donor's death qualifies for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code because by

[REDACTED]

facilitating the donation of organs which will be used to save lives, it is serving the health needs of the community and therefore is promoting health within the meaning of the general law of charity.

Rev. Rul. 77-68, 1977-1 C.B. 142, held that a nonprofit organization formed to provide individual psychological and educational evaluations, as well as tutoring and therapy, for children and adolescents with learning disabilities qualifies for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code because it both promoted health and advanced education. Because its services are designed to relieve psychological tensions and thereby improve the mental health of the children of the children and adolescents, it promoted health.

Rev. Rul. 81-298, 1981-1 C.B. 328, held that a nonprofit organization that provides housing, transportation and counseling to hospital patients' relatives and friends who travel to the locality to assist and comfort the patients qualifies for exemption under section 501(c)(3) because it promotes health by helping relieve the distress of hospital patients who benefit from the visitation and comfort provided by their relatives and friends.

Living Faith, Inc. v. Commissioner, 950 F.2d 365 (7th Cir. 1991), involves an organization that operated restaurants and health food stores with the intention of furthering the religious work of the Seventh-Day Adventists Church as a health ministry. However, the Seventh Circuit held that these activities were primarily carried on for the purpose of conducting a commercial business enterprise. Therefore, the organization did not qualify for recognition of exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

Federation Pharmacy Services, Inc. v. Commissioner, 72 T.C. 687 (1979), *aff'd*, 625 F.2d 804 (8th Cir. 1980), held that while selling prescription pharmaceuticals promotes health, pharmacies cannot qualify for recognition of exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code on that basis alone.

Rev. Rul. 70-535, 1970-2 C.B. 117, describes an organization formed to provide management, development and consulting services for low and moderate income housing projects for a fee. The revenue Ruling held that the organization did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(4) of the Code.

Rev. Rul. 54-305, 1954-2 C.B. 127, involves an organization whose primary purpose is operation and maintenance of a purchasing agency for the benefit of its otherwise unrelated members who are exempt as charitable organizations. The ruling held that the organization did not qualify under section 101(6) of the Code (the predecessor to section 501(c)(3)) because its activities consisted primarily of the purchase of supplies and the performance of other related services. The ruling stated that such activities in themselves cannot be termed charitable, but are ordinary business activities.

Rev. Rul. 69-528, 1969-2 C. B. 127, describes an organization formed to provide investment services on a fee basis only to organizations exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Code. The organization invested funds received from participating tax-exempt organizations. The service organization was free from the control of the participating organizations and had absolute and

[REDACTED]

uncontrolled discretion over investment policies. The revenue ruling held that the service organization did not qualify under section 501(c)(3) of the Code and stated that providing investment services on a regular basis for a fee is a trade or business ordinarily carried on for profit.

Rev. Rul. 72-369, 1972-3 C.B. 245, deals with an organization formed to provide management and consulting services at cost to unrelated exempt organizations. This revenue ruling held that providing managerial and consulting services on a regular basis for a fee is a trade or business that is ordinarily carried on for profit. The fact that the services in this case were provided at cost and solely for exempt organizations was not sufficient to characterize this activity as charitable within the meaning of section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

In Rev. Rul. 77-3, 1977-1 C.B. 140, a nonprofit organization that provides rental housing and related services at cost to a city for its use as free temporary housing for families whose homes have been destroyed by fire was found not to be a charitable organization exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

In B. S. W. Group, Inc. v. Commissioner, 70 T.C. 352 (1978), the organization entered into consultant-retainer relationships with five or six limited resource groups involved in the fields of health, housing, vocational skills and cooperative management. The organization's financing did not resemble that of the typical section 501(c)(3) organization. It had neither solicited, nor received, any voluntary contributions from the public. The court concluded that because its sole activity consisted of offering consulting services for a fee, set at or close to cost to nonprofit, limited resource organizations, it did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

In Christian Stewardship Assistance, Inc. v. Commissioner, 70 T.C. 1037 (1978), a nonprofit corporation that assisted charitable organizations in their fund raising activities by providing financial planning advice on charitable giving and tax planning to wealthy individuals was held not to qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code because its tax planning services were a substantial nonexempt activity enabling the corporation to provide commercially available services to wealthy individuals free of charge.

Section 502 of the Code states that an organization operated for the primary purpose of carrying on a trade or business for profit is not tax exempt on the ground that all of its profits are payable to one or more tax-exempt organizations.

Section 1.502-1(b) of the regulations provides that a subsidiary organization of a tax-exempt organization may be exempt on the ground that the activities of the subsidiary are an integral part of the exempt activities of the parent organization. However, the subsidiary is not exempt from tax if it is operated for the primary purpose of carrying on a trade or business which would be an unrelated trade or business if regularly carried on by the parent organization.

In Rev. Rul. 78-41, 1978-1 C.B. 148, a trust created by a hospital to accumulate and hold funds to pay malpractice claims against the hospital was determined to be an integral part organization because the hospital exercised significant financial control over the trust. This was

[REDACTED]

because the trust was required to make payments to claimants at the direction of the hospital, the hospital provided funds for the trust and the hospital directed where the funds from the trust were to be paid.

Geisinger Health Plan v. Commissioner, 100 T.C. 394 (1993), ("Geisinger III"), aff'd, 30 F.3d 494 (3rd Cir. 1994) ("Geisinger IV"), held that a prepaid health plan did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code based on the integral part doctrine of section 1.502-1(b) of the regulations.

Section 513 (a) of the Code defines the term "unrelated trade or business" as any trade or business the conduct of which is not substantially related (aside from the need of the organization for income or funds or the use it makes of the profits derived) to the exercise or performance by such organization of the purpose or function constituting the basis for its exemption.

Section 513(a)(2) of the Code provides that the term "unrelated trade or business" does not include any trade or business which is carried on, in the case of an organization described in section 501(c)(3), such as a hospital, by the organization primarily for the convenience of its patients.

Section 1.513-1(a) of the regulations defines "unrelated business taxable income" to mean gross income derived by an organization from any unrelated trade or business regularly carried on by it, less directly connected deductions and subject to certain modifications. Therefore, gross income of an exempt organization subject to the tax imposed by section 511 of the Code is includible in the computation of unrelated business taxable income if: (1) it is income from trade or business; (2) such trade or business is regularly carried on by the organization; and (3) the conduct of such trade or business is not substantially related (other than through the production of funds) to the organization's performance of its exempt functions.

Section 1.513-1(b) of the regulations states that the phrase "trade or business" includes activities carried on for the production of income which possess the characteristics of a trade or business within the meaning of section 162 of the Code. Section 1.513-1(c) of the regulations explains that "regularly carried on" has reference to the frequency and continuity with which the activities productive of the income are conducted and the manner in which they are pursued.

Section 1.513-1(d)(1) of the regulations states that the presence of the substantially related requirement necessitates an examination of the relationship between the business activities which generate the particular income in question—the activities, that is, of producing or distributing the goods or performing the services involved—and the accomplishment of the organization's exempt purposes.

Section 1.513-1(d)(2) of the regulations states that a trade or business is related to exempt purposes only where the conduct of the business activity has a causal relationship to the achievement of an exempt purpose, and is substantially related for purposes of section 513, only if the causal relationship is a substantial one. Thus, for the conduct of a trade or business from which a particular amount of gross income is derived to be substantially related to

[REDACTED]

purposes for which exemption is granted, the production or distribution of the goods or the performance of the services from which the gross income is derived must contribute importantly to the accomplishment of those purposes.

Section 1.513-1(d)(4) of the regulations states that gross income derived from charges for the performance of exempt functions does not constitute gross income from the conduct of unrelated trade or business.

Your activities consist of arranging contracts for the delivery of health services to be provided by your member organizations and health maintenance organizations. Essentially, you are a facilitator of these contract services and perform no other activities. Under the regulations, an organization that is organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes may qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code. The promotion of health has long been recognized as a charitable purpose.

The Service and courts have recognized that the promotion of health includes activities other than the direct provision of patient care. See Rev. Rul. 81-298, supra; and Rev. Rul. 75-197, supra. However, an organization that merely promotes health, without more, is not entitled to recognition of exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code. See Living Faith, Inc. v. Commissioner, supra; and Federation Pharmacy Services, Inc. v. Commissioner, supra. Therefore, by arranging contracts for the delivery of health services to be provided by your members and health maintenance organizations for the benefit of a limited group of persons, you do not satisfy the community benefit standard of Rev. Rul. 69-545, supra.

Although your activities promote health, you do not promote health in a charitable manner. Any benefits derived by the community from your activities—arranging contracts for the delivery of health services by your members and health maintenance organizations—are remote and incidental. Since your activities are commercial rather than charitable, you are essentially providing commercial services to your members. A nonprofit organization that provides ordinary business services for one or more exempt organizations does not further a charitable purpose. See Rev. Rul. 70-535, supra; Rev. Rul. 54-305, supra; Rev. Rul. 69-528, supra; Rev. Rul. 72-369, supra; Rev. Rul. 77-3, supra; B.S.W. Group, Inc. v. Commissioner, supra; and Christian Stewardship Assistance, Inc. v. Commissioner, supra.

In Geisinger II, supra, the court of appeals held that an HMO did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code because arranging for the provision of health care services exclusively for the organization's members primarily benefited the members, not the community as a whole. Under the community benefit standard, the organization must benefit the community as a whole in addition to its members. In concluding that the organization did not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) on the basis of promoting health, the court of appeals stated that an organization must meet a "flexible community benefit test based on a variety of indicia."

By providing administrative and management services to your members, your activities primarily benefit your members, not the community as a whole. Therefore, you do not satisfy the "flexible community benefit test based on a variety of indicia" established in Geisinger II.

[REDACTED]

supra. Because you have not established that you promote health in a charitable manner, you are not operated exclusively for a charitable purpose. See section 1.501(c)(3)-1(c)(1) of the regulations and Better Business Bureau of Washington, D.C. v. United States, supra. Therefore, you do not qualify for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Code as a charitable organization on the basis that you promote health.

Accordingly, you do not qualify for exemption as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Code and you must file federal income tax returns.

Contributions to you are not deductible under section 170 of the Code.

You have the right to protest this ruling if you believe it is incorrect. To protest, you should submit a statement of your views to this office, with a full explanation of your reasoning. This statement, signed by one of your officers, must be submitted within 30 days from the date of this letter. You also have a right to a conference in this office after your statement is submitted. You must request the conference, if you want one, when you file your protest statement. If you are to be represented by someone who is not one of your officers, that person will need to file a proper power of attorney and otherwise qualify under our Conference and Practices Requirements.

If you do not protest this ruling in a timely manner, it will be considered by the Internal Revenue Service as a failure to exhaust available administrative remedies. Section 7428(b)(2) of the Code provides, in part, that a declaratory judgement or decree under this section shall not be issued in any proceeding unless the Tax Court, the United States Court of Federal Claims, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia determines that the organization involved has exhausted administrative remedies available to it within the Internal Revenue Service.

If we do not hear from you within 30 days, this ruling will become final and a copy will be forwarded to the Ohio Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TE/GE) office. Thereafter, any questions about your federal income tax status should be directed to that office, either by calling 877-829-5500 (a toll free number) or sending correspondence to: Internal Revenue Service, TE/GE Customer Service, P.O. Box 2508, Cincinnati, OH 45201. The appropriate State Officials will be notified of this action in accordance with Code section 6104(c).

When sending additional letters to us with respect to this case, you will expedite their receipt by using the following address:

Internal Revenue Service
[REDACTED] T:EO:RA:T:1
1111 Constitution Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20224

[REDACTED]

If you have any questions, please contact the person whose name and telephone number are shown in the heading of this letter.

Sincerely,

(signed) **Marvin Friedlander**
Marvin Friedlander
Manager, Exempt Organizations
Technical Group 1

cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]