

AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC
Form 10-K
February 26, 2010

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

FORM 10-K

Annual Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934

For the Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2009

Commission File No. 1-13653

AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP

, INC.

Incorporated under the Laws of Ohio

IRS Employer I.D. No. 31-1544320

One East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 579-2121

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

<u>Title of Each Class</u>	<u>Name of Each Exchange on Which Registered</u>
Common Stock	New York Stock Exchange and Nasdaq Global Select Market
7-1/8% Senior Debentures due February 3, 2034	New York Stock Exchange

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

None

Other securities for which reports are submitted pursuant to Section 15(d) of the Act:

9-7/8% Senior Notes due June 15, 2019

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes ___ No

Indicate by check mark whether the Registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months, and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No ___

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

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___ No___

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of 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. ___

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

Large Accelerated Filer X Accelerated Filer___ Non-Accelerated Filer___ 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

State the aggregate market value of the voting and non -voting common equity held by non-affiliates computed by reference to the price at which the common equity was last sold, or the average bid and asked price of such common equity, as of the last business day of the Registrant 's most recently completed second fiscal quarter: \$1.9 billion.

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the Registrant's classes of common stock, as of the latest practicable date: 112,141,781 shares (excluding 14.9 million shares owned by subsidiaries) as of February 1, 2010.

Documents Incorporated by Reference:

Proxy Statement for 2010 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (portions of which are incorporated by reference into Part III hereof).

AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.

INDEX TO ANNUA

L REPORT ON FORM 10-K

	<u>Page</u>
FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS	1
<u>Part I</u>	
<u>Item 1 - Business</u>	<u>2</u>
	<u>15</u>

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Item 1A - Risk Factors

Item 1B - Unresolved Staff Comments none

21

Item 2 - Properties

21

Item 3 - Legal Proceedings

Item 4 - Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders none

Part II

Item 5 - Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder

23

Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

24

Item 6 - Selected Financial Data

Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial

25

Condition and Results of Operations

53

Item 7A - Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk

55

Item 8 - Financial Statements and Supplementary Data

Item 9 - Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on
Accounting and Financial Disclosure none

55

Item 9A - Controls and Procedures

Item 9B - Other Information none

Part III

S-1

Item 10 - Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance

S-1

Item 11 - Executive Compensation

Item 12 - Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners

S-1

and Management and Related Stockholder Matters

Item 13 - Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and

S-1

Director Independence

S-1

Item 14 - Principal Accountant Fees and Services

Part IV

S-1

Item 15 - Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Form 10-K, chiefly in Items 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8, contains certain forward-looking statements that are subject to numerous assumptions, risks or uncertainties. The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 provides a safe harbor for forward-looking statements. Some of the forward-looking statements can be identified by the use of words such as "anticipates", "believes", "expects", "projects", "estimates", "intends", "plans", "seeks", "could", "may", "should", "will" or the negative version of those words or other comparable terminology. Such forward-looking statements include statements relating to: expectations concerning market and other conditions and their effect on future premiums, revenues, earnings and investment activities; recoverability of asset values; expected losses and the adequacy of reserves for asbestos, environmental pollution and mass tort claims; rate changes; and improved loss experience.

Actual results and/or financial condition could differ materially from those contained in or implied by such forward-looking statements for a variety of reasons including but not limited to the following and those discussed in Item 1A - "Risk Factors."

- *changes in financial, political and economic conditions, including changes in interest rates and extended economic recessions or expansions;*
- *performance of securities markets;*
- *AFG's ability to estimate accurately the likelihood, magnitude and timing of any losses in connection with investments in the non-agency residential mortgage market;*
- *new legislation or declines in credit quality or credit ratings that could have a material impact on the valuation of securities in AFG's investment portfolio, including mortgage-backed securities;*
- *the availability of capital;*
- *regulatory actions (including changes in statutory accounting rules);*
- *changes in legal environment affecting AFG or its customers;*
- *tax law and accounting changes;*
- *levels of natural catastrophes, terrorist activities (including any nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological events), incidents of war and other major losses;*
- *development of insurance loss reserves and establishment of other reserves, particularly with respect to amounts associated with asbestos and environmental claims;*
- *availability of reinsurance and ability of reinsurers to pay their obligations;*
- *the unpredictability of possible future litigation if certain settlements of current litigation do not become effective;*
- *trends in persistency, mortality and morbidity;*
- *competitive pressures, including the ability to obtain adequate rates; and*
- *changes in AFG's credit ratings or the financial strength ratings assigned by major ratings agencies to AFG's operating subsidiaries.*

The forward-looking statements herein are made only as of the date of this report. The Company assumes no obligation to publicly update any forward-looking statements.

1

PART I

ITEM 1

Business

Please refer to "Forward-Looking Statements" following the Index in front of this Form 10-K.

Introduction

American Financial Group, Inc. ("AFG") is a holding company that, through subsidiaries, is engaged primarily in property and casualty insurance, focusing on specialized commercial products for businesses, and in the sale of traditional fixed, indexed and variable annuities and a variety of supplemental insurance products. Its address is One East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202; its phone number is (513) 579-2121. SEC filings, news releases, AFG's Code of Ethics applicable to directors, officers and employees and other information may be accessed free of charge through AFG's Internet site at: www.afginc.com. (Information on AFG's Internet site is not part of this Form 10-K.)

Property and Casualty Insurance Operations

General

AFG's specialty property and casualty insurance operations consist of approximately 25 niche insurance businesses offering a wide range of commercial coverages. These businesses report to a single senior executive and operate under a business model that allows local decision-making for underwriting, claims and policy servicing in each of the niche operations. These businesses are managed by experienced professionals in particular lines of business or customer groups and operate autonomously but with certain central controls and accountability. The decentralized approach allows each unit the autonomy necessary to respond to local and specialty market conditions while capitalizing on the efficiencies of centralized investment and administrative support functions. AFG's property and casualty insurance operations employed approximately 5,200 persons as of December 31, 2009.

The primary objectives of AFG's property and casualty insurance operations are to achieve solid underwriting profitability and provide excellent service to its policyholders and agents. Underwriting profitability is measured by the combined ratio, which is a sum of the ratios of losses, loss adjustment expenses ("LAE"), underwriting expenses and policyholder dividends to premiums. A combined ratio under 100% indicates an underwriting profit. The combined ratio does not reflect investment income, other income, or federal income taxes.

While many costs included in underwriting are readily determined (commissions, administrative expenses, and many of the losses on claims reported), the process of determining overall underwriting results is highly dependent upon the use of estimates in the case of losses incurred or expected but not yet reported or developed. Actuarial procedures and projections are used to obtain "point estimates" of ultimate losses. While the process is imprecise and develops amounts which are subject to change over time, management believes that the liabilities for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses are adequate.

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

AFG's statutory combined ratio averaged 85.6% for the period 2007 to 2009 as compared to 100.4% for the property and casualty industry over the same period (Source: "A.M. Best's U.S. Property/Casualty - Review & Preview" - February 2010 Edition). AFG believes that its specialty niche focus, product line diversification and underwriting discipline have contributed to the Company's ability to consistently outperform the industry's underwriting results. Management's philosophy is to refrain from writing business that is not expected to produce an underwriting profit even if it is necessary to limit premium growth to do so.

Financial data is reported in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") for shareholder and other investment purposes and reported on a statutory basis for insurance regulatory purposes. In general, statutory accounting results in lower capital and surplus and lower net earnings than result from the application of GAAP. Major differences for statutory accounting include charging

2

policy acquisition costs to expense as incurred rather than spreading the costs over the periods covered by the policies; reporting investment grade bonds and redeemable preferred stocks at amortized cost rather than fair value; netting of reinsurance recoverables and prepaid reinsurance premiums against the corresponding liabilities rather than reporting such items separately; and charging to surplus certain GAAP assets, such as furniture and fixtures and agents' balances over 90 days old.

Unless indicated otherwise, the financial information presented for the property and casualty insurance operations herein is presented based on GAAP. Statutory information is provided for industry comparisons or where comparable GAAP information is not readily available.

Property and Casualty Results

Performance measures such as underwriting profit or loss and related combined ratios are often used by property and casualty insurers to help users of their financial statements better understand the company's performance. See *Note C - "Segments of Operations"* to the financial statements for the reconciliation of AFG's operating profit by significant business segment to the Statement of Earnings.

The following table shows the performance of AFG's property and casualty insurance operations (dollars in millions):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Gross written premiums	\$3,763	\$4,267	\$3,980
Ceded reinsurance	<u>(1,452)</u>	<u>(1,381)</u>	<u>(1,268)</u>
Net written premiums	<u>\$2,311</u>	<u>\$2,886</u>	<u>\$2,712</u>
Net earned premiums	\$2,412	\$2,867	\$2,703
Loss and LAE	1,187	1,623	1,433
Underwriting expenses	<u>808</u>	<u>889</u>	<u>820</u>
Underwriting gain	<u>\$ 417</u>	<u>\$ 355</u>	<u>\$ 450</u>

GAAP ratios:

Loss and LAE ratio	49.2%	56.6%	52.9%
Underwriting expense ratio	<u>33.5</u>	<u>31.0</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Combined ratio	<u>82.7</u>	<u>87.6</u>	<u>83.3</u>
	%	%	%

Statutory ratios:

Loss and LAE ratio	46.2%	56.8%	53.4%
Underwriting expense ratio	<u>36.1</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>31.4</u>
Combined ratio	<u>82.3</u>	<u>89.1</u>	<u>84.8</u>
	%	%	%

Industry statutory combined ratio (a)

All lines	100.6%	105.1%	95.5%
Commercial lines	101.2%	107.2%	95.1%

(a) Ratios are derived from "A.M. Best's U.S. Property/Casualty - Review & Preview" (February 2010 Edition).

As with other property and casualty insurers, AFG's operating results can be adversely affected by unpredictable catastrophe losses. Certain natural disasters (hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, floods, forest fires, etc.) and other incidents of major loss (explosions, civil disorder, terrorist events, fires, etc.) are classified as catastrophes by industry associations. Losses from these incidents are usually tracked separately from other business of insurers because of their sizable effects on overall operations. Total net losses to AFG's insurance operations from catastrophes, primarily hurricanes and tornadoes, were \$18 million in 2009; \$59 million in 2008; and \$5 million in 2007.

AFG generally seeks to reduce its exposure to catastrophes through individual risk selection, including minimizing coastal exposures, and the purchase of reinsurance. AFG's property exposure to a catastrophic earthquake that industry models indicate could occur once in every 500 years (a "500-year event") is less than 1% of AFG's shareholders' equity. Similarly, AFG has minimal California workers' compensation exposure (less than 1.5% of shareholders' equity) or windstorm exposure (less than 2% of shareholders' equity) to a 500-year event.

Property and Casualty Insurance Products

AFG is focused on growth opportunities in what it believes to be more profitable specialty businesses where AFG personnel are experts in particular lines of business or customer groups. The following are examples of AFG's specialty businesses:

Property and Transportation

Inland and Ocean Marine

		Provides coverage primarily for builders' risk, contractors' equipment, property, motor truck cargo, marine cargo, boat dealers, marina operators/dealers and excursion vessels.
Agricultural-related		Provides federally reinsured multi-peril crop (allied lines) insurance covering most perils as well as crop-hail, equine mortality and other coverages for full-time operating farms/ranches and agribusiness operations on a nationwide basis.
Commercial Automobile		Provides coverage for all types of vehicles in a broad range of businesses and customized insurance programs for various transportation operations (such as buses and trucks), and a specialized physical damage product for the trucking industry.
Specialty Casualty		
Executive and Professional	Liability	Markets coverage for directors and officers of businesses and non-profit organizations; errors and omissions; and provides non-U.S. medical malpractice insurance.
Umbrella and Excess Liability		Provides higher layer liability coverage in excess of primary layers.
Excess and Surplus		Provides liability, umbrella and excess coverage for unique, volatile or hard to place risks, using rates and forms that generally do not have to be approved by state insurance regulators.
General Liability		Provides coverage for contractor-related businesses, energy development and production risks, and environmental liability risks.
Targeted Programs		Includes coverage (primarily liability, property and, in certain cases, workers' compensation) for social service agencies, leisure, entertainment and non-profit organizations, customized solutions for other targeted markets and alternative risk programs using agency captives.
Specialty Financial		
Fidelity and Surety		Provides fidelity and crime coverage for government, mercantile and financial institutions and surety coverage for various types of contractors and public and private corporations.
Lease and Loan Services		Provides coverage for insurance risk management programs for lending and leasing institutions, including vehicle and equipment leasing and collateral and mortgage protection.
California Workers' Compensation		
Workers' Compensation		Writes coverage for prescribed benefits payable to employees (principally in California) who are injured on the job.

Management believes specialization is the key element to the underwriting success of these business units. Each unit has separate management with significant operating autonomy to oversee the important operational functions of its business such as underwriting, pricing, marketing, policy processing and claims service. These specialty businesses are opportunistic and their premium volume will vary based on prevailing market conditions. AFG continually evaluates expansion in existing markets and opportunities in new specialty markets that meet its profitability objectives. For example, in January 2008, AFG acquired a majority interest in Marketform Group Limited, a United Kingdom-based Lloyd's insurer that is a leader in the non-U.S. medical malpractice market, and all of Strategic Comp Holdings, LLC, a provider of workers' compensation programs in the United States. Likewise, AFG will withdraw from markets that do not meet its profit objectives, such as the withdrawal from certain automotive-related products in 2009.

Premium Distribution

The geographic distribution of statutory direct written premiums by AFG's U.S.-based insurers in 2009 is shown below (premium distribution for 2005 is given to show changes over a four-year period). Amounts exclude business written under special arrangements on behalf of, and fully reinsured to, the purchasers of several divisions sold. Less than 5% of AFG's direct written premiums were derived from non U.S.-based insurers, primarily Marketform.

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2005</u>		<u>2009</u>	<u>2005</u>
California	12.4%	20.8%	Oklahoma	2.6%	2.8%
Texas	7.7	8.3	Missouri	2.6	2.1
Illinois	6.6	5.0	Indiana	2.6	2.0
New York	4.9	4.6	Georgia	2.4	2.4
Florida	4.8	7.2	Nebraska	2.4	*
Kansas	3.7	*	New Jersey	2.3	2.9
Iowa	2.9	*	South Dakota	2.0	*
Ohio	2.8	2.5	Michigan	2.0	2.1
Pennsylvania	2.7	2.7	Other	<u>32.6</u>	<u>34.6</u>
				<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
				%	%

(*) less than 2%, included in "Other"

The following table shows the distribution of statutory net written premiums for AFG's U.S.-based insurers by statutory annual statement line for 2009 compared to 2005.

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2005</u>
Other liability	22.0%	23.2%
Commercial multi-peril	10.5	5.2
Workers' compensation	10.1	16.5
Auto liability	10.1	8.2
Inland marine	9.7	11.0
Allied lines	9.0	7.9

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Fidelity and surety	7.9	5.0
Auto physical damage	7.5	7.1
Ocean marine	3.5	2.7
Collateral protection	3.2	5.7
Product liability	2.5	4.2
Other	<u>4.0</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	%	%

For a discussion of the performance of AFG's specialty businesses see *Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Results of Operations - Property and Casualty Insurance - Underwriting."*

5

Ratings

The following table shows independent ratings and 2009 net written premiums (in millions) of AFG's major property and casualty insurance subsidiaries. Such ratings are generally based on concerns for policyholders and agents and are not directed toward the protection of investors. AFG believes that maintaining a Standard & Poor's ("S&P") rating of at least "A-" is important to compete successfully in certain lines of business.

<u>Company</u>	<u>Ratings</u>		<u>Net Written</u>
	<u>AM Best</u>	<u>S&P</u>	<u>Premiums</u>
Great American Pool(*)	A	A	\$1,515
Mid-Continent	A	A	158
Republic Indemnity	A	A	168
American Empire Surplus Lines	A+	A	39
National Interstate	A	not rated	275
Marketform Lloyd's Syndicate	A	A+	123
Other			<u>33</u>
			<u>\$2,311</u>

(*) The Great American Pool represents Great American Insurance Company ("GAI") and 10 subsidiaries.

Reinsurance

Consistent with standard practice of most insurance companies, AFG reinsures a portion of its business with other insurance companies and assumes a relatively small amount of business from other insurers. AFG uses reinsurance for

two primary purposes: (i) to provide higher limits of coverage than it would otherwise be willing to provide (i.e. large line capacity) and (ii) to protect its business by reducing the impact of catastrophes. The availability and cost of reinsurance are subject to prevailing market conditions, which may affect the volume and profitability of business that is written. AFG is subject to credit risk with respect to its reinsurers, as the ceding of risk to reinsurers does not relieve AFG of its liability to its insureds until claims are fully settled.

The commercial marketplace requires large policy limits (\$25 million or more) in several of AFG's lines of business, including certain executive and professional liability, umbrella and excess liability, and fidelity and surety coverages. Since these limits exceed management's desired exposure to an individual risk, AFG enters into reinsurance agreements to reduce its net exposure under such policies to an acceptable level. Reinsurance continues to be available for this large line capacity exposure with satisfactory pricing and terms.

AFG has taken steps to limit its exposure to wind and earthquake losses by purchasing catastrophe reinsurance. In addition, AFG purchases catastrophe reinsurance for its workers' compensation businesses. Although the cost of reinsurance rose following Hurricane Katrina in 2005, AFG has been able to obtain reinsurance coverage in adequate amounts at acceptable rates due to management's decision to limit overall exposure to catastrophe losses through individual risk selection (including minimizing coastal exposures) and the Company's limited historical catastrophe losses.

In addition to the large line capacity and catastrophe reinsurance programs discussed above, AFG purchases reinsurance on a product-by-product basis. AFG regularly reviews the financial strength of its current and potential reinsurers. These reviews include consideration of credit ratings, available capital, claims paying history and expertise. This process periodically results in the transfer of risks to more financially secure reinsurers. Substantially all reinsurance is ceded to companies with investment grade or better S&P ratings or is secured by "funds withheld" or other collateral. Under "funds withheld" arrangements, AFG retains ceded premiums to fund ceded losses as they become due from the reinsurer. Recoverables from the following companies were individually between 5% and 10% of AFG's total reinsurance recoverable (net of payables to reinsurers) at December 31, 2009: Swiss Reinsurance America Corporation, Everest Reinsurance Company, Berkley Insurance Company and Munich Reinsurance America, Inc. In addition, AFG has a reinsurance recoverable from Ohio Casualty Insurance Company of \$220 million related to its purchase of AFG's Commercial lines business in 1998.

6

Reinsurance is provided on one of two bases, facultative or treaty. Facultative reinsurance is generally provided on a risk by risk basis. Individual risks are ceded and assumed based on an offer and acceptance of risk by each party to the transaction. AFG purchases facultative reinsurance, both pro rata and excess of loss, depending on the risk and available reinsurance markets. Treaty reinsurance provides for risks meeting prescribed criteria to be automatically ceded and assumed according to contract provisions.

The following table presents (by type of coverage) the amount of each loss above the specified retention maximum generally covered by treaty reinsurance programs (in millions) as of January 1, 2010:

<u>Coverage</u>	<u>Retention Maximum</u>	<u>Reinsurance Coverage(a)</u>
California Workers' Compensation	\$ 2.7	\$147.3
Other Workers' Compensation	2.0	48.0
Commercial Umbrella	4.2	45.8
Property - General	2.5	97.5
Property - Catastrophe	22.6	117.4

- (a) Reinsurance covers substantial portions of losses in excess of retention.
 However, in general, losses resulting from terrorism are not covered.

In addition to the coverage shown above, AFG reinsures a portion of its crop insurance business through the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation ("FCIC"). The FCIC offers both proportional (or "quota share") and non-proportional coverages. The proportional coverage provides that a fixed percentage of risk is assumed by the FCIC. The non-proportional coverage allows AFG to select desired retention of risk on a state-by-state, county, crop or plan basis. AFG typically reinsures 20% to 30% of gross written premium with the FCIC on a quota share basis. AFG also purchases quota share reinsurance in the private market. This quota share provides for a ceding commission to AFG and a profit sharing provision. During 2009, AFG reinsured 90% of premiums not reinsured by the FCIC in the private market and purchased stop loss protection coverage for the remaining portion of the business. In 2008 and 2007, AFG reinsured 50% of premiums not reinsured by the FCIC and plans to return to that level in 2010.

Included in the Balance Sheet caption "recoverables from reinsurers and prepaid reinsurance premiums" were approximately \$334 million on paid losses and LAE and \$2.5 billion on unpaid losses and LAE at December 31, 2009. These amounts are net of allowances of approximately \$28 million for doubtful collection of reinsurance recoverables. The collectibility of a reinsurance balance is based upon the financial condition of a reinsurer as well as individual claim considerations.

Reinsurance premiums ceded and assumed are presented in the following table (in millions):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Reinsurance ceded	\$1,452	\$1,381	\$1,268
Reinsurance ceded, excluding crop	680	693	726
Reinsurance assumed - including involuntary pools and associations	32	37	40
Loss and Loss Adjustment Expense Reserves			

The consolidated financial statements include the estimated liability for unpaid losses and LAE of AFG's insurance subsidiaries. This liability represents estimates of the ultimate net cost of all unpaid losses and LAE and is determined by using case-basis evaluations, actuarial projections and management's judgment. These estimates are subject to the effects of changes in claim amounts and frequency and are periodically reviewed and adjusted as additional information becomes known. In accordance with industry practices, such adjustments are reflected in current year operations. Generally, reserves for reinsurance assumed and involuntary pools and associations are reflected in AFG's results at the amounts reported by those entities.

The following table presents the development of AFG's liability for losses and LAE, net of reinsurance, on a GAAP basis for the last ten years. The top line of the table shows the estimated liability (in millions) for unpaid losses and LAE recorded at the balance sheet date for the indicated years. The second line shows the re-estimated liability as of December 31, 2009. The remainder of the table presents intervening development as percentages of the initially estimated liability. The development results from additional information and experience in subsequent years, particularly with regard to A&E charges, settlements and reallocations as detailed below. The middle line shows a cumulative deficiency (redundancy), which represents the aggregate percentage increase (decrease) in the liability initially estimated. The lower portion of the table indicates the cumulative amounts paid as of successive periods as a percentage of the original loss reserve liability. For purposes of this table, reserves of businesses sold are considered paid at the date of sale. For example, the percentage of the December 31, 2002 reserve liability paid in 2003 includes

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

approximately 20 percentage points for reserves of a former insurance subsidiary at its sale date in February 2003. See *Note O - "Insurance - Insurance Reserves"* to the financial statements for an analysis of changes in AFG's estimated liability for losses and LAE, net and gross of reinsurance, over the past three years on a GAAP basis.

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	
<u>Liability for unpaid losses</u>										
<u>and loss adjustment expenses</u>										
:										
As originally estimated	\$3,321	\$3,282	\$3,338	\$3,466	\$2,901	\$3,155	\$3,619	\$3,791	\$3,868	\$4,
As re-estimated at										
December 31, 2009	\$3,911	\$4,121	\$4,292	\$4,284	\$3,446	\$3,330	\$3,388	\$3,394	\$3,471	\$3,
<u>Liability re-estimated</u>										
:										
One year later	97.7%	104.2%	104.5%	104.4%	104.9%	106.3%	98.4%	97.4%	93.6%	95
Two years later	98.8%	103.8%	110.0%	109.7%	114.0%	106.1%	98.8%	92.3%	89.7%	
Three years later	97.4%	108.0%	113.8%	118.0%	114.7%	107.7%	95.2%	89.5%		
Four years later	100.5%	111.2%	121.1%	118.8%	118.0%	106.0%	93.6%			
Five years later	103.5%	118.1%	122.8%	122.1%	118.5%	105.5%				
Six years later	110.7%	120.0%	126.5%	123.0%	118.8%					
Seven years later	112.4%	123.5%	127.7%	123.6%						
Eight years later	115.9%	124.8%	128.6%							
Nine years later	117.0%	125.6%								
Ten years later	117.8%									
<u>Cumulative deficiency</u>										
	<u>17.8</u>	<u>25.6</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>5.5</u>				
(redundancy) (a)	%	%	%	%	%	%	(6.4%)	(10.5%)	(10.3%)	(4
<u>Cumulative paid as of</u>										
:										
One year later	33.5%	37.1%	32.7%	42.2%	27.3%	25.4%	23.5%	22.3%	21.0%	24
Two years later	50.7%	50.6%	61.3%	60.9%	46.4%	40.8%	37.5%	34.8%	32.9%	
Three years later	57.8%	69.3%	74.4%	72.7%	58.8%	52.4%	46.9%	43.6%		
Four years later	69.9%	79.2%	82.8%	80.3%	68.5%	60.1%	53.6%			

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Five years later	77.8%	84.9%	88.4%	86.2%	75.2%	65.6%
Six years later	81.7%	89.2%	93.4%	90.7%	80.1%	
Seven years later	85.1%	93.6%	97.0%	94.2%		
Eight years later	88.7%	96.6%	100.1%			
Nine years later	91.3%	99.3%				
Ten years later	93.5%					

(a) Cumulative deficiency (redundancy):

Special A&E charges,
settlements and
reallocations

11.0%	11.2%	8.0%	6.8%	8.2%	7.4%	1.6%	1.5%	.3%
<u>6.8</u>	<u>14.4</u>	<u>20.6</u>	<u>16.8</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>(1.9)</u>	<u>(8.0)</u>		

Other

%	%	%	%	%	%)	%)	(12.0%)	(10.6%)	%)
<u>17.8</u>	<u>25.6</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>(6.4)</u>			

Total

%	%	%	%	%	%	%)	(10.5%)	(10.3%)	%)
---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---------	---------	----

The following is a reconciliation of the net liability to the gross liability
for unpaid losses and LAE.

1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007

As originally estimated:

Net liability shown above	\$3,321	\$3,282	\$3,338	\$3,466	\$2,901	\$3,155	\$3,619	\$3,791	\$3,868	\$4,000
Add reinsurance	<u>1,571</u>	<u>1,324</u>	<u>1,525</u>	<u>1,804</u>	<u>2,059</u>	<u>2,234</u>	<u>2,243</u>	<u>2,309</u>	<u>2,300</u>	<u>2,300</u>
recoverables	<u>\$4,892</u>	<u>\$4,606</u>	<u>\$4,863</u>	<u>\$5,270</u>	<u>\$4,960</u>	<u>\$5,389</u>	<u>\$5,862</u>	<u>\$6,100</u>	<u>\$6,168</u>	<u>\$6,168</u>

Gross liability

As re-estimated at

December 31, 2009:

Net liability shown above	\$3,911	\$4,121	\$4,292	\$4,284	\$3,446	\$3,330	\$3,388	\$3,394	\$3,471	\$3,471
Add reinsurance	<u>2,360</u>	<u>2,281</u>	<u>2,475</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>2,735</u>	<u>2,563</u>	<u>2,402</u>	<u>2,290</u>	<u>2,200</u>	<u>2,200</u>
recoverables										

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

		<u>\$6.271</u>	<u>\$6.402</u>	<u>\$6.767</u>	<u>\$6.884</u>	<u>\$6.181</u>	<u>\$5.893</u>	<u>\$5.790</u>	<u>\$5.684</u>	<u>\$5.671</u>	<u>\$6.271</u>
Gross liability											
Gross cumulative		<u>28.3</u>	<u>39.0</u>	<u>39.2</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>24.6</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>(1.2)</u>	<u>(6.8)</u>	<u>(8.1)</u>	
Deficiency (redundancy) (a)	%	%	%	%	%	%	%)	%)	%)	%)	%)

(a) Gross cumulative deficiency (redundancy):

Special A&E charges,
settlements and
reallocations

	9.3%	9.9%	6.5%	5.4%	5.7%	5.2%	1.3%	1.3%	.3%
	<u>19.0</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>32.7</u>	<u>25.2</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>(2.5)</u>	<u>(8.1)</u>	<u>(8.4)</u>

Other

	%	%	%	%	%	%	%)	%)	%)	%)
	<u>28.3</u>	<u>39.0</u>	<u>39.2</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>24.6</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>(1.2)</u>	<u>(6.8)</u>	<u>(8.1)</u>	

Total

	%	%	%	%	%	%	%)	%)	%)	%)
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----

8

In evaluating the re-estimated liability and cumulative deficiency (redundancy), it should be noted that each percentage includes the effects of changes in amounts for prior periods. For example, AFG's \$12 million special A&E charge related to losses recorded in 2008, but incurred before 1999, is included in the re-estimated liability and cumulative deficiency (redundancy) percentage for each of the previous years shown. Conditions and trends that have affected development of the liability in the past may not necessarily exist in the future. Accordingly, it may not be appropriate to extrapolate future redundancies or deficiencies based on this table.

A significant portion of the adverse development in the tables is due to A&E exposures for which AFG has been held liable under general liability policies written prior to 1987, even though such coverage was not intended. Other factors affecting adverse development included changes in the legal environment, including more liberal coverage decisions and higher jury awards, higher legal fees, the general state of the economy and medical cost inflation.

The differences between the liability for losses and LAE reported in the annual statements filed with the state insurance departments in accordance with statutory accounting principles ("SAP") and that reported in the accompanying consolidated financial statements in accordance with GAAP at December 31, 2009 are as follows (in millions):

Liability reported on a SAP basis, net of \$190 million

of retroactive reinsurance	\$3,482
Reinsurance recoverables, net of allowance	2,513
Other, including reserves of foreign insurers	<u>417</u>

Liability reported on a GAAP basis

\$6,412

Asbestos and Environmental Reserves ("A&E")

AFG's property and casualty group, like many others in the industry, has A&E claims arising in most cases from general liability policies written in years before 1987. The establishment of reserves for such A&E claims presents unique and difficult challenges and is subject to uncertainties significantly greater than those presented by other types of claims. For a discussion of these uncertainties, see *Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Uncertainties - Asbestos and Environmental-related Insurance Reserves"* and *Note M - "Contingencies"* to the financial statements.

Management has conducted comprehensive studies of its asbestos and environmental reserves with the aid of outside actuarial and engineering firms and specialty outside counsel every two years with an in-depth internal review during the intervening years. The comprehensive study completed in the second quarter of 2009 relied on a broad exposure analysis and considered products and non-products exposures, paid claims history, the pattern of new claims, settlements and projected development. The study resulted in minor adjustments to A&E reserves. During the course of the 2009 study, there were no newly identified emerging trends or issues that management believes significantly impact the overall adequacy of AFG's A&E reserves. The internal review completed during the second quarter of 2008 resulted in a pretax charge of \$12 million, net of \$6 million in estimated reinsurance recoverables. The 2007 comprehensive study resulted in a pretax charge of \$44 million, net of \$16 million in reinsurance recoverables. For a discussion of the A&E reserve strengthening, see *Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Results of Operations - Asbestos and Environmental Reserve Charges."*

The following table (in millions) is a progression of the property and casualty group's A&E reserves.

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Reserves at beginning of year	\$399	\$423	\$432
Incurred losses and LAE	4	12	51
Paid losses and LAE	<u>(25)</u>	<u>(36)</u>	<u>(60)</u>
)))
Reserves at end of year, net of reinsurance recoverable	378	399	423
Reinsurance recoverable, net of allowance	<u>79</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>63</u>
Gross reserves at end of year	<u>\$457</u>	<u>\$466</u>	<u>\$486</u>

The survival ratio is a measure of the number of years that it would take to pay the amount of the current reserves based on the average paid losses over the preceding three years. This ratio is often used by industry analysts to compare A&E reserves strength across companies. At December 31, 2009, AFG's three year survival ratio was 10.6 times average paid losses for the asbestos reserves and 9.3 times average paid losses for the total A&E reserves. Excluding amounts associated with the settlements of asbestos-related coverage litigation for A.P. Green Industries

(see *Item 3 - "Legal Proceedings"*) and another large claim, AFG's three year survival ratio was 9.1 and 8.0 times paid losses for the asbestos reserves and total A&E reserves, respectively. These ratios compare favorably with data published by A.M. Best in December 2009, which indicate that industry survival ratios were 8.1 for asbestos reserves and 7.5 for total A&E reserves at December 31, 2008.

Marketing

The property and casualty insurance group directs its sales efforts primarily through independent property and casualty insurance agents and brokers, although portions are written through employee agents. Independent agents and brokers generally receive a commission on the sale of each policy. Some agents and brokers are eligible for a bonus commission based on the overall profitability of policies placed with AFG by the broker or agent in a particular year. The property and casualty insurance group writes insurance through several thousand agents and brokers.

Competition

AFG's property and casualty insurance businesses compete with other individual insurers, state funds and insurance groups of varying sizes, some of which are mutual insurance companies possessing competitive advantages in that all their profits inure to their policyholders. See *Item 1A - "Risk Factors."* They also compete with self-insurance plans, captive programs and risk retention groups. Due to the specialty nature of these coverages, competition is based primarily on service to policyholders and agents, specific characteristics of products offered and reputation for claims handling. Financial strength ratings, price, commissions and profit sharing terms are also important factors. Management believes that sophisticated data analysis for refinement of risk profiles, extensive specialized knowledge and loss prevention service have helped AFG compete successfully.

Annuity and Supplemental Insurance Operations

General

AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance operations are conducted through Great American Financial Resources, Inc. ("GAFRI"). GAFRI's primary insurance subsidiaries include Great American Life Insurance Company ("GALIC"), Annuity Investors Life Insurance Company ("AILIC"), Loyal American Life Insurance Company ("Loyal") and United Teacher Associates Insurance Company ("UTA"). These companies market retirement products, primarily fixed, indexed and variable annuities, and various forms of supplemental insurance. All of these companies sell their products through independent producers. In addition, certain GAFRI subsidiaries also sell products through career agents. GAFRI and its subsidiaries employed approximately 1,100 persons at December 31, 2009.

Following is certain information concerning GAFRI's largest subsidiaries (dollars in millions).

<u>Company</u>	<u>Principal Products</u>	2009 <u>Statutory Premiums</u>	<u>Policies In Force</u>	AM Best <u>Rating</u>	S&P <u>Rating</u>
GALIC	Fixed and indexed annuities	\$1,032	385,000	A	A
AILIC	Fixed, indexed and variable annuities	422	134,000	A	A
UTA	Supplemental insurance	236	215,000	A-	Not rated
Loyal	Fixed annuities and supplemental insurance	53	132,000	A	Not rated

Statutory premiums of AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance companies over the last three years were as follows (in millions):

		<u>Premiums</u>	
	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Non-403(b) indexed annuities	\$ 402	\$ 571	\$ 874
Non-403(b) fixed annuities	294	311	272
403(b) fixed and indexed annuities	337	358	345
Bank fixed annuities	314	345	-
Variable annuities	<u>87</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>81</u>
Total annuities	1,434	1,676	1,572
Supplemental insurance	390	381	364
Life insurance	<u>44</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>59</u>
Total	<u>\$1,868</u>	<u>\$2,089</u>	<u>\$1,995</u>

AFG believes that the ratings assigned by independent insurance rating agencies are important because agents, potential policyholders and school districts often use a company's rating as an initial screening device in considering annuity products. AFG believes that (i) a rating in the "A" category by A.M. Best is necessary to successfully market tax-deferred annuities to public education employees and other non-profit groups and (ii) a rating in the "A" category by at least one rating agency is necessary to successfully compete in other annuity markets. AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance entities also compete in markets other than the sale of tax-deferred annuities. Ratings are an important competitive factor; AFG believes that these entities can successfully compete in these markets with their respective ratings. AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance operations could be materially and adversely affected by ratings downgrades.

Annuities

AFG's principal retirement products are Flexible Premium Deferred Annuities ("FPDAs") and Single Premium Deferred Annuities ("SPDAs"). Annuities are long-term retirement saving instruments that benefit from income accruing on a tax-deferred basis. The issuer of the annuity collects premiums, credits interest or earnings on the policy and pays out a benefit upon death, surrender or annuitization. FPDAs are characterized by premium payments that are flexible in both amount and timing as determined by the policyholder and are generally made through payroll deductions. SPDAs are generally issued in exchange for a one-time lump-sum premium payment.

Annuity contracts are generally classified as either fixed rate (including indexed) or variable. With a traditional fixed rate annuity, AFG seeks to maintain a desired spread between the yield on its investment portfolio and the rate it credits. AFG accomplishes this by: (i) offering crediting rates that it has the option to change after any initial guarantee period (subject to minimum interest rate guarantees); (ii) designing annuity products that encourage persistency; and (iii) maintaining an appropriate matching of assets and liabilities.

An indexed annuity provides policyholders with the opportunity to receive a crediting rate tied, in part, to the performance of an existing market index (generally the S&P 500) while protecting against the related downside risk through a guarantee of principal (excluding surrender charges). AFG purchases call options designed to substantially offset the effect of the index participation in the liabilities associated with indexed annuities.

In addition to traditional fixed rate and indexed annuities, AFG offers variable annuities. With a variable annuity, the earnings credited to the policy vary based on the investment results of the underlying investment options chosen by

the policyholder, generally without any guarantee of principal except in the case of death of the insured. Premiums directed to the underlying investment options maintained in separate accounts are invested in funds managed by various independent investment managers. AFG earns a fee on amounts deposited into separate accounts. Subject to contractual provisions, policyholders may also choose to direct all or a portion of their premiums to various fixed rate options, in which case AFG earns a spread on amounts deposited.

11

Supplemental and Life Insurance Products

Loyal and UTA offer a variety of supplemental insurance products through independent agents. Principal products include coverage for Medicare supplement, cancer, long-term care, accidental injury, short-term disability and hospital indemnity. Other subsidiaries offer Medicare supplement and other supplemental insurance products primarily for individuals age 55 and older through independent agents and a captive agency force.

AFG ceased new sales of long-term care insurance beginning in January 2010. Renewal premiums on approximately 66,000 policies will be accepted unless those policies lapse. At December 31, 2009, AFG's long-term care insurance reserves were \$359 million, net of reinsurance recoverables.

Although GALIC no longer issues new life insurance policies, it continues to service and receive renewal premiums on its in-force block of approximately 150,000 policies and \$23 billion gross (\$5 billion net) of life insurance in force at December 31, 2009.

Marketing

The majority of AFG's FPDAs are sold in qualified markets under sections 403(b), 457 and 401(k) of the Internal Revenue Code. In the 403(b) and 457 markets, schools, government agencies and certain other non-profit organizations may allow employees to save for retirement through contributions made on a before-tax basis. In the 401(k) market, both for-profit and non-profit organizations may establish qualified retirement plans whereby employees are eligible to save for retirement through contributions made primarily on a before-tax basis. Federal income taxes are not payable on pretax contributions or earnings until amounts are withdrawn.

AFG sells its fixed rate annuities primarily through a network of approximately 200 managing general agents ("MGAs") who, in turn, direct over 2,000 actively producing independent agents. The top 10 MGAs accounted for approximately one-third of AFG's fixed rate annuity premiums in 2009. The largest MGA represented less than 6% of total fixed rate annuity premiums in 2009. In 2008, AFG began selling fixed rate annuities through banks. PNC Financial Group is its primary distribution channel for this business.

In recent years, AFG has offered its variable annuity as an ancillary product solely through its 403(b) and 401(k) sales channels. About one-third of AFG's variable annuity sales in 2009 were made through a wholly-owned subsidiary, Great American Advisors, Inc. ("GAA"). GAA is a broker/dealer licensed in all 50 states to sell stocks, bonds, options, mutual funds and variable insurance contracts through independent representatives and financial institutions. GAA also acts as the principal underwriter and distributor for AFG's variable annuity products.

AFG is licensed to sell its fixed annuity products in all 50 states; it is licensed to sell its variable products in all states except New York and Vermont. In 2009, no individual state accounted for more than 10% of AFG's annuity premiums other than California (12%) and Ohio (12%). At December 31, 2009, AFG had approximately 410,000 annuity policies in force.

Competition

AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance businesses operate in highly competitive markets. They compete with other insurers and financial institutions based on many factors, including: (i) ratings; (ii) financial strength; (iii) reputation; (iv) service to policyholders and agents; (v) product design (including interest rates credited, index participation and premium rates charged); (vi) commissions; and (vii) number of school districts in which a company has approval to sell. Since most policies are marketed and distributed through independent agents, the insurance companies must also compete for agents.

No single insurer dominates the markets in which AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance businesses compete. See *Item 1A - "Risk Factors."* Competitors include (i) individual insurers and insurance groups, (ii) mutual funds and (iii) other

12

financial institutions. In a broader sense, AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance businesses compete for retirement savings with a variety of financial institutions offering a full range of financial services.

Sales of annuities, including renewal premiums, are affected by many factors, including: (i) competitive annuity products and rates; (ii) the general level and volatility of interest rates, including the slope of the yield curve; (iii) the favorable tax treatment of annuities; (iv) commissions paid to agents; (v) services offered; (vi) ratings from independent insurance rating agencies; (vii) other alternative investments; (viii) performance and volatility of the equity markets; (ix) media coverage of annuities; (x) regulatory developments regarding suitability and the sales process; and (xi) general economic conditions.

Other Operations

Through subsidiaries, AFG is engaged in a variety of other operations, including commercial real estate operations in Cincinnati (office buildings and The Cincinnati Hotel), New Orleans (Le Pavillon Hotel), Whitefield, New Hampshire (Mountain View Grand Resort), Chesapeake Bay (Skipjack Cove Yachting Resort and Bay Bridge Marina), Charleston (Charleston Harbor Resort and Marina), Palm Beach (Sailfish Marina and Resort), Florida City, Florida (retail commercial development) and apartments in Louisville and Pittsburgh. These operations employed approximately 600 full-time employees at December 31, 2009.

Investment Portfolio

General

A summary of AFG's fixed maturity investments and equity securities is shown in Note E to the financial statements. For additional information on AFG's investments, see *Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Investments."* Portfolio yields are shown below.

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Yield on Fixed Income Investments (a):			
Excluding realized gains and losses	6.4%	6.3%	5.8%
Including realized gains and losses	6.5%	5.5%	5.7%

Yield on Equity Securities (a):

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Excluding realized gains and losses	5.0%	2.5%	2.8%
Including realized gains and losses	15.5%	(40.5%)	(5.8%)

Yield on Investments (a)(b):

Excluding realized gains and losses	6.4%	6.2%	5.6%
Including realized gains and losses	6.6%	3.8%	5.2%

(a) Based on amortized cost; excludes effects of changes in unrealized gains and losses. Realized losses include impairment charges.

(b) Excludes "Real Estate and Other Investments."

The table below compares total returns, which include changes in fair value, on AFG's fixed income and equity securities to comparable public indices. While there are no directly comparable indices to AFG's portfolio, the two shown below are widely used benchmarks in the financial services industry. Both AFG's performance and the indices include changes in unrealized gains and losses.

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>
Total return on AFG's fixed income investments	19.1%	(5.2%)	5.8%
Barclays Capital U.S. Universal Bond Index	8.6%	2.4%	6.5%
Total return on AFG's equity securities	44.2%	(27.0%)	(15.8%)
Standard & Poor's 500 Index	23.5%	(36.6%)	5.5%

13

Fixed Maturity Investments

AFG's bond portfolio is invested primarily in taxable bonds. The following table shows AFG's available for sale fixed maturities by Standard & Poor's Corporation or comparable rating as of December 31, 2009 (dollars in millions).

<u>S&P or comparable rating</u>	Amortized		<u>%</u>
	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Fair Value</u> <u>Amount</u>	
AAA, AA, A	\$11,209	\$11,361	68%
BBB	<u>3,978</u>	<u>4,045</u>	<u>24</u>
Total investment grade	<u>15,187</u>	<u>15,406</u>	<u>92</u>
BB	556	503	3
B	384	345	2
CCC, CC, C	464	433	3

D	<u>139</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>*</u>
Total noninvestment grade	<u>1,543</u>	<u>1,417</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	<u>\$16,730</u>	<u>\$16,823</u>	<u>100</u>

%

(*) less than 1%

AFG invests in bonds and redeemable preferred stocks that have primarily intermediate-term maturities. This practice is designed to allow flexibility in reacting to fluctuations of interest rates.

At December 31, 2009, approximately 87% of AFG's mortgage-backed securities ("MBS") having a fair value of \$5.5 billion were rated investment grade (BBB or better) by major rating firms. Beginning with year-end 2009 reporting of MBS by insurance companies, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners ("NAIC") retained a third-party investment management firm to assist in the determination of appropriate NAIC designations for all non-agency residential MBS based not only on the probability of loss (which is the primary basis of ratings by the major ratings firms), but also on the severity of loss and statutory carrying value. At December 31, 2009, 98% (based on Statutory carrying value of \$5.5 billion) of AFG's MBS portfolio had an NAIC designation of 1 or 2 (the highest of the six designations).

Equity Investments

At December 31, 2009, AFG held common and perpetual preferred stocks with a fair value of \$411 million, the largest of which was a \$184 million common stock investment in Verisk Analytics, Inc. ("Verisk")(formerly Insurance Services Office, Inc.), a provider of risk information for insurance companies. In October 2009, AFG recorded an after-tax gain of \$49 million on the sale of a portion of its investment in Verisk through an initial public offering.

Regulation

AFG's insurance company subsidiaries are subject to regulation in the jurisdictions where they do business. In general, the insurance laws of the various states establish regulatory agencies with broad administrative powers governing, among other things, premium rates, solvency standards, licensing of insurers, agents and brokers, trade practices, forms of policies, maintenance of specified reserves and capital for the protection of policyholders, deposits of securities for the benefit of policyholders, investment activities and relationships between insurance subsidiaries and their parents and affiliates. Material transactions between insurance subsidiaries and their parents and affiliates generally must receive prior approval of the applicable insurance regulatory authorities and be disclosed. In addition, while differing from state to state, these regulations typically restrict the maximum amount of dividends that may be paid by an insurer to its shareholders in any twelve-month period without advance regulatory approval. Such limitations are generally based on net earnings or statutory surplus. Under applicable restrictions, the maximum amount of dividends available to AFG in 2010 from its insurance subsidiaries without seeking regulatory clearance is approximately \$673 million.

Legislation has been proposed to establish procedures for insurers to be subject to federal regulation. The implications of this proposal on AFG's insurance operations cannot be determined at this time.

Most states have created insurance guaranty associations to provide for the payment of claims of insurance companies that become insolvent. Annual guaranty assessments for AFG's insurance companies have not been material.

ITEM 1A

Risk Factors

Following is a discussion of the material risk factors to investors in AFG securities.

Continued adverse developments in the financial markets and deterioration in global economic conditions could have a material adverse effect on AFG's results of operations and financial condition.

Worldwide economic conditions deteriorated significantly during 2008 and early 2009. The highly volatile debt and equity markets, lack of liquidity, widening credit spreads and the collapse of several financial institutions during this period resulted in significant realized and unrealized losses in AFG's investment portfolio. Although the U.S. and other foreign governments have taken a number of unprecedented actions to help stabilize the markets, it is uncertain whether those actions will be effective over the long term. At December 31, 2009, AFG's net unrealized gain on fixed maturity investments was \$93 million consisting of gross gains of \$581 million and gross losses of \$488 million. Although AFG intends to hold its investments with unrealized losses until they recover in value, its intent may change for a variety of reasons as discussed in *Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Investments."* A change in AFG's ability or intent with regard to a security in an unrealized loss position would result in the recognition of a realized loss.

AFG's investment performance could also be adversely impacted by the types of investments, industry groups and/or individual securities in which it invests. As of December 31, 2009, 87% of AFG's investment portfolio was invested in fixed maturity securities. Certain risks are inherent in connection with fixed maturity securities including loss upon default and price volatility in reaction to changes in interest rates and general market factors. AFG's equity securities, which represent 2% of its investment portfolio, are subject to market price volatility.

MBS represented about one-third of AFG's fixed maturity securities at December 31, 2009. AFG's MBS portfolio will continue to be impacted by general economic conditions, including unemployment levels, real estate values and other factors that could negatively effect the creditworthiness of borrowers. MBS in which the underlying collateral is subprime mortgages represented 2% of AFG's total fixed maturity portfolio at December 31, 2009; MBS in which the underlying collateral is Alt-A mortgages (risk profile between prime and subprime) represented approximately 5%. See *Item 7A, "Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk - Fixed Maturity Portfolio."*

AFG cannot predict whether and the extent to which industry sectors in which it maintains investments may suffer losses as a result of potential declines in commercial and economic activity, or how any such decline might impact the ability of companies within the affected industry sectors to pay interest or principal on their securities, or how the value of any underlying collateral might be affected.

Investment returns are an important part of AFG's overall profitability. Accordingly, adverse fluctuations in the fixed income or equity markets could adversely impact AFG's profitability, financial condition or cash flows.

In addition, the continuing economic downturn could have a material adverse effect on AFG's insureds and reinsurers. However, the impact that this would have on AFG's business cannot be predicted.

AFG's ability to recognize future tax benefits on realized and unrealized investment losses is limited.

At December 31, 2009, AFG had a net deferred tax asset of \$36.3 million related to capital loss carryforwards. Future realization of this asset, as well as the ability to record tax benefits on future realized and unrealized capital losses, will depend on management's assessment of available tax planning strategies such as realizing the existing appreciation in certain investment assets. If management believes realization of a deferred tax asset is not likely, a valuation allowance would be established by increasing income tax expense, or in the case of additional future unrealized losses, reducing accumulated other comprehensive income.

Adverse developments in the financial markets may limit AFG's access to capital.

Financial markets in the U.S. and elsewhere experienced extreme volatility during the latter part of 2008 and early 2009. These circumstances exerted downward pressure on stock prices and limited access to the equity and debt markets for certain issuers, including AFG. Although access to credit markets eased somewhat by mid-2009, enabling AFG to issue \$350 million in 10-year Senior Notes, there is no assurance access to these markets will continue.

The five-year revolving credit facility entered into by AFG in 2006 under which it can borrow up to \$500 million expires in March 2011. There is no assurance that this facility will be renewed. In addition, AFG's access to funds through this facility is dependent on the ability of its banks to meet their funding commitments. There were no borrowings outstanding under this agreement at December 31, 2009.

If AFG cannot obtain adequate capital or sources of credit on favorable terms, or at all, its business, operating results and financial condition would be adversely affected.

Intense competition could adversely affect AFG's profitability.

The specialty insurance business is highly competitive and, except for regulatory considerations, there are relatively few barriers to entry. AFG's specialty insurance businesses compete with other individual insurers, state funds and insurance groups of varying sizes, some of which are mutual insurance companies possessing competitive advantages in that all their profits inure to their policyholders. In addition, certain foreign insurers can write business in the U.S. on a tax-advantaged basis and therefore hold a competitive advantage over AFG. AFG also competes with self-insurance plans, captive programs and risk retention groups. Peer companies and major competitors in some or all of AFG's specialty lines include the following companies and/or their subsidiaries: ACE Ltd., American International Group Inc. (Chartis and Lexington Insurance), Arch Capital Group Ltd., Chubb Corp., Cincinnati Financial Corp., CNA Financial Corp., Liberty Mutual, Markel Corp., Munich Re Group (Midland), Hartford Financial Services Group, HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc., Ironshore Insurance Ltd., RLI Corp., The Travelers Companies Inc., Tokio Marine Holdings, Inc. (Philadelphia Consolidated), W.R. Berkley Corp., Wells Fargo Corporation, XL Capital Ltd., Zenith National Insurance Corp and Zurich Financial Services Group.

AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance businesses compete with individual insurers and insurance groups, mutual funds and other financial institutions. Competitors include the following companies and/or their subsidiaries: ING Life Insurance and Annuity Company, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, American International Group Inc., Life Insurance Company of the Southwest, Midland National Life Insurance Company, Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America, Aviva Life and Annuity Company, Mutual of Omaha Insurance Company and Bankers Life and Casualty Company.

Competition is based on many factors, including service to policyholders and agents, product design, reputation for claims handling, ratings and financial strength. Price, commissions, fees, profit sharing terms, interest crediting rates, technology and distribution channels are also important factors. Some of AFG's competitors have more capital and greater resources than AFG, and may offer a broader range of products and lower prices than AFG offers. If competition limits AFG's ability to write new or renewal business at adequate rates, its results of operations will be adversely affected.

AFG's revenues could be negatively affected if it is not able to attract and retain independent agents.

AFG's reliance on the independent agency market makes it vulnerable to a reduction in the amount of business written by agents. Many of AFG's competitors also rely significantly on the independent agency market. Accordingly, AFG must compete with other insurance carriers for independent agents' business. Some of its competitors offer a wider variety of products, lower price for insurance coverage or higher commissions. Loss of a substantial portion of the business that AFG writes through independent agents could adversely affect AFG's revenues and profitability.

AFG is subject to comprehensive regulation, and its ability to earn profits may be restricted by these regulations.

As previously discussed under "Regulation," AFG is subject to comprehensive regulation by government agencies in the states where its insurance company subsidiaries are domiciled and where these subsidiaries issue policies and handle claims. AFG must obtain prior approval for certain corporate actions. The regulations may limit AFG's ability to obtain rate increases or take other actions designed to increase AFG's profitability. Such regulation is primarily intended for the protection of policyholders rather than securityholders.

Existing insurance-related laws and regulations may become more restrictive in the future or new restrictive laws may be enacted; it is not possible to predict the potential effects of these laws and regulations. The costs of compliance or the failure to comply with existing or future regulations could harm AFG's financial results and its reputation with customers.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed rules which would be effective in January 2013 whereby certain indexed annuities will be considered securities which can only be sold by registered representatives. Approximately 38% of AFG's statutory annuity premiums in 2009 were from sales of indexed annuities. Future premium volume may be adversely impacted by these new rules.

New IRS regulations governing 403(b) plans became effective January 1, 2009. As a result, school districts and other not-for-profit employers are required to assume additional responsibilities for 403(b) plans offered to their employees. One consequence of these new regulations is that many of these employers have reduced the number of companies allowed to offer 403(b) products to their employees. AFG's annuity premiums could be negatively impacted if its insurance company subsidiaries are excluded from school districts that have historically been the source of a significant amount of premiums.

The 2008 Federal Farm Bill reduced administrative and operating expense subsidies to crop insurers and authorized the United States Department of Agriculture's Risk Management Agency ("RMA") to renegotiate the Standard Reinsurance Agreement ("SRA"), which governs the FCIC's reinsurance agreements with insurers such as AFG. The RMA's proposal was released in December 2009 and would become effective for policies written beginning June 30, 2010. The RMA hopes to have a final agreement in place in the second quarter of 2010. As proposed, the SRA would reduce flexibility in managing underwriting risks, limit potential underwriting gains, and further lower expense reimbursement.

The failure of AFG's insurance subsidiaries to maintain a commercially acceptable financial strength rating would have a significant negative effect on their ability to compete successfully.

As discussed under "Property and Casualty Insurance Operations" and "Annuity and Supplemental Insurance Operations - General," financial strength ratings are an important factor in establishing the competitive position of insurance companies and

may be expected to have an effect on an insurance company's sales. A downgrade out of the "A" category in AFG's insurers' claims-paying and financial strength ratings could significantly reduce AFG's business volumes, adversely impact AFG's ability to access the capital markets and increase AFG's borrowing costs.

17

AFG's results may fluctuate as a result of cyclical pricing changes in the specialty insurance industry.

The property and casualty group operates in a highly competitive industry that is affected by many factors that can cause significant fluctuations in its results of operations. The industry has historically been subject to pricing cycles characterized by periods of intense competition and lower premium rates (a "downcycle") followed by periods of reduced competition, reduced underwriting capacity due to lower policyholders' surplus and higher premium rates (an "upcycle"). The trend of AFG's underwriting results typically follows that of the industry and a prolonged downcycle could adversely affect AFG's results of operations.

AFG's property and casualty reserves may be inadequate, which could significantly affect AFG's financial results.

AFG's property and casualty insurance subsidiaries record reserve liabilities for the estimated payment of losses and loss adjustment expenses for both reported and unreported claims. Due to the inherent uncertainty of estimating reserves, it has been necessary in the past, and will continue to be necessary in the future, to revise estimated liabilities as reflected in AFG's reserves for claims and related expenses. While AFG recorded favorable development of \$198 million in 2009, \$242 million in 2008, \$99 million in 2007 and \$57 million in 2006, it had unfavorable development of \$199 million (due primarily to A&E charges) in 2005. The historic development of reserves for losses and loss adjustment expense may not necessarily reflect future trends in the development of these amounts. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to extrapolate redundancies or deficiencies based on historical information. To the extent that reserves are inadequate and are strengthened, the amount of such increase is treated as a charge to earnings in the period in which the deficiency is recognized.

AFG's results could be negatively impacted by severe weather conditions or other catastrophes.

AFG recorded catastrophe losses of \$18 million in 2009, \$59 million in 2008 (principally wind-related storm damage from hurricanes Gustav and Ike and tornadoes) and \$5 million in 2007. Catastrophes (some of which are seasonal) can be caused by natural events such as hurricanes, windstorms, tornadoes, hailstorms, severe winter weather, earthquakes, explosions and fire, and by man-made events, such as terrorist attacks and riots. The extent of losses from a catastrophe is a function of the amount of insured exposure in the area affected by the event and the severity of the event. In addition, certain catastrophes could result in both property and non-property claims from the same event. A severe catastrophe or a series of catastrophes could result in losses exceeding AFG's reinsurance protection and may have a material adverse impact on its results of operations or financial condition.

Climate change and related regulation could adversely affect AFG's property and casualty insurance operations.

While AFG does not believe that its operations are likely to be impacted by existing laws and regulations regarding climate change, it is possible that future regulation in this area could result in additional compliance costs and demands on management time.

To the extent that global climate change meaningfully alters weather and tidal patterns, or sea levels, it is possible that the AFG's property and casualty insurance operations could experience an increase in claims, primarily in coastal areas and in AFG's crop and agricultural businesses.

Volatility in crop prices could negatively impact AFG's financial results.

Weather conditions and the level of crop prices in the commodities market heavily impact AFG's crop insurance business. These factors are inherently unpredictable and could result in significant volatility in the results of the crop insurance business from one year to the next.

18

Declines in used car prices could negatively impact AFG's financial results.

AFG's run-off residual value business in Canada is heavily impacted by the level of used car prices obtained at auction. A significant decline in the market value of used Honda automobiles could result in losses. AFG's exposure to Canadian used car prices substantially ends in 2010.

The inability to obtain reinsurance or to collect on ceded reinsurance could adversely impact AFG's results.

AFG relies on the use of reinsurance to limit the amount of risk it retains. The following amounts of gross property and casualty premiums have been ceded to other insurers: 2009 - \$1.5 billion (39%); 2008 - \$1.4 billion (32%) and 2007 - \$1.3 billion (32%). The availability and cost of reinsurance are subject to prevailing market conditions, which are beyond AFG's control and which may affect AFG's level of business and profitability. AFG also reinsures the death benefits above certain retained amounts on its run-off life insurance business. AFG is also subject to credit risk with respect to its reinsurers, as AFG will remain liable to its insureds if any reinsurer is unable to meet its obligations under agreements covering the reinsurance ceded.

Variations from the actuarial assumptions used to establish certain assets and liabilities in AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance business could negatively impact AFG's reported financial results.

The earnings on certain products sold by AFG's annuity and supplemental insurance business depend significantly upon the extent to which actual experience is consistent with the assumptions used in setting reserves and establishing and amortizing deferred policy acquisition costs ("DPAC"). These assumptions relate to investment yields (and spreads over fixed annuity crediting rates), mortality, surrenders, annuitizations and, on some policies, the ability to obtain price increases, and morbidity. Developing such assumptions is complex and involves information obtained from company-specific and industry-wide data, as well as general economic information. These assumptions, and therefore AFG's results of operations, could be negatively impacted by changes in any of the factors listed above. For example, AFG recorded a \$13 million pretax charge in 2009 (related primarily to its fixed annuity business) in connection with a review of major actuarial assumptions, including management's expectation of investment yields.

The continued threat of terrorism and ongoing military and other actions may adversely affect AFG's financial results.

The continued threat of terrorism, both within the United States and abroad, and the ongoing military and other actions and heightened security measures in response to these types of threats, may cause significant volatility and declines in the equity markets in the United States, Europe and elsewhere, loss of life, property damage, additional disruptions to commerce and reduced economic activity. Actual terrorist attacks could cause losses from insurance claims related to AFG's property and casualty and life insurance operations with adverse financial consequences. In addition, some of the assets in AFG's investment portfolios may be adversely affected by declines in the capital markets and economic activity caused by the continued threat of terrorism, ongoing military and other actions and heightened security measures.

As a holding company, AFG is dependent on the operations of its insurance company subsidiaries to meet its obligations and pay future dividends.

AFG is a holding company and a legal entity separate and distinct from its insurance company subsidiaries. As a holding company without significant operations of its own, AFG's principal sources of funds are dividends and other

distributions from its insurance company subsidiaries. As discussed under "Regulation," state insurance laws limit the ability of insurance companies to pay dividends or other distributions and require insurance companies to maintain specified levels of statutory capital and surplus. AFG's rights to participate in any distribution of assets of its insurance company subsidiaries are subject to prior claims of policyholders and creditors (except to the extent that its rights, if any, as a creditor are recognized). Consequently, AFG's ability to pay debts, expenses and cash dividends to its shareholders may be limited.

19

AFG may be adversely impacted by a downgrade in the ratings of its debt securities.

AFG's debt securities are rated by Standard & Poor's and Moody's independent corporate credit rating agencies. AFG's senior indebtedness is currently rated BBB by Standard & Poor's and Baa2 by Moody's. Securities ratings are subject to revision or withdrawal at any time by the assigning rating organization. A security rating is not a recommendation to buy, sell or hold securities. An unfavorable change in either of these ratings could make it more expensive to access the capital markets and may increase the interest rate charged under AFG's current multi-bank credit line.

AFG is a party to litigation which, if decided adversely, could impact its financial results.

AFG and its subsidiaries are named as defendants in a number of lawsuits. See *Item 1 - "Property and Casualty Insurance Operations - Asbestos and Environmental Reserves ("A&E"),* *Item 3 - "Legal Proceedings,"* and *Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis - "Uncertainties."* Litigation, by its very nature, is unpredictable and the outcome of these cases is uncertain and could result in liabilities that may vary from amounts AFG has currently recorded and a material variance could have a material effect on AFG's business, operations, profitability or financial condition.

Certain shareholders exercise substantial control over AFG's affairs, which may impede a change of control transaction.

Carl H. Lindner is Chairman of the Board of Directors of AFG, and his sons, Carl H. Lindner III and S. Craig Lindner, are each Co-Chief Executive Officers and Directors of AFG. Carl H. Lindner, Carl H. Lindner III and S. Craig Lindner beneficially own 5.4%, 9.2% and 8.0%, respectively, of AFG's outstanding Common Stock as of February 1, 2010. As a result, certain members of the Lindner family have the ability to exercise significant influence over AFG's management, including over matters requiring shareholder approval.

The price of AFG Common Stock may fluctuate significantly, which may make it difficult for holders to resell common stock when they want or at a price they find attractive.

The price of AFG's Common Stock as listed on the NYSE and Nasdaq Global Select Market constantly changes. During 2009, AFG's Common Stock traded at prices ranging between \$12.77 and \$26.63. AFG's Common Stock price can fluctuate as a result of a variety of factors, many of which are beyond its control. These factors include but are not limited to:

- actual or anticipated variations in quarterly operating results;
- actual or anticipated changes in the dividends paid on AFG Common Stock;
- rating agency actions;
- recommendations by securities analysts;
- significant acquisitions or business combinations, strategic partnerships, joint ventures or capital commitments by or involving AFG or its competitors;
- operating and stock price performance of other companies that investors deem comparable to AFG;
- news reports relating to trends, concerns and other issues in AFG's lines of business;
- general economic conditions, including volatility in the financial markets; and

- geopolitical conditions such as acts or threats of terrorism or military conflicts.

20

ITEM 2

Properties

Subsidiaries of AFG own several buildings in downtown Cincinnati. AFG and its affiliates occupy about half of the aggregate 680,000 square feet of commercial and office space in these buildings.

AFG's insurance subsidiaries lease the majority of their office and storage facilities in numerous cities throughout the United States, including Great American's and GAFRI's home offices in Cincinnati and UTA's home office in Austin. In December 2007, AFG signed a 15-year lease for space in a new office tower currently under construction in downtown Cincinnati. The new building is scheduled for completion in 2011 and will enable AFG to consolidate operations from several leased locations. A property and casualty insurance subsidiary owns approximately 177,000 square feet of office space on 17.5 acres of land in Richfield, Ohio, approximately 80% of which it occupies; the remaining space is leased to unaffiliated tenants. See *Item 1 - "Other Operations"* for a discussion of AFG's other commercial real estate operations.

ITEM 3

Legal Proceedings

Please refer to "Forward-Looking Statements" following the Index in front of this Form 10-K.

AFG and its subsidiaries are involved in various litigation, most of which arose in the ordinary course of business, including litigation alleging bad faith in dealing with policyholders and challenging certain business practices of insurance subsidiaries. Except for the following, management believes that none of the litigation meets the threshold for disclosure under this Item.

AFG's insurance company subsidiaries and its 100%-owned subsidiary, American Premier Underwriters (including its subsidiaries, "American Premier"), are parties to litigation and receive claims alleging injuries and damages from asbestos, environmental and other substances and workplace hazards and have established loss accruals for such potential liabilities; other than the A.P. Green Company discussed below, none of such litigation or claims is individually material to AFG. The ultimate loss for these claims may vary materially from amounts currently recorded as the conditions surrounding resolution of these claims continue to change.

American Premier is a party or named as a potentially responsible party in a number of proceedings and claims by regulatory agencies and private parties under various environmental protection laws, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), seeking to impose responsibility on American Premier for hazardous waste or discharge remediation costs at certain railroad sites formerly owned by its predecessor, Penn Central Transportation Company ("PCTC"), and at certain other sites where hazardous waste or discharge allegedly generated by PCTC's railroad operations and American Premier's former manufacturing operations is present. It is difficult to estimate American Premier's liability for remediation costs at these sites for a number of reasons, including the number and financial resources of other potentially responsible parties involved at a given site, the varying availability of evidence by which to allocate responsibility among such parties, the wide range of costs for possible remediation alternatives, changing technology and the period of time over which these matters develop. Nevertheless, American Premier believes that its accruals for potential environmental liabilities are adequate to cover the probable amount of such liabilities, based on American Premier's estimates of remediation costs and related expenses and its estimates of the portions of such costs that will be borne

by other parties. Such estimates are based on information currently available to American Premier and are subject to future change as additional information becomes available.

As previously reported, Great American Insurance Company and certain other insurers were parties to declaratory judgment coverage litigation brought in 2001 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio (arising from

21

claims alleging asbestos exposure resulted in bodily injury) under insurance policies issued during the 1970's and 1980's to Bigelow-Liptak Corporation and related companies, subsequently known as A.P. Green Industries, Inc. ("A.P. Green"). A.P. Green sought to recover defense and indemnity expenses related to those claims from a number of insurers, including Great American.

In February 2002, A.P. Green filed petitions for bankruptcy under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania (In Re Global Industrial Technologies, Inc., et al, filed February 14, 2002) and subsequently (in 2002) commenced adversary proceedings in that Court against Great American Insurance Company and other companies to obtain an adjudication of the insured's rights under the above-referenced insurance policies.

In 2003, Great American Insurance Company entered into an agreement, which was approved by the Bankruptcy Court, for the settlement of coverage litigation related to A.P. Green asbestos claims. The settlement of \$123.5 million (Great American has the option to pay in cash or over time with 5.25% interest) has been fully accrued and allows up to 10% of the settlement to be paid in AFG Common Stock. The settlement agreement is conditioned upon confirmation of a plan of reorganization that includes an injunction prohibiting the assertion against Great American of any present or future asbestos personal injury claims under policies issued to A.P. Green and related companies.

During 2007, the Bankruptcy Court confirmed the A. P. Green Plan of Reorganization which includes the injunction required by Great American's settlement agreement. Certain parties appealed the confirmation on issues that management believes are ancillary to the Great American settlement.

22

PART II

ITEM 5

Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters
and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

Please refer to "Forward-Looking Statements" following the Index in front of this Form 10-K.

AFG Common Stock is listed and traded on the New York Stock Exchange and the Nasdaq Global Select Market under the symbol AFG. The information presented in the table below represents the high and low sales prices per share reported on the NYSE Composite Tape.

		<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	
First Quarter	\$24.20	\$12.77	\$29.30	\$24.19	

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Second Quarter	23.54	15.51	30.45	25.23
Third Quarter	26.63	20.40	32.00	24.58
Fourth Quarter	26.52	23.26	29.75	13.65

There were approximately 7,900 shareholders of record of AFG Common Stock at February 1, 2010. In 2009 and 2008, AFG declared and paid quarterly dividends of \$.13 and \$.125 per share, respectively. In January 2010, AFG increased its quarterly dividend to \$.1375 per share. The ability of AFG to pay dividends will be dependent upon, among other things, the availability of dividends and payments under intercompany tax allocation agreements from its insurance company subsidiaries.

Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

AFG repurchased shares of its common stock during the fourth quarter of 2009 as follows:

	Total Number of Shares Purchased	Average Price Paid Per Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs	Maximum Number of Shares that May Yet be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs (a)
October	345,000	\$25.26	345,000	914,100
November	1,366,835	\$24.73	1,366,835	4,547,265
December	1,580,000	\$24.38	1,580,000	2,967,265

- (a) Represents the remaining shares that may be repurchased under the Plans authorized by AFG's Board of Directors in 2007 and November 2009. In February 2010, AFG's Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of five million additional shares. Between January 1, 2010 and February 19, 2010, an additional 2.1 million shares were repurchased at an average price of \$25.09 per share leaving 5.8 million shares authorized under the Plans.

Under AFG's shareholder-approved Stock Option Plan, 800 shares of AFG Common Stock were exchanged at \$23.54 per share in connection with the exercise of stock options in December 2009; 175,530 shares were exchanged at \$24.81 per share in connection with option exercises in July 2009.

23

ITEM 6

Selected Financial Data

The following table sets forth certain data for the periods indicated (dollars in millions, except per share data).

<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2005</u>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Earnings Statement Data

:					
Total Revenues	\$4,321	\$4,293	\$4,379	\$4,225	\$3,984
Operating Earnings Before Income Taxes	813	316	639	694	327
Earnings from Continuing Operations	530	200	413	460	222
Discontinued Operations	-	-	2	31	13
Less: Net Earnings Attributable to Noncontrolling Interests	11	4	32	38	28
Net Earnings Attributable to Shareholders	519	196	383	453	207
Basic Earnings Per Common Share:					
Earnings from Continuing Operations	\$4.49	\$1.71	\$3.24	\$3.63	\$1.69
Discontinued Operations	-	-	.01	.21	.09
Net Earnings Attributable to Shareholders	4.49	1.71	3.25	3.84	1.78
Diluted Earnings Per Common Share:					
Earnings from Continuing Operations	\$4.45	\$1.67	\$3.09	\$3.54	\$1.66
Discontinued Operations	-	-	.01	.21	.09
Net Earnings Attributable to Shareholders	4.45	1.67	3.10	3.75	1.75
Cash Dividends Paid Per Share of Common Stock	\$.52	\$.50	\$.40	\$.37	\$.33
Ratio of Earnings to Fixed Charges Including Annuity Benefits (a)	2.58	1.63	2.40	2.62	1.77

Balance Sheet Data

:					
Total Assets	\$27,683	\$26,428	\$25,808	\$25,101	\$22,816
Long-term Debt	828	1,030	937	921	1,000
Shareholders' Equity	3,781	2,490	3,046	2,929	2,458

(a) Fixed charges are computed on a "total enterprise" basis. For purposes of calculating the ratios, "earnings" have been computed by adding to pretax earnings the fixed charges and the noncontrolling interests in earnings of subsidiaries having fixed charges and the undistributed equity in losses of investees. Fixed charges include interest (including annuity benefits as indicated), amortization of debt premium/discount and expense, preferred dividend and distribution requirements of subsidiaries and a portion of rental expense deemed to be representative of the interest factor.

The ratio of earnings to fixed charges *excluding* annuity benefits was 11.06, 4.75, 8.49, 9.15 and 4.58 for 2009, 2008, 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. Although the ratio of earnings to fixed charges *excluding* annuity benefits is not required or encouraged to be disclosed under Securities

and Exchange Commission rules, some investors and lenders may not consider interest credited to annuity policyholders' accounts a borrowing cost for an insurance company, and accordingly, believe this ratio is meaningful.

24

ITEM 7

Management's Discussion and Analysis
of Financial Condition and Results of Operations

INDEX TO MD&A

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Page</u>
		43
<u>General</u>	25	
	25	43
<u>Overview</u>	26	43
<u>Critical Accounting Policies</u>	26	50
<u>Liquidity and Capital Resources</u>	26	51
Ratios	27	
	27	
Parent and Subsidiary Liquidity	29	52
Contractual Obligations	29	
Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements	29	
Investments	29	
Uncertainties	34	

Please refer to "Forward-Looking Statements" following the Index in front of this Form 10-K.

GENERAL

Following is a discussion and analysis of the financial statements and other statistical data that management believes will enhance the understanding of AFG's financial condition and results of operations. This discussion should be read in conjunction with the financial statements beginning on page F-1.

OVERVIEW

Financial Condition

AFG is organized as a holding company with almost all of its operations being conducted by subsidiaries. AFG, however, has continuing cash needs for administrative expenses, the payment of principal and interest on borrowings,

shareholder dividends, and taxes. Therefore, certain analyses are best done on a parent only basis while others are best done on a total enterprise basis. In addition, because most of its businesses are financial in nature, AFG does not prepare its consolidated financial statements using a current-noncurrent format. Consequently, certain traditional ratios and financial analysis tests are not meaningful.

At December 31, 2009, AFG (parent) held approximately \$223 million in cash and securities and had \$500 million available under a bank line of credit expiring in March 2011.

Results of Operations

Through the operations of its subsidiaries, AFG is engaged primarily in property and casualty insurance, focusing on specialized commercial products for businesses and in the sale of traditional fixed, indexed and variable annuities and a variety of supplemental insurance products.

The property and casualty business is cyclical in nature with periods of high competition resulting in low premium rates, sometimes referred to as a "soft market" or "downcycle" followed by periods of reduced competition and higher premium rates, referred to as a "hard market" or "upcycle." The 1990's were a soft market period; prices started to harden in 2000 and accelerated significantly following the terrorist attacks in 2001. Rate increases for AFG's specialty businesses moderated during the latter part of 2003 and that trend continued until 2005, when renewal rates were flat. While AFG's workers' compensation operations experienced significant rate decreases from 2005 through 2008, reflecting the improved claims environment from reform legislation, overall average renewal pricing was down about 2% in 2006, 4% in 2007 and 2008 and unchanged in 2009.

25

AFG reported net earnings attributable to shareholders of \$519 million (\$4.45 per share diluted) in 2009 compared to \$196 million (\$1.67 per share diluted) in 2008. Results for 2009 reflect net realized gains on investments compared to net realized losses in 2008, higher investment income and improved underwriting results in the property and casualty insurance operations.

CRITICAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Significant accounting policies are summarized in Note A to the financial statements. The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that can have a significant effect on amounts reported in the financial statements. As more information becomes known, these estimates and assumptions change and thus impact amounts reported in the future. The areas where management believes the degree of judgment required to determine amounts recorded in the financial statements make accounting policies critical are as follows:

- the establishment of insurance reserves, especially asbestos and environmental-related reserves,
- the recoverability of reinsurance,
- the recoverability of deferred acquisition costs,
- the establishment of asbestos and environmental reserves of former railroad and manufacturing operations, and
- the valuation of investments, including the determination of "other-than-temporary" impairments.

See "*Liquidity and Capital Resources - Uncertainties*" for a discussion of insurance reserves, recoverables from reinsurers, and contingencies related to American Premier's former operations and "*Liquidity and Capital Resources - Investments*" for a discussion of impairments on investments. Deferred policy acquisition costs ("DPAC") and certain liabilities related to annuities and universal life insurance products are amortized in relation to the present value of

expected gross profits on the policies. Assumptions considered in determining expected gross profits involve significant judgment and include management's estimates of assumed interest rates and investment spreads, surrenders, annuitizations, renewal premiums and mortality. Should actual experience require management to change its assumptions (commonly referred to as "unlocking"), a charge or credit would be recorded to adjust DPAC or annuity liabilities to the levels they would have been if the new assumptions had been used from the inception date of each policy.

LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES

Ratios

AFG's debt to total capital ratio on a consolidated basis is shown below (dollars in millions). Management intends to maintain the ratio of debt to capital at or below 25% and intends to maintain the capital of its significant insurance subsidiaries at or above levels currently indicated by rating agencies as appropriate for the current ratings.

	<u>December 31,</u>	
	<u>2009</u>	<u>2008</u>
Long-term debt	\$ 828	\$1,030
Total capital (*)	4,698	4,351
Ratio of debt to total capital:		
Including debt secured by real estate	17.6%	23.7%
Excluding debt secured by real estate	16.4%	22.5%

(*) Includes long-term debt, noncontrolling interests and shareholders' equity (excluding unrealized gains (losses) related to fixed maturity investments).

AFG's ratio of earnings to fixed charges, including annuity benefits as a fixed charge, was 2.58 for the year ended December 31, 2009. Excluding annuity benefits, this ratio was 11.06 for 2009. Although the ratio excluding annuity benefits is not required or encouraged to be disclosed under Securities and Exchange Commission rules, it is presented because interest credited to annuity policyholder accounts is not always considered a borrowing cost for an insurance company.

26

The NAIC's model law for risk based capital ("RBC") applies to both life and property and casualty companies. RBC formulas determine the amount of capital that an insurance company needs so that it has an acceptable expectation of not becoming financially impaired. At December 31, 2009, the capital ratios of all AFG insurance companies substantially exceeded the RBC requirements.

Parent and Subsidiary Liquidity

Parent Holding Company Liquidity

Management believes AFG has sufficient resources to meet its liquidity requirements. If funds generated from operations, including dividends, tax payments and borrowings from subsidiaries, are insufficient to meet fixed charges in any period, AFG would be required to utilize parent

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

company cash and marketable securities or to generate cash through borrowings, sales of other assets, or similar transactions.

AFG can borrow up to \$500 million under a revolving credit facility, which expires in March 2011. There were no borrowings outstanding under this agreement at December 31, 2009.

During 2009, AFG repurchased 3.3 million shares of its Common Stock for \$81 million. Through February 19, 2010, an additional 2.1 million shares were repurchased for \$53 million, using cash on hand at the parent company.

AFG retired the \$136 million of 7-1/8% Senior Debentures at maturity in April 2009, using cash on hand. In June 2009, AFG issued \$350 million of 9-7/8% Senior Notes due 2019. As a result of this issuance, AFG terminated its 364 day credit facility under which it could borrow up to \$120 million and voided its intercompany credit facility with a subsidiary under which it could borrow up to \$50 million.

During 2008, AFG repurchased \$37 million of its 7-1/8% Senior Debentures due April 2009, paid \$190 million in cash and issued 2.4 million shares of Common Stock to redeem its Senior Convertible Notes and repurchased 1.8 million shares of its Common Stock for \$47 million.

During 2007, AFG repurchased 6.9 million shares of its Common Stock for \$199 million, funded the \$239 million in costs associated with GAFRI's purchase of its Common Stock not previously owned by AFG, and redeemed the \$59 million of 7-1/8% Debentures that matured in December 2007.

All debentures and notes issued by AFG (and AAG Holding Company, a GAFRI subsidiary) are rated investment grade by two nationally recognized rating agencies. Under a currently effective shelf registration statement, AFG can offer additional equity or debt securities. The shelf registration provides AFG with flexibility to access the capital markets from time to time as market and other conditions permit.

Under tax allocation agreements with AFG, its 80%-owned U.S. subsidiaries generally pay taxes to (or recover taxes from) AFG based on each subsidiary's contribution to amounts due under AFG's consolidated tax return.

Subsidiary Liquidity

Great American Life Insurance Company ("GALIC"), a wholly-owned annuity and supplemental insurance subsidiary, became a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati ("FHLB") in the third quarter of 2009. The FHLB makes loans and provides other banking services to member institutions. Members are required to purchase stock in the FHLB in addition to maintaining collateral deposits that back any funds borrowed. GALIC's \$14 million investment in FHLB capital stock at December 31, 2009, is included in other investments at cost. Membership in the FHLB provides the annuity and supplemental insurance operations with a substantial additional source of liquidity. No funds have been borrowed from the FHLB.

In 2008, GAFRI used cash on hand to redeem its \$28 million in 6-7/8% notes at maturity. In 2007, AAG Holding used funds borrowed under a bank credit line to redeem its \$22 million in outstanding 8-7/8% Subordinated Debentures for \$23 million in cash.

In 2007, National Interstate Corporation ("NATL"), a 53%-owned subsidiary of GAI, entered into a five-year unsecured credit agreement under which it can borrow

up to \$75 million, subject to certain conditions. Amounts borrowed bear interest at rates ranging from .45% to .9% (currently .65%) over LIBOR based on NATL's credit rating. In 2008, NATL borrowed \$15 million under the credit agreement to redeem its subordinated debentures at par. No additional amounts have been borrowed on this line.

The liquidity requirements of AFG's insurance subsidiaries relate primarily to the liabilities associated with their products as well as operating costs and expenses, payments of dividends and taxes to AFG and contributions of capital to their subsidiaries. Historically, cash flows from premiums and investment income have provided more than sufficient funds to meet these requirements without requiring a sale of investments or contributions from AFG. Funds received in excess of cash requirements are generally invested in additional marketable securities. In addition, the insurance subsidiaries generally hold a significant amount of highly liquid, short-term investments.

The excess cash flow of AFG's property and casualty group allows it to extend the duration of its investment portfolio somewhat beyond that of its claim reserves.

In the annuity business, where profitability is largely dependent on earning a "spread" between invested assets and annuity liabilities, the duration of investments is generally maintained close to that of liabilities. With declining rates, AFG receives some protection (from spread compression) due to the ability to lower crediting rates, subject to guaranteed minimums. In a rising interest rate environment, significant protection from withdrawals exists in the form of temporary and permanent surrender charges on AFG's annuity products.

For statutory accounting purposes, equity securities of non-affiliates are generally carried at fair value. At December 31, 2009, AFG's insurance companies owned publicly traded equity securities with a fair value of \$385 million. In addition, GAI's investment in NATL common stock had a fair value of \$173 million and a statutory carrying value of \$137 million at December 31, 2009. Decreases in market prices could adversely affect the insurance group's capital, potentially impacting the amount of dividends available or necessitating a capital contribution. Conversely, increases in market prices could have a favorable impact on the group's dividend-paying capability.

AFG believes its insurance subsidiaries maintain sufficient liquidity to pay claims and benefits and operating expenses. In addition, these subsidiaries have sufficient capital to meet commitments in the event of unforeseen events such as reserve deficiencies, inadequate premium rates or reinsurer insolvencies. Nonetheless, changes in statutory accounting rules, significant declines in the fair value of the insurance subsidiaries' investment portfolios or significant ratings downgrades on these investments, could create a need for additional capital.

28

Contractual Obligations

The following table shows an estimate (based on historical patterns and expected trends) of payments to be made for insurance reserve liabilities, as well as scheduled payments for major contractual obligations (in millions).

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Within One Year</u>	<u>2-3 Years</u>	<u>4-5 Years</u>	<u>More than 5 Years</u>
Annuity, life, accident and health liabilities (a)	\$12,938	\$1,563	\$2,716	\$2,511	\$6,148
Property and casualty unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses (b)	6,412	1,800	2,000	1,300	1,312
Long-term debt, including interest	1,763	78	177	147	1,361
Operating leases (c)	<u>404</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>227</u>
Total (d)	<u>\$21,517</u>	<u>\$3,475</u>	<u>\$4,972</u>	<u>\$4,022</u>	<u>\$9,048</u>

(a) Reserve projections include anticipated cash benefit payments only. Projections do not include any impact for future earnings or additional premiums.

- (b) Dollar amounts and time periods are estimates based on historical net payment patterns applied to the gross reserves and do not represent actual contractual obligations. Based on the same assumptions, AFG projects reinsurance recoveries related to these reserves totaling \$2.5 billion as follows: Within 1 year - \$700 million; 2-3 years - \$800 million; 4-5 years - \$500 million; and thereafter - \$513 million. Actual payments and their timing could differ significantly from these estimates.
- (c) Includes 15-year lease for new office space with rentals, including estimated operating costs, averaging approximately \$16.9 million per year beginning in 2011.
- (d) AFG's \$46 million liability for unrecognized tax benefits as of December 31, 2009, is not included because the period of payment cannot be reliably estimated.

AFG has no material contractual purchase obligations or other long-term liabilities at December 31, 2009.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

See Note P - "Additional Information - Financial Instruments with Off-Balance Sheet Risk" to the financial statements.

AFG owns interests in certain variable interest entities which are not presently required to be consolidated. See "Collateralized Loan Obligations" in Note P to the financial statements. There are no contractual requirements or intentions to make additional investments in these entities.

Investments

AFG attempts to optimize investment income while building the value of its portfolio, placing emphasis upon total long-term performance.

AFG's investment portfolio at December 31, 2009, contained \$16.8 billion in "Fixed maturities" classified as available for sale and \$411 million in "Equity securities", all carried at fair value with unrealized gains and losses included in a separate component of shareholders' equity on an after-tax basis. In addition, \$373 million in fixed maturities were classified as trading with changes in unrealized holding gains or losses included in investment income.

As detailed under "Net Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Marketable Securities" in Note E to the financial statements, unrealized gains and losses on AFG's fixed maturity and equity securities are included in Shareholders' Equity after adjustments for related changes in deferred policy acquisition costs and certain liabilities related to annuities, noncontrolling interests and deferred income taxes. DPAC applicable to annuity products is adjusted for the impact of unrealized gains or losses on investments as if these gains or losses had been realized, with corresponding increases or decreases (net of tax) included in equity under "Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss)."

Fixed income investment funds are generally invested in securities with intermediate-term maturities with an objective of optimizing total return while allowing flexibility to react to changes in market conditions. At December 31, 2009, the average life of AFG's fixed maturities was about six years.

Fair values for AFG's portfolio are determined by AFG's internal investment professionals using data from nationally recognized pricing services as well as non-binding broker quotes. Fair values of equity securities are generally based on closing prices obtained from the pricing services. For mortgage-backed securities ("MBS"), which comprise approximately one-third of AFG's fixed maturities, prices for each security are generally obtained from both pricing services and broker quotes. For the other two-thirds of AFG's fixed maturity portfolio, approximately 95% are priced using a pricing service and the balance is priced internally or by using non-binding broker quotes. When prices obtained for the same security vary, AFG's internal investment professionals select the price they believe is most

indicative of an exit price.

The pricing services use a variety of observable inputs to estimate fair value of fixed maturities that do not trade on a daily basis. Based upon information provided by the pricing services, these inputs include, but are not limited to, recent reported trades, benchmark yields, issuer spreads, bids or offers, reference data, and measures of volatility. Included in the pricing of MBS are estimates of the rate of future prepayments and defaults of principal over the remaining life of the underlying collateral. Due to the lack of transparency in the process that brokers use to develop prices, valuations that are based on brokers' prices are classified as Level 3 in the GAAP hierarchy unless the price can be corroborated, for example, by comparison to similar securities priced using observable inputs.

Valuation techniques utilized by pricing services and prices obtained from external sources are reviewed by AFG's internal investment professionals who are familiar with the securities being priced and the markets in which they trade to ensure the fair value determination is representative of an exit price. To validate the appropriateness of the prices obtained, these investment managers consider widely published indices (as benchmarks), changes in interest rates, general economic conditions and the credit quality of the specific issuers. Prices obtained from a broker or pricing service are adjusted only in cases where they are deemed not to be representative of an appropriate exit price (fewer than 1% of the securities).

Increasing turmoil in the global financial markets caused credit spreads (the difference in rates between U.S. government bonds and other fixed maturities) to widen significantly during 2008 and early 2009. These wider spreads, as well as a lack of liquidity and the collapse of several financial institutions, were the primary cause of AFG's pretax net unrealized loss on fixed maturities rising from \$47 million at December 31, 2007, to \$1.9 billion at December 31, 2008. The impact of improving market conditions on the fair value of AFG's portfolio beginning in the second quarter of 2009 resulted in a pretax net unrealized gain of \$93 million at December 31, 2009.

In general, the fair value of AFG's fixed maturity investments is inversely correlated to changes in interest rates. The following table demonstrates the sensitivity of such fair values to reasonably likely changes in interest rates by illustrating the estimated effect on AFG's fixed maturity portfolio that an immediate increase of 100 basis points in the interest rate yield curve would have at December 31, 2009 (dollars in millions). Increases or decreases from the 100 basis points illustrated would be approximately proportional.

Fair value of fixed maturity portfolio	\$17,195
Pretax impact on fair value of 100 bps increase in interest rates	(\$ 825)
Pretax impact as % of total fixed maturity portfolio	(4.8%)

Approximately 92% of the fixed maturities held by AFG at December 31, 2009, were rated "investment grade" (credit rating of AAA to BBB) by nationally recognized rating agencies. Investment grade securities generally bear lower yields and lower degrees of risk than those that are unrated and noninvestment grade. Management believes that the high quality investment portfolio should generate a stable and predictable investment return.

AFG's \$5.5 billion investment in MBS represented approximately one-third of its fixed maturities at December 31, 2009. MBS are subject to significant prepayment risk due to the fact that, in periods of declining interest rates, mortgages may be repaid more rapidly than scheduled as borrowers refinance higher rate mortgages to take advantage of lower rates.

Summarized information for AFG's MBS (including those classified as trading) at December 31, 2009, is shown (in millions) in the table below. Agency-backed securities are those issued by a U.S. government-backed agency; Alt-A mortgages are those with risk profiles between prime and subprime. The majority of the Alt-A securities and

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

substantially all of the subprime securities are backed by fixed rate mortgages. The average life of the residential and commercial MBS is approximately 4 and 5 years, respectively.

<u>Collateral type</u>	<u>Amortized Cost</u>	<u>Fair Value</u>	<u>Fair Value as % of Cost</u>	<u>Unrealized Gain (Loss)</u>	<u>% Rated Investment Grade</u>
Residential:					
Agency-backed	\$ 595	\$ 619	104%	\$ 24	100%
Non-agency prime	2,249	2,182	97	(67)	89
Alt-A	960	864	90	(96)	62
Subprime	356	310	87	(46)	71
Other	29	28	97	(1)	50
Commercial	<u>1,468</u>	<u>1,465</u>	100	<u>(3)</u>	100
)		
	<u>\$5.657</u>	<u>\$5.468</u>	97%	<u>(\$189)</u>	87%

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners ("NAIC") assigns creditworthiness designations on a scale of 1 to 6 with 1 being the highest quality and 6 being the lowest quality. Beginning with year-end 2009 reporting of MBS by insurance companies, the NAIC retained a third-party investment management firm to assist in the determination of appropriate NAIC designations for all non-agency residential mortgage-backed securities based not only on the probability of loss (which is the primary basis of ratings by the major ratings firms), but also on the severity of loss and statutory carrying value. At December 31, 2009, 98% (based on statutory carrying value of \$5.5 billion) of AFG's MBS securities had an NAIC designation of 1 or 2.

Issuers will sometimes purchase monoline insurance to "wrap" or enhance the credit of a security issuance in order to benefit from better market execution. At December 31, 2009, AFG owned approximately \$1.1 billion of fixed maturity securities wrapped by monoline insurers. Of the credit enhancement, 31% was provided by MBIA Inc., 26% by Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. and an additional 25% by Ambac Assurance Corporation. AFG's direct investment in monoline credit insurers was approximately \$13 million at December 31, 2009.

The table below summarizes (in millions) the credit quality of AFG's investments that have been enhanced by monoline insurers at December 31, 2009.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Carrying Value</u>	
	<u>Insured Rating</u>	<u>Underlying Rating</u>
AAA-A	\$ 923	\$ 875
BBB	100	103
BB	26	18
Other	62	48
Not rated	<u>-</u>	<u>67</u>
	<u>\$1,111</u>	<u>\$1,111</u>

Summarized information for the unrealized gains and losses recorded in AFG's Balance Sheet at December 31, 2009, is shown in the following table (dollars in millions). Approximately \$339 million of available for sale "Fixed maturities" and \$46 million of "Equity securities" had no unrealized gains or losses at December 31, 2009.

	Securities With Unrealized <u>Gains</u>	Securities With Unrealized <u>Losses</u>
<u>Available for Sale Fixed Maturities</u>		
Fair value of securities	\$10,947	\$5,537
Amortized cost of securities	\$10,366	\$6,025
Gross unrealized gain (loss)	\$ 581	(\$ 488)
Fair value as % of amortized cost	106%	92%
Number of security positions	2,367	1,263
Number individually exceeding \$2 million gain or loss	28	32
Concentration of gains (losses) by type or industry (exceeding 5% of unrealized):		
Mortgage-backed securities	\$ 148	(\$ 337)
Banks, savings and credit institutions	39	(55)
Gas and electric services	81	(8)
States and Municipalities	40	(15)
Percentage rated investment grade	96%	84%
<u>Equity Securities</u>		
Fair value of securities	\$ 313	\$ 52
•	an increase in private litigation against us; and	
•	damage to our reputation in various markets.	

Table of Contents

In 2004, one of our Medicare fiscal intermediaries began to conduct selected reviews of claims previously submitted by and paid to some of our facilities. While we have always been subject to post-payment audits and reviews, more intensive “probe reviews” appear to be a permanent procedure with our fiscal intermediary. Although some of these probe reviews identified patient miscoding, documentation deficiencies and other errors in our recordkeeping and Medicare billing, these errors resulted in no Medicare revenue recoupment, net of appeal recoveries, to the federal government and related resident copayments. As of December 31, 2013, we had one facility under probe review.

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

In some cases, probe reviews can also result in a facility being temporarily placed on prepayment review of reimbursement claims, requiring additional documentation and adding steps and time to the reimbursement process for the affected facility. Failure to meet claim filing and documentation requirements during the prepayment review could subject a facility to an even more intensive “targeted review,” where a corrective action plan addressing perceived deficiencies must be prepared by the facility and approved by the fiscal intermediary. During a targeted review, additional claims are reviewed pre-payment to ensure that the prescribed corrective actions are being followed. Failure to make corrections or to otherwise meet the claim documentation and submission requirements could eventually result in Medicare decertification. None of our operations are currently on prepayment review, although some may be placed on prepayment review in the future. We have no operations that are currently undergoing targeted review.

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

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

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

Facilities with otherwise acceptable regulatory histories generally are given an opportunity to correct deficiencies and continue their participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs by a certain date, usually within nine months, although where denial of payment remedies are asserted, such interim remedies go into effect much sooner. Facilities with deficiencies that immediately jeopardize patient health and safety and those that are classified as poor performing facilities, however, are not generally given an opportunity to correct their deficiencies prior to the imposition of remedies and other enforcement actions. Moreover, facilities with poor regulatory histories continue to be classified by CMS as poor performing facilities notwithstanding any intervening change in ownership, unless the new owner obtains a new Medicare provider agreement instead of assuming the facility's existing agreement. However, new owners (including us, historically) nearly always assume the existing Medicare provider agreement due to the difficulty and time delays generally associated with obtaining new Medicare certifications, especially in previously-certified locations with sub-par operating histories. Accordingly, facilities that have poor regulatory histories before we acquire them and that develop new deficiencies after we acquire them are more likely to have sanctions imposed upon them by CMS or state regulators. In addition, CMS has increased its focus on facilities with a history of serious quality of care problems through the special focus facility initiative. A facility's administrators and owners are notified when it is identified as a special focus facility. This information is also provided to the general public. The special focus facility designation is based in part on the facility's compliance history typically dating before our acquisition of the facility. Local state survey agencies recommend to CMS that facilities be placed on special focus status. A special focus facility receives heightened scrutiny and more frequent regulatory surveys. Failure to improve the quality of care can result in fines and termination from participation in Medicare and Medicaid. A facility "graduates" from the program once it demonstrates significant improvements in quality of care that are continued over time.

We have received notices of potential sanctions and remedies based upon alleged regulatory deficiencies from time to time, and such sanctions have been imposed on some of our facilities. We have had several facilities placed on special focus facility status, due largely or entirely to their respective regulatory histories prior to our acquisition of the operations, and have successfully graduated four facilities from the program to date. CMS currently has not included any of our facilities on its special focus facilities listing, however, facilities may be identified for such status in the future.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

The therapy cap exception has been reauthorized in a number of subsequent laws, most recently in the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2014, which extends the cap and exception process through March 31, 2014. That statute implements a two-tiered exception process, with an automatic exception process and a manual medical review exception process. The automatic exception process applies for patients who reach a \$1,920 threshold. The manual medical review exception process applies at the \$3,700 threshold.

In addition, the Multiple Procedure Payment Reduction (MPPR) was increased from a 25% to 50% reduction applied to therapy by reducing payments for practice expense of the second and subsequent therapies when therapies are provided on the same day. The implementation of MPPR includes 1) facilities that provide Medicare Part B speech-language pathology, occupational therapy, and physical therapy services and bill under the same provider number; and 2) providers in private practice, including speech-language pathologists, who perform and bill for multiple services in a single day. The change from 25% of the practice expense to a 50% reduction went into effect for Medicare Part B services provided on or after April 1, 2013.

The application of annual caps, or the discontinuation of exceptions to the annual caps, could have an adverse effect on our rehabilitation therapy revenue. Additionally, the exceptions to these caps may not be extended beyond March 31, 2014, which could also have an adverse effect on our revenue after that date.

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

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

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

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

- facility and professional licensure, certificates of need, permits and other government approvals;
- adequacy and quality of healthcare services;
- qualifications of healthcare and support personnel;
- quality of medical equipment;
- confidentiality, maintenance and security issues associated with medical records and claims processing;
- relationships with physicians and other referral sources and recipients;

Table of Contents

constraints on protective contractual provisions with patients and third-party payors;
operating policies and procedures;
certification of additional facilities by the Medicare program; and
payment for services.

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

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

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

We are also required to comply with state and federal laws governing the transmission, privacy and security of health information. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) requires us to comply with

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

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

• cost reporting and billing practices;

• quality of care;

• financial relationships with referral sources; and

• medical necessity of services provided.

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

Federal law provides that practitioners, providers and related persons may not participate in most federal healthcare programs, including the Medicaid and Medicare programs, if the individual or entity has been convicted of a criminal offense related to the delivery of a product or service under these programs or if the individual or entity has been convicted under state or federal law of a criminal offense relating to neglect or abuse of patients in connection with the delivery of a healthcare product or service. Other individuals or entities may be, but are not required to be, excluded from such programs under certain circumstances, including, but not limited to, the following:

• medical necessity of services provided;

• conviction related to fraud;

• conviction relating to obstruction of an investigation;

• conviction relating to a controlled substance;

• licensure revocation or suspension;

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

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

31

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

The Office of the Inspector General or other organizations may choose to more closely scrutinize the billing practices of for-profit skilled nursing facilities, which could result in an increase in regulatory monitoring and oversight, decreased reimbursement rates, or otherwise adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In December 2010, the OIG released a report entitled “Questionable Billing by Skilled Nursing Facilities.” The report examined the billing practices of skilled nursing facilities based on Medicare Part A claims from 2006 to 2008 and found, among other things, that for-profit skilled nursing facilities were more likely to bill for higher paying therapy RUGs, particularly in the ultra high therapy categories, than government and not-for-profit operators. It also found that for-profit skilled nursing facilities showed a higher incidence of patients using RUGs with higher activities of daily living (ADL) scores, and had a “long” average length of stay among Part A beneficiaries, compared to their government and not-for-profit counterparts. The OIG recommended that CMS vigilantly monitor overall payments to skilled nursing facilities, adjust RUG rates annually, change the method for determining how much therapy is needed to ensure appropriate payments and conduct additional reviews for skilled nursing operators that exceed certain thresholds for higher paying therapy RUGs. CMS concurred with and agreed to take action on three of the four recommendations, declining only to change the methodology for assessing a patient's therapy needs. The OIG issued a separate memorandum to CMS listing 384 specific facilities that the OIG had identified as being in the top one percent for use of ultra high therapy, RUGs with high ADL scores, or “long” average lengths of stay, and CMS agreed to forward the list to the appropriate fiscal intermediaries or other contractors for follow up. Although we believe our therapy assessment and billing practices are consistent with applicable law and CMS requirements, we cannot predict the extent to which the OIG's recommendations to CMS will be implemented and, what effect, if any, such proposals would have on us. Two of our facilities have been listed on the report. Our business model, like those of some other

for-profit operators, is based in part on seeking out higher-acuity patients whom we believe are generally more profitable, and over time our overall patient mix has consistently shifted to higher-acuity and higher-RUGs patients in most facilities we operate. We also use specialized care-delivery software that assists our caregivers in more accurately capturing and recording ADL services in order to, among other things, increase reimbursement to levels appropriate for the care actually delivered. These efforts may place us under greater scrutiny with the OIG, CMS, our fiscal intermediaries, recovery audit contractors and others, as well as other government agencies, unions, advocacy groups and others who seek to pursue their own mandates and agendas. Efforts by officials and others to make or advocate for any increase in regulatory monitoring and oversight, adversely change RUG rates, revise methodologies for assessing and treating patients, or conduct more frequent or intense reviews of our treatment and billing practices, could reduce our reimbursement, increase our costs of doing business and otherwise adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

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

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

• the purchase, construction or expansion of healthcare facilities;

• capital expenditures exceeding a prescribed amount; or

• changes in services or bed capacity.

In addition, other states that do not require certificates of need have effectively barred the expansion of existing facilities and the development of new ones by placing partial or complete moratoria on the number of new Medicaid beds they will certify in certain areas or in the entire state. Other states have established such stringent development standards and approval procedures for constructing new healthcare facilities that the construction of new facilities, or the expansion or renovation of existing facilities, may become cost-prohibitive or extremely time-consuming. Our ability to acquire or construct new facilities or expand or provide new services at existing facilities would be adversely affected if we are unable to obtain the necessary approvals, if there are changes in the standards applicable to those approvals, or if we experience delays and increased expenses associated with obtaining those approvals. We may not be able to obtain licensure, certificate of need approval, Medicaid certification, or other necessary approvals for future expansion projects. Conversely, the elimination or reduction of state regulations that limit the construction, expansion or renovation of new or existing facilities could result in increased competition to us or result in overbuilding of facilities in some of our markets. If overbuilding in the skilled nursing industry in the markets in which we operate were to occur, it could reduce the occupancy rates of existing facilities and, in some cases, might reduce the private rates that we charge for our services.

Changes in federal and state employment-related laws and regulations could increase our cost of doing business.

Our operations are subject to a variety of federal and state employment-related laws and regulations, including, but not limited to, the U.S. Fair Labor Standards Act which governs such matters as minimum wages, overtime and other working conditions, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and similar state laws that provide civil rights protections to individuals with disabilities in the context of employment, public accommodations and other areas, the National Labor Relations Act, regulations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), regulations of the Office of Civil Rights, regulations of state Attorneys General, family leave mandates and a variety of similar laws enacted by the federal and state governments that govern these and other employment law matters. Because labor represents such a large portion of our operating costs, changes in federal and state employment-related laws and regulations could increase our cost of doing business.

The compliance costs associated with these laws and evolving regulations could be substantial. For example, all of our facilities are required to comply with the ADA. The ADA has separate compliance requirements for “public accommodations” and “commercial properties,” but generally requires that buildings be made accessible to people with disabilities. Compliance with ADA requirements could require removal of access barriers and non-compliance could result in imposition of government fines or an award of damages to private litigants. Further legislation may impose additional burdens or restrictions with respect to access by disabled persons. In addition, federal proposals to introduce a system of mandated health insurance and flexible work time and other similar initiatives could, if implemented, adversely affect our operations. We also may be subject to employee-related claims such as wrongful discharge, discrimination or violation of equal employment law. While we are insured for these types of claims, we could experience damages that are not covered by our insurance policies or that exceed our insurance limits, and we

may be required to pay such damages directly, which would negatively impact our cash flow from operations.

Compliance with federal and state fair housing, fire, safety and other regulations may require us to make unanticipated expenditures, which could be costly to us.

We must comply with the federal Fair Housing Act and similar state laws, which prohibit us from discriminating against individuals if it would cause such individuals to face barriers in gaining residency in any of our facilities. Additionally, the Fair Housing Act and other similar state laws require that we advertise our services in such a way that we promote diversity and not limit it. We may be required, among other things, to change our marketing techniques to comply with these requirements.

In addition, we are required to operate our facilities in compliance with applicable fire and safety regulations, building codes and other land use regulations and food licensing or certification requirements as they may be adopted by governmental agencies and bodies from time to time. Like other healthcare facilities, our skilled nursing facilities are subject to periodic surveys or inspections by governmental authorities to assess and assure compliance with regulatory requirements. Surveys occur on a regular

Table of Contents

(often annual or biannual) schedule, and special surveys may result from a specific complaint filed by a patient, a family member or one of our competitors. We may be required to make substantial capital expenditures to comply with these requirements.

We depend largely upon reimbursement from third-party payors, and our revenue, financial condition and results of operations could be negatively impacted by any changes in the acuity mix of patients in our facilities as well as payor mix and payment methodologies.

Our revenue is affected by the percentage of our patients who require a high level of skilled nursing and rehabilitative care, whom we refer to as high acuity patients, and by our mix of payment sources. Changes in the acuity level of patients we attract, as well as our payor mix among Medicaid, Medicare, private payors and managed care companies, significantly affect our profitability because we generally receive higher reimbursement rates for high acuity patients and because the payors reimburse us at different rates. For the year ended December 31, 2013, 72.2% of our revenue was provided by government payors that reimburse us at predetermined rates. If our labor or other operating costs increase, we will be unable to recover such increased costs from government payors. Accordingly, if we fail to maintain our proportion of high acuity patients or if there is any significant increase in the percentage of our patients for whom we receive Medicaid reimbursement, our results of operations may be adversely affected.

Initiatives undertaken by major insurers and managed care companies to contain healthcare costs may adversely affect our business. Among other initiatives, these payors attempt to control healthcare costs by contracting with healthcare providers to obtain services on a discounted basis. We believe that this trend will continue and may limit reimbursements for healthcare services. If insurers or managed care companies from whom we receive substantial payments were to reduce the amounts they pay for services, we may lose patients if we choose not to renew our contracts with these insurers at lower rates.

Compliance with state and federal employment, immigration, licensing and other laws could increase our cost of doing business.

We have hired personnel, including skilled nurses and therapists, from outside the United States. If immigration laws are changed, or if new and more restrictive government regulations proposed by the Department of Homeland Security are enacted, our access to qualified and skilled personnel may be limited.

We operate in at least one state that requires us to verify employment eligibility using procedures and standards that exceed those required under federal Form I-9 and the statutes and regulations related thereto. Proposed federal regulations would extend similar requirements to all of the states in which our facilities operate. To the extent that such proposed regulations or similar measures become effective, and we are required by state or federal authorities to verify work authorization or legal residence for current and prospective employees beyond existing Form I-9 requirements and other statutes and regulations currently in effect, it may make it more difficult for us to recruit, hire and/or retain qualified employees, may increase our risk of non-compliance with state and federal employment, immigration, licensing and other laws and regulations and could increase our cost of doing business.

We are subject to litigation that could result in significant legal costs and large settlement amounts or damage awards.

The skilled nursing business involves a significant risk of liability given the age and health of our patients and residents and the services we provide. We and others in our industry are subject to a large and increasing number of claims and lawsuits, including professional liability claims, alleging that our services have resulted in personal injury, elder abuse, wrongful death or other related claims. The defense of these lawsuits has in the past, and may in the future, result in significant legal costs, regardless of the outcome, and can result in large settlement amounts or damage awards. Plaintiffs tend to sue every healthcare provider who may have been involved in the patient's care and,

accordingly, we respond to multiple lawsuits and claims every year.

In addition, plaintiffs' attorneys have become increasingly more aggressive in their pursuit of claims against healthcare providers, including skilled nursing providers and other long-term care companies, and have employed a wide variety of advertising and publicity strategies. Among other things, these strategies include establishing their own Internet websites, paying for premium advertising space on other websites, paying Internet search engines to optimize their plaintiff solicitation advertising so that it appears in advantageous positions on Internet search results, including results from searches for our company and facilities, using newspaper, magazine and television ads targeted at customers of the healthcare industry generally, as well as at customers of specific providers, including us. From time to time, law firms claiming to specialize in long-term care litigation have named us, our facilities and other specific healthcare providers and facilities in their advertising and solicitation materials. These advertising and solicitation activities could result in more claims and litigation, which could increase our liability exposure and legal expenses, divert the time and attention of our personnel from day-to-day business operations, and materially and adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations. Furthermore, to the extent the frequency and/or severity of losses from such claims and suits

Table of Contents

increases, our liability insurance premiums could increase and/or available insurance coverage levels could decline, which could materially and adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

Healthcare litigation (including class action litigation) is common and is filed based upon a wide variety of claims and theories, and we are routinely subjected to varying types of claims. One particular type of suit arises from alleged violations of state-established minimum staffing requirements for skilled nursing facilities. Failure to meet these requirements can, among other things, jeopardize a facility's compliance with conditions of participation under certain state and federal healthcare programs; it may also subject the facility to a notice of deficiency, a citation, civil monetary penalty, or litigation. These class-action "staffing" suits have the potential to result in large jury verdicts and settlements, and have become more prevalent in the wake of a previous substantial jury award against one of the Company's competitors. The Company expects the plaintiff's bar to become increasingly aggressive in their pursuit of these staffing and similar claims.

A class action staffing suit was previously filed against the Company in the State of California, alleging, among other things, violations of certain Health and Safety Code provisions and a violation of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act at certain of the Company's California facilities. In 2007, the Company settled this class action suit, and the settlement was approved by the affected class and the Court. The Company has been defending a second such staffing class-action claim filed in Los Angeles Superior Court; however, a settlement was reached with class counsel and has received Court approval. The total costs associated with the settlement, including attorney's fees, estimated class payout, and related costs and expenses, are projected to be approximately \$6.5 million, of which, approximately \$1.5 million of this amount was recorded in the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013, with the balance having been expensed in prior periods. We believe that the settlement will not have a material ongoing adverse effect on the Company's business, financial condition or results of operations.

Other claims and suits, including class actions, continue to be filed against us and other companies in our industry. For example, there has been an increase in the number of wage and hour class action claims filed in several of the jurisdictions where we are present. Allegations typically include claimed failures to permit or properly compensate for meal and rest periods, or failure to pay for time worked. If there were a significant increase in the number of these claims or an increase in amounts owing should plaintiffs be successful in their prosecution of these claims, this could have a material adverse effect to our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. In addition, we contract with a variety of landlords, lenders, vendors, suppliers, consultants and other individuals and businesses. These contracts typically contain covenants and default provisions. If the other party to one or more of our contracts were to allege that we have violated the contract terms, we could be subject to civil liabilities which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

Were litigation to be instituted against one or more of our subsidiaries, a successful plaintiff might attempt to hold us or another subsidiary liable for the alleged wrongdoing of the subsidiary principally targeted by the litigation. If a court in such litigation decided to disregard the corporate form, the resulting judgment could increase our liability and adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

On February 26, 2009, Congress reintroduced the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act of 2009. After failing to be enacted into law in the 110th Congress in 2008, the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act of 2009 was introduced in the 111th Congress and referred to the House and Senate judiciary committees in March 2009. The 111th Congress did not pass the bill and therefore has been cleared from the present agenda. This bill was reintroduced in the 112th Congress as the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act of 2012, and was referred to the House Judiciary committee. If enacted, this bill would require, among other things, that agreements to arbitrate nursing home disputes be made after the dispute has arisen rather than before prospective residents move in, to prevent nursing home operators and prospective residents from mutually entering into a pre-admission pre-dispute arbitration agreement. We use arbitration agreements, which have generally been favored by the courts, to streamline the dispute resolution process and reduce our exposure to legal fees and excessive jury awards. If we are not able to secure pre-admission arbitration agreements, our litigation exposure and costs of defense in patient liability actions

could increase, our liability insurance premiums could increase, and our business may be adversely affected.

The U.S. Department of Justice has conducted an investigation into the billing and reimbursement processes of some of our operating subsidiaries, which could adversely affect our operations and financial condition.

In October 2013, we entered into a settlement agreement (the Settlement Agreement) with the DOJ pertaining to an investigation of certain of our operating subsidiaries. Pursuant to the settlement agreement, we made a single lump-sum remittance to the government in the amount of \$48.0 million in October 2013. We have denied engaging in any illegal conduct, and have agreed to the settlement amount without any admission of wrongdoing in order to resolve the allegations and to avoid the uncertainty and expense of protracted litigation.

Table of Contents

In connection with the settlement and effective as of October 1, 2013, we entered into a five-year corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS (the CIA). The CIA acknowledges the existence of our current compliance program, and requires that we continue during the term of the CIA to maintain a compliance program designed to promote compliance with the statutes, regulations, and written directives of Medicare, Medicaid, and all other Federal health care programs. We are also required to maintain several elements of our existing program during the term of the CIA, including maintaining a compliance officer, a compliance committee of the board of directors, and a code of conduct. The CIA requires that we conduct certain additional compliance-related activities during the term of the CIA, including various training and monitoring procedures, and maintaining a disciplinary process for compliance obligations. Pursuant to the CIA, we are required to notify the Office of Inspector General-HHS in writing, of, among other things: (i) any ongoing government investigation or legal proceeding involving an allegation that we have committed a crime or have engaged in fraudulent activities; (ii) any other matter that a reasonable person would consider a probable violation of applicable criminal, civil, or administrative laws related to compliance with federal healthcare programs; and (iii) any change in location, sale, closing, purchase, or establishment of a new business unit or location related to items or services that may be reimbursed by Federal health care programs. We are also subject to periodic reporting and certification requirements attesting that the provisions of the CIA are being implemented and followed, as well as certain document and record retention mandates.

Our participation in federal healthcare programs is not affected by the Settlement Agreement or the CIA. In the event of an uncured material breach of the CIA, we could be excluded from participation in federal healthcare programs and/or subject to prosecution.

If any additional litigation were to proceed in the future, and we are subjected to, alleged to be liable for, or agree to a settlement of, claims or obligations under federal Medicare statutes, the federal False Claims Act, or similar state and federal statutes and related regulations, our business, financial condition and results of operations and cash flows could be materially and adversely affected and our stock price could be adversely impacted. Among other things, any settlement or litigation could involve the payment of substantial sums to settle any alleged civil violations, and may also include our assumption of specific procedural and financial obligations going forward under a corporate integrity agreement and/or other arrangement with the government.

We conduct regular internal investigations into the care delivery, recordkeeping and billing processes of our operating subsidiaries. These reviews sometimes detect instances of noncompliance which we attempt to correct, which can decrease our revenue.

As an operator of healthcare facilities, we have a program to help us comply with various requirements of federal and private healthcare programs. Our compliance program includes, among other things, (1) policies and procedures modeled after applicable laws, regulations, government manuals and industry practices and customs that govern the clinical, reimbursement and operational aspects of our subsidiaries, (2) training about our compliance process for all of our employees, directors and officers, and training about Medicare and Medicaid laws, fraud and abuse prevention, clinical standards and practices, and claim submission and reimbursement policies and procedures for appropriate employees, and (3) internal controls that monitor, for example, the accuracy of claims, reimbursement submissions, cost reports and source documents, provision of patient care, services, and supplies as required by applicable standards and laws, accuracy of clinical assessment and treatment documentation, and implementation of judicial and regulatory requirements (i.e., background checks, licensing and training).

From time to time our systems and controls highlight potential compliance issues, which we investigate as they arise. Historically, we have, and would continue to do so in the future, initiated internal inquiries into possible recordkeeping and related irregularities at our skilled nursing facilities, which were detected by our internal compliance team in the course of its ongoing reviews.

Through these internal inquiries, we have identified potential deficiencies in the assessment of and recordkeeping for small subsets of patients. We have also identified and, at the conclusion of such investigations, assisted in implementing, targeted improvements in the assessment and recordkeeping practices to make them consistent with the existing standards and policies applicable to our skilled nursing facilities in these areas. We continue to monitor the measures implemented for effectiveness, and perform follow-up reviews to ensure compliance. Consistent with healthcare industry accounting practices, we record any charge for refunded payments against revenue in the period in which the claim adjustment becomes known.

If additional reviews result in identification and quantification of additional amounts to be refunded, we would accrue additional liabilities for claim costs and interest, and repay any amounts due in normal course. If future investigations ultimately result in findings of significant billing and reimbursement noncompliance which could require us to record significant additional provisions or remit payments, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially and adversely affected and our stock price could decline.

Table of Contents

We may be unable to complete future facility or business acquisitions at attractive prices or at all, which may adversely affect our revenue; we may also elect to dispose of underperforming or non-strategic operations, which would also decrease our revenue.

To date, our revenue growth has been significantly driven by our acquisition of new facilities and businesses. Subject to general market conditions and the availability of essential resources and leadership within our company, we continue to seek both single-and multi-facility acquisition and business acquisition opportunities that are consistent with our geographic, financial and operating objectives.

We face competition for the acquisition of facilities and businesses and expect this competition to increase. Based upon factors such as our ability to identify suitable acquisition candidates, the purchase price of the facilities, prevailing market conditions, the availability of leadership to manage new facilities and our own willingness to take on new operations, the rate at which we have historically acquired facilities has fluctuated significantly. In the future, we anticipate the rate at which we may acquire facilities will continue to fluctuate, which may affect our revenue.

We have also historically acquired a few facilities, either because they were included in larger, indivisible groups of facilities or under other circumstances, which were or have proven to be non-strategic or less desirable, and we may consider disposing of such facilities or exchanging them for facilities which are more desirable. To the extent we dispose of such a facility without simultaneously acquiring a facility in exchange, our revenues might decrease.

We may not be able to successfully integrate acquired facilities and businesses into our operations, and we may not achieve the benefits we expect from any of our facility acquisitions.

We may not be able to successfully or efficiently integrate new acquisitions with our existing operations, culture and systems. The process of integrating acquired facilities into our existing operations may result in unforeseen operating difficulties, divert management's attention from existing operations, or require an unexpected commitment of staff and financial resources, and may ultimately be unsuccessful. Existing facilities available for acquisition frequently serve or target different markets than those that we currently serve. We also may determine that renovations of acquired facilities and changes in staff and operating management personnel are necessary to successfully integrate those facilities into our existing operations. We may not be able to recover the costs incurred to reposition or renovate newly acquired facilities. The financial benefits we expect to realize from many of our acquisitions are largely dependent upon our ability to improve clinical performance, overcome regulatory deficiencies, rehabilitate or improve the reputation of the facilities in the community, increase and maintain occupancy, control costs, and in some cases change the patient acuity mix. If we are unable to accomplish any of these objectives at facilities we acquire, we will not realize the anticipated benefits and we may experience lower than anticipated profits, or even losses.

During the year ended December 31, 2013, we acquired seven stand-alone skilled nursing facilities, three stand-alone assisted living facilities, three home health operations, three hospice operations and one urgent care center with a total of 652 operational skilled nursing beds and 281 operational assisted living units. During the year ended December 31, 2012, we acquired six facilities and three businesses with a total of 441 operational beds. This growth has placed and will continue to place significant demands on our current management resources. Our ability to manage our growth effectively and to successfully integrate new acquisitions into our existing business will require us to continue to expand our operational, financial and management information systems and to continue to retain, attract, train, motivate and manage key employees, including facility-level leaders and our local directors of nursing. We may not be successful in attracting qualified individuals necessary for future acquisitions to be successful, and our management team may expend significant time and energy working to attract qualified personnel to manage facilities we may acquire in the future. Also, the newly acquired facilities may require us to spend significant time improving services that have historically been substandard, and if we are unable to improve such facilities quickly enough, we may be subject to litigation and/or loss of licensure or certification. If we are not able to successfully overcome these

and other integration challenges, we may not achieve the benefits we expect from any of our facility acquisitions, and our business may suffer.

In undertaking acquisitions, we may be adversely impacted by costs, liabilities and regulatory issues that may adversely affect our operations.

In undertaking acquisitions, we also may be adversely impacted by unforeseen liabilities attributable to the prior providers who operated those facilities, against whom we may have little or no recourse. Many facilities we have historically acquired were underperforming financially and had clinical and regulatory issues prior to and at the time of acquisition. Even where we have improved operations and patient care at facilities that we have acquired, we still may face post-acquisition regulatory issues related to pre-acquisition events. These may include, without limitation, payment recoupment related to our predecessors' prior noncompliance, the imposition of fines, penalties, operational restrictions or special regulatory status. Further, we may incur post-acquisition compliance risk due to the difficulty or impossibility of immediately or quickly bringing non-compliant facilities into

Table of Contents

full compliance. Diligence materials pertaining to acquisition targets, especially the underperforming facilities that often represent the greatest opportunity for return, are often inadequate, inaccurate or impossible to obtain, sometimes requiring us to make acquisition decisions with incomplete information. Despite our due diligence procedures, facilities that we have acquired or may acquire in the future may generate unexpectedly low returns, may cause us to incur substantial losses, may require unexpected levels of management time, expenditures or other resources, or may otherwise not meet a risk profile that our investors find acceptable. For example, in July of 2006 we acquired a facility that had a history of intermittent noncompliance. Although the facility had already been surveyed once by the local state survey agency after being acquired by us, and that survey would have met the heightened requirements of the special focus facility program, based upon the facility's compliance history prior to our acquisition, in January 2008, state officials nevertheless recommended to CMS that the facility be placed on special focus facility status. In addition, in October of 2006, we acquired a facility which had a history of intermittent non-compliance. This facility was surveyed by the local state survey agency during the third quarter of 2008 and passed the heightened survey requirements of the special focus facility program. Both facilities have successfully graduated from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Special Focus program. We currently have no facilities on special focus facility status.

In addition, we might encounter unanticipated difficulties and expenditures relating to any of the acquired facilities, including contingent liabilities. For example, when we acquire a facility, we generally assume the facility's existing Medicare provider number for purposes of billing Medicare for services. If CMS later determined that the prior owner of the facility had received overpayments from Medicare for the period of time during which it operated the facility, or had incurred fines in connection with the operation of the facility, CMS could hold us liable for repayment of the overpayments or fines. If the prior operator is defunct or otherwise unable to reimburse us, we may be unable to recover these funds. We may be unable to improve every facility that we acquire. In addition, operation of these facilities may divert management time and attention from other operations and priorities, negatively impact cash flows, result in adverse or unanticipated accounting charges, or otherwise damage other areas of our company if they are not timely and adequately improved.

We also incur regulatory risk in acquiring certain facilities due to the licensing, certification and other regulatory requirements affecting our right to operate the acquired facilities. For example, in order to acquire facilities on a predictable schedule, or to acquire declining operations quickly to prevent further pre-acquisition declines, we frequently acquire such facilities prior to receiving license approval or provider certification. We operate such facilities as the interim manager for the outgoing licensee, assuming financial responsibility, among other obligations for the facility. To the extent that we may be unable or delayed in obtaining a license, we may need to operate the facility under a management agreement from the prior operator. Any inability in obtaining consent from the prior operator of a target acquisition to utilizing its license in this manner could impact our ability to acquire additional facilities. If we were subsequently denied licensure or certification for any reason, we might not realize the expected benefits of the acquisition and would likely incur unanticipated costs and other challenges which could cause our business to suffer.

Termination of our patient admission agreements and the resulting vacancies in our facilities could cause revenue at our facilities to decline.

Most state regulations governing skilled nursing and assisted living facilities require written patient admission agreements with each patient. Several of these regulations also require that each patient have the right to terminate the patient agreement for any reason and without prior notice. Consistent with these regulations, all of our skilled nursing patient agreements allow patients to terminate their agreements without notice, and all of our assisted living resident agreements allow residents to terminate their agreements upon thirty days' notice. Patients and residents terminate their agreements from time to time for a variety of reasons, causing some fluctuations in our overall occupancy as patients and residents are admitted and discharged in normal course. If an unusual number of patients or residents

elected to terminate their agreements within a short time, occupancy levels at our facilities could decline. As a result, beds may be unoccupied for a period of time, which would have a negative impact on our revenue, financial condition and results of operations.

We face significant competition from other healthcare providers and may not be successful in attracting patients and residents to our facilities.

The skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice fields are highly competitive, and we expect that these fields may become increasingly competitive in the future. Our skilled nursing facilities compete primarily on a local and regional basis with many long-term care providers, from national and regional multi-facility providers that have substantially greater financial resources to small providers who operate a single nursing facility. We also compete with other skilled nursing and assisted living facilities, and with inpatient rehabilitation facilities, long-term acute care hospitals, home healthcare and other similar services and care alternatives. Increased competition could limit our ability to attract and retain patients, attract and retain skilled personnel, maintain or increase private pay and managed care rates or expand our business.

Table of Contents

We may not be successful in attracting patients to our operations, particularly Medicare, managed care, and private pay patients who generally come to us at higher reimbursement rates. Some of our competitors have greater financial and other resources than us, may have greater brand recognition and may be more established in their respective communities than we are. Competing companies may also offer newer facilities or different programs or services than we do and may thereby attract current or potential patients. Other competitors may have lower expenses or other competitive advantages, and, therefore, present significant price competition for managed care and private pay patients. In addition, some of our competitors operate on a not-for-profit basis or as charitable organizations and have the ability to finance capital expenditures on a tax-exempt basis or through the receipt of charitable contributions, neither of which are available to us.

If we do not achieve and maintain competitive quality of care ratings from CMS and private organizations engaged in similar monitoring activities, or if the frequency of CMS surveys and enforcement sanctions increases, our business may be negatively affected.

CMS, as well as certain private organizations engaged in similar monitoring activities, provides comparative data available to the public on its web site, rating every skilled nursing facility operating in each state based upon quality-of-care indicators. These quality-of-care indicators include such measures as percentages of patients with infections, bedsores and unplanned weight loss. In addition, CMS has undertaken an initiative to increase Medicaid and Medicare survey and enforcement activities, to focus more survey and enforcement efforts on facilities with findings of substandard care or repeat violations of Medicaid and Medicare standards, and to require state agencies to use enforcement sanctions and remedies more promptly when substandard care or repeat violations are identified. We have found a correlation between negative Medicaid and Medicare surveys and the incidence of professional liability litigation. From time to time, we experience a higher than normal number of negative survey findings in some of our facilities.

In December 2008, CMS introduced the Five-Star Quality Rating System to help consumers, their families and caregivers compare nursing homes more easily. The Five-Star Quality Rating System gives each nursing home a rating of between one and five stars in various categories. In cases of acquisitions, the previous operator's clinical ratings are included in our overall Five-Star Quality Rating. The prior operator's results will impact our rating until we have sufficient clinical measurements subsequent to the acquisition date. If we are unable to achieve quality of care ratings that are comparable or superior to those of our competitors, our ability to attract and retain patients could be adversely affected.

If we are unable to obtain insurance, or if insurance becomes more costly for us to obtain, our business may be adversely affected.

It may become more difficult and costly for us to obtain coverage for resident care liabilities and other risks, including property and casualty insurance. For example, the following circumstances may adversely affect our ability to obtain insurance at favorable rates:

- we experience higher-than-expected professional liability, property and casualty, or other types of claims or losses;
- we receive survey deficiencies or citations of higher-than-normal scope or severity;
- we acquire especially troubled operations or facilities that present unattractive risks to current or prospective insurers;
- insurers tighten underwriting standards applicable to us or our industry; or
- insurers or reinsurers are unable or unwilling to insure us or the industry at historical premiums and coverage levels.

If any of these potential circumstances were to occur, our insurance carriers may require us to significantly increase our self-insured retention levels or pay substantially higher premiums for the same or reduced coverage for insurance, including workers compensation, property and casualty, automobile, employment practices liability, directors and officers liability, employee healthcare and general and professional liability coverages.

In some states, the law prohibits or limits insurance coverage for the risk of punitive damages arising from professional liability and general liability claims or litigation. Coverage for punitive damages is also excluded under some insurance policies. As a result, we may be liable for punitive damage awards in these states that either are not covered or are in excess of our insurance policy limits. Claims against us, regardless of their merit or eventual outcome, also could inhibit our ability to attract patients or expand our business, and could require our management to devote time to matters unrelated to the day-to-day operation of our business.

Table of Contents

With few exceptions, workers' compensation and employee health insurance costs have also increased markedly in recent years. To partially offset these increases, we have increased the amounts of our self-insured retention (SIR) and deductibles in connection with general and professional liability claims. We also have implemented a self-insurance program for workers compensation in California, and elected non-subscriber status for workers' compensation in Texas. If we are unable to obtain insurance, or if insurance becomes more costly for us to obtain, or if the coverage levels we can economically obtain decline, our business may be adversely affected.

Our self-insurance programs may expose us to significant and unexpected costs and losses.

We have maintained general and professional liability insurance since 2002 and workers' compensation insurance since 2005 through a wholly-owned subsidiary insurance company, Standardbearer Insurance Company, Ltd. (Standardbearer), to insure our SIR and deductibles as part of a continually evolving overall risk management strategy. We establish the insurance loss reserves based on an estimation process that uses information obtained from both company-specific and industry data. The estimation process requires us to continuously monitor and evaluate the life cycle of the claims. Using data obtained from this monitoring and our assumptions about emerging trends, we, along with an independent actuary, develop information about the size of ultimate claims based on our historical experience and other available industry information. The most significant assumptions used in the estimation process include determining the trend in costs, the expected cost of claims incurred but not reported and the expected costs to settle or pay damages with respect to unpaid claims. It is possible, however, that the actual liabilities may exceed our estimates of loss. We may also experience an unexpectedly large number of successful claims or claims that result in costs or liability significantly in excess of our projections. For these and other reasons, our self-insurance reserves could prove to be inadequate, resulting in liabilities in excess of our available insurance and self-insurance. If a successful claim is made against us and it is not covered by our insurance or exceeds the insurance policy limits, our business may be negatively and materially impacted.

Further, because our SIR under our general and professional liability and workers compensation programs applies on a per claim basis, there is no limit to the maximum number of claims or the total amount for which we could incur liability in any policy period.

In May 2006, we began self-insuring our employee health benefits. With respect to our health benefits self-insurance, our reserves and premiums are computed based on a mix of company specific and general industry data that is not specific to our own company. Even with a combination of limited company-specific loss data and general industry data, our loss reserves are based on actuarial estimates that may not correlate to actual loss experience in the future. Therefore, our reserves may prove to be insufficient and we may be exposed to significant and unexpected losses.

The geographic concentration of our facilities could leave us vulnerable to an economic downturn, regulatory changes or acts of nature in those areas.

Our facilities located in California, Texas and Arizona account for the majority of our total revenue. As a result of this concentration, the conditions of local economies, changes in governmental rules, regulations and reimbursement rates or criteria, changes in demographics, state funding, acts of nature and other factors that may result in a decrease in demand and/or reimbursement for skilled nursing services in these states could have a disproportionately adverse effect on our revenue, costs and results of operations. Moreover, since approximately 30% of our facilities are located in California, we are particularly susceptible to revenue loss, cost increase or damage caused by natural disasters such as fires, earthquakes or mudslides.

In addition, our facilities in Texas, Nebraska and Iowa are more susceptible to revenue loss, cost increases or damage caused by natural disasters including hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. These acts of nature may cause disruption to us, our employees and our facilities, which could have an adverse impact on our patients and our business. In order to

provide care for our patients, we are dependent on consistent and reliable delivery of food, pharmaceuticals, utilities and other goods to our facilities, and the availability of employees to provide services at our facilities. If the delivery of goods or the ability of employees to reach our facilities were interrupted in any material respect due to a natural disaster or other reasons, it would have a significant impact on our facilities and our business. Furthermore, the impact, or impending threat, of a natural disaster may require that we evacuate one or more facilities, which would be costly and would involve risks, including potentially fatal risks, for the patients. The impact of disasters and similar events is inherently uncertain. Such events could harm our patients and employees, severely damage or destroy one or more of our facilities, harm our business, reputation and financial performance, or otherwise cause our business to suffer in ways that we currently cannot predict.

Table of Contents

The actions of a national labor union that has pursued a negative publicity campaign criticizing our business in the past may adversely affect our revenue and our profitability.

We continue to maintain our right to inform our employees about our views of the potential impact of unionization upon the workplace generally and upon individual employees. With one exception, to our knowledge the staffs at our facilities that have been approached to unionize have uniformly rejected union organizing efforts. If employees decide to unionize, our cost of doing business could increase, and we could experience contract delays, difficulty in adapting to a changing regulatory and economic environment, cultural conflicts between unionized and non-unionized employees, strikes and work stoppages, and we may conclude that affected facilities or operations would be uneconomical to continue operating.

The unwillingness on the part of both our management and staff to accede to union demands for “neutrality” and other concessions has resulted in a negative labor campaign by at least one labor union, the Service Employees International Union. From 2002 to 2007, this union, and individuals and organizations allied with or sympathetic to this union actively prosecuted a negative retaliatory publicity action, also known as a “corporate campaign,” against us and filed, promoted or participated in multiple legal actions against us. The union's campaign asserted, among other allegations, poor treatment of patients, inferior medical services provided by our employees, poor treatment of our employees, and health code violations by us. In addition, the union has publicly mischaracterized actions taken by the DHS against us and our facilities. In numerous cases, the union's allegations created the false impression that violations and other events that occurred at facilities prior to our acquisition of those facilities were caused by us. Since a large component of our business involves acquiring underperforming and distressed facilities, and improving the quality of operations at these facilities, we may have been associated with the past poor performance of these facilities. To the extent this union or another elects to directly or indirectly prosecute a corporate campaign against us or any of our facilities, our business could be negatively affected.

The Service Employees International Union has issued in the past, and may again issue in the future, public statements alleging that we or other for-profit skilled nursing operators have engaged in unfair, questionable or illegal practices in various areas, including staffing, patient care, patient evaluation and treatment, billing and other areas and activities related to the industry and our operations. We continue to anticipate similar criticisms, charges and other negative publicity from such sources on a regular basis, particularly in the current political environment and following the recent December 2010 OIG report entitled “Questionable Billing by Skilled Nursing Facilities,” described above in “The Office of the Inspector General or other organizations may choose to more closely scrutinize the billing practices of for-profit skilled nursing facilities, which could result in an increase in regulatory monitoring and oversight, decreased reimbursement rates, or otherwise adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.” Two of our facilities have been listed on the report. Such reports provide unions and their allies with additional opportunities to make negative statements about, and to encourage regulators to seek investigatory and enforcement actions against, the industry in general and non-union operators like us specifically. Although we believe that our operations and business practices substantially conform to applicable laws and regulations, we cannot predict the extent to which we might be subject to adverse publicity or calls for increased regulatory scrutiny from union and union ally sources, or what effect, if any, such negative publicity would have on us, but to the extent they are successful, our revenue may be reduced, our costs may be increased and our profitability and business could be adversely affected.

This union has also attempted to pressure hospitals, doctors, insurers and other healthcare providers and professionals to cease doing business with or referring patients to us. If this union or another union is successful in convincing our patients, their families or our referral sources to reduce or cease doing business with us, our revenue may be reduced and our profitability could be adversely affected. Additionally, if we are unable to attract and retain qualified staff due to negative public relations efforts by this or other union organizations, our quality of service and our revenue and profits could decline. Our strategy for responding to union allegations involves clear public disclosure of the union's

identity, activities and agenda, and rebuttals to its negative campaign.

Our ability to respond to unions, however, may be limited by some state laws, which purport to make it illegal for any recipient of state funds to promote or deter union organizing. For example, such a state law passed by the California Legislature was successfully challenged on the grounds that it was preempted by the National Labor Relations Act, only to have the challenge overturned by the Ninth Circuit in 2006 before being ultimately upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 2008. In addition, proposed legislation making it more difficult for employees and their supervisors to educate co-workers and oppose unionization, such as the proposed Employee Free Choice Act which would allow organizing on a single “card check” and without a secret ballot and similar changes to federal law, regulation and labor practice being advocated by unions and considered by Congress and the National Labor Relations Board, could make it more difficult to maintain union-free workplaces in our facilities. If proponents of these and similar laws are successful in facilitating unionization procedures or hindering employer responses thereto, our ability to oppose unionization efforts could be hindered, and our business could be negatively affected.

Table of Contents

A number of our facilities are operated under master lease arrangements or leases that contain cross-default provisions, and in some cases the breach of a single facility lease could subject multiple facilities to the same risk.

We currently occupy approximately 6% of our facilities under agreements that are structured as master leases. Under a master lease, we may lease a large number of geographically dispersed properties through an indivisible lease. With an indivisible lease, it is difficult to restructure the composition of the portfolio or economic terms of the lease without the consent of the landlord. Failure to comply with Medicare or Medicaid provider requirements is a default under several of our master lease and debt financing instruments. In addition, other potential defaults related to an individual facility may cause a default of an entire master lease portfolio and could trigger cross-default provisions in our outstanding debt arrangements and other leases, which would have a negative impact on our capital structure and our ability to generate future revenue, and could interfere with our ability to pursue our growth strategy.

In addition, we occupy approximately 7% of our facilities under individual facility leases that are held by the same or related landlords, the largest of which covers five of our facilities. These leases typically contain cross-default provisions that could cause a default at one facility to trigger a technical default with respect to one or more other locations, potentially subjecting us to the various remedies available to the landlords under each of the related leases.

Failure to generate sufficient cash flow to cover required payments or meet operating covenants under our long-term debt, mortgages and long-term operating leases could result in defaults under such agreements and cross-defaults under other debt, mortgage or operating lease arrangements, which could harm our operations and cause us to lose facilities or experience foreclosures.

At December 31, 2013, we had \$260.0 million of outstanding indebtedness under the Senior Credit Facility, Ten Project Note, promissory notes, bonds and mortgage notes, plus \$139.6 million of operating lease obligations. We intend to continue financing our facilities through mortgage financing, long-term operating leases and other types of financing, including borrowings under our lines of credit and future credit facilities we may obtain.

We may not generate sufficient cash flow from operations to cover required interest, principal and lease payments. In addition, our outstanding credit facilities and mortgage loans contain restrictive covenants and require us to maintain or satisfy specified coverage tests on a consolidated basis and on a facility or facilities basis. These restrictions and operating covenants include, among other things, requirements with respect to occupancy, debt service coverage, project yield, net leverage ratios, minimum interest coverage ratios and minimum asset coverage ratios. These restrictions may interfere with our ability to obtain additional advances under existing credit facilities or to obtain new financing or to engage in other business activities, which may inhibit our ability to grow our business and increase revenue.

From time to time the financial performance of one or more of our mortgaged facilities may not comply with the required operating covenants under the terms of the mortgage. Any non-payment, noncompliance or other default under our financing arrangements could, subject to cure provisions, cause the lender to foreclose upon the facility or facilities securing such indebtedness or, in the case of a lease, cause the lessor to terminate the lease, each with a consequent loss of revenue and asset value to us or a loss of property. Furthermore, in many cases, indebtedness is secured by both a mortgage on one or more facilities, and a guaranty by us. In the event of a default under one of these scenarios, the lender could avoid judicial procedures required to foreclose on real property by declaring all amounts outstanding under the guaranty immediately due and payable, and requiring us to fulfill our obligations to make such payments. If any of these scenarios were to occur, our financial condition would be adversely affected. For tax purposes, a foreclosure on any of our properties would be treated as a sale of the property for a price equal to the outstanding balance of the debt secured by the mortgage. If the outstanding balance of the debt secured by the mortgage exceeds our tax basis in the property, we would recognize taxable income on foreclosure, but would not receive any cash proceeds, which would negatively impact our earnings and cash position. Further, because our

mortgages and operating leases generally contain cross-default and cross-collateralization provisions, a default by us related to one facility could affect a significant number of other facilities and their corresponding financing arrangements and operating leases.

Because our term loans, promissory notes, bonds, mortgages and lease obligations are fixed expenses and secured by specific assets, and because our revolving loan obligations are secured by virtually all of our assets, if reimbursement rates, patient acuity mix or occupancy levels decline, or if for any reason we are unable to meet our loan or lease obligations, we may not be able to cover our costs and some or all of our assets may become at risk. Our ability to make payments of principal and interest on our indebtedness and to make lease payments on our operating leases depends upon our future performance, which will be subject to general economic conditions, industry cycles and financial, business and other factors affecting our operations, many of which are beyond our control. If we are unable to generate sufficient cash flow from operations in the future to service our debt or to make lease payments on our operating leases, we may be required, among other things, to seek additional financing in the debt or equity markets, refinance or restructure all or a portion of our indebtedness, sell selected assets, reduce or delay planned capital

Table of Contents

expenditures or delay or abandon desirable acquisitions. Such measures might not be sufficient to enable us to service our debt or to make lease payments on our operating leases. The failure to make required payments on our debt or operating leases or the delay or abandonment of our planned growth strategy could result in an adverse effect on our future ability to generate revenue and sustain profitability. In addition, any such financing, refinancing or sale of assets might not be available on terms that are economically favorable to us, or at all.

If we decide to expand our presence in the assisted living, home health, hospice or urgent care industries, we would become subject to risks in a market in which we have limited experience.

The majority of our facilities have historically been skilled nursing facilities. If we decide to expand our presence in the assisted living, home health, hospice and urgent care industries or other relevant healthcare service, our existing overall business model would change and we would become subject to risks in a market in which we have limited experience. Although assisted living operations generally have lower costs and higher margins than skilled nursing, they typically generate lower overall revenue than skilled nursing operations. In addition, assisted living and urgent care revenue is derived primarily from private payors as opposed to government reimbursement. In most states, skilled nursing, assisted living, home health, hospice and urgent care are regulated by different agencies, and we have less experience with the agencies that regulate assisted living, home health, hospice and urgent care. In general, we believe that assisted living is a more competitive industry than skilled nursing. If we decided to expand our presence in the assisted living, home health, hospice and urgent care industries, we might have to adjust part of our existing business model, which could have an adverse effect on our business.

If our referral sources fail to view us as an attractive skilled nursing provider, or if our referral sources otherwise refer fewer patients, our patient base may decrease.

We rely significantly on appropriate referrals from physicians, hospitals and other healthcare providers in the communities in which we deliver our services to attract appropriate residents and patients to our facilities. Our referral sources are not obligated to refer business to us and may refer business to other healthcare providers. We believe many of our referral sources refer business to us as a result of the quality of our patient care and our efforts to establish and build a relationship with our referral sources. If we lose, or fail to maintain, existing relationships with our referral resources, fail to develop new relationships, or if we are perceived by our referral sources as not providing high quality patient care, our occupancy rate and the quality of our patient mix could suffer. In addition, if any of our referral sources have a reduction in patients whom they can refer due to a decrease in their business, our occupancy rate and the quality of our patient mix could suffer.

We may need additional capital to fund our operations and finance our growth, and we may not be able to obtain it on terms acceptable to us, or at all, which may limit our ability to grow.

Our ability to maintain and enhance our facilities and equipment in a suitable condition to meet regulatory standards, operate efficiently and remain competitive in our markets requires us to commit substantial resources to continued investment in our facilities and equipment. We are sometimes more aggressive than our competitors in capital spending to address issues that arise in connection with aging and obsolete facilities and equipment. In addition, continued expansion of our business through the acquisition of existing facilities, expansion of our existing facilities and construction of new facilities may require additional capital, particularly if we were to accelerate our acquisition and expansion plans. Financing may not be available to us or may be available to us only on terms that are not favorable. In addition, some of our outstanding indebtedness and long-term leases restrict, among other things, our ability to incur additional debt. If we are unable to raise additional funds or obtain additional funds on terms acceptable to us, we may have to delay or abandon some or all of our growth strategies. Further, if additional funds are raised through the issuance of additional equity securities, the percentage ownership of our stockholders would be diluted. Any newly issued equity securities may have rights, preferences or privileges senior to those of our common

stock.

The condition of the financial markets, including volatility and deterioration in the capital and credit markets, could limit the availability of debt and equity financing sources to fund the capital and liquidity requirements of our business, as well as, negatively impact or impair the value of our current portfolio of cash, cash equivalents and investments, including U.S. Treasury securities and U.S.-backed investments.

Financial markets experienced significant disruptions from 2008 through 2010. These disruptions impacted liquidity in the debt markets, making financing terms for borrowers less attractive and, in certain cases, significantly reducing the availability of certain types of debt financing. As a result of these market conditions, the cost and availability of credit has been and may continue to be adversely affected by illiquid credit markets and wider credit spreads. Concern about the stability of the markets has led many lenders and institutional investors to reduce, and in some cases, cease to provide credit to borrowers.

43

Table of Contents

Further, our cash, cash equivalents and investments are held in a variety of interest-bearing instruments, including U.S. treasury securities. As a result of the uncertain domestic and global political, credit and financial market conditions, investments in these types of financial instruments pose risks arising from liquidity and credit concerns. Given that future deterioration in the U.S. and global credit and financial markets is a possibility, no assurance can be made that losses or significant deterioration in the fair value of our cash, cash equivalents, or investments will not occur. Uncertainty surrounding the trading market for U.S. government securities or impairment of the U.S. government's ability to satisfy its obligations under such treasury securities could impact the liquidity or valuation of our current portfolio of cash, cash equivalents, and investments, a substantial portion of which were invested in U.S. treasury securities. Further, unless and until the current U.S. and global political, credit and financial market crisis has been sufficiently resolved, it may be difficult for us to liquidate our investments prior to their maturity without incurring a loss, which would have a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

Though we anticipate that the cash amounts generated internally, together with amounts available under the revolving credit facility portion of the Senior Credit Facility, will be sufficient to implement our business plan for the foreseeable future, we may need additional capital if a substantial acquisition or other growth opportunity becomes available or if unexpected events occur or opportunities arise. We cannot assure you that additional capital will be available or available on terms favorable to us. If capital is not available, we may not be able to fund internal or external business expansion or respond to competitive pressures or other market conditions.

Delays in reimbursement may cause liquidity problems.

If we experience problems with our information systems or if issues arise with Medicare, Medicaid or other payors, we may encounter delays in our payment cycle. From time to time, we have experienced such delays as a result of government payors instituting planned reimbursement delays for budget balancing purposes or as a result of prepayment reviews. For example, in January 2009, the State of California announced expected cash shortages in February which impacted payments to Medi-Cal providers from late March through April. Medi-Cal had also delayed the release of the reimbursement rates which were announced in January 2010. These rate increases were put in place on a retrospective basis, effective August 1, 2009.

Further, on March 24, 2011, the governor of California signed Assembly Bill 97 (AB 97), the budget trailer bill on health, into law. AB 97 outlines significant cuts to state health and human services programs. Specifically, the law reduced provider payments by 10% for physicians, pharmacies, clinics, medical transportation, certain hospitals, home health, and nursing facilities. AB X1 19 Long Term Care was subsequently approved by the governor on June 28, 2011. Federal approval was obtained on October 27, 2011. AB X1 19 limited the 10% payment reduction to skilled-nursing providers to 14 months for the services provided on June 1, 2011 through July 31, 2012. The 10% reduction in provider payments was repaid by December 31, 2012. There can be no assurance that similar delays or reductions in our payment cycle of provider payments will not lead to material adverse consequences in the future.

Compliance with the regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development may require us to make unanticipated expenditures which could increase our costs.

Two of our facilities are currently subject to regulatory agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that give the Commissioner of HUD broad authority to require us to be replaced as the operator of those facilities in the event that the Commissioner determines there are operational deficiencies at such facilities under HUD regulations. In 2006, one of our HUD-insured mortgaged facilities did not pass its HUD inspection. Following an unsuccessful appeal of the decision, we requested a re-inspection. The re-inspection occurred in the fourth quarter of 2009 and the facility passed its HUD re-inspection. Compliance with HUD's requirements can often be difficult because these requirements are not always consistent with the requirements of other federal and state

agencies. Appealing a failed inspection can be costly and time-consuming and, if we do not successfully remediate the failed inspection, we could be precluded from obtaining HUD financing in the future or we may encounter limitations or prohibitions on our operation of HUD-insured facilities.

Failure to comply with existing environmental laws could result in increased expenditures, litigation and potential loss to our business and in our asset value.

Our operations are subject to regulations under various federal, state and local environmental laws, primarily those relating to the handling, storage, transportation, treatment and disposal of medical waste; the identification and warning of the presence of asbestos-containing materials in buildings, as well as the encapsulation or removal of such materials; and the presence of other substances in the indoor environment.

Table of Contents

Our facilities generate infectious or other hazardous medical waste due to the illness or physical condition of the patients. Each of our facilities has an agreement with a waste management company for the proper disposal of all infectious medical waste, but the use of a waste management company does not immunize us from alleged violations of such laws for operations for which we are responsible even if carried out by a third party, nor does it immunize us from third-party claims for the cost to cleanup disposal sites at which such wastes have been disposed.

Some of the facilities we lease, own or may acquire may have asbestos-containing materials. Federal regulations require building owners and those exercising control over a building's management to identify and warn their employees and other employers operating in the building of potential hazards posed by workplace exposure to installed asbestos-containing materials and potential asbestos-containing materials in their buildings. Significant fines can be assessed for violation of these regulations. Building owners and those exercising control over a building's management may be subject to an increased risk of personal injury lawsuits. Federal, state and local laws and regulations also govern the removal, encapsulation, disturbance, handling and disposal of asbestos-containing materials and potential asbestos-containing materials when such materials are in poor condition or in the event of construction, remodeling, renovation or demolition of a building. Such laws may impose liability for improper handling or a release into the environment of asbestos containing materials and potential asbestos-containing materials and may provide for fines to, and for third parties to seek recovery from, owners or operators of real properties for personal injury or improper work exposure associated with asbestos-containing materials and potential asbestos-containing materials. The presence of asbestos-containing materials, or the failure to properly dispose of or remediate such materials, also may adversely affect our ability to attract and retain patients and staff, to borrow when using such property as collateral or to make improvements to such property.

The presence of mold, lead-based paint, underground storage tanks, contaminants in drinking water, radon and/or other substances at any of the facilities we lease, own or may acquire may lead to the incurrence of costs for remediation, mitigation or the implementation of an operations and maintenance plan and may result in third party litigation for personal injury or property damage. Furthermore, in some circumstances, areas affected by mold may be unusable for periods of time for repairs, and even after successful remediation, the known prior presence of extensive mold could adversely affect the ability of a facility to retain or attract patients and staff and could adversely affect a facility's market value and ultimately could lead to the temporary or permanent closure of the facility.

If we fail to comply with applicable environmental laws, we would face increased expenditures in terms of fines and remediation of the underlying problems, potential litigation relating to exposure to such materials, and a potential decrease in value to our business and in the value of our underlying assets.

In addition, because environmental laws vary from state to state, expansion of our operations to states where we do not currently operate may subject us to additional restrictions in the manner in which we operate our facilities.

If we fail to safeguard the monies held in our patient trust funds, we will be required to reimburse such monies, and we may be subject to citations, fines and penalties.

Each of our facilities is required by federal law to maintain a patient trust fund to safeguard certain assets of their residents and patients. If any money held in a patient trust fund is misappropriated, we are required to reimburse the patient trust fund for the amount of money that was misappropriated. In 2005 we became aware of two separate and unrelated instances of employees misappropriating an aggregate of approximately \$0.4 million in patient trust funds, some of which was recovered from the employees and some of which we were required to reimburse from our funds. If any monies held in our patient trust funds are misappropriated in the future and are unrecoverable, we will be required to reimburse such monies, and we may be subject to citations, fines and penalties pursuant to federal and state laws.

We are a holding company with no operations and rely upon our multiple independent operating subsidiaries to provide us with the funds necessary to meet our financial obligations. Liabilities of any one or more of our subsidiaries could be imposed upon us or our other subsidiaries.

We are a holding company with no direct operating assets, employees or revenues. Each of our facilities is operated through a separate, wholly-owned, independent subsidiary, which has its own management, employees and assets. Our principal assets are the equity interests we directly or indirectly hold in our multiple operating and real estate holding subsidiaries. As a result, we are dependent upon distributions from our subsidiaries to generate the funds necessary to meet our financial obligations and pay dividends. Our subsidiaries are legally distinct from us and have no obligation to make funds available to us. The ability of our subsidiaries to make distributions to us will depend substantially on their respective operating results and will be subject to restrictions under, among other things, the laws of their jurisdiction of organization, which may limit the amount of funds available for distribution to investors or shareholders, agreements of those subsidiaries, the terms of our financing arrangements and the terms of any future financing arrangements of our subsidiaries.

Table of Contents

Changes in federal and state income tax laws and regulations could adversely affect our provision for income taxes and estimated income tax liabilities.

We are subject to both state and federal income taxes. Our effective tax rate could be adversely affected by changes in the mix of earnings in states with different statutory tax rates, changes in the valuation of deferred tax assets and liabilities, changes in tax laws and regulations, changes in our interpretations of tax laws, including pending tax law changes. In addition, in certain cases more than one state in which we operate has indicated an intent to attempt to tax the same assets and activities, which could result in double taxation if successful. Unanticipated changes in our tax rates or exposure to additional income tax liabilities could affect our profitability.

We are subject to the continuous examination of our income tax returns by the Internal Revenue Service and other local, state and foreign tax authorities. We regularly assess the likelihood of outcomes resulting from these examinations to determine the adequacy of our estimated income tax liabilities. The outcomes from these continuous examinations could adversely affect our provision for income taxes and estimated income tax liabilities.

The proposed Spin-Off transaction may not be completed on the terms contemplated, or at all, may not result in the benefits expected, will result in costs whether or not completed, or distract our management.

On November 7, 2013, we announced a proposed plan to separate our healthcare business and our real estate business into two separate, publicly traded companies through the proposed Spin-Off. The Spin-Off is a complex transaction, and its completion will require significant time, effort and expense. This could distract management from the day-to-day operations of our business, which could adversely affect our operations. The completion of the Spin-Off is subject to a number of conditions, and there is no assurance that the conditions will be satisfied and that the Spin-Off will be completed. In addition, we reserve the right to abandon, defer or modify the Spin-off at any time if our board of directors so determines. If the Spin-Off is completed, it is possible that, due to unforeseen changes in market or economic conditions, or other events or circumstances, the two resulting companies may not achieve the full strategic and operational benefits expected from the Spin-Off, which could result in the combined market value of the stock of both companies being less than the market value of our common stock if the Spin-Off had not occurred. If the Spin-Off is not completed for any reason, the market price of our common stock may decline to the extent that the market price at that time reflects a market assumption that the Spin-Off will be completed. Whether or not the Spin-Off is completed, we will incur costs related to the transaction, including legal and accounting fees and certain fees payable to our financial advisors.

Risks Related to Ownership of our Common Stock

We may not be able to pay or maintain dividends and the failure to do so would adversely affect our stock price.

Our ability to pay and maintain cash dividends is based on many factors, including our ability to make and finance acquisitions, our ability to negotiate favorable lease and other contractual terms, anticipated operating cost levels, the level of demand for our beds, the rates we charge and actual results that may vary substantially from estimates. Some of the factors are beyond our control and a change in any such factor could affect our ability to pay or maintain dividends. In addition, the revolving credit facility portion of the Senior Credit Facility restricts our ability to pay dividends to stockholders if we receive notice that we are in default under this agreement. The failure to pay or maintain dividends could adversely affect our stock price.

If the ownership of our common stock continues to be highly concentrated, it may prevent you and other stockholders from influencing significant corporate decisions and may result in conflicts of interest that could cause our stock price to decline.

Our current executive officers, directors and their affiliates, if they act together, will have substantial influence over the outcome of corporate actions requiring stockholder approval, including the election of directors, any merger,

consolidation or sale of all or substantially all of our assets or any other significant corporate transactions. The significant concentration of stock ownership may adversely affect the trading price of our common stock due to investors' perception that conflicts of interest may exist or arise.

Table of Contents

The market price and trading volume of our common stock may be volatile, which could result in rapid and substantial losses for our stockholders.

The market price of our common stock may be highly volatile and could be subject to wide fluctuations. In addition, the trading volume in our common stock may fluctuate and cause significant price variations to occur. We cannot assure you that the market price of our common stock will not fluctuate or decline significantly in the future. On some occasions in the past, when the market price of a stock has been volatile, holders of that stock have instituted securities class action litigation against the company that issued the stock. If any of our stockholders brought a lawsuit against us, we could incur substantial costs defending or settling the lawsuit. Such a lawsuit could also divert the time and attention of our management from our business.

Future offerings of debt or equity securities by us may adversely affect the market price of our common stock.

In the future, we may attempt to increase our capital resources by offering debt or additional equity securities, including commercial paper, medium-term notes, senior or subordinated notes, series of preferred shares or shares of our common stock. Upon liquidation, holders of our debt securities and preferred shares, and lenders with respect to other borrowings, would receive a distribution of our available assets prior to any distribution to the holders of our common stock. Additional equity offerings may dilute the economic and voting rights of our existing stockholders or reduce the market price of our common stock, or both. Because our decision to issue securities in any future offering will depend on market conditions and other factors beyond our control, we cannot predict or estimate the amount, timing or nature of our future offerings. Thus, holders of our common stock bear the risk of our future offerings reducing the market price of our common stock and diluting their shareholdings in us. We also intend to continue to actively pursue acquisitions of facilities and may issue shares of stock in connection with these acquisitions.

Any shares issued in connection with our acquisitions, the exercise of outstanding stock options or otherwise would dilute the holdings of the investors who purchase our shares.

Failure to maintain effective internal controls in accordance with Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act could result in a restatement of our financial statements, cause investors to lose confidence in our financial statements and our company and have a material adverse effect on our business and stock price.

We produce our consolidated financial statements in accordance with the requirements of GAAP. Effective internal controls are necessary for us to provide reliable financial reports to help mitigate the risk of fraud and to operate successfully as a publicly traded company. As a public company, we are required to document and test our internal control procedures in order to satisfy the requirements of Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, or Section 404, which requires annual management assessments of the effectiveness of our internal controls over financial reporting.

We produce our consolidated financial statements in accordance with the requirements of GAAP. Effective internal controls are necessary for us to provide reliable financial reports to help mitigate the risk of fraud and to operate successfully as a publicly traded company. As a public company, we are required to document and test our internal control procedures in order to satisfy the requirements of Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, or Section 404, which requires annual management assessments of the effectiveness of our internal controls over financial reporting.

Testing and maintaining internal controls can divert our management's attention from other matters that are important to our business. We may not be able to conclude on an ongoing basis that we have effective internal controls over financial reporting in accordance with Section 404 or our independent registered public accounting firm may not be able or willing to issue an unqualified report if we conclude that our internal controls over financial reporting are not

effective. If either we are unable to conclude that we have effective internal controls over financial reporting or our independent registered public accounting firm is unable to provide us with an unqualified report as required by Section 404, investors could lose confidence in our reported financial information and our company, which could result in a decline in the market price of our common stock, and cause us to fail to meet our reporting obligations in the future, which in turn could impact our ability to raise additional financing if needed in the future.

Table of Contents

Our amended and restated certificate of incorporation, amended and restated bylaws, stockholder rights plan and Delaware law contain provisions that could discourage transactions resulting in a change in control, which may negatively affect the market price of our common stock.

In addition to the effect that the concentration of ownership by our significant stockholders may have, our amended and restated certificate of incorporation and our amended and restated bylaws contain provisions that may enable our management to resist a change in control. These provisions may discourage, delay or prevent a change in the ownership of our company or a change in our management, even if doing so might be beneficial to our stockholders. In addition, these provisions could limit the price that investors would be willing to pay in the future for shares of our common stock. Such provisions set forth in our amended and restated certificate of incorporation or amended and restated bylaws include:

- our board of directors are authorized, without prior stockholder approval, to create and issue preferred stock, commonly referred to as “blank check” preferred stock, with rights senior to those of common stock;
- advance notice requirements for stockholders to nominate individuals to serve on our board of directors or to submit proposals that can be acted upon at stockholder meetings;
- our board of directors are classified so not all members of our board are elected at one time, which may make it more difficult for a person who acquires control of a majority of our outstanding voting stock to replace our directors;
- stockholder action by written consent is limited;
- special meetings of the stockholders are permitted to be called only by the chairman of our board of directors, our chief executive officer or by a majority of our board of directors;
- stockholders are not permitted to cumulate their votes for the election of directors;
- newly created directorships resulting from an increase in the authorized number of directors or vacancies on our board of directors are filled only by majority vote of the remaining directors;
- our board of directors is expressly authorized to make, alter or repeal our bylaws; and
- stockholders are permitted to amend our bylaws only upon receiving the affirmative vote of at least a majority of our outstanding common stock.

On November 7, 2013, we adopted a stockholder rights plan, which could make it more difficult for a third party to acquire, or could discourage a third party from acquiring, 9.8% or more of our outstanding common stock. A third party that acquires 9.8% or more of our common stock could suffer substantial dilution of its ownership interest under the terms of the stockholder rights plan through the issuance of our common stock or other securities to all stockholders other than the acquiring person.

These and other provisions in our amended and restated certificate of incorporation, amended and restated bylaws, stockholder rights plan and Delaware law could discourage acquisition proposals and make it more difficult or expensive for stockholders or potential acquirers to obtain control of our board of directors or initiate actions that are opposed by our then-current board of directors, including delaying or impeding a merger, tender offer or proxy contest involving us. Any delay or prevention of a change of control transaction or changes in our board of directors could cause the market price of our common stock to decline.

Our systems are subject to security breaches and other cybersecurity incidents.

We may experience cyber attacks, and as a result, unauthorized parties may obtain access to our computer systems and networks. Such cyber attacks could result in the misappropriation of our proprietary information and technology or interrupt our business. The reliability and security of our information technology infrastructure is critical to our business. To the extent that any disruptions or security breaches result in significant loss or damage to our data, or inappropriate disclosure of significant proprietary information, it could cause damage to our reputation and affect our relationships with our residents and ultimately harm our business.

Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments

None.

48

Item 2. Properties

Service Center. We currently lease 29,829 square feet of office space in Mission Viejo, California for our Service Center pursuant to a lease that expires in August 2019. We have two options to extend our lease term at this location for an additional five-year term for each option.

Facilities. As of December 31, 2013, we operated 119 facilities in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Washington, with the operational capacity to serve approximately 13,000 residents. Of the 119 facilities that we operated, we owned 96 facilities and leased 23 facilities pursuant to operating leases, two of which contain purchase options that provide us with the right to purchase or agreements to purchase the facility in the future. We currently do not manage any facilities for third parties, except on a short-term basis pending receipt of new operating licenses by our operating subsidiaries.

The following table provides summary information regarding the number of operational beds at our facilities at December 31, 2013:

State	Leased without a Purchase Option	Purchase Agreement or Leased with a Purchase Option	Owned	Total Operational Beds
California	1,510	414	2,049	3,973
Arizona	575	—	1,327	1,902
Texas	112	—	3,241	3,353
Utah	108	—	1,305	1,413
Colorado	42	—	463	505
Washington	—	—	555	555
Idaho	—	—	477	477
Nevada	—	—	304	304
Nebraska	—	—	366	366
Iowa	—	—	356	356
Total	2,347	414	10,443	13,204
Skilled nursing	2,347	344	8,433	11,124
Assisted living	—	70	1,533	1,603
Independent living	—	—	477	477
Total	2,347	414	10,443	13,204

Item 3. Legal Proceedings

Regulatory Matters — Laws and regulations governing Medicare and Medicaid programs are complex and subject to interpretation. Compliance with such laws and regulations can be subject to future governmental review and interpretation, as well as significant regulatory action including fines, penalties, and exclusion from certain governmental programs. We believe that we are in compliance in all material respects with all applicable laws and regulations.

A significant portion of our revenue is derived from Medicaid and Medicare, for which reimbursement rates are subject to regulatory changes and government funding restrictions. Any significant future change to reimbursement rates or regulation on how services are provided could have a material effect on our operations.

Cost-Containment Measures — Both government and private pay sources have instituted cost-containment measures designed to limit payments made to providers of healthcare services, and there can be no assurance that future measures designed to limit payments made to providers will not adversely affect us.

Income Tax Examinations — During the first quarter of 2012, the State of California initiated an examination of our income tax returns for the 2008 and 2009 income tax years. The examination is primarily focused on the Captive and the treatment of related insurance matters. To date, California has not proposed any adjustments. We are not currently under examination by any other major income tax jurisdiction. During 2013, the statute of limitations has lapsed on our 2009 Federal tax year and will lapse on certain 2008 and 2009 state tax years during the fourth quarter. The lapse of the Federal statute had no significant impact on

Table of Contents

the balance of unrecognized tax benefits. We do not believe the state statute lapses, the California examination, or any other event will significantly impact the balance of unrecognized tax benefits in the next twelve months. See Note 14, Income Taxes.

Indemnities — From time to time, we enter into certain types of contracts that contingently requires us to indemnify parties against third-party claims. These contracts primarily include (i) certain real estate leases, under which we may be required to indemnify property owners or prior facility operators for post-transfer environmental or other liabilities and other claims arising from our use of the applicable premises, (ii) operations transfer agreements, in which we agree to indemnify past operators of facilities we acquire against certain liabilities arising from the transfer of the operation and/or the operation thereof after the transfer, (iii) certain lending agreements, under which we may be required to indemnify the lender against various claims and liabilities, (iv) agreements with certain lenders under which we may be required to indemnify such lenders against various claims and liabilities, and (v) certain agreements with our officers, directors and employees, under which we may be required to indemnify such persons for liabilities arising out of their employment relationships. The terms of such obligations vary by contract and, in most instances, a specific or maximum dollar amount is not explicitly stated therein. Generally, amounts under these contracts cannot be reasonably estimated until a specific claim is asserted. Consequently, because no claims have been asserted, no liabilities have been recorded for these obligations on our balance sheets for any of the periods presented.

Litigation — The skilled nursing business involves a significant risk of liability given the age and health of our patients and residents and the services we provide. We and others in the industry are subject to an increasing number of claims and lawsuits, including professional liability claims, alleging that services have resulted in personal injury, elder abuse, wrongful death or other related claims. The defense of these lawsuits may result in significant legal costs, regardless of the outcome, and can result in large settlement amounts or damage awards.

In addition to the potential lawsuits and claims described above, we are also subject to potential lawsuits under the Federal False Claims Act and comparable state laws alleging submission of fraudulent claims for services to any healthcare program (such as Medicare) or payor. A violation may provide the basis for exclusion from federally-funded healthcare programs. Such exclusions could have a correlative negative impact on our financial performance. Some states, including California, Arizona and Texas, have enacted similar whistleblower and false claims laws and regulations. In addition, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 created incentives for states to enact anti-fraud legislation modeled on the Federal False Claims Act. As such, we could face increased scrutiny, potential liability and legal expenses and costs based on claims under state false claims acts in markets in which it does business.

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

In July 2010, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act). The Dodd-Frank Act establishes rigorous standards and supervision to protect the economy and American consumers, investors and businesses. Included under Section 922 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) will be required to pay a reward to individuals who provide original information to the SEC resulting in monetary sanctions exceeding \$1,000 in civil or criminal proceedings. The award will range from 10 to 30 percent of the amount recouped and the amount of the award shall be at the discretion of the SEC. The purpose of this reward program is to “motivate those with inside knowledge to come forward and assist the Government to identify and prosecute persons who have violated securities laws and recover money for victims of financial fraud.”

Healthcare litigation (including class action litigation) is common and is filed based upon a wide variety of claims and theories, and we are routinely subjected to varying types of claims. One particular type of suit arises from alleged violations of state-established minimum staffing requirements for skilled nursing facilities. Failure to meet these requirements can, among other things, jeopardize a facility's compliance with conditions of participation under certain state and federal healthcare programs; it may also subject the facility to a notice of deficiency, a citation, civil monetary penalty, or litigation. These class-action "staffing" suits have the potential to result in large jury verdicts and settlements, and have become more prevalent in the wake of a previous substantial jury award against one of our competitors. We expect the plaintiff's bar to become increasingly aggressive in their pursuit of these staffing and similar claims.

Table of Contents

A class action staffing suit was previously filed against us in the State of California, alleging, among other things, violations of certain Health and Safety Code provisions and a violation of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act at certain of our California facilities. In 2007, we settled this class action suit, and the settlement was approved by the affected class and the Court. We have been defending a second such staffing class-action claim filed in Los Angeles Superior Court; however, a settlement was reached with class counsel and has received Court approval. The total costs associated with the settlement, including attorney's fees, estimated class payout, and related costs and expenses, are projected to be approximately \$6.5 million, of which, approximately \$1.5 million of this amount was recorded during the year ended December 31, 2013, with the balance having been expensed in prior periods. We believe that the settlement will not have a material ongoing adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations. Other claims and suits, including class actions, continue to be filed against us and other companies in our industry. If there were a significant increase in the number of these claims or an increase in amounts owing should plaintiffs be successful in their prosecution of these claims, this could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

We have been, and continue to be, subject to claims and legal actions that arise in the ordinary course of business, including potential claims related to care and treatment provided at our facilities as well as employment related claims. We do not believe that the ultimate resolution of these actions will have a material adverse effect on our business, cash flows, financial condition or results of operations. A significant increase in the number of these claims or an increase in amounts owing should plaintiffs be successful in their prosecution of these claims, could materially adversely affect our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

We cannot predict or provide any assurance as to the possible outcome of any litigation. If any litigation were to proceed, and we are subjected to, alleged to be liable for, or agrees to a settlement of, claims or obligations under federal Medicare statutes, the federal False Claims Act, or similar state and federal statutes and related regulations, our business, financial condition and results of operations and cash flows could be materially and adversely affected and our stock price could be adversely impacted. Among other things, any settlement or litigation could involve the payment of substantial sums to settle any alleged civil violations, and may also include our assumption of specific procedural and financial obligations going forward under a corporate integrity agreement and/or other arrangement with the government.

Medicare Revenue Recoupments — We are subject to reviews relating to Medicare services, billings and potential overpayments. We have one operation subject to probe review during the year ended December 31, 2013. We anticipate that these probe reviews will increase in frequency in the future. Further, we currently have no facilities on prepayment review; however, others may be placed on prepayment review in the future. If a facility fails prepayment review, the facility could then be subject to undergo targeted review, which is a review that targets perceived claims deficiencies. We have no facilities that are currently undergoing targeted review.

U.S. Government Inquiry — In late 2006, we learned that we might be the subject of an on-going criminal and civil investigation by the DOJ. This was confirmed in March 2007. The investigation was prompted by a whistleblower complaint, and related primarily to claims submitted to the Medicare program for rehabilitation services provided at skilled nursing facilities in Southern California. We, through our outside counsel and a special committee of independent directors established by its board, worked cooperatively with the U.S. Attorney's office to produce information requested by the government as part of an ongoing dialogue designed to resolve the issue.

In December 2011, the DOJ notified us that it had closed its criminal investigation without action although, as is typical, it reserved the right to reopen the criminal case if new facts came to light. This left only the civil investigation to resolve, and we continued to supply requested information to the DOJ and the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), including specific patient records and documents from 2007 to 2011 from six Southern California skilled nursing facilities that had been the subject of previous requests.

In early 2013, discussions between government representatives and our special committee, its outside counsel and their experts had advanced sufficiently that we recorded an initial estimated liability in the amount of \$15.0 million in the fourth quarter of 2012 for the resolution of claims connected to the investigation. In April 2013, we and government representatives reached an agreement in principle to resolve the allegations and close the investigation. Based on these discussions, we recorded and announced an additional charge in the amount of \$33.0 million in the first quarter of 2013, increasing the total reserve to resolve the matter to \$48.0 million (the Reserve Amount).

Table of Contents

In October 2013, we completed and executed a settlement agreement (the Settlement Agreement) with the DOJ and received the final approval of the Office of Inspector General-HHS and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The settlement agreement fully and finally resolves the previously disclosed DOJ investigation and any ancillary claims which have been pending since 2006. Pursuant to the settlement agreement, we made a single lump-sum remittance to the government in the amount of \$48.0 million in October 2013. We have denied engaging in any illegal conduct, and have agreed to the settlement amount without any admission of wrongdoing in order to resolve the allegations and to avoid the uncertainty and expense of protracted litigation.

In connection with the settlement and effective as of October 1, 2013, we entered into a five-year corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS (the CIA). The CIA acknowledges the existence of our current compliance program, and requires that we continue during the term of the CIA to maintain a compliance program designed to promote compliance with the statutes, regulations, and written directives of Medicare, Medicaid, and all other Federal health care programs. We are also required to maintain several elements of our existing program during the term of the CIA, including maintaining a compliance officer, a compliance committee of the board of directors, and a code of conduct. The CIA requires that we conduct certain additional compliance-related activities during the term of the CIA, including various training and monitoring procedures, and maintaining a disciplinary process for compliance obligations. Pursuant to the CIA, we are required to notify the Office of Inspector General-HHS in writing, of, among other things: (i) any ongoing government investigation or legal proceeding involving an allegation that we have committed a crime or have engaged in fraudulent activities; (ii) any other matter that a reasonable person would consider a probable violation of applicable criminal, civil, or administrative laws related to compliance with federal healthcare programs; and (iii) any change in location, sale, closing, purchase, or establishment of a new business unit or location related to items or services that may be reimbursed by Federal health care programs. We are also subject to periodic reporting and certification requirements attesting that the provisions of the CIA are being implemented and followed, as well as certain document and record retention mandates.

Participation in federal healthcare programs by us is not affected by the Settlement Agreement or the CIA. In the event of an uncured material breach of the CIA, we could be excluded from participation in federal healthcare programs and/or subject to prosecution.

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

Market Information

Our common stock has been traded under the symbol "ENSG" on the NASDAQ Global Select Market since our initial public offering on November 8, 2007. Prior to that time, there was no public market for our common stock. The following table shows the high and low sale prices for the common stock as reported by the NASDAQ Global Select Market for the periods indicated:

	High	Low
Fiscal 2012		
First Quarter	\$29.73	\$24.01
Second Quarter	\$28.71	\$23.40
Third Quarter	\$30.76	\$26.53
Fourth Quarter	\$31.25	\$24.97
Fiscal 2013		
First Quarter	\$33.70	\$27.54
Second Quarter	\$38.08	\$31.57
Third Quarter	\$42.26	\$35.24
Fourth Quarter	\$46.39	\$39.60

During fiscal 2013, we declared aggregate cash dividends of \$0.265 per share of common stock, for a total of approximately \$5.9 million.

As of February 10, 2014, there were approximately 230 holders of record of our common stock.

The graph below shows the cumulative total stockholder return of an investment of \$100 (and the reinvestment of any dividends thereafter) on December 31, 2008 in (i) our common stock, (ii) the Skilled Nursing Facilities Peer Group 1 and (iii) the NASDAQ Market Index. Our stock price performance shown in the graph below is not indicative of future stock price performance.

COMPARISON OF 60 MONTH CUMULATIVE TOTAL RETURN*

Among Ensign Group, the NASDAQ Composite Index and a Peer Group

*\$100 invested on 12/31/08 in stock in index, including reinvestment of dividends.

Fiscal year ending December 31.

Comparison of 60 month cumulative total return among The Ensign Group, Inc., NASDAQ Market Index, Skilled Nursing Facilities

	December 31,					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$100.00	\$93.05	\$152.25	\$151.32	\$169.20	\$277.92
NASDAQ Market Index	\$100.00	\$145.34	\$171.70	\$170.34	\$200.57	\$281.14
Peer Group	\$100.00	\$90.13	\$127.89	\$105.17	\$126.22	\$156.74

The current composition of the Skilled Nursing Facilities Peer Group 1, SIC Code 8051 is as follows:

AdCare Health Systems, Inc., Diversicare Healthcare Services, Five Star Quality Care, Inc., Lexington Healthcare Group, National Healthcare Corporation, Skilled Healthcare Group, Inc., and The Ensign Group, Inc.

Dividend Policy

The following table summarizes common stock dividends declared to shareholders during the two most recent fiscal years:

	Dividend per Share	Aggregate Dividend Declared (in thousands)
2012		
First Quarter	\$0.060	\$1,292
Second Quarter	\$0.060	\$1,298
Third Quarter	\$0.060	\$1,306
Fourth Quarter	\$0.065	\$1,424
2013		
First Quarter	\$0.065	\$1,437
Second Quarter	\$0.065	\$1,438
Third Quarter	\$0.065	\$1,443
Fourth Quarter	\$0.070	\$1,564

We do not have a formal dividend policy but we currently intend to continue to pay regular quarterly dividends to the holders of our common stock. From 2002 to 2013, we paid aggregate annual dividends equal to approximately 5% to 15% of our net income, after adjusting for the charge related to the U.S. Government inquiry settlement of \$33.0 million and \$15.0 million in fiscal years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. However, future dividends will continue to be at the discretion of our board of directors, and we may or may not continue to pay dividends at such rate. We expect that the payment of dividends will depend on many factors, including our results of operations, financial condition and capital requirements, earnings, general business conditions, legal restrictions on the payment of dividends and other factors the board of directors deems relevant. The senior credit facility agreement governing our revolving line of credit with a lending consortium arranged by SunTrust and Wells Fargo restricts our subsidiaries and our ability to pay dividends to stockholders in excess of 20% of consolidated net income, or at all if we receive notice that we are in default under this agreement. In addition, we are a holding company with no direct operating assets, employees or revenues. As a result, we are dependent upon distributions from our independent subsidiaries to generate the funds necessary to meet our financial obligations and pay dividends. It is possible that in certain quarters, we may pay dividends that exceed our net income for such period as calculated in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Issuer Repurchases of Equity Securities

Common Stock Repurchase Program. In the fourth quarter of 2012, the board of directors authorized the renewal of our common stock repurchase program, authorizing the repurchase of up to \$10.0 million of our common stock over the next 12 months. Under this program, we are authorized to repurchase our issued and outstanding common shares from time to time in open-market and privately negotiated transactions and block trades in accordance with federal securities laws, including Rule 10b-18 promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as amended.

The number of shares repurchased will depend entirely upon the levels of cash available, the attractiveness of alternate investment and business opportunities either at hand or on the horizon, Management's perception of value relative to

market price and other legal, regulatory and contractual requirements. The repurchase program does not obligate us to repurchase any particular dollar amount or number of shares of common stock. The repurchase program expired on November 15, 2013. During the year ended December 31, 2013, we did not repurchase any shares of our common stock. During the year ended December 31, 2012, we repurchased 7,340 shares of our common stock for a total of \$0.2 million.

Item 6. Selected Financial Data

The following selected consolidated financial data for the periods indicated have been derived from our consolidated financial statements. The financial data set forth below should be read in connection with Item 7 - "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" and with our consolidated financial statements and related notes thereto:

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
	(In thousands, except per share data)				
Revenue	\$904,556	\$823,155	\$758,277	\$649,532	\$542,002
Expense:					
Cost of services (exclusive of facility rent and depreciation and amortization shown separately below)	725,989	656,424	600,804	516,668	434,318
Charge related to U.S. Government inquiry	33,000	15,000	—	—	—
Facility rent - cost of services	13,613	13,281	13,725	14,478	14,703
General and administrative expense	40,103	31,819	29,766	26,099	20,767
Depreciation and amortization	33,909	28,358	23,286	16,633	13,276
Total expenses	846,614	744,882	667,581	573,878	483,064
Income from operations	57,942	78,273	90,696	75,654	58,938
Other income (expense):					
Interest expense	(12,787)	(12,229)	(13,778)	(9,123)	(5,691)
Interest income	506	255	249	248	279
Other expense, net	(12,281)	(11,974)	(13,529)	(8,875)	(5,412)
Income before provision for income taxes	45,661	66,299	77,167	66,779	53,526
Provision for income taxes	20,003	25,134	29,492	26,253	21,040
Income from continuing operations	25,658	41,165	47,675	40,526	32,486
Loss from discontinued operations	(1,804)	(1,357)	—	—	—
Net income	\$23,854	\$39,808	\$47,675	\$40,526	\$32,486
Less: net loss attributable to noncontrolling interests	(186)	(783)	—	—	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675	\$40,526	\$32,486
Amounts attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.:					
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$25,844	\$41,948	\$47,675	\$40,526	\$32,486
Loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax	(1,804)	(1,357)	—	—	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675	\$40,526	\$32,486
Net income per share ⁽¹⁾ :					
Basic:					
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.18	\$1.96	\$2.27	\$1.95	\$1.58
Loss from discontinued operations ⁽²⁾	(0.08)	(0.07)	—	—	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.10	\$1.89	\$2.27	\$1.95	\$1.58
Diluted:					
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.16	\$1.91	\$2.21	\$1.92	\$1.55
Loss from discontinued operations ⁽²⁾	(0.09)	(0.06)	—	—	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.07	\$1.85	\$2.21	\$1.92	\$1.55
Weighted average common shares outstanding:					
Basic	21,900	21,429	20,967	20,744	20,603
Diluted	22,364	21,942	21,583	21,159	20,925

(1) See Note 5 of Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

(2) See Note 4 of Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

	Years Ended		
	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands)		
Other Non-GAAP Financial Data:			
EBITDA ⁽¹⁾	\$92,037	\$107,414	\$113,982
Adjusted EBITDA ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾	136,741	131,427	115,978
EBITDAR ⁽¹⁾	105,650	120,695	127,707
Adjusted EBITDAR ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾	149,345	143,848	129,703

EBITDA, EBITDAR, Adjusted EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDAR are supplemental non-GAAP financial measures. Regulation G, Conditions for Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures, and other provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, define and prescribe the conditions for use of certain non-GAAP financial information. We calculate EBITDA as net income from continuing operations, adjusted for net losses attributable to noncontrolling interest, before (a) interest expense, net, (b) provision for income taxes, and (c) depreciation and amortization. We calculate EBITDAR by adjusting EBITDA to exclude facility rent—cost of services. These non-GAAP financial measures are used in addition to and in conjunction with results presented in accordance with GAAP. These non-GAAP financial measures should not be relied upon to the exclusion of GAAP financial measures. These non-GAAP financial measures reflect an additional way of viewing aspects of our operations that, when viewed with our GAAP results and the accompanying reconciliations to corresponding GAAP financial measures, provide a more complete understanding of factors and trends affecting our business. We believe EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR are useful to investors and other external users of our financial statements in evaluating our operating performance because:

- they are widely used by investors and analysts in our industry as a supplemental measure to evaluate the overall operating performance of companies in our industry without regard to items such as interest expense, net and depreciation and amortization, which can vary substantially from company to company depending on the book value of assets, capital structure and the method by which assets were acquired; and
- they help investors evaluate and compare the results of our operations from period to period by removing the impact of our capital structure and asset base from our operating results.

We use EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR as measurements of our operating performance to assist us in comparing our operating performance on a consistent basis;

- to allocate resources to enhance the financial performance of our business;
- to evaluate the effectiveness of our operational strategies; and
- to compare our operating performance to that of our competitors.

We typically use EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR to compare the operating performance of each operation. These measures are useful in this regard because they do not include such costs as net interest expense, income taxes, depreciation and amortization expense, and, with respect to EBITDAR, facility rent—cost of services, which may vary from period-to-period depending upon various factors, including the method used to finance facilities, the amount of debt that we have incurred, whether a facility is owned or leased, the date of acquisition of a facility or business, and the tax law of the state in which a business unit operates. As a result, we believe that the use of these measures provide a meaningful and consistent comparison of our business between periods by eliminating certain items required by GAAP.

We also establish compensation programs and bonuses for our leaders that are partially based upon the achievement of Adjusted EBITDAR targets.

Despite the importance of these measures in analyzing our underlying business, designing incentive compensation and for our goal setting, EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR are non-GAAP financial measures that have no standardized meaning defined by GAAP. Therefore, our EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR measures have limitations as analytical tools, and they should not be considered in isolation, or as a substitute for analysis of our results as reported in accordance with GAAP. Some of these limitations are:

- they do not reflect our current or future cash requirements for capital expenditures or contractual commitments;
- they do not reflect changes in, or cash requirements for, our working capital needs;
- they do not reflect the net interest expense, or the cash requirements necessary to service interest or principal payments, on our debt;
- they do not reflect any income tax payments we may be required to make;
- although depreciation and amortization are non-cash charges, the assets being depreciated and amortized will often have to be replaced in the future, and EBITDA and EBITDAR do not reflect any cash requirements for such replacements; and
- other companies in our industry may calculate these measures differently than we do, which may limit their usefulness as comparative measures.

We compensate for these limitations by using them only to supplement net income on a basis prepared in accordance with GAAP in order to provide a more complete understanding of the factors and trends affecting our business.

Management strongly encourages investors to review our consolidated financial statements in their entirety and to not rely on any single financial measure. Because these non-GAAP financial measures are not standardized, it may not be possible to compare these financial measures with other companies' non-GAAP financial measures having the same or similar names. For information about our financial results as reported in accordance with GAAP, see our consolidated financial statements and related notes included elsewhere in this document.

- (2) Adjusted EBITDA is EBITDA adjusted for non-core business items, which for the reported periods includes, to the extent applicable:

- Charges related to the DOJ settlement;
- Expenses incurred in connection with the Company's proposed spin-off of real estate assets in a newly formed publicly traded real estate investment trust (REIT);
- Legal costs incurred in connection with the DOJ settlement;
- Settlement of a class action lawsuit regarding minimum staffing requirements in the State of California.
- Impairment charges
- Losses incurred by our newly opened urgent care centers;
- Losses incurred by one newly constructed skilled nursing facility;
- Acquisition-related costs; and
- Costs incurred to recognize income tax credits.

Adjusted EBITDAR is EBITDAR adjusted for the above noted non-core business items.

The table below reconciles net income to EBITDA, Adjusted EBITDA, EBITDAR and Adjusted EBITDAR for the periods presented:

	Years Ended				
	December 31,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
	(In thousands)				
Consolidated statements of income Data:					
Net income	\$23,854	\$39,808	\$47,675	\$40,526	\$32,486
Net loss attributable to noncontrolling interests	186	783	—	—	—
Loss from discontinued operations	1,804	1,357	—	—	—
Interest expense, net	12,281	11,974	13,529	8,875	5,412
Provision for income taxes	20,003	25,134	29,492	26,253	21,040
Depreciation and amortization	33,909	28,358	23,286	16,633	13,276
EBITDA	\$92,037	\$107,414	\$113,982	\$92,287	\$72,214
Facility rent—cost of services	13,613	13,281	13,725	14,478	14,703
EBITDAR	\$105,650	\$120,695	\$127,707	\$106,765	\$86,917
EBITDA	\$92,037	\$107,414	\$113,982	\$92,287	\$72,214
Charge related to the U.S. Government inquiry ^(a)	33,000	15,000	—	—	—
Expenses related to the Spin-Off ^(b)	4,050	—	—	—	—
Legal costs ^(c)	1,098	1,945	1,544	—	—
Settlement of class action lawsuit ^(d)	1,524	2,596	—	—	—
Impairment of goodwill and other indefinite-lived intangibles ⁽ⁱ⁾	490	2,225	—	185	—
Urgent care center losses ^(e)	1,844	546	—	—	—
Losses at skilled nursing facility not at full operation ^(f)	1,256	—	—	—	—
Acquisition related costs ^(g)	288	250	452	150	349
Costs incurred to recognize income tax credits ^(h)	145	591	—	—	—
Rent related to items (e) and (f) above ⁽ⁱ⁾	1,009	860	—	—	—
Adjusted EBITDA	\$136,741	\$131,427	\$115,978	\$92,622	\$72,563
Facility rent—cost of services	13,613	13,281	13,725	14,478	14,703
Less: rent related to items (e) and (f) above ⁽ⁱ⁾	(1,009)	(860)	—	—	—
Adjusted EBITDAR	\$149,345	\$143,848	\$129,703	\$107,100	\$87,266

(a) Charges related to our resolution of any claims connected to the DOJ settlement.

(b) Expenses incurred in connection with the Company's proposed spin-off of its real estate assets to a newly formed publicly traded real estate investment trust (REIT).

(c) Legal costs incurred in connection with the DOJ settlement.

(d) Settlement of a class action lawsuit regarding minimum staffing requirements in the State of California.

(e) Losses incurred at newly opened urgent care centers, excluding rent, depreciation, interest and income taxes.

(f) Losses incurred through the second quarter at one newly constructed skilled nursing facility which began operations during the first quarter of 2013, excluding rent, depreciation, interest and income taxes. The facility began running at full capacity during the third quarter of 2013, and therefore, results for the third and fourth quarters were not included in the results above.

(g) Costs incurred to acquire operations which are not capitalizable.

(h) Costs incurred to recognize income tax credits which contributed to a decrease in effective tax rate.

(i) Rent related to newly opened urgent care centers and one newly constructed skilled nursing facility which began operations during the first quarter of 2013, not included in items (e) and (f) above.

(j)

Impairment charges to goodwill for a skilled nursing facility in Utah during the year ended December 31, 2013 and a decline in the estimated fair value of redeemable noncontrolling interest of our urgent care franchising business during the year ended December 31, 2012.

Table of Contents

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

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and accompanying notes, which appear elsewhere in this Annual Report. This discussion contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. Our actual results could differ materially from those anticipated in these forward-looking statements as a result of various factors, including those discussed below and elsewhere in this Annual Report. See Item 1A. - "Risk Factors" and "Cautionary Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements."

Overview

We, through our subsidiaries, provide skilled nursing and rehabilitative care services through the operation of 119 facilities, nine home health and seven hospice operations, seven urgent care centers and a mobile x-ray and diagnostic company as of December 31, 2013, located in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Washington. Our operations, each of which strives to be the operation of choice in the community it serves, provides a broad spectrum of healthcare services including skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice, mobile ancillary, and urgent care services. Our facilities have a collective capacity of approximately 13,200 operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds. As of December 31, 2013, we owned 96 of its 119 facilities and operated an additional 23 facilities through long-term lease arrangements, and had options to purchase two of those 23 facilities.

The following table summarizes our facilities and operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds by ownership status as of December 31, 2013:

	Owned		Leased (with a Purchase Option)		Leased (without a Purchase Option)		Total	
Number of facilities	96		2		21		119	
Percent of total	80.7	%	1.7	%	17.6	%	100.0	%
Operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds	10,443		414		2,347		13,204	
Percent of total	79.1	%	3.1	%	17.8	%	100.0	%

The Ensign Group, Inc. is a holding company with no direct operating assets, employees or revenues. All of our skilled nursing, assisted living and home health and hospice operations are operated by separate, wholly-owned, independent subsidiaries, which have their own management, employees and assets. In addition, one of our wholly-owned independent subsidiaries, which we call our Service Center, provides centralized accounting, payroll, human resources, information technology, legal, risk management and other services to each operating subsidiary through contractual relationships between such subsidiaries. In addition, we have the Captive that provides some claims-made coverage to our operating subsidiaries for general and professional liability, as well as for certain workers' compensation insurance liabilities. References herein to the consolidated "Company" and "its" assets and activities, as well as the use of the terms "we," "us," "our" and similar verbiage in this annual report is not meant to imply that The Ensign Group, Inc. has direct operating assets, employees or revenue, or that any of the facilities, the Service Center or the Captive are operated by the same entity.

Recent Developments

Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT) Spin-Off — On November 7, 2013, we announced a plan to separate our healthcare business and real estate business into two separate, publicly traded companies:

Ensign, which will continue to provide healthcare services through its existing operations; and
CareTrust REIT, Inc. (CareTrust), which will own, acquire and lease real estate serving the healthcare industry.

We intend to accomplish the proposed separation by distributing all of the outstanding shares of CareTrust common stock to our stockholders on a pro rata basis (the Spin-Off). At the time of the Spin-Off, CareTrust, which is currently a wholly-owned subsidiary of ours, will hold substantially all of the real property owned by us, and will own and operate three independent living facilities. After the Spin-Off, all of these properties (except for three independent living facilities that CareTrust will operate) will be leased to us on a triple-net basis, under which we will be responsible for all costs at the properties, including property taxes, insurance and maintenance and repair costs.

Table of Contents

The proposed Spin-Off is conditioned on, among other things, final approval by our board of directors, the receipt of a ruling from the IRS that, among other things, the Spin-Off will qualify as a tax-free transaction for U.S. federal income tax purposes, the receipt of an opinion of counsel as to the satisfaction of certain requirements for such tax-free treatment, and the receipt of an opinion of counsel that, commencing with CareTrust's taxable year ending on December 31, 2014, CareTrust has been organized in conformity with the requirements for qualification as a REIT under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and its proposed method of operation will enable it to meet the requirements for qualification and taxation as a REIT.

U.S. Government Inquiry Settlement — In April 2013, we and government representatives reached an agreement in principle to resolve the allegations and close the investigation. Based on these discussions, we recorded and announced an additional charge in the amount of \$33.0 million in the first quarter of 2013, increasing the total reserve to resolve the matter to \$48.0 million (the Reserve Amount).

In October 2013, we completed and executed a settlement agreement (the Settlement Agreement) with the DOJ and received the final approval of the Office of Inspector General-HHS and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The settlement agreement fully and finally resolves the previously disclosed DOJ investigation and any ancillary claims which have been pending since 2006. Pursuant to the settlement agreement, we made a single lump-sum remittance to the government in the amount of \$48.0 million in October 2013. We have denied engaging in any illegal conduct, and have agreed to the settlement amount without any admission of wrongdoing in order to resolve the allegations and to avoid the uncertainty and expense of protracted litigation.

In connection with the settlement and effective as of October 1, 2013, we entered into a five-year corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS (the CIA). The CIA acknowledges the existence of our current compliance program, and requires that we continue during the term of the CIA to maintain a compliance program designed to promote compliance with the statutes, regulations, and written directives of Medicare, Medicaid, and all other Federal health care programs. Our participation in federal healthcare programs is not affected by the Settlement Agreement or the CIA. In the event of an uncured material breach of the CIA, we could be excluded from participation in federal healthcare programs and/or subject to prosecution. See further details of the CIA at Note 19, Commitments and Contingencies of Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Urgent Care Franchising — On March 25, 2013 we announced that our urgent care subsidiary, Immediate Clinic Healthcare, Inc., agreed to terms to sell Doctors Express, a national urgent care franchise system. The sale of specific assets and liabilities of Doctors Express was finalized on April 15, 2013. In accordance with the authoritative guidance for the disposal of long-lived asset, the sale of Doctors Express has been accounted for as discontinued operations. Accordingly, the results of operations of this business for all periods presented and the loss or impairment related to this divestiture have been classified as discontinued operations in the accompanying consolidated statements of income. As the sale was effective April 15, 2013, all assets and liabilities included in the sale were recorded as held for sale on our accompanying consolidated balance sheets as of December 31, 2012. See Note 4, Discontinued Operations in Notes to consolidated Financial Statements.

Facility Acquisition History

The following table sets forth the location of our facilities and the number of operational beds located at our facilities as of December 31, 2013:

	CA	AZ	TX	UT	CO	WA	ID	NV	NE	IA	Total
Number of facilities	36	13	27	12	6	6	6	3	5	5	119
Operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds	3,973	1,902	3,353	1,413	505	555	477	304	366	356	13,204

During the first quarter of 2013, we acquired a three home health operations in Washington and Texas, three hospice operations in Arizona, California and Washington, respectively, and one skilled nursing facility in Texas, in six separate transactions, for an aggregate purchase price of approximately \$10.6 million, which was paid in cash. The skilled nursing facility acquisition added 150 operational skilled nursing beds to our operations. The home health and hospice acquisitions did not have an impact on our operational bed count.

During the second quarter of 2013, we acquired five skilled nursing facilities in Texas, Nebraska and Washington and three assisted living facilities in Washington, California and Utah in five separate transactions for an aggregate purchase price of approximately \$28.7 million, which was paid in cash. These acquisitions added 460 operational skilled nursing beds and 281 operational assisted living units to our operations.

Table of Contents

During the third quarter of 2013, we acquired a skilled nursing facility and an urgent care center in Washington for approximately \$6.1 million, which was paid in cash. The skilled nursing acquisition added 82 operational skilled nursing beds to our operations. The urgent care center acquisition did not have an impact on our bed count.

We also entered into a separate operations transfer agreement with the prior tenant as part of each transaction noted above. See further discussion of facility acquisitions in Note 8, Acquisitions in Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Key Performance Indicators

We manage our skilled nursing business by monitoring key performance indicators that affect our financial performance. These indicators and their definitions include the following:

Routine revenue: Routine revenue is generated by the contracted daily rate charged for all contractually inclusive skilled nursing services. The inclusion of therapy and other ancillary treatments varies by payor source and by contract. Services provided outside of the routine contractual agreement are recorded separately as ancillary revenue, including Medicare Part B therapy services, and are not included in the routine revenue definition.

Skilled revenue: The amount of routine revenue generated from patients in our skilled nursing facilities who are receiving higher levels of care under Medicare, managed care, Medicaid, or other skilled reimbursement programs. The other skilled residents that are included in this population represent very high acuity residents who are receiving high levels of nursing and ancillary services which are reimbursed by payors other than Medicare or managed care. Skilled revenue excludes any revenue generated from our assisted living services.

Skilled mix: The amount of our skilled revenue as a percentage of our total routine revenue. Skilled mix (in days) represents the number of days our Medicare, managed care, or other skilled patients are receiving services at our skilled nursing facilities divided by the total number of days patients (less days from assisted living services) from all payor sources are receiving services at our skilled nursing facilities for any given period (less days from assisted living services).

Quality mix: The amount of routine non-Medicaid revenue as a percentage of our total routine revenue. Quality mix (in days) represents the number of days our non-Medicaid patients are receiving services at our skilled nursing facilities divided by the total number of days patients from all payor sources are receiving services at our skilled nursing facilities for any given period (less days from assisted living services).

Average daily rates: The routine revenue by payor source for a period at our skilled nursing facilities divided by actual patient days for that revenue source for that given period.

Occupancy percentage (operational beds): The total number of residents occupying a bed in a skilled nursing, assisted living or independent living facility as a percentage of the beds in a facility which are available for occupancy during the measurement period.

Number of facilities and operational beds: The total number of skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living facilities that we own or operate and the total number of operational beds associated with these facilities.

Skilled and Quality Mix. Like most skilled nursing providers, we measure both patient days and revenue by payor. Medicare, managed care and other skilled patients, whom we refer to as high acuity patients, typically require a higher level of skilled nursing and rehabilitative care. Accordingly, Medicare and managed care reimbursement rates are typically higher than from other payors. In most states, Medicaid reimbursement rates are generally the lowest of all payor types. Changes in the payor mix can significantly affect our revenue and profitability.

Table of Contents

The following table summarizes our overall skilled mix and quality mix for the periods indicated as a percentage of our total routine revenue (less revenue from assisted living services) and as a percentage of total patient days (less days from assisted living services):

	Year Ended December 31,			
	2013	2012	2011	
Skilled Mix:				
Days	26.4	% 25.9	% 25.5	%
Revenue	50.0	% 50.0	% 51.3	%
Quality Mix:				
Days	40.1	% 39.1	% 38.1	%
Revenue	59.5	% 59.5	% 60.1	%

Occupancy. We define occupancy as the ratio of actual patient days (one patient day equals one resident occupying one bed for one day) during any measurement period to the number of beds in facilities which are available for occupancy during the measurement period. The number of licensed and independent living beds in a skilled nursing, assisted living or independent living facility that are actually operational and available for occupancy may be less than the total official licensed bed capacity. This sometimes occurs due to the permanent dedication of bed space to alternative purposes, such as enhanced therapy treatment space or other desirable uses calculated to improve service offerings and/or operational efficiencies in a facility. In some cases, three- and four-bed wards have been reduced to two-bed rooms for resident comfort, and larger wards have been reduced to conform to changes in Medicare requirements. These beds are seldom expected to be placed back into service. We define occupancy in operational beds as the ratio of actual patient days during any measurement period to the number of available patient days for that period. We believe that reporting occupancy based on operational beds is consistent with industry practices and provides a more useful measure of actual occupancy performance from period to period.

The following table summarizes our overall occupancy statistics for the periods indicated:

	Year Ended December 31,			
	2013	2012	2011	
Occupancy:				
Operational beds at end of period	13,204	12,198	11,702	
Available patient days	4,710,768	4,371,034	3,945,511	
Actual patient days	3,648,651	3,452,598	3,124,724	
Occupancy percentage (based on operational beds)	77.5	% 79.0	% 79.2	%

Table of Contents

Revenue Sources

Our total revenue represents revenue derived primarily from providing services to patients and residents of skilled nursing facilities, and to a lesser extent from assisted living facilities and ancillary services. We receive service revenue from Medicaid, Medicare, private payors and other third-party payors, and managed care sources. The sources and amounts of our revenue are determined by a number of factors, including bed capacity and occupancy rates of our healthcare facilities, the mix of patients at our facilities and the rates of reimbursement among payors. Payment for ancillary services varies based upon the service provided and the type of payor.

The following table sets forth our total revenue by payor source and as a percentage of total revenue for the periods indicated:

	Years Ended December 31,					
	2013		2012		2011	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
	(Dollars in thousands)					
Revenue:						
Medicaid	\$323,803	35.8 %	\$302,046	36.7 %	\$277,736	36.6 %
Medicare	292,917	32.4	278,578	33.8	272,283	35.9
Medicaid-skilled	36,085	4.0	25,418	3.1	20,290	2.7
Total	652,805	72.2	606,042	73.6	570,309	75.2
Managed Care	118,168	13.1	106,268	12.9	94,266	12.4
Private and Other(1)	133,583	14.7	110,845	13.5	93,702	12.4
Total revenue	\$904,556	100.0 %	\$823,155	100.0 %	\$758,277	100.0 %

(1) Private and other payors includes revenue from urgent care centers and other ancillary businesses.

Primary Components of Expense

Cost of Services (exclusive of facility rent and depreciation and amortization shown separately). Our cost of services represents the costs of operating our facilities and primarily consists of payroll and related benefits, supplies, purchased services, and ancillary expenses such as the cost of pharmacy and therapy services provided to residents. Cost of services also includes the cost of general and professional liability insurance and other general cost of services with respect to our operations.

Facility Rent - Cost of Services. Facility rent - cost of services consists solely of base minimum rent amounts payable under lease agreements to third-party owners of the facilities that we operate but do not own and does not include taxes, insurance, impounds, capital reserves or other charges payable under the applicable lease agreements.

General and Administrative Expense. General and administrative expense consists primarily of payroll and related benefits and travel expenses for our Service Center personnel, including training and other operational support. General and administrative expense also includes professional fees (including accounting and legal fees), costs relating to our information systems, stock-based compensation and rent for our Service Center office.

Depreciation and Amortization. Property and equipment are recorded at their original historical cost. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the depreciable assets. The following is a summary of the depreciable lives of our depreciable assets:

Buildings and improvements	Minimum of three years to a maximum of 57 years, generally 45 years
Leasehold improvements	Shorter of the lease term or estimated useful life, generally 5 to 15 years
Furniture and equipment	3 to 10 years

64

Table of Contents

Critical Accounting Policies

Our discussion and analysis of our financial condition and results of operations are based on our consolidated financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States. The preparation of these financial statements and related disclosures requires us to make judgments, estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. On an ongoing basis we review our judgments and estimates, including, but not limited to, those related to doubtful accounts, income taxes, stock compensation, intangible assets and loss contingencies. We base our estimates and judgments upon our historical experience, knowledge of current conditions and our belief of what could occur in the future considering available information, including assumptions that we believe to be reasonable under the circumstances. By their nature, these estimates and judgments are subject to an inherent degree of uncertainty and actual results could differ materially from the amounts reported. The following summarizes our critical accounting policies, defined as those policies that we believe: (a) are the most important to the portrayal of our financial condition and results of operations; and (b) require management's most subjective or complex judgments, often as a result of the need to make estimates about the effects of matters that are inherently uncertain.

Revenue Recognition

We recognize revenue when the following four conditions have been met: (i) there is persuasive evidence that an arrangement exists; (ii) delivery has occurred or service has been rendered; (iii) the price is fixed or determinable; and (iv) collection is reasonably assured. Our revenue is derived primarily from providing healthcare services to residents and is recognized on the date services are provided at amounts billable to individual residents. For residents under reimbursement arrangements with third-party payors, including Medicaid, Medicare and private insurers, revenue is recorded based on contractually agreed-upon amounts on a per patient, daily basis.

Revenue from Medicare and Medicaid programs account for 72.2%, 73.6% and 75.2% of our revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. We record revenue from these governmental and managed care programs as services are performed at their expected net realizable amounts under these programs. Our revenue from governmental and managed care programs is subject to audit and retroactive adjustment by governmental and third-party agencies. Consistent with healthcare industry accounting practices, any changes to these governmental revenue estimates are recorded in the period the change or adjustment becomes known based on final settlement. We recorded retroactive adjustments to revenue which were not material to our consolidated revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011.

Our service specific revenue recognition policies are as follows:

Skilled Nursing Revenue

Our revenue is derived primarily from providing long-term healthcare services to residents and is recognized on the date services are provided at amounts billable to individual residents. For residents under reimbursement arrangements with third-party payors, including Medicaid, Medicare and private insurers, revenue is recorded based on contractually agreed-upon amounts on a per patient, daily basis. We record revenue from private pay patients, at the agreed-upon rate, as services are performed.

Home Health Revenue

Medicare Revenue

Net service revenue is recorded under the Medicare prospective payment system based on a 60-day episode payment rate that is subject to adjustment based on certain variables including, but not limited to: (a) an outlier payment if patient care was unusually costly; (b) a low utilization payment adjustment if the number of visits was fewer than five; (c) a partial payment if the patient transferred to another provider or we received a patient from another provider before completing the episode; (d) a payment adjustment based upon the level of therapy services required; (e) the number of episodes of care provided to a patient, regardless of whether the same home health provider provided care for the entire series of episodes; (f) changes in the base episode payments established by the Medicare Program; (g) adjustments to the base episode payments for case mix and geographic wages; and (h) recoveries of overpayments.

We make adjustments to Medicare revenue on completed episodes to reflect differences between estimated and actual payment amounts, an inability to obtain appropriate billing documentation or authorizations acceptable to the payor and other reasons unrelated to credit risk. Therefore, we believe that its reported net service revenue and patient accounts receivable will be the net amounts to be realized from Medicare for services rendered.

65

Table of Contents

In addition to revenue recognized on completed episodes, we also recognize a portion of revenue associated with episodes in progress. Episodes in progress are 60-day episodes of care that begin during the reporting period, but were not completed as of the end of the period. Thereby, estimating revenue and recognizing it on a daily basis.

Non-Medicare Revenue

Episodic Based Revenue — We recognize revenue in a similar manner as it recognizes Medicare revenue for episodic-based rates that are paid by other insurance carriers, including Medicare Advantage programs; however, these rates can vary based upon the negotiated terms.

Non-episodic Based Revenue — Revenue is recorded on an accrual basis based upon the date of service at amounts equal to its established or estimated per-visit rates, as applicable.

Hospice Revenue

Revenue is recorded on an accrual basis based upon the date of service at amounts equal to the estimated payment rates. The estimated payment rates are daily rates for each of the levels of care we deliver. We make adjustments to revenue for an inability to obtain appropriate billing documentation or authorizations acceptable to the payor and other reasons unrelated to credit risk. Additionally, as Medicare hospice revenue is subject to an inpatient cap limit and an overall payment cap, we monitor our provider numbers and estimates amounts due back to Medicare if a cap has been exceeded. We record these adjustments as a reduction to revenue and increases to other accrued liabilities.

Accounts Receivable and Allowance for Doubtful Accounts

Accounts receivable consist primarily of amounts due from Medicare and Medicaid programs, other government programs, managed care health plans and private payor sources. Estimated provisions for doubtful accounts are recorded to the extent it is probable that a portion or all of a particular account will not be collected.

In evaluating the collectability of accounts receivable, we consider a number of factors, including the age of the accounts, changes in collection patterns, the composition of patient accounts by payor type and the status of ongoing disputes with third-party payors. On an annual basis, the historical collection percentages are reviewed by payor and by state and are updated to reflect the recent collection experience of the Company. In order to determine the appropriate reserve rate percentages which ultimately establish the allowance, the Company analyzes historical cash collection patterns by payor and by state. The percentages applied to the aged receivable balances are based on the Company's historical experience and time limits, if any, for managed care, Medicare, Medicaid and other payors. The Company periodically refines its estimates of the allowance for doubtful accounts based on experience with the estimation process and changes in circumstances.

Self-Insurance

We are partially self-insured for general and professional liability up to a base amount per claim (the self-insured retention) with an aggregate, one-time deductible above this limit. Losses beyond these amounts are insured through third-party policies with coverage limits per claim, per location and on an aggregate basis for us. For claims made after January 1, 2013, the self-insured retention was \$0.5 million per claim, subject to an additional one-time deductible of \$1.0 million for California facilities and a separate, one-time deductible of \$0.8 million for non-California facilities. For all facilities, except those located in Colorado, the third-party coverage above these amounts was \$1.0 million per claim, \$3.0 million per facility, with a \$5.0 million blanket aggregate available to both California and non-California operations separately. In Colorado, the third-party coverage above these limits was \$1.0 million per claim and \$3.0 million per facility, which is independent of the aforementioned blanket aggregate applicable to our other 113 facilities.

The self-insured retention and deductible limits for general and professional liability and workers' compensation are self-insured through the Captive, the related assets and liabilities of which are included in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets. The Captive is subject to certain statutory requirements as an insurance provider. These requirements include, but are not limited to, maintaining statutory capital. Our policy is to accrue amounts equal to the actuarially estimated costs to settle open claims of insureds, as well as an estimate of the cost of insured claims that have been incurred but not reported. We develop information about the size of the ultimate claims based on historical experience, current industry information and actuarial analysis, and evaluates the estimates for claim loss exposure on a quarterly basis.

Our operating subsidiaries are self-insured for workers' compensation liability in California. To protect ourself against loss exposure in California with this policy, we purchased individual stop-loss insurance coverage that insures individual claims that exceed \$0.5 million for each occurrence. In Texas, the operating subsidiaries have elected non-subscriber status for workers' compensation claims and, effective February 1, 2011, we purchased individual stop-loss coverage that insures individual claims

Table of Contents

that exceed \$0.8 million for each occurrence. Our operating subsidiaries in other states have third party guaranteed cost coverage. In California and Texas, we accrue amounts equal to the estimated costs to settle open claims, as well as an estimate of the cost of claims that have been incurred but not reported. We use actuarial valuations to estimate the liability based on historical experience and industry information.

We provide self-insured medical (including prescription drugs) and dental healthcare benefits to the majority of its employees. We are fully liable for all financial and legal aspects of these benefit plans. To protect ourselves against loss exposure with this policy, we purchased individual stop-loss insurance coverage that insures individual claims that exceed \$0.3 million for each covered person with an aggregate individual stop loss deductible of \$0.1 million.

We believe that adequate provision has been made in the consolidated balance sheets for liabilities that may arise out of patient care, workers' compensation, healthcare benefits and related services provided to date. The amount of our reserves was determined based on an estimation process that uses information obtained from both company-specific and industry data. This estimation process requires us to continuously monitor and evaluate the life cycle of the claims. Using data obtained from this monitoring and our assumptions about emerging trends, we, with the assistance of an independent actuary, develop information about the size of ultimate claims based on our historical experience and other available industry information. The most significant assumptions used in the estimation process include determining the trend in costs, the expected cost of claims incurred but not reported and the expected costs to settle or pay damage awards with respect to unpaid claims. The self-insured liabilities are based upon estimates, and while management believes that the estimates of loss are reasonable, the ultimate liability may be in excess of or less than the recorded amounts. Due to the inherent volatility of actuarially determined loss estimates, it is reasonably possible that we could experience changes in estimated losses that could be material to net income. If our actual liability exceeds its estimates of loss, its future earnings, cash flows and financial condition would be adversely affected.

Income Taxes

Deferred tax assets and liabilities are established for temporary differences between the financial reporting basis and the tax basis of our assets and liabilities at tax rates in effect when such temporary differences are expected to reverse. We generally expect to fully utilize our deferred tax assets; however, when necessary, we record a valuation allowance to reduce our net deferred tax assets to the amount that is more likely than not to be realized.

When we take uncertain income tax positions that do not meet the recognition criteria, we record a liability for underpayment of income taxes and related interest and penalties, if any. In considering the need for and magnitude of a liability for such positions, we must consider the potential outcomes from a review of the positions by the taxing authorities.

In determining the need for a valuation allowance, the annual income tax rate, or the need for and magnitude of liabilities for uncertain tax positions, we make certain estimates and assumptions. These estimates and assumptions are based on, among other things, knowledge of operations, markets, historical trends and likely future changes and, when appropriate, the opinions of advisors with knowledge and expertise in certain fields. Due to certain risks associated with our estimates and assumptions, actual results could differ.

Noncontrolling Interest

The noncontrolling interest in a subsidiary is initially recognized at estimated fair value on the acquisition date and is presented within total equity in our consolidated balance sheets. We present the noncontrolling interest and the amount of consolidated net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc. in our consolidated statements of income and net income per share is calculated based on net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.'s stockholders. The carrying amount of the noncontrolling interest is adjusted based on an allocation of subsidiary earnings based on ownership interest.

Derivatives and Hedging Activities

We evaluate variable and fixed interest rate risk exposure on a routine basis and to the extent we believe that it is appropriate, we will offset most of our variable risk exposure by entering into interest rate swap agreements. It is our policy to only utilize derivative instruments for hedging purposes (i.e. not for speculation). We formally designate our interest rate swap agreements as hedges and document all relationships between hedging instruments and hedged items. We formally assess the effectiveness of our hedging relationships, both at the hedge inception and on an ongoing basis, then measure and record ineffectiveness. We would discontinue hedge accounting prospectively (i) if it is determined that the derivative is no longer effective in offsetting change in the cash flows of a hedged item, (ii) when the derivative expires or is sold, terminated or exercised, (iii) if it is no longer probable that the forecasted transaction will occur, or (iv) if management determines that designation of the derivative as a hedge instrument is no longer appropriate. The Company's derivative is recorded on the balance sheet at its fair value.

Table of Contents

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

Except for rules and interpretive releases of the SEC under authority of federal securities laws and a limited number of grandfathered standards, the FASB Accounting Standards Codification™ (ASC) is the sole source of authoritative GAAP literature recognized by the FASB and applicable to the Company. The Company has reviewed the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) accounting pronouncements and interpretations thereof that have effectiveness dates during the periods reported and in future periods. The Company has carefully considered the new pronouncements that alter previous generally accepted accounting principles and does not believe that any new or modified principles will have a material impact on the Company's reported financial position or operations in the near term. The applicability of any standard is subject to the formal review of the Company's financial management and certain standards are under consideration.

Additionally, the FASB and the International Accounting Standards Board are working on joint convergence projects to address accounting differences between GAAP and International Financial Reporting Standards in order to support their commitment to achieve a single set of high-quality global accounting standards. One of the projects under deliberation includes accounting for leases. If enacted in its current draft form, we anticipate that the lease accounting proposal could have an impact on our consolidated financial statements; however the FASB's standard-setting process is ongoing and until new standards have been finalized and issued, we cannot quantify and determine the impact on our consolidated financial statements that may result from such future changes.

Table of Contents

Results of Operations

The following table sets forth details of our revenue, expenses and earnings as a percentage of total revenue for the periods indicated:

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2013		2012		2011	
Revenue	100.0		% 100.0		% 100.0	%
Expenses:						
Cost of services (exclusive of facility rent, general and administrative expense and depreciation and amortization shown separately below)	80.3		79.7		79.2	
U.S. Government inquiry settlement	3.6		1.8		—	
Facility rent—cost of services	1.5		1.6		1.8	
General and administrative expense	4.4		3.9		3.9	
Depreciation and amortization	3.8		3.4		3.1	
Total expenses	93.6		90.4		88.0	
Income from operations	6.4		9.6		12.0	
Other income (expense):						
Interest expense	(1.4)	(1.5)	(1.8)
Interest income	—		—		—	
Other expense, net	(1.4)	(1.5)	(1.8)
Income before provision for income taxes	5.0		8.1		10.2	
Provision for income taxes	2.2		3.1		3.9	
Income from continuing operations	2.8		5.0		6.3	
Loss from discontinued operations	(0.2)	(0.2)	—	
Net income	2.6		4.8		6.3	
Less: net loss attributable to the noncontrolling interests	(0.1)	(0.1)	—	
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	2.7	%	4.9	%	6.3	%

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2013 Compared to Year Ended December 31, 2012

	Years Ended December 31,		Change	%	
	2013	2012			
	(Dollars in thousands)				
Total Facility Results:					
Revenue	\$904,556	\$823,155	\$81,401	9.9	%
Number of facilities at period end	119	108	11	10.2	%
Actual patient days	3,648,651	3,452,598	196,053	5.7	%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	77.5	% 79.0	%	(1.5))%
Skilled mix by nursing days	26.4	% 25.9	%	0.5	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	50.0	% 50.0	%	—	%
Same Facility Results(1):					
Revenue	\$679,610	\$670,747	\$8,863	1.3	%
Number of facilities at period end	77	77	—	—	%
Actual patient days	2,618,541	2,638,029	(19,488)	(0.7))%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	80.8	% 81.2	%	(0.4))%
Skilled mix by nursing days	28.3	% 27.5	%	0.8	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	52.1	% 52.0	%	0.1	%
Transitioning Facility Results(2):					
Revenue	\$141,180	\$135,639	\$5,541	4.1	%
Number of facilities at period end	25	25	—	—	%
Actual patient days	724,243	736,995	(12,752)	(1.7))%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	73.8	% 74.9	%	(1.1))%
Skilled mix by nursing days	20.2	% 18.2	%	2.0	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	42.0	% 39.2	%	2.8	%
Recently Acquired Facility Results(3):					
Revenue	\$83,766	\$16,769	\$66,997	NM	
Number of facilities at period end	17	6	11	NM	
Actual patient days	305,867	77,574	228,293	NM	
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	62.7	% 55.5	%	NM	
Skilled mix by nursing days	18.0	% 11.2	%	NM	
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	38.1	% 20.9	%	NM	

(1) Same Facility results represent all facilities purchased prior to January 1, 2010.

(2)

Transitioning Facility results represents all facilities purchased from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011.

(3) Recently Acquired Facility (or “Acquisitions”) results represent all facilities purchased on or subsequent to January 1, 2012.

Table of Contents

Revenue. Revenue increased \$81.4 million, or 9.9%, to \$904.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to \$823.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Of the \$81.4 million increase, Medicare and managed care revenue increased \$26.2 million, or 6.8%, Medicaid custodial revenue increased \$21.8 million, or 7.2%, private and other revenue increased \$22.7 million, or 20.5% and Medicaid skilled revenue increased \$10.7 million, or 42.0%. Revenue generated by Recently Acquired Facilities increased by approximately \$67.0 million. Since January 1, 2012, the Company has acquired seventeen facilities, five home health and four hospice operations in seven states.

Revenue generated by Same Facilities increased \$8.9 million, or 1.3%, for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to the year ended December 31, 2012. This increase was primarily due to an increase in skilled mix days of 0.8% to 28.3% as compared to 2012. This increase was primarily due to an increase in managed care days of 11.1% during the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012, partially offset by a decrease in Medicare days of 5.4% during the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012.

Revenue at Transitioning Facilities increased by \$5.5 million, or 4.1% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012. This increase was due to a 2.0% increase in skilled mix days primarily attributable to increases in Medicare days of 5.6% and managed care days of 13.3% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012.

The following table reflects the change in the skilled nursing average daily revenue rates by payor source, excluding services that are not covered by the daily rate:

	Years Ended		Transitioning		Acquisitions		Total		% Change
	December 31, Same Facility 2013	December 31, 2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	
Skilled Nursing Average Daily Revenue Rates:									
Medicare	\$564.45	\$555.44	\$474.16	\$471.25	\$461.98	\$418.73	\$544.51	\$541.63	0.5 %
Managed care	398.86	391.08	378.70	395.32	458.55	427.52	400.44	391.32	2.3 %
Other skilled	455.88	457.58	708.32	529.85	253.00	—	460.76	458.67	0.5 %
Total skilled revenue	492.13	490.63	462.86	460.25	460.78	418.88	487.53	486.98	0.1 %
Medicaid	176.97	168.85	158.45	155.16	167.26	204.57	174.04	167.78	3.7 %
Private and other payors	188.44	189.62	167.45	165.93	154.87	168.26	179.40	181.52	(1.2) %
Total skilled nursing revenue	\$267.38	\$259.48	\$222.39	\$213.93	\$218.10	\$223.11	\$257.67	\$252.18	2.2 %

The average Medicare daily rate increased by 0.5%. This rate was impacted by a 1.8% market basket increase, which went into effect in October 2012 and a market basket increase of 1.3%, which went into effect October 2013. These market basket increases were offset by a 2% sequestration payment reduction that went into effect on April 1, 2013. The average Medicaid daily rate increased 3.7% for the year ended December 31, 2013 relative to the same period in the prior year, primarily due to increases in rates in various states, including Arizona and California.

Table of Contents

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

	Years Ended December 31,									
	Same Facility		Transitioning		Acquisitions		Total			
	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012
Percentage of Skilled Nursing Revenue:										
Medicare	31.3	% 33.0	% 35.1	% 33.3	% 26.6	% 20.6	% 31.4	% 32.9	%	
Managed care	15.2	13.7	5.7	5.3	11.5	0.3	13.9	12.4		
Other skilled	5.6	5.3	1.2	0.6	—	—	4.7	4.7		
Skilled mix	52.1	52.0	42.0	39.2	38.1	20.9	50.0	50.0		
Private and other payors	7.5	7.6	21.4	22.6	12.1	11.2	9.5	9.5		
Quality mix	59.6	59.6	63.4	61.8	50.2	32.1	59.5	59.5		
Medicaid	40.4	40.4	36.6	38.2	49.8	67.9	40.5	40.5		
Total skilled nursing	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%	%

	Years Ended December 31,									
	Same Facility		Transitioning		Acquisitions		Total			
	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012
Percentage of Skilled Nursing Days:										
Medicare	14.8	% 15.4	% 16.5	% 15.1	% 12.6	% 11.0	% 14.8	% 15.3	%	
Managed care	10.2	9.1	3.3	2.8	5.4	0.2	8.9	8.0		
Other skilled	3.3	3.0	0.4	0.3	—	—	2.7	2.6		
Skilled mix	28.3	27.5	20.2	18.2	18.0	11.2	26.4	25.9		
Private and other payors	10.7	10.4	28.4	29.2	17.0	14.7	13.7	13.2		
Quality mix	39.0	37.9	48.6	47.4	35.0	25.9	40.1	39.1		
Medicaid	61.0	62.1	51.4	52.6	65.0	74.1	59.9	60.9		
Total skilled nursing	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%	%

Cost of Services (exclusive of facility rent and depreciation and amortization shown separately). Cost of services increased \$69.6 million, or 10.6%, to \$726.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to \$656.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Of the \$69.6 million increase, Same Facilities increased \$7.9 million, or 1.5%, and Recently Acquired Facilities increased \$55.9 million. The increase at Same Facilities was primarily related to an increase in quality assurance fee of \$3.7 million in certain states where related Medicaid rates were also increased. In addition, we recorded additional costs of \$1.5 million related to the class action staffing lawsuit during the year ended December 31, 2013. Cost of services increased as a percent of total revenue to 80.3% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 79.7% for the year ended December 31, 2012.

Charge Related to U.S. Government Inquiry. The Company recorded an additional charge in the amount of \$33.0 million during the year ended December 31, 2013 related to investigation into some of our subsidiaries conducted by the DOJ. During the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company accrued an estimated liability of \$15.0 million. See further discussion of the DOJ investigation and related estimated settlement in Liquidity and Capital Resources.

Facility Rent — Cost of Services. Facility rent — cost of services increased \$0.3 million, or 2.3%, to \$13.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to \$13.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Facility rent-cost of services decreased as a percent of total revenue to 1.5% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 1.6% for the year ended December 31, 2012.

Table of Contents

General and Administrative Expense. General and administrative expense increased \$8.3 million, or 26.1%, to \$40.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to \$31.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. General and administrative expenses increased as a percent of total revenue to 4.4% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 3.9% for the year ended December 31, 2012. The \$8.3 million increase was primarily due to costs incurred in connection with the Company's proposed spin-off of its real estate assets to a newly formed publicly traded real estate investment trust (REIT) and wages and benefits as a result of enhancements made to its internal compliance team.

Depreciation and Amortization. Depreciation and amortization expense increased \$5.5 million, or 19.4%, to \$33.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to \$28.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Depreciation and amortization expense increased as a percent of total revenue to 3.8% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 3.4% for the year ended December 31, 2012. This increase was primarily related to the additional depreciation of \$3.5 million at Recently Acquired Facilities, as well as an increase of \$1.9 million at Same Facilities due to recent renovations and the purchase of the underlying assets of three of our skilled nursing facilities which we previously operated under long-term lease agreements during the year ended December 31, 2012. Of the \$3.5 million increase at Recently Acquired Facilities, \$0.7 million represented amortization expense of patient base intangible assets which are amortized over four to eight months.

Other Income (Expense). Other expense, net increased \$0.3 million, or 2.6%, to \$12.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to \$12.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. Other expenses, net decreased as a percent of total revenue to 1.4% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 1.5% for the year ended December 31, 2012.

Provision for Income Taxes. Provision for income taxes decreased \$5.1 million, or 20.3%, to \$20.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to \$25.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2012. This decrease resulted from the decrease in income before income taxes. Our effective tax rate was 43.8% for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to 37.9% for the year ended December 31, 2012.

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2012 Compared to the Year Ended December 31, 2011

	Years Ended December 31,		Change	% Change	
	2012	2011			
	(Dollars in thousands)				
Total Facility Results:					
Revenue	\$823,155	\$758,277	\$64,878	8.6	%
Number of facilities at period end	108	102	6	5.9	%
Actual patient days	3,452,598	3,124,724	327,874	10.5	%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	79.0	% 79.2	%	(0.2))%
Skilled mix by nursing days	25.9	% 25.5	%	0.4	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	50.0	% 51.3	%	(1.3))%
	Years Ended December 31,		Change	% Change	
	2012	2011			
	(Dollars in thousands)				
Same Facility Results(1):					
Revenue	\$563,719	\$568,087	\$(4,368)	(0.8))%
Number of facilities at period end	62	62	—	—	%
Actual patient days	2,152,011	2,137,951	14,060	0.7	%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	82.7	% 82.2	%	0.5	%
Skilled mix by nursing days	29.5	% 29.0	%	0.5	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	54.2	% 55.4	%	(1.2))%
	Years Ended December 31,		Change	% Change	
	2012	2011			
	(Dollars in thousands)				
Transitioning Facility Results(2):					
Revenue	\$147,104	\$138,521	\$8,583	6.2	%
Number of facilities at period end	20	20	—	—	%
Actual patient days	662,290	640,396	21,894	3.4	%
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	75.0	% 72.7	%	2.3	%
Skilled mix by nursing days	18.3	% 16.3	%	2.0	%
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	39.0	% 37.3	%	1.7	%
	Years Ended December 31,		Change	% Change	
	2012	2011			
	(Dollars in thousands)				
Recently Acquired Facility Results(3):					
Revenue	\$112,332	\$51,669	\$60,663	NM	
Number of facilities at period end	26	20	6	NM	
Actual patient days	638,297	346,377	291,920	NM	
Occupancy percentage — Operational beds	72.1	% 74.9	%	NM	
Skilled mix by nursing days	17.5	% 14.2	%	NM	
Skilled mix by nursing revenue	38.2	% 34.0	%	NM	

(1) Same Facility results represent all facilities purchased prior to January 1, 2009.

(2) Transitioning Facility results represents all facilities purchased from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2010.

(3) Recently Acquired Facility (or “Acquisitions”) results represent all facilities purchased on or subsequent to January 1, 2011.

74

Table of Contents

Revenue. Revenue increased \$64.9 million, or 8.6%, to \$823.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$758.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. Of the \$64.9 million increase, Medicare and managed care revenue increased—\$18.3 million, or 5.0%, Medicaid revenue increased \$24.3 million, or 8.8%, private and other revenue increased \$17.2 million, or 20.0% and other skilled revenue increased \$5.1 million, or 25.3%. Revenue generated by Recently Acquired Facilities increased by approximately \$60.7 million, due to the Company's acquisition of 26 facilities, five home health and two hospice operations in ten states since January 1, 2011.

Revenue generated by Same Facilities decreased \$4.4 million, or 0.8%, for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2011. Medicare revenue per patient day at Same Facilities decreased 8.6% during the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2011. This decrease was primarily due to the impact of the CMS-imposed 11.1% reduction in Medicare skilled nursing PPS payments and therapy changes, which were implemented on October 1, 2011. This reduction was partially offset by an increase in occupancy of 0.5% to 82.7%, as well as an increase in skilled mix by nursing days of 0.5%, to 29.5%, which was the result of an increase in other skilled patient days at Same Facilities of 9.8%, as well as increases in Medicare and managed care patient days as compared to the year ended December 31, 2011.

Revenue at Transitioning Facilities increased by \$8.6 million, or 6.2%, for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to the year ended December 31, 2011. This increase was achieved despite a decrease in Medicare revenue per patient day of 7.1% at Transitioning Facilities for the year ended December 31, 2012. This increase in revenue was primarily due to an increase in occupancy of 2.3% to 75.0%, as well as an increase in skilled mix by nursing days of 2.0%, to 18.3%, which was the result of increases in managed care and Medicare patient days of 35.4% and 6.6%, respectively, as compared to the year ended December 31, 2011.

The following table reflects the change in the skilled nursing average daily revenue rates by payor source, excluding services that are not covered by the daily rate:

	Years Ended December 31,								% Change
	Same Facility 2012	2011	Transitioning 2012	2011	Acquisitions 2012	2011	Total 2012	2011	
Skilled Nursing Average Daily Revenue Rates:									
Medicare	\$564.94	\$618.22	\$485.07	\$522.28	\$471.49	\$464.57	\$541.63	\$595.30	(9.0) %
Managed care	377.94	367.74	408.23	415.82	400.94	408.28	382.13	372.41	2.6 %
Other skilled	521.11	542.93	571.97	554.10	610.62	—	528.00	564.60	(6.5) %
Total skilled revenue	492.71	519.82	470.08	497.87	461.19	458.06	486.98	515.90	(5.6) %
Medicaid	170.76	168.36	164.91	161.43	154.04	138.48	167.78	165.11	1.6 %
Private and other payors	196.64	188.21	167.34	173.40	165.64	158.35	181.52	179.42	1.2 %
Total skilled nursing revenue	\$268.24	\$272.35	\$221.20	\$218.01	\$211.56	\$191.02	\$252.18	\$256.34	(1.6) %

The 2011 results include the impact of the implementation of RUGS IV on both revenue reimbursement and related cost structure changes included in MDS 3.0 and concurrent therapy in the first three quarters of 2011. Medicare daily rates decreased by 9.0%, due to the impact of the CMS imposed 11.1% reduction in Medicare skilled nursing PPS payments and therapy changes, which were implemented in October 2011. The average Medicaid rate increased 1.6% for the year ended December 31, 2012 relative to the same period in the prior year, primarily due to increases in rates in several states and increased acuity in case mix states where rates were cut, partially offset by decreases in rates in Arizona due to changes in base reimbursement rates.

Historically, we have generally experienced lower occupancy rates, lower skilled mix and quality mix at Recently Acquired Facilities and therefore, we anticipate generally lower overall occupancy during years of growth. In the future, if we acquire additional facilities into our overall portfolio, we expect this trend to continue. Accordingly, we anticipate our overall occupancy will vary from quarter to quarter based upon the maturity of the facilities within our portfolio.

Table of Contents

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

	Years Ended December 31,									
	Same Facility		Transitioning		Acquisitions		Total			
	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011
Percentage of Skilled Nursing Revenue:										
Medicare	34.4	% 37.1	% 26.3	% 28.3	% 33.3	% 30.5	% 32.9	% 35.3	%	
Managed care	15.6	14.7	9.4	7.5	4.9	3.5	13.4	12.9		
Other skilled	4.2	3.6	3.3	1.5	—	—	3.7	3.1		
Skilled mix	54.2	55.4	39.0	37.3	38.2	34.0	50.0	51.3		
Private and other payors	7.1	7.1	10.3	10.6	24.9	30.3	9.5	8.8		
Quality mix	61.3	62.5	49.3	47.9	63.1	64.3	59.5	60.1		
Medicaid	38.7	37.5	50.7	52.1	36.9	35.7	40.5	39.9		
Total skilled nursing	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%	%

	Years Ended December 31,									
	Same Facility		Transitioning		Acquisitions		Total			
	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011
Percentage of Skilled Nursing Days:										
Medicare	16.3	% 16.3	% 12.0	% 11.8	% 14.9	% 12.5	% 15.3	% 15.2	%	%
Managed care	11.2	10.9	5.1	3.9	2.6	1.7	9.0	8.9		
Other skilled	2.0	1.8	1.2	0.6	—	—	1.6	1.4		
Skilled mix	29.5	29.0	18.3	16.3	17.5	14.2	25.9	25.5		
Private and other payors	9.7	10.3	13.6	13.4	31.9	36.6	13.2	12.6		
Quality mix	39.2	39.3	31.9	29.7	49.4	50.8	39.1	38.1		
Medicaid	60.8	60.7	68.1	70.3	50.6	49.2	60.9	61.9		
Total skilled nursing	100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	%	%

Cost of Services (exclusive of facility rent and depreciation and amortization shown separately). Cost of services increased \$55.6 million, or 9.3%, to \$656.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$600.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. Of the \$55.6 million increase, Same Facilities increased \$1.4 million, or 0.3% and Recently Acquired Facilities increased \$49.0 million. The \$1.4 million increase in Same Facility cost of services was primarily due to an increase in ancillary expenses, partially offset by decreases in wages and benefits. The increase in ancillary expenses was primarily due to increased therapy costs as was anticipated due to the change in therapy regulation implemented on October 1, 2011. The decrease in wages and benefits was primarily due to reduced performance during the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to 2011. Included in the \$49.0 million increase in cost of services at Recently Acquired Facilities were impairment charges to intangible assets of \$2.2 million resulting from a decline in fair value of DRX. See further discussion of impairment charges at Note 11, Goodwill and Other Indefinite-Lived Intangibles in Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements. Cost of services increased as a percent of total revenue to 79.7% for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to 79.2% for the year ended December 31, 2011.

Charge Related to U.S. Government Inquiry. During the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company accrued an estimated liability of \$15.0 million related to the ongoing investigation into some of our subsidiaries being conducted by the DOJ. See further discussion of the DOJ investigation and related estimated settlement in Liquidity and Capital Resources.

Table of Contents

Facility Rent — Cost of Services. Facility rent — cost of services decreased \$0.4 million, or 2.9%, to \$13.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$13.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. Facility rent-cost of services decreased as a percent of total revenue to 1.6% for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to 1.8% for the year ended December 31, 2011. The decrease in facility rent is due to our purchase of the underlying assets of eight of our skilled nursing facilities in California, Utah and Idaho which we previously operated under long-term lease agreements, partially offset by additional rent recognized for a facility for which the Company has begun construction activities, but has not commenced operations of a skilled nursing facility as of December 31, 2012, new leases related to our urgent care centers, and normal annual increases in rent at leased facilities.

General and Administrative Expense. General and administrative expense increased \$2.0 million, or 6.7%, to \$31.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$29.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. General and administrative expenses remained consistent as a percent of total revenue at 3.9% for the year ended December 31, 2012 and 2011. The \$2.0 million increase was primarily due to increases in wages and benefits due to our growth and increased legal costs incurred in connection with the ongoing investigation into the billing and reimbursement process of some of our subsidiaries being conducted by the DOJ.

Depreciation and Amortization. Depreciation and amortization expense increased \$5.1 million, or 21.9%, to \$28.4 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$23.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2011.

Depreciation and amortization expense increased as a percent of total revenue to 3.4% for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to 3.1% for the year ended December 31, 2011. This increase was primarily related to the additional depreciation of \$1.9 million at Recently Acquired Facilities, as well as increases of \$2.0 million and \$1.2 million at Same and Transitioning Facilities, respectively, due to recent renovations and the purchase of the underlying assets of eight of our skilled nursing facilities which we previously operated under a long-term lease agreements. Of the \$1.9 million increase at Recently Acquired Facilities, \$0.5 million represented amortization expense of patient base intangible assets which are amortized over four to eight months.

Other Income (Expense). Other expense, net decreased \$1.5 million, or 11.5%, to \$12.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$13.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. The decrease in other expense, net was primarily the result of a one-time exit fee and related extinguishment fees of \$2.5 million upon prepaying the Six Project Note and exiting our former revolving credit facility during the year ended December 31, 2011. This decrease was partially offset by increased interest expense due to the additional \$21.5 million in long-term debt added with the promissory notes with RBS Asset Finance, Inc. (2012 RBS Loan) in February 2012.

Provision for Income Taxes. Provision for income taxes decreased \$4.4 million, or 14.9%, to \$25.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$29.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2011. This decrease resulted from the decrease in income before income taxes of \$10.9 million, or 14.1%. In addition, our effective tax rate decreased 0.3% to 37.9% for the year ended December 31, 2012 as compared to 38.2% for the year ended December 31, 2011.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our primary sources of liquidity have historically been derived from our cash flow from operations and long-term debt secured by our real property and our revolving credit facilities.

Since 2004, we have financed the majority of our facility acquisitions primarily through refinancing of existing facilities, and cash generated from operations. Cash paid for business acquisitions was \$45.4 million, \$31.6 million and \$106.7 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. Cash paid for asset acquisitions was \$0, \$11.3 million and \$23.4 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. Where we enter into a facility lease agreement, we typically do not pay any material amount to the prior facility operator, nor do we acquire any assets or assume any liabilities, other than our rights and obligations under the new lease and operations transfer agreement, as part of the transaction. Total capital expenditures for property and equipment were \$29.8 million, \$38.9 million and \$40.8 million for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. We currently have a combined \$30.0 million budgeted for renovation projects for 2014.

We believe our current cash balances, our cash flow from operations and the revolving credit facility portion of our senior credit facility with a six-bank lending consortium arranged by SunTrust and Wells Fargo (the Senior Credit Facility), which was increased from \$75.0 million to \$150.0 million on February 1, 2013, will be sufficient to cover our operating needs for at least the next 12 months. We may in the future seek to raise additional capital to fund growth, capital renovations, operations and other business activities, but such additional capital may not be available on acceptable terms, on a timely basis, or at all.

Table of Contents

Our cash and cash equivalents as of December 31, 2013 consisted of bank term deposits, money market funds and U.S. Treasury bill related investments. In addition, as of December 31, 2013, we held debt security investments of approximately \$22.4 million, which were split between AA- and A-rated securities. Our market risk exposure is interest income sensitivity, which is affected by changes in the general level of U.S. interest rates. The primary objective of our investment activities is to preserve principal while at the same time maximizing the income we receive from our investments without significantly increasing risk. Due to the low risk profile of our investment portfolio, an immediate 10% change in interest rates would not have a material effect on the fair market value of our portfolio. Accordingly, we would not expect our operating results or cash flows to be affected to any significant degree by the effect of a sudden change in market interest rates on our securities portfolio.

In connection with the Spin-Off, we anticipate that CareTrust will assume the mortgage debt related to certain of the properties it acquires. CareTrust will also issue senior unsecured notes and mortgage indebtedness. A portion of those proceeds is expected to be transferred to us. We expect that we will use the proceeds to repay certain outstanding third-party bank debt and other indebtedness and, subject to the approval of and declaration by our board of directors, pay up to eight regular quarterly dividends. The Spin-Off and related transactions are subject to conditions, and their terms are subject to change in the sole discretion of our board of directors. Further details can be found at CareTrust's registration statement on Form 10 (File No. 001-36181) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 13, 2014.

The following table presents selected data from our consolidated statement of cash flows for the periods presented:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands)		
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$37,424	\$82,050	\$72,687
Net cash used in investing activities	(65,235)	(84,496)	(156,052)
Net cash provided by financing activities	52,881	13,547	40,861
Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	25,070	11,101	(42,504)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	40,685	29,584	72,088
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$65,755	\$40,685	\$29,584

Year Ended December 31, 2013 Compared to Year Ended December 31, 2012

Net cash provided by operations for the year ended December 31, 2013 was \$37.4 million compared to \$82.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2012, a decrease of \$44.7 million. This decrease was primarily due to the payment of the U.S. Government investigation settlement of \$15.0 million, an increase in accounts receivable of \$11.1 million as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012 and an increase in prepaid income taxes of \$8.2 million as compared to the year ended December 31, 2012, due to the timing of payments.

Net cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2013 was \$65.2 million compared to \$84.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2012, a decrease of \$19.3 million. The decrease was primarily the result of \$71.3 million in cash paid for business acquisitions, asset acquisitions and purchased property and equipment in the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to \$86.2 million in the year ended December 31, 2012, a decrease of \$14.9 million. The remainder of this difference is due to cash proceeds received on the sale of the Company's urgent care franchising business of \$3.6 million and equity method investment of \$1.6 million during the year ended December 31, 2013.

Net cash provided by financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2013 was \$52.9 million as compared to \$13.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2012, an increase of \$39.4 million. This increase was primarily due to the receipt of \$58.7 million in borrowing proceeds from our Senior Credit Facility during the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to \$36.5 million during the year ended December 31, 2012, an increase of \$22.2 million, combined with a decrease in long-term debt repayments of \$7.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to \$16.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012, a decrease of \$9.6 million.

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2012 Compared to Year Ended December 31, 2011

Net cash provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2012 was \$82.1 million compared to \$72.7 million for the year ended December 31, 2011, an increase of \$9.4 million. The increase was primarily due to our improved operating results, which contributed \$94.5 million in 2012 after adding back depreciation and amortization, the charge related to U.S. Government inquiry, impairment charges, deferred income taxes, provision for doubtful accounts, share-based compensation, excess tax benefits from share-based compensation and loss on disposition of property and equipment (non-cash charges), as compared to \$85.3 million for 2011, an increase of \$9.2 million.

Net cash used in investing activities for the year ended December 31, 2012 was \$84.5 million compared to \$156.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2011, a decrease of \$71.8 million. The decrease was primarily the result of \$86.2 million in cash paid for business acquisitions, asset acquisitions and purchased property and equipment in the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to \$156.7 million in the year ended December 31, 2011.

Net cash provided by financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2012 was \$13.5 million as compared to \$40.9 million for the year ended December 31, 2011, a decrease of \$27.4 million. This decrease was primarily due to the receipt of \$75.0 million in proceeds from the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility during the year ended December 31, 2011 as compared to \$21.5 million in proceeds received from the 2012 RBS Loan during the year ended December 31, 2012, a decrease of \$53.5 million. The reduction in long-term debt proceeds received was partially offset by a decrease in long-term debt repayments from \$46.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2011 to \$16.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2012, a difference of \$29.5 million. The remaining decrease is due to the use of long-term debt proceeds to repay existing debt in the prior year.

Principal Debt Obligations and Capital Expenditures

Total long-term debt obligations, net of debt discount, outstanding as of December 31, 2013, 2012, 2011, 2010 and 2009 were as follows:

	December 31,				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
	(in thousands)				
Senior Credit Facility	\$—	\$—	\$88,125	\$89,375	\$144,325
Ten Project Note	53,200	52,229	51,185	50,072	48,864
Six Project Loan	39,970	39,495	—	—	—
Mortgage Loan and Promissory Notes	15,064	49,744	48,560	68,245	66,117
Bond payable	1,232	1,038	—	—	—
Total	\$109,466	\$142,506	\$187,870	\$207,692	\$259,306

The following table represents the Company's cumulative facility growth from 2008 to the present:

	December 31,					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Cumulative number of facilities	63	77	82	102	108	119

Senior Credit Facility with a Lending Consortium Arranged by SunTrust and Wells Fargo (the Senior Credit Facility)

On April 22, 2013, we entered into the fourth amendment to the Senior Credit Facility (the Fourth Amendment), which amended our existing Senior Credit Facility Agreement, dated as of July 15, 2011, to amend certain covenants, representations and other key provisions in the credit agreement to, among other things, (i) allow for the settlement relating to the previously disclosed federal civil investigation that has been conducted by the U.S. DOJ and related federal agencies in an amount up to \$50.0 million and (ii) permit us to enter into a corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS. Except as set forth in the Fourth Amendment, all other terms and conditions of the Senior Credit Facility, as amended, remain in full force.

Table of Contents

On February 1, 2013, we entered into the third amendment to the Senior Credit Facility (the Third Amendment), which amended our existing Senior Credit Facility Agreement, dated as of July 15, 2011. The Third Amendment revised the Senior Credit Facility Agreement to, among other things, (i) increase the revolving credit portion of the Senior Credit Facility by \$75.0 million to an aggregate principal amount of \$150.0 million, of which \$78.7 million was drawn as of December 31, 2013, and (ii) extend the maturity date of the Senior Credit Facility from July 15, 2016 to February 1, 2018. Except as set forth in the Third Amendment, all other terms and conditions of the Senior Credit Facility remained in full force and effect as described below.

On July 15, 2011, we entered into the Senior Credit Facility in an aggregate principal amount of up to \$150.0 million comprised of a \$75.0 million revolving credit facility and a \$75.0 million term loan advanced in one drawing on July 15, 2011. Borrowings under the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility amortize in equal quarterly installments that commenced on September 30, 2011, in an aggregate annual amount equal to 5.0% per annum of the original principal amount. Interest rates per annum applicable to the Senior Facility will be, at our option, (i) LIBOR plus an initial margin of 2.5% or (ii) the Base Rate (as defined under the Senior Credit Facility) plus an initial margin of 1.5%. Under the terms of the Senior Credit Facility, the applicable margin adjusts based on our leverage ratio as set forth in further detail in the Senior Credit Facility agreement. Amounts borrowed pursuant to the Senior Credit Facility are guaranteed by certain of our wholly-owned subsidiaries and secured by substantially all of our personal property. To reduce the risk related to interest rate fluctuations, we, on behalf of the subsidiaries, entered into an interest rate swap agreement to effectively fix the interest rate on the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility. See further details of the interest rate swap at Note 6, Fair Value Measurements in Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

Among other things, under the Senior Credit Facility, we must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a maximum net leverage ratio, minimum interest coverage ratio and minimum asset coverage ratio. The loan documents also include certain additional reporting, affirmative and negative covenants including limitations on the incurrence of additional indebtedness, liens, investments in other businesses, dividends declared in excess of 20% of consolidated net income, stock repurchases and capital expenditures. As of December 31, 2013, we were in compliance with all loan covenants. As of December 31, 2013, our subsidiaries had \$144.3 million outstanding on the Senior Credit Facility.

Promissory Notes with RBS Asset Finance, Inc.

On February 22, 2012, two of our real estate holding subsidiaries as Borrowers executed a promissory note in favor of RBS Asset Finance, Inc. (RBS) as Lender for an aggregate of \$21.5 million (the 2012 RBS Loan). The 2012 RBS Loan was secured by a Commercial Deed of Trust, Security Agreement, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Fixture Filings on the two properties owned by the two Borrowers, and other related instruments and agreements, including without limitation a promissory note and a Company guaranty. The 2012 RBS Loan bears interest at a fixed rate of 4.75%. Amounts borrowed under the 2012 RBS Loan may be prepaid starting after the second anniversary of the note subject to certain prepayment fees. The term of the RBS Loan is for seven years, with monthly principal and interest payments commencing on March 1, 2012 and the balance due on March 1, 2019.

Among other things, under the 2012 RBS Loan, we must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a minimum debt service coverage ratio, an average occupancy rate and a minimum project yield. The Loan Documents also include certain additional affirmative and negative covenants, including limitations on the disposition of the Borrowers and the collateral and minimum average cash balance requirements. As of December 31, 2013, we were in compliance with all loan covenants. As of December 31, 2013, our subsidiaries had \$20.3 million outstanding on the 2012 RBS Loan.

Promissory Notes with RBS Asset Finance, Inc.

On December 31, 2010, four of our real estate holding subsidiaries as Borrowers executed a promissory note with RBS as Lender for an aggregate of \$35.0 million (RBS Loan). The 2010 RBS Loan was secured by Commercial Deeds of Trust, Security Agreements, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Fixture Filings on the four properties owned by the four Borrowers, and other related instruments and agreements, including without limitation a promissory note and a Company guaranty. The 2010 RBS Loan bears interest at a fixed rate of 6.04%. Amounts borrowed under the 2010 RBS Loan may be prepaid starting after the second anniversary of the note subject to certain prepayment fees. The term of the 2010 RBS Loan is for seven years, with monthly principal and interest payments commencing on February 1, 2011 and the balance due on January 1, 2018.

Table of Contents

Among other things, under the 2010 RBS Loan, we must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a minimum debt service coverage ratio, an average occupancy rate and a minimum project yield. The Loan Documents also include certain additional affirmative and negative covenants, including limitations on the disposition of the Borrowers and the collateral and minimum average cash balance requirements. As of December 31, 2013, we were in compliance with all loan covenants. As of December 31, 2013, our subsidiaries had \$32.1 million outstanding on the 2010 RBS Loan.

Term Loan with General Electric Capital Corporation

On December 29, 2006, a number of our independent real estate holding subsidiaries jointly entered into the Third Amended and Restated Loan Agreement, with GECC, which consists of an approximately \$55.7 million multiple-advance term loan, further referred to as the Ten Project Note. The Ten Project Note matures in June 2016, and is currently secured by the real and personal property comprising the ten facilities owned by these subsidiaries. The Ten Project Note was funded in advances, with each advance bearing interest at a separate rate. The interest rates range from 6.95% to 7.50% per annum.

Under the Ten Project Note, we are subject to standard reporting requirements and other typical covenants for a loan of this type. Effective October 1, 2006 and continuing each calendar quarter thereafter, we are subject to restrictive financial covenants, including average occupancy, Debt Service (as defined in the agreement) and Project Yield (as defined in the agreement). As of December 31, 2013, we were in compliance with all loan covenants. As of December 31, 2013, our subsidiaries had \$48.9 million outstanding on the Ten Project Note.

Promissory Notes with Johnson Land Enterprises, Inc.

On October 1, 2009, four of our subsidiaries entered into four separate promissory notes with Johnson Land Enterprises, LLC, for an aggregate of \$10.0 million, as a part of our acquisition of three skilled nursing facilities in Utah. The unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest from these notes is due on September 30, 2019. The notes bear interest at a rate of 6.0% per annum. As a part of this transaction, the Company recorded a discount to the debt balance in the form of imputed interest of \$1.2 million. This amount will be amortized over the term of the promissory notes, or 10 years. As of December 31, 2013, our subsidiaries had \$8.9 million outstanding on the Promissory Notes.

Mortgage Loan with Continental Wingate Associates, Inc.

Ensign Southland LLC, a subsidiary of The Ensign Group, Inc., entered into a mortgage loan on January 30, 2001 with Continental Wingate Associates, Inc. The mortgage loan is insured with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or HUD, which subjects our Southland facility to HUD oversight and periodic inspections. As of December 31, 2013, the balance outstanding on this mortgage loan was approximately \$5.4 million. The unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest from this mortgage loan is due on February 1, 2027. The mortgage loan bears interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum.

This mortgage loan is secured by the real property comprising the Southland Care Center facility and the rents, issues and profits thereof, as well as all personal property used in the operation of the facility.

Common Stock Repurchase Program

In the fourth quarter of 2012, the board of directors authorized the renewal of our common stock repurchase program, authorizing the repurchase of up to \$10.0 million of our common stock over the next 12 months. Under this program, we are authorized to repurchase our issued and outstanding common shares from time to time in open-market and privately negotiated transactions and block trades in accordance with federal securities laws, including Rule 10b-18 promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as amended.

The number of shares repurchased will depend entirely upon the levels of cash available, the attractiveness of alternate investment and business opportunities either at hand or on the horizon, Management's perception of value relative to market price and other legal, regulatory and contractual requirements. The repurchase program does not obligate us to repurchase any particular dollar amount or number of shares of common stock. The repurchase program expired on November 15, 2013. During the year ended December 31, 2013, we did not repurchase any shares of our common stock. During the year ended December 31, 2012, we repurchased 7,340 shares of our common stock for a total of

\$0.2 million.

81

Table of Contents

Contractual Obligations, Commitments and Contingencies

Our principal contractual obligations and commitments as of December 31, 2013 were as follows:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Thereafter	Total
			(In thousands)				
Operating lease obligations	\$13,693	\$13,677	\$13,686	\$13,722	\$13,764	\$71,093	\$139,635
Long-term debt obligations	7,411	7,672	52,589	6,584	157,790	27,960	260,006
Interest payments on long-term debt	11,674	11,117	9,486	7,333	2,166	1,900	43,676
Total	\$32,778	\$32,466	\$75,761	\$27,639	\$173,720	\$100,953	\$443,317

Not included in the table above are our actuarially determined self-insured general and professional malpractice liability, worker's compensation and medical (including prescription drugs) and dental healthcare obligations which are broken out between current and long-term liabilities in our financial statements included in this annual report. We lease certain facilities and our Service Center office under operating leases, most of which have initial lease terms ranging from five to 20 years. Most of these leases contain options to renew or extend the lease term, some of which involve rent increases. We also lease a majority of our equipment under operating leases with initial terms ranging from three to five years. Total rent expense, inclusive of straight-line rent adjustments, was \$14.2 million, \$13.8 million and \$14.2 million during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

US Government Inquiry

In late 2006, we learned that we might be the subject of an on-going criminal and civil investigation by the DOJ. This was confirmed in March 2007. The investigation was prompted by a whistleblower complaint, and related primarily to claims submitted to the Medicare program for rehabilitation services provided at skilled nursing facilities in Southern California. We, through our outside counsel and a special committee of independent directors established by our board, worked cooperatively with the U.S. Attorney's office to produce information requested by the government as part of an ongoing dialogue designed to resolve the issue.

In December 2011, the DOJ notified us that it had closed its criminal investigation without action although, as is typical, it reserved the right to reopen the criminal case if new facts came to light. This left only the civil investigation to resolve, and we continued to supply requested information to the DOJ and the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), including specific patient records and documents from 2007 to 2011 from six Southern California skilled nursing facilities that had been the subject of previous requests.

In early 2013, discussions between government representatives and our special committee, our outside counsel and their experts had advanced sufficiently that we recorded an initial estimated liability in the amount of \$15.0 million in the fourth quarter of 2012 for the resolution of claims connected to the investigation. In April 2013, we and government representatives reached an agreement in principle to resolve the allegations and close the investigation. Based on these discussions, we recorded and announced an additional charge in the amount of \$33.0 million in the first quarter of 2013, increasing the total reserve to resolve the matter to \$48.0 million (the Reserve Amount).

In October 2013, we and the government executed a final settlement agreement in accordance with the April agreement and we remitted full payment of the Reserve Amount. In addition, we executed a corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General HHS as part of the resolution.

See additional description of our contingencies in Notes 15, 16, 17 and 19 in Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

Inflation

We have historically derived a substantial portion of our revenue from the Medicare program. We also derive revenue from state Medicaid and similar reimbursement programs. Payments under these programs generally provide for reimbursement levels that are adjusted for inflation annually based upon the state's fiscal year for the Medicaid programs and in each October for the Medicare program. These adjustments may not continue in the future, and even if received, such adjustments may not reflect the actual increase in our costs for providing healthcare services.

Table of Contents

Labor and supply expenses make up a substantial portion of our cost of services. Those expenses can be subject to increase in periods of rising inflation and when labor shortages occur in the marketplace. To date, we have generally been able to implement cost control measures or obtain increases in reimbursement sufficient to offset increases in these expenses. We may not be successful in offsetting future cost increases.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

As of December 31, 2013 and 2012, we had approximately \$2.0 million of borrowing capacity on the Revolver pledged as collateral to secure outstanding letters of credit, respectively.

Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk

Interest Rate Risk. We are exposed to interest rate changes in connection with the revolving credit facility portion of the Senior Credit Facility, which is available but historically has not regularly been used to maintain liquidity and fund capital expenditures and operations. Our interest rate risk management objective is to balance the impact of interest rate changes on earnings and cash flows and maintain a lower interest rate. To achieve this objective, we have historically borrowed primarily at fixed rates, although the revolving credit facility portion of the Senior Credit Facility is available and could be used for short-term borrowing purposes. As of December 31, 2013, we had outstanding borrowings under the revolving credit facility portion of the Facility of \$78.7 million.

The Senior Credit Facility agreement exposes us to variability in interest payments due to changes in LIBOR interest rates. We entered into an interest rate swap agreement to reduce risk from volatility in the income statement on the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility. The swap agreement, with a notional amount of \$75.0 million, amortizing concurrently with the related term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility, is five years in length and set to mature on February 1, 2018. Under the terms of this agreement, the net effect of the hedge was to record swap interest expense at a fixed rate of approximately 4.3%.

Our cash and cash equivalents as of December 31, 2013 consisted of bank term deposits, money market funds and U.S. Treasury bill related investments. In addition, as of December 31, 2013, we held debt security investments of approximately \$22.4 million, which were split between AA- and A-rated securities. Our market risk exposure is interest income sensitivity, which is affected by changes in the general level of U.S. interest rates. The primary objective of our investment activities is to preserve principal while at the same time maximizing the income we receive from our investments without significantly increasing risk. Due to the low risk profile of our investment portfolio, an immediate 10% change in interest rates would not have a material effect on the fair market value of our portfolio. Accordingly, we would not expect our operating results or cash flows to be affected to any significant degree by the effect of a sudden change in market interest rates on our securities portfolio.

The above only incorporates those exposures that exist as of December 31, 2013, and does not consider those exposures or positions which could arise after that date. If we diversify our investment portfolio into securities and other investment alternatives, we may face increased risk and exposures as a result of interest risk and the securities markets in general.

Table of Contents

Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data

Quarterly Financial Data (Unaudited)

The following table presents our unaudited quarterly consolidated results of operations for each of the eight quarters in the two-year period ended December 31, 2013. The unaudited quarterly consolidated information has been derived from our unaudited quarterly financial statements on Forms 10-Q, which were prepared on the same basis as our audited consolidated financial statements. You should read the following table presenting our quarterly consolidated results of operations in conjunction with our audited consolidated financial statements and the related notes included elsewhere in this Annual Report on Form 10-K. The operating results for any quarter are not necessarily indicative of the operating results for any future period

	Dec. 31, 2013	Sept. 30, 2013	June 30, 2013	Mar. 31, 2013	Dec. 31, 2012	Sept. 30, 2012	June 30, 2012	Mar. 31, 2012
(In thousands, except per share data)								
Revenue	\$237,008	\$229,261	\$220,086	\$218,201	\$210,505	\$206,691	\$203,919	\$202,040
Cost of services (exclusive of facility rent and depreciation and amortization)	187,843	186,172	175,913	176,061	169,133	164,579	162,085	160,627
Charge related to U.S. Government inquiry	—	—	—	33,000	15,000	—	—	—
Total expenses	211,893	208,972	196,794	228,955	202,553	183,184	180,587	178,558
Income (loss) from operations	25,115	20,289	23,292	(10,754)	7,952	23,507	23,332	23,482
Income (loss) from continuing operations	\$13,349	\$10,642	\$12,430	\$(10,763)	\$2,917	\$12,956	\$12,398	\$12,894
(Loss) income from discontinued operations	\$—	\$(30)	\$(26)	\$(1,748)	\$(1,252)	\$80	\$(119)	\$(66)
Net income (loss)	\$13,349	\$10,612	\$12,404	\$(12,511)	\$1,665	\$13,036	\$12,279	\$12,828
Income (loss) attributable to noncontrolling interests	\$(7)	\$148	\$37	\$(364)	\$(272)	\$(258)	\$(177)	\$(76)
Net income (loss) attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$13,356	\$10,464	\$12,367	\$(12,147)	\$1,937	\$13,294	\$12,456	\$12,904
Income (loss) from continuing operations attributable to the Ensign Group, Inc.	\$13,356	\$10,494	\$12,393	\$(10,399)	\$3,189	\$13,214	\$12,575	\$12,970
(Loss) income from discontinued operations	\$—	\$(30)	\$(26)	\$(1,748)	\$(1,252)	\$80	\$(119)	\$(66)
Net income (loss) attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$13,356	\$10,464	\$12,367	\$(12,147)	\$1,937	\$13,294	\$12,456	\$12,904
Basic income (loss) per share:								
Income (loss) from continuing operations	\$0.61	\$0.48	\$0.57	\$(0.48)	\$0.15	\$0.61	\$0.59	\$0.61

attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.								
(Loss) income from discontinued operations	\$—	\$—	\$—	\$(0.08)) \$(0.06)) \$0.01	\$(0.01)) \$—
Net income (loss) attributable to the Ensign Group, Inc.	\$0.61	\$0.48	\$0.57	\$(0.56)) \$0.09	\$0.62	\$0.58	\$0.61
Diluted income (loss) per share:								
Income (loss) from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$0.59	\$0.47	\$0.55	\$(0.48)) \$0.14	\$0.60	\$0.57	\$0.60
(Loss) income from discontinued operations	\$—	\$—	\$—	\$(0.08)) \$(0.05)) \$—	\$—	\$(0.01)
Net income (loss) attributable to the Ensign Group, Inc.	\$0.59	\$0.47	\$0.55	\$(0.56)) \$0.09	\$0.60	\$0.57	\$0.59
Weighted average common shares outstanding:								
Basic	22,028	21,941	21,859	21,768	21,605	21,488	21,368	21,251
Diluted	22,507	22,409	22,321	21,768	22,075	22,010	21,886	21,796

The additional information required by this Item 8 is incorporated herein by reference to the financial statements set forth in Item 15 of this report, Exhibits, Financial Statement and Schedules.

Table of Contents

Item 9. Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosures

None.

Item 9A. Controls and Procedures

(a) Conclusion Regarding the Effectiveness of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

The Company maintains disclosure controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that information we are required to disclose in reports that we file or submit under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (Exchange Act) is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in Securities and Exchange Commission rules and forms. In designing and evaluating our disclosure controls and procedures, our management recognized that any system of controls and procedures, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving the desired control objectives, as ours are designed to do, and management necessarily was required to apply its judgment in evaluating the cost-benefit relationship of possible controls and procedures.

In connection with the preparation of this Annual Report on Form 10-K our management evaluated, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer, the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures, as such term is defined under Rule 13a-15(e) promulgated under the Exchange Act, and to ensure that information required to be disclosed is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our principal executive and financial officers, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. Based on this evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer have concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of the end of the period covered by this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

(b) Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

Our management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting, as defined in Rule 13a-15(f) promulgated under the Exchange Act. Internal control over financial reporting is designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting using the criteria set forth by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (1992). Based on our evaluation, our management concluded that our internal control over financial reporting was effective as of the end of the period covered by this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Our independent registered public accounting firm, Deloitte & Touche LLP, has audited the consolidated financial statements included in this annual report on Form 10-K and, as part of their audit, has issued an audit report, included herein, on the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting. Their report is set forth below.

(c) Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

There were no changes in our internal controls over financial reporting, as defined in Rule 13a-15(f) promulgated under the Exchange Act, that occurred during the fourth quarter of fiscal 2013 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents

(d) Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

To the Board of Directors and Stockholders of
The Ensign Group, Inc.
Mission Viejo, California

We have audited the internal control over financial reporting of The Ensign Group, Inc. and subsidiaries (the “Company”) as of December 31, 2013, based on criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. The Company's management is responsible for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting, included in the accompanying Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects. Our audit included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk, and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed by, or under the supervision of, the company's principal executive and principal financial officers, or persons performing similar functions, and effected by the company's board of directors, management, and other personnel to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (1) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (2) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (3) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of the inherent limitations of internal control over financial reporting, including the possibility of collusion or improper management override of controls, material misstatements due to error or fraud may not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. Also, projections of any evaluation of the effectiveness of the internal control over financial reporting to future periods are subject to the risk that the controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the Company maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on the criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (1992) issued by

the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission.

We have also audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the consolidated financial statements and financial statement schedule as of and for the year ended December 31, 2013 of the Company and our report dated February 13, 2014 expressed an unqualified opinion on those financial statements and financial statement schedule.

/s/ DELOITTE & TOUCHE LLP

Costa Mesa, California
February 13, 2014

86

Table of Contents

Item 9B. Other Information

None.

PART III.

Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance

There is incorporated herein by reference the information required by this Item in our definitive proxy statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders that will be filed with the SEC no later than 120 days after the close of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

Item 11. Executive Compensation

There is incorporated herein by reference the information required by this Item in our definitive proxy statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders that will be filed with the SEC no later than 120 days after the close of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters

There is incorporated herein by reference the information required by this Item in our definitive proxy statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders that will be filed with the SEC no later than 120 days after the close of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

Item 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions and Director Independence

There is incorporated herein by reference the information required by this Item in our definitive proxy statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders that will be filed with the SEC no later than 120 days after the close of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

Item 14. Principal Accountant Fees and Services

There is incorporated herein by reference the information required by this Item in our definitive proxy statement for the 2014 Annual Meeting of Stockholders that will be filed with the SEC no later than 120 days after the close of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

PART IV.

Item 15. Exhibits, Financial Statements and Schedules

The following documents are filed as a part of this report:

(a) (1) Financial Statements:

The Financial Statements are included in Item 8 and are filed as part of this report.

(2) Financial Statement Schedule:

Schedule II: Valuation and Qualifying Accounts

(a) (3) Exhibits: An “Exhibit Index” has been filed as a part of this Annual Report on Form 10-K and is incorporated herein by reference.

87

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this Report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Dated: February 13, 2014

The Ensign Group, Inc.

By: /s/ Christopher R. Christensen
 Christopher R. Christensen
 Chief Executive Officer and President

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this Report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the Registrant in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

Signature	Title	Date
/s/ CHRISTOPHER R. CHRISTENSEN Christopher R. Christensen	Chief Executive Officer, President and Director (principal executive officer)	February 13, 2014
/s/ SUZANNE D. SNAPPER Suzanne D. Snapper	Chief Financial Officer (principal financial and accounting officer)	February 13, 2014
/s/ ROY E. CHRISTENSEN Roy E. Christensen	Chairman of the Board	February 13, 2014
/s/ ANTOINETTE T. HUBENETTE Antoinette T. Hubenette	Director	February 13, 2014
/s/ JOHN G. NACKEL John G. Nackel	Director	February 13, 2014
/s/ DAREN J. SHAW Daren J. Shaw	Director	February 13, 2014
Clayton M. Christensen	Director	February 13, 2014
/s/ LEE A. DANIELS Lee A. Daniels	Director	February 13, 2014

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

INDEX TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES

<u>Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>	<u>90</u>
Consolidated Financial Statements:	
Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012	<u>91</u>
<u>Consolidated Statements of Income for the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011</u>	<u>92</u>
Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income for the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011	<u>94</u>
<u>Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity for the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011</u>	<u>95</u>
<u>Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011</u>	<u>96</u>
<u>Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	<u>98</u>

Table of Contents

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Board of Directors and Stockholders of
The Ensign Group, Inc.
Mission Viejo, California

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of The Ensign Group, Inc. and subsidiaries (the “Company”) as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the related consolidated statements of income, comprehensive income, stockholders' equity, and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2013. Our audits also included the financial statement schedule listed in the Index at Item 15. These financial statements and the financial statement schedule are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and the financial statement schedule based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, such consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of The Ensign Group, Inc. and subsidiaries as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2013, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Also, in our opinion, such financial statement schedule, when considered in relation to the basic consolidated financial statements taken as a whole, presents fairly, in all material respects, the information set forth therein.

We have also audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on the criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission and our report dated February 13, 2014 expressed an unqualified opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

/s/ DELOITTE & TOUCHE LLP

Costa Mesa, California
February 13, 2014

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.
CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
	(In thousands, except par values)	
Assets		
Current assets:		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$65,755	\$40,685
Accounts receivable—less allowance for doubtful accounts of \$16,540 and \$13,811 at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively	111,370	94,187
Investments—current	5,511	5,195
Prepaid income taxes	9,915	3,787
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	9,213	8,606
Deferred tax asset—current	9,232	14,871
Assets held for sale—current (Note 4)	—	268
Total current assets	210,996	167,599
Property and equipment, net	479,770	447,855
Insurance subsidiary deposits and investments	16,888	17,315
Escrow deposits	1,000	4,635
Deferred tax asset	4,464	2,234
Restricted and other assets	9,804	8,640
Intangible assets, net	5,718	6,115
Long-term assets held for sale (Note 4)	—	11,324
Goodwill	23,935	21,557
Other indefinite-lived intangibles	7,740	3,588
Total assets	\$760,315	\$690,862
Liabilities and equity		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable	\$23,793	\$26,069
Accrued charge related to U.S. Government inquiry (Note 19)	—	15,000
Accrued wages and related liabilities	40,093	35,847
Accrued self-insurance liabilities—current	15,461	16,034
Liabilities held for sale—current (Note 4)	—	339
Other accrued liabilities	25,698	20,871
Current maturities of long-term debt	7,411	7,187
Total current liabilities	112,456	121,347
Long-term debt—less current maturities	251,895	200,505
Accrued self-insurance liabilities—less current portion	33,642	34,849
Fair value of interest rate swap	1,828	2,866
Long-term liabilities held for sale (Note 4)	—	130
Deferred rent and other long-term liabilities	3,237	3,281
Total liabilities	403,058	362,978
Commitments and contingencies (Notes 15, 17 and 19)		
Equity:		
Ensign Group, Inc. stockholders' equity:		
Common stock; \$0.001 par value; 75,000 shares authorized; 22,580 and 22,113 shares issued and outstanding at December 31, 2013, respectively, and 22,244 and 21,719 shares issued and outstanding at December 31, 2012, respectively	22	22

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Additional paid-in capital	101,364	90,949
Retained earnings	257,502	239,344
Common stock in treasury, at cost, 237 and 301 shares at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively	(1,680)) (2,099)
Accumulated other comprehensive loss	(1,112)) (1,745)
Total Ensign Group, Inc. stockholders' equity	356,096	326,471
Non-controlling interest	1,161	1,413
Total equity	357,257	327,884
Total liabilities and equity	\$760,315	\$690,862

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

91

Table of ContentsTHE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands, except per share data)		
Revenue	\$904,556	\$823,155	\$758,277
Expense:			
Cost of services (exclusive of facility rent, general and administrative and depreciation and amortization expenses shown separately below)	725,989	656,424	600,804
U.S. Government inquiry settlement (Note 19)	33,000	15,000	—
Facility rent—cost of services	13,613	13,281	13,725
General and administrative expense	40,103	31,819	29,766
Depreciation and amortization	33,909	28,358	23,286
Total expenses	846,614	744,882	667,581
Income from operations	57,942	78,273	90,696
Other income (expense):			
Interest expense	(12,787)	(12,229)	(13,778)
Interest income	506	255	249
Other expense, net	(12,281)	(11,974)	(13,529)
Income before provision for income taxes	45,661	66,299	77,167
Provision for income taxes	20,003	25,134	29,492
Income from continuing operations	25,658	41,165	47,675
Loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax benefit of \$1,157, \$869 and \$0 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively (Note 4)	(1,804)	(1,357)	—
Net income	23,854	39,808	47,675
Less: net loss attributable to noncontrolling interests	(186)	(783)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675
Amounts attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.:			
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$25,844	\$41,948	\$47,675
Loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax benefit	(1,804)	(1,357)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675
Net income (loss) per share:			
Basic:			
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.18	\$1.96	\$2.27
Loss from discontinued operations	(0.08)	(0.07)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.10	\$1.89	\$2.27
Diluted:			
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.16	\$1.91	\$2.21
Loss from discontinued operations	(0.09)	(0.06)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.07	\$1.85	\$2.21
Weighted average common shares outstanding:			
Basic	21,900	21,429	20,967
Diluted	22,364	21,942	21,583
Dividends per share	\$0.27	\$0.25	\$0.23

Table of Contents

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

93

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE INCOME

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands)		
Net income	\$23,854	\$39,808	\$47,675
Other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax:			
Unrealized gain (loss) on interest rate swap, net of income tax provision (benefit) of (\$405), \$286, and \$835 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.	633	(437)	(1,308)
Comprehensive income	24,487	39,371	46,367
Less: net loss attributable to noncontrolling interests	(186)	(783)	—
Comprehensive income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,673	\$40,154	\$46,367

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY
(In thousands)

	Common Stock Shares	Amount	Additional Paid-In Capital	Retained Earnings	Treasury Stock Shares	Stock Amount	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Loss	Non-Controlling Interest	Redeemable Noncontrolling Interest	Total
	(In thousands)									
Balance - January 1, 2011	20,815	\$ 21	\$ 70,814	\$ 161,168	582	\$(3,800)	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 228,203
Issuance of common stock to employees and directors resulting from the exercise of stock options and grant of stock awards	344	1	1,607	—	(186)	1,241	—	—	—	2,849
Issuance of restricted stock to employees	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dividends declared	—	—	—	(4,770)	—	—	—	—	—	(4,770)
Employee stock award compensation	—	—	3,356	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,356
Excess tax benefit from exercise of stock options	—	—	1,480	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,480
Net income	—	—	—	47,675	—	—	—	—	—	47,675
Other comprehensive loss	—	—	—	—	—	—	(1,308)	—	—	(1,308)
	21,179	\$ 22	\$ 77,257	\$ 204,073	396	\$(2,559)	\$ (1,308)	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 277,485

Balance - December 31, 2011										
Issuance of common stock to employees and directors resulting from the exercise of stock options and grant of stock awards	488	—	4,067	—	(102)	634	—	—	—	4,701
Issuance of restricted stock to employees	52	—	1,360	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,360
Repurchase of common stock	—	—	—	—	7	(174)	—	—	—	(174)
Dividends declared	—	—	—	(5,320)	—	—	—	—	—	(5,320)
Employee stock award compensation	—	—	3,379	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,379
Excess tax benefit from exercise of stock options	—	—	1,868	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,868
Noncontrolling interests assumed related to acquisitions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,778	11,600	13,378
Acquisition of noncontrolling interests, net of tax	—	—	3,018	—	—	—	—	340	(11,522)	(8,164)
Net loss attributable	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(705)	(78)	(783)

to noncontrolling interests										
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	—	—	—	40,591	—	—	—	—	—	40,591
Other comprehensive loss	—	—	—	—	—	—	(437)	—	—	(437)
Balance - December 31, 2012	21,719	\$ 22	\$ 90,949	\$ 239,344	301	\$(2,099)	\$ (1,745)	\$ 1,413	\$ —	\$ 327,884
Issuance of common stock to employees and directors resulting from the exercise of stock options and grant of stock awards	343	—	3,163	—	(64)	419	—	—	—	3,582
Issuance of restricted stock to employees	51	—	385	—	—	—	—	—	—	385
Dividends declared	—	—	—	(5,882)	—	—	—	—	—	(5,882)
Employee stock award compensation	—	—	4,013	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,013
Excess tax benefit from exercise of stock options	—	—	2,854	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,854
Net loss attributable to	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(186)	—	(186)

noncontrolling interests										
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	—	—	—	24,040	—	—	—	—	—	24,040
Purchase price adjustment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(66)	(66)
Other comprehensive income	—	—	—	—	—	—	633	—	—	633
Balance - December 31, 2013	22,113	\$ 22	\$ 101,364	\$ 257,502	237	\$(1,680)	\$(1,112)	\$ 1,161	\$ —	\$ 357,257

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Table of ContentsTHE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands)		
Cash flows from operating activities:			
Net income	\$23,854	\$39,808	\$47,675
Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:			
Loss from sale of discontinued operations (Note 4)	2,837	—	—
Depreciation and amortization	33,942	28,464	23,286
Goodwill impairment (Note 11)	490	2,225	—
Amortization of deferred financing fees and debt discount	821	826	717
Deferred income taxes	3,006	(2,111)) 1,090
Provision for doubtful accounts	12,106	9,474	7,921
Share-based compensation	4,399	4,739	3,356
Excess tax benefit from share-based compensation	(2,854)) (1,868)) (1,480)
Deferred income tax effect of purchase of noncontrolling interest	—	(2,464)) —
Loss on extinguishment of debt	—	—	2,542
Gain on sale of equity method investment	(380)) —	—
Loss on disposition of property and equipment	1,379	412	190
Change in operating assets and liabilities			
Accounts receivable	(27,290)) (16,150)) (24,795)
Prepaid income taxes	(6,129)) 2,095) (4,549)
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	(501)) (944)) (491)
Insurance subsidiary deposits and investments	110	(5,758)) (394)
Accounts payable	(2,236)) 3,152	2,701
U.S. Government inquiry accrual (Note 19)	(15,000)) 15,000	—
Accrued wages and related liabilities	4,246	(6,360)) 4,581
Other accrued liabilities	6,645	4,908	6,367
Accrued self-insurance	(1,842)) 6,205	4,059
Deferred rent liability	(179)) 397	(89)
Net cash provided by operating activities	37,424	82,050	72,687
Cash flows from investing activities:			
Purchase of property and equipment	(29,759)) (38,853)) (40,773)
Cash payment for business acquisitions	(45,101)) (31,558)) (106,747)
Cash payment for asset acquisitions	—	(11,261)) (23,385)
Escrow deposits	(1,000)) (4,635)) (175)
Escrow deposits used to fund business acquisitions	4,635	175	14,422
Cash proceeds on sale of urgent care franchising business, net of note receivable	3,607	—	—
Cash proceeds on sale of equity method investment	1,600	—	—
Cash proceeds from the sale of property and equipment	929	155	766
Restricted assets and other	(146)) 1,481	(160)
Net cash used in investing activities	(65,235)) (84,496)) (156,052)
Cash flows from financing activities:			
Proceeds from issuance of debt	58,700	36,525	90,000
Payments on long-term debt	(7,207)) (16,825)) (46,259)
Repurchase of shares of common stock	—	(174)) —

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Issuance of treasury stock upon exercise of options	419	634	1,241
Issuance of common stock upon exercise of options	3,163	4,067	1,607
Dividends paid	(4,318)	(6,604)	(4,637)
Excess tax benefit from share-based compensation	2,854	1,868	1,480
Purchase of noncontrolling interest	—	(5,700)	—
Payments of deferred financing costs	(730)	(244)	(2,571)
Net cash provided by financing activities	52,881	13,547	40,861
Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	25,070	11,101	(42,504)
Cash and cash equivalents beginning of period	40,685	29,584	72,088
Cash and cash equivalents end of period	\$65,755	\$40,685	\$29,584

See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS — (Continued)

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
	(In thousands)		
Supplemental disclosures of cash flow information:			
Cash paid during the period for:			
Interest	\$12,809	\$12,394	\$13,871
Income taxes	\$19,323	\$24,842	\$31,602
Non-cash financing and investing activity:			
Acquisition of redeemable noncontrolling interest	\$—	\$11,600	\$—
Accrued capital expenditures	\$1,693	\$1,734	\$571
Note receivable on sale of urgent care franchising business	\$4,000	\$—	\$—
See accompanying notes to consolidated financial statements.			

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Dollars and shares in thousands, except per share data)

1. DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS

The Company — The Ensign Group, Inc., through its subsidiaries (collectively, Ensign or the Company), provides skilled nursing and rehabilitative care services through the operation of 119 facilities, nine home health and seven hospice operations, seven urgent care centers and a mobile x-ray and diagnostic company as of December 31, 2013, located in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, Texas, Utah and Washington. The Company's operations, each of which strives to be the operation of choice in the community it serves, provide a broad spectrum of healthcare services including skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice, mobile ancillary, and urgent care services. The Company's facilities have a collective capacity of approximately 13,200 operational skilled nursing, assisted living and independent living beds. As of December 31, 2013, the Company owned 96 of its 119 facilities and operated an additional 23 facilities through long-term lease arrangements, and had options to purchase two of those 23 facilities.

The Ensign Group, Inc. is a holding company with no direct operating assets, employees or revenue. All of the Company's operations are operated by separate, independent subsidiaries, each of which has its own management, employees and assets. One of the Company's wholly-owned subsidiaries, referred to as the Service Center, provides centralized accounting, payroll, human resources, information technology, legal, risk management and other centralized services to the other operating subsidiaries through contractual relationships with such subsidiaries. The Company also has a wholly-owned captive insurance subsidiary (the Captive) that provides some claims-made coverage to the Company's operating subsidiaries for general and professional liability, as well as coverage for certain workers' compensation insurance liabilities.

Like the Company's facilities, the Service Center and the Captive are operated by separate, wholly-owned, independent subsidiaries that have their own management, employees and assets. References herein to the consolidated "Company" and "its" assets and activities, as well as the use of the terms "we," "us," "our" and similar verbiage in this annual report is not meant to imply that The Ensign Group, Inc. has direct operating assets, employees or revenue, or that any of the facilities, the Service Center or the Captive are operated by the same entity.

2. PROPOSED SPIN-OFF OF REAL ESTATE ASSETS THROUGH A REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST (REIT)

On November 7, 2013, the Company announced a plan to separate its healthcare business and its real estate business into two separate, publicly traded companies:

Ensign, which will continue to provide healthcare services through its existing operations; and
CareTrust REIT, Inc. (CareTrust), which will own, acquire and lease real estate serving the healthcare industry.

The Company intends to accomplish the proposed separation by distributing all of the outstanding shares of CareTrust common stock to the Company's stockholders on a pro rata basis (the Spin-Off). At the time of the Spin-Off, CareTrust, which is currently a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, will hold substantially all of the real property owned by the Company, and will own and operate three independent living facilities. After the Spin-Off, all of these properties (except for three independent living facilities that CareTrust will operate) will be leased to the Company on a triple-net basis, under which the Company will be responsible for all costs at the properties, including property taxes, insurance and maintenance and repair costs.

In accordance with Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 505-60, Equity-Spinoffs and Reverse Spinoffs, the accounting for the separation of the Company follows its legal form, with Ensign as the legal and accounting spinor

and CareTrust as the legal and accounting spinnee, due to the relative significance of Ensign's healthcare business, the relative fair values of the respective companies, the retention by Ensign of all senior management except Gregory K. Stapley by Ensign, and other relevant indicators.

As part of the proposed Spin-Off, CareTrust intends to elect to be taxed and intends to qualify as a real estate investment trust (REIT) for U.S. federal income tax purposes commencing with its taxable year ending December 31, 2014. As a REIT, CareTrust will have to satisfy certain requirements relating to diversity of ownership, including a requirement that not more than 50% of its stock may be owned by five or fewer individuals. In order to help CareTrust satisfy the REIT requirements, its charter will include "excess share" provisions typical for REITs that will prohibit ownership of more than 9.8% of its outstanding shares. On November 7, 2013, the board of directors of the Company adopted a stockholder rights plan to discourage any of the Company's stockholders from exceeding this ownership level prior to the Spin-Off. In connection with the adoption of the stockholder rights plan, the board of directors declared a dividend of one right (a Right) for each share of Company common stock held by stockholders of record at the close of business on November 18, 2013. The Company will also issue one Right with each new share of the

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Company's common stock that is subsequently issued while the stockholder rights plan is in place. The Rights are issued pursuant to a Rights Agreement, dated as of November 7, 2013 (the Rights Agreement). Initially, the Rights will not be exercisable and will trade with the shares of Company common stock. The Rights will generally be exercisable only if a person or group becomes an "acquiring person" by (i) acquiring beneficial ownership of 9.8% or more of the Company's common stock or, in the case of any person (including such person's affiliates and associates) that beneficially owns 9.8% or more of the Company's common stock, upon the acquisition of additional shares by such person, or (ii) commencing a tender offer or exchange offer which, if consummated, could result in a person owning 9.8% or more of the Company's common stock.

If a person or group becomes an acquiring person, the Rights will generally entitle each holder, other than the acquiring person, to acquire, for the exercise price of \$200 per Right (subject to adjustment), shares of the Company's common stock (or, in certain circumstances, other consideration) having a market value equal to twice the exercise price. The Rights will expire at 5:00 P.M., New York City time, on the earlier of (i) the first business day after consummation of the proposed Spin-Off, or (ii) November 6, 2014, unless redeemed or exchanged earlier or unless the board of directors extends the expiration date. The Rights will not prevent a takeover of the Company, but may cause substantial dilution to a person that acquires 9.8% or more of the Company's common stock.

The proposed Spin-Off is conditioned on, among other things, final approval by the Board of Directors of the Company, the receipt of a ruling from the IRS that, among other things the Spin-Off will qualify as a tax-free transaction for U.S. federal income tax purposes, the receipt of an opinion of counsel as to the satisfaction of certain requirements for such tax-free treatment and, the receipt of an opinion of counsel that, commencing with CareTrust's taxable year ending on December 31, 2014, CareTrust has been organized in conformity with the requirements for qualification as a REIT under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and its proposed method of operation will enable it to meet the requirements for qualification and taxation as a REIT.

3. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation — The accompanying consolidated financial statements (Financial Statements) have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP). The Company is the sole member or shareholder of various consolidated limited liability companies and corporations; each established to operate various acquired healthcare service operations. All intercompany transactions and balances have been eliminated in consolidation. The Company presents noncontrolling interest within the equity section of its consolidated balance sheets. The Company presents the amount of consolidated net income that is attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc. and the noncontrolling interest in its consolidated statements of income.

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of all entities controlled by the Company through its ownership of a majority voting interest and the accounts of any variable interest entities (VIEs) where the Company is subject to a majority of the risk of loss from the VIE's activities, or entitled to receive a majority of the entity's residual returns, or both. The Company assesses the requirements related to the consolidation of VIEs, including a qualitative assessment of power and economics that considers which entity has the power to direct the activities that "most significantly impact" the VIE's economic performance and has the obligation to absorb losses of, or the right to receive benefits that could be potentially significant to, the VIE. The Company's relationship with variable interest entities was not material at December 31, 2013.

On March 25, 2013, the Company agreed to terms to sell Doctors Express (DRX), a national urgent care franchise system. The asset sale was effective on April 15, 2013. The results of operations for DRX have been classified as discontinued operations for all periods presented in the accompanying Financial Statements (see Note 4, Discontinued Operations). Certain assets and liabilities included in the sale of DRX have been presented as held for sale in the

accompanying consolidated balance sheet as of December 31, 2012. In addition, the results of operations of DRX and the loss or impairment related to this divestiture have been classified as discontinued operations in the accompanying consolidated statements of income for all periods presented.

Estimates and Assumptions — The preparation of Financial Statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting periods. The most significant estimates in the Company's Financial Statements relate to revenue, allowance for doubtful accounts, intangible assets and goodwill, impairment of long-lived assets, general and professional liability, worker's compensation, and healthcare claims included in accrued self-insurance liabilities, other contingent liabilities, interest rate swaps, and income taxes. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Business Segments — The Company has a single reportable segment — healthcare services, which includes providing skilled nursing, assisted living, home health and hospice, urgent care and related ancillary services. The Company's single reportable segment is made up of several individual operating segments grouped together principally based on their geographical locations within the United States. Based on the similar economic and other characteristics of each of the operating segments, management believes the Company meets the criteria for aggregating its operating segments into a single reportable segment.

Fair Value of Financial Instruments — The Company's financial instruments consist principally of cash and cash equivalents, debt security investments, interest rate swap agreements, accounts receivable, insurance subsidiary deposits, accounts payable and borrowings. The Company believes all of the financial instruments' recorded values approximate fair values because of their nature or respective short durations. The interest rate swap is carried at fair value on the balance sheet. The Company's fixed-rate debt instruments do not actively trade in an established market. The fair values of this debt are estimated by discounting the principal and interest payments at rates available to the Company for debt with similar terms and maturities. See further discussion of debt security investments in Note 6, Fair Value Measurements.

Revenue Recognition — The Company recognizes revenue when the following four conditions have been met: (i) there is persuasive evidence that an arrangement exists; (ii) delivery has occurred or service has been rendered; (iii) the price is fixed or determinable; and (iv) collection is reasonably assured. The Company's revenue is derived primarily from providing healthcare services to residents and is recognized on the date services are provided at amounts billable to the individual. For reimbursement arrangements with third-party payors, including Medicaid, Medicare and private insurers, revenue is recorded based on contractually agreed-upon amounts on a per patient, daily basis.

Revenue from the Medicare and Medicaid programs accounted for 72.2%, 73.6% and 75.2% of the Company's revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The Company records revenue from these governmental and managed care programs as services are performed at their expected net realizable amounts under these programs. The Company's revenue from governmental and managed care programs is subject to audit and retroactive adjustment by governmental and third-party agencies. Consistent with healthcare industry accounting practices, any changes to these governmental revenue estimates are recorded in the period the change or adjustment becomes known based on final settlement. The Company recorded retroactive adjustments to revenue which were not material to the Company's consolidated revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011.

The Company's service specific revenue recognition policies are as follows:

Skilled Nursing Revenue

The Company's revenue is derived primarily from providing long-term healthcare services to residents and is recognized on the date services are provided at amounts billable to individual residents. For residents under reimbursement arrangements with third-party payors, including Medicaid, Medicare and private insurers, revenue is recorded based on contractually agreed-upon amounts on a per patient, daily basis. The Company records revenue from private pay patients, at the agreed-upon rate, as services are performed.

Home Health Revenue

Medicare Revenue

Net service revenue is recorded under the Medicare prospective payment system based on a 60-day episode payment rate that is subject to adjustment based on certain variables including, but not limited to: (a) an outlier payment if patient care was unusually costly; (b) a low utilization payment adjustment if the number of visits was fewer than five; (c) a partial payment if the patient transferred to another provider or the Company received a patient from another provider before completing the episode; (d) a payment adjustment based upon the level of therapy services required; (e) the number of episodes of care provided to a patient, regardless of whether the same home health provider provided care for the entire series of episodes; (f) changes in the base episode payments established by the Medicare Program; (g) adjustments to the base episode payments for case mix and geographic wages; and (h) recoveries of

overpayments.

The Company makes adjustments to Medicare revenue on completed episodes to reflect differences between estimated and actual payment amounts, an inability to obtain appropriate billing documentation or authorizations acceptable to the payor and other reasons unrelated to credit risk. Therefore, the Company believes that its reported net service revenue and patient accounts receivable will be the net amounts to be realized from Medicare for services rendered.

100

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

In addition to revenue recognized on completed episodes, the Company also recognizes a portion of revenue associated with episodes in progress. Episodes in progress are 60-day episodes of care that begin during the reporting period, but were not completed as of the end of the period. Thereby, estimating revenue and recognizing it on a daily basis.

Non-Medicare Revenue

Episodic Based Revenue — The Company recognizes revenue in a similar manner as it recognizes Medicare revenue for episodic-based rates that are paid by other insurance carriers, including Medicare Advantage programs; however, these rates can vary based upon the negotiated terms.

Non-episodic Based Revenue — Revenue is recorded on an accrual basis based upon the date of service at amounts equal to its established or estimated per-visit rates, as applicable.

Hospice Revenue

Revenue is recorded on an accrual basis based upon the date of service at amounts equal to the estimated payment rates. The estimated payment rates are daily rates for each of the levels of care the Company delivers. The Company makes adjustments to revenue for an inability to obtain appropriate billing documentation or authorizations acceptable to the payor and other reasons unrelated to credit risk. Additionally, as Medicare hospice revenue is subject to an inpatient cap limit and an overall payment cap, the Company monitors its provider numbers and estimates amounts due back to Medicare if a cap has been exceeded. The Company records these adjustments as a reduction to revenue and increases other accrued liabilities.

Accounts Receivable and Allowance for Doubtful Accounts — Accounts receivable consist primarily of amounts due from Medicare and Medicaid programs, other government programs, managed care health plans and private payor sources. Estimated provisions for doubtful accounts are recorded to the extent it is probable that a portion or all of a particular account will not be collected.

In evaluating the collectability of accounts receivable, the Company considers a number of factors, including the age of the accounts, changes in collection patterns, the composition of patient accounts by payor type and the status of ongoing disputes with third-party payors. On an annual basis, the historical collection percentages are reviewed by payor and by state and are updated to reflect the recent collection experience of the Company. In order to determine the appropriate reserve rate percentages which ultimately establish the allowance, the Company analyzes historical cash collection patterns by payor and by state. The percentages applied to the aged receivable balances are based on the Company's historical experience and time limits, if any, for managed care, Medicare, Medicaid and other payors. The Company periodically refines its estimates of the allowance for doubtful accounts based on experience with the estimation process and changes in circumstances.

Cash and cash equivalents — Cash and cash equivalents consist of bank term deposits, money market funds and treasury bill related investments with original maturities of three months or less at time of purchase and therefore approximate fair value. The fair value of money market funds is determined based on "Level 1" inputs, which consist of unadjusted quoted prices in active markets that are accessible at the measurement date for identical, unrestricted assets. The Company places its cash and short-term investments with high credit quality financial institutions.

Insurance Subsidiary Deposits and Investments — The Company's captive insurance subsidiary cash and cash equivalents, deposits and investments are designated to support long-term insurance subsidiary liabilities and have been classified as long-term assets. The majority of these deposits and investments are currently held in AA- and A-rated debt security investments and the remainder is held in a bank account with a high credit quality financial institution. See further discussion at Note 6, Fair Value Measurements.

Equity Investment — As of December 31, 2012, one of the Company's subsidiaries had a non-marketable equity investment which was accounted for under the equity method. The investment was initially recorded at cost and the Company adjusted the carrying amount for its share of the earnings or losses of the investee after the date of investment. On April 23, 2013, the Company entered into a common unit redemption agreement with the investee where the non-marketable equity investment was repurchased. See further discussion at Note 12, Restricted and Other

Assets.

Property and Equipment — Property and equipment are initially recorded at their historical cost. Repairs and maintenance are expensed as incurred. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the depreciable assets (ranging from three to 57 years). Leasehold improvements are amortized on a straight-line basis over the shorter of their estimated useful lives or the remaining lease term.

101

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Impairment of Long-Lived Assets — The Company reviews the carrying value of long-lived assets that are held and used in the Company's operations for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Recoverability of these assets is determined based upon expected undiscounted future net cash flows from the operations to which the assets relate, utilizing management's best estimate, appropriate assumptions, and projections at the time. If the carrying value is determined to be unrecoverable from future operating cash flows, the asset is deemed impaired and an impairment loss would be recognized to the extent the carrying value exceeded the estimated fair value of the asset. The Company estimates the fair value of assets based on the estimated future discounted cash flows of the asset. Management has evaluated its long-lived assets and has not identified any asset impairment during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 or 2011.

Intangible Assets and Goodwill — Definite-lived intangible assets consist primarily of favorable leases, lease acquisition costs, patient base, facility trade names and customer relationships. Favorable leases and lease acquisition costs are amortized over the life of the lease of the facility, typically ranging from ten to 20 years. Patient base is amortized over a period of four to eight months, depending on the classification of the patients and the level of occupancy in a new acquisition on the acquisition date. Trade names at facilities are amortized over 30 years and customer relationships are amortized over 20 years.

The Company's indefinite-lived intangible assets consist of trade names and home health and hospice Medicare licenses. The Company tests indefinite-lived intangible assets for impairment on an annual basis or more frequently if events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of the intangible asset may not be recoverable. Goodwill represents the excess of the purchase price over the fair value of identifiable net assets acquired in business combinations. Goodwill is subject to annual testing for impairment. In addition, goodwill is tested for impairment if events occur or circumstances change that would reduce the fair value of a reporting unit below its carrying amount. The Company defines reporting units as the individual operations. The Company performs its annual test for impairment during the fourth quarter of each year. See further discussion at Note 11, Goodwill and Other Indefinite-Lived Intangible Assets.

Deferred Rent — Deferred rent represents rental expense (determined on a straight-line basis over the life of the related lease) in excess of actual rent payments.

Self-Insurance — The Company is partially self-insured for general and professional liability up to a base amount per claim (the self-insured retention) with an aggregate, one-time deductible above this limit. Losses beyond these amounts are insured through third-party policies with coverage limits per claim, per location and on an aggregate basis for the Company. For claims made after January 1, 2013, the self-insured retention was \$500 per claim, subject to an additional one-time deductible of \$1,000 for California facilities and a separate, one-time deductible of \$750 for non-California facilities. For all facilities, except those located in Colorado, the third-party coverage above these amounts was \$1,000 per claim, \$3,000 per facility, with a \$5,000 blanket aggregate available to both California and non-California operations, separately. In Colorado, the third-party coverage above these limits was \$1,000 per claim and \$3,000 per facility, which is independent of the aforementioned blanket aggregate applicable to its other 113 facilities.

The self-insured retention and deductible limits for general and professional liability and California workers' compensation are self-insured through the Captive, the related assets and liabilities of which are included in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets. The Captive is subject to certain statutory requirements as an insurance provider. These requirements include, but are not limited to, maintaining statutory capital. The Company's policy is to accrue amounts equal to the actuarially estimated costs to settle open claims, as well as an estimate of the cost of insured claims that have been incurred but not reported. The Company develops information about the size of the ultimate claims based on historical experience, current industry information and actuarial analysis, and evaluates the estimates for claim loss exposure on a quarterly basis.

The Company's operating subsidiaries are self-insured for workers' compensation liability in California. To protect itself against loss exposure in California with this policy, the Company has purchased individual stop-loss insurance coverage that insures individual claims that exceed \$500 for each occurrence. In Texas, the operating subsidiaries have elected non-subscriber status for workers' compensation claims and, effective February 1, 2011, the Company has purchased individual stop-loss coverage that insures individual claims that exceed \$750 for each occurrence. The Company's operating subsidiaries in other states have third party guaranteed cost coverage. In California and Texas, the Company accrues amounts equal to the estimated costs to settle open claims, as well as an estimate of the cost of claims that have been incurred but not reported. The Company uses actuarial valuations to estimate the liability based on historical experience and industry information.

In addition, the Company has recorded an asset and equal liability of \$3,280 and \$3,219 at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, respectively, in order to present the ultimate costs of malpractice and workers' compensation claims and the anticipated insurance recoveries on a gross basis. See Note 12, Restricted and Other Assets.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The Company provides self-insured medical (including prescription drugs) and dental healthcare benefits to the majority of its employees. The Company is fully liable for all financial and legal aspects of these benefit plans. To protect itself against loss exposure with this policy, the Company has purchased individual stop-loss insurance coverage that insures individual claims that exceed \$300 per each covered member, subject to an additional one-time deductible of \$75.

The Company believes that adequate provision has been made in the Financial Statements for liabilities that may arise out of patient care, workers' compensation, healthcare benefits and related services provided to date. The amount of the Company's reserves was determined based on an estimation process that uses information obtained from both company-specific and industry data. This estimation process requires the Company to continuously monitor and evaluate the life cycle of the claims. Using data obtained from this monitoring and the Company's assumptions about emerging trends, the Company, with the assistance of an independent actuary, develops information about the size of ultimate claims based on the Company's historical experience and other available industry information. The most significant assumptions used in the estimation process include determining the trend in costs, the expected cost of claims incurred but not reported and the expected costs to settle or pay damage awards with respect to unpaid claims. The self-insured liabilities are based upon estimates, and while management believes that the estimates of loss are reasonable, the ultimate liability may be in excess of or less than the recorded amounts. Due to the inherent volatility of actuarially determined loss estimates, it is reasonably possible that the Company could experience changes in estimated losses that could be material to net income. If the Company's actual liability exceeds its estimates of loss, its future earnings, cash flows and financial condition would be adversely affected.

Income Taxes — Deferred tax assets and liabilities are established for temporary differences between the financial reporting basis and the tax basis of the Company's assets and liabilities at tax rates in effect when such temporary differences are expected to reverse. The Company generally expects to fully utilize its deferred tax assets; however, when necessary, the Company records a valuation allowance to reduce its net deferred tax assets to the amount that is more likely than not to be realized.

When the Company takes uncertain income tax positions that do not meet the recognition criteria, it records a liability for underpayment of income taxes and related interest and penalties, if any. In considering the need for and magnitude of a liability for such positions, the Company must consider the potential outcomes from a review of the positions by the taxing authorities.

In determining the need for a valuation allowance or the need for and magnitude of liabilities for uncertain tax positions, the Company makes certain estimates and assumptions. These estimates and assumptions are based on, among other things, knowledge of operations, markets, historical trends and likely future changes and, when appropriate, the opinions of advisors with knowledge and expertise in certain fields. Due to certain risks associated with the Company's estimates and assumptions, actual results could differ.

Noncontrolling Interest — The noncontrolling interest in a subsidiary is initially recognized at estimated fair value on the acquisition date and is presented within total equity in the Company's consolidated balance sheets. The Company presents the noncontrolling interest and the amount of consolidated net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc. in its consolidated statements of income and net income per share is calculated based on net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.'s stockholders. The carrying amount of the noncontrolling interest is adjusted based on an allocation of subsidiary earnings based on ownership interest.

Stock-Based Compensation — The Company measures and recognizes compensation expense for all share-based payment awards made to employees and directors including employee stock options based on estimated fair values, ratably over the requisite service period of the award. Net income has been reduced as a result of the recognition of the

fair value of all stock options and restricted stock awards issued, the amount of which is contingent upon the number of future grants and other variables.

Derivatives and Hedging Activities — The Company evaluates variable and fixed interest rate risk exposure on a routine basis and to the extent the Company believes that it is appropriate, it will offset most of its variable risk exposure by entering into interest rate swap agreements. It is the Company's policy to only utilize derivative instruments for hedging purposes (i.e. not for speculation). The Company formally designates its interest rate swap agreements as hedges and documents all relationships between hedging instruments and hedged items. The Company formally assesses effectiveness of its hedging relationships, both at the hedge inception and on an ongoing basis, then measures and records ineffectiveness. The Company would discontinue hedge accounting prospectively (i) if it is determined that the derivative is no longer effective in offsetting change in the cash flows of a hedged item, (ii) when the derivative expires or is sold, terminated or exercised, (iii) if it is no longer probable that the forecasted transaction will occur, or (iv) if management determines that designation of the derivative as a hedge instrument is no longer appropriate. The Company's derivative is recorded on the balance sheet at its fair value.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Leases and Leasehold Improvements — At the inception of each lease, the Company performs an evaluation to determine whether the lease should be classified as an operating or capital lease. The Company records rent expense for leases that contain scheduled rent increases on a straight-line basis over the term of the lease. The lease term used for straight-line rent expense is calculated from the date the Company is given control of the leased premises through the end of the lease term. The lease term used for this evaluation also provides the basis for establishing depreciable lives for buildings subject to lease and leasehold improvements, as well as the period over which the Company records straight-line rent expense.

Accumulated Other Comprehensive Loss and Total Comprehensive Income — Accumulated other comprehensive loss refers to revenue, expenses, gains, and losses that are recorded as an element of stockholders' equity but are excluded from net income. The Company's other comprehensive loss consists of net deferred gains and losses on certain derivative instruments accounted for as cash flow hedges. As of December 31, 2013 accumulated other comprehensive loss was \$1,828, recorded net of tax of \$716, or \$1,112. As of December 31, 2012, accumulated other comprehensive loss was \$2,866, recorded net of tax of \$1,121, or \$1,745.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements — Except for rules and interpretive releases of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) under authority of federal securities laws and a limited number of grandfathered standards, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) ASC is the sole source of authoritative GAAP literature recognized by the FASB and applicable to the Company. The Company has reviewed the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) accounting pronouncements and interpretations thereof that have effectiveness dates during the periods reported and in future periods. The Company has carefully considered the new pronouncements that alter previous generally accepted accounting principles and does not believe that any new or modified principles will have a material impact on the Company's reported financial position or operations in the near term. The applicability of any standard is subject to the formal review of the Company's financial management and certain standards are under consideration.

Additionally, the FASB and the International Accounting Standards Board are working on joint convergence projects to address accounting differences between GAAP and International Financial Reporting Standards in order to support their commitment to achieve a single set of high-quality global accounting standards. One of the projects under deliberation includes accounting for leases. If enacted in its current draft form, the Company anticipates that the lease accounting proposal could impact its consolidated financial statements; however, the FASB's standard-setting process is ongoing and until new standards have been finalized and issued, the Company cannot quantify and determine the impact on its consolidated financial statements that may result from such future changes.

4. DISCONTINUED OPERATIONS

On March 25, 2013, the Company agreed to terms to sell DRX, a national urgent care franchise system for approximately \$8,000, adjusted for certain assets and liabilities. The asset sale was effective on April 15, 2013. The assets acquired at the initial purchase of DRX, including noncontrolling interest, were recorded at fair value. The initial fair value was greater than total cash paid to acquire all interests in DRX and the subsequent sale price. The sale of DRX has been accounted for as discontinued operations. Accordingly, the results of operations of this business for all periods presented and the loss related to this divestiture have been classified as discontinued operations in the accompanying consolidated statements of income. As the sale was effective April 15, 2013, all assets and liabilities included in the sale were recorded as held for sale on the Company's consolidated balance sheets as of December 31, 2012.

A summary of discontinued operations follows:

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Revenue	\$728	\$1,564	\$—
Cost of services (exclusive of facility rent, general and administrative and depreciation and amortization expenses shown separately below)	(807) (3,646) —
Charges to discontinued operations for the excess carrying amount of goodwill and other indefinite-lived intangible assets	(2,837) —) —
Facility rent—cost of services	(12) (38) —
Depreciation and amortization	(33) (106) —
Loss from discontinued operations	(2,961) (2,226) —
Benefit from income taxes	(1,157) (869) —
Loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax benefit	\$(1,804) \$(1,357) \$—

104

Table of Contents

A summary of the net assets held for sale are as follows:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Current assets	\$—	\$268
Long-term assets:		
Goodwill	—	1,099
Other identifiable intangible assets, net	—	10,200
Other long-term assets, net	—	25
Total assets held for sale	—	11,592
Current liabilities	—	(339)
Long-term liabilities	—	(130)
Total liabilities held for sale	—	(469)
Net assets held for sale	\$—	\$11,123

5. COMPUTATION OF NET INCOME PER COMMON SHARE

Basic net income per share is computed by dividing income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc. stockholders by the weighted average number of outstanding common shares for the period. The computation of diluted net income per share is similar to the computation of basic net income per share except that the denominator is increased to include the number of additional common shares that would have been outstanding if the dilutive potential common shares had been issued.

A reconciliation of the numerator and denominator used in the calculation of basic net income per common share follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Numerator:			
Income from continuing operations	\$25,658	\$41,165	\$47,675
Less: net loss attributable to noncontrolling interests	(186)	(783)	—
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	25,844	41,948	47,675
Plus: loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax	(1,804)	(1,357)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675
Denominator:			
Weighted average shares outstanding for basic net income per share	21,900	21,429	20,967
Basic net income (loss) per common share:			
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.18	\$1.96	\$2.27
Loss from discontinued operations	(0.08)	(0.07)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.10	\$1.89	\$2.27

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

A reconciliation of the numerator and denominator used in the calculation of diluted net income per common share follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Numerator:			
Income from continuing operations	\$25,658	\$41,165	\$47,675
Less: net loss attributable to the noncontrolling interests	(186)	(783)	—
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	25,844	41,948	47,675
Plus: loss from discontinued operations, net of income tax	(1,804)	(1,357)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$24,040	\$40,591	\$47,675
Denominator:			
Weighted average common shares outstanding	21,900	21,429	20,967
Plus: incremental shares from assumed conversion ⁽¹⁾	464	513	616
Adjusted weighted average common shares outstanding	22,364	21,942	21,583
Diluted net income (loss) per common share:			
Income from continuing operations attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.16	\$1.91	\$2.21
Loss from discontinued operations	(0.09)	(0.06)	—
Net income attributable to The Ensign Group, Inc.	\$1.07	\$1.85	\$2.21

⁽¹⁾ Options outstanding which are anti-dilutive and therefore not factored into the weighted average common shares amount above were 402, 340 and 97 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

6. FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS

Fair value measurements are based on a three-tier hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs used to measure fair value. These tiers include: Level 1, defined as observable inputs such as quoted market prices in active markets; Level 2, defined as inputs other than quoted prices included within Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly; and Level 3, defined as observable inputs for which little or no market data exists, therefore requiring an entity to develop its own assumptions.

The following table summarizes the financial assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis as of December 31, 2013 and 2012:

	December 31,					
	2013			2012		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Cash and cash equivalents	\$65,755	\$—	\$—	\$40,685	\$—	\$—
Fair value of interest rate swap	\$—	\$1,828	\$—	\$—	\$2,866	\$—

Our non-financial assets, which include long-lived assets, including goodwill, intangible assets and property and equipment, are not required to be measured at fair value on a recurring basis. However, on a periodic basis, or whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that their carrying value may not be recoverable, we assess our long-lived assets for impairment. When impairment has occurred, such long-lived assets are written down to fair value. See Note 3, Summary of Significant Accounting Policies for further discussion.

Investments - Held to Maturity

At December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company had approximately \$22,399 and \$22,510, respectively, in insurance subsidiary debt security investments which were classified as held to maturity and carried at amortized cost. The carrying value of the debt securities approximates fair value. The Company has the intent and ability to hold these debt securities to maturity. Further, at December 31, 2013, \$4,066 is held in AA-rated debt securities backed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) under the Temporary Liquidity Guarantee Program, and \$18,333 is held in A-rated debt securities. These debt securities mature from February 2013 to October 2015. At December 31, 2012, \$6,310 was held in AA-rated debt securities and \$16,200 was held in A-rated debt securities.

Interest Rate Swap Agreement

In connection with the Senior Credit Facility with a lending consortium arranged by SunTrust and Wells Fargo (the Senior Credit Facility), in July 2011, the Company entered into an interest rate swap agreement in accordance with Company policy to reduce risk from volatility in the income statement due to changes in the LIBOR interest rate. The swap agreement, with a notional amount of \$75,000, amortizing concurrently with the related term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility, was five years in length and set to mature on July 15, 2016. The interest rate swap has been designated as a cash flow hedge and, as such, changes in fair value are reported in other comprehensive income in accordance with hedge accounting. Under the terms of this swap agreement, the net effect of the hedge was to record swap interest expense at a fixed rate of approximately 4.3%, exclusive of fees. Net interest paid under the swap was \$1,047, \$951 and \$471 for the year ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, respectively. In addition, based on the December 31, 2013 interest rate swap valuation, the Company expects to record swap interest expense of approximately \$1,100 during the year ended December 31, 2014.

The Company assesses hedge effectiveness at inception and on an ongoing basis by performing a regression analysis. The regression analysis compares the historical monthly changes in fair value of the interest rate swap to the historical monthly changes in the fair value of a hypothetically perfect interest rate swap over the trailing 30 months. The change in fair value of the hypothetical derivative is regarded as a proxy for the present value of the cumulative change in the expected future cash flows on the hedged transaction. The regression analysis serves as the Company's prospective and retrospective assessment of hedge effectiveness. Assuming the hedging relationship qualifies as highly effective, the actual swap will be recorded at fair value on the balance sheet and accumulated other comprehensive income (loss) will be adjusted to reflect the lesser of either the cumulative change in the fair value of the actual swap or the cumulative change in the fair value of the hypothetical derivative.

The interest rate swap agreement is recorded at fair value based upon valuation models which utilize relevant factors such as the contractual terms of the interest rate swap agreements, credit spreads for the contracting parties and interest rate curves. Based on this valuation method, the Company categorized the interest rate swap as Level 2 and recorded accumulated other comprehensive losses as of December 31, 2013 of \$1,828, recorded net of tax of \$716, or \$1,112 in stockholders' equity, compared to \$2,866, recorded net of tax of \$1,121, or \$1,745 as of December 31, 2012. There are no amounts attributable to hedge ineffectiveness that were required to be recognized in earnings.

7. REVENUE AND ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

Revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 is summarized in the following tables:

	December 31,		2012		2011			
	2013							
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%		
Medicaid	\$323,803	35.8	% \$302,046	36.7	% \$277,736	36.6	%	
Medicare	292,917	32.4	278,578	33.8	272,283	35.9		
Medicaid — skilled	36,085	4.0	25,418	3.1	20,290	2.7		
Total Medicaid and Medicare	652,805	72.2	606,042	73.6	570,309	75.2		
Managed care	118,168	13.1	106,268	12.9	94,266	12.4		

Edgar Filing: AMERICAN FINANCIAL GROUP INC - Form 10-K

Private and other payors ⁽¹⁾	133,583	14.7	110,845	13.5	93,702	12.4
Revenue	\$904,556	100.0 %	\$823,155	100.0 %	\$758,277	100.0 %

⁽¹⁾ Private and other payors includes revenue from urgent care centers and other ancillary businesses.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Accounts receivable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 is summarized in the following table:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Medicaid	\$38,068	\$28,534
Managed care	30,911	26,707
Medicare	34,562	32,168
Private and other payors	24,369	20,589
	127,910	107,998
Less: allowance for doubtful accounts	(16,540) (13,811
Accounts receivable	\$111,370	\$94,187

8. ACQUISITIONS

The Company's acquisition policy is generally to purchase or lease operations to complement the Company's existing portfolio. The results of all the Company's operations are included in the accompanying Financial Statements subsequent to the date of acquisition. Acquisitions are typically paid for in cash and are accounted for using the acquisition method of accounting. Where the Company enters into facility lease agreements, the Company typically does not pay any material amount to the prior facility operator nor does the Company acquire any assets or assume any liabilities, other than rights and obligations under the lease and operations transfer agreement, as part of the transaction. Some leases include options to purchase the facilities. As a result, from time to time, the Company will acquire facilities that the Company has been operating under third-party leases.

During the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company acquired seven stand-alone skilled nursing facilities, three stand-alone assisted living facilities, three home health operations, three hospice operations and one urgent care center. The aggregate purchase price of the 17 business acquisitions was approximately \$45,364, which was paid in cash. The Company also entered into a separate operations transfer agreement with the prior tenant as part of each transaction. The operations acquired during the year ended December 31, 2013 are as follows:

On January 1, 2013, the Company acquired a home health operation in Washington for approximately \$2,801, which was paid in cash. The acquisition did not have an impact on the Company's operational bed count. The Company recognized \$1,966 and \$815 in goodwill and other indefinite-lived intangible assets, respectively, as part of this transaction.

On January 1, 2013, the Company acquired two hospice operations in Arizona and California, respectively, for approximately \$1,825, which was paid in cash. The acquisition did not have an impact on the Company's operational bed count. The Company recognized \$1,825 in other indefinite-lived intangible assets as part of these transactions.

On February 16, 2013, the Company acquired a home health operation in Texas for approximately \$375, which was paid in cash. This acquisition did not have an impact on the Company's operational bed count. The Company recognized \$375 in other indefinite-lived intangible assets as part of this transaction.

On March 1, 2013, the Company acquired a home health and hospice operation in Washington for approximately \$1,137, which was paid in cash. This acquisition did not have an impact on the Company's operational bed count. The Company recognized \$1,137 in other indefinite-lived intangible assets as part of this transaction.

In addition, on March 1, 2013, the Company purchased a skilled nursing facility in Texas for approximately \$4,508, which was paid in cash. This acquisition added 150 operational skilled nursing beds to the Company's operations.

On April 1, 2013, the Company acquired three skilled nursing facilities in Texas for an aggregate purchase price of approximately \$7,114, which was paid in cash. These acquisitions added 280 operational skilled nursing beds to the Company's operations.

On May 1, 2013, the Company acquired a skilled nursing facility and an assisted living facility in Washington for an aggregate purchase price of \$11,585, which was paid in cash. These acquisitions added 102 operational assisted living units and 110 operational skilled nursing beds to the Company's operations.

107

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

In addition, on May 1, 2013, the Company acquired a skilled nursing facility in Nebraska for approximately \$2,846, which was paid in cash. This acquisition added 70 operational skilled nursing beds to the Company's operations. On June 1, 2013, the Company acquired an assisted living facility in California for approximately \$4,263, which was paid in cash. This acquisition added 110 operational assisted living units to the Company's operations. In addition, on June 1, 2013, the Company acquired an assisted living facility in Utah for approximately \$2,856, which was paid in cash. This acquisition added 69 operational assisted living units to the Company's operations. On July 1, 2013 the Company acquired a skilled nursing facility in Washington for approximately \$4,499, which was paid in cash. This acquisition added 82 operational skilled nursing beds to the Company's operations. In addition, on September 16, 2013, the Company acquired an existing leased urgent care center for approximately \$1,555, which was paid in cash. The Company assumed the existing lease that was in place at the time of acquisition. The urgent care center acquisition did not have an impact on the Company's bed count. As part of this acquisition, the Company recognized \$1,231 in goodwill.

During the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company acquired five stand-alone skilled nursing facilities, one stand-alone assisted living facility, two home health operations and one hospice operation. The aggregate purchase price of the nine long-term care business acquisitions was approximately \$31,558, which was paid in cash. The Company also entered into a separate operations transfer agreement with the prior tenant as part of each transaction.

In addition, during the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company purchased the underlying assets of three of its skilled nursing facilities in California which it previously operated under long-term lease agreements, which contained options to purchase, for \$11,386, which was paid in cash. These acquisitions did not impact the Company's operational bed count.

In January 2012, the Company announced the formation of Immediate Clinic (IC) to develop and operate urgent care centers and related businesses. The first IC operated centers opened in the third quarter of 2012. As of the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company had seven IC operated centers open. On October 4, 2012, the Company invested an additional \$6,000 to IC in exchange for senior preferred stock, which resulted in the Company holding approximately 96% of the outstanding interests in the joint venture on a fully-diluted basis. On December 20, 2012, the Company purchased the remaining outstanding interests in IC for approximately \$400.

On March 1, 2012, DRX Urgent Care LLC (DRX), a newly formed subsidiary of IC, purchased substantially all of the assets and assumed certain liabilities of Doctors Express Franchising LLC, a national urgent care franchise system for \$2,000, adjusted for certain items at the time of close and redeemable noncontrolling interest. The redeemable noncontrolling interest was fair valued at the acquisition date at \$11,600. The Company recognized intangible assets of \$7,900 in trade name, \$3,000 in franchise relationships and \$2,724 in goodwill. See additional details in Note 11, Goodwill and Other Indefinite-Lived Intangible Assets - Net. On December 31, 2012, IC purchased the remaining ownership interest in DRX for approximately \$5,300.

On December 31, 2012, the Company purchased 80% of the membership interest of a mobile x-ray and diagnostic company for \$5,800, plus preliminary net working capital of approximately \$1,300 for total consideration of approximately \$7,100, which was paid in cash. The Company recognized intangible assets of approximately \$900 in trade name, \$4,200 in customer relationship and \$2,100 in goodwill. The Company believes that goodwill will be deductible for tax purposes. See additional details in Note 11 Goodwill and Other Indefinite-Lived Intangible Assets-Net to the Financial Statements.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The table below presents the allocation of the purchase price for the operations acquired in business combinations during the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Land	\$9,312	\$1,012
Building and improvements	26,593	17,615
Equipment, furniture, and fixtures	1,386	1,771
Assembled occupancy	724	289
Goodwill	3,197	7,105
Other indefinite-lived intangible assets	4,152	10,007
Definite-lived intangible assets	—	7,200
Other assets acquired, net of liabilities assumed	—	651
Total acquisitions	\$45,364	\$45,650
Less: redeemable noncontrolling interest	—	(11,600)
Less: noncontrolling interest in mobile diagnostic company acquired	—	(1,778)
Less: cash received at acquisition	—	(714)
Total cash paid for acquisitions	\$45,364	\$31,558

The Company's acquisition strategy has been focused on identifying both opportunistic and strategic acquisitions within its target markets that offer strong opportunities for return on invested capital. The operations acquired by the Company are frequently underperforming financially and can have regulatory and clinical challenges to overcome. Financial information, especially with underperforming operations, is often inadequate, inaccurate or unavailable. Consequently, the Company believes that prior operating results are not meaningful, representative of the Company's current operating results or indicative of the integration potential of its newly acquired operations. The businesses acquired in each of the years ending December 31, 2013, and 2012 were not material acquisitions to the Company individually or in the aggregate. Accordingly, pro forma financial information is not presented. These acquisitions have been included in the consolidated balance sheet of the Company, and the operating results have been included in the consolidated statement of income of the Company since the dates the Company gained effective control.

9. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment consist of the following:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Land	\$79,679	\$70,487
Buildings and improvements	379,021	341,096
Equipment	97,984	80,860
Furniture and fixtures	8,851	8,790
Leasehold improvements	44,123	32,570
Construction in progress	2,081	14,185
	611,739	547,988
Less: accumulated depreciation	(131,969)	(100,133)
Property and equipment, net	\$479,770	\$447,855

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

10. INTANGIBLE ASSETS — Net

Intangible Assets	Weighted Average Life (Years)	December 31,			2012		
		2013 Gross Carrying Amount	Accumulated Amortization	Net	Gross Carrying Amount	Accumulated Amortization	Net
Lease acquisition costs	15.5	\$684	\$(589)) \$95	\$684	\$(545)) \$139
Favorable lease	15.0	1,596	(532)) 1,064	1,596	(426)) 1,170
Assembled occupancy	0.5	2,979	(2,948)) 31	2,255	(2,211)) 44
Facility trade name	30.0	733	(195)) 538	733	(171)) 562
Customer relationships	20.0	4,200	(210)) 3,990	4,200	—) 4,200
Total		\$10,192	\$(4,474)) \$5,718	\$9,468	\$(3,353)) \$6,115

Amortization expense was \$1,121, \$571 and \$1,329 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. Of the \$1,121 in amortization expense incurred during the year ended December 31, 2013, approximately \$737 related to the amortization of patient base intangible assets at recently acquired facilities, which is typically amortized over a period of four to eight months, depending on the classification of the patients and the level of occupancy in a new acquisition on the acquisition date.

Estimated amortization expense for each of the years ending December 31 is as follows:

Year	Amount
2014	\$416
2015	365
2016	345
2017	345
2018	345
Thereafter	3,902
	\$5,718

11. GOODWILL AND OTHER INDEFINITE-LIVED INTANGIBLE ASSETS

The Company performs its annual goodwill impairment analysis during the fourth quarter of each year for each reporting unit that constitutes a business for which discrete financial information is produced and reviewed by operating segment management and provides services that are distinct from the other components of the operating segment. The Company tests for impairment by comparing the net assets of each reporting unit to their respective fair values. The Company determines the estimated fair value of each reporting unit using a discounted cash flow analysis. In the event a unit's net assets exceed its fair value, an implied fair value of goodwill must be determined by assigning the unit's fair value to each asset and liability of the unit. The excess of the fair value of the reporting unit over the amounts assigned to its assets and liabilities is the implied fair value of goodwill. An impairment loss is measured by the difference between the goodwill carrying value and the implied fair value.

On March 25, 2013, the Company agreed to terms to sell DRX, a national urgent care franchise system for approximately \$8,000, adjusted for certain assets and liabilities. The asset sale was effective on April 15, 2013. The sale resulted in a pre-tax loss of \$2,837 for the year ended December 31, 2013. The Company recognized charges to discontinued operations for the excess carrying amount of goodwill and other indefinite-lived intangible assets of \$1,099 and \$1,738, respectively, during the year ended December 31, 2013 as part of this transaction. See Note 4, Discontinued Operations for additional information.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The following table represents activity in goodwill as of and for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011:

	Goodwill
January 1, 2011	\$ 10,339
Additions	6,838
Impairments	—
December 31, 2011	17,177
Additions	7,104
Impairments	(1,625)
December 31, 2012	22,656
Less: charge to discontinued operations for the excess carrying amount of goodwill	(1,099)
	21,557
Additions	3,197
Impairment	(490)
Purchase price adjustment	(329)
December 31, 2013	\$ 23,935

The Company recorded an impairment charge to goodwill on one facility of \$490 for the year ended December 31, 2013. The facility experienced a significant reduction in admissions due to extensive renovations, which occurred over a year, which resulted in declines in related forecasted cash flows, resulting in the impairment to goodwill. Prior to this, the Company had not recorded a goodwill impairment charge related to a facility since the year ended December 31, 2010. Since 1999, the Company has recognized cumulative goodwill impairment losses of \$3,399. The purchase price adjustment of \$329 relates to the finalization of net working capital for the Company's acquisition in a mobile x-ray and diagnostic company in fiscal year 2012.

The initial fair value of DRX assets and liabilities incorporated the fair value analysis of the noncontrolling interest. Therefore, the original carrying value was based on the fair value of the noncontrolling interest and cash paid. In the course of performing its impairment analysis for the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company performed an impairment test over the assets of DRX. As part of the impairment test, the Company calculated the fair value of certain assets, including trade name and franchise agreements. To determine the implied value of goodwill, fair values were allocated to the assets and liabilities of DRX as of December 31, 2012. The implied fair value of goodwill was measured as the excess of the fair value of DRX over the amounts assigned to its assets and liabilities. The impairment loss for DRX was measured by the amount the carrying value of goodwill exceeded the implied fair value of the goodwill. Based on this assessment, the Company recorded a charge to goodwill and trade name at DRX of \$1,625 and \$600, respectively, in the year ended December 31, 2012, which the Company attributed to a decline in the estimated fair value of redeemable noncontrolling interest. See Note 4, Discontinued Operations.

As of December 31, 2013, the Company anticipates that total goodwill recognized will be fully deductible for tax purposes.

During the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company recorded \$4,109 and \$43 in home health and hospice Medicare license and trade name indefinite-lived intangible assets, respectively, as part of its acquisition of three home health and three hospice operations.

Other indefinite-lived intangible assets consists of the following:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Trade name	\$ 1,033	\$ 990

Home health and hospice Medicare license	6,707	2,598
	\$7,740	\$3,588

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

12. RESTRICTED AND OTHER ASSETS

Restricted and other assets consist of the following:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Note receivable	\$2,000	\$—
Debt issuance costs, net	2,801	2,769
Long-term insurance losses recoverable asset	3,280	3,219
Deposits with landlords	872	749
Capital improvement reserves with landlords and lenders	706	683
Equity method investment	—	1,220
Other long-term assets	145	—
Restricted and other assets	\$9,804	\$8,640

Included in other assets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, are anticipated insurance recoveries related to the Company's general and professional liability claims that are recorded on a gross rather than net basis in accordance with an Accounting Standards Update issued by the FASB, capitalized debt issuance costs and the long-term portion of a note receivable from the sale of DRX. See Note 4, Discontinued Operations. Included in other assets as of December 31, 2012, was a non-marketable equity investment accounted for under the equity method. On April 23, 2013, the Company entered into a common unit redemption agreement with the investee where the non-marketable equity investment was repurchased for \$1,600. The Company recognized a gain on the sale of its non-marketable equity investment of \$380 in the second quarter of 2013.

13. OTHER ACCRUED LIABILITIES

Other accrued liabilities consist of the following:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Quality assurance fee	\$3,933	\$2,010
Resident refunds payable	5,238	4,564
Deferred revenue	4,633	5,661
Cash held in trust for residents	1,780	1,520
Resident deposits	1,680	1,666
Dividends payable	1,564	—
Property taxes	2,894	2,264
Other	3,976	3,186
Other accrued liabilities	\$25,698	\$20,871

Quality assurance fee represents amounts payable to California, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Colorado, Iowa, and Nebraska in respect of a mandated fee based on resident days. Resident refunds payable includes amounts due to residents for overpayments and duplicate payments. Deferred revenue occurs when the Company receives payments in advance of services provided. Cash held in trust for residents reflects monies received from, or on behalf of, residents. Maintaining a trust account for residents is a regulatory requirement and, while the trust assets offset the liability, the Company assumes a fiduciary responsibility for these funds. The cash balance related to this liability is included in other current assets in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

14. INCOME TAXES

The provision for income taxes for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 is summarized as follows:

	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Current:			
Federal	\$13,457	\$24,434	\$24,217
State	2,766	4,445	4,185
	16,223	28,879	28,402
Deferred:			
Federal	3,777	(2,433)	2,041
State	3	(1,312)	(951)
	3,780	(3,745)	1,090
Total	\$20,003	\$25,134	\$29,492

A reconciliation of the federal statutory rate to the effective tax rate for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively, is comprised as follows:

	December 31,					
	2013		2012		2011	
Income tax expense at statutory rate	35.0	%	35.0	%	35.0	%
State income taxes - net of federal benefit	4.0		3.0		2.9	
Non-deductible settlement costs	5.0		—		—	
Non-deductible expenses	0.6		0.5		0.3	
Other adjustments	(0.8)		(0.6)		—	
Total income tax provision	43.8	%	37.9	%	38.2	%

The Company's deferred tax assets and liabilities as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 are summarized as follows:

	December 31,	
	2013	2012
Deferred tax assets (liabilities):		
Accrued expenses	\$12,814	\$16,916
Allowance for doubtful accounts	6,836	5,705
Tax credits	2,898	2,400
Captive insurance	8,979	7,360
Total deferred tax assets	31,527	32,381
State taxes	(1,111)	(327)
Depreciation and amortization	(10,825)	(11,828)
Prepaid expenses	(5,895)	(3,121)
Total deferred tax liabilities	(17,831)	(15,276)
Net deferred tax assets	\$13,696	\$17,105

The Company had state credit carryforwards as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 of \$2,898 and \$2,400, respectively. These carryforwards almost entirely relate to state limitations on the application of Enterprise Zone employment-related tax credits. These Enterprise Zone credits are currently expected to carryforward until 2023 to offset future state income tax. The remainder of these carryforwards relate to credits against the Texas margin tax and is expected to carryforward until 2027.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The Company had Federal net operating loss carryforwards as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 of \$1,243 and \$932, respectively. These Federal net operating losses are expected to carry forward until 2032. The Company also had state net operating losses as of December 31, 2013 and 2012 of \$559 and \$1,134, respectively. These state net operating losses carry forward over various periods.

As of December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, the Company did not have any unrecognized tax benefits that would affect the Company's effective tax rate.

The Federal statutes of limitations on the Company's 2007, 2008, and 2009 income tax years lapsed during the third quarter of 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively. During the fourth quarter of each year, various state statutes of limitations also lapsed. The lapses for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 had no impact on the Company's unrecognized tax benefits.

During the first quarter of 2012, the State of California initiated an examination of the Company's income tax returns for the 2008 and 2009 income tax years. The examination was primarily focused on the Captive and the treatment of related insurance matters. To date, California has not proposed any adjustments. The Company is not currently under examination by any other major income tax jurisdiction. The Company does not believe the California examination or any other event will significantly impact the balance of unrecognized tax benefits in the next twelve months.

The Company classifies interest and/or penalties on income tax liabilities or refunds as additional income tax expense or income. Such amounts are not material.

The Company recorded total pre-tax charges related to the settlement with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and related expenses of \$33,000 and \$15,000 during the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively, for a total charge of \$48,000. The Company recorded estimated tax benefits of \$10,383 and \$5,865 during the year ended December 31, 2013 and three months ended December 31, 2012, respectively. See Note 19, Commitments and Contingencies.

15. LEASES

The Company leases certain facilities and its administrative offices under non-cancelable operating leases, most of which have initial lease terms ranging from five to 20 years. The Company also leases certain of its equipment under non-cancelable operating leases with initial terms ranging from three to five years. Most of these leases contain renewal options, certain of which involve rent increases. Total rent expense, inclusive of straight-line rent adjustments, was \$14,073, \$13,779 and \$14,185 for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Future minimum lease payments for all leases as of December 31, 2013 are as follows:

Year	Amount
2014	\$ 13,693
2015	13,677
2016	13,686
2017	13,722
2018	13,764
Thereafter	71,093
	\$ 139,635

Six of the Company's facilities are operated under two separate three-facility master lease arrangements and a breach at a single facility could subject multiple facilities covered by the same master lease to the same default risk. Under a master lease, the Company may lease a large number of geographically dispersed properties through an indivisible lease. Failure to comply with Medicare and Medicaid provider requirements is a default under several of the Company's master lease agreements and debt financing instruments. In addition, other potential defaults related to an individual facility may cause a default of an entire master lease portfolio and could trigger cross-default provisions in the Company's outstanding debt arrangements and other leases. With an indivisible lease, it is difficult to restructure the composition of the portfolio or economic terms of the lease without the consent of the landlord. In addition, a number of the Company's individual facility leases are held by the same or related landlords, and some of these leases include cross-default provisions that could cause a default at one facility to trigger a technical default with respect to others, potentially subjecting certain leases and facilities to the various remedies available to the landlords under separate but cross-defaulted leases. The Company is not aware of any defaults as of December 31, 2013.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

16. SELF INSURANCE RESERVES

The following table represents activity in our insurance reserves as of and for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012:

	General and Professional Liability	Worker's Compensation	Health	Total
Balance January 1, 2012	\$32,010	\$ 9,827	\$2,436	\$44,273
Current year provisions	13,226	7,186	14,302	34,714
Claims paid and direct expenses	(9,207)	(5,031)	(14,271)	(28,509)
Long-term insurance losses recoverable	(921)	1,326	—	405
Balance December 31, 2012	35,108	13,308	2,467	50,883
Current year provisions	7,879	6,656	17,170	31,705
Claims paid and direct expenses	(11,890)	(4,755)	(16,901)	(33,546)
Long-term insurance losses recoverable	(648)	709	—	61
Balance December 31, 2013	\$30,449	\$ 15,918	\$2,736	\$49,103

Included in long-term insurance losses recoverable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, are anticipated insurance recoveries related to the Company's general and professional liability claims that are recorded on a gross rather than net basis in accordance with GAAP.

17. DEBT

Long-term debt consists of the following:

	December 31, 2013	2012
Promissory note with RBS, principal and interest payable monthly and continuing through March 2019, interest at a fixed rate, collateralized by real property, assignment of rents and Company guaranty.	\$20,347	\$21,032
Senior Credit Facility with SunTrust and Wells Fargo, principal and interest payable quarterly, balance due at February 1, 2018, secured by substantially all of the Company's personal property.	144,325	89,375
Ten Project Note with GECC, principal and interest payable monthly; interest is fixed, balance due June 2016, collateralized by deeds of trust on real property, assignment of rents, security agreements and fixture financing statements.	48,864	50,072
Promissory note with RBS, principal and interest payable monthly and continuing through January 2018, interest at a fixed rate, collateralized by real property, assignment of rents and Company guaranty.	32,122	33,167
Promissory notes, principal, and interest payable monthly and continuing through October 2019, interest at fixed rate, collateralized by deed of trust on real property,	8,919	9,203

assignment of rents and security agreement.

Mortgage note, principal, and interest payable monthly and continuing through

February 2027, interest at fixed rate, collateralized by deed of trust on real property, 5,429 5,665

assignment of rents and security agreement.

260,006 208,514

Less current maturities

(7,411) (7,187)

Less debt discount

(700) (822)

\$251,895 \$200,505

115

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Senior Credit Facility with a Lending Consortium Arranged by SunTrust and Wells Fargo (the Senior Credit Facility)

On April 22, 2013, the Company entered into the fourth amendment to the Senior Credit Facility (the Fourth Amendment), which amended the Company's existing Senior Credit Facility Agreement, dated as of July 15, 2011, to amend certain covenants, representations and other key provisions in the credit agreement to, among other things, (i) allow for the settlement relating to the previously disclosed federal civil investigation that has been conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice and related federal agencies in an amount up to \$50,000 and (ii) permit the Company to enter into a corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS. Except as set forth in the Fourth Amendment, all other terms and conditions of the Senior Credit Facility, as amended, remained in full force.

On February 1, 2013, the Company entered into the third amendment to the Senior Credit Facility (the Third Amendment), which amended the Company's existing Senior Credit Facility Agreement, dated as of July 15, 2011. The Third Amendment revised the Senior Credit Facility Agreement to, among other things, (i) increase the revolving credit portion of the Senior Credit Facility by \$75,000 to an aggregate principal amount of \$150,000, of which \$78,700 was drawn as of December 31, 2013, and (ii) extend the maturity date of the Senior Credit Facility from July 15, 2016 to February 1, 2018. Except as set forth in the Third Amendment, all other terms and conditions of the Senior Credit Facility remained in full force and effect as described below.

On July 15, 2011, the Company entered into the Senior Credit Facility in an aggregate principal amount of up to \$150,000 comprised of a \$75,000 revolving credit facility and a \$75,000 term loan advanced in one drawing on July 15, 2011. Borrowings under the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility amortize in equal quarterly installments commencing on September 30, 2011, in an aggregate annual amount equal to 5% per annum of the original principal amount. Interest rates per annum applicable to the Senior Credit Facility are, at the option of the Company, (i) LIBOR plus an initial margin of 2.5% or (ii) the Base Rate (as defined by the agreement) plus an initial margin of 1.5%. Under the terms of the Senior Credit Facility, the applicable margin adjusts based on the Company's leverage ratio as set forth in further detail in the Senior Credit Facility agreement. Amounts borrowed pursuant to the Senior Credit Facility are guaranteed by certain of the Company's wholly-owned subsidiaries and secured by substantially all of their personal property. To reduce the risk related to interest rate fluctuations, the Company, on behalf of the subsidiaries, entered into an interest rate swap agreement to effectively fix the interest rate on the term loan portion of the Senior Credit Facility. See further details of the interest rate swap at Note 6, Fair Value Measurements.

Among other things, under the Senior Credit Facility, the Company must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a maximum net leverage ratio, minimum interest coverage ratio and minimum asset coverage ratio. The loan documents also include certain additional reporting, affirmative and negative covenants including limitations on the incurrence of additional indebtedness, liens, investments in other businesses, dividends declared in excess of 20% of consolidated net income and repurchases and capital expenditures. As of December 31, 2013, we were in compliance with all loan covenants.

Promissory Note with RBS Asset Finance, Inc.

On February 17, 2012, two of the Company's real estate holding subsidiaries as Borrowers executed a promissory note in favor of RBS Asset Finance, Inc. (RBS) as Lender for an aggregate of \$21,525 (the 2012 RBS Loan). The 2012 RBS Loan was secured by Commercial Deed of Trust, Security Agreement, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Fixture Filings on the properties owned by the Borrowers, and other related instruments and agreements, including without limitation a promissory note and a Company guaranty. The 2012 RBS Loan bears interest at a fixed rate of 4.75%. Amounts borrowed under the 2012 RBS Loan may be prepaid starting after the second anniversary of the note subject to certain prepayment fees. The term of the RBS Loan is for seven years, with monthly principal and interest

payments commencing on April 1, 2012 and the balance due on March 1, 2019.

Among other things, under the RBS Loan the Company must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a minimum debt service coverage ratio, an average occupancy rate and a minimum project yield. The Loan Documents also include certain additional affirmative and negative covenants, including limitations on the disposition of the Borrowers and the collateral and minimum average cash balance requirements. As of December 31, 2013, the Company was in compliance with all loan covenants.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Promissory Notes with RBS Asset Finance, Inc.

On December 31, 2010, four of the Company's real estate holding subsidiaries executed a promissory note with RBS as Lender for an aggregate of \$35,000 (RBS Loan). The RBS Loan was secured by Commercial Deeds of Trust, Security Agreements, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Fixture Filings on the four properties and other related instruments and agreements, including without limitation a promissory note and a Company guaranty. The RBS Loan bears interest at a fixed rate of 6.04%. Amounts borrowed under the RBS Loan may be prepaid starting after the second anniversary of the note subject to prepayment fees of 5.0% of the principal balance on the date of prepayment. These prepayment fees are reduced by 1.0% a year for years three through seven of the loan. The term of the RBS Loan is for seven years, with monthly principal and interest payments commencing on February 1, 2011 and the balance due on January 1, 2018.

Among other things, under the RBS Loan, the Company must maintain compliance with specified financial covenants measured on a quarterly basis, including a minimum debt service coverage ratio, an average occupancy rate and a minimum project yield. The loan documents also include certain additional affirmative and negative covenants, including limitations on the disposition of the Borrowers and the collateral. As of December 31, 2013, the Company was in compliance with all loan covenants.

Term Loan with General Electric Capital Corporation

On December 29, 2006, a number of the Company's independent real estate holding subsidiaries jointly entered into the Third Amended and Restated Loan Agreement, with General Electric Capital Corporation (GECC), which consists of an approximately \$55,700 multiple-advance term loan, further referred to as the Ten Project Note. The Ten Project Note matures in June 2016, and is currently secured by the real and personal property comprising the ten facilities owned by these subsidiaries. The Ten Project Note was funded in advances, with each advance bearing interest at a separate rate. The interest rates range from 6.95% to 7.50% per annum.

Under the Ten Project Note, the Company is subject to standard reporting requirements and other typical covenants for a loan of this type. Effective October 1, 2006 and continuing each calendar quarter thereafter, we are subject to restrictive financial covenants, including average occupancy, Debt Service (as defined in the agreement) and Project Yield (as defined in the agreement). As of December 31, 2013, the Company was in compliance with all loan covenants.

Promissory Notes with Johnson Land Enterprises, Inc.

On October 1, 2009, four subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. entered into four separate promissory notes with Johnson Land Enterprises, LLC, for an aggregate of \$10,000, as a part of the Company's acquisition of three skilled nursing facilities in Utah. The unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest from these notes is due on September 30, 2019. The notes bear interest at a rate of 6.0% per annum. As a part of this transaction, the Company recorded a discount to the debt balance in the form of imputed interest of \$1,218. This amount will be amortized over the term of the promissory notes, or 10 years.

Mortgage Loan with Continental Wingate Associates, Inc.

Ensign Southland LLC, a subsidiary of The Ensign Group, Inc., entered into a mortgage loan on January 30, 2001 with Continental Wingate Associates, Inc. The mortgage loan is insured with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or HUD, which subjects the Company's Southland facility to HUD oversight and periodic inspections. The unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest from this mortgage loan is due on February 1, 2027. The mortgage loan bears interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum.

This mortgage loan is secured by the real property comprising the Southland Care Center facility and the rents, issues and profits thereof, as well as all personal property used in the operation of the facility.

Based on Level 2, the carrying value of the Company's long-term debt is considered to approximate the fair value of such debt for all periods presented based upon the interest rates that the Company believes it can currently obtain for similar debt.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Future principal payments due under the long-term debt arrangements discussed above are as follows:

Years Ending	Amount
December 31, 2014	\$7,411
2015	7,672
2016	52,589
2017	6,584
2018	157,790
Thereafter	27,960
	\$260,006

18. OPTIONS AND AWARDS

Stock-based compensation expense consists of share-based payment awards made to employees and directors, including employee stock options and restricted stock awards, based on estimated fair values. As stock-based compensation expense recognized in the Company's consolidated statements of income for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was based on awards ultimately expected to vest, it has been reduced for estimated forfeitures. The Company estimates forfeitures at the time of grant and, if necessary, revises the estimate in subsequent periods if actual forfeitures differ.

The Company has three option plans, the 2001 Stock Option, Deferred Stock and Restricted Stock Plan (2001 Plan), the 2005 Stock Incentive Plan (2005 Plan) and the 2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan (2007 Plan), all of which have been approved by the stockholders. The total number of shares available under all of the Company's stock incentive plans was 1,780 as of December 31, 2013.

2001 Stock Option, Deferred Stock and Restricted Stock Plan - The 2001 Plan authorizes the sale of up to 1,980 shares of common stock to officers, employees, directors, and consultants of the Company. Granted non-employee director options vest and become exercisable immediately. Generally, all other granted options and restricted stock vest over five years at 20% per year on the anniversary of the grant date. Options expire ten years from the date of grant. The exercise price of the stock is determined by the board of directors, but shall not be less than 100% of the fair value on the date of grant. At December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, there were 319, 319 and 314, respectively, unissued shares of common stock available for issuance under this plan, including shares that have been forfeited and are available for reissue.

2005 Stock Incentive Plan - The 2005 Plan authorizes the sale of up to 1,000 shares of treasury stock of which only 800 shares were repurchased and therefore eligible for reissuance. Options granted to non-employee directors vest and become exercisable immediately. All other granted options vest over five years at 20% per year on the anniversary of the grant date. Options expire 10 years from the date of grant. There were 147 unissued shares of common stock available for issuance under this plan for each of the years ending December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, including shares that have been forfeited and are available for reissue.

2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan - The 2007 Plan authorizes the sale of up to 1,000 shares of common stock to officers, employees, directors and consultants of the Company. In addition, the number of shares of common stock reserved under the 2007 Plan will automatically increase on the first day of each fiscal year, beginning on January 1, 2008, in

an amount equal to the lesser of (i) 1,000 shares of common stock, or (ii) 2% of the number of shares outstanding as of the last day of the immediately preceding fiscal year, or (iii) such lesser number as determined by the Company's board of directors. Granted non-employee director options vest and become exercisable in three equal annual installments, or the length of the term if less than three years, on the completion of each year of service measured from the grant date. All other granted options vest over five years at 20% per year on the anniversary of the grant date. Options expire ten years from the date of grant. At December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, there were 1,314, 1,149 and 1,039 unissued shares of common stock available for issuance under this plan.

The Company uses the Black-Scholes option-pricing model to recognize the value of stock-based compensation expense for all share-based payment awards. Determining the appropriate fair-value model and calculating the fair value of stock-based awards at the grant date requires considerable judgment, including estimating stock price volatility, expected option life and forfeiture rates. The Company develops estimates based on historical data and market information, which can change significantly over time. The Black-Scholes model required the Company to make several key judgments including:

118

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The expected option term reflects the application of the simplified method set out in Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) No. 107 Share-Based Payment (SAB 107), which was issued in March 2005. In December 2007, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) released Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 110 (SAB 110), which extends the use of the “simplified” method, under certain circumstances, in developing an estimate of the expected term of “plain vanilla” share options. Accordingly, the Company has utilized the average of the contractual term of the options and the weighted average vesting period for all options to calculate the expected option term. The Company will utilize its own experience to calculate the expected option term in the future when it has sufficient history.

Estimated volatility also reflects the application of SAB 107 interpretive guidance and, accordingly, incorporates historical volatility of similar public entities until sufficient information regarding the volatility of the Company's share price becomes available. The Company will utilize its own experience to calculate estimated volatility in the future when it has sufficient history.

• The dividend yield is based on the Company's historical pattern of dividends as well as expected dividend patterns.

• The risk-free rate is based on the implied yield of U.S. Treasury notes as of the grant date with a remaining term approximately equal to the expected term.

• Estimated forfeiture rate of approximately 8.45% per year is based on the Company's historical forfeiture activity of unvested stock options.

The Company used the following assumptions for stock options granted during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011:

Grant Year	Options Granted	Weighted Average Risk-Free Rate	Expected Life	Weighted Average Volatility	Weighted Average Dividend Yield
2013	248	1.18 % - 1.87%	6.5 years	55 %	0.64 % - 0.93%
2012	246	0.84 % - 1.18%	6.5 years	55 %	0.93%
2011	97	1.42 % - 2.53%	6.5 years	55 %	0.93%

For the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, the following represents the exercise price and fair value displayed at grant date for stock option grants:

Grant Year	Granted	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Fair Value of Options
2013	248	\$35.47	\$17.70
2012	246	\$27.65	\$13.47
2011	97	\$24.79	\$12.38

The weighted average exercise price equaled the weighted average fair value of common stock on the grant date for all options granted during the periods ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 and therefore, the intrinsic value was \$0 at date of grant.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The following table represents the employee stock option activity during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011:

	Number of Options Outstanding	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Number of Options Vested	Weighted Average Exercise Price of Options Vested
January 1, 2011	1,904	\$ 11.55	921	\$9.07
Granted	97	24.79		
Forfeited	(54) 13.57		
Exercised	(314) 7.90		
December 31, 2011	1,633	\$ 12.97	936	\$ 10.65
Granted	246	27.65		
Forfeited	(63) 15.80		
Exercised	(429) 10.95		
December 31, 2012	1,387	\$ 16.06	739	\$ 11.88
Granted	248	35.47		
Forfeited	(66) 24.71		
Exercised	(320) 11.19		
December 31, 2013	1,249	\$ 20.71	681	\$ 14.23

The following summary information reflects stock options outstanding, vested and related details as of December 31, 2013:

Year of Grant	Stock Options Outstanding					Stock Options Vested
	Exercise Price	Number Outstanding	Black-Scholes Fair Value	Remaining Contractual Life (Years)	Vested and Exercisable	
2005	4.99 - 5.75	20	*	2	20	
2006	7.05 - 7.50	96	923	3	96	
2008	9.38 - 14.87	254	1,409	5	254	
2009	14.88 - 16.70	280	2,221	6	208	
2010	17.47 - 18.16	73	653	7	35	
2011	21.61 - 29.30	80	993	8	29	
2012	24.04 - 29.16	215	2,890	9	39	
2013	29.25 - 42.13	231	4,116	10	—	
Total		1,249	\$ 13,205		681	

* The Company will not recognize the Black-Scholes fair value for awards granted prior to January 1, 2006 unless such awards are modified.

In addition to the above, during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, the Company granted 93, 71 and 143 restricted stock awards, respectively. All awards were granted at an exercise price of \$0 and vest over five years. The fair value per share of restricted awards granted in 2013, 2012 and 2011 ranged from \$27.98 to \$42.13, \$24.04 to \$29.16 and \$21.61 to \$29.30, respectively.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

A summary of the status of the Company's nonvested restricted stock awards as of December 31, 2013, and changes during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 is presented below:

	Nonvested Restricted Awards	Weighted Average Grant Date Fair Value
Nonvested at January 1, 2011	102	\$ 18.05
Granted	143	25.52
Vested	(31) 24.18
Forfeited	(4) 19.16
Nonvested at December 31, 2011	210	\$ 22.32
Granted	71	27.78
Vested	(44) 27.53
Forfeited	(13) 21.98
Nonvested at December 31, 2012	224	\$ 23.04
Granted	93	35.27
Vested	(51) 23.67
Forfeited	(36) 24.70
Nonvested at December 31, 2013	230	\$ 28.68

In addition, during the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company granted 10 automatic quarterly stock awards to non-employee directors for their service on the Company's board of directors. The fair value per share of these stock awards ranged from \$27.98 to \$41.91 based on the market price on the grant date. The Company also granted 11 executive incentive awards at a fair value per share of \$32.85 based on the market price on the grant date.

Total share-based compensation expense recognized for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Share-based compensation expense related to stock options	\$2,217	\$1,903	\$2,265
Share-based compensation expense related to restricted stock awards	1,387	1,084	1,091
Share-based compensation expense related to stock awards	795	1,752	—
Total	\$4,399	\$4,739	\$3,356

For the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company expensed \$410 in share-based compensation related to the quarterly stock awards to non-employee directors.

The Company recognized tax benefits related to share-based compensation expense of \$1,723, \$1,740, and \$1,285 during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. In future periods, the Company expects to recognize approximately \$7,089 and \$5,867 in share-based compensation expense for unvested options and unvested restricted stock awards, respectively, that were outstanding as of December 31, 2013. Future share-based compensation expense will be recognized over 3.8 and 3.5 weighted average years for unvested options and restricted stock awards, respectively. There were 568 unvested and outstanding options at December 31, 2013, of which 530 are expected to vest. The weighted average contractual life for options vested at December 31, 2013 was 6.3 years.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The aggregate intrinsic value of options outstanding, vested, expected to vest and exercised as of December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011 is as follows:

	December 31,		
	2013	2012	2011
Outstanding	\$29,431	\$15,703	\$18,942
Vested	20,465	11,285	12,960
Expected to vest	7,873	4,088	5,374
Exercised	8,709	7,123	5,651

The intrinsic value is calculated as the difference between the market value of the underlying common stock and the exercise price of the options.

19. COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Regulatory Matters — Laws and regulations governing Medicare and Medicaid programs are complex and subject to interpretation. Compliance with such laws and regulations can be subject to future governmental review and interpretation, as well as significant regulatory action including fines, penalties, and exclusion from certain governmental programs. The Company believes that it is in compliance in all material respects with all applicable laws and regulations.

A significant portion of the Company's revenue is derived from Medicaid and Medicare, for which reimbursement rates are subject to regulatory changes and government funding restrictions. Any significant future change to reimbursement rates or regulation on how services are provided could have a material effect on the Company's operations.

Cost-Containment Measures — Both government and private pay sources have instituted cost-containment measures designed to limit payments made to providers of healthcare services, and there can be no assurance that future measures designed to limit payments made to providers will not adversely affect the Company.

Income Tax Examinations — During the first quarter of 2012, the State of California initiated an examination of the Company's income tax returns for the 2008 and 2009 income tax years. The examination is primarily focused on the Captive and the treatment of related insurance matters. To date, California has not proposed any adjustments. The Company is not currently under examination by any other major income tax jurisdiction. See Note 14, Income Taxes.

Indemnities — From time to time, the Company enters into certain types of contracts that contingently require the Company to indemnify parties against third-party claims. These contracts primarily include (i) certain real estate leases, under which the Company may be required to indemnify property owners or prior facility operators for post-transfer environmental or other liabilities and other claims arising from the Company's use of the applicable premises, (ii) operations transfer agreements, in which the Company agrees to indemnify past operators of facilities the Company acquires against certain liabilities arising from the transfer of the operation and/or the operation thereof after the transfer, (iii) certain lending agreements, under which the Company may be required to indemnify the lender against various claims and liabilities, (iv) agreements with certain lenders under which the Company may be required to indemnify such lenders against various claims and liabilities, and (v) certain agreements with the Company's officers, directors and employees, under which the Company may be required to indemnify such persons for liabilities arising out of their employment relationships. The terms of such obligations vary by contract and, in most instances, a specific or maximum dollar amount is not explicitly stated therein. Generally, amounts under these contracts cannot be reasonably estimated until a specific claim is asserted. Consequently, because no claims have been asserted, no liabilities have been recorded for these obligations on the Company's balance sheets for any of the periods presented.

Litigation — The skilled nursing business involves a significant risk of liability given the age and health of the Company's patients and residents and the services the Company provides. The Company and others in the industry are subject to an increasing number of claims and lawsuits, including professional liability claims, alleging that services have resulted in personal injury, elder abuse, wrongful death or other related claims. The defense of these lawsuits

may result in significant legal costs, regardless of the outcome, and can result in large settlement amounts or damage awards.

122

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

In addition to the potential lawsuits and claims described above, the Company is also subject to potential lawsuits under the Federal False Claims Act and comparable state laws alleging submission of fraudulent claims for services to any healthcare program (such as Medicare) or payor. A violation may provide the basis for exclusion from federally-funded healthcare programs. Such exclusions could have a correlative negative impact on the Company's financial performance. Some states, including California, Arizona and Texas, have enacted similar whistleblower and false claims laws and regulations. In addition, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 created incentives for states to enact anti-fraud legislation modeled on the Federal False Claims Act. As such, the Company could face increased scrutiny, potential liability and legal expenses and costs based on claims under state false claims acts in markets in which it does business.

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

In July 2010, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act). The Dodd-Frank Act establishes rigorous standards and supervision to protect the economy and American consumers, investors and businesses. Included under Section 922 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) will be required to pay a reward to individuals who provide original information to the SEC resulting in monetary sanctions exceeding \$1,000 in civil or criminal proceedings. The award will range from 10 to 30 percent of the amount recouped and the amount of the award shall be at the discretion of the SEC. The purpose of this reward program is to "motivate those with inside knowledge to come forward and assist the Government to identify and prosecute persons who have violated securities laws and recover money for victims of financial fraud." Healthcare litigation (including class action litigation) is common and is filed based upon a wide variety of claims and theories, and we are routinely subjected to varying types of claims. One particular type of suit arises from alleged violations of state-established minimum staffing requirements for skilled nursing facilities. Failure to meet these requirements can, among other things, jeopardize a facility's compliance with conditions of participation under certain state and federal healthcare programs; it may also subject the facility to a notice of deficiency, a citation, civil monetary penalty, or litigation. These class-action "staffing" suits have the potential to result in large jury verdicts and settlements, and have become more prevalent in the wake of a previous substantial jury award against one of the Company's competitors. The Company expects the plaintiff's bar to become increasingly aggressive in their pursuit of these staffing and similar claims.

A class action staffing suit was previously filed against the Company in the State of California, alleging, among other things, violations of certain Health and Safety Code provisions and a violation of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act at certain of the Company's California facilities. In 2007, the Company settled this class action suit, and the settlement was approved by the affected class and the Court. The Company has been defending a second such staffing class-action claim filed in Los Angeles Superior Court; however, a settlement was reached with class counsel and has received Court approval. The total costs associated with the settlement, including attorney's fees, estimated class payout, and related costs and expenses, are projected to be approximately \$6,500, of which, approximately \$1,500 of this amount was recorded during the year ended December 31, 2013, with the balance having been expensed in prior periods. The Company believes that the settlement will not have a material ongoing adverse effect on the Company's business, financial condition or results of operations.

Other claims and suits, including class actions, continue to be filed against us and other companies in our industry. If there were a significant increase in the number of these claims or an increase in amounts owing should plaintiffs be successful in their prosecution of these claims, this could materially adversely affect the Company's business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

The Company has been, and continues to be, subject to claims and legal actions that arise in the ordinary course of business, including potential claims related to care and treatment provided at its facilities as well as employment related claims. The Company does not believe that the ultimate resolution of these actions will have a material adverse effect on the Company's business, cash flows, financial condition or results of operations. A significant increase in the number of these claims or an increase in amounts owing should plaintiffs be successful in their prosecution of these claims, could materially adversely affect the Company's business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

The Company cannot predict or provide any assurance as to the possible outcome of any litigation. If any litigation were to proceed, and the Company is subjected to, alleged to be liable for, or agrees to a settlement of, claims or obligations under federal Medicare statutes, the federal False Claims Act, or similar state and federal statutes and related regulations, its business, financial condition and results of operations and cash flows could be materially and adversely affected and its stock price could be adversely impacted. Among other things, any settlement or litigation could involve the payment of substantial sums to settle any alleged civil violations, and may also include the Company's assumption of specific procedural and financial obligations going forward under a corporate integrity agreement and/or other arrangement with the government.

Medicare Revenue Recoupments — The Company is subject to reviews relating to Medicare services, billings and potential overpayments. The Company had one operation subject to probe review during the year ended December 31, 2013. The Company anticipates that these probe reviews will increase in frequency in the future. Further, the Company currently has no facilities on prepayment review; however, others may be placed on prepayment review in the future. If a facility fails prepayment review, the facility could then be subject to undergo targeted review, which is a review that targets perceived claims deficiencies. The Company has no facilities that are currently undergoing targeted review.

U.S. Government Inquiry — In late 2006, the Company learned that it might be the subject of an on-going criminal and civil investigation by the DOJ. This was confirmed in March 2007. The investigation was prompted by a whistleblower complaint, and related primarily to claims submitted to the Medicare program for rehabilitation services provided at skilled nursing facilities in Southern California. The Company, through its outside counsel and a special committee of independent directors established by its board, worked cooperatively with the U.S. Attorney's office to produce information requested by the government as part of an ongoing dialogue designed to resolve the issue.

In December 2011, the DOJ notified the Company that it had closed its criminal investigation without action although, as is typical, it reserved the right to reopen the criminal case if new facts came to light. This left only the civil investigation to resolve, and the Company continued to supply requested information to the DOJ and the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), including specific patient records and documents from 2007 to 2011 from six Southern California skilled nursing facilities that had been the subject of previous requests.

In early 2013, discussions between government representatives and the Company's special committee, its outside counsel and their experts had advanced sufficiently that the Company recorded an initial estimated liability in the amount of \$15,000 in the fourth quarter of 2012 for the resolution of claims connected to the investigation. In April 2013, the Company and government representatives reached an agreement in principle to resolve the allegations and close the investigation. Based on these discussions, the Company recorded and announced an additional charge in the amount of \$33,000 in the first quarter of 2013, increasing the total reserve to resolve the matter to \$48,000 (the Reserve Amount).

In October 2013, the Company completed and executed a settlement agreement (the Settlement Agreement) with the Department of Justice and received the final approval of the Office of Inspector General-HHS and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The settlement agreement fully and finally resolves the previously disclosed DOJ investigation and any ancillary claims which have been pending since 2006. Pursuant to the settlement agreement, the Company made a single lump-sum remittance to the government in the amount of \$48,000 in October 2013. The Company has denied engaging in any illegal conduct, and has agreed to the settlement amount without any admission of wrongdoing in order to resolve the allegations and to avoid the uncertainty and expense of protracted litigation.

In connection with the settlement and effective as of October 1, 2013, the Company entered into a five-year corporate integrity agreement with the Office of Inspector General-HHS (the CIA). The CIA acknowledges the existence of the Company's current compliance program, and requires that the Company continue during the term of the CIA to maintain a compliance program designed to promote compliance with the statutes, regulations, and written directives of Medicare, Medicaid, and all other Federal health care programs. The Company is also required to maintain several elements of its existing program during the term of the CIA, including maintaining a compliance officer, a compliance committee of the board of directors, and a code of conduct. The CIA requires that the Company conduct certain additional compliance-related activities during the term of the CIA, including various training and monitoring procedures, and maintaining a disciplinary process for compliance obligations. Pursuant to the CIA, the Company is required to notify the Office of Inspector General-HHS in writing, of, among other things: (i) any ongoing government investigation or legal proceeding involving an allegation that the Company has committed a crime or has engaged in fraudulent activities; (ii) any other matter that a reasonable person would consider a probable violation of applicable criminal, civil, or administrative laws related to compliance with federal healthcare programs; and (iii) any change in location, sale, closing, purchase, or establishment of a new business unit or location related to items or services that may be reimbursed by Federal health care programs. The Company is also subject to periodic reporting and certification requirements attesting that the provisions of the CIA are being implemented and followed, as well as certain document and record retention mandates.

Table of Contents

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — (Continued)

Participation in federal healthcare programs by the Company is not affected by the Settlement Agreement or the CIA. In the event of an uncured material breach of the CIA, the Company could be excluded from participation in federal healthcare programs and/or subject to prosecution.

Concentrations

Credit Risk — The Company has significant accounts receivable balances, the collectability of which is dependent on the availability of funds from certain governmental programs, primarily Medicare and Medicaid. These receivables represent the only significant concentration of credit risk for the Company. The Company does not believe there are significant credit risks associated with these governmental programs. The Company believes that an appropriate allowance has been recorded for the possibility of these receivables proving uncollectible, and continually monitors and adjusts these allowances as necessary. The Company's receivables from Medicare and Medicaid payor programs accounted for approximately 56.8% and 56.2% of its total accounts receivable as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. Revenue from reimbursement under the Medicare and Medicaid programs accounted for 72.2%, 73.6% and 75.2% of the Company's revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Cash in Excess of FDIC Limits — The Company currently has bank deposits with financial institutions in the U.S. that exceed FDIC insurance limits. FDIC insurance provides protection for bank deposits up to \$250. In addition, the Company has uninsured bank deposits with a financial institution outside the U.S. As of February 11, 2014, the Company had approximately \$1,001 in uninsured cash deposits. All uninsured bank deposits are held at high quality credit institutions.

20. DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLAN

The Company has a 401(k) defined contribution plan (the 401(k) Plan), whereby eligible employees may contribute up to 15% of their annual basic earnings. Additionally, the 401(k) Plan provides for discretionary matching contributions (as defined in the 401(k) Plan) by the Company. The Company expensed matching contributions to the 401(k) Plan of \$487, \$444 and \$369 during the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. Beginning in 2007, the Company's plan allowed eligible employees to contribute up to 90% of their eligible compensation, subject to applicable annual Internal Revenue Code limits.

(b) Financial Statement Schedules

THE ENSIGN GROUP, INC. and SUBSIDIARIES

Schedule II

Valuation and Qualifying Accounts

	Balance at Beginning of Year	Additions Charged to Costs and Expenses	Deductions	Balances at End of Year
		(In thousands)		
Year Ended December 31, 2011				
Allowance for doubtful accounts	\$ (9,793)	\$ (7,921)	\$ 4,932	\$ (12,782)
Year Ended December 31, 2012				
Allowance for doubtful accounts	\$ (12,782)	\$ (9,474)	\$ 8,445	\$ (13,811)
Year Ended December 31, 2013				
Allowance for doubtful accounts	\$ (13,811)	\$ (12,106)	\$ 9,377	\$ (16,540)

All other schedules have been omitted because the information required to be set forth therein is not applicable or is shown in the consolidated financial statements or notes thereto.

Table of Contents

EXHIBIT INDEX

(c) Exhibit Index

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
3.1	Fifth Amended and Restated Certificate of Incorporation of The Ensign Group, Inc., filed with the Delaware Secretary of State on November 15, 2007	10-Q	001-33757	3.1	12/21/2007	
3.3	Amended and Restated Bylaws of The Ensign Group, Inc.	10-Q	001-33757	3.2	12/21/2007	
3.4	Certificate of Designation, Preferences and Rights of Series A Junior Participating Preferred Stock, as filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Delaware on November 7, 2013	8-K	001-33757	3.1	11/7/2013	
4.1	Specimen common stock certificate	S-1	333-142897	4.1	10/5/2007	
4.2	Stock Position Management Agreement, dated October 16, 2008, between The Ensign Group, Inc. and Terri M. Christensen	10-K	001-33757	4.2	2/18/2009	
4.3	Rights Agreement, dated as of November 7, 2013, between The Ensign Group, Inc. and Registrar and Transfer Company, as Rights Agent.	8-K	001-33757	4.1	11/7/2013	
10.1	+ The Ensign Group, Inc. 2001 Stock Option, Deferred Stock and Restricted Stock Plan, form of Stock Option Grant Notice for Executive Officers and Directors, stock option agreement and form of restricted stock agreement for Executive Officers and Directors	S-1	333-142897	10.1	7/26/2007	
10.2	+ The Ensign Group, Inc. 2005 Stock Incentive Plan, form of Nonqualified Stock Option Award for Executive Officers and Directors, and form of restricted stock agreement for Executive Officers and Directors	S-1	333-142897	99.2	7/26/2007	
10.3	+ The Ensign Group, Inc. 2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan	S-1	333-142897	10.3	10/5/2007	
10.4	+ Amendment to The Ensign Group, Inc. 2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan	8-K	001-33757	10.2	7/28/2009	
10.5	+ Form of 2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan Notice of Grant of Stock Options; and form of Non-Incentive Stock Option Award Terms and Conditions	S-1	333-142797	10.4	10/5/2007	
10.6	+ Form of 2007 Omnibus Incentive Plan Restricted Stock Agreement	S-1	333-142897	10.5	10/5/2007	
10.7	+ Form of Indemnification Agreement entered into between The Ensign Group, Inc. and its directors, officers and certain key employees	S-1	333-142897	10.6	10/5/2007	
10.8	Fourth Amended and Restated Loan Agreement, dated as of November 10, 2009, by and among certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. as Borrowers, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Agent and Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.1	11/17/2009	
10.9		S-1	333-142897	10.8	7/26/2007	

10.10	Consolidated, Amended and Restated Promissory Note, dated as of December 29, 2006, in the original principal amount of \$64,692,111.67, by certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. in favor of General Electric Capital Corporation Third Amended and Restated Guaranty of Payment and Performance, dated as of December 29, 2006, by The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and General Electric Capital Corporation as Agent and Lender, under which Guarantor guarantees the payment and performance of the obligations of certain of Guarantor's subsidiaries under the Third Amended and Restated Loan Agreement	S-1	333-142897	10.9	7/26/2007
-------	--	-----	------------	------	-----------

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	File Form No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.11	Form of Amended and Restated Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of June 30, 2006 (filed against Desert Terrace Nursing Center, Desert Sky Nursing Home, Highland Manor Health and Rehabilitation Center and North Mountain Medical and Rehabilitation Center), by and among Terrace Holdings AZ LLC, Sky Holdings AZ LLC, Ensign Highland LLC and Valley Health Holdings LLC as Grantors, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary and Schedule of Material Differences therein	S-1	333-142897	10.10	7/26/2007
10.12	Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of June 30, 2006 (filed against Park Manor), by and among Plaza Health Holdings LLC as Grantor, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.11	7/26/2007
10.13	Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of June 30, 2006 (filed against Catalina Care and Rehabilitation Center), by and among Rillito Holdings LLC as Grantor, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.12	7/26/2007
10.14	Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of October 16, 2006 (filed against Park View Gardens at Montgomery), by and among Mountainview Communitycare LLC as Grantor, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.13	7/26/2007
10.15	Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of October 16, 2006 (filed against Sabino Canyon Rehabilitation and Care Center), by and among Meadowbrook Health Associates LLC as Grantor, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.14	7/26/2007
10.16	Form of Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Financing Statement, dated as of December 29, 2006 (filed against Upland Care and Rehabilitation Center and Camarillo Care Center), by and among Cedar Avenue Holdings LLC and Granada Investments LLC as Grantors, Chicago Title Insurance Company	S-1	333-142897	10.15	7/26/2007

as Trustee and General Electric Capital Corporation
as Beneficiary and Schedule of Material Differences
therein

Form of First Amendment to (Amended and
Restated) Deed of Trust, Assignment of Rents,
Security Agreement and Fixture Financing
Statement, dated as of December 29, 2006 (filed
against Desert Terrace Nursing Center, Desert Sky
Nursing Home, Highland Manor Health and
Rehabilitation Center, North Mountain Medical and
Rehabilitation Center, Catalina Care and
Rehabilitation Center, Park Manor, Park View

10.17	Gardens at Montgomery, Sabino Canyon Rehabilitation and Care Center), by and among Terrace Holdings AZ LLC, Sky Holdings AZ LLC, Ensign Highland LLC, Valley Health Holdings LLC, Rillito Holdings LLC, Plaza Health Holdings LLC, Mountainview Communitycare LLC and Meadowbrook Health Associates LLC as Grantors, Chicago Title Insurance Company as Trustee, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Beneficiary and Schedule of Material Differences therein Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, dated as of March 25, 2004, by and	S-1	333-142897	10.16	7/26/2007
10.18	among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrower, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Agent and Lender Amendment No. 1, dated as of December 3, 2004, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security	S-1	333-142897	10.19	5/14/2007
10.19	Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrower, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.20	5/14/2007

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	File Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.20	Second Amended and Restated Revolving Credit Note, dated as of December 3, 2004, in the original principal amount of \$20,000,000, by The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries in favor of General Electric Capital Corporation	S-1	333-142897	10.19	7/26/2007	
10.21	Amendment No. 2, dated as of March 25, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrower, and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.22	5/14/2007	
10.22	Amendment No. 3, dated as of June 22, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrower and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.21	7/26/2007	
10.23	Amendment No. 4, dated as of August 1, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrowers and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.42	8/17/2007	
10.24	Amendment No. 5, dated September 13, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrowers and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.43	10/5/2007	
10.25	Revolving Credit Note, dated as of September 13, 2007, in the original principal amount of \$5,000,000 by The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries in favor of General Electric Capital Corporation	S-1	333-142897	10.44	10/5/2007	
10.26	Commitment Letter, dated October 3, 2007, from General Electric Capital Corporation to The Ensign Group, Inc., setting forth the general terms and conditions of the proposed amendment to the revolving credit facility, which will increase the available credit thereunder to \$50.0 million	S-1	333-142897	10.46	10/5/2007	
10.27	Amendment No. 6, dated November 19, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrowers and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.1	11/21/2007	
10.28	Amendment No. 7, dated December 21, 2007, to the Amended and Restated Loan and Security Agreement, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Borrowers and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.1	12/27/2007	

	Amendment No. 1 and Joinder Agreement to Second Amended and Restated Loan and Security				
10.29	Agreement, by certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. as Borrower and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.1	2/9/2009
	Second Amended and Restated Revolving Credit Note, dated February 4, 2009, by certain				
10.30	subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. as Borrowers for the benefit of General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.2	2/9/2009
	Amended and Restated Revolving Credit Note, dated February 21, 2008, by certain subsidiaries of				
10.31	The Ensign Group, Inc. as Borrowers for the benefit of General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.2	2/27/2008
	Ensign Guaranty, dated February 21, 2008,				
10.32	between The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.3	2/27/2008

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.33	Holding Company Guaranty, dated February 21, 2008, by and among The Ensign Group, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries as Guarantors and General Electric Capital Corporation as Lender	8-K	001-33757	10.4	2/27/2008	
10.34	Pacific Care Center Loan Agreement, dated as of August 6, 1998, by and between G&L Hoquiam, LLC as Borrower and GMAC Commercial Mortgage Corporation as Lender (later assumed by Cherry Health Holdings, Inc. as Borrower and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. as Lender)	S-1	333-142897	10.23	5/14/2007	
10.35	Deed of Trust and Security Agreement, dated as of August 6, 1998, by and among G&L Hoquiam, LLC as Grantor, Ticor Title Insurance Company as Trustee and GMAC Commercial Mortgage Corporation as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.24	7/26/2007	
10.36	Promissory Note, dated as of August 6, 1998, in the original principal amount of \$2,475,000, by G&L Hoquiam, LLC in favor of GMAC Commercial Mortgage Corporation	S-1	333-142897	10.25	7/26/2007	
10.37	Loan Assumption Agreement, by and among G&L Hoquiam, LLC as Prior Owner; G&L Realty Partnership, L.P. as Prior Guarantor; Cherry Health Holdings, Inc. as Borrower; and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., the Trustee for GMAC Commercial Mortgage Securities, Inc., as Lender	S-1	333-142897	10.26	5/14/2007	
10.38	Exceptions to Nonrecourse Guaranty, dated as of October 2006, by The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. as Trustee for GMAC Commercial Mortgage Securities, Inc., under which Guarantor guarantees full and prompt payment of all amounts due and owing by Cherry Health Holdings, Inc. under the Promissory Note	S-1	333-142897	10.22	7/26/2007	
10.39	Deed of Trust with Assignment of Rents, dated as of January 30, 2001, by and among Ensign Southland LLC as Trustor, Brian E. Callahan as Trustee and Continental Wingate Associates, Inc. as Beneficiary	S-1	333-142897	10.27	7/26/2007	
10.40	Deed of Trust Note, dated as of January 30, 2001, in the original principal amount of \$7,455,100, by Ensign Southland, LLC in favor of Continental Wingate Associates, Inc.	S-1	333-142897	10.28	5/14/2007	
10.41	Security Agreement, dated as of January 30, 2001, by and between Ensign Southland, LLC and Continental Wingate Associates, Inc.	S-1	333-142897	10.29	5/14/2007	
10.42	Master Lease Agreement, dated July 3, 2003, between Adipiscor LLC as Lessee and LTC Partners VI, L.P., Coronado Corporation and Park	S-1	333-142897	10.30	5/14/2007	

	Villa Corporation collectively as Lessor			
	Lease Guaranty, dated July 3, 2003, between The			
	Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and LTC			
	Partners VI, L.P., Coronado Corporation and Park			
10.43	Villa Corporation collectively as Lessor, under	S-1	333-142897	10.31 5/14/2007
	which Guarantor guarantees the payment and			
	performance of Adipiscor LLC's obligations under			
	the Master Lease Agreement			
	Master Lease Agreement, dated September 30,			
	2003, between Permunitum LLC as Lessee, Vista			
10.44	Woods Health Associates LLC, City Heights Health	S-1	333-142897	10.32 5/14/2007
	Associates LLC, and Claremont Foothills Health			
	Associates LLC as Sublessees, and OHI Asset (CA),			
	LLC as Lessor			
	Lease Guaranty, dated September 30, 2003, between			
	The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and OHI Asset			
10.45	(CA), LLC as Lessor, under which Guarantor	S-1	333-142897	10.33 5/14/2007
	guarantees the payment and performance of			
	Permunitum LLC's obligations under the Master			
	Lease Agreement			

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	File Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.46	Lease Guaranty, dated September 30, 2003, between Vista Woods Health Associates LLC, City Heights Health Associates LLC and Claremont Foothills Health Associates LLC as Guarantors and OHI Asset (CA), LLC as Lessor, under which Guarantors guarantee the payment and performance of Permunitum LLC's obligations under the Master Lease Agreement	S-1	333-142897	10.34	5/14/2007	
10.47	Master Lease Agreement, dated January 31, 2003, between Moenium Holdings LLC as Lessee and Healthcare Property Investors, Inc., d/b/a in the State of Arizona as HC Properties, Inc., and Healthcare Investors III collectively as Lessor	S-1	333-142897	10.35	5/14/2007	
10.48	Lease Guaranty, between The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor and Healthcare Property Investors, Inc. as Owner, under which Guarantor guarantees the payment and performance of Moenium Holdings LLC's obligations under the Master Lease Agreement	S-1	333-142897	10.36	5/14/2007	
10.49	First Amendment to Master Lease Agreement, dated May 27, 2003, between Moenium Holdings LLC as Lessee and Healthcare Property Investors, Inc., d/b/a in the State of Arizona as HC Properties, Inc., and Healthcare Investors III collectively as Lessor	S-1	333-142897	10.37	5/14/2007	
10.50	Second Amendment to Master Lease Agreement, dated October 31, 2004, between Moenium Holdings LLC as Lessee and Healthcare Property Investors, Inc., d/b/a in the State of Arizona as HC Properties, Inc., and Healthcare Investors III collectively as Lessor	S-1	333-142897	10.38	5/14/2007	
10.51	Lease Agreement, by and between Mission Ridge Associates LLC as Landlord and Ensign Facility Services, Inc. as Tenant; and Guaranty of Lease, dated August 2, 2003, by The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor in favor of Landlord, under which Guarantor guarantees Tenant's obligations under the Lease Agreement	S-1	333-142897	10.39	5/14/2007	
10.52	First Amendment to Lease Agreement dated January 15, 2004, by and between Mission Ridge Associates LLC as Landlord and Ensign Facility Services, Inc. as Tenant	S-1	333-142897	10.40	5/14/2007	
10.53	Second Amendment to Lease Agreement dated December 13, 2007, by and between Mission Ridge Associates LLC as Landlord and Ensign Facility Services, Inc. as Tenant; and Reaffirmation of Guaranty of Lease, dated	10-K	001-33757	10.52	3/6/2008	

	December 13, 2007, by The Ensign Group, Inc. as Guarantor in favor of Landlord, under which Guarantor reaffirms its guaranty of Tenants obligations under the Lease Agreement				
10.54	Third Amendment to Lease Agreement dated February 21, 2008, by and between Mission Ridge Associates LLC as Landlord and Ensign Facility Services, Inc. as Tenant	10-K	001-33757	10.54	2/17/2010
10.55	Fourth Amendment to Lease Agreement dated July 15, 2009, by and between Mission Ridge Associates LLC as Landlord and Ensign Facility Services, Inc. as Tenant	10-K	001-33757	10.55	2/17/2010
10.56	Form of Independent Consulting and Centralized Services Agreement between Ensign Facility Services, Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries	S-1	333-142897	10.41	5/14/2007
10.57	Agreement of Purchase and Sale and Joint Escrow Instructions, dated August 31, 2007, as amended on September 6, 2007	S-1	333-142897	10.45	10/5/2007
10.58	Form of Health Insurance Benefit Agreement pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the Medicare program	S-1	333-142897	10.48	10/19/2007
10.59	Form of Medi-Cal Provider Agreement pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the California Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.49	10/19/2007

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	File Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.60	Form of Provider Participation Agreement pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the Arizona Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.50	10/19/2007	
10.61	Form of Contract to Provide Nursing Facility Services under the Texas Medical Assistance Program pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the Texas Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.51	10/19/2007	
10.62	Form of Client Service Contract pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the Washington Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.52	10/19/2007	
10.63	Form of Provider Agreement for Medicaid and UMAP pursuant to which certain subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc. participate in the Utah Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.53	10/19/2007	
10.64	Form of Medicaid Provider Agreement pursuant to which a subsidiary of The Ensign Group, Inc. participates in the Idaho Medicaid program	S-1	333-142897	10.54	10/19/2007	
10.65	Six Project Promissory Note dated as of November 10, 2009, in the original principal amount of \$40,000,000, by certain subsidiaries of the Ensign Group, Inc. in favor of General Electric Capital Corporation	8-K	001-33757	10.2	11/17/2009	
10.66	Commercial Deeds of Trust, Security Agreement, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Fixture Filing, dated as of December 31, 2010, made by certain subsidiaries of the Company for the benefit of RBS Asset Finance, Inc.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	1/6/2011	
10.67	Note, dated December 31, 2010 by certain subsidiaries of the Company.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	1/6/2011	
10.68	Revolving Credit and Term Loan Agreement, dated as of July 15, 2011, among the Ensign Group, Inc. and the several banks and other financial institutions and lenders from time to time party thereto (the "Lenders") and SunTrust Bank, in its capacity as administrative agent for the Lenders, as issuing bank and as swingline lender.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	7/19/2011	
10.69	Commercial Deeds of Trust, Security Agreements, Assignment of Leases and Rents and Future Filing, dated as of February 17, 2012, made by certain subsidiaries of the Company for the benefit of RBS Asset Finance, Inc. 8-K.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	2/22/2012	
10.70	First Amendment to Revolving Credit and Term Loan Agreement, dated as of October 27, 2011, among The Ensign Group, Inc. and the several banks and other financial institutions and lenders	10-K	001-33757	10.70	2/13/2013	

from time to time party thereto (the "Lenders") and SunTrust Bank, in its capacity as administrative agent for the Lenders, as issuing bank and as swingline lender.

Second Amendment to Revolving Credit and Term Loan Agreement, dated as of April 30, 2012, among The Ensign Group, Inc. and the several banks and other financial institutions and lenders from time to time party thereto (the "Lenders") and SunTrust Bank, in its capacity as administrative agent for the Lenders, as issuing bank and as swingline lender.

10.71

10-K 001-33757 10.71 2/13/2013

Table of Contents

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description	File Form	File No.	Exhibit No.	Filing Date	Filed Herewith
10.72	Third Amendment to Revolving Credit and Term Loan Agreement, dated as of February 1, 2013, among The Ensign Group, Inc. and the several banks and other financial institutions and lenders from time to time party thereto (the "Lenders") and SunTrust Bank, in its capacity as administrative agent for the Lenders, as issuing bank and as swingline lender.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	2/6/2012	
10.73	Fourth Amendment to Revolving Credit and Term Loan Agreement, dated as of April 16, 2013, among the Ensign Group, Inc. and the several banks and other financial institutions and lenders from time to time party thereto(the "Lenders") and SunTrust Bank, in its capacity as administrative agent for the Lenders, as issuing bank and as swingline lender.	8-K	001-33757	10.1	4/22/2013	
10.74	Corporate Integrity Agreement between the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services and The Ensign Group, Inc. dated October 1, 2013.					X
21.1	Subsidiaries of The Ensign Group, Inc., as amended					X
23.1	Consent of Deloitte & Touche LLP					X
31.1	Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002					X
31.2	Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002					X
32.1	Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002					X
32.2	Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002					X
101	Interactive data file (furnished electronically herewith pursuant to Rule 406T of Regulations S-T)					X
+	Indicates management contract or compensatory plan.					