

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER/SUPPLIER/CLIA IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:  46A064	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION A. Building B. Wing	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED  10/09/2025
NAME OF PROVIDER OR SUPPLIER  Pine Creek Rehabilitation and Nursing		STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE  876 West 700 South Salt Lake City, UT 84104	

For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.

(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (Each deficiency must be preceded by full regulatory or LSC identifying information)
<p>F 0602</p> <p>Level of Harm - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm</p> <p>Residents Affected - Few</p>	<p>Protect each resident from the wrongful use of the resident's belongings or money.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>

Any deficiency statement ending with an asterisk (\*) denotes a deficiency which the institution may be excused from correcting providing it is determined that other safeguards provide sufficient protection to the patients. (See instructions.) Except for nursing homes, the findings stated above are disclosable 90 days following the date of survey whether or not a plan of correction is provided. For nursing homes, the above findings and plans of correction are disclosable 14 days following the date these documents are made available to the facility. If deficiencies are cited, an approved plan of correction is requisite to continued program participation.

LABORATORY DIRECTOR'S OR PROVIDER/SUPPLIER  
REPRESENTATIVE'S SIGNATURE

TITLE

(X6) DATE

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER/SUPPLIER/CLIA IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:  46A064	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION A. Building B. Wing	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED  10/09/2025
NAME OF PROVIDER OR SUPPLIER  Pine Creek Rehabilitation and Nursing		STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE  876 West 700 South Salt Lake City, UT 84104	
For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.			
(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (Each deficiency must be preceded by full regulatory or LSC identifying information)		
<p>F 0602</p> <p>Level of Harm - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm</p> <p>Residents Affected - Few</p>	<p><b>**NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY**</b> Based on interview and record review, the facility did not prevent misappropriation of a resident's property. Specifically, for 1 out of 23 sampled residents, a resident gave a Nursing Assistant (NA) money and the NA did not return the money when the resident asked for the money back. Resident identifier: 38. Findings included: Resident 38 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with diagnoses which included, but were not limited to, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, generalized anxiety disorder, and adjustment disorder with mixed disturbance of emotions and conduct. Resident 38's medical record was reviewed. The facility Incident Report Form was reviewed. On 3/4/25 at 1:37 PM, resident 38 reported that she had learned that the (Nursing Assistant) NA was having some struggles financially and resident 38 offered to give the NA \$100.00 to help. After multiple attempts resident 38 finally forced the funds in the NA's pocket and the NA accepted the funds. After a few days resident 38 texted the NA asking for the \$100.00 back so resident 38 could pay for some personal storage expenses. The NA did not respond to resident 38 and resident 38 reported the issue to two different staff members to ask for help. The facility Follow-up Investigation Report was reviewed. Resident 38 reported that she wanted to do something nice for the NA and felt bad for the NA's situation. Resident 38 reported that she gave the NA \$100.00 and was not hearing back from the NA now. Resident 38 reported it was getting to the point where resident 38 really needed her money back and had not heard from the NA. The summary of interviews with staff documented that multiple staff members commented on how upset resident 38 was and how worried she was getting. Many staff members agreed that resident 38 felt bad for the NA in question and that resident 38 was trying to do the right thing to help the NA. The alleged perpetrator statement dated 3/4/25 at 1:00 PM, documented that the NA was talking to resident 38 about her financial situation and talking about life. After resident 38 found out that she was struggling a little bit, resident 38 offered her \$100.00 to help get her by. The NA reported that she did not accept the money at first but after she kept pressing and put the money in her pocket she kept the money. The NA reported that she did not know it was not allowed. A staff interview documented Spoke to her [the resident] in tears about the situation. She was upset that she wasn't hearing back from [name redacted]. An additional staff interview documented I know she is really upset she doesn't have her funds. The employee was terminated and the facility verified the allegation. On 10/8/25 at 11:22 AM, an interview was conducted with the Resident Advocate (RA). The RA stated that she did not currently work at the facility but she was the RA when she did. The RA stated that she was informed that resident 38 let a NA borrow \$100.00, and the NA had not paid it back. The RA stated that resident 38 had no changes in behavior. The RA stated that she notified the Administrator (ADM) and Director of Nursing once she became aware of the incident. The RA stated that she did not help with investigating incidents. The RA stated that abuse training was provided to staff twice a year and the training included signs and symptoms of abuse, who to report allegations to, and the time frame of reporting. On 10/8/25 at 1:22 PM, an interview was conducted with the ADM. The ADM stated that he was not the ADM when the incident with resident 38 had occurred. The ADM stated he called the prior ADM and was told that he had not been completely in the loop regarding that incident. The ADM stated that the prior ADM spoke with corporate staff and was told to pay resident 38 back the money that was taken. The ADM stated that was all the prior ADM could say. The ADM stated that yes he would have called local law enforcement and reported the allegation. The ADM stated that he would investigate the allegation by speaking with the individual and the resident. The ADM stated that he would have assessed how the resident was doing. The ADM stated that he would have completed the typical investigation stuff and he would have asked for the money back from the individual that took it. The ADM stated that he had a curriculum of training that he presented at the all staff monthly meetings. The ADM stated that abuse was presented twice a year. The ADM stated if there was a unique case he would bring abuse up again. The ADM stated there was no training that he could find regarding the incident with resident 38.</p>		

STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES AND PLAN OF CORRECTION	(X1) PROVIDER/SUPPLIER/CLIA IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:  46A064	(X2) MULTIPLE CONSTRUCTION A. Building B. Wing	(X3) DATE SURVEY COMPLETED  10/09/2025
NAME OF PROVIDER OR SUPPLIER  Pine Creek Rehabilitation and Nursing		STREET ADDRESS, CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE  876 West 700 South Salt Lake City, UT 84104	
For information on the nursing home's plan to correct this deficiency, please contact the nursing home or the state survey agency.			
(X4) ID PREFIX TAG	SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DEFICIENCIES (Each deficiency must be preceded by full regulatory or LSC identifying information)		
<p>F 0609</p> <p>Level of Harm - Minimal harm or potential for actual harm</p> <p>Residents Affected - Few</p>	<p>Timely report suspected abuse, neglect, or theft and report the results of the investigation to proper authorities.</p> <p><b>**NOTE- TERMS IN BRACKETS HAVE BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY**</b> Based on interview and record review, the facility did not ensure all alleged violations involving abuse, including misappropriation of resident property, were reported immediately, but not later than two hours after the allegation was made, to Adult Protective Services (APS) and local law enforcement. Specifically, for 1 out of 23 sampled residents, an allegation of misappropriation of resident property was not reported to law enforcement and the report to APS was reported 17 days after the allegation. Resident identifier: 38. Findings included: Resident 38 was admitted to the facility on [DATE] with diagnoses which included, but were not limited to, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, generalized anxiety disorder, and adjustment disorder with mixed disturbance of emotions and conduct. Resident 38's medical record was reviewed. The facility Incident Report Form was reviewed. On 3/4/25 at 1:37 PM, resident 38 reported that she had learned that the (Nursing Assistant) NA was having some struggles financially and resident 38 offered to give the NA \$100.00 to help. After multiple attempts resident 38 finally forced the funds in the NA's pocket and the NA accepted the funds. After a few days resident 38 texted the NA asking for the \$100.00 back so resident 38 could pay for some personal storage expenses. The NA did not respond to resident 38 and resident 38 reported the issue to two different staff members to ask for help. The alleged perpetrator statement dated 3/4/25 at 1:00 PM, documented that the NA was talking to resident 38 about her financial situation and talking about life. After resident 38 found out that she was struggling a little bit, resident 38 offered her \$100.00 to help get her by. The NA reported that she did not accept the money at first but after she kept pressing and put the money in her pocket she kept the money. The NA reported that she did not know it was not allowed. The employee was terminated and the facility verified the allegation. The APS report included with the facility investigation was submitted on 3/21/25 at 1:51 PM. The facility Alleged Resident Abuse/Neglect Investigation Checklist documented Notification of Police was not applicable. On 10/8/25 at 11:22 AM, an interview was conducted with the Resident Advocate (RA). The RA stated that she did not currently work at the facility but she was the RA when she did. The RA stated that she was informed that resident 38 let a NA borrow \$100.00, and the NA had not paid it back. The RA stated that resident 38 had no changes in behavior. The RA stated that she notified the Administrator (ADM) and Director of Nursing once she became aware of the incident. The RA stated that she did not help with investigating incidents. The RA stated that abuse training was provided to staff twice a year and the training included signs and symptoms of abuse, who to report allegations to, and the time frame of reporting. On 10/8/25 at 1:22 PM, an interview was conducted with the ADM. The ADM stated that he was not the ADM when the incident with resident 38 had occurred. The ADM stated he called the prior ADM and was told that he had not been completely in the loop regarding that incident. The ADM stated that the prior ADM spoke with corporate staff and was told to pay resident 38 back the money that was taken. The ADM stated that was all the prior ADM could say. The ADM stated that yes he would have called local law enforcement and reported the allegation. The ADM stated that he would investigate the allegation by speaking with the individual and the resident. The ADM stated that he would have assessed how the resident was doing. The ADM stated that he would have completed the typical investigation stuff and he would have asked for the money back from the individual that took it. The ADM stated that he had a curriculum of training that he presented at the all staff monthly meetings. The ADM stated that abuse was presented twice a year. The ADM stated if there was a unique case he would bring abuse up again. The ADM stated there was no training that he could find regarding the incident with resident 38.</p>		