

Konrad Jackson

From: Rep. Kurt Olson
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 11:36 AM
To: Konrad Jackson
Subject: FW: Support for HB 122

From: fsdre7 [<mailto:fsdre7@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 10:08 AM
To: Rep. Kurt Olson
Subject: Support for HB 122

Dear Representative Olson

I am writing in support of HB122. I am a patient-consumer, 41-year old Alaska resident and have resided in Fairbanks most of my adult life.

I support HB122 for several reasons: 1) Naturopathic care provides better long-term care in many situations. 2) Passing HB 122 is more cost-effective for consumers. 3) Granting limited prescription authority to ND's will provide for better healthcare for Alaska residents.

1) Naturopathic care provides better long-term care in many situations.

Last winter my wife had a series of illnesses over a six-month period including several cases of pneumonia. All cases were successfully treated with antibiotics prescribed by her Allopathic provider; however, with in a week or two she would come down with another infection. She repeatedly ask her provider what was wrong with her immune system that she kept getting sick but received little response beyond, "here's your prescription, come back again if you don't see improvement after a few days." After several attempts to get assistance in finding and addressing underlying long-term problems contributing to her series of infections with no response, she turned to a Naturopathic provider who immediately started looking deeper than her current presenting symptoms. After several sets of tests, her doctor identified the cause of her suppressed immune system and began treatment. Her immune system is greatly improved and this winter she has rarely gotten sick.

2) Granting pharmacy access similar to ND's in most states is more cost-effective for consumers.

Because of the above experience, our entire family now receives our primary medical care from a Naturopathic Doctor. This costs our family more money for a number of reasons: a) our insurance does not cover many naturopathic treatments like supplements; b) Denali Kid Care does not pay for services from Naturopaths; c) and when we have "run of the mill" bacterial infections diagnosed by our ND, he is not able to prescribe antibiotics, so we have to pay to see a Allopathic provider, often paying for the same tests to be done again, and miss additional time off work, all so that we can get the treatment that our ND knew we needed several hours earlier. Passage of HB 122 will not help reduce my family's additional costs from reason "a" but it will reduce costs due to reasons "b" and "c".

3) Granting limited prescription authority to NDs will provide for better healthcare for Alaska residents.

Example 2c above is just one the ways that NDs in Alaska are forced to provide health care with one arm tied behind their backs. In most cases, NDs preferred treatment does not include prescription medicines because of negative long-term side effects; however, for certain cases the best treatment (short term and long term) is a prescription medicine. My wife's case (see #1 above) is an example of this. According to the leading expert on the disease, the first choice treatment (a prescription medicine) is 3x more effective than the next most effective treatment (an over the counter supplement).

The primary/sole opposition to the bill (based on opposing documents) is from the MD and DO associations. I have read the ASMA's letter of opposition and recommend that you pay no more attention to it than you would any whiny child who doesn't want to share a bite of his pie with a younger sibling. I would address the pettiness of each of their objections but I will not bore you by pointing out what I'm sure you are able to see for yourself. However, if you would like my review of their objections, I would be happy to provide it.

By passing HB122 you will improve the health of Alaskans while reducing health care costs for hard working families.

Respectfully
Dennis Eames
Kuskokwim Ave.
Fairbanks, Alaska