


March 2006

UA Research Summary No. 6

Institute of Social and Economic Research • University of Alaska Anchorage

Figure 1. Growth in Alaska Health-Care Spending, 1991-2005



Spending for health care in Alaska topped \$5 billion in 2005. Just how big is \$5 billion? It is, for perspective, one-third the value of North Slope oil exports in 2005—a year of high oil prices. It's nearly one-sixth the value of everything Alaska's economy produced last year.

In 1991, health-care spending in Alaska was about \$1.6 billion. Even after we take population growth into account, spending for health care increased 176% per Alaskan in 15 years. These soaring costs are taking a growing share of family and government budgets, increasing labor costs, and putting businesses at a competitive disadvantage.

The \$5.3 billion in spending in 2005 was all for the 665,000 people who live in Alaska, but individuals didn't pay all the bills. They paid nearly 20% out of their pockets and through payroll deductions. Businesses (including non-profits) and governments paid about 80%. Of course, individual Alaskans and other Americans indirectly pay all these costs, because they buy goods and services, own businesses, and pay taxes.

What does health-care spending buy? Stays in the hospital, visits to doctors and dentists, prescription drugs, and more, as well as program administration and public health programs. Our estimates don't include capital expenditures.¹

Who pays the bills, and how has that burden shifted as spending increased?

- *Private and government employers spent about \$2 billion for employee health-care coverage in 2005.* For comparison, they paid \$11.8 billion in wages in 2005. With rising costs, businesses and governments have become increasingly likely to pay health-care bills themselves—"self-insure"—rather than pay through insurance premiums.

- *Alaska households spent just over \$1 billion for health care in 2005, up from \$361 million in 1991.* That includes everything individual Alaskans spent—not only their out-of-pocket costs, but also what was deducted from their paychecks to help pay for health coverage through their employers.

- *Governments spent \$2.2 billion for health care programs in 2005, up from \$736 million in 1991.* Medicaid spending was almost \$1 billion.


Health-care spending could double again by 2013, if current trends continue. Why are costs of medical care so high, and why are they increasing faster than everything else? Why have health-care costs in Alaska stayed higher than U.S. averages, even as other costs moved closer to national levels? Are we getting better care now? Who can't afford care?

We're starting to assemble data to help answer those questions. Alaskans face some hard choices about how to control costs but still have a health-care system that provides good care and is accessible to everyone. We hope to provide some useful insights.

This publication is the first step in ISER's research on the health-care industry. It starts with our new estimates of spending and of changes since 1991, when we last looked at health-care spending.² But cost alone is only one part of the complicated health-care story, and here we also begin looking at:

- Who are the most expensive patients? Our analysis of national data shows that the average "high-cost" patients aren't as expensive as you might think.
- Who is more likely to have health insurance provided through their jobs at a reasonable cost? Single people working for big companies.
- How does use of the health care system in the U.S. compare with use in other countries? Canadians and Australians seem to use their systems about as much.
- What is driving costs? Despite what many people think, there are no simple explanations: it's a puzzle with many pieces.

Figure 2. Who Pays The Bills?
(Total 2005 Spending: \$5.3 Billion)





ORGANIZATION OF SUMMARY

We first describe what health-care dollars buy—what shares go to doctors, hospitals, drugs, and other expenses. Then we look in more detail at our estimates of health-care spending in 2005 and the changes since 1991. We think our estimates are a good effort to update our previous work. But the health-care industry is complex, and tracking all the spending is difficult.


After we talk about spending, we give readers a glimpse of related health-care issues. In some cases we have no Alaska data and rely on national figures, which are still useful in illustrating important issues.

Pages 4, 5, and 6 discuss access to, use of, and benefits from the health-care system: who is uninsured; who has health-care coverage and how that coverage is provided; which patients get the costliest care; how Americans' use of medical care compares with use by people in other industrialized countries; and whether we've gotten healthier in exchange for more spending.

Page 7 summarizes what we know about how medical costs in Alaska differ from the U.S. average, and page 8 concludes with a discussion about the many things that may be driving health-care costs.

Keep in mind that population growth and general inflation account for part of the increase in health-care spending since 1991. Alaska's population increased from about 570,000 in 1991 to 665,000 by 2005. Also, prices for everything Americans buy also went up, by about 43% nationwide and 39% in Anchorage. But prices of medical care nearly doubled (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Increase in Consumer Price Index Anchorage and U.S., 1991-2005



Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, Anchorage and U.S. City Average

WHAT ARE WE BUYING?

Figure 4 shows that as of 2000, more than 70% of Alaska's health-care spending was for hospital care and visits to doctors. Prescription drugs accounted for about 9% and dental care 7%. The "other" category includes medical products, health care provided on the job and in schools, and Medicaid payments for in-home care.

Nursing home and home health care made up only 2% of health-care spending in 2000, far short of the U.S. average of 11%—and that share actually dropped between 1990 and 2000, despite fast growth in the number of Alaskans over 65. There has been a shift in how long-term care is provided in Alaska. A change in Medicaid allowed payment for in-home and assisted-living care for people who would otherwise have been cared for in nursing homes.


All types of health-care spending grew rapidly since 1990, but the fastest growth was in prescription drugs and the "other" category (described in the footnote to Figure 4).

HOW HAS SPENDING CHANGED?

Table 1 details who paid for health-care in 2005. Figures 5 and 6 show changes in levels and shares of spending from 1991 to 2005.

- Growth in government spending wasn't uniform. The federal government's share of spending increased (Figure 5). Costs for Medicare and Medicaid more than quadrupled and costs for the Indian Health Service doubled.

Figure 4. What Are We Buying?
(Alaska Health Care Spending, 2000)




*Includes, among other things, durable and non-durable medical products, direct services employers provide employees, government expenditures in schools, and Medicaid payments that allow people to be cared for at home instead of in institutions.

Source: Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services

- State government's share dropped, partly because the federal government paid a bigger share of Medicaid costs in 2005 than in 1991.³
- Local government is the smallest government spender, but the local share of spending increased, mostly because of growing costs for employee health coverage.
- Employers saw the fastest growth. Combined spending by private and government employers increased about 290% (Figure 6).
- Spending by individual Alaskans didn't go up as much—184%—but the \$1 billion they spent in 2005 was still more than the \$922 million businesses spent.

Figure 5. How Did Shares of Spending Change From 1991 to 2005, Among Those Who Buy Health Care?



*See endnote 3, page 8. Note: Totals may not add to 100% because of rounding.

Source: Authors' estimates




Table 1. Health-Care Spending in Alaska, Fiscal Year 2005
(Total Spending: \$5.3 Billion)

Who Provides the Coverage?	Who Buys the Care? (In Million of Dollars)					
	Individuals	Businesses	Local Government	State Government	Federal Government	Total
Individuals	\$1,028					\$1,028
Out-of-pocket costs	\$431					
Individual policies	\$276					
Payments for employer-based insurance	\$320					
Employers (Including retiree coverage)		\$922	\$454	\$252	\$411	\$2,039
Insurance Premiums		\$303	\$103	\$72	\$75	
Self-Insured Costs ^a		\$485	\$352	\$180	\$116	
Military Medical Costs					\$221	
Worker's Compensation (medical benefits)		\$134				
Government Health Programs			\$38	\$535	\$1,654	\$2,227
Medicare					\$419	
Medicaid				\$303	\$667	
Other Public Programs						
Federal						
Indian Health Service Contracts					\$401	
Veterans' Affairs					\$105	
Community Health Centers					\$29	
State						
Grant to local governments, private groups				\$116		
API, Pioneers' Homes				\$55		
Other State-Administered				\$31		
Elementary and Secondary Schools			\$3	\$8	\$33	
WAMI Medical Education				\$2		
Department of Corrections				\$21		
Local						
Health and hospital spending			\$35			
Total Spending	\$1,028	\$922	\$492	\$787	\$1,950	\$5,294

^aMany organizations that self-insure—that is, they pay some of their bills themselves—also still carry some insurance to help cover extraordinary risks.

Source: Authors' estimates Note: Totals may not sum because of rounding.

Figure 6. How Did Spending Change From 1991 to 2005, Among Those Who Provide Coverage?



Source: Authors' estimates

Biggest Kinds of Changes

- Individual Alaskans have seen big increases not only in costs they notice most—how much they have to pay out of their own pockets—but also in less obvious costs: deductions from their paychecks to pay their share of employer-based insurance.
- Both private and government employers became much more likely to self-insure. Self-insurance costs made up about two-thirds of combined employer spending for insurance premiums and self-insurance in 2005, up from about one-third in 1991.
- Spending for Medicaid more than quadrupled (from \$215 million to \$970 million), so that in 2005 it alone made up nearly \$1 in every \$5 of health-care spending. Analysts attribute the fast growth of Medicaid nationwide to growing numbers of eligible Americans, including low-paid workers whose employers don't provide coverage and low-income seniors; to program expansion; to increasing prices of medical care; and to treatment of medical conditions at lower thresholds.



HEALTH-CARE COVERAGE

Most Alaskans—an estimated 87%—have some form of health-care coverage, either through private insurance or government programs.⁴ Some people have more than one kind of coverage, so the percentages in Figure 7 add to more than 100%.

Around 64% of Alaskans are covered by private insurance, 38% by government programs, and nearly 13% have no coverage. Nationwide, 68% of people are covered by private insurance, 30% by government programs, and close to 16% have no coverage.

Alaskans are more likely to have coverage through the military (reflecting the state's large number of active-duty and retired military); the Indian Health Service (because Alaska Natives make up 20% of the population); and Medicaid (the joint federal-state program mainly for low-income and disabled people). Fewer Alaskans are covered by Medicare, because fewer are over 65.

We don't know characteristics of the 13% of Alaskans with no health-care coverage, but we know that nationwide the uninsured are most likely to be young adults and to have annual incomes below \$25,000 (Figure 8).

Children in Alaska are more likely to have coverage than both adults in Alaska and children nationwide. Figure 9 shows that about 8% of children in Alaska had no coverage in 2003, compared with the U.S. average of nearly 12%.⁵ The smaller share of uninsured children in Alaska is probably due to the fact that Alaska Native children are eligible for care through the Indian Health Service, and also to the Denali KidCare program, an extension of Medicaid that provides coverage for low-income children without other coverage.

It's outside the scope of this summary to describe all the ways that families, communities, and governments are affected because millions of Americans lack health insurance. But a recent report by the National Academy of Sciences broadly summarized those effects. It found that the uninsured are in worse health; that uninsured children are more likely to have development delays; that the direct costs of caring for uninsured Americans fall heavily on local communities; and that governments pay hospitals large public subsidies to offset their costs for uncompensated care.⁶

The 64% of Alaskans with private insurance either pay for that coverage themselves (through individual policies) or are covered through their jobs and share the costs with their employers. Figures 10, 11, and 12 show how the rising costs of medical care have affected health-insurance coverage for Alaskans working for private industry.

- Health insurance in Alaska was already more expensive in the 1990s and still is. In 2003, insurance premiums for family coverage at private firms were about \$10,500 in Alaska and \$9,200 nationwide. By 2005, those premiums had jumped to an average of \$11,268 nationally (Figure 10).

- Premiums are higher in Alaska, but workers here pay a smaller share, as Figure 11 shows. As of 2003, employees at private firms in Alaska paid 11% of the premiums for single-person coverage and 17% for family coverage, compared with 17% for single-person coverage and 25% for family coverage nationwide. But employers, especially at small firms, have been shifting more insurance costs to workers. The 2005 UBA-Ingenix Health Plan Survey found that employees of businesses nationwide paid 43% of the premiums for family coverage.

Figure 7. Health-Care Coverage, Alaska and U.S., 2004

	Private Insurance	Medicaid	Medicare	Military	IHS only*	None
Alaska	63.5%	15.3%	7.3%	11.6%	4.2%	12.8%
U.S.	68.1%	12.9%	13.7%	3.7%	N/A	15.7%

*Authors' adjustment. See endnote 4, page 8.


Note: Totals are more than 100% because some people have more than one coverage.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2004

Figure 8. Who Is Most Likely To Be Uninsured in U.S.?

By Age	Percent Uninsured
18-24	31%
65+	1%
By Annual Income	
Less than \$25,000	24%
\$75,000+	8.4%


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the U.S.*, 2004

Figure 9. Health-Care Coverage for Children (18 and Under), Average 2001-2003




Source: American Academy of Pediatrics, adjusted U.S. Census data; see endnote 5, page 8.

Figure 10. Health Insurance Premiums For Family Coverage^a, Private Firms



^aTotal costs shared by employer and employee. ^bAlaska figures for 2005 not available.
Sources: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, U.S. Agency For Health Care Research and Quality, 2003; 2005 UBA/Ingenix Health Plan Survey

Figure 11. Share of Health Insurance Premiums Employees Pay (At Private Firms Offering Health Insurance)




^aReported in Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, 2003

^bAlaska 2005 figures not available; national figures from 2005 UBA/Ingenix Health Plan Survey



Figure 12. Private Firms Offering Health Insurance,* Alaska and U.S., 2003



* Not all workers at firms that offer insurance carry that insurance. Source: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, 2003

• Small Alaska businesses are less likely to offer insurance coverage. Only about a third of those with fewer than 50 employees offer coverage, compared with 43% nationwide (Figure 12).

A lot of Alaskans work for small businesses. In 2003, about 91,500 of the state's 224,500 private-industry employees worked for businesses with fewer than 50 employees. That's more than 40% of all those with jobs in private industry.

WHO COSTS THE MOST AND THE LEAST?

We've talked about the costs of health care and of health-care coverage. Now we turn to the other side of the equation: who's getting the benefits of the spending?

Health-care spending in Alaska was close to \$8,000 per person in 2005. But not everyone is average. The cost of care for a few is significantly higher than average, but for many it's only a few hundred dollars a year.

As a first step toward understanding who gets the benefits of health-care spending, ISER analyzed national data on the characteristics of high- and low-cost patients. That data is from a federal panel survey—that is, a survey that follows households over time.

As Figure 13 shows, just 5% of patients nationwide account for almost half of all health-care spending in any given year, while at the other extreme 50% of patients account for just 3% of spending in a year.

A lot of Americans tend to think that the most expensive patients are probably very

old, or suffering from some catastrophic illness or injury, and are possibly uninsured.

The high-cost patients are older; health-care costs do go up as people age.⁷ But their average age is 57, and fewer than 40% are over 65. The average bill for high-cost patients in 2002, under \$20,000, doesn't reflect major illnesses or end-of-life care. Rather, it's for a few days in the hospital for surgery, several visits to doctors, and significant spending for prescription drugs. Few of the high-cost patients—2%—are uninsured.

The low-cost patients are mostly young, averaging 28 years old. They may see a doctor or a dentist once a year, and they pay almost half their modest medicals bills out of their pockets.

Many of the low-cost group—nearly 20%—are uninsured. The share of uninsured patients in this group tracks with what the National Academy of Sciences has reported: that the uninsured often don't have any medical costs at all in a year, and among those who do, their expenses are less than half the average for people under 65.⁸


Keep in mind that it's easy to go from being a low-cost patient in one year to a much costlier one the next—a car accident, the sudden onset of an illness, or a hundred other unpredictable events can push anyone into the ranks of the high-cost patients.

Figure 13. Who Are the High-Cost and the Low-Cost Patients in the U.S.?

Distribution of Health-Care Spending on Patients, 2002

Who Are the High-Cost Patients?

- Mostly middle-aged people (average age 57), who are hospitalized for a few days, see doctors several times a year, and spend considerable money (average \$3,000) on prescription drugs.
- About 40% are over 65
- They are from all income levels. A third have high incomes (family income over \$80,000), and about a fifth are poor (family income under \$18,000).
- Only 2% are uninsured. More than two-thirds have private insurance, and nearly a third are covered by government health programs, the most common being Medicare.
- They pay about 12% (average \$2,400) of their bills out-of-pocket.



Who Are the Low-Cost Patients?

- Mostly young (average age 28), healthy people, who are likely to see a doctor and a dentist once a year and spend little (average \$44) for prescription drugs.
- About 3% are over 65
- They are from all income levels, with almost the same breakdown as among high spenders: nearly a third have high incomes and about a fifth are poor.
- Nearly 20% are uninsured. About 17% are covered by government programs, most commonly Medicaid. The majority have private insurance.
- They pay about 40% (average \$84) of their bills out-of-pocket.

Sources: MEPS Statistical Brief No. 81, May 2005 and analysis of MEPS data by Stephanie Martin of ISER



Do We Use More Medical Care?

Americans spend more on health care than anybody else. Do Americans increase health-care costs by getting more medical care than people in other developed countries? Or conversely, do countries with national health-care systems hold down costs by rationing care?

Figure 14 compares Americans with the British, Canadians, New Zealanders, and Australians on use of, access to, and satisfaction with their health-care systems. The comparison countries all have some form of national health-care system.

Overall, the comparisons show that residents of all four countries are almost equally likely to see doctors and have diagnostic tests, and that Americans are slightly more likely to take prescription drugs.

Americans are, however, more likely to skip medical tests because of cost and less likely to get appointments the same day they call. They also seem to be somewhat less satisfied with care they get from their doctors and in the emergency room.

ARE WE HEALTHIER?

Another important aspect of the health-care story is what we're getting in return for the high spending. Are Alaskans healthier than in 1990?

The answer seems mixed. In 2005 the United Health Foundation ranked Alaska as among the most improved states in health outcomes since 1990. Despite that improvement, the foundation still ranks Alaska somewhere in the mid-range of states on health measures—because 15 years ago Alaska was ranked toward the bottom.⁹ Figure 15 illustrates some of the improvements Alaska has made since 1990.

Rates of infectious disease (which include hepatitis, tuberculosis, and many more) went from far above the U.S.

Figure 14. Use of Medical Care, U.S. and Selected Countries, 2004
(Percent of Survey Respondents)

	U.S.	Great Britain	New Zealand	Canada	Australia
Saw at least one doctor in previous 2 years	97%	95%	97%	95%	98%
Regularly take prescription drugs	46%	44%	39%	43%	39%
Had blood tests, x-rays, or other diagnostic tests in past 2 years	84%	71%	82%	84%	83%
Able to get doctor's appointment same day when sick	33%	41%	60%	27%	54%
Skipped medical tests, treatment or follow-up because of cost	27%	2%	20%	8%	18%
Rate regular doctor's care excellent or very good	61%	64%	74%	68%	71%
Among those who used emergency room, share who rate emergency services fair or poor	34%	23%	27%	27%	23%

Source: Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey, 2004

average in 1990 to significantly below by 2005. Infant mortality dropped in Alaska and throughout the country.

Declines in infectious disease and infant deaths in Alaska can be traced partly to public-health spending for immunizations, as well as for safe water and sewer systems, new housing, and better access to medical care in remote villages.¹⁰ In Alaska and nationwide, advances in treatment and technology have also reduced infant deaths.


With improved treatments for heart disease, the rate of death from heart disease

declined by 20% in Alaska since 1990, dropping slightly faster than the national rate.

Rates of smoking among Alaskans fell also, but Alaskans are still more likely to smoke than other Americans. Again, public-health campaigns to fight smoking likely contributed to the decline.

On the down side, Alaskans and other Americans are far more likely to be obese now than in 1990—and obese people are more likely to require treatment for diabetes and high blood pressure.

Figure 15. Are Alaskans Healthier Now Than in 1990?



Source: United Health Foundation, *America's Health Rankings 2005*



ALASKA AND U.S. COSTS

Years ago, everything cost more in Alaska, and costs still remain high in remote areas. But in Anchorage and other urban places, the historically high costs of many things have moved closer to U.S. averages in recent times, as the population grew, local markets got bigger, and infrastructure and transportation improved.

But costs of medical care haven't declined relative to U.S. averages. Overall medical costs are probably somewhere in the range of 25% higher in Alaska, but that cost difference varies quite a bit among services and procedures, and prices don't always reflect cost.

Alaska has fewer practicing doctors per capita than the nation as a whole, but somewhat more dentists—so how the supply of medical professionals may affect costs is not clear (Figure 16).

Figures 17 through 20 show some examples of cost differences, but it isn't a comprehensive picture.

- Overall costs of medical and surgical procedures in Alaska were about 18% above the U.S. average in 2001 and dental procedures 37% more (Figure 17).


- Average costs of a visit to a doctor's office were 30% higher in Alaska in 2001. But the average is a mix of private insurance

and government payments. A private insurer in Anchorage and Fairbanks paid nearly twice as much as Medicare for an office visit in 2001, as Figure 18 shows.

- Alaskans don't use as many prescription drugs as other Americans—mostly because there are fewer Alaskans over 65—but we pay more. In 2003, the average price of retail prescriptions was 25% higher in Alaska.


- Costs of hospital care went up faster in Alaska than nationwide from 2000 to 2003—so in 2003 average expenses for a day in an Alaska hospital were 42% above the U.S. average, compared with 30% in 2000.

Figure 16. How Do Numbers of Alaska Doctors and Dentists Compare with U.S. Averages?



Note: Figures updated and corrected March 2007; see endnote 11.
Sources: American Medical Association; American Dental Association; U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 18. Costs of An Office Visit, Alaska and U.S., 2001 (Established Patient, 15 minutes)



*Insurance coverage for active-duty and retired military personnel for medical care not available from military facilities.

Source: GAO Report GAO-01-620, May 2001

Figure 17. How Much Higher are Medical Costs in Alaska? (Costs Paid by Private Insurer, 2000)

	Percent Above U.S. Average
Medical/Surgical Procedures	18.1%
Dental Procedures	37.7%


Source: Ingenix data base; cited in Alaska Division of Medical Assistance, HealthCare Cost Analysis, 2001

Figure 19. Prescription Use and Cost, Alaska and U.S., 2003

	Prescriptions Per Capita	Average Price of Retail Prescriptions	Average Cost Per Capita
United States	10.7	\$52.97	\$566.78
Alaska	6.3	\$66.89	\$421.41

Source: Kaiser Family Foundation, based on data from Verispan, L.L.C.: Special Data Request, 2004; and U.S. Census Bureau, State Population Datasets for six Race Groups

Figure 20. Hospital Costs, Alaska and U.S., 2000 and 2003 (Expenses per In-Patient Day)




Source: 2003 American Hospital Association, Annual Survey



Figure 21. What's Driving Health-Care Spending In Alaska?

Annual Growth, 1990-2005*
8.9%



What's driving this extra growth?
General inflation
More people

*Authors' estimate

WHAT'S DRIVING COSTS? IT'S A PUZZLE

Spending for health care in Alaska increased an average of nearly 9% a year from 1990 to 2005—and that figure doesn't reflect the big capital costs for building hospitals and clinics in the state since 1990.

More people and general inflation together account for only about 40% of that growth. So what's driving the rest?

Just about everybody has an opinion about what's pushing up medical costs, here and nationwide. Alaska has some special conditions—mostly small markets and high costs in rural areas—but other possible contributors to high costs are common to Alaska and the rest of the country.

Some people think the big factors have to do with our system of delivering health care. Those include market forces—like lack of competition, for instance, and lack of incentives in many parts of the system to control costs—as well as inefficiencies created by the complexity of the U.S. system.

Other arguments related to the delivery system are that Americans get more medical care than they need, because most of the bills are still paid by health insurance. Others believe, by contrast, that costs of caring for uninsured people are responsible.

Others blame environmental factors, especially Americans eating too much and not exercising—leading to the spread of diabetes and other conditions requiring more care.

Still others say the growth has to do with changes in treatments and technology—treating conditions at lower thresholds (like the recent drop in the cholesterol level at which doctors recommend treatment); more effective but costlier treatments and prescription drugs; and more complex technology.

Other arguments have to do with changing demographics and a shift in the kinds of illnesses treated. Americans are getting older, and older people need more medical care. Also, some point out that decades ago, more of the illnesses treated were acute—like influenza—and the patient either got better or died in a fairly short time. Now, chronic illnesses and conditions—like high blood pressure—are common and require long-term treatment.


And many Americans link high costs to behavior of drug companies, the insurance industry, the medical and legal professions, and individual Americans. Such behavior would include, for instance, insurance and drug companies making high profits; doctors overbilling government programs; and patients filing lawsuits—causing doctors to practice “defensive medicine.”

Probably there are other opinions we haven't discussed here. We're not endorsing any of them, but merely pointing out that many things could be contributing to rising costs—and it's a puzzle how all the pieces fit together. We will learn more as we study Alaska's health-care system. But for now, we want to emphasize that the answer to what is driving health-care costs is not simple, and finding solutions won't be simple either.

ENDNOTES

1. Our estimates are based on the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services' definitions of personal health care spending. See http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NationalHealthExpend-Data/01_Overview.asp#TopOfPage. We have also included insurance costs, to capture the expenses paid by employers and employees.
2. ISER *Research Summary* No. 53, “The Cost of Health Care in Alaska,” December 1992.

3. The decline in state share is expected to ameliorate somewhat beginning in FY 2006, due to a decision by the 9th District Appellate Court to disallow the Fair Share program that enabled tribal hospitals to receive a higher reimbursement than non-tribal hospitals for uncompensated care.
4. U.S. Census Bureau figures from the Current Population Survey classify Alaskans with coverage only through the Indian Health Service as “uninsured.” We have adjusted those figures, separating those with IHS-only coverage from the uninsured. The adjustment is based on methods of the University of Minnesota's School of Medicine, State Health Access Data Center.
5. American Academy of Pediatrics figures for uninsured Alaska children are adjusted U.S. Census figures, separating children with IHS-coverage only from the “uninsured” category.
6. National Academy of Sciences, *Hidden Costs, Value Lost: Uninsurance in America*. Available at: <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10719.html>. Public subsidies for uncompensated care are illustrated in the State of Alaska's FY 2007 budget request, which includes \$27 million to help Alaska hospitals pay for uncompensated care.
7. In 1999, for example, health-care spending for Americans 75 to 84 was seven times higher than for those 18 and under.
8. See note 6.
9. United Health Foundation, *America's Health Rankings*, 2005 edition.
10. See Chapter 3 in ISER report, *Status of Alaska Natives 2004*, May 2005.
11. Our original figure for number of dentists per 100,000 in Alaska was incorrect. We thank researchers at Health Planning and Systems Development in the Alaska Department of Social Services for helping us identify that error. A separate addendum, *Dentists in Alaska*, prepared in March 2007, provides more information about the source of the error and the correction. See: http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/researchsumm/UA_RS6_addendum03_07.pdf



ABOUT THE AUTHORS: Mark Foster is a research consultant to ISER. Scott Goldsmith is a professor of economics at ISER. The authors thank their colleagues at ISER for their help—Rosylind Frazier, Virgene Hanna, Lexi Hill, Stephanie Martin, and Kerry Pride.

EDITOR—Linda Leask GRAPHIC ARTIST—Clemencia Merrill