

**ALASKA LEGISLATURE**

**2605**

**HOUSE and SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE FILES, 2003-2004**

Adopted  
3.4.04

23-LS1768U.2  
Luckhaupt  
3/4/04

AMENDMENT

2

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

TO: CSHB 509( ), Draft Version "U"

- 1 Page 6, line 5, following "if":
- 2 Insert "that participation and those activities are"

Adopted  
3.4.04

23-LS1768\U  
Luckhaupt  
3/3/04

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 509( )

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY

Offered:  
Referred:

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVE KOTT

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act relating to establishing the Alaska Gaming Commission."

2 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

3 \* Section 1. AS 04.11.370(c) is amended to read:

4 (c) If the board receives notice from the Alaska Gaming Commission  
5 [DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE] that a licensee or permittee has violated a provision  
6 of AS 05.15 related to gambling, the board

7 (1) may suspend the license or permit; and

8 (2) shall suspend the license or permit for a period of at least 30 days if  
9 the offense is the person's second or subsequent violation of AS 05.15 related to  
10 gambling.

11 \* Sec. 2. AS 05.15.010 is amended to read:

12 Sec. 05.15.010. Alaska Gaming Commission [DEPARTMENT OF  
13 REVENUE] to administer chapter. The Alaska Gaming Commission in the  
14 Department of Revenue shall administer this chapter.

15 \* Sec. 3. AS 05.15.690 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

1 (46) "commission" means the Alaska Gaming Commission.

2 \* Sec. 4. AS 05 is amended by adding a new chapter to read:

3 **Chapter 18. Alaska Gaming Commission.**

4 **Article 1. Administration.**

5 **Sec. 05.18.010. Creation of commission.** (a) The Alaska Gaming  
6 Commission is established for the purposes of generating revenue for the state and  
7 regulating gaming activities in the state. The commission is established in the  
8 Department of Revenue. The commission consists of five voting members and two  
9 exofficio nonvoting members appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by  
10 the legislature. One voting member shall be appointed from each of the four judicial  
11 districts of the state. One voting member shall be an at-large member. Not more than  
12 three of the seven members may be members of the same political affiliation or party.  
13 One voting member of the commission must have at least five years' experience in law  
14 enforcement and one voting member must be a certified public accountant. One  
15 exofficio member of the commission must hold a permit or license under AS 05.15  
16 and one exofficio member must hold a license or permit under AS 04.11. The voting  
17 members of the commission shall elect one voting member to serve as chair of the  
18 commission.

19 (b) The voting members serve staggered terms of three years. The exofficio  
20 members serve nonstaggered three-year terms. A member may be reappointed but  
21 may not serve for more than six years.

22 (c) A member of the commission does not receive a salary for service on the  
23 commission but is entitled to per diem and travel expenses authorized for members of  
24 boards and commissions under AS 39.20.180.

25 (d) A member of the commission may not have a pecuniary interest in a  
26 contract or agreement entered into by the commission.

27 (e) A person may not serve as a voting member of the commission if that person

28 (1) has been convicted of

29 (A) a felony; or

30 (B) an offense under this chapter, AS 11.66.200 - 11.66.280, or a  
31 comparable provision of municipal, state, or federal law;

1 (2) is an elected official of the state or of a political subdivision of the  
2 state;

3 (3) holds a license, permit, or registration under AS 05.15; or

4 (4) holds a license or permit under AS 04.11.

5 (f) a person may not serve as an exofficio member of the commission if that  
6 person has been convicted of a crime listed in (e)(1) of this section or is an elected  
7 official of the state or of a political subdivision of the state.

8 (g) A person may not serve as a member of the commission until the  
9 investigation required under AS 18.65.080(b) is completed.

10 (h) Three voting members of the commission constitute a quorum for the  
11 transaction of business.

12 (i) The governor may remove a member for cause, including incompetence,  
13 neglect of duty, or misconduct in office. A member being removed for cause shall be  
14 given a copy of the charges and afforded an opportunity to publicly present a defense in  
15 person or by counsel upon not less than 10 days' notice. If a member is removed for  
16 cause, the governor shall file with the lieutenant governor a complete statement of all  
17 charges made against the member and the governor's findings based on the charges,  
18 together with a complete record of the proceedings.

19 (j) The governor may immediately suspend a member for a violation of law or  
20 for misconduct in office pending removal from office under (a) of this section.

21 **Sec. 05.18.020. Meetings.** (a) The commission shall meet at least quarterly at  
22 the call of the chair, at the request of a majority of the voting members, or at a  
23 regularly scheduled time set by the commission.

24 (b) An action of the commission is not binding unless taken at a meeting  
25 where three or more of the voting members are present and vote in favor of the action.

26 **Sec. 05.18.030. Duties and powers of commission.** The commission shall

27 (1) ente. into contracts and agreements necessary to carry out the  
28 provisions of this chapter;

29 (2) adopt regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this  
30 chapter;

31 (3) administer, regulate, and enforce the charitable gaming laws under

1 AS 05.15;

2 (4) recommend policy direction for the operation and administration of  
3 gaming activities in Alaska;

4 (5) report to the governor and the legislature each quarter on the  
5 gaming activities authorized and on the total revenue, prize disbursement, and other  
6 expenses for the preceding quarter;

7 (6) report to the governor and the legislature each year on authorized  
8 gaming activities, including a full and complete statement of revenue, prize  
9 disbursement, and other expenses, and recommendations for changes in this chapter;

10 (7) report to the governor and the legislature as frequently as the  
11 commission determines necessary on conclusions from the analysis of the reaction of  
12 state residents to gaming activities, and on matters that require changes in the law to  
13 prevent violations or evasions of this chapter or to correct undesirable conditions in  
14 connection with the operation or administration of gaming activities;

15 (8) monitor the operation of gaming throughout the state; and

16 (9) study and investigate the operation and administration of gaming  
17 laws of other states and of federal laws that affect gaming activities.

18 **Sec. 05.18.040. Regulations.** The commission shall adopt regulations under  
19 AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act) to establish

20 (1) the types of gaming activities to be conducted if those activities are  
21 permitted under AS 05.18.100;

22 (2) the places and locations where gaming activities under this chapter  
23 may be conducted; and

24 (3) all matters necessary or desirable to carry out this chapter to  
25 operate gaming activities efficiently and economically, and to make the participation  
26 in gaming activities and the distribution of prizes convenient.

27 **Sec. 05.18.050. Executive director and employees.** (a) The commission  
28 shall employ an executive director who is qualified by training and experience to  
29 conduct the day-to-day work of the commission. The director may not engage in  
30 another profession or occupation.

31 (b) Subject to the approval of the commission, the director may appoint

1 deputies required to carry out the functions and duties of the commission. The  
2 director may appoint professional, technical, and clerical employees necessary to  
3 perform the duties of the commission.

4 (c) The director is in the exempt service under AS 39.25.110. ←

5 (d) The commission may not employ a person who has been convicted,  
6 including conviction based on a guilty plea or plea of nolo contendere, of an offense  
7 that disqualifies a person from being a member of the commission.

8 **Sec. 05.18.060. Duties of director.** The director shall ←

9 (1) supervise the operation and administration of gaming activities;

10 (2) act as secretary to the commission;

11 (3) meet at least quarterly with the commission on the operation and  
12 administration of gaming activities;

13 (4) make available for inspection by the commission, upon request, all  
14 books, records, files, and other information and documents of the commission;

15 (5) advise the commission and make recommendations to improve the  
16 operation and administration of gaming in the state;

17 (6) suspend or revoke a contract issued under this chapter for a  
18 violation of this chapter or the regulations adopted under this chapter;

19 (7) provide each month to the commission a full and complete  
20 statement of the revenue, prize disbursements, and other expenses for the preceding  
21 month; and

22 (8) administer and enforce the charitable gaming laws in AS 05.15.

23 **Sec. 05.18.070. Subpoenas.** (a) The director or the commission may  
24 subpoena witnesses and documents in a matter over which the commission has  
25 jurisdiction, control, or supervision. The director or the commission may administer  
26 oaths and affirmations to persons whose testimony is required.

27 (b) If a person fails to obey a subpoena, or if a person refuses to answer a  
28 relevant question or to exhibit a document when ordered to do so by the director or the  
29 commission, the director or the commission may apply to the superior court for an  
30 order directing the person to comply with the subpoena or the order. The court may  
31 order the person to comply.

1 **Article 2. Gaming Activities.**

2 **Sec. 05.18.100. Gaming activities.** (a) The commission may not authorize a  
3 gaming activity unless that activity is authorized by the legislature in this section.

4 (b) The commission may participate with other states in multi-state gaming  
5 activities if permitted by the legislature.

6 **Article 3. Miscellaneous Provisions.**

7 **Sec. 05.18.300. State gaming fund and appropriations.** There is created in  
8 the general fund the state gaming fund. The state gaming fund consists of all revenue  
9 received from gaming activities and all other money credited or transferred to the fund  
10 from another fund or source.

11 **Sec. 05.18.310. Audit.** The commission shall have an audit of the books and  
12 accounts of the commission performed at least once in each year by certified public  
13 accountants. The Legislative Budget and Audit Committee shall annually perform  
14 post-audits of the commission and report to the legislature. The commission may have  
15 special audits performed at any time on its own motion or at the request of the  
16 director. The commission shall file a copy of each audit with the commissioner of  
17 revenue and the legislature.

18 **Sec. 05.18.320. Prohibited acts.** (a) A person may not

19 (1) knowingly act as an agent or sell a gaming product unless the  
20 person has a contract with the commission to be an agent, or is an employee of an  
21 agent and sells gaming products or awards gaming prizes under the supervision of the  
22 agent;

23 (2) knowingly sell or offer to sell a gaming product to a person under  
24 21 years of age;

25 (3) knowingly present a counterfeit or altered gaming product for  
26 payment or transfer a counterfeit or altered gaming product to another person to  
27 present for payment;

28 (4) with intent to defraud, falsely make, alter, forge, utter, pass or  
29 counterfeit a gaming product; or

30 (5) impersonate a representative of the commission.

31 (b) A contractor, an agent, the governor, or an officer or employee of the

1 commission may not purchase a gaming product, receive a gaming prize, or participate  
2 in a gaming activity under this chapter.

3 (c) An agent or contractor may not knowingly withhold funds owed to the  
4 commission.

5 (d) In this section, "knowingly" has the meaning given in AS 11.81.900.

6 **Sec. 05.18.330. Assignment of contracts.** A person that enters into a contract  
7 under this chapter may not assign the contract without the approval of the commission.

8 **Sec. 05.18.340. Penalty.** A person that violates AS 05.18.320 or 05.18.330 is  
9 guilty of a class C felony.

10 **Sec. 05.18.350. Statement of odds.** Each gaming product must indicate the  
11 odds of winning a prize in the particular gaming activity represented by the product.

#### 12 **Article 4. General Provisions.**

13 **Sec. 05.18.900. Definitions.** In this chapter, unless the context requires  
14 otherwise,

15 (1) "commission" means the Alaska Gaming Commission;

16 (2) "director" means the executive director of the commission;

17 (3) "gaming product" means a ticket, receipt, card, or other item,  
18 except a prize, received by a person from an agent or an employee of an agent as  
19 evidence of participation in a gaming activity under this chapter;

20 (4) "operation and administration" includes accounting, sales,  
21 promotion, and security;

22 (5) "person" has the meaning given in AS 01.10.060 and also includes  
23 an estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or other person acting in a fiduciary or  
24 representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and a department,  
25 commission, agency, or instrumentality of the state, including a municipality and an  
26 agency or instrumentality of a municipality.

27 \* **Sec. 5.** AS 11.66.280(2) is amended to read:

28 (2) "gambling" means that a person stakes or risks something of value  
29 upon the outcome of a contest of chance or a future contingent event not under the  
30 person's control or influence, upon an agreement or understanding that that person or  
31 someone else will receive something of value in the event of a certain outcome;

1 "gambling" does not include

2 (A) bona fide business transactions valid under the law of  
3 contracts for the purchase or sale at a future date of securities or commodities  
4 and agreements to compensate for loss caused by the happening of chance,  
5 including contracts of indemnity or guaranty and life, health, or accident  
6 insurance;

7 (B) playing an amusement device that

8 (i) confers only an immediate right of replay not  
9 exchangeable for something of value other than the privilege of  
10 immediate replay; and

11 (ii) does not contain a method or device by which the  
12 privilege of immediate replay may be cancelled or revoked; or

13 (C) an activity authorized by the Alaska Gaming Commission  
14 [DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE] under AS 05.15 or AS 05.18;

15 \* Sec. 6. AS 18.65.080 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

16 (b) The Department of Public Safety shall investigate and ascertain whether a  
17 person appointed by the governor to serve as a member of the Alaska Gaming  
18 Commission has been convicted of a crime set out in AS 05.18.010(e).

19 \* Sec. 7. AS 39.25.110 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

20 (40) the executive director of the Alaska Gaming Commission.

21 \* Sec. 8. AS 39.50.200(b) is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

22 (58) Alaska Gaming Commission (AS 05.18).

23 \* Sec. 9. AS 05.15.690(9) is repealed.

24 \* Sec. 10. The uncodified law of the State of Alaska is amended by adding a new section to  
25 read:

26 REVISOR INSTRUCTION. The revisor of statutes is instructed to change references  
27 to the "commissioner" and "department" in AS 05.15 to "commission" unless it is clear from  
28 the context that "commissioner" refers to a commissioner other than the commissioner of  
29 revenue and "department" refers to a department other than the Department of Revenue.

Hidden Treasures MBP  
Juneau Montessori Center, Southeast Alaska Friends of the Montessori, Juneau  
Dance Unlimited. 750 St. Ann's Ave. Douglas, AK 99824

## Questions: HB509

House finance committee  
Honorable Chairman and members of the Committee  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 9821

03/04/04

**Sec. 05.18.010, line 5. Creation of commission.**

***"The Alaska Gaming Commission is established for the purposes of generating revenue for the state and regulating gaming activities in the state.***

**What does "generating revenue," mean?**

- Does it mean find new ways to expand gambling? Study these new ways and present them to the legislature?
- Does it mean study and present ways to increase taxation of existing forms of gambling? Is that not what SB102 does?
- Does it mean study gambling outside of the current context of "charitable" gaming that being gaming for the benefit of non-profit groups?
- Does it mean to direct the "Gaming Commission" to actively study, promote, and help the legislature approve and implement means of gambling that are solely meant to help generate revenue for the general fund?
- Does it mean that all gambling activity in the state should be viewed within the context of a form of voluntary taxation with the purpose of generating revenue for the state?
- Does this phrase "generating revenue for the state" not actively imply that the state sanctions gambling, which is a vice, and encourages its citizens to participate in gambling activity for the good of the general fund? Will the state for the "purpose of generating revenue" advertise and promote gambling? For example, the state actively encourages the sale of its fisheries products would the same apply for gambling products?
- Does this imply that the state views gambling as a means of "creating" wealth when it has long been established that gambling only "transfers" wealth?

- **Sec. 05.18.010, line 5. Creation of commission.**

**“The Alaska Gaming Commission is established *for the purposes of generating revenue for the state* and regulating gaming activities in the state.**

**What does regulating gaming activities mean?**

- Does it mean increasing enforcement if the commission sees a need for more enforcement? Will the commission have the power to actually finance any additional enforcement it may deem necessary? This bill currently according to the CS does not add any new enforcement or audit personnel to the gaming unit, which will presumably be moved under the new commission.
- Does this exclusion of new funding for personnel imply that the committee and sponsor feel there is already adequate enforcement of the existing gaming statutes? Currently there are two actual enforcement officers who may also be tasked with the tobacco tax stamp enforcement.
- Will regulation become even more politicized if it is moved to “exempt” status regarding its top personal as is not currently the case and placed under an appointed commission?
- Does regulation and revenue creation under the same “tent” inherently create a conflict? For example, imagine the conflicts that may arise if the Liquor Control Board was tasked with the additional duties of not only “regulating” alcohol sales but also tasked with “generating” revenue for the general fund through encouraging more consumption of alcohol thus more tax revenue?
- Will any regulators or personnel under the Gaming Commission be allowed to help with other duties within the dept. of revenue? If not, will this commission create bureaucratic inefficiencies at precisely the time when more efficiency is being actively pursued?

**Sec. 05.18.030. line 17 through 11 Duties and powers of the commission.**

- Is not this entire section the cart before the horse i.e., creating infrastructure for something that does not exist?
- For example, item 1. “enter into contracts and agreements” would this not only be implicit of contracts regarding an expansion of gambling like EGM’s or Lottery?
- Item (2) “adopt regulations” Would this mean that a future date if the state were to approve a Lottery or EGM’s the commission would be tasked and be free without legislative oversight to write all the regulations as well as be tasked with generating revenue?

- Item (4) "recommend policy direction for the operation and administration of gaming activities in Alaska" Does this imply that gaming is to be a state run enterprise?
- Item (5) through (9) Are these lines taken directly from another states reporting requirements for EGM's or a lottery?

**Sec. 05.18.040. line 12-19 Regulations.**

- Is it the intention of this committee and the sponsor to give away legislative powers and let the commission determine the "types" of gaming activity as well as the "locations" where these gaming activities may take place?

**Sec. 05.18.060. line 02-20 Duties of the director.**

- Is this language directly from another states statutes for the duties of a executive director of EGM's or a lottery and is this not creating a paid position for which there is no task as of yet?

**Sec. 05.18.100. lines 1-5 Gaming activities.**

- Does this language imply that the sponsor and this committee are intending that the legislature may want to simply delegate "class" forms of gaming like Class 1, Class 2, Class 3, etc. and then give away its powers to the commission to figure out the details?

**Sec. 05.18.300. line 7-10 State gaming fund and appropriations.**

- Why a specific fund within the general fund? Is this a tool to potentially earmark some of these funds and will that potentially create constitutional problems?

**Sec. 05.18.320. line 18- 09 Prohibited acts.**

- Item (1) would this imply that all current permit holders will now have to also become "agents" and sell pull tabs, bingo paper, raffle tickets, fish derby tickets, etc under "contract" with the state?
- "This section does not prohibit a person from giving a gaming product to another person of any age." (gaming product defined as a ticket, receipt, card or other item except a prize..... under sec 05.18.900) does this mean one could sit and play pull tabs with ones child if one was giving them the tickets?

These are just a few questions surrounding this legislation. I am certain a trained independent legal eye could present hundreds of others. The ultimate question is two

fold. Why would the legislature move legislation seemingly written and created to regulate and derive revenue from something that does not yet exist? This is tantamount to buying and tailoring a suite for your own funeral at the age of 21. There is no way to predict what the legislature may deem appropriate in the future this legislation only succeeds in tying their hands before any discussion of the future is even on the table. Secondly if the intent of this legislation is to strengthen regulation why not keep the non-political gaming unit and add enforcement and audit personnel?

I would urge you to slow down and carefully consider all the ramifications of this legislation before advancing it to the floor.

Sincerely,

David Sanden

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Finance Committee

Committee on HB 509 , Dated : 02/25/2004

On completion of public testimony I faxed my concerns as to Pull-Tab and Bingo Operators and C.H.A.R. , Cabernet Hotel and Restaurant Association as to representing the gaming industry on the Alaska Gaming Commission.

In returning home I contacted the officers of Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization as to testimony of Mr. Wright, representing someone else, non stated, and the testimony of C.H.A.R. Cabernet Hotel and Restaurant Association.

Mr. Wright is one of the largest operators of gaming, representing permit holders, in the entire state of Alaska. C.H.A.R. is an organization representing themselves as to be members of the gaming industry in being a vendor for non profit organizations, that the permit holders are ultimately responsible for the permit's liabilities, and not the vendor themselves.

Accountability for the permit is subject to revocations of the permit and or fines or reimbursement for restitution, is the responsibility of the permit holder and not the operator or vendor. Basically saying, operators or vendors are for profit and not the charities, in sharing the liabilities of suspension of the permit, fines or penalties assessed against the permit holder.

Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization, represents charitable organizations that use some of the proceeds of charitable gaming for their organization, the community programs that are supported by that organization, community charities, and community members with physical or financial need. Helping in time of need that may not be covered by any other community charities.

Our organization represents charitable organization's permit holders, that are the heart of and purpose of the charitable gaming industry. Not for profit, political influence, or benefit of other non-profits of non charitable nature.

We represent permit holders, but do not hold a permit. We are state wide in all 4 regions considered by this bill and are not politically affiliated.

We are the organizations in support of our communities, charities, and the proceeds of our permit holders to go into our communities and not a non charity organization with special interests.

SB 331 has been introduced this session that qualifies organizations for charitable gaming and if passed, would bring into question just what organizations C.H.A.R. and commercial operators represent. Maybe they would be disqualified from portions of charitable gaming and could only represent a part of the gaming industry. The permits they represent maybe for non-profit organizations , but not charitable non-profits.

Please consider Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization and organizations like us, to represent charitable gaming industry on the Alaskan Gaming Commission.

Thank You for Your consideration in this matter.

Ed J. Moeglein *Ed J. Moeglein*

Legislative Liaison to: Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization

P.O. Box 3942 Soldotna, Alaska. 99669

907) 262-7477

Page 1 of 1

## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FUNDRAISING TICKET MANUFACTURERS

246 IRIS PARK PLACE  
1885 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST  
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 55104

PHONE 651-644-4710 • FAX 651-644-5904

February 25, 2004

Honorable Members  
House Finance Committee  
Alaska State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Committee Members:

I am writing on behalf of the National Association of Fundraising Ticket Manufacturers (NAFTM) a non-profit trade association of manufacturers of charity gaming supplies. The individual companies of NAFTM are licensed by and doing business in the State of Alaska. I am writing regarding H.B. 509, as substituted by the Labor and Commerce Committee, and would appreciate your consideration of the following concerns.

As a general matter, it appears that the bill is intended permit the as yet undetermined expansion of legal gambling in Alaska. This is evident by the first sentence of Section 05.18.010 which states that the "Alaska Gaming Commission is established for the purposes of generating revenue for the state and regulating gaming activities in the state" (Emphasis added). Because the commission is not a taxing authority, it appears that the commission is intended to authorize gaming activity that generates all or a portion of its revenue for the state (i.e. a lottery or electronic slot machines). With limited exception around the country, an agency charged with regulating gaming is typically not also an operator of gaming. The duties and responsibilities of an operator are not always consistent with the duties and responsibilities of a regulator and too often, conflicts emerge. In our view, charity gaming in particular is better regulated by a separate division within the Department of Revenue, not by an agency that may also be an operator of gaming activity that undoubtedly will conflict with charity gaming.

We are also concerned about what could be interpreted as a wholesale change or even elimination of charity gaming by this bill. Section 15.18.100 defines the gaming activities that may be authorized by the commission. While the commission is limited by those activities that are permitted by the legislature, there is nothing in the bill that would prohibit the commission from NOT authorizing charity gaming, or any other gaming activity authorized by legislative enactment. As to charity gaming, the bill only

prohibits the commission from authorizing charity gaming activity not permitted under AS 05.15. It does not require the commission to authorize it in the first instance. In other words, although the legislature has authorized charity gaming under AS 05.15, this bill could be read to enable the commission to prohibit that activity if it is a gaming activity the commission does not determine to be "appropriate". Indeed, the bill could be read to require the commission to affirmatively authorize charity gaming if that activity is to continue in Alaska.

If authorized, the activity then becomes subject to the provisions of Section 05.18. This is problematic. Section 05.18.320 requires a contract with the commission to be an agent to sell gaming product and gaming product may only be sold at a price fixed by the commission. Section 05.18.060 requires the director to contract with agents and contractors to "engage in or conduct or operate gaming activities". This suggests that contract, rather than licenses are required for the conduct of charity gaming." Section 05.18.350 requires the odds of winning a prize to be indicated in the particular gaming activity, represented by the product. This is not really possible in bingo, inaccurate with respect to pull-tabs (the odds change depending on the number of tickets sold) and not customary in other forms of gambling except ticket lotteries. Finally, Section 05.18.320 allows persons to give gaming products to persons of any age. We are committed to responsible gaming, and to permit our gaming products to be given to minors is inconsistent with our views.

It may be that the bill is intended to separate charity gaming from the other forms of gambling that will be permitted by the commission. However, as I have attempted to point out, there appear to be several areas of overlap. If this is the intent, we would suggest language that separates charity gaming from the other gaming activities that will be authorized by the commission, and perhaps even leaves the regulation of charity gaming to a separate division within the Department of Revenue as it currently exists.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

*Mary B. Magnuson*

Mary B. Magnuson  
Legal Counsel

MBM/hls



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Finance Committee  
committee name

Committee on HB 509, dated 2/25/04  
Page 1 of 2 bill # / subject public hearing date

Concerning representation on the Gaming Commission as to people in the industry to be appointed.

In the industry involves operators that operate many different permittees or permit holders, such as Mr. Wright that testified today on behalf of someone else today, as being one of the biggest operators of gaming in the State. Other establishments and organizations that act as vendors for local permit holders for ongoing fund raising effort such as C.H.A.R. that sell pull tabs for permits of their choosing.

Then there are establishments of organizations run by their members and employees that sell pull tabs or have bingo for their own fund raising efforts.

Charitable gaming is divided by non-profits and charitable non-profits that give charitable donations to the community and people in the community by ways of programs, education programs in the schools, scholarships, and many ways to provide - cont

Signed: Ed J. Moeglin  
Testifier

Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization  
Representing (optional)

PO Box 3942 Soldotna, Alaska, 99669  
Address

907) 262-7477  
Phone number



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House Finance Committee  
committee name

Committee on HB 509, dated 2/25/04  
Page 2 of 2 bill # / subject public hearing date

Alaska Non-Profit Charitable Organization is made up of permit holders that are true charitable non profit organizations. We are made up of V.F.W., Amvets, American Legion; Moose, Elks, Disabled American Veterans, Eagles and many others. With organizations State Wide and having State Departments, we jointly contribute to our Veterans, students and schools by providing scholarships and education programs, donations for participation in school funded and non funded programs such as Chase-Up, school travel for extra curricular activities. We also assist community members in time of natural disasters and terminal illnesses.

The Voice of Democracy contests, The Vet. Center, The VA, Domiciliary, Veterans picnic and Standdown, Community programs, community services, and a hand in time of need all come from proceeds of charitable gaming from our organizations.

Please consider us for a position on the Gaming Commission as a true charitable gaming organization and not just a non profit in the Gaming industry.

Signed:

Testifier

Alaska Non Profit Charitable Organization

Representing (optional)

P.O. Box 3942 Soldotna, Alaska 99669

Address

907) 262-7477

Phone number

**HB**

**511**

**HFIN**

**FILE**



# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1  
 Bill Version: CSHB 511(HES)  
 ( H ) Publish Date: 3/24/04  
 Dept. Affected: Health & Social Services  
 RDU Public Health  
 Component Community Health/EMS Services

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):  
 Title RELATING TO CERTIFICATES OF NEED

Sponsor SAMUELS  
 Requester HOUSE (HES)

Component No. 2078

**Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)**

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</b>						
<b>CHANGE IN REVENUES (0)</b>						

**FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)**

FUND SOURCE	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

**POSITIONS**

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

**ANALYSIS:** *(Attach a separate page if necessary)*

It is difficult to estimate how much actual additional CON work this bill would generate for the Department. Our rough projection of 5 new CON applications per year would be absorbed by existing staff, thus this zero fiscal note.

However, should CON applications increase dramatically in the future, then a new position (Health Planner II, \$82,500) would be needed, as well as additional travel (\$10,000) and contractual services (\$10,000) - for a total projected annual cost of \$102,500.

Prepared by: Sherry Hill, Special Assistant Phone 465-1618  
 Division Office of the Commissioner Date/Time 03/01/2004  
 Approved by: Joel S. Gilbertson, Commissioner Date 03/01/2004  
 Agency Department of Health and Social Services

# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 2  
 Bill Version: CSHB 511(HES)  
 ( H ) Publish Date: 3/24/04

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):  
 Title RELATING TO CERTIFICATES OF NEED  
 Dept. Affected: Health & Social Services  
 RDU Behavioral Health  
 Component Behavioral Hlth Medicaid Svcs

Sponsor SAMUELS  
 Requester HOUSE (HES)  
 Component No. 2660

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

**CAPITAL EXPENDITURES**

**CHANGE IN REVENUES (0)**

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
Other(Specify Type-do not abbreviate)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY2004) cost: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal:

**POSITIONS**

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Passage of this legislation will make Residential Psychiatric Treatment Centers (RPTC) subject to the requirements of the state's Certificate of Need law. While the department is aware that there is considerable interest in developing additional RPTC capacity, the department has no reliable data to predict how many additional facilities or beds may be licensed in the near-term and is therefore unable to calculate the impact on the Medicaid program.

Over the long-term, the department believes that controlling RPTC capacity through the CON program and encouraging the development of lower levels of health care for children, Medicaid costs will be less than would otherwise be the case and the quality of care provided to Alaskan children will be improved. (continued on page 2)

Prepared by: Sherry Hill, Special Assistant Phone 465-1618  
 Division Office of the Commissioner Date/Time 03/01/2004  
 Approved by: Joel S. Gilbertson, Commissioner Date 03/01/2004  
 Agency Department of Health and Social Services

FISCAL NOTE  
FN # 2

STATE OF ALASKA  
2004 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSHB 511(HES)

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

RPTC services are expensive and the costs continue to increase. In FY 02 Alaska spent \$32.2 million to provide RPTC services to 728 children, most between the ages of 7 and 19. The total number of youth served in the program has increased 222% from 226 in 1998 to 728 in 2002. The total amount spent on RPTC care has risen 485% in four years, from \$5.5 million in 1998 to \$32.2 million in 2002.

The average per diem rate to keep children in RPTC facilities outside Alaska in 2002 was \$55 per day lower than in-state care (\$303 in-state to \$248 per day out-of-state). However, the average length of stay for a child in out-of-state placement was longer (141 days compared to 118 days). Some out of state services are specialized services not currently offered in Alaska. Best practices indicate children are better served closer to home and that in-state care facilitates involvement in treatment and discharge planning to improve transition for children or youth back into community based care, reducing length of stay and readmissions.

Although the cost cannot be estimated, the transition from out-of-state care to in-state care could be very costly if proper planning and development are not done. It is important to ensure that the beds are distributed according to community need and that support services are in place so that children do not end up in higher, more expensive levels of care for a longer period than necessary. Developing capacity to serve these children in Alaska will create more jobs in Alaska and ensure that Alaskan dollars are spent in Alaska. It is conceivable that up to 150 new RPTC beds could be built in Alaska in a number of facilities with construction costs of up to \$3 to \$10 million and cost of care could be up to \$20 million.

This \$20 million is not expected to be a cost that is in addition to the \$32 million currently spent, but will reduce the amount spent out of state if the development is well planned. If development is not well planned, there will be additional costs.

By: STOLTZE

3.31.04

Failed 3-8

AMENDMENT 1

TO: HB511

PAGE3, LINE 21:

Delete:

"independent diagnostic testing facility"

2004 HOUSE FINANCE  
COMMITTEE VOTE SHEET

DATE: 3/31/04

Amendment: Am 1 AB511

MEMBER

Favor

Oppose

MEMBER	Favor	Oppose
MEYER		✓
MOSES	✓	
STOLTZE	✓	
CHENAULT		✓
CROFT		✓
FATE		✓
FOSTER	✓	
HAWKER		✓
JOULE		✓
HARRIS		✓
WILLIAMS		✓

Yea \_\_\_\_\_

Nay \_\_\_\_\_

By Stolte

3.31.03 Withdrawn

23-LS1755\S.1  
Mischel  
3/31/04

AMENDMENT #2

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

TO: CSHB 511(HES)

1 Page 4, following line 16:

2 Insert a new bill section to read:

3 "\* Sec. 7. The uncodified law of the State of Alaska is amended by adding a new section to  
4 read:

5 APPLICABILITY. To the extent that secs. 3 and 4 of this Act relate to residential  
6 psychiatric treatment centers, as defined in sec. 5 of this Act, secs. 3 and 4 of this Act apply to  
7 a residential psychiatric treatment center that has not been substantially initiated before the  
8 effective date of this Act through either an investment commitment of at least 50 percent of  
9 the construction costs or acquisition of a building permit for that facility.

10

11 Renumber the following bill section accordingly.

## Rod's Talking Points For HB 511

Rod Betit

Page 1

March 31, 2004

Mr. Chairman, my name is Rod Betit, and I am President of the Alaska Hospital & Nursing Home Association representing 10 free standing hospitals, 15 combined hospitals and nursing homes, and 4 free standing hospitals.

Let me say that this issue potentially impacts all of our members, not just one or two as has been implied in some earlier testimony.

All 29 facility CEOs and their Boards stand united behind CSHB 511 as passed out of House HESS.

As further evidence of the level of concern outside of Anchorage and Fairbanks, I have copies of letters to Chairman Williams from Ketchikan General Hospital, Valdez Regional Health Authority, Sitka Community Hospital, Wrangell Medical Center, Petersburg Medical Center, and South Peninsula Hospital expressing their support for HB 511.

As committee members know, a number of these hospitals are already struggling and any further dilution of a finite number of medical procedures provided in a community.

- **We are talking about fairness in HB 511, not whether we should have CON**

CON is in place and is an important tool for the Department to manage the health care infrastructure in communities across Alaska. We support CON because of the finite amount of care a community requires, and the adverse impact that over investment in facilities and equipment can have on overall access and cost for the full range of medical services a community expects.

Some would have you believe that your consideration of HB 511 is about free market principles and imaging centers being squeezed out of the market. That simply is not the case.

Our member hospitals and nursing homes have had to submit justification through a CON application each time they have wanted to add equipment, space or new services that exceed \$1 million, including adding, expanding or upgrading imaging centers.

**In contrast, Alaska Open Imaging has not had to meet this same requirement.** As a result they have opened facilities in Wasilla, Anchorage and Soldotna without any review by the Department of Health & Social Services.

You have to wonder why there is such strong disagreement over requiring imaging centers to submit to the same review and approval as hospitals must go through. Could it be there are plans to open centers in other communities and the project sponsors do not want the need for these projects reviewed by the Department?

In our view, it is only fair that all new independent imaging center projects be required to undergo the same review as currently required of hospital based projects. HB 511 makes this small but critically important change to CON law.

- **Hospitals must provide imaging services even if an independent center comes on line.**

Providing imaging services is not an either/or decision for hospitals. Imaging services must be provided to support their emergency departments and surgery services, not to mention a whole host of diagnostic needs for inpatient purposes. Some of this is provided free of charge due to lack of ability to pay.

*Competition for this finite amount of imaging service seriously impacts a community hospital's ability to accomplish this portion of their mission.*

- **Is CON an effective review mechanism?**

Yes. Since 1996 there have been 36 CON applications; 61% were approved as requested, 11% were denied, 11% were partially approved, 6% were withdrawn, and 14% were given special conditions that had to be met.

[Taken from March 15, 2004 letter from Janet Clark, Assistant Commissioner to Representative Peggy Wilson]

- **Is the CON process being circumvented?**

Yes. "Most ambulatory surgery centers are able to lease equipment or space in a building and avoid CON. Only 6 CON applications for freestanding ambulatory surgery centers have been received since the inception of the CON program 27 years ago. Fifty percent of these were approved. Independent diagnostic testing facilities are not required to go through the CON process, so no applications have even been received from them".

[Janet Clark letter dated March 15, 2004]

It is vital these loopholes be fixed in the interest of health care providers and consumers alike.

- **Are hospitals being protected in some way by CON?**

Absolutely not. Since 1996 a number of freestanding facilities in Anchorage, Wasilla and Kenai have been built without a CON that would have required a CON if built by a hospital. For example, Alaska Open Imaging has opened facilities in Wasilla, Anchorage and Soldotna without a CON and purchased a PET scanner. Providence had to go through the CON process to get approval for a PET scanner. Anchorage Fracture Clinic purchased an MRI, and several Ambulatory Surgical Clinics in Anchorage were able to develop projects without a CON that hospitals would have to go through the CON process to build or buy the equipment. A private group of physicians built a cardiac cath lab without a CON. Also, if the Department's goal is to protect hospitals from competition, why do hospitals appeal our decisions? [Janet Clark letter dated March 15, 2004]

Clearly it is time to correct these inequities in the CON law and HB 511 does that. We request the Committee move HB 511 out of the Finance Committee without amendment. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.



# REPRESENTATIVE RALPH SAMUELS

HOUSE DISTRICT 29

## House Bill 511 Sponsor Statement

**“An Act relating to the certificate of need program for health care facilities; and providing for an effective date.”**

The Certificate of Need review process, which is administered by the Department of Health and Social Services, establishes a set of statutory criteria to guide the development of new healthcare facilities and services in Alaska. Among the objectives of the program are ensuring reasonable access to needed healthcare services throughout the state without unnecessary service duplication and assuring that the need, cost, type, level, quality, and feasibility of providing any new health services be subject to review and assessment prior to any offering or development. In that process, a focus is placed on managing growth in capital expenditures in order to ensure that the new services will provide high-quality services in a cost-effective manner.

With the demand for healthcare services constantly evolving and technology rapidly changing, the resulting impact on the state's existing statutes must be addressed from time to time. It is in that vein that I am sponsoring this piece of legislation. Current state law governing this program requires any person wishing to expend \$1,000,000 or more to construct a health care facility, alter the bed capacity of a health care facility, or add a category of health services provided by a health care facility, must apply for a Certificate of Need. That law leaves a gaping hole in state oversight in that any person who wishes to establish or alter a health care facility or related service may circumvent the Certificate of Need process by simply leasing space and equipment. This legislation seeks to "level the playing field" by subjecting all those seeking to provide these services to the same rules.

Additionally, the number of Alaska's children and youth who are sent out of state for residential psychiatric treatment has skyrocketed from 83 children in FY98 to 528 children in FY02. The state infrastructure must be developed to provide a comprehensive system of behavioral health care. However, uncontrolled growth could result in a system focused on the most intensive care, not necessarily the most effective or needed care. While the state is anxious to build up the necessary in-state capacity needed to serve Alaskan children with in-state care, without safeguards in place, secure care could quickly be overbuilt. Since all children and youth served by residential psychiatric treatment centers (RPTCs) are paid for by Medicaid after 30 days in an out-of-home placement, this becomes a Medicaid issue. Adding secure residential psychiatric treatment facilities to the Certificate of Need (CON) program would be an advantage to the state in managing the way in which the service delivery system is developed.

Email: [Representative\\_Ralph\\_Samuels@legis.state.ak.us](mailto:Representative_Ralph_Samuels@legis.state.ak.us)

Session: Alaska State Capitol, Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182 • Phone: (907) 465-2095 Fax: (907) 465-3810  
Interim: 716 W. 4th Ave., Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2133 • Phone: (907) 269-0240 Fax: (907) 269-0242

# STATE OF ALASKA

DEPT. OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 110650  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0650  
PHONE: (907) 465-3082  
FAX: (907) 465-2499

March 15, 2004

The Honorable Peggy Wilson, Chair  
The Honorable Carl Gatto, Vice-Chair  
House HESS Committee  
State Capitol, Room 104 and 411  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representatives Wilson and Gatto:

Recently, members of the House Health Education and Social Services (HESS) Committee received correspondence from Tanana Valley Clinic regarding HB 511-Certificate of Need Bill. The correspondence alleges that the Certificate of Need program has approved 99% of all the projects submitted for CON consideration, which is not accurate.


To clear up any confusion on the subject, the department completed an analysis of Certificate of Need approvals, disapprovals, etc. and in *Attachment #1* have provided the analysis.

Also attached for your information, in *Attachment #2*, is a summary of Questions and Answers related to Certificate of Need.

We have also had questions concerning the number and activity of "competing applications", *Attachment #3* includes information on this subject.

I hope this information is useful to all members of the House HESS Committee. If you have any further questions I will be available on Thursday March 18, 2004 to testify on HB 511 you can also contact me at 465-1630.

Sincerely,



Janet Clarke  
Assistant Commissioner

cc: Representative John Coghill, Capitol Building 204  
Representative Paul Seaton, Capitol Building, Room 428  
Representative Kelly Wolf, Capitol Building, Room 418  
Representative Sharon Cissna, Capitol Building, Room 420  
Representative Mary Kapsner, Capitol Building, Room 424  
Joel Gilbertson, Commissioner  
Sherry Hill, Special Assistant

## RESPONSE TO TVC ASSERTIONS

Tanana Valley Clinic has asserted that 1) the CON review process automatically "rubber stamps" hospital projects; 2) none of the non-hospital CONs are approved; 3) that the true purpose of the CON program is to protect hospitals from competition; and 4) that 99% of applicants are approved, which indicates that CON is an unnecessary and expensive process. The clinic urges that the program be eliminated.

**1) Rubber Stamping:** There are 5 possible outcomes to a certificate of need review 1) approval as requested; 2) denial; 3) partial approval (which could be considered partial denial); 4) approval but with special conditions; and 5) withdrawal of an application. The Commissioner has the authority to approve an application, but may attach special conditions such as allowing an activity to be shelved in but delaying full implementation until a certain use rate is reached.

The Department has reviewed 36 certificate of need applications since 1996; 61% were approved as requested and 39% were not approved as requested. Of those not approved as requested, 11% were denied, 11% partially approved, 6% withdrawn and 14% were given special conditions that had to be met. (See attached chart. Percentages are more than 100% because a decision may include both a special condition and partial approval).

Of the 39% that were not approved as requested: 50% of the denials or partial approval/denials were for hospitals or collocated facilities (hospital and nursing home together), 38% were for Ambulatory Surgery Centers; and 12% were freestanding nursing home beds. 50% of withdrawn applications were for nursing home beds and 50% for acute inpatient psych beds. 60% of the special conditions were for acute hospitals and 40% for acute inpatient psych beds. *The fact that only 61% of all applications are approved as requested, that hospitals and nursing homes are denied or given conditional approval shows that there is no "rubber stamping" going on.*

**2) Non-hospital CON approval:** Most of the approved CON applications are from acute care hospitals, nursing homes and kidney dialysis centers because they are required to go through the CON process while other organizations are not required to go through the process or can avoid the process in some way. Most ambulatory surgery centers are able to lease equipment or space in a building and avoid CON. Only 6 CON applications for freestanding ambulatory surgery centers have been received since the inception of the CON program 27 years ago. Fifty percent of these were approved. Independent diagnostic testing facilities are not required to go through the CON process, so no applications have ever been received from them. Other non-acute care hospital facilities that have had CON applications approved include free-standing nursing home facilities, freestanding psychiatric hospitals, and kidney dialysis centers. Although there are no longer any Intermediate Care facilities for the Mentally Retarded in the Alaska, the CON applications for these services were approved in the past.

**3) The CON program protect's hospitals from competition:** It is difficult to imagine that the CON program is protecting hospitals from competition since many ambulatory surgery centers are able to avoid CON and independent diagnostic centers are not covered by CON. Since 1996 a number of freestanding facilities in Anchorage, Wasilla and Kenai have been built without a CON that would have required a CON if built by a hospital. For example, Alaska Open

imaging has opened facilities in Wasilla, Anchorage and Soldotna without a CON and purchased a PET scanner. Providence had to go through the CON process to get approval for a PET scanner. Anchorage Fracture Clinic purchased an MRI, and several ASCs in Anchorage were able to develop projects without a CON that hospitals would have to go through the CON process to build or buy the equipment. A private group of physicians built a cardiac cath lab without a CON. Also, if the Department's goal is to protect hospitals from competition, why do hospitals appeal our decisions?

**4) 99% of applicants are approved, which indicates that CON is unnecessary:**

This is not true. As can be seen from the data supplied on the attached page *only 61% of the applications were approved as requested* and overall, *11% of the applications were denied outright*. The fact that most applications are approved is exhibited as proof that the program has little or no effect. If the number of projects denied is the benchmark for showing how well certificate of need is working, then the more projects denied the better, and the very best program would deny all applications. This obviously isn't true. Over time, healthcare providers gain expertise in writing applications and the CON process and gain an understanding of the trends in healthcare. They avoid the time and expense of applying for projects that are unlikely to be approved. Technical assistance and current state plans produced by senior services and behavioral health help eliminate poorly conceived and marginal projects before submission of a CON application. Development of new review criteria and standards in the new State Health Systems Plan will help even more. In the regulation of healthcare, just as in the promotion of health, prevention is by far the most effective strategy.

Projects that are denied may be few and far between, but the ongoing cost of one poorly planned project will last for many years. As someone once said, build it and they will come. Over the 28-year life of one CON program in a sparsely populated state, 573 nursing home beds, 468 acute care hospital beds, 9 ambulatory surgery suites, 144 substance abuse beds, 60 psych beds, and 30 rehab beds were denied. This resulted in the avoidance of nearly \$200 million in construction costs alone and an additional \$240 million in annual operating costs. Also, going through the CON process has resulted in improved project planning for many facilities. The brief information that TVC gathered from the internet to develop their assertions does not present the whole picture. For example, the 1996 Providence-Seward Medical Center project looks like it was a blanket approval as requested, and it was. However, the Department spent years working with the applicant and informed them that a 35-bed facility recommended by outside consultants was not feasible and had a poor chance of being approved. As a result, they submitted an approvable application.

Certificate of need programs have assisted other agencies in promoting changes in service delivery methods. In particular, it has been helpful in changing the direction of the long-term care industry and psychiatric care in Alaska and other states. It has been a tool used to slow nursing home bed growth to allow development of home and community based alternatives to nursing homes. Since many patients can be served in either a hospital or residential setting, the CON program has been helpful in defining the continuum of care.

The cost of Medicaid is a serious problem facing Alaska. Commissioner Gilbertson is working to contain that. CON is only one of the tools needed to contain costs, but it is an important one.

## CERTIFICATE OF NEED DECISIONS FROM 1996-2003

	No. of CON Decisions*	Approved as Requested	CONs Denied	Partial** Approval	Withdrawn	Special Conditions	Shape Helped by CON***
2003	6	4	0	1	0	1	0
2002	6	4	0	0	0	2	2
2001	3	2	0	1	0	0	1
2000	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
1999	9	3	3	1	1	1	0
1998	5	3	1	1	0	1	1
1997	4	3	0	0	1	0	1
1996	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>17%</b>

\*Number of CON applications approved, denied or withdrawn in that year.

Other CONs may have been in progress, but not finished.

\*\* Partial approval means that part of the project was approved and part denied.

\*\*\* CON efforts influenced shape or scope of project before it was submitted or helped outcome.

### CON Influences Project or Assists by being there:

1996	PSMC	Number of beds reduced from 20 to 6 - a change from prior proposals
1997	Valley Hosp	CON influenced the withdrawal of application after assisting with moratorium
1998	WFC	Included adult day and 10 assisted living beds
1999	API	Withdrew due to planning prob, need for alternatives CON gave time
2001	BRH	Included Kidney Dialysis in CON App
2002	PAMC	Psych design included Single Pt of entry & DET
2002	Valdez	No of acute & NH beds influenced

### Special Conditions:

1998	ARH	May not convert Surg Suite to OHC for 5 years.
1999	PAMC	Open Heart shelled, not avail for 5 yrs.
2002	PAI/C	8 Psych Beds Shelled until higher use
2002	API	8 Beds shelled until higher use
2003	MSVMC	Conditions for shelled space and Cath Lab

### Partial Approval/Denial or Complete Denial:

1998	SPH	10 Nursing home beds not approved/delayed
1998	FSC	Denied an extension or modification due to lack of need
1999	FBKS Surg	3 denials, TVC, McGuire & FMH
1999	SPH	Partial Denial - only 5 NH Beds approved
2001	FMH	Partial Denial - Reduced acute beds, healing garden
2003	WFC	Denied conversion but offered 5 -bed unit.

## Certificate of Need Questions & Answers

**Question: What types of projects are required to submit a certificate of need application and go through the review process?**

**Answer:** Any health care facility project that involves the expenditure of \$1 million or more for construction, renovation or the purchase of new equipment, and any project, regardless of cost, that converts space into nursing home beds is required to submit a certificate of need application.

**Question: Are there any types of "health care facility" projects that are currently exempt from the certificate of need program?**

**Answer:** Projects are exempt from certificate of need if: 1) the project cost is under the \$1 million threshold; 2) the project is for routine maintenance or routine replacement regardless of the cost; 3) the project is for specifically exempted Pioneer Homes, private physicians' offices, or dentists' offices; or 4) the project is not included in the definition of "health care facility."

**Question: Will the definition of a "health care facility" change if HB 511 passes?**

**Answer:** Yes. If HB 511 passes, two additional types of facilities will be added to the list of those projects that may be required to go through the CON process: 1) Residential Psychiatric Treatment Centers (RPTCs), and 2) independent diagnostic testing facilities.

**Question: Are all projects exempt from certificate of need if they fall below the dollar threshold?**

**Answer:** All projects that fall below \$1 million are exempt from certificate of need except for space converted to nursing home beds, which must submit a CON application regardless of the cost.

**Question: What are the components of the certificate of need (CON) process?**

- Submission of a letter of intent - (includes who, what, where, how large, the cost and timeline);
- Letter of intent (LOI) determination - a decision is made as to whether a CON is required;
- 60-Day wait - A CON application may be submitted 60 days after the LOI determination;
- Completeness Check - The application is checked for completeness, and more information is requested if the application is incomplete. The applicant has 60-days to submit information;
- Review Period - The analysis document must be submitted to the Commissioner in 90 days;
- Public Notice & Public Comment - Public notice is given at the beginning of a review and the public comment period runs concurrently with the review,
- Commissioner's Decision - The Commissioner makes the decision, which is published, and
- Appeal - The applicant has 30 days to appeal if dissatisfied.

**Question: If I apply for a certificate of need, how long will it take for a decision?**

**Answer:** Once your application is received and declared complete, a review document must be submitted to the Commissioner for a decision within 90 days. The Commissioner does not have a timeline to make a decision, but generally makes one in about two weeks.

**Question: How much does it cost to prepare a certificate of need application?**

**Answer:** That depends on the size of the project, its complexity and whether it is controversial. A rule of thumb is that a certificate of need application should not cost more than 1% of the total project cost with a maximum of \$25,000. Health Facilities Planning and Development, a consulting firm that writes approximately 70% of all CON applications for facilities in Washington State and has done at least 4 applications in Alaska, charges approximately \$15,000 per application, regardless of the size of the facility.

## History of Concurrent (Competing) Certificate of Need Reviews

There have been only 6 concurrent reviews since the inception of the CON program in 1976. Only 8.2% of all applications since 1990 were reviewed concurrently. 7 AAC 07.060(a), states: "In the commissioner's discretion, the agency shall defer commencement of the review process for a period not to exceed 60 days after the determination that the application is complete to enable the state agency and the appropriate health systems agency to receive and consider concurrently applications from each person who has submitted a letter of intent... proposing an activity within the appropriate health service area which is similar to the activity proposed by the applicant." *Key Points: A letter of intent must be in hand from a competing project in order for a concurrent review to be allowed and a competing application must be submitted within 60 days after the first application has been declared complete.* The six concurrent reviews are:

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1982 | Charter Medical Corporation submitted a CON to construct a \$12.2 million 80-bed psychiatric/alcohol/drug abuse hospital in Anchorage. An application for a 34-bed, \$3.4 million alcohol/drug hospital was received from Advanced Health Systems/Raleigh Hills. Comprehensive Care Corporation submitted a letter of intent for \$5.5 million, 50-bed alcohol/drug treatment hospital but did not submit an application. Charter and Advanced Health Systems were approved. |
| 1982 | Providence Hospital submitted a CON application for an \$80 million, 150-bed addition and Humana Hospital (now Alaska Regional) submitted a CON for a \$21.6 million, 93-bed addition. The projects were approved, but reduced to 53 additional beds and 39 additional beds respectively.  |
| 1985 | Heritage Place (Soldotna) and South Peninsula Hospital (Homer) submitted CON applications for 60 nursing home beds. Heritage Place was approved for 45 nursing beds and a shelled in space for 15 additional beds to be opened later when use increased. South Peninsula's request for 60 beds was denied.   |
| 1985 | Camai Care Center, Palmer; Careage Nursing Center, Wasilla; and Cook Inlet Housing Development Corporation submitted CON applications for 90-bed nursing facilities. Cook Inlet Housing Development Corporation was approved to build a 60-bed facility and 30 assisted living beds at a cost of \$8.8 million. This facility was named the Mary Conrad Center. Careage was denied, Camai Care approved, but was later denied a time extension due to lack of process.       |
| 1995 | Fairbanks Memorial Hospital (FMH) submitted a CON application for outpatient services including ambulatory surgery, and Fairbanks Surgery Center (FSC) submitted a CON for a freestanding ambulatory surgery center. Only the surgery portion of the FMH CON was reviewed concurrently with the FSC CON. Both were approved. FSC was later denied due to lack of progress.   |
| 1999 | Tanana Valley Clinic, Fairbanks Surgery Center, Inc. and Fairbanks Memorial Hospital submitted CON applications for 5 surgery suites and 4 procedure rooms costing \$11 million. None of the applicants were approved.   |



ALASKA OPEN IMAGING CENTER, LLC

WASILLA CENTER

BOGARD PROFESSIONAL PLAZA

1751 EAST GARDNER WAY, STE. B

WASILLA, ALASKA 99654

907-357-1220  
907-357-1222 FAX



ANCHORAGE CENTER

6911 DeBARR RD.

ANCHORAGE, AK 99504

907-330-1220  
907-330-1222 FAX

March 31, 2004  
TO: Alaska Legislature  
RE: Response to DHSS remarks on HB511

Most importantly, the Department has not indicated how its CON program has resulted in any cost containment of health expenditures in Alaska nor any rationale for including independent diagnostic testing facilities in Alaska. If cost containment is the ultimate goal of the department, the facts show that the independent facilities currently charge as much as 25% less for these advanced medical diagnostic services. The higher fees of the other facilities are ultimately born by Alaskan consumers and by the state in higher Medicaid costs.

The Department has also not provided any analysis on the difference in quality of services provided by the various facilities for people facing some of the most extreme medical emergencies in their lives.

The department claims that there is not a level playing field between the hospitals and the independent facilities and that "Providence had to go through the CON process to get approval for a P.E.T. scanner." This is in fact incorrect. Providence never actually completed their CON application but instead purchased their P.E.T equipment through their independent subsidiary Providence Imaging Center which is operating today.

In another example, when Providence Imaging Center applied for an additional MRI unit at a total cost of \$2.5 million, the department reported in their 2003 annual report on CON activity that "The MRI will be located adjacent to the inpatient elevators, operating rooms and Heart Center. It was determined that a CON is not required because the facility is not a health care facility as defined by certificate of need regulations." (Note: This MRI would be located within the hospital itself.)

Even the federal government has rejected CON as a method for containing medical costs and has instead focused on other more effective methods of containing costs that should be investigated by the state.

For these reasons, there is no reason to support including independent diagnostic testing facilities in HB511.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sam Korsmo".

Sam Korsmo  
Chief Operating Officer

Testimony of Sam Korsmo  
Regarding House Bill 511  
March 29, 2004

Good Afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee.

I am Sam Korsmo, a partner in Alaska Open Imaging Center in Wasilla, Alaska. We provide diagnostic imaging and professional reading services to Alaskans. I am here to provide you with information that hopefully cause you to seek additional information of the effects of this bill on Alaskans and on your long term budget considerations before you move it out of this Committee. I believe that if you consider all the ramifications of this new and unwarranted intrusion of government into the private sector provision of critical medical services to Alaskans you will see why you should not move this bill from Committee or why you should amend the bill to remove independent diagnostic testing facilities (IDTF's) from the bill.

In the first case, the department has not provided you with any information showing how certificate of need has resulted in any cost savings for patients or the state in their existing jurisdiction over medical facilities. Accordingly, there is no justification for expanding their bureaucratic control over other facilities such as IDTF's.

I believe it is a legitimate concern that this bill is a move to restrain trade and competition by the major hospitals in Alaska. The bill's sponsor said as much in a television interview which I have recorded on this CD. This is similar to the legislation you see each year in which the telecommunications companies try to use government laws and regulations to seek a competitive advantage over each other.

When this happens, it is the consumer that is always hurt. In our own facilities, our prices are regularly 25 to 30% lower than those provided by the largest hospitals in Alaska, our business model is predicated on a global billing method which saves money. Our services are also better in that we use an open imaging technology, we can accommodate larger patients so they do not have to be shipped outside, saving them money. These cost savings have ramifications for your budgeting process in that the higher costs of medical care for Medicaid patients are paid for by general fund dollars. I am aware of the struggle you have had in meeting these increased Medicaid costs. The department should be required to provide with an estimate of the impact this bill will have on future Medicaid payment by the State of Alaska.

The Department claims in its fiscal note that vastly expanding the certificate of need program as proposed in this bill will not cost the department any more money. To do a real analysis of whether new services are required and what impact they will have on quality of outcomes and costs would require substantial analysis. If it is just to be done on a cursory level, it confirms out worst fears that this could be a politically driven process, which I am sure all of you would agree would lead to bad outcomes. If they have the time to do these analyses, which I seriously doubt, you have to ask yourself what they are supposed to be doing in their current jobs.

If the Department is going to use some simplistic, population based formula – it won't work here in Alaska either due to our large geographic area and low population numbers. How would they calculate a population ratio for Wasilla when our company is also providing diagnostic services under contract for Maniilaq Health Corporation and Alaska Native Medical Center because we can provide these services on a more cost effective basis? Alaskans come to our facility from all around the entire State – and especially from the entire Southcentral region (where the majority of the people in the entire State currently are residing).

This bill is bad public policy which will come back to haunt you in the future if you pass it. You should hold this bill until these basic questions can be addressed by the department. If you still feel you want to move the other sections of the bill, I would request that you amend the bill to exempt independent diagnostic testing facilities since we do not fit the pattern of traditional medical facilities such as hospitals and because under the Medicaid rules, the department doesn't even have a definition for what an independent diagnostic testing facility is.

Because of the failure of certificate of need programs on a federal level, these laws were repealed in favor of measure that actually work such a the prospective payment system for Medicare cost reimbursements and other cost containment measures. Again, the department should be asked to provide any example of how their current CON program has saved money for Alaskan patients of the State of Alaska.

Thank you for your attention. I would be glad to answer any questions you may have.

# **Alaska State Hospital & Nursing Home Association**

*We're helping people care for people!*

March 23, 2004

Representative Bill Williams, Co-Chair  
Representative John Harris, Co-Chair  
House Finance Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol Building, Room 515  
Juneau AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Williams and Harris:

As you prepare to debate HB 511, "An Act Relating to Certificate of Need", I wanted to make certain that you are aware of the Alaska State Hospital and Nursing Home Association's (ASHNHA), strong support for passage of this important legislation.

HB 511 strengthens the Department of Health & Social Services ability to guard against overdevelopment of Alaska's critical health care infrastructure. Of particular importance to ASHNHA are the following two provisions:

- **Section 2, lines 4 and 5 amending AS 18.07.031:**

This new language clarifying that the "net present value of a lease for space occupied by or the equipment required for a health care facility" is included in the meaning of the term "expenditure".

This language is important because it removes the potential for health care developers to circumvent CON law by leasing rather than purchasing needed space or equipment. ASHNHA sees this language as vital to preserving a level playing field for all in a very competitive health care market place.

- **Section 4, lines 20, 21 and 22 amending AS 18.07.111(8):**

This new language adds additional health care provider types to the definition of "health care facility". ASHNHA strongly supports this change as it recognizes that an independent diagnostic testing facility is another health care category that, if not monitored, can lead to excess capacity in the community.

ASHNHA appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments in support of HB 511. Alaska's health care market already faces economic challenge from an increasing number of uninsured Alaskans that current providers must serve. Existing capacity in the health care system must be used fully to enable Alaska's providers to offset this largely uncompensated care. To allow capacity to grow in a community without giving the Department an opportunity to assess the need for this additional investment invites serious problems. Questions such as the sustainability of all providers already in the market, and the impact on overall cost of care as developers expand profitable parts of


426 Main Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801

Phone: 907-586-1790 • Fax: 907-463-3573 • Web: ashnha.com

the health care system without a commensurate requirement to assume a proportionate share of the uncompensated care, are examples of questions that the department must address to assure a level playing field for all providers, and to assure sustainability of the health care system as a whole.

ASHNHA's many members hope your Committee will agree with this analysis and pass HB 511 from your Committee favorably next week. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Rod L. Betit  
President/CEO

Cc: Representative Ralph Samuels  
ASHNHA Executive Committee  
Representative Kevin Meyer, Vice Chair  
Representative Mike Chenault  
Representative Hugh Fate  
Representative Richard Foster  
Representative Mike Hawker  
Representative Bill Stoltze  
Representative Eric Croft  
Representative Reggie Joule  
Representative Carl Moses

**Subject:** [Fwd: HB 511]

**Date:** Tue, 23 Mar 2004 10:30:51 -0900

**From:** Bill Williams <Representative\_Bill\_Williams@Legis.state.ak.us>

**Organization:** Alaska State Legislature

**To:** Peter Ecklund <Peter\_Ecklund@legis.state.ak.us>

---

**Subject:** HB 511

**Date:** Fri, 19 Mar 2004 11:28:26 -0900

**From:** "Linda Snow" <llsnow@ci.kenai.ak.us>

**To:** <Representative\_Kelly\_Wolf@legis.state.ak.us>,  
<Representative\_Mike\_Chenault@legis.state.ak.us>,  
"Representative\_" <Ralph\_Samuels@legis.state.ak.us>,  
<Representative\_Bill\_Williams@legis.state.ak.us>,  
<Representative\_John\_Harris@legis.state.ak.us>

**CC:** "John J. Williams (E-mail)" <kenai\_mayor@hotmail.com>

Mayor John Williams has asked me to convey opposition to the Bill referenced above in which secure residential psychiatric treatment centers (RPTC's) are added to the list of health care facilities falling under the certificate of need program of the Department of Health and Social Services. We believe all references to the RPTC's in these amendments should be removed from the Bill in their entirety.

The City of Kenai is currently working with two experienced secure RPTC facility owners and operators who are very interested in building new facilities in Kenai for the purpose of bringing Alaskan youths back to Alaska from other states for this kind of treatment. We believe that the expansion of these private sector RPTC's in Alaska should be a decision left to the owners and operators of these facilities, rather than a decision made by the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services.

Linda L. Snow, City Manager  
City of Kenai, Alaska

# Alaska State Hospital & Nursing Home Association

*We're helping people care for people!*

February 27, 2004

RECEIVED

FEB 27 REC'D

Representative Peggy Wilson  
Chair, House Health & Social Services Committee  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol Building, Room 104  
Juneau AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Wilson:

Unfortunately I am unable to attend Tuesday's hearing on HB 511, "An Act Relating to Certificate of Need", but I wanted to make certain that the Alaska State Hospital and Nursing Home Association, ASHNHA, expressed its support for passage of this important legislation.

HB 511 strengthens the Department of Health & Social Services ability to guard against overdevelopment of Alaska's critical health care infrastructure. Of particular importance to ASHNHA are the following two provisions:

- **Section 2, lines 4 and 5 amending AS 18.07.031:**

This new language clarifying that the "net present value of a lease for space occupied by or the equipment required for a health care facility" is included in the meaning of the term "expenditure".

This language is important because it removes the potential for health care developers to circumvent CON law by leasing rather than purchasing needed space or equipment. ASHNHA sees this language as vital to preserving a level playing field for all in a very competitive health care market place.

- **Section 4, lines 20, 21 and 22 amending AS 18.07.111(8):**

This new language adds additional health care provider types to the definition of "health care facility". ASHNHA strongly supports this change as it recognizes that an independent diagnostic testing facility is another health care category that, if not monitored, can lead to excess capacity in the community.

ASHNHA appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments in support of HB 511. Alaska's health care market already faces economic challenge from an increasing number of uninsured Alaskans that current providers must serve. Existing capacity in the health care system must be used fully to enable Alaska's providers to offset this largely uncompensated care. To allow capacity to grow in a community without giving the Department an opportunity to assess the need for this additional investment invites serious problems. Questions such as the sustainability of all providers already in the

426 Main Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801

Phone: 907-586-1790 • Fax: 907-463-3573 • Web: ashnha.com

market, and the impact on overall cost of care as developers expand profitable parts of the health care system without a commensurate requirement to assume a proportionate share of the uncompensated care, are examples of questions that the department must address to assure a level playing field for all providers, and to assure sustainability of the health care system as a whole.

ASHNHA's many members hope your Committee will agree with this analysis and pass HB 511 from your Committee favorably. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rod Betit".

Rod L. Betit  
President/CEO

Cc: Representative Ralph Samuels

THE  
FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT(S)  
ARE  
POOR  
ORIGINAL  
COPIES



GAO

Accountability • Integrity • Reliability

United States General Accounting Office  
Washington, DC 20548

April 18, 2003

The Honorable Bill Thomas  
Chairman  
Committee on Ways and Means  
House of Representatives

The Honorable Jerry Kline  
House of Representatives

Subject: *Specialty Hospitals: Information on National Market Share, Physician Ownership, and Patients Served*

Specialty hospitals represent a small but growing segment of the health care industry. These hospitals specialize in providing care for certain conditions, such as cardiac care, or performing certain procedures, such as orthopedic surgery. Specialty hospitals are not an entirely new phenomenon, as children's and other types of specialty hospitals have existed for decades. Consequently, it is challenging to distinguish between the old and new types of specialty hospitals. One aspect that sets apart the newer genre of specialty hospitals is that many are owned, in part, by the physicians who work in them.

Advocates contend that, because of their focused mission, specialty hospitals can provide high-quality specialty services more efficiently than general hospitals. Because specialty hospitals can tailor their facilities and resources to best fit the needs of certain types of patients, individuals treated in such hospitals may enjoy relatively greater convenience and comfort. Specialty hospitals may also offer physicians financial and work environment advantages. Advocates have stated that the focused mission and dedicated resources of specialty hospitals allow physicians to treat more patients than they could in general hospitals. Physicians may gain financially from this increased productivity. If they are part owners, physicians may also share in the financial gains that accrue to the hospital. Physicians in specialty hospitals may also have more control over patient scheduling and the purchasing of desired equipment.

However, concerns have been raised by general hospitals and others in the health care community that specialty hospitals are siphoning off the most financially rewarding portions of general hospitals' business. Representatives of general hospitals contend that specialty hospitals concentrate on the most profitable procedures and serve patients that have fewer complicating conditions—leaving general hospitals with a sicker, higher-cost patient population. Part of the concern is that physician ownership in specialty hospitals creates incentives to concentrate on

patients who are less sick than other patients with the same diagnosis, as a hospital is typically paid a fixed, lump-sum amount for treating someone with a given diagnosis. Hospitals can benefit financially by treating a disproportionate share of less ill patients because the payment amounts for these patients are not reduced to reflect the fact that fewer services are needed. Critics contend that this practice of drawing away a more favorable selection of patients makes it more financially difficult for general hospitals to fulfill their broad mission to serve all of a community's needs, including charity care, emergency services, and stand-by capacity to respond to community-wide disasters.

A federal law, known as the Stark anti-self-referral law, generally prohibits physicians from referring Medicare patients to facilities in which they (or their immediate family members) have financial interests.<sup>1</sup> The law was enacted after several studies found that physicians with ownership interests in separate clinical laboratories, diagnostic imaging centers, or physical therapy providers tended to make more referrals to them and order substantially more services at higher costs.<sup>2</sup> The Stark self-referral prohibitions do not apply in the case of specialty hospitals, however, because the law does not prohibit physicians who have ownership in an entire hospital from referring patients to that hospital.<sup>3</sup> It is likely that any referral or decision made by a physician who has a stake in an entire general hospital would produce little personal economic gain because such hospitals tend to provide a diverse and large group of services. However, the Stark law does prohibit physicians who have an ownership interest only in a hospital subdivision from referring patients to that subdivision. Concern exists with respect to specialty hospitals, that since they are usually much smaller in size and scope than general hospitals and closer in size to hospital departments, that their physician owners could influence their hospitals'—and therefore their own—financial gain through practice patterns and referrals.

In light of these concerns, you asked us to provide information on the prevalence of specialty hospitals, their characteristics in terms of ownership and patients treated, and the effect specialty hospitals have on the greater hospital communities in which they operate. We are preparing a comprehensive report to be issued later this year that will address these issues. This report provides available information on the

- share of the national hospital market comprising specialty hospitals,
- extent to which physicians have ownership interests in specialty hospitals, and
- patients served by specialty hospitals compared with those served by general hospitals, in terms of illness severity.

---

<sup>1</sup>42 U.S.C. § 1395nn(a)(1)(A) (2000).

<sup>2</sup>U.S. General Accounting Office, *Medicare: Referrals to Physician-Owned Imaging Facilities Warrant HCFA's Scrutiny*, GAO/HEHS-95-2 (Washington, D.C.: Oct. 20, 1994). Jean Mitchell and Elton Scott, "Physician Ownership of Physical Therapy Services," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 268 (Oct. 21, 1992). For additional discussion of the topic, see Jennifer O'Sullivan, *Health Care: Physician Self-Referrals "Stark I and II"*, Congressional Research Service 97-5 EPW (Dec. 6, 1995).

<sup>3</sup>42 U.S.C. § 1395nn(d)(3) (2000).

Our work focused on hospitals that tended to treat patients for a limited group of diseases or conditions or that tended to perform surgical procedures. Specifically, we considered a hospital to be a specialty hospital if the diagnosis-related group (DRG) classification for two-thirds of its Medicare patients (or two-thirds of all of its patients where such data were available) fell into no more than two major diagnosis categories, such as diseases of the circulatory system (cardiac), or if at least two-thirds of its patients were classified in surgical DRGs. We excluded hospitals that specialized in providing long-term care or otherwise had missions that were largely distinct from the missions of short-term, acute care general hospitals.<sup>4</sup> We classified the hospitals that fit these criteria into five specialty types—cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, women's, and other specialty. Because the other-specialty category contained a diverse set of hospitals that could not be compared to one another, we excluded hospitals in that category.<sup>5</sup> The information in this report is derived from our analysis of hospital inpatient discharge data, various administrative databases, and responses to our survey of specialty hospitals. We analyzed Medicare inpatient discharge data from all hospitals nationwide to help identify specialty hospitals. We also obtained Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) data on all patient discharges in 2000 from hospitals located in six states.<sup>6</sup> These states contained 25 urban specialty hospitals, slightly more than one-fourth of the existing specialty hospitals we identified. The all-patient discharge data from hospitals in these states were used to help identify specialty hospitals and analyze the relative illness severity among patients at specialty and general hospitals. For more detail regarding our specialty hospital criteria and analysis methodology, see the enclosure at the end of this report. Our work was performed from September 2002 through April 2003 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

### Results in Brief

Specialty hospitals represent a small but growing share of the national market. In February 2003, the 92 cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, and women's hospitals that we identified and were open for business accounted for less than 2 percent of the short-term, acute care hospitals nationwide. Recent growth in specialty hospitals has been rapid—the number of facilities has tripled since 1990 and another 20 facilities are under development. Because specialty hospitals tend to be relatively small, they account for a somewhat low share of inpatient spending relative to their share of hospitals. The specialty hospitals in existence in fiscal year 2000 accounted for about 1 percent of Medicare spending for inpatient services.

---

<sup>4</sup>Thus, we excluded hospitals that specialized in providing rehabilitation or in treating mental disorders, alcohol or drug problems, respiratory conditions, or newborns and children.

<sup>5</sup>The other-specialty category contained 18 hospitals that specialized in a variety of other areas, such as eye and ear, nose, and throat procedures.

<sup>6</sup>Data were from all hospitals in Arizona, California, New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina and the hospitals located in three regions of Texas.

About 70 percent of the specialty hospitals in existence or under development had some physician owners, according to our 2003 specialty hospital survey results. Among these hospitals, total physician ownership averaged slightly more than 50 percent. The average share owned by an individual physician was more than 2 percent at half the hospitals, while it was less than 2 percent at the other half. In about one-fifth of the hospitals with some degree of physician ownership, the largest share owned by an individual physician was at least 15 percent. Nearly all specialty hospitals with physician owners reported that some of the owners were members of a single group practice. The largest share owned by physicians in a single group practice was more than 25 percent at half the hospitals and less than 25 percent at the other half. In about 1 out of 10 specialty hospitals with physician owners, physicians in a single group practice owned 80 percent or more of the hospital.

We found that patients at specialty hospitals tended to be less sick than patients with the same diagnoses at general hospitals, although we did not determine the clinical and economic importance of this finding. Our analysis of all inpatient discharge data from the 25 urban specialty hospitals for which these data were available—about one-fourth of all specialty hospitals we identified nationwide—showed that 21 of the 25 specialty hospitals treated lower proportions of severely ill patients than did area general hospitals. For example, at an urban cardiac hospital in Arizona, about 17 percent of patients with the most commonly treated diagnoses were severely ill, whereas at 26 general hospitals in the same urban area, about 22 percent of patients treated for the same diagnoses were severely ill. For all four specialty hospital types included in our study—cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, and women's—the median percentage of severely ill patients treated was lower than that for general hospitals. Four of the 25 specialty hospitals were exceptions, as they had treated patients that were as sick, or sicker, than the patients at general hospitals.

The American Surgical Hospital Association and two major specialty hospital chains—MedCath Corporation and National Surgical Hospitals—provided comments on a draft of this report. Representatives from these groups stated that physician ownership of specialty hospitals did not affect physician referral behavior and that our physician ownership discussion was potentially misleading. Our report provides information on the extent of physician ownership of specialty hospitals but, because of data limitations, we did not attempt to analyze the relationship between ownership and referral patterns. The specialty hospital representatives also questioned the extent to which the illness severity differences we reported might apply to specialty hospitals not in our sample and the economic significance of these differences. The illness severity differences that we report are based on an analysis of thousands of claims from more than one-fourth of the specialty hospitals that we identified. We did not attempt to assess the economic significance of these differences. A more complete summary of their comments and our evaluation of their comments is included at the end of this report.

## Background

The fixed-rate, lump-sum payments that health care payers typically make to hospitals for inpatient care for patients with a given diagnosis, regardless of the costs of serving particular patients, are designed to promote efficiency by discouraging hospitals from providing unnecessary services as a way to boost revenues. However, these lump-sum payments foster undesirable incentives, as hospitals may gain financially by serving a disproportionate share of low-cost patients. The mechanics of Medicare's hospital payment system illustrate this principle.

Under its system of prospective payments, Medicare pays a predetermined rate for each hospital discharge, based on the patient's diagnosis and whether the patient received surgery. In other words, the payments reflect an average bundle of services that the beneficiary is expected to receive as an inpatient for a particular diagnosis. Discharges are classified according to a list of DRGs. DRG payment rates are based on the expected cost of the diagnosis group's typical case compared with the cost for all Medicare inpatient cases. The DRG payment is not adjusted for within-DRG differences in severity of illness.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, hospitals have a financial incentive to treat as many patients as possible whose costs are low relative to the average patient in each DRG.


## Specialty Hospitals Represent a Small but Growing Share of the National Market

In February 2003, there were 17 cardiac, 36 orthopedic, 22 surgical, and 17 women's hospitals that met our specialty hospital definition and were open for business.<sup>2</sup> These 92 hospitals represent about 2 percent of all short-term, acute care hospitals nationwide. (See fig. 1.) The most recent Medicare discharge data indicate that the 80 specialty hospitals in existence in 2001 accounted for slightly less than 1 percent of Medicare spending for inpatient services.

---

<sup>1</sup>An "outlier" policy exists to make additional payments to hospitals when their costs for a particular patient are extraordinarily high compared with the DRG rate for that patient's diagnosis group. Although we used several methods to identify specialty hospitals, the counts included in this report should not be interpreted as a complete census of the specialty hospitals in existence or under development. In particular, it is likely that our estimate of the number of women's hospitals is low. See the enclosure for a discussion of this issue.


Figure 1: Number of Specialty Hospitals Relative to All Short-term, Acute Care General Hospitals, 2003



Sources: GAO and American Hospital Association (AHA).

The number of these facilities has grown rapidly in recent years—as of March 2003, the number of specialty hospitals had tripled from the 29 that existed in 1990. (See fig. 2.)

Figure 2: Opening Years of Existing Specialty Hospitals, by Decade




Sources: GAO and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).

Note: Data are from the GAO specialty hospital universe file (2003) and the CMS Medicare Providers of Service file (2002).

An additional 20 specialty hospitals are now under development, most of which specialize in surgical care. (See fig. 3.)

Figure 3: Number of Specialty Hospitals Open and Under Development, by Specialty Type




Sources: HCUP, CMS, industry groups, and hospital chains.

Note: Data are from HCUP (2000) and CMS Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MedPar) file (2001). Data on the number of women's hospitals under development were not readily available.

In terms of beds, specialty hospitals are relatively small. In our study, surgical care facilities were the smallest, with a median of 16 beds, compared with a median of 61 beds for women's hospitals. (See fig. 4.) In contrast, the average short-term general hospital had approximately 170 beds.

Figure 4: Median Number of Beds in Specialty Hospitals, by Specialty Type  
70 Median bed size



Source: GAO.


Note: Data are from GAO's specialty hospital survey (2003).

### Physician Ownership of Specialty Hospitals Is Common, but Shares Owned by Individual Physicians or Physician Group Practices Vary Widely

Our survey of the more than 100 specialty hospitals in existence or under development indicates that about 70 percent of specialty hospitals had some physician owners.<sup>2</sup> Of the specialty hospitals with any degree of physician ownership, physicians' combined ownership shares averaged slightly more than 50 percent of the hospital. About one-fifth of specialty hospitals were owned entirely, or nearly so, by physicians. (See fig 5.) Physicians owned 20 percent or less of the hospital in relatively few specialty hospitals.

<sup>2</sup>Approximately 80 percent of specialty hospitals returned our survey, although the response rate on certain questions was somewhat lower. Physician ownership information was self-reported by hospitals and does not reflect ownership by physician family members.

**Figure 5: Specialty Hospitals by Extent of Physician Ownership**




Source: GAO.

Note: Data are from GAO's specialty hospital survey (2003). Data include the approximately 70 percent of specialty hospitals that reported some degree of physician ownership.

Physicians tended to own somewhat smaller percentages of cardiac hospitals and larger percentages of surgical hospitals. (See fig 6.)

**Figure 6: Median Percentage of Hospital Owned by Physicians, by Specialty Type**




Source: GAO.

Note: Data are from GAO's specialty hospital survey (2003). Data include the approximately 70 percent of specialty hospitals that reported some degree of physician ownership.

On average, individual physicians owned relatively small shares of their hospitals. At half the specialty hospitals with physician ownership, the average individual share was less than 2 percent; at the other half, it was greater than 2 percent. Some physicians owned substantially larger shares. In nearly one-fifth of the specialty hospitals with some physician ownership, the largest share owned by a single physician was 15 percent or greater. (See fig. 7.)

**Figure 7: Largest Share of Specialty Hospital Owned by an Individual Physician**  
 60 Percentage of specialty hospitals




Source: GAO.

Note: Data are from GAO's specialty hospital survey (2003). Data include the approximately 70 percent of specialty hospitals that reported some degree of physician ownership.

Nearly all specialty hospitals with physician owners reported that some of the owners were members of a single group practice. The largest percentage of each hospital owned by physicians in a single group varied widely—at half the hospitals the largest percentage was more than 25 percent and at the other half it was less than 25 percent. In about 1 in 10 specialty hospitals, physicians in a single group practice owned 80 percent or more of the hospital. (See fig 8.)

**Figure 8: Largest Ownership Share by Physicians In a Single Group Practice at Specialty Hospitals**  
 30 Percentage of specialty hospitals



Source: GAO.

Note: Data are from GAO's specialty hospital survey (2003). Data include the approximately 70 percent of specialty hospitals that reported some degree of physician ownership.

### Specialty Hospitals Tend to Treat a Lower Percentage of Severely Ill Patients than General Hospitals

Some patients are more severely ill than others—even when compared to individuals who have the same principal diagnosis. Differences in age, secondary diagnosis, and other complicating conditions can affect the severity of patients' illnesses and the amount and cost of the resources required for their treatment.

To determine whether there were differences in illness severity between the patients treated at specialty hospitals and the patients treated at general hospitals, we analyzed calendar year 2000 patient discharge data at 25 specialty hospitals. These hospitals were located in 18 urban areas in six states: Arizona, California, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Texas.<sup>10</sup> Our group of comparison hospitals consisted of the 396 general hospitals located in the same 18 urban areas. Our comparisons included only those general hospitals that provided short-term, acute care. We used a widely recognized system, known as All Payer Refined-Diagnosis Related Groups (APR-DRG), to assign an illness severity level to each patient on the basis of the information contained in the discharge data. This system, which is frequently used by hospitals and private insurers, groups patients into one of 355 diagnosis categories and assigns one of four severity levels (minor, moderate, major, or extreme) to each patient based on patient diagnosis, age, sex, and procedure. While we examined

<sup>10</sup>Data on all inpatient discharges were obtained from HCUP, a federal-state-industry partnership sponsored by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

illness severity differences between specialty and general hospitals, we did not determine the clinical or economic importance of these differences."


The vast majority of specialty hospitals with HCUP data available to us—21 out of 25—treated a lower percentage of patients who were severely ill—that is, assigned to the major or extreme severity levels by the APR-DGR system—relative to patients in the same diagnosis categories treated at general hospitals in the same urban areas. For example, 3 percent of the patients in the 10 most common diagnosis categories at one Texas orthopedic hospital were classified as severely ill. A higher proportion—8 percent—of the patients in the same diagnosis categories were classified as severely ill at the 51 general hospitals in the same urban area. A cardiac hospital in Arizona provides a similar example. About 17 percent of the patients in that hospital's most common diagnosis categories were classified as severely ill. In contrast, 22 percent of the patients in the same diagnosis categories who were treated at the 26 general hospitals in the same urban area were classified as severely ill. Not all specialty hospitals treated patients who were, by comparison, less sick. Two of the 25 specialty hospitals treated a higher percentage of severely ill patients and two others treated about the same percentage as area general hospitals.

For all four specialty hospital categories—cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, and women's—the median share of severely ill patients treated was lower than the median share of severely ill patients in the same diagnostic categories treated at the corresponding general hospitals. (See fig 9.) For example, the median orthopedic hospital, in terms of patient illness severity, had 5 percent of patients in its most common diagnosis group classified as severely ill. The median general hospital in the urban areas with orthopedic hospitals had 8 percent of patients in the same diagnosis groups classified as severely ill.

---

"Average inpatient costs may be substantially higher for sicker individuals. In its March 2000 report to Congress, the Medicare Payment Review Advisory Commission (MedPAC) illustrated this relationship with several examples, including one for patients diagnosed with intracranial hemorrhage (APR-DRG 44). MedPAC found, based on its analysis of fiscal year 1997 Medicare data, that the estimated inpatient cost was \$3,195 for patients whose illness severity was classified as minor. The estimated costs were higher for patients with the same diagnosis who were classified as more severely ill: \$4,214 for moderate severity, \$5,454 for major severity, and \$11,255 for extreme severity. MedPAC noted that illness severity cost differences were smaller for some diagnoses and larger for others. In June 2000, MedPAC recommended that Medicare's hospital inpatient payment system be improved by accounting for illness severity differences within DRGs.

**Figure 9: Median Percentage of Severely Ill Patients Treated in Specialty Hospitals and General Hospitals, by Specialty Hospital Category**  
 25 Percentage



Source: HCUP.

Note: Data are from HCUP (2000).

**Comments Obtained from Organizations Representing Specialty Hospitals and Our Evaluation**

We obtained comments from officials representing the American Surgical Hospital Association—a specialty hospital association—and from officials representing MedCath Corporation and National Surgical Hospitals—two major specialty hospital chains. Their comments, summarized below, primarily focused on physician ownership issues and our illness severity analysis. Unless otherwise noted, the following comments reflect the positions of all three organizations.

The specialty hospital representatives said that our report provided an inadequate, and potentially misleading, discussion of the financial incentives facing the physician owners of specialty hospitals. The officials believe that the average physician who invests in a specialty hospital owns such a small share that the theoretical incentive to steer relatively sick patients away from the facility is very weak. Instead, they believe that there is a strong incentive for physicians to treat patients in specialty hospitals because high-quality care can be provided efficiently in such facilities. According to the representatives, our report did not sufficiently discuss the efficiency gains achieved by specialty hospitals. The representatives also noted that many physicians who work in specialty hospitals are completely unaffected by investor-related financial incentives because they have no ownership stake in the facilities.

The representatives stated that our illness severity analysis had several potential limitations and that our results may not apply to all specialty hospitals. The representatives said that our results are based on a sample that is too small to be representative of all specialty hospitals. MedCath representatives noted that Medicare data were available for most of the 92 specialty hospitals that we identified and that we could have increased our sample size if our illness severity analysis had been based on Medicare data. Representatives from the three specialty hospital organizations suggested that we might have obtained different results if we had analyzed more claims from the hospitals that we did include. They also stressed that our reported differences in illness severity could be misleading because we did not analyze the economic or clinical implications of the differences.

Our report discusses the concerns that some have raised regarding physician ownership of specialty hospitals and the potential effect on referrals. Data were not available on the identity of physician owners and therefore we could not determine if there was a relationship between physician ownership and referral behavior. Instead, our report provides descriptive information on the extent to which physicians own specialty hospitals. Our results show that many physicians who invest in specialty hospitals own relatively small shares. In about half the specialty hospitals the average share was 2 percent or less. However, our results also show that some physicians own considerably larger shares of 15 percent or more. Furthermore, the combined share owned by physicians who are members of a single group practice represents the majority ownership in some hospitals.

We disagree with the criticisms of our illness severity analysis. The 25 specialty hospitals included represent more than one-fourth of the facilities that we identified as meeting our criteria for a specialty hospital. We analyzed data pertaining to nearly 75,000 specialty hospital patients and approximately 900,000 general hospital patients. By focusing on the 10 most common diagnoses at each specialty hospital, we included nearly two-thirds of all patients treated at the specialty hospitals in our sample. Although an analysis of Medicare patients alone would have allowed us to increase the number of hospitals in our sample, it would have provided much less comprehensive information on the patients treated at each hospital. As we stated in our report, we did not attempt to determine the economic implications of the illness severity differences we observed between specialty and general hospitals. Research by MedPAC suggests that average treatment costs tend to rise with illness severity, as classified by the APR-DRG system, but we did not quantify the cost differences for the specific diagnoses we analyzed.

-----

We plan to further distribution of this report until 30 days after the letter's date. At that time, we will send copies of this report to appropriate congressional committees and other interested parties. We will also make copies available to others upon request. This report will be available at no charge on GAO's Web site at: <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you or your staffs have any questions, please call me at (202) 512-7119 or James Cosgrove at (202) 512-7029. Other contributors to this report include Hannah Fein, Zachary Gaumer, and Ariel Hill.



A. Bruce Steinwald  
Director, Health Care—Economic  
and Payment Issues

Enclosure

### Scope and Methodology

This enclosure provides additional information on three key aspects of our analysis. First, it lists the criteria we used to define specialty hospitals and the process we followed to identify them. Second, it discusses the survey used to collect physician ownership information. Finally, it describes the data and methodological approach used to compare patient illness severity at specialty and general hospitals.

#### **Specialty Hospital Definition and Identification**

Although a standard definition for a specialty hospital does not exist, a reasonable approach is to define specialty hospitals as those that predominately treat certain diagnoses or perform certain procedures. For this report, we classified a hospital as a specialty hospital if the data indicated that

- two-thirds or more of its inpatient claims were in one or two major diagnosis categories (MDC) or
- two-thirds or more of its inpatient claims were for surgical diagnosis-related groups (DRGs).

Because our study focused on private, short-term, acute care hospitals, we eliminated from consideration hospitals that were government-owned and those that tended to provide long-term care or otherwise had missions very different from those of short-term, acute care general hospitals. Thus, we excluded

- government-owned hospitals;
- hospitals where the majority of inpatient claims were for MDCs that related to rehabilitation, psychiatry, alcohol and drug treatment, children, or newborns; and
- hospitals with fewer than 10 claims per bed per year.

Of the hospitals that met our criteria, 92 could be classified into four specialization categories: cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, and women's.<sup>13</sup> An additional 18 hospitals specialize in a variety of other areas, such as eye and ear, nose, and throat procedures. For this report, we focused on the specialty hospitals in the four major categories listed above.

We applied our criteria to inpatient discharge data from two different data sources: the 2001 Medicare Provider Analysis Review file and the 2000 Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) data set. Medicare and HCUP data both have distinct advantages and disadvantages. Medicare data contain patient information from virtually all of the nation's hospitals, but only for Medicare patients. Patients covered by Medicare are predominately age 65 or older. Consequently, some conditions—such as those that affect women of childbearing age—may be underrepresented, or

---

<sup>13</sup>This number does not include hospitals that initially appeared to be specialty hospitals, but informed us through our survey that they did not meet our criteria for a specialty hospital.

not represented at all, in Medicare data. Thus, it is likely that an identification based on Medicare data may undercount the number of hospitals that specialize in treating such conditions.

In contrast to Medicare, HCUP data provide information on all of a hospital's patients. However, HCUP data are only available for hospitals in 29 states and each state's data must be purchased separately. We obtained HCUP data from the following six states: Arizona, California, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Texas.<sup>12</sup> These states were selected because Medicare data identified them as having potentially large concentrations of specialty hospitals.

To identify specialty hospitals that opened too recently to be included in the Medicare or HCUP data, we obtained information from the American Surgical Hospital Association and two national specialty hospital chains: MedCath Corporation and National Surgical Hospitals. These three organizations also provided information on specialty hospitals that are under development.

#### **Source of Physician Ownership Information**

To obtain information on physician ownership of specialty hospitals, we surveyed the more than 100 cardiac, orthopedic, surgical, and women's hospitals that we identified as in existence or under development. Among other questions, hospital representatives were asked about the number of physician owners, the overall percentage of the hospital owned by physicians, the largest share owned by a single physician, and the largest combined percentage of the hospital owned by physicians in a single revenue-sharing group practice. The survey was conducted from January through March 2003. Approximately 80 percent of the hospitals responded to our survey.

#### **Severity of Illness Analysis**

To compare patient illness severity at specialty and general hospitals, we analyzed 2000 HCUP data from Arizona, California, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, and Texas. An analysis of HCUP data for these six states identified 25 specialty hospitals in 18 urban areas.<sup>13</sup> Patients at each specialty hospital were compared to patients in the same diagnosis categories at short-term, acute care general hospitals in the same urban area. (See table 1.) A total of 396 general hospitals were used in the comparisons.

---

<sup>12</sup>We obtained HCUP data on hospitals in three of Texas's five regions. .

<sup>13</sup>One specialty hospital was excluded because it was located in a rural area and we could not readily identify a set of general hospitals that should serve as the comparison group.

**Table 1: Number of Urban Specialty Hospitals and Comparison General Hospitals Used in Patient Illness Severity Analysis, by Specialty Hospital Type**

Specialty hospital type	Number of urban specialty hospitals	Number of urban areas	Number of general hospitals in urban areas (range)
Cardiac	7	7	5 to 26
Orthopedic	8	6	10 to 87
Surgical	3	3	2 to 51
Women's	7	7	7 to 87

Source: HCUP.

Note: Data are from HCUP (2000).

We used All Payer Refined Diagnosis Related Groups (APR-DRG), a widely recognized patient classification system developed by 3M Health Information Systems, to assign an illness-severity level (minor, moderate, major, or extreme) to each patient on the basis of the DRG information contained in the HCUP discharge data. The system, which is frequently used by hospitals and private insurers, groups patients into one of 356 diagnosis categories and assigns a severity level based on patient diagnosis, age, sex, discharge status, and procedure.

Based on numbers of patients treated, we identified the 10 most common diagnosis categories at each specialty hospital and computed the percentage of patients in each of those categories determined to be severely ill (that is, assigned to the major or extreme severity level by the APR-DRG system). We then determined the percentage of severely ill patients in the same 10 diagnostic categories treated at general hospitals located in the same urban area and used the result as a benchmark against which to compare the specialty hospitals. We repeated this process for each specialty hospital. This ensured that we compared illness severity among the types of patients typically treated at each specialty hospital to the illness severity for similar types of patients treated at area general hospitals.

(290181)

---

## GAO's Mission

The General Accounting Office, the audit, evaluation and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

---

## Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through the Internet. GAO's Web site ([www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov)) contains abstracts and full-text files of current reports and testimony and an expanding archive of older products. The Web site features a search engine to help you locate documents using key words and phrases. You can print these documents in their entirety, including charts and other graphics.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. GAO posts this list, known as "Today's Reports," on its Web site daily. The list contains links to the full-text document files. To have GAO e-mail this list to you every afternoon, go to [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov) and select "Subscribe to daily E-mail alert for newly released products" under the GAO Reports heading.

---

## Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office  
441 G Street NW, Room LM  
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone:   Voice:   (202) 512-6000  
                          TDD:    (202) 512-2537  
                          Fax:     (202) 512-6061

---

## To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

### Contact:

Web site: [www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm](http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm)  
E-mail: [fraudnet@gao.gov](mailto:fraudnet@gao.gov)  
Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

---

## Public Affairs

Jeff Neilligan, managing director, [NeilliganJ@gao.gov](mailto:NeilliganJ@gao.gov) (202) 512-4800  
U.S. General Accounting Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149  
Washington, D.C. 20548

---

---

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

**Certificate of Need Thresholds by State - 2001**

State	Capital	Equipment	New Service
Alabama	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 1,500,000	All
Alaska	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
Arkansas (LTC)	\$ 500,000	N/A	All Home Health
Connecticut	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 400,000	All
Delaware	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	N/A
Dist. of Columbia	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 600,000
Florida	None	None	All
Georgia	\$ 1,155,881	\$ 642,157	All
Hawaii	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	All
Illinois	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	All new, expansions
Iowa	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 500,000
Kentucky	\$ 1,772,224	\$ 1,772,224	N/A
Louisiana	N/A	N/A	All LTC/MR
Maine	.5M-NH/2M-Hosp	\$ 1,000,000	\$100,000 Capital
Maryland	\$ 1,450,000	N/A	All
Massachusetts (Acute)	\$ 9,841,075	\$ 524,857	All
Mass. (Non Acute)	\$ 1,049,715		
Mass. (LTC Op Budget)	\$ 558,461		
Michigan	\$ 2,352,000	All	All Clinical
Mississippi	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	All
Missouri	.6M-LTC/1M-Other	.4M-LTC/1M-Other	\$ 1,000,000
Montana	\$ 1,500,000	N/A	\$ 150,000
Nebraska	All LTC	All LTC	All LTC
Nevada	\$ 2,000,000	N/A	n/a
New Hampshire	\$ 1,759,512	\$ 400,000	All
New Jersey	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	All
New York	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	All
North Carolina	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 750,000	certain services
Ohio	\$2M Renovations	n/a	n/a
Oklahoma	\$ 500,000	N/A	All/w beds
Oregon	All LTC/Hosp	N/A	All LTC/Hosp
Rhode Island	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 750,000
South Carolina	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 400,000
Tennessee	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	All w/beds
Vermont	\$1.5M Hsp/\$.75M Other	\$ 500,000	\$ 300,000
Virginia	\$ 5,000,000	N/A	n/a
Washington	\$ 1,202,000	N/A	All
West Virginia	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	23 Services
Wisconsin	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 600,000	All LTC
Mean	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,000,000	All
Mode	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	All
Average	\$ 1,788,429	\$ 1,258,861	\$ 150,000

THE  
FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT(S)  
ARE  
POOR  
ORIGINAL  
COPIES

MAR-04-04 THU 12:02 PM MATSU L10

FAX NO. 9073786180

P. 01



# Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the Health, Education and Social Services committee name

committee on HCS 511 dated March 4, 2004  
bill/subject

The Greater Wasilla Chamber of Commerce is opposed to HB 511. Our opposition is predicated upon first-hand knowledge of and interaction with one of our member businesses, Alaska Open Imaging Center (AOIC). AOIC is an independent diagnostic testing facility that is providing state-of-the-art healthcare services to residents of the State of Alaska. Their hi-tech equipment is providing critical early-detection of serious ailments for many Alaskans.

HB 511 would amend the present Certificate of Need (CON) process by adding independent diagnostic testing facilities, like AOIC, into the definition of 'health care facilities', thus requiring a CON.

We believe HB 511 would inadvertently create a monopoly on services for CON holders by adding a new and costly layer of additional regulation for private or independent facilities. It would require them to provide justification of their services and methods of operation, with a probable benchmark being the services which CON-holders or hospitals are providing. This bill discourages competition, which is always of benefit to the consumer. It also would discourage qualitative improvements, similar to those which AOIC introduced to Alaska residents several years ago. Alaskans wishing to avail themselves of state-of-the-art diagnostic testing would find their options severely limited.

We also believe that stifling existing or new business ventures is the exact opposite of what should be occurring in Alaska. Alaska is faced with a significant fiscal challenge, and possibly the most positive approach is to create a climate which is conducive to the expansion of existing and introduction of new businesses in our State. It appears that HB 511 would have the complete opposite affect.

Signed: Robert Baker  
Testify for  
President-Elect Greater Wasilla Chamber of Commerce  
Representing (Optional)  
415 E. Railroad Ave, Wasilla 99654  
Mailing Address  
376-1299  
Phone Number

# Petersburg Medical Center

103 Fram Street  
P.O. Box 589  
Petersburg, Alaska 99833



Phone: (907) 772-4291  
Fax: (907) 772-3085

Representative William K. Williams  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801

March 24, 2004

Dear Representative Williams,

I want to share some information with you relative to the Certificate of Need legislation HB 511 being considered by the finance committee. I would like to share a few things based on my personal experience that I believe are relevant.

First of all, it is important that the threshold for CON inclusion remain at \$1,000,000. One of the principle benefits of CON legislation is to provide the community with a means of regulating the growth of specialty providers – so called “niche providers”. Raising the threshold to \$2.5 million would allow the unregulated spread of such services. For the same reason, it is important to retain language that includes leased facilities under CON regulation. This closes a loophole that would allow many health care providers – including niche providers- to skirt the certificate of need process by simply leasing their assets.

The growth of specialty health business- niche providers- is growing rapidly across the United States. The negative impact they are having on full-service hospitals is causing the federal government and state governments across the nation some concern as to whether they serve a public good. Alaska would be wise to maintain its ability to regulate the growth of these specialty centers through certificate of need laws.

I have had experience with specialty centers in Oregon prior to coming to Petersburg. My first experience was with a doctor-owned imaging center constructed near a major referral hospital with which I was employed. The radiologists that owned the imaging center also held the contract for x-ray interpretation at the hospital. It was obvious from the beginning of their business venture that they scheduled the simple, uncomplicated cases from well-insured patient to their facility, and left the difficult and poorly-insured cases for the hospital. The effect of lower patient volumes and higher percentages of complicated cases had its effect on the hospital's profitability and its ability to keep charges down.

My next experience was with a physician-owned outpatient surgery center. Before it was even opened the surgery center raised our costs at the hospital by increasing competition for the limited supply of surgery-trained nurses in the community. The surgery center had the advantage of offering jobs that were day-shift only, with no weekends or holidays. Furthermore their nurses were not required to take “call”. The only thing our hospital could do to compete was to offer higher wages. The surgeons' ability to refer cases either to the hospital or their surgery center depending on the


complexity of the case and the patient's ability to pay , created unfair competition , and increased the cost of care the hospital. Occasionally, surgery center patients experienced the added cost of an expensive ambulance ride across town to the hospital when the care they required exceeded what was available at the surgery center, or when their recovery period extended beyond working hours of the surgery center.

The most alarming outcome, in my opinion , was the increased volume of surgery done in the community as a result of the center opening . The total of surgery the hospital and the surgery center combined exceeded the total volume before the surgery center by close to 30 %. This increased volume is typical in communities introducing physician-owned facilities, and raises serious questions about the objectivity of physicians referring patients for services where they have an economic interest.

In summery, there is hardly a service which a hospital provides which cannot be offered more efficiently by a provider who has limited hours of operation; who handles simple, uncomplicated cases, and who excludes patients whose ability to pay is limited. This situation offers significant profit potential to those providers, which will come at the expense of the full-service hospital that maintain availability at all hours of the day, to all patients regardless of their financial resources. Whether these providers should be allowed into an area should be up to that community, and certificate of need provides the community with a means of having a say. I urge your support of a certificate of need law that will enable that kind of control.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely



John F. Bringham  
Administrator, Petersburg Medical Center.



# Wrangell Medical Center

## Administrative Offices

Brian D. Gilbert, CEO  
E-mail: [bgilbert@wmcmail.org](mailto:bgilbert@wmcmail.org)  
Karen A. Wright  
Administrative Assistant  
E-mail: [kwright@wmcmail.org](mailto:kwright@wmcmail.org)

March 24, 2004

Representative Bill Williams  
Co-Chair House Finance

Dear Rep. Williams:

I believe you have been talking to Ron Betit, the CEO of our Hospital and Nursing Home Association about House Bill 511. There have been some changes in that since last year that we requested.

Because of these changes, I want you to know that I support the bill in its present form, and ask that if you can, you also support and pass it out of your committee.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Gilbert, CEO

BDG:kaw

## Health care regulation and Alaska *An Overview*

Prepared by Mike Powers, CEO/Administrator, Fairbanks Memorial Hospital  
and Denali Center  
February, 2004

Regulation is pervasive in healthcare and serves many good purposes. Physician licensure is an easy example of a case where the rule of law confers benefits greater than those of the marketplace. Furthermore, effective regulation is highly specific. This limits, at times, the lessons that can be learned from the experiences of other states in addressing the common problem of ensuring the greatest possible degree of consumer choice consistent with overall public benefit. For, as in so many other areas, Alaska differs dramatically from the rest of the United States in its health care.

### Special considerations in the Alaskan market:

1. Alaska has an extremely low population density, resulting in a uniquely high proportion of sole community providers.
2. There are significant physician shortages in psychiatry, internal medicine, and obstetrics. In Ohio, 14 delivery programs have closed since repeal of CON in 1996. Could that happen here, as profits dwindle and recruitment costs rise? The competitive model suffers pervasive physician supply shortages since they work to concentrate physician power to an extent not witnessed in the lower 48.
3. Even where physician shortages do not exist, certain specialties are highly concentrated. One cardiology group handles the whole state. One radiation therapy group services the whole state. There is only one ophthalmologist in Fairbanks.
4. Tertiary services are unusually distant. Most tertiary services are available only in Anchorage, a six to seven hour drive from Fairbanks; even air transport requires three hours including the time taken to arrange logistical support.
5. Not all tertiary/quaternary services are available in Alaska and residents sometimes must travel to the lower 48. Over 500 children currently receive inpatient psychiatric treatment out-of-state.
6. Alaska's demographics are skewed toward younger populations, and the State has a higher proportion of males.
7. Labor turnover is extremely high. This is partly due to the fact that many health care workers are military dependants. Fairbanks experiences a 25% turnover in labor annually.

8. Many expenses are unusually high. Construction costs are inflated by sub-arctic construction seasons, and the need for special construction materials.
9. The State has a high proportion of Alaska Natives; who use, to some extent, their own system of healthcare.
10. The State has an unusually high percentage of charge-based payers, including Medicaid.
11. There is no managed care in the State and no rate setting.
12. An uncommonly high level of commercial insurance leads to high potential for moral hazard, for both provider and patient.

Many of these factors combine to make cherry-picking unusually attractive. Sole community providers are responsible for the spectrum of local care. Since they are necessarily monopolies, cross-subsidies are possible. They are social institutions that accept responsibilities other than marketplace gain, thus making cross-subsidies unavoidable if any measure of charity care is going to be provided. The high-margin services providing the subsidies are attractive targets for opportunists, who do not use the profits to subsidize other services. They can easily under-price the monopoly and still collect windfall profits, or as economists say, "rents."

This does not create competition. It merely exploits the social mission of the monopoly by converting a community benefit to a shareholder benefit. Cross-subsidies are a public good with positive social "spillovers." Allowing predatory entry reduces the ability to cross-subsidize and converts a portion of the subsidy to private profit. The cost of the subsidy will not be eliminated from the system altogether, however. It provides the majority of the entrant's profits, and rates are not monitored by the state apart from CON reviews. Certificate of Need is one means of recognizing and dealing with these unusual features.

### Loss of Cross-Subsidy

Under deregulation, cross-subsidies become excess profits. Eliminating cross-subsidies while allowing excess profits does not lower the cost of health care. Transforming cross-subsidies into excess profits, that is, moving funds from public-use to private-use, does not address the issue of how the community will continue to provide subsidized services when the subsidy is reduced. An understanding of this dynamic explains the social benefit of shielding community providers from predatory entrants.

Deregulation will not reduce costs because as deregulation reduces the supply of cross-subsidy funds from certain individual services, providers will react. They may try to increase the utilization of other well-insured areas to make up the loss, thereby shifting the lost subsidy to other payers, as has been observed in other markets. This is more easily accomplished in a state without managed care and its incentives for utilization

review, like Alaska. Therefore, for these reasons alone, usage rates can be expected to increase with capacity. Furthermore, in a state without rate review, rates themselves will also increase.

Eventually, the cross-subsidies lost to new entrants will be replaced by higher prices and increased usage elsewhere. This dynamic itself creates new opportunities for rent-seeking entrepreneurs and the cycle begins again. Total costs shift and rise overall, in an ever-tighter spiral of increasing costs until the system of subsidies collapses altogether.

## Competition

In the lower 48, managed care brings insurance into the heart of the medical decision-making process. It does it with explicit concern for costs. This doesn't happen in Alaska since there is no managed care; physicians enjoy a degree of decision-making latitude long since extinguished elsewhere.

In the lower 48, managed care companies often make the facility choice for patients by restricting their options. This process allows hospitals to become involved in patient-directing behaviors through their managed care contracts, and makes price a part of the referral decision. In the lower 48, managed care companies often play a negotiating role, weakening the physician referral autonomy and introducing a measure of price competition. This doesn't happen here and managed care is unlikely to enter the market.

Without managed care as a vehicle, hospitals in Alaska have a greatly reduced ability to compete with physicians for patient flow. This differential market power makes a mockery of the notion of a level playing field where marginal utility equals marginal cost and to determine the amount consumed. Hospitals simply don't, and won't, have access to the only medical decision-making process in Alaska – that of the physician. Therefore, for example, Alaskan hospitals would inevitably lose business to a captive surgeon-owned surgery center. Not because they're more expensive, not because they're less convenient, not because they're less efficient – but because they don't have the same power over the decision-making as physicians. That is, "physician self-referral puts the hospital at a potentially significant disadvantage when it competes for patients with surgeon-owned ASCs."<sup>1</sup>

Managed care companies in the lower 48 also employ extensive utilization review mechanisms to reduce moral hazard. These curbs are also significantly absent in Alaska, so the problem of moral hazard is severe, and moral hazard is a powerful factor in escalating health care costs, especially when combined with physician ownership of facilities.

---

<sup>1</sup> William J. Lynk and Carina S. Longley. *The Effect of Physician-Owned Surgery Centers on Hospital Outpatient Surgery*. Health Affairs. Vol. 21 Number 4. July August 2002: Page 219.

For these reason, and others, the growth of managed care in the lower 48 led to decreased reliance on CON as a cost and utilization control mechanism in many states. For along with their onerous choice-limiting mechanisms, they do bring a measure of price-based market discipline to the health care marketplace. We do not advocate the establishment of managed care in Alaska, even if it could be made to work here. There are other ways to achieve its benefits while avoiding its limitations.

What we do advocate is an understanding of the intricate market dynamics at work in Alaskan healthcare and the necessity for a measure of government oversight and regulation greater than that required to ensure free, informed choice in the markets for other goods and services. Leveling the playing field in Certificate of Need regulations is a good place to start.

## Certificate of Need Questions & Answers

**Question: What types of projects are required to submit a certificate of need application and go through the review process?**

Answer: Any health care facility project that involves the expenditure of \$1 million or more for construction, renovation or the purchase of new equipment, and any project, regardless of cost, that converts space into nursing home beds is required to submit a certificate of need.

**Question: Are any types of "health care facility" projects that are currently exempt from the certificate of need program?**

Answer: Projects are currently exempt from certificate of need if: 1) the cost of the project is below the \$1 million threshold; 2) the project is for routine maintenance or routine replacement regardless of the cost; and 3) the project is for a Pioneer Home, or 4) the project is for private physicians or dentists offices, or projects not under the definition.

**Question: Will the "health care facilities" definition change if HB 511 passes?**

Answer: Yes. If HB 511 passes, two additional types of facilities will be added to the list of those projects that may be required to go through the CON process: 1) Residential Psychiatric Treatment Centers (RPTCs), and 2) independent diagnostic testing facilities.

**Question: Are all projects exempt from certificate of need if they fall below the dollar threshold?**

Answer: Any project that falls below \$1 million is exempt from certificate of need except for conversions of space to nursing home beds, which must submit a CON application regardless of the cost.

**Question: What are the components of the certificate of need process?**

- Letter of intent (who, what, where, how large, the cost and timeline);
- A determination is made as to whether a CON is required;
- If required, a CON application may be submitted within 60 days;
- The CON application is checked for completeness, more info may be requested;
- Once it is determined complete, an analysis document must be submitted to the Commissioner within 90 days;
- Public notice is given and a concurrent public comment process is announced;
- The Commissioner makes a decision, which is published, and
- The applicant has 30 days to appeal if dissatisfied.

**Question: If I apply for a certificate of need, how long will it take for a decision?**

Answer: Once your application is received and declared complete, a review document must be submitted to the Commissioner for a decision within 90 days. The Commissioner does not have a timeline to make a decision, but generally makes one in about two weeks.

**Question: How much does it cost to prepare a certificate of need application?**

Answer: That depends on the size of the project, its complexity and whether it is controversial. A rule of thumb is that a certificate of need application should not cost more than 1% of the total project cost with a maximum of \$25,000. Health Facilities Planning and Development, a consulting firm that writes approximately 70% of all CON applications for facilities in Washington State and has done at least 4 applications in Alaska, charges approximately \$15,000 per application, regardless of the size of the facility.



*Petersburg Medical Center*

P.O. BOX 559  
103 FT. 11M ST.  
PETERSBURG, AK 99833  
PHONE (907) 772-4291

*Perfect!  
465-3793*

March 31, 2004

Representative Bill Williams

Re: HB 511

Dear Representative Williams;

I understand that you will soon be meeting with the President of Open Imaging, regarding his desire to have an imaging center open on Tongass Avenue in Ketchikan. Here in Petersburg we understand the concerns this raises for Ketchikan General Hospital. All of our facilities in southeast Alaska struggle to maintain a break-even budget status and strong rely on services such as radiology imaging to help offset losses in areas such as OB care and Emergency services.

We are concerned about the impact for profit groups would have on our community facilities. Loss of a revenue generating service, would lead to serious reductions in the services offered to our communities. For profit groups entering the marketplace, are interested in providing those services with the best reimbursement. They are able to pick and choose their clients, avoiding the uninsured and indigent patient. This increases the financial burden placed on local community hospitals.

As a small facility we struggle with continues financial stresses. We depend on facilities such as Ketchikan General and Bartlett Regional Hospitals as providers of a higher level of care that we are unable to offer in Petersburg. For profit centers, which would negatively impact the services provided at these facilities would also impact the care available to the residents in communities such as Petersburg and Wrangell.

I fully support the provisions of HB 511 as currently written.

I appreciate your willingness to listen to all aspects of this question and hope that you will strongly support the interests of our local community hospitals in southeast.


Sincerely,

Sandra Tackett, RN DON  
Director of Nursing

# SITKA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

## FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

To: Representative Billy Williams  
State of Alaska  
Fax #: (907) 465-3793  
Date: March 31, 2004

From: Mark Nellis,   
Chief Financial Officer  
Off #: (907) 747-1764  
# Pages 1 (w/cover)

Dear Representative Williams:

Please be advised that Sitka Community Hospital is severely concerned with certain gaps which exist within the current Certificate of Need process, and particularly with the absence of inclusion of controls with regards to freestanding Diagnostic Imaging Centers.

We believe that House Bill 511 will be beneficial to the long term sustainability of rural hospitals such as ours, wherein our operational margins are so tight that the loss of just a small portion of our patient base to independent ancillary services providers (such as imaging services) would severely strain our fiscal abilities.

We therefore seek your support by asking you to vote favorably on House Bill 511, so as to protect the ongoing provision of hospital-based healthcare services.

### KEY PROVISION OF HOUSE BILL 511

#### CON is extended to cover Diagnostic Imaging Centers

##### The Bill:

1. Strengthens the CON statute. This is good because health care is a public good. It requires responsible regulation to keep costs down. In health care, the free market isn't always the best approach in deciding how resources should be allocated.
2. Closes several loopholes. Two specific areas are clarified where the current law is unclear or silent:
  - Freestanding diagnostic centers. This bill recognizes that they should be considered as being health care facilities. It ensures that they must meet the same CON criteria that are in force for a hospital-based imaging center.
  - The cost of leases for space is counted as a project cost. This bill specifies that the fair market value will be counted toward meeting the criterion for CON review.
3. The bill makes sure that the CON rules are applied more equally. It won't be possible to avoid CON review by leasing space instead of building it, and having an outside provider offer diagnostic imaging instead of the local hospital provider.
4. It makes sure that the rules are applied in the cases where they should be, and particularly with Diagnostic Imaging Centers.
5. Unclear rules make for bad public policy. When the rules are clear and when they apply equally to everyone, competition is fair and the outcome is better for the public.

Thank you.

March 31, 2004

Representative Bill Williams

Re: **HB 511**

Dear Bill;

I wanted to just state one more time, prior to your meeting with the President of Open Imaging, that the quickest way to close Ketchikan General Hospital would be to have an imaging center open on Tongass Avenue. Most of the services we provide at the hospital are done at a break-even or slight loss. Radiology imaging is one area in which we actually see a positive revenue. As a result of this area of positive revenue, we are able to provide the full scope of health care services to the community. If that source of revenue was skimmed away by a for-profit group then I would be forced to look at serious reductions in the services we offer to the community, up to and including emergency services. Hospitals today operate on the narrowest of margins. When a for-profit entity is allowed to enter the marketplace, take only the best reimbursement services from only those patients able to pay and leave the uninsured, indigent, and expensive services with low reimbursement to the local hospital then disaster is imminent.

**I fully support the provisions of HB 511.**

Thanks very much for listening to our situation and weighing that carefully.

Patrick J. Branco  
CEO



# Valdez Regional Health Authority, Inc.

911 Meals Avenue • PO Box 550 • Valdez, Alaska 99686  
907-835-2249 • Fax 907-835-3735 • www.valdezhra.org

9 March 2004

Representative Peggy Wilson  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol Building, Room 104  
Juneau AK 99801-1182

*John*  
*For your information they has the potential to affect us if NOT PASSED*

Dear Representative Wilson:

Unfortunately I was unable to attend the hearing on HB 511, "An Act Relating to Certificate of Need", but I wanted to make certain that the Valdez Regional Health Authority expressed its support for passage of this legislation.

One of the most important duties of the Department of Health and Social Services is to insure that the critical safety-net for providing care is viable. Alaska's small hospitals are that safety-net in many communities. It is therefore important that many of the current loopholes that give unfair advantage to some providers to the detriment of others be closed. By adding new language to the definition of "health care facility," an important step will be taken. Although many small towns may not currently face outside competition, by the time they do it will be too late, unless this legislation is in place. HB 511 also restricts the ability of health care developers to circumvent CON laws by leasing rather than purchasing space or equipment. Again a step toward leveling the playing field for those of us that currently must be concerned about CON and competing with those without similar constants.

As you are well aware, hospitals already face economic challenges from an increasing number of uninsured Alaskans that we are mandated to serve without regard to their ability to pay. Existing capacity in the health care system must be used fully to enable Alaska's providers to offset this largely uncompensated care. To allow capacity to grow in a community without giving the Department an opportunity to assess the need for this additional investment invites serious problems. Hospitals already in the market are constantly challenged without the impact on overall cost of care as developers expand profitable parts of the health care system without a commensurate requirement to assume a proportionate share of the uncompensated care.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James R. Culley  
Chief Executive Officer

✓ Cc: Representative John Harris

## Wrangell Medical Center

P.O. Box 1081  
Wrangell, AK 99929  
March 30, 2004

[www.wrangellmedicalcenter.com](http://www.wrangellmedicalcenter.com)

(907) 874-7000  
Fax (907) 874-7122

Representative Bill Williams  
Alaska State Capitol  
Room 511  
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: House Bill 511 – Certificate of Need (CON) Program


Dear Representative Williams:

I am very concerned that diagnostic imaging centers must be included in the Certificate of Need planning process to allow for a level playing field within our Alaskan communities.

Intelligent oversight is provided by the current CON process. It provides a forum for the public's involvement. HB511, as written, ensures that the CON rules are applied more equally – particularly with respect to niche providers who seek to carve out only the profitable services from community hospitals – and intelligent community health planning occurs.


I support this legislation and strongly urge you to pass HB511.

Sincerely,



Brian Gilbert  
CEO, Wrangell Medical Center

cc: House Finance Committee



# South Peninsula Hospital

March 30, 2004

Representative Bill Williams, Co- Chair  
Representative John Harris, Co- Chair  
House Finance Committee  
State Capitol Building, Room 515  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Representatives Williams and Harris

I am the Chief Executive Officer of South Peninsula Hospital a small community owned and operated hospital in Homer. Our hospital has served the community since 1956. I have had the honor of serving as its CEO since 1995. I have not had the opportunity to testify on HB 511, "An Act Relating to Certificate of Need," but wanted to share some information with you.

You have heard testimony from representatives of an Independent Diagnostic Testing Facility (IDTF) stating that they provide services at a lower cost than hospitals. This is probably a true statement. However, it is important for you and the committee members to understand why this may be possible. IDTFs specifically target one of the most lucrative services provided by hospitals. Imaging services are a major "profit center" for hospitals. Profit centers are what help hospitals offset the cost of providing unprofitable services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year to all patients who show up on our doorsteps.

Community hospitals serve the community. IDTFs are businesses. IDTFs generally operate during normal business hours Monday through Friday. Consequently, they do not have to bear the additional cost of staffing 24 hours a day nor do they have to keep their doors open during periods of low utilization. Community hospitals, on the other hand, are always open, standing by for the emergency patient or the mother who goes into labor in the middle of the night.

HB511 will not limit competition or stop the development of IDTFs. However, it will eliminate the unfair advantage IDTFs currently have of being able to compete with local community hospitals without having to demonstrate the need for their service. If the CON statute is not changed and the playing field leveled, IDTFs will continue to have this unfair advantage. They will be able to continue carving the profitable services out of hospitals, leaving us with the responsibility of providing unprofitable services with very limited resources. Hospitals will have to raise rates to compensate for the loss of revenue when the profitable services are gone. As a result, the cost of care for everyone in the

Ph 907-235-8101 • Fx 907-235-0253  
4300 Bartlett Street, Homer, Alaska 99603  
[www.sphosp.com](http://www.sphosp.com)

Representatives Williams and Harris  
HB 511

March 30, 2004  
Page 2

community will go up. Small rural hospitals operate on a very thin margin or no margin with support from local tax dollars. If they lose profitable services and don't raise rates, the community will lose its hospital or will have to provide greater tax subsidies to the hospitals.

Please do what is right for your community and mine; preserve access to care; pass HB 511; and correct this iniquity.

Sincerely,



Charles C. Franz, CHE  
Chief Executive Officer