

From: Richard Ross [mailto:rossrck@hotmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 10, 2012 5:40 PM

To: Knopp, Gary; Knopp, Gary; Smalley, Hal; Hal Smalley; Tauriainen, Ray; Tauriainen, Ray; Murphy, Linda; Murphy, Linda; Pierce, Charlie; Pierce, Charlie; McClure, Sue; McClure, Sue; Johnson, Brent; Brent, Johnson; Smith, Bill; Smith, Bill; Haggerty, Mako; Mako, Haggerty; Blankenship, Johni

Subject: ORD 2011-19-72 Radiation Oncology Facility

I am unable to be present for the March 13 Assembly Meeting and request that this message be considered as my testimony on the subject ordinance:

The hospital's plan is that a full range of patient centered cancer healthcare that is reasonably possible for our population base be provided on campus. Additionally it is the position of the hospital that the full range of the available services should be available to all residents including insured, medicare/medicaid and under/uninsured. This is the manner in which cancer care is presently delivered at Providence Hospital. But like many of you, my family experienced what cancer care was like before and after CPH was developed, and before Providence developed its full range of cancer health care on campus.

Our relatives that have gone through cancer treatment in recent years that have involved radiation oncology have had a much more patient centered experience than was the case 34 years ago when my younger 29 year old sister was being treated in her unsuccessful efforts to overcome breast cancer. At that time as a Providence in-patient, a very ill young woman had to be moved from hospital bed to ambulance and then transported offsite for radiation oncology, and when at the radiation oncology site moved again from ambulance to treatment area. At the termination of the treatment the process of transport repeated. In addition to the discomfort to this young woman, the additional expenses involved generated by all parties involved were not insignificant to the family.

I have been told that in-patient would be a minority of cases. But the decision you make tonight will be perhaps a 20-30 year decision. During that time as our population ages that minority will only increase. How many patients will be affected and how much unnecessary expense will be generated over that time if we do not co-locate the radiation oncology with the hospital? Why duplicate in our area a system Providence moved away from?

The hospital's proposal to the radiation oncology groups is not that it own the equipment or employ the necessary staff, it is simply to provide to their business the facilities located with hospital access that do not require outside transport. This is not an issue of hospital dominance or physician independence. It is not about whether the capital costs should be paid by the hospital and rent charged to recover the appropriate portion of those costs, versus private party capital venture investors with the return they expect if the facility is built off site. Ultimately those costs may well be very similar. It is in my mind simply about what is best for patients in their comfort and treatment as well as the unnecessary expenses incurred by them if radiation oncology is located off site. I encourage you to adopt this ordinance.

Thank you, Rick Ross
1505 Kittiwake
Kenai



2841 DEBARR ROAD | SUITE 100 | ANCHORAGE, AK 99508 | P: 907.276.2400 | TOLL-FREE: 877.276.4655 | F: 907.276.4888

March 12, 2012

Peninsula Radiation Oncology Services

Dear Mayor Navarre and KPB Assembly Members:

We (Drs. Chung, Bertucio, and Bucci) currently provide radiation oncology services at both Alaska Regional Hospital and Mat-Su Regional Hospital. We strongly believe that there are clear advantages to providing these services on a hospital campus. Thus, we hope you continue plans to develop radiation capacity on your local hospital campus.

As you may be aware, we responded to Request For Information (RFI) to provide radiation oncology at Central Peninsula Hospital (CPH). Our understanding was that CPH wisely sought to build a campus-based radiation therapy center. Thus, we never considered pursuing an independent, off-campus venture.

It is our hope that you will allow the competitive RFI process to continue. However, even if we are not selected to participate in your Cancer Center, we strongly recommend you locate radiation oncology services on your hospital campus.

Sincerely,

Richard Chung, MD

Clare Bertucio, MD

Kara Bucci, MD

From: joalaska [mailto:joalaska@ptialaska.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 1:22 PM
To: Blankenship, Johni
Subject: oops!

Hi Johni,

Sorry I sent by email some comments I wanted added to tonight's Assembly packet.

I've got that terrible cold that's going around, and wasn't thinking, I guess....forgot to give my name and address:

Joann Odd
P.O. Box 62
Clam Gulch, AK 99568

in case you can still get it in.

Thanks
joann

From: joalaska
To: jblankenship@borough.kenai.ak.us
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2012 11:52 AM
Subject: please add to packet

Can this be added to the packets of all assembly members, for tonight's meeting?

Regarding Ordinance 2011-19-70: Appropriating \$200,000 to Hire a Consultant to Assist the Borough in Determining the Course of Action to Pursue Regarding Curtailing Health Care Costs (Mayor) (Referred to Finance Committee):

How will this proposed study differ from the recent similar study done by the State of Alaska? Spending \$200,000 to study this issue LOCALLY, is a waste of time and money. The Mayor should study the results of the STATE study, before spending more Borough money for information that may already exist at the state level. Voters WILL be looking very closely, to see where this \$200,000 is spent and who is hired to do it.

Regarding Ordinance 2011-19-72: Appropriating \$4,700,000 for the Purpose of Constructing a Radiation Oncology Facility at Central Peninsula Hospital (Mayor) (Referred to Finance Committee):

I object to earmarking this huge amount BEFORE negotiations are completed by both parties. We should see final proposals as to this issue before ANY Borough money is committed. If no solution between the hospital and the doctors is arrived at, that is the time to consider this HUGE amount.

Why isn't this money coming out of the large surplus fund the hospital has built up?

Isn't there a 1.5 million dollar limit the Assembly can request before adding this HUGE amount on to the taxpayers? I thought an initiative limiting the amount the Borough could spend without voter approval, is still a law?

Regarding Ordinance 2011-19-73: Appropriating \$569,292 from the Equipment Replacement Fund for the Purchase of New Sales Tax Software (Mayor) (Referred to Finance Committee)

I object to the purchase of NEW sales tax software until the people have been given adequate reasons for this expenditure. This seems like a LOT of money for a software program. I thought we just bought new software a few years ago. Why isn't that adequate? Didn't it bring in enough money?

Will this 'new software' become obsolete in a few years?

Was there any examination done to see if a comparable program might be found that costs less?

Is this just another way the new Mayor shows his disregard for the voters intent to SAVE MONEY, NOT SPEND MORE?

Regarding Ordinance 2012-07: Amending KPB Titles 2-Administration, 4--Elections and 16--Service Areas to Provide that All Kenai Peninsula Borough Service Area Boards are Appointed Instead of Elected (Murphy) (Hearings on 04/03/12 and 04/17/12) (Referred to Policies and Procedures Committee)

THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS! The PEOPLE should select who is on these Boards, NOT the Assembly.

Is this just one more POWER GRAB by the Assembly? If you pass this, legal action WILL follow, and MORE MONEY will be needed to defend this in court.

I ask the Assembly to re-think this horrible idea and shelve it for good!

Regarding Resolution 2011-108: Approving a New Senior Clerk Typist Classified Position in the River Center Department (Mayor) (Referred to Policies and Procedures Committee) TABLED 01/17/12

Again, our new Mayor seems to never run out of ways to spend more money. Will there be NO END to ways you can spend money on the River Center? What will ever be ENOUGH?

Times are HARD for a lot of Borough residents, and spending more money on NON ESSENTIAL ITEMS does not help.

Have you looked into ways PAPER WORK could be reduced, or whether existing employees are being used efficiently? Maybe some Department heads could type some of their own work? If they had to do it, maybe they would think twice before adding new regulations and policies that just generate more paperwork and justify hiring more people.

Is there ANY stipulation that this new position must be filled by a Borough resident? At least that would give a job to a local person.

Hiring new employees should be the LAST RESORT, because once they are hired, they are seldom, if ever, let go, and their benefits program adds to the financial indebtedness of the Borough and Borough taxpayers.

To the Assembly: I am ASKING YOU, to please review all possible ways to save money- not spend more.

The increase in gas prices and heating fuel costs mean that those of us on fixed incomes must make hard choices on how our money is being spent. I now have 1/4 of my spendable income cut, and must find ways to make what I get - go farther. I expect nothing less from you, who spend our tax dollars.

YOU can just increase my taxes, _I_ have no way to increase what I get.

PLEASE GET THE SPENDING UNDER CONTROL! Learn to prioritize our needs against our wants. PLEASE!