CAB 97-99 / October 1997 Annotated Briefing

# A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Shipboard Telemedicine

Federico Garcia • Peter H. Stoloff

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release; Distribution Unlimited

# 19980114 078

# **Center for Naval Analyses**

4401 Ford Avenue • Alexandria, Virginia 22302-1498

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

#### Approved for distribution:

Laurie J. May, Director iu

Medical Team Support Planning and Management

Oct

CNA's annotated briefings are either condensed presentations of the results of formal CNA studies that have be documented elsewhere or stand-alone presentations of research reviewed and endorsed by CNA. These briefing the best opinion of CNA at the time of issue. They do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Department

Distribution limited to the provide the providence of the providence of this document can. CNA Document Contor and Distribution Section (703)824-2943.

REPORT DOCUMENT ATION PAGE
----------------------------

4

٠

Form Approved OPM No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of inf maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the of for reducing this burden, to Washington Headque the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs	formation is estimated collection of informati arters Services, Direct Office of Managemen	to average 1 hour per res on. Send comments regardin orate for Information Operat tt and Budget, Washington. D	ponse, including the ng this burden estimations and Reports, 1 DC 20503.	time for reviewing ir ate or any other aspect 215 Jefferson Davis H	structions, se of this colle lighway, Suit	earching existing data sources gathering and ection of information, including suggestions e 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. RI	EPORT DATE		3. REPORT TYPI	E AND DA	TES COVERED
		October 1997		Fina	1	
4 TITLE AND SUBTITLE		·			5. FUND	ING NUMBERS
A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Shinboar	d Telemedicine					
A cost-benefit Maijas of Simpoour					С-	N00014-91-C-0002
		645 m			PE -	65154N
6. AUTHOR(S)					ממ	D0149
Federico Garcia, Peter H. Stoloff					rk •	K0170
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(	S) AND ADDRESS	S(ES)			8. PERFO	DRMING ORGANIZATION
					KEI O.	
Center for Naval Analyses					CAB	97-99
Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268						
······································					10 000	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)						NSOKING/MONITORING AGENCY ORT NUMBER
Assistant Chief for Plans, Analysis, a	nd Evaluation (l	MED-08)				
2300 E Street, NW						
Washington, D.C. 20372-5300						
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATE	MENT				12b. DIS	TRIBUTION CODE
CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE						
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)						
In this study, we estimate the peacet telemedicine technology were availa sick-in-quarters (SIQ) days. We cons we are unable to attach a monetary telemedicine. We estimated the ban	time demand for able to the entire sider several imp value to a partic ndwidth requirer	r telemedicine (TM) f e fleet. These savings v olementations of telem ular benefit, we quant nent for different sho	or ships at sea. would result fro nedicine and m tify it in other w p types based o	We estimate the s om avoiding medi easure the mone ays. Telecommur n the demand fo	cal evacua cal evacua tary costs a hications i r telemedi	at would accrue if ations (MEDEVACs) and and benefits of each. Where s a central component of icine consulting.
14. SUBJECT TERMS				modicing shire		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 40
Casualties, cost analysis, health care technology, telecommunications, te	issues, medical elemedicine	evacuation, medical se	ervices, military	medicine, snips,		16. PRICE CODE
7. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	18. SECURITY CL	ASSIFICATION	19. SECURITY	CLASSIFICATIO	1	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
OF REPORT Unclassified	OF THIS PAGE	E Unclassified	OF ABSTR	ACT Unclass	ified	SAR
SN 7540-01-280-5500						Standard Form 298, (Rev. 2-89



DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

an an is the type the confidence



In this study, we estimate the peacetime demand for telemedicine (TM) for ships at sea. We estimate the savings that would accrue if telemedicine technology were available to the entire fleet. These savings would result from avoiding medical evacuations (MEDEVACs) and sick-in-quarters (SIQ) days.

We consider several implementations of telemedicine and measure the monetary costs and benefits of each. Where we are unable to attach a monetary value to a particular benefit, we quantify it in other ways.

Telecommunications is a central component of telemedicine. We estimated the bandwidth requirement for different ship types based on the demand for telemedicine consulting.



This slide shows an overview of the topics we covered in our analysis. As a preamble, let's define telemedicine and the scope of the study.



Telemedicine (TM) is the use of communication technologies to support health care when distance separates the participants. It allows the transfer of medical information between platforms at sea and medical facilities ashore. TM is an umbrella of technologies, not a specific technology.

Telemedicine makes it possible for physicians and other health care providers to see patients and share diagnostic information in geographically dispersed areas. Performing consultations in this manner increases ships' access to specialized medical resources. It has the potential to improve the quality of care for deployed sailors and Marines.

4



Telemedicine technology has the following uses:

•Consulting. The greatest potential for telemedicine is in medical consulting.

•Health promotion. Land-based specialists could track a rise in the incidence of a disease aboard a ship or disseminate preventive health care literature. Telemedicine could ease the sense of isolation of at-sea medical providers from the rest of the medical community.

•Distance learning. Onboard medical staff could download instructional and reference materials.

Although not part of the scope of our study, providers at sea could use telemedicine technology to access databases containing electronic patient records. Providers at sea could have access to patients' medical records with digital images of X-rays and other diagnostic data.



We analyzed four telemedicine technologies.

**E-mail** provides the ability to send and receive E-mail with attachments, such as digitized medical images. Used in conjunction with a digital camera, E-mail allows the transmission of pictures and videos in store-and-forward mode.

Internet connectivity allows for posting and retrieving pictures and videos and searches of medical resource materials on the World Wide Web.

VTC refers to real-time, full-motion, audio and video teleconferencing.

**Teleradiology** consists of adding a digitizing scanner to existing X-ray equipment. We did *not* analyze computed radiology, which uses filmless X-ray technology.

A variety of digital diagnostic instruments can enhance TM consultations. We analyzed the cost-effectiveness of the following **instruments**: dermascope, ophthalmoscope, otoscope, stethoscope, endoscope, EKG/defibrillator, and ultrasound.

We did *not* include administrative automation systems (such as CHCS) in our analysis.



Next, we discuss our method for estimating the demand for telemedicine. We also discuss the data and how we determined the costs and benefits of implementing the technology.

#### Methodology

- Senior Medical Department Representatives (SMDRs) in LANT and PAC reconstructed Sep 95-Aug 96 MEDEVACs
  - Response rate was 52% (62 of 120 ships sampled)
- Panel of experts (physicians and IDCs) estimated
  - Applicability of TM from about 13,000 individual medical encounters from SAMS
  - Potential reduction in SIQ days
  - Potential enhancement in quality of care
  - Need for add-on digital instruments

We developed a self-administering survey mainly for the purpose of reconstructing MEDEVACs. Fleet Surgeons from the different TYCOMs distributed the survey to ships' medical departments. We asked for ships that had deployed at least 90 days during the analysis period. MEDEVAC information consisted of patient diagnosis, destination, means of transportation, and potential effect of TM in avoiding the MEDEVAC.

Fleet Surgeons also asked ships to submit Snap Automated Medical System (SAMS) data. We looked at the medical encounter information on SAMS. SAMS reports sick bay visits on an individual basis. Our SAMS data included ICD-9, patient symptoms and relevant medical history, prescribed treatment, light- or no-duty days recommended, and referral for follow-up treatment. We used this information to determine the need for consulting with a specialist, and the potential benefits arising from the consultation.

Because some of the telemedicine technology is new, few fleet medical personnel have actually used it. We convened a panel of physicians and Independent Duty Corpsmen (IDCs) familiar with the technology to review the SAMS data and estimate some of the benefits of telemedicine.

8



Our SAMS data consisted of 13,000 medical encounters from a representative sample of ships. We screened out 2,000 encounters with too little detail and 3,000 encounters with no applicability of TM, such as physical exams and common colds.

We passed on the remaining 8,000 cases to a group of IDCs. The IDCs selected the cases for which they thought a consult with a specialist would help establish or confirm a diagnosis or treatment path (regardless of which TM modality). The IDCs considered the ship type and its available medical resources in determining the need for a consult. The IDCs then presented 875 cases requiring a consult to Navy physicians (by specialty) to determine the possible role of TM.

	Background/Specialty	Rank	Command
Physicians	Fleet Medical Officer	САРТ	SURFPAC
·	Professor, Dermatology	CAPT	USUHS
	SMO (CVA)	CDR	USS George Washington
	Former SMO (CVA)	CDR	BUMED
	Director, MIDN Project	CDR	NNMC
	GMO, SW	LT	BUMED
	Internal Medicine	Civilia	NNMC
DCs	Analyst, MIDN Project	HMC	NNMC
	Corpsman, SW	HMC	BMC Arlex
	Corpsman, SW	HM1	BMC Arlex
	Corpsman, SS	HM1	Washington Navy Yard

Г

٦

This slide lists the members of the panel of experts. The panel included seven physicians and four IDCs. The panel had Fleet and BuMed representation. All panel members had experience with TM as either providers or "consumers" of telemedicine consulting.

# Other Data MEDEVACs Aircraft flying costs (fuel, repairs, and maintenance) Ship steaming costs Personnel costs Aircraft hazards TM equipment costs Off-the-shelf prices NMIMC factors for installation, maintenance, training, and supplies Communication costs (INMARSAT)

We complemented the survey and SAMS data with the following information.

Aircraft. We collected other data to support the analysis, including hourly flight cost of aircraft that typically conduct MEDEVACs attributable to the following:

- Fuel
- Depot-level repairables
- Maintenance.

Ships. We also obtained data to estimate the cost of ship diversions and returns to port, including the following:

- Petroleum, oil, and lubricants
- Repair parts
- Direct depot maintenance
- Nonscheduled repair.

**TM equipment**. We used off-the-shelf prices for TM equipment. Prices varied widely, but we chose products in the lower end that are currently in use by the military. We added the cost of installation, maintenance, training, and supplies from information supplied by the Navy Medical Information Management Center (NMIMC).

**INMARSAT**. In the event that ships' communications would not be available for telemedicine, we considered the alternative of a commercial satellite. International Maritime Satellites (INMARSAT), a commercial satellite system, provides relay of voice and data communication. INMARSAT costs \$4.00/minute for 9.6-kbps voice transmission and \$10.00/minute for 64-kbps data transmissions.



We discounted future benefits and costs to transform gains and losses occurring in different time periods to a common unit of measurement. In general, investments with a positive net present value are desirable because the benefits outweigh the costs.

We assigned monetary values to benefits and costs—whenever possible. For benefits with no direct monetary value, such as quality-of-care enhancements, we provided measures of their effect.

We ignored sunk costs, such as MEDEVACs:

•Conducted on the mail run

•Logged as training hours.

These airlifts would have occurred in the absence of the medical emergency and, therefore, do not represent potential savings due to telemedicine.

Because our data are based on a sample of ships, we scaled up the savings estimates to the entire Navy. We used scale factors based on ship employment and manning.

#### Assumptions

- Fleet initiatives (IT-21) will provide computers and software
- Access to ships' communications may be problematical
  - Two scenarios: With and without INMARSAT
- □ Shore infrastructure cost not included

We assumed that IT-21 would provide for local area networks afloat, as well as off-the-shelf personal computers with communications software. IT-21 would also extend the satellite communications capabilities to provide each ship with sufficient computing capacity to support the TM equipment we investigated.

In the absence of the necessary bandwidth, medical departments may have to buy satellite time. Many ships are currently using INMARSAT for some of their transmissions.

We did not consider the cost of developing a shore infrastructure, or "catcher's mitt," to support telemedicine consults. Members of the medical panel had some insights as to the general process for telemedicine consulting. They envisioned consults going to a centralized point and then being electronically relayed to a medical duty officer of the appropriate specialty.

A prototype for this setup is the Telemedicine Multimedia Integrated Distributed Network (MIDN). This network currently supports remote clinical consultations with ships at sea and the Naval Academy. MIDN channels TM consulting, drawing from existing medical resources.



We now present our findings. First, let's look at our estimates of the demand for telemedicine.



We estimate that, if the technology were available to the entire fleet, there would be over 18,500 telemedicine consults per year. The majority of these consults (79 percent) would use the less technologically sophisticated TM modalities of E-mail and telephone.



This slide shows the estimated annual number of consults for particular medical specialties. Not all consults require a specialist. Twenty-one percent of the consults would be with a GMO—physicians aboard large ships could handle these consults.

Orthopedic consults account for the largest group of referrals requiring a specialist (24 percent). Ophthalmology accounts for the second largest group of referrals to a specialist (6 percent).

We estimate that 6.7 percent of all sick bay visits could potentially result in a TM consult.



We estimated that two-thirds of TM consults would result in improved quality of care. Of those, over 80 percent do not require any add-on digital instrument. For the rest, the consultants felt that a diagnostic instrument (such as a digital dermascope for magnified views of skin tissue) would be required. Nonetheless, the lack of such instruments aboard ship would not necessarily reduce the demand for TM consults.



Now, we look at the role of telemedicine in MEDEVACs.



Based on our survey of ship medical departments, we estimated that Navy ships evacuated 911 patients during the 12-month period from 1 September 1995 to 1 September 1996. Not all MEDEVACs are avoidable. Many are related to orthopedic injuries (such as broken bones) and psychiatric illnesses (such as attempted suicides). Fleet policy is to evacuate personnel with these conditions. Intervention with TM would not avoid these MEDEVACs. On the other hand, many MEDEVACs result when a ship's medical department does not have the resources for a proper diagnosis.

This figure shows the MEDEVACs that, according to the SMDRs, could have been avoided if TM had been available to aid in the diagnosis and treatment of patients. We highlight avoidable MEDEVACs conducted on *dedicated* transport (17.2 percent) because these generate savings.

Mode of transport	Miles
Fixed wing	147,217
Helo	<b>8,15</b> 4
Ship	<b>90</b> 5

Avoiding MEDEVACs also eliminates a considerable amount of travel. The mode of transport to the immediate destination is distributed as follows:

- Fixed wing: 64 percent
- Helicopter: 29 percent
- Ship diversions: 6 percent
- Returns to port: 1 percent.

Based on data for seven helicopter and three fixed-wing airframes, the average one-way distance of a MEDEVAC was:

- Fixed-wing: 466 miles
- Helicopter: 68 miles.



We divided the cost components of avoidable MEDEVACs into the following categories:

- Fuel and maintenance account for more than half of the costs.
- Corpsman refers to medical staff escorting evacuated patient.
- Ship diversions refer to pay of ship personnel diverted or returned to port.
- Aircrew refers to pilot and aircrew pay.

We applied the probability of occurrence of an aircraft safety **hazard** to the fixed-wing and helicopter travel miles potentially avoided by TM. Hazards cost up to \$10,000 and include localized fires and electromagnetic interference causing loss of a signal. We obtained aircraft hazard data from the Navy Safety Center.

• (pe	ercentage of total)	
	Expedite	Facilitate decision
Platform	(%)	(%)
Carriers	20	38
Amphibs	14	37
Small ships	36	57
Submarines	9	50

Arranging for a MEDEVAC requires planning and coordination between the ship's medical staff and the receiving facility. TM expedites MEDEVACs by routing patients to appropriate sources of care and forwarding data to the receiving facility. Consulting by TM reduces uncertainty, making the decision to MEDEVAC less arbitrary.



Now, let's look at the cost-effectiveness of each of the TM modalities.



This slide and the next three show the costs and savings associated with implementing each TM modality. On each chart, we show the costs as bars to the left of the horizontal axis. The costs have two components: equipment (solid black portion) and communications (INMARSAT) (striped portion). The savings are to the right of the horizontal axis. The solid white part of the bar represents the recouped pay of sailors avoiding SIQ due to the intervention by TM. The striped part represents the avoided MEDEVACs. We estimated the costs and savings in FY 1997 dollars over the 5-year life cycle of the technology. We show estimates for each of the four ship types.

E-mail and Internet connectivity would be cost-effective on all platforms, even if ship's communication were unavailable (and INMARSAT were used). Note that the cost of equipment for E-mail/Internet is negligible.



This slide shows the costs and savings associated with providing ship medical departments with a telephone and a fax. We assumed that each consult would require a 30-minute call. If a commercial satellite is used, this modality would not be cost-effective on any ship platform. If the ships' communications resources are used, phone and fax would be cost-effective on all platforms.



Video teleconferencing is not cost-effective on any platform if a commercial satellite is used. If own ship's communication were available, VTC would be cost-effective on the large platforms (carriers and amphibious ships) only.



When ship's communications are used, teleradiology is cost-effective on aircraft carriers only. When INMARSAT is used, teleradiology is not cost-effective on any platform.

This slide shows estimates of savings through the use of teleradiology on small ships, although these ships currently do not have the required film X-ray equipment. The potential teleradiology savings are limited on small platforms, and would not justify the investment of an X-ray machine solely to support teleradiology. We did not consider teleradiology for submarines because of their space limitations.

	Stetho- scope	Ophthal- moscope	Derma- scope	Ultra- sound	Defibr./ EKG	Oto- scope	Endo- scope
Carrier	6,788	5,621	2,513	(1,300)	(2,987)	(3,965)	(5,874)
Amphibious	2,317	232	(226)	(1,971)	(4,601)	(3,965)	(5,874)
Small ship	(1,309)	(2,938)	(1,021)	(2,758)	(6,478)	(3,305)	(5,628
Submarine	(2,041)	(2,281)	(732)	(2,937)	(6,608)	(2,648)	(5,874)

Here, we look at the cost-effectiveness of digital diagnostic instruments. The numbers in parentheses are *negative* savings (that is, the costs exceed the savings). The demand for these digital instruments is relatively small. Only the stethoscope, ophthalmoscope, and dermascope are cost-effective on the large platforms. The other instruments are *not* cost-effective on any platform.



In the next section, we look at the bandwidth requirement for implementing TM on ships at sea.

		Asynchrono	us Synchr	onous
		S&F	Phone/Fax	VTC
<u> </u>		(64k)	(9.6k)	(128k)
Carri	ers	166	191	160
Ampr	nibious	36	42	35
Small	ships	I	50	0
	Nine hour About 1%	s/month on c	carriers width	Ū

Store-and-forward (S&F) transmissions include E-mail messages on all platforms and X-ray transmissions on carriers and amphibious ships. We assumed a 64-kbps pipe for S&F transmissions. Real-time communications include phone on all platforms and VTC on carriers and amphibious ships.

Would providing the medical departments access to the ships' communications capabilities place a burden on the available bandwidth? No. For example, for carriers, where the largest volume of transmissions would take place, telemedicine would require less than 1 percent of a month's time.



This slides summarizes our findings. Here, we focus on the demand for and potential benefits of implementing telemedicine in the fleet.

From the sailor's perspective, it would improve the *quality of life* aboard ship. From the Fleet Commander's perspective, it would improve *readiness* by:

- Increasing availability of aircraft
- Keeping sailors on the job.

Modality	Ships' comms	INMARSAT
E-mail/Internet	All platforms	All platforms
Phone/Fax	All platforms	None
VTC	Large platforms	None
Teleradiology	Carriers	None

This slide summarizes the cost-effectiveness of the four modalities of telemedicine on the different platforms. Access to ships' communications is essential for telemedicine to be cost-effective.

The Navy should reevaluate fleet policy for assigning communication priorities aboard ships. Providing ship's medical departments with their "fair share" of the bandwidth to support telemedicine would result in savings from avoided MEDEVACs and reduced SIQ days. It would also improve sailors' quality of life.

#### Ponderables

□ Per-ship net savings relatively small

- Range from ±\$35K (excluding INMARSAT)

- Does value of quality of life make investment costeffective?
- Costs are highly variable
  - Wide range of equipment costs—Will low-cost alternatives suffice?

- Availability of ships' communications uncertain

- We assume Fleet will provide computers (IT-21). If not, will existing computers suffice?

To put the results of the study in context, we need to consider the following issues. Telemedicine's net costs and savings per ship are relatively small. Over the 5-year life cycle of the technology, the net monetary savings on any platform are plus or minus \$35,000. (These figures pertain to the scenario in which own ship's communications are used.) This is a relatively small sum of money in a ship's budget.

We observed a wide range of costs associated with any given type of telemedicine equipment. We chose the low end of the spectrum. However, given the declining prices of technology over time, the prices we used may be those of mid-range equipment in a few years.

Access to ship's communications is essential for cost-effective telemedicine. Giving medical its fair share of the bandwidth to support telemedicine would enhance fleet readiness.

## **Distribution list**

Annotated Briefing 97-99

#### SNDL

**US CINCPAC** Attn: Force Surgeon RADM Wright 21A1 CINCLANTFLT NORFOLK VA Attn: N00 Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: LCDR Gabb Attn: HMCM(SS) Raney 21A2 CINCPACFLT PEARL HARBOR HI Attn: 00 ADM Clemmins Attn: Fleet Surgeon CAPT Mayo 21A3 CINCUSNAVEUR LONDON UK Attn: Force Surgeon 22A2 COMSEVENTHFLT Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CAPT Foster 22A3 COMSIXTHFLT Attn: Force Surgeon 24A1 COMNAVAIRLANT NORFOLK VA Attn: Force Surgeon 24A2 COMNAVAIRPAC SAN DIEGO CA Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CAPT Deakins 24D1 COMNAVSURFLANT NORFOLK VA Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CAPT Hayashi 24D2 COMNAVSURFPAC SAN DIEGO CA Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CAPT Snyder Attn: LCDR McGivern 24G1 COMSUBLANT NORFOLK VA Attn: Force Surgeon 24G2 COMSUBPAC PEARL HARBOR HI Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CAPT Murray 26A2 COMPHIBGRU THREE SAN DIEGO CA Attn: Force Surgeon Attn: CDR Jeff Young

Annotated Briefing 97-99

# **SNDL** 28C2

2802	COMNAVSUDECDU MIDDAC
2002	Atta: IT Shanira
20D1	HUI. LI SHAPHO
29D1	USS ENTERFRISE Atta: Soniar Madical Officer
	Aun: Senior Medical Officer
	USS GEORGE WASHINGTON
	Attn: Senior Medical Officer
	USS THEODORE ROOSEVELT
00000	Attn: Senior Medical Officer
29B2	USS CARL VINSON
	Attn: Senior Medical Officer
AIH	ASSISECNAV MRA WASHINGTON DC
	Attn: Ms. Heath
A 7 A	
A2A	Attri Forme Surgeon
A 5	CUDIMED (DIMED)
AJ	Attn: Surgeon General VADM Koenig
	Attn: Denuty SG P ADM Fisher
	Attn: HMCM(SS)Force MI Stewart
	Attn: MED_01 Mr Cuddy
	Attn: MED-01 Mi Cuddy
	Attn: OOIG RADM Sanford
	Attn: OOMCB CAPT Hufstader
	Attn: OOMCB LT Craig
	Attn: MED-21
	Attn: MED-22
	Attn: MED-23
	Attn: MED-24
	Attn: MED-25
	Attn: MED-26
	Attn: MED-27 CAPT Fahey
	Attn: MED-03 CDR DuVall
	Attn: MED-04
	Attn: MED-05
	Attn: MED-05B
	Attn: MED-06
	Attn: MED-08 RADM Johnson

-

## **Distribution list**

Annotated Briefing 97-99

#### SNDL

Attn: MED-08B CAPT Midas Attn: MED-82 CAPT Durm C34F NAVMEDCLINIC LONDON DET LANDSTUHL GE Attn: Commanding Officer C52E NAVMEDATASERVCEN DET SAN DIEGO Attn: Commanding Officer Attn: Ophthmology Department FB58 NAVHOSP OKINAWA JA Attn: Commanding Officer FC17 NAVHOSP NAPLES IT Attn: Commanding Officer FH20 NAVHLTHRSCHCEN SAN DIEGO CA Attn: Commanding Officer Attn: Technical Director FKN3 OICC NAVHOSP PORTSMOUTH VA Attn: Commanding Officer FW1 NATNAVMEDCEN BETHESDA MD Attn: USUHS CAPT Vindmer Attn: Internal Medicine Department Dr Millman Attn: Radiology Department CAPT Thomas Attn: CAPT Dieffenbach Attn: Commanding Officer Attn: Telemedicine Department CAPT (Sel) Bakalar Attn: NMIMC CAPT Tibbits Attn: NMIMC LT Pettit Attn: NMIMC LT Cunningham MISC MISC Attn: HQ USAF/SG Attn: US Army Surgeon General Attn: Director, Telemedicine Project CDR CF Faison Attn: Tripler Army Medical Center, Commanding Officer Attn: Commanding Officer/AKAMI Project OASD OASD (HA/CS) Attn: Principal Deputy Dr. Martin

V12 CG MCCDC QUANTICÔ VA

Attn: Code C-392 CAPT Frank

Annotated Briefing 97-99

#### SNDL

#### OPNAV N093M

11075111	Attn: RADM Diaz
N6	Aun. CAI I Suddaid
N62M	
	Attn: CDR Ferraro
	Attn: LCDR Tillery (N62M4)
N813	-
	Attn: CDR Balistrari
N931	
	Attn: RADM Phillips