

From: [David Zumbro](#)
To: [Sen. Click Bishop](#); [Sen. Berta Gardner](#); [Sen. Lyman Hoffman](#); [Sen. John Coghill](#); [Sen. Gary Stevens](#); [David Zumbro](#); [Sen. Mia Costello](#); [Sen. Dennis Egan](#); [Sen. Bert Stedman](#); [Sen. Tom Begich](#); [Sen. Peter Micciche](#); [Sen. Anna MacKinnon](#); [Sen. Shelley Hughes](#); [Sen. Kevin Meyer](#); senator.natasha.vonimhoff@akleg.gov; [Sen. Pete Kelly](#); [Sen. Donny Olson](#); [Sen. Bill Wielechowski](#); [Sen. David Wilson](#); [Sen. Mike Dunleavy](#)
Subject: Vote No on HB 103
Date: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 5:34:58 PM

Voting yes on this bill is a vote for special interest and against patient safety. The Alaska Medical Association and the Alaska State Medical Board both oppose this bill. If you believe that Optometrists receive surgical training, then you are wrong. Please err on the side of public safety. There is no rush to pass this bill. A definition of surgery amendment is an easy fix. Unfortunately, the ophthalmologists (who actually perform eye surgery), were not consulted when this definition was corrupted by the special interest optometry lobby. Thank you for your honest evaluation of this proposed legislation.

David Zumbro, MD
Eye surgeon

Sent using the free mail.com iPad App

On 5/5/17 at 8:10 AM, David Zumbro wrote:

> Dear Senator,

>

> I am writing again to express my opposition to HB 103 and SB 36. As currently worded, this legislation is poorly and incompletely crafted and will lead to Alaska patient harm if passed. The optometry lobby expresses quite loudly that they will not do procedures for which they are not trained. I think that is true, but in this case we need to trust but verify. That's why a clear definition of eye surgery amendment is imperative. If you look in Oklahoma, Kentucky and Louisiana, where similar legislation has been ratified, you can see quite clearly that optometrists are doing laser procedures for which they have no formal training, certification or medicine oversight. We have given you copies of journal articles which show a huge deviation in practice between optometrists and trained eye surgeons. Doesn't it make sense to you that ophthalmologists (medical doctors with formal training and continuing oversight) should take the lead in defining eye surgery?

>

> This issue is not about respect. Respect should be earned and not legislated. It is not about access. Where is the data that access is an issue. Where is the public outcry? It is not about a turf war or economics. Again, where is the data. If economics is a consideration, then we need to look closely at the complete economic picture such as co-management and utilization issues.

>

> Quite simply, this is about patient safety. Persons not trained in surgery or lasers should not perform or regulate such procedures. Trained personnel who are certified and licensed to perform such procedures should be regulated by the medical board. The medical board exists to oversee physicians who practice medicine and surgery. Optometry is not a surgical vocation.

>

> Thank you for your consideration. Your constituents and our patients deserve your honest and thorough assessment to protect them.

>

> David Zumbro, MD

>

> Alaska Eye Physician and Surgeon