

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES

2007-2008

SHES

12

Southcentral
Foundation



April 9, 2007

Representative Kurt Olson
State Capitol, Rm 408
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

RE: Support HB 113 - "An Act relating to Optometry"

Dear Representative Olson:

I am writing to urge support of HB 113, which would add additional prescriptive authority for licensed optometrists with a board endorsement, who obtain the additional educational requirements approved by the Alaska Board of Examiners in Optometry. Alaska optometrists already treat eye disease by prescribing medications, but this bill increases their scope by authorizing additional systemic medications with certain restrictions and requiring additional education.

Southcentral Foundation is a non-profit health care organization of Cook Inlet Region, Inc., which provides a wide range of health care and related services to Alaska Natives and American Indians in Anchorage, the Mat-Su Valley, and surrounding rural villages. When Southcentral Foundation was established in 1982, it consisted of 12 staff providing limited services in three program areas: optometry, dental, and social services. Today, after 25 years, optometry remains one of our core health care services, although we now have over 900 employees and provide health-related services to over 32,000 Alaska Natives through about 65 different programs.

We seek optimum health care for our Alaska Native clients, and view optometry with the respect that is due a profession of its caliber. Please vote "YES" on the passage of HB 113 to ensure quality optometry that is both cost-effective and accountable. This bill has been modified to comply with issues raised in earlier years, and now contains several added restrictions and requirements placed upon the license endorsements of qualified Alaska doctors of optometry.

Sincerely,
SOUTHCENTRAL FOUNDATION

Katherine Gottlieb, MBA
President/CEO



ALPHA

ALASKA PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Committed To Advancing Alaska's Public Health Since 1978

The Alaska Public Health Association supports HB 113. Currently 45 states, Washington, DC and Guam allow optometrists to prescribe systemic drugs with no reported problems in over 30 years. The American Public Health Association in 1991 recommended that legislatures amend licensing statutes to allow optometrists to use those therapeutic pharmaceuticals that have been determined by the State Board of Examiners in Optometry as being within the scope of competency pharmaceutically licensed optometrists. The State of Alaska has 106 practicing optometrists in 84 communities. We believe that by expanding the scope of practice of optometrists HB 113 will increase access to care in those communities that are not served by an ophthalmologist.

John Riley
Board President
April 10, 2007

Alaska Primary Care Association

"...uncompromising in the pursuit of access to primary care for all Alaskans."



The Honorable Ralph Samuels
Alaska House of Representatives
State Capitol, Room 204
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Re: Support for HB 113 Optometrists' Use of Pharmaceuticals

April 17, 2007

Dear Representative Samuels,

The Alaska Primary Care Association (APCA) wishes to express its support for your legislation, HB 113, which would expand the scope of practice for optometrists by allowing them to administer systemic eye medications in addition to the topical medications they can currently administer under the law. The APCA considers the education and training of the relevant health care providers prior to lending its support to increased scopes of practice changes; in the case of the optometrists, the APCA has concluded that these providers have received the proper training for the administration of these medications.

By expanding the scope of practice for optometrists, HB 113 will increase access to health care for Alaskans while reducing health care costs. Because the APCA's main mission is to increase access to primary care in Alaska, the APCA has an interest in the success of HB 113. Primary care encompasses basic medical care, which includes the treatment of routine eye conditions, in addition to behavioral health and dental services.

The Alaska Primary Care Association represents 24 Community Health Centers (CHCs) with 115 clinic delivery sites as well as other safety net providers throughout the state. Alaska's CHCs treat over 80,000 patients annually. The expansion of health providers' scopes of practice, when educationally appropriate, is an important step the Alaska State Legislature can take to assist in the promotion of health care access, the reduction in health care costs, and the improvement of health outcomes for its residents. The APCA offers its full support for HB 113 and joins you in asking the Senate to move this legislation through the committee process and secure its passage.

Respectfully,

Handwritten signature of Regan Mattingly in black ink.

Regan Mattingly
State Affairs Coordinator

Handwritten signature of Shelley S. Hughes in black ink.

Shelley S. Hughes
Government Affairs Director

Handwritten signature of Marilyn Kasmar in black ink.

Marilyn Kasmar
Executive Director

MARSH

Marsh Affinity Group Services
a service of Seabury & Smith, Inc.
1440 Renaissance Drive
Park Ridge, IL 60068-1400
847-803-3100
800-323-2106

January 26, 2007

Ms. Sherry L. Cooper, Manager
State Government Relations
American Optometric Association
243 N. Lindbergh Blvd., Floor 1
St. Louis, MO 63141

Dear Ms. Cooper:

On behalf of our client, the American Optometric Association (AOA), we ask that you please consider the following information regarding professional liability coverage available to licensed Optometrists practicing in all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Marsh Affinity Group Services, a service of Seabury & Smith, Inc., has an uninterrupted 10+ year relationship with the AOA as their sponsored professional liability partner. Because of our long-term partnership with AOA, we believe Marsh currently represents the largest portfolio of Optometrist professional liability insurance in the country. We are very fortunate to have over 7,500 Optometrists depend on Marsh for this important liability coverage.


Our primary carrier for professional liability coverage is Chicago Insurance Company, a member of the Interstate National Corporation, one of the Fireman's Fund Insurance Companies. Chicago Insurance Company does not currently charge different rates based on the procedures performed or not performed by each Optometrist. In other words, the scope of optometric related professional services does not increase or decrease the rate charged for each insured. Prescription authority granted to Optometrists in other states does not in any way impact the premium paid by individuals in those states.

Unfortunately, a small percentage of our insured Optometrists have experienced professional liability claims that they in turn have reported to Chicago Insurance Company. When allegations of professional malpractice have necessitated a defense, the carrier has responded by conducting a professional investigation of care and outcome. Chicago Insurance Company confirmed on January 25, 2007 that their very credible claim portfolio shows that prescription authority is not a significant cause of loss for Optometrists. As such, they also confirmed that they have no plans to change their underwriting guidelines or rates regarding prescriptive authority.

Marsh is not presently concerned with the overall financial health or performance of the AOA professional liability program, although we must acknowledge that we have not conducted an actuarial review of the adequacy of Optometrist rates. We rate the likelihood of Chicago Insurance Company remaining a professional liability market for Optometrists as "Excellent".

We appreciate your willingness to consider the above information. If any questions or concerns arise as a result of this letter, please contact us at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,



Mark A. Brostowitz, Senior Vice President
Allied Healthcare Professional Liability
Mark.brostowitz@marshom.com
847-493-4418

D.L. THANEFOHN, OD.
P.N. REBER, O.D.
S.A. LENTNER, O.D.
J.C. FALCONER JR., O.D.
L.M. NOELIN, O.D.



**Alaska
EYE CARE CENTERS**

DOWNTOWN ANCHORAGE
(907) 272-2557

VASILLA
(907) 376-5266

1345 VE 9th Ave.
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 272-2557
FAX (907) 274-6932

March 19, 2007

Representative Peggy Wilson
Chair, House HESS Committee

Representative Wilson,

I am writing to express my support for the committee substitute for House Bill 113. This bill will allow me to prescribe drugs other than those topically applied (drops and ointments) to my patients.

As an optometrist in Alaska, I am a health care provider who is not being utilized to his fullest capabilities. Optometrists have degrees from four year graduate institutions which include extensive education and training in the treatment of ocular disease and pharmacology. While the topical drugs which I can now prescribe are sufficient for treating many types of eye disease, there are many others in which alternative routes of drug administration are far superior or even essential. Some eye conditions that come into my office are accompanied by severe pain, and some are medical emergencies. It is inefficient and unnecessary to require them to see another doctor to get the prescription. And in Alaska, with many rural communities where the only eye doctor is an optometrist, this legislation is especially needed.

Forty-five states have already seen the wisdom in allowing optometrists prescribe oral drugs, and we still have one of the lowest malpractice rates in the health care industry. That gives you a measure of how much of a risk we are to our patients.

The people of Alaska expect their local eye doctor to be able to prescribe the treatment they need. Please let us do our jobs better.

Sincerely,

James C. Falconer, Jr. OD
President-Elect, Alaska Optometric Association



March 20, 2007

Honorable Representative Peggy Wilson
Chair, House HESS Committee

Representative Wilson:

I am writing to support your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

This is legislation that is long overdue for the state of Alaska. Similar legislation has been adopted in 45 other U.S. states which has allowed Optometrists to provide more comprehensive care to their patients.

As you know Alaska is largely a rural state, consequently Alaskans don't have the same access to care that patients have in the lower-48. Optometrists outnumber ophthalmologists in Alaska and we better serve rural Alaska than does ophthalmology. This legislation would give Alaskans better access to more comprehensive eye care, and would eliminate the need for a patient to see another provider for a medication the Optometrist has already determined they need.

You may hear arguments against this legislation stating that Optometry does not have the training or the experience needed to prescribe systemic medications. These arguments simply do not hold water. An Optometric education consists of four years of post-graduate, doctoral-level training concentrating on the eye, visual system, and systemic diseases affecting vision. If we were not adequately trained and experienced 45 other states would not have already adopted this legislation.

This legislation would be good for Alaskans giving them better access to quality eye care.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Barney, O.D.
Center Director
Pacific Cataract & Laser Institute
Anchorage, Alaska

Robert Ford, MD
President, CEO

Debbie Edwards
Executive VP, COO

DIRECTORS

Bruce Allen
Building & Equipment

Barrie Stewart, MBA
Professional Relations

Jeffrey Grimes
Information Services

Charles Johns, MD
MD Director

Nancy McWilliams, MBA
Finance

Cynthia Merrill, OD, MPH
OD Director

Gail Pascoe
Site Director

Larry Hall, III
Center Visits
Quality Improvement

PHYSICIANS

Paul Barry, OD

Frank Barnhart, OD

Victoria Bell, OD

Nick Bok, OD

Paul Oving, MD

Shawn Coombs, OD

Mark Evans, OD

Bruce Fife, OD

Robert Ford, MD

Robert Glabe, OD

Art Gubel, MD

Michael Givertz, OD

William Gromovoy, MD

Janet Groat, MD

Doug Hansen, OD

Donald James, OD

Charles Johns, MD

Brian Johnson, OD

James Marshall, MD

Rand Mendel, OD

Cynthia Merrill, OD, MPH

Abigail Neal, OD

Marybeth Pelt, OD

Paul Shick, MD

David Starnes, OD

Karen Swenson, MD

Jeffrey Thomas, OD

Michael Van Dierendonck, OD

Susan Williams, OD

Tom Whipple, MD

SPECIALIZING IN:

Cataract Surgery

Laser Vision Correction

Corporate Office
2517 In-S. Front Ave.
Chugiak, AK 99522-2433
(907) 748-8672
(907) 488-7888
(907) 488-8888
www.pcl.com

April 9, 2007

House of Representatives
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Legislator,

I have had experience with the treatment of eye diseases by an optometrist. He was very knowledgeable and thorough during his examinations and I have every confidence in an optometrist ability to treat eye diseases. So with that said, I support HB113.

Sincerely,

Ted M. Rohloff
Finance Director
Denali Family Services
1675 C St. Suite 117
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 222-2307

cc: Alaska Optometric Association

March 23, 2007

The Honorable Peggy Wilson
Chair, Health, Education & Social Services
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Madame Chair,

I am writing to ask your committee's support on HB 113. This bill, if passed, would bring the scope of practice of Alaska's optometrists to a level commensurate with their training and closer to the scope allowed in 45 other states. HB 113 would allow optometrists to add systemic medications for treatment of diseases of the eye and related structures. Since 1987 optometrists in Alaska have been able to use topical medication for treatment. Optometric practice expansion to include treatment with systemic medications is a contentious issue with strong views for and against. When you blow away the smoke and look at it on face value this bill IS important to the eye health of Alaskans now and especially in the future.

I am an optometrist who has practiced in Alaska for 21 years. I feel blessed to have been able to be the eye expert in a wide variety of practice situations. In the 21 years I have practiced in Alaska I was the primary vision care provider in Barrow for 3 years and after that Ketchikan for the past 18 years. I have done itinerant clinics in Kotzebue, Nome, King Salmon, Dutch Harbor, Pt. Hope, Pt. Lay, Wainwright, Atkasuk, Nuiqsut, Kaktovik, Anaktuvuk Pass, Metlakatla, and Craig, Alaska. Ketchikan serves as the hub of Southeast Alaska so I have patients from Hyder, Myers Chuck, Thorne Bay, Coffman Cove, Hydaburg, Klawock, Port Protection, Port Alexander, and Kasaan. I have referred patients to and co-managed with many ophthalmologists in the state. Because I am in Ketchikan I have also worked with ophthalmologists in the Seattle area. I have seen and co-managed many hundreds of patients with the M.D.s/physicians assistants/nurse practitioners/health aides at the clinics based in the communities above.

In primary eye care it's about proper diagnosis and instituting the proper initial treatment in a timely fashion.

In 1987 optometrists in Alaska with a proper license endorsement began using topical medications only for treatment of eye and related disease. This expansion of practice allowed M.D.s/physicians assistant's/nurse practitioners/health aides (collectively Primary Health Care Providers = PHCPs) to place the responsibility of diagnosing and treating eyes in the optometrist's hands. It gave these medical professionals and the patients they serve an additional eye expert besides the ophthalmologist to refer to for diagnosis and treatment of primary eye disease. This provider, the optometrist, is local and usually available. PHCPs are more than happy to refer their patients to the local eye expert because accurate eye disease diagnosis is dependent on having and being able to properly use specialty equipment (i.e. slit lamp, ophthalmoscopes, tonometers) to gain clinical knowledge about the affected organ (eye and related structures). Proper treatment is based on accurate diagnosis and timely institution of therapy. PHCPs do not have access to or are unfamiliar with the operation of eye diagnostic instruments. Optometrists and ophthalmologists have access to eye diagnostic equipment and have the necessary expertise to use these devices to make accurate eye diagnoses. If the initial diagnosis is not accurate the patient is put through needless worry; un-necessary travel; un-necessary medical testing; improper use of the wrong medicines; increased disability; increased time off work; and in some cases permanent vision loss. Optometrists are accurate diagnosticians of eye disease. Our track record with topical medications and practice liability rates prove it.

Look at the facts and not the rhetoric. Optometrists already manage the eye conditions affected by HB 113...indirectly.

PHCPs have developed a trust in optometry to manage primary eye problems, make the proper diagnosis, choose the appropriate initial treatment, and make the proper referral to a sub-specialist. When a patient is referred to an optometrist does the PHCP single out those patients who need topical medication only? NO!!! The PHCP sees the patient and says "your eye is red/or vision is decreased/or you have sudden vision loss/or something is in your eye and hurts/or it itches/or there is mucous coming out/or your cornea is cloudy/or your eyelids are swollen". GO SEE THE EYE DOCTOR. When the patient comes in the optometrist uses their specialty tools and medical expertise to diagnose the problem. If topical medication is most appropriate then a prescription is written for this medication. If an oral or systemic medication is needed the optometrist must take time and contact the referring provider and tell them what medication is recommended. The PHCP then will see the patient again for an office visit to simply write an RX. If the O.D./PHCP relationship is good they may write the prescription for the patient based on the information given them by the doctor of optometry. The doctor of optometry is then typically asked by the provider to follow the patient. Does the initial referring provider see the patient again? No, not unless there are other conditions needing their attention. Who monitors the side effects of the medication in most cases? The doctor of optometry does!!! Doctors of optometry are already one of the primary decision makers in treating primary eye disease. The only thing we can't do is RX systemic medications that we recommend for acute treatment or prescribe refills in the case of chronic treatment. The current method of needing an M.D. to write the RX for these medications is cumbersome and increases the amount of time necessary to begin time sensitive treatment.

HB 113 is not new ground. HB 113 is about trust in the clinical decision making skills of doctors of optometry and acknowledging the additional responsibility associated with prescribing systemic medications. There are only a handful of eye problems that need treatment with systemic medications and these conditions fall into two general categories...ACUTE and CHRONIC conditions of the eye and related structures. Who sees the patient in these instances? The optometrist sees the acute patient due to their availability and primary care focus. In rural Alaska the optometrist again is the one who follows the chronic patient after they return home from seeing the medical sub-specialist. We live close to or where the patient lives. Optometrists in rural Alaska and in larger urban clinics already do the diagnosing and treating of the majority of primary eye disease...directly with topical medications and indirectly through other PCHPs by recommending systemic medications. Optometrists already manage the case. Ophthalmology doesn't get involved unless the patient is not responding and needs more intensive treatment. We are already seeing the patient for follow-up and are the first one they call if they are having problems.

No there isn't public outcry about rampant eye mistreatment by PHCPs. Why? Because most of the time the eye heals itself or the patient feels they must live with the discomfort and effects on vision they have because of treatment from inaccurate diagnosis. The patient deserves to have the best and most up-to-date care possible. Optometrists and Ophthalmologists have much greater access to information on advances in eye treatment than PHCPs. Proper diagnosis and treatment of eye conditions greatly improves the patient's quality of life.

Passing HB 113 is the right thing to do for Alaskan's today and tomorrow. Look ahead to the future of eye care and the additional contributions prescribing optometrists bring to the table. Increasing the pool of doctoral level educated professionals that are involved in treatment and committed to research makes the probability of finding future cures for common eye problems bright.

Do the proper thing for your constituents...our patients...acknowledge the ability of the optometrist or family eye doctor...finish placing the responsibility for treatment of primary eye disease in the hands of the most available and best trained primary health care provider for the eyes...the doctor of optometry...give us direct access to the additional tools necessary to effectively and efficiently continue to treat primary eye disease. Pass HB 113!!!

Regards,

Erik D. Christianson, O.D.
Ketchikan Eye Care Center
351 Carlanna Lake Rd
Ketchikan, AK 99901
907 225-2020

March 28, 2007

**The Honorable Peggy Wilson
Chair, Health, Education & Social Services
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182**


Dear Representative Wilson;

I am writing in support of your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

About ten years ago, I began experiencing vision distortions and color loss. After several unfruitful visits with local ophthalmologists, who kept telling me to "come back in six weeks", I turned to Roy Box, my optometrist. After careful evaluation, he told me that I was presenting symptoms of MS, and he immediately researched and then referred me to an excellent MS neural ophthalmologist in Seattle. This doctor confirmed Dr. Box's diagnosis and immediately started treatment, which probably saved what vision I had left. I will be ever grateful to Dr. Box for his knowledge and quick and appropriate referral, and have received equally competent and informed care from his successor. As a result of my optometrists' professional knowledge and cooperative collaboration with the MD's in Seattle, I believe I have had most excellent care, care which allowed me to continue teaching for several years.

I believe that Alaskans need options in choosing competent and conscientious health care professionals. For many Alaskans living in isolated communities, their optometrist is their primary eye care professional. Alaska should follow the examples set by almost all other states and give their optometrists the tools to best serve their patients.

Sincerely, Jacklyne Lorenson


**PO Box 210108
Auke Bay, Alaska**

March 19, 2007

Steve Dobson, OD
1000 E Dimond Blvd
Anchorage, AK 99515

Honorable Representative Peggy Wilson
Chair, House HESS Committee

Representative Wilson:

I am writing to support your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

HB113 would significantly *improve access* and *decrease cost* for the thousands of Alaskans in our state who each year seek quality *optometric medical eye care*. HB113 when enacted will allow patients to receive prescriptive treatment in-office or go straight to a pharmacy with a prescription written by the primary eye care doctor, instead of having to schedule another doctor's visit simply to get the prescription or the medicine the optometrist has already determined they need. Optometrists do not gain additional income by expanding their prescriptive authority, as the patient is charged for the office visit not which drug is prescribed.

Currently, optometrists in Alaska including myself, prescribe *antibiotics, anti-virals, anti-inflammatory, allergy, and steroid medications along with medications to treat glaucoma (beta-blockers, alpha-agonists, carbonic anhydrase inhibitors, prostaglandins)* on a routine basis when treating our patients for diseases of the eye and adnexa. Unfortunately, for those optometric patients residing in Alaska these medications are limited to topical (not so for the patients who seek optometric medical eye care throughout most of the United States).

Today, 45 other states allow optometrists to prescribe oral medications for their patients. Levels of authority vary slightly from state to state based on the authority granted by each state legislature. Even if HB113 were enacted, many states would still have more expansive scopes of practice. In fact, optometrists in one state currently perform laser surgeries.

Since 1970 all optometry schools have elevated their education level to a four year post-graduate, doctorate-level professional program along with extensive core curriculum course work in pharmacology, physiology and pathology using the same medical model as taught in dental and medical schools. As a result, optometrists have been safely prescribing systemic drugs in other states since 1977. *Alaska is unfortunately behind the curve in eye care access and delivery.*

When posed with the question whether Ophthalmologists have more education and training than the Optometrists the answer would be yes. The Optometric curriculum is

comprised of four years of post-graduate, doctorate-level study emphasizing the eye, vision and associated systemic disease with an optional one-year residency. This education is the same medical model as medicine, dentistry, and podiatry. Ophthalmology is a three-year residency beyond medical school. This additional three year residency prepares the Ophthalmologist to be an eye surgeon and tertiary-level specialist. This model is the same for other medical specialties such as cardiology, ENT's (ear, nose, and throat), nephrology, orthopedics etc. Patients routinely schedule appointments with their primary care provider and are referred to a specialist when necessary. This model *increases access* to care and helps to *control costs*. Optometrists refer patients frequently to Ophthalmologists for more advanced eye care or surgery the same as family doctors refer their patients for specialty consultations. General practitioners including Optometrists live and serve in many rural communities throughout our state. Other specialists including Ophthalmologists reside mostly in the more metropolitan communities.

HB113 will provide Alaskans with *additional access* to high quality medical eye care and help *control costs* associated with *unnecessary referrals* (lost wages due to time away from work, additional office visit fees). An important fact to realize is similar legislation has passed in 45 other states throughout the last 30 years with *none* ever repealed and no reported problems. In fact, the Alaska Medical Board surveyed medical boards throughout the nation to find out if there were any problems in states where similar legislation had passed. Not one medical board reported any problems. In addition, medical malpractice insurance premiums for optometrists did not rise in states where systemic medication (versus topical only) prescriptive authority legislation was approved

Sincerely,

Steven S Dobson O.D.
Past Chairman, Board of Examiners in Optometry

March 20, 2007

David Karpik, OD
1001 Noble St, Ste 410
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Honorable Representative Peggy Wilson
Chair, House HESS Committee
Juneau, AK 99801

Representative Wilson:

I am writing to support your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

First of all, I am passionate about both Alaska and her people. I am a recent graduate of The Ohio State University College of Optometry. Following receiving my degree, I completed post-graduate specialty training: a residency in contact lens and family practice optometry through Pacific University. I now have the good fortune to be serving patients in Fairbanks.

It was quite a shock to come to a state in which so much of my training went underutilized due to restrictive legislation. My didactic and clinical training in pharmacology met or exceeded the quantity and caliber of my colleagues in Dentistry and Medicine at Ohio State. This is not to claim a superior education is provided at Ohio State; in fact a comparison between Illinois College of Optometry, Pacific University College of Optometry, Harvard College of Dental Medicine, and The Ohio State College of Medicine shows equivalency in pharmacology hours of education. This is by design. Optometry is a doctoral level program. The current legislation would make sense 2 generations ago, but does not today.

Additionally, competence with oral pharmaceuticals is confirmed through rigorous testing by the National Board of Examiners in Optometry (NBEO). This board certification consists of approximately 36 hours of testing, with 1 out of the 4 sections of board certification dedicated to treatment of ocular disease with systemic and topical pharmaceuticals. Passing all sections of NBEO examination is required to gain licensure in Alaska.

It is the patient who will gain the most from expansion of prescriptive privilege already in place in the lower 48 that matches the past 30 years of level of training received in an optometric education. No longer will delayed treatment for simple and well understood eye problems cause harm. No longer will public health dollars be wasted for duplicate office

visits to prescribe the medication that the optometrist has deemed necessary.

Sincerely,

David Karpik, O.D.

Dr. Bill Faulkner, Optometrist
400 L Street, Suite 104 Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 276-1984
Fax (907) 276-1981

Honorable Representative Peggy Wilson
Chair, House HESS Committee

Representative Wilson:

I am writing to support your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

This is a very simple issue. Optometrists in Alaska would like to join their colleagues in 45 other states in being able to provide a higher level of care to our patients.


With regard to eye care, Optometry takes care of most of the problems most of the people have, most of the time. The circumstances that would require our use of systemic agents might not occur for a week, or we might have three patients in one day that would benefit from this service. We just never know from day to day.

I have recently activated my Oregon Optometric license. It is interesting to note that in the State of Oregon, by the 2009 licensing cycle, it will be an absolute requirement for all licensed Optometrists to have their systemic medication certification. If it is not obtained, then you cannot practice in that State. This is how "mainstream" this certification has become in our profession.

When Optometrists have tried to enhance our level of care in the past, organized Ophthalmology has demonstrated a history of misruths, half truths and distortions in their opposing testimony. This surely must be based on ego, not logic. Please do not be fooled by their self serving claims.

Alaskan Optometrists simply want to join with the rest of the profession in the United States in being better able to care for our patients.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.



William D. Faulkner, O.D.
Cc: Alaskan Optometric Association

Alaska State Medical Association

Rep. Anna Fairclough

From: katy rice [katyrice4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2007 3:41 PM
To: Rep. Peggy Wilson; Rep. Bob Roses; Rep. Anna Fairclough; Rep. Mark Neuman; Rep. Paul Seaton; Rep. Sharon Cissna; Rep. Berta Gardner
Subject: *****SPAM***** House Bill 113

Dear Representatives,

I am an optometrist currently practicing in Fairbanks, AK. I moved here last summer after completing an ocular disease residency at a Veterans Administration Hospital in Huntington, West Virginia and continue to hold licensure in the states of Ohio and Alaska.

After listening to the audio from Wed. March 21, 2007 regarding House Bill 113, Optometrists' Use of Pharmaceuticals, I wanted to give my opinion in hopes that this would be considered before a final decision is made. One significant part of any profession is to understand one's boundaries and limitations and know when it is necessary to refer a patient to a different doctor. However, it is not necessary for me to refer a patient to someone else in order to treat certain eye conditions that I have been educated, trained, and tested on. Opposition to HB 113 states that optometrists do not have the same education or training as an ophthalmologist. This is true. We do not have the same training for if we did, we would be asking for privileges to do surgery. Optometrists and ophthalmologists are not the same in training, or clinical applications, however that does not mean that optometrists should be limited by what they are allowed to do because the state already has ophthalmologists. If the state wanted to limit eye care availability because "there are already enough doctors" then they would put a cap on the number of ophthalmologists or optometrists allowed to practice in this state and this is obviously a ridiculous situation. We are simply asking for the right to practice to the level of our training. I am confident that once the members of the committee understand the training and testing of doctors of optometry, support of HB 113 will come with significantly less difficulty.

Base on the audio of the HESS committee hearing on March 21, I would like to provide additional information on some issues that were brought up. First, it should be known that the pre-requisites for getting into optometry, dental, medical, osteopathy, pharmacy, veterinary, and podiatry school are essentially the same. All of the medical professions schools are four year programs, and yes this means optometry as well. All optometrists graduate with a Doctor of Optometry degree. The amount of pharmacology, anatomy, and pathology are essentially the same between optometry, medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. (I do not have the exact number of semester hours to give you but know Representative Kawasaki can pass this information on to you.) Also, before anyone is considered for optometric licensure in a state, one must have already graduated from an optometry school and pass all of the National Board of Examiners in Optometry tests. These are a series of approximately 36 hours of testing taken over two years. You can access the content information on the website: <http://www.optometry.org/index.cfm>. This can be compared to the medical boards that Doctors of Osteopathy and Medical Doctors and must pass.

Representative Samuels emphasized that because we live in a "rural" state where medical help can be hours or days away, it is even more important for optometrists to have prescriptive authority. I would like to add that it doesn't matter if there are two ophthalmologists right across the street from me, or two days away from me. My proximity to an ophthalmologist does not change, negate, or validate my level of training. While I understand that the proximity will influence my decisions and care, it should not

dictate the care I provide. A dentist does not have to call an M.D. or D.O. in order to inject a shot of Novocain, why should I have to call an M.D. or D.O. in order to practice within the training of my profession?

I understand that the committee has concerns regarding this bill. I urge you to look at the other 45 states who already grant prescriptive authority as an example that this is nothing new or out of the ordinary, but is a commonly accepted way of practicing. Yes, our bill will be different than any other state, but that is because optometry is state legislated, unlike medicine or osteopathy. Also, please look at the malpractice insurance across the country for optometrists as an indicator of the level of safety with which optometrists utilize their prescriptive authority. Private insurers are in it to make money and have very sophisticated ways of placing statistical evidence on their clients. If optometrists were taking advantage of their prescriptive rights and placing patients in harms way this would be evident and optometry would not have the lowest malpractice insurance rates of all doctorate level health care professions.

Two concerns that were brought up during the meeting were whether optometrists are trying to get their foot in the door to do laser surgery and if writing for oral medications would make optometrists more money. These questions seem irrelevant to the issue at hand. What is relevant is that we have the training to prescribe, and that we have a proven track record of safely doing so in all states that have had this authority granted. To satisfy curiosity, I don't want to do laser surgery, just as not all ophthalmologists want to do laser surgery. And no, allowing optometrists to prescribe oral medications to treat eye conditions will not provide a larger income. An office visit is charged when a patient is seen regardless of any medication being prescribed or any referrals written. These concerns do not relate to optometrists' education or training with regard to writing prescriptions, nor should they prevent optometrists' from treating eye conditions that are well within the scope of practice and level of training. Full prescriptive authority is within the level of training.

Thank you for all of your time and consideration to House Bill 113. If you have any questions or concerns you would like to discuss further, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Rice, O.D.
2142 Standard Ave
Fairbanks, AK 99701
614-214-5289

Get your own web address.

Have a HUGE year through Yahoo! Small Business.

Honorable Representative Kurt Olson
Fax 907-465-3835

Representative Olson:

I am writing to support your committee substitute for House Bill 113.


First of all, I am passionate about both Alaska and her people. I am a recent graduate of The Ohio State University College of Optometry. Following receiving my degree, I completed post-graduate specialty training: a residency in contact lens and family practice optometry through Pacific University. I now have the good fortune to be serving patients in Fairbanks.

It was quite a shock to practice in a state in which so much of my training went underutilized due to restrictive legislation. My didactic and clinical training in pharmacology met or exceeded the quantity and caliber of my colleagues in dentistry and medicine at Ohio State. This is not to claim a superior education is provided at Ohio State; in fact a comparison between Illinois College of Optometry, Pacific University College of Optometry, Harvard College of Dental Medicine, and The Ohio State College of Medicine shows equivalency in pharmacology hours of education. This is by design. Optometry is a doctoral level program. The current legislation would make sense several generations ago, but does not today.

Additionally, competence with oral pharmaceuticals is confirmed through rigorous testing by the National Board of Examiners in Optometry (NBEO). This board certification consists of approximately 36 hours of testing, with 1 out of the 4 sections of board certification dedicated to treatment of ocular disease with systemic and topical pharmaceuticals. Passing all sections of NBEO examination is required to gain licensure in Alaska.

It is the patient who will gain the most from expansion of prescriptive privilege already in place in 45 other states that corresponds with the level of training received in an optometric education during the past 30 years. Optometrists have a proven track record of safe, high quality care in these other states. No longer will delayed treatment for simple and well understood eye problems cause harm, and no longer, and no longer will public health dollars be wasted for duplicate office visits to prescribe the medication that the optometrist has deemed necessary.

Sincerely,



David Karpik, O.D.
2142 Standard Ave.
Fairbanks, AK 99701



Alaska Optometric Association

Alaska's Authority on Primary Eye & Vision Care

1689 C Street, Ste 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
907.770.3777
Fax: 907.272.7532
akoa@alaska.com
www.ako.org

Michael Bennett, OD
President

Sam Falconer, Jr., OD
President-Elect

Bob Fleckenstein, OD
Vice President

Dawn Harris, OD
Secretary

Kevin Berg, OD
Treasurer

Tracy Oman
Executive Director

March 19, 2007

The Honorable Peggy Wilson
Chair, Health, Education & Social Services
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Representative Wilson;

On behalf of the frontline eye care providers serving patients in communities across our state, the Alaska Optometric Association would like to voice our support of your committee substitute for House Bill 113.

Optometrists across the United States have been safely diagnosing and treating eye conditions with topical and systemic medications since 1977 with no problems, and with topical medications in Alaska since 1992, with zero complaints to the Board. HB 113 simply elevates Alaska optometry scope of practice to include systemic medications.

Optometrists are fully educated and trained on all types of prescriptive medicines for the whole body plus the eye, including contraindications and side effects. They pass comprehensive National Board Examinations covering these topics. This education and training fully prepares them to diagnose and treat eye conditions appropriately or refer patients to a more specialized provider when necessary.

The purpose of this bill is to allow patients to receive prescriptive treatment from their primary eye-care provider, instead of having to schedule another doctor's visit simply to get the prescription for the medicine the optometrist has already determined they need. Optometrists gain no additional income by expanding their drug authority, it simply benefits the patients by providing better access to eye care throughout Alaska.

Alaska is far behind the curve in eye care access and delivery. HB 113 elevates optometry's scope of practice in line with the 45 other states throughout the nation that have been successfully prescribing systemic medications for the past 30 years with no reported problems. In addition, it lowers health care costs for Alaskans and provides better incentives to bring the best qualified doctors of optometry to Alaska.

Please review the enclosed "Frequently Asked Questions" for more details.

Sincerely,

Tracy Oman
Executive Director

Enclosure

1609 C Street, Suite 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
Email: akoa@alaska.com

Phone: 907-770-3777
Toll Free: 877-493-2562
Fax: 907-272-7532



Frequently Asked Questions

Do optometrists have sufficient education, training, and experience to use systemic drugs?

Yes. Courses in pharmacology, physiology, and pathology are an integral component of the core curriculum in optometry school, using the same medical model as taught in dental and medical schools. Optometry schools are fully accredited by nationally-recognized agencies. Circa 1970, all optometry schools elevated their education level to a 4 year professional program identical to the medical and dental model. Optometrists have been safely prescribing systemic drugs in other states since 1977, and currently 45 states allow all or some systemic treatment of eye diseases. Licensed optometrists are required to take continuing education courses in this area to stay current in their knowledge and training. This is not new ground, Alaska is far behind the curve in eye care access and delivery.

If HB 113 is enacted, would optometrists in Alaska have one of the most expansive scopes of practice in the Country?

No. Optometrists in 45 other states in the country are allowed to prescribe oral medication, but levels of authority vary slightly from state to state based on the authority granted by each state legislature. Alaska is currently far behind other states scope of practice laws. Even if enacted, there are many states that would still have more expansive scopes of practice. In fact, optometrists currently perform laser surgeries in one state.

Does HB 113 allow optometrists to administer pharmaceuticals by injection and infusion?

Yes. The route of administration of a drug is not the primary factor. In fact, injectable drugs are generally not a class of separate drugs. Optometrists are fully educated and competent to use any drug regardless of its route of administration. Optometrists currently use needles every day routinely for removing corneal foreign bodies, and needle-type cannulas for irrigating tear ducts, so that is not a factor.

Are there potential risks associated with prescribing systemic drugs?

Absolutely. The prescribing of any drug is very serious, that is why doctors of optometry, dentistry, and medicine educate a minimum of 8 years and are state licensed. In Alaska, advanced nurse practitioners safely prescribe all the systemic drugs unrestricted with currently less education. Optometrists go through rigorous training on all types of prescriptive medicines for the whole body plus the eye, including contraindications and side effects. HB 113 restricts optometrists to treating ONLY the eye and surrounding tissues. When systemic medications are indicated for certain and emergent conditions they are absolutely necessary. Optometrists use their professional judgment to decide whether to treat or to refer a patient to a more specialized provider.

Do ophthalmologists have more education and training than optometrists?

Yes. Optometry school consists of four years of post-graduate, doctoral-level study concentrating on the eye, vision and associated systemic disease with an optional one-year residency. This education is the same medical model as medicine, dentistry & podiatry. Ophthalmology is a 3 year residency above and beyond medical school. This additional three-year residency prepares the ophthalmologist to be an eye surgeon and tertiary-level specialist. This is the same as cardiology, orthopedics, or ear, nose, throat specialists. Patients see a primary care provider for their general health needs and are referred to a specialist when necessary. This system increases access to care and holds costs lower. Optometrists routinely refer patients to ophthalmologists for advanced eye care or surgery, the same as family doctors refer to needed specialty consultation. The critical factor is that there are optometrists in a vast number of Alaskan communities, while the specialty ophthalmologists are only in a few large cities.

Who benefits from HB 113?

Patients. This bill will allow patients to receive prescriptive treatment in-office or go straight to a pharmacy with a prescription written by the patient's primary eye doctor, instead of having to schedule another doctor's visit simply to get the prescription for the medicine the optometrist has already determined they need. Optometrists gain no additional income by expanding their drug authority, as the patient is charged for the office visit, not which drug is prescribed.

Will HB 113 put Alaskans at risk?

No. Often times, legislators must make difficult decisions based on assumptions. Fortunately, with HB 113, there are no assumptions necessary because we can look at facts. Similar legislation has passed in 45 other states throughout the last 30 years with none ever repealed and no reported problems. In fact, the Alaska Medical Board surveyed medical boards throughout the Nation to find out if there were any problems in states where similar legislation had passed. Not one medical board reported any problems.



Alaska Optometric Association

Alaska's Authority on Primary Eye & Vision Care

1689 C Street, Ste 222
Anchorage, AK 99501
907.770.3777
Fax: 907.272.7532
akoa@alaska.com
www.ako.org

Michael Bennett, OD
President

Jim Falconer, Jr., OD
President-Elect

Ron Fleckenstein, OD
Vice President

Dawn Harms, OD
Secretary

Kevin Berg, OD
Treasurer

Tracy Oman
Executive Director

January 12, 2007

The Honorable Ralph Samuels
House of Representatives
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Representative Samuels;

This letter is in response to the letter sent to you by Carl Rosen, MD regarding his analysis of HB 113, Optometric Scope of Practice Legislation. Although I am sure Dr. Rosen's letter was well intended, his analysis does not reflect the education, training, and experience of optometrists over the past 30 years.

Optometrists across the United States have been safely diagnosing and treating eye conditions with topical and systemic medications since 1977 with no problems, and with topical medications in Alaska since 1992, with zero complaints to the Board. HB 113 simply elevates Alaska optometry scope of practice to include systemic medications.

Optometrists are fully educated and trained on all types of prescriptive medicines for the whole body plus the eye, including contraindications and side effects. They pass comprehensive National Board Examinations covering these topics. This education and training fully prepares them to diagnose and treat eye conditions appropriately or refer patients to a more specialized provider when necessary.

The purpose of this bill is to allow patients to receive prescriptive treatment from their primary eye-care provider, instead of having to schedule another doctor's visit simply to get the prescription for the medicine the optometrist has already determined they need. Optometrists gain no additional income by expanding their drug authority, it simply benefits the patients by providing better access to eye care throughout Alaska.

Alaska is far behind the curve in eye care access and delivery. HB 113 elevates optometry's scope of practice in line with the 45 other states throughout the nation that have been successfully prescribing systemic medications for the past 30 years with no reported problems. In addition, it lowers health care costs for Alaskans and provides better incentives to bring the best qualified doctors of optometry to Alaska.

Please review the enclosed "Frequently Asked Questions" for more details.

Sincerely,

Tracy Oman
Executive Director

Enclosure



Doctor of Optometry Education

Optometrists are fully educated and trained on all types of prescriptive medicines for the whole body plus the eye, including contraindications and side effects.

Optometrists education includes:

- **4 years undergraduate** school.
- **4 years optometry school** containing both classroom instruction and clinical education with at least 2,000 patient contact hours.
- **Three-part national board examination** which includes academic science, clinical science and patient care.
- **36 hours of continuing medical education** every two years, 24 of those 36 hours must be in pharmacology or pathology.
- In 1992, legislation was passed allowing optometrists in Alaska to diagnose and treat eye disease with topical pharmaceuticals. Optometrists were required to pass a **100 hour course in pharmacology and ocular disease** in order to receive a pharmaceutical license endorsement authorizing them to prescribe topical pharmaceuticals.
- HB 113 calls for an **additional 23 hour course** on the treatment and management of ocular disease as well as a **7 hour injection course**. This 30 hour course, administered by the Pacific College of Optometry, was designed specifically for states who pass legislation such as HB 113.

It is important to note that **optometrists in Alaska have been diagnosing eye disease safely and effectively for 15 years**. In those 15 years, optometrists have been **determining the best course of treatment for their patients**. Unfortunately, if a systemic medication is indicated, the patient must then schedule **another doctor's visit simply to get the prescription for the medicine the optometrist has already determined they need**.

HB 113
Optometrists' Use of Pharmaceuticals

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(s) SAMUELS, Thomas, Kawasaki, Gruenberg, LeDoux

CURRENT STATUS: (H) RUL/ Floor

FISCAL NOTE:

#1: 0.0/DCCED-Corps, Bus, and Prof Licensing

BILL HISTORY/ACTION:

(H) Floor: 30Y, 5N

(H) L&C 1DP: LeDoux; 6 NR: Buch, Gardner, Gatto, Neuman, Olson, Ramras

(H) HES 4DP: Cissna, Seaton, Neuman, Fairclough; 1 NR: Gardner; 2AM: Roses, Wilson

BILL SUMMARY: HB 113 proposes to allow optometrists to prescribe systemic medications to treat Alaskans' eye issues, and to provide epinephrine injections to treat anaphylaxis. Intended to increase rural and remote Alaska's access to affordable visual health care.

ISSUES (pros & cons):

Pro:

- Expand eye care to rural areas, rarely visited by ophthalmologists.
- Reduce the cost of care by permitting more procedures by the less specialized.
- Bring Alaska up to the standards of many other states, thereby attracting more optometrists who can carry out these procedures elsewhere.

Con:

- Ophthalmologists are MD's with broad integrative training in recognizing systemic health problems; optometrists have 4 yrs of narrow training and are not MD's.
- Ophthalmologists have additional 3 years of specialized training in eye medicine.
- Opposed by the Alaska State Medical Board.
- No outcry in favor of this bill from the user groups in affected rural areas.

TALKING POINTS (if any): Very tough to evaluate competing and conflicting statements made by ophthalmologists and optometrists. Is this simply a turf war, or are there real issues of competency to carry out risky procedures? It is difficult for the legislature to evaluate and make decisions on such technical matters.

COMMITTEE/DATE: (H) FLOOR 4/19/07

YEAS: 30 NAYS: 5 EXCUSED: 4 ABSENT: 1

Yeas: Buch, Chenault, Cissna, Coghill, Doogan, Edgmon, Fairclough, Foster, Gatto, Gruenberg, Guttenberg, Harris, Holmes, Johansen, Joule, Kawasaki, Kelly, Kohring, Lynn, Meyer, Nelson, Neuman, Olson, Ramras, Roses, Salmon, Samuels, Seaton, Stoltze, Thomas
Nays: Crawford, Doll, Gardner, Johnson, Wilson

Action: Passed the House

Next Referral: Transmitted to the Senate
Amendments: None

COMMITTEE/DATE: (H) L&C 4/11/07

Roll: Buch, Gardner, Gatto, LeDoux, Neuman, Olson, Ramras
Action: Moved from committee.
Next Referral: (H) RUL
Amendments: None
Change in CS: None

Amendments/Changes:

Committee Discussion/Action:

Rep. Neuman pointed out that the AK State Medical Board surveyed other states with expanded optometrist authority and found no problems over 30 years.

Rep. LeDoux asked pointed questions re. ophthalmologists' claim that the training and testing standards for optometrists are not sufficient for the duties they would gain. She pointed out that foreign-trained doctors who move to the US can treat eye problems without the same training required in US med schools.

Rep. Gardner noted that North Carolina is listed in the most permissive group of states allowing expanded optometrist duties, but it prohibits all injections of drugs according to the ophthalmologists' matrix. The optometrists' map of 45 states permitting is somewhat misleading, since what practices are allowed varies greatly from state to state.

Rep. Ramras: Flabbergasted at the degree of lobbying on this issue. He's on the side of the optometrists, since they have provided him good care since childhood. This is a battle of the rich vs. poor. "These doctors and their arrogance are going to wear out the medical system."

Testimony Summary:

Rep. Samuels presented the bill, emphasizing that optometrists are permitted to do more in 90% of the states than in Alaska, despite our large rural areas.

Rep. Thomas noted that ophthalmologists admitted that they visit only Sitka and not the other 23 smaller communities in his district, and that it can be a 3-day round trip from Kake to Sitka.

Dr. Cindy Bradford, American Academy of Ophthalmology, Oklahoma U prof., practicing in Oklahoma City: CON.

- Concerned about allowing injectible drugs that affect the whole body.
- Training is different: a single course of study, vs. the broad integrative course study of med school.
- Eye is complex, not like the tooth.
- Has witnessed problems (near blindness) with patients held back by optometrists' mistreatment.
- We shouldn't allow inferior care due to location.

Dr. Eric Coulter, member American Academy of Ophthalmology: CON.

- Seven or eight ophthalmologists are always on call in AK: not shorthanded.
- Not appropriate for optometrists (like chiropractors) to do the same things as highly specialized ophthalmologists; the difference is the value of a medical degree.

- It is not appropriate for the legislature to decide the standards for medical practice.
- Optometrists should take their case to the AK State Medical Board, which has the knowledge to evaluate the proposal.

Dr. Carl Rosen, President Alaskan Ophthalmology Society, largest practice in Anchorage: CON.

- Optometric board is not as transparent as the medical board.
- Not true that there have been no problems; knows of 2 cases in the last few months of problems stemming from optometrists using this expanded authority.
- Many complications from use of steroids, most commonly used drug.
- Currently recruiting for more ophthalmologists in AK, but not a shortage.

Dr. Daniel Bryson, American Academy of Ophthalmology, AZ practice: CON.

- Absurd to claim there have been no problems with optometrists: 2 cases going to trial now in AZ.
- No such thing as an optometry school; blatantly untrue that their training is the same as medical school.

Dr. Mike Bennett, President Alaska Optometric Association: PRO.

- AK would fall somewhere in the middle (15th to 22nd) in permissiveness for optometrists' expanded duties – a long way from Oklahoma's lead.
- Optometrist schools have board accrediting very similar to med schools.
- National board tests are required to enter practice.
- Low malpractice premiums are the best measure of optometrists' track record.

COMMITTEE/DATE: (H) HES 3/31/07

Roll: Wilson, Roses, Seaton, Gardner, Fairclough, Neuman, Cissna

Action: Moved from committee.

Next Referral: (H) L&C

Amendments: 1 offered, failed.

Change in CS: -

Amendments/Changes:

#1 (conceptual, Roses): optometrist may not inject except for emergency treatment of anaphylaxis. **Amendment #1 failed** 3y (Seaton, Roses, Wilson) / 4n (Neuman, Gardner, Fairclough, Cissna).

Committee Discussion/Action:

Cissna recalled rural AK's higher costs, less access to care. Suggests small prescriptive authority allows providers to go further in prevention, requiring less need for advanced high-level specialist treatment, emergency travel to hubs with available care. **Roses** noted real need to recognize urban, rural, and remote Alaska.

Gardner notes high volume industry lobbying on HB 113, no public outcry, very little word from individuals, health providers outside Alaska's urban areas.

Roses offered conceptual amendment #1 striking optometrists' ability to inject except for emergency treatment of anaphylaxis. Amendment failed.

Seaton moved, HB 113 **passed out of committee** on role call 5y (Seaton, Cissna, Gardner, Fairclough, Neuman) / 2n (Roses, Wilson) vote.

Testimony Summary:

Rep. Bill Thomas stressed rural Alaska's need for health care access. Supports HB 113.

Mike Bennett; President, Alaska Optometric Association, supports HB 113.

- optometrists are adequately trained to inject in allowable areas around eye.
- Malpractice charges against Alaska optometrists are rare.

Aaron Weingeist; American Academy of Ophthalmologists uncomfortable with HB113.

- Systemic medication prescription is rare among ophthalmologists; currently allowable topical meds usually sufficient. .5% of ophthalmologist visits produce oral med prescriptions.
- optometrist pharmaceutical training primarily is classroom based and extremely limited.
- to Roses: HB 113 would be "less objectionable" if injections are not allowed.

Paul Barney; Optometrist and Director, Pacific Cataract and Laser Institute supports HB 113.

- acknowledged optometrist/ophthalmologist professional turf battles

Robert Breffel; Ophthalmologist, anti-HB113.

COMMITTEE/DATE: (H) HES 3/20/07

Roll: Wilson, Roses, Seaton, Gardner, Fairclough, Neuman, Cissna

Action: heard and held.

Next Referral: --

Amendments: none.

Change in CS: See below.

Amendments/Changes:

CS version 25-LS0411K adopted before introduction:

- Allows up to 4 days' prescription of oral pharmaceuticals of all but schedule 1,2, or 6 drugs by if optometrists who: pass exam, complete 30 approved training course including 7 hours re: injections, have a physician/patient relationship, hold a DEA registration number.
- Allows injections into area surrounding eyeball and for treatment of anaphylaxis.
- Endorsement renewal required every 4 years. Requirements: 8 hours cont ed re: pharmaceutical use and prescription, 7 hours re: injections. Board of Optometrists currently requires more continuing education hours than bill.

Committee Discussion/Action:

Wilson related personal experience with professionals in all medical fields: some are good, some bad in any area of expertise.

Testimony Summary:

Rep. Ralph Samuels and aide **Sydney Morgan** introduced CS HB 113 version 25-LS0411K, intended to improve rural access to quality dental care. Alaska currently houses approximately 20 ophthalmologists in 6 communities, 109 optometrists in 85 communities. 45 states, D.C., and Guam allow optometrists to practice as HB 113 proposes.

Cindy Bradford; Ophthalmologist, American Academy of Ophthalmology.

Optometrists are inadequately trained to administer systemic medication; majority of eye complications are treated topically.

Lesley L. Walls; Optometrist and President, Southern California College of Optometry. Dually accredited as optometrist, family physician.

Supports HB113. AK's optometrists well-qualified to perform HB113 allowable practices.

- to Roses: familiar with AK Board of Optometry's requirements – confident that professionals who meet requirements are suited to practice as bill allows.
- to Neuman: optometrists trained to confer with and use pharmacists as info resources.
- to Gardner, Fairclough: large range of prescriptive-specific authority in states where optometrists are allowed to prescribe systemic meds. Not sure how many allowed it at the level HB 113 proposes.

Mike Bennett; private practice Optometrist, Juneau.

Supports HB113. Medicare and other insurance providers recognize optometrists as physicians.

Bob Loescher; Juneau resident.

Opposes HB113. Individual with serious health issues. Stresses eye sensitivity, connection to other body systems. Supports erring on caution's side.

Jill Geering Mathieson; President, Board of Optometry.

Feels specific training and certification requirements should be detailed in regulation instead of statute, but stresses Board of Optometry has not taken a position on HB 113 and is confident adequate supporting regulations can be developed and supported.

4/18/07

OPPOSITION TO CSHB113

Attachments enclosed.

Sincerely,

Carl Rosen, M.D.
American Academy of Ophthalmology/Alaska
Chapter
Anchorage, Alaska
907-276-1617

April 18, 2007

Dear Members of the House of Representatives,

As the American Academy of Ophthalmology/Alaska Chapter President I am writing this letter of opposition to cshb113 for four reasons.

Firstly, our patients and the citizens of Alaska place their trust in their doctors and in their elected officials to act in their best interest. To enact this far reaching bill would not be in the best interests of Alaskans. Medical school graduates have proven themselves and Ophthalmologists represent the best the American Medical System has to offer with regards to diagnosing and treating diseases of the visual system. To equate optometric training as equal to medical school and ophthalmology residency training would be like suggesting there is no difference between Major and Minor League Baseball. As a fellowship trained board certified ophthalmologist I have performed over 24,000 hours of supervised clinical training, with my final fellowship year as a one on one apprenticeship. At best an optometrist may perform 2000 clinical hours.

Secondly, this bill is massive in expanding optometric scope of practice. As a busy surgeon I have no use for pain medicines typically for more than 2-3 days, and I use a handful of oral antibiotics when needed and consult infectious disease specialists if atypical presentations arise. There is simply no need for an optometrist either in an urban or remote setting to have the ability to use the drugs listed in cshb113. In virtually all states where these privileges are given an Ophthalmologist must be consulted or supervise the optometrist.


Thirdly, injecting drugs around the eye can lead to hemorrhage given the vascular nature of the eyelids and orbital area and to direct injury to the eyeball. A seven hour course deemed satisfactory by the optometric board is very concerning, especially since residents are required to have three years of experience doing this procedure, and to patients who won't know or understand the training differences. In fact, when optometrists talk about injections they really are concerned with chalazions or styes that they want to inject with steroids. You should know that styes are treated first with warm compresses and time which cure well over 80%. Rarely have I injected a steroid into a chalazion and I am Alaska's only eyelid specialist.

Fourthly, there is simply no public outcry for this bill. The only advocates are the optometrists. With the implementation of telemedicine and digital technology we are getting better and better at diagnosing and treating patients using digital images and computer networks. This applies to the entire State of Alaska. In fact, Robert Arnold, MD a pediatric ophthalmologist has screened over 21,000 children looking for amblyopia or lazy eyes using this technology and continues to do so. David Chamberlain at Alaska Native Medical Center travels throughout the State to see patients as do most of the ophthalmologists who live in Alaska. For the past two years I have been working with Dr. Fred Pearce at the University of Alaska Anchorage on a first responder trauma

system whereby information gathered by EMT's is sent to physicians in the Emergency Room allowing for faster patient diagnoses and treatment. There are approximately 40 Ophthalmologists who are licensed to practice and currently do treat Alaskans and they visit approximately 35 communities. With telemedicine this number keeps growing and within the next 3 to 5 years I predict we will have the State wired and telemedicine centric for not only Ophthalmology consults but other medical specialties as well.

I urge you to vote against cshb113, it is simply not a good bill as written.

Sincerely,


Carl Rosen, MD
President

American Academy of Ophthalmology/Alaska Chapter
542 West Second Ave.
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
907-276-1617
Director of Orbital and Oculoplastic Surgery and Neuro-Ophthalmology
Ophthalmic Associates
Anchorage, Alaska

American Academy of Ophthalmology
State Governmental Affairs
April 18, 2007

Review of Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry Letter dated April 10, 2007.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry claims that this bill would allow optometrists to prescribe limited systemic drugs. In fact, compared to the optometric practice acts in 49 out of 50 states, this bill is not limited.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry claims that similar legislation has been enacted in 45 states. In fact, similar legislation has not been enacted in 45 states. Virtually, every state has stricter limitations on the use of systemic medications.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry claims that there are many new drug treatments every year. This is not a reason to expand the scope of practice of optometry. In fact, there are not many new drug treatments that are introduced every year in the specialty of ophthalmology. The standard of care in the treatment of eye disease evolves over time.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry claims that optometrists are fully educated and competent to prescribe any drug for the treatment of the eye regardless of the route of administration. Fully competent suggests an equivalence with ophthalmology. Unlike ophthalmologists, optometrists do not go to medical school, complete a hospital residency, and complete a three year residency in ophthalmology. Optometric education does not include substantial clinical training in the prescribing of systemic medications.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry cites a 2001 survey of optometric boards in other states that have enacted similar legislation, suggesting there have been no problems. In 2001, there were no states that had similar legislation. In fact today, there is only one state with a comparable statute.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry claims that there are adequate safeguards in place to protect the public. Given that no one on the board prescribes these medications in the state of Alaska and that the board did not consult with the medical board on any education and training requirements that might be needed, a claim about protecting the public cannot be made with authority or confidence by the state optometry board.

The Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry states that this bill would improve access to quality eye care and reduce costs. In fact, this bill would only create two tiers in access to quality eye care. Given the fact that many patients with serious eye disease requiring systemic drugs will obtain a second opinion and that delayed, appropriate treatment by an ophthalmologist may result in additional costs to the patient and lost work time for the patient, this bill would not reduce costs. Moreover, federal law requires ophthalmologists and optometrists to be reimbursed at the same rate for the services they provide to Medicare patients, regardless of any differential in education and training. Private payors generally follow the same fee schedule and use similar reimbursement practices.

April 18, 2007

Alaska State Legislature
House of Representatives
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

Suite 700
1101 Vermont Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20005-3570

Tel. 202.737.6662
Fax 202.737.7061
<http://www.aao.org>

Dear Representative:

I am writing to ask you to oppose CSHB 113, a bill that would give optometrists the authority to prescribe oral and injectable drugs. Although the bill language has changed since introduction, the current language does not improve the quality of eye healthcare available to Alaska citizens. Indeed, enactment of this legislation would result in a decline of both the short and long-term quality of eye care available to Alaska citizens.

The CSHB 113 "blank check" authorization of oral medications (antivirals, antifungals, antihistamines, antimetabolites, steroids, antibiotics, and oral anti-glaucoma drugs) will result in increased potential patient risks. In addition to the oral systemic drugs authorized in CSHB 113, this legislation also would allow Alaska optometrists to inject Botox into the eyelids and surrounding tissues, inject steroids into chalazions, inject anesthetics into the lid, and prescribe a broad array of narcotics and analgesics. Such a wide expanded prescription and injection authority is not in the best interest of patient care.

Optometry did not seek the approval of or even consult with the Alaska State Medical Board, any medical schools, or any ophthalmology residency program regarding the education and clinical training necessary to competently prescribe and administer the drugs authorized in CSHB 113. Optometry school is not a substitute for four years of medical school, a hospital residency, and three years of ophthalmology residency training.

It should be pointed out that optometry education is not comparable to even podiatry or dentistry education. To be licensed in Alaska, podiatrists must complete a one-year podiatric surgical residency program. To be licensed as a dental specialist in Alaska, these students must complete a two-year postgraduate program. Although there is no residency requirement for dental school graduates, 41 percent of dental school graduates immediately enter a post-graduate training program. In contrast, only about 10 percent of optometrists complete a residency program nationally. Furthermore, a residency program is not required as a part of any optometry school program or a requirement to be licensed in Alaska.

The supporters of the bill state that optometrists are authorized to prescribe oral drugs in 45 states. However, most of these states have significant limitations and patient safeguards on oral drug prescribing authority. Frankly, we wish there were additional limitations. Even so, given that our paramount concern is patient safety, we are alarmed that Alaskan optometrists are refusing to present and discuss these limitations with you. Unwisely, what optometrists want in Alaska is a "blank check" to prescribe any oral drug for any eye disease without any significant, additional educational requirement. It is important to remember that one cannot treat serious eye disease separately from having an understanding of the entire body. Medical schools uniquely provide this knowledge base. Optometrists lack this critical, fundamental knowledge and experience.

This legislation is not of front of you because of public concern and an outcry regarding a lack of quality eye care. This is a piece of rather unfortunate, special interest legislation promoted by Alaska's optometry lobby. As an ophthalmologist, it is important for me to ensure that the citizens of your state receive appropriate medical eye care. Limiting optometrists to the tasks for which they are competent is in the best interest of patients. Therefore, I ask you again to oppose CSHB 113.

Sincerely,



C.P. Wilkinson, MD
President

Cc: Alaska House of Representatives



ALASKA STATE MEDICAL BOARD

RESOLUTION OF THE
ALASKA STATE MEDICAL BOARD

Title: An Act Relating to the Prescription and Use of Pharmaceutical Agents,
Including Controlled Substances, by Optometrists

WHEREAS, the Alaska State Legislature is considering CSHB 113, a bill that would give optometrists licensed in the State of Alaska the authority to prescribe oral and injectable medications; and

WHEREAS, a degree from a college of optometry school is not a substitute for four years of medical school, a hospital residency, and three years of ophthalmology residency training; and

WHEREAS, optometrists do not have the clinical experience to safely administer injections and prescribe oral medications; and

WHEREAS, CSHB 113 may result in increased potential patient risks; and

WHEREAS, CSHB 113 would not improve the quality of eye healthcare available to the citizens of Alaska.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Alaska State Medical Board opposed CSHB 113 because the board believes that this legislation would endanger patients.

David M. Head, MD, Chair
Alaska State Medical Board

12 April 2007



Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 2

Resolution No: 001-07

Resolution in Opposition to CSHB113

Whereas the Alaska Native Brotherhood Camp 2 (A.N.B. Camp 2) of Juneau is a Native membership organization; and,

Whereas the A.N.B. Camp 2 represents and advocates for Tribal members in the Greater City and Borough of Juneau, Alaska; and,

Whereas, the A. N.B. Camp 2 is an institution that protects and promotes the best interest in health, education and welfare, and other social concerns of its membership; and,

Whereas the A. N. B. Camp 2 has members from rural Alaska and the urban communities of Alaska; and,

Whereas, the A. N. B. Camp 2 has advocated that people of Alaska continue to receive quality health care, including eye health; and,

Whereas, A.N.B. Camp 2 has opposed legislation in the past similar to CSHB 113, now being considered in the Legislature.

Now, Therefore be it resolved, by the A.N.B. Camp2 finds that CSHB 113 is contrary to the core of health services that its citizens would receive under the proposed legislation; and,

Be it further resolved that A.N.B. Camp 2 opposes the passage of CSHB 113.

President:

Andrew Ebona Date: 4-12-07

Andrew Ebona, President

Secretary:

Sueann Williams Date: 4/12/07

Sueann Williams



Tlingit and Haida Indians of the City and Borough of Juneau

P.O. Box 020770

Juneau AK 99802

A T&H Community of the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska



April 17, 2007


To Whom it May Concern:

Attached is a Resolution entitled: An Act Relating to the Prescription and Use of Pharmaceutical Agents, Including Controlled Substances, by Optometrists.

This resolution was passed at our Regular Council Meeting held on April 12, 2007 and will be forwarded by the Community Council to the Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska General Assembly to be held in Wrangell April 18, 2007 through April 21, 2007. The Council Secretary is on travel status to Wrangell and not available to sign the resolution but we thought it important to forward the adopted resolution to the Alaska State Legislature to show our position on CS4 HB 113.

If there are any questions please feel free to call Alberta Aspen, Administrator at 463-5680.

Sincerely,


James Jack, Sr.
President

OFFICE: 907.463-5680

FAX: 907.463-3061

TRIBAL ADMINISTRATOR jthadmin@gci.net

BOOKKEEPER jthacct@gci.net

HOUSING jthhousing@gci.net

SECRETARY jthadmin@gci.net

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIAN TRIBES OF ALASKA
Seventy-Second Annual General Assembly
April 18-21, 2007

Resolution GA/ 07- _____

Title: An Act Relating to the Prescription and Use of Pharmaceutical Agents, Including Controlled Substances, by Optometrists

By: Tlingit and Haidas of the City & Borough of Juneau

WHEREAS, Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (Central Council) is a federally recognized tribe of more than 26,000 tribal citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska State Legislature has been considering proposed changes to law that would enable optometrists to use oral and injectable drugs; and

WHEREAS, there exists a difference in the education and training between optometrists and ophthalmologists, with the more comprehensive training of ophthalmologists who are considered medical doctors. Optometrists complete four years education at optometry school without any requirement in Alaska for residency training, ophthalmologists, must complete four year of medical school, a hospital residency, and an additional three to four year residency training program that specializes in medical and surgical treatment of the eye; and

WHEREAS, over the last six years optometrists and ophthalmologists have been engaged in a professional dispute in the legislature with the optometrists promoting the expansion of their scope of practice and the ophthalmologists supporting and protecting public health by advocating comprehensive eye and total health care of Alaskans; and

WHEREAS, very little citizen input to protect the safety and health of Alaskan citizens has been presented to law makers; and

WHEREAS, eye care is related to total body health and the risk of the loss of eyesight is great if eye care is not undertaken by qualified medical doctors. The loss of eyesight cannot be replaced and the diminishment of eyesight can be only prevented with the assistance of medical doctors addressing comprehensive health of patients; and

WHEREAS, legislative authorization of eye care by unqualified persons with the expanded authority to undertake the prescription of drugs and other procedures is not in the best interest of Alaskan citizens.

Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (Central Council) is a federally recognized tribe of more than 26,000 tribal citizens; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Seventy-Second General Assembly of Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska convened in Wrangell, Alaska on April 18-21, 2007, hereby opposes CS for HB 113, An Act Relating to the Prescription and Use of Pharmaceutical Agents, Including Controlled Substances, by Optometrists; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, it is believed that CSHB 113 provides authorization of oral medications (antivirals, antifungals, antihistamines, antimetabolites, steroids, antibiotics, and oral anti-glaucoma drugs) - that will result in increased potential patient risks. In addition to the oral systemic drugs authorized in CSHB 113, this legislation also would allow Alaska optometrists to inject Botox into the eyelids and surrounding tissues, inject steroids into chalazions, inject anesthetics into the lid, and prescribe a broad array of narcotics and analgesics. Such a wide expanded prescription and injection authority is not in the best interest of patient care for Alaskans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that it is believed that Alaskans should receive specialized medical care from the most qualified medical doctors available on the most comprehensive basis possible for the human body, including eyes; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Alaska State Legislature emphasize patient safety for all Alaskan citizens in the provision of all health care and that the Legislature, on behalf of its citizens, protect citizen and consumer interests over economic competition between professional service groups, including optometrists and ophthalmologists.

ADOPTED this _____ day of April 2007, by the Seventy-Second General Assembly of Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska.

CERTIFY

President Edward K. Thomas

ATTEST


Tribal Secretary William E. Martin

Post Graduate Training Comparison Between Optometrists and Selected Professions

Ophthalmologists are medical doctors who specialize in the treatment of eye disease after three to four years of training after medical school and hospital residency. In arguing for expanded scope of practice to treat eye disease, optometrists, on the other hand, compare their education and training to podiatrists and dentists. However amongst the many significant differences between optometrists and these other professions is post-graduate training.

Since we are discussing eyes - not feet or teeth, the more reasonable comparison is between the education and training of an ophthalmologist and that of an optometrist. The question at hand is whether optometrists, without seeking the approval of or consulting with the state medical board, any medical schools, or any ophthalmology residency program, have devised a unique method to learn to prescribe systemic medications with just enough fragments and bits of knowledge to not harm patients in this state. The answer is that they have not. Optometry school is not a substitute for four years of medical school, a hospital residency, and three years of ophthalmology residency training.

It should be pointed out that optometry education is not comparable to even podiatry or dentistry education. To be licensed in this state, podiatrists must complete one-year podiatric surgical residency program. To be licensed as a dental specialist, these specialists must complete a two-year postgraduate program. Although there is no residency requirement for dental school graduates, 41 percent of dental school graduates immediately enter a post-graduate training program. In contrast, only about 10 percent of optometrists complete a residency program nationally. Furthermore, the completion of a residency is not required as a part of any optometry school program and is not a requirement to be licensed in this state.



Medical Doctors

All medical doctors must complete at least a one year residency program upon graduation from medical school. In Alaska, the requirement is two years if the medical doctor graduated after 1995. http://www.labor.state.ak.us/research/dlo/phy_surg.htm

Ophthalmologists (EYE MDs)

In addition to the same one year residency program that all medical doctors must complete, to become an ophthalmologist, the medical doctor must also complete an additional three to four year residency training program that specializes in medical and surgical treatment of the eye. http://www.acgme.org/acWebsite/downloads/RRC_progReq/240pr106.pdf

Optometrists

Nationally, approximately 10 percent of all optometrists complete a one year residency program. Moreover, optometric *residencies are not required in Alaska or elsewhere by law or by professional standard.* <http://www.opted.org/teampublish/uploads/SpringStudentInterest.pdf>

Dentists

Nationally, approximately 41 percent of dental school graduates immediately enter into post-graduate training program. About 27 percent of all dentists enter a general dentistry residency program and an additional 14 percent enter a dental specialty program. www.adea.org/DEPR/Assoceptjune01.pdf

Dental Specialists

Completion of a two year post graduate program is a prerequisite to be licensed as a dental specialist in Alaska. <http://www.labor.state.ak.us/research/dlo/dentist.htm>

Podiatrists

Alaska requires podiatrists to complete a one-year podiatric surgical residency program. Today, virtually all podiatry school graduates in the US complete a podiatric residency. It is now a licensing requirement in 41 states. <http://www.labor.state.ak.us/research/dlo/podiatrt.htm>

Comparison of Training and Accreditation in Optometry with Medicine and Ophthalmology

The following chart is based on requirements and minimum standards, or averages if no standards are stated.

Degree	Ophthalmologist	Optometrist
	M.D.	O.D.
Medical School/ Optometry School Accreditation	Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). The LCME has determined minimum curriculum and patient contact standards.	Council on Education (COE). The COE has no minimum curriculum or patient contact standards
Pre-training Admission requirements	4 year college degree Premedical program	3 years of undergraduate courses and pre-optometry program (most complete a 4 year degree program ¹)
Didactic curriculum	First two years of medical school: 2,000 hours in class, at least 1,250 hours of basic and clinical sciences, according to minimum accreditation standards.	No accreditation standard minimums. Typical didactic program is one year of basic and clinical sciences and two years of vision sciences
Student clinical training	Second two years (3,200 hours): Clinical rotations in hospitals / health care settings completing 2,000 hours in basic medical specialty services plus 1,200 hours in elective rotations, according to minimum accreditation standards.	No accreditation standard minimums or required service rotations. Typical service is an average of 2,000 hours in the 4th year, split between school-based clinic and whatever externship rotations can be arranged.

¹ Three of the 17 optometry schools in the U.S. require an undergraduate degree before admission.

Degree	Ophthalmologist	Optometrist
	M.D.	O.D.
Postgraduate Accreditation	Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), Ophthalmology RRC	Council on Education
Postgraduate clinical training: First Residency (PGY-1)	Required: hospital residency, including on-call service. 50 week, 80 hour a week limit (60 hours week average = 3,000 patient contact hours)	Optional: one year postgraduate training (less than 10% of OD graduates ever pursue postgraduate training)
Postgraduate clinical training: Second Residency (PGY-2) <i>Completion of PGY-1 required</i>	Required: 36 month ophthalmology service to include 360 hours didactic education in basic and clinical sciences and 50 hours in pathology. Minimum patient requirements 3,000 outpatient visits with 1,000 closely supervised (including 1,500 refractions), 150 consultations involving disease, documented surgical experience, and 288 hours of clinical conferences.	No option
Specialty Board Certification	Optional (but achieved by almost all recent graduates): American Board of Ophthalmology, accredited by the Association of Medical Specialty Boards	No option
Subspecialty Fellowship Training	Optional (but achieved by approximately one-half of all recent graduates): one to two year position. No accreditation, but programs follow guidelines of subspecialty associations	No option

md_od.doc



April 3, 2007

Chair Kurt Olson
House Labor & Commerce Committee
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801 Re: CSHB 113

Dear Representative Olson:

In the interest of patients, optometrists should communicate with medical doctors over circumstances requiring systemic medications. In the event of an ocular manifestation of a potentially systemic disease, the Alaskan optometrist should confer with local ophthalmologists. In the extremely unlikely event of an anaphylactic reaction in the optometrist's office, emergency services or local family medical doctors should be called.

Since 1989, I have practiced with some fine optometrists as collegial partners with subspecialty ophthalmologists. Their experience has been gleaned by decades of optometric practice adjacent to ophthalmic practice. There are optometrists, when covering cases that might benefit from systemic medications, easily contact ophthalmologists in or out of our practice, or directly with other medical physicians. They also clearly recognize that their individual familiarity with medical conditions has been mainly influenced by the years of adjacent practice with ophthalmologists rather than from their training in optometry school. I recommend we keep things as they are in Alaska and oppose HB 113, if the system is not broken, why meddle, especially when it comes to patient care.

The following information is written to clear up some misinformation expressed by several optometrists that occurred in House HESS, regarding the extent to which Alaskan ophthalmologists interact with rural patients.

After graduating from UAF in 1980, I trained at Yale Medical School and did an Internship and ophthalmology residency at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. After completing an additional year of subspecialty training in pediatric ophthalmology in Indiana, I returned to Alaska to start a practice with Ophthalmic Associates. I have since conducted ongoing subspecialty clinics in Cordova, Homer, Kodiak, Wasilla, Bethel, Galena and the Koyukon region as well as a surgical practice in Anchorage covering both private hospitals, ANMC and Elmendorf. I have mentored a dozen premedical students one of the first of which is now Dr. Griff Steiner. At the request of Alaskan optometrists, I have offered education to many of them and to optometrist interns. Over arrange of experiences and skills, it is best for Alaskan eye patients, young and old, to have collegial communication between optometrists, local physicians and with general and subspecialty ophthalmologists who continuously cover the urgent and emergent cases.

The most common cause of vision impairment in children is Amblyopia; this disease can potentially be eliminated through early consistent screening and persistent,

accurate treatment. As a result, I have devoted over a decade and over \$300,000 to a cooperative, charitable vision screening program called the Alaska Blind Child Discovery (ABCD; w www.abcd-vision.org). As you may know, the single most expensive component of the Alaska Medicaid travel budget has been for follow-up exams and glasses for children who are referred by non-specific wall-chart acuity screening. ABCD instead offers much more valid, and cost-effective objective screening to over 21,000 children through out the state. Ketchikan to Adak, from Kodiak to Barrow. No insurance or Medicaid yet pays for this new enhanced vision screening. The ABCD program carefully interprets objective screening results and recommends that referred children get a carefully defined Confirmatory Exam from the "nearest convenient eye doctor." ABCD then coordinates follow up over the years referred children are treated. ABCD has demonstrated a significant reduction in Alaskan amblyopia vision impairment cost-effectively.

This is one example of the extent to which ophthalmologists in Alaska are offering rural eye care. Please review our experiences offering this state-of-the-art pediatric vision screening free of charge to Alaskans at the State Fair(1), in the Koyukon region(2, 3), and state-wide(4-7).

Sincerely Yours,

Robert W. Arnold

Robert W. Arnold, M.D.

Cc: House Labor & Commerce Committee

1. Arnold RW. Highly specific photoscreening at the Alaska State Fair: Valid Alaska Blind Child Discovery photoscreening and interpretation. *Alaska Med* 2003;45(2):34-40.
2. Lang DM, Arnold AW, Lemman RE, Arnold RW. Validated portable pediatric vision screening in the Alaska Bush: A VIPS-like study in the Koyukon. *Alaska Med* 2007;49(1):2-13.
3. Arnold RW, Arnold AW, Stark L, Arnold KK, Lemman RE, Armitage MD. Amblyopia detection by camera (ADBC): Gateway to portable, inexpensive, vision screening. *Alaska Med* 2004;46(3):63-72.
4. Arnold RW, Armitage MD, Gionet EG, et al. The cost and yield of photoscreening: Impact of photoscreening on overall pediatric ophthalmic costs. *JPOS* 2005;42(2):103-11.
5. Arnold RW, Donahue SP. The yield and challenges of charitable state-wide photoscreening. *Binocular Vis Strabismus Q* 2006;21(2):93-100.
6. Arnold RW, Gionet E, Jastrzebski A, Kovtoun T, Armitage M, Coon L. The Alaska Blind Child Discovery project: Rationale, Methods and Results of 4000 screenings. *Alaska Med* 2000;42:58-72.
7. Lemman R, Clausen MM, Bates J, Stark L, Arnold KK, Arnold RW. A comparison of patched HOTV visual acuity and photoscreening. *J Sch Nurs* 2006;22(4):237-43.

CR

March 14, 2007

Representative/Chairman Peggy Wilson
House Health, Education and Social Services Committee
Capitol Building, Room #204
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Representative Wilson:

A bill, House Bill 113, though well intentioned, may have devastating effects to uninformed patients.

UNINFORMED
Ocular diseases are very serious, often resulting in partial or complete loss of vision. In treatment, strong and potentially dangerous drugs are administered when necessary, and only under the most extreme circumstances. Ophthalmologists are well trained to recognize when systemic drugs are necessary and are qualified in the administration of these medications in coordination with other medications.

Optometrists have not been provided with this expertise. Their education and training is approximately one half of that of an Ophthalmologists and are traditionally qualified to center their concerns to defects in vision and the issuance of corrective lenses. Extending to them the right to work on the same level of Ophthalmologists would defy logic or responsibility.

Professional standards are crucial to the medical field; especially to the human eye, as any faulty determination can lead to loss of the patient's vision. For these reasons, and for the interests of all Alaskans, I respectfully request your "NO" vote on HB 113.

Thank you for your consideration

Joseph Bustamante
P.O. Box 201836
Anchorage, AK 99520

cc: House HESS Committee members

Handwritten notes and signatures at the bottom of the page, including names like "Bustamante" and "Wilson".

April 16, 2007

Honorable Representative John Coghill
State House of Representatives
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol, Rm 214
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

**Re: Opposition to CS HB 113, An Act Relating to the Prescription and Use of
Pharmaceutical Agents, Including Controlled Substances, by Optometrists**

Dear Representative Coghill:

The Alaska State Legislature has been considering proposed changes to law that would enable optometrists to use oral and injectable drugs.

There exists a difference in the education and training between optometrists and ophthalmologists, with the more comprehensive training of ophthalmologists who are considered medical doctors. Optometrists complete four years education at optometry school without any requirement in Alaska for residency training, ophthalmologists, must complete four year of medical school, a hospital residency, and an additional three to four year residency training program that specializes in medical and surgical treatment of the eye.

Over the last six years optometrists and ophthalmologists have been engaged in a professional dispute in the legislature with the optometrists promoting the expansion of their scope of practice and the ophthalmologists supporting and protecting public health by advocating comprehensive eye and total health care of Alaskans. Very little citizen input to protect the safety and health of Alaskan citizens has been presented to law makers.

Eye care is related to total body health and the risk of the loss of eyesight is great if eye care is not undertaken by qualified medical doctors. The loss of eyesight cannot be replaced and the diminishment of eyesight can be only prevented with

the assistance of medical doctors addressing comprehensive health of patients. Legislative authorization of eye care by unqualified persons with the expanded authority to undertake the prescription of drugs and other procedures is not in the best interest of Alaskan citizens.

It is believed that CS HB 113 provides authorization of oral medications (antivirals, antifungals, antihistamines, antimetabolites, steroids, antibiotics, and oral anti-glaucoma drugs) - that will result in increased potential patient risks. In addition to the oral systemic drugs authorized in CS HB 113, this legislation also would allow Alaska optometrists to inject Botox into the eyelids and surrounding tissues, inject steroids into chalazions, inject anesthetics into the lid, and prescribe a broad array of narcotics and analgesics. Such a wide expanded prescription and injection authority is not in the best interest of patient care for Alaskans. I believe that Alaskans should receive specialized medical care from the most qualified medical doctors available on the most comprehensive basis possible for the human body, including eyes.


I urge you to advocate, in your capacity as an Alaska State Legislator, to emphasize patient safety for all Alaskan citizens in the provision of all health care and that the Legislature, on behalf of its citizens, protect citizen and consumer interests over economic competition between professional service groups, including optometrists and ophthalmologists.

As you know, I am legally blind. I have had nine (9) surgeries on my eyes and have remaining only a little bit of clouded vision in my left eye. All of this blindness was brought on by me through diabetes and a kidney transplant. My experience is that a person's eyes are a part of his total health well being and must be treated in concert with all other vital functions of the body. Only qualified medical doctors are able to keep medications, treatment of other vital organs and a prescribed health regime in balance.

I urge you to oppose CH HB 113 as a measure of protecting the health and safety for all Alaskans and I urge you to continue the Legislatures effort to fund and train more qualified medical doctors so that comprehensive and quality health care is available to all Alaskans.

Thanking you for this consideration.

Sincerely,



Robert W. Loescher

**10645 Misty Lane
Juneau AK, 99801
Ph: 907-723-8516**

House of Representatives
State of Alaska
Health and Commerce Committee

April 5, 2007

Re: cshb113

Representatives,


I am writing to you in opposition of House Bill 113. This bill would give Optometrists within the State of Alaska full authority to prescribe both oral and injectible pharmaceuticals. As such, the bill would allow Optometrists to use intravenous medications and give peri-ocular injections. As an Ophthalmic surgeon specializing in retinal surgery, I perform intravenous angiograms and give intra and peri-ocular injections on a daily basis. Ocular injections entail the risk of infection, retinal tear, retinal detachment, hemorrhage, blindness and death. An infection related to an intra-ocular injection is an absolute surgical emergency requiring surgical vitrectomy and injection of antibiotics to the eye. Only an Ophthalmic surgeon specializing in retinal surgery is capable of treating such an emergency. Only a retinal surgeon should be performing such procedures.

Bill 113 would also give Optometrists the authority to use intravenous medications and perform procedures such as intravenous fluorescein angiography in the office. This procedure entails numerous risks including: extravasation of the dye with skin necrosis, allergic reaction, anaphylaxis and death. In our office we keep a "crash cart" with all the medications and supplies necessary to treat an anaphylactic reaction, in the room where the procedure is performed. The treatment of anaphylaxis entails the use of medications and may require full resuscitation with intubation of the patient, placement of central venous access and treatment of cardiac arrhythmias and cardiovascular collapse. In spite of proper treatment, several people die in the United States each year as a result of anaphylaxis related to the use of intravenous fluorescein angiography.

As an Ophthalmic surgeon, I have completed four years of college, four years of medical school, a year of internship, three years of surgical residency, and one year of subspecialty fellowship training. This experience qualifies me to use intravenous medications and perform ocular injections. This experience qualifies me to treat the complications of the use of intravenous medications and ocular injections. Optometrists do not have the education or experience to use such medications. Optometrists do not have the education or experience to treat the complications related to the use of such medications. This bill is a danger to the residents of Alaska.

I urge you to vote against HB 113.

Sincerely,


Scott A. Limstrom, M.D.

ALASKA RETINAL CONSULTANTS

David E. Swanson, M.D.
Scott A. Limstrom, M.D.
3500 LaTouche, Suite 250
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
Telephone: (907) 561-1530
Facsimile: (907) 561-2611

HESS Committee
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: HB113

Dear Representative Wilson:

Expanding the scope of practice for optometrists through the legislature, especially as delineated in the current bill, would be a horrible mistake. We ophthalmologists have repeatedly delineated the vast educational differences, so I will not repeat them here. Mistakes made by other states do not constitute a safe precedent. It is very frustrating and dangerous that these bills keep coming before you. **At the end of the day it has to somehow make sense to you to pass a bill allowing optometrists to perform injections of the eyes of Alaskans, including your own eyes and the eyes of your children.** These are injections that ophthalmologists do hundreds of times in training under the supervision of other MDs - optometrists have never done them. Never. The injection itself requires skill and just as importantly the experience to know when to use them. Optometrists have none of this experience. Zero. Passage of this bill will be equivalent to allowing chiropractors to inject the spine because they swear up and down they have read as much as orthopedists or neurosurgeons. Even if they had read as much, which is manifestly false, this does not remotely qualify them to perform these injections.

Also relevant is that these injections are rarely necessary. What is the positive outcome of such a bill? Is the optometric agenda actually improved patient care? If a patient in a rural area has such a severe condition that it requires an eye injection, it is already beyond the scope of optometrists and the patient must see an ophthalmologist. Other milder conditions that might benefit from an injection, such as chronic sties, are rarely injected. I am a subspecialist in this area and I never inject them, using more conservative measures the vast majority of the time, with surgery only if these measures fail.

It is also well documented in other states that these absurd requests for increased procedural scope of practice (that can hardly enhance patient care) are actually designed as legislative stepping stones to later argue for surgical privileges.

As MDs our most important oath is "First do no harm". Please help us help Alaskans by rejecting this bill. Please contact me at any time if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Griff C. Steiner MD (4th generation Alaskan and Stanford graduate)
Ophthalmologist subspecializing in Cornea/External disease.
542 W. 2nd Ave.
Anchorage, AK 99501
bngriff@aci.net
907-276-1617 main office
907-264-2643 back line at office
907-350-4232 cell

cc: HESS Committee Members

March 18, 2007

Honorable Representative Peggy Wilson, Chair
Health Education & Social Services Committee
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Representative Wilson:

I am an Alaskan ophthalmologist and I strongly urge you to oppose HB 113. This bill would allow optometrists to prescribe oral medications to patients. This bill is touted as a convenience for patients, claiming that optometrists have the training and experience to prescribe narcotics, steroids, and all other classes of potentially lethal medicine to patients with eye conditions.


I believe that optometrists are often helpful in screening patients for eye disease and systemic problems. **But it would be very dangerous to allow the unsupervised "practice of medicine" by anyone who has no medical training.** Please understand that I have completed 11 years of intensive medical training since college, as compared to 4 years of optometry school. I became "board certified" by the Academy of Ophthalmology after two more years of work/study. I complete over 25 hours of accredited "continuing education" every year to maintain my medical license under the jurisdiction of the Alaska Medical Board.

As far as patient convenience, I have never turned down a patient or optometrist request for a same-day exam, usually with less than one hour waiting time. For routine exams, my "next available" appointment is only 2 weeks or so away. I work very hard to protect patients and to see them within a reasonable time period.

Perhaps like you, I grow weary of the annual "turf battles" that occur in state legislatures across the country. If optometrists want to be medical doctors (physicians) or even surgeons, there are plenty of openings in medical schools for qualified applicants.

Please reject this dangerous bill, this year and in the future.

Sincerely,



Evan Wolf, MD, PhD

Valley Eye Associates, PC
935 E Westpoint Drive
Wasilla, AK 99654

CC: Legislative members of the House HESS Committee

UNIVERSITY EYE SPECIALISTS

215 North Broad Street, 3rd Floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
215-8832-0080 • Fax 215-832-0087

40 Monument Road, 5th Floor
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
610-664-8880 • Fax: 610-660-0419

Steven Yanoff, MD
Comprehensive Ophthalmology
Cataract Surgery

Leo Santamarina, M.D.
Retina-Vitreous
Medical and Surgical

Elliot B. Werner, M.D.
Glaucoma
Cataract Surgery

March 12, 2004

Harry Grossman, M.D.
100 Brick Road
Suite 115
Marlton, NJ 08053

Dear Harry:

It has been brought to my attention that Sheryl Lenzler, O.D., a 1996 graduate of The Pennsylvania College of Optometry testified before a committee of the Alaska State Legislature. According to Committee Minutes 23 Legislature, "She explained that at the school she attended the first year ophthalmology residents were under (fourth year optometry students) in emergency care." This is found on page 26 of the document as posted on the web site of the Alaska State Legislature.

This is not a true statement. Since 1988 until the present time I have been a member of the clinical staff of The Eye Institute of the Pennsylvania College of Optometry (TEI). I have the title of Glaucoma Consultant and have served as Co-chief of The Glaucoma Service at TEI. During that time I have been actively involved in patient care and educational activities at The Pennsylvania College of Optometry. During that time I have also served on the faculty of the Department of Ophthalmology at Hahnemann University Hospital and currently serve as the Residency Program Director. At no time and under no circumstance would any ophthalmology resident be "under" optometry students in any capacity. Ophthalmology residents at Hahnemann at all times report to and are supervised by the faculty of the Department of Ophthalmology and the officers of the hospital and medical school. Students at The Pennsylvania College of Optometry neither supervise any activity of our ophthalmology residents nor do they have any role in formal or informal teaching of our residents. I hope this clarifies this matter.

Very truly yours



Elliot B. Werner, M.D.

Feb 3, 2004 Health Education & Social Services Committee Hearing on HB 306:

SHERYL LENTFER, O.D., testified in support of HB 306 and answered questions from the committee. She told the members that access to the curriculums of the schools is readily available. She urged the members to take a look at [the curriculums] because she believes that will clarify the education issue. She questioned why, if education is a big issue, PAs and nurse practitioners are prescribing and not prescribing with a doctor right behind them at every moment. They are able to do this pretty much on their own, she commented. Dr. Lentfer asked the members to deal with the education issue factually by comparing [the curriculums] of the optometry schools and medical schools. Dr. Lentfer stated that education should not even be an issue in this debate. She urged the committee to compare the education qualifications with those for dentists or podiatrists.

DR. LENTFER told the members that she would like to talk about who currently treats the public with oral prescriptions and the educational relationship to these professionals. She said medical doctors, osteopathic doctors, podiatrists, dentists, nurse practitioners, and PAs all have prescriptive authority to prescribe pharmaceutical agents in Alaska. Medical doctors, osteopathic doctors, podiatrists, dentists, and optometrists all have a four-year doctor degree.

DR. LENTFER clarified that after a four-year college undergraduate degree, an optometrist receives a four-year doctorate degree. There is no variation in that education, she stated. Nurse practitioners have two years of master's work after an undergraduate degree, but to her surprise she found that PAs do not have to have a four-year undergraduate degree to be accepted into the [PA] program.

Number 1916

DR. LENTFER emphasized that PAs and nurse practitioners have been very beneficial to Alaska and that it is not her intention to [undermine their role in ensuring good public health]. She emphasized that her point is only to demonstrate the correlation between their ability to prescribe drugs and their educational background, compared to that of optometrists.

DR. LENTFER pointed out that the pharmacology education for medical doctors, osteopathic doctors, and optometric doctors is

the same. She told the members that optometrists provide 70 percent of the eye care in the U.S. Considering that there are many professionals treating eye conditions today including PAs, nurse practitioners, physicians, and eye surgeons, that is a large percentage. In Alaska [the percentage of eye care that is provided by optometrists] is greater. There are 103 optometrists in 17 different locations, and many travel a lot. There are only 28 eye surgeons in six locations, most of which do surgery. She pointed out that with a population of over 500,000, eye surgeons availability and accessibility have been a big challenge for this state. Dr. Lentfer explained that this [fact] has put more demand on optometrists to practice to their fullest training.

DR. LENTFER spoke to Representative Coghill's comments about training. She told the members that this is not new or additional training, since she was prescribing [oral medications] in 1996 after graduating from medical school. She told the members that while additional training is not required, there will be additional training for those optometrist who have not had prescriptive authority in the last few years. The [Alaska Board of Examiners in Optometry] will require optometrists to probably have over 200 hours of course work, pass a test, and get a therapeutic endorsement on the license. If the optometrist does not pass the test, he/she cannot prescribe [oral medications], she said. An OD [doctor of optometry] would have to have graduated [from medical school] in the last two years in order to be qualified to prescribe. When therapeutic eye drops were approved by the legislature, optometrists were not automatically allowed to prescribe because the [Alaska Board of Examiners in Optometry] required that optometrists prove that they were qualified.

DR. LENTFER pointed out that the language in this legislation is for the treatment of eye-related conditions, as the language on line 9 and 10 is very specific where it says "ocular disease or conditions, ocular adnexal disease or conditions, or emergency anaphylaxis." She added that [this language] makes it clear that optometrist are not interested in prescribing a broad spectrums of pharmaceuticals like PAs or nurse practitioners. The only interest in prescribing is for the treatment of conditions and diseases for which optometrists are trained and practicing.

DR. LENTFER explained that it is difficult physically, as well as financially for patients to be sent from an optometrist's

office to another practitioner's office to receive treatment that the optometrist has prescribed. In some instances this requires the patient to travel some distance, she said. Dr. Lentfer told the members of an individual who needed an oral prescription for a drug that would relieve a condition she had diagnosed, but could not find a practitioner to prescribe the medication. In this case the medication is most effective when administered within the first 48 hours.

Number 1719

DR. LENTFER told the members that after the then Governor Knowles vetoed the legislation that passed the Alaska House of Representatives and the Alaska State Senate, the Alaska Board of Examiners in Optometry went to the State Medical Board and did everything Governor Knowles requested. She stated that there was no cohesiveness. The "so-called turf war" is not a good reason to make a judgment on this bill. The only reason to support this bill is to provide better health care for Alaskans.

Number 1680

CHAIR WILSON explained that she worked in the clinic Tok where she worked with a PA or a nurse practitioner who were under the umbrella of a [physician]. She asked if optometrist would want work under [the umbrella] of a physician in the prescribing of drugs.

DR. LENTFER responded that optometrists have already completed a four-year doctorate degree program. She said the same comparison could be made in asking a dentist to work under a medical doctor.

CHAIR WILSON clarified that she is not talking about dentists; she is talking about PAs and advanced nurse practitioners.

DR. LENTFER responded that going under an umbrella of another physician does not make sense. Whose umbrella would optometrists be under? She said that optometrists are established entities with a regulating board that has an excellent history. If the committee had doubts about optometrists' education, training, and ability to prescribe [oral] medications, she urged them to research the educational background. Optometrists are not [in the same educational category] as PAs or nurse practitioners. The educational background is the same as for dentists and medical doctors in