

**From:** Anne Donahue  
**Sent:** Friday, March 30, 2018 7:38 AM  
**To:** Loring Starr  
**Subject:** Fw: David Weissgold, MD comments on S.253 - Bill related to Interstate Medical Licensure Compact Testimony on S 253 for committee.  
Anne

---

**From:** David Weissgold <[dweissgold@retinacentervermont.com](mailto:dweissgold@retinacentervermont.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 29, 2018 9:25 PM  
**To:** Anne Donahue  
**Cc:** David Weissgold  
**Subject:** David Weissgold, MD comments on S.253 - Bill related to Interstate Medical Licensure Compact

**Subject: David Weissgold, MD comments on S.253 - Bill related to Interstate Medical Licensure Compact**

Representative Anne Donahue  
Vice Chair, House Committee on Health Care

Dear Representative Donahue,

I am writing in objection to S.253, a Bill promoting Vermont's entry into the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact. I learned earlier today that your Committee is presently debating this. Please share my comments with your colleagues.

I am an ophthalmologist in private practice in South Burlington. I was employed at Fletcher Allen Health Care between 1997 & 2004. In 2005, I founded Retina Center of Vermont, where I have been practicing since. I will spend the remainder of my career there. As I am 53 years old, I pray that that will be a long time. I am extremely fortunate to have work that I love and to have the great privilege of helping Vermonters who are facing very challenging and frightening vitreoretinal diseases that threaten their vision.

I do not believe Vermont should participate in the multi-state Compact. I don't believe such efforts at improved access are inherently 'bad'. Indeed, I believe there to be great opportunity in the possibility of 'breaking down barriers' that exist between patients and physicians whose care they desire, regardless of who lives where, etc. However, the proposed Compact gets it wrong in many ways. A handful of examples:

1) Cost. This proposal increases costs to physicians. Those would, ultimately, be passed on to patients. Not good.

2) Speed/efficiency. I'm not entirely sure what's 'driving' Vermont to consider the Compact. In reading the original language in S.253 I was left with the sense that its proponents may believe that Vermonters are in need of improved access to physicians, and that some of that need might be met through the use of so-called Telemedicine, practiced by physicians residing out of state. There is a good

deal of discussion of the expediency the Compact would bring to the credentialing of physicians applying for permission to provide care to Vermonters. I don't believe it. Simply put, I do not believe the Compact will make certification/licensure appreciably faster. And, if such speed is truly needed, Vermont should be both demanding that of its own licensure Board and providing that body with the resources it needs to muster greater speed.

3) Due process. This is an extremely troubling aspect of the Compact and S.253. I'm no attorney, but this entire proposal looks to me like a gigantic affront to the due process rights of physicians accused of wrongdoing. The opportunity for a physician accused in one state to lose any/all privileges of practice in any/all Compact states looks terrifyingly large. Of course, nobody wants 'bad apple' physicians, nor should they. But accusations do not always reflect truth, and the Compact treats the matter in a dangerous 'fast & loose' fashion. (Has the Legislature asked the Attorney General for an opinion as to whether the State's participation in the Compact would be legal with respect to physicians' rights of due process?)

Thanks to you and your colleagues for your attention to this and for your consideration of my perspective.

Sincerely,

David J Weissgold, MD  
Retina Center of Vermont  
99 Swift St, suite 200  
South Burlington, VT 05403  
P: 802-864-3937  
F: 802-864-3936  
[dweissgold@retinacentervermont.com](mailto:dweissgold@retinacentervermont.com)