

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 26, 2005 LB 114

required by subsection (3)--and if you recall, that's the internal and external eye health exam, and they're testing for amblyphobia (phonetic) or amblyopia and strambiosis (phonetic) or whatever those words are...easy for you to say, Senator Aguilar--of this section, free of charge for any child whose parent or guardian requests such an evaluation if the parent or guardian asserts that the family's income is equal to or less than 150 percent of the Office of Management and Budget income poverty guidelines. So basically, what they would have to do is, however they appeared at an optometrist, a physician, a physician's assistants, an advanced practice registered nurse, however they appeared in front of one of those, whether they were referred from a doctor who recognized there was a vision problem during the course of the physical exam, or if they were made aware of the requirement that there be a vision test prior...in the six months prior to them appearing or presenting themselves at the school door, if they told that provider that they were poor, the provider would have to provide that service for them free of charge. Now I'll tell you what the poverty...150 percent of poverty is the following amounts. A family of two, that would be \$1,605 a month. That's gross. If it was a family of three, if they...it's \$2,012 per month; for a family of four, \$2,420 per month. So if a family made less than that, then they simply indicated to the provider they made less than that; that they couldn't afford the exam. The provider would have to provide that exam to them free of charge. And that, again, is my attempt at a compromise to allow these people, who can't otherwise afford it, to get this eye exam and go about their business. And this is, I believe, something we did similar to...this amendment is something similar to what we did in the meningitis bill. We did come up with a way that poor people could get this inoculation free of charge, and I can't remember in that case if it was the pharmaceutical company that provided the inoculation or agreed to set money aside, but we came to an agreement. There was a fund, I believe, that the pharmaceutical company established, and they also gave literature to the colleges saying that this fund was available. So that's my attempt. I'd appreciate any input on it. No pride of authorship, of course; if there's any changes, suggestions, comments, I'd be happy to look at those. And I look forward to Senator Byars' input as well. Thank you.