Minutes of Meeting - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE - 56th ASSEMBLY SESSION - March 10, 1971

- Present: Smalley, Valentine, Wilson, Poggione, Prince, White Glaser, and Homer
- Absent: Swallow

Nelson B. Neff, Nevada Medical Association; Peggy Guests: Martin; William Summers; Carl Kelly, Optical Lab of Reno; Victor Isaacson, National Society for Prevention of Blindness; Walter Immers, Reno Optician; Roy Lear, Reno Optician; Daniel English, University of Nevada; Tom Gonyer, University of Nevada; Helen Callahan, Student; Marthlena Callahan, Housewife; William Van Patten, Optician; William Kanelles, Optician; Bill Shiffman, Vegas Village Pharmacy; George T. Bennett, Inspector, State Board of Pharmacy; Jim Johnson; Margaret Allen, W.C.W.R.O.; William Lacke, Nevada State Board of Pharmacy; Robert Graves, Deputy Attorney General; Shirley Richards, Washoe County Welfare Department; and Merv Flanders, Services for the Blind.

Meeting was convened by Chairman Wilson.

A.B. 408: Requires use of safety lenses in eyeglasses.

Victor Isaacson, National Society for Prevention of Blindness, felt this bill is entirely inadequate. He felt <u>A.B. 417</u> would cover what this bill lacks.

Mr. Valentine made a motion to Indefinitely Postpone <u>A.B. 408;</u> Homer seconded; motion carried unanimously.

<u>A.B. 417</u>: Prohibits dispensing or selling eyeglasses not meeting specifications.

Nelson Neff, Nevada Medical Association, felt safety lenses should be required for the prevention of blindness. He presented the Committee with a Resolution approved by the NSMA House of Delegates. (Attachment_1)

Merv Flanders, Supervisor of the Services for the Blind, felt <u>A.B. 417</u> provides a definite need for prevention of blindness. This bill provides certain standards requiring heat tempered glass. It also prevents the use of flammable materials in the frames.

Mr. Valentine read the bill and wondered why they have such a steep fine for violating this bill.

120

PAGE 2 Minutes of Meeting - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE - 56th ASSEMBLY SESSION - March 10, 1971

125

Roy Lear, Reno Optician, stated that if the penalty is large enough then they won't try to get around it. They will be more careful and see that the eyeglasses meet specifications.

Mr. Poggione wanted to know what this would do to the cost of glasses.

Mr. Lear stated the cost would only be from 50c to 3.00 more. He felt this is a very small price to pay for the safety of a person's eyesight. 80% of the people are already using them.

Dr. Van Patten, Optician, stated he strongly support the intent of this bill but felt this bill was not the answer. He suggested a moratorium on this bill for the time being. After doing some tests, he found that in some instances, regular glass held up better than heat treated lenses. Once the heat treated lenses were broke, they tended to shatter more readily than regular lenses. He felt that in some cases, it is more feasible to prescribe regular lenses without them being heat tempered because this causes added thickness to the lense. With some of these elderly people, the lense is very thick already. He felt it should be the discretion of the doctor as to whether or not they should be heat tempered.

Dr. Ralph Stephens, Eye Physician and Surgeon, read a fact sheet on protective lenses for the general public. (<u>Attachment 2</u>) He felt it should be the discretion of the doctor and patient as to whether they should have safety lenses or not.

Mr. Poggione suggested getting a bill requiring that sunglasses must have a label telling whether they are heat tempered or not.

Mr. Glaser made a motion to Indefinitely Postpone <u>A.B. 417;</u> Homer seconded; motion carried unanimously.

<u>A.B. 346</u>: Requires physical examination of child before placement in foster home.

Mr. Valentine made a motion to Indefinitely Postpone A.B. 346 because this is covered in the Welfare Board. He gave a copy of a memo sent to this affect. (Attachment 3); Prince seconded; motion carried unanimously. PAGE 3 Minutes of Meeting - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE - 56th ASSEMBLY SESSION - March 10, 1971

<u>A.B. 174</u>: Prohibits counting of pills in filling prescription and taking prescription over telephone by person other than pharmacist.

William Lacke, Nevada State Board of Pharmacy, stated <u>A.B. 492</u> changes the wording of this bill.

Robert Graves, Deputy Attorney General representing the State Board of Pharmacy, stated this bill would prevent pharmacists from obtaining licenses in other states so he suggested taking pharmaceutical clerk out of the bill and putting pharmaceutical intern it. Then we wouldn't be jeopardizing reciprocity in other states.

Bill Shiffman, Vegas Village Pharmacy owner, stated that he gets calls from the Doctors nurse - not the doctor - so why shouldn't a pharmacist be able to have a pharmaceutical clerk. When the parmacist signs the prescription, he is automatically responsible so why not let a clerk help him. This way, the pharmacist can be doing more important things.

Mr. Valentine made a motion to Indefinitely Postpone <u>A.B. 671;</u> Prince seconded; motion carried unanimously.

A.B. 644: Requires information on label of prescriptions.

Robert Graves stated that lines 2-6 of this bill are already required and the rest of the bill is just repetitous of A.B. 671.

Mr. Prince made a motion to Indefinitely Postpone A.B. 644; Valentine seconded; motion carried unanimously.

<u>A.B. 159</u>: Permits treatment of minors for drug abuse without parents consent.

Amendments were read to this bill by Zel Lowman and Law Enforcers.

Mr. Glaser suggested getting a subcommittee together to work over these amendments. It was decided Mr. Glaser (Chairman) Smalley, and Prince would be on this subcommittee.

Mr. Wilson stated he had had may requests to revive <u>A.B. 227</u> which: Exempts services involving human blood from strict liability. Mr. Glaser made a motion to revive <u>A.B. 227</u>; Valentine seconded; motion carried with a vote of 6-2 with Mr. Poggione and Prince voting against.

Meeting adjourned.

12c

ASSEMBLY

		ASSEMDLI	· ~ +
	AGENDA FO	R COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND WELFARE	1;
J	Date <u>Mar</u>	ch 10 Time P.N. RecessRoom 328	
Bills or Reso to be consi		Subject	Counsel requested
A.B. 346		Requires physical examination of	
		child before placement in foster	
		home.	
A.B. 408		Requires use of safety lenses in	
		eyeglasses.	
A.B. 417		Prohibits dispensing or selling	میں بر میں رو <mark>ر بور بور میں مناب اولکا</mark> نے
<u></u>		eyeglasses not meeting certain	
		specifications.	
159			
		·	
<u></u>			
Please do not	ask for	counsel unless necessary.	
		HEARINGS PENDING	
ate Subject	Time	Room	
ate	Time	Room	

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Accidental injury and subsequent blindness is frequently preventable; and

WHEREAS, Since the institution of the protection code of the National Bureau of Standards in 1921 has resulted in eye injury rates in industry far below those in the general public; and

WHEREAS, The greatest danger appears to be in home and recreation accidents and in automobile crashes; and

WHEREAS, An economic means of prevention is available and has been demonstrated in the industrial area; and

WHEREAS, Legislation as a precedent has been passed in the State of Alaska; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Nevada State Medical Association importune the Legislature to require that safety lenses be required for all spectacles produced or sold in the State of Nevada.

Approved by NSMA House of Delegates in Annual Meeting, October 24, 1970. 1 14

Facts Sheet - Protective Lenses For the General Fublic

Authorities:

- (1) National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, Inc.
 (2) National Institute of Neurologic Disease
 - (2) National Institute of Neurologic Disease and Blindness Monograph No. 4 Vision and Its Disorders
 (3) F D A
- Over 120,000 persons are injured each year in the United States in accidents involving broken eyeglass lenses. (1)
- 2. Approximately 3,400 persons in the United States involved in accidents each year avoided serious eye injury by wearing safety glasses. (1)
- 3. Over one half of the United States population wear eyeglasses. (2)
- 4. Only 25% of those who wear eyeglasses wear shatter resistant lenses. (3)
- 5. In 1967 the estimated Unisted States annual cost of blindness and visual impairment was 2.4 billion dollars. (2)
- 6. The percentage of legally blind persons caused by injury approximate 3%. (2)
- 7. Approximately 1/5 or 20% of blindness due to injury results from sharp and pointed objects or foreign bodies in the eye. (2)
- 8. The State of Nevada has approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ million population or approximately 0.25% of the population of the United States.

Implication

From the above data it can be calculated that:

- Approximately 72 million dollars per year is expended annually for blindness and visual impairment due to eye injuries in the United States or approximately \$160,000.00 per year for the State of Nevada on a proportionate population basis.
- 2. Since only 1/5 of blindness due to injuries results from pointed objects or foreign bodies in the eye, \$36,000.00 per year annual expenditure for blindness and visual impairment due to eye injuries might be expected in Nevada from injuries resulting from broken eyeglasses in the general population.

128

NEW

- 3. Approximately 8.5 persons per year in Nevada avoid serious injury by wearing safety glasses.
- 4. Approximately 300 persons in Nevada are injured each year in accidents involving broken eyeglass lenses.
- 5. Since over 250,000 persons in Nevada wear eyeglasses, the overall risk or chance each year that someone wearing glasses in Nevada will be injured in an accident involving proken eyeglass lenses is approximately 1 in 800.

6. The risk of serious eye injury is even less. If the 8.5 persons per year in Nevada who are saved from serious eye injury by wearing safety glasses come from the 25% population of eyeglass wearers who wear protective lenses; then 25.5 persons per year in Nevada would be expected to incur serious eye injury who come from the 75% of eyeglass wearers who do not wear protective lenses.

The overall risk or chance that a person wearing nonprotective eyeglass lenses in Nevada will be involved in an accident which breaks his eyeglass lenses and results in serious eye injury is 1 in 7,400.

7. The increased cost of protective lenses is \$1-\$4 per pair. Assuming one new pair of glasses per eyeglass wearer per year the cost of protective lenses to the population of Nevada from forced legislation would be t to 1 million dollars per year.

Comments

I respectfully submit that in my opinion protective lenses are an asset to the public and are prescribed by me on a routine pasis.

However, in view of the minimal risk, legislation to insure dispensing of protective lenses when prescribed or requested and labeling of lenses as protective or non-protective according to prescribed standard seems more appropriate than forcing on Nevadan's a \pm to 1 million dollar bill to offset \$36,000.00.

Ralph W. Stephens, M. D. Eye Physician and Surgeon

(rah Mistephen 2)

DISTRICT OFFICE INSTRUCTION

1971 - DOI No. 15 9 March 1971

TO: All Staff

FROM: G. Handley, Chief, Family and Children's Services

SUBJECT: MEDICAL CARE FOR FOSTER CHILDREN

This is to remind you that the following policy relating to medical care for children in the care and custody of the Welfare Division for foster home or adoptive placement continues in effect:

Each child will have an initial physical examination prior to placement in foster care. When it is not possible to have the examination completed prior to placement because of an emergency situation, the examination must be completed within 48 hours of placement, exclusive of weekends and holidays. A child being transferred from one foster home to another must have an examination prior to replacement, unless an examination was completed within the preceding three months.

Each child must have an annual physical examination.

For newborn infants for whom the Division has care and custody and in communities in which specialized medical services are available, a physical examination by a pediatrician will be completed, preferably within 24 hours after birth but prior to the infant's release from the hospital.

It is the responsibility of each district office to see that the above policy is followed in each applicable case situation.

GH/ms

14.4W