Opinion of the ROD Case No. Page 1		
OPINION OF TRUSTEES		
	In Re	
Complainant: Respondent: ROD Case No	Employee Employer 131, September 29, 1980	
Board of Trustees: Trustee.	Harrison Combs, Chairman; John J. O'Connell, Trustee Paul R. Dean,	
under the authority Trustees have revi	e IX of the United Mine Workers of America 1950 Benefit Plan and Trust, and of an exemption granted by the United States Department of Labor, the ewed the facts and circumstances of this dispute concerning the provision of an Employee's dependent daughter and hereby render their opinion on the	
	Background Facts	
Employee's depending glasses with tinted insurance company and denied the remallowed an additional denied the remallowed an additional denied the remallowed an additional denied the remaindent denied	active mine worker eligible for health benefits under the Employer's Plan. The dent daughter was examined by an ophthalmologist and received a new pair of oversized single lenses. The total charge for these services was \$123.50. The y paid \$34.00 according to the benefit schedule for frames and examinations naining \$89.50 as non-covered services. Subsequently, the insurance company nal \$20,00 coverage for the single lenses when new evidence was submitted hus leaving \$69.50 as a non-covered expense.	
	<u>Dispute</u>	

Position of Parties

<u>Employee</u>: The Employer should pay for the charges related to the lenses, frames and examination for the Employee's daughter. The physician has stated that she had outgrown her glasses and required new ones.

Is the Employer responsible for payment of charges related to vision care for the Employee's

daughter to the extent those charges exceed the amount allowable under the Plan?

<u>Employer</u>: Payment has been made according to the limits established in The Benefit Plan. The schedule of charges allows \$20.00 for an examination, \$14.00 for frames and \$20.00 for single lenses (maximum two) if the beneficiary meets the prescription limitation. These charges were paid to the maximum limit under the Vision Care Program of the Employer's Plan.

Opinion of the Trustees ROD Case No. $\underline{131}$ Page 2

Applicable Regulations

Article III, Section C of The Employer's Plan provides as follows:

(1)

	Actual Charge up to	
Benefits	Maximum Amount	<u>Frequency</u>
Vision Examination	\$ 20.00	Once every 24 months
Per Lens (maximum = 2)		Once every 24 months
o single vision	10.00	
o bifocal	30.00	
o trifocal	20.00	
o lenticular	25.00	
o contact	15.00	
Frames	14.00	Once every 24 months

(2) Lenses will not be covered unless the new prescription differs from the most recent one by an axis change of 20 degrees or .50 diopter sphere or cylinder change and the lenses must improve visual acuity by at least one line on the standard chart.

- (3) Exclusions include:
 - (a) Sunglasses (other than Tints No. 1 and No. 2);
 - (b) Extra charges for photosensitive or anti-reflective frames.

Discussion

The Plan allows coverage for vision care services on a limited basis. The schedule of charges (Article III, C (1)) defines the maximum amount provided and the Employer has made payment accordingly.

Opinion

The Trustees are of the opinion that the Employer is not responsible for the payment of charges related to vision care for the Employee's daughter to the extent those charges exceed the maximum amount allowable under the Plan.