

The survey results suggest that most consumers obtain a copy of their contact lens prescription. Approximately 60% (147/250) of those interviewees did receive a copy of their contact lens prescription either immediately after their last exam or subsequently thereafter. Moreover, the survey results indicate that nearly all practitioners who are requested to release the contact lens prescription to the consumer, do so. Approximately 92% (66/72) of those consumers who requested a copy of their contact lens prescription received the prescription either immediately after the eye examination or subsequently thereafter.⁹

Based on the results of the survey as well as the existence of industry literature continuing to raise quality of care issues relating to unsupervised use of contact lenses, the Commission denied the petition.¹⁰

Part B—Issues for Comments

The Commission solicits written public comments on the following questions:

1. Is there a continuing need for the rule?
 - a. What benefits has the rule provided to purchasers of eye exams and eyeglasses, to opticians or to others affected by the rule?
 - b. Has the rule imposed costs on purchasers?
2. What changes, if any, should be made to the rule to increase the benefits of the rule to purchasers, opticians or to others?
 - a. How would these changes affect the costs the rule imposes on eye care practitioners (optometrists and ophthalmologists) subject to its requirements?
3. What significant burdens or costs, including costs of compliance, has the rule imposed on eye care practitioners?
 - a. Has the rule provided benefits to such practitioners?
4. What changes, if any, should be made to the rule to reduce the burdens or costs imposed on eye care practitioners?
 - a. How would these changes affect the benefits provided by the rule?
5. Does the rule overlap or conflict with other federal, state, or local laws or regulations?

⁹ This survey has been placed on the public record, and is available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, Room 130, Washington, DC 20580; 202-326-2222; TTY for the hearing impaired 202-326-2502.

¹⁰ The petition and the Commission's response have been placed on the public record, and are available from the Commission's Public Reference Branch, Room 130, Washington, DC 20580; 202-326-2222; TTY for the hearing impaired 202-326-2502.

6. Since the rule was issued, what effects, if any, have changes in relevant technology or economic conditions had on the rule?

Section 456.2(a)—Prescription Release Requirement

7. If the rule is retained, should the Commission modify the prescription release requirement of § 456.2(a) to require that an eyeglass prescription be given to a patient only if the patient requests it, rather than in every instance, or should this provision be modified in some other way?

- a. Are consumers generally aware of their ability to seek and obtain their eyeglass prescriptions?
- b. To what extent are consumers able to obtain a copy of their eyeglass prescription if they request one?
- c. To what extent would practitioners release eyeglass prescriptions in the absence of any federal requirement to do so?

Section 456.2(d)—Waivers and Disclaimers

8. Should any changes be made to § 456.2(d)'s prohibition on the use of certain waivers or disclaimers of liability, and/or the Commission interpretation thereof?

- a. What problems, if any, has the current requirement, and/or its interpretation, caused?
- b. How could any such problems be remedied?

Contact Lens Prescriptions

9. Should the rule be extended to require the release of contact lens prescriptions?

- a. Are consumers able to get their contact lens prescriptions upon request?
- b. What evidence is there to show that refusal to release contact lens prescriptions does or does not have benefits justifying the refusal? Specifically, are there any significant administrative costs incurred when releasing contact lens prescriptions? What evidence is there to show that there is or is not a danger that the lenses may not conform to the eye as expected, thus justifying a refusal to release contact lens prescriptions to permit the fitter to verify the fit of the lens?

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 456

Advertising; Medical devices; Ophthalmic goods and services; Trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 41-58.

By direction of the Commission.

Benjamin I. Berman,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-8494 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

36 CFR Part 1258

RIN 3095-AA71

NARA Reproduction Fee Schedule; Correction

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking; correction.

SUMMARY: NARA is correcting a typographical error in the notice of proposed rulemaking published on March 31, 1997, setting out the proposed revised NARA reproduction fee schedule. In that document, the proposed fee for orders of additional paper-to-paper copies placed at a Washington, DC, facility was correctly stated as \$5 for each additional block of 20 copies in the preamble, but was stated as \$5 for each additional block of up to 10 copies in the proposed § 1258.12(b)(2)(ii).

Correction

In the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** on March 31, 1997 (61 FR 15137), on page 15138, in the second column, proposed paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of § 1258.12 is corrected to read as follows:

§ 1258.12 [Corrected]

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) All other orders placed at a Washington, DC, area facility: \$10 for the first 1-20 copies; \$5 for each additional block of up to 20 copies.

* * * * *

Dated: April 1, 1997.

Nancy Y. Allard,

Alternate Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 97-8636 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[IN53-1b; FRL-5710-2]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Indiana

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: In this action, EPA is proposing to approve the following as revisions to the Indiana ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP): A rate-of-

progress (ROP) plan to reduce volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions in Lake and Porter Counties by 15 percent (%) by November 15, 1996; a contingency plan to reduce VOC emissions by an additional 3% beyond the ROP plan, and an Indiana agreed order requiring VOC emission controls on Keil Chemical Division, Ferro Corporation, located in Lake County (Keil Chemical). The 15% ROP plan, 3% contingency plan, and the agreed order were submitted together on June 26, 1995. The plans will help to protect the public's health and welfare by reducing the emissions of VOC that contribute to the formation of ground-level ozone, commonly known as urban smog. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving this action as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received on or before May 5, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed to: J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR18-J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Copies of the State submittal are available for inspection at: Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR18-J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark J. Palermo, Environmental Protection Specialist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR18-J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6082.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: February 19, 1997.

Michelle D. Jordan,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-8384 Filed 4-2-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 63

[IB Docket No. 96-261, DA 97-440]

International Settlement Rates

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On December 19, 1996 the Federal Communications Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the matter of *International Settlement Rates*, FCC No. 96-484 (61 FR 68702, December 30, 1996). In response to a request for an extension of time, on February 27, 1997, the Commission released an order granting an extension of time for filing reply comments in this proceeding.

DATES: Reply comments must be submitted on or before March 31, 1997.

ADDRESSES: All supplemental comments and supplemental reply comments should be addressed to: Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington DC 20554. All supplemental comments and supplemental reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239) of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M St., NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Giusti, Attorney-Advisor, Policy and Facilities Branch, Telecommunications Division, International Bureau, (202) 418-1407.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. On February 21, 1997, the Republic of Panama filed a motion to extend the reply comment date in the captioned proceeding from March 10, 1997 to April 14, 1997. The Republic of Panama contends that the current schedule provides it insufficient time to prepare informed reply comments for two reasons. First, the Republic of Panama asserts that the failure of the

Commission's Record Imaging Processing System ("RIPS") has made it difficult for it and other interested parties to obtain a complete set of the comments filed in this proceeding. Second, the Republic of Panama states that it needs more time to review the recent agreement of the World Trade Organization's Group on Basic Telecommunications and assess the agreement's impact on the proposals made in this proceeding.

2. Although we do not routinely grant extensions of time, See 47 CFR § 1.46(a), we believe that extending the reply comment date in this case will serve the public interest by allowing the Republic of Panama and other interested parties adequate time to review and reply to any comments that they had difficulty in obtaining because of the failure of RIPS. We believe that an extension to March 31, 1997 will provide sufficient time for interested parties to complete their reply comments. Interested parties may obtain copies of the comments filed in this proceeding from the Commission's Reference Center, 1919 M Street NW., Room 239, Washington, DC 20554. Copies of the comments filed in this proceeding are also available for purchase from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Services, Inc. ("ITS"), 2100 M Street NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037. In order to compensate further for the RIPS outage, we will place copies of the comments filed in this proceeding in the International Bureau Reference Center, Room 102, 2000 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20554.

3. Accordingly, *it is ordered*, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j) and 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 154(j), and 155(c), and sections 0.51, 0.261, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 0.51, 0.261, and 1.46, that the reply comment date in the captioned proceeding *is extended* from March 10, 1997 to March 31, 1997.

4. *It is further ordered*, pursuant to sections 4(i), 4(j) and 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 154(j), and 155(c), and sections 0.51, 0.261, and 1.46 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 0.51, 0.261, and 1.46, that the Republic of Panama's motion to extend the reply comment date *is granted* to the extent it requests additional time up to March 31, 1997, but *is denied* to the extent it requests additional time beyond that date.