$$\text{Rate} = \frac{(\text{Number of Injuries from question \#3}) \times 200{,}000\,*}{\text{Hours Worked}\,**}$$

** Includes hours worked by all full time, part time, or temporary workers covered by your bloodborne pathogens exposure control plan.

OSHA seeks information and comment on needlestick and other percutaneous injury rates and/or patterns associated with particular employee groups, work locations, procedures, or devices.

5. What methods and criteria are used in your workplace to evaluate the effectiveness of existing exposure controls? If a system is used in your workplace for periodic review of the feasibility of instituting more effective engineering controls, please describe the system including the type of information obtained, how this information is applied, and how the appropriate individuals in your workplace become aware of the availability of new controls.

6. Has any type of integrated percutaneous injury prevention program, as discussed above, been established in your workplace to reduce the incidence of needlesticks and other percutaneous injuries? If yes, OSHA solicits information and comment on the structure and content of this program (e.g., safer work practices, safer medical devices, training), the results achieved, and any specific problems and/or successes that have been encountered in the implementation and operation of the program.

7. To what extent have devices designed to reduce the incidence of needlesticks and other percutaneous injuries been adopted in your workplace? Please provide any workplace- or industry-specific data you have available indicating the degree to which devices incorporating safety features have replaced standard devices, with specific information on the types (e.g., needleless IV connector, blunt suture needle) and brand or description of devices used; where such devices are used (i.e., specific locations, procedures, or employee groups); and any historical data indicating the rate at which your workplace has implemented safer medical devices over the years.

8. On what basis are decisions made in your workplace concerning selection of safer medical devices? OSHA solicits information and comment on design and/or performance criteria being used to select safer medical devices and the basis for using the particular criteria; if and how percutaneous injury data are used in making selection decisions; if and how the opinions of the primary users of needles and other sharps are considered in selection decisions; how costs are considered in the selection process; and any other factors that influence selection decisions.

9. Have new safer medical devices been readily accepted and correctly used when provided? OSHA seeks information and comment on factors influencing successful implementation of safer medical devices in the workplace.

10. What provisions are made to ensure adequate training and education in the use of safer medical devices and/or safer work practices in your workplace? OSHA solicits information and comment on the effectiveness of training and education in reducing needlesticks and other percutaneous injuries, both relative to and in conjunction with the implementation of safer medical devices and/or safer work practices. Specific information is desired regarding program elements, successful and/or unsuccessful measures undertaken, and the method(s) by which results were measured.

11. How effective are safer medical devices and/or safer work practices in reducing percutaneous injury rates? OSHA seeks information and comment on the efficacy of safer medical devices and/or safer work practices in reducing injuries from needles and other sharps, including any data available that will aid in quantifying these results in total and/or for specific employee groups, work locations, procedures, devices or work practices; and the method(s) by which these data were obtained. OSHA is particularly interested in data regarding the percutaneous injury rates prior to implementing the device(s) and/or work practice(s), steps used in selecting and implementing the device(s) and/or work practice(s) in the work setting, and the percutaneous injury rates after implementation.

12. Has use of safer medical devices and/or safer work practices in any way affected the delivery of patient care? If yes, please describe the effects and any data quantifying these effects.

13. Based on observations in your workplace and your knowledge from other sources, please describe any obstacles that may be encountered relative to the selection, purchase, and effective implementation of currently available and new safer medical devices in the workplace, along with any specific information and comment you can provide detailing successful and/or unsuccessful methods of overcoming these obstacles.

14. OSHA solicits information on the costs associated with the implementation of safer medical devices and any savings resulting from their use. Please provide specific information on the methods used to calculate these costs and savings.

15. Please describe any problems associated with sharps disposal containers in your workplace, as well as successful and/or unsuccessful measures that have been undertaken to correct these problems.

16. Based on experience in your workplace and your knowledge from other sources, what are the most effective means of preventing needlesticks and other percutaneous injuries? Please explain the basis for your opinion on this matter and provide any supporting evidence.

Authority and Signature

This document was prepared under the direction of Charles N. Jeffress, Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210. It is issued pursuant to section 6(b) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1593: 29 U.S.C. 655).

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd day of September 1998.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 98–24124 Filed 9–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

August 31, 1998.

''FEDERAL REGISTER'' CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Vol. 63, No. 164, at 45,267, August 25, 1998.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE: This meeting will commence immediately following the conclusion of the meeting starting at 10:00 a.m., Friday, August 28, 1998, to consider Secretary of Labor v. White Oak Mining & Constr. Co., Docket No. WEST 96–338.

PLACE: Room 6005, 6th Floor, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

STATUS: Open.

CHANGES IN THE MEETING: The status of the Commission meeting to consider and act upon the following item was changed from open to closed:

1. Secretary of Labor v. Lone Mountain Processing, Inc., Docket No. KENT 98–254–D. (Issues include whether the Mine Act's temporary reinstatement remedy applies to an applicant for employment.)

Because agency business so required, it was determined by a majority vote of the Commission on August 28, 1998, to change the status of this meeting from open to closed [Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(10)]. Chairman Jordan and Commissioners Marks and Beatty voted to change the meeting status to closed and Commissioners Riley and Verheggen voted to keep the meeting status open. No earlier announcement of the change was possible.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jean Ellen, (202) 653–5629/(202) 708–9300 for TDD Relay/1–800–877–8339 for toll free.

Jean H. Ellen,

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 98–24194 Filed 9–3–98; 4:42 pm]

BILLING CODE 6735–01–M

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

Sunshine Act Meeting

TYPE: Quarterly Meeting and Public Hearing.

AGENCY: National Council on Disability.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of the forthcoming quarterly meeting and public hearing of the National Council on Disability. Notice of this meeting is required under Section 552b(2)(1) of the Government in the Sunshine Act (P.L. 94–409).

QUARTERLY MEETING DATES: November 18–19, 1998, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., November 20, 1998, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

PUBLIC HEARING: November 20, 1998, 3:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Albany Marriott Hotel, 189 Wolf Road, Albany, New York; 518–458–8444.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Mark S. Quigley, Public Affairs Specialist, National Council on Disability, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1050, Washington, D.C. 20004–1107; 202–272–2004 (Voice), 202–272–2074 (TTY), 202–272–2022 (Fax).

Agency Mission

The National Council on Disability is an independent federal agency composed of 15 members appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the U.S. Senate. Its overall purpose is to promote policies, programs, practices, and procedures that guarantee equal opportunity for all people with disabilities, regardless of the nature of severity of the disability; and to empower people with disabilities to achieve economic self-sufficiency, independent living, and inclusion and integration into all aspects of society.

Accommodations

Those needing interpreters or other accommodations should notify the National Council on Disability prior to this meeting.

Environmental Illness

People with environmental illness must reduce their exposure to volatile chemical substances in order to attend this meeting. In order to reduce such exposure, we ask that you not wear perfumes or scents at the meeting. We also ask that you smoke only in designated areas and the privacy of your room. Smoking is prohibited in the meeting room and surrounding area.

Open Meeting

This quarterly meeting and public hearing of the National Council on Disability will be open to the public.

Agenda

The proposed agenda includes:

Reports from the Chairperson and the Executive Director

Committee Meetings and Committee Reports

Executive Session

Unfinished Business

New Business

Announcements

Adjournment

Public Hearing on Federal Policy Issues Affecting People with Psychiatric Disabilities

Records will be kept of all National Council on Disabilities proceedings and will be available after the meeting for public inspection at the National Council on Disability.

Signed in Washington, DC, on September 3, 1998.

Ethel D. Briggs,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 98–24251 Filed 9–4–98; 11:06 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–MA–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–302]

In the Matter of Florida Power Corporation, et al.; Crystal River, Unit 3; Revocation of Exemption

I

The Florida Power Corporation, et. al. (FPC or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR–72, which authorizes operation of Crystal River Unit 3. The license provides that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of a pressurized-water reactor at the licensee's site located in Citrus County, Florida.

II

With respect to certain generic issues for facilities operating prior to January 1, 1979, except to the extent set forth in 10 CFR 50.48(b), 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, sets forth fire protection features required to satisfy general design Criterion 3 of the Commission's regulations. Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III. O, ''Oil collection system for reactor coolant pump,'' the reactor coolant pump (RCP) shall be equipped with an oil collection system which ''* * * shall be capable of collecting lube oil from all potential pressurized and unpressurized leakage sites in the RCP lube oil system.''

When replacing the RCP motors with new motors and re-designed RCP lube oil system, physical interference and other design difficulties prevented four specific sites in the RCP motor lube oil system from accommodating an oil collection system for collecting potential oil leakage. By letter dated June 7, 1993, as supplemented March 28, 1994, the licensee submitted an exemption request to exclude these four specific sites from leakage protection. On October 7, 1994, as appended on September 17, 1996, the NRC granted the requested exemption because it was determined that a collection system at the four specific sites was not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the regulation.

By letter dated November 13, 1997, the licensee informed the NRC that modifications had been made to the RCP Oil Collection System such that collection coverage for these four potential leakage sites was assured, and that the Crystal River Unit 3 RCP Oil Collection System now conforms to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III. O. In the FPC