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?

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

[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.

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-