Volume Curve Normal Standards, Variability, and Effects of Age. 113 Am. Rev. of Respir. Disease 587 (1976)

9. Is either (or both) of these sets of reference values superior to the Knudson 1976 values? Why?
10. Which of these two sets of reference values is better suited to evaluating respiratory disability in coal miners? Why?
11. Are there other sets of reference values OWCP should consider?

C. Arterial Blood Gas Studies—Test Administration
12. Should OWCP require facilities administering ABG studies and analyzing samples to either have a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA) certificate or be CLIA-exempt? See 42 CFR 493.2.
14. Should OWCP require that a blood sample be analyzed within a certain time period of the sample being drawn for the result to be considered valid, and if so, what should that time period be? See id.

15. Currently, § 718.105(b) provides that if an exercise ABG study is conducted, “blood shall be drawn during exercise.” Should OWCP allow pulse oximetry measurements (S\textsubscript{p}O\textsubscript{2}) to be used in lieu of a blood draw during exercise? See, e.g., 20 CFR part 404, subpart P, appendix 1, part A, Listing 3.02C (allowing chronic impairment of gas exchange to be demonstrated through ABG test or pulse oximetry result).

16. Currently, appendix C to part 718 provides that ABG tests “must not be performed during or soon after an acute respiratory or cardiac illness.” Should OWCP further define this requirement? If so, how should it be defined?
17. What are the costs, benefits, and the technological and economic feasibility of these suggested changes to ABG administration standards?

D. Arterial Blood Gas Studies—Qualifying Disability Criteria
18. Do the Tables in Appendix C need to be revised? If so, what criteria should OWCP consider and why?

E. Pulse Oximetry (S\textsubscript{p}O\textsubscript{2})
20. Are there S\textsubscript{p}O\textsubscript{2} values that would establish total respiratory disability in a coal miner under the BLBA absent contrary probative evidence? If so, what values should OWCP consider adopting and why?

21. Should OWCP require a threshold measurement of a miner’s oxygen saturation level through pulse oximetry before determining whether more invasive testing such as an ABG is necessary? If so, what should the threshold be? What are the advantages and disadvantages (including potential costs or benefits) of adopting such a threshold measurement?

F. Diffusing Capacity of the Lungs for Carbon Monoxide (DLCO)
23. Are there DLCO values that would establish total respiratory disability in a coal miner under the BLBA absent contrary probative evidence? If so, what values should OWCP consider adopting and why?

G. Other Information
24. Please provide any other data or information that may be useful to OWCP in evaluating its quality standards and related disability criteria, including whether there are other tests of respiratory disability for which quality standards or qualifying disability criteria should be developed.

Dated: September 18, 2019.
Julia K. Heathway,
Director, Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs.
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[DOCKET NO. MSHA–2016–0013]

RIN 1219–AB36

Respirable Silica (Quartz)

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Announcement of public meeting and correction.

SUMMARY: The Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) is announcing the date and location of a public meeting on the Agency’s Request for Information on Respirable Silica (Quartz). In addition, this document corrects a typographical error included in the Request for Information that published on August 29, 2019.

DATES: The meeting date and location is listed in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document. Comments must be received or postmarked by midnight Eastern Daylight Saving time on October 28, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments and informational materials, identified by Docket No. MSHA–2016–0013, by one of the following methods:


• Email: zzMSHA-comments@dol.gov.

• Email: GoodGuidance@dol.gov.


• Hand Delivery or Courier: 201 12th Street South, Suite 4E401, Arlington, Virginia, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Sign in at the receptionist’s desk on the 4th floor East, Suite 4E401.

• Fax: 202–693–9441.

Instructions: All submissions must include Docket No. MSHA–2016–0013. Do not include personal information that you do not want publicly disclosed.

Email Notification: To subscribe to receive email notification when MSHA
publishes rulemaking documents in the Federal Register, go to https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USDOL/subscriber/new.

Docket: For access to the docket to read comments received, go to http://www.regulations.gov or http://arlweb.msha.gov/currentcomments.asp.
To read background documents, go to http://www.regulations.gov. Review the docket in person at MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 201 12th Street South, Arlington, Virginia, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. Sign in at the receptionist’s desk in Suite 4E401. [Docket Number: MSHA–2016–0013]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sheila A. McConnell, Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, MSHA, at mcconnell.sheila.a@dol.gov (email), 202–693–9440 (voice), or 202–693–9441 (fax). These are not toll-free numbers.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Public Meeting

MSHA will hold a public meeting on the Agency’s Request for Information on Respirable Silica (Quartz) to receive input from industry, labor, and other interested parties. The public meeting will be held on October 17, 2019, at MSHA Headquarters, 201 12th Street South, Arlington, Virginia 22202–5452. The public meeting will begin at 9 a.m. local time and conclude at 5 p.m., or until the last speaker speaks. The meeting will be conducted in an informal manner. Presenters and attendees may provide written information to the court reporter for inclusion in the record. MSHA will make the transcript of the meeting available at http://www.regulations.gov and on MSHA’s website at: https://arlweb.msha.gov/currentcomments.asp.

II. Correction

MSHA’s Request for Information, which published in the issue of August 29, 2019, at 84 FR 45452, included a typographical error.

On page 45453, in the first paragraph, in the third column, the last sentence is revised to read: “In 2016, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) amended MSHA’s existing respirable crystalline silica standards to establish a permissible exposure limit (PEL) of 50 µg/m³ (ISO).” The sentence should read: “In 2016, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) amended MSHA’s existing respirable crystalline silica standards to establish a permissible exposure limit (PEL) of 50 µg/m³ (ISO).”

David G. Zatezalo,
Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health Administration.

[FR Doc. 2019–20751 Filed 9–26–19; 8:45 am]
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ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM).

SUMMARY: The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act of 2012 directs NHTSA to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to amend Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 208, “Occupant crash protection,” to require a seat belt use warning system for rear seats. NHTSA initiated a rulemaking proceeding in 2013, and as it continues with this proceeding NHTSA is seeking public comment on a variety of issues related to a requirement for a rear seat belt warning system. NHTSA seeks comment on, among other things, potential requirements for such systems, the vehicles to which they should apply, their effectiveness, the likely consumer acceptance, and the associated costs and benefits.

DATES: You should submit your comments early enough to be received not later than November 26, 2019.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments to the docket number identified in the heading of this document by any of the following methods:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.


• Hand Delivery or Courier: 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building

• Fax: 202–493–2251.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act discussion below. We will consider all comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated above. To the extent possible, we will also consider comments filed after the closing date.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to http://www.regulations.gov at any time or to 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. Telephone: (202) 366–9826.

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT’s complete Privacy Act Statement in the Federal Register published on April 11, 2000, (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78) or you may visit http://www.dot.gov/privacy.html.

Confidential Business Information: If you wish to submit any information under a claim of confidentiality, you should submit three copies of your complete submission, including the information you claim to be confidential business information, to the Chief Counsel, NHTSA, at the address given under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT. In addition, you should submit two copies, from which you have deleted the claimed confidential business information, to the Docket at the address given above. When you send a comment containing information claimed to be confidential business information, you should include a cover letter setting forth the information specified in our confidential business information regulation (49 CFR part 512).