

reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research?

13. What impact has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works had on the ability of interested persons to engage in noninfringing uses of such works, including fair use and activities permitted by exemptions prescribed by law?

14. Are there specific works or classes of works with respect to which the ability of interested persons to engage in criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research has been hindered because of the implementation of such technological measures? If so, identify them, explain how such activities have been hindered, and explain whether those works or classes of works are also available in other formats to which such technological measures have not been applied.

15. Are there specific works or classes of works with respect to which the ability of interested persons to engage in noninfringing uses has been hindered because of the implementation of such technological measures? If so, identify them, explain how such activities have been hindered, and explain whether those works or classes of works are also available in other formats to which such technological measures have not been applied.

16. For purposes of this rulemaking, in classifying works that are to be exempted from the prohibition against circumvention of technological measures that control access, should any classes of works be defined, in part, based on whether the works are being used for purposes of criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research? Explain why or why not.

17. For purposes of this rulemaking, in classifying works that are to be exempted from the prohibition against circumvention of technological measures that control access, should any classes of works be defined, in part, based on whether the works are being used in ways that do not constitute copyright infringement, e.g., as fair use or in a manner permitted by exemptions prescribed by law? Explain why or why not.

E. Effect of Circumvention on the Market for or Value of Copyrighted Works

18. In what ways can technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works be circumvented? How widespread is such circumvention?

19. Has such circumvention (or the likelihood of circumvention) had any impact on the price of copyrighted works? Please explain.

20. Has such circumvention (or the likelihood of circumvention) had any impact on the availability of copyrighted works? In particular formats or in all formats? Please explain.

21. Has such circumvention had any other impact on the marketing of copyrighted works? If so, please explain the impact and which works or classes of works have been affected.

22. Do the answers to any of these questions relating to the effect of circumvention on the market for or value of copyrighted works depend upon the class of work? Please explain.

F. Other Factors and Questions

23. For purposes of this rulemaking, what criteria should be used in determining what is a "class" of copyrighted works?

24. With respect to any adverse effect on use of or access to copyrighted works that has been identified in response to any of the preceding questions, is there an explanation for the adverse effect other than the presence of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works?

25. Has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works resulted in making copyrighted works more widely available? Please explain.

26. Has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works resulted in facilitating lawful uses of copyrighted works?

27. Are there other factors that should be taken into account? If so, please identify and address those factors.

28. What other comments, if any, do you have?

29. Do you wish to testify at a hearing to be conducted by the Copyright Office in connection with this rulemaking?

Dated: November 15, 1999.

Marybeth Peters,
Register of Copyrights.

Approved by:
James H. Billington,
The Librarian of Congress.

[FR Doc. 99-30556 Filed 11-23-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 1410-30-P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

Standards Governing the Design of Curbside Mailboxes; Meeting

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service will hold further meetings of a Consensus Committee to develop recommendations for revision of USPS STD 7A, which governs the design of curbside mailboxes. The committee will develop and adopt its recommendations through a consensus process. The committee will consist of persons who represent the interests affected by the proposed rule, including mailbox manufacturers, mailbox accessory manufacturers, and postal customers.

Meeting Dates: The third committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 12-13, 2000. The meeting tentatively scheduled for December 14-15, 1999 is canceled.

Meeting Place: U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Washington, DC 20260.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Annamarie Gildea, (202) 268-3558.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Mail comments and all other communications regarding the committee to Annamarie Gildea, U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Room 7142, Washington, DC 20260. Committee documents will be available for public inspection and copying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. weekdays at the address above. Entry into U.S. Postal Service Headquarters is controlled. Persons wishing to attend the next meeting must send a fax to Annamarie Gildea at 202-268-5293 no later than January 5, 2000 with the person's name and organizational affiliation, if any. For additional information regarding the USPS STD 7A Consensus Committee, see **Federal Register** Vol 64, No. 158, p. 44681 (August 17, 1999).

Stanley F. Mires,

Chief Counsel, Legislative.

[FR Doc. 99-30377 Filed 11-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CA 022-0196; FRL-6480-7]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; South Coast Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing a disapproval of revisions to the