

of moral rights. We would like to see examples of as many visual art contracts as possible, especially those with waivers, and would appreciate any party sending us such contracts.

The Copyright Office specifically invites comments on the following questions:

Awareness of rights. To what extent are artists aware of VARA and the rights of integrity and attribution provided by VARA? Has awareness of VARA increased? Please give examples.

Extent of waiver. Are waiver of moral rights provisions routinely included in artists' contracts? Do parties that obtain waiver of moral rights in a contract exercise the waiver or is a waiver secured merely as an "insurance policy"? Does waiver vary depending on the nature of the work? For example, are mobiles and sculptures treated differently than paintings and prints? Does it vary based on the location of the work, for example, murals that are part of buildings? What experiences have artists had with owners of buildings? Does it vary depending on the purchaser? Does it matter whether the purchaser is a national or regional institution, an owner of a public or private building, an art collector or investor? Please give examples where possible.

Contract specifics. What is the economic effect of a waiver in the course of contract negotiations? Is there any evidence on how much a waiver is worth—that is, how much more a purchaser would pay if the artist waived the right? Are there proportionately more waivers given for artistic works that are included in buildings than for other types of works? When a waiver is included in a contract, does the contract specifically identify the work and use for which the waiver applies? What types of contracts include waivers: contracts for sale of work? contracts for transfer of copyright ownership? contracts for commissioned works? contracts that include only a waiver provision? If a waiver is included in a contract, is that waiver limited in duration? If limited in duration, what is the typical term of the waiver?

Artists' concerns. What are the factors artists consider when determining whether to agree to a waiver of moral rights in a contract? Describe any instances where artists were coerced into waiving their moral rights. Has VARA had an effect on commission of visual art?

Do artists have unequal bargaining power when dealing with established galleries and other organizations? If the artist's selling power (demand for his or her works) or reputation affects or

determines whether or not waiver will be required, how much experience or how well know does the artist have to be in order to avoid waiver? Give specific examples, if possible.

Experience in other countries. What types of experiences have artists had with moral rights abroad? Are artists asked to waive their moral rights in contracts entered into in foreign countries? If so, in what countries?

Experience with U.S. law. Should moral rights be waivable? Should the provisions of the Visual Artists Rights Act be amended or modified in any way?

The Copyright Office is interested in receiving public comment on these issues and any other issues relevant to the VARA study.

Dated: May 18, 1995.

Marybeth Peters,

Register of Copyrights.

[FR Doc. 95-12606 Filed 5-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1410-30-M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 95-031]

National Environmental Policy Act; International Space Station Program

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a Tier 2 environmental impact statement (EIS) and conduct scoping for the assembly and operation of the proposed International Space Station (ISS) Program.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and NASA's policy and procedures (14 CFR Part 1216 Subpart 1216.3), intends to prepare a Tier 2 EIS for the ISS Program. The proposed action by NASA is to continue to provide U.S. participation in the assembly and operation of the ISS. The alternative is cancellation of the ISS Program, specifically, the "No Action" alternative. The Tier 2 EIS will focus on those areas of the ISS Program which have changed substantially since the Tier 1 EIS was prepared. This includes modifications to the space station itself, its assembly and operation, and an assessment of the probability and consequences of reentry of the station into Earth's atmosphere.

DATES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments to NASA on or before July 7, 1995, to ensure full consideration during the scoping process.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be in writing and addressed to Mr. David Ruszczyk, NASA Johnson Space Flight Center, Code OF, Houston, Texas 77058-3696.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Ruszczyk, 713-244-7756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NASA issued the Final Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement for Space Station Freedom, March 1991 (hereinafter referred to as the "Tier 1 EIS"). The Tier 1 EIS was prepared as part of the decision process to determine whether to proceed with the development, assembly, and operation of a human occupied space station in cooperation with the Canadian Space Agency, the European Space Agency, and Japan's National Space Development Agency. Several programmatic and design configuration alternatives were considered, along with the alternative to take no action. The program decision, made on the basis of the Tier 1 EIS and other relevant documents, was to proceed with full scale design and development of the concept known as Space Station Freedom.

At the time the Tier EIS was prepared, detailed design information was not available. As a consequence, some issues relating to the potential environmental effects of Space Station Freedom were deferred to the Tier 2 EIS. These issues included the impacts of any significant design modifications that might be incorporated as the design matured; and a quantitative analysis of the probability and consequences of accidental or uncontrolled reentry into the Earth's atmosphere during assembly and operation. Other impacts that were reserved include venting of nontoxic gases during station operation, and change to a hydrazine propulsion system.

On March 9, 1993, the President directed NASA to undertake a major redesign of the space station program in such a manner that major reductions in the projected costs of Space Station Freedom could be realized. An Advisory Committee on the Redesign of the Space Station was chartered to provide advice with respect to the redesign options for the U.S. space station program. The results of the redesign studies were presented in the Space Station Redesign Team Final Report to the Advisory Committee on the Redesign of the Space Station, dated June 1993. The result was the currently proposed ISS, which

includes design modifications and agreements to include Russia as a partner, and incorporates Russian hardware and capabilities into the program.

The proposed action considered in this Tier 2 EIS is to continue the implementation of the U.S. contribution to the overall effort to assemble and operate the ISS. The remaining alternative involves the "No Action" alternative (*i.e.*, cancellation of U.S. participation in the ISS). Significant design changes that have occurred since the Tier 1 EIS include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following: The number of research laboratories on the space station has been increased from three to six; the number of logistics modules has been increased from one to two; the pressurized volume has been almost doubled; the crew size has been increased from four to six; and the orbital inclination has been changed from 28.5 degrees to 51.6 degrees, permitting space station access by Russian launch vehicles and additional mission control capabilities from Russia's mission control center. The ISS contemplates 15 Russian launches, increasing the total number of launches through completion of assembly from 32 to 44, and reducing the number of U.S. launches from 29 to 27, one European launch, and one launch yet to be determined. Accordingly, resupply flights to the completed ISS will now include Russian as well as U.S. flights; whereas Space Station Freedom was to be resupplied exclusively by U.S. Space Shuttle flights. The planned U.S. launches will not include any expendable launch vehicles; only the Space Shuttle will be used. However, the U.S. may use expendable launch vehicles in a contingency or backup role.

The design of the ISS has progressed to the point where it is now possible to conduct a quantitative analysis of the probability and consequences of accidental or uncontrolled reentry into the Earth's atmosphere. The Tier 2 EIS will assess the probabilities and potential impacts associated with accidental or uncontrolled reentry. The Tier 2 EIS also will address decommissioning alternatives, including the plan presented in the Tier 1 EIS.

Other issues to be addressed in the Tier 2 EIS include, but will not necessarily be limited to, the following: the cumulative effects of the U.S. launches associated with the assembly and operation of the ISS; the change to a Unsymmetrical Dimethylhydrazine/Nitrogen Tetroxide propulsion system; and the venting and outgassing of

nontoxic gases from the ISS. The Tier 2 EIS will address environmental effects on the United States and the integrated ISS impacts on the global commons.

Written public input and comments on the range of alternatives being considered and the potential environmental issues related to the assembly and the operation of the International Space Station are hereby solicited.

Dated: May 12, 1995.

Benita A. Cooper,

Associate Administrator for Management Systems and Facilities.

[FR Doc. 95-12553 Filed 5-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

[Notice 95-032]

Intent To Grant a Partially Exclusive License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent to grant a patent license.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice of intent to grant MERCO Incorporated, 1667 Cole Boulevard, Suite 400, Golden, Colorado 80401, a partially exclusive license to practice the invention protected by U.S. Patent No. 5,128,797, "NON-MECHANICAL OPTICAL PATH SWITCHING AND ITS APPLICATION TO DUAL BEAM SPECTROSCOPY INCLUDING GAS FILTER CORRELATION RADIOMETRY," which was issued on July 7, 1992, by the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The partially exclusive license will contain appropriate terms and conditions to be negotiated in accordance with the Department of Commerce patent licensing regulations (37 CFR 404). NASA will negotiate the final terms and conditions and grant the license unless, within 60 days of the date of this notice, the Director of Patent Licensing receives written objections to the grant, together with supporting documentation. The Director of Licensing will review all written responses to the notice and then recommend to the Associate General Counsel (Intellectual Property) whether to grant the license.

DATES: Comments to the notice must be received by July 24, 1995.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code GP, Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Harry Lupuloff, NASA, Director of Patent Licensing, (202) 358-2041.

Dated: May 16, 1995.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95-12552 Filed 5-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY

National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board; Meeting

AGENCY: National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board, National Institute for Literacy.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This Notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board (Board). This notice also describes the function of the Board. Notice of this meeting is required under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This document is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend the meeting.

DATES AND TIMES: June 15, 1995, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: World Education, 210 Lincoln Street, 6th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts, 02111.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sharyn M. Abbott, Acting Executive Officer, National Institute for Literacy, 800 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20006. Telephone (202) 632-1503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board is established under Section 384 of the Adult Education Act, as amended by Title I of Public Law 102-73, the National Literacy Act of 1991. The Board consists of ten individuals appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board is established to advise and make recommendations to the Interagency Group, composed of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, which administers the National Institute for Literacy (Institute). The Interagency Group considers the Board's recommendations in planning the goals of the Institute and in the implementation of any programs to achieve the goals of the Institute. Specifically, the Board performs the following functions: (a) Makes recommendations concerning the appointment of the Director and the staff of the Institute; (b) provides independent advice on operation of the Institute; and (c) receives reports from the Interagency Group and the Director of the Institute. In addition, the Institute consults with the Board on the award of