

government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Commission or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of the complainant within the 2-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.7 (environmental reports), 49 CFR 1105.8 (historic report), 49 CFR 1105.11 (transmittal letter), 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

As a condition to use of this exemption, any employee adversely affected by the abandonment shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10505(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) has been received, this exemption will be effective on June 22, 1995 (unless stayed pending reconsideration). Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues,¹ formal expressions of intent to file OFA under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2),² and trail use/rail banking requests under 49 CFR 1152.29³ must be filed by June 2, 1995. Petitions to reopen or requests for public use conditions under 49 CFR 1152.28 must be filed by June 12, 1995, with: Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, DC 20423.

A copy of any pleading filed with the Commission should be sent to applicant's representative: Charles M. Rosenberger, CSX Transportation, Inc., 500 Water Street J150, Jacksonville, FL 32202.

If the notice of exemption contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*.

CSXT has filed an environmental report which addresses the abandonment's effects, if any, on the environment and historic resources. The Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) will issue an environmental

assessment (EA) by May 26, 1995. Interested persons may obtain a copy of the EA by writing to SEA (Room 3219, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, DC 20423) or by calling Elaine Kaiser, Chief of SEA, at (202) 927-6248. Comments on environmental and historic preservation matters must be filed within 15 days after the EA becomes available to the public.

Environmental, historic preservation, public use, or trail use/rail banking conditions will be imposed, where appropriate, in a subsequent decision.

Decided: May 16, 1995.

By the Commission, Joseph H. Dettmar, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-12554 Filed 5-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Settlement Pursuant to the Clean Air Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on May 15, 1995 a proposed Joint Stipulation And Order of Dismissal in *United States v. Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc.* Civil Action No. 1:95 CV 1073 was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. This Joint Stipulation And Order of Dismissal represents a settlement of claims against Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc. for violations of the Clean Air Act.

On May 15, 1995, the United States filed a Complaint pursuant to Sections 204 and 205 of the Clean Air Act ("CAA" or "the Act"), 42 U.S.C. 7523 and 7524, for injunctive relief and assessment of civil penalties against Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc. The Complaint alleged that Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc. violated CAA Section 203(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. 7522(a)(1), by manufacturing and selling Citroen 2CV based automobiles which were not covered by certificates of conformity issued under CAA Section 206(a), 42 U.S.C. 7525(a). The United States, Jeffrey M. Kanter, and Kanter Cars, Inc. have reached a settlement which resolves the issues set forth in the Complaint. Under this settlement, Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc. will pay the United States a civil penalty of \$4800.00.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Joint Stipulation And Order of Dismissal.

Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Jeffrey M. Kanter and Kanter Cars, Inc.*, D.J. ref. 90-5-2-1-1870A.

The proposed Joint Stipulation And Order of Dismissal may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Northern District of Ohio, 1800 Bank One Center, 600 Superior Ave., Cleveland, OH 44114-2600 and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. A copy of the proposed Joint Stipulation And Order of Dismissal may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$2.00 (25 cents per page reproduction costs) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Acting Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 95-12560 Filed 5-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

[Docket No. 95-5]

Request for Comments on the Waiver of Moral Rights in Visual Artworks

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice of hearing and request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Office is holding a public hearing to solicit comments on the effect of the waiver of moral rights provision of the Visual Artists Rights Act of 1990 (VARA). Section 608 of VARA requires the Copyright Office to study the effect of VARA's waiver provision and to publish its findings. To fulfill the statutory obligations of section 608, the Copyright Office is examining the extent to which authors waive moral rights in their visual artworks under the waiver provision. The Office also will accept written comments.

DATES: The public hearing will be held on Wednesday, June 21, 1995, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Requests to present oral testimony at the hearing should be received on or before June 16, 1995. Written comments by those persons testifying at the hearing should

¹ A stay will be issued routinely where an informed decision on environmental issues (whether raised by a party or by the Commission's Section of Environmental Analysis in its independent investigation) cannot be made prior to the effective date of the notice of exemption. See *Exemption of Out-of-Service Rail Lines*, 5 I.C.C.2d 377 (1989). Any entity seeking a stay on environmental grounds is encouraged to file promptly so that the Commission may act on the request before the effective date.

² See *Exempt. of Rail Abandonment Offers of Finan. Assist.*, 4 I.C.C.2d 164 (1987).

³ The Commission will accept late-filed trail use statements so long as it retains jurisdiction.

be received on or before June 19, 1995. All other written comments must be received on or before July 31, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit written comments and requests to present oral testimony by mail to Marilyn J. Kretsinger, Acting General Counsel, Copyright Office GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024, or by hand delivery to the Office of General Counsel, Copyright Office, James Madison Memorial Building, Room LM 407, First Street and Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C., or by Telefax: (202) 707-8366. The hearing will be held in Room 414, which is located on the fourth floor of the Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, First Street and Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. Written comments and a transcript of the hearing will be available for public inspection in the Office of the General Counsel, Copyright Office, James Madison Memorial Building, Room LM-407, First Street and Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT: Marilyn J. Kretsinger, Acting General Counsel, Copyright Office GC/I&R, P.O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024. Telephone (202) 707-8389. Telefax: (202) 707-8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 1, 1990, President Bush signed into law the Visual Artists Rights Act (VARA), which was codified as section 106A of title 17 of the United States Code and went into effect on June 1, 1991. VARA grants certain visual artists the moral right of attribution, which is the right to claim or disclaim authorship of a work, and the moral right of integrity, which is the right to prevent any intentional distortion, mutilation or other modification of a work which is prejudicial to the artist's reputation or honor and to prevent the destruction of a work of recognized stature by any intentional or grossly negligent act. VARA also provides that these rights may not be transferred but can be waived.

The waiver provision was the most controversial portion of VARA. Congress was concerned that artists might be compelled to waive their rights of integrity and attribution. This concern is detailed in the House Report:

The Committee intends to ensure that the waiver provisions serve to facilitate current practices while not eviscerating the protections provided by the proposed law. It is important, therefore, for the Congress to know whether waivers are being automatically obtained in every case

involving a covered work of visual art, whether any imbalance in the economic bargaining power of the parties serves to compel artists to waive their rights, and whether the parties are properly adhering to the strict rules governing waiver.

H.R. Rep. No. 514, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 22 (1990).

To address this concern, when Congress passed VARA it included section 608, requiring the Copyright Office to study the waiver provision to determine whether artists' contracts routinely provide for waiver of moral rights. Specifically, section 608 requires the Copyright Office to study the extent to which the rights conferred by VARA are being waived by visual artists and to present its findings to Congress in an interim report which was submitted on December 1, 1992, and in a final report which must be submitted by December 1, 1995. The Copyright Office is in the process of preparing this final report.

I. Background

On March 1, 1989, the United States acceded to the Paris text of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. Article 6*bis* of the Berne Convention requires countries to provide protection of the moral rights of paternity and integrity.¹ During the debate on adherence to the Berne Convention, some argued that the United States needed to enact specific moral rights legislation. The vast majority of those seeking adherence contended that existing laws, both Federal and State, statutory and common, were sufficient to meet the requirements of the Berne Convention. Congress agreed with the majority and therefore did not include any substantive moral rights provisions in the Berne Convention Implementation Act. H.R. Rep. No. 514, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 7-8 (1990).

Congress acknowledged that adherence to the Berne Convention did not end the debate about whether the United States should adopt artists' rights laws and it did enact such a law in 1990; through VARA it created a uniform Federal system of rights for certain visual artists.

The scope of VARA is very narrow; it applies only to works of fine art which are identified as "works of visual art." A "work of visual art" as defined in the Copyright Code includes any painting, drawing, print, sculpture, or still

¹ This provision was added in the Rome Conference (1928). As part of the VARA study, the Copyright Office is examining the moral rights protection, if any, in selected countries and also looking at case law and practices in those countries. This overview should provide some insight into international practice on waiver of moral rights.

photographic image produced for exhibition purposes, produced in a single copy or an edition of 200 or fewer if signed and consecutively numbered by the artist. 17 U.S.C. 101 (1990). VARA specifically excludes works for hire, motion pictures and other audiovisual works, and works of applied art.²

If a work qualifies as a "work of visual art" the author of that work is granted two rights: the right of attribution and the right of integrity. The right of attribution gives the visual artist the right to be named as author of a work; the right to prevent use of his or her name as author of a work he or she did not create; and the right to prevent the use of his or her name if the work has been distorted, mutilated or modified in a manner that would be prejudicial to the artist's honor or reputation. 17 U.S.C. 106A(a) (1990). The right of integrity allows the artist to prevent intentional distortion or modification of the work that would be prejudicial to the artist's honor or reputation, and to prevent destruction of a work of recognized stature. *Id.*

The rights granted by VARA are not absolute. The integrity rights are subject to special provisions if the work of visual art is incorporated into or otherwise made part of a building. Where such a work of visual art cannot be removed from the building without being damaged or otherwise modified, the moral right of integrity in section 106A will apply unless the work was installed in the building before the effective date of VARA or the artist signed a written agreement acknowledging that the work may be damaged or modified when it is removed from the building. 17 U.S.C. 113(d)(1) (1990). If the work of visual art can be removed from the building without damage or modification, the moral rights in section 106A will apply unless the owner of the building complies with special notice requirements. See 17 U.S.C. 113(d)(2) (1990).

Another limitation on the rights granted by VARA concerns their duration. Despite Berne's general requirement that the term of protection for moral rights be at least coextensive with the term of protection for economic

² It also explicitly excludes posters, maps, globes, charts, technical drawings, diagrams, models, books, magazines, newspapers, periodicals, data bases, electronic information services, electronic publications and similar publications, any merchandising item or advertising, promotional, descriptive, covering, or packaging material or container, and any portion or part of any of these items. Works not entitled to copyright protection under title 17 are also excluded. 17 U.S.C. 101 (1990).

rights, which is the life of the author and fifty years after the author's death, VARA rights endure only for the life of the artist, or where the work is a joint work, the life of the last surviving artist. 17 U.S.C. 106A(d) (1990).

The subject of the study is waiver of the rights of integrity and attribution. Congress explicitly provided that the moral rights of integrity and attribution may be waived. 17 U.S.C. 106A(e) (1990). For a waiver to be valid it must be expressly agreed to in a written instrument that is signed by the artist and that specifically identifies the work and the uses of the work to which the waiver applies. 17 U.S.C. 106A(e)(1) (1990). A waiver will apply only to the work and uses identified in the written instrument. *Id.*³ In the case of a joint work, a valid waiver by one author constitutes a waiver of the rights for all joint authors. *Id.*

The Copyright Office published a **Federal Register** notice on June 10, 1992, requesting information and inviting public comment on the moral rights waiver provision in VARA. 57 FR 24659 (1992). In response to this notice, the Copyright Office received a total of seven comments.⁴ Although the comments were helpful, most of them were very brief. At the time of the interim report, VARA had been in effect for only two years and there were few, if any, measurable effects of the waiver provision. The comments of the seven parties are summarized in the interim report, submitted to Congress on December 1, 1992.

II. Current Status of the Copyright Office Study

The results of the interim study demonstrated that obtaining information from artists on their experience with the waiver provision for the final report would be a major challenge. The Copyright Office thus began an extensive outreach program aimed at getting factual information on the effects of VARA's waiver provision.

To reach individual artists, the Copyright Office developed a survey questionnaire designed to reveal the effect of VARA waiver provisions on the visual arts community. The survey was

modeled in part after the "Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts Visual Artists Rights Act of 1990 Questionnaire" submitted by the Massachusetts Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts in response to the June 1992 **Federal Register** notice.

One goal of the survey was to determine whether waiver of moral rights provisions are routinely included in art contracts; and, if so, whether this occurs because of the parties' relative bargaining power or for other reasons. Another goal of the survey was to ascertain whether waivers occur only in the context of a written contract, as required by statute, or whether waivers also occur orally.

Following review of the survey by a group consisting of copyright experts and representatives of the art community, the Office revised and distributed the survey questionnaire to hundreds of visual art-related organizations. These organizations consisted primarily of state art councils, volunteer lawyers for the arts associations, and art schools and universities. Altogether, the Copyright Office mailed out more than 6,800 surveys. The actual number of surveys distributed was far greater, however, because many of the surveys were duplicated by the recipient organizations and distributed to still others in the visual arts community.

III. Preliminary Analysis of VARA Survey

By May 15, 1995, the Copyright Office had received 1063 completed surveys. Our final report to Congress will include a detailed analysis of survey results, but a preliminary analysis of 985 surveys received by mid-April reveals the following data.

A. Knowledge of VARA

Even five years after VARA's enactment, survey results indicated that educating artists about their new moral rights is perhaps as critical as the Congressional intent to study the extent to which artists waive these rights. The survey, therefore, fulfilled an educational need. Before receiving the survey, 73 percent of all respondents were aware of moral rights in certain works of visual art. Fifty-eight percent, however, previously were unaware such rights could be waived, and sixty-six percent did not know that waiver requires an express, written agreement. Seventy-nine percent of all respondents said they have not seen contracts that include a waiver provision. Eight percent have waived moral rights in a signed contract, but a full 77 percent

have not, and five percent said they did not know.

B. Respondent Profile

The majority of responses were from artists. Ninety percent of respondents believed they were covered by the survey's definition of "visual artist" (i.e., one who creates a "work of visual art" as defined by VARA). Of these, 58 percent identified themselves as painters (an artist could check as many media as applied). Only eight percent of respondents were not VARA artists: Of these, five percent created art works not covered by VARA, another two percent were art professors, and the remaining were others associated with the arts.

Most respondents did not earn a significant income from their art. More than half have worked under commission, but 68 percent earned less than \$10,000 from their art in an average year. Five percent claimed income between \$25,000-\$40,000, and nine percent said their art-related income exceeded that amount. Roughly half were represented by a gallery or agent, but 42 percent had no representation.

C. Willingness to Waive Moral Rights

Forty-four percent of artists indicated they were unwilling to waive moral rights in the future. Seven percent would waive such rights; 36 percent did not know whether they would waive these rights, and 123 artists declined to say.

Of seventy-nine individuals who had waived the right of integrity or attribution in a signed contract, 42 said they did so to gain exposure and 37 said they did so to make a sale. Eleven percent had declined a contract because it included a waiver clause, and 13 percent had insisted such a clause be struck before signing. Most artists (58%) did not know whether rejecting a waiver would cost them the contract, but some (15%) thought it would. Eighty-one percent had never been pressured to waive moral rights, but six percent had.

IV. Subject Matter To Be Addressed at the Public Hearing

To supplement the information gathered through the survey, the Copyright Office will hold a public hearing to solicit comments on the effect of the waiver of moral rights provision in the Visual Artists Rights Act. We anticipate that the hearing will provide an opportunity to obtain more information on existing practices relating to waivers of moral rights in visual art.

The Copyright Office is also interested in studying actual or model contracts that contain language concerning waiver

³ VARA does not permit blanket waivers and prohibits the specific person to whom the waiver is made from transferring the waiver to a third party. H.R. Rep. No. 514, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 18-19 (1990).

⁴ Comments were received from the Nebraska Arts Council; Professor of Law, John Henry Merryman; the Capital Arts Center/BG-WC Arts Commission; the General Services Administration; the Committee for America's Copyright Community; Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts of Massachusetts, Inc.; and Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts of New York.

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