

Other examples of issues that are not appealable under this section include:

(A) The amount of the dental plan contractor-determined allowable charge since the methodology constitutes a limitation on benefits under the provisions of this section.

(B) Certain other issues on the basis that the authority for the initial determination is not vested in OCHAMPUS. Such issues include but are not limited to the following examples:

(1) A determination of a person's enrollment in the TFMDP is the responsibility of the dental plan contractor and ultimate responsibility for resolving a beneficiary's enrollment rests with the dental plan contractor. Accordingly, a disputed question of fact concerning a beneficiary's enrollment will not be considered an appealable issue under the provisions of this section, but shall be resolved in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section and the dental plan contractor's enrollment policies and procedures.

(2) Decisions relating to the issuance of a nonavailability statement (NAS) in each case are made by the Uniformed Services. Disputes over the need for an NAS or a refusal to issue an NAS are not appealable under this section. The one exception is when a dispute arises over whether the facts of the case demonstrate a dental emergency for which an NAS is not required. Denial of payment in this one situation is an appealable issue.

(3) Any decision or action on the part of the dental plan contractor to include a provider in their network or to designate a provider as participating is not appealable under this section. Similarly, any decision or action on the part of the dental plan contractor to exclude a provider from their network or to deny participating provider status is not appealable under this section.

(vii) *Amount in dispute.* (A) *General.* An amount in dispute is required for an adverse determination to be appealed under the provisions of this section, except as set forth or further explained in § 199.10(a)(7)(ii), (iii) and (iv).

(B) *Calculated amount.* The amount in dispute is calculated as the amount of money the dental plan contractor would pay if the services involved in the dispute were determined to be authorized benefits of the TFMDP. Examples of amounts of money that are excluded by this section from payments for authorized benefits include, but are not limited to:

(1) Amounts in excess of the dental plan contractor's-determined allowable charge.

(2) The beneficiary's cost-share amounts.

(3) Amounts that the beneficiary, or parent, guardian, or other responsible person has no legal obligation to pay.

(4) Amounts excluded under the provisions of § 199.8 of this part.

(viii) *Levels of appeal.* See § 199.10(a)(8)(i). Initial determinations involving the sanctioning (exclusion, suspension, or termination) of TFMDP providers shall be appealed directly to the hearing level.

(ix) *Appeal decision.* See § 199.10(a)(9).

(2) *Reconsideration.* See § 199.10(b).

(3) *Formal review.* See § 199.10(c).

(4) *Hearing.*—(i) *General.* See § 199.10(d) and § 199.10(d)(1) through (d)(5) and (d)(7) through (d)(12) for information on the hearing process.

(ii) *Authority of the hearing officer.* The hearing officer, in exercising the authority to conduct a hearing under this part, will be bound by 10 U.S.C., chapter 55, and this part. The hearing officer in addressing substantive, appealable issues shall be bound by the dental benefits brochure, policies, procedures, instructions and other guidelines issued by the ASD(HA), or a designee, or by the Director, OCHAMPUS, or a designee, in effect for the period in which the matter in dispute arose. A hearing officer may not establish or amend the dental benefits brochure, policy, procedures, instructions, or guidelines. However, the hearing officer may recommend reconsideration of the policy, procedures, instructions or guidelines by the ASD(HA), or a designee, when the final decision is issued in the case.

(5) *Final decision.* See § 199.10(e)(1) and § 199.10(e)(1)(i) for information on final decisions in the appeal and hearing process, with the exception that no recommended decision shall be referred for review by ASD(HA).

Dated: November 12, 1999.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 99-30072 Filed 11-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-10-M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. RM 99-7]

Exemption to Prohibition on Circumvention of Copyright Protection Systems for Access Control Technologies

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Notice of inquiry.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Office of the Library of Congress is preparing to conduct proceedings to make recommendations in accordance with section 1201(a)(1) of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1), which was added by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and which provides that the Librarian of Congress may exempt certain classes of works from the prohibition against circumventing a technological measure that controls access to a copyrighted work. The purpose of this rulemaking proceeding is to determine whether there are classes of works as to which users are, or are likely to be, adversely affected in their ability to make noninfringing uses if they are prohibited from circumventing such technological measures. This notice requests written comments from all interested parties, including representatives of copyright owners, educational institutions, libraries and archives, scholars, researchers and members of the public, in order to elicit information and views on whether noninfringing uses of certain classes of works are, or are likely to be, adversely affected by such prohibition.

DATES: Written comments are due by February 10, 2000. Reply comments are due by March 13, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submissions by electronic mail should be made to "1201@loc.gov"; see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for file formats and other information about electronic filing. If delivered by hand, comments should be delivered to the Office of the General Counsel, Copyright Office, LM-403, James Madison Memorial Building, 101 Independence Avenue, SE., Washington DC. If delivered by mail, comments should be addressed to David O. Carson, General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, PO Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, DC 20024. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for information about formats of submissions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David O. Carson, General Counsel, or

Charlotte Douglass, Office of the General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, PO Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, DC 20024. Telephone (202) 707-8380; telefax (202) 707-8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Written Comments

The Copyright Office will be placing all comments and reply comments that are submitted in electronic form on its Website (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright/1201>). Because of this, the Office prefers that comments and reply comments be submitted in electronic form, in one of the following formats:

If by electronic mail: Send to "1201@loc.gov" a message containing the name of the person making the submission, his or her title, organization, mailing address, telephone number, telefax number and e-mail address. The message should also identify the document clearly as either a comment or reply comment. The document itself must be sent as a MIME attachment, and must be in a single file in either Adobe Portable Document File (PDF) format (preferred), or in Microsoft Word Version 7.0 or earlier, or in WordPerfect 7 or earlier.

If by regular mail or hand delivery: Send, to the appropriate address listed above, two copies, each on a 3.5-inch write-protected diskette, labeled with the name of the person making the submission, his or her title and organization. The document itself must be in a single file in either Adobe Portable Document File (PDF) format (preferred), or in Microsoft Word Version 7.0 or earlier, or in WordPerfect Version 7 or earlier.

Anyone who is unable to submit a comment in electronic form should submit an original and fifteen paper copies by hand or by mail to the appropriate address listed above. It may not be feasible for the Office to place these comments on its website.

All written comments (in electronic or nonelectronic form) should contain the name of the person making the submission, his or her title, organization, mailing address, telephone number, telefax number and e-mail address.

2. Hearings and Further Comments

Following the receipt of reply comments, the Copyright Office will conduct hearings. The Office will then accept post-hearing written submissions that relate to matters addressed at the hearings. A hearing schedule will be announced in the future.

3. Mandate for Rulemaking Proceeding

On October 28, 1998, President Clinton signed into law the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Pub. L. 105-304 (1998). Section 103 (subtitled "Copyright Protection Systems and Copyright Management Information") of Title I of the Act added a new Chapter 12 to title 17 United States Code, which among other things prohibits circumvention of access control technologies employed by or on behalf of copyright owners to protect their works. Specifically, new subsection 1201(a)(1)(A) provides, inter alia, that "No person shall circumvent a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work protected under this title." Subparagraph (B) limits this prohibition. It provides that anticircumvention "shall not apply to persons who are users of a copyrighted work which is in a particular class of works, if such persons are, or are likely to be in the succeeding 3-year period, adversely affected by virtue of such prohibition in their ability to make noninfringing uses of that particular class of works under this title" as determined in this rulemaking. This prohibition on circumvention becomes effective two years after the date of enactment, on October 28, 2000.

During the 2-year period between the enactment and effective date of the provision, the Librarian of Congress must make the determination as to classes of works exempted from the prohibition. This determination will be made upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights in a rulemaking proceeding. The determination thus made will remain in effect during the succeeding three years. In making her recommendation, the Register of Copyrights is to consult with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and report and comment on the Assistant Secretary's views. 17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1)(C).

4. Background

The WIPO Copyright Treaty (WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) require that Contracting Parties provide adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies against the circumvention of effective technological measures that authors (or, in the case of the WPPT, performers and producers of phonograms) use in connection with the exercise of their rights and that restrict acts which they have not authorized and are not permitted by law.

In fulfillment of these treaty obligations, Title I of the Digital

Millennium Copyright Act makes it unlawful to defeat technological protections used by copyright owners to protect their works in digital environments, adding a new Chapter 12 to title 17, United States Code. Specifically, subsection (a)(1) of new section 1201 applies when a person who is not authorized by the copyright owner to gain access to a work seeks to do so by circumventing a technological measure put in place by the copyright owner to prevent access to the work. See Staff of House Committee on the Judiciary, 105th Cong., Section-By-Section Analysis of H.R. 2281 as Passed by the United States House of Representatives on August 4, 1998, (hereafter House Manager's Report) (Representative Coble) 5 (Comm. Print 1998).

That section provides that "No person shall circumvent a technological measure that effectively controls access to a work protected under this title." 17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1)(A) (1998). The relevant terms are defined:

[T]o "circumvent a technological measure" means to descramble a scrambled work, to decrypt an encrypted work, or otherwise to avoid, bypass, remove, deactivate, or impair a technological measure, without the authority of the copyright owner; and (B) a technological measure "effectively controls access to a work" if the measure, in the ordinary course of its operation, requires the application of information, or a process or a treatment, with the authority of the copyright owner, to gain access to the work.

17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(3).

Congress found it appropriate to modify the prohibition to assure that the public will have continued ability to engage in noninfringing uses of copyrighted works, such as fair use. See H. R. Rep. No. 105-551, pt. 2, at 36 (1998) (hereinafter Commerce Comm. Report). To that end, the statute provides that:

The prohibition contained in subparagraph (A) shall not apply to persons who are users of a copyrighted work which is in a particular class of works, if such persons are, or are likely to be in the succeeding 3-year period, adversely affected by virtue of such prohibition in their ability to make noninfringing uses of that particular class of works under this title, as determined under subparagraph (C).

17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1)(B).

The prohibition against circumvention is subject to delayed implementation in order to permit determination whether users of particular classes of copyrighted works are likely to be adversely affected by the prohibition in their ability to make noninfringing uses. Within two years, upon the recommendation of the

Register of Copyrights in a rulemaking proceeding, the Librarian of Congress must determine whether to exempt certain classes of works (which he must identify) from the application of the anticircumvention prohibition due to such adverse effects.

Subparagraph (C) of section 1201(a)(1) provides that:

During the 2-year period described in subparagraph (A), and during each succeeding 3-year period, the Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights, who shall consult with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and report and comment on his or her views in making such recommendation, shall make the determination in a rulemaking proceeding on the record for purposes of subparagraph (B) of whether persons who are users of a copyrighted work are, or are likely to be in the succeeding 3-year period, adversely affected by the prohibition under subparagraph (A) in their ability to make noninfringing uses under this title of a particular class of copyrighted works.

17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1)(C).

The Conference Report clarifies the procedure to be used in conducting the rulemaking:

It is the intention of the conferees that, as is typical with other rulemaking under title 17, and in recognition of the expertise of the Copyright Office, the Register of Copyrights will conduct the rulemaking, including providing notice of the rulemaking, seeking comments from the public, consulting with the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information of the Department of Commerce and any other agencies that are deemed appropriate, and recommending final regulations in the report to the Librarian.

H.R. Rep. No. 105-796, at 64 (1998).

Thus, the Register is to conduct a rulemaking proceeding, soliciting public comment and consulting with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, and make a recommendation to the Librarian, who by October 28, 2000, must make a determination whether any classes of copyrighted works should be exempt from the statutory prohibition against circumvention during the three years commencing on that date.

The primary responsibility of the Register and the Librarian in this respect is to assess whether the implementation of technological protection measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works is diminishing the ability of individuals to use copyrighted works in ways that are otherwise lawful. Commerce Comm. Report, at 37. As examples of technological protection measures in effect today, the Commerce Committee offered the use of "password

codes" to control authorized access to computer programs, for example, or encryption or scrambling of cable programming, videocassettes, and CD-ROMs. *Id.*

Congress intended that the Register and Librarian solicit input that will enable them to consider a broad range of past or likely future adverse impacts. Thus, this notice requests written comments from all interested parties, including representatives of copyright owners, educational institutions, libraries and archives, scholars, researchers and members of the public. The nature of the Librarian's inquiry is delineated in the statutory areas to be examined:

- (i) the availability for use of copyrighted works;
- (ii) the availability for use of works for nonprofit archival, preservation, and educational purposes;
- (iii) the impact that the prohibition on the circumvention of technological measures applied to copyrighted works has on criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research;
- (iv) the effect of circumvention of technological measures on the market for or value of copyrighted works; and
- (v) such other factors as the Librarian considers appropriate.

17 U.S.C. 1201(a)(1)(C).

Substantial Effect on Use

It is clear from the legislative history that a determination to exempt a class of works from the prohibition on circumvention must be based on a determination that the prohibition has a substantial adverse effect on noninfringing use of that particular class of works. The Commerce Committee noted that the rulemaking proceeding is to focus on "distinct, verifiable, and measurable impacts, and should not be based upon *de minimis* impacts." Commerce Comm. Report, at 37. Similarly, the Manager's Report stated that "[t]he focus of the rulemaking proceeding must remain on whether the prohibition on circumvention of technological protection measures (such as encryption or scrambling) has caused any substantial adverse impact on the ability of users to make non-infringing uses," and suggested that "mere inconveniences, or individual cases * * * do not rise to the level of a substantial adverse impact." House Manager's Report, at 6.

Causal Connection

The legislative history also requires the Register and Librarian to disregard any adverse effects that are caused by factors other than the prohibition against circumvention. The House Manager's Report is instructive:

The focus of the rulemaking proceeding must remain on whether the prohibition on circumvention of technological protection measures (such as encryption or scrambling) has caused any substantial adverse impact on the ability of users to make non-infringing uses. Adverse impacts that flow from other sources * * * or that are not clearly attributable to such a prohibition, are outside the scope of the rulemaking.

House Manager's Report, at 6. The House Commerce Committee came to a similar conclusion: "Adverse impacts that flow from other sources, or that are not clearly attributable to implementation of a technological protection measure, are outside the scope of the rulemaking." Commerce Comm. Report, at 37.

Some technological protection measures may mitigate adverse effects. Along those lines, the Librarian must also seek information about positive impacts of technological access control measures. The House Manager's Report notes that:

In assessing the impact of the implementation of technological measures, and of the law against their circumvention, the rule-making proceedings should consider the positive as well as the adverse effects of these technologies on the availability of copyrighted materials. The technological measures—such as encryption, scrambling, and electronic envelopes—that this bill protects can be deployed, not only to prevent piracy and other economically harmful unauthorized uses of copyrighted materials, but also to support new ways of disseminating copyrighted materials to users, and to safeguard the availability of legitimate uses of those materials by individuals.

House Manager's Report, at 6.

Another mitigating factor may arise when a work as to which the copyright owner has instituted a technological control is also available in formats that are not subject to technological protections. For example, a work may be available in electronic format only in encrypted form, but may also be available in traditional hard copy format which has no such technological restrictions on access. The availability without restriction in the latter format may alleviate any adverse effect that would otherwise result from the technological controls utilized in the electronic format. The Librarian is to consider the availability of works in such other formats. *Id.* at 7.

The requirements that proponents of an exemption demonstrate both causality and substantial adverse effects on noninfringing uses also apply to the determination whether users of works "are likely to be" affected adversely in the three years following the conclusion of the rulemaking. Proponents who are unable to satisfy those burdens in the

current rulemaking will have the opportunity to make their cases in each of the triennial proceedings that will succeed it.

Scope of "Class of Copyrighted Works"

A major consideration is to determine how to define the scope of boundaries of a "particular class" of copyrighted works. This inquiry seeks to elicit information to assist the Librarian in addressing that ultimate question.

The House Manager's Report advises that the scope of "class of works" is narrower than the category of works set forth in 17 U.S.C. 102(a). For example, it notes that within the category of literary works, one finds prose journals, periodicals, and books as well as computer programs, and concludes that it is unlikely that the impact on prohibiting circumvention of access control technologies will be the same for scientific journals as it is for computer operating systems. Therefore, all of these types of literary works most likely would not fall within the same class of works for purposes of this section 1201(a)(1)(A) determination. *Id.* at 7. The Commerce Committee Report concurs that "the 'particular class of copyrighted works' (should) be a narrow and focused subset of the broad categories of works of authorship than is (sic) identified in Section 102 of the Copyright Act (17 U.S.C. 102)." Commerce Comm. Report, at 38.

Nevertheless, the Judiciary Committee cautioned against drawing the categories too narrowly, as would be its conclusion if, for example, particular genres of motion pictures were to be divided into thematic categories such as Westerns, comedies or live action dramas. House Manager's Report, at 7.

5. Specific Questions

The Office seeks comment on the following specific questions. Persons submitting comments need not address all questions, but are encouraged to respond to those as to which they have particular knowledge or information. Persons submitting comments are encouraged to submit concrete evidence, examples and data supporting their responses to these questions. Such submissions will carry greater weight than unsupported allegations and predictions.

In response to each question, persons submitting comments are requested to distinguish between (a) their response with respect to the current state of affairs, and (b) their response with respect to the state of affairs that is likely to exist during the period between October 28, 2000 and October 28, 2003. For example, in responding to Question

No. 3, persons submitting comments are requested to state (a) what technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works exist today, and (b) what new technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works are likely to be introduced between October 28, 2000 and October 28, 2003. In discussing the state of affairs that is likely to exist during the period between October 28, 2000 and October 28, 2003, persons submitting comments should explain the basis for their projections.

A. Technological Measures

1. What technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works exist today?

2. Do different technological measures have different effects on the ability of users to make noninfringing uses? Can and should the Librarian take account of those different effects in determining whether to exempt any classes of works from the anticircumvention provisions of section 1201? If so, how? In determining what constitutes a class of works?

B. Availability of Works

3. How has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works affected the availability of such works to persons who are or desire to be lawful users of such works?

4. Are there specific works or classes of works that, because of the implementation of such technological measures, have become unavailable to persons who desire to be lawful users of such works? If so, identify those works or classes of works and explain how they have become unavailable.

5. Are there specific works or classes of works which, because of the implementation of such technological measures, have become less available to persons who desire to be lawful users of such works? If so, identify those works or classes of works, explain the ways in which they have become less available, and explain whether those works or classes of works are also available in other formats to which such technological measures have not been applied.

6. If there are works that are available both in formats to which technological measures have been applied and in formats to which technological measures have not been applied, to what extent can the works in the latter formats substitute for the works in the formats to which technological measures have been applied?

7. Are there works or classes of works that are available only electronically

and only in formats to which such technological measures have been applied? If so, what are they?

C. Availability of Works for Nonprofit Archival, Preservation, and Educational Purposes

8. Has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works affected the availability of such works for nonprofit archival purposes? If so, how? Are there specific works or classes of works that have been affected in this respect? If so, identify them, explain how they have been affected, and explain whether those works or classes of works are also available in other formats to which such technological measures have not been applied.

9. Has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works created problems with respect to the preservation of such works? If so, how? Are there specific works or classes of works that have been affected in this respect? If so, identify them and explain how they have been affected.

10. Has the use of technological measures that effectively control access to copyrighted works affected the availability of such works for nonprofit educational purposes? If so, how? Are there specific works or classes of works that have been affected in this respect? If so, identify them, explain how they have been affected, and explain whether those works or classes of works are also available in other formats to which such technological measures have not been applied.

11. 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 nonprofit archival, preservation, and/or educational purposes? (*E.g.*, "new broadcasts" may not be an exempted class of works, but "news broadcasts used in the course of face-to-face teaching activities of a nonprofit educational institution, in a classroom or similar place of instruction," may be an exempted class.) Explain why or why not.

D. Impact on Criticism, Comment, News Reporting, Teaching, Scholarship, or Research

12. 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 criticism, comment, news

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