7. How should the issue of moral rights be treated, both in relation to current and future industry practices and past fixed performances not protected by this Instrument? Should they be waivable or transferable? Has the Basic Proposal addressed concerns adequately? Would any additional language be helpful in clarifying U.S. current practices?

8. One mechanism for indicating a consensus in the WCT and WPPT where treaty language was not appropriate was the Agreed Statement. What, if any, Agreed Statements would be desirable to use to augment the Basic Proposal?

In your response, please include the following: (1) Clearly identify the matter being addressed; (2) provide examples, where appropriate, of the matter being addressed; (3) identify, if possible, any relevant legal authorities applicable to the matter being addressed; and (4) provide suggestions regarding how the matter should be addressed by the United States.

Dated: November 22, 2000.

Q. Todd Dickinson,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 00–30331 Filed 11–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Final Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) for BRAC 95 Disposal and Reuse of East Fort Baker, California

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Public Law 101–510 (as amended), and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the closure of East Fort Baker, California.

The Final EA evaluates the environmental impacts of the disposal and subsequent reuse of the 91-acre installation. Enactment of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Act (Public Law 92–589) requiring that, when the Department of Defense determined that it no longer had a need for East Fort Baker, the property would transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. Disposal of East Fort Baker to the Secretary of the Interior will allow the property to be reused in accordance with the National Park Service's Proposed Plan. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service prepared a final environmental impact statement (EIS) that examined and analyzed the environmental impacts of the Proposed Plan and its alternatives. This final EIS has been incorporated by reference into the Army's disposal and reuse EA. The only other alternative examined by the Army was the no action alternative. Under the no action alternative, the Army would not dispose of property, but would maintain it in a caretaker status for an indefinite period. Based on the environmental analysis documented in the EA, the Army has determined that the proposed disposal action would have no significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the natural or human environment.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 28, 2000.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the EA may be obtained by writing to Mr. Jerry Fuentes, Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, Environmental Resources Branch, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jerry Fuentes at (916) 557–7730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A Notice of Intent (NOI) declaring the Army's intent to prepare an EA for the closure of East Fort Baker was published in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 1995 (60 FR 49264).

The Final EA and FNSI are available for review at the Marin County Free Library, Marin County Civic Center, San Rafael, CA 94903 and the Sausalito Public Library, 420 Litho, Sausalito, CA 94965.

Dated: November 20, 2000.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA (I&E).

[FR Doc. 00–30180 Filed 11–27–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Acting Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 28, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Lauren Wittenberg, Acting Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the internet address *Lauren__Wittenberg@omb.eop.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Acting Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

Dated: November 21, 2000.

William Burrow,

Acting Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Type of Review: New.

Title: National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS–2) Survey Package.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Not-for-profit institutions.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 18,977
Burden Hours: 7,843

Abstract: NLTS2 will provide nationally representative information about youth with disabilities in secondary school and in transition to adult life, including their characteristics, programs and services and achievements in multiple domains