ACTION: Notice of termination.

SUMMARY: This rulemaking project was initiated to make various administrative changes to clarify the statutory authority and purposes of special anchorage areas and anchorage grounds; remove references to specific state and local ordinances governing special anchorage areas; relocate anchorage grounds (Subpart B) from Part 110 to a new Part 111; adopt a standardized anchorage description format using latitudes and longitudes; and establish a geographically oriented national numbering system for anchorages. Because Coast Guard resources have been devoted to higher priority issues, staff to complete this editorial effort has not been and will not be available in the foreseeable future to complete this initiative. Therefore, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 86-079.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margie G. Hegy, Project Manager, Short Range Aids to Navigation Division, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, (202) 267– 0415.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Responsibility for the administration and enforcement of anchorage regulations was transferred from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to the U.S. Coast Guard in 1967. Many of the regulations have remained basically unchanged since that time. In 1979, the authority to designate special anchorage areas and anchorage grounds and to issue regulations pertaining to anchorage grounds was delegated to Coast Guard district commanders. State and local governments have also promulgated ordinances which apply in some of these designated anchorages.

On March 11, 1988 (53 FR 7949) the Coast Guard proposed a number of editorial changes and a partial reorganization of the anchorage regulations in 33 CFR Part 110. After reviewing the comments received as a result of the NPRM, the Coast Guard published a Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on December 5, 1988 (53 FR 48935) proposing to expand the editorial revision of Part 110 to include creating a new Part 111 and standardizing the format for anchorage descriptions by using latitudes and longitudes.

Because Coast Guard resources have been devoted to higher priority issues, staff to complete this extensive editorial effort has not been and will not be available in the foreseeable future to complete this initiative. Therefore, due to the time that has lapsed since the last section (1988) and the lack of resources to complete this rulemaking, the Coast Guard is terminating further rulemaking under docket number 86–079. This subject may be further reviewed and, as resources permit, future rulemaking projects initiated as needed.

Dated: December 30, 1994.

G.A. Penington,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Chief, Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services. [FR Doc. 95–435 Filed 1–6–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Office

37 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. RM 89-2A]

Cable Compulsory License: Notice of Inquiry Regarding Merger of Cable Systems and Individual Pricing of Broadcast Signals

AGENCY: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Office is reopening the comment period in Docket RM 89–2 (Merger of Cable Systems) to broaden the scope of this proceeding. Specifically, the Office seeks comment as to the copyright royalty implications of *a la carte* offerings of broadcast signals by cable operators and the permissibility of allocating gross receipts among subscriber groups for *a la carte* signals in computing royalties due under the cable compulsory license of the Copyright Act.

DATES: Initial comments should be received by February 23, 1995. Reply comments should be received by February 8, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons should submit fifteen copies of their written comments, if delivered by mail, to: Copyright GC/I&R, P. O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024. If delivered by hand, fifteen copies should be brought to: Office of the General Counsel, James Madison Memorial Building, Room LM–407, 101 Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Marilyn J. Kretsinger, Acting General Counsel, Copyright GC/I&R, P. O. Box 70400, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024. Telephone (202) 707–8380. Telefax: (202) 707–8366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On September 18, 1989, the Copyright Office published a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) in Docket No. RM 89-2 to inform the public that it was examining the issues of merger and acquisition of cable systems and their impact on the computation and reporting of royalties under the cable compulsory license, 17 U.S.C. 111. 54 FR 38390 (1989). At the heart of the 1989 NOI were the royalty filing questions raised by the application of the "contiguous communities" provision of the section 111(f) definition of a cable system. That provision provides that two or more cable facilities are considered as one cable system if the facilities are either in contiguous communities under common ownership or control or operating from one headend. See also 37 CFR 201.17(b)(2).

The Office highlighted some of the difficulties created by cable systems in contiguous communities becoming a single system through either merger or acquisition by a common owner:

For example, assume a situation where there are two completely independent but contiguous cable systems. System A carries two non-permitted (3.75% rate) independent station signals and System B, assigned a different television market, carries the same two independent station signals but on a permitted (base rate) basis, plus a superstation signal on a non-permitted (3.75% rate) basis. Systems A and B are purchased by the same parent company and apparently become a single cable system for purposes of the compulsory license. The purchase raises several problematic issues as to the calculation of the proper royalty fee. Should the independent stations be paid for at the 3.75% rate or the non-3.75% rate system-wide, or should the rates be allocated among subscribers within the system and, if so, on what basis? Furthermore, if allocation is the answer, what rate can be attributed to new subscribers to the merged system? Finally, there is the question of the superstation signal which is only carried by former cable System B. At the time of acquisition, should the superstation be attributed throughout the entire system, even though many subscribers do not receive the signal (a so-called 'phantom' signal)? And which system's market quota (A's or B's) should be used for the entire statement?

54 FR at 38391

Based on the above scenario, the Office also formally posed a set of further questions—many of which addressed the creation of subscriber groups for attributing signals and royalty rates. Among these questions were whether cable operators should be allowed to attribute distant signals among their subscribers in accordance with the conditions that existed prior to