refund period, they are no longer operationally distinct. Accordingly, the OHA determined that they do not qualify for consideration under separate presumptions of injury. The OHA also found that The Circle K Corporation could not receive a full volumetric refund for purchases made by a subsidiary for end-use, in addition to benefitting from the small claims presumption of injury for its two subsidiaries that were retailers of Gulf products. Instead, the OHA ordered that the applicant be granted a full volumetric refund for end-use purchases, and refunds under the mid-range presumption of injury for purchases made by its retailer subsidiaries. Accordingly, the Circle K Corporation was granted a total refund of $15,046. In addition, the OHA denied a competing Application for Refund filed by Fairmont Foods, Inc.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Gulf Oil Corporation/Bracknell Oil Co., Inc	RF300–19716	06/22/95
Quality Gulf	RF300–19987	
Valley View Gulf	RF300–19991	
Gulf Oil Corporation/Denison Oil Co., Inc	RF300–20066	06/22/95
H.R. Higgins Excavating et al	RF272–97036	06/23/95
Old Colony Transportation et al	RF272–90436	06/23/95
Roane County et al	RF272–97600	06/23/95
Sequim School District et al	RF272–97701	06/23/95
Texaco Inc./Look Oil Co	RF321–20305	06/23/95

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
Acme Resin Corporation	RF272–58053
Brattlebono Memorial Hospital	RF272–99147
Butler Landmark Inc	RG272–194
Dallas County Schools	RF272–55467
Digital Equipment Corporation	RF272–53469
DSM Copolymer	RF272–58418
Farmers Elevator & Cooperative Association	RG272–279
International Flavors & Fragrance	RF272–14036
Jamaica Bay Oil Co	RF321–20562
MacArthur Petroleum & Solvent Co	RF321–20576
McLaurin's Texaco	RF321–19757
Nash Equity Exchange	RG272–25
National Standard Company	RF272–17314
Pollard Delivery Service	RF272–89521
Windsor Village Texaco	RF321–20166
Wyatt's Service	RF315–10163

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E–234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

Dated: February 14, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 96–4403 Filed 2–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders; Week of July 24 Through July 28, 1995

During the week of July 24 through July 28, 1995 the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to applications for relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Appeal

Blumberg, Seng, Ikeda & Albers, 7/25/95, *VFA–0052*

Blumberg, Seng, Ikeda & Albers filed an Appeal from a partial denial by the DOE's Office of the Inspector General of a Request for Information that it submitted under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that the FOIA's Exemptions 6 and 7(C) had been properly invoked to withhold the names and other personal identifiers of subjects, sources, witnesses and investigators in connection with the Inspector General's investigation of the death of a particular individual at the Naval Petroleum Reserves in Elk Hills, California. Accordingly, the Appeal was denied.

Petition for Special Redress

State of Louisiana, 7/28/95, *VEG–0002*

The DOE issued a Decision and Order denying a Petition for Special Redress filed by the State of Louisiana. Louisiana sought approval to use Stripper Well funds to match a DOE grant to establish a Natural Gas Pre-Utilization Center at Southern University. Louisiana wished to use the Stripper Well funds to study the

relationship between the geological formation of natural gas fields and the levels of radioactivity in the water brought to the surface as part of the oil and gas extraction process. If successful, the study would provide natural gas producers with data that would allow them to assess probable levels of radioactivity at a site before drilling, thus reducing the volume of radioactive materials brought to the surface. DOE's Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy had determined that this proposal was inconsistent with the terms of the Stripper Well Settlement Agreement in that its main focus was environmental. Louisiana argued in its Petition that the study was authorized by the Chevron consent order, which allows the use of oil overcharge funds for enery research. The OHA agreed with the initial assessment of Louisiana's proposal and concluded that the project could not qualify as an energy research program under the terms of the Chevron consent order because it was not remedial in nature. Accordingly, Louisiana's Petition for Special Redress was denied.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Central Valley Coop Consumers Oil Co	RF272–92208 RF272–92230	07/25/95
Crude Oil Supplemental Refund Distribution	RB272–14	07/25/95
Crude Oil Supplemental Refund Distribution	RB272–20	07/25/95
Crude Oil Supplemental Refund Distribution	RB272–24	07/28/95
Gibraltar School District et al	RF272–84697	07/28/95
Nome City School District et al	RF272–95900	07/28/95
Reserve School District et al	RF272–95426	07/25/95
Texaco Inc./Second Avenue Texaco	RF321–20643	07/25/95
Texaco Inc./Short Stop, Inc	RF321–6657	07/28/95
Texaco Inc./Squaw Transit Co	RF321–8846	07/28/95
Texaco Inc./Webb Texaco Station et al	RF321–1486	07/28/95
Texaco Inc./Whittaker Metals, Inc	RF321–9170	07/28/95

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
Herbert Easterly	VFA–0054
Hopson's Texaco Service Station	RF321–20386
McMinn Texaco	RF321–4191
Rocky Flats Field Office	VSO–0033
San Diego Transit Corporation	RF272–97153

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E–234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines,* a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

Dated: February 14, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 96–4402 Filed 2–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders by the Office of Hearings and Appeals; Week of May 22 Through May 26, 1995

During the week of May 22 through May 26, 1995, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to appeals and applications for other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Appeal

A. Victorian, 5/22/95, VFA–0036

Dr. A. Victorian (Appellant) filed an Appeal from a final determination by the Acting Director of the Office of Intergovernmental and External Affairs of the Albuquerque Operations Office of the Department of Energy (DOE/AL). DOE/AL withheld certain documents identified as responsive to Appellant's request on the grounds that they contained sensitive and personal information. Although the person named in the documents was deceased, DOE/AL found that the surviving relatives of the named individual had a privacy interest in the information and withheld the documents under Exemption 6. In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that while a privacy interest in the information existed, DOE/AL did not balance this interest against the public interest in disclosing the information. Accordingly, the Appeal was remanded to DOE/AL so that it could balance the privacy interest of surviving relatives against the public interest in disclosure in a manner consistent with this Decision.

Personnel Security Hearings

Albuquerque Operations Office, 5/22/95, VSO–0018

An OHA Hearing Officer issued an Opinion recommending against restoring the access authorization of a DOE contractor employee. The employee's ''Q'' clearance had been suspended by the Operations Office Manager after a DOE-sponsored psychiatrist found that the employee was a user of alcohol habitually to excess and suffered from ''substance abuse, alcohol,'' a mental condition which causes or may cause a significant defect in judgment or reliability. The