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, S.W., 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.


George B. Breznay,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 95–4878 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Issuance of Decisions and Orders During the Week of January 2 Through January 6, 1995

During the week of January 2 through January 6, 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 disissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Appeal

Howard W. Spaletta, 01/04/95, LWA–0010

Howard W. Spaletta filed a whistleblower complaint against EG&G Idaho, Inc. in which he alleged that the contractor retaliated against him for making health and safety disclosures. After investigating the complaint, the Office of Contractor Employee Protection found that Spaletta had made protected disclosures and that thereafter the contractor had retaliated against him by referring fewer work assignments to him and by reducing his annual merit pay increases. At the same time OCEP also found that Spaletta had not shown that the contractor had retaliated against him by failing to assign him important and meaningful work, by requiring him to solicit work, or by requiring him to take unpaid leave during a Christmas holiday curtailment of work. Spaletta requested a hearing to challenge OCEP's finding and conclusions.

Subsequent to the hearing, an OHA Hearing Officer issued an Initial Agency Decision, setting forth his findings. As explained below, in the Initial Agency Decision, the OHA Hearing Officer found that some of Spaletta’s claims were meritorious.

The OHA Hearing Officer found that Spaletta’s disclosures were protected by the DOE’s contractor employee protection program. In that regard, the Hearing Officer found that Spaletta made his disclosures with a good faith belief that a final report concerning the evaluation of welds at the Tennessee Valley Authority’s Watts Bar nuclear power plant did not disclose that the evaluation used a weld inspection code that was not mentioned in the plant’s Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and, as a consequence, evaluated employee weld safety concerns against a standard different from the standard contained in the FSAR. The Hearing Officer also found that Spaletta believed that these conditions impacted on safety at the Watts Bar plant.

The Hearing Officer also found that the contractor retaliated against Spaletta by referring fewer work assignments to him and by reducing his annual merit pay increases for a three-year period. The Hearing Officer rejected Spaletta’s claims (i) that the contractor retaliated against him by requiring him to take leave during a Christmas holiday curtailment of work and (ii) that Spaletta was constructively terminated. The Hearing Officer also rejected Spaletta’s request that the Hearing Officer order the contractor to withdraw the report in question. Finally, the Hearing Officer directed the parties to submit additional information concerning the amount of back pay, attorney’s fees, and costs that should be awarded in the case.

Refund Application

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al./Oklahoma, 01/04/95, RM21–277 et al.

The DOE issued a Decision and Order granting a Motion for Modification (Motion) filed by the State of Oklahoma in the Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Belridge Oil Company, Palo Pinto Oil & Gas, OKC Corporation, and Vickers Energy Corporation refund proceedings. In its Motion, Oklahoma proposed to reallocate $21,080 in interest from funds which the State received for other second-stage refund plans to provide a transportation service for individuals departing from three self-help organizations in downtown Oklahoma City and traveling to jobs outside the inner city. The vehicle to be used is a 15-passenger compressed natural gas (CNG) van. In accordance with prior Decisions, where we have noted the benefits of alternative fuel vehicles and the increased use of public transportation, the DOE approved Oklahoma’s Motion.

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.

Atlantic Richfield Company/Edmonds Arco ................................................................. RF 304–13881 01/06/95
Florence Car Wash ........................................................................................................ RF 304–13908
Smith Motor Sales ........................................................................................................ RF 304–13998
Enron Corp./Nixon Company ...................................................................................... RF 340–74 01/04/95
Pioneer Energy, Inc ....................................................................................................... RF 340–89
Bonesteel Oil Company ............................................................................................... RF 340–117
Gulf Oil Corporation/Vic’s Gulf Service et al ............................................................... RF 300–21603 01/06/95
Shellabarger Chevrolet ................................................................................................. RF 272–94629 01/03/95
Texaco Inc./Norm’s Texaco et al ................................................................................ RF 321–20582 01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Rommel’s Holiday Inn Texaco et al ........................................................ RF 321–11298 01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Von’s Texaco Service et al ...................................................................... RF 321–20610 01/06/95
Town of Oelwein et al ................................................................................................. RF 272–96608 01/06/95

Name: Syd Smith .......................................................................................................... Case No. RF321–14088
Name: Vitamilk Dairy .................................................................................................. Case No. RF272–90917
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Agency Information Collection Activities Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before March 30, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, or a copy of this ICR, contact Sandy Farmer at (202) 260-7417.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Office of Air and Radiation

Title: California Pilot Program: Vehicle Credit Program EPA ICR #1590.02; OMB #2060-0229. This ICR requests renewal of the existing clearance.

Abstract: Manufacturers who sell more clean-fuel vehicles in California than the law requires or who sell vehicles in California which are cleaner than the law requires may earn credits which may be banked and applied to future years' sales requirements or traded to other manufacturers. These manufacturers will submit annual reports containing information on vehicle sales in California and the number of credits created, banked, traded and/or used. EPA will use the information to determine compliance with the sales requirements and the credit program.

Burden Statement: Public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing the collection of information.

Respondents: Manufacturers of clean-fueled vehicles sold in California.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 20.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 10 hours.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

Burden Statement: Public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing the collection of information.

Respondents: Manufacturers of clean-fueled vehicles sold in California.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 20.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 10 hours.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

Send comments regarding the burden to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.


Paul Lapsley,
Director, Regulation Management Division.

[FR Doc. 95-4895 Filed 2-27-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

Common Sense Initiative Council, Petroleum Refining Sector Subcommittee; Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Amended Notice of Meeting—Common Sense Initiative Council, Petroleum Refining Sector Subcommittee.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency established the Common Sense Initiative Council (CSIC) on October 17, 1994, to provide independent advice and counsel to EPA on environmental issues associated with the petroleum refining industry and other industrial sectors. The charter for the CSIC was authorized through October 17, 1996, under regulations established by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). The Petroleum Refining Sector (PRS) Subcommittee operates as a subcommittee of the CSIC.

AMENDED OPEN MEETING NOTICE: Notice is hereby given of a change in dates for the upcoming CSIC-PRS Subcommittee meeting from a one day meeting, March 10, 1995, to a two day meeting to be held March 9 and 10, 1995. The meeting was previously noticed in the Federal Register for a one day meeting on Friday, March 10, 1995, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. at the Radisson Inn Hotel, 2150 Veterans Blvd., Kenner, LA 70062 (1-800-333-3333 or 504-467-3111).

The meeting is now scheduled for two days, March 9 and 10 in the same location. An additional day is needed to conduct the full range of committee business and to convene in working groups that will begin identifying specific issues and formulating a CSIC-PRS subcommittee workplan. Seating will be available on a first come, first served basis.

INSPECTION OF SUBCOMMITTEE DOCUMENTS: Documents relating to the topics above will be publicly available at the meeting. Thereafter, these documents, together with the CSIC-PRS meeting minutes, will be available for public inspection in Room 2417M of EPA Headquarters, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C., Mail Code 6101, phone (202) 260-7417.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anyone who would like further information should contact the Common Sense Initiative Program Staff office by phone on (202) 260-7417, or by FAX on (202) 260-9766. Members of the public may submit written comments of any