reporting regulations. These issues are pending before the OHA in Case No. LRO–0003, in which the DOE is seeking nearly $254 million plus prejudgment interest of $915 million.

The Notice also enumerated the considerations which underlay DOE's preliminary view that the settlement is favorable to the government and in the public interest. The Notice solicited written comments from the public relating to the terms and conditions of the settlement and whether the settlement should be made final.

II. Comments Received

Seven written comments were received, three of which, by the terms of their submission, were not considered.[1] The California Attorney General and the Governor of Oklahoma both expressed the view that the proposed settlement was in the public interest and urged DOE to effect the Consent Order as proposed. The American Petroleum Institute provided no specific comment on the proposed Consent Order with Occidental, but generally endorsed the resolution by such agreeable means as settlement of the cases arising out of the price and allocation regulatory controls.

The fourth comment, submitted by various states, expressed no view on the bases of the proposed settlement or the adequacy of the settlement amount. Rather, those particular states pointed out that the settlement would principally resolve alleged violations related to crude oil transactions and therefore, under the Final Settlement Agreement in the *Stripper Well Exemption Litigation,* M.D.L. No. 378 (D. Kan.), 40% of the moneys received from Occidental must be paid to the 56 states, territories and insular possessions pursuant to that 1986 agreement.

The Consent Order requires that the Office of General Counsel petition the OHA to implement a proceeding under 10 CFR Part 205, Subpart V, with regard to all the funds received from Occidental pursuant to the settlement. That disposition is consistent with the Final Settlement Agreement, under which DOE issued a Modified Restitutionary Policy Statement. 51 FR 27899 (August 4, 1986). The settlement with Occidental contemplates application of the 1986 policy statement inasmuch as the Consent Order calls for a Subpart V proceeding for the disposition of the funds, which are recognized by DOE to be crude oil-related.[2] Accordingly, it appears the expressed concern is appropriately addressed by the Consent Order.

The written comments did not afford any information that would warrant consideration of modification or rejection of the proposed Consent Order with Occidental.

Accordingly, DOE concludes that the Consent Order is in the public interest and should be made final.

IV. Decision

By this Notice, and pursuant to 10 CFR 205.199J, the proposed Consent Order between Occidental and DOE, executed on June 27, 1995, is made a final order of the Department of Energy, effective the date of publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register**.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on August 14, 1995.

Eric J. Fygi,

Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95–20555 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

[1] A group of utilities, transporters and manufacturers (UTM) commented upon the prospective settlement in a July 17, 1995 letter sent to DOE, and that letter was treated as a comment responsive to the July 6 Notice seeking comment on the proposed settlement with Occidental. Occidental thereafter submitted a reply addressing the points raised by UTM. UTM then requested that its correspondence be ''withdrawn from the Consent Order file.'' Although UTM's letter, along with a copy of Occidental's reply to UTM, will remain available to the public, consistent with UTM's request DOE has not considered it in determining whether to make the Consent Order final. As Occidental requested that DOE consider its reply to UTM only if UTM's letter was considered in determining final action on the proposed Consent Order, neither has DOE considered Occidental's reply to UTM.

[2] Moreover, since the 1986 Final Settlement Agreement, all moneys recovered by DOE in connection with resolution of alleged petroleum overcharges have been subject to the Subpart V process, and in every instance of crude oil-related recoveries the states have received 40% of the recovered moneys.

Golden Field Office; Notice of Federal Assistance Award to University of Wisconsin

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Financial Assistance Award in response to an Unsolicited Financial Assistance Application.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), pursuant to the DOE Financial Assistance Rules, 10 CFR 600.14, and under authority of section 2104 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, 42 U.S.C. 13454, is announcing its intention to enter into a cooperative agreement with the University of Wisconsin (UW), to perform the research necessary for the construction and testing of a fully integrated pilot-scale polyoxometalate bleaching facility. The UW project represents an innovative, commercially viable technology that will result in waste reduction and decreased energy usage.

ADDRESSES: Questions regarding this announcement may be addressed to the U.S. Department of Energy, Golden Field Office, 1617 Cole Blvd., Golden, Colorado 80401, Attention: John Motz, Contract Specialist. The telephone number is 303–275–4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DOE has evaluated the unsolicited application according to paragraphs 600.14 of the DOE Assistance Regulations, 10 CFR 600, and the criteria for selection in paragraph 600.14 (e)(1). Based on this evaluation, it is recommended that the unsolicited application for Federal Assistance entitled, ''Polyoxometalate Bleaching: An Efficient, Oxygen-Based, Closed Mill Technology,'' submitted by UW, be accepted for support. This award will not be made for at least 14 days, to allow for public comment.

Under this cooperative agreement, UW will seek to duplicate the action of the selective agents used by wood rotting fungi to degrade lignin. The fungi use highly selective enzymes which rely on oxygen as the primary oxidant. The key to success in the UW program has been the identification of a class of agents, the polyoxometalates, which can be as selective as the enzymes with respect to their oxidative action, but which are also robust enough to use at elevated temperatures so that industrially feasible rates of reaction can be achieved. Furthermore, since they consist of metal oxides in their highest oxidation states, they possess the stability that is prerequisite for the use of catalytic systems in industrial processes. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the spent polyoxometalate agents, which have been reduced during the bleaching stage, can be reoxidized with oxygen in a separate stage operated under conditions aggressive enough to completely mineralize all of the organic materials solubilized during bleaching. This would allow UW to achieve a primary goal of the pulp and paper industry, an effluent-free mill.

The proposal has been found to be meritorious, and it is recommended that the unsolicited application be accepted for support. The UW program represents an innovative, commercially viable technology that will result in waste reduction and decreased energy usage. UW has demonstrated capabilities in the technologies directly related to the proposed project and personnel that should provide a basis for a successful project. The proposed project is not

eligible for financial assistance under a recent, current, or planned solicitation.

The project cost over five years is estimated to be $4,174,880 total, with the DOE share being $2,499,880.

Issued in Golden, Colorado, on August 10, 1995.

Matthew A. Barron,

Acting Chief, Procurement, GO.

[FR Doc. 95–20552 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER95–1452–000, et al.]

Northern States Power Company (Minnesota), et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

August 11, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. Northern States Power Company (Minnesota)

[Docket No. ER95–1452–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Northern States Power Company (Minnesota)(NSP), tendered for filing Supplement No. 1 to the original Interconnection and Interchange Agreement between NSP and the Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency (CMMPA). This Supplement will allow the City of Kenyon to become a member of CMMPA effective August 1, 1995.

NSP requests that the Commission accept for filing this Supplement No. 1 effective as of August 1, 1995, and requests waiver of Commission's notice requirements in order for the Supplement to be accepted for filing on that date. NSP requests that this filing be accepted as a supplement to Rate Schedule No. 470, the rate schedule for previously filed agreements between NSP and CMMPA.

Comment date: August 25, 1994, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Commonwealth Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–1453–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Commonwealth Electric Company (Commonwealth) tendered for filing a Network Integration Service Transmission Tariff. Commonwealth proposes that the tariff become effective on September 29, 1995.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. Pennsylvania Power & Light Company

[Docket No. ER95–1454–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Pennsylvania Power & Light Company (PP&L), tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission eight Service Agreements (the Agreements) between PP&L and 1) Public Service Electric & Gas Company, dated July 13, 1995; 2) Atlantic City Electric Company, dated July 18, 1995; and 3) GPU Service Corporation, acting as agent for and on behalf of its operating affiliates Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, and Pennsylvania Electric Company, dated July 25, 1995.

The Agreements supplement a Short Term Capacity and Energy Sales umbrella tariff approved by the Commission in Docket No. ER95–782–000 on June 21, 1995.

In accordance with the policy announced in *Prior Notice and Filing Requirements Under Part II of the Federal Power Act*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,139, *clarified and reh'g granted in part and denied in part*, 65 FERC ¶ 61,081 (1993), PP&L requests the Commission to make the Agreement effective as of the date of execution of each, because service will be provided under an umbrella tariff and each service agreement is filed within 30 days after the commencement of service. In accordance with 18 CFR 35.11, PP&L has requested waiver of the sixty-day notice period in 18 CFR 35.2(e). PP&L has also requested waiver of certain filing requirements for information previously filed with the Commission in Docket No. ER95–782–000.

PP&L states that a copy of its filing was provided to the customers involved and to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. Long Island Lighting Company

[Docket No. ER95–1455–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO), tendered for filing a service agreement with Aguila Power Corporation (Aguila) under LILCO's FERC Tariff.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Tucson Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–1456–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Tucson Electric Power Company (Tucson), tendered for filing a Service Agreement (the Agreement), effective as of July 10, 1995 with National Electric Associates Limited Partnership (National). The Agreement provides for the sale by Tucson to National of economy energy from time to time at negotiated rates in accordance with Service Schedule A of Tucson's Coordination Tariff, Volume 1, Docket No. ER94–1417–000. Tucson requests an effective date of July 10, 1995, and therefore requests all applicable waivers.

Copies of this filing have been served upon all parties affected by this proceeding.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Tucson Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–1458–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Tucson Electric Power Company (Tucson), tendered for filing a Service Agreement (the Agreement), effective as of July 26, 1995 with Citizens Lehman Power Sales (Citizens Lehman). The Agreement provides for the sale by Tucson to Citizens Lehman of economy energy from time to time at negotiated rates in accordance with Service Schedule A of Tucson's Coordination Tariff, Volume 1, Docket No. ER94–1437–000. Tucson requests an effective date of July 26, 1995, and therefore requests all applicable waivers.

Copies of this filing have been served upon all parties affected by this proceeding.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

7. Western States Power Providers, Inc.

[Docket No. ER95–1459–000]

Take notice that on July 31, 1995, Western States Power Providers, Inc. (WSPP) petitioned the Commission for acceptance of WSPP Rate Schedule FERC No. 1, the granting of certain blanket approvals, including the authority to sell electric power at market-based rates, and the waiver of certain Commission Regulations. WSPP is not affiliated with any entity which owns, operates, or controls electric power generating or transmission facilities, or that has a franchised electric power service area.

Comment date: August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

8. Boston Edison Company

[Docket No. ER95–1460–000]

Take notice that on August 1, 1995, Boston Edison Company (Boston Edison), tendered for filing a Fifth