The Commission staff will consider all written comments and may issue a Scoping Document II (SDII). SDII will include a revised list of issues, based on the scoping sessions.

For further information regarding the scoping process, please contact Rich Takacs, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Hydropower Licensing, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20426 at (202) 219–2840, or Ed Lee at (202) 219–2809.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–23995 Filed 9–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 8864–012]

Weyerhauser Company and Calligan Hydro, Inc.; Errata Notice to Notice of Application Filed With the Commission

September 13, 1996.

In the Commission's Notice of Joint Application for Transfer of License for FERC Project No. 9025–008, issued August 12, 1996, (61 FR 43354, August 22, 1996), the Comment Date should be changed from ''September 27, 1996'' to October 14, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–24034 Filed 9–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 9025–008]

Weyerhauser Company and Hancock Hydro, Inc.; Errata to Notice of Application Filed With the Commission

September 13, 1996.

In the Commission's Notice of Joint Application for Transfer of License for FERC Project No. 9025–008, issued August 12, 1996, (61 FR 43355, August 22, 1996), the Comment Date should be changed from ''September 27, 1996'' to October 14, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–24035 Filed 9–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders From the Week of June 24 Through June 28, 1996

During the week of June 24 through June 28, 1996, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to appeals, applications, petitions, or other requests 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.

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. 20585–0107, 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. Some decisions and orders are available on the Office of Hearings and Appeals World Wide Web site at http://www.oha.doe.gov.

Dated: September 5, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Appeals

Anibal L. Taboas, 6/26/96, *VFA–0171*

The OHA remanded on appeal a request to the Chicago Operations Office (COO) for information concerning complaints, investigations, or other information concerning the appellant. COO had withheld responsive documents in their entirety pursuant to Exemptions 5, 6, and 7A of the Freedom of Information Act. The OHA found that COO had failed to consider whether the withheld documents contained releasable material that could be reasonably segregated, and had failed to apply a foreseeable harm test to withheld material.

Bradley S. Tice, 6/26/96, *VFA–0172*

Bradley S. Tice filed an Appeal from a determination issued to him on May 8, 1996 by the Department of Energy's Albuquerque Operations Office (AO) which denied a request for information he filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The request sought information regarding ''aspects of nuclear propulsion for aircraft as well as Richard Feynman's patented design for a nuclear reactor to heat air for a jet engine.'' AO stated that it conducted a search of its records as the Los Alamos National Laboratory and found no responsive documents. The Appeal challenged the adequacy of the search conducted by AO. In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that AO conducted an adequate search which was reasonably calculated to discover documents responsive to Mr. Tice's Request. Accordingly, the Appeal was denied.

David W. Smith, 6/27/96 *VFA–0173*

David W. Smith filed an Appeal from a determination by the Department of Energy's Albuquerque Operations Office (AO). Mr. Smith's mother had filed a request for records relating to her late husband's exposure to radiation while he worked for the Atomic Energy Commission from 1948 to 1956. AO stated that it had conducted a search of its records at AO's Occupational Safety and Health Division (OSHD) and at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), and provided Mrs. Smith with a copy of the radiation dosimetry records it discovered at LANL. In his Appeal, Mr. Smith implicitly argued that AO conducted an inadequate search for records relating to his father. In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that AO conducted an adequate search which was reasonably calculated to discover documents responsive to Mrs. Smith's Request. Accordingly, the Appeal was denied.

Keith E. Loomis, 6/28/96 VFA–0166

Keith E. Loomis filed an Appeal from a denial by the Office of Naval Reactors of a request for information that he filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In considering one report that was withheld but was not addressed in either of the previous Decisions and Orders regarding this Appeal, the Director of Naval Reactors reviewed the report and identified it as Naval Nuclear Propulsion Information (NNPI) material. The DOE therefore determined that the report should be withheld under Exemption 3 of the FOIA. Accordingly, the Appeal was denied.

The Cincinnati Enquirer, 6/25/96 *VFA–0169*

The Cincinnati Enquirer filed an Appeal from a determination issued to it by the Ohio Field Office of the Department of Energy (DOE) in response to a Request for Information submitted under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that the Ohio Field Office improperly withheld names of DOE evaluators of a contractor ''rebaseline'' preliminary proposal under Exemption 6 of the FOIA. In particular, the DOE found that, except in unusual cases, federal employees have no privacy interest either in being identified as federal employees or in their work for the federal government. The DOE also found that where as here a branch of the agency acts in the spirit of the FOIA and releases the substance of internal, predecisional, deliberative documents, it may be permissible to withhold the names of DOE reviewers/evaluators under the ''deliberative process'' privilege incorporated into Exemption 5