Name	Case No.
Syd Smith	RF321-14088 RF272-90917

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.

Dated: February 21, 1995.

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 dismissed 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	RF304-13881	01/06/95
Florence Car Wash	RF304-13908	
Smith Motor Sales	RF304-13998	
Enron Corp./Nixon Company	RF340-74	01/04/95
Pioneer Energy, Inc	RF340-88	
Bonesteel Oil Company	RF340-117	
Gulf Oil Corporation/Vic's Gulf Service et al	RF300-21603	01/06/95
Shellabarger Chevrolet	RF272-94629	01/03/95
Texaco Inc./Norm's Texaco et al	RF321-20582	01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Rommel's Holiday Inn Texaco et al	RF321-11298	01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Von's Texaco Service et al	RF321-20610	01/06/95
Town of Oelwein et al	RF272-96608	01/06/95