and resolved through settlement discussions than through litigation or through the process established by Article XVI of the Standard Contract. Therefore, in accordance with the Department's commitment to increased use of alternative dispute resolution procedures, the Department is prepared to discuss with utilities and other parties to the pending litigation (Northern States Power Company v. U.S. Department of Energy, Nos. 94–1457, 94-1458, 94-1574 (D.C. Cir., 1994)) financial or other assistance that may be appropriate in light of the Department's inability to begin providing disposal services in 1998.

Issued in Washington, D.C., April 28, 1995. **Daniel A. Dreyfus**,

Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

[FR Doc. 95–10902 Filed 5–2–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

### The Office of Hearings and Appeals

## Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders; Week of January 23 Through January 27, 1995

During the week of January 23 through January 27, 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**

The National Security Archive, 1/23/95, VFA-0015

The National Security Archive (NSA) filed an Appeal from a determination issued to it on December 5, 1994, by the Director, Office of Arms Control and

Nonproliferation of the Department of Energy (Arms Control) which denied a request for information it had filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The request sought records relating to negotiations with Japan, and the transfer of plutonium to Japan between 1980 and 1983. Arms Control stated that it did not possess any responsive documents, and the Appeal challenged the adequacy of the search. In considering the Appeal, the DOE found that Arms Control conducted a reasonable search for responsive documents located in its files. However, the DOE found that other offices that were not searched might have responsive documents. Accordingly, NSA's Appeal was granted and the matter was remanded to the FOIA Office for a search of all of the offices or their successors originally named in NSA's request or its Appeal.

# **Implementation of Special Refund Procedures**

Ed'S Exxon, Ron's Shell, 1/27/95, LEF-0078, LEF-0084

The DOE issued a Decision and Order implementing special refund procedures to distribute \$3,657.84, plus accrued interest, which Ed's Exxon and Ron's Shell (the remedial order firms) remitted to the DOE pursuant to Remedial Orders issued on September 30, 1981, and April 27, 1982, respectively. The DOE determined that it would distribute the fund in two stages. In the first stage, the DOE will accept applications for refund from those claiming injury as a result of the remedial order firms' violations of Federal petroleum pricing regulations. If any funds remain after meritorious claims are paid in the first stage, they will be used for indirect restitution through the States in accordance with the provisions of the Petroleum Overcharge Distribution and Restitution Act of 1986.

## **Refund Applications**

Rochdale Village, Inc., 1/27/95, RF272-66448, RD272-66448

The DOE issued a Decision and Order granting a refund to Rochdale Village, Inc., in the crude oil overcharge refund proceeding. Rochdale Village operates an apartment complex in New York City. In granting a refund, the DOE rejected an argument from a group of states and territories that certain increases in New York City's rent control guidelines adequately compensated Rochdale Village for crude oil overcharges. The DOE also denied a Motion for Discovery submitted by the group of states and territories.

Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)/Oklahoma, Belridge/Oklahoma, Palo Pinto/ Oklahoma, OKC/Oklahoma, Vickers/Oklahoma, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)/Oklahoma, 1/25/95, RM21-282, RM8-283, RM5-284, RM13-285, RM1-286, RM251-287

The DOE issued a Decision and Order granting Motions for Modification of previously-approved refund plans filed by the State of Oklahoma in the Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) (Amoco I and II), Belridge Oil, Palo Pinto Oil & Gas, OKC Corp., and Vickers Energy Corp. refund proceedings. Oklahoma requested permission to use \$45,000 in interest from funds which the State originally received or other second-stage refund proposals to install a compressed natural gas line between Kingston, Oklahoma, and Lake Texoma State Park. The project will supply natural gas service to residents and businesses in the surrounding area as well as to the state park, and it is to serve as a pilot program for other sites within the state. In accordance with prior Decisions that have noted the benefits of encouraging the use of alternative fuels, the DOE approved Oklahoma's Motions.