Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before June 20, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of Columbia's filings are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–14864 Filed 6–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP95–52–000]

Granite State Gas Transmission, Inc.; Notice of Site Visit and Technical Conferences

June 13, 1995.

On June 27, 1995, the staff will conduct a second visit to the proposed LNG site in the above docket. Those planning to attend must provide their own transportation.

On June 28, 1995, the staff will conduct two concurrent Technical Conferences in Wells, Maine on the LNG project proposed in the above docket.

The first Technical Conference will be on the Seismic design of the LNG plant and will be held in the Wells Town Hall/Annex at 9 a.m.

The second Technical Conference will be to examine the issues raised by intervenors, protestants, and staff including, but not limited to, the need for the LNG facility, system alternatives, alternative sites, and engineering matters. The second Technical Conference will be held at Wells Town Hall at 9 a.m. An official transcript will be kept.

For both Technical Conferences, the discussion will initially be limited to FERC staff and the members of applicant's staff who have expertise in the given topics. Other attendees will be given the opportunity to ask questions on the above issues after the initial discussion have concluded.

For further information on the site visit or the first Technical Conference call Robert Arvedlund, Chief, Environmental Review and Compliance Branch I, at (202) 208–0091. For further information the second Technical Conference, call Berne Mosley, staff engineer, Special Cases Review Branch, at (202) 208–2256.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–14861 Filed 6–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP95–557–000]

Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Application

June 13, 1995.

Take notice that on June 12, 1995, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern), 5400 Westheimer Court, Houston, Texas 77056–5310, filed an application in Docket No. CP95–557–000 pursuant to Sections 7(b) and Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act requesting permission and approval to abandon, by removal, certain corroded pipeline segments and for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to construct, install and operate replacement facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Texas Eastern requests authorization to replace and operate a total of 1.74 miles of 30-inch pipeline on its Line No. 16 in Refugio and Aransas Counties, Texas. Texas Eastern also requests permission and approval to abandon, by removal, a total of 1.74 miles of existing 30-inch Line No. 16 pipeline. The pipeline will be replaced in three discrete sections: from Milepost (MP) 170.52 to M.P. 171.46, from M.P. 175.03 to M.P. 175.35, and from M.P. 179.34 to 179.82.

Texas Eastern states that a routine in-line tool inspection of Line No. 16 performed in 1994 revealed areas of corrosion in the pipeline, necessitating replacement of the three identified segments. Texas Eastern states that the affected pipeline segments were constructed in 1956 as authorized in Docket No. G–9784 (16 FPC 27). Texas Eastern notes that Line No. 16 is part of one of Texas Eastern's principal transmission lines from its access area to its market areas. It is asserted that if the corroded pipeline were to be taken out of service and not replaced, Texas Eastern would not be able to meet its certified service levels.

Texas Eastern maintains that proposed replacements are required to maintain the integrity, safety, and reliability of its system. It is indicated that the pipeline segments will be replaced with the same 30-inch diameter pipeline as the existing pipeline. Consequently, the project will have no impact on Texas Eastern's design delivery capacity of maximum daily design system capacity. Texas Eastern estimates that the proposed facilities will cost $1,820,000, which will be financed, initially, with corporate funds on hand. Permanent financing will be undertaken at a later date.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before June 20, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate and permission and approval for the proposed abandonment is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Texas Eastern to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–14859 Filed 6–16–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Office of Hearings and Appeals Proposed Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

AGENCY: Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of proposed implementation of special refund procedures.

SUMMARY: The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) of the Department of Energy announces the proposed procedures for disbursement of $34,551,984 (plus additional accrued interest) in alleged or adjudicated crude oil overcharges obtained by the DOE from Dorchester Master Limited Partnership (Case No. VEF–0005), Howell Corporation (Case No. VEF–0006), Placid Oil Company (Case No. VEF–0008), Eton Trading Corporation (Case No. VEF–0009) and Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation (Case No. VEF–0010). The OHA has determined that the funds obtained from these firms, plus accrued interest, will be distributed in accordance with the DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases, 51 Fed. Reg. 27899 (August 4, 1986).

DATE AND ADDRESS: Comments must be filed in duplicate within 30 days of publication in the **Federal Register**, and should be addressed to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585. All comments should conspicuously display a reference to Case Nos. VEF–0005 *et al.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard W. Dugan, Associate Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–2860.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 10 CFR § 205.282(b), notice is hereby given of the issuance of the Proposed Decision and Order set forth below. The Proposed Decision and Order sets forth the procedures that the DOE has tentatively formulated to distribute a total of $34,551,984, plus additional accrued interest, remitted to the DOE by Dorchester Master Limited Partnership, Howell Corporation, Placid Oil Company, Eton Trading Corporation and Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation. The DOE is currently holding these funds in interest bearing escrow accounts pending distribution.

The OHA proposes to distribute these funds in accordance with the DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases, 51 Fed. Reg. 27899 (August 4, 1986) (the MSRP). Under the MSRP, crude oil overcharge monies are divided among the federal government, the states, and injured purchasers of refined petroleum products. Refunds to the states will be distributed in proportion to each state's consumption of petroleum products during the price control period. Refunds to eligible purchasers will be based on the volume of petroleum products that they purchased and the extent to which they can demonstrate injury.

The final deadline for the crude oil proceeding is June 30, 1995. As we state in the Proposed Decision, any party who has previously submitted a refund application in the crude oil refund proceeding should not file another Application for Refund. The previously filed crude oil application will be deemed filed in all crude oil proceedings as the proceedings are finalized.

Any member of the public may submit written comments regarding the proposed refund procedures. Commenting parties are requested to submit two copies of their comments. Comments should be submitted within 30 days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, and should be sent to the address set forth at the beginning of this notice. All comments received by the OHA will be available for public inspection between the hours of 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays, in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, located in Room 1E–234, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585.

Dated: June 12, 1995.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

June 12, 1995.

Proposed Decision and Order of the Department of Energy; Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

Names of Firms:
Dorchester Master Limited Partnership
Howell Corporation
Placid Oil Company
Eton Trading Corporation
Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation

Dates of Filing:
February 27, 1995
February 27, 1995
February 28, 1995
March 8, 1995
March 8, 1995

Case Numbers:
VEF–0005
VEF–0006
VEF–0008
VEF–0009
VEF–0010

In accordance with the procedural regulations of the Department of Energy (DOE), 10 C.F.R. part 205, Subpart V, the Office of General Counsel, Regulatory Litigation (''OGC'') (formerly the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA), Office of Enforcement Litigation), filed five Petitions for the Implementation of Special Refund Procedures with the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) on February 27, 1995, February 28, 1995, and March 8, 1995. The Petitions request that OHA formulate and implement procedures to distribute funds received by the DOE from Dorchester Master Limited Partnership (DMLP), Howell Corporation (Howell), Placid Oil Company (Placid), Eton Trading Corporation (Eton) and Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation, pursuant to DOE enforcement proceedings involving allegations of crude oil pricing and allocation violations by the firms. This Proposed Decision and Order sets forth the OHA's tentative plan to distribute these funds, which are being held in an interest-bearing escrow account maintained at the Department of the Treasury.

I. Background

A. Dorchester Master Limited Partnership

During the period of petroleum price controls, the firms which now comprise DML[1] were engaged in crude oil refining and reselling. The firms were therefore subject to regulations governing the pricing and allocation of crude oil set forth at 10 C.F.R. Parts 211 and 212 of the Mandatory Petroleum Price and Allocation Regulations. In an audit which covered the period from November 1, 1974 through August 1979 the ERA identified instances in which it believed that Dorchester's refinery subsidiary and reseller division engaged in the improper switching of crude oil certifications in violation of 10 C.F.R. §§ 211.67 (the Crude Oil Entitlements Program) and 212.131(b). As a result of the ERA audit, a Proposed Remedial Order (PRO) was issued to Dorchester on March 19, 1982 (Case No. 6A0X00278). The OHA affirmed the findings of the PRO and issued a Remedial Order (RO) to Dorchester on March 11, 1985. *Dorchester Gas Corp.*, 12 DOE ¶ 83,034 (1985), appeal docketed, No. R085–12–000 (FERC April 22, 1985). As a result of another ERA audit, on March 9, 1983, a PRO

[1] DMLP, a limited partnership formed in 1984, is the successor to Dorchester Gas Corporation (Dorchester) and includes Damson Oil Corporation (Damson), the general partner of DMLP, and Doram Energy, Inc. (Doram), a subsidiary of Damson. Therefore, DMLP will be used to refer collectively to Dorchester, Damson, and Doram, and their subsidiaries and affiliates. We will refer to the individual firms in some instances, since the audits originated with those firms during the period of price controls.

was issued to Doram and Damson, the other firms now comprising DMLP, alleging that during the period March 1980 through December 1980, they received illegal revenue by reselling crude oil at prices in excess of those permitted by applicable crude oil reseller price allocation regulations. An RO was issued to those two firms on March 12, 1987. *Doram Energy, Inc.*, 15 DOE ¶ 83,024 (1987), *modified*, 16 DOE ¶ 83,006 (1987), appeal docketed, No. R087–16–000 (FERC April 6, 1987).

On April 4, 1988, a Consent Order was executed between DMLP and the DOE which resolved a number of outstanding issues involving DMLP. Under the terms of the settlement, DMLP would pay the DOE a maximum of $65 million but no less than $11 million, plus installment interest, by July 1, 1997. The Consent Order states that the DOE has made no formal findings of violation by DMLP and that DMLP does not admit it has committed any regulatory violations. As of March 31, 1995, DMLP had paid the DOE the sum of $11,193,730,[2] and it is current in its payments to DOE. Although we anticipate that additional revenues will be collected from DMLP, no good reason exists to forestall implementing procedures for distributing the current balance of the fund, which, with accrued interest, totals $13,165,527.

B. Howell Corporation

During the price control period, Howell was a crude oil producer, refiner, and reseller. Howell was therefore subject to the Federal petroleum price and allocation regulations. In 1981, the ERA audited Howell's compliance with the crude oil Entitlements Program during the period January 1, 1978 through January 27, 1981. As a result of that audit, on June 24, 1988, a PRO was issued to the firm, alleging violations of the crude oil price and allocation regulations.[3] On February 23, 1989, the DOE and Howell executed a Consent Order resolving the issues addressed in the PRO. Pursuant to the Consent Order, Howell agreed to pay the DOE $19,375,000 plus interest, with installment payments over seven years. As of March 31, 1995, Howell had paid the DOE $15,288,098, and it is current in its payments to the DOE. Although we anticipate that additional revenues will be collected from Howell, no good reason exists to forestall implementing procedures for distributing the current balance of the fund, which, with accrued interest, totals $18,527,540.43.

C. Placid Oil Company

Placid was a producer of crude oil during the period of price controls. On March 30, 1981, the ERA issued a PRO in which it alleged that during the period from September 1973 through May 1977, Placid overcharged its customers in sales of crude oil from several properties it operated. In addition, the PRO also alleged that Placid improperly calculated the average daily production for a number of properties and as a result erroneously certified crude oil production from these properties as exempt from price controls pursuant to the stripper well exemption. On February 11, 1985, the OHA issued an RO to Placid, affirming the ERA allegations concerning Placid's overcharges. *Placid Oil Co.*, 12 DOE ¶ 83,030, *modified*, 13 DOE ¶ 83,007 (1985). Placid appealed the RO to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). On February 26, 1987, the FERC reversed and vacated the RO (*Placid Oil Co.*, 38 FERC ¶ 61,199); however, on July 23, 1987, the FERC reversed itself in part, vacating portions of its previous Order (*Placid Oil Co.*, 40 FERC ¶ 61,112). On March 18, 1988, the FERC issued an Order affirming the RO but modifying the violation amount. *Placid Oil Co.*, 42 FERC ¶ 61,326 (1988). Subsequently, in a bankruptcy proceeding involving Placid, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas approved the DOE's claim of $1,196,728.09 against Placid. Placid has fulfilled its financial obligation to the DOE. As of March 31, 1995, the Placid settlement fund contained $1,691,930, including accrued interest.

D. Eton Trading Corporation

Eton and its affiliate, Eton Enterprises, Inc., were resellers of crude oil during the period June 1980 through December 1980, and were subject to the crude oil reseller regulations set forth at 10 C.F.R. Part 212, Subpart L. As the result of an ERA audit of Eton's operations, on January 14, 1986, the ERA issued a PRO to the firm alleging that it had engaged in layered crude oil transactions in violation of 10 C.F.R. § 212.186. The PRO stated that those layered transactions resulted in overcharges amounting to $9,182,412.70. On March 17, 1986, Eton filed a Notice of Objection with this Office but waived its right to contest the determinations made in the PRO by failing to file a Statement of Objections in a timely manner. Accordingly, on December 5, 1986, the OHA issued the PRO as a final Remedial Order. *Eton Trading Corp.*, 15 DOE ¶ 83,011 (1986). In July 1986, Eton Trading Corporation and Eton Enterprises filed for bankruptcy. The DOE filed identical claims in the bankruptcy proceedings of the two firms. Final distributions have been made in the Eton Trading bankruptcy proceeding, but none has been made in the Eton Enterprise proceeding. As of March 31, 1995, the Eton settlement fund contained $1,106,788, including accrued interest. Although the possibility exists that additional revenues will be distributed to the DOE in the Eton Enterprise bankruptcy proceeding, no reason exists to delay implementing distribution of the current balance of the fund.

E. Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation

Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation and Ray V. Rodgers, Jr. (referred to collectively as Rodgers), were crude oil resellers during the period of September 1977 through January 1980. On March 29, 1985, the ERA issued a PRO to Rodgers alleging that during that period, Rodgers failed to properly certify crude oil it sold as required by 10 C.F.R. § 212.131(b). In addition, the ERA alleged that Rodgers failed to submit reports and maintain books and records in accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 212.187 (a) and (b).[4] Rodgers filed a Statement of Objections to the PRO on August 26, 1985. After considering Rodgers' objections, certain provisions of the PRO were modified, and the PRO was issued as a final RO on July 20, 1989. *Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corp.*, 19 DOE ¶ 83,004 (1989). On December 4, 1989, Rodgers and the DOE executed a Consent Order resolving the issues addressed by the RO. Pursuant to the Consent Order, Rodgers agreed to pay the DOE $50,000 plus interest, in two equal payments. Rodgers paid to the DOE the sum of $51,190 and has fulfilled its financial obligation to the DOE. As of March 31, 1995, the Rodgers escrow account contained $60,199.

[2] Of that amount $5,198.52 came from Damson pursuant to its own bankruptcy proceeding.

[3] The PRO alleged violations of 10 C.F.R. §§ 211.66(b) and (h), 205.202, and 210.62(c), resulting from significant understatement of receipts of price-controlled crude oil. Specifically, ERA alleged that during the period April 1978 through December 1979, the Joint Venture consisting of Howell and Quintana Refinery Co. failed to correctly report the tier certifications associated with substantial volumes of its crude oil receipts at its Corpus Christi, Texas, refinery; and Howell Hydrocarbons, a Howell subsidiary, engaged in similar conduct during the period April 1978 through November 1980 at its San Antonio, Texas, refinery. In addition, the ERA alleged that during the period April 1978 through December 1979, Howell Industries, another subsidiary, improperly charged prices for crude oil in excess of its actual purchase prices, in violation of 10 C.F.R. §§ 212.186, 210.62(c) and 205.202.

[4] Crude oil resellers were required to file certain information on ERA–69 ''Crude Oil Reseller's Self-Reporting Forms.''

II. Jurisdiction and Authority

The Subpart V regulations set forth general guidelines which may be used by the OHA in formulating and implementing a plan of distribution of funds received as a result of an enforcement proceeding. The DOE policy is to use the Subpart V process to distribute such funds. For a more detailed discussion of Subpart V and the authority of the OHA to fashion procedures to distribute refunds, *see Petroleum Overcharge Distribution and Restitution Act of 1986,* 15 U.S.C. 4501 *et seq.;* see also Office of Enforcement, 9 DOE ¶ 82,508 (1981), and Office of Enforcement, 8 DOE ¶ 82,597 (1981).

We have considered the OGC's petitions that we implement Subpart V proceedings with respect to the DMLP, Howell, Placid, Eton and Rodgers funds and have determined that such proceedings are appropriate. This Proposed Decision and Order sets forth the OHA's tentative plan to distribute these funds. Before taking the actions proposed in this Decision, we intend to publicize our proposal and solicit comments from interested parties. Comments regarding the tentative distribution process set forth in this Proposed Decision and Order should be filed with the OHA within 30 days of its publication in the **Federal Register**.

III. Proposed Refund Procedures

A. Crude Oil Refund Policy

We propose to distribute the monies received from DMLP, Howell, Placid, Eton and Rodgers in accordance with DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases (MSRP), 51 Fed. Reg. 27899 (August 4, 1986), which was issued as a result of the Settlement Agreement approved by the court in The Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation, 653 F. Supp. 108 (D. Kan. 1986). Shortly after the issuance of the MSRP, the OHA issued an Order that announced that this policy would be applied in all Subpart V proceedings involving alleged crude oil violations. *See* Order Implementing the MSRP, 51 Fed. Reg. 29689 (August 20, 1986) (the August 1986 Order).

Under the MSRP, 40 percent of crude oil overcharge funds will be disbursed to the federal government, another 40 percent to the states, and up to 20 percent may initially be reserved for the payment of claims to injured parties. The MSRP also specified that any funds remaining after all valid claims by injured purchasers are paid will be disbursed to the federal government and the states in equal amounts.

On April 10, 1987, the OHA issued a Notice analyzing the numerous comments received in response to the August 1986 Order. 52 Fed. Reg. 11737 (April 10, 1987). This Notice provided guidance to claimants that anticipated filing refund applications for crude oil monies under the Subpart V regulations. In general, we stated that all claimants would be required to (1) document their purchase volumes of petroleum products during the August 19, 1973 through January 27, 1981 crude oil price control period, and (2) prove that they were injured by the alleged crude oil overcharges. Applicants who were end-users or ultimate consumers of petroleum products, whose businesses are unrelated to the petroleum industry, and who were not subject to the DOE price regulations would be presumed to have been injured by any alleged crude oil overcharges. In order to receive a refund, end-users would not need to submit any further evidence of injury beyond the volume of petroleum products purchased during the period of price controls. *See City of Columbus Georgia,* 16 DOE ¶ 85,550 (1987).

The amount of money subject to this Proposed Decision is $34,551,984, plus additional accrued interest. In accordance with the MSRP, we propose initially to reserve 20 percent of those funds ($6,910,397 plus additional accrued interest) for direct refunds to applicants who claim that they were injured by crude oil overcharges.

We propose to evaluate claims in the DMLP, Howell, Placid, Eton and Rodgers crude oil refund proceedings in exactly the same manner as in other crude oil proceedings. As we stated in the April 10 Notice, claimants will generally be required to document their purchase volumes of petroleum products and prove that they were injured as a result of the alleged violations. We will also presume that the alleged crude oil overcharges were absorbed, rather than passed on, by applicants who were (1) end-users of petroleum products, (2) unrelated to the petroleum industry, and (3) not subject to the regulations promulgated under the Emergency Petroleum Price and Allocation Act of 1973, 15 U.S.C. 751–760. In order to receive a refund, such claimants need not submit any evidence of injury beyond documentation of their purchase volumes.

We propose to base the refunds on a volumetric amount which has been calculated in accordance with the description in the April 10 Notice. That volumetric refund amount is currently $0.0016 per gallon. *See* 57 Fed. Reg. 15562 (March 24, 1995).

Applicants who have executed and submitted a valid waiver pursuant to one of the escrows established by the Stripper Well Settlement Agreement have waived their rights to apply for a crude oil refund under Subpart V and should not file a crude oil refund application. *See Mid-America Dairyman Inc. v. Herrington,* 878 F.2d 1448 (Temp. Emer. Ct. App.); 3 Fed. Energy Guidelines ¶ 26,617 (1989); *In re* Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation, 707 F. Supp. 1267 (D. Kan.), 3 Fed. Energy Guidelines ¶ 26,613 (1987). The deadline for filing an Application for Refund is June 30, 1995. A crude oil refund applicant is only required to submit one application for its share of all available crude oil overcharge funds. *See, e.g., Ernest A. Allerkamp,* 17 DOE ¶ 85,079 at 88,176 (1988). Accordingly, any party that has previously submitted a refund Application in the crude oil refund proceeding need not file another Application.

C. Payments to the States and Federal Government

Under the terms of the MSRP, the remaining 80 percent of the alleged crude oil violation amounts subject to this Proposed Decision, or $27,641,587 plus additional accrued interest, should be disbursed in equal shares to the states and federal government, for indirect restitution. Refunds to the states will be in proportion to the consumption of petroleum products in each state during the period of price controls. The share or ratio of the funds which each state will receive is contained in Exhibit H of the Stripper Well Settlement Agreement. When disbursed, these funds will be subject to the same limitations and reporting requirements as all other crude oil monies received by the states under the Stripper Well Agreement.

It is therefore ordered that: The refund amounts remitted to the Department of Energy by Dorchester Master Limited Partnership, Howell Corporation, Placid Oil Company, Eton Trading Corporation and Rodgers Hydrocarbon Corporation pursuant to their respective Consent Orders or Bankruptcy Court Orders will be distributed in accordance with the foregoing Decision.

[FR Doc. 95–14915 Filed 6–16–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

SUMMARY: The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) of the Department of Energy (DOE) announces the procedures