LIST OF CASES RECEIVED BY THE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS [Week of Jan. 22 through Jan. 26, 1996]

Date	Name and location of applicant	Case No.	Type of submission
Jan. 22, 1996	Archie M. LeGrand, Jr., Summerton, South Carolina.	VFA-0120	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The December 11, 1995 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by the Freedom of Information Privacy Act Division would be rescinded, and Archie M. LeGrand, Jr. would receive access to certain Department of Energy Information.
Do	Barton J. Bernstein, Stanford, California	VFA-0117	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The December 22, 1995 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by Albuquerque Operations Office would be rescinded, and Barton J. Bernstein would receive access to certain DOE information.
Do	Jeffrey R. Leist, Mentor, Ohio	VFA-0119	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The December 27, 1995 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by the DOE Mound Facility would be rescinded, and Jeffrey R. Leist would receive access to certain DOE information.
Do	Waite, Schneider, Bayless & Chelsey Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.	VFA-0118	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The August 9, 1995 Freedom of information Request Denial issued by the DOE Mound Facility would be rescinded, and Waite, Schneider, Bayless & Chelsey Co. would receive access to certain DOE information.
Jan. 23, 1996	Martha Julian, Newburgh, Indiana	VFA-0121	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The January 8, 1996 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by the Albuquerque Operations Office would be rescinded, and Martha Julian would receive access to certain DOE information.
Jan. 24, 1996	Frank Thompson Transport, El Dorado, Arizona.	RR272-230	Request for Modification/Rescission in the Crude Oil Refund Proceeding. If granted: The January 23, 1996 Dismissal Letter, Case Number RF272–78153, issued to Frank Thompson Transport would be modified regarding the firm's application for refund submitted in the Crude Oil Refund Proceeding.
Jan. 25, 1996	Eugene Maples, Hopkins, South Carolina	VFA-0122	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The November 29, 1995 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by the Office of Inspector General would be rescinded, and Eugene Maples would receive certain Department of Energy information.
Do	James H. Stebbings, Naperville, Illinois	VFA-0123	Appeal of an Information Request Denial. If granted: The January 4, 1996 Freedom of Information Request Denial issued by the Argonne National Laboratory would be rescinded, and James H. Stebbings would receive access to certain DOE information.
Jan. 26, 1996	Pittsburgh Naval Reactors Office, West Miff- lin, Pennsylvania.	VSO-0081	Request for Hearing under 10 C.F.R. Part 710. If granted: An individual employed at Pittsburgh Naval Reactors Of- fice would receive a hearing under 10 C.F.R. Part 710, entitled "Criteria and Procedures for Determining Eligi- bility for Access to Classified Matter or Special Nuclear Material."

[FR Doc. 96–14578 Filed 6–7–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

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

ACTION: Notice of Implementation of Special Refund Procedures.

SUMMARY: The Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy announces procedures for the disbursement of \$592,001 (plus accrued interest) collected pursuant to a consent order with Macmillan Oil Company

(Case No. LEF-0046) and \$15,822 (plus accrued interest) collected pursuant to a consent order with Kenny Larson Oil Company (Case No. VEF-0002). The funds will be distributed in accordance with the DOE's special refund procedures, 10 CFR part 205, subpart V.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bryan F. MacPherson, Assistant Director, Office of Hearings and

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, Washington, DC. 20585, (202) 426–1562.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with § 205.282(b) of the procedural regulations of the Department of Energy (DOE), 10 CFR § 205.282(b), notice is hereby given of

the issuance of the Decision and Order set out below. The Decision and Order specifies the procedures that will be used to distribute monies that have been collected by the DOE pursuant to consent orders with Macmillan Oil Company (Macmillan) and Kenny Larson Oil Company (Larson). The consent order with Macmillan settled possible pricing violations with respect to Macmillan's sales of propane, No. 2 fuel oil and Nos. 5 and 6 residual fuel oil. The DOE has collected \$592,001 from Macmillan. The consent order with Larson settled possible pricing violations with respect to Larson's sales of motor gasoline. The DOE has

collected \$15,822 from Larson. The Decision and Order finds that the funds should be distributed to the firms that were overcharged as set forth in DOE audit records. The amount of each firm's potential refund is set forth in the Appendices to the Decision and Order.

Applications for Refund must be filed prior to December 31, 1996 and should contain the information specified in the Decision and Order.

Dated: May 29, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Department of Energy Washington, DC 20585

May 29, 1996.

DECISION AND ORDER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Special Refund Procedures

Name of Firms: Macmillan Oil Company, Kenny Larson Oil Company Dates of Filings: June 5, 1992, October 18, 1994

Case Numbers: LEF-0046, VEF-0002.

In accordance with the procedural regulations of the Department of Energy (DOE), 10 C.F.R. Part 205, Subpart V, the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) filed Petitions to Implement of Special Refund Procedures with the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) on June 5, 1992, and on October 18, 1994. The petitions request that the OHA formulate and implement procedures to distribute funds received pursuant to consent orders entered into between the DOE and Kenny Larson Oil Company (Larson) of Oregon City, Oregon, and Macmillan Oil Company (Macmillan) of Des Moines, Iowa. After reviewing the records in the present cases, we have concluded that a Subpart V proceeding is an appropriate mechanism for distributing the Larson and Macmillan consent order funds. We therefore shall grant the ERA's petitions and assume jurisdiction over distribution of the funds.

I. Background

Larson and Macmillan were "resellerretailers" as defined in 6 C.F.R. § 150.352 and 10 C.F.R. § 212.31. During the relevant periods these companies were subject to the Mandatory Petroleum Price Regulations, 10 C.F.R. Part 212, Subpart F. An ERA audit of Larson's business records revealed possible pricing violations with respect to the firm's sales of motor gasoline during the period May through December 1979. An ERA audit of Macmillan's business records revealed possible pricing violations with respect to the firm's sales of propane, No. 2 fuel oil, and Nos. 5 and 6 residual fuel oil during the period November 1, 1973, through April 30, 1974. In order to settle all claims and disputes between these companies and the DOE regarding their compliance with the price regulations, the DOE entered into consent orders with Larson and Macmillan on September 21, 1981, and March 7, 1988, respectively.

In the Larson consent order, the firm agreed to remit a total of \$7,415. approximately 38 percent of the amount of the overcharges alleged by the DOE, plus installment interest. Of the principal amount, \$5,842 was to be remitted to the DOE, and \$1,573 was to be paid directly to six of Larson's customers. Larson failed to comply with the Consent Order and remitted no funds to either the DOE or the six customers. On August 29, 1994, we granted Larson a refund of \$15,822 in the Texaco special refund proceeding. Texaco Inc./Kenny Larson Oil Company, 24 DOE ¶ 85,081 (1994) (Texaco/Larson). At that time, Larson was in default in the amount of \$26,168 (\$7,415 principal plus \$18,753 interest) in its obligations pursuant to the Consent Order. Accordingly, in Texaco/Larson, we determined that the Texaco refund should be used to fund Larson's consent order escrow account, in satisfaction of the firm's principal settlement amount and partial satisfaction of its debt for interest accrued. Accordingly, the \$15,822 Texaco refund was deposited into the Kenny Larson Oil Company escrow account maintained at the Department of the Treasury, Consent Order No. 000H00439. This is the amount which is available for distribution to Larson's customers in this proceeding.

On February 1, 1983, a Proposed Remedial Order was issued to Macmillan which alleged that the firm violated the price regulations with respect to its sales of propane, No. 2 fuel oil, and Nos. 5 and 6 residual fuel oil. Macmillan contested the PRO before OHA (Case No. HRO-0122). During the course of that proceeding, the ERA reduced the amount of the alleged overcharges from \$383,268 to \$333,853. See Letter from Ann C. Grover, Associate Solicitor, ERA, to Richard T. Tedrow, OHA Deputy Director (October 5, 1987). On March 7, 1988, Macmillan and DOE entered into a consent order that settled the PRO's allegations. Pursuant to the consent order obligation, Macmillan remitted a total amount of \$592,001 (including presettlement interest) to the DOE in full satisfaction of the amount owed. The audit workpapers identify the customers that Macmillan allegedly overcharged.

II. Refund Procedures

On August 2, 1995, a Proposed Decision and Order was issued that tentatively concluded that the procedures set forth below should govern the distribution of funds received pursuant to the Macmillan and Larson consent orders. That Proposed Decision was published in the Federal Register, and interested parties were given 30 days in which to comment. 60 Fed. Reg. 40580 (August 9, 1995). No comments were received. Accordingly, we find that the procedures described in the Proposed Decision, and which are set forth below, should govern the distribution of the Macmillan and Larson consent order funds.

A. Refund Claimants

In the first stage, refund monies will be distributed to those parties which were directly injured in transactions with Larson and Macmillan during the audit periods. We believe that the Larson and Macmillan customers who were adversely affected by the alleged overcharges are primarily those purchasers specifically identified in the consent orders and in the audit papers. In addition, customers who purchased motor gasoline from the three retail outlets operated by Larson were referred to as a class in the ERA audit files but could not be individually identified. These parties may also file for refunds in this proceeding.

Based on the information we have about Larson's business, we expect that all applicants in the Larson proceeding and most applicants in the Macmillan proceeding will be ultimate consumers. As in many other refund proceedings, we are making a finding that end-users or ultimate consumers whose businesses are unrelated to the petroleum industry were injured by the overcharges covered by the Consent Order. Unlike regulated firms in the petroleum industry, members of this group were generally not subject to price controls during the audit period and were not required to keep records which justified selling-price increases by reference to cost increases. See, e.g., Marion Corp., 12 DOE ¶ 85,014 (1984); Thornton Oil Corp., 12 DOE ¶ 85,112 (1984). For these reasons, an analysis of the impact of the increased cost of petroleum products on the final prices of non-petroleum goods and services would be beyond the scope of this special refund proceeding. See Office of Enforcement, 10 DOE ¶ 85,072 (1983); see also Texas Oil & Gas Corp., 12 DOE ¶ 85,069 at 88,209 (1984). Therefore the end-users of Larson and Macmillan petroleum products named in the consent orders or workpapers shall be presumed injured by the alleged overcharges. Other end-user applicants in the Larson proceeding (those purchasing from retail outlets), if any, need only demonstrate that they purchased from Larson and document their purchase volumes to make a sufficient showing that they were injured by the alleged overcharges.1

We expect some of the applicants in the Macmillan proceeding to be resellers or retailers. With respect to such applicants, we shall adopt a small-claims threshold of \$5,000. Reseller or retailer applicants seeking refunds of \$5,000 or less will not be required to demonstrate that they were injured by Macmillan's alleged overcharges. In addition, one former customer of Macmillan, E.L. Bride, appears to be a reseller whose potential refund amount is \$141,986. Consistent with prior cases, it will be able to obtain a refund of \$50,000 without making a demonstration that it was injured by Macmillan's overcharges. In order to obtain a refund of its full overcharge amount, it would have to show that it was injured by the overcharges. See Gulf Oil Corp., 16 DOE

¹ One Larson customer (Portland General Electric) and three Macmillan customers (Iowa Power & Light, Atlantic Municipal Utilities, and Iowa South Utilities) are public utilities. As in other Subpart V proceedings, we will treat the utilities as end-users. Since each of their potential refunds is less than \$5,000, we will not require them to submit the type of certification of pass-through required of public utilities that receive refunds in excess of the \$5,000 small claims threshold. See, e.g., Placid Oil Co., 18 DOE ¶ 85,176 at 88,290 (1988).

¶ 85,381 at 88,738 (1987); *Marathon Petroleum Co.*, 14 DOE ¶ 85,269 at 88,510 (1986).

B. Calculation of Refund Amount

As stated above, the audits which gave rise to the Macmillan Consent Order identified all of the customers allegedly overcharged during the audit period. In total, there are 66 identified customers who were allegedly overcharged by Macmillan during its refund period. The Larson audit identified six customers which account for 21.2 percent of the alleged overcharges, while the remaining 78.8 percent of the alleged overcharges were attributed to Larson's sales to customers at its retail stations. With respect to the identified customers of Larson and Macmillan, we have determined that the use of the audit results to establish potential refunds on a firmspecific basis is more accurate than any other method to relate probable injury to refund amount.

We shall therefore base the identified customers' potential refunds on the amount that each of these firms was allegedly overcharged, as determined by the ERA audit. Thus, the principal amount of each firm's maximum refund is 100 percent of the amount designated for that firm in the Consent Order plus a pro rata share of the interest that the DOE has collected on that amount. (For Larson, the latter is approximately 45 percent of the interest that Larson actually owed at the time the money was placed in the escrow account.) The firms and their potential refund amounts are listed in the Appendices to this Decision. In addition, to the amounts indicated in the Appendices, each successful claimant will receive a pro rata share of the interest accrued on the consent order funds between the date the funds were placed in the Larson and Macmillan escrow accounts and the date the claimant's refund is disbursed.

We shall use a volumetric methodology to distribute that portion of the consent order fund attributable to purchases from Larson's retail outlets. Under the volumetric methodology, customers at Larson's retail outlets will be eligible to receive a refund equal to the number of gallons of motor gasoline purchased from Larson from May through December 1979 multiplied by the volumetric factor. The volumetric factor for Larson is equal to \$0.0123.2 We also establish a minimum amount of \$15 for refund claims,

as the cost of processing claims in which refunds are sought for amounts less than \$15 outweighs the benefits of restitution in those situations. See, e.g., Uban Oil Co., 9 DOE ¶82,541 at 82,225 (1982); see also 10 C.F.R. § 205.286(b). Therefore, retail outlet customers must have purchased at least 1,220 gallons of Larson motor gasoline during the Larson audit period in order to be eligible for a refund.

C. Distribution of Remaining Funds

Any funds that remain after all first-stage claims have been decided will be distributed in accordance with the provisions of the Petroleum Overcharge Distribution and Restitution Act of 1986 (PODRA), 15 U.S.C. §§ 4501-07. PODRA requires that the Secretary of Energy determine annually the amount of oil overcharge funds that will not be required to refund monies to injured parties in Subpart V proceedings and make those funds available to state governments for use in four energy conservation programs. The Secretary has delegated these responsibilities to OHA. Any funds in the Larson and Macmillan escrow account that OHA determines will not be needed to effect direct restitution to injured Larson and Macmillan customers will be distributed in accordance with the provisions of PODRA.

III. Requirements for Refund Applications

To apply for a refund from any of the settlement funds, a claimant should submit an Application for Refund containing all of the following information:

- (1) Identifying information including the claimant's name, current business address, taxpayer identification number, the name, title, and telephone number of a person to contact for additional information, and the name and address of the person who should receive any refund check.³
- (2) Describe any change in ownership of the applicant firm since the refund period. If

the applicant claims a refund as an heir or assignee of the person or firm that purchased products from Larson or Macmillan it should explain why it should receive the refund.

- (3) A statement whether the applicant or a related firm has filed, or has authorized any individual to file on its behalf, any other application in this refund proceeding. If so, an explanation of the circumstances of the other filing or authorization should be submitted.
- (4) If the applicant is or was in any way affiliated with the consenting firms, it should explain this affiliation.
- (5) The statement listed below signed by the individual applicant or a responsible official of the firm filing the refund application:

I swear (or affirm) that the information contained in this application and its attachments is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that anyone who is convicted of providing false information to the federal government may be subject to a fine, a jail sentence, or both, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1001. I understand that the information contained in this application is subject to public disclosure.

Each applicant for which an address appears in the Appendices will be mailed a sample application form that may be used, but which is not required. Copies will be sent to any other party upon request. Each applicant must submit an original and one copy of the application. All refund applications should be postmarked no later than December 31, 1996, and be sent to: Macmillan Oil Company [or] Kenny Larson Oil Company, Special Refund Proceeding, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. 20585–0107.

It Is Therefore Ordered That:

(1) Applications for Refund from the funds remitted to the Department of Energy by Kenny Larson Oil Company pursuant to the September 21, 1981 Consent Order may now be filed. The funds will be distributed in accordance with the foregoing Decision.

(2) Applications for Refund from the funds remitted to the Department of Energy by Macmillan Oil Company pursuant to the March 7, 1988 Consent Order may now be filed. The funds will be distributed in accordance with the foregoing Decision.

(3) To be considered, all Applications for Refund must be postmarked no later than December 31, 1996.

Dated: May 29, 1996.

George B. Breznay.

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

²The volumetric factor was computed by dividing \$12,467 (78.8 percent of the \$15,822 collected for the Larson escrow account) by 1,016,250 (the approximate volume of motor gasoline sold to retail customers during the audit period).

³ Under the Privacy Act of 1974, the submission of a social security number by an individual applicant is voluntary. An applicant that does not wish to submit a social security number must submit an employer identification number if one exists. This information will be used in processing refund applications, and is requested pursuant to our authority under the Petroleum Overcharge Distribution and Restitution Act of 1986 and the regulations codified at 10 C.F.R. Part 205, Subpart V. The information may be shared with other Federal agencies for statistical, auditing or archiving purposes, and with law enforcement agencies when they are investigation a potential violation of civil or criminal law. Unless an applicant claims confidentiality, this information will be available to the public in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and

APPENDIX A.—MACMILLAN CUSTOMERS AND THEIR POTENTIAL REFUND AMOUNTS

	172 \$395
ACE LINES, INC., c/o T.C. MILLER, P.O. BOX 8088, DES MOINES IA 50301	
ARMSTRONG RUBBER, 2345 E MARKET ST, DES MOINES IA 50317–7598	904 \$31,886
	491 \$1,126
	537 \$1,231
	599 \$3,667
	806 \$8,728
	418 \$3,252
BITUCOTE PRODUCTS CO	\$11 \$25 220 \$505
	652 \$1,495
	278 \$638
CITY OF PLEASANT HILL	\$5 \$12
	172 \$394
	785 \$1,800
	320 \$734
	503 \$1,153 318 \$729
	759 \$17,794
E.L. BRIDE COMPANY, P.O. BOX 7470, SHAWNEE MISSION KS 66207	' '
	040 \$2,385
	402 \$922
	662 \$8,398
	165 \$378
FIDELITY WAREHOUSE, c/o JACOBSON WAREHOUSE CO, 1500 DELAWARE AVE, DES	400 CE 570
	432 \$5,578 152 \$348
	400 \$917
	090 \$20,846
	788 \$1,807
H. WEST CONSTRUCTION\$25	\$19 \$44
HOTEL DES MOINES\$325	251 \$576
	702 \$6,196
	845 \$1,938
	983 \$4,548
	365 \$7,717 386 \$7,765
	316 \$725
	828 \$1,899
KRIZAN, CHARLES\$556	430 \$986
	504 \$1,156
LOCAL 334, MUSICIANS UNION, 82 MULBERRY ST, WATERLOO IA 50703\$99	\$77 \$176
MAYTAG, 1 DEPENDABILITY SQ, NEWTON IA 50208–9238	1 ' . '
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	104 \$4,825 404 \$927
	393 \$901
	632 \$3,743
	577 \$1,323
PEPSI COLA BOTTLERS, 3825 106TH ST, DES MOINES IA 50322-2098	740 \$1,697
	990 \$2,271
	797 \$6,414
	149 \$342
	450 \$1,032 \$1,240
STATE OF IOWA, c/o ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, HOOVER BUILDING, DES MOINES IA	588 \$1,349
50319	945 \$2,167
DES MOINES IA 50319	391 \$5,483
MOINES IA 50319 \$183	141 \$324
	365 \$3,131
	227 \$14,281
TARGET READY MIX, c/o BILLY H BRYANT, 405 52ND ST, WEST DES MOINES IA 50265	1 : 1
UNIV OF IOWA, 1111 9TH ST, DES MOINES IA 50314–2527	1 ' 4 '
UNIV OF N. IOWA, 802 W 29TH ST, CEDAR FALLS IA 50613	494 \$8,013 \$9 \$21
	780 \$1,789
	634 \$6,040
HEIGHTS NJ 07922 \$952	736 \$1,688 409 \$3,231

APPENDIX A.—MACMILLAN CUSTOMERS AND THEIR POTENTIAL REFUND AMOUNTS—Continued

Customer name	Overcharge amount	Pre-settle- ment interest	Potential refund amount
YOUNKERS, 7 & WALNUT, DES MOINES IA 50314		\$315	\$722
TOTAL	\$333,853	\$258,148	\$592,001

APPENDIX B.—KENNY LARSON CUSTOMERS AND THEIR POTENTIAL REFUND AMOUNTS

Customer name		Interest collected	Potential principal refund
SCHULTZ SANITARY SERVICE, 10643 NE SIMPSON, PORTLAND OR 97220–1223	\$416	\$471	\$887
B & C TOWING	\$96 \$91	\$109 \$101	\$205 \$192
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC, LEGAL DEPARTMENT, 121 SW SALMON ST, PORTLAND OR 97204		\$773	\$1,458
LARRY HEPLER	\$685 \$93	\$109	\$202
SKIG NAGAL FARMS		\$219	\$411
RETAIL CUSTOMERS	\$5,842	\$6,625	\$12,467
TOTAL	\$7,415	\$8,407	\$15,822

[FR Doc. 96–14577 Filed 6–7–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Sunshine Act Meeting

The following notice of meeting is published pursuant to section 3(a) of the Government in the Sunshine Act (Pub. L. No. 94-409), 5 U.S.C. 552B:

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

DATE AND TIME: June 12, 1996, 10:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 2C, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Agenda.

Note.—Items listed on the agenda may be deleted without further notice.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Lois D. Cashell, Secretary, Telephone (202) 208-0400. For a recording listing items stricken from or added to the meeting, call (202) 208-1627.

This is a list of matters to be considered by the Commission. It does not include a listing of all papers relevant to the items on the agenda; however, all public documents may be examined in the reference and information center.

Consent Agenda—Hydro, 654th Meeting— June 12, 1996, Regular Meeting (10:00 a.m.)

Docket# P-9248, 012, Town of Telluride, Colorado CAH-2.

Docket# P-2315, 002, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company

CAH-3.

Docket# P-2331, 002, Duke Power Company

CAH-4.

Docket# P-2332, 003, Duke Power Company

CAH-5.

Docket# P-2645, 029, Niagara Mohawk **Power Corporation**

CAH-6.

Docket# P-10199, 000, City of Klamath Falls, Oregon

Consent Agenda—Electric

CAE-1.

Docket# ER94-35, 000, Central Vermont Public Service Corporation and Green Mountain Power Corporation

CAE-2.

Docket# ER96-1316, 000, Transalta **Enterprises Corporation**

CAE-3.

Docket# ER96-1485, 000, Illinois Power Company

CAE-4.

Docket# ER96-1580, 000, Minnesota Power & Light Company

CAE-5.

Omitted

CAE-6.

Docket# ER96-688, 000, Northwest Power Marketing Company, L.L.C.

CAE-7.

Docket# ER93-777, 000, Commonwealth **Edison Company**

Other#S ER93-777, 002, Commonwealth **Edison Company**

ER93-777, 003, Commonwealth Edison Company

ER95-371, 000, Commonwealth Edison Company

ER95-371, 001, Commonwealth Edison Company

ER95-1539, 000, Commonwealth Edison Company

ER95-1545, 000, Commonwealth Edison Company

CAE-8.

Docket# EC95-16, 003, Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Northern States Power Company (Minnesota), et al. Other#S EL95–61, 000, Wisconsin Electric

Power Corporation

EL95-68, 000, Wisconsin Public Power Incorporated, et al. v. Wisconsin Electric Power Corporation

ER94–1625, 000, Wisconsin Electric Power Company

ER95-264, 000, Wisconsin Electric Power Company

ER95-1084, 000, Wisconsin Electric Power Company

ER95-1357, 003, Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Northern States Power Company (Minnesota), et al.

ER95–1358, 003, Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Northern States Power Company

ER95-1474, 000, Wisconsin Electric Power Company

CAE-9.

Docket# EC95-16, 004, Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Northern States Power Company (Minnesota), et al.

Other#S ER95-1357, 004, Wisconsin **Electric Power Company and Northern** States Power Company (Minnesota), et

ER95-1358, 004, Wisconsin Electric Power Company and Northern States Power Company

CAE-10.

Docket# ER95-267, 006, New England **Power Company**

CAE-11.

Docket# EF95-5171, 001, United States Department of Energy-Western Area Power Administration (Salt Lake City Area Integrated Projects)

CAE-12. Omitted CAE-13.