

Randall Davis, Department of Marine Biology, Texas A&M University, P.O. Box 1675, Galveston, Texas 77553
Permit Application: 98-004

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Taking and Import into the U.S. The applicant will investigate the behavioral and energetic adaptations that enable Weddell seals to forage into the Antarctic fast-ice environment. They will examine the underwater behavior, locomotor performances (swimming velocity, stroke frequency, amplitude and three-dimensional movements) and energy metabolism during foraging dives. To accomplish this, the applicant proposes to capture up to 15 Weddell seals each season. The seals will be weighed, immobilized and sedated for attachment of a video camera and a small radio transmitter to a piece of neoprene rubber glued to the fur along the dorsal midline above the shoulders with neoprene rubber cement. In addition, blood and muscle tissue samples will be taken and imported in the U.S. for analysis of metabolites and myoglobin. During each deployment of the video system, a single seal will be captured, instrumented and released into an ice hole for five days. The rubber pad will eventually fall off when the seal molts.

Location: McMurdo Sound vicinity.
Dates: October 1, 1997 to February 1, 2000.

3. Applicant

Wayne Z. Trivelpiece, Department of Biology, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana 59717
Permit Application No. 98-005

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Taking; Import into the U.S.; and, Enter Site of Special Scientific Interest. The applicant is conducting a continuing study of behavioral ecology and population biology of the Adelie, gentoo, and chinstrap penguins and the interactions among these species and their principal avian predators: skuas, gulls, sheathbills, and giant fulmars. Up to 1000 Adelie and gentoo chicks, plus 150 adults of each of all three penguin species, will be branded. Up to 50 adults of each penguin species will be fitted with radio transmitters and time-depth recorders to continue studying penguin foraging habits. The study also involves stomach pumping of 40 adult penguins per species. In addition the principal avian predators of the penguins, mentioned above, will also be studied, requiring adults and chicks to be banded, if possible. One (1) milliliter sample of blood will be collected from each of a maximum of 20 breeding

adults of each penguin species for DNA analysis. All captured birds will be released unharmed. Carcasses and skeletons of penguins and other birds salvaged at the study site will be imported into the U.S. for educational and scientific study.

Location: SSSI #8—Western Shore of Admiralty Bay, King George Island, South Shetland Islands, Antarctica.

Dates: October 1, 1997–April 1, 1998.

4. Applicant

Robert Wharton, Jr., Desert Research Institute, P.O. Box 60220, Reno, Nevada 89506
Permit Application No. 98-006

Activity for Which Permit Is Requested

Enter Site of Special Scientific Interest. The applicant proposes to enter the Barwick Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest #3 to obtain hydrological data on lake levels and ice thickness. Besides extending baseline data in Barwick Valley, these data will contribute to ongoing investigations of lake ice dynamics in the Dry Valleys carried out by the LTER and NASA Exobiology projects. Data collection will be done by completely non-intrusive means. There will be no drilling, sample collection, or environmental manipulations of any kind. Lake leveling will be done with optical survey instruments, and ice thickness will be performed with ground penetrating radar (GPR). The applicant plans to enter the SSSI during two day trips in November. Personnel will be put down by helicopter outside the SSSI boundaries, establish a small tent camp, then hike into the SSSI to Lake Vashka (approximately 5 km).

Location: SSSI #3—Barwick Valley, Victoria Land, Antarctica.

Dates: November 1, 1997 to November 15, 1997.

Nadene G. Kennedy,

Permit Office, Office of Polar Programs.

[FR Doc. 97-14143 Filed 5-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-255]

Consumers Power Company; Palisades Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DRP-20, issued to Consumers Power Company, (CPCo, the licensee), for

operation of the Palisades Plant, located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the Facility Operating License No. DRP-20 and the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-20 for the Palisades Plant. Specifically, the proposed action would amend the license to reflect the change in the licensee's name from Consumers Power Company to Consumers Energy Company.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated March 27, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to revise the company name in the license to reflect the corporate name change that occurred on March 11, 1997.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed changes to the license and TS. According to the licensee, the name change will not impact the existing ownership of the Palisades Plant or the existing entitlement to power and will not alter the existing antitrust license conditions applicable to CPCo or CPCo's ability to comply with these conditions or with any of its other obligations or responsibilities. As stated by the licensee, "The corporate existence continues uninterrupted, and all legal characteristics remain the same. Thus, there is no change in the ownership, State of incorporation, registered agent, registered office, directors, officers, rights or liabilities of the Company, nor is there a change in the function of the Company or the way in which it does business. The Company's financial responsibility for the Palisades Plant and its sources of funds to support the facility will remain the same. Further, this name change does not impact the Company's ability to comply with any of its obligations or responsibilities under the license." Therefore, the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there will be no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed

action is administrative in nature and does not involve any physical features of the plant. Thus, it does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Palisades Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 15, 1997, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn, of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 27, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert G. Schaaf,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-14146 Filed 5-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 22681; 811-4910]

Credit Union Government Securities Fund, Inc.; Notice of Application

May 22, 1997.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

ACTION: Notice of application for deregistration under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act").

APPLICANT: Credit Union Government Securities Fund, Inc.

RELEVANT ACT SECTION: Order requested pursuant to section 8(f).

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicant requests an order declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company.

FILING DATES: The application was filed on February 11, 1997, and amended on May 9, 1997 and May 19, 1997.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on June 16, 1997 and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicant, in the form of an affidavit, or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Applicant, c/o Lexington Management Corporation, Park 80 West, Plaza Two, Saddle Brook, New Jersey 07663.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John K. Forst, Staff Attorney, at (202) 942-0569, or Mercer E. Bullard, Branch Chief, at (202) 942-0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application

may be obtained for a fee from the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicant's Representations

1. Applicant is a registered open-end management investment company, organized as a Maryland corporation. Applicant registered on Form N-8A under the Act and filed a registration statement on Form N-1A under the Act and the Securities Act of 1933 on November 20, 1986, at which time its name was "Credit Union Government Securities Trust." Applicant offered shares in two series: the Government Securities Portfolio and the Government Money Market Portfolio (each a "Portfolio"). On January 16, 1987, the registration statement was declared effective and applicant commenced its initial public offering.

2. As of December 31, 1987, applicant's net assets were \$4.1 million, and it had approximately twelve shareholders. Between December 31, 1987 and May 17, 1988, all but one shareholder redeemed voluntarily, and there were no communications relating to the redemption of shares or liquidation. As of May 17, 1988, applicant's sole shareholder was Lexington Management Corporation (the "Adviser"), its investment adviser.

3. On May 17, 1988, applicant's board of directors adopted a plan of complete liquidation (the "Plan"). Prior to that meeting, the Adviser had advised the directors that continued operation of the applicant at its size was not economically feasible for the Adviser or applicant's shareholder. On May 17, 1988, the Adviser, as the Portfolios' sole shareholder, approved the Plan. On September 1, 1988, applicant distributed \$48,916.26 to the Government Securities Portfolio's shareholder, and \$15,840.13 to the Government Money Market Portfolio's shareholder. Each distribution represented the cash value of each Portfolio's liquidated securities and cash less expenses.

4. In connection with its liquidation, applicant incurred auditing and legal expenses which were borne by the Adviser. The Adviser absorbed all unamortized organizational expenses, which totaled \$48,902.68 for the Government Securities Portfolio, and \$36,518.86 for the Government Money Market Portfolio, as of September 1, 1988.

5. Applicant has no shareholders, assets, debts, or other liabilities. Applicant is not a party to any litigation or administrative proceeding. Applicant is not now engaged, nor does it propose to engage, in any business activities