related to the planned unloading of Cask No. 4 and the loading of additional casks at Palisades will be at the discretion of the licensee. As noted above, the NRC staff has committed to open the exit meeting with the licensee to the public at the conclusion of the ongoing inspection and will document its review in an inspection report that will be available for public review.

(3) Require the Licensee to Pay a Substantial Penalty

On the basis of the contention that the licensee's original unloading procedure was inadequate, the Petitioners requested that the NRC levy a monetary penalty of $1.3 million against the licensee. As previously mentioned, the NRC staff determined that, although finding that the deficiencies in the original unloading procedure violated NRC requirements, the violation satisfied the criteria to be treated as a Non-Cited Violation because of the limited safety significance of the procedural deficiencies and consideration of mitigating factors defined in the NRC Enforcement Policy. Enforcement sanctions, including issuance of civil penalties and orders, are normally used as a deterrent to emphasize the importance of compliance with requirements, and to encourage prompt identification and prompt, comprehensive correction of violations. In this case, the licensee identified the deficiencies that constituted the violation of NRC requirements and subsequently revised the unloading procedure to resolve the identified technical issues. It was the judgement of the NRC staff that the violation should be dispositioned as a Non-Cited Violation in order to convey the appropriate regulatory message in this case. Further, even if the violation had been cited, it is the NRC staff's judgment that it would have been categorized at a Severity Level IV, for which a civil penalty would not ordinarily be issued.

In regard to the hydrogen issues identified in the amendment to the Petition, the NRC staff has utilized an administrative mechanism in its enforcement policy (CALs) to ensure that the licensee takes certain actions to resolve this safety concern. As previously mentioned, the specific contentions raised by the Petitioners pertaining to hydrogen issues and the original unloading procedure do not warrant additional enforcement actions by the NRC.

(4) Allow Petitioners to Review Procedure, Require NRC to Hold Hearings, and Allow Petitioners to Participate in Proceedings

The original unloading procedure and the first revision of the unloading procedure have been provided to the Petitioners. In addition, correspondence between the NRC and the licensee regarding the procedures have been furnished to the Petitioners. Further, due to the course of events following the licensee's decision to unload Cask No. 4—including the licensee's evaluation of the original unloading procedure, identification of improvements to the unloading process, and the submittal of this Petition—the original and first revision of the unloading procedure and related documentation have been available for public review. Accordingly, Petitioners have had the opportunity to review the unloading procedure. Further, as noted elsewhere, it is the NRC staff's intention to hold a public meeting in the vicinity of the Palisades Nuclear Plant at the conclusion of its ongoing inspection of the licensee's revised unloading procedure.

The Petitioners' request for hearings and participation in proceedings has been addressed in previous correspondence with the Petitioners and the Attorney General for the State of Michigan. In that correspondence, the NRC staff explained that neither the general licensing provisions of 10 CFR part 72 nor the petition process described in 10 CFR 2.206 require the NRC to institute a proceeding. Under § 2.206, the NRC office director responsible for the subject matter of the request ''shall either institute the requested proceeding in accordance with this subpart or shall advise the person who made the request in writing that no proceeding will be instituted in whole or in part, with respect to the request, and the reasons for the decision.''

As set forth in this Director's Decision, the NRC has determined not to institute the proceeding as requested by the Petition.

IV. Conclusion

Petitioners requested that the NRC determine that Consumers Power Company violated NRC requirements, suspend the licensee's use of the general license, impose a substantial penalty, and hold hearings related to the licensee's unloading procedure for dry storage casks. In response, the NRC determined the licensee violated NRC requirements insofar as the original unloading procedure (Revision 0) would have required revision in order to have completed the unloading process. Further, NRC staff determined that the violation, which was identified and corrected by the licensee, should be treated as a Non-Cited Violation consistent with the NRC's Enforcement Policy. Therefore, to this extent, Petitioners' request for a determination that the licensee violated NRC requirements is granted. The available information is sufficient to conclude, however, that no substantial safety issue has been raised regarding the operation of Palisades or its associated ISFSI given the licensee's commitment not to load or unload a cask until the NRC staff is satisfied that the licensee's procedures are adequate. Therefore, the NRC has determined that no adequate basis exists for granting Petitioners' requests for suspension of Consumers Power Company's use of the general license for dry cask storage of spent nuclear fuel at Palisades or imposition of a civil penalty.

A copy of this decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission to review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c).

As provided by this regulation, this decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 23d day of January 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank J. Miraglia,

*Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97–2162 Filed 1–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7690–01–P

## Individual Plant Examination Program; Perspectives on Reactor Safety and Plant Performance Volume 1, Part 1 and Volume 2, Parts 2–5, Draft

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of revised deadlines for public comments on draft NUREG–1560.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has published a draft of ''Individual Plant Examination Program: Perspectives on Reactor Safety and Plant Performance,'' NUREG–1560, Volumes 1 and 2. Volume 1, Part 1 is a summary report from a review of the Individual Plant Examinations (IPE) submitted to the agency in response to Generic Letter

88–20. Volume 2, Part 2–5 provides an in-depth discussion of the insights and findings summarized in Volume 1, Part 1. In addition, the NRC staff will conduct a public workshop (April 7, 8, 9, 1997) to discuss the contents of the draft NUREG and to solicit comments (See FR notices 61 FR 58429 and 61 FR 65248). In response to requests for additional time to comment, the deadline for public comments on the draft NUREG–1560 is postponed for one month to March 14, 1997, and any additional public comments after the workshop are due within 30 days of the workshop, by May 9, 1997.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Draft NUREG–1560 (Volume 1, Part 1 and Volume 2, Parts 2–5) is available for inspection and copying for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street N.W. (Lower Level), Washington DC 20555–0001. A free single copy of Draft NUREG–1560, to the extent of supply, may be requested by writing to Distribution Series, Printing and Mail Services Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Since there is a wealth of information in the draft NUREG–1560 which provides in-depth discussions on insight findings, the staff recognizes that the public may need extra time to review the draft NUREG and provide relevant comments on the accuracy of the reported results in the IPEs and the appropriateness of the interpretation of the results. In addition, some IPEs/PRAs have been modified and may have an impact on the perspectives discussed in the draft NUREG. Therefore, the deadline for public comments has been extended from February 14, 1997 to March 14, 1997, and any additional public comments after the workshop are due within 30 days of the workshop, by May 9, 1997.

Mail comments on Draft NUREG–1560 (Volumes 1 and 2) by March 14, 1997 to Branch Chief, Rules Review and Directive Branch, Office of Administration, MS: T6-D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward Chow, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, MS T10E50, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, (301) 415–6571.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 21st day of January 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mark Cunningham,

*Chief, Probabilistic Risk Analysis Branch, Division of Systems Technology, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 97–2163 Filed 1–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Request for Public Comment

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Extension:

Rule 30a–1; File No. 270–210; OMB Control No. 3235–0219
Form N–54A; File No. 270–182; OMB Control No. 3235–0237
Form N–54C; File No. 270–184; OMB Control No. 3235–0236
Form N–6F; File No. 270–185; OMB Control No. 3235–0238

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') is publishing the following summaries of collections for public comment.

Form N–54A [17 CFR 274.53] is the notification of election to be regulated as a business development company. The annual burden is about .5 hours per respondent.

Form N–54C [17 CFR 274.54] is used to notify the Commission that a company withdraws its election to be regulated as a business development company. The annual burden is about 1 hour per respondent.

Form N–6F [17 CFR 274.15] permits a company that has lost its exclusion from the Investment Company Act of 1940 because it intends to make a public offering as a business development company, but is not ready to file Form N–54A, to remain exempt from the Act for up to 90 days. The annual burden is about .5 hour per respondent.

Rule 30a–1 [17 CFR 270.30a–1] requires every registered investment company to file a semi-annual report with the Commission. The burden of meeting the requirement of this rule is the burden of filing Form N–SAR, the reporting form prescribed under the rule. Approval for Form N–SAR has been given separately.

The estimates of burden hours set forth above are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and are not derived from a comprehensive or even representative survey or study of the cost of SEC rules and forms.

Written comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: January 15, 1997.

Margaret H. McFarland,

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97–2098 Filed 1–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

**[File No. 1–12546]**

### Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application to Withdraw From Listing and Registration (Pacific Gulf Properties Inc., Common Stock, $.01 Par Value)

January 23, 1997.

Pacific Gulf Properties Inc. (''Company'') has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') and Rule 12d2–2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the above specified security (''Security'') from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Amex'').

The reasons alleged in the application for withdrawing the Security from listing and registration include the following:

According to the Company, it has complied with Rule 18 of the Amex by filing with such Exchange a certified copy of preambles and resolutions adopted by the Company's Board of Directors authorizing the withdrawal of its securities from listing on the Amex and by setting forth in detail to such Exchange the reasons for such proposed withdrawal, and the facts in support thereof. The Security of the Company has been listed on the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. (''NYSE'') as of October