

NOTICES

proposed judgment were considered. The only proposal which was significantly modified was exemption V (C) concerning the Ethics Committee. The original proposal which was considered and rejected by the Government would have allowed the Ethics Committee to hear and resolve fee complaints. This provision has been modified to the present V (C) which allows the ALVMA to continue its previous complaint procedures while ensuring that the complaint procedures will not be a vehicle for reaching fee agreements.

V. REMEDIES AVAILABLE TO POTENTIAL PRIVATE LITIGANTS

Any potential private plaintiff who might have been damaged by the alleged violations will retain the same right to sue for monetary damages and any other legal and equitable remedies which they would have had were the Final Judgment not entered. Entry of the proposed consent judgment in this proceeding will neither impair nor assist the bringing of any such private antitrust actions. Under the provisions of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. Section 16(a)) this consent judgment has no prima facie effect in any subsequent private lawsuits which may be brought against this defendant.

VI. PROCEDURES AVAILABLE FOR MODIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED JUDGMENT

As provided by the Procedures and Penalties Act, any person believing that the proposed consent judgment should be modified may submit written comments to Anthony E. Desmond, Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, San Francisco, California 94102, within the 60-day period provided by the Act. These comments and the responses to them will be filed with the court and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. All comments will be given due consideration by the Department of Justice which remains free to withdraw its consent to the proposed consent judgment at any time prior to its entry if it should determine that some modification is necessary. The proposed judgment of the court retains jurisdiction of the matter and the parties may apply to the court for such orders as may be necessary or appropriate for modification of it.

VII. DOCUMENTS DETERMINATIVE IN FORMULATING THE JUDGMENT

No materials and documents of the type described in Section (b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act [15 U.S.C. § 16(b)] as being determinative in formulating the proposed judgment were considered in formulating this proposed judgment. Therefore, none is being filed with this competitive impact statement.

Dated: August 8, 1977.

CHRISTOPHER S. CROOK,
Attorney, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 77-24222 Filed 8-10-77; 8:45 am]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-251]

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT CO.
Corrective Order

In the matter of Florida Power and Light Company, Turkey Point Plant Unit No. 4.

On August 3, 1977, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued an Order for Modification of License in the captioned matter. Said Order contained two errors

in Section III, Provision 3 and 4. This Corrective Order will rectify such error.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's Rules and Regulations in 10 CFR Parts 2 and 50, it is ordered that facility operating license No. DPR-44 is hereby amended by revising provisions 3 and 4 of Section III of the Order for Modification of License, in the captioned matter, dated August 3, 1977, to read as follows:

3. The concentration of radiiodine in the primary coolant shall be limited to 1 microcurie/gram during normal operation and to 30 microcuries/gram during power transients as defined in the Safety Evaluation.

4. Reactor operation shall be terminated and Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval shall be obtained prior to resuming operation if primary to secondary leakage attributable to the denting phenomena is detected in 2 or more tubes per plant during any 20 day period.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated in Bethesda, Maryland this 11th day of August 1977.

EDSON G. CASE,
Acting Director, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 77-23958 Filed 8-19-77; 8:45 a.m.]

[Docket No. 50-333]

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 26 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-50, issued to the Power Authority of the State of New York (the licensee), which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (the facility) located in Oswego County, New York. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to require periodic surveillance of the recirculation pump discharge valves and the associated bypass valves.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not

be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment submitted by letter dated September 2, 1976, (2) Amendment No. 26 to License No. DPR-59, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. and at the Oswego County Office Building, 46 E. Bridge Street, Oswego, New York.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Operating Reactors.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 8th day of August 1977.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ROBERT W. REID,
Chief, Operating Reactors
Branch No. 4, Division of Operating Reactors.

[FR Doc. 77-23960 Filed 8-19-77; 8:45 am]

[Docket Nos. 50-346A, 50-500A, 50-501A, 50-440A, and 50-441A]

TOLEDO EDISON CO. ET AL

Oral Argument

In the matter of the Toledo Edison Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3), and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al., (Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2).

Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with the Appeal Board's order of August 12, 1977, the date of the oral argument on the appeals from the Licensing Board's January 6, 1977 initial decision in this antitrust proceeding has been changed. That argument is now calendared for 10 a.m. on Monday, September 10, 1977 in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Public Hearing Room, 5th floor, East-West Towers, 4350 East West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland.

For the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board.

Dated: August 12, 1977.

MARGARET E. DU FLO,
Secretary to the
Appeal Board.

[FR Doc. 77-23959 Filed 8-19-77; 8:45 am]

REGULATORY GUIDE
Issuance and Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a new guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public methods acceptable to the NRC staff of implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations and, in some cases, to delineate techniques used

8002250886 M