With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement dated July 1972 for Turkey Point Unit 4.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 16, 1995 the NRC staff consulted with the Florida State official, Dr. Lyle Jerrett of the State Office of Radiation Control, 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 letters dated August 8, 1995, and September 6, 1995, which are 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 Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida 33199.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David B. Matthews,

Director, Project Directorate II–1, Division ofReactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–23930 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–250 and 50–251]

Florida Power and Light Company, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41, issued to Florida Power and Light Company (the licensee), for operation of Turkey Point Unit 3 and 4, respectively, located in Dade County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of July 26, 1995. The proposed action consists of administrative corrections and clarifications.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications (TS) by (a) removing outdated material, (b) incorporating administrative clarifications and corrections, and (c) correcting typographical errors. These changes represent an administrative update to the Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 TS.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed changes would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed changes would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The proposed TS changes are administrative, more conservative than existing specifications, or do not require NRC approval (Bases changes). The changes 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 is 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 does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement dated July 1972 for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 16, 1995 the NRC staff consulted with the Florida State official, Dr. Lyle Jerrett of the *State Office of Radiation Control,* 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 July 26, 1995, 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 Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida 33199.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David B. Matthews,

Director, Project Directorate II–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–23931 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Conversion to the Metric System

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Policy statement; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: On October 7, 1992, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published its policy statement on Conversion to the Metric System in the Federal Register. The policy called for the Commission to assess the state of metric use by the licensed nuclear industry in the United States after 3 years to determine whether the policy should be modified. The purpose of this notice is to gain additional information on the state of metric use by NRC licensees so that the Commission may determine whether the NRC's metrication policy should be modified.

DATES: The comment period expires on December 11, 1995. Comments received after this time will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch. Deliver comments to One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Comments may also be delivered to the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room. For information on submitting comments electronically, see the discussion under Electronic Access in the Supplementary Information Section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Frank A. Costanzi, Chairman, NRC Metrication Oversight Committee, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555; telephone (301) 415–6250; e-mail FAC@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 7, 1992 (57 FR 46202), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published its policy statement on Conversion to the Metric System [1] in the Federal Register. The statement was in response to the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (the Act) and Executive Order 12770. The policy supports and encourages the use of the metric system of measurement and requires the NRC to follow the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the General Services Administration metrication program in executing procurements. It further requires the NRC to publish essentially all documents which are not specific to a given licensee in dual units, i.e., International System of Units first with the English unit in brackets. A key component of the policy requires that ''should the NRC conclude that the use of any particular system of measurement be detrimental to the public health and safety, the Commission will proscribe, by regulation, order, or other appropriate means, the use of that system.'' As a result, the policy requires that all event reporting and emergency response communications between licensees and any Government authorities will be in the English system of measurement. Finally, the policy calls for the Commission to assess the state of metric use by the licensed nuclear industry in the United States after three years to determine whether the policy should be modified.

In order to implement this last portion of the policy, the NRC staff has undertaken several actions. First, the NRC's Metrication Oversight Committee met to discuss both agency and licensee experiences with the Commission's metrication policy. Next, representatives of various industrial and standards groups were contacted to determine their association's view of the policy. The associations contacted included the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), the Nuclear Utility Backfitting and Reform Group (NUBARG), the United States Pharmacopeial Convention, Inc. (USP), the Society of Nuclear Medicine, and the Organization of Agreement States (OAS). The Committee's findings follow.

[1] The metric system refers to units belonging to the Internationale System of Units, which is abbreviated SI (from the French Le Systeme Internationale d'Units), as interpreted or modified for use in the United States by the Secretary of Commerce.

Comments Received

With few exceptions, these various organizations stated their support for the current NRC policy. The nuclear power industry position seems to be exemplified by the NEI comments in which they continue to support the current NRC Metrication Policy and ''a transition to the metric system that is market-driven and avoids a sudden or precipitous move to conduct licensing and regulatory matters in metric units.'' Similarly, although NUBARG did not respond in writing, a phone conversation with a representative indicated that NUBARG was ''very comfortable'' with the NRC's metrication policy.

As for the standards-setting groups, ASME strongly supports the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act and believes that the NRC policy is in accordance with those requirements. IEEE related that its ''standards are to be primarily metric beginning in 1998 and, with minor exceptions, *exclusively* metric beginning in 2000.'' Also, IEEE believes that the United States Government ''can and should do more than it has done to further the metrication process in this country.'' In response to the NRC's request, IEEE provided the following three comments relating directly to the NRC's position:

(1) The NRC should drop the use of dual units in its publications and to use ''metric units exclusively except where doing so would clearly be detrimental to public health and safety.''

(2) The NRC policy of using the English system for all event reporting and emergency response communications, although prudent in 1992, may now cause confusion and have a negative impact after various relevant standards have been converted.

(3) The NRC should include the following statement in its policy: ''Nothing in this statement of policy should be interpreted to require the use of the English system of measurement, or to forbid the use of consensus based standards that are exclusively metric.'' This was proposed so elements of the private sector that wish to move faster than the Government may be protected.

The USP pointed out that the use of dual units by NRC is in line with USP's position and practice. However, the OAS position is that ''to be truly responsive to Congress the Commission now should go on record as requiring the use of SI units in *all* its communication and documentation.'' OAS recommended that the NRC ''support the dual citation standard with the SI unit appearing first and the English or special units following in