



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 171 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-50

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY  
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY  
GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-289

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 22, 1992, the GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN/licensee) submitted a request for a change to the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 (TMI-1) Technical Specifications (TS). The requested change would revise TS Section 6.3, Unit Staff Qualifications, to incorporate requirements prescribed by 10 CFR Part 55. The proposed change will also make the TMI-1 TS consistent in that a change has already been issued to Section 6.4, Training, which specifies that Licensed Operator Training meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55.

2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed change involves a clarification to the current requirements concerning licensed operator qualifications and training programs. The TS requirements for all other affected unit staff qualifications and training programs remain unchanged. The licensed operator qualifications and training programs will continue to be required to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55. The staff has concluded in NUREG-1262 that the standards and guidelines applied by the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO) in their training accreditation program are equivalent to those put forth or endorsed by the NRC. Therefore, maintaining an INPO accredited, systems based licensed operator training program is equivalent to maintaining an NRC approved licensed operator training program which conforms with applicable NRC Regulatory Guides or NRC endorsed ANSI/ANS standards.

GPU Nuclear Corporation's licensed operator training program has been accredited by INPO and is based on a systems approach to training. Therefore, the staff finds the proposed change to be acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Pennsylvania State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment relates to changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (57 FR 47138). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: J. Zimmerman

Date: February 19, 1993