



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 53 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-50

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY  
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY  
PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-289

Introduction

By letter dated October 6, 1977, Metropolitan Edison Company (the licensee) requested a change to the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications (TS). This change would establish the qualifications of the site Supervisor of Radiation Protection and Chemistry.

Evaluation

The proposed change to the TS would specify the qualifications of the site Supervisor of Radiation Protection which would be superior to the existing requirements in Appendix A of the license. The existing requirements call for a person appointed to the position of the Radiation Protection Manager (RPM) to have a minimum of five years experience in radiation protection at a nuclear facility. A maximum of four years of this five years experience may be fulfilled by related technical or academic training.

The proposed change raises the qualifications of the person appointed as the RPM to have a bachelor's degree or equivalent in science or engineering, including some formal training in radiation protection. It also requires the RPM to have at least five years of professional experience in applied radiation protection. Furthermore, at least three years of the five years of professional experience must be in radiation protection work in a nuclear facility concerned with radiological problems encountered in nuclear power stations.

Modifications to the proposed change were discussed with and agreed to by the licensee. The proposed change to TS 6.3.1 specifies the minimum qualifications for the position of the site Supervisor of Radiation Protection and Chemistry. The proposed qualification of the person in this position shall meet or exceed the qualifications of the NRC Regulatory Guide 1.8, "Personnel Selection and Training" dated September 1975 as described above. We conclude that this proposed change to the TS meets the regulatory position of Regulatory Guide 1.8, imposes more stringent requirements on the qualifications of the RPM, and thus is acceptable.

8005220 107

### Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement, or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

### Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: April 30, 1980