

**From:** "Robert L Gill Jr" <rgill@duke-energy.com>  
**To:** "Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 6/7/02 8:37AM  
**Subject:** Re: UFSAR Supp Summary for Crane Inspection Program

Rani,  
Let's discuss this entire topic next week. The SRP LR text contains review guidance for the UFSAR summaries and should be followed by all of us.  
Bob

"Rani  
Franovich" To: <rgill@duke-energy.com>  
<RLF2@nrc.gov cc: "Clifford Munson" <CGM1@nrc.gov>, "Meena  
> Khanna" <MKK@nrc.gov>, "Pei-Ying Chen"  
<PYC@nrc.gov>, "Stewart Bailey" <SNB@nrc.gov>,  
06/07/2002 "Samson Lee" <SSL1@nrc.gov>, "Stephen Hoffman"  
08:08 AM <STH@nrc.gov>  
bcc:  
Subject: Re: UFSAR Supp Summary for Crane  
Inspection Program

Thanks for the reply, Bob.  
In looking at the SRP Table you referred me to (Table 3.5-2), it appears that the reviewer is expected to verify that applicable codes, standards, Reg Guides, NUREGs, Generic Letters, EPRI Documents, and NEI documents are specified in the UFSAR Supplement. As such, it seems reasonable that Duke would provide that information in its UFSAR Supplements for Catawba and McGuire. Sam Lee and I discussed the intent of the SRP, and he confirmed that these references are expected to be provided in the UFSAR Supplement. Perhaps a broad review of the UFSAR Supplement is warranted to ensure that references to these kinds of documents are provided....  
Rani

>>> "Robert L Gill Jr" <rgill@duke-energy.com> 06/07/02 06:26AM >>>

Rani,  
The original RAI B.3.10-1 concerns the acceptance criteria for the Crane Inspection Program. As stated in the Duke response, these criteria are identified in ASME/ANSI requirements and OSHA regulations. Your initial feedback was could we specifically reference ANSI B30.2.0. Now you seem to want to add in other documents that we listed simply to demonstrate that the program is effective. Normally, we do not list documents used to demonstrate effectiveness of a program within the UFSAR Summary description. Adding these to the summary is not necessary.

With respect to ANSI B30.2.0 we were non-specific in the RAI response as to



Please advise if this is acceptable. Bob