



HITACHI

GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy

James C. Kinsey
Vice President, ESBWR Licensing

PO Box 780 M/C A-55
Wilmington, NC 28402-0780
USA

T 910 675 5057
F 910 362 5057

MFN 06-466 Supplement 2

Docket No. 52-010

November 6, 2007

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

**Subject: Response to Portion of NRC Request for Additional
Information Letter No. 79 - Containment Isolation Design - RAI
Number 6.2-103 S01**

Enclosure 1 contains the GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy (GEH) response to the subject NRC RAI originally transmitted via the Reference 1 letter and supplemented by an NRC request for clarification in Reference 2.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

James C. Kinsey
Vice President, ESBWR Licensing

Dave

WRO

References:

1. MFN 06-393, Letter from U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to David Hinds, *Request for Additional Information Letter No. 79 Related to ESBWR Design Certification Application*, October 11, 2006
2. E-Mail from Shawn Williams, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to George Wadkins, GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, dated May 30, 2007 (ADAMS Accession Number ML071500023)

Enclosure:

1. MFN 06-461 Supplement 5 - Response to Portion of NRC Request for Additional Information Letter No. 79 - Related to ESBWR Design Certification Application - Containment Isolation Design - RAI Number 6.2-103 S01

cc: AE Cabbage USNRC (with enclosures)
GB Stramback GEH/San Jose (with enclosures)
RE Brown GEH/Wilmington (with enclosures)
eDRF 0000-0073-5385

Enclosure 1

MFN 06-466 Supplement 2

Response to Portion of NRC Request for

Additional Information Letter No. 79

Related to ESBWR Design Certification Application

Containment Isolation Design

RAI Number 6.2-103 S01

NRC RAI 6.2-103 S01:

RAI 6.2-103 asked for DCD, Tier 2, Table 1.9-6, "Summary of Differences from SRP Section 6," to be revised to state that the passive containment cooling system (PCCS) was different from SRP 6.2.4 acceptance criteria, in that it had no containment isolation valves (CIVs). The applicant, consistent with their response to RAI 6.2-102, stated that the PCCS do not require CIVs and do not deviate from SRP 6.2.4 acceptance criteria.

Consistent with the staff's RAI 6.2-102 supplemental question, the staff requests that the applicant add the PCCS to Table 1.9-6 or change its design to bring it into conformance with SRP 6.2.4.

The staff also asked that the Process Radiation Monitoring System be added to the table, because it has both CIVs outside containment. The applicant responded that these lines conform to the provisions of RG 1.11, "Instrument Lines Penetrating Primary Reactor Containment" (as described in their response to RAI 6.2-127), which would mean that they do conform to SRP 6.2.4 acceptance criteria. However, the applicant has not demonstrated that the system does conform with RG 1.11 (see RAI 6.2-127 supplemental question), and so the staff repeats its request that the applicant add the Process Radiation Monitoring System to Table 1.9-6 or change its design to bring it into conformance with SRP 6.2.4.

GEH Response:

The Passive Containment Cooling System (PCCS) is considered to be part of the containment boundary as opposed to a penetration through the boundary. GEH's position for the PCCS is described in the response to RAI 6.2-102 S01, MFN 06-466 Supplement 1.

The containment isolation provisions of the Process Radiation Monitoring System will be addressed as part of the response to RAI 6.2-127 S01.

DCD Impact:

No DCD changes will be made in response to this RAI.