Note to: Accession unit

Room C50

Phillips Building

From: Gunter Arndt, SD

Please place the attached document in the PDR using the following file and file points:

PDR File (Select one and enter number)

Additional Info (Enter if appropriate)

Proposed Rule (PR)
Reg. Guide 1.10
Petition (PRM)
Effective Rule (RM)
ANSI
IAEA

ACRS Minutes No.
Relates to Proposed Rule (PR)
Relates to Reg. Guide
Relates to Petition (PRM)
Relates to Effective Rule (PM)
Federal Register Notice
SD Task No.
NUREG Report
Contract No.

Subject: Fox-Howlett Rebar Splice

cc: Central Files

Note: Similar, earlier correspondence filed on this subject Aug-Sept 1977. Please add this correspondence to provide continuity and updating. Thank you.

E. Gunter Arndt, SD Room 332 NL +43-5997

POOR ORIGINAL

7907240311

ROUTING AND	TRANSMITTAL SLIP	Dates	1e -	7,19
10: (Name, office symbologiding, Agency/Po	of, room number, st) H Rebar Splice F.	In	itials	Date
2				
	evine a substitute of the			
4.				
Action	File	Note and Return		
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation Prepare Reply		
As Requested	For Correction			
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me		
	Investigate	Signature		
Comment	HILLOSTIFICATIO			

Mr. C. Fox, of Fox Industries, came by this afternoon (~ 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm) to coordinate and update his information on the status of his splice in The Act-ASME code process, and his topical report submitted to the NRC last year.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

Room No .- Bldg. FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post) Gunter Arndt Phone No.

₽ U.S. G.P.O. 1977-241-530/3090

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76) Prescribed by GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

POOR ORIGINAL

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37902

En: MAY 24, 1979

Mr. Charles J. Fox Fox Industries 722 Folger Avenue Berkeley, California 94710

Dear Mr. Fox:

As promised in my April 2/ letter, the staff has reviewed the correspondence relative to your rebar coupler system. In inspecting the files on the Hartsville bid rejection (invitation 72-822237), later communications regarding the Yellow Creek Nuclear Plant (invitation 73-824811), and your as-yet unsuccessful effort to have the topical report on this subject approved by the NRC, I can appreciate your feeling of frustration in this matter.

Our position with respect to the Yellow Creek bids, however, may have been misunderstood. During our August 9, 1977, meeting with Fox Industries concerning the Har sville rejection, TVA indicated that its application for Yellow Creek had been before the NRC for some time and reference to your coupler system could not be made without amending the application. Because of the status of the NRC review, NRC's unfamiliarity with your coupler system, and Regulatory Guide 1.10 approval of Cadweld splices. TVA could not amend its application without a potentially substantial and costly delay in the NRC review process. We have had no mechanism to reference your coupler system for NRC review and approval in a timely manner. Consequently, when we sought bids for Yellow Creek, they had to be consistent with NRC-approved methods, and Fox Industries' nonresponsive bid had to be rejected.

As indicated in Mr. Seeber's March 8, 1978, letter and in Mr. Stroud's letter of April 20, TVA has made a policy decision which should avoid this situation in the future. Specifically, any future nuclear plant construction applications will reference all mechanical rebar coupler systems that are technically acceptable to TVA, appear to have economic merit, and have ACI/ASME Code approval. Further, with its present work, TVA is exploring the use of other coupler systems, such as yours, in non-nuclear and/or non-safety-related applications where historically the rebar lap splicing technique has been used. I hope this explanation will clarify TVA's position in this matter.

Sincerely.

General Manager

RELIANCE SHEET & STRIP CO.

7007040311