

D00013597

02/09/96 08:13 202 586 2323
96-02-09 09:27 PYONGYANG-KOREA

DOE - NN-42
812473

--- V CAROTENUTO 003/009
T-683 P.02

TRANSFERRED TO OTHER AGENCY
TRANSFER FOR DIRECT REPLY - DOE

1199A

MEETING NOTES

MORNING 2/8/96

US: James Viebrock NAC Int. Thomas Grim DOE

Li I want to be able to remove the poles at any time. You agreed to this.

Viebrock Then you could unscrew the pole without breaking the seal. I never agreed to that.

Li Anytime means after removal of the upper plate. You agreed that the tool would be able to do this without removing canisters.

Viebrock This is an argument you must take up with the IAEA.

Li I still want to be able to do this.

Viebrock The design is approved by the IAEA and DPRK.

Li So you say the tool is designed to IAEA requirements!

Viebrock No. I designed the tool. The tool was designed because I agreed to design a tool that would allow you to undo the screws after the program is over. It has nothing to do with the IAEA. You can remove the poles after all 8 canisters are removed and the tool to do this has been provided.

Li We agree to use the tool in the presence of the IAEA after the seal is broken.

Viebrock No. And I would not have accepted it. I agreed to a tool to be used after the program is finished and the racks are to be removed.

Li I think that at that time I required that I could use this tool with canisters in and seal and plate off. I required to be able to remove canisters with the bridge crane or overhead crane. And at that time I required that the poles be short enough to allow use of the bridge crane. You made equipment to my requirement except in this area. It can be said that we need access by the bridge crane and overhead crane. I think it means you only use the overhead crane in emergency (maintenance) situations. So I am considering your equipment shows (showing anger) that you are blocking my equipment. Since you are here for the spent fuel we believe you must cooperate. I think there are several methods to do maintenance work you have only provided one. I am unsatisfied with your explanation. I will study this more. This is becoming empty talk.

Viebrock You and I must have been at different meetings. My recollection is different. In June Li requested changes. They were to be able to remove poles after the program is over, not in the middle. He also wanted the number of poles reduced to make sure the bridge crane to make sure the bridge crane could go over pool 1. We made this modification and for his request removed one pole per rack and reduced the height of the poles. I remember the July meeting because it was not nice meeting between Li and me. I do not want another like it. I understand your concerns. This is not

empty talk but with Li. The equipment here is exactly in accordance with the drawings you approved. I am sure your unhappy, but changes are impossible. You are also asking for a method to violate safeguards after you agreed to them. We are beyond technical issues and into political issues. I have tried to provide everything you wanted. The equipment arrived in October and it is now February. My concern is that if you were concerned why not bring it up in October. In October and today my response is the same, that we did not ever agree to remove poles while the canisters are there. We are now ready, this week, to put the racks in the pool. This could be construed by some as a political delay tactic. I don't. I understand it from a technical point of view. I may ask for things if I was you but I am not. You are asking for flexibility that you can't have and maintain safeguards. This is not empty words, but truth.

Li Let me tell you one thing. When I hear your explanation to political matters. We are technicians, so we should concentrate on technical matters. We understood the use of this tool to remove poles. So we requested a test of this tool (request made to Libby, Pannell, Morris). Your workers said it is impossible with the cans in the rack.

Viebrock That is the truth.

Li They said this tool is only for an empty rack. In my mind you have agreed to remove the screws with cans in the rack. I understand and am not surprised. But what makes me surprised are your words about violating safeguards. It makes me think you are doing IAEA work. There is a difference between our sides. We must study more.

Viebrock Safeguards are under a memo of understanding (agreement). I was responsible for consulting with the IAEA and applying safeguards. These racks and safeguards have been approved by the DPRK. We have records of meeting indicating this. By Director Li and you were there also. This is not new. I remember July. What do you want to do?

Han What Li wants

Viebrock I understand, but the racks would have to be thrown away. It was never agreed to do what Li wants. Never. It was never agreed to use the bridge crane to install or remove the canisters. We agreed to be able to remove the poles after the program was over. It was agreed to be able to move the bridge crane east and west not north and south over pool 2. You want this for a political delay.

Li Why do you say this?

Viebrock This capability would enable canisters to be removed without breaking seals.

02/09/96 08:14 ☎ 202 586 2323
'96-02-09 09:30 PYONGYANG-KOREA

DOE - NN-42
612473

→→→ V CAROTENUTO

☑ 006/009

T-683 P. 05

Grim Engineer Li and Mr. Viebrock have repeated themselves many times. There is no point in continuing this discussion.

Li Both sides understand fully. we must study (the drawings) more.

Viebrock We will not study any more. This equipment has been approved by the DPRK. I agree with Mr. Grim that this meeting should end.

Li This is a serious matter.

Viebrock Not serious but difficult.

Li I have already heard from you that only the overhead crane can be

Viebrock Your boss. There are agreements. Now the DPRK wants to change. I don't think you have that authority.

Li We must stop the discussion.

Viebrock Please look at the record of agreement.