

TRANSFERRED TO OTHER AGENCY  
TRANSFER FOR DIRECT REPLY - DOE

7199

United States Government Department of Energy

# memorandum

CHRON

DATE: February 8, 1996  
REPLY TO: Oakland Operations Office (NSPD)  
ATTN OF:  
SUBJECT: DPRK Rack Modification Request  
TO: Cherie Fitzgerald, NN-42

Attached is a transcript (though not verbatim) concerning Chief Engineer Li's request for modification to the canister/rack system that NAC International has designed and delivered to Nyongbyon, DPRK. The dialog was not as confrontational as it may seem in that Mr. Viebrock and Chief Engineer Li have discussed many difficult subjects in the past. However, this is an important issue.

Chief Engineer Li wants flexibility, but flexibility and safeguards are conflicting terms in this case. The changes he requests would require major work and he is restarting the design and review stage of the project completed last Summer.

I believe that it is beyond Mr. Viebrock's or my position to participate in discussions of this type in this manner. Discussions should be trilateral with us concentrating on technical issues.

CONFIRMED TO BE UNCLASSIFIED  
DOE OFFICE OF CLASSIFICATION H5-13  
T. Sieler DR DATE: 1/30/2009

Thomas Grim  
Program Manager  
National Security  
Programs Division

DOES NOT CONTAIN  
UNCLASSIFIED CONTROLLED  
NUCLEAR INFORMATION

cc: James Viebrock, NAC International

U.S. spent fuel team (DOE) Weekly summaries  
20080002437

TRANSFERRED TO OTHER AGENCY  
TRANSFER FOR DIRECT REPLY - DOE

1199A

## MEETING NOTES

MORNING 2/8/96

US: James Viebrock, NAC Int. Thomas Grim, DOE  
DPRK: Li Sang Hwan, Chief Engineer Han Won Chun, Inspector

This transcript is not verbatim, but an attempt to express the views presented by all attending. Words in parenthesis are what I think was meant by the individual speaking not what was said or they add clarity. The person has been changed to make the text read as a conversation without interpreters.

Li asked questions concerning the waste stream from the canning process. Viebrock answered that the waste would be manifolded and pass through one or maybe two strainers, then be filtered by a High Tech 260, which would discharge to the settling tank.

Li asked about the high pressure washing system that Viebrock intended to use on the fuel baskets. Viebrock described how the baskets would be sprayed in a containment, which would be pumped down to the settling tank.

Meeting was adjourned.

Li asked to reconvene.

Li How does the tool for removing poles work. Does it enable the poles to be removed without removing the canisters?

Viebrock No. It can not remove the screws that secure the poles with the canisters in the rack. The upper plate and canisters prohibit the tool from being used.

Li If there is a leak in a can then the IAEA seals must be cut and the poles removed.

Viebrock This is impossible and not needed without removing the canisters. The poles are not in the way of removing canisters. the grapple and overhead crane can be used to put in and remove canisters.

Li I should have the option to remove canisters using the bridge crane.

Viebrock The design was reviewed and approved by the DPRK and now you want it redesigned. In June the screws holding the poles were not removable at all. You asked for the ability to remove the poles to assist removal of the racks at the end of the program. You were worried about total blockage of the bridge crane. So a modification was made reducing the height of the poles and removing a hole row of poles.

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.

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 used to remove canisters. This blocks our maintenance operations.

Han I agree with Chief Engineer Li. The IAEA will be there and the operator (DPRK) must be able to select the method of maintenance.

Grim The IAEA will not be there 24 hours a day.

Viebrock I am also familiar with maintenance. The bridge crane needs to move in the X and Y directions, but not in all positions in both pools.

Li I require the bridge crane to move in all positions to remove cans.

Viebrock Your demands were satisfied. This is a request. There is a difference.

Li In my memory we agreed in January that the tool would be able to remove the lids. There is no reason to block the bridge crane. After seals are removed you have no relation to if the bridge crane or overhead crane is used.

Viebrock My position is firm. If changes are made we must go to a higher level.

Li I think my requirement was already agreed.

Viebrock We have a disagreement. You and I remember differently. The equipment has been approved and it has been months. The discussion must be at a higher level. What is the problem with Mr. Quinones pass.

Li What do you mean by important persons.

Viebrock This can not be resolved by you and I. I am ready to install it (the racks). You are not happy, but the DPRK approved it.

Li So let me know who.

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.