



The Japanese Nuclear Incident: Technical Aspects

Jonathan Medalia
Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy

April 5, 2011

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

R41728

Summary

Japan's nuclear incident has engendered much public and congressional concern about the possible impact of radiation on the Japanese public, as well as possible fallout on U.S. citizens. This report provides information on technical aspects of the nuclear incident, with reference to human health.

While some radioactive material from the Japanese incident may reach the United States, it appears most unlikely that this material will result in harmful levels of radiation. In traveling thousands of miles between the two countries, some radioactive material will decay, rain will wash some out of the air, and its concentration will diminish as it disperses.

Many atoms are stable; they remain in their current form indefinitely. Other atoms are unstable, or radioactive. They "decay" or "disintegrate," emitting energy through various forms of radiation. Each form has its own characteristics and potential for human health effects.

Nuclear reactors use uranium or mixed oxides (uranium oxide and plutonium oxide, or MOX) for fuel. Uranium and plutonium atoms fission, or split, releasing neutrons that cause additional fissions in a chain reaction, and also releasing energy. A nuclear reactor's core consists of fuel rods made of uranium or MOX encased in zirconium, and neutron-absorbing control rods that are removed or inserted to start or stop the chain reaction. This assembly is placed underwater to carry off excess heat. The incident at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant prevented water from circulating in the core of several reactors, causing water to evaporate and temperature to rise. High heat could melt the fuel rods and lead to a release of radioactive material into the air.

When uranium and plutonium fission, they split into smaller atoms that are highly radioactive and generate much heat; indeed, fuel rods that have just been removed from a reactor are much more radioactive, and hotter, than fuel rods before they have been inserted into a reactor. After fuel rods can no longer efficiently produce energy, they are considered "spent" and are placed in cooling pools of water for several years to keep them from overheating while the most radioactive materials decay. A concern about the spent fuel pool at reactor 4 is that it may have lost most or all of its water, yet it has more fuel rods than pools at the other five reactors, as it contains all the active fuel rods that were temporarily removed from the reactor core in November 2010 to permit plant maintenance in addition to spent fuel rods.

A nuclear reactor cannot explode like an atomic bomb because the concentration of the type of uranium or plutonium that fissions easily is too low to support a runaway chain reaction, and a nuclear weapon requires one of two configurations, neither of which is present in a reactor.

Some types of radiation have enough energy to knock electrons off atoms, creating "ions" that are electrically charged and highly reactive. Ionizing radiation is thus harmful to living cells. It strikes people constantly, but in doses low enough to have negligible effect. A concern about the reactor incident is that it will release radioactive materials that pose a danger to human health. For example, cesium-137 emits gamma rays powerful enough to penetrate the body and damage cells. Ingesting iodine-131 increases the risk of thyroid cancer. Potassium iodide tablets protect the thyroid, but there is no need to take them absent an expectation of ingesting iodine-131.

This update adds a section on useful links.

Contents

Introduction	1
Could Harmful Levels of Fallout Reach the United States?.....	1
What Is Radiation?.....	3
Radioactivity and Nuclear Reactors.....	4
Health Effects of Ionizing Radiation.....	6
Sources of Radiation Exposure.....	7
Measuring Exposure: Absorbed Dose v. Equivalent Dose	7
External v. Internal Exposure: Effective Dose.....	10
Acute Health Effects v. Long-Term Cancer Risk.....	11
Potassium Iodide.....	11
The Japanese Situation	12

Tables

Table 1. Radiation Dose Levels	9
--------------------------------------	---

Appendixes

Appendix. Useful Links	14
------------------------------	----

Contacts

Author Contact Information	18
Acknowledgments	18

Introduction

The Japanese earthquake and tsunami of March 2011 caused extensive damage to the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant (NPP). This damage has released some radioactive materials, and there are widespread fears about the health effects of current and possible future releases. These fears, and public concern about radiation in general, have attracted the world's attention. This report presents scientific and technical aspects of these issues in order to provide a basis for understanding the risks associated with this event.

Could Harmful Levels of Fallout Reach the United States?¹

To monitor radiation in the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) operates RadNet, which “is a national network of monitoring stations that regularly collect air, precipitation, drinking water, and milk samples for analysis of radioactivity. The RadNet network, which has stations in each state, has been used to track environmental releases of radioactivity from nuclear weapons tests and nuclear accidents.”² EPA has an online map of these stations,³ and provides updates on the results of its air monitoring as it relates to the Japanese nuclear incident.⁴

Whether harmful levels of radioactive material from the incident reach the United States depends on many factors:

- Particle size: Tiny particles are more readily carried by the wind and can travel farther than large particles, which fall to Earth more rapidly.
- Wind patterns.
- Amount of material released: The more material released, the more likely some of it is to travel long distances.
- Melt vs. burn: If nuclear fuel rods (fresh or spent) melt and form a pool of very hot, highly radioactive liquid, that liquid might be contained by a containment structure. If it melts through that structure, it might contaminate groundwater. If the fuel rods burn, the fire would loft radioactive material into the air. The larger and hotter the fire, and the longer it burns, the more material would be injected into the air.
- Travel time: The longer radioactive material is in the air, the more of it will decay.
- Distance: The farther radioactive material travels, the greater the volume of air in which the material disperses, diluting it.

¹ This section was written by Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. “RadNet—Tracking Environmental Radiation Nationwide,” <http://www.epa.gov/narel/radnet/>.

³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. “RadNet Map View,” <https://cdxnode64.epa.gov/radnet-public/showMap.do>.

⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. “Japanese Nuclear Emergency: EPA’s Radiation Air Monitoring,” <http://www.epa.gov/japan2011/>.

- Rain and snow: Precipitation washes some particles out of the air.

The first four of these factors depend on circumstances; the other three would reduce the amount of material reaching the United States under any circumstances.

According to U.S. nuclear authorities, the reactor incident does not appear to pose an immediate threat to the United States. On March 13, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stated, “Given the thousands of miles between the two countries [United States and Japan], Hawaii, Alaska, the U.S. Territories and the U.S. West Coast are not expected to experience any harmful levels of radioactivity.”⁵ On March 18, EPA and the Department of Energy stated that a monitoring station in Sacramento “today ... detected minuscule quantities of iodine isotopes and other radioactive particles that pose no health concern at the detected levels,” and that between March 16 and 17, a detector in Washington State detected “trace amounts of Xenon-133, which is a radioactive noble gas produced during nuclear fission that poses no concern at the detected level.”⁶ In a briefing to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on March 21, Bill Borchardt, NRC Executive Director for Operations, said, “natural background from things like ... rocks, sun, buildings, is 100,000 times more than any level that has been detected to date. We feel confident in our conclusion that there is no reason for concern in the United States regarding radioactive releases from Japan.”⁷ A press report of March 22 stated that equipment in Charlottesville, VA, detected radiation from the reactor incident, but that “health experts said that the plume’s radiation had been diluted enormously in its journey of thousands of miles and that—at least for now, with concentrations so low—its presence will have no health consequences in the United States.”⁸

It is useful to put these doses in perspective. Using the figure that natural sources provide 100,000 times the dose recorded in California and Washington state, it is possible to calculate a rough approximation of the dose from the Japanese incident, using the improbable assumption that the dose persists at the detected rate for an entire year. As discussed later, a report estimates that the average American receives a dose of 310 millirem (mrem) per year from natural sources. (Units of radiation dose are discussed under “Health Effects of Ionizing Radiation.”) NRC requires its licensees to “limit maximum radiation exposure to individual members of the public” to 100 mrem per year. One-one-hundred-thousandth of 310 mrem per year is a dose of 0.00310 mrem per year. At that rate, it would take 32,258 years to accumulate a dose of 100 mrem; over a 70-year lifespan, the cumulative dose at this rate would amount to 0.22 mrem.

⁵ U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. “NRC Sees No Radiation at Harmful Levels Reaching U.S. from Damaged Japanese Nuclear Power Plants,” press release no. 11-046, March 13, 2011, <http://pbdupws.nrc.gov/docs/ML1107/ML110720002.pdf>.

⁶ U.S. Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Agency. “Joint EPA/DOE Statement: Radiation Monitors Confirm That No Radiation Levels of Concern Have Reached the United States,” press release, March 18, 2011, <http://www.energy.gov/news/10190.htm>.

⁷ U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. “Briefing on NRC Response to Recent Nuclear Events in Japan,” public meeting, March 21, 2011, p. 13, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/commission/tr/2011/20110321.pdf>.

⁸ William Broad, “Radiation over U.S. Is Harmless, Officials Say,” *New York Times*, March 22, 2011, p. 6.

What Is Radiation?⁹

Many atoms are stable: they will remain in their current form indefinitely. Some atoms are unstable, or radioactive. They “decay” or “disintegrate,” often transforming into atoms of a different element, such as through emission of radiation, which permits the atom to reach a more stable state.¹⁰ The most common types of radiation emitted in decay, and their characteristics, are:

- Alpha particles are two protons plus two neutrons. They are electrically charged and massive by subatomic standards, and travel relatively slowly, so they lose energy quickly in matter. They travel only an inch in air, and are stopped by a sheet of paper or the dead outer layers of skin.
- Beta particles (an electron or positron¹¹) are electrically charged, so are readily absorbed by matter, but are much less massive than alpha particles or neutrons. Depending on their energy, some are stopped by outer layers of skin, while others can penetrate several millimeters. They can travel up to several feet in air.
- Neutrons are typically emitted by heavy atoms like uranium and plutonium. They have no electrical charge and may be highly penetrating, depending on their speed. They can travel tens of meters in air; energetic neutrons can penetrate the body. They can be slowed down by hydrogen-containing material like water.
- Gamma rays are photons released during radioactive decay. Photons may be thought of as packets of electromagnetic energy; radio waves, light, and x-rays are less-energetic photons. Gamma ray energies vary widely. Those of medium to high energies are highly penetrating and can travel hundreds of meters in air. Stopping them requires a thick layer of a dense material like lead.

Several measurements are useful in discussing radioactivity. Radioactivity is measured in units of curies (Ci), where $1 \text{ Ci} = 3.7 \times 10^{10}$ disintegrations per second, or becquerels (Bq), where $1 \text{ Bq} = 1$ disintegration per second. (The curie is widely used in the United States; the Becquerel is more widely used internationally.) Specific activity—curies per gram—measures how radioactive a material is. Half-life is the time for half of the atoms in a mass of a particular type of radioactive material to decay. Specific activity is inversely related to half-life. For example, radioactive iodine-131 is intensely radioactive. It has a specific activity of 124,000 curies per gram and a half-life of 8 days; in 10 half-lives (80 days), 99.9% of the iodine-131 created at a given time will have decayed. In contrast, uranium-235 has a specific activity of 0.000002 curies per gram and a half-life of 700 million years; it would take 7 billion years (10 half-lives) for 99.9% of it to decay.¹² According to Richard Firestone, staff scientist, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,

⁹ This section was written by Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

¹⁰ For descriptions of radiation, see Roger Eckhardt, “Ionizing Radiation—It’s Everywhere,” *Los Alamos Science*, no. 23, 1995, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/doe/lanl/00326627.pdf>, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Radiation: Ionizing and Non-Ionizing,” <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/understand/index.html>.

¹¹ A positron is a positively-charged electron.

¹² For data on half-lives and other characteristics of radionuclides, see Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, “Exploring the Table of Isotopes,” <http://ie.lbl.gov/education/isotopes.htm>, and U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management. “Table B.1. Characteristics of important radionuclides,” http://www.orau.org/ptp/PTP%20Library/library/DOE/Misc/Table%20B_1_%20Characteristics%20of%20Important%20Radionuclides.htm.

uranium-235 emits so little radiation that “holding a piece in the hand would cause negligible radiation exposure.”¹³

Energy released per decay is measured differently. A standard measure is the electron volt or, more commonly, thousands of electron volts (keV).¹⁴ The penetrating power of gamma rays, and thus their threat to human health, increases as their energy increases.

Each radioactive atom, or “radionuclide,” decays in a specific way. For example, when uranium-235 decays,¹⁵ it emits gamma rays, most of which are of 186 keV (a low energy) or less, and alpha particles; cesium-137 emits gamma rays, virtually all of which are of 662 keV, a medium energy, and beta particles. Each radionuclide that emits gamma rays does so in a unique pattern, or “spectrum,” of energies that is the primary characteristic used to identify many radionuclides.

Radioactivity and Nuclear Reactors¹⁶

Some heavy atoms, such as uranium-235 and plutonium-239, “fission” when struck by a neutron. In fission, an atom typically (1) splits into two lighter atoms, called “fission products”; (2) releases two or three neutrons; and (3) emits vast quantities of radiation. Fission products are often highly radioactive, such as cesium-137, iodine-131, and strontium-90.

Uranium-235 and plutonium-239 can support a nuclear chain reaction: to oversimplify, one neutron fissions one atom, which releases two neutrons that fission two atoms, releasing four neutrons that fission four atoms, and so on. Neutrons thus drive chain reactions; this is a key concept for understanding nuclear reactors. A supercritical mass supports an increasing rate of fission; fission diminishes in a subcritical mass; and fission proceeds at a constant rate in a critical mass. In an atomic bomb, a supercritical mass of uranium or plutonium supports a chain reaction that proceeds in a tiny fraction of a second, releasing vast quantities of energy. A nuclear reactor is designed to maintain a constant rate of fission. If fission proceeds too quickly, it gets out of control, in which case the fuel rods generate so much heat that they melt. When control rods are inserted into the reactor core, individual atoms continue to fission but the chain reaction stops. Control rods typically contain boron or cadmium because they are efficient neutron absorbers. (Because boron absorbs neutrons, it was added to cooling water in the Fukushima Daiichi NPP incident to prevent inadvertent criticality.) Fission that proceeds at the desired rate releases energy over several years from one load of fuel. The energy heats water to generate steam that spins turbines to generate electricity.

A nuclear reactor cannot explode like an atomic bomb because the fuels and configurations differ. In nature, uranium is 99.3% uranium-238 and 0.7% uranium-235. Only the latter is “fissile,” that

¹³ Personal communication, March 30, 2011.

¹⁴ “An electron volt is a measure of energy. An electron volt is the kinetic energy gained by an electron passing through a potential difference of one volt.” Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, “How Big Is an Electron Volt?,” <http://www-bd.fnal.gov/public/electronvolt.html>.

¹⁵ The number following the name of an element is the number of protons plus neutrons in the nucleus.

¹⁶ This section was written by Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, and Mark Holt, Specialist in Energy Policy, Resources, Science, and Industry Division. See also CRS Report R41694, *Fukushima Nuclear Crisis*, by Richard J. Campbell and Mark Holt. For the status of each reactor, see “Status of the Nuclear Reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant,” *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/03/16/world/asia/reactors-status.html>, and Japan, Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency, <http://www.nisa.meti.go.jp/english/>.

is, it will fission when struck by neutrons moving at relatively slow speeds. To make fuel for a bomb or a reactor, the fraction of uranium-235 must be increased through “enrichment.”¹⁷ An atomic bomb uses uranium enriched to about 90% uranium-235 (“highly enriched uranium,” HEU), while nuclear reactor fuel is typically enriched to less than 5% (“low enriched uranium,” LEU). LEU does not have enough uranium-235 to support a chain reaction of the sort found in an atomic bomb. In addition, a bomb must be configured in one of two ways to create a large enough mass to support a runaway chain reaction; reactors are arranged in an entirely different configuration.

A nuclear reactor uses pellets of LEU or mixed oxides (MOX, i.e., uranium oxide and plutonium oxide) for fuel. Fuel rods—thin zirconium tubes typically between 12 and 15 feet long—hold the fuel. According to one report,

Zirconium is the metal of choice in this application because it absorbs relatively few of the neutrons produced in a fission reaction and because the metal is highly resistant to both heat and chemical corrosion.

Low neutron absorption is vital to any structural material used in a nuclear reactor because large numbers of neutrons produced by the reaction must be free to interact simultaneously with all the nuclear fuel confined inside hundreds of fuel rods. This interaction sustains the necessary chain reaction throughout the reactor’s core.¹⁸

Even with control rods fully inserted to halt the nuclear chain reaction, the radioactive decay of the fuel rods (primarily from fission products) generates heat, which must be dissipated. At the Fukushima Daiichi NPP, cooling was done by pumping cool water into the reactor. If the heat is not dissipated, the rods become so hot that they melt or burn. A fire would loft particles of radioactive material into the air. If fuel rods become too hot, their zirconium cladding may also react with water and produce hydrogen. The Fukushima Daiichi NPP primary containments used inert nitrogen gas to preclude hydrogen ignition. However, the operators had to vent the primary containment to relieve pressure, introducing hydrogen into the secondary containment, which is believed to have caused the explosions at reactor units 1-3.¹⁹ This explains the urgency of the efforts to keep the fuel rods cool, and why the reactors suffered major damage when backup cooling systems failed.

In order to cool the fuel rods, personnel have been spraying huge amounts of seawater into the reactors and spent fuel pools. However, when seawater boils away from the heat of the fuel rods, it leaves behind large quantities of salt.

The big question is how much of that salt is still mixed with water, and how much now forms a crust on the reactors’ uranium fuel rods. Chemical crusts on uranium fuel rods have been a problem for years at nuclear plants.

Crusts insulate the rods from the water and allow them to heat up. If the crusts are thick enough, they can block water from circulating between the fuel rods. As the rods heat up,

¹⁷ For information on the enrichment process, see U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. “Fact Sheet on Uranium Enrichment,” May 15, 2009, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/enrichment.html>.

¹⁸ “Zirconium: Covering for Fuel Rods,” *New York Times*, June 9, 1995, <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/06/09/nyregion/zirconium-covering-for-fuel-rods.html>.

¹⁹ Information provided by Nuclear Regulatory Commission, personal communication, March 25, 2011.

their zirconium cladding can ignite, which may cause the uranium inside to melt and release radioactive material.²⁰

To alleviate this problem, workers have begun using fresh water instead of seawater.²¹

As the fuel fissions in a reactor, the fraction of fission products in fuel rods increases. When the ratio of fission products to fissile material rises to the point at which a fuel rod can no longer efficiently maintain a chain reaction, it is referred to as spent fuel. “Spent” seems to imply that the fuel has been used up, and is therefore less dangerous, than fresh uranium fuel, but this is not necessarily the case. When fuel rods are first removed from a nuclear reactor, they have a high level of short-lived radionuclides, unlike new fuel rods, so they are intensely radioactive. This radioactivity generates intense heat, so spent fuel rods are placed in pools of water to cool them, typically for several years, until most of the short-lived radionuclides decay. The water also provides shielding against any radioactive release into the air, and the spent fuel pools have no hardened containment structure that would protect against radiation release. If a pool is drained, the fuel rods would heat up, melt, and perhaps burn. This possibility led to concern about the spent fuel rods at Fukushima Daiichi NPP reactor 4:

The spent fuel pools can be even more dangerous than the active fuel rods, as they are not contained in thick steel containers like the reactor core. As they are exposed to air, the zirconium metal cladding on the rods can catch fire, and a deadly mix of radioactive elements can spew into the atmosphere....

According to Tokyo Electric [Power Company]’s data, the spent fuel pool at the No. 4 reactor contains 548 fuel assemblies that were in use at the reactor until last November, when they were moved to the storage pool on the site. That means that the fuel rods were only recently taken out of active use and that their potential to burn and release radioactivity is higher than spent fuel in storage for a longer period.²²

Another danger comes from the potential release of plutonium from the MOX fuel used at reactor 3. Even very small amounts of plutonium, if inhaled, can potentially cause lung cancer. This explains the concern about that reactor, as it is the only one that uses MOX fuel, although irradiation of uranium fuel also creates plutonium. Water is being pumped into the spent fuel pools at the Fukushima Daiichi NPP reactors as well to cool the fuel rods and prevent additional radiation release.

Health Effects of Ionizing Radiation²³

Humans are continuously exposed to significant amounts of ionizing radiation from various naturally occurring and manmade sources. Because of its relatively high energy level, ionizing radiation is capable of producing significant biological change. Ionizing radiation gets its name

²⁰ Keith Bradsher, “New Problems at Japanese Plant Subdue Optimism and Present a Risky Agenda,” *New York Times*, March 24, 2011, p. 11.

²¹ David Nakamura and Steven Mufson, “Japan Urges More to Evacuate,” *Washington Post*, March 26, 2011, p. 1, and “Nuclear Energy—Crisis in Japan,” *New York Times*, update of March 30, 2011.

²² David Sanger, Matthew Wald, and Hiroko Tabuchi, “U.S. Sees ‘Extremely High’ Radiation Level at Plant, Focusing on Spent Fuel’s Impact,” *New York Times*, March 17, 2011, p. 13.

²³ This section was written by Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, and C. Stephen Redhead, Specialist in Health Policy, Domestic Social Policy Division.

from the fact that it causes ionization—ejection of electrons—when it interacts with atoms in the molecules that constitute cells and tissue. This process creates charged, often unstable, and highly reactive entities. The ensuing reactions may result in permanent molecular damage. Radiation disrupts cell division, which is why the most sensitive tissues are those in which cells frequently divide, such as skin, hair, bone marrow (where precursor cells give rise to new blood cells), and the cells that line the stomach and small intestine. Ionizing radiation may also damage DNA in chromosomes, resulting in mutations that are responsible for long-term effects such as the development of cancer.

Sources of Radiation Exposure

Naturally occurring sources of ionizing radiation to which all humans are exposed include cosmic radiation from outer space and terrestrial radiation from radioactive materials in rock deposits and soil. The Earth's atmosphere acts as a shield against cosmic radiation, so exposure levels increase with altitude (especially when flying). The most important source of terrestrial exposure is the inhalation of radon, which is produced by the radioactive decay of naturally occurring uranium.

In the United States, radiation exposure as a result of medical practice has increased significantly over the past 25 years as a result of the growing use of CT scans and nuclear medicine procedures to diagnose and treat disease. Other manmade sources of radiation account for a relatively small fraction of the U.S. population's total exposure. Those sources include consumer products (e.g., cigarettes, building materials, appliances); industrial, security, educational, and research activities, including nuclear power generation; and various types of occupational exposure.

Measuring Exposure: Absorbed Dose v. Equivalent Dose

Human exposure is measured by the amount of energy that ionizing radiation deposits in a unit mass of tissue. This is called the *absorbed dose*. The international unit for the absorbed dose is the gray (Gy), which replaced an earlier unit of dose, the rad (short for “radiation absorbed dose”). One gray equals 100 rad. The biological impact of ionizing radiation, however, depends not just on the absorbed dose (i.e., the amount of energy absorbed) but on the type of radiation. For example, an alpha particle is more damaging to biological tissue than a beta particle or gamma radiation because of its mass, electrical charge, and slow speed. Alpha particles lose their energy much more densely along the relatively short path they travel through biological tissue. Thus, 1 Gy of alpha radiation is more harmful than 1 Gy of beta or gamma radiation.

Radiation scientists use another quantity, called *equivalent dose*, which allows them to measure all types of exposure on an equal basis. Equivalent dose is equal to the absorbed dose multiplied by a factor that takes into account the relative effectiveness of each type of radiation to cause harm. For beta particles and gamma radiation, the factor is set at 1; that is, the absorbed dose equals the equivalent dose. For alpha particles the factor is set at 20, which means that the equivalent dose is 20 times the absorbed dose. This reflects the fact that alpha radiation is more harmful than beta and gamma radiation. The international unit for the equivalent dose is the sievert (Sv). So, 1 Sv of alpha radiation to the lung would create the same risk of lung cancer as 1 Sv of beta radiation. The sievert is a large unit relative to common exposures, so the more common unit is the millisievert (mSv), which is one-thousandth of a sievert. The sievert replaced an earlier unit of equivalent dose, the rem, which is still widely used in the United States. One sievert = 100 rem; 1 mSv = 100 millirem (mrem).

The National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement (NCRP) estimates that the *average annual equivalent dose* to an individual in the United States is 6.2 mSv (620 mrem).²⁴ Of that amount, 3.1 mSv (310 mrem) is from natural background sources, primarily inhalation of radon and its decay products, and 3.0 mSv (300 mrem) is from diagnostic and therapeutic medical procedures. The remaining 0.1 mSv (10 mrem) is from consumer products, industrial activities, and occupational exposure, among other sources. For comparison, the radiation dose from a jet airplane flight is 0.5 millirems (mrem) per hour in the air; from a chest x-ray, 6 mrem; and from living at an altitude of one mile, about 50 mrem/year.²⁵ **Table 1** shows various doses and their health consequences or regulatory limits.

²⁴ National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement, "Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States," report no. 160, 2009.

²⁵ American Nuclear Society, "Radiation Dose Chart," <http://www.ans.org/pi/resources/dosechart/>. This interactive chart permits the user to adjust values to find an approximation of his or her total annual dose.

Table I. Radiation Dose Levels

Dose, mSv	Dose, rem	Source	Comments
1/yr	0.1/yr	(2)	NRC requires its licensees to “limit maximum radiation exposure to individual members of the public” to this level.
6.2/yr	0.62/yr	(1)	Average U.S. individual’s total effective radiation dose in 2006; half is from natural background and half is from medical uses and other human activities.
20	2	(7)	Federal Emergency Management Agency and Environmental Protection Agency recommend relocating the public from an area if the expected dose in the first year after a radiological incident is above this level.
50/yr	5/yr	(2)	NRC requires its licensees to “limit occupational radiation exposure to adults working with radioactive materials” to this level.
100	10	(6)	A National Research Council committee defines “low dose” of certain types of ionizing radiation, such as gamma rays, as this level or below.
0-250	0-25	(3)	For an “acute” (i.e., received over a short time) whole-body external dose of ionizing radiation, “No detectable clinical effects; small increase in risk of delayed cancer and genetic effects.”
250	25	(4)	Japan raised the permitted dose for emergency workers at the Fukushima Daiichi NPP from 100 mSv/10 rem to this level.
500	50	(5)	For an acute whole-body external dose of ionizing radiation, “blood count changes.”
1,000-2,000	100-200	(3)	For an acute whole-body external dose of ionizing radiation, “Minimal symptoms; nausea and fatigue with possible vomiting; reduction in [certain white blood cells], with delayed recovery.”
2,000-3,000	200-300	(3)	For an acute whole-body external dose of ionizing radiation, “Nausea and vomiting on first day; following latent period of up to 2 weeks, symptoms (loss of appetite and general malaise) appear but are not severe; recovery likely in about 3 months unless complicated by previous poor health.”
3,200-3,600	320-360	(5)	Half the population exposed to an acute whole-body external dose of ionizing radiation will die within 60 days despite receiving minimal supportive care.
3,500-5,000	350-500	(2)	NRC believes that half the population receiving this dose in a few hours or less would die within 30 days.
8,000	800	(5)	100% mortality, despite best available treatment, for people receiving this external dose of whole-body ionizing radiation.

Sources: (1) National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement, “Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States,” report no. 160, 2009, p. 11. (2) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. “Fact Sheet on Biological Effects of Radiation,” January 2011, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/bio-effects-radiation.html>, and 10 CFR 20. (3) Dade Moeller, *Environmental Health*, revised edition, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1997, p. 250. (4) Keith Bradsher and Hiroko Tabuchi, “50 Workers Bravely Stay at Troubled Japan Reactors,” *New York Times*, March 16, 2011. (5) Princeton University, Environmental Health and Safety. “Open Source Radiation Safety Training, Module 3: Biological Effects,” <http://web.princeton.edu/sites/ehs/osradtraining/biologicaleffects/page.htm>, adapted from National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, Report No. 98, “Guidance on Radiation Received in Space Activities,” Bethesda, MD, 1989. (6) National Research Council, Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation, “Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation,” BEIR [Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation] VII Phase 2, p. 2, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11340&page=1 and click on PDF Summary. (7) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Radiation Programs. *Manual of Protective Action Guides and Protective Actions for Nuclear Incidents*, revised 1991 (second printing, May 1992), p. 4-4, <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/docs/er/400-r-92-001.pdf>, and Federal Emergency Management Agency, “Planning Guidance for Protection and Recovery Following Radiological Dispersal Device (RDD) and Improvised Nuclear Device (IND) Incidents,” 73 *Federal Register* 45034, August 1, 2008.

External v. Internal Exposure: Effective Dose

The health risks of ionizing radiation can occur as a result of both external and internal exposure. External exposure is almost exclusively from radioactive material that emits gamma radiation, which is very penetrating and, at higher energies, can only be stopped by a thick layer of lead or concrete. External sources of gamma radiation produce a whole-body exposure. Importantly, the level of exposure to gamma radiation falls off sharply with distance from the source. Cesium-137 (¹³⁷Cs), which has a half-life of 30 years, is the most common source of gamma radiation from nuclear weapons tests and reactor accidents.

Alpha and beta particles outside the body are typically not a source of external exposure. Alpha particles travel only a few centimeters through the air and cannot penetrate clothing or the outermost dead layer of skin. Beta particles, composed of electrons or positrons, can travel at most several feet through the air and penetrate to the live layer of skin causing burns (as happened to workers at Chernobyl). But they too are blocked by radiation suits.

Internal radiation exposure occurs through the inhalation of airborne radioactive material or the ingestion of contaminated food and drink. The potential for harm depends on the type and quantities of radioactive material taken in and the length of time they remain in the body. As already noted, isotopes that emit alpha particles present a greater hazard than those that emit beta particles and gamma radiation. In addition, the fate of the radioactive material depends on its chemical identity. For example, Strontium-90 (⁹⁰Sr), which is chemically similar to calcium and emits beta particles, accumulates in bone and can cause leukemia and bone cancer.

Iodine-131 (¹³¹I), another beta emitter, tends to accumulate in the thyroid gland, where it is used in the synthesis of thyroid hormones. Beta radiation from iodine-131 damages the surrounding cells and increase the risk of non-malignant thyroid disease and thyroid cancer. Iodine-131 from radioactive fallout accumulates on grass and leafy crops and becomes concentrated in the milk of cows and goats that feed on the contaminated vegetation. Children who drink the contaminated milk are especially at risk because they are still growing and their thyroid glands are very active. However, iodine-131 has a half-life of only 8 days, so it decays relatively quickly on the ground, in the food chain, and in the body.

Iodine-131 posed the most important health risk following the incident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in 1986. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency:

The main consequence of the Chernobyl accident is thyroid cancer in children, some of whom were not yet born at the time of the accident. Following the vapour [sic] explosion and fire at the Chernobyl reactor, radioactive iodine was released and spread in the surrounding area. Despite measures taken, children in southern Belarus and northern Ukraine, were exposed to radiation in the weeks following the accident, particularly by consuming milk from pastured cows and leafy vegetables that had been contaminated with radioactive iodine.²⁶

Unlike whole-body external exposures, the exposure from ingested or inhaled radioactive material is often limited to certain parts of the body or even specific organs. Radiation scientists

²⁶ International Atomic Energy Agency, "Thyroid Cancer Effects in Children," staff report, August 2005, <http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/features/chernobyl-15/thyroid.shtml>.

are able to calculate a whole-body equivalent dose, or *effective dose*, for partial-body exposures. These amounts can be summed with external exposure to calculate a total dose.

Acute Health Effects v. Long-Term Cancer Risk

The health effects of ionizing radiation exposure depend on the total dose and dose rate. Radiation health experts distinguish between (1) acute, or short-term, effects such as radiation sickness that are associated with relatively high doses over a short period; and (2) long-term effects such as increased lifetime cancer risk that result from chronic exposure to low levels of radiation. Short-term health effects are typically seen in workers and others in close proximity to nuclear weapons tests and accidents, while the long-term cancer risks apply to the general population. Scientists calculate the cancer risk from radiation exposure using data from epidemiological and other studies, such as those following the health outcomes of the Japanese atomic bomb survivors. According to the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), the lifetime risk of contracting a fatal cancer from chronic exposure to low-level radiation exposure is 0.05 per sievert, or 1 in 20 per sievert (i.e., 1 in 2,000 per rem). The ICRP and NCRP both recommend an annual exposure limit of 1 mSv (100 mrem) for members of the general population. An individual that received that much annual exposure over a 70-year lifetime (a total of 70 mSv, or 7 rem) would, as a result, have an increased risk of cancer death of approximately 1 in 300.

Table 1 summarizes the health effects of exposure to various acute doses of ionizing radiation. For comparison, the table also includes the current exposure standards for the general public and workers, and the average background radiation exposure in the United States.

Potassium Iodide

There is considerable interest in potassium iodide (also referred to by its chemical formula, KI) tablets to protect against thyroid cancer. These tablets contain non-radioactive iodine-127, the same type used in iodized table salt, to saturate the thyroid with iodine. Once the thyroid is saturated, it cannot absorb more of any isotope of iodine, including iodine-131. As a result, potassium iodide tablets, taken shortly *before* exposure to iodine-131, offer protection from thyroid cancer. The protection is of limited duration, however, and potassium iodide protects only the thyroid only against radioactive iodine. It does not protect against any other radioactive material or against radiation in general. Nor is there value in taking potassium iodide as a precautionary measure unless iodine-131 is expected to be present. As the next section of this report discusses, the amount of radioactive material that has reached the United States from the Japanese nuclear reactor incident is minuscule. Accordingly, the website of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, accessed on March 22, said, “At this time, CDC does not recommend that people in the United States take KI or iodine supplements in response to the nuclear power plant explosions in Japan. You should only take KI on the advice of emergency management officials, public health officials, or your doctor. There are health risks associated with taking KI.”²⁷ Further, “Some general side effects caused by KI may include intestinal upset, allergic reactions (possibly severe), rashes, and inflammation of the salivary glands.”²⁸

²⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Emergency Preparedness and Response: Radiation and Potassium Iodide (KI),” <http://www.bt.cdc.gov/radiation/japan/ki.asp>.

²⁸ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Emergency (continued...)”

The Japanese Situation

Understanding dose and its health effects casts light on the Japanese situation. The (U.S.) Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation of the National Research Council reported on the health risks from a certain type of radiation that includes gamma rays and x-rays. It considered doses below about 100 mSv (10 rem) to be low doses. The committee found that many factors “make it difficult to characterize the effects of ionizing radiation at low levels,” and that “at doses less than 40 times the average yearly background exposure (100 mSv), statistical limitations make it difficult to evaluate cancer risk in humans.” To develop an estimate of risk, the committee constructed a “lifetime risk model [that] predicts that approximately 1 person in 100 would be expected to develop cancer (solid cancer or leukemia) from a dose of 0.1 Sv [10 rem] above background.” For comparison, about 42% of the population will be diagnosed with cancer in their lifetimes.²⁹ At Fukushima Daiichi NPP,

The workers are being asked to make escalating—and perhaps existential—sacrifices that so far are being only implicitly acknowledged: Japan’s Health Ministry said Tuesday that it was raising the legal limit on the amount of radiation exposure to which each worker could be exposed, to 250 millisieverts from 100 millisieverts, five times the maximum exposure permitted for nuclear plant workers in the United States.

The change means that workers can now remain on site longer, the ministry said. “It would be unthinkable to raise it further than that, considering the health of the workers,” the health minister, Yoko Komiyama, said at a news conference.³⁰

An acute dose of 250 mSv (25 rem) is the upper threshold at which dose is unlikely to cause noticeable health effects, but it increases the risk of cancer. Based on the National Research Council report, 25 of 1,000 people would be expected to develop solid cancers or leukemia as a result of receiving this dose. Workers exposed to this dose will probably not be allowed to be exposed to additional radiation above background for at least a year to give their bodies time to repair cell damage.

Beyond the Fukushima Daiichi NPP, the external doses reported fall far below the low-dose threshold of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology reported dose readings from 80 monitoring stations between 25 and 60 km from the Fukushima Daiichi NPP.³¹ On March 20, almost all the readings were less than 15 microsieverts per hour. (One millisievert = 1,000 microsieverts; 1 microsievert = 0.1 millirem.) At a rate of 15 microsieverts per hour, it would take 278 days to accumulate a dose of 10 rem. At the highest rate reported, 110 microsieverts per hour, it would take 38 days to accumulate that dose. Staying inside an uncontaminated building would reduce exposure

(...continued)

Preparedness and Response: Potassium Iodide (KI),” <http://emergency.cdc.gov/radiation/ki.asp#med>.

²⁹ National Research Council. Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation. *Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation*, Washington, National Academies Press, 2006, pp. 1, 2, 7, 8, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11340&page=1, and click on “pdf summary.”

³⁰ Keith Bradsher and Hiroko Tabuchi, “50 Workers Bravely Stay at Troubled Japan Reactors,” *New York Times*, March 16, 2011.

³¹ Japan. Ministry of Education, Sports, Culture, Science and Technology (MEXT), “Readings at Monitoring Post out of 20 Km Zone of Fukushima Dai-ichi NPP [Nuclear Power Plant],” news release, as of 19:00 March 20, 2011, http://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/20/1303972_2019.pdf.

considerably, and short-lived radionuclides like iodine-131 (half-life, 8 days) would decay significantly during a month or more, sharply reducing the dose they produce. On the other hand, a larger release of radionuclides would be expected to increase dose, and cesium-137 (half-life, 30 years) decays much more slowly than iodine-131, so it would contribute to dose for many decades.

Given the increase in thyroid cancer as a result of the Chernobyl disaster, a major concern in Japan is minimizing the risk of thyroid cancer. This is especially important for children. At Chernobyl, as noted earlier, ingestion of radioactive iodine-131 resulted mainly from drinking milk from cows that ate contaminated feed, and from eating leafy greens. Accordingly, Japanese authorities have tested spinach, other vegetables, and milk for iodine-131, and found elevated levels. In response, on March 23 Prime Minister Naoto Kan restricted the distribution and consumption of spinach, cabbage, broccoli, and other vegetables in Fukushima Prefecture, and restricted the distribution of fresh raw milk and parsley produced in Ibaraki Prefecture.³² In addition, authorities have reportedly found traces of radioactive iodine in drinking water in Tokyo. On March 23,

Ei Yoshida, head of water purification for the Tokyo water department, said ... that infants in Tokyo and surrounding areas should not drink tap water. He said iodine-131 had been detected in water samples at a level of 210 becquerels per liter, about a quart. The recommended limit for infants is 100 becquerels per liter. For adults, the recommended limit is 300 becquerels.... The Health Ministry said in a statement that it was unlikely that there would be negative consequences to infants who did drink the water, but that it should be avoided if possible and not be used to make infant formula.³³

However, by March 24 the level was reported to be 79 becquerels per liter, and by March 27 had diminished to the point where two readings showed no radiation and one showed 27 becquerels per liter.³⁴

³² Japan. Policy Planning and Communication Division. Inspection and Safety Division. Department of Food Safety. "Restriction of Distribution and/or Consumption of Foods Concerned in Fukushima and Ibaraki Prefectures (in Relation to the Accident at Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant)," March 23, 2011, <http://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/houdou/2r98520000015wun-att/2r98520000015xym.pdf>.

³³ David Jolly and Denise Grady, "Tokyo Says Radiation in Water Puts Infants at Risk," *New York Times*, March 23, 2010.

³⁴ David Jolly, "Radiation in Tokyo's Water Has Dropped, Japan Says," *New York Times*, March 24, 2011, and David Jolly, Hiroko Tabuchi, and Keith Bradsher, "High Radiation Found in Water at Japan Plant," *New York Times*, March 28, 2011, p. 11.

Appendix. Useful Links³⁵

U.S. Government

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

“2011 Earthquake, Tsunami, and Radiation Release in Japan: Travel Information”

<http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/content/id/2511.aspx>

“CDC Situation Awareness - 2011 Japan Earthquake”: includes some maps of Japan relevant to the nuclear incident

<http://emergency.cdc.gov/situationawareness/japan/>

“Radiation Emergencies”: includes fact sheets on Japan: radiation and health

http://emergency.cdc.gov/Radiation/?s_cid=emergency_001

Congressional Research Service

“Fukushima Nuclear Crisis,” by Richard Campbell and Mark Holt: describes the crisis, presents status of reactors, includes a map and diagrams

<http://www.crs.gov/Products/R/PDF/R41694.pdf>

Department of Agriculture

“USDA’s Radiation Safety Questions and Answers”: includes information on food imports from Japan

http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentidonly=true&contentid=radiation_safety_qa.html

Department of Energy

“The Situation in Japan”: includes statements, congressional testimony, photos, and detailed radiological assessments based on DOE’s Aerial Measuring System

<http://blog.energy.gov/content/situation-japan>

Department of State

“Embassy of the United States, Tokyo, Japan”: includes information for Americans in Japan, updates on Tokyo water, availability of potassium iodide, travel warnings, press releases, etc.

<http://japan.usembassy.gov/>

³⁵ This appendix was prepared by Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division.

Environmental Protection Agency

“Japanese Nuclear Emergency: EPA’s Radiation Air Monitoring”: home page
<http://www.epa.gov/japan2011/>

“Japanese Nuclear Emergency Radiation Monitoring: Daily Data Summary”
<http://www.epa.gov/japan2011/data-updates.html>

“Radiation Doses in Perspective”
<http://www.epa.gov/radiation/understand/perspective.html>

Food and Drug Administration

“Radiation Safety”: includes FDA actions to assess the situation in Japan and to ensure the safety of products imported from Japan
<http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/PublicHealthFocus/ucm247403.htm>

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

“Exploring the Table of Isotopes”: detailed data on isotopes of each element
<http://ie.lbl.gov/education/isotopes.htm>

Los Alamos National Laboratory

“Ionizing Radiation—It’s Everywhere,” by Roger Eckhardt, *Los Alamos Science*, no. 23, 1995: a detailed primer on ionizing radiation, written in a light style
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/doe/lanl/00326627.pdf>

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

“NRC Actions on Japan’s Emergency”: statements and congressional testimony by commissioners, news releases, FAQs
<http://www.nrc.gov/japan/japan-info.html>

Japanese Sources

Government of Japan

“Countermeasures for Great East Japan Earthquake”: messages from the Prime Minister, press conferences by the Chief Cabinet Secretary, links to ministries and agencies
<http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/incident/index.html>

Japan Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc.

Home page: includes “Information Update on Fukushima Nuclear Power Station” with updates several times a day, such as on reactor status and major events, trend of radiation in the

environment, other press releases
<http://www.jaif.or.jp/english/>

Kyodo News

Home page: news feed, including reports on the nuclear incident
<http://english.kyodonews.jp/>

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

“Reading of Environmental Radioactivity Level”: includes daily updates of radiation levels at many radiation detection posts
http://www.mext.go.jp/english/radioactivity_level/index.htm

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare

“Information about the Great East Japan Earthquake”: announcements on radiation in food and water
<http://www.mhlw.go.jp/english/topics/2011eq/index.html>

NHK World

Home page of Japan Broadcasting Corporation: includes many news stories on the Fukushima Daiichi incident. Note: Members of the Board of Directors are appointed by the Prime Minister and approved by both Houses of the Diet.
http://www3.nhk.or.jp/daily/english/01_33.html

Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency

“Countermeasures for Tohoku—Pacific Ocean Earthquake”: includes updates of information on radiation levels
<http://www.nisa.meti.go.jp/english/>

Prime Minister of Japan and His Cabinet

“The Prime Minister in Action”: includes messages, statements, and a blog by the Prime Minister
<http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/index-e.html>

Tokyo Electric Power Company

Home page of the company that owns the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant: includes press releases and monitoring data
<http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/index-e.html>

Other

American Nuclear Society

“Fukushima”: Links to many news sources, updates on reactor status, an archive of updates and news

<http://ansnuclearcafe.org/fukushima/>

Areva

“The Fukushima Daiichi Incident,” by Matthias Braun: provides a detailed description, with photos and diagrams, of plant design, accident progression, radiological releases, spent fuel pools, and sources of information

<http://www.seyth.com/ressources/quake/AREVA-Document.pdf>

Health Physics Society

“Fukushima Nuclear Plant Update”: health aspects of radiation exposure in general and from the Fukushima Daiichi incident

<http://www.hps.org/fukushima/>

International Atomic Energy Agency

“Fukushima Nuclear Accident Update Log”: daily detailed updates of the situation

<http://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/tsunamiupdate01.html>

New York Times

“Status of the Nuclear Reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant”: for each reactor, daily updates of the situation along with recent developments

<http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/03/16/world/asia/reactors-status.html?ref=asia>

“Assessing the Radiation Danger, Near and Far,” by Joe Burgess et al., April 2, 2011: Combines data from multiple sources to show the potential danger at different distances and in various environments resulting from the Fukushima Daiichi incident

<http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2011/04/02/world/asia/assessing-the-radiation-danger.html?ref=asia>

Nuclear Energy Institute

“Japan Earthquake: Additional NEI Updates”: includes daily updates and an archive of these updates, a timeline of events in Japan, and latest news and events

<http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/information-on-the-japanese-earthquake-and-reactors-in-that-region/japan-earthquake-additional-nei-updates/>

Union of Concerned Scientists

“UCS Spotlight: Nuclear Reactor Crisis in Japan”: daily press briefings on the incident, FAQs, the organization’s position on nuclear power, and a report on NRC and nuclear power plant safety
<http://www.ucsusa.org/>

World Health Organization

“FAQs: Japan Nuclear Concerns”: Q&A from a United Nations Agency, including current risk, human exposure to ionizing radiation, WHO travel advice for Japan
<http://www.who.int/hac/crises/jpn/faqs/en/index.html>

World Institute for Nuclear Security

“Emerging Lessons from the Fukushima Daiichi Accident: Maintaining Nuclear Security in a Complex Crisis”: focuses on lessons learned from the incident for maintaining and improving security, as distinct from safety
<http://wins.org/fileitem.aspx?id=249>

World Nuclear Organization

“Nuclear Power in Japan”: detailed background on many aspects of this topic including history; tables and descriptions of Japan’s nuclear power reactors built, under construction, and planned; fuels used and spent fuel; and R&D. Does not deal with the Fukushima Daiichi incident.
<http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf79.html>

“Fukushima Accident 2011”: technical description of the accident, with diagrams
http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/fukushima_accident_inf129.html

Author Contact Information

Jonathan Medalia
Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy
jmedalia@crs.loc.gov, 7-7632

Acknowledgments

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission provided technical comments on this report.