

# NRC frequently asked questions related to the March 11, 2011 Japanese Earthquake and Tsunami

---

## List of Questions

1) Can an earthquake and tsunami as large as happened in Japan also happen here? .....	1
2) Did the Japanese underestimate the size of the maximum credible earthquake and tsunami that could affect the plants?.....	1
3) How high was the tsunami at the Fukushima nuclear plants? .....	1
4) Was the damage to the Japanese nuclear plants mostly from the earthquake or the tsunami? .....	1
5) Have any lessons for US nuclear plants been identified? .....	1
6) Was there any damage to US reactors from either the earthquake or the resulting tsunami? 2	
7) How many US reactors are located in active earthquake zones? .....	2
8) What level of earthquake hazard are the US reactors designed for? .....	2
9) What magnitude earthquake are currently operating US nuclear plants designed to? .....	2
10) Have events in Japan changed our perception of earthquake risk to the nuclear plants in the US? .....	2
11) Can significant damage to a nuclear plant like we see in Japan happen in the US due to an earthquake? Are the Japanese nuclear plants similar to US nuclear plants? .....	3
12) What is the likelihood of the design basis or “SSE” ground motions being exceeded over the life of a nuclear plant? .....	3
13) Which reactors are along coastal areas that could be affected by a tsunami? .....	3
14) What is magnitude anyway? What is the Richter Scale? What is intensity?.....	4
15) How do magnitude and ground motion relate to each other? .....	4
16) What is Generic Issue 199 about? .....	4
17) Does GI-199 provide rankings of US nuclear plants in terms of safety?.....	4
18) What are the current findings of GI-199? .....	5
19) What do you mean by “increased estimates of seismic hazards” at nuclear plant sites?.....	5
20) Does the Seismic Core Damage represent a measurement of the risk of radiation release or only the risk of core damage (not accounting for additional containment)? .....	5
21) Where can I get current information about Generic Issue 199?.....	5
22) Could an accident sequence like the one at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plants happen in the US?.....	6
23) Are US plants susceptible to the same kind of loss of power as happened in Japan?.....	<b>Error!</b>

**Bookmark not defined.**

**1) Can an earthquake and tsunami as large as happened in Japan also happen here?**

This earthquake occurred on a “subduction zone”, which is the type of tectonic region that produces earthquakes of the largest magnitude. A subduction zone is a tectonic plate boundary where one tectonic plate is pushed under another plate. Subduction zone earthquakes are also required to produce the kind of massive tsunami seen in Japan. In the continental US, the only subduction zone is the Cascadia subduction zone which lies off the coast of northern California, Oregon and Washington. So, a continental earthquake and tsunami as large as in Japan could only happen there. The only nuclear plant near the Cascadia subduction zone is the Columbia Generating Station. This plant is located a large distance from the coast (approximately 225 miles) and the subduction zone (approximately 300 miles), so the ground motions estimated at the plant are far lower than those seen at the Fukushima plants. This distance also precludes the possibility of a tsunami affecting the plant. Outside of the Cascadia subduction zone, earthquakes are not expected to exceed a magnitude of approximately 8. Magnitude is measured on a log scale and so a magnitude 9 earthquake is ten times larger than a magnitude 8 earthquake.

**2) Did the Japanese underestimate the size of the maximum credible earthquake and tsunami that could affect the plants?**

The magnitude of the earthquake was somewhat greater than was expected for that part of the subduction zone. However, the Japanese nuclear plants were recently reassessed using ground motion levels similar to those that are believed to have occurred at the sites. The ground motions against which the Japanese nuclear plants were reviewed were expected to result from earthquakes that were smaller, but were much closer to the sites. The NRC does not currently have information on the maximum tsunami height that was expected at the sites.

**3) How high was the tsunami at the Fukushima nuclear plants?**

The tsunami modeling team at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Pacific Marine Environmental Lab have estimated the wave height just offshore to be approximately 8 meters in height at Fukushima Daiichi and approximately 7 meters in Fukushima Daini. This is based on recordings from NOAA’s Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis (DART) buoys and a high resolution numerical model developed for the tsunami warning system. If plant recordings exist they were not yet provided to the NRC.

**4) Was the damage to the Japanese nuclear plants mostly from the earthquake or the tsunami?**

Because this event happened in Japan, it is hard for NRC staff to make the assessment necessary to understand exactly what happened at this time. In the nuclear plants there may have been some damage from the shaking, and the earthquake caused the loss of offsite power. However, the tsunami appears to have played a key role in the loss of other power sources at the site producing station blackout, which is a critical factor in the ongoing problems.

**5) Have any lessons for US nuclear plants been identified?**

The NRC is in the process of following and reviewing the event in real time. This will undoubtedly lead to the identification of issues that warrant further study. However, a complete

understanding of lessons learned will require more information than is currently available to NRC staff.

**6) Was there any damage to US reactors from either the earthquake or the resulting tsunami?**

No.

**7) How many US reactors are located in active earthquake zones?**

Although we often think of the US as having “active” and “non-active” earthquake zones, earthquakes can actually happen almost anywhere. Seismologists typically separate the US into low, moderate, and high seismicity zones. The NRC requires that every nuclear plant be designed for site-specific ground motions that are appropriate for their locations. In addition, the NRC has specified a minimum ground motion level to which nuclear plants must be designed.

**8) What level of earthquake hazard are the US reactors designed for?**

Each reactor is designed for a different ground motion that is determined on a site-specific basis. The existing nuclear plants were designed on a “deterministic” or “scenario earthquake” basis that accounted for the largest earthquakes expected in the area around the plant, without consideration of the likelihood of the earthquakes considered. New reactors are designed using probabilistic techniques that characterize both the ground motion levels and uncertainty at the proposed site. These probabilistic techniques account for the ground motions that may result from all potential seismic sources in the region around the site. Technically speaking, this is the ground motion with an annual frequency of occurrence of  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ /year, but this can be thought of as the ground motion that occurs every 10,000 years on average. One important aspect is that probabilistic hazard and risk-assessment techniques account for beyond-design basis events. NRC’s Generic Issue 199 (GI-199) project is using the latest probabilistic techniques used for new nuclear plants to review the safety of the existing plants. [see questions 16 to 21 for more information about GI-199]

**9) What magnitude earthquake are currently operating US nuclear plants designed to?**

Ground motion is a function of both the magnitude of an earthquake and the distance from the fault to the site. Nuclear plants, and in fact all engineered structures, are actually designed based on ground motion levels, not earthquake magnitudes. The existing nuclear plants were designed based on a “deterministic” or “scenario earthquake” basis that accounted for the largest earthquakes expected in the area around the plant. A margin is further added to the predicted ground motions to provide added robustness.

**10) Have events in Japan changed our perception of earthquake risk to the nuclear plants in the US?**

The NRC continues to determine that US nuclear plants are safe. This does not change the NRC’s perception of earthquake hazard (i.e., ground motion levels) at US nuclear plants. It is too early to tell what the lessons from this earthquake are. The NRC will look closely at all aspects of response of the plants to the earthquake and tsunami to determine if any actions need to be taken in US nuclear plants and if any changes are necessary to NRC regulations.

**11) Can significant damage to a nuclear plant like we see in Japan happen in the US due to an earthquake? Are the Japanese nuclear plants similar to US nuclear plants?**

All US nuclear plants are built to withstand environmental hazards, including earthquakes and tsunamis. Even those nuclear plants that are located within areas with low and moderate seismic activity are designed for safety in the event of such a natural disaster. The NRC requires that safety-significant structures, systems, and components be designed to take into account even rare and extreme seismic and tsunami events. In addition to the design of the plants, significant effort goes into emergency response planning and accident management. This approach is called defense-in-depth.

The Japanese facilities are similar in design to some US facilities. However, the NRC has required modifications to the plants since they were built, including design changes to control hydrogen and pressure in the containment. The NRC has also required plants to have additional equipment and measures to mitigate damage stemming from large fires and explosions from a beyond-design-basis event. The measures include providing core and spent fuel pool cooling and an additional means to power other equipment on site.

**12) What is the likelihood of the design basis or “SSE” ground motions being exceeded over the life of a nuclear plant?**

The ground motions that are used as seismic design bases at US nuclear plants are called the Safe Shutdown Earthquake ground motion (SSE). In the mid to late 1990s, the NRC staff reviewed the potential for ground motions beyond the design basis as part of the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE). From this review, the staff determined that seismic designs of operating nuclear plants in the US have adequate safety margins for withstanding earthquakes. Currently, the NRC is in the process of conducting GI-199 to again assess the resistance of US nuclear plants to earthquakes. Based on NRC’s analyses to date, the probability of ground motions exceeding the SSE for the plants in the Central and Eastern United States is less than 2%, with values ranging from a low of 0.1% to a high of 6%.

It is important to remember that structures, systems and components are required to have “adequate margin,” meaning that they must continue be able withstand shaking levels that are above the plant’s design basis.

**13) Which reactors are along coastal areas that could be affected by a tsunami?**

Many nuclear plants are located in coastal areas that could potentially be affected by a tsunami. Two nuclear plants, Diablo Canyon and San Onofre, are on the Pacific Coast, which is known to have a tsunami hazard. Two nuclear plants on the Gulf Coast, South Texas and Crystal River, could also be affected by tsunami. There are many nuclear plants on the Atlantic Coast or on rivers that may be affected by a tidal bore resulting from a tsunami. These include St. Lucie, Turkey Point, Brunswick, Oyster Creek, Millstone, Pilgrim, Seabrook, Calvert Cliffs, Salem/Hope Creek, and Surry. Tsunami on the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts occur, but are very rare. Generally the flooding anticipated from hurricane storm surge exceeds the flooding expected from a tsunami for nuclear plants on the Atlantic and Gulf Coast. Regardless, all nuclear plants are designed to withstand a tsunami.

#### **14) What is magnitude anyway? What is the Richter Scale? What is intensity?**

An earthquake's magnitude is a measure of the strength of the earthquake as determined from seismographic observations. Magnitude is essentially an objective, quantitative measure of the size of an earthquake. The magnitude can be expressed in various ways based on seismographic records (e.g., Richter Local Magnitude, Surface Wave Magnitude, Body Wave Magnitude, and Moment Magnitude). Currently, the most commonly used magnitude measurement is the Moment Magnitude,  $M_w$ , which is based on the strength of the rock that ruptured, the area of the fault that ruptured, and the average amount of slip. Moment magnitude is, therefore, a direct measure of the energy released during an earthquake. Because of the logarithmic basis of the scale, each whole number increase in magnitude

represents a tenfold increase in measured amplitude; as an estimate of energy, each whole number step in the magnitude scale corresponds to the release of about 31 times more energy than the amount associated with the preceding whole number value.

The Richter magnitude scale was developed in 1935 by Charles F. Richter of the California Institute of Technology and was based on the behavior of a specific seismograph that was manufactured at that time. The instruments are no longer in use and the magnitude scale is, therefore, no longer used in the technical community. However, the Richter Scale is a term that is so commonly used by the public that scientists generally just answer questions about "Richter" magnitude by substituting moment magnitude without correcting the misunderstanding.

The intensity of an earthquake is a qualitative assessment of effects of the earthquake at a particular location. The intensity assigned is based on observed effects on humans, on human-built structures, and on the earth's surface at a particular location. The most commonly used scale in the US is the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) scale, which has values ranging from I to XII in the order of severity. MMI of I indicates an earthquake that was not felt except by a very few, whereas MMI of XII indicates total damage of all works of construction, either partially or completely. While an earthquake has only one magnitude, intensity depends on the effects at each particular location.

#### **15) How do magnitude and ground motion relate to each other?**

The ground motion experienced at a particular location is a function of the magnitude of the earthquake, the distance from the fault to the location of interest, and other elements such as the geologic materials through which the waves pass.

#### **16) What is Generic Issue 199 about?**

GI-199 investigates the safety and risk implications of updated earthquake-related data and models. These data and models suggest that the probability for earthquake ground motion above the seismic design basis for some nuclear plants in the Central and Eastern United States, although is still low, is larger than previous estimates.

#### **17) Does GI-199 provide rankings of US nuclear plants in terms of safety?**

The NRC does not rank nuclear plants by seismic risk. The objective of the GI-199 Safety/Risk Assessment was to perform a conservative, screening-level assessment to evaluate if further investigations of seismic safety for operating reactors in the central and eastern US (CEUS) are warranted, consistent with NRC directives. The results of the GI-199 safety risk assessment

should not be interpreted as definitive estimates of plant-specific seismic risk because some analyses were very conservative making the calculated risk higher than in reality. The nature of the information used (both seismic hazard data and plant-level fragility information) make these estimates useful only as a screening tool.

### **18) What are the current findings of GI-199?**

Currently operating nuclear plants in the US remain safe, with no need for immediate action. This determination is based on NRC staff reviews of updated seismic hazard information and the conclusions of the first stage of GI-199. Existing nuclear plants were designed with considerable margin to be able to withstand the ground motions from the “deterministic” or “scenario earthquake” that accounted for the largest earthquakes expected in the area around the plant. The results of the GI-199 assessment demonstrate that the probability of exceeding the design basis ground motion may have increased at some sites, but only by a relatively small amount. In addition, the probabilities of seismic core damage are lower than the guidelines for taking immediate action. Although there is not an immediate safety concern, the NRC is focused on assuring safety during even very rare and extreme events. Therefore, the NRC has determined that assessment of updated seismic hazards and plant performance should continue.

### **19) What do you mean by “increased estimates of seismic hazards” at nuclear plant sites?**

*Seismic hazard* (earthquake hazard) represents the chance (or probability) that a specific level of ground motion could be observed or exceeded at a given location. Our estimates of seismic hazard at some Central and Eastern United States locations have changed based on results from recent research, indicating that earthquakes occurred more often in some locations than previously estimated. Our estimates of seismic hazard have also changed because the models used to predict the level of ground motion, as caused by a specific magnitude earthquake at a certain distance from a site, changed. The increased estimates of seismic hazard at some locations in the Central and Eastern United States were discussed in a memorandum to the Commission, dated July 26, 2006. (The memorandum is available in the NRC Agencywide Documents Access and Management System [ADAMS] under Accession No. ML052360044).

### **20) Does the Seismic Core Damage represent a measurement of the risk of radiation release or only the risk of core damage (not accounting for additional containment)?**

Seismic core damage frequency is the probability of damage to the core resulting from a seismic initiating event. It does not imply either a meltdown or the loss of containment, which would be required for radiological release to occur. The likelihood of radiation release is far lower.

### **21) Where can I get current information about Generic Issue 199?**

The public NRC Generic Issues Program (GIP) website (<http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/regulatory/gen-issues.html>) contains program information and documents, background and historical information, generic issue status information, and links to related programs. The latest Generic Issue Management Control System quarterly report, which has regularly updated GI-199 information, is publicly available at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/generic-issues/quarterly/index.html>. Additionally, the US Geological Survey provides data and results that are publicly available at <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/products/conterminous/2008/>.

**22) Could an accident sequence like the one at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plants happen in the US?**

It is difficult to answer this question until we have a better understanding of the precise problems and conditions that faced the operators at Fukushima Daiichi. We do know, however, that Fukushima Daiichi Units 1-3 lost all offsite power and emergency diesel generators. This situation is called “station blackout.” US nuclear power plants are designed to cope with a station blackout event that involves a loss of offsite power and onsite emergency power. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s detailed regulations address this scenario. US nuclear plants are required to conduct a “coping” assessment and develop a strategy to demonstrate to the NRC that they could maintain the plant in a safe condition during a station blackout scenario. These assessments, proposed modifications to the plant, and operating procedures were reviewed and approved by the NRC. Several plants added additional AC power sources to comply with this regulation.

In addition, US nuclear plant designs and operating practices since the terrorist events of September 11, 2001, are designed to mitigate severe accident scenarios such as aircraft impact, which include the complete loss of offsite power and all on-site emergency power sources.

US nuclear plant designs include consideration of seismic events and tsunamis’. It is important not to extrapolate earthquake and tsunami data from one location of the world to another when evaluating these natural hazards. These catastrophic natural events are very region- and location-specific, based on tectonic and geological fault line locations.