

## **Press briefing at the Prime Minister's Office for members of the foreign press**

6 April 2011

Mr. Noriyuki Shikata, Deputy Cabinet Secretary for Public Relations: Good evening. Thank you very much for coming to the press briefing for international press at the Prime Minister's Office. We would like to start today's briefing although Mr. Hidehiko Nishiyama, Deputy Director-General of the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) is going to arrive a bit late due to his briefing for the Japanese press. We would like to get started with the officials who are present at this juncture. My name is Noriyuki Shikata, Deputy Cabinet Secretary for Public Relations at the Prime Minister's Office.

At the outset, I would like to introduce a few points from Chief Cabinet Secretary Edano's press conference this morning. He commented on the issue of the release of radioactive water from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. Concerning the release of radioactive water into the sea, some pointed out that a detailed explanation should have been given in advance to neighboring countries and other related parties. We will sincerely take that point to heart and conduct thorough communication in the future, meaning we will try to make sure that what we are doing will be understood by other countries, including our neighboring countries.

The second point is this discharging water with the lower level of radioactive materials from the nuclear power plant into the sea was, from our viewpoint, an unavoidable measure in order to prevent the release of water estimated to have more than 200,000 times the concentration of radioactive materials compared to the radiation level of the water discharged. We will redouble our efforts to provide a more detailed explanation of the situation to the relevant parties and people concerned.

Regarding possible damage to fishing activities or fishing industry, compensation including temporary payments will be made for the losses to the fishing industry incurred by the release of radioactive water into the sea. Lastly, Mr. Edano mentioned that he believes that the consultations with the food safety commission on the provisional standard values for marine resources will be necessary. So this is something that will be examined in terms of ensuring the food safety of marine products.

Now I would like to ask my colleague from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Takeshi Matsunaga, Assistant Press Secretary, to go next.

Mr. Matsunaga: Thank you, Mr. Shikata. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to start my explanation with respect to the cooperation of other countries and international organizations.

Before going into the respective assistance and cooperation or meetings, I would like to refer to the announcement or information recently released by an international organization, the World Health Organization (WHO). I previously mentioned a news release and Frequently Asked Questions issued by the WHO. Yesterday, the organization updated their information with respect to Japan in relation to the health risk concerning the nuclear plant accident.

Yesterday, the WHO announced on their website that there are no health risks so far to people living in other countries from radioactive material released into the atmosphere from the Japanese nuclear power plants. It further stated that radiation levels measured to date in other countries are far below the level of background radiation that most people are exposed to in normal, everyday circumstances. The WHO also updated their FAQ. They updated three items.

The first one concerns what the current risk of radiation-related health problems in Japan is for those residing near the reactor in comparison to those in other parts of Japan. They provided the following answer: "Radiation-related health consequences will depend on exposure, which is dependant on several things, including: the amount and type of radiation released from the reactor; weather conditions, such as wind and rain; a person's proximity to the plant; and the amount of time spent in irradiated areas. The Government of Japan's recent actions in response to events at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant are in line with the existing recommendations for radiation exposure. The Government has evacuated individuals who were living within a 20km radius around the Fukushima Daiichi plant. Those living between 20km and 30 km from the plant are being asked to evacuate voluntarily. In general, people living farther away are at lower risk than those who live nearby. As and if the situation changes, the Government of Japan may change their advice to the public; WHO is following the situation closely."

The second FAQ they updated asks, “Is there a risk of radioactive exposure from food contamination?” For the answer, they stated, “Yes, there is a risk of exposure as a result of contamination in food.” But they continued, “However, contaminated food would have to be consumed over prolonged periods to represent a risk to human health. The presence of radioactivity in some vegetables and milk has been confirmed and some of the initial food monitoring results show radioactive iodine detected in concentrations above Japanese regulatory limits. Radioactive caesium has also been detected. Local government authorities have advised residents to avoid these foods and have implemented measures to prevent their sale and distribution.”

For the last question they updated, they were asked, “Are there health risks to people living outside of Japan from radiation emitted into the atmosphere from damaged Japanese nuclear power plants?” In reply, they stated, “Thus far, there are no health risks to people living in other countries from radioactive material released into the atmosphere from the Japanese nuclear power plants. Radiation levels measured to date in other countries are far below the level of background radiation that most people are exposed to in every day circumstances. Radiation levels are being monitored by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), which operates 63 surveillance stations around the world.”

The information I provided is given in writing on the table. Next, I would like to mention several additional cooperative measures extended by other countries and organizations. Today, relief supplies arrived in Narita Airport from the European Union (EU). This time, the relief supplies are supplied by Hungary, Slovakia, and Sweden through the European Union. They consist of 16.7 tons of foodstuffs, 4,000 pieces of clothing, 1,000 pairs of shoes, 10,000 pairs of gloves, and about 300 pairs of boots. After arriving in Narita, these supplies will be transported to and distributed in various disaster-stricken areas in Miyagi Prefecture. Japan deeply appreciates the cooperation of the European Union and its member countries. As of 5 April, announcements through the European Union for relief supplies have been made by the following European Union member states: Ireland, the United Kingdom, Austria, the Netherlands, Greece, Sweden, Slovakia, Denmark, Hungary, Finland, France, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and Luxembourg. The previous relief supplies from the European Union, consisting of blankets, mattresses, and sleeping bags arrived on 24 March and were delivered to Ibaraki Prefecture. Some of the blankets were also delivered to Tochigi Prefecture.

I would also like to mention donations from Austria. We are informed that in response to the Great East Japan Earthquake, the government of Austria has provided monetary donations through the country's Red Cross. From Austria, we have received letters and messages from many dignitaries, including H.E. Dr. Heinz Fischer, Federal President of the Republic of Austria, H.E. Mr. Werner Faymann, Federal Chancellor, H.E. Dr. Michael Spindelegger, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs. Furthermore, on 22 March, Federal Minister Spindelegger visited the Japanese embassy in Austria and signed a book of condolences. The government of Japan deeply appreciates the expression of solidarity and great amount of cooperation of the government and people of Austria.

And, as you see in the revised matrix concerning relief supplies, we have received relief supplies from Turkey, which consist of blankets, sheets, canned tuna, canned green peas, canned fish, and water. They arrived 4 April. Also, we received more than 4,600 canned beef from Uruguay on the date of 4 April. We greatly appreciate their cooperation.

Finally, I would like to mention today's telephone conversations between the Japanese and New Zealand foreign ministers. Early this afternoon, Foreign Minister Matsumoto had telephone talks with his New Zealand counterpart, the Honorable Mr. Murray McCully, Minister of Foreign Affairs. In the talks, Mr. Matsumoto appreciated the New Zealand government's various considerations for the confirmation of the safety of 28 Japanese victims of the earthquake in the South Island of New Zealand, as well as their bereaved families. Mr. Matsumoto also wished for progress in the investigation as to the reasons for the collapse of the CTV building. He also expressed his heartfelt appreciation for New Zealand's dispatch of a rescue team of 52 members, the provision of monetary donations, etc. In response, Mr. McCully expressed his gratitude for Japanese cooperation towards the earthquake of the South island of New Zealand, and extended condolences for the victims of the Great East Japan Earthquake, stating that he was prepared to continue necessary cooperation for the families of the Japanese victims of the New Zealand South Island earthquake. Mr. McCully stated that he would like to strengthen the bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the field of disaster prevention and counter-disaster measures, making use of both countries' experience in those fields. Mr. Matsumoto explained the Japanese government's response to assist the people who suffered from the disaster, including those who had evacuated from their residences, as well as to the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident, adding that the government would continue providing information promptly and accurately. Furthermore, Mr. Matsumoto expressed his determination to proceed down the path of

reconstruction in a forceful manner, like New Zealand. The two foreign ministers concurred on the continued close communication between them, with a view to further strengthening their bilateral relations. Thank you very much.

Mr. Shikata: Now, I would like to ask Mr. Nishiyama of NISA to go next.

Mr. Nishiyama: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to update the status of Fukushima Daiichi Plants. The parameters of the reactors of Units 1 through 3 are relatively stable. We are transferring the water in the hot well to the condensate storage tank, as preparation to move the stagnant water to the hot well, with respect to Units 1 to 3. We are considering introducing nitrogen to the containment vessel to Unit 1, first, and then possibly Units 2 and 3 in the future to prevent hydrogen explosions. We are still considering and adjusting the conditions with TEPCO. Regarding the spent fuel pool of Unit 3, we are flowing 75 tons of pure water. Regarding the emergency release of slightly radiated water in the radioactive waste disposal system and in the reactor and turbine buildings of Unit 6 to the sea, TEPCO's work has been going smoothly. The former is preparation for TEPCO to move the highly radiated stagnant water in the turbine building of Unit 2 to the radioactive waste disposal system. The latter, which is related to the underground water intruding Unit 6, the action is to protect Units 5 and 6 from the intrusion of water that will harm important equipment in the basement of those units, especially those related to cooling systems. We successfully stopped the highly radiated water spilling from the crack of the outside wall of the pit where electricity cables are stored. We injected two kinds of chemical liquids which can fill the room among stones and rocks under the ground. We put those chemicals into both the ground beneath the pit and the bottom of the pit. However, we are alert that the highly radiated water may appear elsewhere or the surface of the same kinds of water in the trench of Unit 2 may rise. We are closely monitoring those possibilities. Finally, we sprayed synthetic plastic for the third time to settle the radiated dust which fell to the ground after hydrogen explosions and other events at Units 1, 3, and maybe 4. It seems that the synthetic plastic has been effective to a certain extent to bring down the radiated dust. Thank you very much for listening.

Mr. Shikata: Now I would like to ask Mr. Shinichi Kawarada, Advisor to Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) to go next.

Mr. Kawarada: Thank you. Allow me to speak in Japanese. On behalf of MEXT, I

would like to give a report that we are conducting monitoring out of 20km of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. We are monitoring both the land and sea, and also we are conducting the monitoring from the air. And the area that we cover is an area beyond 20km from the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant.

I would like to share some new developments. I am afraid you do not have the English translation, but if you refer to the very last page, this one page, this is a monitoring by aircraft. In the past we have been requested that we used low speed helicopters to conduct monitoring, and we have been able to start such an operation as of today using low speed helicopters. The first is that MEXT is using a private sector helicopter to monitor the area which is 60 to 80km around the Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. The other is the Department of Energy (DOE) of the United States using small aircraft and helicopters to monitor the range within a 60km radius. And when we have the results, we will add on to the information and we will share that information with you without delay. Thank you.

Mr. Shikata: I would like to ask Mr. Masanori Shinano, Counselor, Secretariat of the Nuclear Safety Commission (NSC) to go next.

Mr. Shinano: Good evening. I would like to report to you the result of the assessment of the environmental monitoring data. And this is from 13:00 hours of April 4 to 10:00 on April 5. Overall the assessment result is that we did not have data that would have an immediate health risk, but unlike what I have reported previously, there are two updates that are made in the report, so I would like to highlight the updated portion of our report. First of all, having to do with spatial radiation dose rate, at the bottom of the second paragraph, so “we are preparing the technical data necessary to study further actions to be taken.” That sentence has been added. And as you are aware of, in this radius from 20 to 30km, the citizens have been instructed to take shelter and stay indoors. But already three weeks have passed since this instruction has been issued, so the taking of shelter had been prolonged, and in some areas, the spatial radiation dose rate accumulation had gone beyond 10mSv. Since such data had been gathered, what would be the most appropriate measure to be taken needs to be studied from a technical perspective.

Secondly, having to do with the radioactive concentration in the air, the concentration level has come down from yesterday's level for both iodine and cesium, and the

concentration limit of course is not exceeded.

Turning to aviation monitoring, we have obtained no new information, so there was no new assessment that was carried out.

Going on to environmental samples, as far as the data that has been gathered, compared to yesterday's data, there had been some readings that had increased.

And going on the fourth paragraph, this paragraph had been added newly. So for marine sea products, be aware of the information related with the request announced by the MHLW. As you are already aware of, off the coast of Fukushima, the lance fish has been monitored and this has exceeded the limit. And so this is why this sentence has been added.

Going on the fifth item, environmental radioactivity level by prefecture, there was no new information available for tap water, so we do not have any new assessment result for the tap water. That is the daily report this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Shikata: My colleague from the Fisheries Agency, Mr. Shoji Takayama. He is the Deputy Director of Resources and the Environment Research Division of the Fisheries Agency. To go next.

Mr. Takayama: Allow to me to present to you in Japanese. In the peripheral prefecture of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, monitoring of radiation level had been carried out, and except for one sample, we have disclosed data that all the readings had been below the limit. But on April 4, Ibaraki Fisheries Co-op obtained readings of the lance fish, which had cesium level of 526Bq, which exceeds the provisional limit. So Ibaraki Prefecture has issued a request to restrict shipment of the lance fish which is caught off the coast of Ibaraki. And the fishery co-ops have followed suit of this instruction in order to ensure safety of the sea products or seafood. Flat fish and also other fishes are subjected to sampling, and in Chiba, off the coast of Choshi, fish such as mackerel and other fish such as sardines are to be sampled. And with full coordination with the other prefectures involved, monitoring and sampling activities shall be carried out.

Mr. Shikata: Now I would like to open the floor for questions. And when you ask a

question, please identify yourself with your name and affiliation, and please limit your question to only one.

QUESTION (Mr. Narioka, Dow Jones Newswires): Mr. Nishiyama, you just said you are planning to consider injecting nitrogen to the containment vessel at Units 1, 2, and 3. And is the likelihood of the hydrogen explosion increasing or decreasing at each reactor? And how do you measure the likelihood of such an event? And what is the level of hydrogen at each reactor? And if the likelihood of a hydrogen explosion is not increasing, why are you considering to do it now? And could you explain how nitrogen can prevent a hydrogen explosion?

Mr. Nishiyama: First of all, we are now cooling all of the Units, 1, 2 and 3, by injecting water. When the cooling goes on, there will be less generation of vapor, and as a result the pressure in the containment vessel will decline. This may have the possibility of bringing in oxygen from the outside. We do not know for sure how much hydrogen there is in each of the units. Of course, there is the possibility that hydrogen may have been generated by the radioactivity. Also, there is a possibility that hydrogen may have been generated as a result of the damage to the fuel that had taken place in the past. We do not believe there is a lot of hydrogen inside the units, but when we consider that there is a possibility of an explosion occurring when the ratio between hydrogen and oxygen reaches a certain ratio, we thought that we might adjust that ratio, inject nitrogen before the level reaches that ratio, which may lead to the likelihood of an explosion. By injecting nitrogen we can prevent the oxygen from coming in and as a result, even if there is hydrogen inside, we can create a situation where an explosion will not occur.

QUESTION (Mr. Palca, National Public Radio): We've heard data today about the radiation levels around Fukushima Plant. I wonder if you can say anything about whether there are any measurable levels of radiation here in Tokyo, and if so, how much? And also how do normal levels in Tokyo compare with levels in Paris, London, New York, Denver?

Mr. Kawarada: If you can look at the documents and material that MEXT has distributed for this briefing and refer to page 34, it shows the radiation level data for each of the prefectures. On page 34, it gives the levels for each prefecture starting from Hokkaido and onwards. The 13th from the top are the figures from Tokyo. The values for Tokyo are measured at a measuring point in Shinjuku Ward. If you can see the



numbers on the very right hand side, which gives the average levels in normal times, you can see that normally the average radiation level in Tokyo is 0.028-0.079 $\mu$ Sv/h. To the left of that average normal level you see all of the levels measured on April 5. As you can see, all of the numbers from the left are somewhere in between 0.087 and 0.089. So the levels for April 5 are just slightly above the normal average levels. In addition to that, we have the numbers the measurement levels for the spatial radiation dose rate, also the radioactive materials in drinking water, which is on page 37. We also have the levels for radioactive material in fallout, which is on page 39. For both drinking water and fallout, the normal numbers would be non-detectable, whereas for the measurements that were made in Tokyo, there is a value, a number attached to the graph in the table, so although it is very small, the levels are just a little bit higher than normal, we expect that this is due to the effect of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant.

Regarding cities like New York and Paris that you mentioned in your question, I don't have the data for New York, Paris, other cities, so I would not be able to tell, but there is quite an amount of variation depending on the country, so we do have the data, but I don't have it with me now, so we can inform you at a later date.

Mr. Shinano: I don't have the numbers for Paris and New York, but for instance in the case of Guarapari, Brazil, this area has a very high level of radioactivity, about 20 times the normal levels that we have in Japan, probably partly due to the soil, such as the volcanic rocks and also because of the radioactive rays from space. So there is quite a variation depending on the area and depending on the country.

QUESTION (Mr. Pollack, New York Times): This is a question for Mr. Nishiyama. We reported just in the last few hours on a document prepared by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in the United States, which seems to suggest the problems are perhaps worse than are being portrayed and that there are various challenges such as the stress on the containment structures from all the water that's being dumped in and what might happen to those structures if there's another quake. The possibility of hydrogen being created by all that water itself being hit by radiation and breaking off the hydrogen, and the build up of salt and the slumping fuel inhibiting the cooling water from reaching the cores and some of the places that have to be cooled down. I was wondering if you would comment on that assessment by the NRC and what it signifies. I'd also be interested in whether the decision to inject the nitrogen was the result of this report.

Mr. Nishiyama: First of all, I wish to mention that the members of the NRC are here in Japan and we are working closely with them every day.

We are sharing almost all information regarding the Fukushima nuclear power plant.

Regarding the degradation of the containment vessel due to the water, it is true I must say, that for the containment vessel they are going through a very rare experience, so to a certain extent that may be possible, but even if we were to have an after-quake right now, I don't believe that will lead to any emergency or any urgent, dangerous situation.

Regarding nitrogen, I believe we share the same understanding. We were considering injecting nitrogen, and the members from the NRC, I believe, have the same view.

Regarding the build up of salt, the use of seawater was an emergency measure that was taken when we had no other choice in the initial stages. We have however received a strong indication from USNRC as well as USDOE, using their views as a reference, we have also been working towards switching over to fresh water as soon as possible and right now we have completed the switchover to fresh water.

Lastly, we have not yet made a final decision whether to inject nitrogen or not, and we are precisely in the final stages of making that decision. Rather than this being a result of the NRC report, we, of our own judgment, also believe we should be injecting nitrogen. Our position has been substantiated and reinforced through our exchange of views with the NRC.

QUESTION: This is a question for the representative from the Fisheries Agency. I only have one question so it is a large question. You mentioned, lance, mackerel and sardines that are being sampled. I'm curious, what other fish are in the area? What direction do the fish swim in? How far and how fast? And what bigger fish eat those small fish, and where do those bigger fish go to?

Mr. Takayama: First of all, in response to your question about what kind of other fish are we monitoring, we are mainly monitoring fish and other products that are placed on the market, so in addition to the lance and the sardines I talked to you about earlier, this includes flounder and skipjack and others. We are also monitoring fresh water fish like

carp and Japanese char.

In response to your second question about how far and how fast these fish swim, I think these fish can be divided into two types: fish that navigate the surface layer of the sea or the medium layer of the sea, which include the lance fish, sardines, mackerel; and on the other hand, fish that would navigate the deeper layers of the sea, such as the alfonsino. We are measuring both of these. For the fish that mainly navigate the deeper layers of the sea, they do not navigate over a wider area in the coastal area, whereas for the types of fish that navigate the surface layer, like sardines and mackerel, they seem to have their fishing ground about 50km off the coast of Chiba.

Also, in response to your question about what kinds of larger fish eat the smaller fish, fish like sardines are eaten by skipjack and tuna, and we are planning to monitor these skipjack and the tuna as well, going forward.

QUESTION: So why hasn't it been monitored yet? And where do you plan on catching the skipjack and the tuna that you are monitoring, considering those fish travel far? They may eat a sardine in front of Fukushima, and then be in Chile in a month, perhaps.

Mr. Takayama: First of all, it is not the season for catching or fishing skipjack and tuna, and so, that is perhaps why we have not the fishing ground offshore from the Tohoku area or offshore from Fukushima, and that may be why we have not been able to catch them yet.

QUESTION (Mr. Neidhart, Sueddeutsche Zeitung): So far, most of the contamination that we had, most of the radiation where we reached or passed the level was iodine 131. This is probably comparably good news because of the short half-life of iodine 131. In Chernobyl, cesium was the biggest problem, especially for the food chain in wide parts of Europe. Can you explain why we have relatively smaller cesium data, or is it because of the type of the reactor? Interestingly, this *konago*, this fish that has been caught with above the limit levels, this fish is cesium contaminated, so how do you explain that, if the other measurements were so relatively low on cesium? Thank you.

Mr. Nishiyama: The greatest difference between the incident that we have now and Chernobyl is that, the way in which the radioactive material was released into the atmosphere I believe is very different. In the case of the Chernobyl accident, they did

not have a containment vessel in the first place, and the radioactive material was released explosively into the atmosphere, whereas, in the case that we are having now in Japan, that is not necessarily the case. I believe this is what is appearing as a major difference.

I don't know how we can explain the detected cesium in the *konago* and the other readings.

Mr. Takayama: Let me explain about the cesium. This is a very simple matter. This is because the provisional regulation standards have been determined for cesium, whereas we did not have the provisional regulation standards for iodine for fish until recently. That is why we were only providing the data for the cesium. But now, if you can look at the Fisheries Agency website, we also have data for the iodine as well.

If I may explain the reason why we did not have a provisional regulation standard for iodine in the beginning, what I have been told was that there was no provisional regulation standard for iodine at the outset for fish and meat, for one because the half-life of iodine is very short, and two, because it dissipates and becomes very diluted in the sea water.

QUESTION (Mr. Azhari, PanOrient News): Thank you. This question is for Mr. Nishiyama. You mentioned that highly radiated water might appear elsewhere in the reactor again. Could you elaborate on this issue? And does that mean you are not in full control of containing any bigger crisis in the units? Thank you.

Mr. Nishiyama: What I said was that the highly irradiated water from the reactor of Unit 2 has been flowing into the sea through the crack that was found on the side wall of the pit that is close by. While we have been able to stop the water from flowing out from the crack in the side wall of the pit, as long as the water is flowing – what I meant to say is that we understand that there is the possibility of that water coming out from somewhere else.

QUESTION (Mr. Pollack, New York Times): For the gentleman from the Fisheries Agency, I just wanted to clarify a couple of things. You mentioned the monitoring and it sounded like you are going to be maybe catching some fish, but if there is a new standard and a new rule on the levels of radiation in the fish, are you going to be

enforcing that regulation? Are you going to be going to Tsukiji [fish market] and saying, 'you can't sell this fish because its radiation level is too high'? Or are you just monitoring it for the environmental information? And I also just wanted to clarify, is there a no-fishing zone around the plant, and how big is that?

Mr. Takayama: First of all, with regard to your first question, the Fisheries Agency is not in a position to respond to your first question. It would be up to MHLW I believe. They are the one to be responding to that question.

In response to your second question, the area up to 30km offshore of the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plants is effectively a no-entry zone. So it is designated as a no-entry zone, but it does not specifically take the form of a no-fishing zone, but the area within 30km is designated as a no-entry zone. Having said so however, as you may all know, Fukushima Prefecture has suffered heavy damage from the tsunami, and all the fishing ports and fishing vessels have suffered a devastating blow. So effectively, there are no vessels that are fishing offshore in Fukushima Prefecture at the moment.

Mr. Shikata: Let me just supplement that yesterday there were instructions coming from the special headquarters, the Nuclear Disaster Response Headquarters, giving instructions to MHLW. It discussed setting up new provisional standard values for marine products regarding radioactive iodine. MHLW is in the position to take measures, and they will also consult with the Food Safety Commission on what are the appropriate measures to take. Regarding the detailed response of MHLW, I would like to have an official from MHLW to be represented for tomorrow's briefing, just as homework. Thank you very much.

And given the time, if you have a very last question, I will take them. Dennis?

QUESTION (Mr. Normile, Science): A question about the soil monitoring and the effects. If I understand it correctly, a group at Kyoto University is saying that even if you have relatively low levels of radioactivity in the soil, the dose of that could be accumulated by someone standing above the soil or sitting on the ground or something – it could accumulate to significant levels over a period of time. If you start out with a reading of 10 $\mu$ Sv/hour, over 24 hours that would be a dose of 240 $\mu$ Sv, and if you get that for 10 days, you are up to 2mSv. Does that pose a health risk? And are there any areas where the concentration of radioactivity in the soil will interfere with spring

planting – that is, for agricultural use?

Mr. Shinano: The value in soil is included in the material that we have distributed to you. If you look at the table of contents I believe soil levels would be on page 17.

On page 17 you can see the dose rate as well as the radiation level in the dust for various monitoring points within Fukushima.

As far as the area that I am responsible for monitoring, which is an area of 20km and beyond, we do not see any large dose rates. The very last part of your question would not fall under my responsibility.

Mr. Nishiyama: Regarding the accumulation of radioactivity, obviously we are taking into consideration accumulation from the past and accumulation expected for the future in determining the evacuation area.

This is determined not based on any prediction, but it is decided based on the monitoring values.

Mr. Shikata: I would like to conclude today's briefing, and we will have another round of briefing tomorrow evening as well. Thank you very much for coming.