

Remediation in areas affected by the Chernobyl Accident

I. Bogdevitch, S. Fesenko, V. Kashparov, N.Sanzharova

**IAEA International Expert Meeting on Decommissioning and
Remediation after Nuclear Accidents**

Vienna, 28 January to 1 February 2013


Contents

- Chernobyl accident: consequences for agriculture
- Most effective remedial actions implemented to reduce internal and external exposures
 - Emergency period
 - Site specific remedial actions
 - Remedial actions in rehabilitation period
- Recommendations to farmers – self-help
- Optimizing remediation measures
 - Decision support for remediation planning – ReSCA presentations
- Lessons learned

The accident at the Chernobyl NPP was the most serious radiation accident:

- Total activity more than 14×10^{18} Bq
- Radiologically most important radionuclides were ^{131}I and ^{137}Cs .
- 340 thousand people were evacuated or resettled.
- More than 5 million people still living in the affected areas.
- The Chernobyl NPP (ChNPP) was surrounded by vast tracts of agricultural land and forests
 - Extremely severe impact on the rural economy.
- The accident occurred in April at a very vulnerable period for farming - end of sowing campaign and start of cattle grazing.

Countries in with activities per unit area above 37 kBq/m² *(Atlas., 1998)*



Acute phase

- During the first few weeks after the accident ^{131}I was the main contributor to internal dose.
- Along with radioiodine contamination, both plants and animals were also contaminated with Cs and Sr-isotopes which represented long-term radiation risk.
- Other radionuclides present such as ^{95}Zr , ^{95}Nb , ^{103}Ru , ^{140}Ba and ^{140}La , ^{141}Ce were of minor importance, due to their short physical half-lives.

Regulatory actions

The main goal - to reduce the external and internal doses of irradiation of population to prevent the deterministic effects and provide production of foodstuff with radionuclide content below TPL.


TPL (Bq/kg) of radionuclide content in food in USSR after Chernobyl (1986-1991)

Date of adoption	6.05.1986	30.05.1986	15.12. 1987	22.01. 1991	
Radionuclide	¹³¹ I	Beta emitters	¹³⁴ Cs & ¹³⁷ Cs	¹³⁴ Cs & ¹³⁷ Cs	⁹⁰ Sr
Drinking water	3700	370	18.5	18.5	3.7
Milk	370-3700	370-3700	370	370	37
Meat and products	—	3700	1850-3000	740	—
Fish	37 000	3700	1850	740	—
Vegetables, fruit,	—	3700	740	600	37
Bread, flour, cereals	—	370	370	370	37
Expected internal dose, mSv		<50	<8	<5	

**Permanent resettlement zone (after 22 May 1986) - exposure >0.2 mGy/h, Dose>100mSv.
 Temporary resettlement zone if exposure 0.05 - 0.2 mGy/h, Dose >25 mSv.
 Maximal doses of rural dwellers during 1986-1990 ≤ 175mSv/**

Countermeasures in an early period of emergency (spring – autumn 1986)

Iodine-131 deposition in Belarus 10.05.1986



27- 28.04.1986. The lowest concentrations of ¹³¹I in air on North of Belarus were 150-200 Bq/m³. Safety limit is 7.3 Bq/m³. There was no Emergency preparedness for the protection of affected people in case of accident on Chernobyl NPP.

- Evacuation of 25 thousand inhabitants from 30-km zone of Chernobyl NPP

- Monitoring of radionuclide content in soil, water, food stuff (deficit of measurement devices. Soil maps of Cs and Sr deposition were prepared in August 1986).

- Feeding the milky cows with “clean” fodder (restricted use).

- Rejection of milk with ¹³¹I content > PL and further processing for butter.

- Slaughtering of cattle from evacuated settlements (unjustified countermeasure).

- Information & recommendations for population on the contaminated territory (lack of experienced experts and reliable information, recommendations directed mainly to public sector of agriculture).

Countermeasures implemented during 1987-1989

- Relocation of people (470 settlements, 113 000 inhabitants started in 1989 and finished in 2001-2005).
- Exclusion of heavily contaminated agriculture land from use
 - 265 000 ha (1986-1991).
- Decontamination of schools, kinder gardens, farmer houses.
- Deep ploughing of meadows on peat soil (limited use).
- Exclusion of crops with high radionuclide uptake from soil (e.g.: legumes, buckwheat)
- Liming 682 000 ha & fertilization with higher doses of K.
- Restriction on the consumption of milk produced in private farms and milk processing.
- If ^{137}Cs -activity per unit area $> 185 \text{ kBq/m}^2$
 - Use of clean feed for 45 days before slaughter
 - Live monitoring Animals
 - exceeding PLs were returned to the farm for further clean feeding

Main countermeasure to reduce external exposure

Decontamination of rural houses with dose monitoring were well accepted:

- Washing the roof, walls and pavement with high pressure water
- Removing contaminated dust with vacuum cleaners
- Removing topsoil from a 1 m strip around house
- Removing topsoil in garden (400-500 m² per house)





Dose reduction -DRF= 0.3-0.5
(80% of reduction due to decontamination of soil)



Summary of reduction factors of countermeasures used in FSU countries

Countermeasure	¹³⁷Cs	⁹⁰Sr
Normal ploughing (first year)	2.5–4.0	
Skim and burial ploughing	8–16	
Liming, mineral and organic fertilisers	1,5–3,0	0,8–2,6
Radical improvement:		
– First year	1,5–9,0*	1,5–3,5
– Further applications	2,0–3,0	1,5–2,0
Surface improvement:		
– First application	2,0–3,0*	2,0–2,5
– Further applications	1,5–2,0	1,5–2,0
Change in fodder crops	3–9	
Clean feeding	2–5	2–5
Administration of Cs binders	2–5	–
Processing milk to butter	4–6	5–10
Processing rapeseed to oil	250	600

Changes with time in the extent of remedial actions applied in the FSU countries




Radical improvement of pastures & meadows

The most efficient and acceptable by farmers remedial action.

- Liming of acid soils, fertilization, destruction old grass mat, sowing of new grass stand, and the regulation of soil water (drainage), if needed.
- Reduction of grass activity 2-10 times (depending on intensity)
- Usually, the **expenses** for pasture improvement are **covered by extra yield** of milk.


^{137}Cs concentration in hay depends on NPK fertilizer rates & ratios

(deposition by ^{137}Cs - 370 kBq.m^{-2})



^{137}Cs concentration in hay depends on type of meadow improvement


(deposition by ^{137}Cs - 370 kBq.m^{-2})



Prussian blue (PB) for cows

The easiest and cheapest remedial action is direct incorporation of Prussian Blue (Hexacyanoferrate compounds) into concentrate during manufacturing.

Dynamics of ^{137}Cs activity of milk after PB application




Reduction factor:

- **Milk: 3**
- **Beef: 2**



Liming

- Liming only efficient on acid soils (pH < 6.0)
- RF for ^{137}Cs and ^{90}Sr activities in plants 1.5-3.0.
- **Cost** of liming on such soils **covered by increased yield**
- Minimal uptake by plants at pH levels at 0.2-0.3 higher than maximum yield is achieved

Accumulation of ^{90}Sr in clover green mass in relation to reaction of Podzoluvisol loamy sand soil



Effect of remediation: Amounts of milk and meat exceeding action levels (tons)



Optimizing remediation measures. Decision support for remediation planning – ReSCA

author's personal copy

Radiat Environ Biophys (2011) 50:67–83
DOI 10.1007/s00411-010-0344-7

ORIGINAL PAPER

ReSCA: decision support tool for remediation planning after the Chernobyl accident

A. Ulanovsky · P. Jacob · S. Fesenko ·
I. Bogdevitch · V. Kashparov · N. Sanzharova

Science of the Total Environment 408 (2009) 14–25

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Science of the Total Environment

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/scitotenv

Rural areas affected by the Chernobyl accident: Radiation exposure and remediation strategies

P. Jacob^{a,*}, S. Fesenko^b, I. Bogdevitch^c, V. Kashparov^d, N. Sanzharova^e, N. Grebenshikova^f, N. N. Lazarev^d, A. Panov^e, A. Ulanovsky^a, Y. Zhuchenko^f, M. Zhurba^d

^a Helmholtz Zentrum München, Institute of Radiation Protection, 85764 Neuherberg, Germany

^b International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria

^c Scientific Research State Enterprise "Institute for Soil Science and Agrochemistry", Minsk, Belarus

^d Ukrainian Institute of Agricultural Radiology, Chabany, Ukraine

^e Russian Institute of Agricultural Radiology and Radioecology, Obninsk, Russia

^f Institute of Radiology, Gomel, Belarus



«Long-term countermeasure strategies and monitoring of human exposures in rural areas affected by the Chernobyl accident»



ReSCA - A Software Tool for Decision Support on the Remediation of Rural Areas

(version 0.9.5)



Journal of Environmental Radioactivity xxx (2010) 1–9



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Environmental Radioactivity

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jenvrad



Justification of remediation strategies in the long term after the Chernobyl accident

S. Fesenko^{a,*}, P. Jacob^b, A. Ulanovsky^b, A. Chupov^a, I. Bogdevitch^c, N. Sanzharova^d, V. Kashparov^e, A. Panov^d, Yu. Zhuchenko^f

^a International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria

^b Helmholtz Zentrum München, Institute of Radiation Protection, Neuherberg, Germany

^c Research Institute for Soil Science and Agrochemistry, Minsk, Belarus




^d Russian Institute of Agricultural Radiology and Radioecology, Obninsk, Russia

^e Ukrainian Institute of Agricultural Radiology, Chabany, Kiev Region, Ukraine


^f Gomel State University, Gomel, Belarus

ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT

Map of affected settlements, collared according to the annual dose as calculated with ReSCA



ReSCA software tool: Assessment effectiveness of the remediation strategies



Strategy 1:

- Best acceptance

Strategy 2:

- Optimized from radiological view

Variation in averted collective dose (person-Sv) depending on funds invested in remediation.

Lessons learned from Chernobyl

- Rural population around the ChNPP - external and internal exposure pathways are important.
- Production of foods with activities above action levels was considered as evidence that land and lifestyle had been severely affected.
- Rapid deployment of optimised countermeasures was a key mechanism to maintain social and psychological stability of the population of affected regions and decreased the level of stress of people inhabiting affected areas.
- Agricultural countermeasures and remedial options were the most efficient in reducing dose, averting 30-40 % of the collective internal dose to the affected population.
- Countermeasures in the early phase of the Chernobyl accident were only partially effective:
 - Little reduction of ^{131}I intake with milk due the lack of timely information on the accident and appropriate countermeasures
 - This led to significant radioiodine exposure of some people in the affected countries.

Lessons learned

- Application of **Prussian Blue** to cows started 6 years after the accident: its an effective alternative to the more expensive radical improvement,
 - Earlier application would have substantially reduced doses to the population.
- Until today, agricultural remedial actions are still effective
 - The application is necessary and justified in view of both national and recent international recommendations.
- It is advisable to use a harmonized approach for remediation planning. The example of such approach was given in this presentation. This approach is based on ICRP Publication 103.
- To identify priorities in remediation strategies with full involvement of all interested parties in planning is necessary.