Evaluation of the Total Exposure Reduction Measures during Construction of the Land-side Impermeable Walls Using the Frozen Soil Method

10 November 2015

1F Frozen Soil Impermeable Walls Construction Office

Kajima Cooperation

Contents

- **1. Overview of the work**
- 2. Measures for reduction of air dose rate
- 3. Reduction based on improvement of efficiency in construction methods
- 4. Evaluation of reduction of total exposure dose
- 5. Education of new workers

1. Overview of the work



Impermeable Walls with Frozen Soil

- + 1500 m long imes 30 m deep
- Freezing pipes 1568 + temperature measuring pipes 359 = 1927
- Amount of frozen soil ca. 70,000 m³

Construction site: freezing plant (Central Monitoring Room, 30 refrigeration machine)



Construction site: brine piping



Overview of construction: concept to handle underground installations

Three options for arrangement of freezing pipes to the underground installations

①Single-line arrangement:
Arrange freezing pipes in a single line
Without underground installation
With small underground installations (mountain side @1.0 m, sea side @1.2 m)

②Multiple-line arrangement: Arrange multiple freezing pipes on both sides of the underground installations

- For underground installations with width < 3 m
- 4-line arrangement (< 1.5 m), 6-line arrangement (< 2.5 m)



③Penetrating arrangement:

Pipes penetrating the underground installations.

For underground installations with width > 3 m



Construction progress: drilling



2. Measures for reduction of air dose rate

Radiation dose rate map (ave. dose rate before construction)



Block	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Ave. dose rate (mSv/h)	0.03	0.21	0.56	0.26	1.2	0.85	0.1
Direction of sources			Building	Building	Building, Slope	Building, Slope	
	0	0	10		10		
Block	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total average
Block Ave. dose rate (mSv/h)	8 0.13	9 0.19	10 0.1	11 0.59	12 0.14	13 0.24	lotal average 0.35





Implementation of the measure for radiation exposure reduction (1): 3-Block Areas

Reduction measure: crushed stone pavement and installation of L-shaped protective walls



Before the measure (radiation sources: ground surface/ left side building)

Air dose rate: 1.0–2.0 mSv/h



After the measure (at the work area protected by the Lshaped protective walls)

Air dose rate: 0.2–0.3 mSv/h (Reduced to 1/5 – 1/6)



Reduction measure: installation of working platforms and RC shielding plates



Before the measure (radiation sources: slope, front building)

Air dose rate: 1.0–1.2 mSv/h After the measure (at the working platform)

Air dose rate: 0.3–0.5 mSv/h (reduced to 1/3 – 1/4)



Example of reduction measures





Break down d	of earthwork
--------------	--------------

	Break down of earthwork	Input until May (man·day)	Ratio
1	Exposure reduction measures	21,165	20%
2	Installation of trench	20,107	19%
3	Excavation/earthwork	19,049	18%
4	Platform setting	8,466	8%
(5)	Residual soil of plant work	6,350	6%
6	Protection of piping	6,350	6%
7	Temporary construction (water supply, etc.)	3,175	3%
8	Recharge	7,408	7%
9	Freezing plant	13,757	13%
	Total	105,825	100%

• Earth work (trade-off of exposure dose until May)

Trade-off of the exposure reduction		Total no. of workers	Increased exposure dose	Total exposure dose
work	ork		mSv/man/day	Man-mSv
1	Exposure reduction work	21,165	—	3,474
Σ(2):(9)	Earthwork	84,660	0.12	-10,159
		Trade-off	of exposure dose	-6,685

Evaluation for each exposure reduction measure (borehole drilling)

	Break down of the borehole drilling								
	Break down of earthwork	Total input until May (man∙day)	Ratio						
1	Drilling boreholes	23,448	34%						
2	Connecting pipes	14,482	21%						
3	Piping	8,276	12%						
4	Additional borehole drilling	4,827	7%						
(5)	Penetration works	4,138	6%						
6	Drilling stand pipes	13,793	20%						
	Total	68,964	100%						

Borehole drilling (trade-off of exposure dose until May)

Trade-off of	the exposure	Total no. of workers	Increased exposure dose	Total exposure dose
reduction work		Man∙day	mSv/man/day	Man∙mSv
Σ①:⑥	Borehole drilling	68,964	0.13	-8,965
		Trade-off	of exposure dose	-8,965

3. Reduction based on improvement of efficiency in construction methods

Objective of improvement in efficiency

The improvement in work efficiency leads to reduction of work hours, resulting in reduction of exposure dose.

* Even a small reduction in work hours, if repeated every day, could lead to a huge reduction in radiation exposure.

Measures for improvement in work efficiency (1)

Amount of reduced exposure dose by trenches of precast concrete

Data for calculation	Data for calculation Values Note					
Dose rate (mSv/h)	а	0.12	 Roads closure takes place only during drilling works as it takes one night 			
Work hours (h)	b	3.0	for installation of trenches of precast concrete.			
Construction length (m)	С	540	Installation of trenches of precast concrete (taking one day) realizes the			
No. of workers (man/day)	d	40	reduction of the total exposure dose worthy of four days because in the			
Rate (m/Blk)	е	6.0	case of all works conducted at the site it takes a total of five days of works			
Additional days per Blk (day	//Blk) f	4	per one block, which consists of reinforcement works (two days),			
No. of blocks (Blk)	g = c/e	90	formwork (two days), and concrete placement (one day).			
Reduced amt. of exp. dose (m	an-mSv)	Eq.: 0.12 m	$V/h \times 3 h \times 40 man/day \times 90 Blk \times 4 day/Blk = -5,184 Man mSv$			





Measures for improvement in work efficiency (2)

Amount of reduced exposure dose by the development of joint jigs in borehole drilling pipes

Data for calculation		Values	Note			
Dose rate (mSv/h)	а	0.13	• Reduction attempted of work hours by mechanically connecting borehole			
Reduction of hours (min/hole) b	20	drilling pipes, which was formerly conducted by human works.			
No. of workers (man/day)	d	200	•Reduction of work hours effective for sea side roadworks due to			
No. of drilled holes	С	1800	installation/removal being conducted every night.			
Rate (hole/day)	е	6	(Reduction of work hours per one pipe)			
			•By humans: 5 min/joint, by machines: 4 min/joint			
			• No. of joints: 20/hole; Reduction of hours: $(5 - 4)$ min × 20=20 min/ho			
Reduced amt. of exp.dose (man-	mSv)	Eq.: 0.13 r	$13 \text{ mSv/h} \times 20/60 \text{ h} \times 200 \text{ man/day} \times 1800 \div 6/\text{day} = -2,600 \text{ Man·mSv}$			





Developed joint jigs for pipes

Measures for improvement in work efficiency (3)

Amount of reduced exposure dose by automated welding of freezing pipes

Data for calculation	Values	Note				
Dose rate (mSv/h) a	a 0.13 • Reduction of work hours, attempted by automated welding for connecting freezi					
Reduction of hours (min/pipe) b	20	pipes.				
Number of workers (man/day) d	100					
No. of pipes c	1500	(reduction of work hours per one freezing pipe)				
Rate (pipe/day) e	8	•Welding by humans: 30 min/joint; automated welding: 20 min/joint				
		•No. of joints: 2 joints/pipe; reduction of hours: (30 min - 20 min) \times 2 = 20 min	n/pipe			
Reduced amt. of exp. rate (man·mSv)	Eq.: 0.13 m	1 Sv/h × 20/60 h × 100 man/day × 1500 \div 8/day = -813 Ma	lan∙mSv			

Measures for improvement in work efficiency (4)

Amount of reduced exposure dose by switching the drilling method to coring

Data for calculation		Values	Note
Dose rate (mSv/h)	а	0.13	• Switching the drilling method from boring (rotary drilling) to coring has achieved
Reduction of hours (min/day)	b	60	reduction in work hours owing to reduction in time for installation/removal and
No. of workers (man/day)	d	30	moving of a drilling machine from one drilling point to another. (Reduction of work hours per one day)
No. of drilled holes	С	150	•Installation/removal of a rotary drill: 60 min
Rate (hole/day)	е	3	Installation/removal of a core drill: 20 min
			 Moving b/w drilling points: rotary drill (20 min/point), Core drill (10 min/point) Reduction of hours: (60-20) + (20-10) × 2 points = 60 min/day
Reduced amt. of exp. rate (man·r	mSv)	Eq.: 0.13	mSv/h \times 60/60 h \times 30 man/day \times 150 \div 3/day = Man mSv



4. Evaluation of reduction of total exposure dose

Evaluation of reduction in total exposure dose

 Total exposure dose without measures for exposure reduction (actual + prediction) Exposure dose during the main works* (2) : 36,574 mSv Increased exposure dose (4) : 31,314 mSv (= (5) + (6)) Total : 67,888 mSv

* Works for construction of the land-side impermeable walls using the frozen soil method

Exposure dose when implementing the measures ③ (actual + prediction)
 : 3,905 mSv

Trade-off of exposure dose between the cases with and without measures
 Exposure dose when implementing the measures vs. Exposure dose without the measures
 = ③ vs. ④ = 3,905 vs. 31,314 ⇒ ▲27,409 mSv

Unit: man·mSv

Total exposure		Exposure dose without the measures for exposure reduction ${\mathfrak A}$					
(actual + prediction) ①		Amount of exposure reduction owing to improvement of work efficiency 5 Increased exposure doses 6			5)		
Exposure dose during the main works ②	36,574	Adoption of trenches of precast concrete	5,184	Earthwork (until May 2015)	10,159		
Measures for exposure reduction ③	3,905	Joint jigs for borehole drill pipes	2,600	Earthwork (since June 2015)	1,616		
		Automated welding of freezing pipes	813	Borehole drilling (until May 2015)	8,965		
		Coring for penetration points	195	Borehole drilling (since June 2015)	1,782		
		⑤ Sub-total	8,792	⁶ Sub-total	22,522		
1=2+3	40,479			(4)=(5)+(6)	31,314		

Evaluation of reduction in total exposure dose



5. Education of new workers

Training in wearing protective equipment (for new workers)



Full face mask



Coverall (white Tyvek)



Anorak (works during rain or handling water)



Shielding vest (weighing 6 kg)