

WORKING MATERIAL
(Limited Distribution)

*Environmental Consequences
of the Chernobyl Accident
and Their Remediation:
Twenty Years of Experience*

*Report of the UN Chernobyl Forum
Expert Group “Environment” (EGE)*

August 2005

(抜粹)

FOREWORD

The explosion on 26 April 1986 at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant located just 100 km from the city of Kyiv in what was then the Soviet Union and now is Ukraine, and consequent ten days' reactor fire resulted in an unprecedented release of radiation and unpredicted adverse consequences both for the public and the environment. Indeed, the IAEA has characterized the event as the "foremost nuclear catastrophe in human history" and the "largest regional release of radionuclides into the atmosphere".

Massive radioactive contamination forced the evacuation of more than 100,000 people from the affected region during 1986, and the relocation, after 1986, of another 200,000 from Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine. Some five million people continue to live in areas contaminated by the accident and have to deal with its environmental, health, social and economic consequences. The national governments of the three affected countries, supported by international organizations, have undertaken costly efforts to remedy contamination, provide medical services and restore the region's social and economic well-being.

The accident's consequences were not limited to the territories of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine but resulted in substantial transboundary atmospheric transfer and subsequent contamination of numerous European countries that also encountered problems of radiation protection of their populations, although to less extent than the three more affected countries.

Although the accident occurred nearly two decades ago, controversy still surrounds the impact of the nuclear disaster. Therefore the IAEA, in cooperation with FAO, UNDP, UNEP, UN-OCHA, UNSCEAR, WHO and The World Bank, as well as the competent authorities of Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine, established the Chernobyl Forum in 2003. The mission of the Forum was — through a series of managerial and expert meetings — to generate "authoritative consensual statements" on the environmental consequences and health effects attributable to radiation exposure arising from the accident as well as to provide advice on environmental remediation and special health care programmes, and to suggest areas where further research is required. The Forum was created as a contribution to the United Nations' ten years strategy for Chernobyl, launched in 2002 with the publication of *Human Consequences of the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident – A Strategy for Recovery*.

In 2003-2004, two groups of experts from twelve countries, including Belarus, Russia and Ukraine, and from relevant international organizations have assessed the accident's environmental and health consequences. In early 2005, the group "Environment," coordinated by the IAEA, and the group "Health," coordinated by the WHO, have presented their reports for Forum consideration. Both reports were considered and approved by the Forum at its meeting on 18-20 April 2005. This meeting also decided, *inter alia*, 'to consider the approved reports ... as a common position of the Forum members, i.e., of the eight United Nations organizations and the three more affected countries, regarding environmental and health consequences of the Chernobyl accident, as well as recommended future actions, i.e., as a consensus within the United Nations system'.

This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Chernobyl Forum concerning environmental effects of the Chernobyl accident. The Forum's report considering health effects is in process of publication under WHO responsibility. The environmental group of experts was chaired by Dr. Lynn Anspaugh from the University of Utah, USA; the scientific secretary of this group and of the whole Chernobyl Forum activity was Dr. Mikhail Balonov of the Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety, IAEA. In all cases the scientists from the UN organisations, the international community, and the three more affected countries have been able to reach consensus in the preparation of their respective documents. After approval by the members of the Forum, this report is the result of that process.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT	2
ENVIRONMENTAL COUNTERMEASURES AND REMEDIATION.....	8
HUMAN EXPOSURE.....	13
RADIATION-INDUCED EFFECTS ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS.....	16
ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF DISMANTLEMENT OF THE SHELTER AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT	18
1. INTRODUCTION	21
1.1. Purpose	21
1.2. Background.....	21
1.3. Objectives	22
1.4. Method of operation	22
1.5. Structure of the Report	23
SECTION 1 REFERENCES	24
2. RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT.....	25
2.1. Radionuclide release and deposition	25
2.1.1. Radionuclide source term	25
2.1.2. Physical and chemical forms of released materials; hot particles	27
2.1.3. Meteorological conditions during the course of the accident.....	29
2.1.4. Concentration of radionuclides in air	32
2.1.5. Deposition of radionuclides on the soil surface	32
2.1.6. Isotopic composition of deposition	40
2.2. Urban environment.....	41
2.2.1. Deposition patterns.....	41
2.2.2. Migration of radionuclides in the urban environment.....	41
2.2.3. Dynamics of exposure rate	44
2.3. Agricultural environment	44
2.3.1. Radionuclide transfer in the terrestrial environment.....	44
2.3.2. Food-production systems affected by the accident	46
2.3.3. Early phase	47
2.3.4. Long-term phase.....	48
2.3.4.1. Physico-chemistry of radionuclides in the soil plant system	49
2.3.4.2. Migration of radionuclides in soil.....	52
2.3.4.3. Radionuclide transfer from soil to crops.....	52
2.3.4.4. Dynamics of radionuclide transfer to crops	56
2.3.4.5. Radionuclide transfer to animals	60
2.3.5. Current contamination of foodstuffs and expected future trends	65
2.4. Forest environment.....	66
2.4.1. Radionuclides in European forests.....	66
2.4.2. The dynamics of contamination during the early phase.....	67
2.4.3. The long-term dynamics of radiocaesium in forests	68

2.4.4.	Uptake into edible products.....	69
2.4.5.	Contamination of wood.....	72
2.4.6.	Expected Future Trends.....	74
2.4.7.	Radiation Exposure Pathways Associated With Forests and Forest Products.....	74
2.5.	Radioactivity in aquatic systems.....	76
2.5.1.	Introduction.....	76
2.5.2.	Radionuclides in surface waters.....	77
2.5.2.1.	Distribution of radionuclides between dissolved and particulate phases.....	77
2.5.2.2.	Radioactivity in rivers.....	77
2.5.2.3.	Radioactivity in lakes and reservoirs.....	81
2.5.2.4.	Freshwater sediments.....	85
2.5.3.	Uptake of radionuclides to freshwater fish.....	85
2.5.3.1.	¹³¹ I in freshwater fish.....	85
2.5.3.2.	¹³⁷ Cs in freshwater fish and other aquatic biota.....	86
2.5.3.3.	⁹⁰ Sr in freshwater fish.....	88
2.5.4.	Radioactivity in marine ecosystems.....	88
2.5.4.1.	Distribution of radionuclides in the sea.....	88
2.5.4.2.	Transfers of radionuclides to marine biota.....	90
2.5.5.	Radionuclides in groundwater.....	91
2.5.5.1.	Radionuclides in groundwater – Chernobyl Exclusion Zone.....	91
2.5.5.2.	Radionuclides in groundwater – outside the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone.....	92
2.5.5.3.	Irrigation water.....	93
2.5.6.	Future trends.....	94
2.5.6.1.	Freshwater ecosystem.....	94
2.5.6.2.	Marine ecosystems.....	94
2.6.	Conclusions.....	96
2.7.	Further monitoring and research needed.....	98
SECTION 2 REFERENCES.....		100
3.	ENVIRONMENTAL COUNTERMEASURES AND REMEDIATION.....	111
3.1.	Radiological criteria.....	111
3.1.1.	International radiological criteria and standards.....	111
3.1.2.	National radiological criteria and standards.....	114
3.2.	Urban decontamination.....	116
3.2.1.	Decontamination research.....	116
3.2.2.	Chernobyl experience.....	117
3.2.3.	Recommended decontamination technologies.....	118
3.3.	Agricultural countermeasures.....	119
3.3.1.	Early phase.....	119
3.3.2.	Later phase.....	121
3.3.3.	Countermeasures in intensive agricultural production.....	124
3.3.3.1.	Soil treatment.....	124
3.3.3.2.	Change in fodder crops grown on contaminated land.....	126
3.3.3.3.	Clean feeding.....	127
3.3.3.4.	Administration of Cs-binders.....	127

3.3.4.	Summary of countermeasure effectiveness in intensive production.....	128
3.3.5.	Countermeasures in extensive production.....	129
3.3.6.	Current status of agricultural countermeasures	130
3.3.7.	A wider perspective of remediation including socio-economic issues.....	131
3.3.8.	Current status and future of abandoned land.....	131
3.3.8.1.	The exclusion and resettlement zones of Belarus	132
3.3.8.2.	Rehabilitation of contaminated lands of Ukraine	133
3.3.8.3.	Abandoned zones in Russia	134
3.4.	Forest countermeasures	135
3.4.1.	Studies on forest countermeasures	135
3.4.2.	Countermeasures for forests contaminated with radiocaesium	135
3.4.2.1.	Management-based countermeasures	135
3.4.2.2.	Technologically based countermeasures.....	137
3.4.3.	Examples of forest countermeasures.....	137
3.5.	Aquatic countermeasures.....	139
3.5.1.	Measures to reduce doses at the water supply and treatment stage.....	140
3.5.2.	Measures to reduce direct and secondary contamination of surface waters	140
3.5.3.	Measures to reduce uptake by fish and aquatic foodstuffs.....	141
3.5.4.	Groundwater	142
3.5.5.	Irrigation water	143
3.6.	Conclusions and recommendations	143
3.6.1.	Conclusions	143
3.6.2.	Recommendations	145
3.6.2.1.	Countries affected by the Chernobyl accident	145
3.6.2.2.	Worldwide.....	146
3.6.2.3.	Research.....	146
	REFERENCES TO SECTION 3.....	147
4.	HUMAN EXPOSURE LEVELS.....	155
4.1.	Introduction	155
4.1.1.	Populations and areas of concern	155
4.1.2.	Exposure pathways.....	156
4.1.3.	Concepts of dose.....	156
4.1.4.	Background radiation levels.....	157
	Table 4.1. Radiation Doses from Natural Sources (UNSCEAR 2000)	157
4.1.5.	Decrease of dose rate with time.....	158
4.1.6.	Critical groups	158
4.2.	External exposure	159
4.2.1.	Formulation of the model of external exposure	159
4.2.2.	Input data for the estimation of effective external dose	159
4.2.2.1.	Dynamics of external gamma-dose rate over open undisturbed soil.....	159
4.2.2.2.	Dynamics of external gamma-dose rate in anthropogenic areas	163
4.2.2.3.	Behaviour of people in the radiation field	164

4.2.2.4.	Effective dose per unit gamma dose in air.....	164
4.2.3.	Results	164
4.2.3.1.	Dynamics of external effective dose.....	164
4.2.3.2.	Measurement of individual external dose by thermoluminescence dosimeters	165
4.2.3.3.	Levels of external exposure	168
4.3.	Internal dose	168
4.3.1.	Model for internal dose	168
4.3.2.	Monitoring data as input for assessment of internal dose	170
4.3.3.	Avoidance of dose by human behaviour	171
4.3.4.	Results for doses to individuals.....	171
4.3.4.1.	Thyroid doses due to radioiodines	171
4.3.4.2.	Long-term internal doses from terrestrial pathways	174
4.3.4.3.	Long-term doses from aquatic pathways	177
4.4.	Total (external and internal) exposure.....	179
4.5.	Collective doses.....	180
4.5.1.	Thyroid	180
4.5.2.	Total (internal + external) dose from terrestrial pathways	181
4.5.3.	Internal dose from aquatic pathways.....	182
4.6.	Conclusions and recommendations	182
4.6.1.	Conclusions	182
4.6.2.	Recommendations	184
REFERENCES TO SECTION 4.....		185
5.	RADIATION-INDUCED EFFECTS ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS	191
5.1.	Prior knowledge of radiation effects on biota	191
5.2.	The temporal dynamics of radiation exposure from the Chernobyl accident.....	194
5.3.	Radiation-induced effects on plants	196
5.4.	Radiation effects on soil invertebrates.....	197
5.5.	Radiation effects on farm animals	199
5.6.	Radiation effects on other terrestrial animals	200
5.7.	Radiation effects on aquatic organisms	201
5.8.	Genetic effects in animals and plants	203
5.9.	Secondary impacts and current conditions	205
5.10.	Conclusions and recommendations	208
5.10.1.	Conclusions	208
5.10.2.	Recommendations for future research.....	209
5.10.3.	Recommendations for countermeasures/remediation.....	209
REFERENCES TO SECTION 5.....		210
6.	ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF DISMANTLEMENT OF THE SHELTER AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT.....	215
6.1.	Current status and the future of Unit 4 and the Shelter	215
6.1.1.	ChNPP Unit 4 after the accident	215
6.1.2.	Current status of damaged Unit 4 and Shelter.....	217
6.1.3.	Long-term strategy for Shelter and New Safe Confinement (NSC).....	220
6.1.4.	Environmental aspects.....	220

6.1.4.1.	Current status of the Shelter.....	220
6.1.4.2.	Impact on air	221
6.1.4.3.	Impact on surface water	222
6.1.4.4.	Impact on groundwater – see Section 2.5.5.1 for details	222
6.1.4.5.	Impacts of Collapse without New Safe Confinement.....	223
6.1.4.6.	Impacts of Shelter Collapse within New Safe Confinement.....	224
6.1.5.	Issues and areas for improvement	225
6.1.5.1.	Source-term uncertainty influence on environmental decisions.....	225
6.1.5.2.	Characterization of fuel-containing material	226
6.1.5.3.	Removal of FCM concurrent with development of a geological disposal facility	226
6.2.	Management of radioactive waste from the accident	226
6.2.1.	Current status of radioactive waste from the accident.....	229
6.2.1.1.	Radioactive waste associated with the Shelter.....	229
6.2.1.2.	Mixing of accident-related waste with operational radioactive waste.....	229
6.2.1.3.	Temporary radioactive waste facilities	230
6.2.1.4.	Radioactive waste-disposal facilities	232
6.2.2.	Strategy on radioactive waste management	233
6.2.3.	Environmental aspects.....	234
6.2.4.	Issues and areas of improvement.....	237
6.2.4.1.	Comprehensive Radioactive Waste-Management Programme for the Exclusion Zone and the ChNPP	237
6.2.4.2.	Ultimate Decommissioning of Unit 4 and Radioactive Waste Generation.....	237
6.2.4.3.	Waste Acceptance Criteria.....	237
6.2.4.4.	Long Term Safety Assessment of Existing Radioactive Waste Sites.....	237
6.2.4.5.	Potential Recovery of past waste facilities located in the Exclusion Zone	238
6.3.	Future of the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone	238
6.4.	Conclusions and recommendations	240
6.4.1.	Conclusions	240
6.4.2.	Recommendations	240
	REFERENCES TO SECTION 6.....	242
	CONTRIBUTORS TO DRAFTING AND REVIEW	245

3.1.2. National radiological criteria and standards

Limitations of human exposure caused by the Chernobyl accident, including standards for radionuclides in food, drinking water, timber, etc., were introduced soon after the accident firstly by the USSR, but also by many European countries, i.e., Nordic countries, EU countries and Eastern European countries (UNSCEAR 1988).

In accordance with the Standards of Radiation Safety (USSR Ministry of Health 1977) in force in 1986, the USSR Ministry of Health introduced a temporary limit of average equivalent whole body dose of 100 mSv for the first year after the Chernobyl accident (from 26 April 1986 till 26 April 1987), then 30 mSv for the second year and 25 mSv in each of 1988 and 1989 (IAC 1991). In all, till 1 January 1990 the dose of general public not exceeding 173 mSv was allowed from the radioactive fallout of the Chernobyl accident.

In order to limit internal exposure of the population, the temporary permissible levels (TPLs) of radionuclide content in food products and drinking water were elaborated in the USSR. Table 3.2 presents the TPLs for main food products (IAC 1991; Balonov 1993). The first TPL set approved by the USSR Ministry of Health on 6 May 1986 concerned the ^{131}I -activity concentrations as a dominating factor of human internal exposure in the early period of the accident, and was aimed at limitation of the thyroid dose of children to 300 mGy. The next TPL set adopted on 30 May 1986 concerned content of all beta emitters in food products caused by surface contamination, but was substantiated with primary attention to ecologically mobile and long-lived caesium radionuclides. The later TPL sets put in force since 1988 (TPL-88) and 1991 (TPL-91) concerned the sum of ^{134}Cs and ^{137}Cs activities. The TPL-91 for caesium radionuclides was supplemented by TPLs for ^{90}Sr .

Annual consumption by rural inhabitants of the usual food ration, all components of which contained caesium radionuclides at the level of TPL-86, would cause internal dose of less than 50 mSv, TPL-88 – less than 8 mSv, and TPL-91 – less than 5 mSv.

TABLE 3.2. TEMPORARY PERMISSIBLE LEVELS (TPL, Bq kg⁻¹) OF RADIONUCLIDE CONTENT IN FOOD PRODUCTS AND DRINKING WATER ESTABLISHED IN THE USSR IN 1986–1991, AFTER THE CHERNOBYL ACCIDENT (IAEA 1991; BALONOV 1993)

TPL	4104-88	129-252	TPL-88	TPL-91	
Date of adoption	06.05.1986	30.05.1986	15.12.1987	22.01.1991	
Nuclide	^{131}I	β -emitters	$^{134}\text{Cs} + ^{137}\text{Cs}$	$^{134}\text{Cs} + ^{137}\text{Cs}$	^{90}Sr
Drinking water	3700	370	18.5	18.5	3.7
Milk	370–3700	370–3700	370	370	37
Dairy products	18500–74000	3700–18500	370–1850	370–1850	37–185
Meat and meat products	–	3700	1850-3000	740	–
Fish	37000	3700	1850	740	–
Eggs	–	37000	1850	740	–
Vegetables, fruits, potato, root-crops	–	3700	740	600	37
Bread, flour, cereals	-	370	370	370	37

TABLE 3.3. CURRENT ACTION LEVELS (Bq kg⁻¹) FOR CAESIUM RADIONUCLIDES IN FOOD PRODUCTS ESTABLISHED AFTER THE CHERNOBYL ACCIDENT

Country, International body	CAC	EU	Belarus	Russia	Ukraine
Year of adoption	1989	1986	1999	2001	1997
Milk	1000	370	100	100	100
Infant food			37	40–60	40
Dairy products			50–200	100–500	100
Meat and meat products		180–500	160	200	
Fish		600	150	130	150
Eggs		–	80	6 Bq/egg	
Vegetables, fruits, potato, root-crops			40–100	40–120	40–70
Bread, flour, cereals			40	40–60	20

Action levels for ¹³¹I in foods established in some European countries in May 1986 varied in the range of 500 to 5000 Bq kg⁻¹ among countries. Later on, the EU authorities established two values for caesium radionuclides in imported foods, one for milk and infant food and another for all other food products, see Table 3.3 (EC 1986; IAC 1991). Similar values were introduced in Nordic countries with an exception for wild foods (reindeer meat, game, freshwater fish, forest berries, fungi and nuts) that are important products for some local populations and especially for indigenous people. Thus, in the first month Sweden imposed action levels of 5 kBq kg⁻¹ for ¹³¹I and 10 kBq kg⁻¹ for ¹³⁷Cs in imported food; for domestic foods the respective values were 2 and 1 kBq kg⁻¹. In the middle of May, action levels of 300 Bq kg⁻¹ ¹³⁷Cs for all food and 2 kBq kg⁻¹ for ¹³¹I in milk and dairy products were introduced. For wild foods produced or consumed in the Nordic countries, the action levels varied between 1500 and 6000 Bq kg⁻¹ in different countries and time periods.

Along with the standards for food products, the standards for agricultural raw materials, wood (see Section 3.3), herbs, and for beta contamination of different surfaces were introduced in the USSR (IAC 1991).

The general policy of the USSR and later on of the authorities in the separate republics was to reduce both the radiological criteria and TPLs along with natural improvement of radiological conditions due to radionuclide decay and penetration/fixation in soil. Gradual TPL reduction has been used as an instrument to force producers to apply technologies that decreased radionuclide content in products in order to limit associated human exposure. The TPLs were substantiated by expert weighting between intentions to reduce internal dose in populations and not to terminate profitable agricultural production and forestry in the controlled areas. Different reference levels for numerous groups of food products were established with the aim not to restrict consumption of any foods, unless the dose criterion might be exceeded.

At the end of 1991, the USSR had split into separate countries, among them Belarus, Russia and Ukraine, which had been strongly affected by the Chernobyl accident, and afterwards each country implemented its own policy of radiation protection of the public. Because of acceptance by ICRP in 1990 of the annual effective dose limit for the public in practice situations equal to 1 mSv, this level was considered by the authorities of the three countries as safe also in post-emergency conditions. Therefore, it is still used in national legislations as an intervention level of annual dose caused by Chernobyl fallout for introduction of countermeasures, including long-term remediation measures.