OSPAR COMMISSION

Implementation of PARCOM Recommendation 91/4 on radioactive discharges for 2010

Report from Norway

Radioactive Substances Series

2010

OSPAR Convention

The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (the “OSPAR Convention”) was opened for signature at the Ministerial Meeting of the former Oslo and Paris Commissions in Paris on 22 September 1992. The Convention entered into force on 25 March 1998. It has been ratified by Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and approved by the European Community and Spain.

Convention OSPAR

La Convention pour la protection du milieu marin de l'Atlantique du Nord-Est, dite Convention OSPAR, a été ouverte à la signature à la réunion ministérielle des anciennes Commissions d'Oslo et de Paris, à Paris le 22 septembre 1992. La Convention est entrée en vigueur le 25 mars 1998. La Convention a été ratifiée par l'Allemagne, la Belgique, le Danemark, la Finlande, la France, l’Irlande, l’Islande, le Luxembourg, la Norvège, les Pays-Bas, le Portugal, le Royaume-Uni de Grande Bretagne et d’Irlande du Nord, la Suède et la Suisse et approuvée par la Communauté européenne et l’Espagne.

Contents

Introduction

This report has been produced as part of the fifth round of implementation reporting on PARCOM recommendation 91/4, where Norway was scheduled to report to the meeting of the OSPAR Radioactive Substance Committee in 2010. The report is outlined according to the guidelines for the submission of information about, and the assessment of, the application of BAT in nuclear facilities (2004 – 03).

The first section gives general information regarding national legislation, dose limits, discharge limits etc. Section 2 and 3 give site specific information about each of the two nuclear installations (research reactors).

1. General information

1.1 Implementation of BAT/BEP in terms of the OSPAR Convention in Norwegian legislation/regulation

Authorisations of nuclear installations are issued on the basis of Act No. 36 of 12 May 2000 on Radiation Protection and Use of Radiation which entered into force 1 July 2000 and Regulation No. 1362 of 21 November 2003 on Radiation Protection and Use of Radiation. With some exceptions, the regulation entered into force 1 January 2004 and replaced former regulations on this field.

Nuclear installations are also regulated in accordance with Act No. 28 of 12 May 1972 concerning Nuclear Energy Activities. This Act was last revised 17 June 2005.

The purpose of the Radiation Protection Act is to prevent harmful effects of radiation on human health and contribute to the protection of the environment. When issuing authorisations for nuclear installations, Norwegian practice is to focus on BAT, ALARA-principle and the precautionary principle. Use of Best Available Techniques (BAT) regarding discharge of radioactive substances is implemented in The Radiation Protection Regulation section 23. In the Radiation Protection Regulation, reference is made to the OSPAR definition of BAT.

> Section 23 *Undertakings which cause discharges of radioactive substances shall have approval to do so from the Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority cf. section 5 o). The undertakings shall use the best available technology such that discharges to the environment are avoided or kept to the lowest possible level.*

1.2 Dose constraints/limits for nuclear facilities

The dose limit is applied in the current discharge authorisation given to each of the two sites of the Norwegian Institute for Energy Technology is 1 µSv/year for the most exposed members of the general population from liquid discharges. The dose limit for emission to air is 100 µSv/year of which iodine isotopes shall not contribute more than 10 µSv/year.

1.3 Discharge limits

The Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority (NRPA) has not defined radionuclide specific discharge limits for the nuclear facilities. Restrictions of discharge are implemented through dose limit to the most exposed members of the general population. In addition to discharge limits, the NRPA have enforced nuclide specific notification levels. If a notification level is exceeded the operator must inform the NRPA, and the reason for the discharge must be explained.

1.4 Monitoring programmes of environmental concentrations of radionuclides

The operators of the research reactors are according to their discharge authorisations required to carry out environmental monitoring. See section 2.3.2, 2.3.4 and 3.3.2 for details. The results are yearly reported to the NRPA.

In the discharge authorisations issued by the NRPA it is also required that the operators carry out control measurements of their discharges to water and air. These measurements are conducted according to a program approved by the NRPA, and the results of the monitoring programs are yearly reported to the NRPA.

In addition to the environmental monitoring programs carried out by the operators, the NRPA coordinates national monitoring programs for radioactive contamination on the marine and terrestrial environments. The marine monitoring program was established in 1999. The principal objective of the program is to document levels, distributions and trends of anthropogenic and naturally occurring radionuclides along the Norwegian coast, in the North Sea, the Norwegian Sea and in the Barents Sea, and to make information regarding radioactive contamination available to authorities, the fishing industry, media and the public in general.

1.5 Environmental norms and standard (other than dose standards for humans)

Action limits for the concentration of Cs-137 and Cs-134 in foodstuffs exists, but in principle they apply in relation to Chernobyl-derived contamination only. Otherwise, the degree of protection of the environment still is based on the protection of human health through the application of dose constraints/limits. The purpose of Act No. 36 of 12 May 2000 on Radiation Protection and Use of Radiation includes the protection of the environment.

In addition to the traditional protection of human health, the principle that the environment should also be protected has been adopted in the radiation protection act.

Internationally accepted and agreed criteria for environmental protection are so far lacking, but the NRPA is engaged in activities of the International Union of Radioecology and the ICRP to develop a framework for the protection of the environment from ionising radiation, and this work is expected to contribute to the development of environmental norms and standards.

1.6 National authority responsible for supervision of discharges

Licensing and supervision of the operation of nuclear sites is carried out by the NRPA.

Nature of inspection and surveillance programmes

The sites of the nuclear research reactors are inspected by the NRPA on a regular basis with regard to nuclear safety, radiation protection and environmental protection. A part of the inspection is the assessment of the yearly reports from the operators on environmental monitoring and control measurements of discharges.

2. Site–Specific Information – Institute for Energy Technology, Kjeller

2.1 Site characteristics

2.1.1 Name of site

Institute for Energy Technology (IFE) Kjeller, Norway

2.1.2 Type of facility

a. Research reactor JEEP II, heavy water cooled and moderated.

b. Metallurgic Laboratory I and II, inc. hot cells.

c. Storage areas for spent fuel and un-irradiated fuel.

d. Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant for LL- and IL waste.

e. Medical Radioactive Isotope Facility.

2.1.3 Year of commissioning/licensing/decommissioning

The JEEP II reactor was commissioned in 1967. Current licence period for facility a) – d) in 2.2 is 1 January 2009 – 31. December 2018. Licence for operation of facility e) in not required according to with Act No. 28 of 12 May 1972 concerning Nuclear Energy Activities.

2.1.4 Location

Institute for Energy Technology Kjeller, about 20 km north east of Oslo.

2.1.5 Receiving waters and catchment area, including, where relevant, information on water flow of receiving rivers

All liquid effluents from the facilities are pumped to the radioactive Waste Treatment Plant. From this facility it is discharged to the River Nitelva about 100 km from the sea. The river, having an annual mean flow of 5 m^3/ second leads into Lake Øyern where the water is mixed with the water of River Glomma having an annual mean flow of 400 m^3/second. Glomma River empties into the Oslo Fjord, having an open connection with Skagerrak (OSPAR region II).

2.1.6 Production

The thermal effect of the JEEP II research reactor is 2 MW.

The Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant receives and manages solid radioactive LL- and IL waste from Norwegian industry, universities, hospitals and other research institutes as well as from IFEs facilities. The annual management of solid waste is about 160 drums (210 litres). The drums are transported from IFE Kjeller to the combined storage and disposal facility in Himdalen.

Liquid radioactive waste is stored for decay at the production sites or in the Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant. Liquid organic waste is solidified. All radioactive wastewater is pumped to the Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant prior to discharges.

2.1.7 Other relevant information

Not relevant.

2.2 Discharges

2.2.1 Systems in place to reduce, prevent or eliminate discharges of radioactive substances to the marine environment

The discharge limit is authorised by the Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority (NRPA). The discharge shall not result in an annual dose exceeding 1 µSv to members in a critical group in the population along the River Nitelva.

The low level liquid radioactive waste are sometimes retained in tanks at the production facility before pumped over to the Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant for further treatment by evaporation, filtration in ion exchange systems or retention in large storage tanks for decay. The short lived radionuclides are normally allowed to decay to a very low level before discharges if sufficient tank capacity is available.

Relevant systems in place (appendix 1) are:

- Storage to reduce the level of radioactivity of short lived nuclides
- Ion exchange filtration
- Vacuum evaporation system

Before discharges are authorised by IFEs Health and Safety Department measurements of the activity levels of all relevant radionuclides are analysed and discharge are authorised if the restriction of annual doses to members in critical groups is fulfilled by the annual accumulated discharges.

No new systems have been taken into operation during the reporting period. Through the authorisation for release of radioactive substances, the operator is obliged to limit the discharge to levels as low as reasonable achievable (ALARA) and use of best available technology (BAT) in order to achieve this. Equipment, methods and routines are continuously evaluated for potential discharge reducing measures, including measures to enhanced worker awareness of the issue. In any effort to reduce discharges, the resulting discharge reduction must, however, be seen in view of doses incurred by occupational exposed individuals and the economic investment necessary to achieve the reduction. Since the current discharge levels and resulting doses to the public are very low, evaluation of possible major new installations often reveal that the doses or investment involved in implementing a measure do not justify the marginal reduction in discharge that is possible to achieve. The best dividends are often achieved through apparently modest changes to existing equipment or procedures, and in increased worker awareness.

For emissions to the air the NRPA has authorised a discharge limited of an annual dose of 100 μSv to members in a critical group in the population in the proximity of IFE. Additional restriction in the emission of iodine isotopes is that this should be limit to an annual dose of 10 μSv to members in the same critical group.

2.2.2 Efficiency of abatement systems

The following abatement systems for liquid radioactive waste have been in operation for several years.

- Delay tanks
- Ions exchange filtration system
- Vacuum evaporation system

All liquid waste produced in IFEs facilities at Kjeller are treated at the Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant by one of the abatement systems above. The efficiencies are given in appendix 1. The efficiencies given for the ion exchange system and the evaporation system do not include abatement of ^{3}H.

During the last six years some changes in the environmental monitoring program has been introduced to improve monitoring efficiency. Water from ion exchange resins contains Cs and Co besides ^{3}H. Processes to reduce the content of Cs and Co have been tested but have not been satisfactorily. After filtering of this water the levels of ^{60}Co were reduced considerably but to a lesser extent for ^{137}Cs and very little for ^{3}H. Further treatment of this wastewater was prohibited by the head of radiation protection at IFE-Kjeller, based on the increasing doses to workers at the Radioactive Waste Treatment Plant from this treatment.

Filtration systems with HEPA filters are installed in the ventilation systems from hot cells, fume cupboards and other installations where work with radioactive materials can result in emissions of radioactive aerosols. In ventilation system from production cells and facilities where volatile radioactive materials are used, active charcoal filters are installed. The efficiencies are given in appendix 1.

Emissions of radioactivity though the filters are continuously monitored. Filters are replaced if measurements show a reduced efficiency.

2.2.3 Annual liquid discharges

Annual liquid discharges of various nuclides to the Nitelva River in 2003 – 2008 are given in table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Annual liquid discharges from IFE-Kjeller 2003 – 2008

Radio-nuclides	2003 (MBq)	2004 (MBq)	2005 (MBq)	2006 (MBq)	2007 (MBq)	2008 (MBq)
^{3}H	2 830 000	295 000	414 000	1 430 000	499 000	1 690 000
^{90}Sr	0.33	2.6	0.34	1.2	0.50	12.2
^{134}Cs	1.2	0.35	0.08	5.3	0.5	4.10
^{137}Cs	22	7.9	0.51	53.6	9.5	32.1
^{125}I	540	327	50	42.8	44.1	44.9
^{131}I	15	27	39	4.2	2.0	1.26
^{60}Co	55	24	6,7	74	71.7	33.1
^{54}Mn	< 0.2	< 0.2	< 0.2	< 0.4	< 0.3	< 0.2
^{65}Zn	0.27	0.10	8.4	< 0.9	< 0.7	2.75
$^{239, 240}Pu$	0.034	0.15	0.15	0.04	0.07	7.65
^{238}Pu	0.002	0.010	0.007	0.003	0.002	0.0469
^{241}Am	0.005	0.0027	0.03	0.006	0.007	0.907
^{51}Cr	< 0.6	< 2	< 1.3	< 0.9	< 0.5	< 1.7
^{59}Fe	< 0.2	< 0.3	< 0.2	< 0.5	< 0.3	< 0.5
^{58}Co	0.26	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.3	< 0.2	< 0.2
^{103}Ru	0.14	0.10	< 0.3	0.02	< 0.1	< 0.2
^{106}Ru	2.0	< 4	< 2.2	< 2.6	< 2.0	< 1.7
^{124}Sb	< 0.2	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.3	< 0.2	< 0.2
^{125}Sb	2.7	0.075	< 0.7	0.7	< 0.7	< 0.6
^{144}Ce	3.3	1.1	0.054	2.7	< 1.3	0.383
^{110m}Ag	2.1	0.089	1.2	0.4	0.05	< 0.2
^{95}Zr	0.14	< 0.2	< 0.2	< 0.5	< 0.2	< 0.4
^{95}Nb	0.42	< 0.06	< 0.1	0.04	< 0.1	< 0.2
^{234}U				0.007	0.0024	0.879
^{235}U				0.0003	0.000025	0.0346
^{238}U				0.005	0.0018	0.924
^{244}Cm				0.004	0.0019	0.000216
^{22}Na					0.56	< 0.2

Total annual liquid discharges in % of the authorised limit are given in table 2.2:

Table 2.2. Total annual liquid discharge in % of the authorised limit from IFE-Kjeller 2003 – 2008.

	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
% of limit	17.2	7.1	2.0	46.6	9.4	30.4

There is no downward trend in discharges of liquid radioactive waste.

The discharge in 2006 of 46.6% of the limit was caused by enhanced levels of ^{3}H and ^{137}Cs in water used in treatment of ion-exchange resins. The discharge in 2008 of 30.4% of the limit was caused by enhanced levels of ^{3}H, ^{60}Co and ^{137}Cs in wastewater from treatment of ion-exchange resins.

2.2.4 Emissions to air

The only emission to air of nuclides with half lives exceeding 30 days form the facilities at IFE, Kjeller, is ^{3}H from operation of the JEEP II research reactor, small amounts of ^{125}I from the radiopharmaceutical production and sometimes traces of ^{137}Cs in emissions form the hot laboratories. Tables 2.3 and 2.4 below show the activity in the annual emissions and in % of the authorised limit. There is no downward trend in emission to air.

Table 2.3. Annual emission of ^{3}H, ^{125}I and ^{137}Cs from IFE-Kjeller 2003 – 2008

Nuclide	2003 (GBq)	2004 (GBq)	2005 (GBq)	2006 (GBq)	2007 (GBq)	2008 (GBq)
^{3}H	6040	6020	5900	5300	4200	4 400
^{125}I	0.0073	0.032	0.012	0.012	0.029	0.038
^{137}Cs		0.000067				

Table 2.4. Total annual emission to air in % of the authorised limit from IFE-Kjeller 2003 – 2008:

% of limit	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Total	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.7	4.1
Iodine	5.1	10	10	12	13	15

2.2.5 Systems for quality assurance

IFE's internal Health and Safety Department has a comprehensive quality control and assurance system where all work tasks, including measurement of activity, are describes in detail in working instructions and procedures. To ensure that the discharge are carried out correctly, several control procedures in relation to the technical condition of the pipeline, procedures to verify that discharges actually reach the discharge point in Nitelva River and control of the water level in the river prior to discharge has been implemented.

Prior to discharges IFE's internal Health and Safety Department has measured the nuclide content and activity levels in the wastewater and authorised discharge if the restriction of annual dose to members in the critical group is fulfilled by the annual accumulated discharges. Emissions to air are measured and analysed weekly and are documented in a database at IFE's internal Health and Safety Department. Discharges to water and to the outdoor air are every three months reported to IFE's board of directors and yearly in a report to NRPA.

2.2.6 Site specific target discharge values

Discharges of liquid radioactive waste are related to the discharge limits given by the NRPA and described in section 2.2.1 above.

Through the authorisation for release of radioactive substances, the operators are obliged to limit the discharge to levels as low as reasonable achievable (ALARA) and use the best available technology (BAT) in order to achieve this. Equipment, methods and routines are continuously evaluated for potential discharge reducing measures.

2.2.7 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

Not relevant.

2.2.8 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators, as well as, when appropriate, a description of on-going or planned activities.

Variations in liquid discharges are caused by variation in the research activities and production of radiopharmaceuticals and other radionuclides at IFE-Kjeller. The increases of discharges in 2006 and 2008 are due to increased levels of ^{137}Cs and ^{3}H in water from treatment of ion exchange resins on two special occasions.

Emission of ^{3}H is from operation of the JEEP II reactor and no downward trend in this emission can be expected.

Emission of ^{125}I is from research and quality control of radiopharmaceuticals and can be expected to vary yearly.

2.2.9 Summary evaluation

Table 2.5 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Kjeller concerning discharge.

Table 2.5 Summary evaluation of discharges from IFE-Kjeller.

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Relevant systems in place	Yes
• Abatement factor	Normal for existing abetment systems
• Downward trend discharges	No downward trend, variation in liquid discharge is caused by variations in research activity and waste treatment
• Downward trend discharge normalized	Not applicable
• Downward trend emission	No downward trend, variation in emission is caused by variations in research activity
• Relevant and reliable QA systems	Yes
• Relevant site specific target values	Target values not implemented
Data completeness	Complete
Causes for deviations from indicators	See text section 2.2.8
Uncertainties	No impact on the conclusions
Other information	None

2.3 Environmental impact

2.3.1 Concentrations of radionuclides of concern in representative samples of water, sediment and fish

Table 2.6 shows the average concentration in mBq/l of radionuclides in representative samples of water from three locations in the Nitelva River during the last six years. VA 1 is up stream form the discharge point, VA 4 and VA 5 are down stream from the discharge point. VA 5 is further down than VA 4.

Table 2.6. Average concentrations in mBq/l of radionuclides in representative samples of water from three locations in the Nitelva River.

Year	Location VA 1		Location VA 4		Location VA 5	
	^{90}Sr	^{239,240}Pu	^{90}Sr	^{239,240}Pu	^{90}Sr	^{239,240}Pu
2003	6.9 (3)	0.038 (3)	9.4 (3)	0.11 (2)	8.4 (3)	0.093 (1)
2004	6.2 (3)	- (0)	6.0 (3)	- (0)	6.2 (3)	- (0)
2005	6.7 (3)	- (0)	6.2 (3)	- (0)	7.7 (3)	- (0)
2006	9.3 (3)	- (0)	9.9 (3)	0.034 (1)	9.8 (3)	- (0)
2007	4.6 (3)	0.046 (1)	4.8 (3)	0.051 (2)	5.1 (3)	0.044 (1)
2008	4.7 (3)	- (0)	4.7 (3)	- (0)	3.3 (3)	0.037 (1)

The numbers in parenthesis are number of samples exceeding the detection limit that is the basis for calculation the average concentration.

Table 2.7 shows the concentration in Bq/kg of radionuclides in samples of sediments during the last six years taken at the same locations as the water samples above (S stands for “sediments”). The results are for the top 10 cm of sediments for annealed samples. The difference in weight between annealed samples and dried samples are 0.95.

Table 2.7 Concentrations in Bq/kg of radionuclides in representative samples of annealed sediments from three locations in the Nitelva River. The results are form the top 10 cm of sediments

SD 1	^{40}K	^{137}Cs	^{239,240}Pu	U_{nat}	^{90}Sr
2003	790	48	0.21	10	1.6
2004	1030	21	0.099	12	0.44
2005	860	22	0.19	44	1.4
2006	750	53	0.14	20	1.6
2007	827 ± 97	40 ± 2	0.6 ± 0.2	89 ± 3	1.9 ± 0.6
2008	940 ± 40	57.9 ± 2.3	0.12 ± 0.07	99 ± 7	0.9 ± 0.4
SD 4	^{40}K	^{137}Cs	^{239,240}Pu	U_{nat}	^{90}Sr
2003	850	60	14	12	1.6
2004	900	78	39	11	1.1
2005	880	81	150	26	2.5
2006	880	72	32	25	3.0
2007	898 ± 48	77 ± 3	21.0 ± 1.6	143 ± 11	2.0 ± 0.4
2008	880 ± 40	51.6 ± 1.9	14.1 ± 1.1	112 ± 7	1.17 ± 0.23
SD 5	^{40}K	^{137}Cs	^{239,240}Pu	U_{nat}	^{90}Sr
2003	850	19	3.7	11	1.0
2004	790	58	28	15	1.4
2005	970	55	25	39	1.7
2006	810	51	40	33	5.0
2007	842 ± 30	53 ± 2	5.5 ± 0.6	129 ± 8	1.9 ± 0.3
2008	840 ± 40	44.1 ± 1.8	28 ± 4	121 ± 9	1.9 ± 0.4

Table 2.8 shows the average concentration of radionuclides in fish of all types during the last six years. The results are in Bq/kg wet weight.

Table 2.8. Concentrations in Bq/kg of radionuclides in fish of all types. The results are for wet weight samples

Year*	^{40}K	^{137}Cs **	$^{239,240}Pu$ **	^{90}Sr
2003 (10)	97	1.9	0.0081 (3)	2.9
2004 (6)	97	1.5	0.0081 (2)	2.8
2005 (4)	114	2.5	- (0)	1.3
2006 (4)	104	2.0	0.0009 (1)	0.12
2007 (6)	177 ± 18	3.9 ± 0.8 (4)	0.0018 ± 0.0007 (1)	0.28 ± 0.09
2008 (4)	126 ± 11	2.4 ± 1.9	0.0013 ± 0.0011 (1)	0.18 ± 0.27

* The total number of samples is given in parenthesis

** The numbers in parenthesis are the number of samples where the nuclide has been measured

2.3.2 Environmental monitoring programme, frequency of sampling, organisms

The environmental program for Nitelva River is operated by IFE's internal Health and Safety Department and includes samples from the river water, sediments, fish and water plants. The following programs have been approved by the NRPA:

- Water samples: Three times a year at 8 locations in the river.
- Sediments: Once a year at 8 location sin the river.
- Water plants: Are collected twice a year at one location in the river
- Fish: Fishing of species used for consumption during the summer period.

The radioactivity content are analysed in the laboratories of IFE's internal Health and Safety Department and reported yearly to the NRPA.

2.3.3 Systems for quality assurance of environmental monitoring program

IFE's internal Health and Safety department has a comprehensive quality control and assurance system where all work tasks, including measurements of activity are described in detail in working instructions and procedures. Criteria for non-conformity are also defined in these procedures. The department is a member of the IAEA's ALMERA network of Radioanalytical laboratories for analysis of environmental samples.

2.3.4 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

In addition to the environmental program in the Nitelva River, IFE's internal Health and Safety Department has a comprehensive program for monitoring of radioactivity in the proximity of IFE and in nearby food production from emission and fallout from operation of nuclear facilities. This includes measurements of the following samples:

- Outdoor air
- Precipitation
- Gras
- Milk
- Agricultural products

2.3.5 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators, as well as, when appropriate, a description of on-going or planned activities

The main bulk of data from analyses of the water samples, sediments and fish show low values and can therefore be interpreted as to meet the BAT/BEP indicators.

The result for the sediments at location 5 can be traced back to discharges in the 1960-ies and 1970 – ties and is residues after clean-up of sediments in the riverbed in 2000 – 2001.

2.3.6 Summary evaluation

Table 2.9 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Kjeller concerning environmental impact.

Table 2.9. Summary evaluation of environmental impact.

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Downward trend in concentrations	Low concentrations, but no downward trend
• Relevant monitoring program	Yes
• Relevant and reliable QA system	Yes
Data completeness	Complete
Causes for deviations from indicators	See text in section 2.3.5
Uncertainties	No impact on the conclusions
Other information	Monitoring of radioactivity in the proximity of IFE and in nearby food production from emission and fallout are in place

2.4 Radiation doses to the public

2.4.1 Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group

Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group from liquid discharges from IFE-Kjeller are given in table 2.10:

Table 2.10 Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group from liquid discharges

	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
μSv to critical group	0.17	0.07	0.02	0.47	0.09	0.30

Average annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to outdoor air IFE-Kjeller are given in table 2.11:

Table 2.11. Average annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to outdoor air IFE-Kjeller

	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
μSv to critical group	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.7	4.1

2.4.2 Total exposures

The total annual effective doses to the public for discharges to the Nitelva River and from emissions to the air can not be measures and are based on model calculations based on exposure pathways and public behaviour. The total doses to the public from liquid discharges are given in section 2.4.1 above and include historical discharges. The total annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to the outdoor air are given above.

The critical groups for liquid discharges and emissions to the air are not the same and the doses should therefore not be added.

2.4.3 The definition of the critical group(s)

The critical group is hypothetical and only defined by their food consumption and living habits. The estimation of doses to the group is based on theoretical radionuclide concentration in the mentioned local river environment situated 100 km from the sea and calculated from discharge values. The doses represent the adult population. It has been established that children, taking their habits into account, does not receive doses that deviate significantly from adults. In calculation of the collective doses from discharges of liquid waste the population in all the municipalities around the lake Øyern, i.e. Skedsmo, Fet, Rælingen, Trøgstad and Spydeberg are included. The total population is close to 75 000 people. The age distribution is given in table 2.12:

Table 2.12. Age distribution in population all the municipalities around the lake Øyern

Group	Age (years)	% of population
Infant	0 – 2	3.3
Child	2 – 17	19.7
Adult	>17	77.0

2.4.4 Information on exposure pathway(s)

The calculation of effective dose to the critical group is based on:

- Annual consumption of 20 kg of fish from the river
- 100 hours/year occupancy on the riverbank

Bathing and boating give negligible contribution to the doses.

2.4.5 Basis for methodology to estimate doses

All modelling of transfer of radionuclides in the environment and doses to critical groups are based on the use of the code PC-CREAM (EUR 17791 EN (NRPB-SR296), UK 1997). The code uses the model described in:

Simmonds J.R., Lawson G. and Mayall A., *Methodology for assessing radiological consequences of routine releases of radionuclides to the environment* European Commission, EUR 15760 EN,
ISSN 1018-5593, (1995)

2.4.6 Site-specific factors

No site specific factors are used except for the K_d factor for ^{60}Co and ^{137}Cs that is determined by IFE's Health and safety Department for the actual river sediments. The estimates are otherwise based on default values from the reference in section 2.4.5.

2.4.7 Site specific target annual effective dose

The discharge limits defined by the NRPA are based on a limiting annual effective dose of 1 µSv to individuals in the critical group, as explained in section 2.2.1. Target values are not implemented.

2.4.8 Systems for quality assurance of processes involved in dose estimates

There are no measurements involved in the dose assessments except for the use of local values for K_d. The calculations have been tested against example calculations from the reference in section 2.4.5.

2.4.9 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

Not relevant.

2.4.10 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators

There are no downward trends for doses from liquid discharges. Variations in liquid discharges and therefore in the doses to these individuals are caused by variation in the research activities and production of radiopharmaceuticals and other radionuclides at IFE-Kjeller.

For explanations of the increased doses in 2006 and 2008, see section 2.2.3.

2.4.11 Summary evaluation

Table 2.13 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Kjeller concerning radiation dose to the public.

Table 2.13. Summary evaluation of radiation dose to the public

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Downward trend in radiation dose, critical groups	Low doses, but no downward trend. Caused by variations in the research activity and waste treatment
• Total exposure within the constraint	Yes
• Relevant critical groups	Yes
• Reliable dose estimates	Yes
• Relevance of target dose	Target dose not implemented
• Relevant and reliable QA system	Yes
Data completeness	Yes
Causes for deviations from indicators	See text section 2.4.10
Uncertainties	No impact on the conclusions
Other information	None

2.5 Summary BAT/BEP

Based on the evaluation of BAT/BEP concerning discharges, environmental impact and radiation dose to the public it is generally concluded that BAT/BEP is applied at IFE-Kjeller during the time period covered by this report.

3. Site–Specific Information – Institute for Energy Technology, Halden

3.1 Site characteristics

3.1.1 Name of site

Institute for Energy Technology, Halden, Norway (IFE Halden)

Halden Boiling Water Reactor (HBWR)

3.1.2 Type of facility

Heavy water cooled and moderated research reactor. HBWR has three main systems, the primary system (heavy water) and two light water heat removal systems, where the secondary system is a closed loop system.

3.1.3 Year of commissioning/licensing/decommissioning

Commissioned: 1959

Current licence: Expiry date 31. December 2014

3.1.4 Location

HBWR is located in the town of Halden, in the south-eastern part of Norway. The containment with the reactor and primary system is located in a mountain hall.

3.1.5 Receiving waters and catchment area, including, where relevant, information on water flow of receiving rivers

Liquid discharge is released to the river Tista which empties into Iddefjord, leading to Skagerrak (OSPAR region II). The average flow of the river Tista is 21 m^3/sec. The volume of Iddefjord is $4 \cdot 10^8$ m^3, the average outflow to Skagerrak is 180 m^3/sec and average inflow from Skagerak is 150 m^3/sec.

3.1.6 Production

The maximum heat removal capacity is 25 MW. The heat is transferred from the tertiary system to an adjacent paper factory as steam. The primary system operates with a water temperature of 235 °C, corresponding to an operating pressure of 33.4 bars.

3.1.7 Other relevant information

Not relevant.

3.2 Discharges

3.2.1 Systems in place to reduce, prevent or eliminate discharges of radioactive substances to the marine environment

Drainage and delay system

This system is designed for collection and disposal of waste water. Water is directed to and flows through a 10 m^3 delay tank, where sedimentation of some of the activity will occur. Activity monitoring is performed continuously on the water leaving the tank to the sewage system. In case of abnormally high water activity, a main outlet valve will close automatically, and the water is directed to storage and delay tanks with a total capacity of 90 m^3. The water can then be cycled through a clean-up system with particle filters and ion exchange resin and discharged after control of activity.

The largest by volume of liquid discharge from HBWR is drainage from the mountain hall. The water is slightly contaminated, primarily with tritium, and is lead directly to the 10 m^3 delay tank. An increase in activity will be detected by a monitoring system before the water reaches the delay tank and the water is then immediately directed to the storage and delay tanks, where clean-up can be performed.

In 2006 a new discharge pipe line was installed. Until then the discharge was directed through a municipal pipe line to the river Tista with the discharge point at the shore of the river. The new line is a double pipe which discharges in the middle of the river.

Ion exchange and evaporation

Discharges from the experimental circuits are multiple cycled through filters and ion exchange columns and the activity is close to zero before it is discharged. Liquid discharges from the laboratories are evaporated to a collection tank and discharged after control of activity.

He-3 decontamination system

A source of tritium to the liquid discharge is diffusion of tritium from He-3 coils. In order to reduce this source, a system for decontamination of the He-3 system was built and put into operation in 2006.

No new systems, processes or changes in management are planned to be introduced for liquid waste treatment in the near future.

3.2.2 Efficiency of abatement systems

Liquid discharge

The efficiency of the sedimentation process in the delay tank is nuclide dependent. The sedimentation is measured to 10 – 20% for transition metals (Mn, Co, Zr, Nb), about 2% for alkali metals (Cs) and 4% for lanthanides (Ce).

The efficiency of clean-up of discharges from experimental circuits (multiple filtration and ion-exchange) and from the laboratories (evaporation) is better than 95% for all nuclides except tritium. The efficiency of the clean-up of activity collected in the storage and delay tanks (filtration and ion-exchange) is better than 95%.

Emission to the atmosphere

Filtration systems with HEPA filters and charcoal filters are installed in the ventilation systems from fuel handling compartments, containment and other buildings where work with irradiated fuel can result in emissions of radioactive aerosols. The efficiencies are given in appendix 2. Emissions of radioactivity though the filters are continuously monitored. Filters are replaced if measurements show a reduced efficiency.

3.2.3 Annual liquid discharges

Annual liquid discharges of various nuclides to the river Tista in 2003 – 2008 are given in table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Annual liquid discharges from IFE-Halden 2003 – 2008

SITE	Radio-nuclides	2003 MBq	2004 MBq	2005 MBq	2006 MBq	2007 MBq	2008 MBq
Institute for Energy Technology Halden Boiling Water Reactor	H-3	2.7E+5	5.4E+5	5.3E+5	3.0E+5	9.8E+6	2.2E+06
	Cr-51	130	210	180	235	25	23.3
	Mn-54	0.18	0.74	2.46	1.13	0.45	0.76
	Fe-59		0.75	0.88		0.55	2.17
	Co-58	3.3	8.7	40.6	4.0	3.6	13.9
	Co-60	62	68	99	86	49	36
	Zr-95	3.3	4.9	5.3	3.8	4.8	4.5
	Nb-95	8.5	11.0	12.2	8.3	12.0	8.6
	Ru-103	0.17	0.45	0.42	0.16	0.86	1.44
	Cd-109	0.016			0.051	0.13	0.024
	Ag-110m	0.17	0.001	0.94	0.21	3.2	1.71
	Sb-124			0.003			
	Sb-125	0.06	0.0019	0.037	0.0064	0.023	0.007
	I-131	3.6	0.68	0.42	21.2	1.8	19.7
	Cs-134	8.8	8	17.8	24.9	29.0	30.2
	Cs-137	130	70	134	187	240	199
	Ce-141	0.29	0.68	0.61	0.25	1.5	1.45
	Ce-144	3.2	16	8.8	3.0	17	17

3.2.4 Emissions to air

Table 3.2. Annual emissions of ^{3}H from IFE-Halden 2003 – 2008.

	2003 TBq	2004 TBq	2005 TBq	2006 TBq	2007 TBq	2008 TBq
Emission of tritium to the atmosphere	40	52	61	54	51	55

The release of I-129 to the atmosphere has been estimated to 0.2 Bq/year. The emission of C-14 has not been estimated.

3.2.5 Systems for quality assurance

The automatic closing function of the main outlet valves on the discharge line from containment and from delay tank, which is initiated by abnormally high activity levels, is tested along with other instrumentation before each reactor start up.

The conductivity of water leaving ion exchange columns is measured continuously in order to follow the ion exchange efficiency of the resin. To further monitor the function of the ion exchange columns, gamma spectrum analysis is performed on samples taken periodically of water entering and leaving the columns.

Continual logging of all instrument signals is taken care of by the Procsee data collection and presentation system. Live time data and historical data can be graphically displayed and trends can be detected.

IFE Halden has a comprehensive quality control and assurance system where all work tasks, including measurement of activity, are described in detail in working instructions and procedures.

3.2.6 Site specific target discharge values

Discharge levels are related primarily to the discharge limits given by the authorities.

In addition to discharge limits which are directly related to resulting doses to the critical group, the authorities have enforced nuclide specific notification levels. These levels are related to previous operational results at the facility. If a notification level is exceeded, the authorities must be informed and the reason for the discharge explained.

Through the authorisation for release of radioactive substances, the operator is obliged to limit the discharge to levels as low as reasonable achievable (ALARA) and use of best available technology (BAT) in order to achieve this. Equipment, methods and routines are continuously evaluated for potential discharge reducing measures, including measures to enhanced worker awareness of the issue. In any effort to reduce discharges, the resulting discharge reduction must, however, be seen in view of doses incurred by occupational exposed individuals and the economic investment necessary to achieve the reduction. Since the current discharge levels and resulting doses to the public are very low, evaluation of possible major new installations often reveal that the doses or investment involved in implementing a measure do not justify the marginal reduction in discharge that is possible to achieve. The best dividends are often achieved through apparently modest changes to existing equipment or procedures, and in increased worker awareness.

3.2.7 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

Not relevant.

3.2.8 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators, as well as, when appropriate, a description of on-going or planned activities.

The liquid discharge of tritium has increased since 2007. The reason is the onset of a series of ramp testing in 2007 where neutron control is achieved with He-3 coils. Tritium builds up in the He-3 coils and diffuses through the metal of the coils. In order to reduce this discharge, a purification system which traps tritium on heated titanium has been built and put into operation. This has resulted in a discharge reduction, but the build-up of tritium in the coils when in use, still leads to a relatively high discharge of tritium.

There has been an increase in the discharge of nuclides associated with the fission process (Cs- and Ce-isotopes and I-131). The reason is several research experiments with an intentional breach in the experimental fuel cladding and release of fission products to the experimental loop water. This has led to an increased contamination in some areas of the containment and resulted in an increased activity concentration in the water discharged from the containment. New housekeeping routines as well as new laundry routines are expected to lead to a decrease over time.

3.2.9 Summary evaluation

Table 3.3 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Halden concerning discharge.

Table 3.3. Summary evaluation of discharge from IFE-Halden.

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Relevant systems in place	Yes
• Abatement factor	Normal for existing abetment systems
• Downward trend discharges	No downward trend, variation in liquid discharge is caused by variations in research activity
• Downward trend discharge normalized	Not applicable
• Downward trend emission	No downward trend, variation in emission is caused by variations in research activity
• Relevant and reliable QA systems	Yes
• Relevant site specific target values	Target values not implemented
Data completeness	Complete
Causes for deviations from indicators	See text section 3.2.8
Uncertainties	No impact on the conclusions
Other information	None

3.3 Environmental impact

3.3.1 Concentrations of radionuclides of concern in representative samples of sediment and fish

Except for in the close vicinity of the discharge point in the river Tista used until 2006 (see section 3.2.1 above), Cs-137 is the only anthropogenic nuclide that can be detected in environmental samples. No sedimentation occurs at the new discharge point, so the environmental monitoring programme will be adjusted and will include sediment samples from other locations, se section 3.3.5.

The Cs-137 activity of shore samples and fish is shown in table 3.4.

Table 3.4. The Cs-137 activity of shore samples and fish

	Shore sand (Average form 4 beaches) (Bq/kg)	**Fish caught in the discharge area from the river Tista (Bq/kg)**
2003	**2.9**	**0.9**
2004	**2.5**	**1.1**
2005	**3.3**	**1.2**
2006	**2.8**	**1.3**
2007	**3.9**	**1.4**
2008	**3.5**	**1.6**

An increase can be observed, especially in the concentration in fish.

3.3.2 Environmental monitoring programme, frequency of sampling, organisms

The environmental monitoring programme includes:

- Bottom sediment from previous discharge area in the river Tista, once a year. There is no sedimentation in the new discharge area.
- Sediment samples from sand beaches along the fjord, once a year
- Fish from the river discharge area in Iddefjord, once a year
- Grass from neighbouring farms, twice a year
- Precipitant (rain, snow) from two locations once a fortnight

3.3.3 Systems for quality assurance of environmental monitoring program

IFE Halden has a comprehensive quality control and assurance system where all work tasks, including measurement of activity, are described in detail in working instructions and procedures.

3.3.4 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

Not relevant.

3.3.5 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators, as well as, when appropriate, a description of on-going or planned activities

106. The reason for the increase of Cs-137 is uncertain. It could be connected to the increase in the discharge of Cs-137 from HBWR, but could also be a consequence of increased inflow to the river of Cs-137 from the Chernobyl fallout. From 2010 the environmental monitoring programme will be extended to water and sediment samples from the river, both above and below the discharge point from HBWR.

3.3.6 Summary evaluation

Table 3.5 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Halden concerning environmental impact.

Table 3.5. Summary evaluation of environmental impact.

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Downward trend in concentrations	Low concentrations, but no downward trend
• Relevant monitoring program	Yes
• Relevant and reliable QA system	Yes
Data completeness	Complete
Causes for deviations from indicators	See text in section 3.3.5
Uncertainties	No impact on the conclusions
Other information	None

3.4 Radiation doses to the public

3.4.1 Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group

Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group from liquid discharges from HBWR is shown in the table 3.6.

Average annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to outdoor air from HBWR is shown in table 3.7

Table 3.6. Average annual effective dose to individuals within the critical group from liquid discharges from IFE-Halden 2003 – 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Annual effective dose (µSv)	0.014	0.016	0.025	0,020	0.017	0.016

Table 3.7. Average annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to outdoor air IFE-Halden 2003 – 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Annual effective dose (µSv)	12.6	18.2	17.6	6.7	6.4	7.3

The drop in dose after 2005 does not represent a reduced release, but is a result of a new methodology for calculating the doses, i.e. implementation of the PC-CREAM (EUR 17791 EN (NRPB-SR296), UK 1997) computer code.

3.4.2 Total exposures

The total annual effective doses to the public for discharges to the river Tista and from emissions to the air cannot be measures and are based on model calculations based on exposure pathways and public behaviour. The total doses to the public from liquid discharges are given in section 3.4.1 above and include historical discharges. The total annual effective doses to individuals in the critical group from emission to the outdoor air are given above.

The critical groups for liquid discharges and emissions to the air are not the same and the doses should therefore not be added.

3.4.3 The definition of the critical group(s)

The critical group is hypothetical and only defined by their food consumption and living habits. The estimation of doses to the group is based on theoretical radionuclide concentration in the environment, calculated from discharge values. The dose represents an average in a group with an age distribution identical to the age distribution of the Norwegian population. It has been established that children, taking their consumption and living habits into account, do not receive doses which deviate significantly from the average.

3.4.4 Information on exposure pathway(s)

The calculation of effective dose to the critical group is based on:

- Annual consumption of 30 kg of fish from the part of the Iddefjord close to the discharge of the river Tista;
- 200 hours/year occupancy on the beaches in the part of the Iddefjord close to the discharge from the river Tista;
- 50 hours of bathing in the fjord and 1000 hours/ year of boating.

3.4.5 Basis for methodology to estimate doses

All modelling of transfer of radionuclides in the environment and doses to critical groups are based on:

Simmonds J.R., Lawson G. and Mayall A., *Methodology for assessing radiological consequences of routine releases of radionuclides to the environment*

European Commission, EUR 15760 EN, ISSN 1018-5593, (1995)

3.4.6 Site-specific factors

No site specific factors are used. The estimates are based on default factors from the above reference, section 3.4.5.

3.4.7 Site specific target annual effective dose

The discharge limits defined by the authorities are based on a limiting annual effective dose of 1 μSv to individuals in the critical group. Target values are not implemented.

3.4.8 Systems for quality assurance of processes involved in dose estimates

There are no measurements involved in the dose assessments. The calculations have been tested by comparison with example calculations from the reference in section 3.4.5.

3.4.9 Any relevant information not covered by the requirements specified above

Not relevant.

3.4.10 Explanations for lack of data or failure to meet BAT/BEP indicators

There are no downward trends for doses from liquid discharges. Variations in the discharges and the corresponding doses are primarily caused by variation in the research activities, as described in section 3.2.8.

3.4.11 Summary evaluation

Table 3.8 summarizes the evaluation of BAT/BEP for IFE-Halden concerning radiation dose to the public.

Table 3.8 Summary evaluation of radiation dose to the public.

Criteria	**Evaluation**
BAT/BEP indicator	
• Downward trend in radiation dose, critical groups	Low doses, but no downward trend. Caused by variations in the research activity and waste treatment
• Total exposure within the constraint	Yes
• Relevant critical groups	Yes
• Reliable dose estimates	Yes
• Relevance of target dose	Target dose not implemented
• Relevant and reliable QA system	Yes
Data completeness	Yes

3.5 Summary BAT/BEP

Based on the evaluation of BAT/BEP concerning discharges, environmental impact and radiation dose to the public it is generally concluded that BAT/BEP is applied at IFE-Halden during the time period covered by this report.

Appendix 1

System(s) in place to reduce, prevent or eliminate discharges and their efficiency IFE-Kjeller

Abatement system/ Management	Into operation (Year)		Efficiency of abatement system		Comments
	Existing	Planned	Decontamination Factor	Other measure of efficiency	
Discharges:					
delay tank(s)	8		3	67%	
chemical precipitation					
Centrifuging					
Hydrocyclone					
cross-flow filtration					
Ion exchange	1		33	97%	except ^{3}H
Osmosis					
Ultrafiltration					
Evaporator	1		20	95%	except ^{3}H
..other….					
Emissions:					
electrostatic precipitation					
cyclone scrubbing					
chemical adsorption					
HEPA filtration	many		50	98%	see 2.2.2
cryogenics					
Active charcoal filters	4		> 20	> 95%	see 2.2.2
Changes in management or processes:					see 2.2.2
……					
……					

Appendix 2

System(s) in place to reduce, prevent or eliminate discharges and their efficiency IFE-Halden

Abatement system/ Management	Into operation (Year)		Efficiency of abatement system		Comments
	Existing	Planned	Decontamination Factor	Other measure of efficiency	
Discharges:					
Sedimentation in delay tank(s)	1		1.02 – 1.25	2 – 20%	see 3.2.2
Filtration and ion exchange from delay tank(s)	1		33	97%	
Ion exchange	many		100	99%	
Evaporation	1		20	95%	
Tritium trapping in He-3 system	1 (2006)		10	90%	
Emissions:					
HEPA filtration and active charcoal filtration	4		100	99%	
Changes in management or processes:					
New discharge line	1 (2006)				

New Court
48 Carey Street
London WC2A 2JQ
United Kingdom

t: +44 (0)20 7430 5200
f: +44 (0)20 7430 5225
e: secretariat@ospar.org
www.ospar.org

OSPAR's vision is of a healthy and diverse North-East Atlantic ecosystem, used sustainably

ISBN 978-1-907390-46-3
Publication Number: 505/2010

© OSPAR Commission, 2010. Permission may be granted by the publishers for the report to be wholly or partly reproduced in publications provided that the source of the extract is clearly indicated.

© Commission OSPAR, 2010. La reproduction de tout ou partie de ce rapport dans une publication peut être autorisée par l'Editeur, sous réserve que l'origine de l'extrait soit clairement mentionnée.