A radionuclide model for the main basins of the Baltic Sea – Identification of representative biota

Ville Kangasniemi & Ari T. K. Ikonen

EnviroCase Oy

NSFS Conference 2019 – Next level of radiation protection 10–14 June 2019, Hanaholmen Cultural Centre, Espoo, Finland



Background

- Evaluation of the exposures of plants and animals is an integral part of the international (ICRP) radiation protection system
- There are several models developed to simulate the radionuclide transport and radiological implications in the Baltic Sea
 - With varying resolutions and level of detail (e.g. Periáñez et al. 2015)
 - Some incorporate dynamic food web models (*e.g.* Maderich *et al.* 2018)
 - The availability and/or applicability of these models is rather limited
- EnviroCase is investing in the development of a *modern and flexible* radionuclide transport and exposure model of the main basins of the entire Baltic Sea, facilitating also probabilistic assessments and uncertainty/sensitivity analyses (Ikonen & Kangasniemi 2019)



Purpose

- Assessing the implications of past, present and future releases of radioactivity in the scale of the main basins of the Baltic Sea
 - Both direct and indirect inputs (atmospheric deposition, runoff, aquatic discharges)
- Holistic assessments of radiation exposures of (the public and) the environment
 - Employing deterministic and probabilistic approaches
 - Including state-of-the-art sensitivity and uncertainty analyses
- Here, focus is on the identification of the representative plant and animal species for the actual sea areas of the Baltic Sea
 - Biota of the shoreline areas will be included in the overall model at a later stage





Baltic Sea

- High degree of freshwater input and limited oceanic connection
 - Brackish water conditions
 - Distinct biota communities \rightarrow high environmental protection values
- Sources of radioactivity (HELCOM 2018a)
 - Natural radioactivity (sea itself and from the catchment)
 - Radioactive fallout (Chernobyl, nuclear weapons tests)
 - Nuclear reactors in operation, under construction, planned, closed or under decommissioning
 - Other nuclear-cycle facilities (mining, fuel manufacturing, waste conditioning and disposal)
 - Research and medical facilities
 - Industry dealing with naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORM)
 - Past dumping of radioactive waste
 - Possible accidents with nuclear-powered vessels or nuclear waste transports



Methods

- In the dose rate calculations, the ICRP recommendations (ICRP 2014) will be followed, with practical guidance drawn from the ERICA assessment tool (Brown *et al.* 2016)
 - Reference Animals and Plants (RAPs) extended with supplementary set of *representative* organisms
- Selection criteria for these supplementary representative species:
 - Common species
 - **Food web importance** (*e.g.* Tomczak *et al.* 2012, Posiva 2013, HELCOM 2018b)
 - **Exposure potential**: highest plausible exposure of the species within its group due to its habits
 - Coverage of the main exposure configurations and their combinations (sediment, water, air)
 - To maximise the time of presence, the non-migratory species were favoured
 - Public and conservation interest
 - Information availability
- Expert judgement & lists of potential candidate species for the various selection criteria were used





Results – part of the list

			Selection criteria					
Organism type (trophic role in the food web)	Representative species for the Baltic Sea	ICRP RAP / ERICA Reference Organism	Common species	Food-web importance	Exposure potential ^{a)}	Public/conser- vation interest ^{b)}	Information availability	
Phytoplankton	- ^{c)}	 – / phytoplankton 	х	х	W	-	??	
Zooplankton	_ c)	– / zooplankton	х	х	W		??	
Submerged macrophyte	Eelgrass	– / vascular plant	х	х	SsW	n	??	
Emergent macrophyte	Common reed	– / vascular plant	х	х	SsWwA	-	?	
Macroalga	Bladder wrack	Seaweed/macroalgae	х	х	sW	n	?	
Detritivorous macrobenthos	Marenzelleria spp.	 – / polychaete worm 	x d)	х	S	d)	??	
Filter-feeding macrobenthos	Baltic macoma	 – / bivalve mollusc 	х	х	S ^{e)}		?	
Scavenging macrobenthos	Saduria entomon	Crab / crustacean	х	х	S		?	
Pelagic fish	Baltic herring	Trout / pelagic fish	х	х	W	+	?	
Benthic fish	European perch	Flatfish / benthic fish	х	х	sW	+	?	
Piscivorous fish	Cod	{Fish ^{f)} }	х	х	sW	+ n	?	
Bird feeding on plants	Mute swan	Duck / bird	х	х	wA	+	??	
Bird feeding on macrobenth.	Common eider	Duck / bird	х	х	WwA	+ n	??	
Bird feeding on fish	Herring gull	Duck / bird	х	х	wA	+	??	
Bird, top predator	White-tailed eagle	Duck / bird	х	Х	Α	+ n	??	
Aquatic mammal	Grey seal	– / mammal	х	Х	Ww	+	??	

Table 1. Representative species selected for the food-web positions typical to the sea areas of the Baltic Sea, with the selection criteria applied and the corresponding globally generic aquatic ICRP Reference Animals and Plants (RAPs) (ICRP 2014) and/or marine Reference Organisms in the ERICA Assessment Tool (Brown et al. 2016). For details, see the full paper in the symposium proceedings.



Discussion

- Some groups considered in ICRP RAPs and/or ERICA Reference Organisms left out:
 - Sea anemones and true corals require saline water (although could be present at the boundary zone, the Danish Strait)
 - Amphibians and reptiles shoreline species
- Balancing and expert decisions needed to keep the suite of representative species manageably small, for example
 - Benthic fish: European perch vs. eelpout (ecologically important)
 - Pelagic fish: **Baltic herring** vs. **three-spine stickleback** (ecologically important, well studied)
 - Bird feeding on fish: Herring gull vs. great cormorant (piscivorous, public interest)
- Not considered so far:
 - Life-stage differences in occupancy (and size and radionuclide transport properties)
 - Seasonal characteristics, e.g. wintering in sediment burrows
 - Shoreline areas (shallow-water/littoral species) and transitory species
 - Data availability
 - Radiosensitivity (little information so far even in general...)



Conclusions

- The generic ICRP/ERICA reference organisms lack in some key characteristics of the Baltic biota communities, but no major difficulties encountered to complement
- The distinct biota communities of the Baltic Sea invite further study of radiological protection
 - At least for scientific and public credibility
- The model development continues; more to come depending on the time (made) available





References

- Brown, J.E., Alfonso, B., Avila, R., Beresford, N.A., Copplestone, D. & Hosseini, A. 2016. A new version of the ERICA tool to facilitate impact assessments of radioactivity on wild plants and animals. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 153: 141–148 + supplement
- HELCOM 2018a. Thematic assessment of radioactive substances in the Baltic Sea, 2011–2015. Baltic Sea Environment Proceedings 151.
- HELCOM 2018b. State of the Baltic Sea: Second HELCOM holistic assessment 2011–2016. Baltic Sea Environment Proceedings 155.
- ICRP 2014. Protection of the environment under different exposure situations. ICRP Publication 124. Annals of the ICRP 43(1).
- Ikonen, A.T.K. & Kangasniemi, V. 2019. A model for radionuclide distribution in the main basins of the Baltic Sea Conceptual framework. Nordic advances and radiation risk estimates – advances and uncertainties: Joint NKS-R and NKS-B seminar, Finlandshuset, Stockholm, 15– 16 January 2019. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21189.91366
- Maderich, V., Bezhenar, R., Tateda, Y., Aoyama, M. & Tsumune, D. 2018. Similarities and differences of ¹³⁷Cs distributions in the marine environments of the Baltic and Black seas and off the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant in model assessments. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 135: 895–906.
- Periáñez, R., Bezhenar, R., Iojspe, M., Maderich, V., Nies, H., Osvath, I., Outola, I. & de With, G. 2015. A comparison of marine radionuclide dispersion models for the Baltic Sea in the frame of IAEA MODARIA program. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 139: 66-77.
- Posiva 2013. Olkiluoto biosphere description 2012. POSIVA 2012-06. Posiva Oy.
- Tomczak, M.T., Niiranen, S., Hjerne, O. & Blenckner, T. 2012. Ecosystem flow dynamics in the Baltic Proper using a multi-trophic dataset as a basis for food-web modelling. *Ecological Modelling* 230: 123–147.





This is how the Baltic Sea food web covered by our representative species looks at the moment...

Thank you!

Extra material follows



2

-

Full paper – species list (1/2)

Table 1. Representative species selected for the food-web positions typical to the sea areas of the Baltic Sea, with the selection criteria applied and the corresponding globally generic aquatic ICRP Reference Animals and Plants (RAPs) (ICRP 2014) and/or marine Reference Organisms in the ERICA Assessment Tool (Brown et al. 2016). For details, see the full paper in the symposium proceedings.

	Representative species for the Baltic Sea	ICRP RAP / ERICA Reference Organism	Selection criteria					
Organism type (trophic role in the food web)			Common species	Food-web importance	Exposure potential ^{a)}	Public/conse rvation interest ^{b)}	Information availability	
Phytoplankton	_ c)	 – / phytoplankton 	х	х	W	_	??	
Zooplankton	_ c)	 – / zooplankton 	х	х	W		??	
Submerged macrophyte	Eelgrass	 – / vascular plant 	х	х	SsW	n	??	
Emergent macrophyte	Common reed	 – / vascular plant 	х	Х	SsWwA	-	?	
Macroalga	Bladder wrack	Seaweed/macroalgae	х	х	sW	n	?	
Detritivorous macrobenthos	Marenzelleria spp.	 – / polychaete worm 	x ^{d)}	х	s	d)	??	
Filter-feeding macrobenthos	Baltic macoma	 – / bivalve mollusc 	х	Х	S e)		?	
Scavenging macrobenthos	Saduria entomon	Crab / crustacean	х	х	S		?	
Pelagic fish	Baltic herring	Trout / pelagic fish	х	х	W	+	?	
Benthic fish	European perch	Flatfish / benthic fish	х	х	sW	+	?	
Piscivorous fish	Cod	{Fish ^f }	х	х	sW	+ n	?	



Full paper – species list (2/2)

Table 1 (cont'd). Representative species selected for the food-web positions typical to the sea areas of the Baltic Sea, with the selection criteria applied and the corresponding globally generic aquatic ICRP Reference Animals and Plants (RAPs) (ICRP 2014) and/or marine Reference Organisms in the ERICA Assessment Tool (Brown et al. 2016). For details, see the full paper in the symposium proceedings.

Organism type (trophic role in the food web)	Representative species for the Baltic Sea	ICRP RAP / ERICA Reference Organism	Selection criteria					
			Common species	Food-web importance	Exposure potential ^{a)}	Public/conse rvation interest ^{b)}	Information availability	
Bird feeding on plants	Mute swan	Duck / bird	х	х	wA	+	??	
Bird feeding on macrobenth.	Common eider	Duck / bird	х	х	WwA	+ n	??	
Bird feeding on fish	Herring gull	Duck / bird	х	х	wA	+	??	
Bird, top predator	White-tailed eagle	Duck / bird	x	х	A	+ n	??	
Aquatic mammal	Grey seal	– / mammal	x	х	Ww	+	??	

a) Coded here through the main environmental (exposure) positions typically occupied by the species: **S** in sediment (burrowed), **s** on the sediment/water interface, **W** in water, **w** on water, **A** in air.

b) Coded here with + for positive and – for negative public interest (e.g. socioeconomically important and/or emblematic or nuisance species), and **n** for nature conservation interests (e.g. endangered species).

c) No specific representative single species for the phytoplankton or the zooplankton has been identified, but they are planned to be parameterised through typical communities acting in these two trophic roles very fundamentally important to the functioning of the ecosystem.

d) A family of invasive species living relatively deep in the sediment and tolerant to anoxia; possibly competes with the native ragworm exhibiting similar lifestyle and present in decreasing numbers.

e) Also, typical to the soft (accumulation) bottoms unlike the foolish mussel that favours harder substrates.

f) Inhabits both the pelagic and benthic environments.



Full paper – references

- Brown, J.E., Alfonso, B., Avila, R., Beresford, N.A., Copplestone, D. & Hosseini, A. 2016. A new version of the ERICA tool to facilitate impact assessments of radioactivity on wild plants and animals. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 153: 141–148 + supplement.
- HELCOM 2010. Atlas of the Baltic Sea. Helsinki Commission.
- HELCOM 2013. HELCOM Red List of Baltic Sea species in danger of becoming extinct. Baltic Sea Environmental Proceedings 140.
- HELCOM 2018a. Thematic assessment of radioactive substances in the Baltic Sea, 2011–2015. Baltic Sea Environment Proceedings 151.
- HELCOM 2018b. State of the Baltic Sea: Second HELCOM holistic assessment 2011–2016. Baltic Sea Environment Proceedings 155.
- ICRP 2014. Protection of the environment under different exposure situations. ICRP Publication 124. Annals of the ICRP 43(1).
- Ikonen, A.T.K. & Kangasniemi, V. 2019. A model for radionuclide distribution in the main basins of the Baltic Sea Conceptual framework. Nordic advances and radiation risk estimates advances and uncertainties: Joint NKS-R and NKS-B seminar, Finlandshuset, Stockholm, 15– 16 January 2019. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21189.91366
- Jaeschke, B., Smith, K., Nordén, S. & Alfonso, B. 2016. Assessment of risk to non-human biota from a repository for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel at Forsmark: supplementary information. TR-13-23, updated 2016-05. Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co.
- Maderich, V., Bezhenar, R., Tateda, Y., Aoyama, M. & Tsumune, D. 2018. Similarities and differences of ¹³⁷Cs distributions in the marine environments of the Baltic and Black seas and off the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant in model assessments. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 135: 895–906.
- Posiva 2013. Olkiluoto biosphere description 2012. POSIVA 2012-06. Posiva Oy.
- Schiewer, U. (ed.) 2010. Ecology of Baltic coastal waters. Ecological Studies 197.
- Szefer, P. 2002. Metals, metalloids and radionuclides in the Baltic Sea ecosystem. Trace Metals in the Environment 5.
- Tomczak, M.T., Niiranen, S., Hjerne, O. & Blenckner, T. 2012. Ecosystem flow dynamics in the Baltic Proper using a multi-trophic dataset as a basis for food-web modelling. *Ecological Modelling* 230: 123–147.
- Zalewska, T. & Suplińska, M. 2012. Reference organisms for assessing the impact of ionizing radiation on the environment of the southern Baltic Sea. Oceanological and Hydrobiological Studies 41(4): 1–7.

