



**Unit of Radiation and Cancer  
International Agency for Research on Cancer  
Lyon, France**

## **RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS**

*20 March 2003*

### *FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT*

Principal Investigator:

Elisabeth Cardis

Co-investigators:

V.P. Krjuchkov, L. Anspaugh A. Bouville, V.V. Chumak, V. Drozdovich, Yu. Gavrilin, I. Golovanov, P. Hubert, S. Illychev, V.K. Ivanov, A. Kesminiene, J. Kurtinaitis, E. Maceika, I.V. Malakhova A. K. Mirhaidarov, V.A. Pitkevitch, A. Stengrevics, M. Tekkel, V. Tenet, A. Tsykalo

Grant No:

R01CCR015763 – US CDC

**LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS AND ACRONYMS**

***Belarus***

- Belarussian Centre for Medical Technologies, Computer Systems, Health Care Administration and Management (BelCMT), Minsk
- Research Institute for Oncology and Medical Radiology, Minsk
- Research Clinical Institute of Radiation Medicine and Endocrinology (IRME), Minsk
- Research Institute of Haematology and Blood Transfusion (RIHBT)

***Russia***

- Institute of Biophysics (IB), Moscow
- Medical Radiological Research Centre of Russian Academy of Medical Sciences (MRRC RAMS), Obninsk

***Ukraine***

- Scientific Centre for Radiation Medicine, Kiev
- Department of Dose Reconstruction, Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant, Chernobyl

***Baltic countries***

- Institute of Experimental and Clinical Medicine, Tallinn, Estonia
- Vilnius University Oncology Institute, Vilnius, Lithuania
- Lithuanian Cancer Registry, Vilnius, Lithuania
- Latvian Centre of Oncology, Riga
- Latvian Cancer Registry, Riga

***Outside CIS***

- International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Lyon, France
- Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire, Fontenay-aux-Roses, France
- US National Cancer Institute, Rockville, MD, USA

## Table of contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS	I
LIST OF FIGURES	II
LIST OF TABLES	III
ABSTRACT	V
SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS	VII
USEFULNESS OF FINDINGS	VII
SCIENTIFIC REPORT	1
Background	1
Specific aims	3
Task 1. Compilation of data from various sources	3
1 Data on radiation environment (RE) measurements. Verification of the data.	3
2 Collected visual information about clean up activities of the liquidators in ChNPP (photographs, videotapes).	6
3 Data on individual dose records of the liquidators.	9
4 Data on operative exposure dose-rate measurements (bank of standard episodes)	10
Task 2 - Adaptation and validation of existing dose reconstruction methods for professional radiation workers	10
1 Development of methods for external exposure dose reconstruction for the liquidators.	10
2 Development of the RADRUE method	11
3 SEAD method	22
4 Validation of RADRUE and SEAD methods	24
5 Methods for thyroid dose assessment	27
Task 3 - Collection of data for validation of dose reconstruction method – interviews of persons with dose estimates	30
1 Extension of the case-control study to Baltic countries	30
2 Additional interviews in Russia and Ukraine	32
3 Evaluation of reliability and replicability of answers to the questionnaire	32
Task 4 - Reconstruction of dose and uncertainty for study subjects	35
1 Processing of questionnaire data and entering of data into RADRUE software	35
2 Quality control and checking of the RADRUE experts work	36
3 Calculations of external doses	38
4 Calculation of the internal thyroid exposure doses for the liquidators.	38
5 Distributions of doses among study subjects in the case-control study	39
Discussion	43
Conclusions	44

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

45

BIBLIOGRAPHY

47

### **List of annexes**

ANNEX 1 – RADRUE operational manual - CONFIDENTIAL

ANNEX 2 – Questionnaire of the case-control studies

ANNEX 3 – Interviewer booklet with instructions, maps and photographs



## List of acronyms

RADRUE – Radiation Dose Reconstruction with Uncertainty Estimates;

SEAD – Soft Expert Assessment Dosimetry

ADR – Analytical Dose Reconstruction

EPR- Electron Paramagnetic Resonance

ER – Exposure Rate

GSD – Geometric Standard Deviation

ChNPP – Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant

RE – Radiation Environment

AR – Accident Remediation

DB – Database

IBPh – Institute of Biophysics

NHL - non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma

RBM□ – Red Bone Marrow

TG – Thyroid Gland

## List of figures

Figure 1	70-km zone around ChNPP	6
Figure 2	30-km zone around ChNPP	7
Figure 3	4-km zone around ChNPP	7
Figure 4	ChNPP industrial site	8
Figure 5	The rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP	8
Figure 6	The rooms of Unit 3 and Unit 4 of the ChNPP	8
Figure 7	The ChNPP main building roofs	9
Figure 8	An image of the RADRUE frame dialog window	12
Figure 9	The ER reconstruction methods usage by different places of AR activities	14
Figure 10	Rules for the correlation coefficients	24
Figure 11	Professional: Correlation SEAD dose, ADR (ILL) dose and DVO (device measurements)	25
Figure 12	Military liquidators: Correlation SEAD , ADR and DVO	25
Figure 13	Civilians: comparison of SEAD, ADR (ILL 1 & 2) and EPR doses	25
Figure 14	Comparison chart of the RADRUE and official doses from Russian registry for some of study subjects.	26
Figure 15	Dynamics of concentration of $^{131}\text{I}$ in air above the damaged reactor in April-June 1986.	28
Figure 16	Comparison between RADRUE doses and GPA results.	35
Figure 17	Correlation between RADRUE external dose estimates before and after corrections, for all subjects in the case-control studies, for Belarus and other liquidators separately.	37
Figure 18	Histogram of doses among study subjects	40
Figure 19	Histogram of dose to the thyroid among study subjects	42
Figure 20	Distribution of Geometric Standard Deviation by the median dose estimate (based on 1000 simulations) for each of the subjects included in the case-control study	43

**List of tables**

Table 1	Estimates of collective effective doses among populations exposed as a result of the Chernobyl accident [Cardis <i>et al.</i> , 1996]	1
Table 2	Location of research sites and organizations conducting RE measurements	4
Table 3	Electronic DB on RE description for different zones of AR.	5
Table 4	Parameters of empirical dose distributions for different groups of liquidators.	9
Table 5	List of files for interpolation in 30-km, 70-km and 4-km zone, on the industrial site and ChNPP roofs.	15
Table 6	Nuclide fall-out compound on the 60-th day after the accident.	18
Table 7	Parameters of dose conversion factors distributions	18
Table 8	Estimates of geometric standard deviation, $\beta_g$ associated with values of external $\gamma$ -exposure rate for different sites where liquidators worked, rested or were transported.	20
Table 9	Location factors values used by the RADRUE system.	21
Table 10	Factor weights for different variations in SEAD	23
Table 11	Distribution of subjects by country and case-control status – Leukemia and NHL	32
Table 12	Distribution of cases and controls by country – Thyroid cancer study	33
Table 13	Comparison of dates of start of mission between NCI and IARC questionnaires	33
Table 14	Comparison of answers concerning organisation which sent the subject to the Chernobyl area between NCI and IARC questionnaires	34
Table 15	List of the corrections made in RADRUE after the checking	38
Table 16	Distribution of all study subjects by BM dose category and by country – Leukemia and NHL	39
Table 17	Median BM dose and dose range by country – all subjects– Leukemia and NHL	41
Table 18	Distribution of all study subjects by total thyroid dose category and by country – Thyroid cancer study	41
Table 19	Median total thyroid and dose range by country – all subjects– Thyroid cancer study	41
Table 20	Median internal thyroid doses (I 131) by country – Thyroid cancer study	42
Table 21	Median external thyroid doses– all subjects by country – Thyroid cancer study	42



### Abstract

Case-control studies of leukaemia and non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL) and of thyroid cancer have been carried out, nested within the cohorts of Chernobyl liquidators, the persons who were involved in the clean-up of the Chernobyl accident in 1986 and 1987 in the area around the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, under a contract from the European Commission. The leukaemia and NHL study included 70 cases and 304 matched controls, while the study of thyroid cancer included 73 cases and 309 matched controls.

The majority of liquidators in the studies were exposed predominantly to whole body radiation (from external sources and intake of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ), although substantial dose to the thyroid from iodine isotopes could be received by liquidators who worked in May-June 1986 and who resided in contaminated territories of Belarus.

The main objective of the current project was to develop, test and implement a detailed method for individual dose reconstruction for the subjects in these epidemiological studies. Two different approaches were considered and tested. The method adopted, RADRUE (Radiation Dose Estimation with Uncertainty Estimates), a variant of an analytical dose reconstruction method previously derived for professional radiation workers of the Chernobyl power plant, appears to work well. It is based on detailed time and motion studies, coupled with the use of very comprehensive databases of radiological data.

The development of this method has involved very extensive work to:

1. locate, collate and evaluate very large databases of gamma background measurements made by various organisations at different times on the industrial site and throughout the 30 and 70 km areas around the Chernobyl nuclear power plant;
2. bring together experts knowledgeable about working conditions in different groups of liquidators and formalise and compile their knowledge into an integrated database;
3. develop an integrated software program that allows the calculation of doses and associated uncertainties from a subject's work history;
4. carefully reconstruct itineraries of the study subjects using the information provided in the very detailed study questionnaires.

Extensive validation of the work has been carried out.

The contract also provided funds for the extension of the case-control study to further groups of liquidators in Baltic countries and Russia. This has allowed the evaluation of possible recall difficulties for a number of questions related to work as a liquidator, as the majority of Baltic liquidators had previously been included in a cohort study and had responded to a similar questionnaire. Data from this questionnaire was obtained. Overall, there was good agreement between the answers to the two questionnaires concerning dates and places of work and type of activity performed.

Doses and associated uncertainties were estimated for all of the subjects in the case-control study. Doses to the bone marrow range from close to 0 to over 1 Gy, with a median of 20 mGy. The average geometric standard deviation was of the order of 2. Doses to the bone marrow among Belarus liquidators tended to be much lower (8 mGy) than among Russia liquidators (55). Doses to the thyroid gland ranged from close to 0 to 2 Gy, with a median of about 70 mGy. The highest doses were found for Belarus liquidators who lived and worked in areas of high contamination and are related to ingestion of I-131. For Russian and Baltic country liquidators, doses from ingestion are thought to be close to zero. Doses from inhalation of I-131 were, however, received for liquidators who worked in the first weeks after the accident.

In conclusion, this contract has permitted the development, testing and optimisation of a detailed analytic dose reconstruction method for the estimation of individual doses and related uncertainties for Chernobyl liquidators. The method has been successfully applied to the subjects included in case-control studies of leukaemia, NHL and thyroid cancer among Chernobyl liquidators from Belarus, Russia and Baltic countries. Analyses of these data are underway under a separate contract and results should be submitted for publication in late 2003.

The approach has implications for dose reconstruction in other situations, and may be adapted for populations of workers involved in clean-up of accidents in the future.

### Significant findings

The work has shown that it is possible to reconstruct, with adequate precision for an epidemiological study, individual doses for workers involved in clean-up from detailed time and motion studies. This requires the development and testing of a detailed questionnaire about history and conditions of work, a set of relevant visual aids to assist the subjects in recalling their places of work, the collection and integration of all available dosimetric information and the analysis of work histories from questionnaires by experts familiar with the work and conditions of work in the clean-up areas.

The result is a fully integrated program that can be adapted to include the following: extensive dose-rate measurements, an interface for plotting and entering information on the liquidators route and conditions of work, calculation of individual doses and simulations designed to take into account dosimetric and questionnaire uncertainties. The dose reconstruction method has been tested, validated and optimized, and an approach for assessing uncertainties has been implemented. Though the method must rely on expert assessment of the questionnaires, it was shown to be sufficiently standardized to be reproducible.

### Usefulness of findings

The work has the following important results:

- *The development and validation of methods for assessing individual doses and associated uncertainties for liquidators involved the Chernobyl accident – this is essential for prediction of the consequences of the accident among liquidators, for improving radiation protection measures and emergency preparedness in the case of future accidents, as well as for estimating radiation doses to other populations of workers involved in clean-up and accidental situations in the US and elsewhere.*
- *The reconstruction of individual doses and of their associated uncertainties for the subjects included in the epidemiological studies – this is essential to ensure that the case-control studies provide valuable scientific information concerning the size and pattern of cancer risk following low dose protracted radiation exposure. This work, in addition to contributing to the understanding of mechanisms of radiation carcinogenesis, has important implications, for radiation protection of workers as well as of the general population.*





## Scientific report

### Background

Since the 1950's, routine occupational radiation doses from external photon radiation have been relatively well monitored through the use of personal radiation dosimeters [Fix *et al.*, 1997]. This is not always the case, however, when workers participate in clean-up and decontamination in the course of a nuclear accident or in environmental clean-up in general. This is illustrated by the Chernobyl accident, which happened on 26 April 1986, exposed millions of people to radiation at different dose-rates and dose levels. The majority of exposed persons received relatively low doses (Table 1).

**Table 1** Estimates of collective effective doses among populations exposed as a result of the Chernobyl accident [Cardis *et al.*, 1996]

Population	Number	Collective effective dose (Sv)
Evacuees	135,000	1,600
Liquidators (1986–1987)	200,000	20,000
Persons living in contaminated areas <sup>1</sup> :		
Deposition density of <sup>137</sup> Cs >15 Ci km <sup>-2</sup>	270,000	10,000–20,000
Deposition density of <sup>137</sup> Cs >1 to 15 Ci km <sup>-2</sup>	6,800,000	35,000–100,000

The populations at risk can be separated into the following groups:

1. the “liquidators” □ also referred to as “clean-up workers” □ they include persons who participated in the clean up of the accident (clean-up of the reactor, construction of the sarcophagus, decontamination, building of roads, destruction and burial of contaminated buildings, forests and equipment), as well as many others, including physicians, teachers, cooks, interpreters who worked in the contaminated territories □
2. the “evacuees” □ those who were evacuated from the town of Pripyat and the 30 km zone around the Chernobyl reactor in April-May 1986 □;
3. the residents of the “strict control zones” (SCZ's): those members of the general population who have continued to live in the more heavily contaminated areas (with level of <sup>137</sup>Cs deposition greater than 555 kBq/m<sup>2</sup>), typically within a few hundred kilometers of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. Within these areas, radiation monitoring and preventive measures have been taken to maintain doses within permissible levels;
4. the general population of the contaminated territories in the three countries.

Because of their numbers, comprehensive registration and follow-up system, and because of their levels of radiation dose, the population of Chernobyl accident recovery workers or “liquidators” appears to be the most likely to be informative for the study of risks following low dose protracted radiation exposure [Cardis *et al.*, 1996; Cardis and Okeanov, 1996; Ivanov *et al.*, 1997a].

Liquidation of the Chernobyl accident consequences lasted for about three years and during that period, different tasks were carried out, such as:

<sup>1</sup> These doses are for the 1986–1995 time period; over the longer term (1996–2056), the collective dose will increase by approximately 50%.

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

- the initial localization of the catastrophe (fire fighting, closing down not affected units of the power plant)
- evacuation of the Pripyat and 30-km zone population
- decontamination inside the Chernobyl NPP buildings, roofs of the nearby buildings and nearby territories
- renovation, run up, and maintenance of the first, second and third blocks
- construction of sarcophagus
- actions to decrease the radioactive materials spread in the environment
- safe guard of the 30-km zone and settlements
- other activities in the 30-km zone (health care, ecological monitoring, servicing of the liquidators, etc.)

Different groups of liquidators were involved in these tasks; they worked under differing conditions of radiation monitoring and safety and were exposed to different types and levels of radiation. The group of the liquidators cannot be simply defined only by the type of the work they have undertaken. It is also necessary to take into account which institution sent the liquidator to the 30-km zone, the time period during which they worked there, the organization to which he/she was affiliated while working in the 30-km zone, and how the dosimetric control was organized.

In all, some 600 000 liquidators from all over the former Soviet Union are thought to have participated in the clean-up of the contaminated areas around the reactor and in other areas of Ukraine and Belarus [UNSCEAR 2000]. For practical reasons, not all of these received individual dosimeters. Moreover, logistic difficulties arose in accurately recording and centralising doses for very large numbers of workers sent and monitored by different organisations. As a result, 12 years after the Chernobyl accident, only a small proportion (less than 10%) of the clean-up workers (usually referred to as "liquidators") had reliable estimates of their doses [Pitkevitch et al., 1995, 1996].

Little effort had been put, until this contract began, into the physical reconstruction of individual doses for the majority of liquidators. The exception is for staff of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant (ChNPP) and a limited number of professional radiation workers from other institutions who worked on the industrial site of the plant. For these, much work has gone into the development, validation and application of methods for estimating individual radiation dose based on an analysis of factors involved in the creation and the dynamics of the radiation field at the plant site and in the immediate vicinity of the ChNPP [Illichev et al., 1996].

A large proportion of liquidators involved in the clean-up of the accident were not professional radiation workers, however, but included military reservists and construction workers who worked throughout the 30-km zone around the Chernobyl reactor. Dose-reconstruction methods developed for professional radiation workers therefore needed to be modified to take into account the less precise and accurate knowledge of the place and conditions of work, different exposure conditions and different dosimetric control practices.

The funds received under this contract were for partial support of the development of these methods and for the application of the method to the reconstruction of individual doses and associated uncertainties for subjects included in the case-control studies of risk of leukemia, non-Hodgkin's lymphomas and thyroid cancer carried out among Chernobyl liquidators in Belarus and Russia in a collaborative project co-ordinated by IARC and funded by the European Commission.

To be informative for the evaluation of radiation related risks, these studies must rely on individual estimates of radiation dose. Dosimetry, however, poses an important problem. As mentioned above,

official data regarding individual doses received by liquidators are not available for all liquidators; further, data available for some groups of liquidators require verification [Pitkevitch et al., 1996]. The biological techniques currently available to estimate individual radiation dose are not sufficiently reliable to derive precise and accurate estimate individual doses in the range received by the majority of liquidators [Cardis and Okeanov, 1996]. Work is actively continuing in this area in many laboratories around the world, and better methods may be available in the future. In anticipation of such developments, blood samples have therefore been obtained from consenting study subjects, lymphocytes isolated, frozen and kept at -70 °C until a biological technique exists which is demonstrated to be sufficiently reliable, precise and accurate for estimating low doses in the range of interest.

Currently, and in the foreseeable future, the most promising approach for estimating doses in epidemiological studies is through analytical dose reconstruction based on time and motion studies.

The development and validation of the current analytical dose reconstruction approach has applications for reconstructing doses to other worker populations involved in clean-up or in accidental situations where individual accurate dosimetric control may not always be possible.

### Specific aims

The specific aims of the project were two-fold:

- To adapt the existing methods for assessment of doses for non-professional liquidators having worked in the zone around the ChNPP in 1986 and 1987
- To reconstruct the individual doses (and uncertainty) to the subjects included in the case-control studies of leukaemia, NHL and thyroid cancer among Belarus and Russian liquidators.

The work was divided into four tasks, as follows:

1. Compilation of data from various sources concerning radiation levels, work histories, etc.
2. Adaptation and validation of existing dose reconstruction methods for professional radiation workers on the industrial site of the Chernobyl NPP and calculation of associated uncertainties.
3. Collection of additional questionnaire data for validation of dose reconstruction method.
4. Reconstruction of dose and uncertainty for study subjects.

The methods and procedures used and the results are described for each of these tasks, below.

### Task 1. Compilation of data from various sources

Work under this task involved the collection, critical review and compilation of data from many sources, including data on radiation environment (RE) measurements, dose records, work histories of liquidators' clean up activities and topological maps of the areas where clean up activities took place after the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant (ChNPP) accident. The detail of the information collected is provided below.

#### 1 Data on radiation environment (RE) measurements. Verification of the data.

Available data on instrumental measurements of radiation environment for the period from the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 1986 till the 31<sup>st</sup> of December 1987 have been collected within the framework of the project. On the basis of these data, a system of interactive digital GIS maps of dose-rates for the whole period and for the territories of interest was created and incorporated into a software package specially conceived for this project. This software, called RADRUE (*Radiation Dose Reconstruction with Uncertainty Estimates*) contains all of the collected data in one integrated database, an interface to enter the details about the liquidator's work history, a "calculator" that uses the information entered as well as the data from the database to calculate a central estimate of dose and a link to a Monte Carlo simulation program for uncertainty calculations. Details of the RADRUE system are provided below under Task 2.

Several types of radiation environment data were collected: data on exposure rate (ER), surface activity and nuclide composition measurements. According to the location where the measurements of the RE were made, data is grouped into several sets, which form the so-called “base maps”. The following different base maps were developed: the base map of the main buildings of ChNPP, that of the industrial site of ChNPP, the 4-km zone map, the 30-km zone map and the 70-km zone map.

The measurements compiled were made by different organizations, in different accident remediation (AR) workplaces. The list of organizations that conducted the measurements is presented in Table 2.

The discrete data on the radiation environment for the Ukrainian part of the 30-km and 70-km zones (including the industrial site and the main building of the ChNPP) were aggregated from different sources and verified by ChNPP radiation protection service, in cooperation with the Sosnoviy Bor branch of the Radium Institute. The methodology used for the collection, systematization and checking of the data is described in Sakulin *et al.* [1992].

For the Belorussian part of 30-km and 70 km zones, RADRUE used an electronic database (DB) which was aggregated and verified in the Institute of Biophysics (IBPh), Ministry of Health USSR [Savkin, 1993] by means of integration of measurements made by regional sanitary-and-epidemiological units and regional civil defense offices, as well as by the IBPh complex expedition.

Thus, the data assembled in the developed RADRUE system have been verified and computerized by the relevant organizations. The total number of original measurements for the different locations in the combined database is given in Table 3. The number of records in the table for the 30-km and the 70 km zones are for the Ukrainian and Belorussian parts of these zones.

**Table 2 Location of research sites and organizations conducting RE measurements**

№	Location	Name of organizations which made the measurements [References]
1	30-km zone, 70-km zone	Chemical forces of the MD <sup>2</sup> USSR [MD USSR, 1988]; DMA PA “Combinat” <sup>3</sup> [UDK NPO “Prypiat”, 1987]; External dosimetric service ChNPP [Shteinberg, 1986]; Sub-units of the HMSB <sup>4</sup> USSR [Izrael, 1987]; CA DMD <sup>5</sup> №605 [US-605, 1986]; AUSRPIET <sup>6</sup> [AUSRPIET, 1987]; IBPh MH USSR <sup>7</sup> [Lyubchanskyi <i>et al.</i> , 1988]; Hlopin's Radium institute [Sakulin <i>et al.</i> , 1992]
2	4-km zone	CA ChNPP <sup>8</sup> [US ChNPP, 1986]; AUSRPIET [AUSRPIET, 1987]; IBPh MH USSR [Lyubchanskyi <i>et al.</i> , 1988]; DMA PA “Combinat” [UDK NPO “Prypiat”, 1987]; Chemical forces of the MD USSR [MD USSR, 1988]; Hlopin's Radium institute [Sakulin <i>et al.</i> , 1992]
3	The industrial site	RPD ChNPP <sup>9</sup> [IBPh MH USSR, 1986]; CE <sup>10</sup> Kurchatov's Institute [Shikalov <i>et al.</i> , 2001]; CA DMD №605 [US-605, 1986]; Chemical forces of the MD USSR [MD USSR, 1988];

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Defense of the USSR

<sup>3</sup> Dosimetric monitoring administration of the production association «Combinat»

<sup>4</sup> Hydrography and Meteorology Statutory Board

<sup>5</sup> Construction Administration Dosimetric Monitoring Department

<sup>6</sup> All-Union Scientific Research and Planning Institute of the Energy Technology

<sup>7</sup> Institute of Biophysics, Ministry of Health USSR

<sup>8</sup> Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant Construction Administration

<sup>9</sup> ChNPP Radiation Protection Department

<sup>10</sup> Complex Expedition

№	Location	Name of organizations which made the measurements [References]
		Hlopin's Radium institute [Sakulin <i>et al.</i> , 1992]
4	The rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP	RPD ChNPP [IBPh MH USSR, 1986]; IBPh MH USSR [Lyubchanskyi <i>et al.</i> , 1988]
5	The rooms of Unit 3 and Unit 4 of the ChNPP	RPD ChNPP [IBP MH USSR, 1986], CE Kurchatov's Institute [Shikalov <i>et al.</i> , 2001], CA DMD №605 [US-605, 1986]
6	The ChNPP main building roofs	RE group of the DE USSR <sup>11</sup> [DE USSR, 1987], CE Kurchatov's Institute [Shikalov <i>et al.</i> , 2001], AUSRPIET [AUSRPIET, 1987], IBPh MH USSR [Lyubchanskyi <i>et al.</i> , 1988]

Analysis of the completeness of measurements made in different locations and different time periods showed that information was missing for some time periods and base maps. Information for these had to be reconstructed using a combination of interpolation (which was in fact used as a basic RE reconstruction method) and the following methods: multiple linear regression from early dates after the accident to later dates, dose-rate reconstruction based on radionuclides fall-out density and a 4- dimensional interpolation method (4-D) specially developed during the project for dose reconstruction inside main ChNPP building. The details of dose reconstruction methods are given under Task 2 below.

A database of fall-out density measurements was also created, based on the information from the database of IBPh. This DB includes 312 records. All of these records correspond to June 1989. The DB contains fall-out density values for gamma-emitters <sup>106</sup>Ru, <sup>137</sup>Cs and <sup>144</sup>Ce, which were the main contributors to the radiation background for the period from the end of the year 1986 till the end of year 1987.

**Table 3 Electronic DB on RE description for different zones of AR.**

№	Zone of AR	Number of records	Distance from the Unit 4
1	70-km zone around ChNPP	14091	2 km-168 km
2	30-km zone around ChNPP	8203	2 km – 43 km
3	4-km zone around ChNPP, including Pripyat	461	350 m – 4700 m
4	ChNPP - industrial site	3126	20 m – 1120 m
5	ChNPP - main building	3463	14 m – 930 m
6	ChNPP roofs	1364	40 m – 140 m

The data collected on the experimental measurements on RE in combination with values obtained by regression and interpolation, permit the estimation of dose-rate for each location of interest within the zone of 70-km radius around Unit 4 of ChNPP, at any moment of time during the period from the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 1986 till the end of year 1987 (the period of interest for the epidemiological study of cancer risk among liquidators, for which this dose reconstruction method was developed). The data on RE was included into the integrated database of the RADRUE software and is used

<sup>11</sup>Radiation Exploration of the Department of Energy and Electrification of the USSR

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

automatically by the program in the process of the external exposure dose reconstruction for the liquidators within the study.

2 Collected visual information about clean up activities of the liquidators in ChNPP (photographs, videotapes).

Collected photographs and topographical schemes of the main buildings of the ChNPP, ChNPP industrial site, 4km zone, 30 km zone and 70km zone have been digitized and integrated into the RADRUE software as images in the interactive GIS dose-rate maps. They served as a visual interface for the RADRUE users to facilitate the indication and drawing of the locations and itineraries of each liquidator's activities during his/her missions. The images of digital maps used in the program are presented in Figures 1-7.

Videotapes and photographs reflecting different cleanup activities after the accident were collected and were used for the training of the interviewers and during interviews of the liquidators. Some of the photographs were also included into the Booklet (Annex 3) used by the interviewers to assist the liquidators in describing their work history in the epidemiological study.




Figure 1 70-km zone around ChNPP

RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS




Figure 2 30-km zone around ChNPP






Figure 3 4-km zone around ChNPP




# RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS



**Figure 4 ChNPP industrial site**



**Figure 5 The rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP**



**Figure 6 The rooms of Unit 3 and Unit 4 of the ChNPP**





3 Data on individual dose records of liquidators.

In addition to previously available data, the data of the Specialized State Construction Company US-605, hereafter called US-605, consists of individual dose records for 35 000 liquidators from 1986-1987 from all republics of the former USSR. These data, which have been computerized, include an identification number of the individual (the time card number), the date and time of beginning and end of work and the dose received during this period. Data on several hundreds of these liquidators have been crosschecked with information from the IBPh database on professional liquidators and appear to be correct.

Data on the individual dose records was used to derive dose distributions for the different contingents of the liquidators, which were implemented in the SEAD (*Soft expert Assessment Dosimetry*) program (see Task 2). A summary of the distribution of dose measurements for the different categories of the liquidators is presented in table 4.

**Table 4** Parameters of empirical dose distributions for different groups of liquidators.

Dbf-files (without exclusions)	Number of entries	<D>, cGy	$\sigma$ D	<lgD>	$\sigma$ lgD
Witnesses of accident	658	55.2	41.7	1.61	0.36
Early liquidators	326	11.5	16.93	0.62	0.74
Personnel of ChNPP-86	2358	8.69	12.9	0.65	0.54
Personnel of ChNPP-87	4498	1.54	2.92	-0.005	0.44
Detached to ChNPP-86	608	5.74	9.03	0.27	0.73
Detached to ChNPP-87	3453	0.86	1.89	-0.41	0.55
Detached to the 30 km zone-86	29866	2.52	5.30	-0.16	0.72
Detached to the 30 km zone-87	33620	0.87	1.31	-0.42	0.56
Military liquidators and MIA-86	13791*	20.0	8.65	1.25	0.265

Dbf-files (without exclusions)	Number of entries	$\langle D \rangle$ , cGy	$\sigma D$	$\langle \lg D \rangle$	$\sigma \lg D$
Military liquidators and MIA-87	14368*	10.8	5.92	0.957	0.315
Civil personnel of US-605 in 1986	8351	6.99	8.04	0.42	0.72
Civil personnel of US-605 in 1987	4086	3.75	5.18	0.116	0.70
Military builders from US-605 in 1986	4790	10.8	9.48	0.75	0.63
Military builders from US-605 in 1987	1352	5.92	6.30	0.44	0.64
Combinat personnel in 1987	6281	1.01	1.12	-0.16	0.39
Belarussian liquidators- 86	4956	6.41	5.16	0.64	0.44
Belarussian liquidators- 87	1822	2.53	2.30	0.26	0.35

\* Doses for these groups of liquidators are given in Roentgens.

#### 4 Data on operative exposure dose-rate measurements (bank of standard episodes)

Information on operative exposure dose-rate measurements made before assignment of work in different locations is available from dosimetric journals of the Chernobyl NPP and was verified by officials of ChNPP Dosimetry Service. It includes measurements of exposure dose-rate taken in work sites before the conduct of specific tasks; organization (name, address) to which liquidator was affiliated during cleanup work; type of work; specialty of the liquidator; place of work; dates of work and, in some cases, evaluated average dose per episode. Information on 437 different episodes of work have been computerized and previously used in the reconstruction of dose to professional liquidators.

For the case-control study, the data collected were used in RADRUE to assign doses for liquidators who had performed one of these “standard” work episodes. A special databank of “standard episodes” incorporated into RADRUE ensured the systematization of dose assignment for liquidators by the different experts reviewing the questionnaires.

## Task 2 - Adaptation and validation of existing dose reconstruction methods for professional radiation workers

### 1 Development of methods for external exposure dose reconstruction for the liquidators.

Two approaches were considered for estimating individual external exposure dose for the liquidators in the case-control study:

- RADRUE (Radiation Dose Reconstruction with Uncertainty Estimates);
- SEAD (Soft expert Assessment Dosimetry).

As explained below, RADRUE was selected as the main method for the external exposure doses assessment. RADRUE was developed and formalized within this contract on the basis of the previous analytical dose reconstruction (ADR) method that had been developed and used earlier for evaluation of the dose of liquidators who were professional radiation workers at the ChNPP [Illichev *et al.*, 1996]. That initial ADR method was modified, with the purpose of:

- obtaining more reliable dose estimations through verification and smoothing of the radiation environment data;
- automating dose estimations to decrease the influence of subjective factors (experts influence on outcomes of doses estimation);
- integrating calculation of uncertainties of dose estimations.

Another, more crude method, SEAD, was also developed within the framework of the current project. Based on the results of the validations described below, it was decided not to use it as the main method for dose reconstruction among liquidators as it has a tendency to regress all doses towards the mean of the doses for a particular type of liquidator. It was, however, used to assign doses for a very small number of liquidators in the case-control study, for whom the data collected by questionnaire was insufficient to calculate their doses analytically with RADRUE. For such subjects individual external exposure doses, and ranges of the uncertainties, were assessed using SEAD and later were entered directly into the RADRUE software. Such possibility of direct entry of pre-assessed doses and uncertainties was foreseen in RADRUE software.

## 2 Development of the RADRUE method

During this contract, the procedure for external dose reconstruction using RADRUE was developed and formalized. It is described in the following.

### *Main terms and definitions used in RADRUE system*

The first step of the dose reconstruction procedure in RADRUE is the analysis of the questionnaires in the case-control study and the transfer of information from the questionnaire to the RADRUE software. This step is performed by a small number of experts from the dosimetry services in Ukraine and Belarus, who are very familiar with the dosimetry, radiation protection and working conditions of liquidators from various organizations in different areas of the 30 and 70 km zone. The experts review thoroughly the information collected in the dosimetry part of the questionnaire, and reconstruct the so-called “liquidator's route” (itinerary).

The liquidator's route is the sum of movement patterns of the liquidator, including indications of the movement speed (staying at the same place is considered as a movement with a zero speed). Once reconstructed, the liquidator's route is input into the computer (by means of the graphic interface made on the basis of the Surfer 7.0, computer program). The graphic interface allows the representation of the liquidator's movement patterns on the base maps (Figures 1-7), with indication of the trajectory's attributes (including movement speed, time of beginning and completing of movement, type of transport used) in the special form view, and also all attributes of uncertainties (when the exact date, duration or place is unknown or uncertain). The data entered appear in the RADRUE frame dialog window (see example in Figure 8). RADRUE then calculates the liquidator's dose automatically, from the data thus entered.

Analysis of the questionnaire and characterization of the route is not a simple task, however. While developing questionnaires for liquidators and the RADRUE method, a series of terms was identified; these are used to describe the liquidator's route in RADRUE:

- mission
- episode
- event
- frame
- subframe

There is a hierarchy of routes in the RADRUE system. The highest is the *mission*. A mission is the sum of movement patterns, which completely characterizes the collection of operations of the liquidator during one trip to Chernobyl region (at least within the 30-km or 70-km zone around the reactor). Most liquidators had only one mission, but some of them may have had several missions. In an interval between two missions, the liquidator would have returned home.

The next level of organization is the *episode*. An episode is a route that completely characterizes one of liquidator's operations due to which one of the mission targets is achieved. Usually one episode corresponds to one day in Chernobyl region. One of the reasons for defining the term “episode” is that different liquidators may have had exactly the same episodes; thus, once the

episode is described, the same description can be used repeatedly for other liquidators. The episode has a certain logical completeness and due to this may be repeated. The episode cannot be described as a sum of two or more episodes. The same episode can be frequently repeated for one liquidator. Examples of episodes include: the trip along the route Chernobyl - Pripyat – Chernobyl for liquidators who were truck drivers, or cleaning the reactor debris from the roof of the Units 3-4 turbine hall. The RADRUE system considers the participation (mission) of the liquidator in AR as a sum of separate episodes.

The screenshot shows the RADRUE frame dialog window with the following fields and values:

- Identificator:** 13088
- Name:** (empty)
- Mission #:** 1
- Period:** 05.06.1986 - 15.06.1986
- Episode #:** 1
- Repeated:** 5
- Period:** 05.06.1986 ± 5 - 09.06.1986 ±
- Frame #:** 1
- Repeated:** 2
- Time:** 0:00:00 - 0:40:00 ± %
- Type of place:** 70-км зона
- Fragment of map:** (empty)
- Place of operation:** Хойники - граница 30-км зоны
- Operation (work):** Перемещение по 70-км зоне
- Location factor:** Автобус
- Modifying coefficient:** Обычные условия
- Dose rate:** 2,14
- Point dose:** 0,41
- Uncertainty:** 2,71
- Interval of doses:** min 0,17 max 1,01
- Comment:** (empty)

Figure 8 An image of the RADRUE frame dialog window

Any episode can be described as a series of *events*, which are the following:

- transportation (from the place of residence to the place of work or vice-versa, from one workplace to other),
- changing of clothes,
- instructions period, where appropriate,
- walking to a workplace,
- the work (on the spot or in motion),
- resting at workplace or waiting for an assignment,
- lunch,
- resting at place of residence during AR.

The reason for defining the term “event” is the high events frequency in questionnaires.

The RADRUE system uses a number of base maps, and one event connected with transportation may occur on one, two and more base maps. That's why in RADRUE system the concept of “*frame*” has been introduced. The frame depicts the sum of a person's movement patterns within one base map as well as their attributes. If movement parameters vary, the frame is broken into two so that each frame is associated with constant attributes. Each episode of each mission of a

liquidator is represented as the sum of a number of frames. If the person's movement pattern is located within only one base map and if the movement attributes are constant, then "the event" will correspond to one frame. In other cases, the event will be broken down into several frames. Unlike a logically completed episode the frame is characterized by invariability of base map and attributes.

The final term used is the *subframe*. This term is invisible for the RADRUE computer program user but very important for understanding the uncertainty estimations. For every base map in RADRUE system there are several grids of dose-rates. One grid works within a given time interval. For each frame the appropriate grid is chosen according to frame's attributes. Each base map and grid is divided into 10,000 cells (subframes) (100×100). The dose-rate within one cell is a constant value for one grid. The computer uses the values of dose-rates that correspond to the cells of the appropriate grid the trajectory passes through. Together with the grids, the RADRUE system uses other means to describe radiation environment like analytic formulas, for example. It is important to understand that the term "subframe" is connected not only with grids but also with all other means of description.

*The event* and *frame* are the basic terms in RADRUE system. The first term describes some elementary liquidator's action from the logical point of view, and the second – from the point of view of RADRUE computer program. The discrepancy of elementary actions from these two points is the result of using several local base maps instead of one universal base map. Creating the event's template can eliminate this discrepancy. In this case the frames are used only while creating the event's template, and then the initial data is inputted to computer in parts that correspond to the events, but not to frames.

The events usually follow each other. The same thing is with frames. But there are two important exceptions to general rules.

1. In case the exact route is unclear, it is possible to enter **alternative events** – the RADRUE program will then have, for the same event, two different descriptions. Example: liquidator could have gone from Pripyat to Kopachi using either road #1 or road #2. The liquidator could take only one of these roads, but the expert is unsure which one it was. Both events are therefore entered and given a probability (see the Operations Manual in Annex 1).
2. If there were two sources of radiation at the same time – for example the liquidator was driving a contaminated car in the 30-km zone around ChNPP. He was then being exposed by two irradiation sources at the same time - radionuclides dispersed on the ground and on the surface of the car. Two frames are then used to describe that liquidator's exposure. The first frame describes the ground surface effect, the second the effect of the surface contamination of the car. The duration of the first frame is used in the calculations that ensure that the 24 hours in the day are accounted for (between work, transport, meals and rest). The second frame, however, is a "parallel frame" and its duration is not taken into account in the 24 hours calculations.

The RADRUE method makes it possible to manually input the dose-rate in case the expert does not agree with ER value offered by the program. The expert must however include a comment to identify this and justify his reasons.

### *Evaluation of the person's external exposure dose*

A person's **exposure dose**,  $X$ , for a frame is calculated as follows:

$$X = n \times \dot{X} \times t, \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  denotes the repetition factor (i.e. the number of times the frame was repeated within the episode, unitless),  $\dot{X}$  the average-exposure dose-rate for that frame (in mR h<sup>-1</sup>) and  $t$  the time spent to accomplish the activity described within the frame (in hours). A person's **total exposure** can be thought of as a sum of all frames defined for that person, although the actual process of "summing"

the total exposure is more complicated due to the Monte Carlo simulation that is used to define uncertainties and to derive this sum. A person's dose is then defined in terms of **air kerma**,  $K$ , as:

$$K = C \times X, \quad (2)$$

where  $C$  is a constant equal to  $0.00875 \text{ mGy mR}^{-1}$ . Based upon assumptions on the energy spectrum of the field, values of  $K$  can be converted to other quantities such as effective dose or dose to the red bone marrow. Air kerma is also the agreed upon standard to be used for the comparison of calculated doses versus those derived from electron paramagnetic resonance measurements of teeth or bone (one of the approaches used to check the adequacy of the RADRUE estimation process).

#### *Exposure dose-rate reconstruction for the RADRUE base maps*

As mentioned under Task 1 above, the RADRUE system uses the following base maps:

- From 30-km to 70-km zone around ChNPP,
- From 4-km to 30-km zone around ChNPP,
- From industrial site boundary to 4-km zone around ChNPP,
- ChNPP industrial site,
- The rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP
- The rooms of Unit 3 and Unit 4 of the ChNPP
- The ChNPP main building roofs

Reconstruction of the RE for the locations and itineraries of a liquidator is done automatically by the RADRUE program and independently in each of the 7 base maps. Each base map includes a set of files with smoothed dose-rate sub-maps, which correspond to different time periods. Those smoothed sub-maps of dose-rates were obtained from the point experimental measurements by applying several interpolation or extrapolation methods. Figure 9 summarizes the ER reconstruction methods used for different places of AR activities and for different periods following the accident.

70-km zone	30-km zone	4-km zone	Period, Days after Chernobyl accident	The industrial site	Unit 1 and Unit 2	ChNPP roofs
Kriging- interpolation	Kriging- interpolation	Kriging- interpolation	0-100	Kriging- interpolation	4-D interpolation	No works
		Regression	101-130			Kriging- interpolation
			131-140			
	141-160					
	161-220		Trend function			
	221-611		Regression			
Fall-out density						

**Figure 9 The ER reconstruction methods usage by different places of AR activities**

Table 5 shows the list of files used for these estimations and the number of points (measurements) contained in each. Each file is made for such a time period that allows to get a sufficient number of

points for interpolation/extrapolation for any site of 70-km, 30-km, 4-km zones and buildings or industrial site of ChNPP. The filename reflects the time period of the data contained.

### 30-km zone around ChNPP

The DB on 30-km zone that contains 8203 records is divided into 25 data files. ER interpolation was conducted by means of Surfer 7.0 application package. The Kriging method was used for interpolation. Kriging is an unbiased, minimum variance method of data interpolation that may or may not be performed on a regularly spaced grid. The smoothing Kriging version was used. The point searching method is quadrant without anisotropy. The logarithm of the ER was interpolated, not the ER value itself. As mentioned above, this interpolation method, in comparison with ER interpolation this interpolation method gives better results in high ER gradient conditions [Illychev et al, 1996]. ER co-ordinates equal records were averaged. Linear and nugget effect models were used. The models' parameters were defined right before the interpolation. The grids were of standard sizes: 100×100 cells (in the RADRUE terms – subframes). For better adjustment of the interpolation results on 30-km zone with the results on 4-km zone, the initial data (measured ER) on 4-km zone was added to the file of initial data on 30-km zone (taking into account time periods).

Starting from the 141th day till the 615th day after the accident there were not enough ER measurements within the 30-km zone. Dose estimation for this time period was made basing on density of the quite long-living radionuclides such as  $^{106}\text{Ru}$ ,  $^{134}\text{Cs}$ ,  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{144}\text{Ce}$  fall-out. The ER dynamics was calculated based on already available conversion factors, taking into account the radionuclides fall-out and ground deepening [Izrael, 1990]. The model of plane unending source screened by 1-meter air layer was used.

The Kriging method was used for the starting time period and for the later periods the exposure rates were estimated on fall-out density.

**Table 5** List of files for interpolation in 30-km, 70-km and 4-km zone, on the industrial site and ChNPP roofs.

File	Period, Days	N
30-km zone around ChNPP		
0-3.dat	1-2	225
2-4.dat	3-4	252
4-6.dat	5-6	267
6-8.dat	7-8	503
8-10.dat	9-10	307
10-12.dat	11-12	219
12-15.dat	13-15	397
15-18.dat	16-18	482
18-21.dat	19-21	379
19-24.dat	20-24	439
24-29.dat	25-29	369
27-30.dat	28-30	250
30-40.dat	31-40	325
40-45.dat	41-45	138
45-50.dat	46-50	168
50-55.dat	51-55	118
55-60.dat	56-60	146
60-65.dat	61-65	167
65-75.dat	66-75	394
75-85.dat	76-85	330
85-90.dat	86-90	152
90-110.dat	91-110	461



# RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

File	Period, Days	N
110-120.dat	111-120	364
120-130.dat	121-130	512
130-140.dat	131-140	438
70-km zone		
1-10.slk	1-10	1679
10-20.slk	11-20	1736
20-30.slk	21-30	871
30-50.slk	31-50	956
50-70.slk	51-70	1165
70-90.slk	71-90	2137
90-110.slk	91-110	770
110-130.slk	111-130	1716
130-150.slk	131-150	1260
150-200.slk	151-200	1317
200-270.slk	201-270	327
270-360.slk	271-360	46
360-450.slk	361-450	48
450-600.slk	451-600	63
4-km zone around ChNPP		
bd_4km_1-9_right.dat	1-9	183
bd_4km_10-35_right.dat	10-35	190
bd_4km_35-60_right.dat	36-60	352
bd_4km_ff_60-100_right.dat	61-100	321
The ChNPP industrial site		
prom_0-1_right.dat	1	74
prom_1-2.dat	2	42
prom_2-4.dat	3-4	51
prom_4-14.dat	5-14	86
prom_14-22.dat	15-22	53
prom_22-27.dat	23-27	146
Prom_27-32-right.dat	28-32	157
prom_32-38-r.dat	33-38	238
prom_38-45-r.dat	39-45	328
Prom_45-50-r.dat	46-50	258
Prom_50-60-r.dat	51-60	529
Prom_60-70-r.dat	61-70	303
Prom_70-85.dat	71-85	446
Prom_85-90.dat	86-90	189
Prom_90-120.dat	91-120	286
Prom_120-130.dat	121-130	86
Prom_130-160_right.dat	131-160	40
Prom_350-374_right.dat	351-374	366
Prom_725_right.dat	725	306
The ChNPP roofs		
Digit_rad_09_86_right.dat	100-158	527
Digit_rad_10_86_right.dat	159-359	93
Digit_rad_20_04_87_right.dat	360-387	201
Digit_rad_05_87_right.dat	388-445	255
Roof1.dat	446-615	332



70-km zone around ChNPP

DB on 70-km zone contains 6888 records divided on 14 data files. For better interpolation results the DB records on 70-km zone were combined with those of 30-km zone (8203 records). The filename reflects the time period of the contained data. Table 5 shows the list of files and the number of points contained in each. Each file is made for a time period that allows getting a sufficient number of points for any site of 70-km zone. 124 ER values from Table 5 were added to the last five ER measurements files. These values were calculated using radiation pollution density by the method described above. They were added because of the lack of ER value records for some sites of the 70-km zone. The ER interpolation was made using the Surfer 7.0 application package.

4-km zone around ChNPP

The DB on the 4-km zone contains 461 records and data from the industrial site DB. DB is divided on 4 data files. The list of files and the number of points contained in each are given in Table 5. Each file is made for such a time period that allows getting a sufficient number of points for any site of 4-km zone. Kriging interpolation method was applied. Because of insufficient data, a multiple regression has been used for time period of 101-615 days (till the end of 1987).

ChNPP industrial site

The DB on the ChNPP industrial site contains 3126 records and it is divided on 18 data files. The filename reflects the time period during which the measurements were made. The list of files and the number of points contained in each are given in Table 5. Each file is made for such a time period that allows to get a sufficient number of points for any site of the Industrial Site. Kriging interpolation method was used. The ChNPP industrial site data were directly used only for interpolation itself in the time period of 1-160 day after the accident. Starting from day 161 after the accident, there were only two short time intervals that contained large enough number of ER records from the industrial site. These maps have been used together with days 1-160 maps and by means of the Excel "trend-function" for estimation of ER dynamics in the period of 161-615 day after the accident (31 December 1987). Trend-function has also been used for all time intervals with the exception of the first day of accident.

ChNPP roofs

The DB on the ChNPP roofs contains 1364 records and it is divided on 5 data files. The list of files and the number of points contained in each are given in Table 5. Unlike industrial site, 4-km, 30-km, 70-km zone files, the roof files contain ER values that were measured within one workday. The records on these maps were done accordingly on 4 September and 1 October 1986, 20 April, 18 May and 15 June 1987. Kriging was used for the spatial interpolation of the dose-rates. In the current RADRUE version, the RE on the roofs is considered to correspond to discrete time periods as shown in Table 5. Trend-function has also been used for all time intervals.

The rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP

Unlike all other base maps, ER reconstruction in the rooms of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the ChNPP needs another approach, because Kriging and other standard interpolation methods work only in two dimensions. For the inside of the ChNPP building a simple 4-D interpolation method has been invented. This method is similar to 2-D method of inverse distance zero degree (weight dependence inversely to a distance in zero degree). There were 3463 measurements inside ChNPP main building within the 1-220 days interval after the accident. For each point for which an interpolation was needed, the 5 nearest neighbor records were taken. To find the distance between the points  $(x_1, y_1, z_1, t_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2, z_2, t_2)$  the Mahalanobis distance (m) was used.

A different approximation was preferable for later time periods (from 220 days after the accident -1 December 1986) on Unit 4. In this case the exposure dose-rate logarithm P at point with co-

ordinates (x, y, z, t) is defined by a non-linear interpolation function with empirically fitted coefficients.

All basic maps of doses rates were reviewed by the panel of experts, guided by A.Tsykalo. Data was confirmed to be consistent with official documents, as well as with the personal notes of dose-rate measurements held by the expert.

***Dose factors for conversion from air kerma to dose for red bone marrow and thyroid gland***

The RADRUE calculation program estimates exposure dose. For the purpose of the epidemiological study, it was required to estimate the dose to the red bone marrow and to some other specific organs. Parameters of the distributions of air-kerma to organ-doses ratios were derived.

It was shown that the conversion ratios quasi don't depend on the time period. Therefore calculations were done for the 60th day after the accident on the Unit 4 on ChNPP. It was presumed that radionuclide composition listed in Table 6 was typical for that day. The second and the fourth columns give the radionuclide's relative activity (100% is the summary radionuclide's activity at the moment of the accident).

From [Ilyin *et al.*, 1995] it was known that the geometry of irradiation of liquidators can be considered as a combination of directed, isotropic and rotational irradiation. The contribution of each geometry depended on the concrete place of work, as well as on whether the activity of the liquidator in a given place was connected to environmental radioactivity or not. The latter means, that for the liquidator occupied with cleaning of sources of radioactivity, with radiation survey or construction of protective barriers, the main geometry of irradiation would be anterior-posterior since the liquidator is generally facing the main source. In cases when the activity of the liquidator is not connected to radioactivity, the geometry of irradiation was assumed to be close to rotational.

**Table 6 Nuclide fall-out compound on the 60-th day after the accident.**

Radionuclide	Activity, %	Radionuclide	Activity, %
Ba-140	1.0	Pm-147	0.5
Ce-141	1.0	Ru-103/Rh-103M	1.0
Ce-144/Pr-144	2.8	Ru-106/Rh-106	1.7
Cs-134	0.4	Sr-90/Y-90	2.6
Cs-137/Ba-137M	0.8	Zr-95/Nb-95M	1.8
Nb-95	2.7		

Based on these considerations, and in order to simplify the calculations, it was decided to allocate two geometry of irradiation depending on whether the liquidator was on the roofs or not.

On the roofs, the geometry of irradiation was considered a combination of AP and rotational geometry; in all other cases the geometry of an irradiation was considered as mixture of rotational and isotropic. It was clear, however, that on the industrial site and on Unit 4 of the ChNPP cases of AP irradiation were possible; this was solved by postulating a distribution for the conversion factors, taking into account the likelihood of such irradiations. The chosen distributions and their parameters are given in Table 7.

**Table 7 Parameters of dose conversion factors distributions**

Organ	Everything, except for roofs	The roofs
RBM	normal distribution; mean=0.72; $\sigma$ =0.07	normal distribution; mean=0.77; $\sigma$ =0.08
Thyroid Gland	normal distribution; mean=0.80; $\sigma$ =0.16	lognormal distribution; mean=0.86; $\beta$ =1.34

The values and distributions of the conversion factors satisfy the following criteria, which were established after examination of experimental measurements on spatial distributions and spectrums of radiation [Kotchetkov *et al.*, 1992; Troshin *et al.*, 1992; ICRP, 1975; Jacob *et al.*, 1990]

- the values of dose conversion factors for the roofs (RBM and TG) is more than factors for other places of work,
- the standard deviation of dose conversion factors distributions should be more than 5 % for RBM and 13 % for TG,
- the average value of dose conversion factors should be in limits from 0.69 till 0.77 for RBM and in limits from 0.73 till 1.0 for TG,
- the most part of probability of values of dose conversion factors should fall in the intervals 0.69-0.77 for RBM and 0.73-1.00 for TG,
- the values of dose conversion factors for TG on the average should be greater than those for RBM,
- the standard deviation for distribution of dose conversion factors on the ChNPP roofs should be higher, than the standard deviation in other places of works,
- on average, conditions of irradiation are the closest to rotational geometry, even for roofs ChNPP,
- the value of dose conversion factor is higher in places where there was more scattered radiation.

### ***Dose uncertainty estimation***

The RADRUE system includes a program, which consists of two modules: CALCULATOR and SIMULATOR. CALCULATOR allows the description of the liquidators route, the attribution of frame describing uncertainties in non-standard situations and also provides central dose estimates. SIMULATOR automatically calculates dose uncertainties. Below are described the different dose uncertainty estimations stages.

### ***Uncertainty in the ER estimations***

A key assumption in the ER estimations is that the ER values from any liquidator workplace point are distributed according to a lognormal distribution. This assumption is right with all ER reconstruction methods: Kriging method, interpolation or extrapolation, estimation based on available radionuclides fall-out. In accordance with our assumption, the estimation of ER reconstructed values is associated with a geometric standard deviation  $\beta_g$ .

The GSD estimation procedure is as follows. One ER records was consecutively excluded from every file. Then the ER value for the excluded point was reconstructed. Then these reconstructed and measured ER values were compared and the difference between reconstructed ER value logarithm and measured ER value logarithm was found. The procedure was repeated for the next point until the procedure was done for all points from current file (each time only one point was excluded). So if the file contains  $n$  experimental points, then a subset of  $n$  differences is formed. For this subset, the GSD value was found and was then used as a parameter of the potential dose distribution for every point on the base map corresponding to the file used. As the uncertainty of measured ER value is much less then the uncertainty of the reconstructed ER value this procedure has been chosen quite properly. The calculated GSD values are given in Table 8. In case of Kriging interpolation there are several data files for each base map. For this case Table 8 gives average GSD values. For interpolation, regression extrapolation and 4-D interpolation there is only one file for each base map. For this case Table 8 gives exact  $\beta_g$  values.

**Table 8** Estimates of geometric standard deviation,  $\beta_g$  associated with values of external  $\gamma$ -exposure rate for different sites where liquidators worked, rested or were transported.

Map type	$\beta_g$	Time of validity, day	Method
Roof	2.17	3 August – 30 September 1986	Kriging
	2.25	1 October 1986 – 19 April 1987	Kriging
	2.26	20 April 1987-17 May 1987	Kriging
	2.99	18 May 1987-14 July 1987	Kriging
	2.01	After 15 July 1987	Kriging
ChNPP	3.58	26 April 1986 – 1 December 1986	4-D interpolation
building	4.78	2 December 1986 – 31 December 1987	Extrapolation by Regression
	2.77	Until 2 October 1986	Kriging
Industrial Site	3.27	After 2 October 1986	Kriging+trend function
	2.98	26 April 1986 – 3 August 1986	Kriging
4-km zone	4.31	After 3 August 1986	Extrapolation by Regression
30-km zone	2.64	26 April 1986 – 12 September 1986	Kriging
	1.67	After 12 September 1986	Analitical Formula
70-km zone	2.71	26 April 1986 – 31 December 1987	Kriging

The uncertainty estimation for ER reconstruction through fall-out density was done in a different way. In this case the records in 30-km zone settlements were chosen at random and ER in these points was reconstructed based on fall-out density of available isotopic composition. After that, the uncertainty estimation procedure was no different from that used for the other methods.

#### Frames uncertainty estimations

Each subframe consists of one grid in a map. For an individual frame, there may be only one subframe, but for movements there may be many subframes. There obviously exists a spatial correlation of the exposure rate in one subframe with the exposure rate in another. For the industrial site and the 30-km zone, for example, the lengths of one of the 10,000 cells in the map grid are equal to 20 m and 600 m, respectively, and the spatial correlation between exposure rates in cells assumed to be of an exponential form:

$$\text{corr}(R) = \exp\left(\frac{-R}{k}\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $R$  is the distance between points and  $k$  is equal to 500 m and 4000 m, respectively, for the Industrial zone and the 30-km zone. Thus, the coefficients of correlation for the industrial site and the 30-km zone were found to be 0.96 and 0.86, respectively. A general value of 0.9 for this coefficient has been accepted provisionally for all maps.

Let GSD for exposure rate on the current base map be equal to  $\beta_{g0}$  and  $\beta_{g0} = \exp(\sigma_0)$ . Let also the movement trajectory pass through the series of the “subframes” (grid’s cells) consisting of  $N$  subframes. At first we’ll consider some  $i$ -th grid’s cell  $(p_i, q_i)$ , where  $(p_i, q_i)$  a couple of numbers, which define the position of the  $i$ -th grid’s cell, in X-direction or in Y-direction, correspondingly. Let the geometric mean of the exposure corresponding to the part of the trajectory passing through the chosen  $i$ -th cell be equal to  $D_{gpqi}$  and the GSD value of this exposure be equal to the GSD value of the exposure rate on the current base map, i.e.  $\beta_{g0}$ . Then the average dose  $\langle D_{pqi} \rangle$  for exposure,

which liquidator receives when passing the subframe  $(p_i, q_i)$  and the standard deviation for this exposure  $\sigma_{D_{p_i q_i}}$  are equal to:

$$\langle D_{p_i q_i} \rangle = D_{g p_i q_i} \exp(\sigma_0^2 / 2), \quad \sigma_{D_{p_i q_i}}^2 = [D_{g p_i q_i} \cdot \exp(\sigma_0^2 / 2)]^2 \cdot [\exp(\sigma_0^2) - 1] \quad (4)$$

Total frame average dose  $\langle D \rangle$  and total frame standard deviation  $\sigma_D$  are calculated according to the following:

$$\langle D \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle D_{p_i q_i} \rangle, \quad \sigma_D^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (0.9)^{\sqrt{(p_i - p_j)^2 + (q_i - q_j)^2}} \cdot \sigma_{D_{p_i q_i}} \cdot \sigma_{D_{p_j q_j}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $(p_i, q_i)$  and  $(p_j, q_j)$  a couple of numbers, which define the position of the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th grid cell, in X-direction or in Y-direction, correspondingly.

Finally (this follows directly from the form (4) while the summary frame dose consider to be a logarithmically normal value), uncertainty on the whole frame is equal to:

$$\beta_{\Sigma} = \exp(\sigma_{\Sigma}^2), \text{ where } \sigma_{\Sigma}^2 = \ln[1 + (\frac{\sigma_D}{\langle D \rangle})^2], \quad (6)$$

where  $\langle D \rangle$  and  $\sigma_D$  are calculated according to the form (5).

### Uncertainty in time spent in various activities

A further source of uncertainty is the amount of time a person spent executing each task or activity (including resting and sleeping). The dosimetry subcommittee for the epidemiological study decided to assume the time spent for each task or activity could be described by a uniform distribution with the distribution centre on the value provided by the interviewed person. The lower time limit is equal to 0.9 and the upper time limit to 1.1 of the stated time (it is noted that the range of uncertainties will be broadened for some subjects, based on the level of detail available in the questionnaire - the epidemiologists are currently working on these distributions).

Note: the duration of the final activity of the day (including resting and sleeping) is not given a distribution as it is adjusted to make sure that the total duration of the day is 24 hours.

### Uncertainty in location factor

For the persons traveling in vehicles or for persons who worked in lead-shielded clothing a shielding factor ("location factor") is taken into account by RADRUE in calculating the dose. This shielding factor was considered to have a normal distribution. The standard deviation was assumed to have a value equal to 0.25 from the best estimate. The location factors values used by the RADRUE system are listed in Table 9.

**Table 9 Location factors values used by the RADRUE system.**

Location	Factor	Location	Factor
Man on the open air	1,00	Helicopter, h=100 meters	0,04
Tent	1,00	Adobe (wooden) house	0,11
Motorcycle	1,00	ATC <sup>1</sup>	0,017
A man in the lead apron	0,67	ALTC <sup>2</sup>	0,017
Car	0,50	Country brick house (cottage)	0,07
Bus	0,29	Brick multi-storey building	0,03
Truck	0,29	Reinforced concrete multi-storey building	0,03
Helicopter, h=10 meters	0,36	EOCM <sup>3</sup>	0,01
Helicopter, h=20 meters	0,14	CEFM <sup>4</sup>	0,01
Helicopter, h=30 meters	0,11	Bathyscaph <sup>5</sup>	0,0005
Helicopter, h=50 meters	0,08	Demag <sup>6</sup>	0,0003

<sup>1)</sup> armoured troop-carrier,

<sup>2)</sup> armoured landing troop-carrier,

<sup>3)</sup> engineering obstacle clearing machine,

<sup>4)</sup> chemical exploring fighting machine,

<sup>5)</sup> Exploring device used for the high ER values conditions moving by means of the lifting crane «Demag».

<sup>6)</sup> The operator's workplace on the lifting crane «Demag».

## Uncertainty due to special situations

There were additional uncertainties in liquidator's dose estimations when the liquidator could not recall the dates of a mission, the location of his workplace or the number of repetitions of this or that activity when working on AR. For these cases rules were developed in RADRUE, which the experts had to obey when entering initial data into the computer. These rules are specified as experts' instruction in the Operation Manual. If the beginning work date is known roughly (with  $\pm k_b$  days error) and the ending work date is known roughly ( $\pm k_e$ ), then the SGD value  $\beta_{g0}$  will be increased:

$$\beta_g = 0.5 \cdot \beta_{g0} \cdot [\exp(0.02 \cdot k_b) + \exp(0.02 \cdot k_e)] \quad (7)$$

The form (7) was found by means of the regression analysis of the ER time dependences in different 30-km zone points and was extended on all other base maps.

## Correlations in RADRUE

An episode dose is a summary of separate frame doses, which are taken in RADRUE as random values.

Frame parameters can be unambiguously defined through a subset of 4 numbers (values): ( $N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4$ ), where  $N_1$ - the mission number,  $N_2$  – episode number,  $N_3$  –frame sequence number.  $N_4$  characterises parameter type: exposure dose-rate  $P$ , task time  $T$  or the location factor value  $ShF$ . If  $N_4=1$ , then it is equal to  $P$ , if  $N_4=2$ , then it is equal to  $T$ , if  $N_4=3$ , then it is equal to  $ShF$ . If we have two parameters subsets for two frames ( $N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4$ ) and ( $N_1', N_2', N_3', N_4'$ ), then correlation coefficient for either pair of these frames  $CC_{N_1, N_2, N_3, N_4}^{N_1', N_2', N_3', N_4'}$  are calculated based on the rules

summarized in Figure 10.

If a person goes on more than one mission, there is generally a substantial separation in time between the missions, and typically the missions are also separated geographically. Therefore, the assumption is made that there is no correlation among the exposures received during different missions. That is, the correlation coefficient is set equal to 0.

For the performance of a single episode, there may be many frames involved. For the purpose of the simulation, it is assumed that the exposure rates in all frames except the one(s) for the resting and sleeping period(s) are perfectly correlated.

If a person performs the same episode multiple times during the same mission, then the assumption is made that the exposure rates experienced are perfectly correlated, that is, the correlation coefficient is assumed equal to 1.0. It is also assumed that the values of the shielding factors in the simulation are correlated perfectly. However, a separate simulation is performed for the duration of the activity for each day the activity was repeated.

If a person performs different types of episodes during the same mission, it is assumed that the correlation among the different types of episodes is equal to 0.

## 3 SEAD method

The alternative dose reconstruction method considered in this project, SEAD, relies on the use of determinant analysis, taking into account the answers of the liquidator to the questionnaire. In this method, liquidators are classified according to the period in which they worked and the institution which sent them to the Chernobyl area in order to derive more uniform groupings (categories) of

individuals with similar working conditions and dosimetry control (factors which are determinant for dose formation), e.g. drivers, dosimetrists, management etc.

Then, a set of parameters (factors) which may influence the dose within the group needs to be determined. Factors to be considered include: time of beginning of clean-up activities, type of work in the Chernobyl area, organization which sent the liquidator to the zone, place and duration of work, personal perception of exposure, attitude to the performed task. The reliability of answers obtained from the questionnaire is assessed by experts familiar with the work and taken into account in this step.

The dose  $D$  received by a liquidator is determined as a function of these factors as follows:

$$\ln(\rho D) + \rho D = f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_n$$

The parameters of this function are estimated by fitting this model to data on specific liquidators under study for whom individual dose measurements are available. Since each category of liquidators has its own peculiarities, “calibration” of the factors needs to be performed separately for each category.

Initially SEAD method was using the same weights for all of the modifying factors. Later the method was improved by allowing assigning different weights for the different modification factors. Different sets of values of the weight were assessed (see Table 10) and a new SEAD software was created.


Good agreement was initially demonstrated between SEAD with new weights and other dose estimates. This agreement, however, was based on estimation of the weights on the subjects on whom the method was being tested. Despite extensive searches, no sufficiently large and detailed databases had been found to allow the independent estimation of the importance of the different modifying factors.

Following extensive discussions, it was decided to abandon the SEAD method for two reasons:

- in its current form, the method had a tendency to regress all dose estimates towards the mean of the distribution in that group (this is normal as the distribution of doses in each “group” of liquidators was characterized and subjects are initially assigned the geometric average, and then their dose may be increased or decreased by the expert depending on a number of factors)
- absence of independent data to estimate the weights given to the modifying factors.

**Table 10 Factor weights for different variations in SEAD**

N	Name of variant	Factor Weights											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Method of Likert	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Automation	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5	x6	x7	x8	x9	x10	x11	x12
3	Likert without psi-factors	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
4	ADR	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	DEA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	Regression	1/4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	Direction+Regression (1)	1/2	1/2	1	1/2	1	1/2	1/2	0	0	0	0	1
8	Direction+Regression (2)	1/4	1/4	1	1/4	1	1/4	1/4	0	0	0	0	1
9	Correlation model	1/4	1/4	1	1/4	1	1/4	1/4	0	0	0	0	1



**Figure 10** Rules for the correlation coefficients

## 4 Validation of RADRUE and SEAD methods

A number of validations were carried out to assess the adequacy of the methods, by applying them to various sets of liquidators with reliable alternative doses estimates:

These validations involved identification of liquidators with reliable dose estimates, tracing of these subjects, interviewing those willing to participate using the case-control study questionnaire and application of the initial ADR, SEAD and RADRUE methods to the calculation of their individual doses.

The “gold standard” used depended on the group of liquidators: official dose records or doses reconstructed by method of measuring electron spin resonance signals, induced by the liquidators’ tooth enamel. The EPR method is sensitive to influence of X-rays, therefore efforts had been made to identify persons who did not have prior dental X-rays and history of occupational radiation exposures. However, high EPR doses were found for some liquidators who, on the basis of the questionnaire data provided, were unlikely to have received such doses. EPR techniques were improved by separating the enamel into buccal and lingual parts. EPR doses were then measured for both parts separately. If the doses for the two parts of the teeth were significantly different, it was an indication, that person received significant dental X-rays dose. It helped to trace liquidators with the high prior dental X-rays dose and to exclude such tooth from the analysis.




The first set of validations showed that ADR (the predecessor to RADRUE) and SEAD methods performed reasonably well for liquidators who were professional radiation workers (Figure 11). Note that this is the group of liquidators for whom the method was initially developed.

For Military liquidators, the agreement between the reconstructed doses and the official doses was not good – particularly for ADR (ILLin Fig. 12). For civilian liquidators, there was little relation between the SEAD and ADR doses and the EPR doses (Fig. 13). The EPR doses shown here were assessed without separation of the teeth to the buccal and lingual parts.

Specific cases with large differences were explored and discussed. Validation enabled to reveal and correct number of problems (for example the ADR method did not consider dose received by military personnel in places where they slept).


**Figure 11 Professional: Correlation SEAD dose, ADR (ILL) dose and DVO (device measurements)**



**Figure 12 Military liquidators: Correlation SEAD , ADR and DVO**

**Figure 13 Civilians: comparison of SEAD, ADR (ILL 1 & 2) and EPR doses**

When RADRUE was developed, dose estimated by this method were validated on the liquidators' with instrumental measurements as well. For a large part of the Russian liquidators official dose records were available. A comparison of RADRUE with recorded doses is presented in Figure 14.




**Figure 14 Comparison chart of the RADRUE and official doses from Russian registry for some of study subjects.**

It can be seen satisfactory agreement between official doses from Russian registry and RADRUE estimates. RADRUE tends to overestimate high doses, compared to official dose records. It is noted, however, that the adequacy of the registered doses is under question. A system of dose constraints for the maximum daily dose was proposed to be introduced in the RADRUE estimates, reflecting the radiation protection practices at the time of the work of liquidators. This may improve the correlation with recorded doses. The rules for the application of these constraints are under development.

Further comparisons with dose estimated with EPR among Ukrainian workers are underway in a parallel project and will be available shortly. It should be noted, however, that comparisons with EPR are limited by the sensitivity of the method (sensitivity level of about 100 mGy).

Despite the absence of a satisfactory gold standard (in the range of dose under study) to validated RADRUE, it was decided that, once the internal consistency of the RADRUE was completely checked (as was done during the project – see Task 4), the epidemiological study would rely on dose estimates calculated with RADRUE, which is a logical, consistent and reproducible approach to the reconstruction of doses, based on extensive validated data on exposure rates and ER as described under Task 1.



## 5 Methods for thyroid dose assessment

In addition to the liquidators' external thyroid dose estimates, calculated by RADRUE, internal thyroid exposure doses were evaluated as well for the case-control study of thyroid cancer. An initial screening of liquidators was made to identify those for whom reconstruction of internal thyroid exposure doses was necessary. They were:

- Russian liquidators who took part in the clean-up in the first weeks after the accident (until June 20 1986)
- Belarussian liquidators who resided in contaminated territories of Belarus

Others were assumed not to have received a significant internal thyroid exposure dose.

Intake of KI pills and other protective measures was taken into account according to approaches described in the Operations Manual, Annex 1 [Gavrilin *et al.*, 2001].

Study subjects with a potential for exposure, were further subdivided into three groups according to the main model of  $^{131}\text{I}$  intake:

3. Liquidators who worked only at the Chernobyl NPP;
4. Liquidators who worked only in settlements located within the 30-km zone and did not work at the Chernobyl NPP;
5. Liquidators who worked in settlements located within the 30-km zone and at the Chernobyl NPP.

### ***Liquidators who worked only at the Chernobyl NPP***

For the liquidators included in this group, thyroid dose assessment is carried out according to the methodology of Styro *et al* [1992], assuming inhalation intake of  $^{131}\text{I}$ . That  $^{131}\text{I}$  intake is considered to be typical for the liquidators who worked at the Chernobyl NPP in the period from April 26 to May 5, 1986. These liquidators are thought to have little or no dose from ingestion of  $^{131}\text{I}$  as they did not consume milk, milk products, and leafy vegetables during their work at the ChNPP.

In late April/early May 1986 and again in late May 1986, direct gamma spectrometry of the thyroid was made for approximately 700 liquidators (including workers of the ChNPP and about 100 other persons in the 30 km zone) at their temporary place of residence during the clean-up operations. In addition, about 300 direct thyroid measurements were also made in Clinic No.6 on "accident victims" (liquidators who participated in the very early emergency operations and were hospitalized in Moscow for radiation sickness). Some of the measurements were made on the same persons on different times, thus allowing a better estimation of the actual incorporated dose from iodine and other short-lived isotopes. Information on itineraries, time of work and use of stable iodine prophylaxis was obtained by questionnaire at the time of the measurement on a large number of these liquidators. Results of analyses of urinary excretion of  $^{131}\text{I}$  are also available for some liquidators

Thyroid dose estimation for these people is based on available data on dynamics of concentration of radionuclides [Styro *et al*, 1992] (especially of  $^{131}\text{I}$ ) in air above the damaged reactor as well as at different directions from ChNPP at the altitudes of 200-1300m (Figure 15),


It follows from the data, presented in Figure 15 that dynamics of concentration of  $^{131}\text{I}$  (C) in air above the reactor can be fitted by equation:

$$C = 417 \times \exp(-0.135 \times t), \quad (T_{1/2} = 5.13 \text{ days}) \quad (8)$$

where  $t$  is counted from April 28, 1986.

Comparison of data in Figure 15 with available data on dynamics of concentration of  $^{131}\text{I}$  in ground-level air at the place located at 140 km to south direction from ChNPP as well as with data on dynamics of concentration of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{134}\text{Cs}$  in ground-level air at Berezin national park of Belarus

shows good agreement of peaks and minimum values of daily radionuclide concentrations at least from May 5, 1986. This agreement supports the hypothesis that contamination of ground-level air in the vicinities of the reactor since May 5, 1986 was due to radionuclides coming from upper air layers rather than from release of radionuclides from the reactor.



**Figure 15 Dynamics of concentration of  $^{131}\text{I}$  in air above the damaged reactor in April-June 1986.**

In such case it is assumed that dynamics of inhalation intake of radioiodine to the liquidators who worked at ChNPP and around it would be correlated with (on average) the dynamics of concentration of  $^{131}\text{I}$  above the reactor. To calculate thyroid doses it is thus assumed that the concentrations of  $^{131}\text{I}$  in air of the rooms of ChNPP, in ground-level air in the vicinities of the reactor (10 km around the reactor) including Prip'yat town since May 5, 1986 were equal to averaged values of concentration of  $^{131}\text{I}$  ( $\bar{C}$ ) above the reactor. Time variation is also described with equation.7.

The estimates of thyroid dose for the liquidators in this group are calculated as follows (note: this correspond to the maximum values of possible thyroid dose):

$$D = \bar{C} \times Y \times H \times S \times v \times F_h \times K_1 \times K_2, \text{ Gy} \quad (8)$$

where  $Y$  is number of days of work in episode;

$H$  is number of hours of work during a day;

$S$  is number of seconds in an hour ( $S=3600 \text{ s h}^{-1}$ );

$v$  is breathing rate for an adult person,  $v = 2.8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;

$F_g$  is inhalation dose coefficient for an adult person,  $F_g = 2.8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ Gy Bq}^{-1}$ ;

$K_1$  is coefficient accounting for iodine prophylaxis ( $K_1 \approx 0.043$  under prolonged consumption of potassium iodide pills);

$K_2$  is coefficient accounting for presence in the air of hardly absorbed fractions of iodine ( $K_2 \approx 3$ ).

Insertion of  $K_2$  is explained by the fact that only aerosol filter was used under aircraft sampling above the reactor and other territories of the former USSR. That filter does not catch hardly absorbed fractions of iodine. The use of respirators was not taken into account, because of their low

efficiency, especially in case of presence in air of hardly absorbed fractions of iodine [Styro *et al*, 1992].

***Liquidators who worked only in settlements located within the 30-km zone and did not work at the Chernobyl NPP***

For Belarus liquidators included into this group the following procedure was used. If a liquidator worked and lived in a non-evacuated settlement, the individual thyroid dose was estimated to be the average thyroid dose for the adult population in the settlement considered.

The average thyroid dose for adult population in this settlement was estimated according to available “passport” for that settlement, or (in case such “passport” is absent) by use of a modified semiempirical model as described in the operations manual [Gavrilin *et al*, 2001]. An average consumption rate ( $0.7 \text{ L d}^{-1}$ ) of milk typical for adult Belarus population was accepted for dose calculation. If the liquidator worked in several non-evacuated settlements, then the total thyroid exposure was calculated as a sum of the separate doses (inhalation and ingestion), received in each settlement taking into account the length of time that the liquidator worked there.

If the liquidator served with the military or any other large organization and lived in non-evacuated settlement, but worked in an evacuated settlement, the milk consumption rate,  $V_{\text{milk}}$ , was determined as follows:

$$V_{\text{milk}} = (X/24) \times 0.7 \quad \text{L d}^{-1} \quad (9)$$

where  $X$  is time spent by the liquidator in non-evacuated settlement.

If the liquidator served in a civilian organization (especially if such organization was small) and lived in non-evacuated settlement, but worked in an evacuated settlement, the milk consumption rate should be accepted to be equal to  $0.7 \text{ L d}^{-1}$ , assuming that he took milk with himself for his work.

If the liquidator lived and worked in an evacuated settlement, then no intake of contaminated milk is assumed. In such case total dose is a sum of inhalation doses received in each settlement where he lived and worked.

For non-Belarus liquidators included this group, the presumption is that they did not have any significant thyroid dose other than through inhalation exposure. This is because they did not come from contaminated territories, and they are presumed to have consumed clean food during their period of working within the 30-km zone. Their inhalation dose was calculated as for the first group of liquidators.

***Liquidators who worked in settlements located within the 30-km zone and at the Chernobyl NPP***

For the liquidators included in this group, their thyroid dose estimate was calculated to be the sum of two contributions: (1) during the work at the Chernobyl NPP, and (2) during residence and work within the 30-km zone.

***Radiation dose not related to the work as a Chernobyl liquidator***

Due to the wide-scale contamination of Belarusian territory following the Chernobyl accident, liquidators from Belarus have received radiation doses not only related to work as a Chernobyl liquidator but also related to their residential status. This is a peculiarity of Belarusian liquidators in comparison with subjects of study from Baltic States and Russia. Radiation doses to Belarusian liquidators were therefore estimated for the following pathways and radionuclides:

- Internal dose from  $^{131}\text{I}$  inhalation and ingestion for Belarusian subject, applying the same method as for the liquidators who worked in settlements located within the 30-km operations manual [Gavrilin *et al*, 2001];

- External dose to thyroid from deposited radionuclides [Drozdovitch *et al.* 2003; Minenko *et al.* 2002].

### **Task 3 - Collection of data for validation of dose reconstruction method – interviews of persons with dose estimates**

Information on work history was obtained for the study subjects from a detailed questionnaire covering aspects of the time, place, type and condition of work in the Chernobyl area (Annex 2). This questionnaire was prepared as a collaborative effort between dosimetrists, radiation protection experts, persons familiar with the organisation of work in the Chernobyl area and epidemiologists. It was successfully tested on 120 liquidators (half professional workers and half military) to ensure that the questions were clear and answerable and that all the information needed in principle by dosimetrists for dose reconstruction could be obtained. Specific sections (2, 3 and 4) of the history of work had to be completed respectively for each mission on which the subject was sent and for each episode of work within each mission. Spare sets of sections 2-4 were provided to the interviewer for this purpose.

The case-control studies of leukaemia and NHL and of thyroid cancer were extended to the populations of Baltic country liquidators in order to test the adequacy of the dose reconstruction method developed in Task 2. A workshop was therefore held in Tallinn (Estonia) on 15-16 May 2000 to train the interviewers for the case-control study in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. This workshop included interviewers, principal investigators as well as faculty from IARC and the Institute of Biophysics. Practical training of the interviewers took place on the second training day: four volunteer interviewees participated in the workshop and were interviewed by the interviewers. The completed practice interviews were then analysed by the lecturers and the results discussed with the interviewers.

Standardised description and explanation of terms used in the study questionnaire which may be difficult for some interviewees to understand were provided in an Interviewer Instructions Document, together with specific instructions related to specific questions. To assist the study subject and the interviewer in obtaining the most precise and correct information about the subject's work in the Chernobyl area, the interviewer was also provided with a Booklet (Annex 3) including detailed maps, photographs, a glossary of Chernobyl "jargon", a historical review of events which took place in the clean-up of the accident, a list of organisations involved as well as detailed lists of settlements within and outside the 30 km zone around the plant, in which subjects may have resided, worked or rested.

If the case has died, the next of kin (the spouse, brother or sister or child of the liquidator) was found where possible, interviewed and asked about the name of colleagues who worked with the subject in the Chernobyl area. One of these colleagues should then have been contacted and asked to answer questions from section 2-4 of the questionnaire concerning the history and conditions of work as a liquidator. The identity of the respondent was clearly indicated.

#### **1 Extension of the case-control study to Baltic countries**

16 retrospective cases of leukaemia and NHL among liquidators from the Baltic countries were identified during a cohort study of cancer risk among the Baltic liquidators, coordinated by the National Cancer Institute, USA, and Finnish Cancer Registry (hereafter – the Baltic cohort study). The procedure was similar in the three countries – all cases diagnosed in 1990-1998 were identified through the cancer registries in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which cover the three entire countries, using record linkage techniques. No prospective cases have been identified in the Baltic countries (numbers of the liquidators in these countries are very small and one-year period was too short for diseases of interest to occur in the study population).

In Estonia, two retrospective cases of thyroid cancer were detected through thyroid screening carried out in 1995 (Inskip *et al*, 1997). In Latvia and Lithuania, where specialised medical care centres for Chernobyl liquidators were set-up (in Lithuania operated until 1998), and the ultrasound examination of thyroid gland is a regular procedure of the annual health check-up, 4 thyroid cancer cases were diagnosed during their regular medical examinations. Two prospective cases were identified in Latvia in 2000, also during the annual health check-up. No prospective cases were identified in Estonia and Lithuania. In all, 8 thyroid cancer cases were included in the study.

To maximise the statistical power, 4 controls were interviewed for each case (hence 64 for the leukaemia and NHL study and 32 for the thyroid cancer study). In a first step, potential cases were selected at random from the roster of the study population using a random numbers generator, among all liquidators of the same age as the case (within 1 year). The controls had to be alive at the time of the diagnosis of the case to which they were matched in order to minimise selection bias. For each potential control selected, information on their names, gender, date of birth, address at the time of registration and most recent address registered were abstracted from the lists of Chernobyl liquidators rosters available in the national cancer registries in Latvia and Lithuania and at the Institute of Experimental and Clinical Medicine in Estonia. They include the current address of the liquidator, which was used for mailing questionnaires during the Baltic cohort study and obtained from all available sources - address bureaus, population registries, migration offices, Chernobyl liquidators' non-governmental organizations, local medical and social welfare institutions.

The most recent address of the cases and potential controls was available from the lists of Chernobyl liquidators (see above). When a potential study subject's address was changed, attempts were made to trace the new address through the population registry (formerly known as "address bureau"), as was previously done in epidemiological studies in Baltic countries [Tekkel *et al*, 1987].

Once the current address of the cases and potential controls was obtained, primary contact was made by letter signed by the principal investigator in the study. In Latvia and Lithuania, the interviewers contacted the majority of study subjects also by telephone, explained about the study and asked to participate. If a study subject agreed to participate then an appointment for interview was made - either at home or at the Institute of Experimental Medicine in Tallinn, the Latvian Centre of Oncology, the Lithuanian Cancer Registry or the offices of the local Chernobyl Movement Committee in Lithuania. Every effort was made to maximise the participation rate. If the subject did not answer within 3 weeks (1 week in Estonia), therefore, a reminder letter was sent. If a case refused to take part in the study, this was noted and the reason specified. If a control refused to take part in the study, he or she was replaced by another one until four controls were interviewed for each case. If any of the selected controls could not be interviewed, the reason was specified.

### ***Information from previous questionnaire***

Sixty-one liquidators from the Baltic countries included in the case-control study were previously interviewed in the cohort study of Baltic liquidators, coordinated by NCI. As some of the questions in the previous cohort study questionnaire are similar to those in the case-control questionnaire, this re-interviewing allowed the evaluation of the reliability and replicability of answers to the questionnaire. The comparison was done in the following steps:

- Identification of study subjects interviewed in both studies;
- Retrieval of information from questionnaire (duration, dates of mission, type of work, anything relevant to the mission);
- Cross-checking of the answers to the similar questions from both questionnaires using kappa test for agreement.

**Biological dosimetry data**

Blood samples from majority of Estonian study subjects and from part of the subjects in the Latvian and Lithuanian cohorts have been collected previously for the Baltic cohort study. Biodosimetry using two biological markers of exposure, namely, fluorescence *in situ* hybridisation (FISH) for translocation analysis and the glycophorin A (GPA) somatic cell mutation assay has been applied on a number of collected samples in several laboratories [Bigbee *et al*, 1996; 1997; Inskip *et al*, 1997]. Though overall results of the biodosimetric assays suggested that the average radiation exposure of the Baltic liquidators did not greatly exceed 10 cGy, the minimum level at which radiation effects might be detectable by the assays, it was expected that some of the individuals included in the case-control study could have received doses higher than 10 cGy. The case-control subjects, who donated their blood samples for biodosimetry during the Baltic cohort study, were identified and the results of GPA and FISH assays compared with RADRUE predictions for the same subjects.

**2 Additional interviews in Russia and Ukraine**

Additional information for validation was also collected from *Russia* by interviewing cases and controls within a subcohort of the professional radiation workers who were employed by the Ministry of Atomic Energy (MAE) and are registered by this Ministry. The doses of these liquidators were measured directly with the use of personal dosimeters and the dosimetric data are supposed to be included in the archives of the MAE. Twelve cases were identified from the clinics of the MAE and four controls were interviewed for each case (i.e. 48 controls), selected at random from the list of liquidators registered by the MAE. It was found out during the study, however, that the dosimetric data in the archives was incomplete and usable dose estimates could not be obtained in the framework of this project.

52 professional radiation workers with good quality instrumental dosimetry were also interviewed using the case-control study questionnaire. Both SEAD and the ADR method (the predecessor to the final RADUE) were used to estimate their dose, which was compared to the dose recorded by filmbadges and/or TLD (Figure 11 – see Task 2, above) in order to inform the choice of dose reconstruction approach.

50 military liquidators from Russia were also interviewed and their SEAD and ADR doses estimated. For these liquidators, good records on dates, place and type of work are kept by Military Registry (maintained by the Military Medical Academy in St Petersburg) and time and motion studies have been used by the military at the time of the work to estimate doses. The SEAD and ADR were therefore compared to the official military doses to inform the choice of dose reconstruction approach (Figure 12 – see Task 2, above).

Finally 50 military reservists and 41 civilian liquidators sent on mission, were also chosen at random among Ukrainian subjects for whom samples of dental enamel are available and EPR dosimetry has been carried out at the Scientific Centre for Radiation Medicine in Kiev. These liquidators, once identified, were traced and interviewed using the case-control study questionnaire. Their SEAD and ADR doses are compared to EPR in Figure 13 (Task 2, above).

**3 Evaluation of reliability and replicability of answers to the questionnaire**

Twenty subjects were included in the Estonian study, 65 in Lithuania, 35 in Latvia and 60 in Russia. Their distribution by case and control status is shown in Tables 11 and 12, respectively for leukaemia and NHL and for thyroid cancer.

**Table 11 Distribution of subjects by country and case-control status – Leukemia and NHL**

Status	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Total
--------	--------	---------	--------	-----------	-------



Status	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Total
Case	6	2	3	11	20
Control	24	8	12	44	80
Total	30	10	15	55	100

**Table 12 Distribution of cases and controls by country – Thyroid cancer study**

Status	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Total
Case	6	2	4	2	9
Control	24	8	16	8	36
Total	30	10	20	10	45

Out of the 145 subjects interviewed, 61 were found to have also responded to the Baltic country/NCI cohort study questionnaire.

Information on demographic variables (date of birth) shows very good agreement between the case-control and Baltic/NCI cohort study questionnaires.

Many of the questions differed slightly (in the way they were formulated and in the choice and groupings of answers) and hence comparisons are not always possible.

Table 13 summarises differences in answers between the two studies related to dates of start or ending of mission. The great majority of answers are in agreement (within one week). In some cases, information was available in the case-control study from official documents on the dates of start and stop of mission and in these cases the answer in the case-control questionnaire was in agreement with the dates on these documents. It should be noted that the duration of missions in the Baltic country cohort study was from the date the liquidator left his home to the date he returned, while in the case-control study, only the period of actual stay in the Chernobyl area was considered. This may explain some of the differences in end dates reported.

**Table 13 Comparison of dates of start of mission between NCI and IARC questionnaires**

	Differences between answers to NCI and IARC questionnaires (date of mission IARC- date of mission NCI, in days)						
	(-)	(-)	(-)	0	(+)	(+)	(+)
	> 1 month	1 week to 1 month	1 day to 1 week		1 day to 1 week	1 week to 1 month	>1 month
Start date of mission	2	3	9	30	9	3	4
End date of mission	2	3	4	35	7	6	2

Overall, information on the location of work in the Chernobyl area (70 km zone) agrees only partially between the two questionnaires. 7 are in perfect agreement; for 26 subjects, the agreement is partial (in the majority of cases this is due to the fact that more settlements are listed in the IARC questionnaire); for 20 subjects a disagreement is observed, but is difficult to interpret as the NCI questionnaire did not differentiate between places of work and residence. The information collected with the case-control questionnaire tends to be more detailed than in the cohort study questionnaire. This is most likely related to the much more detailed questions about work in the case-control study and to the use of maps, lists of settlements and other documents designed to assist the liquidator in reconstructing his history of work at the time. It is noted however that, in a few instances, the

liquidator answered the name of a settlement in the cohort study but could not give a precise name in the case-control study; this is most likely related to the time that has passed since the accident and the greater difficulty in remembering the details in the later study (the cohort study questionnaire was administered in the period 1993-1996, depending on the country, while the case-control study interviews were carried out in 2000-2002).

Agreement is complete for the question concerning the organisation that sent the liquidator to the Chernobyl area (Table 14).

**Table 14 Comparison of answers concerning organisation which sent the subject to the Chernobyl area between NCI and IARC questionnaires**

	IARC	Regular army	Military reserve office	NIM/KGB	Other	Missing
NCI						
Regular army		0	0	0	0	0
Military training ex.		0	60	0	0	0
Hired/contract work		0	0	0	1	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0
Missing		0	0	0	0	0

Out of 61 subjects who answered they had used protective measures, agreement was reasonable for use of masks (only 10 subjects reported having used a mask in one of the questionnaire but not in the other); it was less good for the use of gloves (18 subjects gave conflicting answers).

There was complete agreement concerning the activities carried out as a liquidator for 21 of the subjects; the agreement was good (but not complete) for 34 more subjects – it should be noted that the IARC questionnaire is more detailed than the NCI questionnaire and hence lists activities which are not included in the later -. Disagreement was noted only for 5 subjects (including one for whom a proxy was interviewed); in addition, one subject listed activities in the IARC questionnaire but not in the NCI one. Overall, the agreement in the main activities is quite good. Again, the case-control study questionnaire is much more detailed concerning type and conditions of work than the cohort study questionnaire.

Concerning the use of stable iodine prophylaxis, agreement was reasonable: 42 out of 53 subjects who answered the question gave the same answer in both questionnaires.

Concerning doses assigned at the time of the accident, 3 out of the 18 subjects who showed their official dose documents had reported a different dose in the cohort study. Two out of the three had a 10-fold difference in dose, probably reflecting the fact that the liquidator reported his dose in the wrong unit in the cohort study questionnaire.

For those who could not show an official dose document (forgotten or not issued), 38 out of 43 did not report a dose in the case-control questionnaire. The doses were the same for 3 out of the five liquidators who reported a dose in that questionnaire. It is noted that 12 subjects reported a dose in the cohort study questionnaire but not in the case-control study.


### Biological dosimetry and RADRUE

Fifteen cases-control study subjects were identified to be MN heterozygotes and GPA assay could therefore be performed during the Baltic cohort study: on 2 liquidators from Estonia, 4 from Latvia and 9 from Lithuania. Frequency of erythrocyte variants, expressing GPA allele-loss (N/Ø) or GPA allele-loss and duplication (N/N) phenotypes, which in previous studies have been found to be

correlated with radiation dose, was compared with the RADRUE doses for the same individuals (Figure 16).

Blood for translocation analyses was previously taken from 3 liquidators from Estonia included in the case-control study. Because stable types of chromosome aberrations in lymphocytes are considered to be the most relevant marker for exposure to ionising radiation, the comparison between translocation frequencies and RADRUE predictions was performed. No correlation was found between RADRUE doses and translocation frequencies.

The absence of correlation between RADRUE and GPA and FISH is not surprising and does not invalidate the use of RADRUE for dose reconstruction. Indeed, the minimum level at which radiation effects might be detectable by these assays is of the order of 100 mGy. Only two of the subjects in the case-control study for whom GPA results are available had received doses estimated to be above this level by RADRUE. Even at this level, uncertainties in GPA are very large.



**Figure 16 Comparison between RADRUE doses and GPA results.**

## Task 4 - Reconstruction of dose and uncertainty for study subjects

### 1 Processing of questionnaire data and entering of data into RADRUE software

Following the development, testing, optimization and systematization of the RADRUE method, a decision was made to base the dose calculations for subjects in the case-control studies on this method.

The dose reconstruction procedure consisted of the following steps:

- assembling of personal file and recording it into RADRUE database: available information (primarily from the questionnaire) was analyzed by a team of experts and entered into RADRUE software for the calculations of liquidators' external exposure doses.
- quality control of the dose calculations: a small subcommittee of experts review and check all of the dose estimates.

Data from the questionnaires in the previous European Union funded case-control studies were sent to the experts for analysis and data calculation. The data sent was in the form of computerized files, containing only the information from sections 2-4 of the questionnaire (i.e. history and conditions of work of the liquidator). No information on case/control status of the liquidator was sent to the experts.

Two experts from Ukraine (led by Dr. A. Tsykalo) and two from Belarus (led by Dr. A. Mirkhaidarov) were chosen to analyse the questionnaires and extract information on the liquidators'

routes for entry into RADRUE. The Ukrainian experts, who had previously worked for the dosimetry department of the ChNPP and were very familiar with exposure conditions on the industrial site and in the Ukrainian part of the 30 km zone around the plant, were responsible for dose calculation of liquidators from Russia and the Baltic countries. The Belarus experts focused on dose reconstruction for Belarus liquidators who, because of the proximity to their residences to Chernobyl generally worked in the Belarus part of the 30 km zone and had activities of a different nature than that of liquidators of other nationalities. In the case a Belarussian liquidator had worked on the industrial site, the questionnaire data for that part of the work was sent to the Ukrainian experts who calculated the relevant dose.

Detailed instructions were provided to these experts (see Operations Manual in Annex 1) and a number of meeting were held to review possible errors in interpretation of the questionnaire data and/or in describing the liquidators missions, episodes, frames, etc. The manual describes the rules to be applied, which all experts had to follow strictly. In cases where the experts needed to make personal decision or completely disagreed with the data in the questionnaire, they entered their best evaluation of the work conditions and were ask to document it extensively in the remarks sections of RADRUE. All such disagreements had to be reviewed and proved by the panel of experts afterwards.

The main issue of concern was the possibility that interpretation of the questionnaire data may be subjective and hence that the dose reconstruction may not be reproducible. Because of this, dose reconstruction was done independently by two (and in some cases three) experts for a 5% sample of all subjects and resulting dose estimations compared. Some of these meetings and exercised revealed features which were not clear in the RADRUE and this software was updated for clarity and user friendliness. Frequent communications took place between the experts and Dr Krjuchkov, who had developed the method, as well as staff at IARC in Lyon who reviewed the doses calculated and checked their internal consistency. During the course of the dose assessment, experts from the Institute of Biophysics in Moscow and the Ukrainian Institute for Radiation Medicine were reviewing the work of the experts and discussing errors and inconsistencies at periodic meetings held in Kiev, Gomel and Moscow.

In all, the Ukrainian team assessed doses for 310 Russian and Baltic's liquidators, and the Belarus experts for the 464 Belarussian liquidators. In the dose reconstruction all experts used the same RADRUE method and the same software.

Monte Carlo simulations were performed at IARC for the evaluation of the uncertainties of the dose estimates by the specialized computer software program. The computer program for the uncertainty evaluation was created according to methodology under Task 2.

During the course of the dose assessment, experts from the Institute of Biophysics in Moscow and the Ukrainian Institute for Radiation Medicine were reviewing the work of the experts and discussing errors and inconsistencies at periodic meetings held in Kiev, Gomel and Moscow.


As indicated under Task 2, there were a small number of liquidators for whom it was not possible to apply RADRUE due to the incomplete nature of the information provided in the questionnaire. For these, an average dose and associated uncertainty were assessed by the SEAD method and the information directly entered into RADRUE. Again, when applying SEAD, experts had strict rules to follow, which are described in the SEAD application Operations Manual.

### 2 Quality control and checking of the RADRUE experts work

As the process of the dose reconstruction was extensively relying on the processing of the experts (with possible data entry errors when the information was transferred into RADRUE), all the information in RADRUE for each questionnaire in the study was reviewed by one to two independent experts in Lyon.

This checking included automated checks of the internal consistency of the data in RADRUE, checks of the consistency of dates, activities, places between RADRUE and the questionnaire and manual review of all of the questionnaires and how they had been translated into a liquidator's route in RADRUE. This involved in particular checking one by one the break-down of every liquidators' missions into episodes and frames performed by the experts.

Approximately 13 500 corrections were made in RADRUE after checking, as illustrated in Table 15. About 12 500 corrections were related to the introduction of sub-frames, which appear after additional breaking-down of long episodes into shorter ones, in order to ensure that each corresponded to exactly one of the exposures rates grid maps in RADRUE. Having identified this problem, these corrections were automated, using a specially created macro program. Corrections were also made of erroneous repetition of some frames, start or end dates of the episodes,



inadequate uncertainties on dates and durations of the episodes, incorrectly indicated living/work places in RADRUE, durations of the work/living/traveling, improper location factors for the frames and other mistakes and discrepancies. Many of these errors are likely to be the results of data entry errors in RADRUE. To systematize the work, extensive use of standard frames, particularly for the frames related to travel of the Russian and Baltic liquidators in the 70 and 30 km zones, was made.

Comparison charts of the dose estimates before and after verification are presented in Figure 17. The vast majority of corrections had, in fact, very little effect on the resulting dose estimates.

**Figure 17 Correlation between RADRUE external dose estimates before and after corrections, for all subjects in the case-control studies, for Belarus and other liquidators separately.**

During systematic checking of the RADRUE experts' work it was required that processed data had to fulfill the following formal consistency criteria, as follows:

- Repetition of the episode could not be more than duration of the episode in days.
- Start date of the episode could not be later than end date.
- Start of the first episode could not be different from the start of the mission.
- End of the last episode could not be later than the end of the mission.
- Frames "contaminated cloth" had to be marked as parallel frames.
- Control of 24h/day.

- Frames with indicated uncertainties of the dates in questionnaire had to have entered uncertainties in RADRUE.
- Start of the episodes could not be before 26/04/1986 or end could not be later than 31/12/1987.
- Frames without indicated itineraries on the maps of RADRUE.
- Repetition of some specific frames (traveling, lunch) was controlled.
- Screening of very long episodes was done.
- Standard frames for the traveling of the Russian and Baltic liquidators were introduced.
- Review of the location factors on the list of all RADRUE frames, sorted by the type of action was done.
- Review of the values of velocity and location factors in the frames was done.
- Review of the description of the frames was done.

**Table 15 List of the corrections made in RADRUE after the checking**

Type of mistake	Number of corrections
Insufficient breakdown into frames and sub-frames for long episodes	≈12500
Introduction of standard frames	≈320
Incorrect uncertainties for the beginning and end dates of the episodes	144
Shielding factors	75
Incorrect dates of working/living episodes	43
Repetition of the episodes	43
Duration of travel	31
Incorrect or missing place of work/living in RADRUE	28
Duration of work	23
Added comments	18
Description of the frames	10
Application of the RADRUE map system	6
Balance of the 24h/day	5

### 3 Calculations of external doses

Once the information from the questionnaires was entered into the RADRUE database, calculations of exposure doses were carried on automatically by the computer. The CALCULATOR module in RADRUE estimated the central estimates of the liquidators' external exposure dose in Roentgens (R).

The average and median absorbed exposure doses by the RBM and THY organs were derived by consequent running of the RADRUE SIMULATOR, as the exposure-to-organ dose conversion coefficients had probabilistic nature.

The uncertainties of the calculated doses were calculated by RADRUE SIMULATOR module as well. The simulator generated a set of 1000 point dose estimates for every liquidator, with had distribution of the values caused by the probabilistic nature of the variables (dose-rates, durations, shielding factors and etc.). Average, median and uncertainties of the organ specific dose estimates were calculated from this set of the values of point estimates for every liquidator.

### 4 Calculation of the internal thyroid exposure doses for the liquidators.

The internal thyroid exposure doses were reconstructed according to the methods, described under Task 2. Dates and places of residence of the liquidators were extracted from the case-control study questionnaires. The data was entered into created Visual Basic (Excel) computer program, and doses were calculated automatically by the software for the subjects. No information on individual consumption rates was available.

For the reconstruction of internal thyroid exposure doses for the Belarussian liquidators, averages of contamination levels of  $^{131}\text{I}$  for the settlements, dates of fallouts and dates of pasture were used by

the program in the calculations. Residential external doses to thyroid been reconstructed using the model for estimation of external exposure to population of contaminated areas of Belarus.

#### 5 Distributions of doses among study subjects in the case-control study

Tables 16 and 17 and Figure 18 show the distribution of bone marrow doses, by country, among the subjects included in the leukaemia and lymphoma case-control study. The median dose in Belarus is much lower than in Russia and Baltic countries (Table 17), even though doses received in their places of residence are included for Belarus subjects. If one considers only dose received working as a liquidator, the median BM for Belarus liquidators is 4.4 mGy.

The distribution of subjects by total dose to the thyroid due to external and internal exposure, and by country is shown in tables 18 and 19 and in figure 19. The majority of liquidators have received low doses to the thyroid: 60% of liquidators from Estonia, 45% from Russia and Latvia, and 40% from Lithuania belong to the lowest exposure category – below 50 mGy. A greater proportion of Belarusian liquidators was exposed to higher doses – 10% received doses above 500mGy. On average, doses in Belarus are higher than in Russia and Baltic countries (Table 19).


**Table 16 Distribution of all study subjects by RBM dose<sup>12</sup> category and by country – Leukemia and NHL**

Dose category (mGy)_	Country					Total
	Belarus	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	
<50	187	47	7	11	25	277
50-99	5	10	1	3	11	30
100-149	1	19			8	28
150-199		4	2		3	9
200-249		2		1	2	5
250-299		8			1	9
300-349		3			1	4
350-399		2				2
400-449		1			1	2
450-499					1	1
500+		4			2	6

---

RADRUE dose calculated as average of simulated doses; results are similar for calculated doses.

Figure 18 Histogram of doses among study subjects





**Table 17 Median RBM dose<sup>13</sup> and dose range by country – all subjects– Leukemia and NHL**

Country	N	Median BM dose (mGy)	Range (mGy)
All countries	373	19.3	0.1 - 1 928.3
Belarus (total)	193	7.9	0.2 - 108.0
Belarus (only as liquidator)	193	4.4	0 - 106.6
Russia:	100	55.9	0.1 - 1 928.3
Estonia	10	21.8	2.5 - 166.9
Latvia	15	20.7	0.1 - 240.1
Lithuania	55	59.2	5.0 - 1 092.5

**Table 18 Distribution of all study subjects by total thyroid dose category and by country – Thyroid cancer study**

Dose category (mGy)_	Country					All countries
	Belarus	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	
<50	69	34	6	9	4	122
50-99	70	15	3	9	4	101
100-149	16	9		1	1	27
150-199	16	5				21
200-249	22	2			1	25
250-299	17	1		1		19
300-349	2	3	1			6
350-399	20	2				22
400-449	5	1				6
450-499	3	1				4
500+	26	3				29

The median thyroid dose in Belarus is higher than in Russia and Baltic countries (Table 19).

**Table 19 Median total thyroid and dose range by country – all subjects– Thyroid cancer study**

Country	N	Median total dose (mGy)	Range (mGy)
All countries all subjects	382	70.845	0.13-2152.1
Belarus (all)	266	86.835	0.29-2152.1
Russia:	76	64.38	0.13-1064.57
Estonia	10	41.58	2.79-307.59
Latvia	20	55.77	2.94-273.54
Lithuania	10	61.1	21.54-200.83

The dose to the thyroid for the Belarusian liquidators was calculated taking into account the environmental exposure received in their place of residence. Due to consumption of local contaminated milk and vegetables, the median internal dose to the thyroid for Belarusian liquidators is much higher than in other countries (Table 20), while the external thyroid dose is much lower (Table 21).

**Table 20 Median internal thyroid doses (I 131) by country – Thyroid cancer study**

Dose (mGy)	Belarus	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Total
N	160	13	6	10	1	190
Median (all)	175.1	0.6	0.6	0.5	1.4	130.7
Range	1.65-2124.4	0-8.5	0.048-2.3	0.29-1.5	1.4-1.4	0-2124.4

**Table 21 Median external thyroid doses– all subjects by country – Thyroid cancer study**

Dose (mGy)	Belarus	Russia	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Total
N	266	76	10	20	10	382
Median (all)	2.7	64.4	41.4	55.6	61.1	6.7
Range	0-279.7	0.1-1064.6	2.8-307.2	2.9-273.5	21.5-200.8	0 -1064.6

**Figure 19 Histogram of dose to the thyroid among study subjects**





Figure 20 shows the distribution of the geometric standard deviation compared to the median dose estimate (based on 1000 simulations) for each of the subjects included in the case-control study. Although for a small number of subjects the geometric standard deviation is very large (up to 4.5, mainly for subjects with low RADRUE doses – and one subject with a high RBM RADRUE dose but a very uncertain work history), the median geometric standard deviation is of the order of 2.



**Figure 20 Distribution of Geometric Standard Deviation by the median dose estimate (based on 1000 simulations) for each of the subjects included in the case-control study**

## Discussion

The main objective of the current project was to develop, test and implement a detailed method for individual dose reconstruction. Two different approaches were considered and tested. The method adopted, RADRUE (Radiation Dose Estimation with Uncertainty Estimates), a variant of an analytical dose reconstruction method previously derived for professional radiation workers of the Chernobyl power plant, appears to work well. It is based on detailed time and motion studies, coupled with the use of very comprehensive data bases of radiological data.

The development of this method has involved very extensive work to:

1. locate, collate and evaluate very large databases of gamma background measurements made by various organisations at different times on the industrial site and throughout the 30 and 70 km areas around the Chernobyl nuclear power plant;
2. bring together experts knowledgeable about working conditions in different groups of liquidators and formalise and compile their knowledge into an integrated database;
3. develop an integrated software program that allows the calculation of doses and associated uncertainties from a subject's work history;
4. carefully reconstruct itineraries of the study subjects using the information provided in the very detailed study questionnaires.

Extensive validation of the work has been carried out. In particular, large groups of liquidators with instrumental dosimetry, with doses based on time and motion studies at the time of their work (military liquidators) and with EPR were identified, traced and interviewed using the case-control study questionnaire. Their doses were calculated using both of the methods initially considered for this project (ADR and SEAD) and these comparisons allowed the choice and further testing and optimisation of the main method, RADRUE. Comparisons with instrumental doses and doses from time and motion studies were generally good, while there was little correlation between reconstructed doses and EPR. The later may reflect the fact that it was not possible in the time frame of the project to exclude other exposures received by the liquidator

(from UV, for example) by analysing only the lingual part of the tooth enamel. An additional validation study is currently underway in the Ukraine on a further group of liquidators. Moreover, the lower limit of detection of EPR is of the order of 100 mGy, and few of the subjects included in the study are thought to have received external doses much greater than 150 or 200 mGy.

The case-control study was extended to further groups of liquidators in Baltic countries and Russia, thus increasing the power of the initial epidemiological study. Data were available for Baltic country liquidators from a questionnaire administered in a previous cohort study and comparison of these data with those collected by questionnaire in the case-control study allowed the evaluation of possible recall difficulties for a number of questions related to work as a liquidator. Overall, there was good agreement between the answers to the two questionnaires concerning dates and places of work and type of activity performed.

Data on a very small number of Baltic liquidators was also available for biological dosimetry (GPA and FISH). The correlation between the RADRUE estimates and the biological dose estimates is poor, as is expected in this dose range, which is below the limit of detection for individual doses for both of these biodosimetric methods.

Doses and associated uncertainties were estimated for all of the subjects in the case-control study. Doses to the bone marrow range from close to 0 to over 1 Gy, with a median of 20 mGy. Doses to the bone marrow among Baltic country liquidators tended to be much lower (8 mGy) than among Russia liquidators (55 mGy). Doses to the thyroid gland ranged from close to 0 to nearly 2 Gy. The highest doses were found for Belarus liquidators who lived and worked in areas of high contamination; these doses are related to ingestion of I-131. For Russian and Baltic country liquidators, doses from ingestion are thought to be close to zero. Doses from inhalation of I-131 were, however, received for liquidators who worked in the first weeks after the accident.

Uncertainties in the dose estimates have also been calculated, taking into account uncertainties in the input radiological data and in the answers to the questionnaires. Although for a small number of subjects the geometric standard deviation is very large (up to 4.5, mainly for subjects with low RADRUE doses – and one subject with a high RBM RADRUE dose but a very uncertain work history), the median geometric standard deviation is of the order of 2.

This contract has permitted the development, testing and optimisation of a detailed analytic dose reconstruction method for the estimation of individual doses and related uncertainties for Chernobyl liquidators and its application to an epidemiologic study of cancer risk in this population.

## Conclusions

The work under this project has shown that it is possible to reconstruct, with adequate precision for an epidemiological study, individual doses for workers involved in clean-up from detailed time and motion studies. This requires the development and testing of a detailed questionnaire about history and conditions of work, a set of relevant visual aids to assist the subjects in recalling their places of work, the collection and integration of all available dosimetric information and the analysis of work histories from questionnaires by experts familiar with the work and conditions of work in the clean-up areas.

The results are a fully integrated program that can be adapted to include extensive databases of dose-rate estimates, an interface for plotting and entering information on the liquidators route and conditions of work, calculation of individual doses and simulations to take into account dosimetric and questionnaire uncertainties.

The dose reconstruction method has been tested and validated and optimized and an approach for assessing uncertainties has been implemented. Though the method must rely on expert

assessment of the questionnaires, the method was shown to be sufficiently standardized to be reproducible.

### Acknowledgements

In addition to the current grant, the epidemiological study of cancer risk among Chernobyl liquidators was made possible by contracts F14C-CT96-0011 and ERBIC15-CT96-0317 from the European Union (Nuclear Fission Safety and INCO-Copernicus Programmes).

The Study Group is grateful to

- Drs A.Ye. Okeanov, G. Tolochko, N. Bazoulko (Minsk), A. Konogorov (Obninsk) who participated in the feasibility study and took part in the design and start of implementation of this study,
- to Professor Ilyin, Director of Institute of Biophysics in Moscow, for support and guidance in the setting up and conduct of the dose reconstruction project
- to Professor A. Tsyb, Director of the MRRC for assistance in the organisation of the study in Russia
- to Dr V. Stzyezhko head of Department of Medicine of Catastrophe in the Belarus Ministry of Public Health and Professor N. Piliptsevitch, former Director of the BelCMT, for assistance in the organisation and conduct of the study
- to Professor E. Ivanov, former Director of the RIHBT for assistance in the identification of cases of leukaemia, the retrieval of slides and medical records for verification and the isolation and storage of lymphocytes
- to Mrs K. Rahu from the Institute of Experimental and Clinical Medicine, for technical assistance.
- to the interviewers who collected the data (Belarus: Tierekhovitch, Tatiana; Kunitskyi Dimitry, Bondarovitch Pavel, Zolotko Natalia; Estonia: Vello Jaakmees; Latvia: Kojalo Una; Lithuania: Stankevic Audrone; Russia),
- to the personnel of the regional centres of the National Radiation and Epidemiological Registry in Northwest, Volgo-Vyatsky, Central-Chernozem, North-Caucasus and Urals who participated in the organisation of the work and collection of data in the regions,
- to the Center of Occupational Diseases and Radiation Pathology (head physician Dr. E. Tchurbakova) of the RSU Clinical Hospital and the Latvian Republics Association Chernobyl for assistance in the tracing, recruitment and establishment of contact with the study subjects
- to the Chernobyl Movement of Lithuania for assistance in the tracing, recruitment and establishment of contact with the study subjects,
- to the members of the panels of pathologists and haematologists who carried out the review of the cases included in the study: Drs Yu. Sidorov, formerly of the Minsk City Oncological Dispensary, Drs E.F. Lushnikov, S. Chayt and A. Abrosimov of the Medical Radiological Research Centre in Obninsk, Dr Kaarle Franssila, former Head of Oncological Pathology at the Department of Pathology at the Helsinki University Hospital, Pr A. Svirnovsky of the Research Institute for Hematology and Blood Transfusion, Dr Lasse Teerenhovi, Helsinki University Hospital.
- to all the collaborators from the joint Baltic country/US/Finnish study cohort study of Baltic country liquidators

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

- to Drs Hans Storm (Danish Cancer Society, Copenhagen, Denmark). Geoff Howe (Columbia University, New York, USA) and Colin Muirhead (National Radiological Protection Board, Didcot, UK) for useful discussion and comments in the design and conduct of the study,
- and to Dr L. Stayner (National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, USA) - for participating in modelling of impact of errors in dosimetry on risk estimates.

## Bibliography

- AUSRPIET: Acts on the results of the issuing certificates (passportisation) for the rooms of ChNPP. Archive of AUSRPIET 1987, (in Russian)
- Balonov M, Jacob P et al.: Pathways, levels and trends of population exposure after the Chernobyl accident. Proc of first International Conference of the European Commission, Belarus, the Russian Federation and the Ukraine on the radiological consequences of the Chernobyl accident, Minsk, Belarus, March 18-22, 1996, IOS Press, Amsterdam.
- BEIR V: Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation: The effects on populations of exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC, 1990.
- Bigbee W, Jensen R, Veidebaum T, Tekkel M, Rahu M, Stengrevics A, Kesminiene A, Kurtinaitis J, Auvinen A, Hakulinen T, Servomaa K, Rytomaa T, Obrams G, Boice JD Jr.: Glycophorin A biodosimetry in Chernobyl cleanup workers from the Baltic countries. *British Medical Journal* 312: 1078-1079, 1996
- Bigbee W, Jensen R, Veidebaum T, Tekkel M, Rahu M, Stengrevics A, Auvinen A, Hakulinen T, Servomaa K, Rytomaa T, Obrams G, Boice JD Jr: Biodosimetry of Chernobyl cleanup workers from Estonia and Latvia using the Glycophorin A in vivo somatic cell mutation assay. *Radiation Research* 147: 215-224, 1997
- Buzunov V, Omelyanetz N, Strapko N, Ledoschuk B, Krasnikova L & Kartushin G: Chernobyl NPP accident consequences cleaning up participants in Ukraine - health status epidemiologic study - main results, 1996. Brussels, European Commission 1-871, 1996. First International Conference of the European Commission, Belarus, the Russian Federation and the Ukraine on the radiological consequences of the Chernobyl accident. Minsk, Belarus, March 18-22, 1996
- Cardis E, Gilbert ES, Carpenter L, Howe G, Kato I, Armstrong BK, Beral V, Cowper G, Douglas A, Fix J, et al.: Effects of low doses and low dose rates of external ionizing radiation: cancer mortality among nuclear industry workers in three countries. *Radiation Research* 142: 117-132, 1995
- Cardis E, Okeanov AE, Anspaugh L, et al.: Estimated long-term health effects of the Chernobyl accident. Proc of The Joint EU, IAEA and WHO International Conference One Decade after the Chernobyl Accident, Vienna, 241-271, 1996
- Cardis E, Okeanov AE: What's Feasible and Desirable in the Epidemiologic Follow-Up of Chernobyl. Brussels, European Commission 1-835. First International Conference of the European Commission, Belarus, the Russian Federation and the Ukraine on the radiological consequences of the Chernobyl accident, Minsk, Belarus, March 18-22, 1996
- DE USSR: Report of the governmental commission on the performed work in year 1986 Moscow: 21, 1987, (in Russian)
- Drozdovitch V, Mirkhaidarov A, Shevchuk V: Uncertainty analysis of external doses used to evaluate radiological consequences of the accident on NPP. Preprint IPEP 70, Minsk, Belarus, 1-43, 2003
- Fix J J, Salmon L, Cowper G, Cardis E: A retrospective evaluation of the dosimetry in an international combined epidemiological study. *Radiation Protection Dosimetry* 74: 39-53, 1997
- Gavrilin YuI, Khrouch VT, Shinkariov SM, Krysenko NA, Skryabin AM, Bouville A, Anspaugh LR. Chernobyl accident: reconstruction of thyroid dose for inhabitants of the Republic of Belarus. *Health physics* 76: 105-119, 1999
- Gavrilin YuI, Krjuchkov VP, Khrouch VT, Shinkariov SM: Retrospective evaluation of the individual internal thyroid exposure doses, received by the ChNPP accident liquidators. (Project of MU). Moscow: 19, 2000
- Gavrilin Yu, Khrouch V, Shinkarev S: Estimation of individual internal thyroid doses due to <sup>131</sup>I intake for the subject in the case-control study in Belarus (Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts) and in Russia (Bryansk, Kaluga, Orel, and Tula Oblasts). Operations manual, Moscow, Russia, 2001

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

- IBP MH USSR: Journals of the operative control by the service of Radiation Safety of ChNPP. Archive of IBP MH USSR, 1986, (in Russian)
- ICRP: Report of the task group on reference man. A report prepared by a task group of committee 2 of the international commission on radiological protection. Pergamon Press. Oxford. New York. Toronto. Sydney. Braunschweig, 1975
- Illichev SV, Kochetkov OA, Krjuchkov VP, Mazurik VK, Nosovskii AV, Pavlov DA, Snisar IV, Tsov'yanov AG: Retrospective Dosimetry of Accident Remediation Personnel at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. (eds. Kryuchkov VP, Nosovskii AV), Seda-Still, 1996
- Ilyin LA, Balonov MI, Buldakov LA et al: Radiocontamination patterns and possible health consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. *Journal of Radiological Projection* 10: 3-29, 1990
- Ilyin LA, Krjuchkov VP, Osanov DP et al.: External gamma-radiation doses for liquidators of the Chernobyl issues within 1986-1987. Date of individual dosimetric monitoring and doses reconstructed retrospectively. *Radiobiology and Radioecology* 35: 1995
- Inskip PD, Hartshorne MF, Tekkel M, Rahu M, Veidebaum T, Auvinen A, Crooks GL, Littlefield LG, McFee AF, Salomaa S, et al.: Thyroid Nodularity and Cancer among Chernobyl Clean-up Workers from Estonia. *Radiation Research* 147: 225-235, 1997
- Inskip P, Tekkel M, Rahu M, Veidebaum T, Hakulinen T, Auvinen A, Rytomaa T, Servomaa K, Orams G, Stengrevics A, Kesminiene A, Kurtinaitis J, Hartshorne M, Littlefield LG, Salomaa S, Tucker J, Bigbee W, Jensen R, Moloney W, Boice JD Jr.: Studies of leukaemia and thyroid disease among Chernobyl clean-up workers from the Baltics. *Proc of 1997 National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP)*, 1-123, 1997
- Ivanov VK, Tsyb AF, Gorsky AI, Maksyutov MA, Rastopchin EM, Konogorov AP, Biryukov AP, Matyash VA, Mould RF: Thyroid cancer among "liquidators" of the Chernobyl accident. *British Journal of Radiology* 70: 937-941, 1997
- Ivanov VK, Tsyb AF, Gorsky AL, Maksyutov MA, Rastopchin EM, Konogorov AP, Korelo AM, Biryukov AP, Matyash VA: Leukaemia and thyroid cancer in emergency workers of the Chernobyl accident: estimation of radiation risks (1986-1995). *Radiation Environmental Biophysics* 36: 9-16, 1997
- Ivanov VK, Tsyb AF, Konogorov AP, Rastopchin EM, Khait SE: Case-control analysis of leukemia among Chernobyl accident emergency workers residing in the Russian Federation, 1986-1993. *Journal of Radiological Protection* 17:137-157, 1997
- Ivanov VK, Tsyb AF, Petrov MA, Maksyutov MA, Shilyaeva TP, Kochergina EV: Thyroid cancer incidence among liquidators of the Chernobyl accident. Absence of dependence of radiation risks on external radiation dose. *Radiation Environmental Biophysics* 41:195-198, 2002
- Izrael YA: Chernobyl: radioactive contamination of the natural environment, Hydrometeoizdat: 1-296, 1990 (in Russian)
- Izrael YA: Radioactive contamination of natural environment in the ChNPP accident zone. *Meteorology and hydrology* 2: 5-18, 1987 (in Russian)
- Jacob P, Rosenbaum H, Petoussi N, Zankl M: Calculation of organ doses from environmental gamma rays using human phantoms and Monte Carlo methods. Part II: Radionuclides Distributed in the air or deposited on the ground. *GSF-Bericht* 12: May, 1990
- Kesminiene A, Kurtinaitis J, Rimdeika G: The study of Chernobyl clean-up workers from Lithuania. *Acta Medica Lituanica* 2: 55-61, 1997
- Kotchetkov OA, Coyjanov AG, Timofeev LV, Baranov IV et al.: Computational-experimental prognosis of the individual and collective exposure during the commitment of the works on the object "Sarcophagus". Outcome report on the theme 5.2 of the contract 70-H/4. Moscow, Russia, 1992 (in Russian)



## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

- Krjuchkov VP, Osanov DP, Pavlov DA: Retrospective dose estimation of external gamma and beta radiation for liquidators of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident using computational method. Proc of 1994 International Symposium on Radiation Safety (ISRS), Moscow, Russia, 1-231, 1994
- Likhtarev IA, Chumak VV et al.: Retrospective reconstruction of individual and collective external gamma doses of population evacuated after the Chernobyl accident. Health Physics 66:643-652, 1994
- Lloyd DC, Sevan'kaev AV(editors): International scientific collaboration on the consequences of the Chernobyl accident (1991-95) - Experimental collaboration Project No.6 - Biological dosimetry for persons irradiated by the Chernobyl accident. Brussels. European Commission. EUR 16532, 1996
- Lyubchanskyi EP et al. : Radiation-hygienical situation in the territory of 30-km zone and surrounding rayons. According to the materials of the examination in 1986-1987. Report of IBP MH USSR, Filial. Ref. No.401, 1988
- MD USSR: Levels of the dose rates from  $\gamma$ - radiation in the settlements of the ChNPP 30-km zone from the 26.04.86 till 01.07.86. Directorate of the chemical military forces, Ord.566/8/08820 from December 06, 1988 (in Russian)
- Minenko VF, Drozdovitch VV, Tretiakievitch SS, Ulanovsky AV: Exposure of Belarus population after Chernobyl accident: collective doses and forecast of stochastic effects. Medical and Biological Aspects of Chernobyl Accident 4:50-65, 1996 (in Russian)
- Minenko VF, Ulanovsky AV, Drozdovitch VV, Shemiakina EV, Gavrilin YuI, Khrouch VT, Shinkarev SM, Bouville A, Anspaugh LR, Voilleque P: Case-control study of Chernobyl - related thyroid cancer among children in Belarus. Part II: Estimation of individual thyroid doses from long-lived radionuclides and external radiation. Health Physics, Submitted, 2002
- Okeanov AE, Cardis E, Antipova SI, Poliakov SM, Sobolev AV, Bazoulko NV: Health Status and Follow-up of Liquidators in Belarus. Brussels, European Commission, 1-851, 1996. First International Conference of the European Commission, Belarus, the Russian Federation and the Ukraine on the radiological consequences of the Chernobyl accident, Minsk, Belarus, March 18-22, 1996
- Osanov DP, Krjuchkov VP, Shaks AI: Determination of beta radiation doses received by personnel involved in the mitigation of the Chernobyl Accident. Research Enterprise Publication. Doses of the Soviet Population and Early Health Effects Studies, 1-313, 1993
- Pitkevich VA, Ivanov VK, Tsyb AF, et al.: Dosimetric data of the All-Russia Medical and Dosimetric State Registry for emergency workers. Radiation and Risk Special Issue 2: 1-44, 1995
- Pitkevich VA, Ivanov VK, Checkin S, Tsyb AF: On the problem of exposure levels for persons involved in recovery operations following the Chernobyl accident and included in the All-Russia State Medical and Dosimetric Registry. Radiation Biology and Radioecology 36: 747-757, 1996
- Prisyazhniuk AE, Fedorenko Z, Okeanov AE, Ivanov V, Starinsky V, Gristchenko V, Remennik L: Epidemiology of cancer in population living in contaminated territories of Ukraine, Belarus, Russia after the Chernobyl accident, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, 909-921, 1996
- Rahu M, Tekkel M, Veidebaum T, Pukkala E, Hakulinen T, Auvinen A, Rytomaa T, Inskip PD, Boice JD Jr.: The Estonian study of Chernobyl clean-up workers: II. Incidence of Cancer and Mortality. Radiation Research 147:653-657, 1997
- Sakulin SY, Rimskyi-Korsakov AA, Shuijskaya LG et al.: Report on the scientific-exploratory work "collection, analysis and systematization of the data on radiation environment in 5-km zone of ChNPP for the period from 26.04.86 till 31.12.86 (Contract No.17/86 of 12.03.92). Sosnovyi Bor, 1992 (in Russian)
- Savkin MN: Particularities of ecological and hygienic radiation situation in 30-km zone of Chernobyl NPP at the late stage after the accident. Radiation and risk, Bulletin of the all-Russia Medical and Dosimetric State Registry Moscow-Obninsk 3: 94-121, 1993
- Shikalov VF, Usatyi AF et al. : Radiation Environment in the object "Sarcophagus" according to the reports and protocols of 1986-1988. Institute of Kurchatov, Moscow, Russia, 2001 (in Russian)

## RECONSTRUCTION OF DOSES FOR CHERNOBYL LIQUIDATORS

- Shteinberg NA: Report on status of the ChNPP environment within the 30-km zone one month after the accident. Executive director of the laboratory of external dosimetry Perminov VG. Pioneer camp "Skazochnyi", 1986, proved by the chief engineer of ChNPP Shteinberg NA, 1-9, June 20, 1986, (in Russian).
- Storm HH, Okeanov AE: Epidemiological investigation including dose assessment and dose reconstruction. Report, Brussels, European Commission, 1996
- Styro BI, Nedvetskaite TN, Phylistovich VI: Isotopes of iodine and radiation safety. Sankt-Petersburg. Hydrometeoizdat, 255, 1992
- Tekkel M, Rahu M T, Veidebaum T, Hakulinen T, Auvinen A, Rytomaa T, Inskip PD, Boice JD Jr.: The Estonian study of Chernobyl cleanup workers: I. Design and questionnaire data. Radiation Research 147: 641-652, 1997
- Troshin VS, Smirnov VV, Zaycev RY et al.: Development of the method for the reconstruction of the spectral-angular distribution of the photons field base on the function of response of the dosimetrical detectors. Report for the theme N 92-3-296, 1-50, MIFI, Moscow, Russia, 1992 (in Russian)
- Tsyb AF et al.: Registry material. Radiation Risk 1:67-131, 1992
- UDK NPO: "Prypiat" Report on the committed work of technical department of the dosimetrical control board of PO "Kombinat" for the year 1987. Prypiat, archive of UDK NPO "Prypiat", 1987, (in Russian)
- UNSCEAR (United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation): Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation, Report II, United Nations, No. E.00.IX.4. New York, USA, 2000
- US ChNPP: Journals on the operative control of radiation environment by the service of US ChNPP radiation control for the year 1986. Archive of US ChNPP, 1986, (in Russian)
- US-605: Journal of the operative control of the radiological situation by department of US-605 radiological control. Archive of US-605, 1986, (in Russian)

Annex 1

***RADRUE***  
**Operations Manual**

## Annex 2

# *Case-control studies* **QUESTIONNAIRE**

## Information about liquidator from the Chernobyl Registry

	Chernobyl Registry	Corrections, if applicable
0.1 Last name	_____	_____
0.2 First name	_____	_____
0.3 Patronymic name	_____	_____
0.4 Date of birth	day <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> month <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 19 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	day <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> month <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 19 <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
0.5 Type of document used for proof of identity	1 <input type="checkbox"/> passport 2 <input type="checkbox"/> military passport 3 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____ _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> passport 2 <input type="checkbox"/> military passport 3 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____ _____
Serial number	_____	_____
Number	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
0.6 Home address		
ZIP code	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
oblast, region	_____	_____
rayon	_____	_____
<i>if in city:</i>		
city	_____	_____
street	_____	_____
street #	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
apartment #	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<i>if in countryside:</i>		
agricultural sovet	_____	_____
settlement	_____	_____
0.7 telephone number:		
at work	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	at work <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
at home	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	at home <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

---

Last, first and patronymic names of interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview: \_\_\_\_\_ day |\_\_|\_\_| month |\_\_|\_\_| year 19|\_\_|\_\_|

Time interview began: \_\_\_\_\_ hour |\_\_|\_\_| minutes |\_\_|\_\_|

Identity of respondent:

- 1 ☐ liquidator himself  
2 ☐ his wife  
3 ☐ his brother or sister

- 4 ☐ his daughter or son  
5 ☐ someone else, specify \_\_\_\_\_

*If not the liquidator responds, please indicate last, first and patronymic name of respondent*

---

*and check the reason why not the liquidator :*

- 1 ☐ deceased  
2 ☐ too ill to answer

- 3 ☐ long-term mission  
4 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

Do you know the names and addressees of colleagues of your spouse (*brother, father...*), who worked together with him in the 30-km zone? If yes, please indicate their:

Last, first and patronymic names

Address, telephone number

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## 1. Some information about the liquidator

At first I would like to ask you answer the general questions and then to show a document proofing your liquidator's status.

### 1.1 Your nationality (check one)?

1 ☐ Belarussian

2 ☐ Russian

3 ☐ Ukrainian

4 ☐ other, specify: \_\_\_\_\_

### 1.2 Your family status (check one)?

1 ☐ married (including cohabiting)

2 ☐ single

3 ☐ widowed

4 ☐ divorced

### 1.3 What is your education (check one)?

1 ☐ eight classes or less

2 ☐ high school

3 ☐ special high school

4 ☐ higher school

### 1.4 Please show me a document proofing your liquidator's status.

#### a. If a document was given, write down the following information:

Type of document	Serial number, number, date of issue	Name of organisation, which issued a document
_____	____ - _____	_____
_____	____/____/19____	_____
_____	____ - _____	_____
_____	____/____/19____	_____
_____	____ - _____	_____
_____	____/____/19____	_____

#### b. If the document is not available (lost, etc.), please tell me (write "don't remember, if so):

the reason, why not available \_\_\_\_\_

the type of document \_\_\_\_\_

the organization which issued it \_\_\_\_\_

### 1.5 How many times were you sent on mission to the 30-km zone (check one)?

1 ☐ once

2 ☐ twice

3 ☐ three times

4 ☐ more, specify \_\_\_\_\_

The following sections (2-4) should be completed for each liquidator's mission to the 30-km zone separately. After completion of sections 2-4 for the first mission, complete the same sections in the additional sheets for the following missions, if liquidator was sent to the 30-km zone several times. If he doesn't remember date you are asking about, enter 99 into the box for year (if doesn't remember year), enter 99 into the box for month (if doesn't remember month). If liquidator doesn't remember day, ask him either it happened in the beginning, middle or end

4



3 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

If "yes" please show it to me. (If the document was shown or the liquidator remember please write down the following information):

Type of document, organization	Serial number, number, date of issue	Period of exposure, dose, unit	Is it cumulative dose?
_____	_____ - _____	from _____ / _____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes
_____	_____	to _____ / _____ / 19____	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no
_____	_____ / _____ / 19____	dose _____	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know
_____	_____ - _____	from _____ / _____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes
_____	_____	to _____ / _____ / 19____	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no
_____	_____ / _____ / 19____	dose _____	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know
_____	_____ - _____	from _____ / _____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes
_____	_____	to _____ / _____ / 19____	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no
_____	_____ / _____ / 19____	dose _____	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know

2.8 Did you work shifts (check one)?

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

3 ☐ both, indicate dates when worked shifts

from \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / 19\_\_\_\_  
to \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / 19\_\_\_\_

9 ☐ don't know

2.9 Please tell me where you usually worked in the 30-km zone and what proportion of your time (percentage) you spent in the following conditions (check all that apply)

1 ☐ outside buildings and vehicles (outdoor)

1 ☐ yes, specify proportion of time \_\_\_\_\_%

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

2 ☐ inside buildings

1 ☐ yes, specify proportion of time \_\_\_\_\_%

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

3 ☐ inside vehicle (for example, car)

1 ☐ yes, specify proportion of time \_\_\_\_\_%

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

4 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐ yes, specify proportion of time \_\_\_\_\_%

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

9 ☐ don't remember where worked

2.10 Please tell me – using the list of settlements – main areas where you worked, as well as the following information (*interviewer should write down all the main settlements, one per line*).

Settlement, rayon	Date when started day/month/year	Duration (days)	Average number of hours per day
a _____	____ / ____ / 19____	_____	____
б _____	____ / ____ / 19____	_____	____
в _____	____ / ____ / 19____	_____	____
г _____	____ / ____ / 19____	_____	____
д _____	____ / ____ / 19____	_____	____

2.11 Please tell me – using the list of settlements – main areas where you lived or the settlements closest to your place of stay, as well as the following information (*interviewer should write down all the main settlements, one per line*).

Settlement, rayon	Date when started to live there, duration (days) and average number of hours per day	What was a type of dwelling where you mainly lived?
a _____	____ / ____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> tent
_____	_____ days	2 <input type="checkbox"/> wooden
_____	_____ hours / day	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brick or concrete block
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____
		9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember
б _____	____ / ____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> tent
_____	_____ days	2 <input type="checkbox"/> wooden
_____	_____ hours / day	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brick or concrete block
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____
		9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember
в _____	____ / ____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> tent
_____	_____ days	2 <input type="checkbox"/> wooden
_____	_____ hours / day	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brick or concrete block
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____
		9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember
г _____	____ / ____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> tent
_____	_____ days	2 <input type="checkbox"/> wooden
_____	_____ hours / day	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brick or concrete block
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____
		9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember

Settlement, rayon	Date when started to live there, duration (days) and average number of hours per day	What was a type of dwelling where you mainly lived?
A _____	____ / ____ / 19____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> tent
_____	_____ days	2 <input type="checkbox"/> wooden
_____	_____ hours / day	3 <input type="checkbox"/> brick or concrete block
		4 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____
		9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember

2.12 Please tell me the reason why you left the zone after the mission (*check one*).

- 1 ☐ your dose was higher than the admissible level  
 2 ☐ your dose was equal to the admissible level  
 3 ☐ your mission was over  
 4 ☐ illness  
 5 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 ☐ have not left, working till now  
 9 ☐ don't remember

### 3. Conditions of work in the 30-km zone during the fist mission

The following questions concern the methods used for dosimetry, radiation protection measures (if applicable) and type of work undertaken during your stay in the 30-km zone.

3.1 Was your dose estimated (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't know

If "yes" please indicate the method and approximate period when it was applied (*check one* - "yes", "no" or "don't know" for each method; if "yes" indicate requested information). If your dose was estimated with a personal dosimeter, please indicate for each period the number corresponding to the dosimeter you wore (*see photographs from the booklet*).

Method of estimation	Period	Number of dosimeter
With a personal dosimeter ( <i>see photographs from the booklet</i> )	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember	
By group dosimetry	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	from ____ / ____ / 19____ to ____ / ____ / 19____	_____
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember	

Method of estimation	Period	Number of dosimeter
By itinerary	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ] to [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ]	
	from [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ] to [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ]	
	from [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ] to [ ]/[ ]/[ ]/19[ ]	
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
	9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember	

3.2 If you had a personal dosimeter, how often did you wear it (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ all the time                      3 ☐ sometimes at work  
 2 ☐ only at work                      9 ☐ don't remember

3.3 Was the dosimeter regularly returned to the dosimetry service (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", please tell me how often (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ daily                                      5 ☐ always when dosimetry service asked to return it  
 2 ☐ once a week                              9 ☐ don't remember  
 3 ☐ every two weeks  
 4 ☐ once a month

3.4 Did you estimate your own radiation dose while working (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", what was your estimated dose?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Indicate unite of estimated dose (*check one*):

- 1 ☐ rem                                      4 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 ☐ rad                                      9 ☐ unknown  
 3 ☐ R (Roentgen)

What was your attitude to radiation exposure while staying in the 30-km zone: was your dose higher than your colleagues, explain why do you think so?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

3.5 Did you participate in any of the following activities (*check one of the boxes for each line*)?

Type of activity	Yes	No	Don't remember
Construction of sarcophagus on the industrial site of the ChNPP	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Removal of the radioactive fragments and pieces of graphite from the roofs or places close to the ventilation chimney	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Decontamination of the rooms and equipment inside ChNPP buildings	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>

Type of activity	Yes	No	Don't remember
Decontamination of industrial site and neighbourhood, including equipment outside ChNPP buildings	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Dosimetry service (razvedka)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Decontamination of vehicles in PUSO (Points for strict sanitary clean-up)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Repair and servicing of ChNPP equipment	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other types of activities on the industrial site, specify	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/>			
Decontamination activities and burial of radioactive waste outside the industrial site	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Construction of roads inside the 30-km zone	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Working as a driver	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Guarding of objects of ChNPP or inside the 30-km zone	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other types of activities outside the industrial site, specify	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>

3.6 Did you ever use any of the following protective measures while working in the 30-km zone (*check one of the boxes for each line*)?

Type of protective measure	Yes	No	Don't remember
Respirator or gas mask	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Gloves	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Protective glasses	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Protective clothes	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Lead apron	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Vehicles with protective covering (armoured cars, lead sheets in helicopters)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Other, specify	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>

3.7 Did you work on the industrial site of ChNPP (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

3.8 Did you receive the preparations of stable iodine during your participation in the activities in the 30-km zone (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", please specify period

from / / 19  to / / 19

and number of tablets per day



3.9 Please list the people who worked with you.

Last, first and patronymic names	Title

4. Description of the first episode of work during the first participation in the 30-km zone

In the following section I would like to ask you to remember in detail work you were usually undertaking. If you worked in the 30-km zone during the first days after the accident - in the end of April and beginning of May - please start from the episodes when you could receive the substantial dose of exposure.

4.1 Please tell me where you worked (use the photographs, schemes and maps from Booklet - part B- as well as explanation of abbreviations- pp. 16-19 -, list of rooms - pp. 20-23- and of settlements -pp. 24-57 - from Booklet - part A. Check all that apply):

- 1 ☐ on the industrial site of the ChNPP inside buildings (complete section a)
- 2 ☐ on the industrial site of the ChNPP on the roof of building (complete section b)
- 3 ☐ outside buildings in the other places of the industrial site of the CNPP (complete section c)
- 4 ☐ outside buildings and outside industrial site of the CNPP (complete section c)
- 5 ☐ inside vehicles - along the 30-km zone, including industrial site -(complete section d)
- 9 ☐ don't remember ((go to question 4.2)

a. On the industrial site of the ChNPP inside buildings (if no, go to paragraph b. and c.):

a.1 Show me the building where you worked in (use the schemes and photos from Booklet - part B -, and also explanation of abbreviations- pp. 16-19 - and list of rooms - pp. 20-23 - from Booklet - part A. Select one number and enter it).                 

a.2 How long did it take you to walk to the place where you worked after entering the building (enter duration in minutes)?         

a.3 Did you pass more than two staircases on the way?

- 1 ☐ yes
- 2 ☐ no
- 9 ☐ don't remember

a.4 What was a size of the room you worked in (enter in m<sup>2</sup>)?         

a.5 Where there any windows?

- 1 ☐ yes
- 2 ☐ no
- 9 ☐ don't remember

a.6 If yes, where they covered with lead?

- 1 ☐ yes
- 2 ☐ no
- 9 ☐ don't remember

a.7 What was a colour of the walls (check one)?

- 1 ☐ white
- 2 ☐ grey
- 3 ☐ golden
- 4 ☐ silver
- 5 ☐ green
- 6 ☐ brown
- 7 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_
- 9 ☐ don't remember

a.8 Was the door thick (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

a.9 What was the floor covered with (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ plastic  
2 ☐ concrete  
3 ☐ tiles  
4 ☐ wood  
5 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_  
9 ☐ don't remember

a.10 Was there large machinery in the room (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

a.11 Give more details describing your working place inside building:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. On the industrial site of the ChNPP on the roof of building:

b.1 On the roof of which building did you work (use the schemes and photos from Booklet - part B -, select one number from the scheme or map - pp. 2-3 - and enter it)?

b.2 Where other buildings nearby (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes" please enter the numbers of buildings from scheme-map of buildings and structures on the CHNPP plant grounds from booklet:

/     /

b.3 Was the roof you worked on (*check one*):

- 1 ☐ higher than other buildings?  
2 ☐ lower than other buildings?  
9 ☐ don't remember?

b.4 Did the roof have different levels (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

b.5 What was a size of the roof? (*enter in m<sup>2</sup>*)

b.6 What material the roof was covered with (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ concrete  
2 ☐ asbestos sheets  
3 ☐ wood  
4 ☐ asphalt  
5 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_  
9 ☐ don't remember

b.7 Was the roof damaged near the place you worked (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

b.8 Where there debris or pieces of waste near the place you worked (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

b.9 Where was a staircase leading to the roof (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ outside building  
2 ☐ inside building  
9 ☐ don't remember

b.10 Give more details describing your working place on the roof:

---

---

c. Outside buildings:

c.1 If you worked on the industrial site of the ChNPP, but not on the roof of buildings, please indicate the number of building you worked nearby (*use the schemes and photos from Booklet and enter a number*)

\_\_\_\_

c.2 If you worked outside industrial site of the ChNPP, please indicate the name of settlement (rayon, oblast, etc.) where (or nearby) you worked (*use the maps and lists of settlements*):

---

c.3 Where there following landmarks near the place you worked (*check all that apply*)?

- 1 ☐ buildings  
2 ☐ electricity pylons  
3 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_  
9 ☐ don't remember

c.4 What kind of machinery was nearby (*check all that apply*)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> bulldozers  | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> cranes                         |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> dump trucks | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> other machinery, specify _____ |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> excavators  | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember                 |

c.5 What was under your feet (*check one*)?

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> earth    | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> sand                 |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> gravel   | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____ |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> concrete | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember       |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> asphalt  |   |

c.6 Were there activities to reduce the dust level (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

c.7 Give more details describing your working place:

---

---

d. Inside vehicles (along the 30-km zone, including industrial site):

d.1 Indicate type of vehicle you worked inside (*check one*):

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> bulldozer  | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> tractor              |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> bus        | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> crane                |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> dump truck | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____ |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> car        | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> don't remember       |



d.2 Did vehicle have protective covering (*check one*)?

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes" describe it: \_\_\_\_\_

d.3 Describe the routes which were followed: roads, settlements, production sites (*use the maps and lists of settlements*):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4.2 Type of activities in the episode:

a. Please describe in detail work undertaken, what tools and devices were used?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. How did you work (*check one*)?

1 ☐ in the group

2 ☐ alone

9 ☐ don't remember

c. Did you work in "mogilnik" (places for burial radioactive waste) (*check one*)?

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

4.3 Commuting to the place of work in the episode:

a. What type of transportation did you use to commute to your working place and from (*check one*)?

1 ☐ BTR (armoured car)

5 ☐ car

2 ☐ bus

6 ☐ lorry

3 ☐ tractor

7 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

4 ☐ helicopter

9 ☐ don't remember

b. Please describe the route you followed to get to your working place (*use the maps and lists of settlements*):

from where you started \_\_\_\_\_

to where did you go \_\_\_\_\_

landmarks along the route \_\_\_\_\_

c. Did you change vehicles while commuting (*check one*)?

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes" specify where you did it \_\_\_\_\_

d. How long did it take from the place where you lived to get to the place where you worked and back (*enter in minutes*)?

e. Did you walk to your working place after getting out from vehicle (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes" please enter duration in minutes

|\_|\_|

f. Please describe the route you followed to get back from your working place:

from where you started \_\_\_\_\_

to where did you go \_\_\_\_\_

landmarks along the route \_\_\_\_\_

#### 4.4 Meals and leisure in the episode

a. Where did you take your meals during working hours (*use maps and photos from Booklet - part B*):

- 1 ☐ outside building (enter number of closest building from the map or scheme or enter name of settlement): \_\_\_\_\_  
2 ☐ inside building (enter number of building from the map or scheme or enter name of settlement): \_\_\_\_\_  
3 ☐ inside vehicle (*specify which*) \_\_\_\_\_  
9 ☐ don't remember

b. How did you get to the place where you ate (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ on foot  
2 ☐ by transport  
9 ☐ don't remember

If by transport, please indicate how long did it take (*enter duration in minutes*)?

|\_|\_|

and route \_\_\_\_\_

c. How long was your lunch break (*enter duration in minutes*)?

|\_|\_|

d. Where did you rest during breaks (*use the maps and photos from Booklet and check on answer*)?

- 1 ☐ outside building (enter number of closest building from the map and scheme 2-3 or enter name of settlement): \_\_\_\_\_  
2 ☐ inside building (enter number of building from the map or scheme 2-3 or enter name of settlement): \_\_\_\_\_  
3 ☐ inside vehicle (*specify which*) \_\_\_\_\_  
9 ☐ don't remember

e. How did you get to the place where you rested (*check one*)?

- 1 ☐ on foot  
2 ☐ by transport  
9 ☐ don't remember

If by transport, please indicate how long did it take (*enter duration in minutes*)?

|\_|\_|

and route \_\_\_\_\_

f. How long did rest during your working day (*enter duration in minutes*)?

|\_|\_|

4.5 Working period in the episode:

from |\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/19|\_|\_| to |\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/19|\_|\_|

Working days in the episode: (circle the days that correspond if liquidator worked in April-May 1986, and circle the months if worked later - starting from June 1986 till the end 1987)

April / May 1986						
M	T	W	Th	F	S	S
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

June 1986 r.						
M	T	W	Th	F	S	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	8	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

1986	1987	
Jul	Jan.	Jul
Aug	Feb	Aug
Sep.	Mar	Sep.
Oct.	Apr	Oct.
Nov	May	Nov
Dec	Jun	Dec

4.6 Number of working hours per day in the episode (in average) | | |

4.7 Dosimetric control in the episode:

a. Did you change your clothes before work (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

b. Did you start to work immediately upon arrival (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

If "no" please enter duration of time before you started your work in minutes | | |

c. Did you pass through control points for checking radioactive contamination (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

d. Did you pass trough containers filled with potassium permanganate (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

e. Did dosimetrist control radiation situation during your work or was nearby (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

f. Did your supervisor communicate with dosimetrist (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

g. Was dosimetrist military (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

---

4.8 Your comments concerning the episode:

a. You think that activities described above were well organised and under control of supervisor, dosimetrist, etc. (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

b. What surprised you during your work?

---

---

c. Please give any comments concerning activities in the episode.

---

---

**5. General information about occupational history**

I would like to ask you now several questions about your occupational history and possible hazardous working conditions if applicable.

5.1 What is your current occupational group (check one)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> student             | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> self employed                            |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> agricultural worker | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> unemployed                               |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> industrial worker   | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> not work due to disability or retirement |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> office worker       | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____                     |

5.2 What was your occupational group before the Chernobyl accident (check one)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> student             | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> self employed                            |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> agricultural worker | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> unemployed                               |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> industrial worker   | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> not work due to disability or retirement |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> office worker       | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> other, specify _____                     |

5.3 Have you ever worked with radiation (other than the time you spent in the Chernobyl area) (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

if yes, please indicate in which activity, dates of employment, name and location of organization where you worked (check "no" or "yes" for each type of professional activity).

Activity	Period of employment, month/year	Organization (name, location)
Medicine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from _ _ / _ _  to _ _ / _ _	_____
	from _ _ / _ _  to _ _ / _ _	_____
	from _ _ / _ _  to _ _ / _ _	_____
2 <input type="checkbox"/> no		

---

Activity	Period of employment, month/year	Organization (name, location)
Nuclear industry (including NPP)	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Industrial radiography	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Army service, other than above	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
Other, specify	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	

5.4 Have you ever worked in one of the following hazardous industries (show to the liquidator list of hazardous industries), including army service (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

if yes, please indicate type of industry, dates of employment, position, name and location of organization where you worked.

Type of industry	Period of employment, month/year	Organization (name, location)
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	
	from       /       to       /	



5.5 Did you ever work with hazardous chemicals (*show to the liquidator list of hazardous chemicals and check one*)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

if yes, please indicate chemical, dates of employment, name and location of organization where you worked.

Chemical	Period of employment, month/year	Organization (name, location)
_____	from _ _ / _ _ to _ _ / _ _	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	from _ _ / _ _ to _ _ / _ _	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	from _ _ / _ _ to _ _ / _ _	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	from _ _ / _ _ to _ _ / _ _	_____
_____	_____	_____

## 6. Medical history

Please try to remember have you ever had following diseases.

6.1 Have you ever had a thyroid disease?

- 1 ☐ yes  
 2 ☐ no  
 9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", please indicate following:

Diagnosis	Year of diagnosis	Name of hospital, address (oblast, rayon)
Goitre	19 _ _	_____
Thyroid nodules	19 _ _	_____
Hypothyroidism	19 _ _	_____
Hyperthyroidism	19 _ _	_____
Thyroiditis	19 _ _	_____
Other, specify	19 _ _	_____

6.2 Has a doctor ever told you that you had a tumour (benign or malignant) or leukaemia (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", please specify (indicate for each of them separately: primary localisation, hospital of diagnosis, year of diagnosis and check type of treatment received).

a. First tumour

Localisation \_\_\_\_\_

Hospital \_\_\_\_\_

Year of diagnosis \_\_\_\_\_

19|\_|\_|

Treatment

Yes

No

Don't know

Radiotherapy

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Chemotherapy

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Surgery

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

b. Second tumour

Localisation \_\_\_\_\_

Hospital \_\_\_\_\_

Year of diagnosis \_\_\_\_\_

19|\_|\_|

Treatment

Yes

No

Don't know

Radiotherapy

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Chemotherapy

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Surgery

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

1 ☐

2 ☐

9 ☐

6.3 Have you ever received radiotherapy for medical conditions other than listed in question 6.1 (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no  
9 ☐ don't remember

If "yes", please specify:

disease \_\_\_\_\_

hospital, where radiotherapy was received \_\_\_\_\_

year of treatment \_\_\_\_\_

19|\_|\_|

6.4 Have you ever had any of the following radio-diagnostic procedures (check "yes", "no" or "don't know" one for each procedure; if "yes" enter number of times)?

Radio-diagnostic procedure		Number of times
Dental X-ray	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify number of times	_ _
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	
	9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	

Radio-diagnostic procedure		Number of times
Chest X-ray (except fluoroscopy)	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify number of times 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	
X-ray of bone	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify number of times 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	
Other, specify _____ _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify number of times 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	

## 7. Family information

Please answer the following questions about your family and relatives

7.1 How many brothers and sisters do you have? |||

7.2 Have any of your first degree blood relatives (parents, brothers, sisters and children) and second degree blood relatives (grand parents, aunts, uncles and grand children) had any of the following thyroid diseases: thyroiditis, goitre, hypothyroidism, hyperthyroidism, thyroid nodules (benign), etc.?

Relationship to the liquidator		Disease	Year of diagnosis
Mother	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify	_____	19
		_____	19
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know		
Father	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify	_____	19
		_____	19
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know		
Other relative, specify _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify	_____	19
		_____	19
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know		
Other relative, specify _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify	_____	19
		_____	19
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know		



7.3 Have any of your first degree blood relatives (parents, brothers, sisters and children) and second degree blood relatives (grand parents, aunts, uncles and grand children) ever had any type of cancer: solid cancer or leukaemia (check "yes", "no", or "don't know" for each of the relatives). If "yes", indicate the primary localization and the year of diagnosis; enter "don't remember" if the respondent does not remember localization?

Relationship to the liquidator		Localization	Year of diagnosis
Mother	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	_____	19 _ _
Father	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	_____	19 _ _
Other relative, specify _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	_____	19 _ _
Other relative, specify _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	_____	19 _ _

## 8. Smoking habits

The questions in the following two sections concern your smoking and drinking habits (if applicable) and have only scientific interest, the answers will be kept confidentially and used only for research.

8.1 Have you ever smoked regularly (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no (go to question 9.1)

8.2 How old were you when you started smoking regularly?

|\_|

8.3 Do you currently smoke cigarettes regularly (check one)?

- 1 ☐ yes  
2 ☐ no (go to question 8.5)

8.4 How old were you when you stopped smoking regularly?

|\_|

8.5 How many total years have you smoked cigarettes regularly in your lifetime, not counting any periods when you stopped smoking

|\_|

8.6 How many cigarettes (papirosy) do you smoke (or did you smoke if you have stopped) in a typical day?

|\_|

8.7 What do you usually smoke (or did smoke, if you have stopped) (check all that apply)?

- 1 ☐ cigarettes with filter                      3 ☐ hand-rolled cigarettes  
2 ☐ cigarettes without filter/papirosy      4 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

## 9. Alcohol consumption habits

9.1 How often do you drink alcohol currently (*check one*)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> never                | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> once a week          |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> once a month or less | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> several times a week |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2-3 times a month    | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> every day            |

If you drink alcohol, please tell me whether you drink the followings and the typical amount you drink per day?

Beverage		Quantity (ml)
beer	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Vodka, including samogon <sup>1</sup>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
wine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Other, specify _____	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, specify 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

9.2 Have your alcohol habits changed since you were in the Chernobyl area (*check one*)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> didn't change    | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> I started drinking after Chernobyl |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> I now drink more | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> I do not drink currently           |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> I now drink less |   |

## 10. Conclusion

10.1 Thank you very much for answering my questions. Please use the lines below for any additional comments you may have.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Time interview ended:

hours  minutes

<sup>1</sup> Home-made spirit

---

## 11. Questions to the interviewer

### 11.1 Location of interview (*check one*).

1 ☐ polyclinic

2 ☐ other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

### 11.2 Was respondent responsive (*check one*)?

1 ☐ no, (was uninterested, reticent))

2 ☐ fairly cooperative and responsive

3 ☐ very cooperative , helpful

### 11.3 How well did the liquidator seem to remember the details of his work in the 30-km zone (*check one*

1 ☐ very well

4 ☐ not well

2 ☐ well

5 ☐ not at all

3 ☐ fairly well

### 11.4 If liquidator answered that he had worked on the industrial site of the ChNPP, how confident are you about his answer (*please take into consideration how he described his work, proposed maps, schemes and photographs*) ?

1 ☐ I am confident

2 ☐ I am not enough confident

3 ☐ I think he didn't work on the industrial site of the ChNPP

8 ☐ liquidator answered that he didn't work on the industrial site

9 ☐ I don't know

explain, why do you think so \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

### 11.5 How well did the liquidator remember the details about history of radiation exposure - medical and occupational (*check one*)?

1 ☐ very well

4 ☐ not well

2 ☐ well

5 ☐ not at all

3 ☐ fairly well

### 11.6 How well did the liquidator remember the details about history of chemical exposure - medical (chemotherapy) or occupational (*check one*)?

1 ☐ very well

4 ☐ not well

2 ☐ well

5 ☐ not at all

3 ☐ fairly well

### 11.7 Please add any additional notes, comments on the liquidator's answers and your general comments on the interview. In particular, please provide any details and information, not covered by the questionnaire but received from the liquidator, if you think it's relevant; please give all the details about liquidator's state which might have affected quality of his/her answers (such as was he/she ill, whether he/she had any problems or was in a hurry during the interview).).

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Annex 3

*Case-control studies*  
**INTERVIEWER BOOKLET**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## PART A

Introduction .....	4
Instructions for conducting the interview .....	4
General procedures .....	4
Specific instructions for the interviewer for completing the questionnaire .....	4
Some information about the liquidator .....	5
Information about missions in the 30-km zone .....	5
Conditions of work and activities during missions to the 30-km zone .....	6
Description of episodes of work during missions in the 30-km zone around the Chernobyl NPP .....	6
General occupational history .....	6
Conclusion .....	7

## Annexes

1. List of activities aimed at the elimination of the radiological consequences of the accident .....	9
2. Abbreviations and jargon terms used for communication during the elimination of the consequences of the accident .....	11
3. Explanation of indications on diagram of the industrial site and construction of the ChNPP .....	14
4. Explanation of indications on diagram of locations in the main building of the ChNPP .....	17
5. Settlements inside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP - Kiev oblast, Ukraine (sorted by alphabetical order of settlement) .....	22
6. Settlements inside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP - Gomel oblast, Belarus (sorted by alphabetical order of settlement) .....	23
7. Settlements inside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP - Kiev oblast, Ukraine (sorted by alphabetical order of raion and settlement) .....	26
8. Settlements inside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP - Gomel oblast, Belarus (sorted by alphabetical order of raion and settlement) .....	28
9. Settlements in Ukraine outside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP (sorted by alphabetical order of settlement):	
Zhitomir oblast .....	30
Kiev oblast .....	33
Chernigov oblast .....	36
10. Settlements in Ukraine outside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP (sorted by alphabetical order of raion and settlement):	
Zhitomir oblast .....	38
Kiev oblast .....	41
Chernigov oblast .....	44
11. Settlements in Belarus outside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP (sorted by alphabetical order of settlement):	
Gomel oblast .....	46
12. Settlements in Belarus outside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP (sorted by alphabetical order of raion and settlement):	
Gomel oblast .....	49
13. List of industries and occupations .....	52
14. List of exposures .....	52

## PART B

Map of 5-km zone around the Chernobyl NPP .....	1
Diagram of the industrial sites and construction base of the ChNPP .....	2
Diagram of building and structures on the site of the ChNPP .....	3
Diagram of locations in the main building of the ChNPP .....	4
Map of settlements inside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP .....	5

Map of settlements outside the 30-km zone around the ChNPP .....	6
Photograph of dosimeters used in the elimination of the consequences of the accident .....	7
View of the station from the side of the damaged block before the beginning of the construction of the sarcophagus	8
Roof of the machine hall on the side of the fourth block .....	9
Episode of the construction of the sarcophagus (beginning stage) .....	10
Episode of the construction of the sarcophagus (final stage) .....	11
View of the station from the side of the 5-6 blocks (the side of Chernobyl at the moment of completion of the construction of the sarcophagus) .....	12
View of the station from the side of the city of Pripyat after the completion of the construction of the sarcophagus	13
View of the station from the side of the northern cooling pond .....	14
Example of a Chernobyl liquidator certificate with red cover .....	15



## Introduction

This Booklet contains the information, which is needed to help the liquidators answer the questions of the interviewer as completely as possible, as well as to help the interviewer complete correctly the answers to the corresponding questions.

## Instructions for conducting the interview

### **General procedures**

- The questionnaire should be administered by a trained interviewer to the Chernobyl liquidator during a face to face interview. If the liquidator cannot answer the questions himself due to illness or death or other reasons, the questionnaire will be administered to the next of kin and the identity of the respondent will be indicated in the questionnaire. The person interviewed should not complete the questionnaire instead of the interviewer and the answers should be given on behalf of the liquidator.
- Standardised description and explanation of terms which may be difficult for you to understand are provided in the following sections of Booklet (list of activities, maps, schemes etc.) and it is expected you will study them as well as the the questionnaire before to start the interviewing.
- Before the beginning of the interview, you should spend 3-5 minutes talking to the liquidator about unrelated matters. This helps the liquidator relax and be well disposed towards the interviewer. The interview should be carried out in active , well-wishing manner keeping up the interviewee's interest to participate in the interview. You must avoid showing your reaction to his answers what ever they could be.
- The interviewer must ask all the questions in the questionnaire (unless otherwise indicated). The questions should not be read but asked looking into interviewee's eyes.
- You should follow up attentively the answers and write down them as more precisely and completely as possible. You must not hurry the interviewee to answer the questions and prompt the answers or to ask additional questions not included in the questionnaire. The explanations of terms, which may be difficult for some interviewees to understand, are acceptable.
- The interview should be carried out in the uniform manner while asking questions. Various approaches might be chosen only for making contacts with the study subjects before to start the interview.
- The questions addressed to the interviewee are printed as usual text and those addressed to the interviewer are given *in italic*
- When multiple choices are provided, the interviewer should check the box corresponding to the correct answer by putting one of the following signs "x" or "+". Unless otherwise indicated, only one answer should be checked for each question.
- For the questions concerning dates, it is necessary to complete with 2 figures each for year, month and day, for example: year 19|8|6| month |0|5| day |0|7|.
- Please write clearly (print) when completing the questionnaire avoiding abbreviations.



- The questionnaire should be completed using preferably blue ink ball pen. The corrections are allowed only in red ink above the previously written answer (or word) after crossing it out.
- The subject identification composed of four digits and a family name appears at the left-hand upper corner of the first page of the questionnaire. It is to be completed before the interview by the person in charge of the selection of study subjects. If you use additional materials of the questionnaire (additional sheets) write down the same number on the first pages.
- The questionnaire includes a section 11 with questions directed to you, the interviewer, concerning the interview. These should be completed immediately after the interview. Here answering the question 11.7 you can record all details which you think relevant and important for the study. If you have some difficulties in understanding specific terms or other problems you can also record them there.
- Prior to the interview, the study subject will have been contacted by letter by a staff member of the regional Chernobyl registry. The letter will include a description of the study objectives and a form to be returned including whether or not they agree to take part in the study and providing possible dates for the interview. Following this, you will be asked to send a letter directly to the study subject confirming the date and time of the interview and asking them to prepare a number of documents for the interview, including the certificate of liquidator, all certificates concerning doses obtained and the period of stay in the 30-km zone.

### ***Specific instructions for the interviewer for completing the questionnaire***

- *For the questions in the section: "Information about liquidator from the Chernobyl Registry"* (page 2), the information should be completed, from the Chernobyl Registry, prior to the interview. You should check it with the liquidator during the interview. If there is a difference, you should enter the corrections in the right hand column. Any information not available from the Registry should be entered in the right-hand column at the time of the interview.
- *"Date of interview" and "Time interview began"* (page 3) are to be completed by you at the beginning of the interview. You should write your name in the space provided. Please also specify who answered the questionnaire. If the questionnaire is not administered to the liquidator himself but to the next of kin, try to find out and record the names and addresses of the colleagues with whom he worked in the Chernobyl area.
- You should also record the time the interview ends.
- If there were some reasons to interrupt the interview the date and the time when it was stopped and then started again should be recorded and a reason why it was interrupted should be indicated. The interview should be continued from the same question where it was interrupted.

### ***Some information about the liquidator***

- *Question 1.4.* A photograph of an official liquidator certificate is included in Part B (photograph page 15) of this Booklet; you can compare it with the document shown by the liquidator.

- *Question 1.5.* The entire work period is considered to be a single mission if:
  - A liquidator was sent (for mission) by one organisation (by local military commissariat and etc) for appropriate period of time, lived in the settlement outside of 30 km zone and was commuted from there to his working place in the 30-km zone (including industrial site) by different forms of transport. The starting date is the date of the first entry to 30-km zone and the finishing date - the date of final departure.
  - A liquidator was sent more than for one mission as described above, but the interruption between the missions was less than one month and another one followed soon. The starting date is also the date of the first entry to 30 km zone and the finishing date - the date of final departure.
  - A liquidator was sent by organisation that was located near Chernobyl (Kiev) without special order for appropriate task and was coming back to Kiev (or to the other place he lived) on the end of the working day. The first time of his entry to 30 km zone is pointed out as starting date and the finalisation of his task - as the finishing date (even if it was only one day).
  - A liquidator (the staff of the ChNPP, "Kombinat" etc) worked shifts (two weeks in the zone of the elimination of the consequences of the accident followed by two weeks of rest). The period of mission is indicated by dates of the beginning and ending working shifts.
- In case when a liquidator worked (the staff of the ChNPP, "Kombinat" etc) continuously for few years in 30 km zone, you should select the most important periods of time from April 1986 till December 1987 in terms of possibly the highest level of exposure he could receive. As a fact, most of them were professionals and could help you to do that.
- If a liquidator has had an interruption of one month or more between two or more visits to the zone, he will be assumed to have few missions.

### ***Information about missions in the 30 km zone***

Sections 2-4 should be completed for each mission of the liquidator to the 30-km zone. Complete the sections in the main body of the questionnaire for the first mission and fill in additional sets of these sections for each subsequent mission if the liquidator had more than one mission in the 30-km zone.

- *Question 2.1:* When the subject was sent to Chernobyl as a military man of the regular army or as an officer, check "1", if civilians sent by the local military committees, check "2". Check "3" if the liquidator was sent by the Ministry of Medium Machinery, the Ministry of Atomic Energy Industry or the Ministry of Atomic Energy.
- *Questions 2.3, 2.4* - see 1.5 above for the definition of a mission.
- *Question 2.5, 2.7:* A liquidator may have several documents on the dates of staying in the 30-km zone and on the radiation doses (you should write down the data only from the stamped documents), you should record all the documents if the dates mentioned in them correspond to the period of the mission. If the liquidator has a document on internal and external doses of exposure to the whole body or to the organ you should write down the external whole body dose. If the records are not understandable for you, copy them to 11.7 paragraph. Before completing the last column in the table do not forget to ask is this a cumulative dose or not.

- *Question 2.8:* shift workers were either permanent staff of the ChNPP or subjects who worked for periods longer than one month. They generally worked for periods of 15 days in a row, sleeping in special settlements outside the 30-km zone, followed by 15 days of rest at home. Some categories of persons could work longer periods but maintaining the principle of equal duration of the periods of work and rest at their place of constant residence.
- *Question 2.9* When evaluating the percentage of time spent in different places of work, remember that the sum should not exceed 100%. For the calculation you can use the rough copy.
- *Questions 2.10, 2.11:* To complete these questions, the liquidator should be shown the map of the territories inside and outside the 30-km zone (pp. 5 and 6 respectively of Part B of the Booklet) and the list of settlements inside (pp. 22-29 of Part A of the Booklet) and outside (pp. 30-51 of Part A of the Booklet) that zone. Note that there are both lists sorted by alphabetical order of settlement and by alphabetical order or rayon and settlement to help the study subject to better recollect the events. If the liquidator worked in the industrial site, write "industrial site of the ChNPP"(not Pripiat-city). If he/she do not remember the exact date enter only month and year. If the liquidator worked or lived in the same settlement again after some interval it should be counted together. The calendar (p. 15 of the questionnaire will help you).
- *Question 2.13.* If the liquidator answered that he left the zone because his mission was over and his radiation dose was higher than the admissible level, you should check "1", if you were told that the liquidator had left the zone because his mission was over and his radiation dose was equal to the admissible level, you should check "2".

### ***Conditions of work and activities during missions to the 30-km zone***

- *Question 3.1.* If the liquidator wore an individual dosimeter given by the dosimetry service all the time (or during work in the 30-km zone), you should check "1", if he didn't wear the dosimeter himself but knew that there was an individual dosimeter given by the dosimetry service in the group - check "2".

Estimation of dose by the itinerary and time of work method is as follows. The dosimetrist estimated the dose on the basis of known radiation levels in different places, duration of work and route to the place of work and attributed this dose estimate to all members of a group who had worked together. If the study subject remembers that his dose was estimated in this way you should check "3".

- *Question 3.3.* "Regularly" in this question should be interpreted as when requested by the staff of the dosimetry service.
- *Question 3.4.* Some liquidators estimated their doses themselves. From this question, we'd like to find out whether the interviewee did in fact estimate his dose himself.
- *Question 3.6.* *Protective clothes* means the clothes worn over usual clothes and taken off before getting into less contaminated zone.

### ***Description of episodes of work during missions in the 30-km zone around the Chernobyl NPP***

Completing this part of the questionnaire you should divide the entire work during the mission (using the rough copy) into separate episodes. A liquidator will be assumed to have one episode during entire mission unless he or she has not changed type, duration and place of work as well as his/her place of residence Otherwise it is considered to be another episode. The number of the

episodes depends on how many times any of the above-mentioned characteristics has been changed. Fill in additional sets for each subsequent episode if the liquidator had more than one episode in the 30-km zone.

Completing section 4 of the questionnaire you should use the material in the current Booklet as much as possible including pictures, all kinds of lists of settlements, lists of the activities, jargon, etc

- *Question 4.1a.* If the liquidator informed you that he worked on the industrial site, show all photographs, diagrams of buildings (if he worked inside buildings or on the roof), maps of the industrial site in order for him to better recollect the episode described and to show his route on the industrial site. If the liquidator worked outside the industrial plant, show him the map of the 30-km zone and different lists of settlements.

### **General occupational history**

- *Question 5.3.* The term “medicine” includes nuclear medicine, radiology and radiotherapy as well as research in these areas. Activities in medicine, nuclear industry and industrial radiography should be indicated as such, even if they were carried out in army institutions. Army service here refers to activities other than those listed above.
- *Questions 5.4.* In the Booklet (p. 51) there is the list of industries; show it to the liquidator. If he worked in such an industry, you should complete the table. If the liquidator doesn't remember the exact dates, just enter the years. Record also his occupation, full name of the plant and the oblast (region) and town/settlement where it was located.
- *Question 5.5.* In the Booklet (p. 51) there is a list of chemicals; show it to the liquidator. If he worked with any of the chemicals mentioned in the list, you should complete the table. If the liquidator doesn't remember the exact dates, just enter the years. Record also the name of the plant and the oblast (region) and town/settlement where it was located.

### **Conclusion**

- *Questions 10.1.* The interviewer should give the liquidator the possibility to write down any comments he wishes.





## **ANNEXES**



**1. LIST OF ACTIVITIES AIMED AT THE ELIMINATION OF THE RADIOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACCIDENT.**

Type of work	Time period <sup>1</sup>	Responsible organization
<b>1. General work done in the industrial site</b>		
Filling in the mine under the reactor of unit 4	27.04-10.05.1986	Ministry of Defense (MD)
Cleaning the territory of the industrial site	30-04-10.05.1986	MD
Strengthening of the fundamentals of unit 4	03.06-28.06.1986	Ministry of Coal Industry, Miestrotoy (MCI)
Decontamination of the industrial site and roads	10.05-15.06.1986	MD
Organization of station of decontamination and special treatment (PUSO)	01-10.05.1986	MD, Ministry of Energy (ME)
Construction of waste disposal facility	30.08.1986	ME, Ministry of Geology, Ministry of Middle Machinery (place selection and design)
Construction of water, heat, and energy supply facility for the industrial site	30.08.1986	ME
Decontamination of facilities in units 1 and 2	15.06-10.08.1986	ME, Ministry of Montage and Special Constructions (MMSC)
Construction of warehouse in Vilcha	30.07.1986	ME
Construction of settlement for shift workers (Zelony Mis), including the following:	Jan-Jun 1987	ME, MMSC
First phase of construction for 3000 persons	30.10.1986	
Construction of warehouse for delivery department	30.10.1986	ME, MMSC
<b>2. Basic activities in the industrial site of NPP</b>		
Construction of a "wall in the ground"	28.07.1986	ME, MD
Construction of drainage inside the "wall in the ground"	30.08.1986	ME, MD
Construction of drainage in the beach along the Pripyat River	25.09.1986	Ministry of Water Supply (MWS), Ministry of Construction in Oil and Gas Industry (MCOG)
Construction of vertical drainage in well along the cooling pond	25.09.1986	MWS, MCOG
Construction of sarcophagus	December	ME, Ministry of Middle Machinery (selection of

<sup>1</sup> If only one date is indicated, it is the date of completion of the activity



Type of work	Time period <sup>1</sup>	Responsible organization
	1986	Machinery (selection of location)
Conservation of "zavala"	30.09.1986	MMM
Closing of reactor division of unit 4, including:	30.10.1986	MMM
Put into operation concrete-making plan No. 3 in Chernobyl No. 4	10.07.1986 30.09.1986	MMM MMM
Covering a territory and site with concrete	30.08.1986	MMM
Construction of cascade walls	26.09.1986	MMM
Montage and covering with concrete the protective wall along the axis "51"	10.09.1986	MMM, MMSC
Construction of roofing	30.10.1986	MMM
Covering of protective walls of "B" unit with concrete	30.10.1986	MMM
Covering of protective walls in the dearator facility with concrete	30.10.1986	MMM
Closing the machinery hall	30.10.1986	MMM, ME, MSPC
Construction of wall that separates units 3 and 4	30.10.1986	MMM
Separation of units 2 and 1 from units 3 and 4	30.09.1986	ME
<b>3. Supplementary work</b>		
Finishing the construction of the storage for used nuclear fuel with special drainage for rainwater (Khoyat)	30.09.1986	ME
Construction of technical communications in the industrial site	30.09.1986	ME, MMM
Preparation of the first unit to operate	01.10.1986	ME
Preparation of unit 2 to operate	03.11.1986	ME
Construction of Slavutich	04.01.1987- 31.03.1988	ME
Activities of the Construction Organization 605	18.05.1986 - 21.11.1987	MMM
Second decontamination of unit 3	02.04.1987 - 01.10.1987	MD, MMM, ME
Covering the red forest	1st trimester of 1987	MD
Preparation of unit 3 for operation	03.12.1987	ME

## 2. ABBREVIATIONS AND JARGON TERMS USED FOR COMMUNICATION DURING THE ELIMINATION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACCIDENT

Terms and abbreviations	Definitions
Ostrov (island)	Part of the industrial site near the 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> reactors
Partisan	Military reserve liquidator
Mashka	Zone M on the illustration of the building - part of the roof of the 4 <sup>th</sup> reactor just under the ventilation chimney
Elena	Metallic construction "scheme E" of the reactor which fell during the reactor explosion
Demag	Remote control of cranes used for construction of the sarcophagus
Kormotsekh	Canteen at the corner of Kirov and Sovetskaya streets (the largest in Chernobyl)
"Golden" Corridor	Corridor (room 301) decorated by golden aluminum from which it was possible to enter most of the rooms in which the power plant personnel worked. This corridor was used by the permanent NPP personnel but not by partisans
9 <sup>th</sup> point	Same as above
12 <sup>th</sup> point	Place for turbines and their control systems in the machine hall - one of the main facilities with the length of 1 200m.
School No 1	Dosimetry control of Construction Organization 605 and production union "Kombinat" from 7 June 1986 (Kirov St.)
Jupiter	Plant in Pripyat town
Fekalka (Fikalka)	Fecal pump station in Pripyat - one of the places from where the buses to the ChNPP left
Podlesnie (khutor)	Small settlement which no longer existed in 1986
Podlesnie (garage)	Garage co-operative situated on the site of khutor
Metallist (garage)	Same as above
Elektronika	Canteen for construction workers situated in the most contaminated place in the 30 km zone
Fialka	Canteen in the area of the ChNPP (150m from the 4 <sup>th</sup> reactor)
Ramashka	Canteen close to Fialka
Hot channel	Canal for return of water after cooling turbine condensators
Cold channel	Canal bringing in water for cooling turbines
Beregovaya	Water pump station on the dam between cooling pool and river Pripyat
Khodovaya	Pripyat river-bed separated by the dam from the cooling pool
Semykhodovskiy starik (old man)	Reservoir of the water of river Pripyat, located close to the city
Yanovskiy starik (old man)	Part of the same reservoir upstream

<b>Terms and abbreviations</b>	<b>Definitions</b>
Teplyak	Office for Installation and Construction GEM, UTEM
Treatment facility (for chalybeate water)	Water-supply treatment facility in city Pripyat
Wastewater treatment facility (sewerage)	Wastewater treatment facility, located outside city Pripyat
Hydrotsekh	Hydrotsekh building located on the "Island"
Semykhody (platform)	Railway station for local Diesel trains, located close to the ChNPP
Fakel	Metallic torch-shaped monument located nearby Pripyat entry pointer and cross-road
Byk	Sculpture in the village of Kupovatoe
Bronyrowanyi (lead-covered) bus	Bus equipped to commute the people to the areas with high gamma-radiation dose rate
Dosik	Dosimetrist
Radik, Shitik	Ionising radiation
Afghanka	Field dress popular among the liquidators
VSO	Dress of military builders popular among the civilian
South side	South side of the plant - where the main exit from ABK-1 was located (front part)
North side	North side (back) of the plant
Old man	Previous Pripyat river-bed
Jupiter	Factory in Pripyat
Old Jupiter	Factory in Pripyat (old building)
Pine tree	Trident-shaped pine tree located nearby industrial site of the ChNPP
MREO	Transport police office
ABK	Administration/general service building
BSchU	Unit control room
GO	Civil defense
GTsN	Reactor coolant pump
ZGIS	Deputy Chief, Power Plant Engineer
ZNRTs	Deputy Chief, Reactor Department
ZNTsTsR	Deputy Chief, Centralized Repair Department
IDK	Individual dosimetric monitoring
KMPTs	Forced multiple circulation coolant loop
LA	Accident remediation
LPA	Liquidation of the consequences of the accident
LLB	Staircase and elevator unit
MO	Ministry of Defense

<b>Terms and abbreviations</b>	<b>Definitions</b>
MSM	Ministry of Industrial/Mechanical Engineering
MSTch	Medical and health unit
MED	Exposure rate
NSO	Shift Change Manager
NTs	Department Manager
Nts MO	Ministry of Defense Science Center
OG OZ MO	Special zone operational group, Ministry of Defense
OLB	Acute radiation sickness
ORVD ChAE	Retrospective Dose Reconstruction Department, ChNPP
OT&TB	Industrial Hygiene & Safety Technology
PO	Production Association
RB	Radiation safety
RM	Radiation route
RO	Radiation conditions
RPU	Backup control room
RTs	Reactor Department
SIUR	Senior Reactor Control Engineer
SICH	Whole-body counter
TB	Safety Technology
TG	Turbine generator unit
KhOYaT	Nuclear waste storage facility
TsZ	Reactor hall

### 3. EXPLANATION OF INDICATIONS ON DIAGRAM OF THE INDUSTRIAL SITE AND CONSTRUCTION BASE

Number on map	Buildings and constructions
1	Bloc "A"
2	Bloc "B"
3	Bloc "V"
4	Bloc "G"
5	VSRO - Reactor hall auxillary structure
6	VZS - Coolant water intake facilities
7	BNS - Coolant water intake pump building
8	ABK - Administration/general service building
9	Dining room
10	OBK - Common reactor auxiliary
11	KS - Compressor station
12	TsLK - Silicon-doping shop
13	AKS - Nitrate facility
14	Chemical reagent warehouse
15	Fresh fuel storage area
16	Reagent storage area
17	PRK - backup boiler
18	TsPR - Repair training facility
19	"LER" - "L'vovenergoremont" (L'vov Off. of State Trust for Overhaul of Power Equip.)
20	Stage-3 pumping station
21	DES - Diesel generator building
22	Wastewater treatment facility
23	Gas hold-up chamber
24	Garage and vehicle-washing facility
25	KhZhTO - liquid-waste storage facility
26	KhOYaT - Nuclear waste storage facility
27	KPP - main gate checkpoint
28	Firehouse
29	KSSK - Precast concrete plant
29a	Administration building
29b	Reinforced-concrete plant
30	Woodworking plant
30a	Woodworking shop
30b	General service building
30v	Shop



Number on map	Buildings and constructions
31	Concrete mixing plant
32	Motor pool
32a	Office
32b	Repair area
32v	Enclosed parking
32a	General service building
32b	Repair area
32v	Mechanical repair shops
33	RII - Mechanical repair shops
34	Office
35	Tool repair shop
36	Graphite warehouse
37	Managers' warehouse
37a	Special warehouse
37b	Central materials warehouse
37v	Equipment warehouse
37g	Equipment warehouse
38	"Gidroelectromontazh"
38a	Production building
38b	Special machine repair shop
38v	Measurement and test equipment shop
39	Chernobyl office "Yuzhteploenergmontazh"
39a	General service building
39b	Pre-installation shop
39v	Warehouses
40	SAEM - "Soyuzatomenergmontazh"
40a	Office
40b	Reinforcement shop
40v	Warehouse
41	YuEM - "Yuzhenergmontazh"
41a	Administration building
41b	Shops
42	Pripyat' office "Yuzhteploenergmontazh"
42a	Administration building
42b	Shops
43	Heated warehouse
44	"Gidroenergmontazh" (Office for the design, Manufacture and Installation of Hydroelectric Structures, Equipment and Bridges)

Number on map	Buildings and constructions
45	TMU-YuTEM - Tripol' Construction Unit
46	"Soyuzenergozashchita"
46a	Unit 16
46b	Unit 2
46v	Unit 18
46g	Unit 10
47	GEM - "Gidroelektromontazh" (State Trust for Installation of Hydroelectric Equipment)
48	Prefabricated residential construction plant
48a	Administration building
48b	General service building
48v	Shop
48g	Shop
49	Flamable-liquids warehouse
50	SEZh - "Soyuzenergozashchita"
50a	Common building
50b	Chemical protection shop
50v	Administration/General service building
50g	Warehouses
51	Bitumen concrete plant
51a	Office
51b	General service building
52	YuEMV - "Yuzhenrgomontazhventilatsiya"
52a	Office
52b	General service building
53	Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant Construction Administration
54	Administration building
55	Mayak building
56	ORU-750 [Open switchgear]
57	ORU - 330
58	ORU - 110
59	ZRShch - Distribution panel building

#### 4. EXPLANATION OF INDICATIONS ON DIAGRAM OF LOCATIONS IN THE MAIN BUILDING OF THE ChNPP

##### 1. List of facilities of the machinery hall (unit G) at the level 10.00.

Number on map	Facility
GO0/1	Clean staircase
G110/1	Contaminated staircase
G180	Contaminated lift
G301	Clean corridor
G304	Station for communication systems
G305	Laboratory of "Scala" system
G306	Protective system "Scala"
G308	Contaminated hall
G361	Reactor Control Room
G362	Room for programming engineers
G364	Central Control Room
G365	Screen "DK"
G367	Tambour
G369	Construction unit
G384	Ventilation center
G385	Refrigerating facilities
G010/2	Clean staircase"
G110/2	Contaminated staircase
G174/2	Clean elevator
G180/2	Contaminated elevator"
G324/2	Backup control room
G325/2	Screen SPO and ZUBR
G326/2	Ventilation chamber
G327/2	Tambour
G347	Clean corridor
G348	Clean lavatory
G349	Contaminated lavatory
G350	Clean hallway
G351	Contaminated hallway point 12.00
G352	Refrigerating facilities
G353	Ventilation center
G354	Station for communication systems
G355	Room for programming engineers
G356	Room for tapes perforation
G357	Laboratory of the system "Skala"



Number on map	Facility
G358	Operator's zone
G359	Protective system "Scala"
G360	BShchU
G365	Screen "DK"
G383	Room for communication systems
G221	Main ejectors room, point 7,50
G223/1-4	Lubricant tanks for turbines storage site
G438	Site for the turbogenerator service, point,12,00
G439/1-8	Electric installation facility. Cable route for turbines, point 13,40/12,00
G440/1.2	KRU site

## 2. List of facilities of blocks “A”, “B”, “V” at the level 12.50.

Number on map	Facility
401/1-4	Corridor for transportation
402/1-4	Room for the engines GNTs
403/1-4	Mine for turbine wiring, point 13.00
404/1-4	Box NVK, point 13.80
405/1,2	Corridor for turbine wiring, point 14.80
406/1,2	Corridor for service
407/1,2	Room for counters KIP TTTch point 13.00
410	Transformation facility
411/1,2	Room for the decontamination of equipment
412	Repair shop for operating facilities SUZ
413	Room for KIP SVO
414	Room for the tanks with solution for decontamination
415/1,2	Room for ultrasonic decontamination
416	Room for the heat conductors
417	Room for the tanks with solution for decontamination
418	Corridor for service
419	Station for preparation of reagents and pearlier
420	Station for preparation tars
421	Warehouse SVO
423/1,2	Room for tank with the water for washing the coolant loop
424	Contaminated corridor
425	Pumping station for testing system PVN-8 of the coolant loop MPTs
426/1	Clean lavatory, point 12.50
427/1,2	Gas-main distribution panel room
428/1-6	Construction room RTZO
429/1,2	Sampling room SVO-1
430/1,2,5,6	Contaminated lavatory, point 12.50
430/3,4	Contaminated lavatory, point 16,95
431	RTs Shift Change Manager's office
435	Backup room
436/3,4	Staircase from point. 12.50 to point 22.30
437	Switchgear room
438	Mine for electric cables

## 3. List of facilities of block "BCRO" at the level 12.50

Number on map	Facility
201/1,2	Tambours
202	Warehouse for liquid reagents (acids)
203	Preparation room
204	Chemical laboratory for the shift workers
205	Office of the chief of laboratory
206	Laboratory of lubricant
207	Radiometric laboratory
208	Laboratory for the gas samples analysis
209	Turning-mechanical repair shop KRB
210	Warehouse
212	Radiometric laboratory
213	Chemical laboratory for regular workers
214	Radiometric laboratory
215	Room for personnel
216	Laboratory of lubricant
217	Warehouse
218	Laboratory of low-salinity samples
219	Laboratory of low-salinity samples
220	Laboratory for the gas samples analysis
221	Low-salinity sampling room
222	Reinforcement control room
223	Laboratory of low-salinity samples
224	Laboratory high-salinity samples (saturated)
225	Laboratory high-salinity samples (saturated)
226	Sampling room
227	Warehouse for non-liquid reagents
228	Laboratory for repair portable dosimeters
229	Laboratory for repair equipment KGO
230	Laboratory of the Nuclear Physics equipment KRB
231	Laboratory KRB
232	Construction room RTZO
233	Communication center
234	Distribution panel VSRO
235	Warehouse for filter-materials
236	Warehouse for filter-materials
237	Warehouse for filter-materials
238	Warehouse for filter-materials

Number on map	Facility
239	Repair shop for subcontractors
240	Corridor for transportation
241	Corridor for network of pipes
242	Corridor
243	Corridor
244	Ladies room
245	Gentlemen room
246	Room for the cleaning inventory
247	Gentlemen room
248	Ladies room
249	Room for the cleaning inventory
250	Reinforcement control room
251/1,2	Auxiliary systems GNTs
252	Backup room
253	Repair shop for cleaning and decontamination detectors
254	Communication center
255	Preparation room for the high radioactivity samples KRB
256	Switchgear room
257	Switchgear room
258	Room KZhO

**5. Settlements in the 30-km zone of Kiev oblast in Ukraine (sorted by name of settlement)**

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Иванковский	Иванковский	Андреевка
Полесский	Полесский	Бовище
Иванковский	Иванковский	Буда
Иванковский	Иванковский	Буряковка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Бычки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Глинка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Городчан
Полесский	Денисовичский	Денисовичи
Полесский	Дибровский	Диброва
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Дитятки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Залесье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Замошня
Иванковский	Иванковский	Заполье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Зимовище
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ивановка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Иловница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ильинцы
Иванковский	Иванковский	Каменка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Копачи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Корогод
Иванковский	Иванковский	Коцюбинское
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кошаровка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кошевка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Красное
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кривая Гора
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ладыжичи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Лелев
Полесский	Полесский	Лубянка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Машево
Полесский	Радинский	Нивецкое
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новая Красница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новоселки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новошепеличи
Полесский	Полесский	Ольшанка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Опачичи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Паришев
Иванковский	Иванковский	Плютовище
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Припять
Иванковский	Иванковский	Разъезжее
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рассоха

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Иванковский	Иванковский	Речица
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудня Вересня
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудня Ильинецкая
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудьки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Старая Красница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Староселье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Старые Шепеличи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Стечанка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Терехов
Иванковский	Иванковский	Толстый Лес
Иванковский	Иванковский	Усов
Иванковский	Иванковский	Чапаевка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Черевач
Полесский	Радинский	Черемошна
Иванковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Чернобыль
Иванковский	Иванковский	Чистогаловка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ямполь
Припять	Припятский горсовет	Янов

**6. Settlements in the 30-km zone of Kiev oblast in Ukraine (sorted by name of rayon and settlement)**

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Дитятки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Андреевка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Буда
Иванковский	Иванковский	Буряковка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Бычки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Глинка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Городчан
Иванковский	Иванковский	Залесье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Замошня
Иванковский	Иванковский	Заполье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Зимовище
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ивановка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Иловница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ильинцы
Иванковский	Иванковский	Каменка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Копачи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Корогод
Иванковский	Иванковский	Коцюбинское
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кошаровка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кошевка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Красное
Иванковский	Иванковский	Кривая Гора
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ладъжичи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Лелев
Иванковский	Иванковский	Машево
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новая Красница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новоселки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Новошепеличи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Опачичи
Иванковский	Иванковский	Паришев
Иванковский	Иванковский	Плютовище
Иванковский	Иванковский	Разъездное
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рассоха
Иванковский	Иванковский	Речица
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудня Вересня
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудня Ильинецкая
Иванковский	Иванковский	Рудьки
Иванковский	Иванковский	Старая Красница
Иванковский	Иванковский	Староселье
Иванковский	Иванковский	Старые Шепеличи



Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Иванковский	Иванковский	Стечанка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Терехов
Иванковский	Иванковский	Толстый Лес
Иванковский	Иванковский	Усов
Иванковский	Иванковский	Чапаевка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Черевач
Иванковский	Иванковский	Чистогаловка
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ямполь
Иванковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Чернобыль
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Припять
Полесский	Денисовичский	Денисовичи
Полесский	Дибровский	Диброва
Полесский	Полесский	Бовище
Полесский	Полесский	Лубянка
Полесский	Полесский	Ольпанка
Полесский	Радинский	Нивецкое
Полесский	Радинский	Черемошна
Припять	Припятский горсовет	Янов



**7. Settlements in the 30-km zone of Gomel oblast in Belarus** (sorted by name of settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Александровка
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Белая сорока
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Борщевка
Брагинский	Гденский	Вельмов
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Вепры
Брагинский	Храковичский	Верховая Слобода
Брагинский	Храковичский	Выгребная Слобода
Брагинский	Гденский	Гдень
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Града
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Довляды
Брагинский	Гденский	Желибор
Брагинский	Храковичский	Жердное
Брагинский	Гденский	Залесье
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Капоренка
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Капоренские Ляды
Брагинский	Комаринский	Карловка
Брагинский	Комаринский	Катичев
Брагинский	Гденский	Колыбань
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Красноселье
Брагинский	Гденский	Крюки
Брагинский	Гденский	Кулажин
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Лесок
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Людвиново
Брагинский	Храковичский	Ляды
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Масаны
Брагинский	Гденский	Михалевка
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Молочки
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Надточаевка
Брагинский	Храковичский	Нежихов
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Новые ляды
Брагинский	Храковичский	Новый степанов
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Оревичи
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Осинник
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Осиповка
Брагинский	Храковичский	Пересетинец
Брагинский	Храковичский	Пирки
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Погонное
Брагинский	Гденский	Посудово
Брагинский	Гденский	Пристанское
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Радин

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Рожова
Брагинский	Храковичский	Савичи
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Синцы
Брагинский	Гденский	Скородное
Брагинский	Новоииолченский	Старые ляды
Брагинский	Храковичский	Старый Степанов
Брагинский	Храковичский	Сувиды
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Уласы
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Хатки
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Хутор-Лес
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Чемков
Брагинский	Храковичский	Чернев
Брагинский	Гденский	Чикаловичи

**8. Settlements in the 30-km zone of Gomel oblast in Belarus** (sorted by name of rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Брагинский	Гденский	Вельмов
Брагинский	Гденский	Гдень
Брагинский	Гденский	Желибор
Брагинский	Гденский	Залесье
Брагинский	Гденский	Кольбань
Брагинский	Гденский	Крюки
Брагинский	Гденский	Кулажин
Брагинский	Гденский	Михалевка
Брагинский	Гденский	Посудово
Брагинский	Гденский	Пристанское
Брагинский	Гденский	Скородное
Брагинский	Гденский	Чикаловичи
Брагинский	Комаринский	Карловка
Брагинский	Комаринский	Катичев
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Александровка
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Капоренка
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Капоренские Ляды
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Людвиново
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Новые Ляды
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Осинник
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Старые Ляды
Брагинский	Храковичский	Верховая Слобода
Брагинский	Храковичский	Выгребная Слобода
Брагинский	Храковичский	Жердное
Брагинский	Храковичский	Ляды
Брагинский	Храковичский	Нежихов
Брагинский	Храковичский	Новый Степанов
Брагинский	Храковичский	Пересетинец
Брагинский	Храковичский	Пирки
Брагинский	Храковичский	Савичи
Брагинский	Храковичский	Старый Степанов
Брагинский	Храковичский	Сувиды
Брагинский	Храковичский	Чернев
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Белая Сорока
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Вепры
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Довляды
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Надточаевка
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Осиповка
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Рожова
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Хатки

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Хутор-Лес
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Борщевка
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Града
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Красноселье
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Лесок
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Масаны
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Молочки
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Оревичи
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Погонное
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Радин
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Синцы
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Уласы
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Чемков

**9. Settlements outside the 30-km zone in Ukraine (sorted by name of settlement)**

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
<b>А. Житомирская Область</b>			
Радомышльський	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Белая Криница	95.7
Малинський	Любовичський	Белый Берег	82.9
Овручський	Журбовський	Будолюбовка	66.7
Радомышльський	Вепринський	Веприн	93.9
Новоград-Волинський	Пилиповичський	Городище	200.9
Чудновський	Тютюнниковський	Городище	199.9
Черняхівський	Забродський	Городище	147.5
Андрушевський	Миньковецкий	Городище	170.5
Житомирський	Вертокиевський	Городище	169.6
Малинський	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Гранитное	89.2
Народичський	Залесский	Давыдки	54.4
Коростенський	Давыдковский	Давыдки	125.0
Житомирський	Ивановський	Давыдовка	166.9
Володарско-Волинський	Грушковський	Давыдовка	152.2
Володарско-Волинський	Дворищенський	Дворище	150.4
Дзержинський	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дзержинск	205.8
Емільчинський	Великоцвилянський	Дзержинск	188.3
Лугинський	Бовсуновський	Диброва	117.0
Малинський	Дибровський	Диброва	81.4
Коростенський	Стремигородський	Диброва	106.4
Олевський	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Диброва	149.2
Олевський	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дружба	148.8
Барановський	Дубровський	Дубровка	221.6
Малинський	Горьинський	Елевка	97.8
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Житомир	161.2
Черняхівський	Зороковский	Иванков	154.4
Андрушевський	Иванковский	Иванков	164.3
Малинський	Ивановський	Ивановка	106.1
Коростенський	Веселовський	Ивановка	121.5
Володарско-Волинський	Краєвцінський	Ивановка	144.7
Барановський	Смолдыревський	Ивановка	203.5
Житомирський	Ивановський	Ивановка	164.4
Лугинський	Великодівлинський	Ивановка	139.0
Володарско-Волинський	Поромовський	Калиновка	144.9
Лугинський	Калиновський	Калиновка	138.4
Коростенський	Калиновський	Калиновка	135.4
Новоград-Волинський	Повчинський	Калиновка	216.2
Житомирський	Левковский	Калиновка	155.6
Народичський	Калиновський	Калиновка	81.2

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE - UKRAINE  
(sorted by settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Народичский	Межилеский	Карпиловка	-
Новоград-Волынский	Малоцвилянский	Карпиловка	189.2
Олевский	Зольнянский	Ковалевка	180.1
Коростенский	Каленский	Корма	97.2
Емильчинский	Степановский	Королевка	155.4
Малинский	Ворсовский	Королевка	101.1
Попельнянский	Корнинский	Королевка	148.1
Обл. подчинение		Коростень	112.4
Новоград-Волынский	Лебедевский	Лебедевка	185.1
Овручский	Липско-Романовский	Липские Романы	71.6
Овручский	Руднянский	Людвиновка	72.2
Попельнянский	Макаровский	Макаровка	178.5
Малинский	Район. подчинение	Малин	90.3
Новоград-Волынский	Полияновский	Малиновка	173.1
Коростышевский	Соловеевский	Малиновка	137.5
Черняховский	Стыртовский	Малиновка	134.0
Малинский	Малиновский	Малиновка	88.1
Червоноармейский	Мартыновский	Мартыновка	170.7
Бердичевский	Райгородокский	Мартыновка	211.2
Барановский	Район. подчинение	Марьяновка	197.4
Радомышльский	Ленинский	Марьяновка	123.3
Ружинский	Дергановский	Марьяновка	207.5
Володарско-Волынский	Суховольский	Марьяновка	147.8
Народичский	Норинцевский	Марьяновка	69.9
Коростышевский	Озерский	Марьяновка	149.6
Емильчинский	Рыхальский	Марьяновка	175.1
Коростышевский	Соловеевский	Морозовка	135.4
Малинский	Морозовский	Морозовка	69.9
Новоград-Волынский	Красиловский	Морозовка	200.9
Народичский	Район. подчинение	Народичи	73.5
Емильчинский	Николаевский	Николаевка	152.2
Новоград-Волынский	Каменномайданский	Николаевка	181.9
Народичский	Радчанский	Новая Радча	54.0
Овручский	Усовский	Новая Рудня	129.6
Лугинский	Старосельский	Новая Рудня	127.4
Житомирский	Буковский	Новая Рудня	183.2
Житомирский	Каменский	Новоселица	156.1
Попельнянский	Новоселицкий	Новоселица	170.4
Малинский	Любовичский	Новоселица	85.0
Овручский	Район. подчинение	Овруч	89.3
Любарский	Гизовщинский	Озерное	236.7
Народичский	Радчанский	Ольховая	49.5



Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Народичский	Малоклещевский	Перемога	69.1
Черняховский	Вильский	Перемога	159.4
Новоград-Волынский	Новоромановский	Перемога	191.1
Овручский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Першотравневое	84.2
Житомирский	Песковский	Пески	163.8
Коростенский	Горщиковский	Пески	132.7
Попельнянский	Саварецкий	Пески	167.2
Черняховский	Клетищенский	Плехов	148.8
Народичский	Великоклещевский	Полесское	70.6
Овручский	Песчаницкий	Полесское	99.8
Коростенский	Полесский	Полесское	121.1
Овручский	Руднянский	Прилуки	84.9
Народичский	Радчанский	Радча	55.9
Дзержинский	Романовский	Романовка	208.3
Попельнянский	Романовский	Романовка	160.5
Коростышевский	Романовский	Романовка	138.0
Новоград-Волынский	Брониковский	Романовка	187.0
Барановский	Рогачовский	Рудня	198.2
Коростенский	Рышавский	Рудня	146.9
Коростенский	Полесский	Рудня	123.4
Овручский	Игнатпольский	Рудня	100.7
Черняховский	Очеретянский	Рудня	134.5
Коростышевский	Харитоновский	Рудня	151.2
Олевский	Журжевический	Рудня	169.9
Овручский	Руднянский	Рудня	78.5
Народичский	Радчанский	Старая Радча	54.4
Лугинский	Степановский	Степановка	130.0
Емильчинский	Степановский	Степановка	159.7
Малинский	Украинский	Украинка	86.1
Малинский	Гранитнянский	Федоровка	92.5
Черняховский	Стыртовский	Федоровка	134.1
Новоград-Волынский	Федоровский	Федоровка	181.7
Червоноармейский	Очеретянский	Ясная Поляна	165.3
<b>Б. Киевская Область</b>			
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Бабинцы	85.4
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Белая Церковь	177.2
Иванковский	Шпилевский	Белый Берег	50.8
Полесский	Полесский	Бобер	-
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Борисполь	132.9
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Бородянка	84.5
Барышевский	Волошиновский	Борщев	152.5
Полесский	Будо-Варовичский	Буда-Варовичи	42.5

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE - UKRAINE  
(sorted by settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Полесский	Полесский	Варовичи	38.7
Полесский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Вильча	47.0
Полесский	Волчковский	Волчков	49.9
Переяслав-Хмельницкий	Пристромский	Волчков	166.8
Кагарлыкский	Халчанский	Вороновка	172.5
Вышгородский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Вышгород	95.4
Иванковский	Горностайпольский	Горностайполь	38.8
Бориспольский	Глубокский	Городище	142.1
Белоцерковский	Пилипчанский	Городище	187.4
Иванковский	Иванковский	Городище	36.3
Вышгородский	Демидовский	Демидов	77.1
Васильковский	Здоровский	Диброва	133.8
Иванковский	Песковский	Домановка	36.8
Иванковский	Дымарский	Дымарка	40.2
Вышгородский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дымер	70.2
Киево-Святошинский	Заборский	Заборье	120.8
Иванковский	Иванковский	Запрудка	56.5
Иванковский	Зеленомысский	Зеленый Мыс	42.2
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Зорин	38.6
Бориспольский	Иванковский	Иванков	138.5
Киево-Святошинский	Малютянский	Иванков	125.1
Иванковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Иванков	53.0
Богуславский	Ивановский	Ивановка	218.4
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ивановка	20.4
Белоцерковский	Ивановский	Ивановка	171.8
Ставищенский	Ивановский	Ивановка	215.1
Кагарлыкский	Гороховатский	Ивановка	170.3
Згуровский	Туровский	Ильинское	163.8
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Ирпень	98.7
Васильковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Калиновка	131.1
Макаровский	Макаровский	Калиновка	110.4
Богуславский	Ольховецкий	Калиновка	217.5
Броварский	Калиновский	Калиновка	107.0
Кагарлыкский	Кадомский	Калиновка	183.1
Полесский	Стещинский	Калиновка	35.0
Броварский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Калита	97.9
Иванковский	Песковский	Карпиловка	31.9
Бориспольский	Кировский	Кирово	136.6
Иванковский	Кухаревский	Кирово	74.2
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Клавдиево-Тарасово	91.0
Иванковский	Песковский	Ковалевка	33.6



Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Васильковский	Ковалевский	Ковалевка	158.0
Полесский	Полесский	Ковпиловка	42.5
Макаровский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Кодра	97.0
Макаровский	Королевский	Королевка	97.7
Макаровский	Речицкий	Королевка	-
Полесский	Максимовичский	Королевка	41.5
Фастовский	Пилиповский	Королевка	157.5
Полесский	Красятичский	Красятичи	47.4
Иванковский	Иванковский	Куповатое	33.4
Иванковский	Кухаревский	Кухари	73.7
Яготинский	Годуновский	Лебедевка	185.8
Вышгородский	Лебедевский	Лебедевка	83.1
Белоцерковский	Розалиевский	Людвиновка	166.1
Иванковский	Варовский	Людвиновка	65.3
Макаровский	Людвиновский	Людвиновка	114.8
Обуховский	Долинский	Макаровка	159.2
Иванковский	Макаровский	Макаровка	45.9
Полесский	Максимовичский	Максимовичи	39.8
Иванковский	Макаровский	Малая Макаровка	42.7
Полесский	Мартыновичский	Мартыновичи	35.6
Васильковский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	149.4
Макаровский	Колонщинский	Марьяновка	102.9
Макаровский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	121.0
Переяслав-Хмельницкий	Великокаратульский	Марьяновка	178.3
Полесский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	47.2
Богуславский	Медвинский	Медвин	230.4
Иванковский	Зеленомысский	Медвин	39.1
Бородянский	Микуличский	Микуличи	91.5
Полесский	Млачевский	Млачевка	44.3
Барышевский	Морозовский	Морозовка	141.2
Иванковский	Мусийковский	Мусийки	44.6
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Немешаево	92.9
Макаровский	Колонщинский	Николаевка	104.1
Вышгородский	Литвиновский	Николаевка	74.6
Бородянский	Новогребельский	Новая Гребля	92.0
Иванковский	Мусийковский	Новые Соколы	33.0
Полесский	Новомирский	Новый Мир	34.3
Яготинский	Супоевский	Озерное	162.8
Иванковский	Оранский	Ораное	39.5
Полесский	Стещинский	Орджоникидзе	32.5
Барышевский	Перемоговский	Перемога	130.1
Броварский	Калиновский	Перемога	110.8

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Иванковский	Песковский	Пески	34.7
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Песковка	84.8
Вышгородский	Пирновский	Пирново	83.4
Броварский	Плюсковский	Плюское	119.1
Таращанский	Плюсковский	Плюское	214.7
Полесский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Полесское	51.5
Таращанский	Лесовичский	Потоки	210.0
Иванковский	Песковский	Потоки	31.5
Иванковский	Приборский	Приборск	42.9
Броварский	Руднянский	Рудня	104.0
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Славутич	50.5
Васильковский	Соколовский	Соколовка	166.5
Згуровский	Новоалександровский	Старое	153.1
Бориспольский	Старовский	Старое	156.9
Иванковский	Песковский	Старые Соколы	32.4
Иванковский	Оранский	Степановка	37.3
Васильковский	Ольшанско-Новоселицкий	Степановка	158.7
Полесский	Стецинский	Стещина	37.1
Вышгородский	Гавриловский	Тарасовщина	77.4
Иванковский	Термаховский	Термаховка	45.5
Иванковский	Тетеревский	Тетеревское	65.7
Обуховский	Трипольский	Триполье	150.3
Обуховский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Украинка	146.9
Вышгородский	Рововский	Федоровка	59.1
Фастовский	Великогуляковский	Федоровка	145.0
Иванковский	Иванковский	Федоровка	47.1
Яготинский	Засупоевский	Федоровка	173.7
Полесский	Радинский	Федоровка	33.7
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Фрузиновка	40.2
Иванковский	Оранский	Хочева	40.3
Иванковский	Термаховский	Чкаловка	55.2
Иванковский	Шпилевский	Шпили	54.8
<b>В. Черниговская Область</b>			
Ичнянский	Хаенковский	Вороновка	167.9
Черниговский	Смолинский	Гончаровское	59.8
Бахмацкий	Городищенский	Городище	189.3
Новгород-Северский	Бучковский	Городище	233.1
Менский	Городищенский	Городище	133.4
Городнянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Городня	118.1
Ичнянский	Городнянский	Городня	185.5
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Десна	70.9
Новгород-Северский	Гремячский	Диброва	240.8

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Нежинский	Крутовский	Диброва	150.9
Черниговский	Днепровский	Днепровское	42.5
Ичнянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дружба	172.3
Козелецкий	Олбинский	Дымерка	78.0
Черниговский	Жукотковский	Жукотки	67.8
Репкинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Замглай	87.7
Прилукский	Замостянский	Замостье	186.4
Черниговский	Ивановский	Ивановка	84.1
Щорский	Софиевский	Ивановка	150.7
Семеновский	Ивановский	Ивановка	198.7
Борзнянский	Николаевский	Ивановка	176.0
Коропский	Крисковский	Иваньков	203.9
Нежинский	Великодорожский	Калиновка	148.5
Бахмачский	Халимоновский	Калиновка	203.9
Носовский	Калиновский	Калиновка	137.2
Сребнянский	Карпиловский	Карпиловка	226.3
Козелецкий	Карпиловский	Карпиловка	69.2
Новгород-Северский	Кировский	Кирово	219.1
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Козелец	90.6
Куликовский	Смолянский	Коростень	94.7
Коропский	Краснопольский	Краснополье	211.4
Козелецкий	Максимовский	Лебедевка	64.7
Репкинский	Редьковский	Лесковка	46.7
Черниговский	Боровиковский	Лесное	44.1
Репкинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Любеч	52.2
Бобровицкий	Бобровицкий Горсовет	Макаровка	113.0
Черниговский	Ведильцовский	Малейки	53.8
Репкинский	Любечский	Малиновка	56.2
Черниговский	Тереховский	Малиновка	93.3
Ичнянский	Мартыновский	Мартыновка	182.9
Черниговский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Михайло- Коцюбинское	69.7
Репкинский	Неданчичский	Неданчичи	40.5
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Нежин	132.0
Бобровицкий	Гавриловский	Николаев	140.6
Борзнянский	Николаевский	Николаевка	174.0
Прилукский	Погребовский	Николаевка	155.8
Менский	Николаевский	Николаевка	118.0
Талалаевский	Украинский	Новая	207.4
Козелецкий	Стависский	Новая Гребля	100.5
Прилукский	Новогребельский	Новая Гребля	199.6
Репкинский	Неданчичский	Новая Рудня	44.8

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE - UKRAINE  
(sorted by settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Насел. пункт	Расстояние, км
Коропский	Пролетарский	Новоселица	205.3
Бобровицкий	Соколовский	Новоселица	125.1
Талалаевский	Поповичковский	Обухово	214.3
Козелецкий	Савинский	Озерное	90.4
Черниговский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Олипевка	89.4
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Остер	75.9
Носовский	Степнохуторский	Отрадное	132.2
Нежинский	Переможский	Перемога	149.8
Бахмацкий	Красиловский	Перемога	181.3
Корюковский	Александровский	Пески	146.5
Бобровицкий	Песковский	Пески	127.9
Бахмацкий	Песковский	Пески	182.2
Черниговский	Песковский	Пески	94.9
Щорский	Клюсовский	Плехов	146.7
Черниговский	Плеховский	Плехов	59.2
Носовский	Плосковский	Плоское	116.0
Козелецкий	Остерский Горсовет	Полесское	77.6
Городнянский	Полесский	Полесье	130.2
Сосницкий	Матвеевский	Полесье	165.8
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Прилуки	186.0
Репкинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Радуль	64.8
Репкинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Репки	82.9
Сосницкий	Козляничский	Рудня	179.8
Корюковский	Шишковский	Рудня	167.8
Козелецкий	Моровский	Рудня	65.0
Черниговский	Пакульский	Рудня	42.7
Черниговский	Смолинский	Смолин	65.2
Бобровицкий	Соколовский	Соколовка	130.6
Козелецкий	Максимовский	Соколовка	63.8
Борзнянский	Степановский	Степановка	140.6
Менский	Волосковский	Степановка	135.7
Черниговский	Тереховский	Тереховка	94.5
Семеновский	Александровский	Углы	212.0
Бобровицкий	Гавриловский	Украинка	144.5
<i>Обл. подчинение</i>		Чернигов	84.6
Новгород-Северский	Бучковский	Ясная Поляна	234.8

**10. Settlements outside the 30-km zone in Ukraine (sorted by name of rayon and settlement)**

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
А. Житомирская Область			
Андрушевский	Иванковский	Иванков	164.3
Андрушевский	Миньковецкий	Городище	170.5
Барановский	Дубровский	Дубровка	221.6
Барановский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Марьяновка	197.4
Барановский	Рогачовский	Рудня	198.2
Барановский	Смолдыревский	Ивановка	203.5
Бердичевский	Райгородокский	Мартыновка	211.2
Володарско-Волынский	Грушковский	Давыдовка	152.2
Володарско-Волынский	Дворищенский	Дворище	150.4
Володарско-Волынский	Краевщинский	Ивановка	144.7
Володарско-Волынский	Поромовский	Калиновка	144.9
Володарско-Волынский	Суховольский	Марьяновка	147.8
Дзержинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дзержинск	205.8
Дзержинский	Романовский	Романовка	208.3
Емильчинский	Великоцвилянский	Дзержинск	188.3
Емильчинский	Николаевский	Николаевка	152.2
Емильчинский	Рыхальский	Марьяновка	175.1
Емильчинский	Степановский	Королевка	155.4
Емильчинский	Степановский	Степановка	159.7
Житомирский	Буковский	Новая Рудня	183.2
Житомирский	Вертокиевский	Городище	169.6
Житомирский	Ивановский	Давыдовка	166.9
Житомирский	Ивановский	Ивановка	164.4
Житомирский	Каменский	Новоселица	156.1
Житомирский	Левковский	Калиновка	155.6
Житомирский	Песковский	Пески	163.8
Коростенский	Веселовский	Ивановка	121.5
Коростенский	Горщиковский	Пески	132.7
Коростенский	Давыдковский	Давыдки	125.0
Коростенский	Калиновский	Калиновка	135.4
Коростенский	Каленский	Корма	97.2
Коростенский	Полесский	Полесское	121.1
Коростенский	Полесский	Рудня	123.4
Коростенский	Рыпавский	Рудня	146.9
Коростенский	Стремигородский	Диброва	106.4
Коростышевский	Озерский	Марьяновка	149.6
Коростышевский	Романовский	Романовка	138.0
Коростышевский	Соловеевский	Малиновка	137.5



OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE- UKRAINE  
(sorted by rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Коростышевский	Соловеевский	Морозовка	135.4
Коростышевский	Харитоновский	Рудня	151.2
Лугинский	Бовсуновский	Диброва	117.0
Лугинский	Великодивлинский	Ивановка	139.0
Лугинский	Калиновский	Калиновка	138.4
Лугинский	Старосельский	Новая Рудня	127.4
Лугинский	Степановский	Степановка	130.0
Любарский	Гизовщинский	Озерное	236.7
Малинский	Ворсовский	Королевка	101.1
Малинский	Горынский	Елевка	97.8
Малинский	Гранитнянский	Федоровка	92.5
Малинский	Дибровский	Диброва	81.4
Малинский	Ивановский	Ивановка	106.1
Малинский	Любовичский	Белый Берег	82.9
Малинский	Любовичский	Новоселица	85.0
Малинский	Малиновский	Малиновка	88.1
Малинский	Морозовский	Морозовка	69.9
Малинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Гранитное	89.2
Малинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Малин	90.3
Малинский	Украинский	Украинка	86.1
Народичский	Великоклевщевский	Полесское	70.6
Народичский	Залесский	Давыдки	54.4
Народичский	Калиновский	Калиновка	81.2
Народичский	Малоклевщевский	Перемога	69.1
Народичский	Межилеский	Карпиловка	
Народичский	Норинцевский	Марьяновка	69.9
Народичский	Радчанский	Новая Радча	54.0
Народичский	Радчанский	Ольховая	49.5
Народичский	Радчанский	Радча	55.9
Народичский	Радчанский	Старая Радча	54.4
Народичский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Народичи	73.5
Новоград-Волынский	Брониковский	Романовка	187.0
Новоград-Волынский	Каменномайданский	Николаевка	181.9
Новоград-Волынский	Красиловский	Морозовка	200.9
Новоград-Волынский	Лебедевский	Лебедевка	185.1
Новоград-Волынский	Малоцвилянский	Карпиловка	189.2
Новоград-Волынский	Новоромановский	Перемога	191.1
Новоград-Волынский	Пилиповичский	Городище	200.9
Новоград-Волынский	Повчинский	Калиновка	216.2
Новоград-Волынский	Полияновский	Малиновка	173.1
Новоград-Волынский	Федоровский	Федоровка	181.7
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Житомир	161.2

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Коростень	112.4
Овручский	Журбовский	Будолюбовка	66.7
Овручский	Игнатпольский	Рудня	100.7
Овручский	Липско-Романовский	Липские Романы	71.6
Овручский	Песчаницкий	Полесское	99.8
Овручский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Овруч	89.3
Овручский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Першотравневое	84.2
Овручский	Руднянский	Людвировка	72.2
Овручский	Руднянский	Прилуки	84.9
Овручский	Руднянский	Рудня	78.5
Овручский	Усовский	Новая Рудня	129.6
Олевский	Журжевический	Рудня	169.9
Олевский	Зольнянский	Ковалевка	180.1
Олевский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Диброва	149.2
Олевский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дружба	148.8
Попельнянский	Корнинский	Королевка	148.1
Попельнянский	Макаровский	Макаровка	178.5
Попельнянский	Новоселицкий	Новоселица	170.4
Попельнянский	Романовский	Романовка	160.5
Попельнянский	Саверецкий	Пески	167.2
Радомышльский	Вепринский	Веприн	93.9
Радомышльский	Ленинский	Марьяновка	123.3
Радомышльский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Белая Криница	95.7
Ружинский	Дергановский	Марьяновка	207.5
Червоноармейский	Мартыновский	Мартыновка	170.7
Червоноармейский	Очеретянский	Ясная Поляна	165.3
Черняховский	Вильский	Перемога	159.4
Черняховский	Забродский	Городище	147.5
Черняховский	Зороковский	Иванков	154.4
Черняховский	Клетищенский	Плехов	148.8
Черняховский	Очеретянский	Рудня	134.5
Черняховский	Стыртовский	Малиновка	134.0
Черняховский	Стыртовский	Федоровка	134.1
Чудновский	Тютюнниковский	Городище	199.9
Б. Киевская Область			
Барышевский	Волопиновский	Борщев	152.5
Барышевский	Морозовский	Морозовка	141.2
Барышевский	Перемоговский	Перемога	130.1
Белоцерковский	Ивановский	Ивановка	171.8
Белоцерковский	Пилипчанский	Городище	187.4
Белоцерковский	Розалиевский	Людвировка	166.1

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Богуславский	Ивановский	Ивановка	218.4
Богуславский	Медвинский	Медвин	230.4
Богуславский	Ольховецкий	Калиновка	217.5
Бориспольский	Глубокский	Городище	142.1
Бориспольский	Иванковский	Иванков	138.5
Бориспольский	Кировский	Кирово	136.6
Бориспольский	Старовский	Старое	156.9
Бородянский	Микуличский	Микуличы	91.5
Бородянский	Новогребельский	Новаяг Ребля	92.0
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Бабинцы	85.4
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Бородянка	84.5
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Клавдиево-Тарасово	91.0
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Немешаево	92.9
Бородянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Песковка	84.8
Броварский	Калиновский	Калиновка	107.0
Броварский	Калиновский	Перемога	110.8
Броварский	Плосковский	Плоское	119.1
Броварский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Калита	97.9
Броварский	Руднянский	Рудня	104.0
Васильковский	Здоровский	Диброва	133.8
Васильковский	Ковалевский	Ковалевка	158.0
Васильковский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	149.4
Васильковский	Ольшансконовоселицкий	Степановка	158.7
Васильковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Калиновка	131.1
Васильковский	Соколовский	Соколовка	166.5
Вышгородский	Гавриловский	Тарасовщина	77.4
Вышгородский	Демидовский	Демидов	77.1
Вышгородский	Лебедевский	Лебедевка	83.1
Вышгородский	Литвиновский	Николаевка	74.6
Вышгородский	Пирновский	Пирново	83.4
Вышгородский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Вышгород	95.4
Вышгородский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дымер	70.2
Вышгородский	Рововский	Федоровка	59.1
Згуровский	Новоалександровский	Старое	153.1
Згуровский	Туровский	Ильинское	163.8
Иванковский	Варовский	Людвиновка	65.3
Иванковский	Горностайпольский	Горностайполь	38.8
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Зорин	38.6
Иванковский	Дитятковский	Фрузиновка	40.2
Иванковский	Дымарский	Дымарка	40.2
Иванковский	Зеленомысский	Зеленый Мыс	42.2



Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Иванковский	Зеленомысский	Медвин	39.1
Иванковский	Иванковский	Городище	36.3
Иванковский	Иванковский	Запрудка	56.5
Иванковский	Иванковский	Ивановка	20.4
Иванковский	Иванковский	Куповатое	33.4
Иванковский	Иванковский	Федоровка	47.1
Иванковский	Кухаревский	Кирово	74.2
Иванковский	Кухаревский	Кухари	73.7
Иванковский	Макаровский	Малая Макаровка	42.7
Иванковский	Макаровский	Макаровка	45.9
Иванковский	Мусийковский	Мусийки	44.6
Иванковский	Мусийковский	Новые Соколы	33.0
Иванковский	Оранский	Ораное	39.5
Иванковский	Оранский	Степановка	37.3
Иванковский	Оранский	Хочева	40.3
Иванковский	Песковский	Домановка	36.8
Иванковский	Песковский	Карпиловка	31.9
Иванковский	Песковский	Ковалевка	33.6
Иванковский	Песковский	Пески	34.7
Иванковский	Песковский	Потоки	31.5
Иванковский	Песковский	Старые Соколы	32.4
Иванковский	Приборский	Приборск	42.9
Иванковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Иванков	53.0
Иванковский	Термаховский	Термаховка	45.5
Иванковский	Термаховский	Чкаловка	55.2
Иванковский	Тетеревский	Тетеревское	65.7
Иванковский	Шпилевский	Белый Берег	50.8
Иванковский	Шпилевский	Шпили	54.8
Кагарлыкский	Гороховатский	Ивановка	170.3
Кагарлыкский	Кадомский	Калиновка	183.1
Кагарлыкский	Халчанский	Вороновка	172.5
Киево-Святошинский	Заборский	Заборье	120.8
Киево-Святошинский	Малютянский	Иванков	125.1
Макаровский	Людвиновский	Людвиновка	114.8
Макаровский	Макаровский	Калиновка	110.4
Макаровский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	121.0
Макаровский	Колонцинский	Марьяновка	102.9
Макаровский	Колонцинский	Николаевка	104.1
Макаровский	Королевский	Королевка	97.7
Макаровский	Речицкий	Королевка	-
Макаровский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Кодра	97.0
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Белая Церковь	177.2

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Област. подчинение		Борисполь	132.9
Област. подчинение		Ирпень	98.7
Област. подчинение		Славутич	50.5
Обуховский	Долинский	Макаровка	159.2
Обуховский	Район. подчинение	Украинка	146.9
Обуховский	Трипольский	Триполье	150.3
Переяслав-Хмельницкий	Великокаратульский	Марьяновка	178.3
Переяслав-Хмельницкий	Пристромский	Волчков	166.8
Полесский	Будо-Варовичский	Буда-Варовичи	42.5
Полесский	Волчковский	Волчков	49.9
Полесский	Красятинский	Красятичи	47.4
Полесский	Максимовичский	Королевка	41.5
Полесский	Максимовичский	Максимовичи	39.8
Полесский	Мартыновичский	Мартыновичи	35.6
Полесский	Марьяновский	Марьяновка	47.2
Полесский	Млачевский	Млачевка	44.3
Полесский	Новомирский	Новый Мир	34.3
Полесский	Полесский	Бобер	-
Полесский	Полесский	Варовичи	38.7
Полесский	Полесский	Ковшиловка	42.5
Полесский	Радинский	Федоровка	33.7
Полесский	Район. подчинение	Вильча	47.0
Полесский	Район. подчинение	Полесское	51.5
Полесский	Степчинский	Калиновка	35.0
Полесский	Степчинский	Орджоникидзе	32.5
Полесский	Степчинский	Стещина	37.1
Ставищенский	Ивановский	Ивановка	215.1
Таращанский	Лесовичский	Потоки	210.0
Таращанский	Плосковский	Плоское	214.7
Фастовский	Великогуляковский	Федоровка	145.0
Фастовский	Пилиповский	Королевка	157.5
Яготинский	Годуновский	Лебедевка	185.8
Яготинский	Засупоевский	Федоровка	173.7
Яготинский	Супоевский	Озерное	162.8
В. Черниговская Область			
Бахмацкий	Городищенский	Городище	189.3
Бахмацкий	Красиловский	Перемога	181.3
Бахмацкий	Песковский	Пески	182.2
Бахмацкий	Халимоновский	Калиновка	203.9
Бобровицкий	Бобровицкий Горсовет	Макаровка	113.0
Бобровицкий	Гавриловский	Николаев	140.6

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Бобровицкий	Гавриловский	Украинка	144.5
Бобровицкий	Песковский	Пески	127.9
Бобровицкий	Соколовский	Новоселица	125.1
Бобровицкий	Соколовский	Соколовка	130.6
Борзнянский	Николаевский	Ивановка	176.0
Борзнянский	Николаевский	Николаевка	174.0
Борзнянский	Степановский	Степановка	140.6
Городнянский	Полесский	Полесье	130.2
Городнянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Городня	118.1
Ичнянский	Городнянский	Городня	185.5
Ичнянский	Мартыновский	Мартыновка	182.9
Ичнянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Дружба	172.3
Ичнянский	Хаенковский	Вороновка	167.9
Козелецкий	Карпиловский	Карпиловка	69.2
Козелецкий	Моровский	Рудня	65.0
Козелецкий	Максимовский	Лебедевка	64.7
Козелецкий	Максимовский	Соколовка	63.8
Козелецкий	Олбинский	Дымерка	78.0
Козелецкий	Остерский Горсовет	Полесское	77.6
Козелецкий	Савинский	Озерное	90.4
Козелецкий	Ставиский	Новая Гребля	100.5
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Десна	70.9
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Козелец	90.6
Козелецкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Остер	75.9
Коропский	Краснопольский	Краснополье	211.4
Коропский	Крисковский	Иваньков	203.9
Коропский	Пролетарский	Новоселица	205.3
Корюковский	Александровский	Пески	146.5
Корюковский	Шишковский	Рудня	167.8
Куликовский	Смолянский	Коростень	94.7
Менский	Волосковский	Степановка	135.7
Менский	Городищенский	Городище	133.4
Менский	Николаевский	Николаевка	118.0
Нежинский	Великодорожский	Калиновка	148.5
Нежинский	Крутовский	Диброва	150.9
Нежинский	Переможский	Перемога	149.8
Новгород-Северский	Бучковский	Городище	233.1
Новгород-Северский	Бучковский	Ясная Поляна	234.8
Новгород-Северский	Гремячский	Диброва	240.8
Новгород-Северский	Кировский	Кирово	219.1
Носовский	Калиновский	Калиновка	137.2
Носовский	Плосковский	Плоское	116.0

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Носовский	Степнохуторский	Отрадное	132.2
Област. подчинение		Нежин	132.0
Област. подчинение		Прилуки	186.0
Област. подчинение		Чернигов	84.6
Прилукский	Замостянский	Замостье	186.4
Прилукский	Новогребельский	Новая Гребля	199.6
Прилукский	Погребовский	Николаевка	155.8
Репкинский	Любечский	Малиновка	56.2
Репкинский	Неданчичский	Неданчичи	40.5
Репкинский	Неданчичский	Новая Рудня	44.8
Репкинский	Район. подчинение	Замглай	87.7
Репкинский	Район. подчинение	Любеч	52.2
Репкинский	Район. подчинение	Радуль	64.8
Репкинский	Район. подчинение	Репки	82.9
Репкинский	Район. подчинение	Лесковка	46.7
Семеновский	Александровский	Углы	212.0
Семеновский	Ивановский	Ивановка	198.7
Сосницкий	Козляничский	Рудня	179.8
Сосницкий	Матвеевский	Полесье	165.8
Сребнянский	Карпиловский	Карпиловка	226.3
Талалаевский	Поповичковский	Обухово	214.3
Талалаевский	Украинский	Новая	207.4
Черниговский	Боровиковский	Лесное	44.1
Черниговский	Ведильцовский	Малейки	53.8
Черниговский	Днепровский	Днепровское	42.5
Черниговский	Ивановский	Ивановка	84.1
Черниговский	Жукотковский	Жукотки	67.8
Черниговский	Пакульский	Рудня	42.7
Черниговский	Песковский	Пески	94.9
Черниговский	Плеховский	Плехов	59.2
Черниговский	Район. подчинение	Михайло-Коцюбинское	69.7
Черниговский	Район. подчинение	Олишевка	89.4
Черниговский	Смолинский	Гончаровское	59.8
Черниговский	Смолинский	Смолин	65.2
Черниговский	Тереховский	Малиновка	93.3
Черниговский	Тереховский	Тереховка	94.5
Щорский	Клюсовский	Плехов	146.7
Щорский	Софиевский	Ивановка	150.7

**11. Settlements outside the 30-km zone of Gomel oblast in Belarus (sorted by name of settlement)**

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Бабчин	42.9
Брагинский	Остроглядовский	Бакуны	47.3
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Белый Берег	50.8
Наровлянский	Кировский	Боровичи	34.9
Брагинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Брагин	44.9
Речицкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Василевичи	96.2
Буда-Кошелевский	Глазовский	Васильевка	143.2
Кормянский	Струменский	Васильевка	196.9
Добрушский	Васильевский	Васильевка	136.2
Ветковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Ветка	149.6
Буда-Кошелевский	Морозовичский	Ветка	147.0
Житковичский	Брониславский	Вильча	194.1
Чечерский	Крутоеvский	Вольск	165.9
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Гомель	130.7
Петриковский	Копаткевичский	Городище	127.8
Речицкий	Свиридовичский	Городище	93.3
Брагинский	Малейковский	Городище	48.5
Буда-Кошелевский	Кошелевский	Городище	159.4
Брагинский	Храковичский	Грушное	31.8
Светлогорский	Давыдовский	Давыдовка	132.6
Гомельский	Давыдовский	Давыдовка	125.7
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Дворище	48.0
Жлобинский	Щедринский	Дворище	162.9
Хойникский	Дворищенский	Дворище	53.3
Наровлянский	Головчицкий	Демидов	63.4
Лельчицкий	Дзержинский	Дзержинск	177.9
Наровлянский	Красновский	Дзержинск	52.3
Добрушский	Кормянский	Добруш	140.5
Гомельский	Рудня- Маримоновский	Добруш	97.3
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Добруш	142.0
Рогачевский	Звонецкий	Дружба	202.5
Брагинский	Сперижский	Дублин	41.0
Буда-Кошелевский	Липиничский	Дубровка	162.7
Ельский	Валаvский	Дубровка	103.0
Буда-Кошелевский	Потаповский	Дубровка	152.6
Чечерский	Крутоеvский	Дубровка	163.5
Брагинский	Сперижский	Дубровка	41.7
Добрушский	Дубровский	Дубровка	133.4



Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Чечерский	Холочский	Дудичи	159.0
Калинковичский	Дудичский	Дудичи	101.0
Ельский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Ельск	79.0
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Жлобин	166.4
Калинковичский	Наховский	Замостье	100.1
Петриковский	Комаровичский	Замостье	168.9
Ветковский	Даниловичский	Замостье	149.4
Брагинский	Комаринский	Иванки	31.4
Речицкий	Жмуровский	Ивановка	102.2
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Ивановка	46.5
Чечерский	Ленинский	Ивановка	168.0
Чечерский	Нисимковичский	Ивановка	183.0
Кормянский	Ворновский	Ивановка	185.1
Гомельский	Тереничский	Ивановка	130.8
Буда-Кошелевский	Глазовский	Ивановка	142.1
Лоевский	Малиновский	Иваньков	66.9
Гомельский	Телешевский	Иваньков	121.1
Жлобинский	Новомарковичский	Калиновка	134.0
Житковичский	Люденевичский	Калиновка	189.6
Гомельский	Телешевский	Калиновка	125.5
Хойникский	Поселичский	Карпиловка	53.8
Наровлянский	Кировский	Киров	47.0
Брагинский	Комаринский	Кирово	35.2
Рогачевский	Довский	Ковалевка	203.5
Кормянский	Вольнецкий	Колюды	210.2
Брагинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Комарин	34.3
Добрушский	Кормянский	Корма	144.2
Ельский	Валавский	Корма	107.0
Кормянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Корма	199.3
Лельчицкий	Букченский	Корма	175.7
Октябрьский	Любанский	Корма	147.5
Калинковичский	Зеленочский	Корма	104.8
Брагинский	Брагинский	Красная Гора	43.4
Добрушский	Носовичский	Красная Гора	125.4
Брагинский	Маложинский	Красная Поляна	49.9
Речицкий	Артуковский	Краснополье	90.2
Жлобинский	Лукский	Лебедевка	170.1
Кормянский	Каменский	Лебедевка	202.1
Добрушский	Переростовский	Лебедевка	134.4
Рогачевский	Болотнянский	Лесное	202.6
Речицкий	Новобарсуковский	Лесное	85.3
Лоевский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Лоев	78.3

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Хойникский	Дворищенский	Людвин	52.0
Брагинский	Малейковский	Малейки	47.8
Ветковский	Светиловичский	Малиновка	181.5
Рогачевский	Довский	Малиновка	202.9
Рогачевский	Столпненский	Малиновка	167.1
Рогачевский	Старосельский	Малиновка	202.0
Гомельский	Тереничский	Малиновка	129.8
Жлобинский	Щедринский	Малиновка	172.9
Лоевский	Малиновский	Малиновка	74.3
Гомельский	Телешевский	Малиновка	124.8
Светлогорский	Давыдовский	Мартыновичи	124.2
Светлогорский	Полесский	Мартыновка	146.8
Брагинский	Микуличский	Микуличи	50.3
Област. подчинение		Мозырь	93.9
Добрушский	Круговский	Морозовка	164.8
Наровлянский	Район. подчинение	Наровля	59.1
Лоевский	Ручаевский	Николаевка	61.5
Ельский	Старовысоковский	Николаевка	97.4
Добрушский	Усохо-Будский	Николаевка	126.1
Буда-Кошелевский	Николаевский	Николаевка	177.1
Буда-Кошелевский	Губичский	Николаевка	146.0
Светлогорский	Николаевский	Николаевка	152.3
Брагинский	Храковичский	Новая Гребля	36.5
Брагинский	Новоолченский	Новая Иолча	32.8
Добрушский	Переростовский	Новый Мир	134.2
Ветковский	Радужский	Новый Мир	146.6
Наровлянский	Кировский	Окопы	35.0
Лельчицкий	Гребеневский	Ольховая	121.1
Брагинский	Остроглядовский	Острогляды	42.8
Брагинский	Сперижский	Петьковщина	34.6
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Плоское	43.4
Добрушский	Кормянский	Плоское	148.9
Светлогорский	Полесский	Полесье	139.8
Чечерский	Полесский	Полесье	203.9
Речицкий	Борщовский	Полесье	114.9
Хойникский	Поселичский	Пудаков	52.2
Област. подчинение		Рогачев	188.6
Речицкий	Ровенско-Слободской	Романовка	86.1
Рогачевский	Запольский	Романовка	189.6
Мозырский	Слободской	Романовка	103.5
Наровлянский	Завойтянский	Романовка	68.9
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Рудаков	45.8



Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Мозырский	Слободской	Рудня	96.6
Лельчицкий	Тонежский	Рудня	172.3
Кормянский	Литвиновичский	Рудня	211.0
Речицкий	Озерцинский	Рудня	109.1
Мозырский	Михалковский	Рудня	82.0
Кормянский	Ворновский	Рудня	192.2
Житковичский	Рудненский	Рудня	171.1
Мозырский	Скрыгаловский	Рудня	116.4
Жлобинский	Новомарковичский	Рудня	135.2
Ветковский	Светиловичский	Светиловичи	176.9
Речицкий	Свиридовичский	Сокол	90.0
Хойникский	Поселичский	Сокол	48.5
Светлогорский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Сосновый Бор	129.2
Речицкий	Заспенский	Степановка	97.5
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Стреличево	49.0
Добрушский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Тереховка	130.5
Рогачевский	Старосельский	Тереховка	200.1
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Тешков	44.9
Лельчицкий	Буйновичский	Углы	107.0
Октябрьский	Протасовский	Углы	164.1
Калинковичский	Крюковичский	Углы	126.5
Брагинский	Угловский	Углы	54.1
Наровлянский	Кировский	Углы	38.1
Рогачевский	Столпненский	Углы	167.8
Рогачевский	Довский	Федоровка	190.1
Ветковский	Новиловский	Федоровка	177.1
Хойникский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Хойники	55.5
Брагинский	Храковичский	Целуйки	33.7
Гомельский	Улуковский	Юбилейный	131.2
Чечерский	Холочский	Ясная Поляна	159.0
Буда-Кошелевский	Недойский	Ясная Поляна	141.8

**12. Settlements outside the 30-km zone of Gomel oblast in Belarus**  
(sorted by name of rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Брагинский	Брагинский	Красная Гора	43.4
Брагинский	Комаринский	Иванки	31.4
Брагинский	Комаринский	Кирово	35.2
Брагинский	Малейковский	Городище	48.5
Брагинский	Малейковский	Малейки	47.8
Брагинский	Маложинский	Красная Поляна	49.9
Брагинский	Микуличский	Микуличи	50.3
Брагинский	Новоюлченский	Новая Иолча	32.8
Брагинский	Остроглядовский	Бакуны	47.3
Брагинский	Остроглядовский	Острогляды	42.8
Брагинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Брагин	44.9
Брагинский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Комарин	34.3
Брагинский	Сперижский	Дублин	41.0
Брагинский	Сперижский	Дубровка	41.7
Брагинский	Сперижский	Петьковщина	34.6
Брагинский	Угловский	Углы	54.1
Брагинский	Храковичский	Грушное	31.8
Брагинский	Храковичский	Новая Гребля	36.5
Брагинский	Храковичский	Целуйки	33.7
Буда-Кошелевский	Глазовский	Васильевка	143.2
Буда-Кошелевский	Глазовский	Ивановка	142.1
Буда-Кошелевский	Губичский	Николаевка	146.0
Буда-Кошелевский	Кошелевский	Городище	159.4
Буда-Кошелевский	Липиничский	Дубровка	162.7
Буда-Кошелевский	Морозовичский	Ветка	147.0
Буда-Кошелевский	Недойский	Ясная Поляна	141.8
Буда-Кошелевский	Николаевский	Николаевка	177.1
Буда-Кошелевский	Потаповский	Дубровка	152.6
Ветковский	Даниловичский	Замостье	149.4
Ветковский	Новиловский	Федоровка	177.1
Ветковский	Радужский	Новый Мир	146.6
Ветковский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Ветка	149.6
Ветковский	Светиловичский	Малиновка	181.5
Ветковский	Светиловичский	Светиловичи	176.9
Гомельский	Давыдовский	Давыдовка	125.7
Гомельский	Рудня-Маримоновский	Добруш	97.3
Гомельский	Тереничский	Ивановка	130.8

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE- BELARUS  
(sorted by rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Гомельский	Тереничский	Малиновка	129.8
Гомельский	Телешевский	Иваньков	121.1
Гомельский	Телешевский	Калиновка	125.5
Гомельский	Телешевский	Малиновка	124.8
Гомельский	Улуковский	Юбилейный	131.2
Добрушский	Васильевский	Васильевка	136.2
Добрушский	Дубровский	Дубровка	133.4
Добрушский	Кормянский	Добруш	140.5
Добрушский	Кормянский	Корма	144.2
Добрушский	Кормянский	Плоское	148.9
Добрушский	Круговский	Морозовка	164.8
Добрушский	Носовичский	Красная Гора	125.4
Добрушский	Переростовский	Лебедевка	134.4
Добрушский	Переростовский	Новый Мир	134.2
Добрушский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Тереховка	130.5
Добрушский	Усохо-Будский	Николаевка	126.1
Ельский	Валавский	Дубровка	103.0
Ельский	Валавский	Корма	107.0
Ельский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Ельск	79.0
Ельский	Старовысоковский	Николаевка	97.4
Житковичский	Брониславский	Вильча	194.1
Житковичский	Люденевичский	Калиновка	189.6
Житковичский	Рудненский	Рудня	171.1
Жлобинский	Лукский	Лебедевка	170.1
Жлобинский	Новомарковичский	Калиновка	134.0
Жлобинский	Новомарковичский	Рудня	135.2
Жлобинский	Щедринский	Дворище	162.9
Жлобинский	Щедринский	Малиновка	172.9
Калинковичский	Дудичский	Дудичи	101.0
Калинковичский	Зеленочский	Корма	104.8
Калинковичский	Крюковичский	Углы	126.5
Калинковичский	Наховский	Замостье	100.1
Кормянский	Волынецкий	Колюды	210.2
Кормянский	Ворновский	Ивановка	185.1
Кормянский	Ворновский	Рудня	192.2
Кормянский	Каменский	Лебедевка	202.1
Кормянский	Литвиновичский	Рудня	211.0
Кормянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Корма	199.3
Кормянский	Струменский	Васильевка	196.9
Лельчицкий	Буйновичский	Углы	107.0
Лельчицкий	Букченский	Корма	175.7

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE- BELARUS  
(sorted by rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Лельчицкий	Гребеневский	Ольховая	121.1
Лельчицкий	Дзержинский	Дзержинск	177.9
Лельчицкий	Тонежский	Рудня	172.3
Лоевский	Малиновский	Иваньков	66.9
Лоевский	Малиновский	Малиновка	74.3
Лоевский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Лоев	78.3
Лоевский	Ручаевский	Николаевка	61.5
Мозырский	Михалковский	Рудня	82.0
Мозырский	Слободской	Романовка	103.5
Мозырский	Слободской	Рудня	96.6
Мозырский	Скрыгаловский	Рудня	116.4
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Белый Берег	50.8
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Дворище	48.0
Наровлянский	Вербовичский	Тешков	44.9
Наровлянский	Головчицкий	Демидов	63.4
Наровлянский	Завойтянский	Романовка	68.9
Наровлянский	Кировский	Боровичи	34.9
Наровлянский	Кировский	Киров	47.0
Наровлянский	Кировский	Окопы	35.0
Наровлянский	Кировский	Углы	38.1
Наровлянский	Красновский	Дзержинск	52.3
Наровлянский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Наровля	59.1
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Гомель	130.7
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Добруш	142.0
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Жлобин	166.4
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Мозырь	93.9
<i>Област. подчинение</i>		Рогачев	188.6
Октябрьский	Любанский	Корма	147.5
Октябрьский	Протасовский	Углы	164.1
Петриковский	Комаровичский	Замостье	168.9
Петриковский	Копаткевичский	Городище	127.8
Речицкий	Артуковский	Краснополье	90.2
Речицкий	Борщовский	Полесье	114.9
Речицкий	Жмуровский	Ивановка	102.2
Речицкий	Заспенский	Степановка	97.5
Речицкий	Новобарсуковский	Лесное	85.3
Речицкий	Озерщинский	Рудня	109.1
Речицкий	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Василевичи	96.2
Речицкий	Ровенско-Слободской	Романовка	86.1
Речицкий	Свиридовичский	Городище	93.3
Речицкий	Свиридовичский	Сокол	90.0

OUTSIDE 30-KM ZONE- BELARUS  
(sorted by rayon and settlement)

Район	Сельсовет	Населённый пункт	Расстояние, км
Рогачевский	Болотнянский	Лесное	202.6
Рогачевский	Довский	Ковалевка	203.5
Рогачевский	Довский	Малиновка	202.9
Рогачевский	Довский	Федоровка	190.1
Рогачевский	Запольский	Романовка	189.6
Рогачевский	Звонецкий	Дружба	202.5
Рогачевский	Старосельский	Малиновка	202.0
Рогачевский	Старосельский	Тереховка	200.1
Рогачевский	Столпненский	Малиновка	167.1
Рогачевский	Столпненский	Углы	167.8
Светлогорский	Давыдовский	Давыдовка	132.6
Светлогорский	Давыдовский	Мартыновичи	124.2
Светлогорский	Николаевский	Николаевка	152.3
Светлогорский	Полесский	Мартыновка	146.8
Светлогорский	Полесский	Полесье	139.8
Светлогорский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Сосновый Бор	129.2
Хойникский	Дворищенский	Дворище	53.3
Хойникский	Дворищенский	Людвин	52.0
Хойникский	Поселичский	Карпиловка	53.8
Хойникский	Поселичский	Пудаков	52.2
Хойникский	Поселичский	Сокол	48.5
Хойникский	<i>Район. подчинение</i>	Хойники	55.5
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Бабчин	42.9
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Плоское	43.4
Хойникский	Рудаковский	Рудаков	45.8
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Ивановка	46.5
Хойникский	Стреличевский	Стреличево	49.0
Чечерский	Крутоеvский	Вольск	165.9
Чечерский	Крутоеvский	Дубровка	163.5
Чечерский	Ленинский	Ивановка	168.0
Чечерский	Нисимковичский	Ивановка	183.0
Чечерский	Полесский	Полесье	203.9
Чечерский	Холочский	Дудичи	159.0
Чечерский	Холочский	Ясная Поляна	159.0

**БУКЛЕТ ИНТЕРВЬЮЕРА**  
**ДЛЯ ЗАПОЛНЕНИЯ АНКЕТЫ НА УЧАСТНИКА ЛИКВИДАЦИИ**  
**ПОСЛЕДСТВИЙ КАТАСТРОФЫ НА ЧЕРНОБЫЛЬСКОЙ АЭС.**  
**“ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ СОСТОЯНИЯ ЗДОРОВЬЯ ЛИКВИДАТОРОВ”**

**ЧАСТЬ В**  
*Схемы, карты, фотографии*

*1997 - 1999*

**МОСКВА**  
**КИЕВ**  
**ЛИОН**

**МИНСК**  
**ОБНИНСК**  
**ВАШИНГТОН**



Карта 5-км зоны вокруг ЧАЭС












Схема зданий и сооружений на промплощадке ЧАЭС





Схема помещений главного здания СХАЭС







ТЕРМОЛЮМИНЕСЦЕНТНЫЕ И ХИМИЧЕСКИЕ  
ИНДИВИДУАЛЬНЫЕ И АВАРИЙНЫЕ ДОЗИМЕТРЫ.  
ИСПОЛЬЗОВАВШИЕСЯ ДЛЯ КОНТРОЛЯ ОБЛУЧЕНИЯ  
УЧАСТНИКОВ ЛИКВИДАЦИИ ПОСЛЕДСТВИЙ АВАРИИ  
И НАСЕЛЕНИЯ ПОСЛЕ АВАРИИ НА ЧАЭС









Вид станции со стороны разрушенного блока до начала строительства объекта "Укрытие"



Крыша машзала со стороны 4-го блока









Эпизод строительства объекта "Укрытие" (завершающаяся стадия)



Вид станции со стороны 5-6 блока (со стороны Чернобыля) к моменту завершения строительства объекта "Укрытие"








Вид станции со стороны г. Припять после завершения строительства объекта "Укрытие"





Вид станции со стороны северной части пруда-охладителя



Удостоверение участника ЛПА на ЧАЭС в красной корочке (лицевая сторона удостоверения синяя)