



*A Symposium on*

**RADIOISOTOPES  
IN THE BIOSPHERE**

*Sponsored by the*

University of Minnesota  
National Science Foundation  
Atomic Energy Commission  
Agricultural Research Service, United States  
Department of Agriculture

*Edited by*

Richard S. Caldecott and Leon A. Snyder

University of Minnesota  
Center for Continuation Study  
of the General Extension Division

1960

Copyright 1960, the University of Minnesota.  
Distributed by the Center for Continuation Study.  
Printed in the United States of America by the  
Printing Department, University of Minnesota.

## PREFACE

A symposium on the ecology of radioisotopes was held at the University of Minnesota from October 19-23, 1959. In addition to the University, the sponsors of the meeting were the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Agricultural Research Service, USDA.

The demonstration that the debris from atomic explosions and from the peaceful uses of atomic energy included radioisotopes that were, biologically, of consequence to man has resulted in studies on numerous aspects of their presence in the biosphere. In this regard, the symposium was concerned with a discussion of the facts and deficiencies in our knowledge relating to the pathway of radioisotopes from the time they enter soils until they are excreted from living systems. Particular emphasis was placed on the uptake of radioisotopes by plants, animals, and man and the genetic consequences of their ingestion.

In planning the symposium, numerous members of the University faculty gave generously of their time. In addition, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the valuable contributions of the following section chairmen: Dr. E. R. Graham and Dr. T. C. Broyer, Section 1; Dr. E. L. Powers, Section 2; Dr. Bernard H. Trum, Section 3; Dr. Wallace D. Armstrong, Section 4; Dr. Joseph H. Ross, Section 5; and Dr. William P. Norris, Section 6.

April 25, 1960

### Symposium Organizing Committee

W. D. Armstrong  
C. P. Barnum  
A. J. Linck  
W. M. Myers  
M. B. Visscher  
R. S. Caldecott, Chairman

# CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE .....	v
SECTION I: RADIOISOTOPES IN SOILS AND PLANTS	
1. Radioisotopes in Soils: Particularly with Reference to Strontium <sup>90</sup> .....	3
<i>Lyle T. Alexander, Edward P. Hardy, Jr., and Hal L. Hollister</i>	
2. Radioisotopes in Soils: Physical-Chemical Composition .....	23
<i>R. O. Hansen, Ramon Dios Vidal, and P. R. Stout</i>	
3. Radioisotopes in Soils: Effects of Amendments on Availability .....	37
<i>Ronald G. Menzel</i>	
4. Radioisotopes in Soils: Soil-Plant Relationship .....	47
<i>Maurice Fried and W. R. Heald</i>	
5. Radioisotopes in Plants: Root Entry and Distribution .....	60
<i>A. B. Hope</i>	
6. Radioisotopes in Plants: Foliar Entry and Distribution .....	73
<i>O. Biddulph</i>	
7. Radioisotopes in Plants: Practical Aspects of Aerial Contamination with Strontium <sup>89</sup> and Cesium <sup>137</sup> .....	86
<i>L. J. Middleton</i>	
8. Radioisotopes in Plants: Absorption and Incorporation of Carbon <sup>14</sup> in Cell Metabolism .....	97
<i>Martin Gibbs</i>	
9. Radioisotopes in Soils and Plants: A Critical Review .....	110
<i>A. G. Norman</i>	
SECTION II: RADIOISOTOPES AND THEIR RELATION TO THE GENETIC MECHANISM AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PROCESSES	
10. Radioisotopes and the Genetic Mechanism: Isotopic Transmutation and Biochemical Function .....	123
<i>David Pratt</i>	

## Contents

	Page
11. Radioisotopes and the Genetic Mechanism: Cytology and Genetics of Divalent Metals in Nuclei and Chromosomes .....	132
<i>Dale Steffensen and Leo E. LaChance</i>	
12. Radioisotopes and the Genetic Mechanism: The Problem of Genetic Effects of Low-Level External Radioactivity .....	146
<i>Earl L. Green</i>	
13. Radioisotopes and the Genetic Mechanism: Mutagenic Aspects	160
<i>M. R. Zelle</i>	
14. Genetic Control of Physiological Processes: The Genetics of Radiation Toxicity in Animals .....	181
<i>Douglas Grahn</i>	
15. Genetic Control of Physiological Processes: Consideration of Differential Ion Uptake by Plants .....	201
<i>W. M. Myers</i>	
16. Radioisotopes and Their Relation to the Genetic Mechanism and Physiological Processes: A Critical Review .....	227
<i>R. K. Appleyard</i>	

## SECTION III: RADIOISOTOPES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CIRCUMSTANCES

17. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: Significance of Nuclear Industry Effluents in Animal Populations .....	243
<i>Leo Bustad</i>	
18. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: The Passage of Pairs of Elements Through Food Chains .....	255
<i>H. A. Kornberg</i>	
19. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: The Passage of Fission Products Through Food Chains .....	269
<i>R. Scott Russell</i>	
20. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: Reduction of the Hazard in the Food Chain .....	293
<i>B. B. Migicovsky</i>	

## Contents

	Page
21. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: The Internal Radioactive Contamination of a Pacific Island Community Exposed to Local Fallout .....	306
<i>S. H. Cohn, J. S. Robertson, and H. A. Conard</i>	
22. Radioisotopes and Environmental Circumstances: A Critical Review .....	331
<i>Arthur H. Wolff</i>	

### SECTION IV: RADIOISOTOPES IN THE SKELETON

23. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: Late Observations of the Distribution of Radium in the Human Skeleton .....	339
<i>R. E. Rowland</i>	
24. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: Observations on Distribution in Man .....	354
<i>Göran C. H. Bauer</i>	
25. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: Naturally Occurring Radioisotopes in Man .....	366
<i>Andrew F. Stehney</i>	
26. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: Considerations of Radiation Dosage in Relation to Bone Damage .....	382
<i>L. F. Lamerton</i>	
27. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: Dosage Implications Based on Microscopic Distribution .....	401
<i>Rolf Björnerstedt and Arne Engström</i>	
28. Radioisotopes in the Skeleton: A Critical Review .....	423
<i>James S. Robertson</i>	

### SECTION V: RADIOISOTOPE TOXICITY

29. Radioisotope Toxicity: From Pulmonary Absorption .....	431
<i>W. J. Bair</i>	
30. Radioisotope Toxicity: As Related to the Thyroid .....	449
<i>John A. D. Cooper</i>	
31. Radioisotope Toxicity: Significance of Chronic Administration .....	461
<i>Miriam P. Finkel, Birute O. Biskis, and Patricia J. Bergstrand</i>	

## Contents

	Page
32. Radioisotope Toxicity: A Critical Review .....	474
V. P. Bond	
SECTION VI: RADIOISOTOPE ABSORPTION AND METHODS OF ELIMINATION	
33. Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: Relative Significance of Portals of Entry .....	489
Wright H. Langham	
34. Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: Nutritional Considerations .....	514
R. C. Thompson	
35. Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: Differential Behavior of Substances in Metabolic Pathways .....	526
C. L. Comar and R. H. Wasserman	
36. Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: Factors Influencing Elimination from the Body .....	541
Marcia White Rosenthal	
37. Radioisotope Absorption and Methods of Elimination: A Critical Review .....	564
R. H. Wasserman	
SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS .....	577
AUTHOR INDEX .....	587



*Section I*

**RADIOISOTOPES IN SOILS AND PLANTS**



## RADIOISOTOPES IN SOILS:

### PARTICULARLY WITH REFERENCE TO STRONTIUM<sup>90</sup>

Lyle T. Alexander

Soil Survey Laboratory, U. S. Department of Agriculture  
Beltsville, Maryland

Edward P. Hardy, Jr.

Health and Safety Laboratory, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
New York, New York

Hal L. Hollister

Division of Biology and Medicine, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission  
Washington, D. C.

Radioisotopes have been recognized constituents of soils for many years. In particular  $K^{40}$ ,  $Rb^{87}$ ,  $C^{14}$ ,  $Th^{232}$ ,  $U^{238}$  and the associated daughter products of the latter two, may be found in a great many soils throughout the world. Radium<sup>226</sup>, which is a daughter product found in the uranium series, was given attention as a soil element by Moore (1914).

These naturally occurring radioisotopes are present in soil because their half-lives are comparable to the age of the earth or because they are continually being produced by the decay of unstable parent nuclei or by nuclear reactions from cosmic rays. The types of deposits in which these radioisotopes occur therefore, differ considerably. Thorium is abundant as a rock component, but uranium is found in a much greater variety of chemical combinations. This fact is responsible for the major differences in distribution that do exist.

For reference we have listed in table 1 (Dudley, 1957) known naturally occurring radioisotopes of half-life greater than a few days, and in table 2 (Dudley, 1957) the abundance of the corresponding naturally occurring inert elements appear. It is interesting as a basis for later comparisons with man-made radioisotopes to estimate the abundance of radioactive  $K^{40}$  in soil. Using table 1, the isotopic abundance of  $K^{40}$  in natural potassium is, expressed in activity units, about  $8.4 \times 10^{-4}$   $\mu\text{c/g}$  potassium. Converting to per cent abundance,  $K^{40}$  is about 0.01 per cent of natural potassium. From table 2, the abundance of inert potassium in igneous rock in the earth's crust is about 2.6 per cent of the rock by weight. Potassium<sup>40</sup> then, would be about 0.026 per cent of the rock by weight. Or, returning to activity units, the activity of  $K^{40}$  in igneous rock would be about 0.032  $\mu\text{c/g}$  of rock. Let us go on to a hypothetical calculation assuming that we have a soil containing  $K^{40}$  of the abundance just computed. Very roughly, a 1-foot depth of soil runs about 35

TABLE 1. Data on naturally occurring radioisotopes

Isotope	Long-lived ancestor	Half-life	Particulate radiation	Average energy (Mev)	Natural activity ( $\mu\text{C/g}$ )	Comment
$\text{C}^{14}$	.....	$5.6 \times 10^3$ yr	beta	0.05	$7 \times 10^{-6}$	Activity of living carbon (beta activity) (gamma activity)
$\text{K}^{40}$	.....	$1.2 \times 10^9$ yr	beta	0.4	$8.4 \times 10^{-4}$ $0.9 \times 10^{-4}$	
$\text{Rb}^{87}$	.....	$6 \times 10^{10}$ yr	beta	0.1	$1.9 \times 10^{-2}$	
$\text{La}^{138}$	.....	$2 \times 10^{11}$ yr	beta	0.3	$7 \times 10^{-7}$	
$\text{Sm}^{147}$	.....	$1.4 \times 10^{11}$ yr	alpha	2.2	$2.6 \times 10^{-8}$	Natural activity was computed from average Pb and U concentration in earth's crust, and is therefore not applicable to Pb ore deposits
$\text{Lu}^{176}$	.....	$7 \times 10^{10}$ yr	beta	0.1	$8 \times 10^{-4}$	
$\text{Re}^{186}$	.....	$4 \times 10^{12}$ yr	beta	0.1	$3 \times 10^{-4}$	
$\text{Pb}^{210}$ (RaD)	$\text{U}^{238}$	22 yr	beta (beta (alpha (decay products	0.006 0.3 5.3 )	$8 \times 10^{-2}$ (average)	
$\text{Pb}^{213}$ (ThB)	$\text{Th}^{232}$	10.6 hr	beta (beta (alpha (decay products	0.1 0.7 8.9 )	$8 \times 10^{-2}$ (average)	Natural activity was computed from average Pb and Th concentration in earth's crust, and is therefore not applicable to Pb ore deposits
$\text{Po}^{210}$	$\text{U}^{238}$	140 d	alpha	5.3	.....	
$\text{Rn}^{222}$	$\text{U}^{238}$	3.8 d	alpha (beta (alpha (decay products	5.5 1.5 19.0 )	.....	
$\text{Ra}^{226}$	$\text{U}^{238}$	1600 yr	alpha (beta (alpha (decay products	4.8 1.5 24.5 )	$1.0 \times 10^6$	

TABLE 1 (continued)

Isotope	Long-lived ancestor	Half-life	Particulate radiation	Average energy (Mev)	Natural activity ( $\mu\text{c/g}$ )	Comment
$\text{Ra}^{226}$	$\text{Th}^{232}$	6.7 yr	beta (beta (alpha (decay products	0.01 0.5 ) 32 ) )	$1.0 \times 10^6$ (average)	Natural activity based on abundance of Ra element and is therefore only an average value
$\text{Ac}^{227}$	$\text{U}^{235}$	22 yr	beta (beta (alpha (decay products	0.01 0.5 ) 32 ) )	.....	No long lived isotope
$\text{Th}^{232}$	.....	$1.4 \times 10^{10}$ yr	alpha (beta (alpha (decay products	4.0 1.3 ) 32 ) )	0.11	
$\text{Th}^{232}$ (RdTh)	$\text{Th}^{232}$	1.9 yr	alpha (beta (alpha (decay products	6.4 1.3 ) 27 ) )	0.11	Natural specific activity based on abundance of $\text{Th}^{232}$
$\text{Th}^{230}$	$\text{U}^{238}$	$8 \times 10^4$ yr	alpha	4.7	0.1 (average)	Natural specific activity based on abundance of $\text{Th}^{230}$ and is therefore an average value
$\text{U}^{238}$	.....	$4.5 \times 10^9$ yr	alpha	4.20	0.335	
$\text{U}^{234}$	$\text{U}^{238}$	$2.5 \times 10^5$ yr	alpha	4.76	0.335	Natural specific activity based on abundance of $\text{U}^{238}$
$\text{U}^{235}$	.....	$7.1 \times 10^8$ yr	alpha	4.4	0.015	

## Alexander, Hardy, Hollister

TABLE 2. Abundance of elements in various rocks (ppm)

Element	Earth's crust Igneous	Sedimentary		
		Sandstone	Shale	Limestone
K.....	$2.6 \times 10^4$	$1.1 \times 10^4$	$2.7 \times 10^4$	$2.7 \times 10^8$
Ca.....	$3.6 \times 10^4$	$3.9 \times 10^4$	$2.2 \times 10^4$	$3.0 \times 10^5$
Rb.....	$3.1 \times 10^2$	$2.7 \times 10^2$	$3 \times 10^2$	0
Sr.....	$3 \times 10^2$	26	$1.7 \times 10^2$	$4 \times 10^2 - 8 \times 10^2$
Ba.....	$2.5 \times 10^2$	$1.7 \times 10^2$	$4.6 \times 10^2$	$1.2 \times 10^2$
La.....	18	.....	.....	.....
Sm.....	6	.....	.....	.....
Lu.....	0.7	.....	.....	.....
Re.....	$10^{-3}$	.....	.....	.....
Pb.....	16	20	20	5 - 10
Th.....	12	6	10	1
U.....	4	1.2	1.2	1.3

kilograms per square foot. On an area basis, therefore, the above  $K^{40}$  abundance amounts to 21,300 millicuries per square mile.

For  $Ra^{226}$ , using radium assay data in soils (Lowder, 1956) one can estimate that between 80 and 800 millicuries per square mile can be found in the surface foot of various United States soils.

There are interesting possibilities for study of the naturally occurring radioisotopes in soil. For example, the use of soil carbon as a basis for dating has hardly been explored. A few measurements made on some of our grassland soils indicate carbon ages of from a few hundred to about 1,000 years.

Although, as will appear in the coming discussion, the activity levels of man-made isotopes such as  $Cs^{137}$ ,  $Sr^{90}$ ,  $Zr^{95}$ , etc. are far lower in soils than that of some of the natural radioisotopes, our effort has been strongly fixed on these man-made isotopes for two reasons: first, because activity level alone is not a valid measure of potential biological hazard, and second, because nation-wide concern has been focused on the hazard to man from such man-made isotopes as occur in radioactive fallout. This paper will henceforth discuss in detail, the purpose and results of the work on environmental  $Sr^{90}$  levels and distribution patterns over large areas, and will include as well, some measurements on gamma emitters in fallout.

### CRITERIA FOR SAMPLING AND MEASURING STRONTIUM<sup>90</sup> IN SOILS

In our world-wide fallout program, there are two basic reasons for measuring  $Sr^{90}$  in soils. In the first place one wants to relate levels in soils to levels in plants, animals, human foods and human beings. Secondly, one wants to relate levels in soils to amounts produced in weapons testing and to amounts existing elsewhere in the environment in order to determine a world-wide material balance. It is clear that there is a difference in the approach to sampling and

## Strontium<sup>90</sup> in Soils

analysis depending upon which goal is in mind. Thus for soil sampling in relation to up-take, one must be assured that the samples represent what the plants "see" and, similarly, that the analytical methods do not measure Sr<sup>90</sup> that would be completely unavailable to a plant.

For soil sampling to determine total deposition of Sr<sup>90</sup>, the objective is to obtain a soil sample from an area having all the Sr<sup>90</sup> that ever fell out on it but no other. It is to be remembered that rainfall is undoubtedly the principle mechanism that brings Sr<sup>90</sup> to the ground from the air. Hence, a suitable spot would be level and sufficiently permeable to absorb all of the precipitation that falls on it. But it must not receive water from higher ground by run-off. It should have base exchange capacity adequate to keep the Sr<sup>90</sup> ions from being readily leached into the ground water. The area should not, of course, be sheltered by buildings or trees. A good grass turf aids in absorption of the water and reduces the likelihood of run-off.

The extent to which vegetation enhances the removal of Sr<sup>90</sup> from the air is not known. It is our opinion that the Sr<sup>90</sup> fallout on a bare ground surface is less than on an area covered by a dense stand of alfalfa, for example. In our work we have standardized on short-cropped grass sods as the most suitable sampling areas. Here is a subject for which our knowledge is scant and research work is clearly needed for studying the effect of different kinds and densities of vegetation with respect to impaction or screening of Sr<sup>90</sup> deposition from the air.

### WORLD-WIDE SAMPLING PROGRAMS FOR STRONTIUM<sup>90</sup>

Limited soil sampling activities began in 1953. Since then, the work has expanded greatly to the point where we now sample regularly over the United States and over much of the free world's land area. For special studies of, for instance, the relationship of Sr<sup>90</sup> deposition to rainfall, more intensive sampling in selected regions has been done.

The following are the soil collection and analysis programs which have been carried out recently by the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Atomic Energy Commission (Alexander, 1959).

1. 1958 Outside U. S. soils (62 localities, 78 sites).
2. 1958 United States soils (17 localities, 23 sites).
3. 1958 Special soil sampling along a 32 inch rainfall contour in central United States (18 localities).
4. 1957 Special soil sampling along a 40 inch rainfall contour on the west coast of the United States and Canada (11 localities).

### RESULTS OF STRONTIUM<sup>90</sup> SOIL SAMPLING

The 1958 sampling provided us with a much better estimate than we had previously of what errors might be involved in the sample-taking and the

## Alexander, Hardy, Hollister

sample processing and radiochemical analysis. A study of the total  $\text{Sr}^{90}$  in a number of paired sites (that is, localities sampled in duplicate) in 1958 in various parts of the world outside the United States, showed an average of about 1.6 millieuries per square mile difference between the two sites at any one locality. This was for sites from one to twenty-five miles apart but still sampled as one locality (table 3). Examination of data from six Health and Safety Laboratory localities in the United States sampled in duplicate in 1958 showed an average site difference of 4.8 mc of  $\text{Sr}^{90}$  per square mile (table 4). The analytical duplicate error was 1.1 mc per square mile. Including both sample replication and analytical error the difference between the paired sites is about 10 to 12 per cent. This result comes in spite of the fact that for these United States locations the second site in each locality was originally selected because of some doubts regarding the validity of the original sampling site.

The world-wide data for soils (figures 1, 2) show a strong peaking of the  $\text{Sr}^{90}$  deposition in the north temperate latitudes, a low deposition in equatorial regions and a moderate increase from the equator southward to the middle southern latitudes. The contribution of an abnormally high rainfall site in Oahu, Hawaii is shown as a blank or non-cross hatched bar on the graphs and is considered to be an anomalous value since high rainfall areas were not sampled in other latitude belts. Conversely, the fallout at Lima, Peru was so low that considerable doubt is cast on the analytical values. Again the contribution of this site is shown by a blank bar on the graphs but the value is considered an anomalous one. The low amounts found in the area from  $70^\circ$  to  $80^\circ$  north latitude (and presumably for southern latitudes) are largely due to the fact that these areas are very low in total precipitation. In the very cold, very dry northern areas such as found on Ellesmere Island and Cornwallis Island, vegetation is sparse and in small clumps only. The areas in between the vegetation are bare. The soil materials blow and shift about with the winds. In the winter, snow blows from such areas into the clumps of vegetation and also to distant drifts. The clumps accumulate winter precipitation. They represent abnormal accumulations of  $\text{Sr}^{90}$  rather than the fallout that actually was deposited per square mile. The 2 sites on Cornwallis Island differ from each other by more than 2-fold. Both are high in relation to the sites at Point Barrow, Alaska where there is a complete tundra cover. Perhaps there is not a satisfactory way of sampling the partially vegetated, wind-swept areas. The contribution of the data from Ellesmere and Cornwallis Island is shown as the non-cross hatched section on the bar graph.

A similar situation exists in our southwestern desert areas. Between the clumps of sagebrush and greasewood the soil surface horizon is in frequent motion due to wind-action. Blown materials accumulate in the vegetation at heights greater than those of bare areas. Heavy rains wash some of the soil material in the clumps back into the lower-lying bare spots. Larson (1958) found several-fold differences between replicate samples taken in these virgin areas near the Nevada Test Site. This kind of local variation is to be expected



TABLE 3. Replication—1958 soils collected by L. T. Alexander<sup>a,b</sup>

Location	Distance between sites (mi)	Site A			Site B		
		Depth (in.)	Aliquot <sup>c</sup>	mc Sr <sup>90</sup> /mi <sup>2</sup> (av)	Depth (in.)	Aliquot <sup>c</sup>	mc Sr <sup>90</sup> /mi <sup>2</sup> (av)
Japan, Tokyo .....	3	0-7	a	30.82	0-7	a	23.47
			b	30.03		b	25.76
Philippines, Manila .....	4	0-6	a	9.24	0-6	a	7.10
			b	8.37		b	6.30
Un. of So. Africa, Durban .....	2	0-6	a	7.50	0-6	a	6.23
			b	6.36		b	7.58
Canal Zone, Panama .....	5	0-6	a	6.69	0-6	a	8.57
			b	7.53		b	9.45
Singapore .....	2	0-6	a	4.20	0-6	a	4.22
			b	3.93		b	4.15
Belgian Congo, Leopoldville .....	1	0-6	a	5.90	0-6	a	4.80
			b	6.15		b	5.01
Brazil, Belem .....	4	0-6	a	6.24	0-6	a	7.25
			b	6.66		b	6.07
Southern Rhodesia, Salisbury .....	1	0-6	a	5.04	0-6	a	5.24
			b	4.84		b	4.55
North Dakota, Mandan .....	15	0-6	a	44.80	0-6	a	40.20
			b	44.80		b	40.20
Alaska, Barrow .....	3	0-6	a	4.29	0-6	a	3.52
			b	4.29 <sup>a</sup>		b	3.52 <sup>a</sup>
Hawaii, Oahu .....	25	0-2	a	21.15	0-2	a	22.04
			b	22.69		b	22.24
		2-6	a	10.03	2-6	a	11.51
			b	9.84		b	10.56
	Total			31.86	Total		33.18

<sup>a</sup> Average difference between analytical duplicates—0.72 mc/mi<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> Average difference between means of site duplicates—1.64 mc/mi<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> a and b are analytical duplicates on separate soil aliquots from same soil sample.

<sup>d</sup> Duplicate not analyzed.