



# RADIOLOGICAL HAZARD IMPACT OF RESERVOIR FRACKING WASTEWATER: DRINKING WATER IMPLICATION, NIGERIA

#### \*Esi Emmanuel Oghenevovwero, Oduah Emeka Charles and Nwabuoku Augustine Onyema

Department of Physics, Dennis Osadebay University, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding authors' email: <u>esiemmanuel@yahoo.com</u>

#### ABSTRACT

Petroleum can be extracted from the earth reservoir through hydraulic fracking drilling technique. It is the technique being used by hydrocarbon operatives in Otu-Jeremi community. The wastewater released into natural water bodies during this process may contain natural occurring radioactive materials as a result of geological formation and radiologically hazardous chemicals used during production. This study area contains the local geological formations (Benin, Agbada and Akata formations) of the Niger Delta. This research thus investigated the radiological hazard impact of reservoir fracking on drinking wells water due to release of wastewater into Otu-Jeremi community waters. Thirty wells water samples were collected using 2-liter plastic containers and were analyzed using 3"x3" Sodium iodide [NaI(TI)] detector. The mean radionuclide concentrations values are 7.68±1.14 Bq/L, 5.70±0.92 Bq/L, and 30.40±1.54 Bq/L respectively. These values exceeded the (WHO, 2008) limit values of 1.0 Bql<sup>-1</sup>, 0.1Bql<sup>-1</sup> and 10.0Bql<sup>-1</sup> respectively. The radiological hazard risk were computed using scientific mathematical models and their mean values are  $18.07\pm2.65$  BqL<sup>-1</sup>,  $0.129\ mSvy^{-1}, 0.0499 mSvy^{-1}, 0.0803 mSvy^{-1}, 8.364\ \eta Gyh^{-1}, 0.103\ mSv/y, 0.410\ mSv/y, 0.029\ mSv/y and 0.114$ mSv/y respectively. The radiological elements computed reveal that AEDE and ELCR values did not exceeds recommended limits. Although the overall results obtained do not indicate potential radiological risks in the community drinking water. However, as a preventive major, it is essential to conduct regular radiological monitoring of public drinking water to ensure future potential risks on the residents.

Keywords: Radiological, Oil and Gas, Hydraulic Fracking, Water, Environment

#### INTRODUCTION

Hydraulic fracturing is one of the very few unconventional methods employed by operators of oil and gas to extract oil and natural gas from the earth (Kerr, 2010; Arthur et al., 2009). This technique has improved exploration and production capacity due to increase in demand for petroleum byproducts in recent years (Avner et al., 2013; Kargbo et al., 2010; Kerr, 2010). However, during production, crude oil may spill and possible discharge of hazardous waste (produced water) into the environment that may lead to environmental and public health impacts on the residents. Hence various international organizations have set up standard and policies to safeguide the environment from radiological hazards (Howarth et al., 2011; Goldstein et al., 2012; Avwiri and Esi, 2014; Shi et al., 2021). One of the concerns regarding hydraulic fracking technique is its impact on drinking waters (Vidic et al., 2013; Gregory et al., 2011) which occurred as a result of the release of naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs) among the other constituent from the drilling process which may increase the level of radiological pollution of the environment (Osborn et al., 2011; Warner et al., 2012; Nte et al., 2013; Brown, 2014). These NORMs such as produce water, sludge scales etc may have potential radiological public health impacts on the environment.

In Nigeria, crude oil exploration and production started in 1956 after its discovery in Oloibiri oil field, Niger Delta and gradually spread across the Niger Delta region. The research area (Otu-Jeremi community) has experienced oil and gas operations which may have led to spill and released of fracking wastewater containing radiological elements and may have impacted on the drinking water of the residents. Consequently because of these, to the best of our knowledge, there is no documented literature on the radiological hazard impact of reservoir fracking wastewater on drinking water in Otu-Jeremi community in particular and the Niger Delta region in general. Lately, the public health centers in the community have recorded similar health-related issues such as skin cancer, breast cancer, leukaemia, eye cataract, sterility, genetic disorders etc that may be traced to wastewater pollution. Hence, these study to evaluate radiological contamination level, potential health impact and implication of reservoir fracking wastewater in drinking water of the area. Therefore, this research will serve as baseline study of the area. Otu-Jeremi is the headquarter of Ughelli South Local Government Area, Delta State, Nigeria. The inhabitants is about 23,576 with occupational history of farming, fishing trading and government workers (ministry and oil and gas). The area has geographic coordinates of latitude 5.433 and longitude 5.867The area play host to Otorogun gas plant and many oil fields (Agaja, 2012).



Figure 1: Map of Otu-Jeremi town

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS Sample Collection and Preparation

In Otu-Jeremi town, a total of thirty water samples were collected (in triplicates, this is to ensure dependability of results) from ten hand-dug wells (three per well). Each water sample was given a code 1 to 3 per location and the mean coding per location ranging from HDWW 1 to HDWW 10. During the sampling process, 2-liter plastic containers with approximately 1% air space were used to collect the samples. To minimize contamination from the container itself a deionized water was first used to wash the inner part of the container and allow to dried. However, the well water to be sampled was also used to wash the sample containers thoroughly foe about three to four times before sampling the well water. After sample collection, 10ml of acid per liter (2 M HCL) of water solution was added to the sampled water to avoid assimilation of radioactivity on the walls of the container. Subsequently, the collected samples were forwarded to Obafemi Awolowo University's Energy Research Centre for detailed sample preparation and analysis. Preparations of samples were carried out using one-liter capacity beakers that were thoroughly washed and rinsed with water down sulfuric acid and subsequently carefully desiccated in an oven. The beakers were filled with a predetermined quantity of samples were tightly sealed for an interval of thirty days (30 days before radionuclide concentrations analysis was done via 3"x3" Sodium iodide [NaI(TI)] detector. This procedure was carried out to ensure the preservation of radon and establish an equilibrium state in the samples.

#### Sample analysis

The detector, thallium-activated 3"x3" Sodium iodide [NaI(TI)] attached to an ORTEC 456 amplifier, used was in a lead shielded house of about thickness of 100mm, and a computer software SAMPO 90 was connected to the detector. In order to ascertain accurate quantitative measurements of the samples, appropriate energy calibration was carried out on the detector using Cs-137 and Co-60 system efficiency standard sources with resolutions energy of 39.5% and 22.2% respectively. These standard sources were purchased from IAEA in Vienna. For background measurement, spectra were accumulated for 29000 seconds at 900 volts, resulting in strong peaks at specific gamma emitting energies: 1460keV for 40K, 609keV for 214Bi, and 911keV for 228Ac. These peaks were used to evaluate the concentration of <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th respectively. During the calibration process, the activity levels of the standards were determined to be 25.37KBq and 4.84KBq for Cs-137 and Co-60 respectively. The surroundings background spectra were used to adjust the calculated activity concentrations of the samples. This correction was done in accordance with the methodology described by Avwiri et al. (2007) and Agbalagba et al. (2012). Subsequently, the sample concentration (C) of the radionuclides were calculated in units of Bql<sup>-1</sup> (becquerels per liter) after applying decay correction and using the expression equation provided in equation 1.

$$C_{S} = \frac{N_{ey}}{Q_{ey} \times V_{y} \times P_{y} \times R_{y}} (BqL^{-1})$$
(1)

 $C_s$  = Concentration of sample, N<sub>ey</sub> = energy net peak area, Q<sub>ey</sub>= the  $\gamma$ -energy of interest efficiency of the detector, V<sub>y</sub> = Sample volume, P<sub>y</sub> = Counting period summation, R<sub>y</sub> = Emission probability interest of the radionuclide.

# Calculation of Radiation Hazard Indices

 Table 1: Formulas for Calculating Radiation hazard risk of Community Drinking Water Implication (UNSCEAR, 2000; Diab et al., 2008; Esi and Akpoyibo, 2024)

S/No	Hazard Index	Formulas	
1	Radium Equivalent Index	$Ra_{eq} = H_{Ra} + 1.43 H_{Th} + 0.077 H_k$	(2)
2	Representation Level Index (Iyr)	$I_{yr} = \frac{H_{Ra}}{150} + \frac{H_{Th}}{100} + \frac{H_k}{1500}$	(3)
3	Absorbed Does Rate (D)	$D = 0.462 H_{Ra} + 0.621 H_{Th} + 0.0417 H_k$	(4)
4	External Hazard Index (HI <sub>ex</sub> )	$HI_{ex} = \frac{H_{Ra}}{370} + \frac{H_{Th}}{259} + \frac{H_k}{4810}$	(5)

#### RADIOLOGICAL HAZARD IMPACT OF...

Esi et al.,

Where all parameters retained their usual meaning: Where  $Ra_{eq}$  is the radium equivalent index,  $I_{yr}$  is the representative level index, D = absorbed dose rate, HIex and HI<sub>in</sub> are external hazard index and internal hazard index and HRa, HTh and HK, are the activity concentrations symbols representing values of  $^{238}\text{U},~^{232}\text{Th}$  and  $^{40}\text{K}$  respectively. For AEDE the following constant values are recommended for both outdoor and indoor of 0.7 Sv/Gy conversion coefficient and 0.2 and 0.8 for outdoor and indoor factor of occupancy respectively (UNSCEAR, 2000). Where, AEDR is the annual effective dose rate. Also, for ELCR, AEDE is the annual effective dose Equivalent, LD is life duration (55.75 years) (Ramasamy et al., 2009; Avwiri and Esi, 2015) and RF is risk factor (Sv<sup>-1</sup>), fatal cancer risk. ICRP 60 uses values of 0.05 for the public for stochastic effects (Ramasamy et al., 2009; Mokobia et al, 2020).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The radiological hazard impacts of reservoir fracking wastewater in the studied samples of Delta Central Community (Otu-Jeremi) town are specified in Table 2. The mean radionuclide concentrations values varied between  $3.7\pm0.6$  to  $11.7\pm0.4$  Bq/L with a mean of  $7.68\pm1.14$ Bq/L,  $3.9\pm0.6$  to  $8.2\pm1.0$ Bq/L with a mean of  $5.70\pm0.92$ Bq/L and 24.2

 $\pm 1.5$  Bq/L to 42.1 $\pm 0.3$  Bq/L with a mean of 30.40 $\pm 1.54$  Bq/L for <sup>238</sup>U, <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K respectively. The obtained mean values when compared with world limits, exceeded the (WHO, 2008) limit values of 1.0 Bq/L, 0.1 Bq/L and 10.0 Bq/L for <sup>238</sup>U and <sup>232</sup>Th and <sup>40</sup>K correspondingly. The findings are noticeably depicted in figures 1-3. However, <sup>40</sup>K results in the water samples is consistently higher than values of  $^{238}\mbox{U}$  and  $^{232}\mbox{Th}$  in all points of sampling and this may be ascribed to the area geographical structure and the content of mineral substances explored by the operators of the oil industry (Agbalagba et al., 2013; Shi et al., 2021). It was observed from the present study which was compared with similar scientific reports as presented in table 4. The obtained results were observed to be greater than the reported values from Algeria; Samsun, Turkey; Anglian, England; Kirkuk, Iraq; Saudi Arabia and Ghana. However, the observed values are in agreement the scientific report in Nigeria. The mean calculated radiological results of radium equivalent (Raeq) ranged from  $12.23 \pm 2.9$  Bq/L to  $25.61 \pm 2.0$  Bq/L with mean value of 18.07±2.65 Bg/L. The obtained results of Raeg are lower than the world limit of 370 Bq/L (Agaja and Ajisafe, 2013; Mohammad et al., 2015). The mean representative index (Iyr) ranged from 0.088 mSvy-1 to 0.179 mSvy-1 with mean of 0.129 mSvy<sup>-1</sup>.

Table 2: Mean activity concentration of radionuclides in hand dug well water from Otu-Jeremi town

Table 2: Mean activity concentration of fationactices in nand dug wen water from Ota-serenii town								
S/N	Coding	<sup>238</sup> U (Bql <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>232</sup> Th (Bql <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>40</sup> K (Bql <sup>-1</sup> )				
1	HDWW 1	$8.5 \pm 1.6$	$5.3 \pm 0.8$	$24.2 \pm 1.5$				
2	HDWW 2	$9.6 \pm 0.9$	$4.8 \pm 1.2$	$28.5 \pm 1.8$				
3	HDWW 3	$7.8 \pm 1.1$	$6.6 \pm 0.7$	$31.1 \pm 2.2$				
4	HDWW 4	$11.7 \pm 0.4$	$8.2 \pm 1.0$	$28.4 \pm 2.1$				
5	HDWW 5	$6.9 \pm 1.2$	$7.0 \pm 1.3$	$42.1 \pm 0.3$				
6	HDWW 6	$6.4 \pm 0.4$	$5.1 \pm 0.6$	$26.8 \pm 1.8$				
7	HDWW 7	$9.2 \pm 1.4$	$5.6 \pm 0.7$	$35.7 \pm 3.1$				
8	HDWW 8	$3.7 \pm 0.6$	$4.4 \pm 1.1$	$29.02 \pm 0.9$				
9	HDWW 9	$7.4 \pm 1.5$	$3.9\pm0.6$	32.09 ±0.3				
10	HDWW 10	$5.6 \pm 2.3$	$6.1 \pm 1.2$	$26.10 \pm 1.4$				
	MEAN	7.68±1.14	5.70±0.92	30.40±1.54				



Figure 2: Relationship of <sup>238</sup>U obtained values (Bql<sup>-1</sup>) in well water with WHO world limit



Figure 3: Relationship of <sup>232</sup>Th obtained values (Bql<sup>-1</sup>) in well water with WHO world limit



Figure 4: Relationship of <sup>40</sup>K obtained values (Bql<sup>-1</sup>) in well water with WHO world limit



Figure 5: Percentage distribution of Radionuclides in well water

	· · · · · ·									
C/NI	Code	Da	Iyr	Harr	TT!	D	AEDE	AEDE	ELCR×10 <sup>-3</sup>	ELCR×10 <sup>-3</sup>
<b>5/1</b>		Ka <sub>eq</sub>		пех	піп	D	(Outdoor)	(Indoor)	(Outdoor)	(Indoor)
1	HDWW 1	$17.94{\pm}2.9$	0.126	0.0492	0.0714	8.227	0.101	0.404	0.028	0.113
2	HDWW 2	$18.66{\pm}2.8$	0.131	0.0511	0.0764	8.605	0.106	0.422	0.029	0.118
3	HDWW 3	$19.63 \pm 2.3$	0.139	0.0540	0.0741	8.999	0.114	0.441	0.032	0.123
4	HDWW 4	$25.61{\pm}2.0$	0.179	0.0703	0.1008	11.762	0.144	0.577	0.040	0.161
5	HDWW 5	$19.10 \pm 3.1$	0.144	0.0554	0.0731	9.290	0.114	0.456	0.032	0.127
6	HDWW 6	$15.76 \pm 1.4$	0.112	0.0432	0.0599	7.242	0.089	0.355	0.025	0.099
7	HDWW 7	$19.96 \pm 2.6$	0.141	0.0547	0.0787	9.217	0.113	0.452	0.032	0.127

**Table 3: Computed Radiological Hazard Values** 

8	HDWW 8	$12.23 \pm 2.9$	0.088	0.0336	0.0430	5.652	0.069	0.277	0.019	0.077
9	HDWW 9	$15.45 \pm 2.4$	0.110	0.0427	0.0617	7.179	0.088	0.352	0.025	0.098
10	HDWW 10	$16.33 \pm 4.1$	0.116	0.0450	0.0593	7.464	0.915	0.366	0.026	0.102
	MEAN	$18.07 \pm 2.65$	0.129	0.0499	0.0803	8.364	0.103	0.410	0.029	0.114



Figure 6: Comparison of the Raeq against UNSCEAR Standard



Figure 7: Comparison of the Representative index (Iyr), External hazard index (Hex) and Internal hazard index (Hin), against UNSCEAR Standard



Figure 8: Comparison of the Absorbed Dose Rate(D) against UNSCEAR Standard

FJS



Figure 9: Comparison of the AEDE Outdoor and Indoor against UNSCEAR Standard



Figure 10: Comparison of the ELCR Outdoor and Indoor against ICRP Standard

|--|

Country	Natural A	Dofessor			
Country	<sup>238</sup> U	<sup>232</sup> Th	<sup>40</sup> K	- Kelerence	
Algeria	63.56mB/L	9.83mBq/L	6.80mBq/L	Kebir, 2022	
Turkey (Samsun)	419 mBq/L	142mBq/L	806mBq/L	Aydan et al, 2015	
England (Anglian)	1.2±0.38Bq/L	4.88±2.20 Bq/L	3.56±6.45 Bq/L	Beresford et al, 2007	
Iraq (Kirkuk)	121.95 mBq/L	81.52 mBq/L	1091.37 mBq/L	Najeba&Murtadha, 202	
Saudi Arabia	0.32 Bq/L	0.12 Bq/L	10.96 Bq/L	Al-Zahrani, 2016	
Ghana (Bomaa)	0.38 ±0.02 Bq/L	0.41 ±0.02 Bq/L	4.24 ±0.32 Bq/L	Darko et al, 2015	
Nigeria (Delta State)	6.04±2.48 Bq/L	5.18±2.14 Bq/L	48.78±13.67 Bq/L	Avwiri et al, 2013	
Nigeria (Out-Jeremi)	7.68±1.14 Bq/L	5.70±0.92 Bq/L	30.40±1.54 Bq/L	Present Study	

The mean results of HIex and HIin ranged from 0.0336mSvy<sup>-1</sup> (0.0430mSvy<sup>-1</sup>) to 0.0703mSvy<sup>-1</sup> (0.1008mSvy<sup>-1</sup>) with mean 0.0499mSvy<sup>-1</sup> (0.0803mSvy<sup>-1</sup>) respectively. It was observed from the computed values that HIex and HIin are lower than unity (Agaja and Ajisafe, 2013; Tchokossa *et al.*, 2011) which is the recommended international limit. The mean absorbed dose rate (D) of computed radiological results ranged from  $5.652\eta$ Gyh<sup>-1</sup> to  $11.762\eta$ Gyh<sup>-1</sup> with mean value of  $8.364\eta$ Gyh<sup>-1</sup>. These results are in agreement with scientific reports of drinking water from other similar study area (Tchokossa *et al.*, 2011; Ajayi and Achuka, 2009; Aguko *et al.*, 2020; Nwankwo, 2013; Fasunwon *et al.*, 2010). The mean results of AEDE outdoor and indoor ranged from  $0.06 \text{ mSvy}^{-1}$  to 0.144mSvy<sup>-1</sup> with mean of 0.103mSvy<sup>-1</sup> respectively. It was

observed that the AEDE outdoor and indoor values are below the world limit of 1.0 mSvy<sup>-1</sup>. These results are also in agreement with reported scientific literature (Agbalagba *et al.*, 2012; Avwiri *et al.*, 2007; Guogang and Giancarlo, 2007). The mean ELCR outdoor and indoor have a minimum value of 0.019 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> and maximum of 0.040 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> with mean of 0.029 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> and 0.077 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> to 0.161 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> with mean of 0.114 mSvy<sup>-1</sup> respectively. It is evident that the obtained values are lower than 0.29 x 10<sup>-3</sup> world limit (ICRP, 2003; Ramasamy *et al.*, 2009). These may be attributed to discharge of fracking wastewater into the environment area and geology structure of the area. These results do not indicate an immediate radiological risk to the drinking water of Otu-Jeremi, but may have long term associated radiologically potential risks if not manage properly. The objective of the study is to investigate radiological safety and quality of drinking water being consumed by residents of Otu-Jeremi town with regards to the release of reservoir fracking wastewater from oil exploration in the locality. A thallium-activated 3"x3" Sodium iodide [NaI(TI)] detector was used to analyze the concentrations of radionuclides in water samples and consequently, the radiological hazard impact was computed from the obtained results using mathematical models. The results indicate that the community's drinking water is safe for consumption since the computed radiological values do not pose any risk. However, necessary cautions such as constant quarterly radiation monitoring, introducing strict radiation regulations and guidelines for handling hazardous waste by both government agencies and oil and gas stakeholders and appropriate treatment of the reservoir fracking wastewater before release into the environment. Also, it is important creating public awareness about the potential radiological hazards associated with fracking wastewater if found in drinking water.

## REFERENCES

Agaja, S.A. (2012). Spatial distribution of primary health care centres in Ughelli south and Warri south local government areas of Delta State, Nigeria. International Journal o f Scientific and Technology Research. 1(9): 38-41.

Agaja, S. A. and Ajisafe, J. I (2013) Natural Radioactivity Of Surface And Ground Water Samples In Coastal Communities Of Delta State, Nigeria. *International Journal Of Current Research* Vol. 5, Issue, 12, Pp.4057-4061

Agbalagba, E.O., Avwiri, G.O. and Ononugbo, C.P. (2012). Activity Concentration and Radiological Impact Assessment of 226Ra, 228Ra and 40K in drinking waters from (OML) 30, 58 and 61 oil fields and host communities in Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, 116(2013), 197-200

Agbalagba, E.O., Avwiri, G.O., and Ononugbo, P.C. (2013). Activity concentration and radiological impact assessment of <sup>226</sup>Ra, <sup>228</sup>Ra and <sup>40</sup>K in drinking waters from (OML) 30, 58 and 61 oil fields and host communities in Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Elsevier; Journal of EnvironmentalRadioactivity116:197-200* 

Aguko W. O., Kinyua R.and Githiri J. G. (2020) Natural Radioactivity in Drinking Water Sources in Kargi Area, Marsabit – Kenya. *International Journal of Physical Sciences Research*, Vol.4, No.1, pp.1-13

Ajayi O.S and Achuka, J. (2009). Radioactivity in Drilled and dug well drinking water of Ogun State Southwestern Nigeria and Consequent dose estimates. *Rad. Prot. Dos*, 135(1) 54-63.

Ajayi, O.S., Adesida, G. (2009). Radioactivity in some sachet drinking water samples produced in Nigeria. Iran. *J. Radiat. Res.*, 7(3) 151 -153.

Al-Zahrani, J.H. (2016). Risk assessment due to ingestion of natural radionuclides and heavy metals in drinking water, Int. J. Dev. Res. 06 (06): 8039–8044.

Arthur, J.D., Bohm, B., Coughlin, B.J., and Layne, M. (2009). Evaluating the environmental implications of hydraulic fracturing in shale gas reservoirs. SPE Americas E&P Environmental and Safety Conference.San Antonio, Texas, Society of Petroleum Engineers

Avner, V., Nathaniel, W., Rob, J., and Tom, D. (2013). The effects of shale gas exploration and hydraulic fracturing on the quality of water resources in the United States. *Procedia Earth and Planetary Science* 7: 863 – 866

Avwiri G. O., Tchokossa P., Mokobia C. E. (2007) Natural radionuclides in bore-hole water in Port-Harcourt, Rivers state, Nigeria. *Radiat. Protect. Dosimetry.* vol. 123, no. 4, pp. 509–514

Avwiri G.O and <u>Esi</u> E.O (2014) Evaluation of background ionization radiation level in some selected dumpsites in Delta State, Nigeria. *Advances in Physics Theories and Applications* 35: 36-42

Avwiri G.O and <u>Esi</u> E.O (2015) Survey of background ionization radiation level in some selected automobile mechanic workshops in Uvwie LGA Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 5: 8 – 17

Avwiri Gregory O., Esi Emmanuel, Agbalagba Ezekiel O. (2013) Gamma Spectroscopy Analysis of Produced Water from Selected Flow Stations in Delta State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environmental Monitoring and Analysis*. Vol. 1 (5): 167-174.

Aydan, A., Seref, T., and Hasan, G. (2015). The natural and artificial radionuclides in drinking water samples and population doses. Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences. 8(4): 578-582

Beresford, N.A., Appleton, J.D., Barnet, C.L., Bescoby, M.W., Breward, N., Jones, D.G., MacKenzie, A.C., Scheib, C., Thorring, H. and Wood, M.D. (2007). Assessment of naturally occurring radionuclides in England and Wales. Environment Agency, Rio House, Waterside Drive, Aztec West, Almondsbury, Bristol. 61 (4): 24–38

Brown V, (2014) Radionuclides in fracking wastewater: managing a toxic blend. Environ. Health Perspect. 122, A50– A55

Darko, G., Faanu, A., Akoto, O., Acheampong, A., Goode, E.J., and Gyamfi, O. (2015). Distribution of natural and artificial radioactivity in soils, water and tuber crops, Environ. Monit. Assess. 187 (6): 1–11.

Diab, H. M., Nouh, S.A., Hamdy, A., and El- Fiki, S.A. (2008). Evaluation of natural radioactivity in a cultivated area around a fertilizer factory. J. Nucl. and Rad. Phys. 3(1): 53-62.

Fasunwon, O. O, Alausa, S.K., Odunaike, R.K., Alausa, I.M., SOsanya, F.M. and Ajala, B.A (2010). Activity concentrations of natural radionuclide levels in well waters of Ago Iwoye, Nigeria. *Iran. J. Radiat. Res.*, 7 (4): 207-210.

Goldstein, B.D.; Kriesky, J.; Pavliakova, B. (2012) Missing from the table: role of the environmental public health community in governmental advisory commissions related to Marcellus shale drilling. Environ. Health Perspect. 120 (4): 483–486 Gregory KB, Vidic RD, Dzombak DA (2011) Water management challenges associated with the production of shale gas by hydraulic fracturing. Elements 7 (3), 181–186.

Guogang, J., Giancarlo, T. (2007).Estimation of Radiation Doses to members of the public in Italy from intakes of some important Naturally OccuringRadionuclides (<sup>238</sup>U, <sup>234</sup>U, <sup>235</sup>U, <sup>226</sup>Ra, <sup>228</sup>Ra, <sup>224</sup>Ra and <sup>210</sup>Po) in Drinking Water.*App. Rad. Isot.*, 65: 849-857.

Howarth RW, Santoro R, Ingraffea A. (2011) Methane and the greenhouse-gas footprint of natural gas from shale formations. Climatic Change. 106: 679-690

ICRP (International Commission on Radiological Protection) (1997). ICRP Publication 78; Individual Monitoring for Internal Exposure of workers

Kargbo, D.M., Wilhelm, R.G., and Campbell, D.J. (2010). Natural Gas Plays in the Marcellus Shale: Challenges and Potential Opportunities. *EnvSciTechnol* 44: 5679–5684.

Kebir, H. (2022). Natural radionuclide concentrations in drinking water (well and spring mineral waters) samples from Bordj-Bouarreridj region, east Algeria.Journal of Radioanalytical and Nuclear Chemistry. 331: 727-737.

Kerr, R.A. (2010). Natural gas from shale bursts onto the scene. Science 328: 1624–1626.

Mohammad Reza Zare, Mahdi Kamali, Zohre Omidi, Mahdi Khorambagheri, Mohammad Seddigh Mortazavi, Mahmood Ebrahimi and Gholamali Akbarzadeh (2015) Evaluation of natural radioactivity content in high-volume surface water samples along the northern coast of Oman Sea using portable high-resolution gamma-ray spectrometry. *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity* 144 (2): 134-139

Mokobia, C.E., Nwabuoku, A.O., and Igbeka, C. (2020). Indoor Radon Concentration Measurements in Houses of Selected Communities in Delta Central of Delta State. *Nigerian Journal of Science and Environment* 18 (2): 34-46

Najeba, S. and Murtadha, A. (2023).Measuring the radioactivity concentration of <sup>40</sup>K, <sup>226</sup>Ra, <sup>232</sup>Th with PH, conductivity and radiological risk in tap water. *International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry*. 12 (3) 11-24

Nte F, Chizurumoke M and Esi E.O (2013) <u>Measurement of</u> <u>magnetic fields from liquid crystal display (LCD) computer</u> <u>monitors</u>. *International Journal of Current Research* 5 (7), 1771-73

Nwankwo, L.I. (2013). The determination of natural radioactivity in groundwater in Tankellorin Nigeria *West African Journal of Applied Ecology*, vol. 21(1) 111-119

Oghenevovwero Emmanuel Esi and Akpoyibo Ogheneovo (2024) Geophysical Survey and Radiometric Assessment of Aquifer Strata and vulnerable Groundwater Quality of Ukwuani Communities in Delta State. *Scientia Africana* Vol. 23 (2) 88 – 103

Osborn SG, Vengosh A, Warner NR, Jackson RB. (2011) Methane contamination of drinking water accompanying gaswell drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci 108 (20), 8172–8176.

Ramasamy .V, Suresh .G, Meenakshisundaram .V. and Gajendran .V. (2009). Evaluation of Natural Radionuclide Content in River Sediments and Excess Lifetime Cancer Risk Due to Gamma Radioactivity.*Research Journal of Environmenal and Earth Sciences* 1(1): 6-10.

Shi, Y., Gao, W., Siqin, T., Li, Z., Zhang, J., Guan, R., Li, J., Sun, P. and Zhao, H. (2021). The gross  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  radioactivity levels of drinking water source in one oil industrial city in northeast China. Radiation Medicine and Protection 2:61–66

Tchokossa, P., Olomo, J.B. and Balogun, F.A (2011). Assessment of Radionuclide concentrations and absorbed dose from consumption of community water supplies in oil and gas producing areas in Delta State, Nigeria. *World journal of Nuclear science and technology*, 1, 77-86.

Tchokosse, P., Olomo, J.B. and Osibota, O.A. (1999).Radioactivity in the community water supplies of Ifecentral and Ife-East L.G.A.'S Osun State, Nigeria.*Nucl.Instr. And Methods in Phys. Res.* (A422:780-784).

UNSCEAR (2000).Sources and Effects of Ionizing Radiation. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, United Nations, New York

Vidic, R.D.; Brantley, S.L.; Vandenbossche, J.M.; Yoxtheimer, D.; Abad, J.D (2013) Impact of shale gas development on regional water quality Science 340 (6134), 1235009.

Warner NR, Jackson, RB, Darrah, TH, Osborn, SG, Down A, Zhao K, White A, Vengosh A. (2012) Geochemical evidence for possible natural migration of Marcellus Formation brine to shallow aquifers in Pennsylvania. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci 109 (30), 11961–11966.

WHO (2008): Guideline for Drinking Water Quality. Radiation Quality of Drinking, *World Health Organization*, Geneva, Switzerland. Groundwater Protection Council and ALL Consulting. Modern Shale Gas Development in the United States: A Primer.



©2024 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license viewed via <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</u> which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited appropriately.