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Objective:
FAIRDO aims at providing substantive inputs to the ongoing decontamination/remediation operations, reflecting the realities of local conditions for effective designing and implementation.

Leader: Dr. Hiroshi Suzuki, Professor Emeritus, Fukushima University
Chair of Reconstruction Committee in Fukushima Pref.

Components and mode of operation:

(1) Governance for Effective Remediation/Decontamination Operations
IGES and Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS)
Tokyo Keizai University, Chiba University of Commerce, etc.

(2) Development of remediation/decontamination strategies
Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Fukushima University, KIT, Bundesamt fur Strahlenschutz (BfS)

(3) Effective communications to promote collaboration
Tokyo Institute of Technology, Fukushima University, Berlin Freie Universitat

Major outputs/outcomes:
• Substantive inputs to the ongoing decontamination/remediation operations through relevant experts’ channels
• Japan optimal model based on EURANOS/RODOS developed
• Guidelines for effective decontamination/remediation operations shared
FAIRDO Project

FAIRDO’s messages
Toward better decontamination and recovery

Integrated discussions and planning of decontamination and recovery
- Establishment of the Information Platform to facilitate information sharing and ensure transparency/credibility
- Review of the current decontamination plans to include clearer visions toward recovery and development of the local societies
- Development (or review) of local reconstruction plans envisaging that some of radioactive matters aren’t cleared even after decontamination

Better communication among municipalities on their experiences and lessons
- Introduction / dissemination of participatory decontamination planning and implementation
- Application of brief assessment

Development and utilization of tools to understand and reflect local situations in decontamination/recovery
- Utilization of RODOS model to enable clear understandings of effects, costs, amounts of wastes and workloads.
- More utilization of experts such as Decontamination Promotion Workers
- Establishment of community roundtables at each municipality
Ratio of progress to planned decontamination in FY2012

- Public Facility
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Ordered/Planned vs Finished/Planned (%)
Decontamination progress for houses by municipalities
(Source: based on data from Fukushima Prefectural Government)

(as of Oct 31, 2013)
Comparison on Initiatives of Decontamination Operations for houses

• Purpose:
  To clarify the characteristics of communication of with citizen and the promotion of decontamination operation under the limited resources and information.

• Methodology:
  – By clarified situations of chosen municipalities with three aspects; communication “planning stage”, “implementation stage” and “diversity of means”
  – Target municipalities: 2 cities, 1 town and 1 village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima City</td>
<td>• Background of Decontamination, and the status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koriyama City</td>
<td>• Status of temporary storage area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawauchi Village</td>
<td>• Status of Awareness raising and explanatory meetings and the responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirono Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*( ) shows ambient dose rate as of 2011/6
First two decontamination areas in Fukushima city
• Results: analysis of responsiveness of the municipalities (case of Fukushima city)

- 2011/5-6 Radiation measurement
- ~2011/7 Model project at Watari area
  - Lengthy discussion
  - Issues related to temporary storage
  - Debates among residents

Completion of model project
- 2011/9 Dev. of Decontamination plan based on the guidelines
- 2012/5 Prioritization of decontamination area by representatives (committee of local decontamination response)
  - Explanation to community leader
  - trilateral talk at each households

M: Measurement
D: Decontami.
OUTCOMES

- Workshop of committee of local decontamination response in Fukushima city
- Identification of rain flow
- Classify and prioritize the decontamination area
• Results: analysis of responsiveness of the municipalities (case of Koriyama City)

Decontamination plan

- Dev. of Decontamination manual
  - 2011/10
  - Explanatory meeting on the manual
  - Explanatory meetings at each area (2012/1, almost every week)

- Development of decontamination plan
  - 2011/12

Implementation of the plan

- Ikenodai Area
  - 2012/1 model project at Ikenodai area
  - Explanatory meeting in the area and implementation of the project

- 2012/10~
  - Explanatory meeting about the decontami., reflecting the model project

- 2012/10~
  - Started decontamination

Awareness raising with public newsletter, TV or, telephone consultation
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### Results: Comparison Analysis among the municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fukushima</th>
<th>Koriyama</th>
<th>Kawauchi</th>
<th>Hirono</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement at</strong></td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>planning stage</strong></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement at</strong></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>implementation stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity of means</strong></td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
<td>Relatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics of the municipalities

- **Fukushima City**: widely opened communication windows. Took advantages well from the model project.
- **Koriyama City**: dealing with the various approaches even though there is a limited communication at implementation stage.
- **Kawauchi Village**: low diversity of means, but conducting in-depth trilateral talk at implementation stage. Also generous support to scattered evacuated shelters.
- **Hirono Town**: In addition to the trilateral talk, enhancing communication at implementation stage by establishing the office for external affairs at each area.
Causes of the differences in responses among the municipalities

① Accumulation of knowledge/experiences from reaction to hotspot

– Experiences required the good Liaison with national and prefectural government, communication with local residents, quick responses to various requests from residents. ⇒ accumulation of knowledge
– Utilized the experiences for discussion on responses to contaminated area with stakeholders

② Agreement of temporally storage sites

– Remote area from residential area ⇒ initiatives of municipalities for establishing temporally storage area (Kawauchi and Hirono)
– Closed from residential area ⇒ required some efforts
  • Developed appropriate approaches through trial and errors of model project (Fukushima)
Causes of the differences in responses among the municipalities

③ Leadership of Mayors
- Statement of continuous and strong decision of returning home by mayor (Kawauchi)
- It seems that a system of municipal organization is more involved at the place where there is no clear statement from its mayor (Fukushima)

④ Organizational structure for decontamination promotion
- Establishment of responsible department and arrangement of personnel, preparing budget
  - Effective decontamination promotion with support from decontamination promoters, who were appointed by national government. (Fukushima)
- Building trust among residents by utilization of local staff of the contractor (Hirono)
Changes of citizen awareness associated with the progress of decontamination:

• Purpose: To reveal awareness change of local citizens on decontamination and rehabilitation associated with the progress from the disaster.

• Methodology:
  – Extracting the statements from roundtable (details later) and dialogues with local residents
  – Examining trends of the statements based on the citizen’s categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorization</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>residents with special knowledge</td>
<td>Residents, working in the field of medical care and health sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation/Prefectural wide network</td>
<td>Members of nation wide organization, doing activities and making policy recommendations in Fukushima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local network</td>
<td>Member of local organization, composed of local stakeholders for reconstruction at specified area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>Residents, living in the decontamination target area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Overview of roundtable (related to research methodology):
  – Purpose: to review the way of consensus building toward decontamination and reconstruction by sharing the information among government, resident and experts
  – Date, theme, participants: as shown at the bottom right
  – Position at this study:
  • To extracting statements for reviewing the understanding and acceptances associated with decontamination operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 26, 2013</td>
<td>Issues to be revealed after implementation of decontamination</td>
<td>Governments, experts, citizens’ organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27, 2013</td>
<td>How to proceed Information sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12, 2013</td>
<td>Status and issues in Data city</td>
<td>Governments, experts, citizens’ organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29, 2014</td>
<td>How to proceed regional development after the disaster</td>
<td>Governments, experts, citizens’ organizations, Local residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a government stands side of residents with sharing the feeling fight together, the distance between the government and residents would come closer and there would be a lot of potential. I want this way of discussion (roundtable) to spread more.”【residents with special knowledge】

When we think how reconstruct Fukushima, ambient dose in Kawauchi village is lower than Fukushima city. Reconstruction is not only the issue of ambient dose. Key issue is whether residents can live or not.【Nation/Prefectural wide network】

I think limits of decontamination is getting clear. Issues of decontamination and evacuation were considered one issue, and decontamination operation itself became the purpose. Therefore, there was an aspect that decontamination created the obstacles of evacuation.【Nation/Prefectural wide network】

Too much expectation of decontamination in the explanation to residents made limited choices such as evacuation.【Nation/Prefectural wide network】

- Positive opinion evaluating the performance of communication on decontamination operation so far
- Re-evaluation of the decontamination in the reconstruction
Now, I also have this (glass badge). Now decontamination is completed and it seems like very calm. I worry that the ambient dose is high since I am wearing this (glass badge). I aware that decontamination operation has been progressed in data city. But I still feel on the way.【Local residents】

During the disaster period, Media and people living Tokyo asked me what is going on in Oguni. But I did not understand the situation and how I live. There was electricity, water supply. I received some information but did not understand one thing, which is radioactivity.【Local network】

At the time (when specify specific encouragement evacuation point) why government decided unilaterally without asking local people. furthermore, this situation revealed personal characteristics such as slander which has not been able to see before. This is a kind of community divide caused by the nuclear disaster.【Local network】

- While lack of information is still continued, people may have a psychological labeling effects.
- While safety and reconstruction measurement have shown certain effects, they also have created new challenges.
OUTCOMES

1. Responsiveness of Municipalities

2. Statements of Citizens

• Results:

There are houses with/without appointed the specific encouragement evacuation point in one same area. There is a community divide. People who have been working together divided into half. Therefore, we could not work together anymore. Deepened the boundary between the appointed house and not appointed house. My house was appointed but my friend was not.

--(snip)--

After principal of school changed, school allow kids off-campus activities. I worry about the school lunch since the rice was from date city. In initially, I gave my kids rice from home. But my kids told that why I bring my own rice? And I want to eat what other kids eat.

I thought I am the only who can protect but I began to think its necessary to be living with everyone for the mental health.【Local residents】

- Aspect of differences of decontamination by appointed points and creation of friction among local residents.
- Conflict between to protect children from radiation and to keep the mental health of children.
## Construction of Information Platform (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>General info.</th>
<th>Info. for decision-making in each area</th>
<th>Info. for supporting personal and families’ choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition in wide-area Condition in each area Decontamination tech. Personal exposure Contami. level in each site Reconstruction plan of the pref. area Temporary waste storage Issues after decontamination site Contami. level of foods Area-wise Method for avoiding recovery and livelihood storage Contami. level in each sites exposures</td>
<td>Decontamination tech.</td>
<td>Public service for recovery and livelihood support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>National Gov. Municipalities Municipalities Fukushima Pref. Researchers Agricultural and citizen Contami. level of foods Contractors cooperatives Cooperatives</td>
<td>Researchers Citizen groups Contami. level of foods</td>
<td>Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients</td>
<td>Citizens of Fukushima Communities Communities Individuals, Families and other Prefs.</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>Individuals, Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Publicity papers and Publicity papers and Publicity papers and Personal communication websites Meeting websites communication websites and websites</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicity papers and Publicity papers and Personal communication websites and websites websites and websites</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicity papers and Publicity papers and Publicity papers and Websites and Websites and Social media Social media</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction of Information Platform (2)

- Recovery, Livelihood support
- Decontamination, Waste management
- Consensus Building / Choice of Persons or families
- Compensation
- Ambient contamination
- Contaminated level of foods
- Health Impacts

Info. for livelihood support, choice such as long-term evacuation, return

Info. necessary for health care