



ELSEVIER

Chemosphere xxx (2005) xxx-xxx

CHEMOSPHERE

www.elsevier.com/locate/chemosphere

Short Communication

## Dioxin hot spots in Vietnam

L. Wayne Dwernychuk \*

*Hatfield Consultants Ltd., 201-1571 Bellevue Ave., West Vancouver, BC, Canada V7V 1A6*

Received 1 September 2004; received in revised form 13 January 2005; accepted 26 January 2005

**Keywords:** Herbicide; 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin; Ranch Hand; Soil; Dioxin hot spots; Former US military installations; Agent orange; Dioxin exposure

During the Vietnam conflict, US forces sprayed a greater volume of defoliant with higher dioxin content than originally estimated (Stellman et al., 2003). The Vietnamese have been exposed to these levels during spraying, and it is suspected on a regular basis for the past 30 years, primarily through contact with former US military infrastructure. Vietnamese people continue to be exposed to dioxin and its effects today; this is not a historical problem. The revised estimates of defoliant volumes and dioxin content (Stellman et al., 2003), increase the quantity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) released in Vietnam to perhaps over 600 kg, much greater than the ~170 kg quoted since the war (IOM, 2001).

Stellman et al. (2003) raise the profile of the "Hatfield hot spot theory", which was proven through field validation studies in the Aluoi Valley, central Vietnam (Dwernychuk et al., 2002). Hot spots labeled by Hatfield exist today, that is, soils that have very high TCDD levels due to higher levels of TCDD loading during the conflict. A significant point is that Hatfield hot spots are not the expansive forested areas targeted by routine flights of Operation Ranch Hand, the US military code name for the spray program.

In barren regions of the Aluoi Valley, once consisting of triple-canopy jungle and heavily sprayed with Agent Orange by aircraft, soils do not retain high levels of TCDD (Dwernychuk et al., 2002), given years of tropi-

cal rains, erosion, and chemical degradation. Forces of nature have reduced TCDD in soils when defoliants were originally dispensed from aircraft during planned spray missions. Hot spots that exist today are soils where Agent Orange was spilled, applied by truck-mounted sprayers, including intensive perimeter spraying of bases, etc., thereby effecting a dioxin loading to soils that was significantly higher than that resulting from aerial spray applications. The highest concentration of TCDD in soils was collected from within the boundaries of a former US Special Forces base in the Aluoi Valley (Dwernychuk et al., 2002); soil samples originated from the former personnel camp. Two other former bases in the valley, operational for a shorter period of time, also had soil TCDD levels that were generally higher than aurally sprayed regions. This strongly suggests that any US soldier assigned to a military installation in southern Vietnam where Agent Orange was used, could have been exposed to dioxin.

Ranch Hand bases at Bien Hoa and Da Nang are examples of major hot spots. A TCDD concentration in soil from Bien Hoa was reported up to 1.2 million parts per trillion (ppt) (Schechter et al., 2001). Anecdotal information from Vietnamese scientists suggests soil dioxin levels from Da Nang are in the several hundred thousand ppt ranges. Typical urban soils in the United States are less than 10 ppt TCDD (Nestrick et al., 1986).

Stellman et al. (2003) outline potential hot spots through graphical representations of defoliant volumes sprayed over Vietnam. These hot spots probably existed at the time of spraying, and relate primarily to exposure of US troops on maneuvers in specific areas during

\* Tel.: +1 604 926 3262.

E-mail address: [wdwernychuk@hatfieldgroup.com](mailto:wdwernychuk@hatfieldgroup.com)

71 Ranch Hand operations. Stellman et al. (2003) configura-  
 72 tions of volume are more relevant to historical conta-  
 73 minant levels, than to levels that may exist today.  
 74 Important footnotes to Stellman et al. (2003) hot  
 75 spot configurations are their qualifiers regarding esti-  
 76 mates of increased defoliant volumes which do not in-  
 77 clude herbicides sprayed by the Republic of Vietnam,  
 78 US Army and US Navy forces, the 400 000 l of Agent  
 79 Pink that were unaccounted for, and the possibility that  
 80 200 spray missions released Agent Pink not Orange. Gi-  
 81 ven that Pink was more contaminated with TCDD than  
 82 Orange, the true loading of TCDD to the Vietnamese  
 83 environment could be higher than suspected on the basis  
 84 of recently uncovered records. To what extent these  
 85 uncatalogued volumes have compromised the health of  
 86 US veterans, and continue to compromise the health  
 87 of the Vietnamese remains unknown.  
 88 Hatfield hot spots (i.e., former US military installa-  
 89 tions) must be the focal point of studies to determine  
 90 sites for remediation, thereby removing them from the  
 91 exposure equation for perhaps hundreds of thousands  
 92 of Vietnamese. This strategy is particularly justified  
 93 where former US bases have been abandoned and set-  
 94 tled by locals to form villages and sites of concentrated  
 95 human activity. Remediation efforts must also be direc-  
 96 ted at situations where topographical features near for-  
 97 mer US bases are such as to direct runoff water to  
 98 areas presently used for food production by local inhab-  
 99 itants. This scenario relates primarily to circumstances  
 100 where a former base continues to serve as a public air-  
 101 port or military establishment for the Vietnamese gov-  
 102 ernment. These contaminated areas are logical sites for

comprehensive epidemiological and human health inves- 103  
 tigations, including appropriate interventions. 104  
 New information on the use of herbicides by the US 105  
 military during the Vietnam conflict should heighten 106  
 health concerns for US veterans and the Vietnamese 107  
 who continue to deal with the consequences of TCDD 108  
 throughout their daily lives, and potentially for many 109  
 years into the future. 110

## References

- 111
- Dwernychuk, L.W., Cau, H.D., Hatfield, C.T., Boivin, T.G., 112  
 Hung, T.M., Dung, P.T., Thai, N.D., 2002. Dioxin reser- 113  
 voirs in southern Viet Nam—A legacy of agent orange. 114  
*Chemosphere* 47, 117. 115  
 IOM (Institute of Medicine), 2001. *Veterans and Agent Orange:* 116  
*update 2000.* National Academy Press, Washington, DC, p. 117  
 604. 118  
 Nestrick, T.J., Lamparski, L.L., Frawley, N.N., Hummel, R.A., 119  
 Koher, C.W., Mahle, N.H., McCoy, J.W., Miller, D.L., 120  
 Peters, T.L., Pillepich, J.L., Smith, W.E., Tobey, S.W., 121  
 1986. Perspectives of a large scale environmental survey for 122  
 chlorinated dioxins: Overviews and soil data. *Chemosphere* 123  
 15, 1453. 124  
 Schecter, A., Cao, D.L., Papke, O., Prange, J., Constable, J.D., 125  
 Matsuda, M., Duc, T.V., Piskac, A.L., 2001. Recent dioxin 126  
 contamination from agent orange in residents of a southern 127  
 vietnam city. *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* 43, 435. 128  
 Stellman, J.M., Stellman, S.D., Christian, R., Weber, T., 129  
 Tomasallo, C., 2003. The extent and patterns of usage of 130  
 Agent Orange and other herbicides in Vietnam. *Nature* 422, 131  
 681. 132  
 133