



## Wastewater treatment and public health in Nunavut: a microbial risk assessment framework for the Canadian Arctic

Daley, Kiley; Jamieson, Rob; Rainham, Daniel; Hansen, Lisbeth Truelstrup

*Published in:*  
Environmental Science and Pollution Research

*Link to article, DOI:*  
[10.1007/s11356-017-8566-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-8566-8)

*Publication date:*  
2018

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Daley, K., Jamieson, R., Rainham, D., & Hansen, L. T. (2018). Wastewater treatment and public health in Nunavut: a microbial risk assessment framework for the Canadian Arctic. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(33), 32860-32872. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-8566-8>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

[Click here to view linked References](#)

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  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## **Title Page**

### **Authors**

Kiley Daley<sup>1</sup>, Rob Jamieson<sup>2</sup>, Daniel Rainham<sup>3</sup>, and Lisbeth Truelstrup Hansen<sup>4</sup>

### **Review Article**

#### **Title**

Wastewater Treatment and Public Health in Nunavut: A Microbial Risk Assessment Framework for the Canadian Arctic

#### **Affiliations and addresses**

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Water Resource Studies, Dalhousie University, Halifax Nova Scotia, Canada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Process Engineering and Applied Science, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Science Program, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

<sup>4</sup>National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

#### **Corresponding Author**

Kiley Daley

Email address: kiley.daley@dal.ca

Telephone number: 902-494-6070

#### **Abstract**

Wastewater management in Canadian Arctic communities is influenced by several geographical factors including climate, remoteness, population size and local food harvesting practices. Most communities use trucked collection services and basic treatment systems, which are capable of only low-level pathogen removal. These systems are typically reliant solely on natural environmental processes for treatment and make use of existing lagoons, wetlands and bays. They are operated in a manner such that partially treated wastewater still containing potentially hazardous microorganisms is released into the terrestrial and aquatic environment at random times. Northern communities rely heavily on their local surroundings as a source of food, drinking water and recreation, thus creating the possibility of human exposure to wastewater effluent. Human exposure to microbial hazards present in municipal

1  
2  
3 wastewater can lead to acute gastrointestinal illness or more severe disease. Although estimating the  
4 actual disease burdens associated with wastewater exposures in Arctic communities is challenging,  
5 waterborne and sanitation related illness is believed to be comparatively higher than in other parts of  
6 Canada. This review offers a conceptual framework and evaluation of current knowledge to enable the  
7 first microbial risk assessment of exposure scenarios associated with food harvesting and recreational  
8 activities in Arctic communities where simplified wastewater systems are being operated.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 **Keywords**

16 Conceptual Model, Environmental Exposures, Indigenous Health, Inuit, QMRA (Quantitative  
17 Microbial Risk Assessment), Rural Health, WaSH (water, sanitation and hygiene), Wastewater  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **Acknowledgements**

24 The authors thank the Government of Nunavut’s Department of Community and Government Services  
25 as well as communities across the territory for their assistance and support. Additionally, the first  
26 author acknowledges the Nasivvik Centre for Inuit Health and Changing Environments, the Propel  
27 Centre for Population Health Impact, the Northern Scientific Training Program, and Dalhousie  
28 University for support. And finally, all authors thank colleagues at Dalhousie University's Centre for  
29 Water Resources Studies for their assistance.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 **Review Article**  
4  
5  
6

7 **Wastewater Treatment and Public Health in Nunavut: A Microbial Risk Assessment Framework**  
8 **for the Canadian Arctic**  
9

10  
11  
12 **1. INTRODUCTION**  
13

14 Communities in the Canadian Arctic territory of Nunavut face unique wastewater treatment  
15 challenges due to climate, remoteness, small populations and local food harvesting practices  
16 (Bjerregaard et al. 2008; Johnson et al. 2014; Lam and Livingston 2011; Martin et al. 2007). The  
17 territory has a total population of 34,000 spread across 25 remote communities, varying in population  
18 from 150 to 7000 (Nunavut Bureau of Statistics 2014). No roads connect the 25 isolated communities  
19 to one another or to other communities in Southern Canada. Thus each community requires its own  
20 municipal public works infrastructure including wastewater treatment facilities. All but three have  
21 trucked drinking water distribution and wastewater collection services, as opposed to piped conveyance  
22 or individual on-site systems. Communities use basic wastewater treatment systems that are capable of  
23 only low levels of pathogen removal (Huang et al. 2014). These systems typically rely exclusively on  
24 natural environmental processes for treatment such as existing lagoons, wetlands and ocean bays. They  
25 are operated in a manner such that effluent - partially treated wastewater still containing potentially  
26 hazardous microorganisms - is released into the terrestrial and aquatic environment at random times.  
27

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Inuit, the indigenous inhabitants of the region whom comprise 84 percent of the territory's  
39 population, as well as other residents rely significantly on their local surroundings for food, drinking  
40 water and recreation. Inuit were semi-nomadic hunters and gatherers until settlement increased in the  
41 1950s and traditional fishing, hunting and foraging activities are still ingrained in daily life (Fleming et  
42 al. 2006; Suk et al. 2004). These traditional activities increase the risk of human exposure to effluent  
43 both directly as people move through wastewater treatment areas, and indirectly via the food web.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Human exposure to microbial hazards present in municipal wastewater can lead to acute  
50 gastrointestinal illness, more severe infectious enteric disease and longer term chronic illness (Ashbolt  
51 2004; Prüss et al. 2002). Although estimating the actual disease burden associated with wastewater  
52 exposures in the remote arctic territories is difficult, waterborne and sanitation related illness in  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65 northern communities is believed to be comparatively higher than in other parts of Canada (Harper et  
al. 2011a, 2015b; Thomas et al. 2013).

1  
2  
3 Exposure pathways and public health risks associated with sustenance and recreational  
4 activities in Nunavut communities, where simplified wastewater systems are concurrently being  
5 operated, have never been systematically assessed. There is limited site-specific data available to  
6 evaluate the potential risks associated with the basic wastewater treatment systems used in Canadian  
7 Arctic communities and, in particular, among Inuit populations who access their immediate natural  
8 environment to harvest food and drinking water. The objective of this paper is to propose a conceptual  
9 model of the ecological system, thus providing a foundation for a microbial risk assessment of potential  
10 exposure scenarios related to current wastewater treatment practices. A topical review of literature  
11 relevant to the hazard identification and exposure assessment steps involved in the risk assessment is  
12 also included. The intent is to diagram the complexities involved in the ecological system being  
13 studied, evaluate the current level of scientific evidence available, and to identify the critical  
14 knowledge gaps and research needed to complete a comprehensive microbial health risk assessment.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 ***1.1 Background and Context***

27  
28 In 2009, the majority of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment endorsed a  
29 strategy for a harmonized, Canada-wide management framework of municipal wastewater effluent  
30 standards (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment 2009). This strategy was developed in  
31 preparation for the country's first national regulations for wastewater treatment, which were  
32 commissioned in 2012 (Environment Canada 2015). However, Nunavut did not endorse the strategy  
33 given the stark differences between conditions in the territory and most of the rest of Canada (Inuit  
34 Tapiriit Kanatami and Johnson 2008). There was also a very limited base of information regarding the  
35 potential environmental and human health risks associated with wastewater systems currently in use in  
36 that territory (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment 2009). A grace period was thus  
37 allotted to Nunavut, as well as to some other northern and remote regions experiencing similar  
38 circumstances, prior to their having to comply with the regulations (Canadian Council of Ministers of  
39 the Environment 2014). During this grace period the territorial government of Nunavut launched a  
40 multi-year research program to evaluate their wastewater systems and management practices in an  
41 effort to develop adapted performance standards and risk assessment procedures more suitable for  
42 northern regions (Lam and Livingston 2011).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Engineering assessments show that passive wastewater treatment systems are capable of  
57 reducing the level of *Escherichia coli* (used as a regulatory indicator of the presence of pathogenic  
58 organisms) in an arctic climate, but generally not to levels typically achieved with conventional  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 wastewater disinfection systems (Hayward et al. 2014; Krkosek et al. 2012; Krumhansl et al. 2015;  
4 Ragush et al. 2015; Yates et al. 2012). However, these assessments do not explicitly consider possible  
5 human exposures and potential risks to public health. Many northern wastewater effluent management  
6 policies, although thorough in their definition of receiving environment quality standards, are not  
7 designed with specific consideration of how human populations interact with receiving environments,  
8 or how they may be exposed to health hazards. Public health risks associated with exposure to  
9 wastewater systems have become a higher priority at the community level. For example, in February  
10 2015 the hamlet of Pond Inlet declared a state of emergency following a chain of mechanical and  
11 operational failures with the sanitation system that resulted in lengthy service disruptions and raw  
12 sewage spills near homes (Canadian Broadcast Corporation 2015). Therefore, an assessment  
13 specifically focused on human health risks is a necessary and timely next step towards a comprehensive  
14 municipal wastewater treatment strategy for northern and remote regions.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 ***1.2 Model development and literature review sources***

27  
28 The microbial risk assessment framework proposed in this paper includes a conceptual model of  
29 exposure pathways and a literature review of public health risks associated with wastewater treatment  
30 in the Canadian Arctic. The model is an initial visualization of exposure pathways between hazards  
31 present in wastewater effluent and human receptors. The literature review is a guide to support the  
32 progression of the unparameterized model into a quantitative risk assessment tool.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 The conceptual model is informed by prior research of the authors (Daley et al. 2015) as well as  
38 more recent stakeholder meetings with municipal administrators, wastewater treatment employees,  
39 engineers, health professionals, environmental conservation officers and hunter and trapper  
40 organizations in Iqaluit, Pangnirtung and Pond Inlet, Nunavut, Canada that took place in September  
41 2014.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The literature review was conducted using three academic databases: PubMed, Web of Science,  
48 and Environmental Science and Pollution Management. A general internet search was also used for  
49 grey literature. Grey literature reviewed includes policy and guideline documents, trade journals,  
50 reports, and assessments from government and non-government organizations involved with public  
51 health, water, and wastewater issues in the Arctic. In all databases, queries were made using  
52 combinations of terms relevant to the topic such as risk assessment; wastewater; sanitation; arctic;  
53 Indigenous/Aboriginal health; exposure; and pathogen. Only English literature was included. Search  
54 results were screened by title and abstract and documents deemed relevant were kept for full reading.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Reference lists of these documents were also reviewed manually and relevant citations were added to  
4 the collection of papers. As these papers were being reviewed, additional searches were conducted as  
5 needed for more in-depth information of specific subtopics. Traditional ecological knowledge (such as  
6 Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit) pertaining to the natural environment and health is increasingly, and  
7 deservedly, becoming more valued and included in scientific and grey literature. This was the case in  
8 many of the documents reviewed and is therefore duly represented.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 **2. RISK ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK**

### 16 *2.1 Human Health Risk Assessment General Considerations*

17  
18 Risk can be defined as a function of hazard and exposure (Robson and Ellerbusch 2007).  
19  
20 Human health risk assessment is a process used to identify and evaluate the probability of adverse  
21 health effects in humans who may potentially be exposed to hazards in contaminated environmental  
22 media (Bartell 2005; United State Environmental Protection Agency 2012). The purpose of an  
23 assessment is to determine how best to measure exposures where and when they occur. This helps to  
24 more fully understand the effect of the contaminant on human health, deem what are acceptable  
25 concentrations in the environment, and establish monitoring and management practices to mitigate risk  
26 (Bartell, 2005).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 A risk assessment may involve a single hazard with a single associated health outcome in a  
37 single exposure scenario such as the case with a chemical contaminant or in an occupational hazard  
38 assessment. Microbial risks in a community setting typically require a broader assessment as  
39 contaminated environmental media commonly contain multiple hazards with a range of associated  
40 health outcomes in individuals of different susceptibilities and numerous direct and indirect exposure  
41 scenarios (Haas et al. 2014). Therefore, an important first stage is clearly defining the specific problem  
42 and scope to be addressed in the risk assessment through the creation of a preliminary, conceptual  
43 model.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 *2.2 Conceptual Model*

53  
54 A conceptual model is a depiction of the assumed relationship between hazard sources and  
55 exposed populations. Such models function as a communication tool between risk assessors and  
56 stakeholders and are directional guides for organizing and conducting the risk assessment (Suter 1999).  
57  
58 Figure 1 presents a new conceptual model of potential exposure pathways between microbial pathogens  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

originating from wastewater treatment systems and humans in an Arctic Canadian community. In particular, the model reflects an Inuit community in Nunavut which relies heavily on local natural resources for food, water, recreation, and livelihood. The model could be tailored to any arctic region or community.

Within the model, we have divided the system being studied into five categories of primary factors: pathogen source, physical environment, biological environment, human activities, and transmission routes. Each category is subdivided into several processes or environmental pathways. As pathogens move from the source towards potential human receptors, the model illustrates the chain of events that could result in exposure. Tracing pathogen pathways through the model is a way to begin understanding the complexities involved, prioritizing potential exposures, and defining risk scenarios (Beaudequin et al. 2015). Ultimately, the tracing exercise increases the accuracy and practical utility of the microbial risk assessment. When conducting the actual assessment for a given pathway, each subcategory is expanded into a process model and quantified using an appropriate mathematical equation. Following the risk assessment framework section of this paper, the processes or human-environment interactions conceptualized in each of the five categories are discussed in the review section. The reader is encouraged to refer to this model when prompted in the text.





1  
2  
3 *Figure 1: A Conceptual Model of Potential Wastewater Effluent Exposure Pathways in Arctic*  
4 *Canadian Communities through Five Categories of Factors*  
5  
6

7  
8 **2.3 Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment**  
9

10 Quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) is a structured, systematic, science-based  
11 approach that quantitatively estimates the level of exposure to microbial hazards and resulting risk to  
12 human health (Haas et al. 2014). It is particularly useful for evaluating background or endemic risk at  
13 low levels of exposure when health outcome end points or surveillance data is generally lacking (Haas  
14 et al. 2014). In cases with limited site-specific evidence, QMRA uses mathematical models to best  
15 estimate the probability of infection from existing databases and literature associated with human  
16 exposure experiments. The outputs are the attributed risk of infection or disease for each defined  
17 exposure and can be expressed in individual or population terms. Depending on data availability, one  
18 of two modelling techniques can be used: point or stochastic. In point models each parameter is  
19 represented by a single value, whereas in stochastic models, probability functions quantifying  
20 uncertainty about spatially and temporal varying processes are used. Stochastic models are theoretically  
21 superior for this reason (Haas et al. 2014).  
22

23 QMRA research does not generate new empirical evidence on health effects in a manner similar  
24 to that of epidemiology or toxicology. Rather, it synthesizes estimates using existing scientific evidence  
25 and judgement (Bartell 2005). Although the assessments involve the use of assumptions, resulting in  
26 quantifications with a large range of variation, this approach is seen as useful for ranking risks and  
27 comparing possible interventions or controls (Sales-Ortells and Medema 2014; United States  
28 Environmental Protection Agency 2012). QMRA has been applied to drinking water systems, grey  
29 water and wastewater reuse, food safety, recreational water safety and evaluation of new engineering  
30 controls for treatment (Beaudequin et al. 2015; Ferrer et al. 2012; Haas et al. 2014; Murphy et al.  
31 2016a, b; Schoen and Ashbolt 2010; Westrell et al. 2004). QMRA has also been shown as an  
32 appropriate approach to study health risks in settings with limited data and resources (Howard et al.  
33 2006; Yapo et al. 2014).  
34

35 Conducting a QMRA involves four steps: 1) hazard identification; 2) exposure assessment; 3)  
36 dose-response assessment; and 4) risk characterization (Haas et al. 2014). Hazard identification is the  
37 selection of the relevant agent(s) and associated health effect(s) for assessment. Exposure assessment is  
38 a function of the type, magnitude, duration and timing of human exposure to the agent of interest.  
39 Measuring the true exposure is quite difficult as it requires the simultaneous presence of a defined  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 concentration of contaminant and a human receptor in the same microenvironment. Often assessors rely  
4 on default assumptions about media contact such as water ingestion or contact rates. These rates are  
5 combined with human activity pattern estimations or scenarios to arrive at types and levels of exposure.  
6  
7 The dose-response assessment describes the quantitative relationship between exposure and health  
8 outcome. A mathematical model is selected that predicts the relationship of health effect, or response,  
9 for any dose. Trusted dose-response curves for many microorganisms have already been developed  
10 (Center for Advancing Microbial Risk Assessment 2016). The risk characterization step combines  
11 information from the other three steps to estimate levels of response for the identified health effect to  
12 the agent of interest at the specific level of exposure in the defined population. The output is often, but  
13 not exclusively, expressed in terms of a distribution of attributed risk estimates or a disease burden  
14 measure such as disability-adjusted life years (DALYs). During risk characterization, the strength of all  
15 evidence, assumptions used, and any uncertainties with the estimate should be discussed. A sensitivity  
16 analysis of the assessment may be conducted to identify which inputs were most strongly correlated  
17 with the final health risk estimates and which variables are most responsible for high levels of  
18 uncertainties (Haas et al. 2014).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 QMRA can serve as a suitable exploratory tool for early or screening-level assessment of health  
31 risks, prior to more detailed studies, environmental monitoring or public health surveillance (Ashbolt et  
32 al. 2013; Sales-Ortells and Medema 2014). For the Arctic communities described in this paper, the  
33 pathogen removal capability of typical wastewater treatment systems has recently been characterized  
34 (Hayward et al. 2014; Huang et al. 2014; Ragush et al. 2015; Yates et al. 2012) and serves as a starting  
35 point, allowing the corresponding range of risks of infection to be estimated for assumed exposures.  
36 The following section is a discussion of the evidence that is best suited and currently available to  
37 inform the hazard identification and exposure assessment steps of such a QMRA of the public health  
38 risks associated with wastewater treatment systems in Nunavut, Canada. The majority of information is  
39 relevant to communities across the Canadian North and other arctic regions. The final two QMRA  
40 steps, dose-response assessment and risk characterization, are not included in this review. Although  
41 there are several inherent data limitations involved, such as differences in dose potencies resulting in  
42 illness among people of different ages and immune status, they are general in nature and are not unique  
43 to an arctic context.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

### 58 **3. WASTEWATER HAZARDS AND EXPOSURE PATHWAYS IN CANADIAN ARCTIC** 59 **COMMUNITIES** 60 61 62 63 64 65

### 3.1 Hazard Identification

The hazard identification stage of a QMRA involves identification of the microbial agents of concern, the contexts in which they are found, and the associated range of illnesses and diseases. Currently, there are no studies of associations that quantitatively link uptake of wastewater pathogens and health effects in an arctic community setting. However, related epidemiological studies investigating water-borne disease in the region are discussed.

From a public health perspective, the primary aim of wastewater treatment processes is the removal or inactivation of pathogenic microorganisms and parasites. The reduction or removal of organic materials, toxic metals and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) is also important to mitigate human health risks (Bitton 2005). However, the focus of this assessment is on microbial risks as they represent the more immediate health concern in the context being considered. Numerous bacterial, viral, and protozoan microbial pathogens are present in domestic wastewater (Leclerc et al. 2002). The major pathogenic bacteria that can be transmitted directly or indirectly by the waterborne route are *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio cholera*, *Campylobacter*, *Helicobacter pylori* and pathogenic strains of *Escherichia coli*. Human exposure to these pathogens can cause salmonellosis, cholera, shigellosis, or other enteric infections affecting the gastrointestinal tract. Some human enteric virus groups include *Enteroviruses*, *Rotaviruses*, and norovirus (Caliciviridae). Viruses may result in a range of diseases including gastroenteritis, fever, skin rash, and respiratory infections. Specific viruses found in a particular community's wastewater reflect infections among the human population. The most common waterborne protozoan parasites affecting human health are *Giardia lamblia* and *Cryptosporidium*. Both affect the gastrointestinal tract resulting in diarrhea, nausea, fatigue, and weight loss. It is estimated that millions of cases of giardiasis occur annually worldwide, though it is rarely fatal (Bitton 2005). *Cryptosporidium* oocysts may persist in the environment for longer periods and is potentially fatal in sensitive populations such as with immunodeficient patients (Bitton 2005).

#### 3.1.1 Types of wastewater treatment in Nunavut: mechanical and passive systems

Wastewater may be treated through a combination of physical as well as biological and chemical processes (Conceptualized in Figure 1 – Category 1). The types of treatment are classified into a sequence of steps that increase in effectiveness and complexity: preliminary; primary; secondary; and tertiary (Bitton 2005). Preliminary treatment is the basic screening of large debris and solids. Primary treatment involves sedimentation of the influent to remove suspended solid waste and aid the

1  
2  
3 breakdown of organic material present in the wastewater. Secondary treatment incorporates biological  
4 and chemical processes designed to remove soluble organic materials and provide some level of  
5 pathogenic inactivation. Tertiary or advanced treatment is any process implemented beyond the  
6 previous steps in effort to further disinfect and remove contaminants or specific pollutants (Bitton  
7 2005). Presently, most systems in Nunavut are classified as primary treatment with low levels of  
8 pathogen removal.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Twenty-one of the twenty-five communities in Nunavut use passive wastewater treatment  
15 systems typically consisting of either stabilization ponds and/or wetlands (Krkosek et al. 2012).  
16 Wastewater is continuously deposited into the ponds, where it remains frozen for the winter which lasts  
17 from approximately September to June. In June, as conditions warm, the wastewater influent begins to  
18 melt and a period of natural treatment occurs for two to four months depending on the location of the  
19 community (Ragush et al. 2015). These passive treatment systems result in sedimentation and  
20 microbial decomposition as well as some pathogen inactivation due to ultra violet irradiation during the  
21 arctic daylight hours (Smith 1996). At the end of the treatment season, many of the wastewater ponds  
22 are then decanted into an adjoining natural wetland. This is typically done at a scheduled time to  
23 maximize the treatment period and controlled manually using a pump. However, in some instances  
24 wastewater intermittently decants in an uncontrolled manner through a gravel berm into the wetland.  
25 Further sedimentation, filtration and other natural processes may occur in the wetland continuing to  
26 treat the wastewater to some degree (Crites and Tchobanoglous 1998). The final receiving  
27 environments, after the effluent passes through the wetlands, are aquatic estuaries and ocean waters. In  
28 one Nunavut community, wastewater is discharged directly to a marine outfall without passing through  
29 a wetland. Passive treatment systems can reduce contaminant concentrations in an arctic climate  
30 (Chouinard et al. 2014; Doku and Heinke 1995; Hayward et al. 2014; Ragush et al. 2015; Schmidt et al.  
31 2016; Yates et al. 2012). As noted by Hayward et al. (2014) and Yates et al. (2012), however, *E. coli*  
32 concentrations in the wetlands are highly variable over the treatment season.  
33

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Three communities in Nunavut, including the capital of Iqaluit (population *ca.* 7, 600), use  
some form of a conventional mechanical wastewater treatment system. Treatment typically consists of  
preliminary screening of large debris and basic sedimentation tanks. These systems continuously  
discharge into aquatic waters such as tidal bays bordering the community. Retention time within the  
treatment system before discharge into the receiving environment is dictated by the volume of influent  
entering the system and the carrying capacity of the system itself. Most of these systems provide  
preliminary or primary treatment and a low level of pathogen removal (Bitton 2005) thus leading to

1  
2  
3 local pollution problems. Similar issues have also been observed in Greenland when untreated  
4 wastewater was released into areas with limited natural water exchange occurring in the receiving  
5 waters (Gunnarsdottir et al. 2013). An environmental assessment that examined benthic invertebrates as  
6 indicators of wastewater effluent impact upon receiving waters showed significant variation between  
7 communities (Krumhansl et al. 2015). In smaller communities (populations less than 2,000), impacts to  
8 benthic communities generally occurred less than 200 metres from the effluent discharge point. In  
9 contrast, significant impacts were detected up to 500 metres from the effluent discharge point in the  
10 larger community of Iqaluit. The total volume and duration of effluent being discharged were  
11 suggested as the most important factors influencing the level of environmental impact.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 In pond-wetland and mechanical wastewater treatment systems effluent discharge schedules are  
20 likely to have a significant influence on the spatio-temporal variability of pathogens in the natural  
21 environment and subsequent human exposures. For example, in one study of selected bodies of water  
22 that receive inadequately treated effluent, but are used for drinking, recreation and agriculture were  
23 estimated to pose a daily combined risk of infection by enteric pathogens above the World Health  
24 Organization limit of  $10^{-4}$  (Teklehaimanot et al. 2015). Moreover, uncontrolled or continuous releases  
25 of effluent theoretically present less predictable occurrences of exposure and greater risk than  
26 controlled or scheduled intermittent releases.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Surveillance and monitoring programs related to gastrointestinal illness, specific food- and  
35 waterborne diseases and other sanitation related health outcomes in the Arctic are limited (Harper et al.  
36 2011b); making it difficult to accurately estimate of the burden of disease associated with wastewater  
37 exposures in Canada's Arctic. Studies of the prevalence of several waterborne pathogens present in  
38 human fecal samples from cases of acute gastrointestinal illness (AGI) and enteric diseases in arctic  
39 communities were unable to determine an association with wastewater exposure (Goldfarb et al. 2013;  
40 McKeown et al. 1999; Messier et al. 2012; Pardhan-Ali et al. 2012a, 2012b, 2013). Although AGI is  
41 associated with many food- and water-borne pathogens as well as being transmissible person-to-person,  
42 it may be the most relevant health outcome to use for a risk assessment of wastewater systems in the  
43 region at this time given the absence of pathogen-specific data. AGI and enteric diseases related to  
44 waterborne pathogens often manifest in stomach flu-like symptoms that may not be recounted to front  
45 line clinicians or public health officials. Thus, endemic AGI rates in Inuit and other arctic communities  
46 may be higher than officially reported (Dudarev et al. 2013; Harper et al. 2015b). Based on self-  
47 reporting, the incidence of AGI in these communities is higher than the Canadian average and  
48 comparable with some developing nations (Harper et al. 2015a). These associations may be further  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 complicated by climate change already evident in arctic communities. Continued warming in the region  
4 could further threaten food and water security and increase the prevalence of infectious diseases  
5 (Hedlund et al. 2014; Hennessy and Bressler, 2016; Nickels et al. 2005; Parkinson et al. 2014).  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **3.2 Exposure Assessment**

11  
12 The exposure assessment stage determines the types and levels of human exposure to the agent.  
13 The multiple potential pathways from the contaminant point source to contact with a human receptor  
14 are described, often using scenarios. Creating scenarios involves consideration of human population  
15 characteristics such as behaviours, patterns of consumption and knowledge of hazards. The fate and  
16 transport of the agent from the point source through the environment must also be assessed to predict  
17 the concentration, viability and/or infectivity of microorganisms and the probability of their occurrence  
18 in water or food at the time of exposure (Haas et al. 2014). In this section, determinants of pathogen  
19 fate and transport in the natural environment are discussed. Northern populations, communities and  
20 activities are described as the basis for suggesting environmental reservoirs and exposure pathways that  
21 may be priorities for risk scenarios to be fully assessed.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

#### 31 **3.2.1 Indicator organisms**

32  
33 The direct detection of pathogenic bacteria, protozoa and viruses within the environment is  
34 resource intensive in terms of cost, time and expertise. Therefore, indicator organisms that are more  
35 easily detected are selected to infer the occurrence of fecal contamination. Microbial indicators are not  
36 necessarily human pathogens themselves, but if detected, indicate potential presence of enteric  
37 pathogens (Verhille 2013) Criteria for selecting a fecal indicator organism stipulate that the organism  
38 should be: part of the intestinal microflora of warm-blooded animals; present when enteric pathogens  
39 are present and absent in uncontaminated samples; at least as or equally resistant to environmental  
40 stresses and disinfection as the contaminating pathogen; and, relatively easy to detect (Bitton 2005).  
41 Several indicators are used to detect fecal contamination including total coliforms, fecal coliforms,  
42 coliphages, *Clostridium perfringens*, enterococci and *Escherichia coli*; however, no single ideal  
43 indicator meets all criteria (Bitton 2005). Depending on the pathogens of interest, specific and multiple  
44 detection tests may be necessary to characterize the fate and transport of wastewater contamination in  
45 the receiving environment.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

#### 59 **3.2.2 Fate and transport in physical environments**

1  
2  
3 In order to elicit a disease outcome, pathogens released from the wastewater treatment system  
4 and transmitted through the natural environment (terrestrial or aquatic) must survive long enough to  
5 come into contact with another susceptible host. Fate and transport models are used to estimate the  
6 distribution patterns and inactivation of pathogens as they travel through the various environmental  
7 media (conceptualized in Category 2 – Figure 1). Within general models, the environmental fate of  
8 pathogens is largely related to ambient temperature, biotic activity and sunlight (Nevers and Boehm  
9 2011). Common parameters used in fecal indicator models of transport in surface water include rainfall,  
10 wave and current action, tidal stage, wind direction and turbidity (Nevers and Boehm 2011). The  
11 strength and pressure of the initial wastewater plume will also influence the environmental mobility of  
12 pathogens contained in the effluent being released.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Given that temperature and sunlight are among the most important influences, it should be  
22 considered that fate and transport processes in an arctic environment may be unique (Simon et al.  
23 2013). Temperatures in the region remain consistently below freezing for up to nine months per year,  
24 which has the potential to reduce the concentration of microorganisms in wastewater (Gunnarsdottir et  
25 al. 2012). Rates of pathogen inactivation by sunlight may also differ as arctic summers include several  
26 weeks of 24-hour daylight at higher latitudes. These periods are countered by periods of minimal  
27 daylight during the mid-winter. Modeling the fate and transport of specific pathogens in the Arctic  
28 environment requires parameterizing these factors.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *3.2.3 Reservoirs*

38  
39 As pathogens are released from wastewater treatment plants and migrate through the immediate  
40 surroundings, there is also potential for deposition, storage and concentration in reservoirs and  
41 biological organisms (Conceptualized in Figure 1 – Category 3). Indirect exposure to pathogens via  
42 recreational and occupational activities or food consumption (e.g. hunting, fishing) may also lead to  
43 potential illness or disease in humans. Attributing adverse health impacts to wastewater point sources  
44 via indirect exposures such as these by use of epidemiological studies is difficult unless several cases or  
45 an outbreak has occurred and an investigation can link the infected cases to a shared exposure.  
46 However, discharging wastewater effluent in close proximity to recreational and food harvesting areas  
47 is likely to increase risk of human health effects associated with these activities (Holeton et al 2011).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Bottom sediment of aquatic environments receiving effluent can serve as storage reservoirs for  
57 microbial pathogens. Accumulation leads to higher concentrations of pathogens in the sediment than in  
58 the overlying waters (Bitton 2005). Fecal coliform indicator organisms may be 100 – 1000 times more  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 concentrated in such sediment (Ford 2005; Van Donsel and Geldreich 1971). Pathogen loaded  
4 sediments can become disrupted and resuspended by rain and tides or aerosolized by breaking waves,  
5 creating potential exposure risks during recreational or occupational activities such as swimming,  
6 boating, or fishing (Bitton 2005).  
7  
8  
9

10 Waterborne agents may also concentrate in fish or shellfish. Shellfish are particularly  
11 significant vectors of pathogens because they live in estuarine environments, which often receive  
12 sewage effluent. Filter feeding bivalve mollusks, such as mussels, clams, oysters, scallops, and cockles,  
13 have the potential to accumulate pathogens because they filter between 4-20 l/hr of water while feeding  
14 (Bitton 2005; Kay et al. 2008). The main environmental factors influencing shellfish contamination are  
15 season, water temperature, tidal cycle and rainfall (Lee and Morgan 2003). Furthermore, shellfish is  
16 often eaten raw or undercooked. Infectious disease outcomes resulting from eating shellfish with  
17 concentrated fecal contaminants include campylobacteriosis, salmonellosis, cryptosporidiosis, and  
18 cholera (Ford 2005). Less is known about the potential human health risks of handling and consuming  
19 fish that live in marine water receiving wastewater effluent (Holeton et al. 2011). Loomer et al. (2008)  
20 reported increased concentrations of fecal coliforms on the skin of two species of fish, smelt (*Osmerus*  
21 *mordax*) and mummichog (*Fundulus heteroclitus*), collected at sites near wastewater outfalls in Saint  
22 John Harbour, New Brunswick, Canada. Water samples also collected from the sites showed a broad  
23 range of fecal coliform levels from a low of 21 to a high of  $1.5 \times 10^7$  colony forming units (CFU)/100  
24 mL, the latter being well above recreational water quality guidelines of  $\leq 200$  CFU/100 mL (Health  
25 Canada 2012). The role of marine and land mammals as well as fowl as reservoirs and carriers of  
26 human fecal inference organisms is also not well understood, as many enteric pathogens such as  
27 *Salmonella* species are natural inhabitants of the intestinal tracts of warm-blooded animals and water  
28 fowl (Fallacara et al. 2001; Ford 2005; Messier et al. 2007).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 3.2.4 Inuit Population and Arctic Community Activities

48 Many aspects of life in Arctic communities center on the natural environment. However,  
49 activities such as hunting, fishing, trapping, foraging and consuming untreated drinking water place  
50 Inuit populations and other Arctic residents at elevated risk of exposure to pathogenic agents (Fleming  
51 et al. 2006; Suk et al. 2004). It is necessary to take the details of these activities into consideration to  
52 accurately define exposure pathways and risk scenarios (Conceptualized in Figure 1 – Category 4).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Many Inuit collect raw surface water from rivers and lake or melt ice as a preferred source of  
59 drinking water. The link between this practice and increased risk of gastroenteric diseases has been  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3 previously investigated in Inuit communities (Harper et al. 2011a; Martin et al. 2007). Results showed  
4 that the source water quality was impacted by rainfall and snow melt events (Harper et al. 2011a). Also,  
5 the storage containers used to collect water were contaminated in some instances (Martin et al. 2007).  
6  
7 Environmental monitoring of the collection sites was recommended as well as strategic collection of  
8 health information at the local health clinic (Harper et al. 2011a; Martin et al. 2007). Shellfish  
9  
10 harvesting is common in many Inuit communities, including some that currently use mechanical  
11  
12 wastewater treatment systems that continuously discharge into tidal areas. A study of the microbial  
13  
14 quality of blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) in six Inuit communities in Nunavik, Quebec (Canada) found  
15  
16 the mussels examined to be of good microbiological and viral quality but did detect the presence of the  
17  
18 potentially pathogenic protozoa *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. (Lévesque et al. 2010).  
19  
20 Near-shore fishing in marine waters by rod and net is also common among Inuit in the spring and fall  
21  
22 seasons. Marine mammals are another important food sources for Inuit. Another study in the Inuit  
23  
24 region of Nunavik, which found high prevalence of *G. duodenalis* in ringed and bearded seals,  
25  
26 hypothesized sewage runoff into the marine environment as a potential source of the infection (Dixon  
27  
28 et al. 2008). Furthermore, a relatively higher prevalence of the protozoan pathogen observed in younger  
29  
30 seals, may be associated with their summer habitat near the shore, which is likely more contaminated  
31  
32 with pathogens from wastewater than are offshore habitats (Dixon et al. 2008). This scenario represents  
33  
34 another potential set of pathways for zoonotic transmission to Inuit who consume raw or aged seal meat  
35  
36 that may have come into contact with the intestinal contents during the butchering process. Although  
37  
38 swimming is rare, other shore based activities where low and intermediate exposure may occur include  
39  
40 launching and anchoring small boats which can involve wading into the water, and general recreational  
41  
42 play by children whom tend to be very active along the shore in the long daylight periods.

43 The three routes of exposure by which humans come into contact with a waterborne or  
44  
45 foodborne pathogen are ingestion, inhalation and absorption (Conceptualized in Figure 1 – Category 5).  
46  
47 Most human health risk assessments assume default contact rates, such as an ingestion rate of 2 L of  
48  
49 water per day for example. However, using consumption distributions, if available, that account for  
50  
51 climatic, dietary and urban-rural differences in populations lead to more accurate estimations (Hynds et  
52  
53 al. 2012; Mons et al. 2007). This is an important consideration for Inuit populations as their diet  
54  
55 includes a considerable amount of raw meat and fish. Amounts are likely far greater than the average  
56  
57 consumption frequencies for raw foods used in many QMRAs (Ralson 1995). Once suitable case  
58  
59 specific information regarding potential exposure pathways and exposure routes has been obtained,  
60  
61 these pieces of information can be combined to create risk scenarios, which are the situations that are  
62  
63  
64  
65

actually quantitatively assessed. Tailored scenarios such as these were used in a human health risk assessment of exposures related to contaminated military operations sites in the Arctic (Jacques Whitford Limited 2005)

#### 4. SUGGESTED RESEARCH AND DATA TO ADDRESS GAPS AND SUPPORT QMRA

Based on the reviewed literature, this section outlines the current state of knowledge as it relates to parameterizing variables for each category of the original conceptual model. In Table 1 the evidence base for each category is labeled with a status of ‘strong’, ‘moderate’, or ‘weak’. The labels correspond to the strength and suitability of the applicable input for a quantitative microbial risk assessment. Additional studies, environmental monitoring, and health surveillance activities are suggested in areas where knowledge gaps are identified. Data from which can be used to underpin more comprehensive risk assessments in the future.

Table 1: State of knowledge and data needs for a QMRA of potential wastewater effluent exposure pathways in Inuit communities

	State of Knowledge <sup>a</sup>	Suggested Research and Data to Address Knowledge Gaps
Category		
<b>1. Pathogen Source</b>	Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infectious pathogens that are present in domestic wastewater are documented in general literature (Bitton 2005; Leclerc et al. 2002). Additional pathogens of particular interest in northern communities, although not amongst the most commonly monitored general suite, could also be considered. For instance, there is evidence of high prevalence of some antibiotic resistant bacteria such as methicillin resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (MRSA) (Daloo et al. 2008; Golding et al. 2010). The general process of removing pathogens using mechanical or passive systems is well established (Crites and Tchobanoglous 1998; Bitton 2005).</li> <li>• Data characterizing minimally engineered treatment systems performance in arctic conditions is available in published literature (Chouinard et al. 2014; Doku and Heinke 1995; Gunnarsdottir et al. 2013; Hayward et al. 2014; Krkosek et al. 2012; Ragush et al. 2015; Schmidt et al. 2016; Yates et al. 2012). Additional treatment performance data of a more basic nature such as influent volumes, discharge schedules and discharge point <i>E.coli</i> levels, may be available from municipal or territorial public works departments.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Physical</b>	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fate and transport modeling of wastewater pathogens in arctic</li> </ul>

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  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

<p><b>Environment</b></p>		<p>environments requires a comprehensive research program. Studies on the viability and survival patterns of specific pathogens under arctic conditions have been proposed (Simon et al. 2013).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Until more comprehensive water monitoring and analysis capacity becomes available in the region, <i>E. coli</i> is a suitable fecal indicator in the Arctic; despite its limitations. Detection of <i>E. coli</i> indicates the presence of fecal material from warm-blooded animals. Agriculture is not widely practiced in the Arctic, so humans are the only significant source. However, caribou, sled dogs and waterfowl such as geese may also have to be investigated as potential sources in some communities. <i>E. coli</i> have a survival pattern similar to bacterial pathogens but are less resistant to disinfection than viruses and protozoa (Bitton 2005). Since most treatment systems in the Canadian Arctic lack a disinfection stage, this is only a minor limitation.</li> <li>• It is assumed that the inactivation or dilution of <i>E. coli</i> in either a treatment system or the environment can be used to conservatively predict the reduction of specific pathogenic bacteria (Nevers and Boehm 2011). Therefore if the concentration reduction rates of <i>E. coli</i> are available, based on differences between influent and effluent, those rates can be applied to typical values of actual pathogens that would be present in raw sewage to generate estimates of pathogen concentrations in the environment at different locations (Schoen and Ashbolt 2010). Additional distinctions will be necessary to account for the differences in degradation rates within the physical environment between bacterial pathogens, viruses and protozoans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Biological Environment</b></p>	<p>Weak</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information about the levels of pathogens present in specific wildlife and fish is necessary to build accurate probability distributions for human exposure.</li> <li>• With the exception of shellfish, there is a lack of data about the uptake, latency and transmission of wastewater pollution by animals that are common in the Inuit diet (Lévesque et al. 2010).</li> <li>• Studies and environmental monitoring of the microbiological quality of specific fish and animals that are favoured as a food source, are present near treatment areas, and may be vectors are recommended.</li> <li>• Currently, conservative estimates based on general values or uptake ratios that are available in human health risk assessment guideline documents must be used (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2012).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Human Activity</b></p>	<p>Strong</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human activities that allow for exposure pathways may be unique to each region and community in the Arctic. Consultation with community stakeholders, both via qualitative research methods or more informally, can help to</li> </ul>

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  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

		<p>narrow the broad list of possible exposures presented in the conceptual model and identify the most probable (Guyot et al. 2006). Most communities in Nunavut have local hunters and trappers organizations that are very knowledgeable in these matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Territorial environmental health officers and epidemiologists are also an important source. Although the collection of surveillance data on gastroenteric disease at the community level is limited, these officials may provide direction on emerging food- and waterborne illness and suspected pathogens.</li> <li>• Spatial and temporal details of food harvesting and other activities can be used to create and prioritize risk scenarios.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Transmission Routes</b></p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High-priority risk scenarios must be further developed with the addition of contact rates and exposure frequencies.</li> <li>• Default ingestion, inhalation and absorption values can be found in available literature (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2012). However, these values may need to be adjusted using a proportional or corrective factor to be appropriate for Inuit populations; particularly relating to raw food consumption. Health Canada provides some supplemental guidance on human health risk assessment of locally harvested food (2010).</li> <li>• Community stakeholder consultation combined with human intake data from government food harvesting records may provide more accurate estimations.</li> </ul>

**<sup>a</sup>Legend for state of knowledge**

**Strong:** Sufficient data currently available to support QMRA including general parameter values from established literature as well as context-specific studies.

**Moderate:** Some data currently available to support QMRA such as general parameter values from established literature, but minimal context-specific information. Tailored studies are needed to improve understanding of localized conditions.

**Weak:** Limited data currently available to support QMRA. Considerable knowledge gaps within established literature to inform parameter values resulting in high levels of uncertainty and use of conservative assumptions.

**5. CONCLUSION**

While it appears that passive treatment systems are appropriate for Arctic regions, the human health risks associated with their use in this setting are yet to be assessed. We have proposed a framework for a screening-level QMRA of wastewater management in Canadian Arctic communities. In the supporting literature review, we evaluated the current strength of available evidence for each category of information necessary to begin developing the unparameterized model into a practical risk

1  
2  
3 assessment tool. The state of knowledge pertaining to wastewater treatment systems (pathogen  
4 source), fate and transport of pathogens in the physical environment, and potential exposure pathways  
5 (human activities and transmission routes) are all moderate to strong. Information about the level of  
6 pathogens present in wildlife and fish (biological environment) is weak; however, we recommend the  
7 use of conservative estimates based on literature values until context-specific information becomes  
8 available. The Arctic is a distinct ecosystem and the data sets, models and assumptions that are  
9 necessary to evaluate most types of environmental health risks in this context will likely always be  
10 trademarked by relatively high degrees of uncertainty. Overall, despite the limitations noted, we  
11 conclude that the current state of available data regarding wastewater treatment in Arctic communities  
12 is substantive enough to be applied in a predictive manner to assess the nature and size of associated  
13 public health risks.  
14  
15

16 QMRA can serve as a compliment to customary epidemiological, ecological, and engineering  
17 studies on public health and wastewater treatment in any rural and remote areas where data is  
18 extremely limited. This is particularly important in the Arctic wherein basic sanitation techniques are  
19 being used by a population who rely on their local environment as a source of water, food, recreation,  
20 and livelihood. Our approach also allows for the inclusion of social and cultural aspects of life in  
21 Indigenous and other arctic communities by tailoring exposure pathways and scenarios based on local  
22 input. Ultimately, a fully-developed QMRA will aid decision-makers in selecting appropriate  
23 wastewater treatment system designs, quantifying and prioritizing public health risks, and comparing  
24 relative benefits of various risk mitigation options.  
25  
26

### 27 **Funding and Conflicts of Interest**

28 This study was partially supported by research funding from the Government of Nunavut. The  
29 views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or  
30 policies of the Government of Nunavut. The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.  
31  
32

### 33 **References**

34 Ashbolt N (2004) Microbial contamination of drinking water and disease outcomes in developing  
35 regions. *Toxicology* 198:229-238  
36  
37  
38 Ashbolt N, Amézquita A, Backhaus T, Borriello P, Brandt KK, Collignon P, Coors A, Finley R, Gaze  
39 WH, Heberer T, Lawrence JR, Larsson DGJ, McEwen SA, Ryan JJ, Schönfeld J, Silley P, Snape JR,  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Van den Eede C (2013) Human health risk assessment for environmental development and transfer of  
4 antibiotic resistance. *Environ Health Persp* 121(9):993-1001  
5  
6

7  
8 Bartell S (2005) Risk assessment. In: Frumkin H (ed) *Environmental health: From global to local*.  
9 Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp 940-960  
10  
11

12  
13 Beaudequin D, Harden F, Roiko A, Stratton H, Lemckert C, Mengersen K (2015) Modelling microbial  
14 risk of wastewater reuse: A systems perspective. *Environmental International* 84:131-141  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Bitton G (2005) *Wastewater microbiology*, 3rd edn. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ  
20  
21

22  
23 Bjerregaard P, Berner J, Oyvind J (2008) Chapter 10: environment and living conditions. In: Young K,  
24 Bjerregaard P (eds) *Health transitions in arctic populations*. University of Toronto Press Incorporated,  
25 Toronto, pp 173-191  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 Canadian Broadcast Corporation (2015) February 11: Pond Inlet declares state of emergency over  
31 water, sewage crisis. CBC News. [http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/pond-inlet-declares-state-of-](http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/pond-inlet-declares-state-of-emergency-over-water-sewage-crisis-1.2953531)  
32 [emergency-over-water-sewage-crisis-1.2953531](http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/pond-inlet-declares-state-of-emergency-over-water-sewage-crisis-1.2953531). Accessed 15 June 2016  
33  
34

35  
36  
37 Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (2014) Canada-wide strategy for the management of  
38 municipal wastewater effluent: 2014 progress report.  
39  
40  
41 [http://www.ccme.ca/en/resources/water/municipal\\_wastewater\\_effluent.html](http://www.ccme.ca/en/resources/water/municipal_wastewater_effluent.html). Accessed 15 June 2016  
42  
43

44  
45 Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (2009) Canada wide strategy for the management of  
46 municipal wastewater effluent. [http://www.ccme.ca/assets/pdf/cda\\_wide\\_strategy\\_mwwe\\_final\\_e.pdf](http://www.ccme.ca/assets/pdf/cda_wide_strategy_mwwe_final_e.pdf).  
47  
48  
49 Accessed 15 June 2016  
50

51  
52 Center for Advancing Microbial Risk Assessment (2016) Quantitative microbial risk assessment wiki  
53 [http://qmrawiki.canr.msu.edu/index.php/Quantitative\\_Microbial\\_Risk\\_Assessment\\_\(QMRA\)\\_Wiki](http://qmrawiki.canr.msu.edu/index.php/Quantitative_Microbial_Risk_Assessment_(QMRA)_Wiki).  
54  
55  
56 Accessed 15 June 2016  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3 Chouinard A, Yates CN, Balch GC, Jørgensen SE, Wootton BC, Anderson BC (2014) Management of  
4 tundra wastewater treatment wetlands within a lagoon/wetland hybridized treatment systems using the  
5 SubWet 2.0 wetland model. *Water* 6(3):439-454  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Crites R, Tchobanoglous G (1998) Small and decentralized wastewater management systems.  
11 McGraw-Hill, New York  
12

13  
14  
15 Daley K, Castleden H, Jamieson R, Furgal C, Ell L (2015) Water systems, sanitation, and public health  
16 risks in remote communities: Inuit resident perspectives from the Canadian Arctic. *Soc Sci Med*  
17 135:124-132  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Daloo A, Sobol I, Palacios C, Muluey M, Gravel D, Panaro C (2008) Investigation of community-  
24 associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a remote northern community, Nunavut,  
25 Canada. *Can Commun Dis Rep* 35:1-7  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 Dixon B, Parrington L, Parenteau M, Leclair D, Santin M, Fayer R (2008) *Giardia duodenalis* and  
31 *Cryptosporidium* spp. in the intestinal contents of ringed seals (*Phoca hispida*) and bearded seals  
32 (*Erignathus barbatus*) in Nunavik, Quebec, Canada. *J Parasitol* 94(5):1161-1163  
33  
34

35  
36  
37 Doku IA, Heinke GW (1995) Potential for greater use of wetlands for waste treatment in northern  
38 Canada. *J Cold Reg Eng* 9(2):75-88  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Dudarev A, Dorofeyev V, Dushkina E, Alloyarov P, Chupakhin V, Sladkova Y, Kolesnikova T,  
44 Fridman K, Nilsson LM, Evengard B (2013) Food and water security issues in Russia III: food- and  
45 waterborne diseases in the Russian Arctic, Siberia and the Far East, 2001-2011. *Int J Circumpol Heal*  
46 72:21856  
47  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 Environment Canada (2015) Wastewater systems effluent regulations. <http://www.ec.gc.ca/eu-ww/>.  
53 Accessed 15 June 2016  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3 Fallacara DM, Monahan CM, Morishita TY, Wack RF (2001) Fecal shedding and antimicrobial  
4 susceptibility of selected bacterial pathogens and a survey of intestinal parasites in free-living  
5 waterfowl. *Avian Dis* 45:128-135  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ferrer A, Nguyen-Viet H, Zinsstag J (2012) Quantification of diarrhea risk related to wastewater  
11 contact in Thailand. *Ecohealth* 9:49-59  
12  
13  
14  
15 Fleming LE, Broad K, Clement A, Dewailly E, Elmir S, Knap A, Pomponi SA, Smith S, Solo Gabriele  
16 H, Walsh P (2006) Emerging public health risks in the marine environment. *Mar Pollut Bull* 53(10-  
17 12):545-560  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Ford T (2005) Water and health. In: Frumkin H (ed.) *Environmental health: From global to local*.  
24 Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp 454-518  
25  
26  
27  
28 Goldfarb DM, Dixon B, Moldovan I, Barrowman N, Mattison K, Zentner C, Baikie M, Bidawid S,  
29 Chan F, Slinger R (2013) Nanolitre real-time PCR detection of bacterial, parasitic, and viral agents  
30 from patients with diarrhoea in Nunavut, Canada. *Int J Circumpol Heal* 72: 19903  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Golding G, Levett P, McDonald R, Irvine J, Nsungu M, Woods S, Horbal A, Siemens C, Khan M,  
37 Ofner-Agostini M, Mulvey M, Northern Antibiotic Resistance Partnership (2010) A comparison of risk  
38 factors associated with community-associated methicillin-resistant and –susceptible *Staphylococcus*  
39 *aureus* infections in remote communities. *Epidemiol Infect* 138(5):730-737  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 Gunnarsdottir R, Jenssen P, Jensen PE, Villumsen A, Kallenborn R (2013) A review of wastewater  
46 handling in the Arctic with special reference to pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs)  
47 and microbial pollution. *Ecol Eng* 50:76-85  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 Gunnarsdottir R, Mueller K, Jenssen PE (2012) Effect of long-term freezing and freeze-thaw cycles on  
53 indigenous and inoculated microorganism in dewatered blackwater. *Environ Sci Technol*  
54 46(22):12408-12416  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3 Guyot M, Dickson C, Paci C, Furgal C, Chan HM (2006) Local observations of climate change and  
4 impacts on traditional food security in two northern Aboriginal communities. *Int J Circumpol Heal*  
5 *65(5):403-415*  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Haas G, Rose J, Gerba C (2014) *Quantitative microbial risk assessment*. Wiley, New York  
11

12  
13  
14 Harper SL, Edge VL, Ford J, Thomas MK, Pearl DL, Shirley J, IHACC Research Group, McEwen S  
15 (2015b) Acute gastrointestinal illness in two Inuit communities: burden of illness in Rigolet and Iqaluit,  
16 Canada. *Epidemiol Infect* 143(14):3048-3063  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Harper SL, Edge VL, Ford J, Thomas KM, Rigolet Inuit Community Government, IHACC Research  
22 Group, McEwen S (2015a) Lived experience of acute gastrointestinal illness in Rigolet, Nunatsiavut:  
23 “Just suffer through it.” *Soc Sci Med* 126:86–98  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 Harper SL, Edge VL, Schuster-Wallace CJ, Ar-Rushdi M, McEwen SA (2011b) Improving Aboriginal  
29 health data capture: evidence from a health registry evaluation. *Epidemiol Infect* 139(11): 1774-1783  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Harper S, Edge V, Shuster-Wallace C, Berke O, McEwen S (2011a) Weather, water quality and  
35 infectious gastrointestinal illness in two Inuit communities in Nunatsiavut, Canada: Potential  
36 implications for climate change. *EcoHealth* 8:93-108  
37  
38

39  
40  
41 Hayward J, Jamieson R, Boutilier L, Goulden T, Lam B (2014) Treatment performance assessment and  
42 hydrological characterization of an arctic tundra wetland receiving primary treated municipal  
43 wastewater. *Ecol Eng* 73:786-797  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 Health Canada (2010) *Federal contaminated site risk assessment in Canada: Supplemental guidance on*  
49 *human health risk assessment of country foods*, catalogue no H128-1/11-641E-PDF.  
50 [www.healthcanada.gc.ca](http://www.healthcanada.gc.ca). Accessed 15 June 2016  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 Health Canada (2012) *Guidelines for Canadian recreational water quality*, 3rd edn, catalogue no H129-  
57 15/2012E. [www.healthcanada.gc.ca/waterquality](http://www.healthcanada.gc.ca/waterquality). Accessed 15 June 2016  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3 Hedlund C, Blomstedt Y, Schumann B (2014) Association of climatic factors with infectious diseases  
4 in the Arctic and subarctic region: A systematic review. *Glob Health Action* 7:24161  
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  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Hedlund C, Blomstedt Y, Schumann B (2014) Association of climatic factors with infectious diseases in the Arctic and subarctic region: A systematic review. *Glob Health Action* 7:24161

Hennessy T, Bressler J (2016) Improving health in the Arctic region through safe and affordable access to household running water and sewer services: an Arctic Council initiative. *Int J Circumpol Heal* 75: 31149

Holeton C, Chambers PA, Grace L (2011) Wastewater release and its impact on Canadian waters. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 68:1836-1869

Howard G, Pedley S, Tibetemwa S (2006) Quantitative microbial risk assessment to estimate health risks attributable to water supply: Can the technique be applied in developing countries with limited data? *Journal Wat and Health* 4(1):49-65

Huang Y, Ragush C, Stea E, Jackson A, Lywood J, Jamieson, R, Truelstrup Hansen L (2014) Removal of human pathogens in waste stabilization ponds in Nunavut. Paper presented at the Canadian Society for Civil Engineering 2014 Annual Conference & 13th International Environmental Specialty Conference. Halifax, Nova Scotia. doi:10.13140/2.1.3479.1689

Hynds PD, Misstear BD, Gill LW (2012) Investigation of water consumption patterns among Irish adults for waterborne quantitative microbial risk assessment. *J Water Health* 10(3):453-464

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Johnson K (2008) National Inuit position paper regarding the CCME Canada-wide strategy for the management of municipal wastewater effluent and Environment Canada's proposed regulatory framework for wastewater. <https://www.itk.ca/publication/inuit-position-management-municipal-wastewater>. Accessed 15 June 2016

Jacques Whitford Limited (2005) Human health and ecological risk assessment for CAM-F DEW Line Site: Sarcpa Lake, Nunavut Territory. Nunavut Impact Review Board. [www.nirb.ca](http://www.nirb.ca). Accessed 15 June 2016

1  
2  
3 Johnson K, Prosko G, Lycon D (2014) The challenges with mechanical wastewater systems in the Far  
4 North. Published in the proceedings of the 2014 Annual Conference of Western Canada Water &  
5 Waste Association, September 23-26 2014, Regina, Saskatchewan. www.wcwwa.ca. Accessed 15 June  
6  
7 2016  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Kay D, Kershawn S, Lee R, Wyer M, Watkins J, Francis C (2008) Results of field investigations in the  
13 impact of intermittent sewage discharges on the microbiological quality of wild mussels (*Mytilus*  
14 *edulis*) in a tidal estuary. Water Res 42:3033-3046  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Krkosek WH, Ragush C, Boutlier L, Sinclair A, Krumhansl K, Gagnon GA, Lam B (2012) Treatment  
20 performance of wastewater stabilization ponds in Canada's Far North. In Morse B, Doré G (eds) Cold  
21 regions engineering 2012: Sustainable infrastructure development in a changing cold environment. doi:  
22 10.1061/9780784412473.061  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 Krumhansl K, Krkosek W, Greenwood M, Ragush C, Schmidt J, Grant J, Barrell J, Lu L, Lam B,  
29 Gagnon G, Jamieson R (2015) Assessment of Arctic community wastewater impacts on marine benthic  
30 invertebrates. Environ Sci Technol 49(2):760-766  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 Lam B, Livingston T (2011) Active research into passive systems: A study of wastewater in Nunavut.  
37 Journal of the Northern Territories Water and Waste Association 7:42-45  
38  
39 <http://www.ntwwa.com/journal.asp>. Accessed 15 June 2016  
40  
41  
42

43 Leclerc H, Schwartzbrod L, Dei-CasmE (2002) Microbial agents associated with waterborne disease  
44 Crit Rev Microbiol 28:371-409  
45  
46  
47

48 Lee RJ, Morgan OC (2003) Environmental factors influencing the microbiological contamination of  
49 commercially harvested shellfish. Water Sci Technol 47(3):65-70  
50  
51  
52

53 Lévesque B, Barth C, Dixon B, Parrington L, Martin D, Doidge B, Proulx JF, Murphy D (2010)  
54 Microbiological quality of blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) in Nunavik, Quebec: a pilot study. Can J  
55 Microbiol 56:968-977  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3 Loomer HA, Kidd KA, Vickers T, McAslan A (2008) Swimming in sewage: Indicators of fecal waste  
4 on fish in the Saint John Harbour, New Brunswick. *Water Qual Res J Can* 43(4):283-290  
5  
6  
7  
8 Martin D, Bélanger D, Gosselin P, Brazeau J, Furgal C, Déry, S (2007) Drinking water and potential  
9 threats to human health in Nunavik: Adaptation strategies under climate change conditions. *Arctic*  
10 60(2):195-202  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 McKeown I, Orr P, Macdonald S, Kabani A, Brown R, Coghlan G, Dawood M, Embil J, Sargent M,  
16 Smart G, Bernstein C (1999) *Helicobacter pylori* in the Canadian arctic: Seroprevalence and detection  
17 in community water samples. *Am J Gastroenterol* 94(7):1823-1829  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Messier V, Lévesque B, Proulx JF, Rochette L, Serhir B, Couillard M, Ward BJ, Libman MD,  
24 Dewailly É, Déry S (2012) Seroprevalence of seven zoonotic infections in Nunavik, Quebec, Canada.  
25 *Zoonoses Public Hlth* 59:107-117  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Messier V, Lévesque B, Proulx JF, Ward B, Libman M, Couillard M, Martin D, Hubert B (2007)  
31 Zoonotic diseases in drinking water and gastroenteritis in Nunavik: A brief portrait. *Institute national*  
32 *de santé publique du Québec*. <http://www.inspq.gc.ca>. Accessed 15 June 2016  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Mons MN, van der Wielen JM, Blokker EJ, Sinclair MI, Hulshof IKF, Dangenforf F, Hunter PR,  
38 Medema GJ (2007) Estimation of the consumption of cold tap water for microbial risk assessment: An  
39 overview of studies and statistical analysis of data. *J Water Health* 5(1):151-170  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 Murphy HM, Thomas MK, Medeiros DT, McFayden S, Pintar KDM (2016a) Estimating the number of  
46 cases of acute gastrointestinal illness associated with Canadian municipal drinking water systems.  
47 *Epidemiol Infect* 144(7):1371-1385  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 Murphy HM, Thomas MK, Schmidt PJ, Medeiros DT, McFayden S, Pintar KDM (2016b) Estimating  
53 the burden of acute gastrointestinal illness due to *Giardia*, *Cryptosporidium*, *Campylobacter*, *E. coli*  
54 O157 and norovirus associated with private wells and small water systems in Canada. *Epidemiol Infect*  
55 144(7):1355-1370  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Nevers MB, Boehm AB (2011) Modeling fate and transport of fecal bacteria in surface water. In  
4 Sadowsky MJ, Whitman RL (eds) *The fecal bacteria*. American Society for Microbiology, Washington,  
5 pp 165-187  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Nickels S, Furgal C, Buell M, Moquin H (2005) *Unikkaaqatigiit: Putting the human face on climate*  
11 *change: Perspectives from Inuit in Canada*. Joint publication of Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Nasivvik  
12 Centre for Inuit Health and Changing Environments, and the Ajuuniginig Centre at the National  
13 Aboriginal Health Organization. [https://www.itk.ca/canadian-inuit-perspectives-climate-change-](https://www.itk.ca/canadian-inuit-perspectives-climate-change-unikkaaqatigiit/)  
14 *unikkaaqatigiit/*. Accessed 15 June 2016  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Nunavut Bureau of Statistics (2014) Population estimates. <http://www.stats.gov.nu.ca>. Accessed 15  
22 June 2016  
23  
24  
25

26 Pardhan-Ali A, Berke, O, Wilson J, Edge VL, Furgal C, Reid-Smith R, Santos M, McEwen SA (2012a)  
27 A spatial and temporal analysis of notifiable gastrointestinal illness in the Northwest Territories,  
28 Canada, 1991-2008. *Int. J. Health Geogr* 11:17  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Pardhan-Ali A, Wilson J, Edge,VL, Furgal C, Reid-Smith R, Santos M, McEwen SA (2012b) A  
35 descriptive analysis of notifiable gastrointestinal illness in the Northwest Territories, Canada, 1991-  
36 2008. *BMJ Open* 2:e000732  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Pardhan-Ali A, Wilson J, Edge VL, Furgal C, Reid-Smith R, Santos M, McEwen SA (2013)  
42 Community-level risk factors for notifiable gastrointestinal illness in the Northwest Territories,  
43 Canada, 1991-2008. *BMC Public Health* 13:63  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Parkinson AJ, Evengard B, Semenza JC, Odgen N, Børnensen ML, Berner J, Brubaker M, Sjöstedt A,  
49 Evander M, Hondula DM, Menne B, Pshenichnaya N, Gounder P, Larose T, Revich B, Hueffer K,  
50 Albiñ A (2014) Climate change and infectious diseases in the Arctic: establishment of a circumpolar  
51 working group. *Int J Circumpol Heal* 73:25163  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Prüss A, Kay D, Fewtrell L, Bartam J (2002) Estimating the burden of diseases from water, sanitation,  
58 and hygiene at a global level. *Environ Health Persp* 110(5):537-542  
59  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Ragush C, Schmidt J, Krkosek W, Gagnon G, Truelstrup Hansen L, Jamieson R (2015) Performance of  
6 municipal waste stabilization ponds in the Canadian Arctic. *Ecol Eng* 83:413-421  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ralson K (1995) Identifying frequent consumers of foods associated with foodborne pathogens, pp.41-  
11 50. In Roberts T, Jensen H, Unnevehr L (eds) *Tracking foodborne pathogens from farm to table: Data*  
12 *needs to evaluate control options. Miscellaneous Publication 1532. United States Department of*  
13 *Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, pp 41-50. Reproduced in Haas et al., 2014*  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Robson M, Ellerbusch F (2007) Introduction to risk assessment in public health. In Robson M, Toscano  
20 W(eds) *Risk assessment for environmental health. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco pp 1-10*  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Sales-Ortells H, Medema G (2014) Screening-level microbial risk assessment of urban water locations:  
26 A tool for prioritization. *Environ Sci Technol* 48: 9780-9789  
27  
28  
29  
30 Schoen ME, Ashbolt NJ (2010) Assessing pathogen risk to swimmers at non-sewage impacted  
31 recreational beaches. *Environ Sci Technol* 44(7):2286-2291  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Schmidt J, Ragush C, Krkosek W, Gagnon G, Jamieson R (2016) Characterizing phosphorus removal  
37 in passive waste stabilization ponds in Arctic communities. *Arctic Science* 2:1-14  
38  
39  
40  
41 Simon A, Bigras Poulin M, Rousseau A, Odgen N (2013) Fate and transport of *Toxoplasma gondii* in  
42 seasonally snow covered watersheds: A conceptual framework from a melting snowpack to the  
43 Canadian Arctic coasts. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 10:994-1005  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Smith DW (1996) *Cold regions utilities monograph, 3rd ed. American Society of Civil Engineers,*  
50 *Reston*  
51  
52  
53  
54 Suk W, Avakian M, Carpenter D, Groopman J, Scammell M, Wild C (2004) Human exposure  
55 monitoring and evaluation in the Arctic: The importance of understanding exposures to the  
56 development of public health policy. *Environ Health Persp* 112(2):113-120  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Suter G (1999) Developing conceptual models for complex ecological risk assessments. Hum Ecol  
4 Risk Assess 5(2):375-396  
5  
6

7  
8 Teklehaimanot G, Genthe B, Kamika I, Momba MNB (2015) Prevalence of enteropathogenic bacteria  
9 in treated effluents and receiving water bodies and their potential health risks. Sci Total Environ 518-  
10 519:441-449  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 Thomas MK, Murray R, Flockhart L, Pintar K, Pollari F, Fazil A, Nesbitt A, Marshall B (2013)  
16 Estimates of the burden of foodborne illness in Canada for 30 specified pathogens and unspecified  
17 agents, circa 2006. Foodborne Pathog Dis 10(7):639-651  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 United States Environmental Protection Agency (2012) Human Health Risk Assessment.  
24 <http://www.epa.gov/risk/health-risk.htm>. Accessed 15 June 2016  
25  
26

27  
28 Van Donsel DJ, Geldreich EE (1971) Relationships of *Salmonellae* to fecal coliforms in bottom  
29 sediments. Water Res 5:1079-1087  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Verhille S (2013) Understanding microbial indicators for drinking water assessment: Interpretation of  
35 test result and public health significance. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health.  
36 [http://www.nccch.ca/publications-products/guidance-documents?f\[0\]=field\\_topic%3A493](http://www.nccch.ca/publications-products/guidance-documents?f[0]=field_topic%3A493). Accessed  
37 15 June 2016  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Westrell T, Schonning C, Stenstrom TA, Ashbolt N (2004) QMRA and HACCP for management of  
44 pathogens in wastewater and sewage sludge treatment and reuse. Water Sci Technol 50(2):23-30  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Yapo R, Koné R, Bonfoh B, Cissé G, Zinsstag J, Nguyen-Viet H (2014) Quantitative microbial risk  
50 assessment related to urban wastewater and lagoon reuse in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire. J Water Health  
51 12(2):301-309  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 Yates C, Wootton B, Murphy S (2012) Performance assessment of arctic tundra municipal wastewater  
57 treatment wetlands through an arctic summer. Ecol Eng 44:160-173  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

