A sea change ahead for recreational water quality criteria

ABSTRACT
The United States Environmental Protection Agency is committed to developing new recreational water quality criteria for coastal waters by 2012 to provide increased protection to swimmers. We review the uncertainties and shortcomings of the current recreational water quality criteria, describe critical research needs for the development of new criteria, as well as recommend a path forward for new criteria development. We believe that among the most needed research needs are the completion of epidemiology studies in tropical waters and in waters adversely impacted by urban runoff and animal feces, as well as studies aimed to validate the use of models for indicator and pathogen concentration and health risk predictions.
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INTRODUCTION

Recreational swimming is a popular activity in the United States (US) (Leeworthy & Wiley 2001)—Americans make an estimated 928 million trips to the beach each year (NOAA 2005). Because coastal waters are susceptible to microbial contamination and can serve as a vehicle for transmission of microbial pathogens (NRC 2004), considerable resources are expended to measure microbial water quality at recreational beaches. Nearly 3,000 beaches in the US are tested at least weekly for fecal indicator bacteria (FIB) (Dorfman & Stoner 2007). The requirement for such monitoring was formalized in the Clean Water Act and the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health (BEACH) Act (2000) which require coastal states to monitor beach water quality and warn the public when levels of FIB exceed concentrations considered unacceptable for recreational contact. These monitoring programs have identified many beaches of concern and have resulted in some 25,000 days of closures or advisories issued for recreational beaches in 2006 (Dorfman & Stoner 2007) (Figure 1).

Monitoring programs measure FIB using culture-based laboratory techniques, some of which were originally developed over a century ago. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is now poised to revise the decades old recreational water quality criteria. There are new information, technologies and approaches that should be considered in updates to the old criteria and existing monitoring programs.

The advent of molecular measurement techniques provides the opportunity to greatly expand and improve monitoring programs. Methods which allow measurement of FIB in two hours are in late stages of development, greatly improving upon the 24 hours presently needed for laboratory analysis (Haugland et al. 2005; Noble & Weisberg 2005). Many of the same molecular technologies which allow for rapid measurement also provide opportunities for measuring new indicators or pathogens which are presently difficult to measure using laboratory culture techniques. In addition, a number of researchers have identified genetic markers which distinguish between microbial pollution originating from human or nonhuman fecal sources (reviewed by Stoeckel & Harwood 2007). Source identification techniques potentially allow for establishment of source-dependent criteria, as human fecal material is thought to present a greater health risk to humans (NRC 2004).

There are numerous regulatory hurdles and associated research needs which must be met before newly developed technologies can be incorporated into criteria and adopted in routine monitoring programs. Foremost among these is the need for epidemiology studies which quantify the relationship between the density of new indicators and health risk to swimmers. In March 2007, the USEPA gathered 43 experts from around the world to conceptualize the best approaches for criteria development and to identify research priorities which would assist them in developing criteria and transitioning new methods from the development to the implementation phase (USEPA 2007). This article presents a summary of the findings from that workshop. We describe the current US recreational ambient water quality criteria and their shortcomings, introduce alternative approaches to new criteria development, critical research needs, and a path forward for new criteria development.

THE 1986 CRITERIA: A ONE-SIZE FITS ALL APPROACH

USEPA developed ambient water quality criteria in 1986 (USEPA 1986), hereafter referred to as the “1986 criteria”.
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**Figure 1**  
Beach closures and advisories and the number of beaches monitored in the US as a function of time (Dorfman & Stoner 2007).
The 1986 criteria are based on the outcomes of epidemiology studies conducted at recreational beaches impacted by point discharges of municipal wastewater in the late 1970s at the Great Lakes, Oklahoma, Boston, New York, and Lake Ponchartrain in New Orleans (Cabelli et al. 1982; Cabelli 1983; Dufour 1984). The studies aimed to identify relationships between FIB concentrations and the rates of recreational waterborne illness (RWI) (including gastroenteritis and fever) in swimmers. Geometric mean and single-sample standards were developed for enterococci and E. coli for freshwater, and enterococci for marine waters since these indicators best correlated to gastroenteritis in swimmers in the respective environments. The numerical standards were derived based on historically accepted swimming-associated gastroenteritis rates in freshwater and marine water of 8 and 19 out of 1,000 swimmers, respectively (USEPA 2004a). As the BEACH Act (2000) required coastal states to adopt the 1986 or more stringent criteria prior to 2005, the FIB-gastroenteritis relationships at beaches in the Great Lakes, Oklahoma, Boston, New York, and New Orleans became the bases of water quality standards in recreational waters around the country, from Hawaii to Michigan to Florida.

Exceedances of water quality standards trigger actions aimed at protecting the health of the public and the environment. If measured FIB concentrations exceed state regulatory thresholds, health officials warn the public of potential risk of illnesses or close the beach to swimming. Exceedances of the standards may result in a state listing the waterbody as “impaired” in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. Listing a waterbody as impaired initiates the total maximum daily load (TMDL) process which ultimately leads to implementing remediative actions so that water quality standards can be met and designated uses, such as recreational water contact, can be attained.

**E. coli and enterococci are not just found in human sewage**

Although E. coli and enterococci are found in high concentrations in human sewage (Maier et al. 1999), they are also highly prevalent in the environment. They are excreted in the feces of numerous warm blood animals (Parveen et al. 1999; Harwood et al. 2000; Ashbolt et al. 2001). There is strong evidence that some genotypes of E. coli are naturalized—meaning they are adapted to persisting and even growing in extra-enteric environments like lakes, soils and sediments (Davies et al. 1995; Desmarais et al. 2002; Ishii et al. 2006). E. coli and enterococci can be found in a number of environmental reservoirs including soils and sands in tropical, subtropical and temperate climates (Fujioka et al. 1999; Byappanahalli et al. 2006; Yamahara et al. 2007). Enterococci can be found on terrestrial grasses (Ott et al. 2001) and aquatic plants (Whitman et al. 2003). If E. coli and enterococci measured at a beach during water quality monitoring emanate from these sources rather than municipal wastewater, then the FIB-gastroenteritis relationship upon which the 1986 criteria is based might not hold.

The FIB-gastroenteritis relationship may not be appropriate at many beaches

The epidemiology studies conducted by the USEPA in the 1970s at beaches impacted point source discharges of municipal wastewater are the cornerstones of the 1986 criteria. Since then, many municipal sewage discharges have been upgraded and become well regulated. While there are still point sources of wastewater contributing to poor water quality, urban runoff, stormwater, confined animal feeding operations, agricultural runoff, septic systems, and animal feces are now believed to represent major sources of FIB to most recreational waterbodies (e.g., Ahn et al. 2005). Some studies have investigated the FIB-RWI relationship at beaches impacted by sources other than municipal wastewater, but the results have been mixed. In California, Haile et al. (1999) found swimming in close proximity to urban drains discharging FIB led to significant risks of RWI. In this case, positive, correlative relationships between FIB and numerous RWI were apparent. A New Zealand study showed that RWI was
correlated with enterococci at beaches adversely impact by both rural and urban runoff (McBride et al. 1998). In contrast, Colford et al. (2007) examined the risk associated with exposure to non-point FIB sources in a beach without runoff sources in California, and found no statistical association between FIB and 14 different human health outcomes. Similarly, a study of risk and exposure to enterococci and E. coli from non-point animal sources in a lake in Connecticut showed no correlation between RWI and FIB densities (Calderon et al. 1991). The diverse findings regarding the relationship between RWI and FIB from sources other than municipal wastewater illustrate the potential inappropriateness of applying the FIB-RWI relationships which are the bases of the 1986 criteria to all US waterbodies. If the risks associated with exposure to these other sources are less than those endured during exposure to municipal wastewater, application of 1986 criteria could be overprotective.

The missing causative link between FIB and RWI

A positive, correlative relationship between FIB and human pathogen concentrations (for example, human enteric viruses) has remained elusive. In fact, most studies show a striking lack of correlation between the two (e.g., Noble & Fuhrman 2001; Boehm et al. 2003; Jiang & Chu 2004; Pusch et al. 2005). Ultimately, the lack of strong, positive relationships between FIB and pathogens in ambient waters casts doubt on the appropriateness of extrapolating the 1986 criteria to conditions and sites which were not included in the original epidemiological studies used for criteria development.

Another confounding factor in the search for the FIB-pathogen relationship is our glaring lack of knowledge regarding the etiologies of RWI. RWI are typically self-limiting, requiring no medical visit, therefore there is a paucity of medical and epidemiologic data describing them. While it is widely believed that enteric viruses are the main cause of RWI (WHO 2003), epidemiology studies have largely not incorporated methods to confirm etiology (such as serology or other biological sampling from ill participants) nor enumerated enteric viruses. Until we know which pathogens are causing illness and the infectious doses and potential sources of these pathogens, it will be difficult to know which pathogens to measure in order to elucidate the FIB-pathogen relationship.

The 1986 criteria do not address non-gastrointestinal illnesses

The 1986 criteria purport to protect swimmers from unacceptable rates of gastroenteritis, but do not necessarily protect swimmers from other RWI. Individuals may experience respiratory illnesses, eye irritation, skin rash or infection, and otitis externa (“swimmers ear”) (Prüss 1998; Wade et al. 2003) from swimming. At least two studies have illustrated increased risk of respiratory illness in waters with elevated FIB levels (Fleisher et al. 1996; Haile et al. 1999). However, the USEPA found no relationship between FIB and respiratory illness in their epidemiology studies (Cabelli 1985; Dufour 1984) and therefore non-gastrointestinal illnesses were not addressed in the 1986 criteria. The 1986 criteria do not address risks associated with exposure to free-living water-based pathogens (e.g., Vibrio, Aeromonas spp., and Staphylococcus aureus) and cyanobacteria which are of concern in some geographic regions (Charoenca & Fujioka 1995; Dziuban et al. 2006).

Water quality characterization

The effectiveness of water quality criteria should be measured by an ability to correctly identify conditions when water exposure will lead to unacceptable disease levels. There is concern that the 1986 criteria do not accomplish this (Kim & Grant 2004).

E. coli and enterococci emanating from naturalized or non-fecal sources may result in the water body being incorrectly classified as impaired when the risk of illness is actually not above what had been determined to be acceptable. The development of best management practices and treatment technologies for removing FIB from waters where there are no obvious fecal inputs could be costly, destructive to natural ecosystems, and not substantively reduce the health risk of those using the water for recreation.

FIB concentrations in surface water are variable over time scales from minutes to years owing to variation in mixing, sunlight induced inactivation, infrastructure upgrades, and
seasonal cycles of rainfall (Boehm et al. 2002; Whitman et al. 2004; Roser & Ashbolt 2007). Spatial variability has also been documented over scales of 10 m and more (Boehm et al. 2002; Whitman & Nevers 2004). It is particularly concerning that FIB concentrations vary more quickly than monitoring results can be obtained using USEPA-approved or other culture-based methods (typically 24 h). This means that waters may be left open to swimming when they should be closed and vice versa. In situations where FIB are truly reflective of recreational illness rates, there may be serious health implications to permitting access during times of heightened risk, especially if a waterbody is contaminated with human sewage. In the opposite scenario, limiting access to beaches when there is minimal health risk results in unnecessary loss of the economic resource to the local economy and unnecessarily restricting the public use of a recreational site (Rabinovici et al. 2004; Hou et al. 2006).

Intra-day variation of indicators due to sunlight, tides, and mixing presents a challenge to the utility of the 1986 criteria which rely, in part, on a single-sample exceedance standard as a management tool. Evidence is mounting that a single-sample of water reveals little about the water quality of an entire recreational site (Boehm 2007).

**Acceptable risk**

The USEPA used different levels of public health protection for setting the 1986 criteria in fresh and marine waters, 8 and 19 illnesses per 1000 swimmers, respectively (USEPA 2004a). These “acceptable risk” levels correspond to the estimated level of public health protection afforded by the old fecal coliform criteria of 200 organisms/100 ml (USEPA 2004a) and, thus, to some degree represent a historical precedent. However, it is apparent that the public has never been formally interviewed about its knowledge of or willingness to accept risks during swimming. There is neither scientific nor social justification for providing more stringent protection for swimming in freshwater than marine water (USEPA 2004b).

The selection of health endpoints for the general population (Cabelli et al. 1982) for the 1986 criteria is somewhat concerning because there are specific life-stages when individuals may either be more highly exposed or more susceptible to RWI. In particular, children may face higher risks than the general population because they can have increased exposures (Dufour et al. 2006) and naïve immune systems. Preliminary analysis of epidemiology data from a recent USEPA study of RWI in the Great Lakes suggests that children experience higher rates of illness than adults (Timothy Wade, personal communication 2007). Health endpoints for swimmers with multiple exposures and varying degrees of exposure have not been considered in criteria development either.

**A SEA CHANGE AHEAD: EXAMPLE FROM THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION**

Many water quality managers find themselves constrained by the 1986 criteria. In some situations, managers find themselves spending valuable resources issuing swimming advisories, establishing TMDLs, and developing implementation strategies to address perceived pollution problems at a beach where no real threat to public health exists to recreational swimmers. The time has come to apply new information and technologies to design modern criteria that ultimately should provide increased protection to swimmers.

We suggest that policy makers consider the water quality criteria framework developed by the World Health Organization (hereafter referred to as “WHO approach”) as a starting point for new criteria, following Australia, New Zealand, and the European Union (WHO 1999; WHO 2003; NZME 2003; EP/CEU 2006; Roser et al. 2007). Below, we describe the WHO approach, as well as 7 key requirements we believe the US criteria should meet.

**The WHO approach**

The WHO approach (WHO 2003) provides a basis for standard setting in light of local and regional circumstances. It is based on the perspective that recreational water quality and protection of public health are best described by a combination of sanitary inspection and microbial water quality assessments. The WHO approach considers the probability of human fecal pollution in a recreational water (sanitary investigation category in Table 1), as well as observed levels of fecal pollution (microbial assessment of water quality category in Table 1), and combines them into
a five-level classification scheme for recreational water environments. The microbial assessment criteria set risk ranges for acquiring gastroenteritis, while the sanitary investigation category describes the probability that human waste is contributing to poor water quality. The sanitary investigation category could be modified to include other sources of microbial pollution deemed to be a health threat (e.g., Ashbolt & Bruno 2003), and the risk ranges can be altered to account for other RWI.

**New criteria must meet seven requirements**

We believe the new criteria should meet seven requirements (Table 2). First, criteria must be health-based; that is, they must be anchored by results from epidemiology studies. Second, they must be compatible with all Clean Water Act needs (including BEACH Act updates), including water quality assessment for public notification at beaches and impaired water listings, development of TMDLs and their implementation, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) compliance monitoring and other permitting. Third, new criteria need to be scientifically defensible for application in a wide variety of geographical locations including fresh and marine waters, and temperate, subtropical, and tropical waters. Fourth, they need to be robust and flexible so that they can be configured to protect the public health of those exposed to recreational water impacted by all sorts of pathogen sources including animal feces, stormwater, and sewage. Fifth, criteria should be protective of children as a more exposed and susceptible life-stage. Sixth, they need to based on indicators that can be quantified reliably, robustly, and reproducibly. Seventh, they should be equally protective of all swimmers including those using freshwater and saltwater, regardless of geographic locale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanitary investigation category (susceptibility to fecal influence)</th>
<th>A (40)</th>
<th>B (41–200)</th>
<th>C (201–500)</th>
<th>D (&gt;500)</th>
<th>Exceptional circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Follow up*</td>
<td>Follow up*</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Follow up*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good*</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good*</td>
<td>Fair*</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Follow up*</td>
<td>Fair*</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes that non-fecal source of enterococci may be influencing measurement and this should be verified.

* indicates that there is a possible discontinuous source of enterococci (for example, driven by rainfall) and that these results should be confirmed and analytical results reviewed.

Exceptional circumstances relate to periods with known higher risk, such as during an outbreak from a waterborne pathogen, sewer spills, etc. Under these circumstances, the matrix may not apply and actions should be taken. This table is adapted from WHO (2003).
locale, and those swimming in waters contaminated with microbial pollutants from diverse sources.

**KNOWLEDGE GAPS AND RESEARCH NEEDS**

We have identified four areas where research is needed before criteria that fulfills the requirements can be developed: 1) elucidation of human health risks from exposure to different sources of fecal contamination, 2) identification of new fecal indicators and methods for their measurement, 3) determination of appropriate indicators and means of coping with their variability, and 4) determination of appropriate risk levels and strategies for risk communication.

**Elucidation of human health risks from exposure to different sources of fecal contamination**

There is a strong need for including in the new criteria provisions to protect against RWI risks associated with human and nonhuman sources of fecal contamination, as well as point and non-point sources in a range of climates and water types. Differences between animal and human waste associated risks are not well characterized, and may vary greatly geographically and temporally, and even between animal types. Point sources and non-point sources of fecal contamination may also differ in risk, and those differences are not well characterized. To fully understand these risks, additional epidemiology studies are needed at different locales and with varying microbial pollution sources. In particular, the need for additional epidemiological studies at non-point source, confined animal feeding operations, and runoff impacted beaches is viewed as essential. Epidemiology studies should be augmented with quantitative microbial risk assessments (QMRA) (particularly for non-enteric pathogens and rare diseases (Soller et al. 2003; Seto et al. 2007)), quantitative sanitary investigations (that quantitatively identify potential microbial pollutant and pathogen sources within a watershed), and models (that relate watershed and beach attributes and characteristics to water quality and risk of RWI) to help characterize risks and to provide a basis to better extrapolate information to different recreational settings. The complete range of RWI needs to be considered in the epidemiology studies.

**Identification of new fecal indicators and methods for their measurement**

In the short term, we believe that new recreational criteria should be based on fecal indicators rather than pathogens because the levels of occurrence and the types of pathogens in municipal wastewater and other pathogen sources may vary greatly both temporally and spatially (Harwood et al. 2005). In the long-term, however, detection and enumeration of pathogens or groups of pathogens will be key for identifying dangerous conditions as our understanding of their occurrence, and fate and transport in the environment increases. New and improved methods for measuring fecal indicators and specific pathogens are needed so that they can be tested for correlation to RWI in epidemiology studies and used in QMRA simulations. At the present time, spores of *Clostridium perfringens*, various coliphages, and *Bacteroidales* bacteria are promising candidates for inclusion in the new criteria. Regardless of which indicators are used to set criteria, USEPA standard methods should be published for enumerating the indicators in ambient waters as well as wastewater and other relevant sources. In addition, research must continue to develop affordable and reliable source tracking targets which aid in identification and management of pathogen and indicator sources (Field & Samadpour 2007) including fecal shedding by bathers (Gerba 2000).

Understanding fate and transport differences between new and current indicators and pathogens in treated effluents and in recreational waters will better inform the use of those indicators for TMDL development and NPDES permitting. There is evidence that nucleic-acid based detection of indicators will be problematic for NPDES permitting (He & Jiang 2005). For example, in some preliminary experiments a 2 ppm chlorine residual in secondary treated sewage destroyed culturable enterococci within minutes. However, there was no reduction or loss of either RNA or DNA targets of enterococci after eight hours of exposure to the disinfectant (Griffith et al. 2007). If this preliminary work is confirmed, these methods may not have utility for
determining appropriate concentrations of microbial pollutants in permitted discharges of treated wastewater.

**Determination of appropriate indicators and means of coping with their variability**

Enterococci and *E. coli* may not be appropriate indicators in all locations since they may be naturalized or present in sediments (*Fujioka et al. 1999*). The potential for regrowth and survival of these and other indicators in the environment needs to be further studied and verified, specifically to clarify the absence of other animal fecal inputs. Appropriate indicators that correlate with RWI in locations where indicators are naturalized, such as tropical, subtropical, and temperate climates, as well as in flowing waters where sediment/microbe resuspension occurs, are needed and should be determined by conducting epidemiology studies in these locales.

The spatial and temporal variability evident in FIB data sets as well as the delay in obtaining analytical results render a single sample standard (*USEPA 1986*) impractical for routine water quality notification purposes. Rapid methods, such as quantitative polymerase chain reaction, may help address this issue, particularly in identifying beaches impacted by an undetected sewage spill. However, rapid detection technologies are not likely to be appropriate for all management situations due to equipment costs, skill level of technicians in small agencies, and other logistical aspects.

Simple statistical models that do not necessarily require an understanding of processes and mechanisms controlling indicator fate and transport have the potential to be incorporated into the new criteria, particularly for daily water quality assessment and public notification of water quality. Such “now-casting” models relate environmental factors to water quality at a particular beach in real time and allow early warnings to be issued by managers (*Nevers & Whitman 2005; Francy et al. 2006; Roser et al. 2007*).

**Determination of appropriate risk levels and strategies for risk communication**

Risks for children should be considered as the basis for the new criteria due to their potential for elevated exposure and increased susceptibility. To accomplish this, research should be done to understand risks to children more completely. Of note, although immunocompromised individuals may experience even greater risk than children, their risks may be managed using public health messages targeted at these individuals.

We suggest that the beach-going public should have a voice in identifying the appropriate level of risk used for setting water quality standards, and which types of RWI new criteria should protect against. Future epidemiology studies could incorporate questions to help inform what levels of risk might be appropriate. Providing information to the public on background illness rates for gastroenteritis, skin rash, upper respiratory infections and other RWI could help frame the appropriate risk determination effort. In addition, studies can be initiated to assess how impacted groups understand and perceive risks associated with recreational water use and what level of voluntary risk would be appropriate.

Social science research should inform RWI risk communication strategies. A precedent for such research has been set by the USEPA for air quality warnings (*Johnson 2003*) and beach notifications in Sydney, Australia and California where beach signage, daily newspapers, radio broadcasts, and informative websites are effectively used (*Heal the Bay 2007; NSWEPA 2007*).

**A PATH FORWARD**

The new criteria will need to balance flexibility and scientific robustness with the realities of implementation and USEPA’s commitment to develop new criteria by 2012 (*USEPA 2007*). New criteria will not only need to strengthen public health protection compared to the 1986 criteria, but will also need to provide a mechanism to ensure that the various Clean Water Act needs (NPDES permitting, TMDLs, and water quality assessment) can be met, as outlined in Table 2.

The WHO approach (*Table 1*), provides valuable perspectives from which new criteria could be developed within a context that is consistent with the Clean Water Act, the BEACH Act of 2000, and criteria requirements (*Table 2*). In particular, the sanitary investigation component of the WHO approach provides a mechanism to consider the
relative risks associated with contamination from different sources in diverse waters. In the short term, however, it does not seem feasible to derive criteria based on multiple risk levels (columns in Table 1).

Separate criteria could be developed corresponding to different sources of contamination (as determined by a sanitary investigation) for different waterbody classes (such as standing temperate fresh waters, flowing temperate fresh waters, temperate marine waters, tropical marine waters). The resultant criteria could be represented in a table, similar to the WHO approach (Table 1). Rows would correspond to different sources of contamination and columns, different classes of waterbodies. Values in the table would represent standards that provide the same level of public health protection for each source/waterbody combination. Development of this type of criteria would require research to elucidate relevant pathogens and their relation to pathogen indicators from various sources (including point and non-point), a way of quantifying sources, and an understanding of how these sources vary over time within watersheds. In each waterbody class, a relationship between a measure of water quality appropriate for the particular sources and associated health effects would need to be determined. For each indicator that is used to characterize the water quality for a waterbody type/source combination, linkages would need to be developed within and between the various uses of water in each state to ensure that all Clean Water Act programmatic needs can be harmonized, attained and reliably demonstrated.

The creation of separate criteria for all types of waterbodies and contamination sources may not be feasible within the next five years. For example, if criteria for five pathogen sources and four waterbody types were desired, twenty different waterbody type/source combinations would need to be investigated and characterized. While QMRA may represent one alternative for determining risk for some source-waterbody combinations where there is no epidemiology data, there are still many unknowns regarding the appropriate inputs to these models including etiologic agents and concentrations, dose-response curves, and relationships between pathogens and indicators.

Therefore, we recommend that in the short term, USEPA should give priority to conducting epidemiology studies in tropical/subtropical waters and during exposure to urban runoff and animal feces. The studies should include concurrent environmental data collection so that forecasting models can be developed for indicator and pathogen concentrations, as well as health risk, and their utility as early warning tools explored. Results will facilitate expansion of the criteria to three different source types (urban runoff, animal feces, and treated municipal wastewater) in four types of waterbodies (temperate fresh, temperate marine, tropical fresh, tropical marine) compared to the current criteria which account for one source (treated municipal wastewater) and two types of waterbodies (fresh and marine).

All seven criteria requirements (Table 2) must be met for the 2012 criteria and this will require substantial effort. Thus, we believe it is imperative that the USEPA partner with various academic, state, and other federal agencies to pursue the needed research objectives. The time has come to renew our commitment to the protection of swimmable waters in the US. New criteria should reflect over 25 years of new research in order to better protect the public health of the hundreds of millions of people who swim in US waters every year.
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