AMAP Assessment 2002:
Human Health in the Arctic

Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, 2003

AMAP Assessment 2002: Human Health in the Arctic

ISBN 82-7971-016-7

© Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, 2003

Published by
Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), P.O. Box 8100 Dep, N-0032 Oslo, Norway (www.amap.no)

Citation
AMAP, 2003. AMAP Assessment 2002: Human Health in the Arctic. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, Norway. xiv+137 pp.

Ordering
AMAP Secretariat, P.O. Box 8100 Dep, N-0032 Oslo, Norway

This report is also published as electronic documents, available from the AMAP website at www.amap.no

Production

Overall volume editors / scientific, technical and linguistic editing
Simon J. Wilson, Carolyn Symon

Lay-out and technical production management
Olsen & Olsen, Helstedsvej 10, DK-3480 Fredensborg, Denmark

Design and production of computer graphics
Kai Olsen, Olsen & Olsen

Cover photo
Pavel Abryutin

Printing
Nørhaven Book, Agerlandsvej 5, DK-8800 Viborg, Denmark

AMAP Working Group:
Helgi Jensson (Chair, Iceland), Yuri Tsaturov (Vice-chair, Russia), David Stone (Canada), Lars Moseholm (Denmark), Outi Mähönen (Finland), Gunnar Futsæter (Norway), Cynthia de Wit (Sweden), John Calder (USA), Jan-Idar Solbakken (Permanent Participants of the indigenous peoples organisations).

AMAP Secretariat:
Lars-Otto Reiersen, Vitaly Kimstach, Simon Wilson, Inger Utne.

Indigenous peoples organizations, AMAP observing countries, and international organizations:

Aleut International Association (AIA), Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC), Gwitch'in Council International (GCI), Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC), Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON), Saami Council.

France, Germany, Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom.

Advisory Committe on Protection of the Sea (ACOPS), Association of World Reindeer Herders (AWRH), Circumpolar Conservation Union (CCU), European Environment Agency (EEA), International Arctic Science Committee (IASC), International Arctic Social Sciences Association (IASSA), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFFCRCS), International Union for Circumpolar Health (IUCH), International Union for the Concervation of Nature (IUCN), International Union of Radioecology (IUR), Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM), Nordic Council of Parliamentarians (NCP), North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO), Northern Forum (NF), OECD Nuclear Energy Agency (OECD/NEA), Oslo and Paris Commissions (OSPARCOM), Standing Committee of Arctic Parliamentarians (SCAP), United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN ECE), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Health Organization (WHO), World Meteorological Organization (WMO), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

AMAP data centers:
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), Norwegian Institute for Air Research (NILU), Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority (NRPA), University of Alaska – Fairbanks (UAF).

Contents

Acknowledgements vi
Preface vii
Executive Summary to the AMAP ***Arctic Pollution 2002*** **Ministerial Report** ix

Chapter 1 · **Introduction** 1

1.1. **Background for the Human Health Assessment** 1
1.1.1. Major conclusions from AMAP Phase I 1
1.1.2. Major gaps in knowledge identified under AMAP Phase I 1
1.1.3. Health related recommendations arising from AMAP Phase I 2
1.1.4. Human health assessment under AMAP Phase II 2
1.2. **The concept of combined effects** 3
1.2.1. Combined effect assessment 4
1.3. **The scope of the AMAP Phase II Human Health Assessment Report** 5

Chapter 2 · **Ethno-cultural Adaptation of the Peoples of the Arctic Region** 6

Summary 6
2.1. **Population overview** 6
2.1.1. Arctic North America and Greenland 6
2.1.2. Scandinavia, Finland, and the Kola Peninsula 7
2.1.3. Northern Russia 7
2.2. **Health and socio-cultural changes in the Arctic: A case study of the Inuit** 7
2.2.1. Phase 1 and 2 7
2.2.2. Phase 3 8
2.2.3. Consequences of recent societal development on health 8
2.2.4. Lifestyle changes, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes 9
2.3. **Conclusions** 9

Chapter 3 · **Health Status of the Arctic Residents** 10

Summary 10
3.1. **Introduction** 10
3.1.1. Data sources 10
3.2. **Population demographics** 11
3.2.1. Population structure 11
3.3. **Health status indicators** 12
3.3.1. Life expectancy 12
3.3.2. Maternal and infant indicators 12
3.3.3. Fertility rates 12
3.3.4. Low birth weight 13
3.3.5. Infant mortality and morbidity 13
3.3.6. Child mortality and morbidity 14
3.3.7. Adult mortality and morbidity 14
3.4. **Health status of indigenous Arctic residents** 14
3.4.1. Cancer 15
3.4.2. Infectious diseases 16
3.4.2.1. Bacterial diseases 17
3.4.2.2. Sexually transmitted diseases 17
3.4.2.3. Viral diseases 17
3.4.3. Unintentional injury 18
3.4.4. Intentional injury 18
3.4.5. Diabetes mellitus 18
3.4.6. Substance abuse 19
3.4.7. Indigenous infant and child health 19
3.4.7.1. Infant mortality 19
3.4.7.2. Oral health 19
3.5. **Conclusions and recommendations** 20

Chapter 4 · **Priority Contaminants, 'New' Toxic Substances, and Analytical Issues** 21

Summary 21
4.1. **Persistent toxic substances** 21
4.2. **Industrial chemicals and by-products** 22
4.2.1. Dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans 22
4.2.2. Polychlorinated biphenyls 22
4.2.3. Chlorinated naphthalenes 23
4.2.4. Polychlorinated paraffins 23
4.2.5. Brominated flame retardants 23
4.2.6. Perfluorooctane sulfonate 24
4.2.7. Octachlorostyrene 24
4.2.8. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons 24
4.3. **Chlorinated pesticides** 25
4.3.1. Hexachlorocyclohexanes 25
4.3.2. Hexachlorobenzene 25
4.3.3. DDT group 25
4.3.4. Cyclodiene pesticides 25
4.3.5. Mirex 26
4.3.6. Chlorobornanes 26
4.3.7. Pentachlorophenol 26
4.3.8. Endosulfan 27
4.4. **Heavy metals** 27
4.4.1. Arsenic 27
4.4.2. Cadmium 27
4.4.3. Lead 28
4.4.4. Mercury 28
4.4.5. Selenium 29
4.4.6. Tributyltin compounds 29
4.5. **Quality control and quality assurance** 29
4.6. **Conclusions and recommendations** 30

Chapter 5 · **Biological Monitoring: Human Tissue Levels of Environmental Contaminants** 31

Summary 31
5.1. **Introduction** 31
5.1.1. Comparisons of data 31
5.2. **Persistent organic pollutants** 32
5.2.1. National and regional data 32
5.2.1.1. Canada 32
5.2.1.2. Greenland 34
5.2.1.3. Alaska 36
5.2.1.4. Russia 38
5.2.1.5. Iceland 39
5.2.1.6. Norway, Finland, and Sweden 40
5.2.1.7. Faroe Islands 41
5.2.2. International comparisons 41
5.2.2.1. Non-indigenous populations 41
5.2.2.2. Indigenous populations 45
5.2.2.3. Comparisons of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples or regions 45
5.2.2.4. Comparison of breast milk levels of contaminants 45
5.3. **Metals** 47
5.3.1. National and regional data 47
5.3.1.1. Canada 47
5.3.1.2. Greenland 48
5.3.1.3. Alaska 48
5.3.1.4. Russia 48
5.3.1.5. Finland 48
5.3.1.6. Faroe Islands 49

5.3.2. International comparisons 49
5.3.2.1. Comparisons of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples 49
5.4. **Temporal trends** 50
5.5. **Quality assurance/quality control** 50
5.6. **Conclusions** 51
Annex. Tables A5·1–5 52

Chapter 6 · **Toxicological Properties of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Related Health Effects of Concern for the Arctic Populations** . . . 57

Summary 57
6.1. **Overview** 57
6.1.1. The emergence of endocrine disruption 57
6.1.2. Single compound and chemical mixture exposures . . 59
6.2. **The AMAP Human Health Effects Monitoring Programme** 61
6.3. **Genetic considerations** 62
6.4. **Breast cancer** 63
6.5. **The reproductive system and fertility studies** 63
6.5.1. Time to pregnancy 64
6.5.2. Semen quality and quantity 64
6.5.3. Male reproduction, testicular and prostate cancer 65
6.5.4. Effect on hormone receptor numbers 66
6.5.5. Effects on synthesis, storage, release, transport, and clearance of hormones 66
6.5.6. Hormone profiles 66
6.6. **Osteoporosis** 67
6.7. **Pregnancy outcome** 67
6.7.1. Developmental anomalies 67
6.7.2. Placental biomarkers of in utero development 67
6.7.3. Birth weight 67
6.7.4. Sex ratios 68
6.8. **The neuro-endocrine-immune system** 68
6.8.1. Immune system functions 68
6.8.1.1. Effects of POPs and metals on the immune system 68
6.8.1.2. Effects of POPs on the immune system of laboratory animals 69
6.8.1.3. Effects of POPs on the immune system of wild mammals 69
6.8.1.4. Immunotoxic effects of mercury 69
6.8.1.5. Effects of POPs on the human fetal and neonatal immune system 69
6.8.1.6. Antibody response following vaccination 70
6.8.1.7. Complement system 70
6.8.1.8. Effects of POPs on cytokine production by Th1/Th2 cells 70
6.8.1.9. Vitamin A status 71
6.8.2. Neurological system 71
6.8.2.1. Thyroid hormone disruption and neural development 71
6.8.2.2. Effects of POPs on fetal and neonatal neurological capabilities 71
6.8.2.3. Animal studies 72
6.8.2.4. Thyroid effect studies of Inuit populations exposed to POPs 72
6.8.2.5. Oxidative stress induced to the nervous system by methylmercury 73
6.9. **Conclusions and unanswered questions** 73

Chapter 7 · **Recent Dietary Studies in the Arctic** 75

Summary 75
7.1. Positive effects of traditional foods 75
7.1.1. General changes in food consumption in the various Arctic populations 75
7.2. **Recent and ongoing dietary surveys in Arctic populations** 76
7.2.1. Alaska 76
7.2.2. Canada 76
7.2.3. Greenland 77
7.2.4. Faroe Islands and Iceland 77
7.2.5. Northern Scandinavian Saami 78
7.2.5.1. Sweden 78
7.2.5.2. Norway 78
7.2.5.3. Finland 78
7.2.6. Russia 79
7.3. **Changes in dietary habits** 79
7.3.1. Impact of changes in food consumption on other lifestyle factors 79
7.3.2. Impacts of changes in food consumption on nutritional intake 80
7.3.3. Dietary changes and hygiene 80
7.3.4. Risk of imbalance of certain micronutrients in traditional foods 80
7.3.5. Long-chain fatty acids 81
7.3.6. Genetic aspects of metabolism 83
7.4. **Traditional food as a source of anthropogenic substances** 83
7.4.1. Heavy metals 83
7.4.2. Persistent organic pollutants 84
7.4.3. Dietary intakes, anthropogenic blood levels and dietary indicators 86
7.5. **Conclusions and recommendations** 87

Chapter 8 · **Lifestyle Factors as Determinants of Health in Arctic Communities, with Emphasis on Pregnant Women and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome** 88

Summary 88
8.1. **Effects of tobacco smoking on human health** 88
8.1.1. Contaminants in tobacco 88
8.1.2. Smoking frequency in the Arctic 89
8.1.3. Methodological problems, self-reporting and biomarkers 89
8.1.4. Information, intervention, and cultural aspects 90
8.2. **Effects of alcohol consumption on human health** 90
8.2.1. Alcohol in pregnancy 90
8.2.2. Contaminants and alcohol 91
8.2.3. Assessing consumption, and methodological problems 91
8.2.4. Information or intervention? 91
8.3. **The influence of cultural change on alcohol and substance abuse** 92
8.3.1. Influence of cultural change on alcohol consumption, and related problems 92
8.3.2. Influence of high latitude on lifestyle and health determinants 92
8.3.3. Drug abuse 92
8.4. **Working conditions and adverse pregnancy outcome** . . 93
8.4.1. Work and pregnancy 93
8.4.2. Working conditions and cultural change 93
8.5. **Early onset of puberty, obesity, and exposure to xenohormones** 93
8.6. **Conclusions and recommendations** 94

Chapter 9 · **The Effects of Arctic Pollution on Population Health** 95

Summary 95
9.1. **General considerations** 95
9.2. Epidemiological studies on mercury and persistent organic pollutants 96
9.2.1. Neurobehavioral effects 96
9.2.1.1. Mercury 96
9.2.1.2. Polychlorinated biphenyls 97
9.2.2. Reproduction 98
9.2.2.1. Hormones 98
9.2.2.2. Pregnancy outcome 98
9.2.3. Cancer 98
9.2.4. Immune system effects 99
9.2.5. Cardiovascular effects 99
9.3. **Risk assessment of exposure at levels found in the Arctic** 100
9.3.1. Methylmercury 100
9.3.2. Persistent organic pollutants 102
9.3.3. Lead 104
9.4. **Combined effects** 104

9.4.1. Mixtures 104
9.5. **Conclusions** 104
9.6. **Recommendations** 105

Chapter 10 · **Risk Reduction Strategies for Arctic Peoples** 106

Summary 106
10.1. **Introduction** 106
10.2. **Risk reduction case studies** 107
10.2.1. Alaska 107
10.2.2. Canada 107
10.2.2.1. High levels of persistent organic pollutants in marine mammals 107
10.2.2.2. Mercury in Arctic waterfowl 107
10.2.2.3. Lead shot in traditional foods 107
10.2.2.4. Mercury exposure in Nunavik women and the Arctic char promotion programme 108
10.2.2.5. Seabird egg intervention on the lower north shore of the St. Lawrence River . . 108
10.2.3. Greenland 108
10.2.3.1. Lead levels 108
10.2.3.2. Consumption of traditional foods 108
10.2.4. Iceland 108
10.2.5. Faroe Islands 108
10.2.5.1. Consumption of pilot whale meat and blubber 108
10.2.6. Norway 109
10.2.6.1. Blood lead reductions 109
10.2.6.2. Organic contaminants in fish 109
10.2.6.3. Flame retardants in bird eggs 109
10.2.7. Sweden 109
10.2.8. Finland 109
10.2.8.1. Food and fish advisories 109
10.2.9. Russia 109
10.2.9.1. Blood lead levels 109
10.2.9.2. Social and cultural impacts of modernization in the Kola Peninsula . 110
10.3. **Long-term impacts of risk reduction strategies and scenarios for changing global conditions** 110
10.3.1. The influence of Arctic food on health risk management decisions 110
10.3.2. Global change and risk management 110
10.3.3. Future scenarios in the Arctic 111
10.3.3.1. Speculation factors for POPs 111
10.3.3.2. Speculation factors for metals 112
10.3.3.3. Speculation factors for emerging POPs . . 112
10.3.3.4. Speculation factors for population morbidity and mortality . 112
10.4. **Conclusions and recommendations** 113

Chapter 11 · **Conclusions and Recommendations** . . . 114

11.1. **Conclusions** 114
11.1.1. General 114
11.1.2. Persistent organic pollutants 114
11.1.3. Heavy metals 116
11.1.4. Essential elements 116
11.1.5. Radiation 116
11.1.6. Estimates of exposure and effects 117
11.2. **Recommendations** 118
11.2.1. At the scientific assessment level 118
11.2.2. At the public health policy level 118
11.2.3. At the national and international policy level 118
11.3. **Progress since AMAP Phase I** 118
11.4. **Concluding remarks on combined effects** 119

Personal Communications 121
References 121
Abbreviations 137

Acknowledgements

The AMAP Working Group would like to thank the following persons for their work in preparing the AMAP 2002 Human Health Assessment.

Assessment Leads:
Jens C. Hansen, Center of Arctic Environmental Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark
Andy Gilman, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada

Editors:
Jens C. Hansen
Andy Gilman
Valery Klopov, Regional Centre Monitoring of the Arctic, St. Peterburg, Russia
Jon Øyvind Odland, Institute of Community Medicine, Tromsø Universitet, Tromsø, Norway

AMAP Human Health Assessment Authors:
Pierre Ayotte, Québec University Hospital, Beauport, Québec, Canada (co-author chapter 6)
James E. Berner, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, Anchorage, Alaska, USA (author chapter 3)
Peter Bjerregaard, National Institute of Public Health, Copenhagen, Denmark (author chapter 2)
Eva Cecilie Bonefeld-Jørgensen, Department of Environmental and Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (co-author chapter 6)
Ivan C. Burkow, Norwegian Institute of Fisheries and Aquaculture AS, Tromsø, Norway (co-author chapter 4)
Bente Deutch, Department of Environmental and Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (author chapter 7)
Eric Dewailly, National Institute of Public Health, Beauport, Québec, Canada (co-author chapter 9)
Andy Gilman (author chapter 10, co-author chapters 1 and 11)
Jens C. Hansen (co-author chapters 1 and 11)
Valery Klopov (co-author chapters 1 and 11)
Jon Øyvind Odland (author chapter 8, co-author chapters 1 and 11)
Neil Tremblay, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada (co-author chapter 5)
Jay Van Oostdam, Health Canada, Ottawa, Canada (co-author chapter 5)
Jean-Philippe Weber, Centre de Toxicology, Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec, Sainte-Foy, Québec, Canada (co-author chapter 4)
Pál Weihe, Department of Occupational and Public Health, Faroese Hospital System, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands (co-author chapter 9)

Contributors:
Anders Carlsen, Medical Health Office,Viborg, Denmark
Valery Chashchine, Northwest Public Health Research Center, St. Petersburg, Russia
Philip S. Chen, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA
Torbjørn Messner, Kiruna District Hospital, Kiruna, Sweden
Evert Nieboer, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
Kristin Olafsdottir, Department of Pharmacology, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland
Adrian Ryan, Anchorage Fracture & Orthopedic Clinic, Anchorage, Alaska, USA
Leena Soininen, State Provicial Office of Lapland, Rovaniemi, Finland

Special acknowledgements:

Chapter 3
The author would like to gratefully acknowledge the invaluable editorial assistance of Dr. Torbjørn Messner, Kiruna, Sweden.

Chapter 7
The author gratefully acknowledges the access to unpublished results and data published in local-language, national reports, which have generously been provided by the following local experts:
Poul Johansen, NERI, Roskilde, Denmark
Valery Klopov, RCMA, St. Petersburg, Russia
Helena Mussalo-Rauhamaa, Helsinki, Finland
Leena Soininen, Rovaniemi, Finland
Pál Weihe, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands
Harriet Kuhnlein, Centre for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment, McGill University, Canada is also acknowledged for her detailed work on indigenous diets and her critical review of this chapter

Chapter 10
The author gratefully acknowledges the following individuals for the information they provided for the case studies and for their advice on the chapter: James Berner, Alaska; Eric Dewailly, Benoit Levesque and Jay Van Oostdam, Canada; Jens C. Hansen, Denmark; Valery Klopov, Russia; Torbjørn Messner, Sweden; Jon Øyvind Odland, Norway; Lena Soininen, Finland; and Pál Weihe, Faroe Islands. Several scientists and health policy makers also contributed by reviewing the chapter.

Preface

This assessment report details the results of the 2002 AMAP assessment of Human Health in the Arctic. It builds upon the previous AMAP human health assessment that was presented in 'AMAP Assessment Report: Arctic Pollution Issues' that was published in 1998.*

The Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) is a group working under the Arctic Council. The Arctic Council Ministers have requested AMAP to:

- *produce integrated assessment reports on the status and trends of the conditions of the Arctic ecosystems;*
- *identify possible causes for the changing conditions;*
- *detect emerging problems, their possible causes, and the potential risk to Arctic ecosystems including indigenous peoples and other Arctic residents; and to*
- *recommend actions required to reduce risks to Arctic ecosystems.*

The Ministers have placed special priority on the potential impacts of contaminants on the health of Arctic residents, including the combined effects of mixtures of contaminants acting together with other potential stressors.

*This report is one of five detailed assessment reports that provide the accessible scientific basis and validation for the statements and recommendations made in the second AMAP State of the Arctic Environment report, 'Arctic Pollution 2002' that was delivered to Arctic Council Ministers at their meeting in Inari, Finland in October 2002. It includes extensive background data and references to the scientific literature, and details the sources for figures reproduced in the 'Arctic Pollution 2002'** report. Whereas the 'Arctic Pollution 2002' report contains recommendations that specifically focus on actions aimed at improving the Arctic environment, the conclusions and recommendations presented in this report also cover issues of a more scientific nature, such as proposals for filling gaps in knowledge, and recommendations relevant to future monitoring and research work, etc.*

To allow readers of this report to see how AMAP interprets and developes its scientifically-based assessment product in terms of more action-orientated conclusions and recommendations, the 'Executive Summary of the Arctic Pollution 2002 Ministerial Report', which also covers other priority issues (Persistent Organic Pollutants, Heavy Metals, Radioactivity and Climate Change Effects on Contaminant Pathways), is reproduced in this report on pages ix to xiii.

The AMAP assessment is not a formal environmental risk assessment. Rather, it constitutes a compilation of current knowledge about the Arctic region, an evaluation of this information in relation to agreed criteria of environmental quality, and a statement of the prevailing conditions in the area. The assessment presented in this report was prepared in a systematic and uniform manner to provide a comparable knowledge base that builds on earlier work and can be extended through continuing work in the future.

The AMAP scientific assessments are prepared under the direction of the AMAP Assessment Steering Group. The product is the reponsibility of the scientific experts involved in the preparation of the assessment. Lead countries for the AMAP Human Health Assessment under AMAP Phase II were Canada and Denmark. The assessment is based on work conducted by a large number of scientists and experts from the Arctic countries (Canada, Denmark/Greenland/Faroe Islands, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the United States), together with contributions from indigenous peoples organizations, from other organizations, and from experts in other countries.

AMAP would like to express its appreciation to all of these experts, who have contributed their time, effort, and data; and especially to the lead experts who coordinated the production of this report, and to referees who provided valuable comments and helped ensure the quality of the report. A list of the main contributors is included in the acknowledgements on page vi of this report. The list is not comprehensive. Specifically, it does not include the many national institutes, laboratories and organizations, and their staff, which have been involved in the various countries. Apologies, and no lesser thanks, are given to any individuals unintentionally omitted from the list. Special thanks are due to the lead authors responsible for the preparation of the various chapters of this report.

The support of the Arctic countries is vital to the success of AMAP. AMAP work is essentially based on ongoing activities within the Arctic countries, and the countries also provide the necessary support for most of the experts involved in the preparation of the assessments. In particular, AMAP would like to express its appreciation to Canada and Denmark for undertaking a lead role in supporting the Human Health assessment. Special thanks are also offered to the Nordic Council of Ministers for their financial support to the work of AMAP, and to sponsors of the project on 'Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS) and Food Security of Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North' and other bilateral and multilateral projects that have delivered data for use in this assessment.

The AMAP Working Group that was established to oversee this work, and the AMAP human health assessment group are pleased to present its assessment.

Helgi Jensson
AMAP Working Group Chair

Jens C. Hansen
AMAP Human Health assessment co-lead (Denmark)

Andy Gilman
AMAP Human Health assessment co-lead (Canada)

Lars-Otto Reiersen
AMAP Executive Secretary

Oslo, January 2003

* AMAP, 1998. AMAP Assessment Report: Arctic Pollution Issues. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, Norway. xii+859 pp.

** AMAP, 2002. Arctic Pollution 2002: Persistent Organic Pollutants, Heavy Metals, Radioactivity, Human Health, Changing Pathways. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, Norway. xii+112 pp.

Executive Summary to the *Arctic Pollution 2002* Ministerial Report

The Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) was established in 1991 to monitor identified pollution risks and their impacts on Arctic ecosystems. In 1997 the first AMAP report, *Arctic Pollution Issues: A State of the Arctic Environment Report** was published.

The assessment showed that the Arctic is closely connected to the rest of the world, receiving contaminants from sources far outside the Arctic region. The report was welcomed by the Arctic Council Ministers, who agreed to increase their efforts to limit and reduce emissions of contaminants into the environment and to promote international cooperation in order to address the serious pollution risks reported by AMAP.

The AMAP information greatly assisted the negotation of the protocols on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and heavy metals to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP Convention). They also played an important role in establishing the need for a global agreement on POPs, which was concluded in 2001 as the Stockholm Convention. Persistence, long-range transport, and bioaccumulation are screening criteria under both the POPs protocol and the Stockholm Convention, to be applied to proposals to add substances to the agreements. Information from AMAP will be useful in this context in showing whether persistent substances are accumulating in the Arctic and are therefore candidates for control, and also in assessing the effectiveness of the agreements.

The Arctic Council also decided to take cooperative actions to reduce pollution of the Arctic. As a direct follow up of the AMAP reports, the Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic (ACAP) was created to address sources identified through AMAP. ACAP was approved in 2000 and several projects have begun. The AMAP information was also used in establishing priorities for the Arctic Regional Programme of Action to Prevent Pollution from Landbased Sources (RPA), developed by the working group on Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME), and adopted by the Arctic Council in 1998.

After the first assessment, AMAP was asked to continue its activities and provide an updated assessment on persistent organic pollutants (POPs), heavy metals, radioactivity, human health, and pathways in 2002. Five scientific reports and a plain-language report have been prepared. This Executive Summary provides the main conclusions and recommendations of the 2002 AMAP assessments.

International Agreements and Actions

As described above, the LRTAP Convention protocols and the Stockholm Convention are essential instruments for reducing contamination in the Arctic. However, they cannot have any effect until they are ratified and implemented.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **The UN ECE LRTAP Protocols on Heavy Metals and POPs be ratified and implemented.**
- **The Stockholm Convention on POPs be ratified and implemented.**

Specific recommendations for monitoring activities in support of these agreements are included in subsequent sections.

Persistent Organic Pollutants

The POPs assessment addresses several chemicals of concern, including both substances that have been studied for some time and chemicals that have only recently been found in the environment.

The 1997 AMAP assessment concluded that levels of POPs in the Arctic environment are generally lower than in more temperate regions. However, several biological and physical processes concentrate POPs in some species and at some locations, producing some high levels in the Arctic.

The present AMAP assessment has found that the conclusions and recommendations of the first assessment remain valid. In addition:

It has clearly been established that:

Certain Arctic species, particularly those at the upper end of the marine food chain as well as birds of prey, carry high levels of POPs. Marine mammals, such as polar bear, Arctic fox, long-finned pilot whale, killer whale, harbor porpoise, minke whale, narwhal, beluga, harp seal and northern fur seal, some marine birds including great skua, great black-backed gull and glaucous gull, and birds of prey such as peregrine falcon, tend to carry the highest body burdens.

Most of the total quantity of POPs found in the Arctic environment is derived from distant sources. The POPs are transported to the Arctic by regional and global physical processes, and are then subjected to biological mechanisms that lead to the high levels found in certain species. Several potential source regions have now been identified within and outside of the Arctic. A better understanding of local re-distribution mechanisms has also emphasized the important potential role of local processes and sources in determining observed geographical variability.

There is evidence that:

Adverse effects have been observed in some of the most highly exposed or sensitive species in some areas of the Arctic. Several studies have now been completed on a number of Arctic species, reporting the types of effects that have been associated in non-Arctic species with chronic exposure to POPs, of which there are several examples. Reduced immunological response in polar bears and northern fur seals has led to increased susceptibility

* AMAP, 1997. Arctic Pollution Issues: A State of the Arctic Environment Report. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, Norway, xii+188 pp. *and*
AMAP, 1998. AMAP Assessment Report: Arctic Pollution Issues. Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), Oslo, Norway, xii+859 pp.

to infection. Immunological, behavioral, and reproductive effects as well as reduced adult survival has been found in glaucous gulls. Peregrine falcons have suffered from eggshell thinning and reproductive effects. Reproductive effects in dogwhelks are associated with exposure to tributyltin.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP be asked to further enhance studies aimed at detecting effects in Arctic species relating to exposure to high levels of POPs and to integrate this information with an understanding of general population effects and health.** Without this understanding, it will not be possible to assess whether proposed and existing controls can be expected to afford the necessary protection (e.g., under the LRTAP and Stockholm agreements).

There is evidence that:

The levels of some POPs are decreasing in most species and media in the Arctic, but the rates vary in extent, location and media or species being studied. The decreases can be related to reduced release to the environment. For example, declines in alpha-HCH in air closely follow decreases in global usage, but declines in marine biota are much slower due to a huge reservoir of the substance in the global oceans.

For other POPs, declines are minimal and some levels are actually increasing, despite low current emissions. This illustrates the long period that may pass between the introduction of controls and the resulting decrease in levels in biota, as has been observed for PCBs, toxaphene, and beta-HCH.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP be asked to continue trend monitoring of POPs in key indicator media and biota.** This will enable assessment of whether the measures taken in the LRTAP Protocol and the Stockholm Convention are being effective in driving down POPs levels in the Arctic.

There is evidence that:

POPs substances other than those included in the LRTAP Protocol and Stockholm Convention may be at or approaching levels in the Arctic that could justify regional and global action. For example, levels of the brominated flame retardants such as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs), polychlorinated naphthalenes (PCNs), and some current-use pesticides such as endosulfan have been monitored in Arctic air and biota. PBDEs are increasing in the Canadian Arctic.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP be asked to maintain a capacity to detect current-use POPs in the Arctic.** This will help ensure that Arctic States have an early opportunity to respond to a trend indicating Arctic accumulation, thus allowing a proactive approach to minimize the contamination rather than having to respond to a more serious situation later.

Heavy Metals

The heavy metals assessment focuses on mercury, lead, and cadmium.

It has clearly been established that:

In the Arctic, mercury is removed from the atmosphere and deposits on snow in a form that can become bioavailable. Enhanced deposition occurs in the Arctic. This recently discovered process is linked to polar sunrise, and is unique to high latitude areas. The resulting enhanced deposition may mean that the Arctic plays a previously unrecognized role as an important sink in the global mercury cycle.

There is evidence that:

Some of the deposited mercury is released to the environment at snowmelt, becoming bioavailable at the onset of animal and plant reproduction and rapid growth. Although poorly understood, this process may be the chief mechanism for transferring atmospheric mercury to Arctic food webs.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **The Arctic Council encourage expanded and accelerated research on critical aspects of the mercury cycle and budget in the Arctic.** Such research should include long-range transport, mercury deposition mechanisms, processes leading to biological exposure and effects, and the influence of climate variability and change on these processes.

There is evidence that:

Despite substantial mercury emission reductions in North America and Western Europe during the 1980s, global mercury emissions may, in fact, be increasing. Mercury emissions from waste incineration are likely underestimated. The burning of coal in small-scale power plants and residential heaters, principally in Asia, are major potential sources of current mercury emissions. These emissions are likely to increase significantly due to economic and population growth in this region.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **The Arctic Council promote efforts at global, regional, and national levels to quantify all sources of mercury and report results in a consistent and regular manner to improve emission inventories.** Particular efforts should focus on measuring contributions made by the burning of coal for residential heating and small-scale power plants as well as by waste incineration.

There is strong evidence that:

There is a trend of increasing mercury levels in marine birds and mammals in the Canadian Arctic, and some indications of increases in West Greenland. The effects of these levels are not well understood. However, there are also examples of stable or decreasing levels in other regions, perhaps indicating the importance of local or regional processes.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP be asked to continue temporal trend monitoring and the assessment of effects of mercury in key indicator media and biota.** This will enable assessment of whether the measures taken in the LRTAP Protocol are being effective in driving down mercury levels in the Arctic.

There is evidence that:
Current mercury exposures pose a health risk to some people and animals in the Arctic. These risks include subtle neurobehavioral effects.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **In view of the fact that reducing exposure to mercury can only be addressed by regional and global action to reduce worldwide emissions, and acknowledging the assessment for global action undertaken by UNEP and its resulting proposals, the Arctic Council take appropriate steps to ensure that Arctic concerns are adequately addressed and to promote the development of regional and global actions.**

It has clearly been established that:
Dramatic reduction in the deposition of atmospheric lead has occurred in Arctic regions where the use of leaded gasoline is banned. Arctic-wide elimination of leaded gasoline use will reduce lead exposure in other regions of the Arctic. Although levels in wildlife and fish have not measurably declined, likely reflecting continued uptake from the large reservoir of lead deposited in soils and sediments, lead levels in the environment are expected to diminish over time if current trends continue.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The Arctic Council support continued efforts to eliminate the use of leaded gasoline in all Arctic regions.**

It has clearly been established that:
Certain regions of the Arctic contain elevated lead levels in the environment because of past or current use of lead shot by hunters. Even though lead shot is banned in Alaska, for example, lead blood levels in endangered US populations of Steller's eiders are above known avian toxicity thresholds for lead poisoning, which may be responsible for observed reduced breeding success. In Greenland, lead shot appears to be a significant source of human dietary exposure to lead.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The Arctic Council encourage a complete ban on the use of lead shot in the Arctic, and that enforcement be improved.**

There is evidence that:
Cadmium levels in some seabirds is high enough to cause kidney damage. Monitoring data on cadmium in the abiotic and biotic environment to date provide no conclusive evidence of trends or effects. However, cadmium accumulates in birds and mammals and not enough is known about possible effects.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The monitoring of cadmium in the Arctic be continued to support human exposure estimates.**

There is evidence that:
Levels of platinum, palladium, and rhodium have increased rapidly in Greenland snow and ice since the 1970s. These elements are used in automobile catalytic converters to reduce hydrocarbon pollution. The toxicity and bioaccumulation potential of these elements are largely unknown, which prevents assessment of their potential impact in the Arctic.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **AMAP be asked to consider the need to monitor trends of platinum, palladium, and rhodium in the Arctic.**

Radioactivity

The radioactivity assessment addresses man-made radionuclides and radiation exposures deriving from human activities.

It has clearly been established that:
In general, levels of anthropogenic radionuclides in the Arctic environment are declining. Most of the radioactive contamination in the Arctic land environment is from the fallout from nuclear weapons testing during the period 1945 to 1980. In some areas, the fallout from the Chernobyl accident in 1986 is a major source. For the Arctic marine environment, a major source of radionuclides is the releases from European reprocessing plants at Sellafield and Cap de la Hague.

However, releases from the reprocessing plants have resulted in increases in levels of some radionuclides in the European Arctic seas during recent years, in particular technetium-99 and iodine-129. The present doses to the population are low but the present levels of technetium in some marine foodstuffs marketed in Europe are above the EU intervention levels for food to infants and are close to the intervention level for adults.

The technetium information adds further weight to the recommendation made by AMAP to the Arctic Council in Barrow in 2000 that:
- **'The Arctic Council encourage the United Kingdom to reduce the releases from Sellafield to the marine environment of technetium, by implementing available technology.'**

There is evidence that:
Radionuclides in sediments are now a source of plutonium and cesium-137 to the Arctic. Earlier releases such as those from Sellafield that have deposited in sediments in the Irish Sea, especially cesium-137 and plutonium, have been observed to remobilize so that these deposits are now acting as sources to the Arctic. Thus, even if operational releases of these radionuclides from reprocessing plants are reduced, releases from environmental sources such as contaminated sediment in the Irish Sea and the Baltic Sea will be observed in the Arctic.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The Arctic Council support a more detailed study on the remobilization of radionuclides from sediment and its potential effect on the Arctic.**

It is apparent that:
There is continuing uncertainty about the amount of radionuclides present at a number of sources and potential sources in the Arctic. Access to information about civilian and military sources continues to be a problem.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The Arctic Council promote more openness of restricted information from any sources.**

It has clearly been established that:
Compared with other areas of the world, the Arctic contains large areas of high vulnerability to radionuclides. This is due to the characteristics of vegetation, animals, human diets, and land- and resource-use practices. On land in the AMAP area, there is considerable variation in vulnerability due to differences in these characteristics. In contrast, vulnerability associated with releases of radionuclides to the marine environment is relatively uniform and similar to that for other areas of the world. Maps of vulnerable areas, when combined with deposition maps, can be useful in an accident situation. The information on vulnerability is of importance for emergency planning.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **AMAP be asked to clarify the vulnerability and impact of radioactivity on the Arctic environment and its consequences for emergency preparedness planning.**

It is apparent that:
When performing risk reducing actions, close links to assessment programs are important and interventions should be prioritized in relation to the extent and magnitude of threats posed by nuclear activities, especially in respect to accidents. Interventions themselves can also have negative effects for humans and the environment, and careful judgments have to be made together with environmental impact assessments prior to carrying out a project. It is the view of AMAP that this has not always been done in interventions adopted to date.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **Risk and impact assessment programmes be performed prior to implementation of action to reduce risk.**
- **Risk and impact assessments, including accident scenarios, be performed with regard to the transport of nuclear waste and fuel within the Arctic and nearby areas and with regard to planned storage and reprocessing within the Arctic and nearby areas.**

It is apparent that:
The protection of the environment from the effects of radiation deserves specific attention. The current system of radiological protection is entirely based on the protection of human health. This approach can fail to address environmental damage in areas such as the Arctic that have low human population densities. Recently, an international consensus has emerged that the rapid development of a system and a framework for the protection of the environment needs further effort. The International Union of Radioecology (IUR), with support from AMAP, was one of the first international organizations to promote and present such a system and framework.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **AMAP be asked to take an active part in the continued efforts to address environmental protection, with special responsibility for the Arctic.** This should include the task of adding the need for protection of the environment into monitoring strategies and assessment tools.

It is noted that:
Since the previous AMAP assessment, nuclear safety programmes have been implemented in Russia at some nuclear power plants and other nuclear installations relevant to the Arctic.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The Arctic Council continue its cooperation with Russia to improve the safety and safeguarding of nuclear installations and waste sites.**

Human Health

The human health assessment considered health risks associated with exposure to contaminants in relation to other lifestyle factors determining health. This assessment has extended geographical coverage and confirmed the conclusions and recommendations from the first assessment.

It has clearly been established that:
The highest Arctic exposures to several POPs and mercury are faced by Inuit populations in Greenland and Canada. These exposures are linked mainly to consumption of marine species as part of traditional diets. Temporal trends of human exposures to POPs have so far not been observed. Exposure to mercury has increased in many Arctic regions while exposure to lead has declined.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The monitoring of human exposure to mercury, relevant POPs, including dioxins and dioxin-like compounds and other chemicals of concern, be continued in order to help estimate risk, further elaborate geographical trends, and begin to establish time trends of exposure.**

There is evidence that:
Subtle health effects are occurring in certain areas of the Arctic due to exposure to contaminants in traditional food, particularly for mercury and PCBs. The evidence suggests that the greatest concern is for fetal and neonatal development. In the Arctic, human intake of substances with dioxin-like effects is a matter of concern, confirmed by recent results from Greenland. Increasing human exposure to current-use chemicals has been documented, for example for brominated flame retardants. Others such as polychlorinated naphthalenes (PCN) are expected to be found in human tissues. Some of these compounds are expected to add to the total dioxin activity in humans. The AMAP human health monitoring program includes a number of measures of effects, ranging from biomarkers of effects at the molecular level to epidemiological outcomes.

It is therefore recommended that:
- **The human health effects program developed by AMAP be more extensively applied in order to provide a better base for human risk assessment especially concerning pre- and neonatal exposures.**

It has clearly been established that:
In the Arctic, diet is the main source of exposure to most contaminants. Dietary intake of mercury and PCBs ex-

ceeds established national guidelines in a number of communities in some areas of the Arctic, and there is evidence of neurobehavioral effects in children in some areas. In addition, life-style factors have been found to influence the body burden of some contaminants, for example cadmium exposure from smoking. In the Arctic region, a local public health intervention has successfully achieved a reduction of exposure to mercury by providing advice on the mercury content of available traditional foods. The physiological and nutritional benefits of traditional food support the need to base dietary recommendations on risk-benefit analyses. The health benefits of breast-feeding emphasize the importance of local programs that inform mothers how adjustments within their traditional diet can reduce contaminant levels in their milk without compromising the nutritional value of their diet.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **In locations where exposures are high, carefully considered and balanced dietary advice that takes risk and benefits into account be developed for children and men and women of reproductive age.** This advice should be developed by national and regional public health authorities in close consultation with affected communities.
- **Studies of the nutrient and contaminant content of traditional food items be promoted in order to assess their benefits and to estimate exposures as a basis for public health interventions.**
- **Breast-feeding continue to be recognized as a practice that benefits both mother and child.** Nonetheless, if contaminant levels increase or more information indicates increased risk, the potential need for restrictions should continue to be evaluated.

It is noted that:

From the Arctic human health perspective, it is of utmost importance that considerations for global actions against POPs and mercury take into account the concerns for Arctic human health. The Stockholm Convention and the LRTAP protocols should be properly monitored in the Arctic to determine whether their implementation is effective in protecting human health.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP participate in the global monitoring of human exposure to be established under the Stockholm Convention on POPs.**
- **The Arctic Council monitor proposals for global action on mercury being undertaken by UNEP, and contribute as necessary to ensure that Arctic concerns related to human health are adequately addressed.**

Changing pathways

The assessment of changing pathways provides an introduction to the types of changes on contaminants pathways to, within, and from the Arctic that might be expected as a result of global climate change and variability.

There is evidence that:

The routes and mechanisms by which POPs, heavy metals, and radionuclides are delivered to the Arctic are strongly influenced by climate variability and global climate change. These pathways are complex, interactive systems involving a number of factors, such as temperature, precipitation, winds, ocean currents, and snow and ice cover. Pathways within food webs and the effects on biota may also be modified by changes to climate. Studies using global change scenarios have indicated the potential for substantial changes in atmospheric and oceanographic pathways that carry contaminants to, within, and from the Arctic. These effects mean that climate-related variability in recent decades may be responsible at least in part for some of the trends observed in contaminant levels.

It is therefore recommended that:

- **AMAP be asked to further investigate how climate change and variability may influence the ways in which POPs, heavy metals, and radionuclides move with respect to the Arctic environment and accumulate in and affect biota.** This will enable Arctic States to better undertake strategic planning when considering the potential effectiveness of present and possible future national, regional, and global actions concerning contaminants.