## Toolkit Approach for the Selection of Sustainable Arsenic Remediation Approaches for Rural Communities

LAURA A. RICHARDS<sup>1\*</sup>, NEHA KUMARI<sup>2</sup>, ASHOK GHOSH<sup>2</sup>, HIMANSHU JOSHI<sup>3</sup>, ABHIJIT MUKHERJEE<sup>4</sup>, GILLIAN E. CLAYTON<sup>5</sup>, DARREN M. REYNOLDS<sup>5</sup>, DAVID A. POLYA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Earth and Environmental Sciences and Williamson Research Centre for Molecular Environmental Science, The University of Manchester, Manchester UK; \*laura.richards@manchester.ac.uk

<sup>2</sup>Mahavir Cancer Sansthan and Research Centre, Patna, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Hydrology, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee, India

<sup>4</sup>Department of Geology and Geophysics, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, India

<sup>5</sup>Centre for Research in Biosciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

Globally, geogenic arsenic contamination of groundwater affects the health of millions of people. However, effective implementation of appropriate remediation strategies remains very challenging. Despite the abundance of approaches, technologies are of variable effectiveness, technical complexity and suitability for particular environmental/geochemical conditions and/or user populations [1]. We propose to use a toolkit approach to support decision-making for the selection and management of remediation technologies. This approach utilizes an objective range selection criteria related to performance, of environmental [2], economic, social and regulatory factors, and thus may be flexibly applied for different scales and types of stakeholders [3]. We will illustrate this approach by comparing contrasting approaches via selected case studies. REFERENCES: [1] Richards (2017) Chpt 6 in ISBN13: 9781843393856; [2] Hug et al (2008) ES&T 42, 6318; [3] Polya & Richards (2017) **UNESCAP** Tech Monitor ISSN:0256-9957. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: ECF2015-657, GCRF-HEFCE QR, NE/R003386/1 & DST/TM/INDO-UK/2K17/55(C) & 55(G).