



Environmental Health Program (EHP)
Regulatory Operations & Enforcement Branch (ROEB)
Health Canada
180 Queen Street West, 10th Floor
Toronto, ON
M5V 3L7

March 17, 2023

Ely Weisbrot
A/Project Manager, Ontario Region
Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC)
600-55 York Street
Toronto, ON
M5J 1R7

Submitted to the IAAC Registry for the Northern Road Link Project

Subject: Health Canada's Comments on the Initial Project Description for the Northern Road Link Project

Dear Ely Weisbrot,

Thank you for your email dated February 21, 2023, requesting Health Canada's comments on the Initial Project Description (IPD) for the Northern Road Link Project (the Project).

Health Canada participates in the impact assessment process as a federal authority under the *Impact Assessment Act* (IAA). Health Canada makes available specialist/expert information or knowledge in their possession to reviewing bodies under the IAA, upon request. Health Canada does not make decisions or issue licenses, permits, or authorizations in relation to the impact assessment of a development project.

Health Canada has reviewed the IPD and provided comments for your consideration in Enclosure 2 (Federal Authority Advice Record). Health Canada has identified several areas of human health concern in the IPD, including but not limited to the following issues:

- The scope of the Project's future impact assessment is not clearly stated in relation to the Webequie Supply Road (WSR) and Marten Falls Community Access Road (MFCAR) projects;

- The proposed human health assessment is limited to impacts from Project changes to the biophysical environment and does not consider the potential linkages to social determinants of health; and
- It remains unknown whether/how Indigenous knowledge will inform the human health assessment.

Should you have any questions concerning Health Canada's comments, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

<Original signed by>

Julie Boudreau on behalf of Kitty Ma
Kitty Ma, Regional Manager, EHP – Ontario Region
ROEB, Health Canada
ia-on-ie-on@hc-sc.gc.ca

cc: Heather Jones-Otazo, A/Manager, Environmental Assessment Division (EAD), HECSB, Health Canada
Aurelia Thevenot, Senior Environmental Health Specialist, EAD, HECSB, Health Canada
Dae Young Lee, Impact Assessment Specialist, EHP, ROEB, Health Canada
Umme Akhtar, Impact Assessment Specialist, EHP, ROEB, Health Canada

Attachment 1. Enclosure 2: Federal Authority Advice Record – Summary of Issues, and Potential Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and Permitting Plan.

Enclosure 2: Federal Authority Advice Record – Summary of Issues, and Potential Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines and Permitting Plan

Project: Northern Road Link Project

Proponent: Marten Falls First Nation and Webequie First Nation

CIAR No.: 84331

Response due by: **March 17, 2023**

All comments should be submitted via the **Submit a Comment** feature available on the Project's Canadian Impact Assessment Registry page (Reference 84331)¹. Letters and forms can be uploaded using this feature. If you have any difficulties submitting this way, please contact the Agency at NorthernRoad-RouteDuNord@iaac-aeic.gc.ca for assistance.

Department/Agency: Health Canada
Date of Advice: March 17, 2023
Primary Contact Name, Title, Work Unit: Kitty Ma, Ontario Regional Manager, Environmental Health Program (EHP), Regulatory Operations and Enforcement Branch (ROEB)
Email: ia-on-ie-on@hc-sc.gc.ca
Alternate Contact Name, Title, Work Unit: Dae Young Lee, Impact Assessment Specialist, EHP, ROEB
Email: ia-on-ie-on@hc-sc.gc.ca

1. Expertise

Please identify and describe the specialist or expert information or knowledge within your department or agency that is relevant to an assessment of the Project.

As a federal authority, Health Canada will provide specialist or expert information and knowledge in the Department's possession (expertise) to support the assessment of impacts on human health from projects considered individually or cumulatively under the Impact Assessment Act (IAA). It should also be noted that expertise related to assessing human health that is relevant to impact assessment (IA) may be held by other federal, provincial, and municipal partners, reflecting the shared jurisdiction for environmental and human health within Canada. For example, the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) has expertise in the social determinants of health approach and health equity, and may provide that expertise through Health Canada, upon request from the reviewing body(ies). How the expertise provided by Health Canada and PHAC will be used in the IA process will ultimately be determined by the reviewing body(ies).

Health Canada can provide human health expertise in the following areas:

- Air quality;
- Recreational and drinking water quality;
- Country foods;
- Noise;
- Methodological expertise in human health risk assessment;
- Methodological expertise in conducting health impact assessment;
- Electromagnetic fields;

¹ <http://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/84331?culture=en-CA>

- Radiological emissions; and
- Public health emergency management of toxic exposure events.

2. Key issues and solutions

Respond to the following **using Table 1 on page 3**

(a) From the perspective of the mandate and area(s) of expertise of your department or agency, what are the key issues that are material and relevant to decision-making and should be addressed? In identifying key issues, be mindful of the Project's context (size, scope, geography, policy) and the definitions of *effects*,² *sustainability*³ and *public interest*.⁴

(b) For each **key** issue:

- i. Identify the relevant valued component(s) within your mandate and describe the key pathway of effect, or describe the nature of the issue. This may consider⁵ positive and negative effects on components of the environment or on health, social and economic conditions.
- ii. Identify any clarifications or commitments the Proponent could make in its Detailed Project Description and Response to the Summary of Issues that would build confidence that issues can be addressed and managed without further impact assessment⁶, or that can help focus the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines⁷, if an impact assessment is required.
- iii. Identify, at a very high-level, any information or studies that should be required of the Proponent in the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines, if an impact assessment is required.⁸

(c) For each issue and solution discussed, provide a concise, plain-language summary that is appropriate for inclusion in the Summary of Issues.

3. Operational guidance and powers, duties and functions

(a) Within the mandate and area(s) of expertise of your department or agency, list specific operational policies or guidance documents that could help address issues and manage effects relevant to the project context.

² Note: *effects*, *direct and incidental effects*, and *effects within federal jurisdiction* are defined in section 2 of the *Impact Assessment Act*, which can be found at <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/corporate/acts-regulations/legislation-regulations.html>

³ Guidance: Considering the Extent to which a Project Contributes to Sustainability <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/services/policy-guidance/practitioners-guide-impact-assessment-act/guidance-considering.html>

⁴ Policy Context: Public Interest Determination under the *Impact Assessment Act* <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/services/policy-guidance/public-interest-determination-under-impact-assessment-act.html>

⁵ Other considerations may include sources of high uncertainty that complicate predictions; the purpose and need for the Project and selected alternatives.

⁶ This could mean that mitigation measures that the proponent has committed to implement, in the Detailed Project Description, are referenced in the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.

⁷ For example, regulatory instruments, operational guidance or well-understood mitigation and monitoring measures of proven effectiveness

⁸ Federal authorities are asked what should be included in the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines with specific rationale that is commensurate to the project context. Please also identify studies that are not necessarily based on the information provided by the proponent and based on project context.

To date, Health Canada has published the following guidance documents for evaluating biophysical human health impacts:

Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment:

- Human Health Risk Assessment
- Air Quality
- Drinking and Recreational Water Quality
- Country Foods
- Noise

<https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/search/search.html?st=1&e=0&f=0&ssti=on&ast=Guidance+for+Evaluating+>

Health Canada has also published guidance on environmental public health management of crude oil incidents that may provide guidance to addressing potential human health impacts from hazardous waste events: <https://ncceh.ca/documents/guide/guidance-environmental-public-health-management-crude-oil-incidents>, as well as the methodological approach for conducting Health Impact Assessments of Designated Projects under the *Impact Assessment Act* (Health Canada. Draft Interim Guidance Document for the Health Impact Assessment of Designated Projects under the *Impact Assessment Act*. Draft for review. June 30, 2022. Available upon request at ia-ei@hc-sc.gc.ca).

(b) List the potential powers, duties, or functions, including federal funding, that your department or agency may be required to exercise or perform to enable the Project to proceed, in whole or in part. Validate whether the information in the Initial Project Description is accurate.

Not applicable

(c) For each power, duty or function:

- i. Explain any associated framework to address effects on valued components within your mandate.
- ii. Describe any Indigenous consultation activities that would occur, potential timelines for Indigenous participation, and how potential impacts to Indigenous communities are addressed by your department or agency.
- iii. Describe any public participation opportunities that would occur, and potential timelines for public participation.

Not applicable

(d) Has your department or agency already exercised a power, or performed a duty or function, under any Act of Parliament in relation to the Project; or taken any course of action that would allow the Project to proceed in whole or in part? Specify as appropriate.

Not applicable

4. Is your department or agency aware of any additional information related to the geographic context of the Project (e.g. potential effects to Indigenous protected and conserved areas, migratory bird sanctuaries, federal species at risk, sensitive/vulnerable health, social or economic conditions)?

Health Canada notes that the department provided potentially relevant information through the Ring of Fire Regional Assessment⁹. Since that time, Health Canada funded a research project that looks at publicly available data on multiple environmental, health, social and economic indicators in Northern Ontario. Although the research is still on-going, the preliminary results are publicly available¹⁰.

⁹ Available at: <https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/80468/contributions/id/53439>

¹⁰ Available at: https://planetaryhealth.shinyapps.io/ON_Enviro_Screen/

Table 1: Key Issues and Solutions Material and Relevant to Decision-making

Comment ID	Document Reference	Valued Component	Description of Key Issue (Context and Rationale)	Solutions for the Proponent	Summary of Issues
<p>Please identify comments by organization and comment number. e.g.: IAAC-01</p>	<p>If the comment is related to a specific section of the Initial Project Description, please provide a reference. You may also choose to copy the relevant text here.</p>	<p>Identify the valued component(s)—within the mandate of your department or agency—to which the effect or issue applies. This may include components of the environment, health, social or economic conditions.</p>	<p>Provide context for the effect or issue. Describe, to the extent possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The positive or negative pathway of effect or nature of the issue Any powers, duties or functions that your department or agency has that may mitigate, manage, or set conditions related to the effect Operational guidance or standard and well-understood mitigation or monitoring measures that would address the effect Any established or emerging policies or directives that are relevant The potential for residual effects after mitigation has been applied 	<p>Where applicable and necessary,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide instructions for how the Proponent would build confidence about the management of the potential effect, in the Detailed Project Description and Response to the Summary of Issues, and/or identify, at a high-level, required information or studies to assess the effects, should an impact assessment be required (or templated requirements that are relevant to the Project). 	<p>For issues and effects to be included in the Summary of Issues, provide a concise, plain language synopsis.</p>
<p>HC-01</p>	<p>Section 8.1, pdf pg.55 Section 14.5, pdf pg.83 Section 15.1.1, pdf pg.88 Section 15.1.3, pdf pg.89 Section 16.1.2, pdf pg.119 Section 23.1.1, pdf pg.158 Section 24.5.1, pdf pg.167 Section 24.10.1, pdf pg.174</p>	<p>Human Health – General</p>	<p><u>1) The scope of the impact assessment</u> The purpose of the Northern Road Link Project (the Project) is to complete the proposed road links between the Webequie First Nation (WFN), Ring of Fire mineral deposits, Marten Falls First Nation (MFFN) and provincial highway network (Section 8.1). However, the initial project description (IPD) does not clearly delineate the proposed scope of the assessment in relation to those of the Webequie Supply Road (WSR) and Marten Falls Community Access Road (MFCAR) projects. For example, it is unclear whether the impacts of anticipated vehicle traffic increases (e.g., Section 24.1) will be evaluated only for the Project footprint or for the entire road length from WFN to the provincial highway network.</p> <p><u>2) Information on Project activities as pollution sources</u> While the proponent provides examples of Project activities during construction (i.e., operation of machinery and equipment) and operation (i.e., vehicular traffic and operation of maintenance equipment) that may cause changes to local air quality (Section 24.1), the IPD does not provide an exhaustive list of pollutant emission sources. For example, blasting activities are not mentioned.</p> <p><u>3) Information on human receptor locations</u> Potential human receptors that may be impacted by Project-associated changes to environmental, social and economic conditions are not adequately identified. The IPD states that the proposed road corridor is located on, or in close proximity to, lands that may have been used for traditional purposes by several Indigenous communities (Section 14.5). Although sensitive receptors will be identified for Project-related noise impacts (Section 15.1.3), it is unclear whether human receptors of potential impacts on other environmental (e.g., air, water, country foods) and socio-economic conditions will be identified as well. Additionally, it remains unknown how the selection of sensitive receptors (e.g., Section 15.1.1) will take into account the views of potentially impacted Indigenous groups.</p> <p><u>4) The pathways from Project effects to human health</u> Descriptions of potential Project effects to human health are limited to identifying environmental media where exposure to contaminants may occur (i.e., air, water, soil and country foods)</p>	<p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in the Detailed Project Description (DPD) and/or in response to the Summary of Issues (SOI):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the scope of the assessment, including in relation to the footprints of the WSR and MFCAR projects. Provide an exhaustive list of Project activities that may result in pollutant emission sources. Provide a map indicating approximate locations of known temporary/permanent/seasonal residences, traditional land uses (e.g., hunting, trapping), and known locations of sensitive human receptors (e.g., schools, daycare centres, hospitals, assisted care homes). Specify whether/how Indigenous knowledge will inform the selection of sensitive receptor locations. Describe potential linkages between Project activities, effects on the natural environment (including country foods), and risks to human health. Specify how the proposed Indigenous Knowledge program will inform the problem formulation step of the HHRA. 	<p>The scope of the Project’s impact assessment is not clear in relation to the other road projects in the region.</p> <p>Project activities that may serve as potential pollutant emission sources are not clearly stated.</p> <p>Information on known human receptors is not provided.</p> <p>Certain potential pathways of Project effects to human health are not considered.</p>

			(Section 23.1.1). The effect pathways from Project activities to changes in environmental media are not provided, including information on key transport mechanisms of contaminants. For example, the proponent acknowledges that “(c)hanges to contaminant levels in harvested country food items due to road construction and operation (...)” is one of the potential pathways of the Project effects to human health (Section 23.1.1). However, it is not clear whether related transport mechanisms, such as deposition of airborne contaminants onto country foods (Section 24.10.1) and surface water (Section 24.5.1) that may be consumed by local Indigenous groups, will also be considered. Although Section 16.1.2 mentions a potential human health risk assessment (HHRA), it is conditional on the results of the problem formulation step, which are not provided, and it is not mentioned in Section 23.1.1.		
HC-02	<p>Section 16.1, pdf pg.119</p> <p>Section 16.1.1, pdf pg.119</p> <p>Section 16.1.2, pdf pg.119</p> <p>Section 16.2, pdf pg.120</p> <p>Section 23.1, pdf pg.158</p> <p>Section 23.1.1, pdf pg.158</p>	Health – Socio-Economic Conditions	<p>The proposed human health assessment [in both baseline study (Section 16.1) and project effects assessment (Section 23.1) scenarios] is limited to the health impacts caused by changes to biophysical environment. The IPD briefly acknowledges the existence of links between human health and socio-economic conditions for the proposed mitigation measures (Section 23.1.2). However, no information is provided in the document outlining the potential linkages between socio-economic conditions and baseline community health conditions, or health and well-being. Health Canada identified the following issues with the proposed human health assessment:</p> <p><u>1) Potential linkages of socio-economic conditions to health and well-being</u> Section 16.1.2 only refers to “the problem formulation step of the Human Health Risk Assessment (which is the initial component of the overall human health assessment) (...)”. Section 23.1.1 states that “[t]he following potential effects on Indigenous health may result from Project-related changes to other components of the environment that may influence human health such as noise, air quality, surface water, geology, terrain and soils, and changes to country foods”. It is unclear why the human health assessment is limited to a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) and does not consider socio-economic conditions (Section 16.2) as social determinants of health (SDH).</p> <p><u>2) Baseline community health conditions</u> It is unclear why existing health conditions described in the IPD are limited to community safety, and do not include other indicators of health in the local and regional area. Section 16.1.1 states that “[t]he human health baseline will draw on baseline information from other components of the environment that may influence human health such as noise, air quality, surface water, geology, terrain and soils, as well as knowledge gathered with respect to country foods and community diet”. However, the human health assessment should consider establishing the community health profile(s) based on information that may already be available as part of the WSR and MFCAR projects.</p>	<p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in the DPD and/or in response to the SOI:</p> <p>1) Provide rationale for why the proposed human health assessment considers only potential health impacts caused by changes to the biophysical environment, but not the potential linkages between SDH and health outcomes. Clarify whether these linkages are already sufficiently assessed elsewhere (e.g., HIAs for the WSR and MFCAR projects) and explain how no additional effects on SDH are anticipated for the Project.</p> <p>2) Provide additional information on existing health conditions in the area and an initial screening of social determinants of health related to the Project and communities. Clarify whether baseline community health profile(s) are available from the WSR and MFCAR projects.</p> <p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in future Project documents:</p> <p>3) Describe how the human health assessment will incorporate the determinants of health approach and apply GBA Plus to gather disaggregated socio-economic and health data where available. If an HIA is deemed necessary, use best practices as per Health Canada’s Guidance Document¹¹.</p>	The proposed human health assessment is limited to an HHRA and does not consider the potential linkages between SDH and health outcomes.

¹¹ Health Canada. 2022. Interim Guidance Document for the Health Impact Assessment of Designated Projects under the *Impact Assessment Act*. Draft for review. June 30, 2022. (available upon request to: ia-ei@hc-sc.gc.ca)

			<p>The tailoring of future guidelines for the Project, if an impact assessment is required, would be facilitated if the baseline health section of the DPD included an initial screening of the key determinants of health (i.e., to explore the relevance of the Project activities to a range of health determinants, including socio-economic conditions, and to the health and well-being of potentially affected communities).</p> <p><u>3) Health Impact Assessment and Gender-Based Analysis Plus</u> Health Canada encourages the proponent to use a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) framework to evaluate the possible positive and negative health impacts of a project on communities from changes to the natural environment as well as changes to the social and economic environments. HIA uses the determinants of health approach (including both biophysical and social determinants of health) to depict or conceptualize those factors that are directly or indirectly related to the project and that could influence the health of individuals and communities. This approach provides the conceptual basis to conduct pathways of effects analyses as part of the HIA process.</p> <p>Assessing health effects from an equity perspective is an essential component of the HIA process. The practice of Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA Plus) offers a valuable tool through which to apply an equity lens to the assessment of a project's potential health impacts, which may include the analysis of any differential distribution of project effects across diverse population groups.</p>		
HC-03	<p>Section 15.1.4, pdf pg.90</p> <p>Section 15.1.5, pdf pg.91</p> <p>Section 24.4, pdf pg.166</p> <p>Section 24.5, pdf pg.167</p>	Human Health – Drinking and Recreational Water Quality	<p><u>Information on drinking water sources and receptors</u> While the proponent anticipates that project construction and maintenance activities may cause drinking and recreational water quality changes (Sections 24.4. and 24.5), it is unclear which sources of water may be used for drinking and recreational purposes, besides the results of the desktop search of the provincial water well database (Sections 15.1.4 and 15.1.5). Additionally, the IPD does not specify how the views of potentially impacted Indigenous groups will inform the selection of sensitive receptors and collection of baseline data or support the problem formulation exercise.</p>	<p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in future Project documents:</p> <p>1) Identify all drinking water sources (both surface water and groundwater) used domestically and outside the house (e.g., while fishing, hunting and gathering) either seasonally (e.g., snow) or more regularly (i.e., a surface water body, natural spring or well), as well as waterbodies used for recreational/cultural/traditional purposes, which may be affected by the Project.</p> <p>2) Clarify how Indigenous knowledge (IK) will inform the identification of drinking and recreational water sources and support the problem formulation exercise.</p>	Sources of drinking and recreational water are not identified. It is unclear how Indigenous knowledge will be used to identify drinking/recreational water sources or support the problem formulation exercises.
HC-04	<p>Section 16.1.1., pdf pg.118</p> <p>Section 16.1.2, pdf pg.119</p> <p>Section 23.1, pdf pg.158</p>	Human Health – Country Foods	<p><u>1) Indigenous Knowledge program and country food study</u> The IPD proposes to collect information on dietary patterns of Indigenous communities via an IK program (Section 16.1.1). However, the IPD does not specify whether and how the program will identify human receptors that may experience differential impacts (e.g., senior, pregnant or nursing mothers, infants, consumers of high quantities of local country foods, individuals that rely on food sharing networks) and country food species that are consumed by local Indigenous groups. Additionally, the IPD does not explain how the IK program will</p>	<p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in future Project documents:</p> <p>1) Provide detail on whether and how the IK program will inform the identification of all potential country food species and human receptors (including location and duration of land use activities) and support the problem formulation exercise.</p>	<p>It is unknown whether and how the IK program will support the problem formulation exercise of the HHRA, including the identification of all potential country food species and human receptors.</p> <p>An adaptive management plan can be considered for a timely response to county food contamination.</p>

			<p>support the problem formulation exercise (Section 16.1.2), the results of which will determine whether a further HHRA and country food tissue sampling program will be required.</p> <p><u>2) Timely response to country food quality changes</u> While the IPD proposes mitigation measures to reduce contamination of air, soil and water quality, it does not include mitigation measures for country foods (Section 23.1). Although the project may not be a major source of country food contamination, Health Canada suggests considering an adaptive management plan that includes provisions for a timely response to Project-related aggravation of existing country food quality problems in the region (e.g., mercury in fish).</p>	<p>Should the FNFNES¹² or any other reference data be used as a surrogate to site-specific data, include a discussion on uncertainties related to the use of regional aggregate data in the risk assessment for country foods.</p> <p>2) Consider an adaptive management plan that would provide for a timely response to project impacts on country food quality.</p>	
HC-05	<p>Section 23.1, pdf pg.158</p> <p>Section 25.2, Table 25-1, pdf pg.185</p>	Human Health – Accidents and Malfunctions	<p><u>Information on the accidents and malfunctions scenarios</u> The proponent is anticipated to develop a Management Plan for Spill Prevention and Response (Section 25.2, Table 25-1). However, the IPD does not specify the potential accident and malfunction scenarios to be considered in the assessment (e.g., leaks or spills of fuel and other toxic substances from vehicles and equipment, accidental spills due to improper handling and storage of fuels, oils, lubricants, paints, solvents, etc.), nor does it provide a discussion of emergency responses for the construction phase that take into account the remoteness of the Project. Additionally, the potential for impacts on human health due to accidents and malfunctions are not clearly stated as a consideration in the future human health assessment (Section 23.1).</p>	<p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in the DPD and/or in response to the SOI:</p> <p>1) Provide information on the potential accident and malfunction scenarios that will be considered in the assessment. Include accidents and malfunctions as potential Project effects to human health.</p> <p>HC recommends that the proponent address the following comments in future Project documents:</p> <p>2) Include a qualitative discussion on potential accidents and malfunctions, including the types of accidents and malfunctions, their likelihood and severity and the associated potential environmental and health impacts. If a qualitative discussion is presented, include proposed risk management/mitigation measures¹³.</p> <p>3) Provide detail on the proposed Spill Prevention and Response Management Plan. Health Canada's guidance¹⁴ on responding to crude oil incidents may be useful to inform emergency response planning, if it is determined that an IA is required.</p>	Accidents and malfunctions scenarios are not clearly stated nor considered in the human health assessment.
HC-06	N/A	Human Health – General	N/A	<p>Health Canada recommends an assessment of potential health impacts as per the department's guidance documents for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Air Quality. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/sc-hc/H129-54-1-2017-eng.pdf</p>	Health Canada's guidance documents can be used to guide the assessment of potential Project-related health impacts.

¹² Laurie Chan, Olivier Receveur, Malek Batal, William David, Harold Schwartz, Amy Ing, Karen Fediuk, Andrew Black and Constantine Tikhonov. 2014. First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study (FNFNES): Results from Ontario (2011/2012). Available at: http://www.fnfnes.ca/docs/FNFNES_Ontario_Regional_Report_ENGLISH_2019-10-16.pdf

¹³ Health Canada. 2019. Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment: Human Health Risk Assessment. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2019/sc-hc/H129-54-6-2019-eng.pdf

¹⁴ Health Canada. 2018. Guidance for the Environmental Public Health Management of Crude Oil Incidents: A Guide Intended for Public Health and Emergency Management Practitioners. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/sc-hc/H129-82-2018-eng.pdf

				<p>Noise. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/sc-hc/H129-54-3-2017-eng.pdf</p> <p>Drinking and Recreational Water Quality. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/sc-hc/H129-54-2-2017-eng.pdf</p> <p>Country Foods. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/sc-hc/H129-54-5-2018-eng.pdf</p> <p>Human Health Risk Assessment. Available at: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2019/sc-hc/H129-54-6-2019-eng.pdf</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Please insert additional rows as necessary.