



Radiation Environment and Medicine 2018 Vol.7, No.1 9-12

Review

A Summary of Natural Radionuclides in Canadian Public Water Supply Systems

Jing Chen*

Radiation Protection Bureau, Health Canada, 775 Brookfield Road, Ottawa, Canada

Received 11 September 2017; revised 28 October 2017; accepted 27 November 2017

In an effort to better characterize natural radioactivity levels, including total uranium in public water supply systems, drinking water quality data were reviewed for 24 metropolitan areas and cities which cover more than 64% of the total Canadian population. Levels of radioactivity were generally found to be low compared to national and international guideline standards for drinking water quality. The population-weighted average levels are 0.0021 Bq/L for gross alpha, 0.042 Bq/L for gross beta, 0.0017 Bq/L for ²²⁶Ra, 0.0068 Bq/L for ²¹⁰Pb, and 0.23 μ g/L (0.0058 Bq/L) for total uranium. The average effective dose resulting from drinking water intake at these levels would be 4.2 μ Sv per year.

Key words: natural radionuclides, drinking water

1. Introduction

In Canada, the responsibility for ensuring drinking water supplies are safe is shared between the provincial, territorial, federal and municipal governments. The dayto-day responsibility of providing safe drinking water to the public generally rests with the provinces and territories, while municipalities usually oversee the day to day operations of the treatment facilities.

Radionuclides are naturally present in the environment. Natural sources of radiation are responsible for the large majority of radiation exposure (greater than 98%) to the public, excluding medical exposure. The occurrence of natural radionuclides in drinking water is associated most commonly with groundwater. The concentrations are highly variable and are determined by the composition

E-mail: jing.chen2@canada.ca

of the underlying bedrock as well as the physical and chemical conditions prevailing in the aquifer. Increased levels of natural radionuclides in surface waters may be linked to industrial processes, particularly uranium mining and milling operations. The Canadian Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality¹⁾ recommend that sampling and analyses for individual radionuclides should be carried out often enough to accurately characterize the annual exposure resulting from radionuclides in drinking water. If measured concentrations are consistent and well below the Maximum Acceptable Concentrations (MACs), sampling frequency can be reduced. In the Guidelines¹⁾, the MACs are calculated using a reference dose level of 0.1 mSv for one year's consumption of drinking water, assuming a consumption of 2 L/day at the MAC.

When radiological characteristics are known for a water source, water samples could be routinely analysed for the presence of radioactivity using gross alpha and gross beta measurements rather than measurements of individual radionuclides. The screening levels are 0.5 Bq/L for gross alpha and 1 Bq/L for gross beta¹).

^{*}Jing Chen: Radiation Protection Bureau, Health Canada, 775 Brookfield Road, Ottawa, Canada

In an effort to better characterize natural radioactivity levels, including total uranium in public water supply systems, drinking water quality data were reviewed. Results are summarized here.

2. Data Sources

Water in nature is never pure. Naturally occurring mineral deposits of uranium in the ground are predominantly responsible for the localization of radiological content in drinking water. In addition to gross alpha and beta measurements, some communities have monitored selected individual radionuclides. Almost all water supply systems have monitored total uranium because of the concern associated with the potentially high chemical toxicity for this element. The current review of radiological parameters in drinking water focuses on gross alpha, gross beta and activity concentrations of natural radionuclides in Bq/L, as well as total uranium in μ g/L.

The review of drinking water quality was based on water testing reports of the most recent 5 years from major metropolitan areas of populations more than 300,000 and the capital cities of individual provinces and territories which cover more than 64% of the total Canadian population. For most cities, annual water quality reports were available for the most recent 5 years (2012 to 2016). When this was not the case, available reports of most recent years were reviewed. Test results were downloaded from official websites of individual cities, as listed in the appendix of Data Source References.

The radiological effects of multiple radionuclides in the same drinking water source are assumed to be additive. Therefore, when two or more radionuclides are present, the summation formula should be satisfied in order to demonstrate compliance with the Guidelines. For this reason, the Guidelines require that any testing procedure should aim to achieve a detection limit (DL) not greater than 20% of the MAC of any radionuclide likely to be present, assuming that no more than five radionuclides are likely to be present at concentrations approaching their respective MACs. Since all DLs should be low enough, when calculating the averages, zero value is assigned to all samples with non-detectable activity.

For cities with multiple water supply systems, the mean values of radiological measurements are calculated as weighted averages weighted by annual average flow rates in megalitres per day (ML/day).

For population-weighted averages, the 2016 Canadian population statistics were used²). Population-weighted averages were only made among cities where radiological measurements were conducted, excluding those results reported as "< MAC".

3. Results and Discussion

Radiological testing results are summarized in Table 1 for public water supply systems in a total of 24 metropolitan areas and cities. Gross alpha and gross beta measurements were reported in 9 out of 24 cities. The test results were generally well below the screening levels.

A few cities have monitored individual natural radionuclides commonly found in water sources, such as ²²⁶Ra and ²¹⁰Pb. The MACs are 0.5 Bq/L for ²²⁶Ra, and 0.2 Bq/L for ²¹⁰Pb¹). Test results for ²²⁶Ra and ²¹⁰Pb were either below detection limit or well below the respective MACs. Since only 5 cities provided test results for ²²⁶Ra and ²¹⁰Pb, the population-weighted average levels for those two radionuclides may not be representative for all of Canada. However, the summary results do provide exposure levels to those two radionuclides for more than 5 million water consumers.

In the Canadian Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality¹), a guideline for radon in drinking water is not considered necessary, and has not been established. The health risk from ingesting radon-contained drinking water is considered negligible, because most of the radon escapes at the faucet or water outlet, leaving only minimal amounts in the water itself. However, if the radon level in drinking water is sufficiently elevated, it can affect airborne radon concentration indoors. Well-water systems in a few communities have measured radon levels in their treated water. Most testing results were below detection limits, except in 5 small well-water systems in Ottawa. The highest radon level measured was only 33 Bq/L in Kings Park Well system which provides 165 ML/ day which represents about 0.057% of the total water production in the Ottawa area.

Based on their knowledge of the radiological characteristics of the drinking water sources, most cities have focused their testing on bacteria and chemical parameters. Concentrations of total uranium were, therefore, routinely reported in all cities except Charlottetown and Iqaluit. Generally speaking, uranium concentrations were well below the MAC of 20 μ g/L¹). Natural uranium is made of a mixture of three isotopes. 99.284% of ²³⁸U, 0.711% of ²³⁵U and 0.0053% of ²³⁴U by mass³⁾. A measurement of uranium mass in units $\mu g/L$ would detect only ²³⁸U. Among the natural isotopes of uranium, ²³⁴U has the highest specific activity. By percentage activity, there is 48.9% of ²³⁸U, 2.2% of ²³⁵U and 48.9% of ²³⁴U. The population-weighted average uranium concentration of 0.23 μ g/L would have a total activity concentration of 5.8 mBq/L (2.84 mBq/L for ²³⁸U, 0.12 mBq/L for ²³⁵U and $2.84 \text{ mBq/L for }^{234}\text{U}$).

In summary, the population-weighted average levels are 0.0021 Bq/L for gross alpha, and 0.042 Bq/L for gross beta. Results of gross alpha and gross beta are given

London (Ont.) 512.4 11 Halifax (N.S.) 425.9 6.0E.5 6.4E.5 4.5	City	Population x1000	Gross a Bq/L	Gross β Bq/L	²²⁶ Ra Bq/L	²²² Rn Bq/L	²¹⁰ Pb Bq/L	Uranium µg/L	Based on reports	Data Source Reference
Montreal (que) 4,853 (20,2,03) 2012-2016 2 Vancouver (BC.) 25487 OL (021 (21),007) OD OD (0D1 (21),007) OD (0D1 (21),001) (0D1 (21),010) (0D1 (21),010) (0D1 (21),010) (0D1 (21),010) (0D1 (21),010) (0D2 (21),020) (0D1 (21),000) (0D1 (21),020) (0D1 (21),02	Toronto (Ont.)	6,242.3						0.3 (0.2, 0.6)	2012 - 2016	1
Yancouver (DC.) 2,54.7 3.1 (a)1, (a)7 3.1 3.1 (b)1, (a)7 (c)1, (a)6 (c)1,	Montréal (Que.)	4,093.8							2012 - 2016	2
Calgary (Afrik) (Add.S) (Add.	Vancouver (B.C.)	2,548.7	<dl< td=""><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>2013 - 2016</td><td>3</td></dl<></td></dl<></td></dl<>		<dl< td=""><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>2013 - 2016</td><td>3</td></dl<></td></dl<>	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>2013 - 2016</td><td>3</td></dl<>			2013 - 2016	3
Lamonico (Lula) Lyses June (DL (DL<	Calgary (Alta.)	1,469.3				<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>4</td></dl<>			2012 - 2016	4
Ottawa (uni) 1,333 (a)1, 021 (a)1, 023 (a)1, 023 (a)1, 033	Edmonton (Alta.)	1,392.6	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>5</td></dl<></td></dl<>				<dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>5</td></dl<>		2012 - 2016	5
Winnpeg (Man) 8119	Ottawa (Ont.)	1,323.8							2012 - 2016	6
Hamilton (Ont) 7784 $-262^{9}_{(03,054}$ $206^{2}_{(02,226)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(022,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ 2012^{-2016} $101^{-1}_{(012,056)}$ $2012^{-2016}_{(012,016)}$ $101^{-1}_{(012,016)}$ $2012^{-2016}_{(012,016)}$ $101^{-1}_{(012,016)}$ $2012^{-2016}_{(012,016)}$ $101^{-1}_{(012,016)}$ 101	Winnipeg (Man.)	811.9							2012 - 2016	7
Hamilton (0h.) 7/84 003,054 206 9 Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo (Ont.) 5173 102 101	Québec (Que.)	807.2						<mac< td=""><td>2015 - 2016</td><td>8</td></mac<>	2015 - 2016	8
Altchener Cambridge waterioo (off.) 517.3 $(-0.2, 2.06)$	Hamilton (Ont.)	778.4							2016	9
London (ont) 5124 $(0032, 050)$ $(202, 2016)$ (11) Halifax (NS,) 4259 $60E5$ $64E5$ $(2DL, 0.4)$ $(200, 0.00)$ $(201, 0.05)$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 12 St. Catharines-Niagara (Ont) 4117 $(2DL, 0.4)$ $(201, 0.10)$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 13 Oshawa (Ont) 3940 $(2DL, 0.10)$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 13 Victoria (BC.) 3709 $2DL$ 0038 $(2DL, 0.11)$ $2DL$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 14 Windsor (Ont.) 3403 $(2DL, 0.13)$ $(2DL, 0.13)$ $(2DL, 0.13)$ $2DL$ $2DL$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 15 Sakatoon (Sask.) 3152 $(2DL)$ $(2DL, 0.18)$ $(2DL, 0.10)$ <	Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo (Ont.)	517.3							2012 - 2016	10
Halitax (NS.) 42.9 (OL , 0.3) $(OL$, 0.4) $(OO2, OI1)$ $(OO2, OI1)$ $(OO1, 0.5)$ $2012 \cdot 2016$ 12016 St. Catharines-Niagara (Ont.) 4117 -501 $2014 \cdot 2016$ 13016 Oshawa (Ont.) 3940 -501 0038 (OL , 0.11) -501 $2012 \cdot 2016$ 14016 Victoria (BC.) 3709 OL 0.038 (OL , 0.11) -501 $2012 \cdot 2016$ 15016 Windsor (Ont.) 3403 -501 0.038 (OL , 0.11) -501 $2012 \cdot 2016$ 15016 Saskatoon (Sask.) 3152 OL 0.13 (OL , 0.18) $-DL$ $-DL$ 166 ($0.07, 0.09$) $2012 \cdot 2016$ 15016 Saskatoon (Sask.) 2472 $-DL$ 0.13 (OL , 0.009) $-DL$ 0.0099 (OL , 0.11) $0.012 \cdot 2016$ 15016 St. John's (NL.) 2175 OL $-DL$ $-DL$ 0.0099 (ODL , 0.0099 0.4 ($0.02, 101$) $2012 \cdot 2016$ 15016 St. John's (NL.) 2175 OL $-DL$ $-DL$ $-DL$ $2016 \cdot 0.116$ ($0.02, 101$) $2016 \cdot 0.116$ St. John's (NL.) 1755 $-DL$ $-DL$ $-DL$ $-DL$ $2016 \cdot 0.116$ ($0.02, 101$) $2016 \cdot 0.116$ St. John's (NL.) 1756 $-DL$ $-OL$ $-OL$ $-OL$ $-OL$ $-OL$ $-OL$ St. John's (NL.) 2175 $-OL$ Withehorse (YK) 2	London (Ont.)	512.4							2012 - 2016	11
Oshawa (Ont.) 3940 $202 \cdot 2016$ 1400 Victoria (B.C.) 3709 OL 0038 (OL , 011) OL <	Halifax (N.S.)	425.9							2012 - 2016	12
Victoria (B.C.) 370.9 ΔL $0.038 \\ (\Delta DL, 0.11)$ ΔDL $2012 - 2016$ 14 Windsor (Ont.) 340.3 $-\Delta L$ $0.038 \\ (\Delta DL, 0.11)$ ΔDL $2012 - 2016$ 15 Saskatoon (Sask.) 315.2 ΔL $0.13 \\ (-\Delta DL, 0.18)$ ΔL $-\Delta L$ $0.009 \\ (0.00, 7.009)$ $2012 - 2016$ 16 Saskatoon (Sask.) 315.2 ΔL $0.13 \\ (-\Delta DL, 0.18)$ ΔDL $-\Delta DL$ $0.009 \\ (0.02, 16)$ $2012 - 2016$ 16 St. John's (NL.) 247.2 $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $0.0009 \\ (-\Delta DL, 0.11)$ $0.4 \\ (0.02, 16)$ $2012 - 2016$ 18 St. John's (NL.) 217.5 $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $2012 - 2016$ 18 St. John's (NL.) 217.5 $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $2012 - 2016$ 18 St. John's (NL.) 16.5 $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $2016 - 2016$ 18 St. John's (NL.) 58.2 $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $-\Delta DL$ $2016 - 2016$ 12 Whitehorse (YK) 25.1 $0.017 \\ (-\Delta DL, 0.033)$ $-\Delta DL$	St. Catharines-Niagara (Ont.)	411.7							2014 - 2016	13
Victoria (BC.) $3/03$ ΔL $(\Delta DL, 0.11)$ ΔDL ΔDL $2012 - 2016$ 150 Windsor (Ont.) 340.3	Oshawa (Ont.)	394.0							2012 - 2016	14
Windsor (Ont.) 340.3 $(0.007, 0.09)$ $2012 - 2016$ 160 Saskatoon (Sask.) 315.2 OL 0.13 (OL , $0.18)$ OL <td< td=""><td>Victoria (B.C.)</td><td>370.9</td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>15</td></dl<></td></dl<></td></td<>	Victoria (B.C.)	370.9	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>15</td></dl<></td></dl<>					<dl< td=""><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>15</td></dl<>	2012 - 2016	15
Saskatoon (Sask.) 313.2 CDL (cdDL, 0.18) CDL (0.4, 14) 2012 - 2016 14 Regina (Sask.) 247.2 0.00014 (cDL, 0.0009) CDL 0.0009 (cDL, 0.11) 0.4 (0.02, 1.6) 2012 - 2016 18 St. John's (NL.) 217.5 CDL CDL CDL CDL 2016 2017 2017 2016 2017 2016 2017 2016 2017 2016 2017 2016 2016 2012 2012 2016 2012 2012 2016 2012 2012 2016 2012 2012 2016 2012 2012 2016 2012 2012 2	Windsor (Ont.)	340.3							2012 - 2016	16
Kegma (Sask.) 247.2 (<dl, 0.0009)<="" td=""> <dl< td=""> (<dl, 0.11)<="" td=""> (0.02, 1.6) 2012 · 2016 18 St. John's (N.L.) 217.5 <dl< td=""> <dl< td=""> <dl< td=""> 2016 2017 winter 2017 winter 2017 winter 2016 211 Fredericton (N.B.) 58.2 0.03 2016 2016 211 Charlottetown (PEI) 44.7 2012 · 2016 212 212 2016 212 Whitehorse (YK) 25.1 0.017 (<dl, 0.033)<="" td=""> 0.017 (<dl, 0.033)<="" td=""> 0.37 (<dl, 2.6)<="" td=""> 1999-2002, 2013 23 Yellowknife (NWT) 19.6 0.2 2010 · 2014 24</dl,></dl,></dl,></dl<></dl<></dl<></dl,></dl<></dl,>	Saskatoon (Sask.)	315.2	<dl< td=""><td>0.13 (<dl, 0.18)<="" td=""><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>17</td></dl<></td></dl<></td></dl,></td></dl<>	0.13 (<dl, 0.18)<="" td=""><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>17</td></dl<></td></dl<></td></dl,>	<dl< td=""><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>17</td></dl<></td></dl<>		<dl< td=""><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>17</td></dl<>		2012 - 2016	17
St. John's (NL.) 217.5 2017 winter Fredericton (N.B.) 58.2 0.03 2016 21 Charlottetown (PEI) 44.7 2012 - 2016 22 Whitehorse (YK) 25.1 0.017 (<dl, 0.033)<="" td=""> 0.037 (<dl, 2.6)<="" td=""> 1999-2002, 2013 23 Yellowknife (NWT) 19.6 0.2 2010 - 2014 24</dl,></dl,>	Regina (Sask.)	247.2				<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>2012 - 2016</td><td>18, 19</td></dl<>			2012 - 2016	18, 19
Charlottetown (PEI) 44.7 2012 - 2016 22 Whitehorse (YK) 25.1 0.017 (<dl, 0.033)<="" td=""> 0.37 (<dl, 2.6)<="" td=""> 1999-2002,2013 23 Yellowknife (NWT) 19.6 0.2 2010 - 2014 24</dl,></dl,>	St. John's (N.L.)	217.5	<dl< td=""><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>20</td></dl<></td></dl<></td></dl<>	<dl< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td><dl< td=""><td></td><td>20</td></dl<></td></dl<>				<dl< td=""><td></td><td>20</td></dl<>		20
Whitehorse (YK) 25.1 0.017 (<dl, 0.033)<="" th=""> 0.37 (<dl, 2.6)<="" th=""> 1999-2002, 2013 23 Yellowknife (NWT) 19.6 0.2 2010-2014 24</dl,></dl,>	Fredericton (N.B.)	58.2						0.03	2016	21
Winterorse (TK) 25.1 (<dl, 0.033)<="" td=""> (<dl, 2.6)<="" td=""> 1999-2002, 2013 23 Yellowknife (NWT) 19.6 0.2 2010 - 2014 24</dl,></dl,>	Charlottetown (PEI)	44.7							2012 - 2016	22
								(<dl, 2.6)<="" td=""><td>1999-2002, 2013</td><td>23</td></dl,>	1999-2002, 2013	23
Igahit (NU) 77 9012 95	, ,							0.2		24
Population weighted mean 0.0021 0.042 0.0017 2.3 0.0068 0.23	Iqaluit (NU)	7.7	0.0001	0.049	0.0017	0.0	0.0000	0.00	2012	25

Table 1. Summary of natural radionuclides in drinking water supply systems.

here for monitoring information only. For individual radionuclides, the population-weighted average levels are 0.0017 Bq/L for ²²⁶Ra, 2.3 Bq/L for ²²²Rn, 0.0068 Bq/L for ²¹⁰Pb, and 0.23 μ g/L (0.0058 Bq/L) for total uranium. The average effective ingestion dose resulting from radionuclides found in drinking water at these levels would be 4.2 μ Sv per year⁴.

4. Conclusions

Canadian drinking water supplies are generally of excellent quality. However, water in nature is never pure. Radionuclides are naturally present in the environment. Drinking water quality data on radiological parameters were reviewed for the most recent 5 years reported from major metropolitan areas of populations more than 300,000 and the capital cities of individual provinces and territories which cover more than 64% of the total Canadian population. Population-weighted averages indicate that Canadians are typically exposed to 1.7 mBq/L of ²²⁶Ra, 6.8 mBq/L of ²¹⁰Pb, and 0.23 μ g/L of total uranium in drinking water from publicly-operated systems. The annual effective dose resulting from natural radionuclides in drinking water, assuming drinking water intake of 2 L per day, would be 4.2 μ Sv, which is a relatively small contribution to the typical annual effective dose due to natural background radiation which is in the range of 1-10 mSv with 2.4 mSv being the central estimate⁵⁾.

By providing a better understanding of background exposures, this summary will contribute to the population dose assessment due to background radiation, the environmental impact assessment of future activities/ projects, and radiological emergency preparedness and response.

References

- Health Canada. Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality, Guideline Technical Document-Radiological parameters. 2010. Available from: https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/canada/ health-canada/migration/healthy-canadians/publications/ healthy-living-vie-saine/water-radiological-radiologique-eau/alt/ water-radiological-radiologique-eau-eng.pdf.
- Statistics Canada. Population of census areas. 2017. Available from: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/ demo05a-eng.htm.
- United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR). UNSCEAR 2016 Report, Annex D -Biological effects of selected internal emitters—Uranium. 2016. Available from: http://www.unscear.org/docs/publications/2016/ UNSCEAR_2016_Annex-D.pdf
- International Commission of Radiological Protection. Compendium of dose coefficients based on ICRP Publication 60. ICRP Publication 119. Ann. ICRP 41(Suppl.), 2012.
- United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR). UNSCEAR 2000 Report, Volume I: Sources, Annex B: Exposures from natural radiation sources. 2000. Available from: http://www.unscear.org/docs/publications/2000/ UNSCEAR_2000_Annex-B.pdf.

Appendix - Data Source References

- https://www1.toronto.ca/City%20Of%20Toronto/Toronto%20 Water/Files/pdf/D/A1702891_DrinkingWaterAnalysis2016WebF inalFinal.pdf
- http://ville.montreal.qc.ca/portal/page?_pageid=6937,68593573&_ dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL
- 3. http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/water-quality-report.pdf
- 4. http://www.calgary.ca/UEP/Water/Pages/Drinking-water/

Annual-water-quality-report/Water-Quality-Parameters.aspx

- https://www.epcor.com/products-services/water/water-quality/ Pages/water-quality-reports-edmonton.aspx
- http://ottawa.ca/en/residents/water-and-environment/drinkingwater/education-reports-and-statistics
- http://www.winnipeg.ca/waterandwaste/water/testResults/ default.stm
- https://www.ville.quebec.qc.ca/planification_orientations/eau/ gestion_eau/qualite.aspx
- 9. https://www.hamilton.ca/home-property-and-development/watersewer/water-quality
- 10. http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/aboutTheEnvironment/ QualityTreatment2.asp#Quality
- 11. https://www.london.ca/residents/Water/Water-System/Pages/ Summary-and-Annual-Reports.aspx
- 12. https://www.halifax.ca/home-property/halifax-water/about-yourwater/publications-reports
- 13. https://www.niagararegion.ca/living/water/water-quality-reports/default.aspx
- 14. https://www.durham.ca/works.asp?nr=/departments/works/ reports/reportsinside.htm&setFooter=/includes/worksFooter.inc
- https://www.crd.bc.ca/about/document-library/documents/ annual-reports/environmental-protection/water-quality
- 16. http://www.wuc.on.ca/information/water_reports.cfm
- 17. https://www.saskatoon.ca/services-residents/power-water/waterwastewater/drinking-water
- 18. http://www.regina.ca/residents/water-sewer/water-publications
- https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/ environmental-workplace-health/environmental-contaminants/ environmental-radiation/canadian-radiological-monitoringnetwork.html
- 20. http://www.mae.gov.nl.ca/waterres/reports/index. html#drinkingwatersafety
- 21. http://www.fredericton.ca/en/water-sewer/water-utility/typicalwater-test-results
- 22. http://city.charlottetown.pe.ca/waterutility.php
- http://www.whitehorse.ca/departments/water-and-wasteservices/water-system
- 24. http://www.nwtdrinkingwater.ca/ensuring-safe-drinking-water/ monitoring-and-testing/
- 25. http://www.nwb-oen.ca/site/infosource