

1 **TITLE**

2 Contaminated Sites and Indigenous Peoples in Canada and the United States: A Scoping Review

3
4 **AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS**

5 Katherine Chong¹, Niladri Basu¹

6 ¹ Center for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment, Faculty of Agricultural and
7 Environmental Sciences, McGill University, Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, Quebec, Canada

8
9 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT**

10 Niladri Basu

11 204- Center for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment Building

12 21, 111 Lakeshore Road

13 Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

14 McGill University

15 Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, Québec, Canada

16 H9X 3V9

17 niladri.basu@mcgill.ca

18 514- 398- 8642

19
20 **RUNNING TITLE**

21 Scoping Review of Contaminated Sites and Indigenous Peoples

22
23
24 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

25 We acknowledge funding support to KC from McGill University Faculty of Agricultural and
26 Environmental Sciences (Sustainable Agriculture Fellowship, Graduate Excellence Award) and
27 the PURE CREATE program funded by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of
28 Canada (NSERC). NB's contribution was supported by the Canada Research Chairs (CRC)
29 Program.

30
31 **DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

32 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 **Abstract**

43 **Background:** Indigenous communities in Canada and the US are disproportionately exposed to
44 contaminated sites, often arising from industrial and waste disposal activities. For instance,
45 ~34% of US EPA Superfund sites are of Native American interest, and ~29% of Canadian
46 federal contaminated sites are on Indigenous reserve land. Contaminated sites pose unique
47 challenges to many Indigenous peoples who consider the land as an integral part of food systems,
48 culture, and the economy. Federal management of contaminated sites is challenged by
49 epistemological differences, regulatory barriers, and minimal scientific research.

50 **Objectives:** This scoping review aimed to identify and map information on contaminated sites
51 and Indigenous peoples in Canada and the US, namely: 1) the relationship between contaminated
52 sites and Indigenous people, and their land and food systems; 2) strategies, challenges, and
53 successes for contaminated sites assessment and management on Indigenous land; and 3)
54 Indigenous leadership and inclusion in contaminated site assessment and management.

55 **Methods:** Three streams of data were retrieved from January to March 2022: a systematic
56 literature search (key word groups: Indigenous people and contaminated sites); a grey literature
57 search; and an analysis of federal contaminated site data (Canada's Federal Contaminated Sites
58 Inventory (FCSI) and US EPA's Superfund Database).

59 **Results:** Our search yielded 49 peer-reviewed articles, 20 pieces of grey literature, and 8114
60 federal site records (1236 Superfund, 6878 FCSI), evidencing the contamination of the lands of
61 815 distinct Indigenous tribes and nations and the presence of 440 different contaminants or
62 contaminant groups. Minimal information is available on the potential health and ecological
63 effects, assessment and management of risks, and collaboration on contaminated site processes
64 relative to the number of sites on or adjacent to Indigenous lands.

65 **Discussion:** By integrating three diverse data streams we discovered a multi-disciplinary yet
66 disparate body of information. The results point to a need to prioritize holism, efficiency, and
67 Indigenous leadership in contaminated site assessment, management, and research. This should
68 include a focus on community-specific approaches to site assessment and management; a re-
69 conceptualization of risks related to sites that privileges Indigenous epistemologies; greater
70 collaboration between networks such as the scientific community, Indigenous communities, and
71 federal governments; and a re-evaluation of current management frameworks with Indigenous
72 leadership at the forefront.

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80 1. INTRODUCTION

81 It is well known that pollution has profound effects on human and environmental health
82 (Landrigan et al., 2018). In Canada and the United States (US), contaminated sites that arise
83 from commercial, industrial, or waste disposal activities are a major source of pollution, with
84 contaminant concentrations that can often pose a human or environmental health hazard
85 (Contaminated Sites Management Working Group, 2000; EPA, 2021c). Federal Contaminated
86 Sites (also termed “Superfund” or “Cleanups” in the US) are those which federal governments
87 are responsible for. These sites disproportionately affect Indigenous People. For example, in
88 Canada south of the 60th parallel, there are an estimated 4486 Federal contaminated sites on
89 Indigenous reserve land, making up over 20% of the total sites, although reserves make up only
90 0.5% of the total land mass (Government of Canada, 2021; OECD, 2020). Similarly in the US,
91 ~34% of Superfund sites are categorized under ‘Native American Interest’ by the Environmental
92 Protection Agency (EPA), while Native American people make up only 2.9% of the total
93 population (EPA, 2021a; Jones, 2021).

94 Many Indigenous peoples in Canada and the US have traditional ties to the land,
95 including as an integral part of food systems, language, culture, community, and spirituality. The
96 health of Indigenous communities cannot be understood independent of the health of the
97 environment and thus contaminated sites present unique challenges to Indigenous People
98 (Hoover, 2013). One of the most notable challenges is the impact of contaminants on Indigenous
99 food systems, including agricultural and subsistence activities such as hunting, gathering,
100 farming, and gardening (Fernández-Llamazares et al., 2020). As an example, the First Nations
101 Food and Nutrition Study in Canada recently sampled traditional foods from 92 communities,

102 measuring 2061 samples and finding many of these to have elevated concentrations of mercury,
103 lead, cadmium, and arsenic (Chan, Singh, et al., 2021). Exposure to such contaminants is
104 associated with organ damage, neurodegenerative diseases, cancer, and reproductive and
105 developmental disorders (Briffa et al., 2020; Engwa et al., 2019). Furthermore, contamination of
106 traditional foods has contributed to a ‘nutrition transition’ for many Indigenous communities,
107 characterized by the westernization of diet and lifestyle and a reliance on nutrient-poor market
108 foods. This transition is fueling a high prevalence of chronic diseases including obesity and
109 related cardiometabolic disorders (Chan, Fediuk, et al., 2021; Damman et al., 2008) Overall,
110 exposure to contaminants results in both direct and indirect health effects for Indigenous peoples,
111 contributing to a loss of food sovereignty, which is defined as the right to healthy, culturally
112 appropriate, and self-determined food and agricultural systems, and is a key determinant of
113 overall health (Coté, 2016; Fernández-Llamazares et al., 2020).

114 Unique solutions are required to address the challenges that contaminated sites pose to
115 Indigenous communities, however environmental research and management processes often use
116 western-institutionalized risk assessment tools and frameworks which are generic and poorly
117 apply to Indigenous people (Arsenault et al., 2019; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016; Wang et al.,
118 2020). For example, the application of a generic risk assessment model for mercury exposure to
119 studies involving Indigenous populations did not yield results that were representative of the
120 study population (Canuel et al., 2006). This issue is further complicated by the lack of
121 toxicological data for the hundreds of chemicals found at contaminated sites (EPA, 2021d;
122 Government of Canada, 2021; Wang et al., 2020). Regulatory barriers further challenge
123 contaminated sites management. The variety of US governmental programs, for example, that
124 categorize and address contaminated sites has resulted in a fragmented tracking system and a

125 poor understanding of the scope of the problem (EPA, 2021c). In Canada, Indigenous reserve
126 land falls under federal jurisdiction, while most environmental management is provincially
127 mandated (Eckert et al., 2020). The Indian Act constitutes federal legislation on reserve
128 management, but fails to mention environmental protection, and Indigenous legal systems are not
129 consistently recognized under the Canadian constitution on the same level as federal and
130 provincial legislation (Eckert et al., 2020; Gunn K, 2021). Taken together, there are scientific
131 gaps, regulatory barriers, and a lack of meaningful inclusion of Indigenous communities, which
132 prevent improvements to the management of federal contaminated sites.

133 Contaminated sites threaten land-based food systems that are essential to many
134 Indigenous communities' culture, spirituality, and overall health. Scientific, regulatory and
135 epistemological barriers facing federal contaminated site management adds complexity beyond
136 previous studies of pollution and Indigenous people in general (Fernández-Llamazares et al.,
137 2020). However, to our knowledge, the topic of federal contaminated sites and Indigenous
138 people has yet to be reviewed, preventing the advancement of solutions to these barriers. As
139 such, the objective was this paper was to present the state of knowledge on 1) the relationship
140 between contaminated sites and Indigenous people, and their land and food systems; 2)
141 strategies, challenges, and successes for contaminated sites management on Indigenous land; and
142 3) Indigenous leadership and inclusion in contaminated sites management activities. In doing so,
143 this scoping review maps the available information and identifies evidence gaps and priority
144 actions pertaining to contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples in Canada and the US (Munn et
145 al., 2018).

146

147

148 **2. METHODS**

149 ***2.1 Positionality Statement***

150 This review was conducted by non-Indigenous researchers at McGill University in
151 Montreal, Canada. The authors are non-Indigenous persons of color (a doctoral student and
152 Professor). While every attempt was made to minimize biases, we acknowledge that this
153 positionality and its historical context places limitations on the present work. The motivation for
154 the review is a community-based project lead by the Kanien'kehà:ka (Mohawk) Community of
155 Kanesatake in Quebec, Canada, that addresses a local contaminated site. The authors are based in
156 McGill's Centre for Indigenous Nutrition and Environment (CINE), which affords connections
157 with many Indigenous communities and stakeholders and provides opportunities for the
158 promotion of Indigenous methodologies and decolonizing research practices.

159 ***2.2 Search Strategy and Study Selection Criteria***

160 The search strategy utilized three data streams, which included a systematic scholarly
161 literature search, a grey literature search, and federal contaminated sites data repositories (Figure
162 1). First, a systematic search of peer-reviewed literature was conducted to identify the state of
163 knowledge pertaining to the study objectives. Second, a search for grey literature, such as
164 governmental reports, theses, news articles, and case studies was used to support the findings.
165 Finally, publicly available federal contaminated site data was downloaded from the US and
166 Canadian federal government websites. The results were compiled and scrutinized to map the
167 existing evidence and to develop an understanding of priority scientific and environmental
168 management gaps in a multidisciplinary context. The PRISMA (Transparent Reporting of

169 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) checklist was utilized to ensure that methodology
170 reporting was transparent (Tricco et al., 2018).

171 *2.2.1 Systematic Literature Search*

172 A systematic search of databases (Scopus, Web of Science, and Pubmed) was used to
173 identify relevant articles. The final search was run on January 10, 2022. Boolean operators were
174 used to search each database as follows: (“First Nations” OR “Indigenous people” OR “Native
175 American” OR “Aboriginal” OR “Inuit” OR “Metis” OR “American Indian” OR “Canadian
176 Indian” OR “Traditional food” OR “Indigenous agriculture” OR “Country food*” OR “Tribal
177 land” OR “reservation” OR “reserve land” OR “Indian country”) AND (“contaminated site” OR
178 “superfund” OR “contaminated land” OR “brownfield” OR “abandoned mine”). The Scopus
179 search was limited with the operator TI-ABS-KEY due to initial results from a full-text search
180 that lacked specificity.

181 Overall, inclusion criteria were broad, to capture the diversity and scope of the
182 information available on the topic. Papers were included that pertained to federal contaminated
183 site(s) in Canada or the US, and to Indigenous peoples, communities, and environments exposed
184 to the site. Both qualitative and quantitative studies were included. Both primary studies (i.e.,
185 involving the collection of primary data and direct measurement of an outcome of interest) and
186 secondary studies (i.e., review papers or discussion papers) were included. Literature included
187 was limited to Canada and the US and published in English. No date limit was placed on the
188 studies. The review was limited to First Nations, Inuit, and Metis peoples in Canada, and all
189 Native American peoples in the US, including those residing in non-contiguous states. Notably,
190 many mainland Indigenous people such as the Haudenosaunee, Cree, and Anishinaabe live in
191 both the US and Canada, due to the cutting of common cultural territory by the international

192 border (*Native Land Interactive Map*, 2021). Furthermore, some Indigenous communities live on
193 both sides of the US-Mexico Border, and these were considered if the literature was relevant to
194 the US context. The review used the definition of ‘contaminated site’ as described by the US
195 EPA and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (See Supplemental Materials,
196 Glossary of Key Terms) (EPA, 2021c; Government of Canada, 2021). The review excluded
197 literature on pollution and Indigenous people that was not specific to contaminated sites. The
198 search and screening process, involving the reviewing of titles and abstracts, resulted in a total of
199 49 articles for analysis (Figure 2; Excel Table S1).

200 *2.2.2 Grey Literature Search*

201 Due to the minimal number of publications in academic journals related to contaminated
202 sites and Indigenous People in Canada and the US, and to capture a broader range of
203 perspectives on the topic, a grey literature search was also conducted. Grey literature included
204 multiple document types produced by all levels of government, academics, businesses and
205 organizations, that are not controlled by commercial publishing. (Mahood et al., 2014) The
206 search strategy ‘SYMBALS’ (a systematic review methodology blending active learning and
207 snowballing) (van Haastrecht et al., 2021), which uses backward snowballing to allow
208 researchers to complement their set of relevant papers with additional sources such as grey
209 literature. The grey literature search was conducted from January 2022 through to March 2022
210 inclusive.

211 Grey literature was yielded iteratively from relevant websites, governmental databases,
212 organizations, and reference lists. Search terms were compiled from the authors’ knowledge on
213 the topic and information from previous searches. The search terms used fell into two main
214 categories (“Indigenous People” and “Contaminated Sites”) with the complete list available in

215 Supplemental Materials (Table S1). News articles, reports, dissertations and theses were found in
216 ProQuest and included if relevant. Governmental websites, including Health Canada, Indigenous
217 and Northern Affairs Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada, US EPA and the Tribal
218 Lands Assistance Center were searched. Information on Indigenous peoples and federal
219 contaminated sites is often cited in technical reports and therefore, Google Scholar was searched,
220 which has been cited as an acceptable database for grey literature searches (Haddaway et al.,
221 2015). The search yielded a total of 20 selected grey literature articles (Excel Table S2), which
222 included seven government documents (EPA, 2015; Government of Northwest Territories, 2021;
223 Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2016; Michelsen, 2010; US Government
224 Accountability Office, 2019; US Government Publishing Office, 2016; Woolford, 2017); four
225 journal articles (non-peer-reviewed) (Castleden et al., 2017; Gallo, 2011; Gover, 2007; Lewis et
226 al., 2015), one opinion article (Nolan, 2009), one thesis (Clark, 2020), three news
227 articles,(Bienkowski, 2012; Hansen, 2018; Indian Country Today, 2013), and four conference
228 materials (Ellison, 2012; Gailus, 2013; Hykin, 2016; Kent, 2016). Although not considered as
229 grey literature in this review, information was also gathered from nine government webpages, to
230 better understand the context of the findings (Table S2).

231 *2.2.3 Federal Data Inventory Search*

232 Government websites (US EPA and Government of Canada) were used to identify available
233 datasets for inclusion. Data on contaminated sites was publicly available in an Excel spreadsheet
234 format for all federal contaminated sites on reserve land in Canada from the Federal
235 Contaminated Sites Inventory (FCSI) (n= 6878) (Government of Canada, 2021) (Excel Table
236 S3), which was downloaded on October 14, 2021. A search for US EPA Superfund sites
237 categorized under “Native American Interest” (which includes sites that affect Native American

238 peoples but are not on Tribal lands) from the Superfund Site Information database was run on
239 October 4, 2021, and re-run on February 16, 2022 to include both the Superfund site data (n=
240 1236) (Excel Table S4) and an inventory of data on contaminants at Superfund sites (Excel Table
241 S5) (EPA, 2021d). The searches of the Canadian and US databases resulted in a total of 8114
242 records of contaminated site data for analysis. Canadian and US data was not consistent,
243 however some variables were available in both datasets, which included the site location and
244 Indigenous community affected, site status (i.e., whether the site was currently active), risk
245 classification and prioritization ranking, type of contaminant, and type of contaminant media.
246 Canadian FCSI data also included information on the management strategy and plan for the site,
247 the estimated size of the area contaminated, the number of people living in proximity to the site,
248 and expenditure estimates related to monitoring, remediation, assessment, and maintenance.
249 Superfund data included indications of whether the contaminants were of human or ecological
250 concern, the site type (i.e., source of contamination), and exposure control measures.

251 ***2.3 Data Extraction and Analysis***

252 Included peer-reviewed literature were compiled into a data chart following a model outlined
253 by the Joanna Briggs Institute Methodology for Scoping Reviews (Peters et al., 2015) (Excel
254 Table S1). Per this guideline, the following data were extracted and charted: author(s), year of
255 publication, country of origin, study purpose, location, study population (i.e., sample size),
256 methodology, and key findings related to the scoping review questions. Additionally, data
257 extracted that are specific to this study included: contaminated site name, contaminant name or
258 contaminant class, contaminant media sampled, type (source) of contaminated site, Indigenous
259 community of focus and/or territory of focus, the presence of a collaboration between Indigenous
260 and non-indigenous researchers and/or Indigenous authorship, whether the article was a primary

261 or secondary data source, whether the article collected qualitative or quantitative data, and the
262 discipline in which the article was published. For quantitative data, descriptive statistics were
263 used to map out and better understand the scope of the data. Qualitative data were iteratively
264 analyzed to develop themes presented in the results section.

265 Data from both retrieved articles and federal databases were analyzed using Microsoft
266 Excel Software (Microsoft 365 MSO (Version 2205)), and basic descriptive statistical analyses
267 were run on these datasets. For example, data such as contaminants of focus, risk assessment
268 information, and site locations were extracted and compared across data streams. Data was
269 analyzed in answer to the three study objectives, with additional questions being developed
270 iteratively as the data was explored. A narrative synthesis of qualitative data was integrated into
271 this analysis. Complete datasets can be found in supplementary materials, which includes data
272 extraction charts for peer-reviewed literature (Excel Table S1) and grey literature (Excel Table
273 S2); and raw data retrieved from Canadian FCSI (Excel Table S3) and US EPA Superfund
274 databases (Excel Tables S4 and S5).

275 3. RESULTS

276 *3.1 Overview of results*

277 Information available on contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples in Canada and the
278 USA included 49 peer-reviewed journal articles, 20 pieces of grey literature, and 8114
279 contaminated site records from federal databases (Table 1). These sources provided data on the
280 potential or actual contamination of the lands of 815 distinct Indigenous tribes and nations and
281 indicated the presence of 440 different chemicals or chemical groups found at 4976 distinct
282 contaminated sites. Peer-reviewed literature available on the topic has been published between

283 1996-2021. Of the 49 peer-reviewed articles, 35 were primary data sources (i.e., original data
284 collection), while 14 were secondary, including reviews, historical reviews, and discussion
285 papers. Of the articles collecting primary data, 26 collected quantitative data, three collected both
286 qualitative and quantitative data, and six collected qualitative data only. Throughout these
287 sources, contamination of a wide variety of media, from soil, air, water, groundwater, and food
288 to human biomarkers were described.

289 ***3.2 Indigenous Communities and Geographic Patterns***

290 Peer-reviewed literature described contaminated sites affecting 41 distinct Indigenous
291 Tribes and Nations across Canada and the US (Table 1), with some literature focused on multiple
292 Tribes or Nations. A total of 11 individual communities were the focus of grey articles, with the
293 remaining grey literatures focused on Indigenous Peoples in general as opposed to individual
294 communities. In contrast, more communities were captured under the federal databases as the US
295 EPA reported Superfund sites of interest to 239 Indigenous Tribes (EPA, 2021d), and Canada's
296 FCSI included sites affecting 576 distinct Indigenous communities on 745 different reserve lands
297 (Excel Tables S3 and S4) (Government of Canada, 2021). Notably, Canadian and US federal
298 contaminated site data varied, in that Canada listed multiple "sites" with unique identifiers in the
299 same geographic region, while Superfund tended to list one larger area with a single identifier.
300 Of the 49 peer-reviewed journal articles that were included in the review, 29 were based in the
301 US, 13 were based in Canada, and seven were based in both the US and Canada. In grey
302 literature, the US EPA published a report in 2020 estimating that 146 605 Native American
303 people live within one mile of a Superfund site, and 449 849 live within three miles. (EPA, 2020)
304 Canadian FCSI data provided an estimate of populations (which included Indigenous and non-
305 Indigenous people) living near contaminated sites on reserves, totaling 2 096 197 people living

306 within 1 km (Government of Canada, 2021). Canadian FCSI data also reported estimated sizes of
307 the contaminated areas, ranging from 0.0001 to 1,500,000 cubic square meters per site
308 (Government of Canada, 2021). Figure 3 displays contaminated site locations identified from the
309 four data streams.

310 ***3.3 Contaminated sites, sources, and media***

311 Of the contaminated sites described in the 49 peer-reviewed articles, 25 were from
312 mining activity, eight were industrial waste sites, six were hazardous waste sites, four were
313 military radar, and one was from hydroelectric activities, with the remainder of unspecified
314 origin. Nine grey articles were focused on specific contaminated sites, which included the
315 mention of seven sites due to mining activities, two from industrial activities, one nuclear waste
316 site, and one from an accidental spill. The US EPA reported on Superfund Site types, including
317 159 due to manufacturing/processing/maintenance, 84 mining sites, 98 waste management sites,
318 and 39 recycling sites (EPA, 2021d). However, we note that most of the sites (n=248) were
319 classified as having “other” sources (EPA, 2021d). Canadian FCSI Data does not provide
320 information on contaminant source (Government of Canada, 2021).

321 In the peer-reviewed literature, a total of 45 unique contaminants or contaminant groups
322 were identified or discussed (Table 1). While most grey literature was focused on contaminated
323 sites in general without referencing specific chemicals, seven articles referenced (but did not
324 measure) specific contaminants of concern, which included lead, arsenic, PCBs, benzene,
325 cadmium, formaldehyde, uranium, zinc, pentachlorophenol, dioxin, and creosote. Superfund site
326 data reported the measurement of 440 different contaminants or contaminant groups found at 296
327 contaminated sites, with lead, arsenic, and cadmium as the most common ones listed. Of these
328 contaminants listed, 12% were flagged by US EPA as a potential ecological risk.(EPA, 2021d)

329 Canadian FCSI Data reported contaminant classes as opposed to single contaminants, for a total
330 of 12 different contaminant classes found at 4680 contaminated sites (Table 1). The most
331 commonly reported classes were petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs), polycyclic aromatic
332 hydrocarbons (PAHs), and metals, metalloids, and organometallics.(Government of Canada,
333 2021) In Canadian FCSI Data, there were 2198 contaminated sites listed (~32%) without data on
334 contaminants, and in Superfund site data there were 940 sites (~76%) without contaminant data.

335 Human biomarkers and wildlife were the most common media tested for contaminants in
336 peer-reviewed literature. While grey literature did not measure or detect contamination, water,
337 food, and sediment were the most common contaminated media mentioned. Both Superfund and
338 FCSI datasets reported contaminant media tested, with soil being the most common in both
339 databases, followed by groundwater (Table 2). There were several media utilized in scientific
340 research that were not identified in federal site assessments. These include human biomarkers
341 (Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Goncharov et al., 2008;
342 Kegler & Malcoe, 2004; Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010; Rock et al., 2019; Tsuji et al., 2005),
343 plants and plant foods (Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Garvin, 2018; Koch et al.,
344 2013; Samuel-Nakamura et al., 2017; Sarkar et al., 2019), wildlife and wild game (Brown et al.,
345 2014; Koch et al., 2013; Rock et al., 2019; Samuel-Nakamura et al., 2017), and tree bark (Flett et
346 al., 2021).

347 ***3.4 Risks posed by contaminated sites***

348 Both qualitative and quantitative data from the three evidence streams provided
349 information on contaminated sites and Indigenous people, land, and food systems. Although a
350 causal link to health outcomes cannot be inferred through federal contaminated site databases,
351 information such as prioritization rankings add to our understanding of the issue's scope.

352 *3.4.1 Environmental risk assessment*

353 Six peer-reviewed studies focused on the assessment of contaminants found on
354 Indigenous lands affected by contaminated sites (summarized in Table S4), and in five of these
355 studies there was evidence of contaminant levels exceeding regulatory guidelines. A study on an
356 abandoned mine waste site proximate to the lands of the Navajo Nation (Blue Gap Chapter,
357 Arizona), revealed elevated levels of Uranium (67-170 $\mu\text{g/L-1}$, US EPA max. 30 $\mu\text{g/L-1}$) in
358 spring water, and detected Uranium (6,614 mg/kg-1), Vanadium (15,814 mg/kg-1), and Arsenic
359 (40 mg/kg-1) in mine waste solids (Blake et al., 2015). Another study examined tree bark on the
360 Spokane reservation (Washington), nearby the Midnight Mine Superfund site, finding a high
361 geo-accumulation index for Uranium and a moderate index for Thorium (Flett et al., 2021).
362 Uranium was also detected in stream sediments on Inuit Territory in Labrador, Canada, proximal
363 to the Abandoned Kitts-U mine site (up to 214.46 mg/kg detected, exceeding the max. of 23
364 mg/kg) (Sarkar et al., 2019). Sediment toxicity tests in Inukjuak Inuit Territory (Saglek Bay,
365 Labrador) near a military radar site revealed sediment PCB concentrations exceeding Canadian
366 sediment quality guidelines by 41-fold (Brown et al., 2013). Local birds in Saglek Bay, the
367 shorthorn sculpin and black guillemot, were found to be exposed to sediments with
368 concentrations measuring 1000 ng/g within 3 km of a contaminated marine sediment site,
369 exceeding the limits associated with risk to survival (750 ng/g for sculpin and 77 ng/g for
370 guillemot) (Brown et al., 2013). Other studies examined the presence or origin of contaminants.
371 For example, a study on the Yurok Indian Reservation's Klamath watershed (California)
372 detected a wide variety of contaminants in water, including carbamates, dioxins/furans, mercury,
373 microcystins, organochloride pesticides, and phenols including PCP and TCP (Middleton et al.,
374 2019). The origin of copper contamination dispersed onto the land of the L'anse Indian tribal

375 lands (Michigan) were confirmed to be from the Mass Mill Superfund close to the Keeweenaw
376 Peninsula in one study using sediment core dating (Kerfoot et al., 2020).

377 *3.4.2 Contaminated Sites and Indigenous Food Systems*

378 Seven peer-reviewed articles examined contaminants and Indigenous peoples' food (both
379 plant and wildlife) (Table S5) (Brown et al., 2014; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Garvin, 2018; Koch et
380 al., 2013; Rock et al., 2019; Samuel-Nakamura et al., 2017; Schmitt et al., 2006). A total of 58
381 varieties of plant and animal foods were sampled, including 42 plant species, four mushroom
382 species, and 12 animal species. Seals that are a part of Inuit diets in Labrador, Canada were
383 evidenced to contain PCBs and organochloride pesticides that exceeded adverse effects
384 thresholds of 1.3 mg/kg (Brown et al., 2014). Hares, mushrooms, and wild berries at a variety of
385 contaminated sites affecting First Nations in Canada were assessed, evidencing arsenic
386 bioaccessibility in hare meat and mushrooms (Koch et al., 2013). Mutton consumed by Navajo
387 Nation members in Arizona were found to exceed reference dietary intake levels for uranium,
388 arsenic, cadmium, lead, molybdenum, and selenium (Rock et al., 2019; Samuel-Nakamura et al.,
389 2017). In studies on the traditional foods of the Eight Tribes and Nations of Northeastern
390 Oklahoma, fish and crayfish were found to contain lead and cadmium, posing a hazard to human
391 consumers of carnivorous wildlife (lead consumption from crayfish up to 58.75 mg/kg/day
392 (Toxicological Reference Value (TRV) 1.68), from carp up to 7.54 mg/kg/day; and cadmium
393 from crayfish up to 1.66 mg/kg/day (TRV 1.47) (Schmitt et al., 2006), and 36 species of edible
394 plants within a contaminated area were found to have significantly different levels of cadmium,
395 lead, and zinc than plants outside of the contaminated area (Garvin, 2018). Overall, contaminants
396 studied in food were primarily heavy metals (Garvin, 2018; Koch et al., 2013; Rock et al., 2019;
397 Samuel-Nakamura et al., 2017; Schmitt et al., 2006), with one study examining PCBs and

398 organochloride pesticides (Brown et al., 2014). Traditional foods and medicinal plants are not
399 included as sampling media in Federal site data for Canada or the US (EPA, 2021d; Government
400 of Canada, 2021).

401 *3.4.3 Contaminated Sites and the Health of Indigenous Peoples*

402 Superfund data showed that 59% of contaminants found at Superfund sites were at levels that
403 pose a risk to human health (EPA, 2021c). The Superfund database inventories 122 sites at
404 which human exposures are “under control” (i.e., the exposure is under EPA limits or
405 precautions have been put in place to prevent human exposure), while the human exposure status
406 of 1075 sites remain unknown (EPA, 2021d).

407 In scholarly literature, a total of 3742 Indigenous participants were studied across articles,
408 with a total of 2224 participants in seven articles related to contaminant exposures and human
409 health outcomes (summarized in Table S6), primarily from the Akwesasne Mohawk (Ontario,
410 Quebec, and New York) (823 participants in 5 studies) and Navajo (Utah, New Mexico, and
411 Arizona) (1304 participants in one study) Nations, and also from the Ramapough Lunaape
412 Nation (New Jersey) (97 participants in one study) (Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996;
413 Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Goncharov et al., 2008; Hund et al., 2015; Hwang et al., 2001; Meltzer et
414 al., 2020). The majority of these articles examined PCBs (Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al.,
415 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Goncharov et al., 2008; Hwang et al., 2001). A study conducted in
416 the Mohawk community of Akwesasne evidenced the presence of PCBs in breast milk (Hwang
417 et al., 2001) and serum (Fitzgerald et al., 2004) in a sample of 97 Akwesasne Mohawk women.
418 Among a sample of 138 Akwesasne Mohawk girls, low levels of serum lead (mean 0.49 ug/dL)
419 were associated with significantly lower probability of having reached menarche, and serum
420 PCBs (mean 0.12 ppb) were associated with a significantly higher probability of attaining

421 menarche (Denham et al., 2005). Serum PCBs and pesticides were associated with heart disease
422 in a sample of 335 Akwesasne Mohawk men (Goncharov et al., 2008). A large cohort study
423 (1304 participants) examined chronic diseases in Navajo Nation members, finding self-reported
424 kidney disease, diabetes, and hypertension to be highly prevalent in the population (43% of the
425 sample had at least one of the three diseases, and 20% had at least two), and to be associated
426 with self-reported exposure to Uranium mine wastes (with a 28% higher risk of hypertension for
427 those with an active exposure to mine wastes) (Hund et al., 2015).

428 Furthermore, four peer-reviewed articles explored the impacts of contaminated sites on
429 Indigenous peoples using qualitative interviews (Table S7) (Cassady, 2007; Hoover, 2013; Smith
430 et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). In the case of the Aamjiwnaang First Nation (Ontario),
431 semi-structured interviews of 18 community members were conducted, with interviewees
432 reporting fear related to contamination, unknown long-term health effects, and a changing
433 relationship to the earth resulting from a large contaminated site nearby (“Chemical Valley”)
434 (Smith et al., 2010). According to participants, these effects were not addressed by federal
435 cleanup strategies, and continued to impact the community once the site was remediated (Smith
436 et al., 2010). Loss of culture, language, and social connection was reported as an implication of
437 Superfund sites affecting fishing activities in semi-structured interviews with 65 Akwesasne
438 Mohawk community members (Hoover, 2013). Navajo Nation members in 12 at-home focus
439 group interviews described that the Gold King Mine Spill (San Juan River, Northwestern US)
440 was a continuation of colonial violence on Indigenous peoples which removed the community’s
441 agency and voice and forced their relocation (Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). An ethnographic article
442 that involved informal interviews with Inupiak Inuit members (Alaska) described that the

443 discovery of a contaminated site created suspicions about health effects such as cancer amongst
444 the community (Cassady, 2007).

445 News articles in grey literature provided information on some Indigenous community
446 members' perceptions of the health impacts of contaminated sites. For example, one article
447 described a shift away from cultural practices due to a large contaminated site ("Chemical
448 Valley") close to the Aamjiwnaang First Nation (Bienkowski, 2012), and another described the
449 perceived threat of Superfund Sites to the overall health (including both cancer and non-cancer
450 endpoints) of Native American people across the US (Hansen, 2018). A review article in the grey
451 literature also described concerns of Native American communities on the potential effects of
452 abandoned mine sites in the Western United States on child development (Lewis et al., 2015).

453 ***3.5 Contaminated Sites Management***

454 According to government documents in the grey literature, both US and Canadian
455 contaminated site management programs follow a standard process for assessing, planning for,
456 and remediating contaminated sites (Table S8). Contaminated sites on Indigenous lands are
457 managed similarly to sites on non-Indigenous lands in North America, including the application
458 of standardized risk assessment and management frameworks that fall under federal programs
459 such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
460 (CERCLA) in the US and Contaminated Sites Management Program (CSMP) in Canada
461 (Contaminated Sites Management Working Group, 2000; EPA, 2021c). These programs provide
462 guidelines for site classification and prioritization and outline a step-wise process for addressing
463 federal contaminated sites.

464 Under these programs, 37.5% of Superfund sites are classified as “active” while the
465 remainder have been “archived” in the federal data. Similarly, 35.3% of Canadian sites are
466 categorized as “active” while 23.4% are “suspected” and the remainder are “closed”. FCSI data
467 indicated the current stage of contaminated site management (Figure 4), with the largest
468 proportion of active sites (n=1331) in the “detailed testing” stage. Superfund data reported on
469 whether the site required “no further action/not eligible” (688 records), “referred to a cleanup
470 program” (277 sites), or “assessment needed or ongoing” (62 sites). While it was not possible to
471 categorize all 49 peer-reviewed articles by stages of contaminated site processes, these were
472 tagged by the author based on the topic of focus, which was most commonly risk assessment (11
473 articles), environmental assessment (9 articles), risk management (9 articles), and socio-cultural
474 impacts (8 articles), with fewer articles focused on post-remediation (3 articles) and long-term
475 assessment/legacy impacts (1 article).

476 ***3.6 Health Risk and Exposure Assessment***

477 In an effort to address the unique consumption patterns of subsistence populations, federal
478 governments have published guidelines for more comprehensively assessing exposures to
479 country foods, including in the context of frameworks such as the Human Health Risk
480 Assessment (HHRA) and through the development of exposure scenarios (Harper, 2007; Health
481 Canada, 2018). In peer-reviewed literature, the benefits and challenges of assessments for
482 contaminated sites that include exposure scenarios for Indigenous communities were outlined in
483 two primary and four secondary articles (Tables S9 and S10). Potential benefits were described
484 in two case studies on the testing and validation of exposure scenarios related to hazardous waste
485 contamination on the Umatilla Indian reservation (Oregon), and of uranium contamination on the
486 Spokane reservation (Washington). These exposure scenarios were found to improve the holistic

487 nature of risk assessments, which included the consideration of pre-site land use and socio-
488 political factors associated with exposure, compared to generic risk assessments that do not
489 measure community-specific exposure (Harper et al., 2012; Harper et al., 2002). Challenges to
490 risk assessment were described in two peer-reviewed articles on the development of exposure
491 scenarios for consumption patterns of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
492 Reservation (Oregon) located near a Superfund (Department of Energy's Hanford Site) (Harris &
493 Harper, 1997), and the validation of a risk assessment ingestion value by estimating soil
494 ingestion by the Xeni Gwet'in First Nation (British Columbia) through the contaminated Chilko
495 Watershed (Doyle et al., 2012). Both studies found inconsistencies between risks posed to
496 Indigenous peoples and risks assessed in standard HHRAs, including soil ingestion values and
497 exposures due to lifestyle factors, religious practices, and non-food exposures (Doyle et al.,
498 2012; Harris & Harper, 1997). In qualitative research, interviews with 35 members of the
499 Colombia river basin tribe (Umatilla, Oregon) highlighted that risk assessments in Indigenous
500 communities measure risk on the same scales as non-Indigenous communities, despite evidence
501 that contaminated sites create unique risks for Indigenous people that are not possible to quantify
502 using traditional methods (Harris & Harper, 1997). Furthermore, two discussion articles critiqued
503 standardized risk assessments due to a lack of consideration of cumulative effects of
504 contaminants, incompatibility with tribal life ways (Holifield, 2012), the privileging of property
505 owners and lack of benefit to Indigenous peoples, and the use of non-Indigenous definitions of
506 health to define risks (Arquette et al., 2002). An article focused in the Akwesasne Mohawk
507 community cited a lack of Indigenous involvement and resources allocated to the community as
508 a major barrier to effective risk assessment (Arquette et al., 2002).

509 Grey literature evidenced risk assessments that were conducted for specific sites and
510 communities, including for example an HHRA of legacy arsenic contamination as a response to
511 concerns surrounding health risks from the Ndilo and Dettah (Dene) communities (Yellowknife,
512 Northwest Territories).(Government of Northwest Territories) According to government
513 documents, under CERCLA and CSMP, health risk assessment is used to measure and quantify
514 physical health risks and is part of the standardized process for contaminated site management.
515 Notably, according to Canadian guidelines, conducting an HHRA typically requires the “hire of
516 a qualified consultant with the necessary technical and scientific expertise to perform the work”
517 (Contaminated Sites Management Working Group, 2000). In Canada, the National Classification
518 System for Contaminated Sites is used to evaluate and classify sites based on the level of human
519 and environmental risk posed by the site (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment,
520 2008). In Canadian FCSI Data, sites are ranked as either “High priority” (1016 site records),
521 “Medium priority” (1198 site records), “Low priority” (491 site records), or “No priority for
522 action” (429 site records) based on this system (Government of Canada, 2021). A site classified
523 as “High priority” has imminent risks or documented adverse outcomes to both human and
524 environmental health (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 2008). The US EPA
525 uses a similar tool, the Hazard Ranking System, to assign a quantitative value to the human and
526 environmental risks posed by a site, which determines whether a Superfund site will be
527 categorized under a “National Priorities List” (EPA, 2017). The Superfund dataset categorized
528 site records as “not NPL” (1022 records), “deleted NPL” (27 records), “removed from NPL”
529 (one record), “proposed NPL” (nine records), “part of an NPL site” (46 records), or “final NPL”
530 (131), indicating that 186 sites are of high priority (i.e., classified as “NPL”) (EPA, 2021d). Thus,
531 across Canadian and US federal datasets, there are 1202 sites that are classified as “high priority”

532 due to human and environmental health risks (Chan, Fediuk, et al., 2021; Samuel-Nakamura et
533 al., 2017).

534 ***3.7 Risk Management***

535 The management of risks related to contaminated sites in Canada and the US involves
536 removing or reducing contaminants and limiting the use of contaminated media by affected
537 communities. Risk management strategies are unique to each site, and involve input from
538 regulators, site owners, policies, and local communities (Contaminated Sites Management
539 Working Group, 2000; EPA, 2022d). Five peer-reviewed research articles tested various risk
540 management strategies related to contaminated sites and Indigenous communities (Table S11). A
541 study on risk mapping of contaminants on the lands of the Navajo Nation (Churchrock Chapter,
542 New Mexico) and a survey of 151 community members found that the maps were helpful in
543 avoiding the risk of consumption of contaminated food and water arising from the Churchrock
544 Uranium Mine Site (deLemos et al., 2009). Another study cited the effectiveness of safety
545 protocols (education on the proper handling of hazardous wastes) for nine Fort Albany Cree First
546 Nation workers (Ontario) employed to clean-up the Mid-Canada Radar Contaminated site,
547 finding no significant burden of blood lead and PCBs before and after the clean-up (Tsuji et al.,
548 2005). Three studies explored the influence of a lay-health advisor intervention on blood lead
549 concentrations in children living in proximity to the Tar Creek Superfund Site, comparing results
550 between members of the Eight Tribes and Nations of Northeastern Oklahoma and Non-
551 Indigenous, white participants that lived near the site. Influences on lead exposure prevention
552 behaviors were first assessed through qualitative interviews with 380 children's caregivers
553 (Bland et al., 2005). Then, caregiver-child pairs (n=331 pairs, 43.5% Native American)
554 participated in a cross-sectional study, measuring children's blood lead, and conducting

555 structured caregiver interviews before and after a 2-year intervention in which caregivers were
556 trained by local community health advisors on how to prevent children from blood lead
557 poisoning (Bland et al., 2005; Kegler & Malcoe, 2004). The study found a reduction in blood
558 lead before and after the intervention. Of Native American children, blood lead levels decreased
559 significantly from time 1 (6.00 ug/dL) to time 2 (4.97 ug/dL), with no significant difference from
560 the white control group. Another study was conducted at a third time point (4 years later),
561 finding improved lead preventative behaviors (handwashing) in Indigenous participants (167
562 Indigenous and 213 white participants) (Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010). Another review article
563 described a precautionary principle for risk management at the Zortman-Landusky Mine
564 Superfund Site on the Fort Belknap Reservation (Montana), home to the Assiniboine and Gros
565 Ventre Tribes, in which caution was exercised in site management when risk is unknown (Emel
566 & Krueger, 2003).

567 Five peer-reviewed articles described the use of consumption advisories to manage risks
568 related to country foods. One article focused on the territories of the Ahahminquus community of
569 the Mowachaht Tribe and the Silammon people (British Colombia) and analyzed the use of
570 Canadian health advisories and fishery closures related to contaminated sites near the Gold river
571 and Powell river fisheries. The study found that the risks are comparable when switching from
572 country foods to market foods, and that such advisories may be substituting one risk for another
573 (Wiseman & Gobas, 2002). The relationship between country foods and market foods was also
574 examined in two studies focused on the Inupiaq Inuit and the Akwesasne Mohawk Nation
575 (Cassady, 2007; Hoover, 2013). Advisories for consuming traditional fish resulted in inadequate
576 nutrition and cultural loss for the Akwesasne Mohawk Community (Hoover, 2013). An
577 ethnographic field study focused on the Project Chariot abandoned waste site (Alaska) described

578 that Inupiaq Inuit considered traditional foods to be curative and preventive of health issues,
579 despite the issuance of advisories, and also described local knowledge (e.g., visually checking
580 wild game for tumors) that could be used to determine if food was contaminated (Cassady,
581 2007). Two articles in grey literature discussed the contamination of subsistence food resources
582 in Indigenous communities in general (Bienkowski, 2012; EPA, 2015), with one article noting
583 that studies of contaminants most often result in avoidance advisories (Bienkowski, 2012). One
584 government document described successful implementations of consumption advisories and
585 community education related to contaminated foods on the lands of several Indigenous
586 communities after receiving federal grants from the US EPA Superfund, including the
587 Akwesasne Mohawk Nation, Anishinaabe Nation (Great lakes region of Canada and the US),
588 and Yurok tribe (California) (EPA, 2015).

589 ***3.8 Long-Term Management***

590 In peer-reviewed literature, information in five review articles described that
591 communities continue to face long-term site-related challenges after a site is remediated and
592 closed by the federal government (Moore-Nall, 2015; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016; John
593 Sandlos & Arn Keeling, 2016; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). For example, one
594 article described that a contaminated site resulted in alienation of Navajo Nation members
595 (Arizona) from their traditional territory (John Sandlos & Arn Keeling, 2016). Another article
596 described that there was a lack of acknowledgement of the legacy impacts of contaminated sites
597 by federal governments, despite advocacy efforts by the Dettah and Ndilo communities
598 (Yellowknife) on the remediation of the Giant Mine in Canada (J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016).
599 Long-term health impacts were also described in the context of the Los Alamos National
600 Laboratory Superfund Site and the Tribes of the Southwestern US (Moore-Nall, 2015). The Gold

601 King Mine spill was described in one review article as contributing to a history of relocation and
602 lack of agency and voice for the Navajo (Dine) Nation, with lasting impacts on the community
603 (Teufel-Shone et al., 2021).

604 Three semi-quantitative studies examined post-remediation land uses of contaminated
605 sites (Table S12) (Burger, 2004a, 2004b; LeClerc & Keeling, 2015). Two of these studies
606 utilized structured interviews and found that future land use preferences differed by ethnicity,
607 with participants that were members of the Shoshone Bannock tribe (Idaho) rating camping,
608 fishing, hunting, and returning the land to Native people higher than white participants did.
609 Native American participants were generally underrepresented, however, in both studies (324 out
610 of 1370 participants (23.6%) and 11 out of 254 participants (3.5%)) (Burger, 2004a, 2004b).
611 Another study involving semi-structured interviews of 18 members of the Dene and Metis
612 communities of Fort Resolution (Northwest Territories) found that since the establishment and
613 closing of the Abandoned Pine Point Mine site, the community's land use patterns had changed
614 from a land-based economy to a mixed economy reliant on wage labor, concluding that post-
615 remediation land use would likely be different than land uses before the site's establishment
616 (LeClerc & Keeling, 2015).

617 In conference materials in grey literature, one document recommended designing
618 remediation processes at Superfund sites that can more effectively account for tribal needs to
619 permanently restore the land for tribal uses (Michelsen, 2010). Another article described that due
620 to the political and financial dynamics associated with site remediation on reserve land in
621 Canada, the federal government will remediate a site at the lowest possible cost, which often
622 does not meet the standard that Indigenous communities desire for post-remediation land use and
623 development (Gailus, 2013). In federal datasets, both Superfund and FCSI categorized most of

624 the sites under “no further action required”, with 2408 such sites in Canada and 688 sites in the
625 US (EPA, 2021d; Government of Canada, 2021).

626 ***3.9 Indigenous Inclusion, Collaboration, and Leadership***

627 *3.9.1 Collaborative research*

628 Of the included peer-reviewed literature, 20 articles described a collaboration between
629 academic researchers and Indigenous people or communities (Arquette et al., 2002; Blake et al.,
630 2015; Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Flett et al., 2021;
631 Goncharov et al., 2008; Harper et al., 2012; Hoover, 2013, 2016; Kegler & Malcoe, 2004;
632 Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010; Michelle C. Kegler et al., 2010; Meltzer et al., 2020; Middleton
633 et al., 2019; Rock et al., 2019; Sarkar et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021).
634 Several articles described collaborative efforts between academic institutions and Indigenous
635 communities, as well as community-led research projects (deLemos et al., 2009; Goncharov et
636 al., 2008; Harper et al., 2012; Hoover, 2013, 2016; Kegler & Malcoe, 2004; Michelle C Kegler et
637 al., 2010; Michelle C. Kegler et al., 2010; Rock et al., 2019). Some of these studies described
638 such collaborations as mutually beneficial. For example, interviews with 64 Akwesasne Mohawk
639 members on their collaboration with SUNY Albany, a public University in New York State,
640 revealed that there were benefits to members such as education, job skills, grant money and
641 information; and to researchers such as better results, access to the community and help of
642 Mohawk workers in the field (Hoover, 2016). One article analyzed contaminated site response
643 networks consisting of the Eight tribes of Northeastern Oklahoma and non-Indigenous
644 organizations, concluding that there was an increase in collaboration over time (Michelle C.
645 Kegler et al., 2010). Peer-reviewed literature supports that federal grants help to facilitate multi-
646 study projects in communities, as was the case with a collaborative project between the Eight

647 tribes of Northeastern Oklahoma and the University of Oklahoma entitled ‘Tribal Efforts Against
648 Lead’ (Kegler & Malcoe, 2004; Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010; Michelle C. Kegler et al., 2010).
649 Challenges to collaboration were also described in peer-reviewed literature. For example,
650 members of the Akwesasne Mohawk community described difficulties with time constraints due
651 to the finite nature of academic funding, a lack of trust between researchers and community
652 members, and inadequate science communication (Hoover, 2016). Two review articles described
653 an ongoing need for greater funding and resources allocated to collaborative Indigenous-lead
654 research on contaminated sites in the United States (Lewis et al., 2017; Moore-Nall, 2015).

655 Grey literature and government websites indicated that federal funding agencies in both
656 the US and Canada provide support to Indigenous communities to address contaminated sites
657 (EPA, 2022c; 2021), which has helped to build capacity and resilience (Environment and
658 Climate Change Canada, 2019; Hoover, 2016; United States Government Accountability Office,
659 2020). Examples of such programs include the First Nations Environmental Contaminants
660 Program (FNECP) and the Northern Contaminants Program (NCP) in Canada, and funds
661 allocated under CERCLA in the US, including the Superfund State and Indian Tribe Core
662 Program Cooperative Agreements (EPA, 2022b). Government reports in grey literature describe
663 that tribes in the US have used EPA grants to support capacity building in environmental
664 programs, and that First Nations in Canada have benefitted from the FNECP (Environment and
665 Climate Change Canada, 2019; Hoover, 2016; United States Government Accountability Office,
666 2020). Many federal granting agencies require that Indigenous communities partner with
667 academic institutions (Ferguson, 2021; Indigenous Services Canada, 2021; National Institute of
668 Environmental Health Sciences, 2022), which is aligned with the aforementioned peer-reviewed
669 literature from academics involving collaborative efforts with Indigenous communities.

670 Furthermore, grey literature from governmental funding agencies and review papers described
671 that the requirement to partner with an established scientist trained in an academic institution
672 (Ferguson, 2021; Indigenous Services Canada, 2021; National Institute of Environmental Health
673 Sciences, 2022) limits the ability of many communities to obtain funding independently, and
674 often results in a large amount of scientific and monetary resources focused on a single
675 community (Ferguson, 2021; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Hoover, 2013, 2016;
676 Kegler & Malcoe, 2004; Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010), while other sites have minimal support.

677 *3.9.2 Collaborative Site Management*

678 Peer-reviewed literature described the methods of evaluation collaborations between
679 Indigenous communities and non-Indigenous institutions, such as in the example of the Fort
680 Albany Cree First Nation, wherein a Canadian governmental framework was used to evaluate
681 whether a true partnership existed between the Canadian government and First Nation (Sistili et
682 al., 2006). Another review article described a diminished societal, governmental, academic, and
683 political response to the Sequoyah Corporation fuels release and the Church Rock spill, nuclear
684 releases affecting the Cherokee (Oklahoma) and Navajo (New Mexico) nations, compared to
685 contaminating events of a similar scale affecting white communities (Brugge et al., 2007).

686 Government documents are available in grey literature on inclusion and collaboration
687 with Indigenous communities on contaminated site processes. Canada has a federal guidance
688 document indicating areas in which inclusion of Indigenous communities may occur,
689 recommending that Indigenous people assist with the contaminated site process, and providing
690 potential opportunities for Indigenous involvement (for example, community members
691 performing media sampling or hiring Indigenous companies to carry out remediation work)
692 (Health Canada, 2010). Indigenous inclusion on Superfund site management follows a

693 consultation process outlined by the US EPA, which defines the establishment, appropriateness
694 and extent of consultation and collaboration with federally recognized tribes.(EPA, 2011a) After
695 determining that there was insufficient consultation with tribes at NPL Superfund sites (18 NPL
696 sites with documented consultation, 7 of which had incomplete data), the US Government
697 Accountability Office recommended documented consultation with tribes at 4 of the 9 steps in
698 contaminated site processes, which excludes initial assessment, remedial design, construction
699 completion and post-construction completion (i.e., maintenance and long term actions) and post-
700 remediation development (US Government Accountability Office, 2019).

701 Non-governmental grey literature highlighted a lack of Indigenous inclusion in
702 contaminated sites assessment and management processes voiced by Indigenous peoples. For
703 example, a news article described that members of the Akwesasne Mohawk Tribe (New York)
704 were dissatisfied with their opportunities to provide input into remediation decisions on the US
705 EPA Alcoa Grasse River Superfund site (Indian Country Today, 2013). Chief Glenn Nolan of the
706 Missanabie Cree First Nation (Ontario) outlined the lack of Indigenous involvement in the
707 assessment, management, and communication of risks associated with abandoned mine sites
708 (Nolan, 2009). The article proposed actions to improve consultation with Indigenous people,
709 including community involvement beginning from initial assessment, accessible communication
710 of results, and the development of ongoing collaborative monitoring strategies (Nolan, 2009).

711 While not a dominant theme in literature or government guidance documents, successful
712 instances of Indigenous leadership in contaminated site management are evidenced in grey
713 literature sources (Assembly of First Nations, 2001; EPA, 1996; Tribal Superfund Working
714 Group, 2022). The Tribal Superfund Working Group, for example, has published several tribe-
715 led efforts to fight community contamination, such as in the case of the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe

716 (California) remediation project on the Topock site (Tribal Superfund Working Group, 2022).
717 First Nations in Canada have also demonstrated leadership in reclaiming and remediating land
718 contaminated by abandoned mines, for example, by leading discussions among the Assembly of
719 First Nations (Canada-wide) on remediation options (Assembly of First Nations, 2001).

720 *3.9.3 Traditional Knowledge and Contaminated Sites*

721 In peer-reviewed literature, one discussion article described the negative impacts of
722 historical subsumption of Traditional Knowledge within technical contaminated site processes in
723 the remediation of the Giant Mine, Northwest Territories, which was seen by the local Dene First
724 Nation, Dettah and Ndilo (Navajo) communities as an inadequate and inappropriate inclusion of
725 Traditional Knowledge (J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016). The US EPA recently published a
726 document outlining the ‘integration’ of Traditional Knowledge into environmental science,
727 policy, and decision-making processes, in response to tribal leaders’ requests to enhance its use
728 (Woolford, 2017). In grey literature, Health Canada lists Traditional Knowledge as a component
729 of exposure assessment within the HHRA (Health Canada, 2018), and in a recent update of their
730 Northern Contaminated Sites Management Plan (NCSMP), pledged to increase inclusion of
731 Traditional Knowledge studies into project planning and implementation, although the
732 operational methods of this are not published (Crown-Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada,
733 2021).

734 **4. DISCUSSION**

735 This scoping review identified, mapped, and analyzed the existing information on
736 contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples in Canada and the US, and sought to address the three
737 main objectives outlined in the introduction. The research was motivated by observations that

738 contaminated sites disproportionately affect Indigenous communities (Fernández-Llamazares et
739 al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2017), and that there is limited research on the subject matter, without
740 which a deeper understanding cannot be realized to permit evidence-based solutions. Findings
741 from 49 scholarly articles, 20 grey literature pieces, and US and Canadian federal contaminated
742 site databases revealed a disparate yet also vast and multi-disciplinary body of information on
743 contaminated sites affecting Indigenous peoples and their health, land, and food systems. The
744 number of articles identified from the systematic literature search covers a relatively small
745 proportion of the total number of federal contaminated sites identified from federal inventories
746 that affect Indigenous peoples. Of the peer-reviewed literature retrieved, a total of 35 sites were
747 described, while there were 8114 sites inventoried by federal governments. Information on 815
748 Indigenous communities was identified through this review, while there exist in total 574 Tribal
749 Entities in the US (National Conference of State Legislators, 2020) and in Canada there are 630
750 First Nations and 53 Inuit communities (Crown-Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2022),
751 as well as eight Metis Settlements (although the majority of Metis in Canada do not live on
752 official settlements). Thus, the information available identifies a substantial amount
753 (approximately 64%) of Indigenous communities that are potentially impacted by federal
754 contaminated sites, though this is likely an underestimation.

755 We note through our mapping exercise that site locations in the US and Canada are
756 widespread, however the majority are south of the 60th parallel in Canada, and that data from the
757 three evidence streams may largely underrepresent the geographic scope of contaminated sites
758 that affect Indigenous peoples. A discussion specific to federal contaminated sites is applicable
759 to Indigenous communities that live on federally managed land. Notably, due to regulatory and
760 legal provisions under the Indian Act, Canadian FCSI data primarily concerns First Nations

761 reserves, which are considered federal lands and are mostly inhabited by First Nations
762 communities with the majority being south of the 60th parallel. Approximately 328,048 (40 %) of
763 First Nations members in Canada live on reserve land according to the 2016 census (Indigenous
764 Services Canada, 2020). Accordingly, FCSI data does not represent the total amount of
765 contaminated sites affecting Indigenous communities in the country, and furthermore, Inuit and
766 Metis communities are likely most underrepresented, as the majority do not live on reserve land
767 (Gailus, 2013). Contaminated sites affecting Indigenous communities off-reserve are usually
768 managed provincially or privately and thus are not captured by federal databases (Government of
769 Canada, 1985). One grey literature article estimated that 1200 Indigenous communities in
770 Canada have either an active mine, an abandoned mine site, or a mine exploration project on
771 their territory, which is more than double the number of communities listed in the FCSI,
772 demonstrating that there are many sites of potential or actual concern to Indigenous communities
773 that are not tracked by the federal government (Nolan, 2009). Similarly, the US EPA does not
774 have explicit criteria for determining how a Superfund Site is deemed to be of ‘Native American
775 Interest’, and many sites are managed by non-federal governing bodies (termed ‘cleanups’) or
776 private industries (EPA, 2021b; US Government Accountability Office, 2019), which are not
777 included in Superfund data. Thus, the information presented in this review is limited to federally
778 managed and inventoried contaminated sites affecting Indigenous peoples, but there are many
779 sites managed under other jurisdictions not accounted for by federal governments or this review.

780 Contaminated sites are a pervasive issue for Indigenous communities in Canada and the
781 US, with peer-reviewed literature and federal data indicating that the largest proportion of these
782 sites arise from mining activity and industrial development on or adjacent to lands inhabited by
783 Indigenous peoples. It is notable that there are many sites for which the source of contamination

784 is unknown or not documented, for example, 248 (20%) of Superfund site records do not
785 inventory the source of contamination, and FCSI does not inventory contaminant sources. This
786 review also found that there is minimal primary scientific research on the assessment of
787 contamination from these sites (i.e., 45 unique contaminants measured in scientific studies in the
788 literature compared to 440 unique contaminants measured and recorded in federal datasets), with
789 most studies examining a single contaminant or a handful of contaminants.

790 Indigenous peoples are exposed to contaminants from contaminated sites through a
791 variety of pathways, which includes inhalation, ingestion of drinking water and contaminated
792 foods, and contact with contaminated soil and sediments. Literature on traditional food systems
793 across Canada and the US evidences a diversity of exposure pathways unique to Indigenous
794 communities, including for example through subsistence diets that include wild foods and
795 medicinal plants (Chan, Fediuk, et al., 2021; Fernández-Llamazares et al., 2020; Jonasson et al.,
796 2019). Notably, while peer-reviewed literature examined in this review documents the presence
797 of a variety of contaminants in plant foods, wildlife, wild game, and human biomarkers (Brown
798 et al., 2014; Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004; Flett et al., 2021;
799 Garvin, 2018; Goncharov et al., 2008; Kegler & Malcoe, 2004; Michelle C Kegler et al., 2010;
800 Koch et al., 2013; Rock et al., 2019; Samuel-Nakamura et al., 2017; Sarkar et al., 2019; Tsuji et
801 al., 2005), information on these potential exposure sources is not captured in federal databases.
802 As Indigenous peoples have unique consumption and land use patterns compared to the general
803 population, exposures that are estimated based on generic federal frameworks employed in
804 environmental assessments may be limited (Arquette et al., 2002; Cassady, 2007; Doyle et al.,
805 2012; Harris & Harper, 1997; Holifield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2017). In a search of the US EPA
806 Exposure Factors Handbook with the keyword “Native American”, six tables are available

807 pertaining to exposure to contaminants through the consumption of fish, but there is no
808 information pertaining to any other exposure pathway (EPA, 2022a). This is one example of the
809 paucity of data and classification tools for environmental assessments involving Indigenous
810 peoples.

811 Our review found that the current body of literature on the potential health impacts of
812 contaminated sites on Indigenous peoples is relatively small and lacks diversity. We identified
813 seven peer-reviewed articles with quantitative data on health outcomes. Four of these articles
814 were focused on the Mohawk community of Akwesasne (Table S6), and they documented a
815 range of chronic and developmental outcomes associated with exposure to chemical stressors
816 (primarily lead and PCBs), including early menarche, heart disease, kidney disease, diabetes, and
817 hypertension. In four qualitative peer-reviewed studies, culture, spirituality, language, and
818 community were found to be adversely influenced by contaminated site exposure (Cassady,
819 2007; Hoover, 2013; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021), and these are social and
820 environmental determinants of Indigenous Peoples' health (Reading & Wien, 2009). There was
821 evidence that many Indigenous communities face long-term site-related challenges including a
822 changing relationship to the earth, fear related to contamination, and cultural loss (Moore-Nall,
823 2015; John Sandlos & Arn Keeling, 2016; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). While
824 these findings are not easily generalizable (i.e., they report on findings from 6 of 815
825 communities identified by federal databases who are potentially exposed to contaminated sites),
826 they alert us to the possibility that health risks are elevated in such impacted communities and
827 call for the need to scale-up research in this area.

828 According to federal data, the progression through the ten-step process for addressing a
829 contaminated site can take decades (EPA, 2021a; Government of Canada, 2021). In the Canadian

830 commissioner’s report on federal contaminated sites, it was identified that there are more sites in
831 the inventory than funds available for their management, and as a result only the highest priority
832 sites are addressed (Ellison, 2012; Government of Canada, 2012). Furthermore, existing
833 regulations make it difficult for communities to receive federal funding for site remediation
834 unless they can prove that there is a high risk to human health and the environment, the
835 assessment of which involves lengthy and expensive technical processes that are often
836 outsourced to experts in academic and consulting, for example, that conduct HHRA (Gailus,
837 2013). This results in a catch-22 in which the current regulatory and federal funding structure
838 requires that Indigenous communities rely on outsourcing work, which thus limits internal
839 capacity building.

840 This review found that contaminated sites are often addressed by federal governments,
841 industry, and the scientific community as an isolated, technical problem, (Contaminated Sites
842 Management Working Group, 2000; EPA, 2011b; 2019) while they are considered by many
843 Indigenous peoples as part of a broader legacy of environmental injustice (Cassady, 2007;
844 Holifield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2017; Moore-Nall, 2015; John Sandlos & Arn Keeling, 2016;
845 Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). Federal risk assessment systems are useful to
846 organize and prioritize site management, however according to our review these assessments are
847 not necessarily aligned with the needs of the communities affected by them (Contaminated Sites
848 Management Working Group, 2000). Furthermore, there is evidence in peer-reviewed literature
849 to suggest that the use of generic “one-size-fits-all” risk assessment models (such as the HHRA
850 in Canada and the Hazard Ranking System in the US) for contaminated sites lack benefit to
851 Indigenous people (Arquette et al., 2002; Cassady, 2007; Doyle et al., 2012; Harris & Harper,
852 1997; Holifield, 2012; Lewis et al., 2017). Although sites are ‘closed’ when they are deemed to

853 be at a safe risk level by federal governments, this review found evidence that Indigenous
854 peoples face long-term and cumulative challenges that are not supported by governmental
855 resources and funding (Moore-Nall, 2015; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016; John Sandlos & Arn
856 Keeling, 2016; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). This current western scientific
857 approach contradicts Indigenous epistemologies such as the Seven Generations Principle, a
858 Haudenosaunee philosophy followed by many Indigenous communities in Canada and the US, in
859 which decision-making considers the well-being of people and environments seven generations
860 into the future (Joseph, 2020). These factors point to the need for a holistic approach from both
861 academics and governments which includes moving beyond physical and finite impacts to
862 understanding contaminated sites as complex, multi-faceted issues with long term and
863 cumulative effects (Brugge et al., 2007; Holifield, 2012; Nolan, 2009; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling,
864 2016; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021). Recent evidence affirms the positive benefit
865 of environmental risk assessments that privilege Indigenous epistemologies and leadership, a
866 strategy which may help to respond to the lack of prioritization of Indigenous conceptualizations
867 of risk in contaminated site assessment (Buell et al., 2020). Taken together, these factors point to
868 a need for efficient, low-cost, Indigenous-led and community-based assessment methods that can
869 rapidly predict health and environmental risks, which would help to build community capacity
870 and improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of current assessment and prioritization
871 processes. There is an increasing focus on the development of New Approach Methodologies
872 (NAMs) for environmental risk assessment by industry, government, and academics
873 (Government of Canada, 2017; Krewski et al., 2010), and these findings suggest that Indigenous
874 perspectives should be considered and prioritized as a part of current NAMs development.

875 The majority of peer-reviewed research on risk management included in this review was
876 focused on avoiding contaminant exposure (for example, through the use of fish consumption
877 advisories), which is consistent with a global pollution management trend in which risk reduction
878 through public and community level intervention is replaced with risk avoidance that emphasizes
879 individual level action (Fernández-Llamazares et al., 2020). It is possible that this ‘downstream’
880 approach to management of contaminated sites perpetuates the vulnerability narrative that is
881 often associated with Indigenous communities by Western knowledge systems, having the
882 potential to hinder communities from gaining greater autonomy (Haalboom & Natcher, 2012).
883 However, we note that there are cases where contaminants pose high risks to health and risk
884 avoidance strategies are necessary in the short-term, and in these situations, community
885 involvement may help to improve site management. A recent review indicated that through the
886 involvement of First Nations communities in the process, risk management approaches such as
887 consumption advisories can provide greater benefit to First Nations (McAuley & Knopper,
888 2011). This is one strategy that would increase the effectiveness of federal contaminated site risk
889 management, and the operationalization of this involvement is an area for further research. We
890 also note that a large proportion of peer-reviewed articles (n=20) identified in this review were
891 problem-based (Blake et al., 2015; Brown et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2013; Cassady, 2007;
892 deLemos et al., 2009; Denham et al., 2005; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Fitzgerald et al., 2004;
893 Goncharov et al., 2008; Hoover, 2013; Hund et al., 2015; Hwang et al., 2001; Kerfoot et al.,
894 2020; Koch et al., 2013; Meltzer et al., 2020; Middleton et al., 2019; Rock et al., 2019; Samuel-
895 Nakamura et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021) as opposed to solution-
896 focused. Notably, we did not find any peer-reviewed articles focused on specific remediation
897 strategies nor restoring land back to pre-contamination conditions.

898 Most research we found on contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples involved a
899 collaboration between western academics and Indigenous communities (Excel Table S1). Several
900 such partnerships, such as in the case of the Mohawk community of Akwesasne and SUNY
901 Albany, have shown to provide mutual benefit (Hoover, 2016). While our review notes that
902 industry, government, and the scientific community acknowledge the importance of Indigenous
903 inclusion (Arquette et al., 2002; Ellison, 2012; Gover, 2007; Holifield, 2012; Michelsen, 2010;
904 Nolan, 2009; Sistili et al., 2006), we found minimal evidence of Indigenous leadership in the
905 management of contaminated sites. Recent literature from Indigenous scholars on natural
906 resource management describes that the inclusion of and collaboration with Indigenous peoples
907 in environmental management is often tokenistic (Parsons et al., 2021). The contribution of
908 Indigenous voices in contaminated site management often occurs too late in the federal process,
909 which perpetuates the “downstream” approach to site management discussed earlier. Vague
910 definitions of ‘inclusion’ of Indigenous peoples in contaminated site management were found
911 throughout this review (Health Canada, 2010)(EPA, 2011a), which risks the subsumption of
912 Indigenous peoples into non-Indigenous management bodies.(Fernández-Llamazares et al.,
913 2020) Our review found that non-Indigenous stakeholders are the powerholders in the
914 management of contaminated sites and largely control collaborations with Indigenous
915 communities. For example, US and Canadian federal guidance documents outline how, when,
916 and to what extent Indigenous peoples are to be included or consulted, omitting Indigenous
917 leadership in designing the process or management plan, and thus maintaining federal
918 governments as the power-holders (EPA, 2011a; Health Canada, 2010). In the US, under
919 CERCLA, tribes are excluded from identifying contaminated sites for inclusion on the Superfund
920 National Priorities List (Gover, 2007). Furthermore, based on our findings, the information

921 related to contaminated site management on Indigenous lands was dominated by non-Indigenous
922 voices. Government documents and academic articles included in this review were primarily
923 authored by non-Indigenous persons, while Indigenous voices could be found in news articles
924 and other web-based grey literature. To this effect, platforms that provide a seat at the decision-
925 making table for federal contaminated sites may underrepresent Indigenous peoples. These
926 findings are consistent with a recent review highlighting the inadequate inclusion of Indigenous
927 peoples in environmental management in general (Fernández-Llamazares et al., 2020). Increased
928 efforts and research to strategize Indigenous leadership and prioritize Indigenous epistemologies
929 in relation to contaminated site management may contribute to more holistic and sustainable
930 contaminated site management processes.

931 Results indicated that federal governments, Indigenous communities, and academics
932 acknowledge a complex relationship between Indigenous Traditional Knowledge and western
933 science in the context of contaminated site management, but that the approaches to achieving
934 successful collaboration are a work in progress (EPA, 2011a; Health Canada, 2010; Reid et al.,
935 2021; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016; Woolford, 2017). Recent publications demonstrate that
936 increased efforts are being made to collaborate with Traditional Knowledge holders, including
937 through increased federal funding for collaborations, working groups, and discussions around
938 Traditional Knowledge (EPA, 2011a; J. Sandlos & A. Keeling, 2016; Woolford, 2017).
939 However, federal and academic collaboration initiatives in contaminated site management and
940 research processes may in some cases continue to perpetuate paternalistic environmental
941 practices if left unchecked, as we note that “Using”, “Incorporating”, and “Integrating”
942 Traditional Knowledge into western science and governance has been described in academic
943 literature as a form of assimilation (Reid et al., 2021). New approaches that engage Indigenous

944 and Western ways of knowing harmoniously may continue to propel collaborative engagement
945 between knowledge systems forward. One such approach is Two-Eyed Seeing, a term
946 popularized by Mi'kmaw Elder Dr. Albert Marshall, through which we “learn to see from one
947 eye with the strengths of Indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing, and from the other eye
948 with the strengths of mainstream knowledge, and we use both eyes together” (Reid et al., 2021).
949 Through this approach, Indigenous environmental management goals related to contaminated
950 sites may begin to be realized through collaboration between networks such as Indigenous
951 leadership, Indigenous community members, industry, federal governments, and the scientific
952 community.

953 ***4.1 Strengths and Limitations***

954 This is the first scoping review to examine the issue of federal contaminated sites and
955 Indigenous peoples, and thus addresses a research gap. Given the disparate evidence base, the
956 compilation and synthesis of data and information from the scholarly literature, federal data and
957 grey literature is a major strength of this review, as it enables us to see with greater diversity,
958 clarity, and objectivity the many perspectives involved in the subject matter. The use of both
959 published and unpublished literature promotes the consideration of voices that are not typically
960 heard in academic literature. Furthermore, the study used a rigorous and transparent search
961 strategy, following the PRISMA guideline for scoping reviews (Tricco et al., 2018). To ensure a
962 comprehensive search of the diversity of literature, the search strategy included three databases
963 as well as reference list searches.

964 Despite the strengths of this work, there are some notable limitations. Foremost is the
965 lack of data. Across the three data streams we relied on, there is relatively minimal information
966 (i.e., contaminant sources and types, human exposure pathways, health outcomes) on federal

967 contaminated sites to which Indigenous peoples are potentially exposed. Within federal
968 databases, there are 3138 contaminated sites listed without data on contaminants, and a small
969 fraction of these inventoried sites have been the focus of peer-reviewed scientific studies.
970 Despite evidence from federal databases on the presence of hundreds of contaminants (i.e., 440
971 unique contaminants identified) present at contaminated sites, there is almost no peer-reviewed
972 research on community-specific exposures or health outcomes in the literature. Such a lack of
973 knowledge (i.e., unknown potential health and environmental effects) has been shown to create
974 stress and fear for many Indigenous communities, thereby changing their relationship with the
975 land (Cassady, 2007; Hoover, 2013; Smith et al., 2010; Teufel-Shone et al., 2021).

976 Furthermore, due to the relatively small and disparate body of knowledge on the issue of
977 contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples in North America, it is difficult to draw strong
978 conclusions on the findings (though our findings are generally consistent). While there has been
979 a legacy of challenges related to contaminated sites for Indigenous peoples, the documentation of
980 federal contaminated sites is relatively recent, with the US Superfund program established in
981 1980 (Beins, 2015) and the Canadian Contaminated Sites Working Group established in 1995
982 (Contaminated Sites Management Working Group, 2000). According to our review, peer-
983 reviewed literature available on the topic is dated as early as 1996. In addition, Indigenous
984 peoples across Canada and the US are not a homogenous group, and the findings of this review
985 are not generalizable. However, the nature of a scoping review is that it provides a general
986 overview of current knowledge on the topic and can thus provide some motivation and direction
987 for future research.

988 This study did not identify all relevant grey literature, but rather sought grey literature
989 iteratively as the review developed per the SYMBALS protocol described in the methods (van

990 Haastreht et al., 2021). This strategy helped with the management of the breadth of concepts
991 within the broad topic of contaminated sites and Indigenous communities and enabled the
992 gathering of multiple perspectives on a single concept, as opposed to single perspectives on
993 multiple topics. The included literature was reviewed by one reviewer, and this is a major
994 limitation. However, the relatively small body of literature available allowed for the selected
995 articles to be reviewed with a high degree of detail and rigor by one reviewer. Finally, and as
996 elaborated in the methods section (Positionality Statement), we note that this review was
997 conducted by non-Indigenous academics, who have a limited understanding of the experiences of
998 Indigenous peoples and communities. Every attempt was made to acknowledge this positionality
999 and ensure transparency in the process of writing this article, however, this is a major limitation.

1000 ***4.2 Conclusions***

1001 This scoping review considered academic research, grey literature, and federal data to
1002 better understand the issue of contaminated sites and Indigenous peoples in Canada and the US.
1003 In doing so, we found a vast and diverse but also disparate body of information evidencing the
1004 contamination of the lands of 815 distinct Indigenous tribes and nations and the presence of 440
1005 different contaminants or contaminant groups. Our first objective was to synthesize information
1006 pertaining to the relationship between contaminated sites and Indigenous people, and their land
1007 and food systems. Results demonstrated that there is minimal data on the contaminant sources
1008 and types, human exposure pathways, health outcomes assessment and management of risks
1009 relative to the number of sites on or adjacent to Indigenous lands. Our second objective was to
1010 better understand the strategies, challenges, and successes for contaminated sites assessment and
1011 management on Indigenous land, and our third objective was to explore the evidence on
1012 Indigenous leadership and inclusion in contaminated sites management and research activities.

1013 Overall, our review demonstrated a need for more holistic, upstream, and efficient approaches in
1014 the assessment, management, and research of contaminated sites on Indigenous lands. This
1015 should include a focus on community-specific approaches to site management and a re-
1016 conceptualization of risks related to contaminated sites that privileges Indigenous
1017 epistemologies; greater collaboration between networks such as the scientific community,
1018 Indigenous communities, and federal governments; and a re-evaluation of current frameworks in
1019 which contaminated sites are addressed with Indigenous leadership at the forefront.

1020

1021

1022

1023


1024

1025

1026

1027

1028



1029

1030

1031

Figure 1: Overview of the three data streams used in this scoping review

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042





Figure 2: Adapted PRISMA Chart for Scoping Review for first data stream (systematic literature search) (Tricco et al., 2018)



1071


1072

1073 **Figure 3:** Co-location of Contaminated Sites affecting Indigenous Peoples based on a review of
1074 data from A) Site locations identified via the primary literature review; B) Site locations
1075 identified in grey literature; C) Site locations identified in US EPA Superfund Database; D) Site
1076 locations identified in Canadian Federal Contaminated Site Inventory Data. Each site is indicated
1077 with a dot (note: some site locations are the focus of more than one peer-reviewed article). The
1078 maps were generated using OpenStreet Maps and Tableau Software. The underlying database is
1079 available in the supplementary materials (Excel Tables S1-S4).

1080

1081

1082



1083

1084

1085 **Figure 4:** Bar graph representing the number of sites at each stage of the contaminated sites

1086 management process for Canada and US Data, classified under federal management programs

1087 (CERCLA and CSMP) (Excel Tables S3 and S4)

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099 **Table 1:** Meta-data from three data streams (systematic literature review, grey literature, and
 1100 federal contaminated site databases)
 1101

	<i>Data Peer-reviewed Literature</i>	<i>Grey Literature^a</i>	<i>Canadian Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory (FCSI)</i>	<i>US EPA Superfund Dataset</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
<i>Total # of records</i>	49	20	6878	1236	8180
<i># of active sites^b</i>	n/a	n/a	2428	463	2891
<i># of archived sites^c</i>	n/a	n/a	2843	773	3616
<i># of suspected sites^d</i>	n/a	n/a	1607	n/a	1607
<i>Indigenous communities identified^e</i>	41 (8 Canada, 30 US, 3 US and Canada)	11	576	239	815 ^f
<i># of contaminants identified</i>	45	14	12	440	440 ^f

1102 ^aGrey literature was collected iteratively using SYMBALs methodology as described above (van
 1103 Haastrecht et al., 2021), and therefore is not representative of the entire scope of grey literature
 1104 available on the topic

1105 ^b“Active Sites”: have not completed the process for addressing a contaminated site and continue
 1106 to pose an environmental and/or financial liability to the federal government are classified as
 1107 active (Environment Canada, 2012)

1108 ^c“Closed” or “Archived” sites are defined by federal governments as having shown acceptable
 1109 levels of human and ecological risk by meeting national guidelines, remedial objectives have
 1110 been achieved, and no further action is required (Environment Canada, 2012)

1111 ^dA “suspected site” is one at which further assessment is required to determine if the site is
 1112 ‘contaminated’ (i.e., remedial action may be required) (Government of Canada, 2021)

1113 ^eThe literature review’s definition of Indigenous included First Nations, Inuit, and Metis peoples
 1114 in Canada, and all Native American peoples in the United States, including those residing in non-
 1115 contiguous states; Canadian FCSI data was filtered by sites located on reserve land, and
 1116 inventories the name of the Indigenous community that lives there; Superfund data specifies the
 1117 Native American community which is affected by the site (with the site classified under “Native
 1118 American Interest”)

1119 ^fduplicates removed

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124
 1125 **Table 2:** Number of contaminants reported by media type in peer-reviewed articles and federal
 1126 site records
 1127

Contaminant Media Type	# of contaminants detected per media in peer-reviewed articles ^a (% of total)	# of contaminants reported per media in FCSI data ^b (% of total)	# of contaminants reported per media in Superfund data ^b (% of total)
Soil (incl. surface soil)	4 (6.3%)	3493 (62.8%)	3817 (34.7%)
Groundwater	n/a	1022 (18.4%)	2618 (23.8%)
Sediment	3 (4.8%)	111 (2.0%)	1841 (16.8%)
Surface water	9 (14.3%)	133 (2.4%)	903 (8.2%)
Solid Waste	1 (1.6%)	Not reported	403 (3.7%)
Air	n/a	56 (1.0%)	184 (1.7%)
Other Media	46 (73%)	n/a	n/a
TOTAL #	63	5559	10 988

1128 ^aTo display data that is comparable to federal governmental databases, this column reflects the number of
 1129 contaminants detected per media per peer-reviewed article collecting primary quantitative data. For a
 1130 detailed chart on contaminants sampled including the number of samples taken in each study, see
 1131 supplemental materials (Excel Table S1).

1132 ^bFederal databases (both FCSI and Superfund) provided information on the name of contaminants or
 1133 contaminant groups found at each site, and the media in which they were found. Notably, the databases do
 1134 not indicate the number of samples taken per media or the contaminant level. This number therefore
 1135 provides us with an idea of the prevalence at which each media is sampled, rather than the exact number
 1136 of samples per media

1137 Note: See Excel Tables S1, S3, and S5 for complete datasets (EPA, 2021d; Goncharov et al., 2008)

1138
 1139
 1140

1141 **References**

- 1142 Arquette, M., Cole, M., Cook, K., LaFrance, B., Peters, M., Ransom, J., Sargent, E., Smoke, V., & Stairs,
1143 A. (2002, APR). Holistic risk-based environmental decision making: A native perspective.
1144 *Environmental health perspectives*, 110, 259-264. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.02110s2259>
- 1145
1146 Arsenault, R., Bourassa, C., Diver, S., McGregor, D., & Witham, A. (2019). Including indigenous
1147 knowledge systems in environmental assessments: restructuring the process. *Global*
1148 *Environmental Politics*, 19(3), 120-132.
- 1149
1150 Assembly of First Nations. (2001, May 11-13, 2001). *After the Mine: Healing Our Lands and Nations- a*
1151 *workshop on abandoned mines* The Assembly of First Nations and MiningWatch Canada,
1152 Sudbury, Ontario. https://miningwatch.ca/sites/default/files/afn_mwc_workshop_report.pdf
- 1153
1154 Beins, K. a. L., Stephen. (2015). *Superfund: Polluters pay so children can play*. [https://chej.org/wp-](https://chej.org/wp-content/uploads/Superfund-35th-Anniversary-Report1.pdf)
1155 [content/uploads/Superfund-35th-Anniversary-Report1.pdf](https://chej.org/wp-content/uploads/Superfund-35th-Anniversary-Report1.pdf)
- 1156
1157 Bienkowski, B. (2012). Contaminated Culture: Native People Struggle with Tainted Resources. *Scientific*
1158 *American*.
- 1159
1160 Blake, J. M., Avasarala, S., Artyushkova, K., Ali, A.-M. S., Brearley, A. J., Shuey, C., Robinson, W. P.,
1161 Nez, C., Bill, S., & Lewis, J. (2015). Elevated concentrations of U and co-occurring metals in
1162 abandoned mine wastes in a northeastern Arizona Native American community. *Environmental*
1163 *Science & Technology*, 49(14), 8506-8514.
- 1164
1165 Bland, A. D., Kegler, M. C., Escoffery, C., & Malcoe, L. H. (2005, Jul). Understanding childhood lead
1166 poisoning preventive behaviors: the roles of self-efficacy, subjective norms, and perceived
1167 benefits. *Preventive Medicine*, 41(1), 70-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.10.010>
- 1168
1169 Briffa, J., Sinagra, E., & Blundell, R. (2020, 2020/09/01/). Heavy metal pollution in the environment and
1170 their toxicological effects on humans. *Heliyon*, 6(9), e04691.
1171 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04691>
- 1172
1173 Brown, T. M., Fisk, A. T., Helbing, C. C., & Reimer, K. J. (2014). Polychlorinated biphenyl profiles in
1174 ringed seals (*Pusa hispida*) reveal historical contamination by a military radar station in
1175 Labrador, Canada. *ENVIRONMENTAL TOXICOLOGY AND CHEMISTRY*, 33(3), 592-601.
- 1176
1177 Brown, T. M., Kuzyk, Z. Z. A., Stow, J. P., Burgess, N. M., Solomon, S. M., Sheldon, T. A., & Reimer,
1178 K. J. (2013). Effects-based marine ecological risk assessment at a polychlorinated biphenyl-
1179 contaminated site in Saglek, Labrador, Canada. *ENVIRONMENTAL TOXICOLOGY AND*
1180 *CHEMISTRY*, 32(2), 453-467. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.2070>
- 1181
1182 Brugge, D., delemos, J. L., & Bui, C. (2007). The Sequoyah Corporation fuels release and the Church
1183 Rock spill: unpublicized nuclear releases in American Indian communities. *American journal of*
1184 *public health*, 97(9), 1595-1600.

- 1185
1186 Buell, M.-C., Ritchie, D., Ryan, K., & Metcalfe, C. D. (2020). Using Indigenous and Western knowledge
1187 systems for environmental risk assessment. *Ecological Applications*, 30(7), e02146.
1188 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2146>
- 1189
1190 Burger, J. (2004a). Recreational rates and future land-use preferences for four Department of Energy
1191 sites: consistency despite demographic and geographical differences. *ENVIRONMENTAL*
1192 *RESEARCH*, 95(2), 215-223.
- 1193
1194 Burger, J. (2004b). Study of the future land use of a contaminated site: Preferences versus potential use.
1195 *Remediation Journal: The Journal of Environmental Cleanup Costs, Technologies & Techniques*,
1196 14(4), 97-110.
- 1197
1198 Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. (2008). *National Classification System for*
1199 *Contaminated Sites- Guidance Document*. https://www.ccme.ca/en/res/ncscs_guidance_e.pdf
- 1200
1201 Canadian Geographic. Metis Settlements and Farms. In *Indigenous People's Atlas of Canada*. Canadian
1202 Geographic. <https://indigenouspeoplesatlasofcanada.ca/article/metis-settlements-and-farms/>
- 1203
1204 Canuel, R., Grosbois, S. B. d., Atikessé, L., Lucotte, M., Arp, P., Ritchie, C., Mergler, D., Chan, H. M.,
1205 Amyot, M., & Anderson, R. (2006). New Evidence on Variations of Human Body Burden of
1206 Methylmercury from Fish Consumption. *Environmental health perspectives*, 114(2), 302-306.
1207 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1289/ehp.7857>
- 1208
1209 Cassady, J. (2007). A tundra of sickness: the uneasy relationship between toxic waste, TEK, and cultural
1210 survival. *Arctic Anthropology*, 44(1), 87-97.
- 1211
1212 Castleden, H., Bennett, E., Lewis, D., & Martin, D. (2017). " Put It Near the Indians": Indigenous
1213 Perspectives on Pulp Mill Contaminants in Their Traditional Territories (Pictou Landing First
1214 Nation, Canada). *Progress in community health partnerships: research, education, and action*,
1215 11(1), 25-33.
- 1216
1217 Chan, H. M., Fediuk, K., Batal, M., Sadik, T., Tikhonov, C., Ing, A., & Barwin, L. (2021, 2021/06/01).
1218 The First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study (2008–2018)—rationale, design,
1219 methods and lessons learned. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 112(1), 8-19.
1220 <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-021-00480-0>
- 1221
1222 Chan, H. M., Singh, K., Batal, M., Marushka, L., Tikhonov, C., Sadik, T., Schwartz, H., & Fediuk, K.
1223 (2021). Levels of metals and persistent organic pollutants in traditional foods consumed by First
1224 Nations living on-reserve in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 112(1), 81-96.
- 1225
1226 Clark, T. (2020). *A Comparison of Tribal Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Environmental Justice at the*
1227 *EPA's Onondaga Lake and Superfund Sites* [City University of New York]. New York.
1228 https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/3739/

- 1229
1230 Contaminated Sites Management Working Group. (2000). *Federal approach to contaminated sites*.
1231 [https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/federal-approach.html)
1232 [sites/federal-approach.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/federal-approach.html)
- 1233
1234 Coté, C. (2016). “Indigenizing” food sovereignty. Revitalizing Indigenous food practices and ecological
1235 knowledges in Canada and the United States. *Humanities*, 5(3), 57.
- 1236
1237 Crown-Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2021). *Evaluation of the Northern Contaminated Sites*
1238 *Program*. [https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC/DAM-](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC/DAM-AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_ncsp21_1628679495032_eng.pdf)
1239 [AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_ncsp21_1628679495032_eng.pdf](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC/DAM-AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_ncsp21_1628679495032_eng.pdf)
- 1240
1241 Crown-Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2022). *Indigenous Peoples and Communities*. Crown-
1242 Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. Retrieved June 27 from [https://www.rcaanc-](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100013785/1529102490303)
1243 [cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100013785/1529102490303](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100013785/1529102490303)
- 1244
1245 Damman, S., Eide, W. B., & Kuhnlein, H. V. (2008, 2008/04/01/). Indigenous peoples’ nutrition
1246 transition in a right to food perspective. *Food Policy*, 33(2), 135-155.
1247 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2007.08.002>
- 1248
1249 deLemos, J. L., Brugge, D., Cajero, M., Downs, M., Durant, J. L., George, C. M., Henio-Adeky, S., Nez,
1250 T., Manning, T., Rock, T., Seschillie, B., Shuey, C., & Lewis, J. (2009, 2009/07/09).
1251 Development of risk maps to minimize uranium exposures in the Navajo Churchrock mining
1252 district. *Environmental Health*, 8(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-8-29>
- 1253
1254 Denham, M., Schell, L. M., Deane, G., Gallo, M. V., Ravenscroft, J., & DeCaprio, A. P. (2005, Feb).
1255 Relationship of lead, mercury, mirex, dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene, hexachlorobenzene, and
1256 polychlorinated biphenyls to timing of menarche among Akwesasne Mohawk girls. *Pediatrics*,
1257 115(2), e127-134. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2004-1161>
- 1258
1259 Doyle, J. R., Blais, J. M., Holmes, R. D., & White, P. A. (2012, May 1). A soil ingestion pilot study of a
1260 population following a traditional lifestyle typical of rural or wilderness areas. *SCIENCE OF*
1261 *THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT*, 424, 110-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.02.043>
- 1262
1263 Eckert, L. E., Claxton, N. X., Owens, C., Johnston, A., Ban, N. C., Moola, F., & Darimont, C. T. (2020).
1264 Indigenous knowledge and federal environmental assessments in Canada: applying past lessons to
1265 the 2019 impact assessment act. *Facets*, 5(1), 67-90.
- 1266
1267 Ellison, M. (2012). *Development of Aboriginal Lands: Successes, risks and environmental concerns*
1268 *respecting contaminated sites* Vancouver, BC
- 1269
1270 Emel, J., & Krueger, R. (2003). Spoken but not Heard: The promise of the precautionary principle for
1271 natural resource development. *Local Environment*, 8, 9-25.
- 1272

- 1273 Engwa, G. A., Ferdinand, P. U., Nwalo, F. N., & Unachukwu, M. N. (2019). Mechanism and health
1274 effects of heavy metal toxicity in humans. *Poisoning in the modern world-new tricks for an old*
1275 *dog, 10*.
- 1276
1277 Environment and Climate Change Canada. (2019, 2019-07-24). *Federal Contaminated Sites: Success*
1278 *Stories*. Environment and Climate Change Canada. Retrieved February 15 from
1279 [https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/success-stories.html#kitasoo)
1280 [sites/success-stories.html#kitasoo](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/success-stories.html#kitasoo)
- 1281
1282 EPA. (1996). *Third National Tribal Conference on Environmental Management*.
- 1283
1284 EPA. (2011a). *EPA Policy on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribes*.
1285 [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2013-08/documents/cons-and-coord-with-indian-tribes-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2013-08/documents/cons-and-coord-with-indian-tribes-policy.pdf)
1286 [policy.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2013-08/documents/cons-and-coord-with-indian-tribes-policy.pdf)
- 1287
1288 EPA. (2011b). *This is Superfund A community Guide to EPA's Superfund Program*.
1289 [http://www7.nau.edu/itep/main/hazsubmap/docs/CERCLA/ThisIsSuperfundACommunityGuideT](http://www7.nau.edu/itep/main/hazsubmap/docs/CERCLA/ThisIsSuperfundACommunityGuideToEPAsSuperfundProgram9.13.11.pdf)
1290 [oEPAsSuperfundProgram9.13.11.pdf](http://www7.nau.edu/itep/main/hazsubmap/docs/CERCLA/ThisIsSuperfundACommunityGuideToEPAsSuperfundProgram9.13.11.pdf)
- 1291
1292 EPA. (2015). *A Decade of Tribal Environmental Health Research: Results and Impacts from EPA's*
1293 *Extramural Grants and Fellowship Programs*. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-08/documents/results-impacts.pdf)
1294 [08/documents/results-impacts.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-08/documents/results-impacts.pdf)
- 1295
1296 EPA. (2017). *Revised HRS Final Rule, 40 CFR 300*. <https://semspub.epa.gov/work/HQ/100002489.pdf>
- 1297
1298 EPA. (2020). *Population Surrounding 1857 Superfund Remedial Sites*.
1299 [https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADAYNWViYjc3LTI3OGQtNDRjOC04OWU3L](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADAYNWViYjc3LTI3OGQtNDRjOC04OWU3LTExMjU2Zjg3NzBlZgAQAerw9YWvUtBNqV%2F%2FtjXe5gY%3D?realm=mcgill.ca&path=/mail/search)
1300 [TExMjU2Zjg3NzBlZgAQAerw9YWvUtBNqV%2F%2FtjXe5gY%3D?realm=mcgill.ca&path=/](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADAYNWViYjc3LTI3OGQtNDRjOC04OWU3LTExMjU2Zjg3NzBlZgAQAerw9YWvUtBNqV%2F%2FtjXe5gY%3D?realm=mcgill.ca&path=/mail/search)
1301 [mail/search](https://outlook.office.com/mail/inbox/id/AAQkADAYNWViYjc3LTI3OGQtNDRjOC04OWU3LTExMjU2Zjg3NzBlZgAQAerw9YWvUtBNqV%2F%2FtjXe5gY%3D?realm=mcgill.ca&path=/mail/search)
- 1302
1303 EPA. (2021a). *CIMC Listing* United States Environmental Protection Agency.
1304 <https://cimc.epa.gov/ords/cimc/f?p=CIMC:LIST>
- 1305
1306 EPA. (2021b). *Cleanups in My Community (CIMC)- Cleanups and Grants Listings Page*
1307 <https://cimc.epa.gov/ords/cimc/f?p=CIMC:LIST>
- 1308
1309 EPA. (2021c, September 28, 2021). *Contaminated Land*. United States Environmental Protection Agency.
1310 <https://www.epa.gov/report-environment/contaminated-land#roe-indicators>
- 1311
1312 EPA. (2021d). *Search Superfund Site Information*
1313 <https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm>
- 1314

- 1315 EPA. (2022a). *EPA ExpoBox* [Database]. EPA Expobox.
1316 <https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/risk/expobox/efhTableSearch.cfm>
- 1317
1318 EPA. (2022b). *Land Cleanup Funding Authorities Available to Tribal Governments*. Retrieved June 14
1319 from [https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-](https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-governments-0)
1320 [governments-0](https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-governments-0)
- 1321
1322 EPA. (2022c). *Land Cleanup Funding Authorities Available to Tribal Governments*. Retrieved May 27
1323 2022 from [https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-](https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-governments-0)
1324 [governments-0](https://www.epa.gov/tribal-lands/land-cleanup-funding-authorities-available-tribal-governments-0)
- 1325
1326 EPA. (2022d). *Risk Management*. Retrieved May 30 from <https://www.epa.gov/risk/risk-management>
- 1327
1328 Ferguson, K. (2021). Indigenous Environmental health research secures \$1.3M grant. *Western News*.
1329 <https://news.westernu.ca/2021/08/indigenous-environmental-health-research-secures-1-3m-grant/>
- 1330
1331 Fernández-Llamazares, Á., Garteizgogeoasca, M., Basu, N., Brondizio, E. S., Cabeza, M., Martínez-Alier,
1332 J., McElwee, P., & Reyes-García, V. (2020). A State-of-the-Art Review of Indigenous Peoples
1333 and Environmental Pollution. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 16(3),
1334 324-341. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4239>
- 1335
1336 Fitzgerald, E. F., Brix, K. A., Deres, D. A., Hwang, S.-A., Bush, B., Lambert, G., & Tarbell, A. (1996).
1337 Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) and dichlorodiphenyl dichloroethylene (DDE) exposure among
1338 Native American men from contaminated Great Lakes fish and wildlife. *Toxicology and*
1339 *industrial health*, 12(3-4), 361-368.
- 1340
1341 Fitzgerald, E. F., Hwang, S.-A., Langguth, K., Cayo, M., Yang, B.-Z., Bush, B., Worswick, P., & Lauzon,
1342 T. (2004, 2004/02/01/). Fish consumption and other environmental exposures and their
1343 associations with serum PCB concentrations among Mohawk women at Akwesasne.
1344 *ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH*, 94(2), 160-170. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-9351(03)00133-6)
1345 [9351\(03\)00133-6](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-9351(03)00133-6)
- 1346
1347 Flett, L., McLeod, C. L., McCarty, J. L., Shaulis, B. J., Fain, J. J., & Krekeler, M. P. S. (2021,
1348 2021/03/01/). Monitoring uranium mine pollution on Native American lands: Insights from tree
1349 bark particulate matter on the Spokane Reservation, Washington, USA. *ENVIRONMENTAL*
1350 *RESEARCH*, 194, 110619. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110619>
- 1351
1352 Gailus, J. (2013). *Management of Contaminated Sites on Indian Reserve Lands Site Remediation in*
1353 *British Columbia Conference*, Vancouver. [https://www.dgwlaw.ca/wp-](https://www.dgwlaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Site_Remediation_Conference_Paper.pdf)
1354 [content/uploads/2014/12/Site_Remediation_Conference_Paper.pdf](https://www.dgwlaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Site_Remediation_Conference_Paper.pdf)
- 1355
1356 Gallo, M. (2011). From wood treatment to unequal treatment: The story of the St. Regis Superfund site.
1357 *Law & Ineq.*, 29, 175.
- 1358

- 1359 Garvin, E. M., Bridge, Cas F., Garvin, Meredith S. (2018). Edible wild plants growing in contaminated
1360 floodplains: implications for the issuance of tribal consumption advisories within the Grand Lake
1361 watershed of northeastern Oklahoma, USA. *Environmental Geochemistry and Health*, 40(3), 999-
1362 1025. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10653-017-9960-3>
- 1363
1364 Goncharov, A., Haase, R. F., Santiago-Rivera, A., Morse, G., McCaffrey, R. J., Rej, R., & Carpenter, D.
1365 O. (2008, 2008/02/01/). High serum PCBs are associated with elevation of serum lipids and
1366 cardiovascular disease in a Native American population. *ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH*,
1367 106(2), 226-239. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2007.10.006>
- 1368
1369 Gover, L. (2007). Twenty Years Later-Tribes and the Superfund Program. *Natural Resources &*
1370 *Environment*, 21(3), 48-53.
- 1371
1372 Indian Act, (1985). <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-5/fulltext.html>
- 1373
1374 Government of Canada. (2012). *Report of the Commissioner of the Environmental and Sustainable*
1375 *Development- Federal Contaminated Sites and Their Impacts*.
1376 http://www.oagbvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201205_03_e_36775.html#hd5b,
- 1377
1378 Government of Canada. (2017). *Committee report- November 16-17, 2016*. .
1379 [https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/chemical-substances/chemicals-management-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/chemical-substances/chemicals-management-plan/science-committee/meeting-records-reports/committee-report-november-16-17-2016.html)
1380 [plan/science-committee/meeting-records-reports/committee-report-november-16-17-2016.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/chemical-substances/chemicals-management-plan/science-committee/meeting-records-reports/committee-report-november-16-17-2016.html)
- 1381
1382 Government of Canada. (2019). *Action plan for contaminated sites*. Government of Canada. Retrieved
1383 May 24 from [https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/action-plan.html)
1384 [contaminated-sites/action-plan.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/federal-contaminated-sites/action-plan.html)
- 1385
1386 Government of Canada. (2021). *Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory*. [https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-](https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx)
1387 [rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx](https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx)
- 1388
1389 Government of Northwest Territories. (2021). *Human Health Risk Assessment for Legacy Arsenic*
1390 *Contamination Around Yellowknife- Plain Language Summary*.
1391 [https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/arsenic_human_health_risk_assessment_summ](https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/arsenic_human_health_risk_assessment_summary_june_2021_0.pdf)
1392 [ary_june_2021_0.pdf](https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/sites/enr/files/resources/arsenic_human_health_risk_assessment_summary_june_2021_0.pdf)
- 1393
1394 Gunn K, O. N. C. (2021). Indigenous Law and Canadian Courts. *First Peoples' Law*.
1395 <https://www.firstpeopleslaw.com/public-education/blog/indigenous-law-canadian->
- 1396
1397 Haalboom, B., & Natcher, D. C. (2012). The power and peril of" vulnerability": Approaching community
1398 labels with caution in climate change research. *ARCTIC*, 319-327.
- 1399
1400 Haddaway, N. R., Collins, A. M., Coughlin, D., & Kirk, S. (2015). The role of Google Scholar in
1401 evidence reviews and its applicability to grey literature searching. *PLoS ONE*, 10(9), e0138237.

- 1402
1403 Hansen, T. (2018). Kill the Land, Kill the People: There Are 532 Superfund Sites in Indian Country!
1404 *Indian Country Today*.
- 1405
1406 Harper, B. (2007). *Traditional Tribal Subsistence Exposure Scenario and Risk Assessment Guidance*
1407 *Manual*. [https://health.oregonstate.edu/sites/health.oregonstate.edu/files/research/pdf/tribal-](https://health.oregonstate.edu/sites/health.oregonstate.edu/files/research/pdf/tribal-grant/exposure_scenario_and_risk_guidance_manual_v2.pdf)
1408 [grant/exposure_scenario_and_risk_guidance_manual_v2.pdf](https://health.oregonstate.edu/sites/health.oregonstate.edu/files/research/pdf/tribal-grant/exposure_scenario_and_risk_guidance_manual_v2.pdf)
- 1409
1410 Harper, B., Harding, A., Harris, S., & Berger, P. (2012). Subsistence exposure scenarios for tribal
1411 applications. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*, 18(4), 810-831.
- 1412
1413 Harper, B. L., Flett, B., Harris, S., Abeyta, C., & Kirschner, F. (2002). The Spokane Tribe's multipathway
1414 subsistence exposure scenario and screening level RME. *RISK ANALYSIS*, 22(3), 513-526.
- 1415
1416 Harris, S. G., & Harper, B. L. (1997, Dec). A Native American exposure scenario. *RISK ANALYSIS*,
1417 17(6), 789-795. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1997.tb01284.x>
- 1418
1419 Health Canada. (2010). *A Guide to Involving Aboriginal Peoples in Contaminated Sites Management*.
1420 https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2011/sc-hc/H128-1-10-628-eng.pdf
- 1421
1422 Health Canada. (2018). *Guidance for evaluating human health impacts in environmental assessment:*
1423 *country foods*.
- 1424
1425 Holifield, R. (2012). Environmental Justice as Recognition and Participation in Risk Assessment:
1426 Negotiating and Translating Health Risk at a Superfund Site in Indian Country. *ANNALS OF*
1427 *THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHERS*, 102(3), 591-613.
1428 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2011.641892>
- 1429
1430 Hoover, E. (2013). Cultural and health implications of fish advisories in a Native American community.
1431 *Ecological Processes*, 2(1), 1-12.
- 1432
1433 Hoover, E. (2016). " We're not going to be guinea pigs;" Citizen Science and Environmental Health in a
1434 Native American Community. *Journal of Science Communication*, 15(1), A05.
- 1435
1436 Hund, L., Bedrick, E. J., Miller, C., Huerta, G., Nez, T., Ramone, S., Shuey, C., Cajero, M., & Lewis, J.
1437 (2015). A Bayesian framework for estimating disease risk due to exposure to uranium mine and
1438 mill waste on the Navajo Nation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in*
1439 *Society)*, 178(4), 1069-1091.
- 1440
1441 Hwang, S.-A., Yang, B.-Z., Fitzgerald, E. F., Bush, B., & Cook, K. (2001, 2001/07/01). Fingerprinting
1442 PCB patterns among Mohawk women. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental*
1443 *Epidemiology*, 11(3), 184-192. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500159>
- 1444

- 1445 Hykin, J. B. (2016, September 21, 2016). *Contaminated Sites on First Nations Lands* 2016 Site
1446 Remediation Conference, Vancouver, BC. [http://www.woodwardandcompany.com/wp-](http://www.woodwardandcompany.com/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/2016-09-20-Contaminated_Sites_on_First_Nation_Lands-Final.pdf)
1447 [content/uploads/pdfs/2016-09-20-Contaminated_Sites_on_First_Nation_Lands-Final.pdf](http://www.woodwardandcompany.com/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/2016-09-20-Contaminated_Sites_on_First_Nation_Lands-Final.pdf)
- 1448
1449 Indian Country Today. (2013). Mohawks Say EPA Alcoa-Superfund Cleanup Plan Falls Short. *Indian*
1450 *Country Today*. [https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/mohawks-say-epa-alcoa-superfund-](https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/mohawks-say-epa-alcoa-superfund-cleanup-plan-falls-short)
1451 [cleanup-plan-falls-short](https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/mohawks-say-epa-alcoa-superfund-cleanup-plan-falls-short)
- 1452
1453 Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2016). *Evaluation of the Contaminated Sites On-Reserve*
1454 *(South of the 60th Parallel) Program*. [https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC/DAM-AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_css60_1511896979296_eng.pdf)
1455 [RCAANC/DAM-AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_css60_1511896979296_eng.pdf](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-CIRNAC-RCAANC/DAM-AEV/STAGING/texte-text/ev_css60_1511896979296_eng.pdf)
- 1456
1457 Indigenous Services Canada. (2020). *Annual Report to Parliament* [https://www.sac-](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-ISC-SAC/DAM-TRNSPRCY/STAGING/texte-text/annual-report-parliament-arp-report2020_1648059621383_eng.pdf)
1458 [isc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-ISC-SAC/DAM-TRNSPRCY/STAGING/texte-text/annual-report-](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-ISC-SAC/DAM-TRNSPRCY/STAGING/texte-text/annual-report-parliament-arp-report2020_1648059621383_eng.pdf)
1459 [parliament-arp-report2020_1648059621383_eng.pdf](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-ISC-SAC/DAM-TRNSPRCY/STAGING/texte-text/annual-report-parliament-arp-report2020_1648059621383_eng.pdf)
- 1460
1461 Indigenous Services Canada. (2021). *First Nations Environmental Contaminants Program*. Retrieved
1462 January 31 from <https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1583779185601/1583779243216>
- 1463
1464 Jonasson, M. E., Spiegel, S. J., Thomas, S., Yassi, A., Wittman, H., Takaro, T., Afshari, R., Markwick,
1465 M., & Spiegel, J. M. (2019, 2019/12/01). Oil pipelines and food sovereignty: threat to health
1466 equity for Indigenous communities. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 40(4), 504-517.
1467 <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41271-019-00186-1>
- 1468
1469 Jones, N. M., Rachel; Ramirez, Roberto; Rios-Vargas, Merarys. (2021, August 12, 2021). 2020 Census
1470 Illuminates Racial and Ethnic Composition of the Country. *United States Census Bureau*.
1471 [https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/improved-race-ethnicity-measures-reveal-united-](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/improved-race-ethnicity-measures-reveal-united-states-population-much-more-multiracial.html)
1472 [states-population-much-more-multiracial.html](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/improved-race-ethnicity-measures-reveal-united-states-population-much-more-multiracial.html)
- 1473
1474 Joseph, B. (2020, July 4). What is the seventh generation principle? [https://www.ictinc.ca/blog/seventh-](https://www.ictinc.ca/blog/seventh-generation-principle#:~:text=The%20Seventh%20Generation%20Principle%20is,seven%20generations%20into%20the%20future.)
1475 [generation-](https://www.ictinc.ca/blog/seventh-generation-principle#:~:text=The%20Seventh%20Generation%20Principle%20is,seven%20generations%20into%20the%20future.)
1476 [principle#:~:text=The%20Seventh%20Generation%20Principle%20is,seven%20generations%20i-](https://www.ictinc.ca/blog/seventh-generation-principle#:~:text=The%20Seventh%20Generation%20Principle%20is,seven%20generations%20into%20the%20future.)
1477 [nto%20the%20future.](https://www.ictinc.ca/blog/seventh-generation-principle#:~:text=The%20Seventh%20Generation%20Principle%20is,seven%20generations%20into%20the%20future.)
- 1478
1479 Kegler, M. C., & Malcoe, L. H. (2004). Results from a lay health advisor intervention to prevent lead
1480 poisoning among rural Native American children. *American journal of public health*, 94(10),
1481 1730-1735.
- 1482
1483 Kegler, M. C., Malcoe, L. H., & Fedirko, V. (2010). Primary prevention of lead poisoning in rural native
1484 American children: behavioral outcomes from a community-based intervention in a former
1485 mining region. *Family and Community Health*, 32-43.
- 1486

- 1487 Kegler, M. C., Rigler, J., & Ravani, M. K. (2010). Using network analysis to assess the evolution of
1488 organizational collaboration in response to a major environmental health threat. *Health Education*
1489 *Research*, 25(3), 413-424. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyq022>
- 1490
1491 Kent, T. (2016). *Tribal-Led Cleanup Activities at the Tar Creek Superfund Site* Tribal Lands
1492 Environmental Forum, https://www7.nau.edu/itep/main/iteps/ORCA/6354_ORCA.pdf
- 1493
1494 Kerfoot, W. C., Urban, N., Jeong, J., MacLennan, C., & Ford, S. (2020, 2020/10/01/). Copper-rich “Halo”
1495 off Lake Superior’s Keweenaw Peninsula and how Mass Mill tailings dispersed onto tribal lands.
1496 *JOURNAL OF GREAT LAKES RESEARCH*, 46(5), 1423-1443.
1497 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2020.07.004>
- 1498
1499 Koch, I., Dee, J., House, K., Sui, J., Zhang, J., McKnight-Whitford, A., & Reimer, K. J. (2013,
1500 2013/04/01/). Bioaccessibility and speciation of arsenic in country foods from contaminated sites
1501 in Canada. *SCIENCE OF THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT*, 449, 1-8.
1502 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.01.047>
- 1503
1504 Krewski, D., Acosta, D., Jr., Andersen, M., Anderson, H., Bailar, J. C., 3rd, Boekelheide, K., Brent, R.,
1505 Charnley, G., Cheung, V. G., Green, S., Jr., Kelsey, K. T., Kerkvliet, N. I., Li, A. A., McCray, L.,
1506 Meyer, O., Patterson, R. D., Pennie, W., Scala, R. A., Solomon, G. M., Stephens, M., Yager, J., &
1507 Zeise, L. (2010). Toxicity testing in the 21st century: a vision and a strategy. *Journal of*
1508 *toxicology and environmental health. Part B, Critical reviews*, 13(2-4), 51-138.
1509 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10937404.2010.483176>
- 1510
1511 Landrigan, P. J., Fuller, R., Acosta, N. J. R., Adeyi, O., Arnold, R., Basu, N., Baldé, A. B., Bertollini, R.,
1512 Bose-O'Reilly, S., Boufford, J. I., Breyse, P. N., Chiles, T., Mahidol, C., Coll-Seck, A. M.,
1513 Cropper, M. L., Fobil, J., Fuster, V., Greenstone, M., Haines, A., Hanrahan, D., Hunter, D.,
1514 Khare, M., Krupnick, A., Lanphear, B., Lohani, B., Martin, K., Mathiasen, K. V., McTeer, M. A.,
1515 Murray, C. J. L., Ndahimananjara, J. D., Perera, F., Potočnik, J., Preker, A. S., Ramesh, J.,
1516 Rockström, J., Salinas, C., Samson, L. D., Sandilya, K., Sly, P. D., Smith, K. R., Steiner, A.,
1517 Stewart, R. B., Suk, W. A., van Schayck, O. C. P., Yadama, G. N., Yumkella, K., & Zhong, M.
1518 (2018). The Lancet Commission on pollution and health. *The Lancet*, 391(10119), 462-512.
1519 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32345-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32345-0)
- 1520
1521 LeClerc, E., & Keeling, A. (2015, 2015/01/01/). From cutlines to traplines: Post-industrial land use at the
1522 Pine Point mine. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 2(1), 7-18.
1523 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2014.09.001>
- 1524
1525 Lewis, J., Gonzales, M., Burnette, C., Benally, M., Seanez, P., Shuey, C., Nez, H., Nez, C., & Nez, S.
1526 (2015). Environmental exposures to metals in native communities and implications for child
1527 development: basis for the Navajo Birth Cohort Study. *Journal of Social Work in Disability &*
1528 *Rehabilitation*, 14(3-4), 245-269.
- 1529
1530 Lewis, J., Hoover, J., & MacKenzie, D. (2017, 2017/06/01). Mining and Environmental Health
1531 Disparities in Native American Communities. *Current environmental health reports*, 4(2), 130-
1532 141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-017-0140-5>

- 1533
1534 Mahood, Q., Van Eerd, D., & Irvin, E. (2014). Searching for grey literature for systematic reviews:
1535 challenges and benefits. *Research synthesis methods*, 5(3), 221-234.
- 1536
1537 McAuley, C., & Knopper, L. D. (2011, 2011/06/08). Impacts of traditional food consumption advisories:
1538 Compliance, changes in diet and loss of confidence in traditional foods. *Environmental Health*,
1539 10(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-10-55>
- 1540
1541 Meltzer, G., Avenbuan, O., Wu, F., Shah, K., Chen, Y., Mann, V., & Zelikoff, J. T. (2020, 2020/12/01).
1542 The Ramapough Lunaape Nation: Facing Health Impacts Associated with Proximity to a
1543 Superfund Site. *Journal of Community Health*, 45(6), 1196-1204. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00848-2)
1544 [020-00848-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-020-00848-2)
- 1545
1546 Michelsen, T. (2010). *Superfund on Tribal Lands: Issues, Challenges, and Solutions*. [https://clu-](https://clu-in.org/conf/tio/NARPMpresents1_101211/Superfund-on-Tribal-Lands.pdf)
1547 [in.org/conf/tio/NARPMpresents1_101211/Superfund-on-Tribal-Lands.pdf](https://clu-in.org/conf/tio/NARPMpresents1_101211/Superfund-on-Tribal-Lands.pdf)
- 1548
1549 Middleton, B. R., Talaugon, S., Young, T. M., Wong, L., Fluharty, S., Reed, K., Cosby, C., & Myers, R.
1550 (2019). Bi-directional learning: identifying contaminants on the Yurok Indian reservation.
1551 *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND PUBLIC HEALTH*,
1552 16(19), 3513.
- 1553
1554 Moore-Nall, A. (2015). The legacy of uranium development on or near Indian reservations and health
1555 implications rekindling public awareness. *Geosciences*, 5(1), 15-29.
- 1556
1557 Munn, Z., Peters, M. D., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic
1558 review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping
1559 review approach. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18(1), 1-7.
- 1560
1561 National Conference of State Legislators. (2020). *Federal and State Recognized Tribes*. National
1562 Conference of State Legislators. Retrieved June 27 from [https://www.ncsl.org/legislators-](https://www.ncsl.org/legislators-staff/legislators/quad-caucus/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx#State)
1563 [staff/legislators/quad-caucus/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx#State](https://www.ncsl.org/legislators-staff/legislators/quad-caucus/list-of-federal-and-state-recognized-tribes.aspx#State)
- 1564
1565 National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. (2022). *Superfund Research Program*.
1566 <https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/supported/centers/srp/index.cfm>
- 1567
1568 *Native Land Interactive Map*. (2021). Retrieved November 12 from <https://native-land.ca/>
- 1569
1570 Nolan, C. G. (2009). Risk assessment and orphaned/abandoned mines in Canada—What role do
1571 aboriginal communities play in risk assessment? *Integrated Environmental Assessment and*
1572 *Management*, 5(3), 486-487.
- 1573
1574 OECD. (2020). *Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development in Canada*
1575 <https://doi.org/10.1787/fa0f60c6-en>

- 1576
1577 Parsons, M., Fisher, K., & Crease, R. P. (2021). Environmental Justice and Indigenous Environmental
1578 Justice. *Decolonising Blue Spaces in the Anthropocene: Freshwater management in Aotearoa*
1579 *New Zealand*, 39-73. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61071-5_2
- 1580
1581 Peters, M. D., Godfrey, C. M., Khalil, H., McInerney, P., Parker, D., & Soares, C. B. (2015). Guidance
1582 for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *JBI Evidence Implementation*, 13(3), 141-146.
- 1583
1584 Reading, C., & Wien, F. (2009). *Health Inequities and Social Determinants of Aboriginal Peoples'*
1585 *Health*. [https://www.ccsa-nccah.ca/docs/determinants/RPT-HealthInequalities-Reading-Wien-](https://www.ccsa-nccah.ca/docs/determinants/RPT-HealthInequalities-Reading-Wien-EN.pdf)
1586 [EN.pdf](https://www.ccsa-nccah.ca/docs/determinants/RPT-HealthInequalities-Reading-Wien-EN.pdf)
- 1587
1588 Reid, A. J., Eckert, L. E., Lane, J. F., Young, N., Hinch, S. G., Darimont, C. T., Cooke, S. J., Ban, N. C.,
1589 & Marshall, A. (2021). “Two-Eyed Seeing”: An Indigenous framework to transform fisheries
1590 research and management. *Fish and Fisheries*, 22(2), 243-261.
- 1591
1592 Rock, T., Camplain, R., Teufel-Shone, N. I., & Ingram, J. C. (2019). Traditional sheep consumption by
1593 Navajo people in Cameron, Arizona [Article]. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF*
1594 *ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND PUBLIC HEALTH*, 16(21), Article 4195.
1595 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16214195>
- 1596
1597 Samuel-Nakamura, C., Robbins, W. A., & Hodge, F. S. (2017). Uranium and associated heavy metals in
1598 *Ovis aries* in a mining impacted area in Northwestern New Mexico. *INTERNATIONAL*
1599 *JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND PUBLIC HEALTH*, 14(8), 848.
- 1600
1601 Sandlos, J., & Keeling, A. (2016, APR). Aboriginal communities, traditional knowledge, and the
1602 environmental legacies of extractive development in Canada. *EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES AND*
1603 *SOCIETY-AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL*, 3(2), 278-287.
1604 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.06.005>
- 1605
1606 Sandlos, J., & Keeling, A. (2016). Toxic legacies, slow violence, and environmental injustice at Giant
1607 Mine, Northwest Territories. *Northern Review*(42), 7–21-27–21.
- 1608
1609 Sarkar, A., Wilton, D. H. C., Fitzgerald, E., Sharma, A., Sharma, A., & Sathya, A. J. (2019, Apr).
1610 Environmental impact assessment of uranium exploration and development on indigenous land in
1611 Labrador (Canada): a community-driven initiative. *Environ Geochem Health*, 41(2), 939-949.
1612 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-018-0191-z>
- 1613
1614 Schmitt, C. J., Brumbaugh, W. G., Linder, G. L., & Hinck, J. E. (2006, 2006/10/01). A Screening-Level
1615 Assessment of Lead, Cadmium, and Zinc in Fish and Crayfish from Northeastern Oklahoma,
1616 USA. *Environmental Geochemistry and Health*, 28(5), 445-471. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-006-9050-4)
1617 [006-9050-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10653-006-9050-4)
- 1618

- 1619 Sistili, B., Metatawabin, M., Iannucci, G., & Tsuji, L. J. (2006). An Aboriginal perspective on the
1620 remediation of mid-Canada radar line sites in the Subarctic: A partnership evaluation. *ARCTIC*,
1621 142-154.
- 1622
- 1623 Smith, K., Luginaah, I., & Lockridge, A. (2010). Contaminated therapeutic landscape: the case of the
1624 Aamjiwnaang First Nation in Ontario, Canada. *Geography Research Forum*,
- 1625
- 1626 Teufel-Shone, N. I., Chief, C., Richards, J. R., Clausen, R. J., Yazzie, A., Begay, M. A., Jr., Lothrop, N.,
1627 Yazzie, J., Begay, A. B., Beamer, P. I., & Chief, K. (2021, Sep 6). Development of a Culturally
1628 Anchored Qualitative Approach to Conduct and Analyze Focus Group Narratives Collected in
1629 Diné (Navajo) Communities to Understand the Impacts of the Gold King Mine Spill of 2015. *Int*
1630 *J Environ Res Public Health*, 18(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18179402>
- 1631
- 1632 Tribal Superfund Working Group. (2022). *Tribal Superfund Working Group*. Retrieved January 31 from
1633 <https://triballands.org/tlac/building-relationships/tribal-superfund-working-group/>
- 1634
- 1635 Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D.,
1636 Horsley, T., & Weeks, L. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR):
1637 checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*, 169(7), 467-473.
- 1638
- 1639 Tsuji, L. J., Wainman, B. C., Weber, J.-P., Sutherland, C., Katapatuk, B., & Nieboer, E. (2005).
1640 Protecting the health of First Nation personnel at contaminated sites: A case study of Mid-Canada
1641 Radar Line Site 050 in northern Canada. *ARCTIC*, 233-240.
- 1642
- 1643 United States Government Accountability Office. (2020). *EPA Grants to Tribes- Additional Actions*
1644 *Needed to Effectively Address Tribal Environmental Concerns*. [https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-](https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-21-150.pdf)
1645 [21-150.pdf](https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-21-150.pdf)
- 1646
- 1647 US Government Accountability Office. (2019). *Superfund: EPA Should Improve the Reliability of Data*
1648 *on National Priorities List Sites Affecting Indian Tribes*. [https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-19-](https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-19-123)
1649 [123](https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-19-123)
- 1650
- 1651 US Government Publishing Office. (2016). *Examining EPA's unacceptable response to Indian Tribes*.
1652 <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-114shrg20899/html/CHRG-114shrg20899.htm>
- 1653
- 1654 van Haastrecht, M., Sarhan, I., Yigit Ozkan, B., Brinkhuis, M., & Spruit, M. (2021, 2021-May-28).
1655 SYMBALS: A Systematic Review Methodology Blending Active Learning and Snowballing
1656 [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 6.
1657 <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.685591>
- 1658
- 1659 Wang, Z., Walker, G. W., Muir, D. C. G., & Nagatani-Yoshida, K. (2020, 2020/03/03). Toward a Global
1660 Understanding of Chemical Pollution: A First Comprehensive Analysis of National and Regional
1661 Chemical Inventories. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(5), 2575-2584.
1662 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b06379>

- 1663
1664 Wiseman, C. L., & Gobas, F. A. (2002). Balancing risks in the management of contaminated first nations
1665 fisheries. *International journal of environmental health research*, 12(4), 331-342.
- 1666
1667 Woolford, J. (2017). *Consideration of Tribal Treaty Rights and Traditional Ecological Knowledge in the*
1668 *Superfund Remedial Program*. <https://semspub.epa.gov/work/HQ/500024668.pdf>
- 1669
1670